

older writers. Still after a careful examination of a considerable portion of the work, we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction that it deserves to be marked among the best, if not actually the best of Dr. Brown's commentaries. In saying this we are far from giving Dr. Brown's work an unqualified approval. He has in several instances adopted interpretations of the correctness of which all his arguments have failed to convince us. Some of these are adopted against the views of the soundest interpreters, and appear decidedly strained. For example, in Chap. 10. 19., he interprets the words, "Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" of the entrance of Christ into, and not of believers being admitted to access to the reconciled Divinity, and then explains the expression "that is his flesh" as having no relation to the veil, but to the previous part of the verse, and explains it as devoting his entrance into heaven in human nature. We presume to think their interpretation extremely forced and unnatural. Again we deeply regret to see Dr. Brown on the celebrated passage, Chap. 4. 10, denying all reference to the christian Sabbath, and interpreting the words, "He that hath entered into his rest hath ceased from his labours as God did from his," as descriptive of the believers privilege. We can scarcely see any sense in which the believer can be said to *have* ceased from his labours and to have entered into his rest. Even were we to strain the words to denote the future rest of believers, yet we would still ask with Dr. Owen, "How can they be said to rest from these works as God did from his?" Is it natural or even proper to compare our works with God's work of creation. Besides in distinct contrast with the "we who believe" the verse, brings under our notice *one* person, "he who *hath* entered into his rest." We hold therefore still to the interpretation so ably defended by Owen, Wardlaw, Hamilton of Leeds, and other eminent writers, that the verse describes the Saviour as entering into his rest after he had completed the work of redemption, and the Apostles argument is, that as from God's resting from his work, a day of rest was appointed, so Christ has rested from his works, and "there remaineth therefore a rest," *Sabbatismos*—a keeping of a Sabbath "for the people of God." It has been fashionable with some to seek a reputation for candour, by representing these great men as led by prejudice on behalf of the Sabbath, to take this view of the passage. We regret to see Dr. Brown falling into this view. That this interpretation is not the result of any such pre-judice, is evident from the fact, that late German writers, such as Ebrard, whose prejudices are all against what may be called the British view of the Sabbath, adopt substantially the same view of the passage.

It would be easy to point out minor defects in the work, some of which we think the editor ought to have corrected. It looks for example like book-making, to find a page and a half or two pages taken up with the quotation of a whole chapter or more from the Old Testament. In the delivery of these lectures either before a congregation or in the class room, the reading of these passages with Dr. Brown's magnificent voice and impressive manner was most telling, but where these accessories are wanting, as in the printed page, we think it rather imposing on buyers, to fill up whole pages in this manner, when a simple reference to the passages would have been sufficient. Still we have no hesitation in recommending this as among the best commentaries on this Epistle in the English language. Every student that can get Owen's work ought to do so. He will then be well furnished for the interpretation of the Epistle, and when he has mastered it, as Dr. Chalmers has said, he is very near being an accomplished Theologian, but if he has