

Short Notices.

UNDER the title *Two Present-Day Questions* (published by Messrs Macmillan), Dr. Sanday has given some useful counsel on, first, the progress of Biblical Criticism, and, second, the Social Movement; and the leading thought in discussing both questions is the same—Don't be in a hurry! A really great danger to which Christian opinion is exposed, at the present moment, is "of a premature insistence upon partial and insufficiently-tested solutions of those questions and difficulties with which the inquirer is confronted." Thus, as to Biblical Criticism: "The rate at which we have been moving for some time past," says the Professor, "is the utmost that can be at once sound and salutary." Far better is a "steady, deliberate, well-considered advance than the feverish haste for results and 'conclusions.' It is more important that our results when they come should be sound than that they should come quickly." Truly and wisely said. To note the readiness, even eagerness, with which many accept the latest thing out, and the positive tone in which revolutionary "conclusions" are thrust upon the Church, is very sad.

Six Sermons on the Bible, a right welcome little book, is published by the S.P.C.K. In a prefatory note the Rev. T. Howard Gill mentions that the Sermons were preached in the Parish Church of Tonbridge. They were addressed specially to the people, and they are now published, as they were originally delivered, "in the hope that they may help to confirm some whom recent utterances have tended to unsettle." Bishop Barry, the Dean of Canterbury, Canons Elwyn, Girdlestone, and Bernard, and the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, are the Preachers. We strongly recommend this conservative book.

Three small volumes under the title of *The Gospel History for the Young*, by Dr. W. F. Skene, Historiographer Royal for Scotland, were reviewed in this Magazine when they appeared a few years ago, and we are glad to see that these "Lessons" or "Lectures" on the Life of Christ, delivered to the senior class in a Sunday-school, have been published in a cheap form in one volume (Edinburgh: David Douglas). This ably-written book stands alone, we think, as regards the extent to which the Gospel narrative is illustrated from the views, customs, and institutions of the Jews set forth in the Jewish writings. Dr. Skene's book, evidently a labour of love, is sure to do good service.

A second series of Dr. Almond's sermons is welcome: *Sermons by a Lay Headmaster* (Swan Sonnenschein and Co.). In his preface, the Headmaster (of Loretto School) explains how it was that he felt himself constrained to criticise some sayings of Dr. Cheyne, and certain portions of Dr. Driver's "Introduction." His criticisms are acute and well worth reading. We quote one passage from an excursus on the Davidic Psalms:

I wish to make some remarks on Professor Driver's criticism of the 51st Psalm, from the point of view that "the speaker" is, "perhaps," "the nation." He says (p. 367, *note*) of Psalm li., "A confession written on behalf of the nation, by one who had a deep sense of his people's sin during the exile (composed from a prophetic point of view, Isa. lxxiii. 64; lxxvii. 12). That the title cannot be correct appears especially from the inapplicability of verse 4 to David's situation (for, however great David's sin against God, he had done Uriah the most burning wrong that could be imagined; and an injury to a neighbour is in the Old Testament a 'sin

against him, Gen. xx. 9; Judges xi. 27; Jer. xxxvii. 18, al.); and the assumption that the subject is the nation is the only one which neutralises the contradiction between verse 16 and verse 19; the restoration of Jerusalem would be the sign that God was reconciled to His people (Isa. xl. 2), and would accept the sacrifices in which He had now no pleasure." The remainder of the note is the sheerest guess-work, but I have quoted all the arguments. To which I reply:

1. The passages from Isaiah referred to bear no sort of analogy to the Psalm. And in other parallel passages, e.g. Lamentations i., it is perfectly clear that "Zion" is personified. Where a prophet says "I," without explanation, he always means himself, e.g. Jer. ix.

2. A "sin," in the Old Testament is always against God. The most closely parallel cases are those of Abimelech (Gen. xx. 6) and Joseph (Gen. xxxix. 9). David doubtless had these in his mind, as well as Leviticus vi. 2, and other passages of the Law. Of the passages quoted by Professor Driver, Gen. xx. 9 is the speech of a heathen about a contingency which has not happened. And if it were the speech of a seer about a thing which had happened, it would be nothing to the point, more especially when read in the light of verse 6. Judges xi. 27 is a loose expression, also about a thing which had not happened, in a bragging message from Jephthah. Jer. xxxvii. 18 is irrelevant on the Davidic hypothesis, but if it were otherwise relevant, the quotation of such a passage as this, as bearing on the authorship of Psalm li., is simply frivolous: "Moreover, Jeremiah said unto King Zedekiah, What have I offended against thee, or against thy servants, or against this people, that ye have put me in prison?"

3. The "contradiction" between verse 16 and verse 19 exists only in the critic's mind. The meaning clearly is, whoever wrote the Psalm, that at present God wished for no sacrifice, but that the time would come when sacrifices would be acceptable. Now, on the supposition that the Psalm is written on behalf of the nation, I fail to see how the supposed difficulty is met. During the exile, the expression, "else would I give it thee," would have been meaningless. During the monarchy, the suspension of sacrifices at any other time would have been as contradictory to verse 19 as in David's time. In fact, David's time is the only one where there is no difficulty. Before the temple was built, sacrifices were an occasional thing. But after its consecration by Solomon they became a regular thing, except when God's worship was overthrown. Verse 19 is especially fulfilled, 1 Kings viii. 62.

4. The "restoration" of Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Psalm. What is referred to is the building of Solomon's Temple and Solomon's walls.

A little book which is likely to be very useful is *Why I belong to the Church of England*, by the Rev. T. Howard Gill, M.A., Vicar of Tonbridge; six sermons couched, it is modestly stated, in simple language, and laying no claim to originality; nevertheless, suggestive and telling (Elliot Stock).

Helps to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer (Henry Frowde: Oxford University Press Warehouse) will prove generally acceptable. It is well arranged, full and clear, and as to size, handy. Many of the notes will be quite new, we think, to a large number of students. Here is a specimen from "The Communion of the Sick":

3. *But if a man*, etc. The Sarum Manual directed that in cases where the sick person was desirous to receive, but incapable, the priest should say to him: "Brother, in this case true faith and good will are sufficient for thee; only believe and thou hast eaten."

We have received from Mr. Murray the July *Quarterly Review*. The articles on Professor Freeman, Pitt's War Policy, The Porson of Shakesperian Criticism (Theobald), and Professor Ramsay's Asia Minor, are well up to the usual *Quarterly* standard. That on Freeman, which is severe, was intended, one is glad to know, to be published in the great writer's lifetime. It is very able. We are not altogether satisfied with the paper on Cardinal Manning. The advice which is given to Mr. Rudyard Kipling, whose Tales are sharply criticised, is well-founded and wise. "Disestablishment," "Hymns and Hymn-writers," "Trinity College, Dublin," and "Politics and Ethics," make up a well-varied and interesting *Quarterly*. The last-named article is a review of Mr. Lilly's new book.

The third edition of that standard work, the *Variorum Reference Bible*, just sent to us by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, is a most comely and convenient volume. It contains the Apocrypha, edited by the Rev. C. J. Ball, a separate issue of which will give us an opportunity of comment later on. A Bible student may reckon himself very fortunate if he can obtain this volume and also duly use it. The Queen's Printers' publications are always of the highest as to execution in every respect.

The Rev. J. J. LIAS requests us to insert the following :

I owe Professor Driver an apology for a misquotation which was quite unintentional. I have represented him as saying that Ezekiel had "transferred unconsciously" to the past "the associations of the *future*," whereas I ought to have written "present." I cannot explain the mistake, except as being an unconscious substitution of one word for another. Professor Driver's book lay before me as I wrote, and I had no intention of misquoting him. My argument in regard to the improbability of Ezekiel being mistaken in his facts is not affected by the error, but in a note I refer to the passage as unintelligible. Of course, in its proper shape the passage is intelligible enough.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE MONTH.

THE General Election is over, and Mr. Gladstone has a majority of 41. What will he do with it? The figures are :

Conservatives 268	}	314
Liberal Unionists 46	}	
Gladstonians 274	}	355
Anti-Parnellites 72	}	
Parnellites 9	}	

The polling has been the heaviest on record. The Unionists have gained a clear majority of votes in Great Britain as a whole, and a very large majority (71) in England. Mr. Gladstone's majority in Midlothian was reduced in a most remarkable way.

Ulster is hopeful and determined.

A splendid series of successes in the Midland Counties is due to a large extent to the vigorous eloquence of Mr. Chamberlain.

At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference the Archbishop referred, in a very practical spirit, to the influence of the Press.