

who are well-fed, clothed, and lodged, are "conspicuous by their absence." There are not 73,000 Churchmen in the whole of old Liverpool; there are more than 188,000, or nearly three times the number, in the four townships which wrap it round. In eleven of the worst districts in the lower part, where Protestants are in a minority, and few above the grade of daily labourers, the attendance at church of both sexes and all ages was 7·6 per cent. In the same number of districts in the best parts of the town, the attendance was 5·5. Connected with this last group of churches there are 87,173 attached members of the Church of England absent from every service—an average of nearly 8000, but in one case rising to 13,105. If one-tenth of these could be visited and prevailed upon to attend, the existing churches would be insufficient for their accommodation in little more than a month.

Finally, the cost of the whole matter was a bagatelle amounting to only about a half of the original estimate. But upwards of 1,250 letters and post-cards were written, and the end is not yet. And practically there was no difficulty in obtaining replies to the inquiries; or where there was, it was not on political or sectarian grounds. I think I had two letters of remonstrance, one evidently from a working man; though a few, before stating the facts, made a mild protest, apparently more in joke than in earnest.

A. HUME.

Reviews.

The Holy Bible. (A. V.) With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A. New Testament. Vol. IV. Pp. 840. John Murray.

EIGHTEEN years have passed since this Commentary was undertaken. Its publication was commenced ten years ago, and the concluding volume is now before the public. There are six volumes of the Old Testament, and four of the New. The work is commonly called "The Speaker's Commentary." Its conception was due to the late Lord Ossington, then Speaker of the House of Commons; the idea was the Speaker's, and he maintained a lively interest in the progress of the work. That Mr. Denison's idea was carried into effect is due, in the first instance, to the present Archbishop of York. He called a meeting for forming a Committee, and took an active part in its formation. By that Committee, which comprised many Prelates and distinguished laymen, with the Regius Professors of Divinity in Oxford and Cambridge, the plan of the work was settled, and the selection of the Contributors and of the general Editor was finally approved. Archbishop Thomson, of course, became Chairman, and the practical direction of the work was entrusted to the Editor, Canon Cook.

For some years, meetings of the original Committee were held frequently, generally at the residence of the Speaker; but when questions respecting the form and character of the Commentary had been finally decided, and when the list of Contributors was completed, the execution was left to them and to the Editor, "whose responsibility extends to every part." "From first to last (the Editor relates) the work has proceeded without any clash or danger of disruption; and, as now presented to the public, it affords an attestation to the substantial unity of principles which underlies all superficial divergences of opinion within our Church."

The original list of Contributors is somewhat different from that which is presented by the successive volumes. Thus, the Editor, who originally undertook the Book of Job only, had to write portions of the Commentary on Exodus, on the Psalms, and on the portions of the Gospels left incomplete by the death of Dean Mansel. Some portions of St. Paul's Epistles, from Ephesians to Philemon, surrendered by Bishops Lightfoot and Benson, were undertaken by the Bishop of Derry, aided partly by the Dean of Raphoe. When Dr. Lightfoot became Bishop of Durham, the second Epistle of St. Peter was undertaken by Professor Lumby. Looking through the various volumes, we observe the names of Archbishop Thomson (whose masterly Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels has more than once been noticed in *THE CHURCHMAN*); Bishops Harold Browne, Lord A. Harvey, Jacobson, Jackson, Basil Jones, and Alexander; Mr. Wace; Deans Howson and Johnson; Archdeacon Rose; Canons Espin, Rawlinson, and Elliott; Dean Plumptre; Dr. Kay; Dean Payne Smith; Dr. Currey; Prebendaries Huxtable, Gandell, and Meyrick; Professors Westcott, Lumby, and Evans; Dr. Gifford, Dean Scott, Archdeacon Lee, and others.

The course of thought during the last eighteen years has shown how opportune an undertaking the "Speaker's Commentary" was, and also, as we judge, how wise the plan on which it was designed. In criticizing the Commentary, at all events, it is well to have clearly before one's eyes what are the purposes with which the work was begun and has been carried on. Disappointment, here and there expressed, we are inclined to think, is mainly due to misconception. What were the designs of the work? The able and accomplished Editor tells us. He says:—"In consequence of ever-accumulating discoveries, antiquarian and philological, public attention has been concentrated to an unprecedented extent upon the Holy Scriptures, upon the origin and history of their several Books, upon their text and their interpretation; and this attention has, for the great mass of English readers, given a new interest and importance to the Authorized Version." How do the new discoveries in philology and history bear upon this venerated translation? What corrections of its text have they rendered necessary, and what elucidations of its meaning have they afforded? "To meet this want," says Canon Cook, "was the simple and practical purpose with which our Commentary was designed, and from first to last this purpose has been steadily kept in view."

Corrected translations of all passages which required revision appear in the Notes. The design—it may be repeated—was not to supersede the Authorized Version, but to furnish the requisite corrections and elucidations. The whole work was printed before the appearance of the Revised Version. "Any coincidence, therefore, between our corrections and those of the Revisers," says Canon Cook, "is the more valuable as being undesigned and completely independent." "There is," he adds, "a close approach to agreement in passages which affect the sense, and have any bearing on doctrine. . . . When the corrections or alterations differ, the difference seldom, if ever, occurs in reference to questions of

“pure scholarship. It generally depends on the greater or less importance attached by either party to the testimony of early Versions, or of the great Fathers, and to the general judgment of the Churches.” For ourselves, it must be admitted, that on certain questions of considerable importance, especially as affecting the integrity of Holy Scripture as hitherto generally received—we hold with the “Speaker’s Commentary”—and not with the Revised Version. Turning from the translation and the text to the exposition, the Editor says:—

In respect to the explanatory matter in the Notes, great pains have been taken to present the results of laborious investigations in a condensed form. As a rule, but little space has been allowed to the discussion of interpretations dismissed as untenable by our contributors. Our object has been to put the reader at once in possession of the results of our inquiries, and to spare him the task of comparing conflicting views, especially those which appear merely speculative.

Where subjects required fuller discussion than could conveniently be afforded in notes of this character, they are dealt with separately, in essays, at the close of a book or chapter. Our object has been simply to afford the reader the necessary materials for understanding the text; and the limits of our space precluded us, for the most part, from admitting observations which did not bear directly on this purpose.

That untenable expositions have been barely mentioned, or left unnoticed, is a matter to be rejoiced over. A discussion of sceptical novelties is rarely needed, and references to weak or fanciful criticisms make the exposition tedious. To have the results of laborious and reverent inquiry in clear, terse, Notes is a real boon. As to the closing portion of the volume now before us, the Commentary on the Revelation, we can well understand that Canon Cook “reluctantly acquiesced” in the plan proposed by the Commentator; Archdeacon Lee has given a “complete view of the systems of interpretation adopted by” eminent expositors, ancient and modern; this takes up about half the volume. The Commentary on the Book of the Revelation, that is, extends to some four hundred pages. The space is too great, we think, admitting fully, as we do, the interest of the sacred Book and the industry of the pious and learned Expositor. How many of the clergy, we wonder, have leisure to study these four hundred pages? The size of such volumes, and, we may add, the expense, is a serious matter. One remark, in passing, we may venture to make. The Introduction by the Archbishop of York, and the Commentary on the Psalms, have been published in a separate form: valuable volumes they are. We hope to see another volume shortly—Canon Westcott’s wonderful work, the Commentary on St. John.

In concluding our remarks upon these ten volumes—a really noble Work, in which devout and thoughtful Christians throughout the Catholic Church may well take pleasure, and in which the Church of England has such special reason for thankfulness and pride—we venture to tender our thanks, as well to the Editor as to the Publisher, with our congratulations on the completion of so great an enterprise.

As to the volume before us a “review,” in our disposable space, is of course impossible. But to two or three out of the many passages which, as we read, we marked with a pencil in the margin, we may make a brief allusion.

In an admirable Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Dr. Kay argues strongly for the Pauline authorship. The testimony of the Eastern Church (Alexandria, Syria, Palestine, and Asia Minor), he says, is consistent and clear. The Roman Church of the first century

believed the Epistle to be St. Paul's. Jerome and Augustine stated their conviction that the Epistle was St. Paul's; from the middle of the fourth century, indeed, Latin writers were in accord with the Eastern Church. Dr. Kay's analysis of the Internal Evidence is able, and, as we think, almost conclusive. With Dean Alford, on the point of style, we could never agree. The assertion of Erasmus that the diction of the Epistle has no affinity with St. Paul's (*omnibus notis dissidet*, it differs in all features), is not now put forward by those who object to the Pauline authorship. A more stately and elaborated style in such a treatise from the many-sided man, is only what might be expected from the nature of the case. The author of this Epistle was seeking to reanimate the faith of the Hebrew Christians; but, far more, he was showing that the Statutes, Symbols, and Sacrifices of the Old Testament had been fulfilled, and, also, he was providing a store of most precious theological truth for the Catholic Church of all ages. Is it not most natural that an Epistle whose aims were so lofty should have had extraordinary pains bestowed on its composition?

On Hebrews i. 1, Dr. Kay, remarks that "at sundry times" is only an approximation to the inimitable adverb of the Greek, "many-portion-wise;" R.V. "in divers portions." For "hath appointed," v. 2, he gives "appointed" as R.V., and "through whom" instead of "by whom;" also "effulgence" instead of "brightness," v. 3, and "substance" instead of "person." Chapter ii. v. 1, Dr. Kay gives [so the R.V.] "*lest we drift away*" (the same verb as in Prov. iii. 21); and in v. 18, he renders "in that He hath suffered being Himself tempted," which we think is an improvement. In iv. 12, Dr. Kay gives for "quick and powerful," *living and active*, which the R.V. has. In verse 14, "Having then a great High Priest . . ." agrees with the R.V.; also, "*hath passed through the heavens*." As to "heard to the removing of His fear . . ." v. 7, (R.V. *having been heard for his godly fear*) we have doubts. As to verse 12, "For when *by reason of the time* . . ." (R.V.) instead of "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers," there can hardly be a doubt. Dr. Kay has, "Whereas by this time. . ." In vii. 24, Dr. Kay seems to prefer "priesthood that *passeth not away*;" A.V. "unchangeable," R.V. margin, "priesthood that *doth not pass to another*;" but he also gives, "*that passeth not*" from Him to devolve upon another, which we believe, in spite of the learned commentator's note, is the true translation.

Turning to xiii. 10, "*We have an altar* . . ." the unprejudiced student will admit that Dr. Kay's exposition is at least clear and reasonable. We quote it with pleasure:—

We have an altar by means of which our souls are upheld in health and comfort (v. 9). The Altar¹ is that on which Jesus offered up Himself "to sanctify His people" (v. 12); by which both our thank-offerings to God and our deeds of kindness to our fellow-men are hallowed (vv. 15, 16). We do not stand in need of those Levitical "meats;" we "have meat to eat which they know not of." We have an altar, of (or from) *which they that serve* (viii. 6) *the tabernacle have no right* (or power, as in 1 Cor. ix. 4) *to eat*. Only by faith (*sursum corda*) can any have "power" (comp. John i. 12) to partake of the one true Sin-offering which was offered upon that invisible altar. They who faithlessly adhere to the antiquated type *disable* themselves from feeding on the reality, which is "meat indeed" and "drink indeed" (John vi. 55).

¹ Churchmen who desire to distribute a really useful little book on the Lord's Supper, may be recommended to get *The Communicant*. On p. 121, in a short but very valuable exposition of xiii. 10, it is stated—"Christ Himself is our Altar as He is our Victim and our Priest." So elsewhere.

This is the only view regarding the nature of the "Altar" here spoken of, says Dr. Kay, which satisfies all the requirements of the context:—

It cannot be taken of *the Cross*; that was the instrument by which our Lord's death was effected; but so far was it from being as "the Altar, which sanctifieth the gift," that it stands as the outward symbol of the curse pronounced by the law (Gal. iii. 13) upon the malefactor. The cross was as little an Altar as the Roman soldiers were priests.

(2) Nor yet can it be understood of *the Lord's Table*. It is, of course, true to say that those who continued to serve the Tabernacle had no right to partake of the Lord's Supper; and if v. 10 had stood alone, this might have been what it asserted. But the argument of vv. 11, 12, compels us to carry our thoughts to the Altar on which Christ offered Himself once for all as the world's *Sin-offering*. The Lord's table is not that Altar; though it be the hallowed means by which the faithful partake of that invisible, yet alone real, altar.

That antitypal Altar was wholly outside the range of the Levitical system, because it belonged to an order of things infinitely elevated above it. On that Altar He, who went forth bearing the "reproach" of the legal high priest's anathema, was offered up; realizing in fulness of perfection everything that had been presignified by all the legal sacrifices. If, then, the fire of that antitypal Altar was "the Eternal Spirit"—the "Fire of Love" (see on ix. 14)—what could the Altar itself be but Christ's own Divine-human personality.

Chrysostom's words, that "we have our victim *above*, our priest *above*, our sacrifices *above*; let us offer such sacrifices as can be present on *that altar*," are striking. Thomas Aquinas, we may add, is quoted in Alford's Commentary as saying that the *altar* was the *cross*; but his words are ". . . the cross of Christ, or CHRIST HIMSELF."

We can only add that the Commentary on the Epistle of St. James is written by Dr. Scott, the Dean of Rochester; the Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter is the work of Canon Cook, on the Second, of Professor Lumby; the Bishop of Derry writes on the Epistles of St. John.

Facts and Men. Pages from English Church History, between 1553 and 1683. With a Preface for the Times. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool, Author of "Expository Thoughts on the Gospels," "Knots Untied," &c. Pp. 393. London: W. Hunt & Co. 1882.

THIS work is partly historical and partly biographical. Under the head of "*Facts*," appears an account, first, of Queen Mary's attempt to destroy the work of the Reformation; second, of Land's high-flying and most disastrous sacerdotalism, and third of King James's Romanizing lawlessness, under the plea of "toleration," culminating in the persecution of the Seven Bishops. Under the head of "*Men*" we find an account of the lives and opinions of six leading champions of the Reformation, the martyrs, Hooper, Roger, Taylor, Latimer, Bradford, Ridley, and of three eminent Puritan divines, Ward, Baxter, and Gurnall.

In a vigorous preface, the right reverend author remarks that the "animus" of certain attacks on the Reformers is too clear to be mistaken. The writers who make them desire to un-Protestantize the Church; and the sound, sober principles of the Reformers stand sadly in their way. They try, therefore, to damage the character of the men, and so to impair the value of their testimony. "I predict," says the Bishop, "that they will not succeed. . . . I am not afraid of the result of any amount of examination that can be applied to such men as Hooper and Latimer. . . . They will stand any properly conducted investigation. They will come out unscathed from the ordeal of any just inquiry."

Turning from the Reformers to the Puritans, Dr. Ryle remarks, with undeniable justice, that the impression of most English Churchmen about the Puritans is not correct. There were Puritans and Puritans; but to club them all together as a restless, ignorant, fanatical body, ascetics and sectarians, is most unjust, and—historically speaking—absurd. “There are some ecclesiastical orators of high rank and brilliant reputation, who are never weary of flinging the epithet ‘Puritanical’ at Evangelical Churchmen, as the hardest word of scorn that they can employ. Let no Churchman’s heart fail when he hears himself stigmatized as ‘a Puritan.’ The man who tells the world that there is any disgrace in being ‘a Puritan’ is only exposing his own ignorance of plain facts, or shamefully presuming on that widespread ignorance of English Church history which marks the Nineteenth Century.”

The very reason why many in this day dislike the Puritans is the very reason, says Bishop Ryle, “why I love them, and delight to do honour to their names. They deserve honour, in my opinion, on account of their bold and out-spoken *Protestantism*. They deserve honour on account of their clear, sharply-cut, distinct *Evangelicalism*.”

In the third portion of his Preface, the Bishop shows the relation between the Reformers and Evangelical Churchmen of the present day. As a matter of fact, the Reformers are the genuine prototypes and predecessors of a “school of thought” which, however lightly esteemed by some, is certainly not the least useful and influential within the pale of the Establishment; I mean—says his lordship, “the *Evangelical School*. . . . If agreement with the English Reformers is to be the measure of true Churchmanship there are no truer Churchmen than those who are called “Evangelical. Their title is one which cannot be overthrown. If they are wrong the Reformers are wrong. . . . The leading opinions of the two bodies, after an interval of three centuries, are one and the same.” This historical truth the Bishop explains and expands. Taking ten points, one by one, he asks, Do Evangelical Churchmen hold this? and he answers, So did the Reformers! We quote two of these points, as follows:—

Do Evangelical Churchmen hold and teach that the practice of habitual confession to a minister is nowhere taught or recommended in Scripture? Do they maintain that it is a practice to be strongly deprecated and avoided, having been proved by history to lead to most immoral and soul-ruining consequences? So did the Reformers!

Do Evangelical Churchmen hold and teach that Episcopacy is not absolutely necessary to the *being* of a Church, however useful and desirable for its *well-being*, when properly administered? Do they maintain that we have no right to unchurch non-episcopal churches, and to hand them over to the uncovenanted mercies of God? So did the Reformers!

The Bishop commends these ten points to the calm consideration of all his readers. The passage—we make no apology for quoting it—is characteristic:—

I do not, for a moment, say that no man is a sound Churchman unless he holds all distinctive Evangelical views about them. But I do say that they are precisely the kind of points about which Evangelical Churchmen are continually taunted, sneered at, ridiculed, and held up to scorn, as “unsound Churchmen, half-Dissenters,” and the like. Yet on these very points they are entirely in harmony with the men who first reformed the Church of England, the Edwardian and Elizabethan Reformers! If those who dislike Evangelical views, and look coldly on all who hold them, would undertake to prove that the distinctive opinions of the Evangelical school are a mere modern invention, and unknown to the Reformers, I could understand their position. But until they do this, I shall firmly maintain that the treatment which Evangelical Churchmen too often receive in these latter days is neither fair, nor reasonable, nor wise. They

have a right to demand juster balances and more righteous judgment. Whatever good there may be in other schools of thought, it is certain that no men can show a better title to be called "Successors of the Reformers" than the members of the Evangelical school.

Evangelical Churchmen, says the Bishop of Liverpool, have no cause to be ashamed of their distinctive doctrinal views. Further, they have no cause to be ashamed of their distinctive plans of Church work:—

Which of these plans has not been borrowed by other "schools of thought" in the last thirty-five years, and too often borrowed without the slightest acknowledgment? Who first employed *laymen* in Christ's work, in the face of a torrent of obloquy? The Evangelical body! Who first called *women* forward and gave them an office and position among Church workers, though not an uniform? The Evangelical body! Who first revived a due reverence for the Lord's Supper, and first crowded communion rails with devout communicants? The Evangelical body! It would be hard to name any church at this day where there are so many regular communicants, as there were at Grimshaw's church, at Haworth, a hundred years ago, or at St. John's, Bedford Row, within the present century. Who first introduced hearty and congregational singing? The Evangelical body! Charles Wesley, and Toplady, and John Newton composed hymns which myriads sang long before the compilers of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" were born. Who first commenced special short services for the working classes? The Evangelical body! Exeter Hall was opened on Sunday evenings before Westminster Abbey or St. Paul's. Who first attempted what are now called "mission" services? The Evangelical body! Twenty-five years ago they had preaching for six nights in succession at Birmingham, Ipswich, and Islington parish churches. Who first tried prayer-meetings and short services in unconsecrated places, and were denounced as fanatical and disorderly for holding them? The Evangelical body! Do I ask these questions in a taunting, boastful spirit? God forbid I should do so. I think I know and see the many weaknesses and defects of the Evangelical body as clearly as anyone, and am always ready to acknowledge them. As a Bishop, I hold out my hand to every loyal Churchman, and am ready to welcome him and work with him, to whatever "school" he may belong. I honour a zealous, honest, loyal, working Churchman whenever I see him, though he may not work exactly on what I think the best lines. All I say is, that Evangelical Churchmen have no more cause to be ashamed of their plans of working than they have of their doctrinal views, and I am heartily glad that those old plans are at last so much appreciated by all zealous English Christians.

We heartily recommend this volume. As to the style, not a word is called for; to commend Dr. Ryle's English at this time of day would be an impertinence. Every chapter in the book has a value of its own. Whether the "Facts" or the "Men" will be reckoned more interesting, by readers in general, we cannot tell. The biographies are rich in information, and the historical narratives are clear, fresh and attractive. Not a page has a needless sentence. "If I had had more time," said Mr. Fox, after making a long speech, "I should have been shorter." The hearers of many an extempore preacher may well complain that the sermon is long because the preparation was short. Pascal once said:—"Je n'ai fait celle-ci plus longue que parce que je n'ai pas eu le loisir de la faire plus courte." Bishop Ryle's readers are not likely to make a complaint on this basis. His writings show everywhere the marks of patient research and labour, as well as of ability and judgment.

We should add that this book is well printed, in clear type.

The Revelation of the Risen Lord. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, Canon of Peterborough, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Pp. 200. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.

THESE studies, says Dr. Westcott, are intended to serve as an Introduction or a Supplement to his work, "The Gospel of the Resurrection." It has been his aim in writing them to realize distinctly the characteristic teaching of each manifestation of the Risen Christ, both in relation to the first disciples and in relation to ourselves. "The different narratives when examined," he says, "leave no room for the growth of faith in a delusion; and they show adequately how the import of a new Truth was grasped. They enable us to understand historically, and thus we may expect to have made clear, how the Apostles, starting from the views of the Person and Work of Christ which they had gained while they followed His earthly ministry, checked for a brief space by the unexpected blow of the Passion, had their conceptions transfigured; and how the Christian Church was founded on the belief in the Ascended Lord." At the same time," says Canon Westcott, "a patient endeavour to enter into the meaning of the several recorded incidents, brings out the absolute originality of the prevailing source of the Truth which they combine to make known. The idea of the Resurrection was a new thing; it is seen to produce the effects of a new force." The idea was new: there were no elements present in the society of the believers to produce it. "There was no enthusiastic hope to create visions; still less to create visions which involved the sacrifice of cherished expectations. Everywhere it appears that a new thought is kindled by the successive manifestations of the Lord, for which earlier belief offered a sufficient foundation, but no more." "In this connection," continues Canon Westcott, "the remarkable limitation of the manifestations of the Risen Lord must be noticed. When the lesson of the new Life was once given, it was not repeated. The revelation to St. Paul, the revelation of 'Jesus' as 'the Son of God,' completes the whole series. The visions of St. Stephen and St. John were of a different order."

We have quoted from the Preface. With what quiet force it tells against recent infidel romances or *quasi*-learned arguments, a glance perceives.

There are eleven "studies" in the work, viz.,

- The Revelation through Love.
- The Revelation through Thought.
- The Conviction of Faith.
- The Great Commission.
- Spiritual Sight.
- The Revelation in the Work of Life.
- The Revelation through Active Work.
- The Revelation through Patient Waiting.
- The Revelation of the Kingdom.
- Departure in Blessing.
- The Revelation from Heaven and on Earth.

The Scriptures especially referred to in these studies may well be quoted one by one, in sequence: (1) John xiv. 21, xx. 10-18. (2) Luke xxiv. 13-35, 1 Cor. xv. 4. (3) Luke xxiv. 36-43. (4) John xx. 19-23, Phil. iii. 10. (5) John xx. 24-29; Matt. v. 8. (6) John xxi. 1-14. (7) John xxi. 15-19. (8) John xxi. 20-23. (9) Matt. xxviii. 16-20. (10) Luke xxiv. 50-53.¹

¹ Together with "ACTS i. 6-11 [MARK], xvi. 19, f." We are sorry to see the brackets here.

(11) Acts ix. 3-9, and Acts xxii. 6-11. A look at the Scriptures here quoted will show how suggestive is the argument. It is hardly necessary to say that the exposition is that of a master, and will repay most careful study.

On almost every page appears a sentence well worth quoting; and several passages, as we read, we marked as specially suitable for extract. But our space is limited. Two or three quotations, however, may interest our readers who are not familiar with the learned Professor's style:—

It must never be forgotten that the history is not a history of the Resurrection, but a history of the manifestation of the Risen Christ. The fact of the Resurrection is assumed, but it is nowhere described. As a Revelation the incidents preserved in our Gospels are complete: as a history they are most imperfect (p. 17.)

The appearances on Easter Day seem to be mainly directed to the creation of an immediate present belief; those which took place afterwards to the establishment of a belief in Christ's future and abiding Presence.

She did not venture to enter the sepulchre as the Apostles had done, but as she wept she took courage just to look in (*παρέκλυθεν*). Even then the one object on which she could dwell was her Lord. The vision and the inquiry of angels were unable to surprise or to rouse her. The reply to their question she repeats, with few slight but significant changes (*my Lord for the Lord, I know for we know*), the words which she had before addressed to the Apostles (p. 20).

The special duties, privileges, responsibilities of the Christian ministry remain undiminished and undisparaged when we recognise the common priesthood of all believers as sharers in the Life of the Risen Lord, and charged to make known that which they have experienced. The greatest danger of the Church at present seems to be not lest we should forget the peculiar functions of ministerial office, but lest we should allow this to supersede the general power which it concentrates and represents in the economy of life (p. 89).

Doubts are often dallied with; and, still worse, they are often affected. It is strange that the hypocrisy of scepticism should be looked upon as less repulsive than the affectation of belief; yet in the present day it has become almost a fashion for men to repeat doubts on the gravest questions without the least sense of personal responsibility (p. 104).

"It is impossible to open many popular books of devotion," writes Dr. Westcott, "or to read many modern hymns, without feeling that materialism has invaded faith, no less than science, and that enervating sentimentalism is corrupting the fresh springs of manly and simple service." This is true. The work before us, we believe, will do good service, not only as regards unbelief and scepticism, but as regards the sentimentalism of what idolatrous Rome and her imitators term the "Religious" life.

This volume, we may add, is delightful as to type and paper.

Short Notices.

Should the Revised New Testament be Authorized? By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S., Chancellor and Vicar-General of York. Pp. 193. Murray.
The Quarterly Review, No. 305.

That Sir Edmund Beckett's Essay is able and acute will be admitted on all sides without question. It contains a good deal of information, and is well worth reading. Here and there one meets a sparkling sen-