

will be called for; and, when that time comes, we earnestly request that the translator will add to our obligations to her by returning to the method of the original in one important respect. In the English edition the title of the whole volume, "The Ancient World and Christianity," occupies the top of the left-hand page from beginning to end, while the subject of the chapter occupies the top of the right-hand page. In the French edition, each page has a heading of its own; and these headings serve as a useful analysis. The title of the whole work is quite useless as the heading of a page. On the other hand, whereas Dr. Pressensé has given us only a table of contents, Mrs. Holmden has given us both that and an index.

The concluding paragraph of the volume gives a very fair idea of the manner in which the translation has been executed :

Qu'on le veuille ou non, sa croix devait marquer la limite entre deux mondes et partager l'histoire. Elle répondait à tout le passé et elle allait enfanter un monde nouveau qui, dans ses pires révoltes, ne devait jamais parvenir à l'arracher. Encore aujourd'hui, elle le domine, soit qu'il l'acclame, soit qu'il la maudisse.

Whether men will have it so or no, the Cross of Christ divides two worlds, and forms the great landmark of history. It interprets all the past; it embraces all the future; and however fierce the conflict waged around it, it still is, and shall be through all ages, the symbol of victory.

The work, either in the original or in Mrs. Holmden's English rendering of it, may be safely recommended to all those who wish for information on the subject of which it treats: and those who are already well acquainted with the subject will find a good many bright thoughts and just reflections upon topics already familiar to them. It affords real help towards understanding the moral and spiritual void which it has been the mission of Christianity to fill.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Reviews.

The Skein Unravelled. A Course of Lectures, in the form of Dialogue, on the Main Points of Christianity. In nine numbers. By the Very Rev. Canon DUCKETT, D.D. Jarrold and Sons, London and Norwich. 1888.

THESE lectures, or dialogues, in nine cheap numbers, are some of the latest proselytizing tracts of the Romish faction in England. We understand that they have had some success in undermining the faith of some, and it is this rather than their intrinsic merit which induces us to notice them. For in them there is indeed nothing new in the way

of matter, though the form is somewhat novel. And first a word as to the form of these tracts. A controversial tract, written in dialogue, and thus apparently giving the opponent the power of defending his positions, has the appearance of candour. But it is nothing more than the appearance. It is, in fact, a most insidious method of controversy, for the opponent is of course made to say exactly what the chief disputant desires that he should say, in order that his full artillery may be brought to bear; and he is always conveniently silenced and done for at the end of the tract; thus giving the idea that the battle has been won, when, in fact, it has never been fought. Certainly in this case the disputant invited letters stating difficulties to be sent to him, but he only quotes one (Part VI.), and that he certainly does *not* answer.

The first dialogue is with an unbelieving inquirer, and this is ingeniously adapted to show that the proper temper for an inquirer is a wish to believe, to have a bias towards believing if only the facts can be produced. It is necessary to establish this position for the sake of what is to follow. For granted that one ought to desire to believe, the facts adduced will be received with a more favourable construction, and not be so closely scrutinized. The second tract is an argument with the sceptic on the existence of God. It is rather clumsily stated, and in the midst of it comes in the gentle and apparently harmless appeal, "If you will allow me to assume for the present what I trust to prove in the future, viz., that the Roman Catholic Church is the only depository of true Christian doctrine," etc. Here too, then, there is an eye to the future. In the third number the Theist is very well taught by the Christian the necessity of a revelation. In the fourth it is endeavoured to prove to the "Nonconformist" the necessity of a Church and the insufficiency of the Bible by itself. In this dialogue we have a curious specimen, very artfully done, of the Romanist practice of disparaging the Scriptures. First we have the extraordinary assertion put into the mouth of the Nonconformist, but not contradicted, that the *originals* of the books of Scripture are lost, and that the Scriptures only exist "in very ancient translations or versions." This attempt to canonize the Vulgate is somewhat too audacious. What! are the old and famous codices, over which so many battles have been fought, to be absolutely ignored? Is the Septuagint to be the only source of the Old Testament Scriptures, and Versio Itala of the New? This well accords with the sneer at the English authorized version as "King James's Bible," and with the further depreciatory remark, which is altogether an exaggeration, that "For centuries the Bible as we have it now *did not exist*. Scattered through various local churches were different parts of the New Testament—a copy of a gospel here, a letter from Paul or Peter or James or John there—and these were kept carefully stored as precious treasures, so that the reading of the Bible by all Christians was then, even as it is now, an impossibility." We appeal to anyone at all conversant with the subject whether this is not a mere caricature of the formation of the New Testament Canon. The purpose, of course, is evident. In the fifth number an "Anglican" is brought in to be instructed as to what is the one true Church. The "Catholic" starts with introducing a gross fallacy, which the poor Anglican is made humbly to accept. He professes to prove from

the Articles that the Church of England holds all those churches which have erred in matters of faith to be cut off from the true Church. The Anglican is made to talk feebly about an invisible Church, instead of relying in the words of Canon 30: "It was far from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches in all things which they held and practised." Presently we have another hit at the Anglican Church: "How many times had not the Articles to be remodelled and *changed*? How many times has not your Prayer-book been reconstructed?" And this from a member of a Church who is bound to accept the entire reconstruction of the creeds of the Church by the creed of Pope Pius IV., and the remodelling of Christianity itself by the illustrious Pope Pius IX.! At page 12 in this number occurs what we may really describe as a beautiful argument! "Shall we agree upon this, that if Christ instituted a Church with a central authority, and no other Bishop throughout Christendom even claims that authority, except the Bishop of Rome, then we must allow that he is the central authority," etc. This is marvellous fine logic! A *claim* establishing a right!

But the assurance of the Canon is unbounded. He says of controversies that they are absolutely settled and quieted when Rome once speaks. We hardly think the writer is quite delivered from controversies even yet in his own Church. Father Curci and others seem still to have something to say. But there is such a thing as creating a solitude and calling it peace; and the pusillanimous silence of the late protesting party at the Vatican Council does little honour to their faith or morals. The Canon asserts that the Anglican missions to the heathen have altogether failed, and to prove this, quotes the *North British Review*, edited by a Presbyterian divine, and a careless passage in the *Christian Remembrancer* of 1859! This he calls "distinct evidence." About as good, certainly, as the opinion of Lord Macaulay, which he proceeds to quote, as to the character of the Anglican Church. Then he sums up the glories of Rome: "She alone is one with a wonderful unity; she alone has propagated the name of Christ throughout the world; she alone *claims* to have with her yet the gift of miracles. She alone is conspicuous as the object of the hatred and calumnies of the world." We ask is there not a cause? Her tender mercies towards England are represented by the fires of Smithfield, the Spanish Armada and the Gunpowder Plot; her love of the Netherlands by the hundred thousand victims of Alva's butchery; her love of France by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Dragonades, and unutterable horrors; her love of Spain by the sickening atrocities of the Inquisition and the autos da fé. Truly Rome must learn to disclaim her past a little more loudly before she can put in for the tender regard of the nations of the earth.

Two false assertions meet us at this point of the Dialogues. Peter, says the Canon, means Rock, and to that Apostle alone Christ gave the keys of His kingdom. The meaning of Peter (*πετρος*) is not Rock (*πετρα*), but "of the rock;" and thus St. Augustine, in his "Retractions": "I have said in a certain place of the Apostle Peter that it was on him as on a rock that the Church was built. But I know that since that, I have often

“explained these words of our Lord, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church,’ as meaning upon Him Whom Peter had confessed, so that Peter *taking his name* from this rock would represent the Church which is built upon this rock; *for it is not said to him, Thou art the rock, but Thou art Peter.* But the rock was Christ, Whom because Simon Peter thus confessed, as the whole Church confesses Him, he was named Peter;” and so Chrysostom, “On this faith and confession I will build My Church.” Neither was it to Peter alone that the keys were given. The *meaning* of the keys is explained by the next words, “Whatsoever thou shalt bind,” etc.; and precisely the same power is given to all the Apostles (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23). After a curious misrepresentation of the Early English Church History, we arrive, at page 13, at a sweet little simple truth, told us in the words of the Penny Catechism, viz., that the Pope is *infallible!* We take the liberty here of giving a passage from another Roman Catholic writer, and a very learned one: “To prove the dogma of Papal Infallibility from Church history, nothing less is required than a complete falsification of it. The declarations of Popes which contradict the doctrines of the Church, or contradict each other (as the same Pope sometimes contradicts himself), will have to be twisted into agreement, so as to show that their heterodox or mutually destructive enunciations are at bottom sound doctrine, or, when a little has been subtracted from one dictum and added to another, they are not merely contradictory, and mean the same thing.”¹ How any sane and honest man, who is, in the most superficial way, acquainted with Church history, can talk about Papal infallibility is an absolute enigma.

The Canon has now destroyed the whole army of his opponents, and, riding onwards in triumph, he proceeds to instruct his vanquished foes and other faithful children in the higher mysteries of the faith. We shall say nothing of the Tract on Mass and Benediction. The subject is too solemn and too melancholy. We only remark in passing that, since the days of Paschasius Raderb, who invented the materializing doctrine in the ninth century, this doctrine has been the bane of the Church. Neither have we much to say as to the Dialogue on the Incarnation and Sacraments, in which the catechumen seems to have rather the best of it, except to remind the Canon that *Religion* is not derived from *religare*, but *relegere*, as Cicero has taken the trouble to tell us: “Sunt dicti religiosi a relegendo.” But that is a trifle. We come now to No. 9, “Indulgences and Purgatory.” It must be a hard and ungrateful task for any man possessed of the average amount of sense and honesty to sit down deliberately to defend such wild and fantastic fictions as are included under these names. The Canon appears to feel himself somewhat hampered in coming to treat of these monstrous inventions. “I am about to speak,” he says, “on a subject very difficult to treat before an audience such as the present.” And then he goes on to say that no doctrine has been “so misrepresented, travestied, and belied” as that of Indulgences. Naturally enough, inasmuch as so absurd and profane a doctrine both excites the ridicule of the careless, and offends the con-

¹ “The Pope and the Council,” p. 49.

sciences of the devout. This doctrine is professedly grounded on that saying of our Lord to His Apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc. ; and from this it is inferred that there is a great store of the inexhaustible merits of Christ and the superabundant merits of the saints on which the Church can draw, after the manner of writing a cheque on a bank, and thus transfer to the properly qualified, so as to do away with their penance, and to relieve them of some of the pains of Purgatory. It is denied by the Canon that Indulgences can be granted to souls in Purgatory. But this is the merest quibble. For he admits that they may be granted to the living and "applied to the souls in Purgatory by those who gain them," so that it only needs the intervention of a third party. Moreover, they can be granted to the living not only for this life, but also for Purgatory, inasmuch as they are sometimes granted for 56,000 years. We take the liberty of presenting the reader with a view of Indulgences, not written by a "heretic," or even a Reformer, but by a devout son of the Church in the fifteenth century, who by his position as Chancellor of the University of Oxford probably knew as much about them as the learned Canon : "Sinners nowadays say "I care not what, and how many, evils I have committed before God, "because very easily and very quickly I can have plenary remission of "every fault and penalty by absolution and the Indulgence conceded to "me by the Pope, whose writing or grant I have bought for fourpence, "or sixpence, or for a game of ball.' For they who grant letters of Indulgence run about through the country and sometimes give a letter for "twelvepence, sometimes for a good draught of wine or ale, sometimes "for a game of ball if they be beaten, sometimes as a payment to a courtisan, sometimes for mere favour Oh, how blind are they who "say such things! For how can he be loosed from chains who is still "held fast in chains? How can he be loosed from sins who does not "leave them, nor do the works required by God?"¹ It has been well pointed out that Indulgences, even when most fittingly used, destroy the idea of devotion, inasmuch as the acts of devotion are thus done for a certain price and not of free will ; are inconsistent with Scripture, inasmuch as there can be no superabundant merits of saints, "When ye have done all, say we are all unprofitable servants ;" and even if valid, would be mischievous, inasmuch as they take away the penance deemed requisite for purging and purifying.² As regards the "modern invention" of Purgatory, the Canon thinks that he settles this "once and for ever," and establishes the Scriptural truth of the doctrine by quoting a passage from the Second Book of Maccabees ! Truly, a stable foundation on which to build this portentous doctrine affecting so fundamentally the Christian Church ! The two passages quoted from St. Matthew are so palpably strained and misinterpreted that it is not worth while to discuss them. We meet the Canon's passage from the Apocrypha by another from that book : "The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to

¹ Gascoigne, "Liber Veritatum," pp. 91-125 (ed. Rogers).

² See Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons," pp. 102-4.

die, and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction, but *they are in peace*" (Wisd. iii. 1-3). It must, indeed, be a sorry and a miserable condition for anyone to accept the doctrine of the horrible figments of purgatorial fire in place of the sublime consolation conveyed to the mourner in our Burial Service from the inspired Apostle, "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may *rest from their labours*" (Rev. xiv. 13).

GEORGE G. PERRY.

Augustinische Studien, von HERMANN REUTER. Gotha, 1887. Pp. 516. 8vo.

This is one of the numerous works which tend to prove that during the last twelve or fifteen years there has been a great revival of interest in the teaching of St. Augustine. Scarcely a year passes without one or two volumes appearing in England, Germany, or America on the subject. New translations also of select treatises of Augustine are constantly being produced, among which the noble series which is being edited by Dr. Philip Schaff deserves special mention.

The present volume consists of seven essays or "studies," five of which have already appeared in Brieger's *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, but have been enlarged and partly rewritten. The remaining two are published here for the first time. The subjects are comprehensive and interesting; and from time to time the author supplies his readers with very convenient summaries of the results which he believes himself to have established. Upon these he asks for the criticisms of those who have been investigating the same field, his object being, not to advocate any views of his own respecting Augustine and his teaching, but simply to establish the truth about them by a methodical and comprehensive use of the very ample materials that exist.

The subjects of the seven studies are as follows: (1) The doctrine of the Church and the motive of the Pelagian controversy. (2) A contribution to the question of the relation of the doctrine of the Church to the doctrine of predestinating grace. (3) The Church as "the Kingdom of God," with special reference to *De civitate Dei*, xx. 9. (4) Augustine and the Catholic East. (5) The Episcopate and the Church; the Episcopate and the Roman See; the council and tradition; the infallibility. (6) Secular life and monasticism; secular knowledge and mysticism. (7) A contribution to an estimate of Augustine's position in the history of the Church. The author is particularly anxious that this last essay should be regarded as a contribution, and nothing more. It is deliberately confined to certain definite issues, and does not attempt to cover the whole ground.

It will be seen from the above summary of contents that the first two studies form a pair, and deal with the question of Pelagianism. To many readers they will appear to be the least interesting portion of the volume. It requires a special condition of mind to be able to take much interest in the interminable controversy over the insoluble problems connected with

man's free will and God's free grace. No wise man will believe that he is in possession of a satisfactory answer to them. It is better to accept the apparent contradictions which they involve as the necessary accompaniments of a nature which feels that it is free and knows that it is frail. We pass on, therefore, to notice some of the results collected for us by Herr Reuter in the third essay.

He believes that in the whole of Augustine's writings there is not a single passage which asserts that the historical Church, constitutionally organized under episcopal government, is the kingdom of God. When Augustine says the Church is the kingdom of God, he uses "Church" in the wider sense of the *communio sanctorum*. The *De civitate Dei* was not written to determine the relations between Church and State, but to defend Christendom against heathendom. The *civitas Dei* is primarily the visible Church, secondarily the communion of saints. Conversely, the *civitas terrena* signifies primarily the heathen state; secondarily, the *societas improborum*, which will continue until the end of the world, in spite of the Gospel.

In the fourth study it is pointed out that, according to the view of Augustine and his contemporaries, there was only one Catholic Church in East and West. There was no such thing as a particular "Greek Church." Nevertheless, continued ignorance of Latin in the East and decreasing knowledge of Greek in the West were producing comparative estrangement between West and East. At the beginning of the fifth century there were still not a few in Numidia, and specially in Hippo, who knew Greek. Augustine underrated his own attainments in this respect. He could translate Greek writings without help, if not without difficulty. He prepared the way for the separation between East and West, not by his ignorance of Greek, but by the influence which his own fertile mind exercised upon the course taken by Western theology. But the tendency to a separate development had shown itself in Tertullian and Ambrose before it was emphasized by Augustine.

The lengthy essay which forms the fifth study treats of Augustine's teaching on the subject of episcopacy. In form, his teaching does not differ essentially from that of Cyprian, but in tone it is less pronounced. Partly from circumstances, partly from temperament, Augustine was less of a prelate, less of an ecclesiastical statesman, than his great predecessor. He nowhere cares to insist that submission to the Bishop is a condition of Church membership; and his tendency is to tone down rather than to accentuate the distinction between clergy and laity. The idea of a universal priesthood is several times broached in a comprehensive and decided manner. His doctrine of a *sacramentum ordinis* was put forward, not to promote hierarchical interests, but to oppose the Donatists. It was dictated by expediency, and does not harmonize well with other elements of his teaching. His utterances also respecting the Roman See lack precision and consistency. There are passages in which he seems to allow to it the right to decide in matters of doctrine, and there are other passages in which he clearly denies that it has any gift of infallibility. His attempt to defend Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, shows that Augustine

did not ascribe infallibility to the Roman Church, and still less to its Bishop. It is possible that this want of clearness and decidedness on the subject of the infallibility of the Church has its source in his indecision concerning the respective claims of authority and reason, and of faith and knowledge.

In the sixth essay, Herr Reuter endeavours to form a precise estimate respecting Augustine's attitude towards secular life. Augustine bewails the moral condition of society in the Roman Empire, and recognises the necessity of reform; but he has nothing practical to suggest—for in order to reform society you must mix with it, and that is perilous to the soul. The Christian's duty is to fly from the world. But he who thus goes out of the world must continue to work for it. In the *Liber de Opere Monachorum*, which is perhaps the most important work in the history of industry since the end of the fourth century, there are ideas developed, which, if they had been realized in practice, must have worked a social revolution in the Roman Empire. The moral duty of work and the dignity of labour are defended with great ability; a monasticism that is purely contemplative is condemned; and the idea that work and prayer are antagonistic is denied.

With regard to estimating Augustine's position and influence, the time for such work (Herr Reuter thinks) has not yet come. We need a critical edition of his works, a critical study of his Latinity, a revision of the chronology of his letters, further investigations into the social and intellectual condition of North Africa in his time, in particular into the rhetorical schools there, as well as in Rome and in Milan; and a more comprehensive study of his philosophy and its sources. And then, when all this is done, we need the right man. He must have something more than learning and culture and critical power. He must be a believer, who lives his belief. To understand the historical development of Christianity without understanding Christianity itself is impossible; and to understand Christianity one must live the Christian life. To an outsider the history of the Christian Church is necessarily a revolting caricature. The real springs of action are to him invisible. He sees only the play of the worst passions and the blindest fanaticism. Only a Christian who is such from his heart can give us a genuine history of the Church. The writer concludes with a wish, rather than a hope, that he may live to see this great work accomplished.

A. PLUMMER.

Christ, the Key of the Psalter. With especial reference to the Titles. By an Oxford Graduate. Elliot Stock. 1888.

“To the chief musician, Michtam of David.’ Now ‘Michtam’ is a word of which a threefold interpretation has been offered, and if we accept all three, as we well may, each and all will be beautiful both with the Divine beauty of Christ and with mystical truth.” These three interpretations are, *first*, “hidden;” “most truly the fifty-sixth is a Psalm celebrating the love and grace of the *Hidden One*.” . . . “Only faith which strives not to know, but well believes the mystery of the Eternal Generation, can tell

the glory of the Hidden One." *Secondly*, "'Michtam' may be interpreted to mean an inscription engraved upon a pillar of victory . . . the joyful memorial of the resurrection and of the awaking of Him Who had been there hidden in the burial-hour." *Thirdly*, "Michtam is in the margin of our Authorized Version translated . . . a Golden Psalm . . . By this derivation the word shines with a very splendour of mystical glory. For the sixteenth Psalm sings not only of the Resurrection, but celebrates also the Ascension to the right hand of the Father, the meridian glory, for ever undescending and eternal, of the glorified Manhood of Him Who is the Sun of Righteousness."—P. 161 *seq.*

What can we say in sober criticism of all this? The author is impressed with the belief that in the titles of the Psalms "a very beautiful portion of God's Holy Word suffers a most unhappy neglect," and after stating somewhat discursively his reasons for believing in their inspiration, deduces interpretations such as the above. He gives us often interesting reading, drawing largely upon the stores accumulated by the Bishop of Derry and the late Bishop of Lincoln, but, as with most Patristic comments and Jewish Midrashes, the question is continually recurring, what is the basis for all these devotional thoughts and fine-drawn allegorizings? In this case, at least, no clear answer is given. If, indeed, the author were a converted Jew, holding fast to the tradition of every letter of Holy Writ being inspired by God, his position would be clear enough, for he could answer with the Cabbalists that the fact that the letters of these titles can be made to refer to Christ proves that they were meant to refer to Christ; but we hardly suppose that this theory would commend itself to any "Oxford Graduate" of to-day.

Probably he holds the ordinary view that contained in the inspired Scriptures there are some passages which refer directly to Christ, and others which refer to Christ in a secondary sense. It is thus apparently that he is able to see in these titles such constant reference to Christ. But he should be logical and clear. Let him state clearly which titles he thinks have a direct reference to Christ, and which refer to Christ only secondarily.

But we confess that personally we wish he had adopted another method. The longing to see Christ in every part of the Bible is perfectly intelligible and perfectly right, but he forgets that he may legitimately see Christ in every part without in the least yielding to interpretations which cannot be defended by sound principles of grammar and of historical exegesis. We wish that he could have plainly said, "These titles do not, indeed, refer either directly or indirectly to Christ on any sound principles of grammar or exegesis, and yet, for all that, they have given me very blessed and useful thoughts of Christ which I wish others also to learn." For this is legitimate. The Christian reader may be pointed to Christ by almost every verse of Scripture if he only reads it in the right spirit. The passage may have no direct or secondary reference to Christ, and yet may point the soul to Christ by reminding it of some principle which is only to be found in its fulness in Christ. For every principle of the good and the holy has its full measure nowhere but in Christ. Every mention,

therefore, of anything good in itself may point the Christian away from the passage he is reading to think of Him in Whom the principle was carried out to the full, and thus the Old Testament becomes to the thoughtful reader full of Christ, towards Whom, indeed, its faintest yearnings were ever directed.

If this be true there is no need for the Christian to ask, Is Christ to be legitimately seen here or seen there? Does this verse point to Christ, or is it merely historical? The question is, Does this verse contain any principle of abstract truth—not mere fact, but some branch of truth? For if so, it points to Christ, not as it were purposely or by any special intervention of God, but because it points to a principle which is satisfied in Christ alone. To give an example of what we mean: Is it legitimate to see the Atonement in Rahab's scarlet line? The Fathers do so as a matter of course; moderns merely laugh at such a notion. The truth lies with neither. The passage assuredly does not point to Christ's death in the sense that it was directly inserted by the Holy Ghost with the express and particular aim of leading men to hope for the death of Christ; but in itself, what is it? Something, the natural colour of blood, is the means of deliverance. The Christian, as he reads it, cannot but be led to think of that Blood which was the means of a greater deliverance; cannot but be reminded of the atoning work of the Saviour. It may be thought that this is only one more "drash," but this is hardly the case, for the Jewish "drash" was intimately connected with the Jewish view of inspiration that every single letter was inspired, and that combinations and permutations of the very letters were allowable. But the modern Christian values the broad principle that truths find their fulfilment only in Christ, and, bearing in mind the all-ruling guidance of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the books of the Old Testament, obtains the allusion to Christ not from the letter but from the fundamental truth underlying each historical expression. The modern Christian holds that the *à priori* view that every letter of Scripture in the original tongue was directly inspired is not yet proved, and he therefore desires chiefly to discover the true grammatical meaning and historical reference of each word, satisfied that in that meaning and reference lies necessarily a pointing away from itself to the Person in Whom all principles of truth really find their completion. "The Law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," not merely by types and predictions, but by telling us truths which find their satisfaction in Christ alone.

This, it is evident, is not the method pursued by the author of this book. He would at once repudiate it as insufficient. But it at least encourages the most patient inquiry into the grammatical and historical meaning, not severing us from modern scholarship, and yet enabling us to see Christ throughout the Old Testament. It becomes possible for the most critical scholar to see Christ in almost every verse. Each noble, or generous or kind action, by whomsoever performed, is an imperfect specimen of the same kind of action seen in its perfection in Christ; each yearning of an Old Testament saint for communion with God is seen in its fulness only in Christ; each hint of sacrifice for sin, each thought that nothing but the consecration of a life avails, each

sign of opposition to evil, find their completion only in Christ. The whole of the Old Testament thus becomes one great finger-post inscribed "To Christ."

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

The Gospel of St. John: an Exposition exegetical and homiletical, for the Use of Clergymen, Students, and Teachers. By Rev. THOMAS WHITELAW, M.A., D.D. Glasgow: Maclehose and Sons. 1888. Pp. lxii., 464.

Dr. Whitelaw has already made himself a name as an expositor of Scripture by his work on Genesis for the *Pulpit Commentary*, which has now gone through several editions. The present volume is very much on the same plan. There is, first of all, a comprehensive Introduction, and then the text of the Gospel is commented upon section by section in a twofold manner—first, with a view to the student or lecturer, and, secondly, with a view to the preacher. In the phraseology of the title-page, the first commentary on each section is "exegetical," the second "homiletical." And it is encouraging at the outset to notice that the first commentary is almost invariably the longer of the two. The explanation of the text is full without being tedious, and the homiletics are terse and compact.

It is often remarked that the clergy at the present time either make for themselves, or have thrust upon them, such an immense amount of secular and other work, that they have no time to make adequate preparation for preaching: and the remark, in a very large number of cases, is grievously true. With all kinds of benevolent organizations to start and keep going, with schools to direct and teach in, with a dense population to visit, and frequent services to conduct, how is a clergyman to find sufficient time for study and thought? On the other hand, it may be said that there never was a time when preachers had so many or such excellent manuals to help them in expounding the Scriptures to their flock, and in drawing wholesome and telling lessons from them. And a clergyman who desires help of this kind in studying for himself and explaining to others the lessons to be derived from the Gospel of St. John might do a great deal worse than put himself under the guidance of Dr. Whitelaw.

The Introduction, and especially the first section of it, which treats of the authenticity of the Gospel, is well done. The chief objections to the Apostolic authorship, and the best answers to them, are well summarized. In a few cases, perhaps, an absurd objection has been answered with unnecessary gravity. But it is not everyone who can bow a foolish opponent out of court with the irresistible good-humour and strong common-sense of the new Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, whose invaluable "Introduction to the New Testament" is already (we rejoice to see) in a third edition. If Dr. Whitelaw's readers want any further arguments on the Johannine question, let them read what Dr. Salmon has to say on it in that most delightful volume.

Common-sense is conspicuous in Dr. Whitelaw's work. He is reasonable in his decisions as to the Greek text, and in his interpretations of it. Of course every reader will find some conclusions from which he dissents, but he will find the grounds which are stated for their support well worth

considering. For instance, many persons will remain quite unconvinced that the unnamed feast in John v. 1 is a Passover; or that, in the apparent discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, as to the day on which Christ instituted the Eucharist, it is the impression derived from St. John (that the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover) which has to be corrected by the impression derived from the Synoptists (that the Last Supper coincided with the Passover), and not *vice versâ*; but Dr. Whitelaw states the case for the views which he adopts clearly and forcibly. In some cases, as in the discussion about the brethren of the Lord, he is content to repeat the chief arguments for and against each view, and to attempt no decision. No one ought to quarrel with such a course; but in one important question something more of a decision might have been attempted. Does the discourse in chapter vi. refer to the Eucharist or not? "The truth seems to be that *the idea here expressed* "of inward, believing, spiritual fellowship with the crucified and risen Christ" *was afterwards embodied by our Lord in the Holy Supper*; but whether at "the time of announcing it He had before His mind the institution of that supper, or whether this was an afterthought, 'the product of the hour of the supper itself,' cannot be determined" (p. 159). Perhaps it cannot. But certainly with this language many will not be satisfied.

There are a few slips and omissions in the volume. Thus, we read: "Christ wrought no miracles in either Judæa or Jerusalem on His last visit" (p. 14). Again, is Saul of Tarsus an example of "antecedent wickedness, even of the grossest type," being "no barrier to the reception of Divine grace" (p. 108)? And do we know that the Philippian gaoler was such an example (*ibid.*)? Is it probable, or even possible, that Peter cut off Malchus's ear with a "rapier" (p. 374)? If the woman of Sychar, by leaving her water-pot behind her, "evinced an intention to return," can she also by the same act have shown that her zeal "caused her errand to be forgotten" (p. 109)? And it is surprising that, in discussing the evidence which the Ignatian Epistles and Polycarp yield respecting the use of St. John's writings in the first part of the second century, Dr. Whitelaw gives repeated references to Lightfoot's famous articles in the *Contemporary Review*, written twelve or thirteen years ago in demolition of "Supernatural Religion," and yet makes no reference to the great work of Bishop Lightfoot's life, published comparatively recently, and exhausting the whole subject. Similarly, the discussion of the testimony of Clement of Rome shows little knowledge of the latest investigations; and the treatise by Dr. Ezra Abbott, which has absolutely settled the question, is not referred to in discussing Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel. But these are small blemishes, which can easily be remedied in a new edition. Meanwhile the volume is likely to prove of real use to many.

M. A.

