

As I close these remarks, the latest melancholy wail of the Bishop of Peterborough reaches my ears. Notwithstanding all their "expansiveness," both he and his brother of Manchester appear, alas! to know as little of the things which belong to our peace as that wild ritualist who, a day or two ago, raised the cry of "excommunicated heretic!" against the Bishop of Natal. Happily we have among us our Jowetts and our Stanleys, not to mention other brave men, who see more clearly the character and magnitude of the coming struggle; and who believe undoubtingly that out of it the truths of science will emerge with healing in their wings. Such men must increase, if the vast material resources of the Church of England are not to fall into the hands of persons who may be classed under the respective heads of *weak* and *infatuated*.

And now I have to utter a "farewell," free from bitterness, to all my readers—thanking my friends for a sympathy more steadfast, I would fain believe, if less noisy, than the antipathy of my foes; commending to these, moreover, a passage from Bishop Butler, which they have either not read or failed to take to heart. "It seems," saith the bishop, "that men would be strangely headstrong and self-willed, and disposed to exert themselves with an impetuosity which would render society insupportable, and the living in it impracticable, were it not for some acquired moderation and self-government, some aptitude and readiness in restraining themselves and concealing their sense of things." In this respect, at least, his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has set a good example.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

THE anonymous author of "Supernatural Religion" has replied to Professor Lightfoot in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*. He had an obvious advantage over his critic, of which he evidently desired to avail himself. The Professor's strictures were of that minute and carping character peculiarly annoying to an author, and they were conveyed in language decidedly, and perhaps intentionally, rude and uncourteous. The complaint is certainly just, that "while delivering severe lectures upon want of candour and impartiality, and preaching temperance and moderation, the practice of the preacher, as sometimes happens, falls very short of his precept." This is quite true, and the author, although he visibly "winced" under the attack, was, no doubt, inclined to profit by the Professor's mistaken tactics, when he said—"I shall not emulate the spirit of that article, and I trust that I shall not scant the courtesy with which I desire to treat Dr. Lightfoot, whose ability I admire, and whose position I understand." It was perhaps too much to expect that this calm and dignified tone should be maintained under the circumstances, by ordinary flesh and blood. The defence of "Supernatural Religion" assumes a two-fold aspect. So far as philological disputes are concerned, the writer enters two pleas, one of not guilty, and the other, as the

lawyers would say, of "confession and avoidance." Those who read any of the apologetic or rationalistic treatises on the canon of Scripture will be aware that the name of Papias occupies a prominent place in the controversy. He was bishop of Hierapolis, a Millenarian, and evidently a man of weak and credulous character; but it so happens that he is traditionally reputed to have been a disciple of St. John, and he is the only authority for the Synoptic Gospels till we come to Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century. His writings have been lost, and all that we know of them we owe to Irenæus and Eusebius, the one belonging to the latter part of the second century, and the other to the beginning of the fourth. Now the author was referring to the dubious reference of Irenæus where, speaking of "the presbyter, a disciple of the Apostles," he uses the words "that therefore the Lord said, 'In my Father's house are many mansions.'" This presumptive allusion to the fourth Gospel would be very important, if we could identify Papias with the presbyter; but every one having the slightest acquaintance with patristic literature, however, is well aware that the prevailing method of quotation is extremely loose and untrustworthy. Irenæus himself quotes, as a saying of our Lord's, a monstrous Talmudic fiction regarding the material de-