

Religion," the reviewers had eulogized could not be the same as that lying before him. Then follows a long verbal critique on the author's renderings from Greek and Latin. He is charged with not knowing the difference between the indicative and the infinitive, of translating the present tense by the perfect, an imperfect subjunctive by a present indicative, and so on. He is then accused of self-contradiction, as when he first calls the story of the Pool of Bethesda "a later interpolation," and elsewhere says, "we must believe that this passage did originally belong to the text," &c. The next point examined is the reviewers' eulogy upon the author's candour and honesty in dealing with opponents. To this Professor Lightfoot retorts that he either chooses the weakest points from the apologetic writers, or has a very limited acquaintance with them. The latter his critic thinks the more likely, for otherwise he would have been spared innumerable slips and blunders. Such blunders are, the arguments regarding the length of Christ's ministry, the controversy regarding Easter, &c. One short example may be given. The author asserts that "sent" as a rendering of Siloam, is "a distinct error," because the word means "a spring, a fountain, a flow of water." To which the Professor replies, that it properly means an aqueduct (Latin, *emissarium*) from the Hebrew *shalach*, "to send." The question of miracles is taken up, and a second paper is to follow on the external evidences. The critic's conclusion is, "it must be evident by this time to any 'impartial mind,' that the 'Supernatural Religion' of the reviewers cannot be our 'Supernatural Religion.'"

"Saxon Studies" by Julian Hawthorne, a son of the author of "The Scarlet Letter," is continued. It is exceedingly lively and interesting, but somewhat cynical in spirit, and perhaps too epigrammatic in style. The subject of this instalment is "Gambrinus," the German Bacchus; in other words—beer. The aroma of beer pervades the entire paper—not merely in the brewery, the concert garden, or the *gasthaus*, but in the government. In the national disposition, scholarship, and literature—everything is of beer, beery. The suggestion to Bismarck that he should unite all the breweries into one monster establishment at Berlin, and thus consolidate German unity and his

centralizing system is an admirable specimen of humour, and the story of Frau Schmidt is touchingly told.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen is a thinker, sometimes a deep one; he is also a forcible writer; but there are some things he is not equal to. One of these is the intelligent discussion of philosophical subjects. His paper on "Necessary Truth," proves that he entirely misapprehends the position and even the technology of metaphysicians. It is written in reply to a reply by Dr. Ward, an able Roman Catholic writer in the *Dublin Review*. The arguments cannot be reproduced or even summarized here. Of course, Mr. Stephen denies the distinction between necessary and contingent truths. Dr. Ward upholds it; indeed he is compelled to do so by the creed he holds. To say nothing of some of the Gospel miracles, the doctrine of transubstantiation depends upon it. Mr. Stephen's reasoning is often extremely acute and even subtle, but his premises are sometimes more than doubtful. For our own part, we must confess that we never read anything from his vigorous pen, without feeling that fallacy in argument is often eked out with force of style, and force of will. After all, *sic volo, sic jubeo* is not a logical maxim.

As we have made room for Mr. Proctor's interesting paper on "The Past and Present of our Earth," we need not refer to it here, further than to express our opinion that it is pitched in a more elevated key than we are accustomed to in the popular works on astronomy, written by its author. Mr. James Hinton approaches a difficult task in a most becoming spirit. In a very brief sketch of the subject, the writer treats of "Professor Tyndall and the Religious Emotions." In the first place, these words are quoted from the celebrated Belfast address:—"To find a legitimate satisfaction for the religious Emotions, is the problem of problems of our day." Mr. Hinton contents himself with indicating a probable method of solution without attempting to work it out fully. By "legitimate," he understands "a satisfaction that, while contenting the religious aspirations, does not come into conflict with the operations of the intellect as expressed in science." Now what is there that Science and the Emotions require, that we should not contradict, prior to any attempt at reconciliation? Science forbids the