

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

---

Blood of Christ is the key of Paradise.”<sup>1</sup> As we read these simple words on which I have commented, the very “shadow of Peter passes by.” May it overshadow some of us!

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

---

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

AN Oxford man, whose interests are in theology, cannot but look wistfully towards what we are in the habit of calling our sister university at Cambridge. As a sister we think of her, with affection and pride, but with something too of that generous rivalry which does not like to feel itself altogether distanced. We have indeed some consolations. We have had and have divines of philosophic grasp and of fine and beautiful temper, who are not in the first instance exegetes or critics; and we look forward with great hope to what may be done in the department of Old Testament and Hebrew studies. But in the field of New Testament exegesis and analytic criticism we have nothing at all comparable to the little group of Professors who a few years ago shed lustre upon Cambridge. It is a matter of great rejoicing to us that, though lost to Cambridge, the Bishop of Durham has not been lost to theological learning; and Cambridge too could afford to miss one of its leaders, while the others remain to it in the full vigour and maturity of their powers.

What, it may be asked, are the particular qualities which have won for Bp. Lightfoot so pre-eminent a place, by the universal consent of all competent judges both in England and on the Continent? It is necessary here to weigh our words; for though the impression which Bp. Lightfoot.

<sup>1</sup> “Sanguis Christi est clavis Paradisi.”—*S. Jerome.*

has left upon the public mind is a very distinct one, yet when a comparison is suggested with other illustrious names, it is not enough to use general phrases, and it becomes important to single out special points which are most characteristic and distinctive. I should be disposed to say, then, that the place which Bp. Lightfoot holds was due not only to his possession, but to his very remarkable balance and combination, of a number of distinct excellences—exactness of scholarship, width of erudition, scientific method, sobriety of judgment, lucidity of style. By taking each of these points in turn, we may be able to define our conception a little more closely.

1. It is perhaps the most marked characteristic of the Cambridge school (if I may call it so, and there is that unity and cohesion about its several parts that it may, I think, fairly be called a "school"), that it starts from a basis of first-rate classical scholarship. In this it differs not only from us at Oxford, but also from the contemporary theology of Germany.

When I speak of Oxford, I do not mean to say that there are not good scholars among us (the best perhaps snatched away, like Bp. Lightfoot, by the ruthless claims of Church government and practical administration), but the leading points in our system are philosophy and history rather than scholarship, and the effect of this is seen on those who have turned their attention specially to theology. In the best Oxford work I fancy that I can trace something that the Germans would call "*allgemein-menschliches*," a sort of wide culture in the Humanities, which is not commonly found elsewhere, but in scholarship properly so called I am afraid that we too often found wanting.

The rising generation of New Testament students will perhaps hardly remember that Dr. Lightfoot once crossed swords with the leading Oxford scholars. The almost simultaneous appearance of the Commentaries of Bp.

Ellicott (then Professor of Divinity at King's College, London) on Galatians (1854) and Ephesians (1855), with those of the late Dean Stanley on Corinthians, and Professor Jowett on Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans (both in 1855), called forth from Dr. Lightfoot a masterly criticism in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, vol. iii. p. 81 ff. (1857). It was something more than a review of individual books. It was a conflict of principles. And there could be no question on which side the victory lay. One is indeed reminded of the ever memorable passage in which Mark Pattison described Bentley's handling of the unfortunate Collins (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 308). Dean Stanley's Notes on the Corinthians were indeed a very slipshod performance. It was not only that accents were sprinkled about as if from a pepper-caster, but that the statements of other books were, from sheer inaccuracy, frequently misrepresented; assertions were made as to the use of words which were entirely contrary to the facts; the laws of grammar were set at defiance; a note would begin in one way and end in another, or it would express a different view from the translation, or it would be contradicted by another note a few pages later. It is easy to imagine the exposure which Dr. Lightfoot, with his severe Cambridge discipline, would make of this. In the case of Dean Stanley, it was little more than the fly-away criticism which came natural to his too facile and graceful pen. In Prof. Jowett there was not the same airy and engaging carelessness, but there was a deliberate view that the grammar of New Testament Greek was vague and arbitrary. Bp. Lightfoot set himself against this view with all his resources. No reply was made, except a few characteristic words of thanks to critics "unfavourable as well as favourable," in the second edition (1859) of Prof. Jowett's volume. And, so far as my knowledge goes, the conclusions of Bp. Lightfoot's review have never since been questioned.

A little or a narrow mind might have been betrayed into a tone of unseemly elation, or have failed to do justice to the real excellences of the books that were being criticised. It was not so with Dr. Lightfoot. His essay is unfailingly courteous in style, and it shows the fullest and most generous recognition at once of the charm of Dean Stanley's descriptive writing, and of the many-sided suggestiveness of Prof. Jowett. I am not sure that he quite brings out as it deserves the merit, which was conspicuous in both books, of investing the subject with an air of intense reality, of bringing the Scriptures into direct contact with the nineteenth century, not as it might seem to one who only nominally lived in it, but as it really is. From this point of view, the freshness and independence of the two Oxford Commentaries was as extraordinary as their literary execution was striking; and it is these qualities which make them books which should still—certainly not be followed or trusted as specimens of exegesis—but yet be read and digested. They were perhaps the first examples of German criticism being really assimilated by Englishmen and applied to the problems of the New Testament, with a strong national ingredient added. Their value consists not in their positive results, which are, as I imagine, exceedingly small, but in defining, with a skill and individuality which does not fall short of genius, an attitude that English theology should not allow itself to lose.

I have said that Bp. Lightfoot's conclusions as to the Greek of the New Testament have never, to my knowledge, been questioned. And yet it seems to me that Bp. Lightfoot himself held them with a certain amount of reservation, as not at the time when he wrote resting upon a sufficiently wide basis of induction—it is surprising to see that his article, mature as it is both in style and matter, was written within six years of taking his degree. I suspect that the question is not yet really closed, and that there is still room

for a systematic investigation of it. It is a case, as Dr. Lightfoot pointed out, for the solution *ambulando*. "The best test of the truth of the principle here maintained, is the success of its application to the interpretation of St. Paul." My own impression would be that this test was satisfied; but I should not like to speak too confidently, for want of the necessary basis of induction. I am in hopes that the question may be re-started from the Oxford side by the forthcoming publication of a volume of Grinfield Lectures, in which my knowledge of the author prepares me to look for the highest degree of originality and independence along with a very searching examination of the facts. The ultimate event will perhaps be to leave Bp. Lightfoot's principles standing in the main, but in some respects to restrict their application.

In another allied controversy of more recent date, Bp. Lightfoot was equally victorious. At the outset of the work of revising the New Testament, Bp. Lightfoot brought out a book on the subject (*On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, London and New York, 1871), which had a marked effect on public opinion. In this Bp. Lightfoot laid down the rule that "where the same word occurs in the same contexts in the original it should be rendered by the same equivalent in the Version." This position was challenged in a letter to the *Guardian*, by the Rev. J. Earle, Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford, writing as a student of the English language, and pleading for some of the freedom of which many examples are to be seen in the Authorised Version. To this Bp. Lightfoot made a forcible and uncompromising rejoinder in the preface to his second edition (published in 1872). He carried everything before him; and the Revised Version of 1881 bears the deep impress of his authority. I suppose it was inevitable; and yet I must needs confess that I am one of those who cannot help wishing that in this

instance he had been a little less successful. It is a question of degree and of detail. Bp. Lightfoot begins by expressing his entire agreement with Mr. Earle "in deprecating the mode of procedure which would substitute the fidelity of a lexicon for the faithfulness of a translation." "I am well aware," he adds, "that this is a real danger to careful minds trained in habits of minute verbal criticism, and I always have raised and shall raise my voice against any changes which propose to sacrifice forcible English idiom to exact conformity of expression. For instance, it would be mere pedantry to substitute 'Do not ye rather excel them?' for 'Are not ye much better than they?' in Matt. vi. 26 (*οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν*); or 'The hour hath approached,' for 'The hour is at hand,' in Matt. xxvi. 45 (*ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα*)." The case could not be better stated. But it seems to me, and I imagine that it will seem to others, that the Revisers as a body have fallen into the temptation against which their spokesman wished to be upon his guard, and that changes have been made which are very much upon a parity with those of which he disapproves. I fear that the Revised Version is only another instance of the extreme difficulty of putting a "new patch on to an old garment."

Let me quickly have done with this word of demur, which does not detract from my warm admiration for Bp. Lightfoot as a scholar. He is a signal example of what I trust may long be retained in our English universities—though the rise of the special Theological School in each of them will have some tendency to make it rarer—the combination of the highest excellence as a scholar with the highest excellence as a theologian in the narrower sense. All through his writings we feel that we have before us the Senior Classic, who was at home in Thucydides and Plato before he was at home in St. Paul; he had shown his skill in many a piece of finished classical com-

position before he undertook to reproduce the Greek of Polycarp where the Latin only was extant; and it was his practised hand and trained sensitiveness to Greek idiom that made itself felt in his felicitous emendations of Clement and Ignatius. It is here that the Cambridge scholar has the advantage over his German competitors.

2. *Width of erudition.* If there is one word that we should naturally apply to Bp. Lightfoot, it is the word "accomplished." No branch of his subject comes amiss to him; and he has brought all to an equally high pitch of perfection. He is pre-eminently an "*all-round scholar.*" In every department his eye was quick to recognise at the outset the lines that ought to be pursued, and he has pursued them. Can any theologian be named who has made the use that he has made of inscriptions? From the time when he first utilised the discoveries of the Italian archæologists for the illustration of the Epistles to the Romans and Philippians (*Journal of Class. and Sac. Philology*, vol. iv. p. 57 ff., "they that are of Caesar's household"; a somewhat fuller treatment of the subject than in *Philip.* pp. 169-176) down to the recent Introduction to the Ignatian Epistles, in which he has worked up to the full the ample material collected by Prof. W. M. Ramsay, the whole field of Epigraphy has been open to him. Wherever a question of geography or ethnology was raised, Bp. Lightfoot has treated it more like a geographer or ethnologist than a theologian. He was, I believe, the first to introduce into England the results of the researches of Lebas and Waddington; and I know of no one who has such a mastery of the whole range of knowledge which they cover. In reference to exegesis and criticism, I doubt if it is any exaggeration to say that up to the date of his transference to Durham, not a monograph of any importance in England, France, Italy, or Germany seems to have escaped him. Bp. Lightfoot has dealt with many



an outlying author, and with many an obscure and little known period of Church history, and yet I do not know that he has ever been found tripping. His critics may hold different opinions themselves (based very probably in large part upon the materials which Bp. Lightfoot has given them), but I do not remember to have seen or heard of an instance in which he was convicted of what we should call a mistake. This immunity from mistakes has been claimed for another ornament of the Episcopal bench, and I know of no reason why it should not be claimed for Bp. Lightfoot. We have only to think of the range of his published works to realise what this means.

It is this multiform specialism which is of course the distinguishing characteristic of modern commenting, and pre-eminently of Dr. Lightfoot. As compared with a Casaubon or a Baluze, a Pearson or a Dodwell, we may doubt whether the actual volume of knowledge possessed by our contemporary scholars, even the best of them, is at all superior. But in those days learning consisted of a vast number of facts collected by desultory reading, partly stored away in memories of enormous capacity, and partly consigned to copious common-place books. We are still under a very great debt to those who amassed these facts. The men are indeed few and far between who could illustrate an ancient author now as the scholars of the latter half of the sixteenth century, the seventeenth, and the early part of the eighteenth illustrated them. To this day we still plough with their oxen. But as compared with theirs, knowledge is now more *methodised*. It is concentrated upon particular points, and pursued more on system. The theologian is perhaps less of a specialist in the more limited sense than his brother exponent of natural science, where the wonderfully rapid increase of knowledge and discovery has made it impossible to preserve the comprehensive view of the older masters. A leading theologian

still knows something of most parts of his subject. And yet the theologian too has to specialise. A commentator must specialise in several branches at once. This is what Bp. Lightfoot has evidently done, and done with remarkable completeness.

3. *Scientific Method.* If we ask why it is that Bp. Lightfoot's work is so sound and trustworthy, the answer is that it is built upon a foundation of rigorously scientific method. Conclusions are not evolved out of the inner consciousness, but they are suggested in each case by a large collection of facts. It is impossible to take up a note to any of the editions either of the Pauline Epistles or of the Apostolic Fathers without feeling that this was the case. It does not of course follow that others may not collect *more* examples, and that so the balance of the evidence may not be altered, but any assertion of Bp. Lightfoot's we may be sure rests upon a *great number* of examples, sifted and tested with a scholar's instinct. Of course abundant examples of this might be produced from works that are in everybody's hands. They may be found without difficulty simply by turning the pages. But I should once more like to refer to the admirable series of articles in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, which contain the materials (raw materials I cannot call them, for they are much the reverse) that were afterwards embodied in later works—not as is usually the case in less, but in greater fulness. Let any one turn, for instance, to that in vol. iii. p. 289 ff., *On the Style and Character of the Epistle to the Galatians*, and he will feel that there is really nothing more to be said about it, while every argument is clenched by statistics and examples that are undeniable. In this way one subject after another is gradually taken out of the sphere of merely subjective impression and placed upon a basis of irrefragable logic.

4. *Sobriety and Weight of Judgment.* Other writers have

had a scientific method, and yet they do not command the same degree of confidence. It is impossible altogether to eliminate the individual element in critical decisions, and the peculiar reliance which is placed in those of Dr. Lightfoot is due to the sense that they have been most carefully and judicially weighed. As a critic Dr. Lightfoot is essentially conservative. Thoroughly honest as he is in the recognition of facts, his most marked qualities are caution and circumspection. He is apt to be distrustful of new theories; but—to quote a phrase that was originally used of his great predecessor in the see of Durham—his is “not the unsteadiness of the sceptical but the wariness of the judicial mind.” A novelty of any kind must reckon upon being confronted with a great array of learning and made to establish its case very unmistakably before it will gain admission. And for this reason Dr. Lightfoot has been almost invariably successful in controversy.<sup>1</sup> He never takes up an idea hastily; and if he is slow to give his thoughts expression, they come with all the more weight of maturity when they are expressed.

The function of such a mind is naturally not so much that of a pioneer opening the way to new positions as to make good positions already won; to bank out floods, to clear away jungle, to lay down roads, and plant gardens

<sup>1</sup> There is perhaps just room to doubt as to the result of that on the last petition of the Lord's Prayer, conducted as will be remembered, in letters to the *Guardian* soon after the appearance of the Revised Version. Dr. Lightfoot certainly made some strong points, especially the consent of the Greek Fathers. But to set against these, if I am not mistaken, there was considerable diversity among the Versions; and a really weighty argument, on the same side, was furnished by contemporary Jewish usage, which the best judges pronounced to be in favour of “evil” not “the evil one.” It would be a very great boon to students if Dr. Lightfoot could be persuaded to reprint his letters to the *Guardian*, as well as the papers in the *Contemporary* in reply to *Supernatural Religion*. At present neither of these series is so accessible as could be wished. It was perhaps matter of regret that the fragments of a once projected History of Early Christian Literature should have taken so polemical a form as they did in the controversy with *Supernatural Religion*, but the world would far sooner have them in this or in any form, than not have them at all.

and orchards. This is hardly a fanciful figure to represent the aspect of any great question, like the Ignatian, after it leaves Dr. Lightfoot's hands, compared to what it was before it came into them. I have elsewhere spoken of his treatment of the Ignatian question as in a manner "final," not because I do not believe that there are portions of it, especially those relating to the constitution of the Church, on which more may be discovered and more precise views obtained, but because the main points—the priority of the shorter recension of seven letters and the genuineness of these seven letters with that of Polycarp—will never need to be reopened. Another fixed point has been won for criticism, which it may use as a base for further operations. In the obscure period to which it belongs any such fixed point is of inestimable value. Indeed there are few whose attention has been drawn to that period who will not feel that light is beginning to dawn around them as it had never dawned before.

It will easily be imagined that the qualities which Dr. Lightfoot had shown so conspicuously in criticism, taken together with the remarkable influence which he had exercised at Cambridge, gave a sure guarantee of his capacity to fill the highest places in the Church; and, after doing in the nineteenth century a work which if not exactly similar was parallel to that which Bp. Butler did in the eighteenth, he was called to occupy Bp. Butler's see. The result of this and of some other appointments is, that whereas a few years ago the English bench was somewhat weak in point of learning, at the present moment it is exceptionally strong.

Judgment with Bp. Lightfoot is not by any means a merely passive quality. It is not timidity; it is not temporizing. The Bishop is thoroughly capable of firm and strong action when the occasion arises. The habit of mind which I have been describing would naturally prevent him from

taking rash action at the beginning of his episcopate ; but he has never been wanting to good causes, and public confidence has perceptibly risen since it has been known that his unwavering integrity of purpose, his manly simplicity of character, and his broad judicial mind have been brought directly to bear upon the counsels of the Church.

5. *Lucidity of Style.* I have reserved until last the quality which is of all others perhaps the most distinctive of Dr. Lightfoot, as a writer. If one glances over the roll of illustrious names among the critics and exegetes of Europe and America, there are many who can lay claim to learning, many also who go to work on approved methods ; there are some who possess high scholarship, and some more of sound judgment ; but among them all there is none who comes near to Dr. Lightfoot in lucidity of exposition. The lucidity is perfect ; it is hardly possible to conceive it going further. I choose the word purposely as implying something more than "clearness" or "precision." The best American scholars have both these qualities in a high degree ; but they have not quite the literary finish which goes to convert them into "lucidity." M. Renan has the literary finish, but it is finish of a rather different kind ; it has perhaps a higher æsthetic or poetic quality, but it wants the fundamental clearness and precision of thought. M. Renan's sentences are bright with a golden or pearly haze : they are beautiful, but their object is not to define or develop in logical sequence. This is what Bp. Lightfoot does so inimitably. Paley comes nearest of English writers ; but Paley had not quite the breadth which comes from profound learning, from fulness of matter.

It seems to me that as a critic Bp. Lightfoot's style is absolutely ideal. For myself, as a matter of personal taste, I do not like his pulpit oratory quite so well. The orderly development of a subject is there, and is often

most artistic. But he seems to me to yield just a little too much to the popular demand for eloquence. I remember once how a quotation from Bp. Butler seemed to stand out in bare impressiveness all the more for its rather florid setting. Bp. Lightfoot, I think, is at his best in *historical* sermons. There his natural breadth of treatment is in place; he fills his canvas like Veronese, and masses his lights and shades like Tintoret. It has also been my privilege to hear some of his private addresses to candidates for ordination. There the simplicity of the man came out in urging simplicity, and his reality in enforcing reality, in a way that I shall not soon forget.

About midway between his style as a critic and as a preacher (and it should be remembered that I have tried to judge the latter by the highest standards), I should be inclined to place his style as an exegete. Admirable in the extreme, it has always seemed to me, are the paraphrases which Bp. Lightfoot interweaves with his commentary. These alone are a commentary in themselves. I can imagine it being thought that Bp. Lightfoot was not profound as a commentator; but that is only because his mind rejects all that it has not thoroughly assimilated: it will meddle with nothing but what it can express with perfect clearness. Any one who thinks that Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries are deficient in depth might be advised to read the short section on the *Character and Contents* of the Epistle to the Colossians. If this is wanting in depth, so too is Athanasius.

At the same time, it must be admitted that Dr. Lightfoot has not exactly the gift which makes Bengel such a model for commentators. He is *too* clear; he reveals too much; the thought is not so concentrated and compressed. "Suggestive" is not the word that we should apply to Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries. His sentences are not like those (*e.g.*) of St. Augustine, where lightning flashes out

of the cloud. There is a force behind them, but it is force that has been tamed and composed: there is nothing about it volcanic or eruptive. It is however a rare mood when we desire to see these convulsions of nature, this "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep." We should hardly go to a modern commentary for anything Titanic. Enceladus under Etna seems a fable of the past. Fortunately there are "diversities of gifts," and our wisdom is to enjoy those of one man without complaining that they are not those of another. Bp. Lightfoot in an early article quotes a passage which justly blames that "tyrannous desire for uniformity, which confounds the judgment of men, when they are commenting upon each other. . . .; so that you often find that a long criticism upon a man, or his works, is but a demand that he should be somebody else, and his work somebody else's work" (*Journal of Philology*, iv. p. 84, from *Spanish Conquest in America*, i. p. 275). This is what we should avoid. At the same time, it is no disparagement to place Bp. Lightfoot with all his varied accomplishments, as an exegete, a step below Bengel, though most of us will probably learn much more from him of the two.

I seem to myself to discern a certain growth in Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries considered strictly as commentaries. I have spoken of the remarkable maturity of scholarship which was displayed in his earliest work; but the maturity was mainly of scholarship, of knowledge, of all that appertains to externals. It was not quite that prolonged wrestling with the thought of a writer, which not only gets at his secret, but makes you feel that it is his secret—a central moving force, which does not itself appear upon the surface, though its effects are seen all along the surface. It seems to me, if I am not mistaken, that there is more of this in the Commentary on Colossians than in that on Galatians; and, if it is so, it would

naturally be explained by continued study and closer personal acquaintance with the author.

Of all the great commentators, Bp. Lightfoot perhaps reminds us most of Chrysostom. Allowance being made for the fact that Chrysostom's Homilies were for the most part either delivered from the pulpit or written with the object of being so delivered, and allowing also for the fact that Chrysostom was not only a commentator but a born preacher, there is something, as it seems to me, distinctly parallel in the character of the two minds. Both have the same brightness, clearness, and fulness—which is yet not redundancy—of exposition. Both have the same natural repulsion to anything obscure, which makes them perhaps do not quite the fullest justice to obscurity. The rugged, tortuous, embarrassed, and struggling language of St. Paul is so smoothed out that one seems to lose something of the impressiveness of his mental force and stature. The gain no doubt is immense. Probably no Englishman has done so much to make the Apostle's meaning clear to the Englishspeaking peoples. This is the first and paramount duty of a commentator; and it is not perhaps easy to see how it could be combined with what is almost an opposite function—the function of bringing home with equal insistence the extraordinary difficulties, and extraordinary efforts in contending with his difficulties, of this mighty coiner of new ideas, fetched as it would seem at one moment from the lowest deeps, and at another moment from the third heaven. All that I would say is, after reading St. Paul with Bp. Lightfoot, it is well to read him again without any such aid, if only to get a more thorough idea of the man. The best of mediums is yet a medium. The very light itself may alter and dwarf, while it illuminates. Even Wordsworth's cliff, "familiar with forgotten years," would look less grand in the blaze of a summer's sun.



I should not be at all surprised if these remarks should seem to my readers exceedingly obvious. One who has the gift of clearness to such an extent as Bp. Lightfoot, will necessarily leave a clear impression of himself upon others. I can only hope to help the reader to realize more fully the conception already existing in his own mind. He will do this perhaps if he will first think of the points which I have mentioned separately, and then think of them in combination. Generalities that seem in themselves vague, become less vague when several of them are viewed in connexion. It is not my business now to attempt to characterize the other great leaders of contemporary theology. But supposing that the simple tests which I have been applying to Bp. Lightfoot were applied to them, I think it would be seen how first one and then another would differentiate themselves. One possesses this quality and not that; or this in a high, and that in a subordinate degree. What is perhaps most remarkable about Bp. Lightfoot is the even balance and due proportion in which various characteristics unite in him. With the many-sided learning and scientific methods of the nineteenth century, he combines an attitude and quality of mind that reminds one rather of the eighteenth. The eighteenth century was pre-eminently the age of completeness, balance of parts, lucidity. It was the age of simple, unaffected, moral enthusiasms. What it wanted perhaps was a stronger sense of the mystery of things, "the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world." Something of that more awestruck, wondering and aspiring temper the nineteenth century has brought, but along with it how much that is crude, vapid sickly, sentimental! Have not these vices penetrated our Churches and our theology, as well as our fashions, our poetry and our art? And if so, is it not an immense debt that we owe to a man like Bp. Lightfoot, who is the direct antithesis of all that I have just named? That is a happy

---

age which along with a distinct individuality of its own, with certain excellences which are not exactly shared by other ages, carries in its bosom the corrective for the "defects of its qualities." And can we not truly say that we possess such a corrective? Imagine the spirit of Bp. Lightfoot combined with the spirit of Cardinal Newman. There is surely no reason in the nature of things why it should not be combined. Germany has certainly beaten us in the scientific collection of materials. We use these materials with less shame, and sometimes, I am afraid, with less acknowledgment, than we ought. Germany has twenty workers where we have one. But I doubt if Germany has produced such leaders of men. I doubt if Germany, with all its thinking power, has such inspiring figures to contemplate. There needs a touch of something more than thought and knowledge and science before it is possible to achieve the highest in religion. In England, at least since the Tractarian movement began, there has been more of that fugitive and evanescent quality than of solid material for it to work on. Now, thanks more than any one else to Bp. Lightfoot and his Cambridge compeers, we are beginning to accumulate such material. Meantime the old spirit is not dead, and I sincerely trust that it will not die. The clouds seem to be gathering over our country. Anxious times, in more ways than one, are before us. But in the department of theology it is impossible not to cherish a lively hope, and in what is of more importance still than theology, in the whole sphere of religion.

W. SANDAY.

---