

change as a productive agent. From this point the argument begins to peter out into empirical enquiries, for the evidence is still too scanty to allow of more than the helpful gesture of pointing the way.

The highest praise is reserved for scholasticism, though substance is given a Kantian reading as a category of permanence and the reality of *potentia* within being, and consequently the metaphysical dynamism of Aquinas, is insufficiently appreciated, however just may be the appreciation that most scholastics regard the world as a structure, manifold, complex, yet fixed. The medieval fusion of rationalism and the practical motive of salvation is defended. 'The moderns who have blamed scholasticism for being tied up with religion do not understand what philosophy is.'

R.N.

THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Dom John Chapman. (Sheed & Ward; 4s. 6d.).

To a reader of the Gospels ignorant of how and when they were written this little book forms an easy introduction. Though the four lectures it contains were delivered in 1927 they have been withheld from publication till after the appearance of the author's full study on the Synoptic Problem—*Matthew, Mark and Luke* (1937). Here Abbot Chapman sets out in clear and lively fashion the origins and characteristics of the four Gospels, while an appendix gives a useful citation of Patristic evidence and the relevant decisions of the Biblical Commission.

His exposition follows the views held in his larger book, of which the most striking feature was the assertion of the priority of the Greek translation of Matthew over Mark, contrary to the admission of many Catholic scholars that Greek Matthew was influenced by Mark.

It omits any discussion of the oral tradition previous to the written Gospels and its relation to the latter, but perhaps this was not suited to a book of this size.

C.B.D.

CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS. By A. E. T. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby. (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d.).

The author's purpose in putting out this book is 'to set forth what I believe to be the meaning and message of the Gospels in such terms as can be understood by the ordinary educated reader . . . who would desire to know how the Gospel presents itself to a mind trained in the processes of modern historical study.' And he has achieved his purpose in a clear account well set out with a balanced use of modern critical methods. He asserts the divinity of Our Lord but shows uneasiness in dealing with the Gospel miracles; their basis in history is uncertain, they are evidences of the impression Jesus made on those who believed in Him; they are