

sense, one book; nor does the moral code of the New Testament obtain in the Old. Still the later sprang out of the earlier, and the one throws light upon the other. Mr. Bruce does well, in the volume before us, to interpret for us the meaning of Old Testament Ethics just as they were, bringing out the significance of this teaching to the people to whom it was first given. This he does admirably, more especially in his interpretation of Israel's Code of Duty, and of the Law of the Ten Words—what these taught plainly and directly, and what they involved more than actually expressed. We share his views in regard to Hebrew knowledge of a future state. His remarks on the later Ethics of Judaism are clear and deep.

THE WORLD AND THE WRESTLERS. PERSONALITY AND RESPONSIBILITY. (The Bohnen Lectures for 1895.) By Hugh Miller Thompson, Bishop of Mississippi. 8 vo., pp. 142. \$1. New York: Thomas Whittaker; Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

The topic, selected by the lecturer and illustrated by the character of Jacob, gives full scope to his vigorous diction, incisive humour, and abundant flow of appropriate words. It deals with truly great thoughts, the Personality and Responsibility of God and of Man. Personality and Responsibility as correlative facts underlie every moral code, and the clearness of our perception of them is the strength of our Western civilization. The bishop speaks with unusual plainness as to the character and imperfections of Jacob, but he claims that the genuine picture presented by the Bible is a proof of inspiration which no "higher criticism" can touch. The easy style of the lecturer makes the study of the book a delightful duty, and the thoughts throughout are deeply impressive.

OTHERS. By Rev. D. V. Lucas. London: C. H. Kelly, 1894.

Those who can use this tract with discrimination will find it useful. The author writes ably and earnestly and with the best intentions, but we do not believe that prohibition is a lawful or effective remedy for the evils it seeks to remove.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN. By John Laidlaw, D.D. New edition, price 7s. 6d. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; Toronto: Revel Co. 1895.

To many readers the subject of this volume may seem unimportant. A Biblical psychology may be a subject that will interest the student of nature, but how will it help religion? The answer to this question is not difficult. Throughout the whole Bible, our views of man's nature—unfallen, fallen, regenerate—will greatly modify our understanding of the nature of religion. Body, soul and spirit—the spiritual man and the natural (soulish) man—phrases like these alone may caution us against the notion that we have nothing to learn about these distinctions. Dr. Laidlaw's contribution to the subject is distinctly of value. It does not go upon recent times, but whether we entirely accept his theories or not, we shall be helped and instructed by his discussions. It would be too long to set forth the points on which the writer breaks off from our German masters; but we may assure our readers that even those who are familiar with the greatest of them, Franz Delitzsch, will find they may learn something from Dr. Laidlaw.

The publisher, Mr. Thos. Whittaker, New York, has sent us an extremely handsome service book for *The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church.* It is in large and clear type, and beautifully rubricated. For the American Church it is a most valuable addition to the apparatus at the font.

NON-CHURCH GOING.

The question is much discussed whether the fact that the greatest congregations to-day are found outside the walls of the churches may not legitimately be laid at the door of the pulpit. The opinion seems to be growing, in the secular press at least, that the pulpit is becoming inefficient, and that this is the reason why men are so largely absent from church on the Lord's Day. There can be no question but

that this is a very serious condition of things for the present and future of the national life. In the West the non church going among men is very much greater than in Eastern towns and cities.

Apart from the asserted decadence of the pulpit, many theories are advanced to account for this state of things. Men are not opposed, it is said, to church going, but are too busy to go. The demands of business, the wear and tear of mercantile life, the large space business fills in the life of the average man of affairs—these things push all active thought about personal religion out of immediate range, and men go on building, building, building because the spirit of the time demands it. This seems an easy solution of the problem, but it scarcely fits the facts. Our busiest business men are more apt to be church-goers than men whose business interests never crowd or oppress them. A president of a railroad is much more likely to be seen in his place in church than a grocer in a small way. The force of habit has really more to do with this condition of things than much popular thinking and writing is disposed to see or admit. Men do not go to church because they do not. They have no reason for not going except that they do not go. It is simply an exhibition of *Sabbatic inertia*. And this kind of indifference is the most difficult of all things to overcome. If a census were taken of the reasons why non-church goers do not go to church, a very large proportion of the reasons would fall under the category of mere habit. Not excess of business crowding upon Sunday, not exhaustion from the week's toil, not opposition to church going, not pulpit inefficiency, but simply and solely the habit formed of not going, would be found to account for a very larger proportion of the absenteeism so much discussed in the press of to-day.

It is very true that the calls upon the time and interest and sympathy of men in general are much more numerous and much louder than in former days, and that in the loss of energy consequent upon these demands church-going suffers very seriously. Moreover, men require more amusement than their fathers did, they read more papers, they belong to more clubs, they spend more time in sight seeing. Social functions have a larger share and place in their lives; business, too, does seem to be a very much more serious and complex thing than a generation or two ago, and there is danger that men will let go their hold on things that have the very highest claims upon them, upon all outward habits of religion, simply because the other interests of life have so loud a voice and are so obtrusive.

The pulpit cannot afford to apologize for its mission in these times. Modern life presents more rivals to its voice than in any age since the commission was given, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel." The pulpit has more to do to-day than ever before in the history of Christian preaching. This is no time for saying or admitting that the pulpit is in its decadence. It is the greatest voice in this world. Its mission is heaven-born, and its power and authority cannot decay or die until that mission is completed and consummated in a redeemed humanity. It must go on "rebuking, reproving, exhorting, with all long-suffering," and "beseeching men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God"; its voice must be a cultured voice, an attractive voice, a voice that knows its mission and can adapt itself to the conditions of life to which it must speak its message, but in no sense can it afford to apologize for its message. It must not be afraid to tell the nineteenth century man who does not go to church, and who does not go because he does not go—"By your indifference, your indifference as a citizen, your indifference as a religious being, you are not only imperilling your own soul, but you are imperilling American civilization, American culture, American morals, the very continuance of American government in the twentieth century.—*The Churchman.*"

A STREET SERMON.

I was walking to church on Sunday evening, the fifth of August. On my way I passed seven groups of people who were listening to street preachers. I stopped a few minutes to hear the first of the orators. He stood near Glasgow Bridge, and his audience consisted of "men only." He was a very young man, not far out of his teens. He did not appear to me to have any distinct object in his address. Perhaps I am wronging him in thinking that he spoke for the sake of hearing himself speak or to attain greater freedom in speaking. He seemed to be quite happy in his work and satisfied with himself.

He had been controverting some statements on the subject of "good works." He seemed to speak in favor of good works. This itself was so great a novelty, that I could not help staying to hear more. For, as you know, the usual doctrine in many pulpits, and the special doctrine of the streets, is "do nothing" Plymouth Brethrenism.

Just as I joined the group, the speaker introduced

a new subject. I report his words as well as I can remember as follows:—

"Worldly wisdom, the wisdom of this world, what is it, and what is the good of it? A number of young men go to college, and spend a lot of money on their education. I don't know how much they spend on it. And what's the good of it? What do they learn? Why, they are made clergymen, and they teach the people nothing but foolishness. One of the things they teach is that this world goes round every twenty-four hours. But we look up to the sky and down to the earth, and we see for ourselves that this is all untrue, and that no such thing takes place. Another thing they teach is that this world is a globe, that it is round. Now how could they find that out, except they went outside the world and looked at it, to see if it was round? And the worst of it is that they take the little children (the poor little children would be right enough, if these clergymen would only leave them alone), they take the children, and get them into schools and teach them all this rubbish. And what's the good of this wisdom? It's what the Bible says it is, sensual, devilish."

I kept my countenance while the speaker went on. His oration was so wonderful that I would have been very sorry to interrupt it by even a smile. I do not know what the rest of the audience felt, but all were quietly attentive. I passed on, though I was greatly tempted to stay and hear the rest. I was amused; perhaps I ought to have been saddened. Some people, if they heard what I did, would have had more right to be vexed. They have spent many years in the study of the subjects discussed by the speaker. They have carefully proven what he questioned or denied: they have made discoveries which have enlightened and edified the civilized world. They might "do well to be angry" at the ignorant denunciation of their patient and productive toil. They might laugh, but they could not fail to be disappointed and annoyed.

Be it so. Let us confess that they are justified in feeling as they do about such things. Now is the time to make an appeal to them, and to ask them to sympathize with others who suffer as they do. I use the word "suffer" advisedly, for though both scientific and religious men may despise ignorant cavils; yet they must, for the sake of truth, be sorry for the people who oppose the truth and for those who are hindered in their search for it.

Our appeal is to scientific men, masters and students. The example adduced is enough to show you that your cherished discoveries are ridiculed and repudiated by people who are unwilling or unable to understand them. You are justly indignant at some of us, who care nothing for your work or its great results. We pray you, therefore, to beware, lest you copy the example of the preacher at Glasgow Bridge. Some of you are as unfair to religion, as some of us are unfair to science. Can you not see that ignorance is the cause of the unfairness in both cases? People who do not understand the researches of scientific men make a mock of their wisdom. And people who do not understand "the wisdom that cometh from above" make fun of things that are "too high for them."

You do not confess the justice of our appeal. No, I did not expect you to do so. You have a ready answer for me. You tell me that the cases are quite different. The facts of science are facts, but the alleged facts of revelation are only fictions. It is, therefore, idle and wrong to question the conclusions of science; it is fair and reasonable to scoff at the delusions of religion.

Your argument is founded on the alleged certainty of scientific facts, and the alleged uncertainty of religious dogmas. Our answer is, that there is no such difference between the two. On the contrary, both have their certainties and uncertainties.

As to science in the first place. You have, perhaps, read the interesting address delivered by an eminent statesman as president of the British Association at its meeting in 1894. His subject is the "Enigmas of Science." He passes from one subject to another, showing how far research has been successful, and showing also where it is obliged to confess its failure. Christian apologists take the same method. They claim that certain truths have been established on evidence that cannot be resisted; and they, like Lord Salisbury, are ready to acknowledge that there are "enigmas" in the subject to which they have devoted their lives.

It is no answer to this argument to say that science is a perfectly proved thing as far as it goes, but that religion lacks perfect proof for even its elementary statements. On the one hand, who can tell how far the alleged certainties of science may be modified—some of them at least—when the enigmas are solved? And, on the other hand, if religion cannot claim the same kind of proofs that science does, are its proofs on that account less convincing. Nay, do we not find in the nature of the evidence all that could be expected, if not all that could be desired?

One more point, and that a most important one.

Here it part religion day.

In the advantage Lord of the world, that the Lord knows the certainty of the evidence.

It is a ment.

and ignorant attention those who less from this world.

Religion or denial science unto us religion.

ningly—that we have that the Bible.

When enigma light.

Of course who de But it is in God's mystery.

Hor

J. T. L.

PERU Church of two this year, Troy, liarily of the large the first the na

BEL death friends as Cur charge himself kindly stance earned made partic He ha be gre if we tic Se Mond Celeb Rev. ohora hymn gave the " xiii. 7 verse praye comm asking heav clear prayi betw teach Amor in the prais His pass God mem mere "com faith act c ers,