

competitor with Peloubet, and, it appears, a very worthy one. She has associated with her in its preparation Mrs. Morrow and Mrs. Titterington, the Rev. Edith Hill and the Rev. E. C. Best, who seems to be only a man. The Talker has no prejudice against women's work, just the opposite. Yet he perceives the finger of the woman, and in particular of the American woman, in the nature of many of the anecdotal illustrations. They lack dignity, and belong to the anonymous region of school-room and nursery gossip. Grown-up people who tell such stories are in their anecdotage. The black-board exercises, and the general arrangement of the Commentary are all that could be desired, and the matter appears to be scriptural and therefore sound. The authorities consulted are not so numerous nor so scientific as used to be those in Peloubet, but the ordinary teacher, who finds his time for study and teaching alike short enough, will doubtless get all he needs in this useful lesson-help.

A very useful work, published by Isbister & Co., of London, but sold by the Revell Company for two dollars, is "Book by Book," the collection into one volume of the introductions to the various books of Scripture in *Virtue's New Illustrated Bible*. There are no fewer than 566 pages in "Book by Book." Its introductions or prolegomena are by well-known divines of various denominations, including the Bishops of Ripon and Worcester, Archdeacon Farrar, Professor Stanley Leathes, Canon Maclear, Professors Elmslie, A. B. Davidson, Marcus Dods, W. Milligan, James Robertson, and others. The names of the authors are a guarantee for the worth of the book. Unfortunately, the most important part of it from a critical standpoint, the introduction to the historical books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Esther, is all the work of one writer, Professor James Robertson, who comes out of it like an ordinary man. Professor A. B. Davidson, one of the best living Hebrew scholars, cannot place the book of Job earlier than the time of Solomon. This decision is based on the principles of higher criticism as to the evolution of religious thought, principles that are inconsistent with the history of the genesis of great truths. The failure of many inspired writers of old to be taught by the book of Job is an evidence not of the book's non-existence, but of the theological preconceptions of these writers on the subject of divine sovereignty. The Bishop of Worcester on the Psalms is good, but gives way occasionally to a weakness of great minds. On p. 154 he says: "In the inscription of Psalm xxxiv. Abimelech is said to have been King of Gath in the time of David, whereas the only Abimelech mentioned in the history was a contemporary of Abraham's, and Achish was king of Gath when David found refuge there." This is contemptible criticism. The Hebrew Abimelech means "Father-King," and is a translation of some such Aryan dynastic title as