

momentous subject. His arrangement of matter is excellent; the tone devotional yet sober and restrained; the style, direct and lucid, exactly suited to the purpose. The book will rank as a very able contribution to the series to which it belongs.

H. L. JACKSON.

The Tradition of Scripture: its origin, authority, and interpretation, by the Rev. W. BARRY, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1906)—the first volume of 'The Westminster Library', which is intended to deal with the 'large outlying field of professional knowledge which is always in danger of being crowded out in the years before ordination' of Roman Catholic clergy (inasmuch as their preliminary studies deal mainly with dogmatic and moral theology)—seems to me to fulfil its purpose admirably. If the learned author contrives to leave the impression that the traditional view of the Bible is less fundamentally shaken by recent research than it really is, at least he recognizes the literary and historical method of study; and if he retains the authority of the Church as the ultimate arbiter, he allows a very wide scope for the work of scholars in influencing the decision. The sentences in which he sums up his statement of the problems connected with the *Book of Isaiah* and the *Gospel according to St John* may be taken as expressing the spirit of the whole. As to *Isaiah* he writes: 'Until the Church utters her sentence, individual writers would manifestly be exceeding their commission, if they did more than set out the reasons on each side, within the bounds of orthodoxy, for the opinions advanced. That our *Book of Isaiah* is sacred and canonical we have been taught by conciliar decisions. That it contains the prophecies of the son of Amoz tradition tells us, and critics of every shade maintain. But whether it holds any besides them, and, if so, which are the additions to the original stock, authority has not thus far pronounced.' And as to the Fourth Gospel: 'To define our work as "the Gospel of John the Elder according to John the Apostle"—a phrase of Harnack's which made no small impression not many years ago—is to mingle the certain and the uncertain. That JOHN the Apostle originated Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse, we have learnt from a sure tradition. . . . But if each of the other Gospels exhibits a double influence, . . . there is no reason *a priori* to forbid our distinguishing in the Johannine between matter and form.'

Clergymen of the Church of England are, of course, allowed much greater freedom of utterance than this, but they may learn from Dr Barry's book much that is of intrinsic value, and—not of least importance—what is the official attitude of the authorities of the Church of Rome in England to the 'higher criticism'.

That the Faith of the Church will remain, strengthened and secure, whatever be the issue of criticism, is declared to be also the opinion of the 1725 clergy of the Anglican Communion whose *Declaration on Biblical Criticism*, issued last year, has been published in book form (A. & C. Black, London, 1906), edited, with an introduction and a list of names and various comments, by Mr HUBERT HANDLEY, honorary secretary of the committee.

The same subject is dealt with on a larger scale by M. ALBERT HOUTIN in *La Question Biblique au XX^e Siècle* (E. Nourry, Paris, 1906). Here we have an account of the general state of the question of the inspiration of the Bible among Christians and Rationalists, the attitude of liberal Protestants to biblical criticism, and a collection of the documents relating to the controversy roused by M. Loisy's publications. The author's aim has been to let the facts and the documents tell their own tale, and only to add himself such explanations as seemed necessary to put them in their true historical perspective. In so doing he has produced a book which is of no little interest and value, though his own sympathies are so strongly on the side opposed to tradition that he cannot properly appreciate the position of those who follow the modern method of criticism but do not come to the most 'advanced' conclusions.

In *The Prophet of Nazareth*, by NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in Cornell University and Director of the American School of Archaeology in Jerusalem (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1905), we have a work typical of the point of view of the origin of Christianity and its later developments which is already widely current in Germany. The spirit and the style of the book is shewn in the following sentences from the preface:—'Just and thoughtful men will always remember with gratitude the master-builders who reared the imposing structure of Christian dogma and the faithful believers of every name and denomination who have translated its most valuable thought into lives of spiritual beauty. But as the blessings of a truer knowledge and a larger faith become apparent, they will also accord due honour to the master-miners who have shattered the foundations of untenable dogmas, and most of all to the souls who, free from the bondage of external authority or the ambition for earthly rewards, have passionately striven for the truth . . . and laboured for the emancipation and improvement of the human race, in truest imitation of Him who lived and died for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.'

In this spirit Prof. Schmidt has aimed at tracing the history and sifting the whole evidence, and the general result of his critical study of the records may be stated in his own words. He 'found himself borne along by the force of what seemed to him incontrovertible facts to the

conviction that Jesus of Nazareth actually existed, that some of the events of His life may be known to us, that some of His words may be recovered, and that His personality, imperfectly as we know it, and widely as it differed from the estimate of the Church, is as sublime and potent for good as ever'.

The chapters on 'the Decline of Dogma' and 'the Present Problem' have perhaps some special interest.

J. F. B-B.

Jesus, wer er geschichtlich war, by ARNO NEUMANN (Paul Waetzel, Freiburg i. B., 1904), is the fourth volume of a series entitled 'New Paths to the old God'. The book is designed not so much for theologians as for the educated classes generally, for whom it would portray the Jesus of history in place of the Christ of dogmatics. A true historical description of the personal history and teaching of Jesus implies, however, in the mind of the author, the entire elimination of the supernatural element: everything in the Gospel narrative, which cannot be accounted for by natural causes, must be rejected. The author is, no doubt, sincerely desirous of conserving the ethical teaching of Christianity. He thinks that to strip off from the personality of Jesus all traces of supernatural 'ornamentation', and to represent Him as a true man, is to render service to many of the laity whose minds have been trained by the teaching of science and history to see unchangeable law reigning in God's world. They will thus, he hopes, be rescued from entire unbelief, and will appreciate the greatness of the human personality of Jesus and the depth of His moral teaching.

The book seems to be typical of the theological position of many preachers both in Germany and in Switzerland, and as such it may be worth attention. But the author's claim that his portraiture of Jesus is not an arbitrary one, but stands on firm historical ground, cannot for a moment be allowed. His whole treatment of the subject is vitiated by his preconceived opinion that nothing can occur which transcends the natural; and, as he approaches his sources with this settled judgement in his mind, whatever does not coincide with it, is rejected as belonging to a late stage of the tradition.

G. A. SCHNEIDER.

The Historic Christ, by the Rev. T. A. LACEY (Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1905), is a valuable defence of traditional views, in which timely stress is laid on the fact that the books of the New Testament which contain the accounts of the Resurrection and the Birth of our Lord were received by the Church because they were in accord with the traditional beliefs. Mr Lacey insists that the Fourth Gospel is identical with the Pauline gospel of the death and resurrection of Jesus—the significance of which for St Paul lay in the fact that He was the Son of