

Catholic books, when they were proscribed by law, still awaits a worthy narrator. Dr Southern's account is interesting but only a start, and once again the disadvantages of stopping in 1582 are apparent. Nearly all his references belong to a later period.

It is to be hoped that the reception of this book, which in spite of its shortcomings is of the utmost importance, will encourage the author to continue his scholarly work. In particular one would like to see the Bibliography reprinted, brought down to 1603 and enlarged. If it is to be the reference book that Catholic scholars are waiting for, it must include the Latin works as well. These cannot be found in the Short Title Catalogue and many are missing from Gillow. Some of them, as Campion's *Decem Rationes*, and Bridgewater's *Concertatio*, had a far wider influence than any vernacular works, and to exclude them from a bibliography is greatly to lessen its value.

GODFREY ANSTRUTHER, O.P.

GOSPEL GLEANINGS. By Thomas Nicklin. (Longmans; 21s.)

This is the fruit of a life-long study and love of the Gospels. The resultant essays, notes and jottings can fittingly be termed 'gleanings'; and the gleanings are well worth careful study, despite a general impression that the attitudes and methods are not a little 'dated' and detached from much of the more recent English and Continental work on the New Testament. Significantly there is but a passing reference to form criticism. Most of the stock questions are treated:—'Brethren of the Lord', 'The two genealogies', 'Authorship of the Fourth Gospel', etc.—but with a freshness of presentation and reverent touch. Especially valuable is Part III, on the Dominical Titles, 'Son of God', etc.

The author does not hesitate to challenge long accepted views; he opens up again the question of our Lord's language. 'For a good many years now professors and lecturers have repeated that our Lord did not habitually speak Greek but Aramaic or Neo-Hebrew. Anyone who questions this assertion is discredited as an amateur.' Undeterred he goes on to stress that a great part of the Judæan population of our Lord's time may well have been in the habit of using two idioms, and not a few individuals could have been bilingual, and some even polyglot. Mr Nicklin is right in stressing the phenomenon of bilingualism. It is not sufficiently appreciated. Few New Testament scholars are themselves bilingual, and capable of entering into the mentality, attitudes, and achievements, both oral and literary, of really bilingual individuals and populations. Yet such an understanding is really necessary, if we would judge rightly amidst the many delicate assessments that are called for in the history and criticism of New Testament origins.

R.D.P.