

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'.