

that, while the Fathers, in commenting on passages where physical matters occurred, have sometimes expressed the ideas of their times and thus made statements which in these days have been abandoned as incorrect, on the other hand 'those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the sacred writings, either pervert the catholic notion of inspiration or make God the author of such errors.' As to 'Sermo communis' or 'ordinary speech,' he says, 'Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way, the sacred writers, as the Angelic writer also reminds us, 'went by what sensibly appeared' or put down what God, speaking to men, signified, in the way men could understand and were accustomed to. Had the author weighed what the Pope said about this 'Sermo communis' she would never have made her favorite character, George Sutcliffe, pen the statement, 'no one now believes in the literal truth of Joshua's account of the sun standing still.' The fact is that every one who believes at all in that account, believes in the literal truth of it. The literal truth is the truth of ordinary speech in its primary and proper sense and the Pope reminds us that in this sense ordinary speech 'describes what comes under the senses.' What came under the senses of Joshua and those that were with him was the sun standing for many hours together at one point in the heavens, and he did but describe literally and faithfully what he witnessed. It is no figure of speech, neither is it a fiction that the sun rises or that the sun sets; it is no literal description of a phenomenon as it appears to the senses. The author confounds 'literal truth' with 'scientific truth.' It is the literal truth that to the ordinary eye, the sun is no larger than the dial of a clock and the stars are mere specks of light in the firmament; how far the sensible appearance is from the scientific truth let astronomers tell. But of what really happened when the sun was seen to stand still, those who saw it knew as much as we do--and that is just nothing at all.

There is more in this able review to explain and support these positions but we have sufficient to see the drift of the book. We agree that the culture, the refinement, and what is vastly more, the ardent faith and tender piety of the author, are unquestioned. Not so the theology. We also think that the discussion of grave theological ques-