

lights of the Kingdom. Among the host of authorities cited by the author, Dr. Davidson may be mentioned, who says, "it is impossible to show that the four (Gospels) were current as early as A. D. 150," and, in reference to the disputed passage in Irenæus, asks—"Is it not evident that Irenæus employed it (the word 'elders') loosely, without an exact idea of the persons he meant?" The question regarding the date of Celsus, the heathen writer against Christianity, whose works we only know from Origen's reply, is parried by the author, who shows that if he errs, he errs with Tischendorf, one of Dr. Lightfoot's favourite apologists. There are other points, on which the author, with greater or less success, meets his antagonist. His general conclusions may be summed up thus:—"The higher criticism in which Dr. Lightfoot seems to have indulged in this article, scarcely rises above the correction of an exercise or the conjugation of a verb," and that "if it were granted, for the sake of argument, that each slip in translation, each error in detail, and each oversight in statement with which Canon Lightfoot reproaches 'Supernatural Religion' were well-founded, it must be evident to any intelligent mind that the mass of such a work would not really be affected." We may add that the author announces his intention of comparing the Gospel and Pauline forms of Christianity in a future work.

Sir George Campbell is known to the public chiefly as having been Governor of Bengal during the recent Indian famine. His paper on "The Tenure of Land" is a very interesting and valuable one. He differs from most English "land reformers" in doubting the propriety of abolishing the right of primogeniture. He is of opinion that, instead of building up a peasant proprietary, it would merely, so far as it had any effect, transfer the ownership of land from aristocracy to plutocracy. His remedies, such as the abolishing of entails and settlements, the extension of tenant-right, a cheaper and easier method of conveyance by purchase, and a systematic effort on behalf of popular rights in the remaining commons, call for no special remark. Mr. Symond's critique of Lucretius is of special importance just now from the prominence given to his writings by Prof. Tyndall and his school. This paper is not only written opportunely, but it is a clear and able view of the great philosophical poet of Rome. If we were disposed to demur to any of the writer's claims on behalf of Lucretius, it would be that of originality of thought, which seems to be unduly pressed. Very little of the poet's philosophy was his own; he was, in fact, indebted for it to the Atomic and Eleatic Schools, and to Epicurus. Prof. Cairnes examines Herbert Spencer's theory of Social Evolution. His criticism is, for the most part, of a friendly kind, but he entertains a strong objection to the attempt to base Sociology upon

a Darwinian foundation. In the first place he objects to it as an "unverifiable hypothesis," and then strives to prove in opposition to Spencer that "political institutions do not 'grow' in the sense in which plants and animals grow: they are not the 'products' of a community in the sense in which the fauna and flora of a country are its products; but are due to causes and to processes of an entirely different kind. Under these circumstances to describe them as examples of spontaneous development, and to class them with the ordinary phenomena of organic life, is to use language, and to adopt a classification, fitted to obscure and to confound, rather than to elucidate, the problems of social existence."

Mr. Hales' paper on *King Lear* is an acute and careful analysis of Shakespeare's tragedy. The writer justly complains of the depreciative criticism of some critics, native as well as foreign, and he proceeds to show that it has proceeded entirely from inability to understand the poet's aim. "It has not been seen," he says, "that it was his design in this play to depict an age unruly and turbulent, but now emerging from barbarism, in whose ears the still voice of conscience was scarcely yet audible, and where Passion was yet lord of all." In short, it was a pre-Christian period in a scarcely half-civilized country. Mr. Hales has the credit also of striking upon an original clue to the tragedy. He points out with great clearness, and fortified by a careful analysis, that Shakespeare was aiming at the portraiture not only of men but also of a race. *Lear*, in this view, becomes in fact a curiously-varied series of sketches of the characteristics of the Celtic temperament. The second of Mr. Morley's papers on "Mill's Essays on Religion" is similar to the first in contending that Mr. Mill concedes too much to the theologians.

The *Contemporary Review* contains no less than nine papers, each one of which would require, in justice, more space than we can devote to them all. Professor Lightfoot continues his examination of "Supernatural Religion." The present article is devoted to a careful analysis of the writings of what are known distinctively as the Apostolic Fathers. There is a decided improvement in the tone of the criticism, which may be partially accounted for by the delicate and precarious ground on which Dr. Lightfoot has ventured to tread. Still some of his objections are extremely trifling, as when he complains that the author, in referring to Eusebius, uses "knows nothing" as a substitute for "says nothing"—surely a pardonable way of impressing upon his readers that "silence" of the ecclesiastical historian which is a weapon in the hands of both disputants. There is also a disposition on the part of the apologist to use the word "Canon" in an elastic and ambiguous way; for it is clear that the canon Dr. Lightfoot is concerned in defend-