

AUGUST 1890

The Theological Monthly

LUX MUNDI.

THE writer of the essay now become notorious states that his purpose in the latter part of it "has not been to inquire how much we can without irrationality believe inspiration to involve, but rather, how much may legitimately and without real loss be conceded." And his position generally may be regarded as an endeavour to maintain that there is a corrective element in the abiding inspiration of the Church, which may be safely trusted to counteract the influence of what is vaguely termed Modern Criticism. He has an equal faith in the abiding inspiration of the Church and in what he calls the "results" of "criticism," and in this belief he is prepared to surrender such points as the post-Exilic origin of a large part of the Pentateuch, the composite nature of Isaiah, the Maccabæan origin of the Psalms, the allegorical character of Jonah, and the lateness of the book of Daniel. He thinks that the position of the Church is independent of all discussion on these points if they are allowed to remain free, and even of an adverse decision if they are closed. His belief in criticism, therefore, is very strong, but his belief in the Church is somewhat stronger. He sits above, entrenched in what he calls "the religion of the incarnation," and contemplates with serene indifference the issue of the battle that is raging on these minor points below.

Now, my complaint against the class of writers with whom he must now be identified is the loose and indeterminate way in which they use the words "inspiration" and "revelation," as though they were words in their intrinsic meaning common to all alike. For instance, they will continue to speak of the