

tutes its power and riches. Not that the Church disowns theology, or dogma, or philosophy, among her trusty weapons of warfare; but her liturgy is far above and more than all these, and has place only for the memorial and the promised coming again of God manifest in the flesh.

This is altogether a divinely inspired intuition of the Church, even from the beginning. It struggled for utterance in her earliest symbolism. It memorialized Christ, and the life and things of Christ, in her unfolding architecture, in every particular of decoration and sacramental service; in the cruciform foundations, in the doors, windows, aisles, pillars, columns; in the sanctuary, with its altar of unbloody sacrifice. Art, as it sprang from her faith and devotions, took up and reiterated the vast theme, from the Annunciation to the Ascension.

Far upraised among the Tyrol ranges lies the remote hamlet of Ober Ammergau, whose pious cottagers every tenth year, make ready as an act of holy devotion, with the best accessories of sacred art within reach, the "Passion Play," or drama of the Christ-Passion; so tenderly and reverently, too, that tens of thousands from all quarters of Christendom flock thitherwards to contemplate the spectacle. Yet every church where the Catholic Liturgy is duly and reverently observed, year in and out, is a thousand-fold more inspiring than any Ober Ammergau. For the Church Liturgy for all this half year to come, will be busy with nothing else than a revival, a portrayal, of the entire, unbroken story of Jesus the Christ; not in picturesque tableaux, but in the living Word, that came down from God, and which is itself Life, even the Divine Life; Word and Sacrament both incorporated in eloquent persuasive ritual. And the end of all shall be the renewal in us of that one Perfect Life, brought to light in Jesus, the Son of Mary, who was Himself in very deed the Word made Flesh Which dwelt among us and Which shall come again.

It is in this way that the liturgy meets all spiritual needs and answers all questions. So that they who live within its sacred enclosures, are like ships safely anchored, where no tumult of stormy sea or tempest can reach them. It is full of the Life of Christ, and when He is made manifest to the believing soul it is not strange that the soul is satisfied.

Here is brought into painful clearness a vital defect of what may be called denominational Christianity, which has become estranged from this historic and liturgic presentation of our Blessed Lord. Here it all is, a mystery, a fact, a faith, kept alive and ever present in the divine liturgy; and it is this perpetual witness of the Catholic Church that separates between her, and all doubt, and error, and unbelief.

When the head gets the better of the heart, and science and philosophy strive mightily with faith, and the Church herself is storm-swept with vain questionings, and men's hearts fail them because of fear and a shaking of the foundations; when learned doctors and schools seem ready to betray and surrender the substance of the Faith once delivered and once for all, there is the calm, untroubled liturgy, which every priest must read, and all the faithful may read, mark, and inwardly digest, and the ancient creed testifies that this is verily Jesus the Christ Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of

the Virgin Mary; and then clamorous voices are hushed, idle questionings and blind cavils are stilled, for no man may gainsay the Catholic Creeds without apostasy; since they, like the Christ they declare, lie infinitely above the plane of controversy in the supernatural realms of faith.

"Until He come"; let no man ask how or when! According to His promise so shall it be made good. It is not for us to know or forecast, neither wise nor wholesome. The ways of Divine Providence are higher than our ways. Already He may have drawn nearer than we have suspected or dare surmise, along the highways of civilization, in the maturing of better and purer social conditions, in the outgoings of a world-embracing philanthropy, in the manumission of slaves, in the larger diffusion of knowledge and invention. Who can tell the way-marks of His approach or declare the secret tokens of His appearing? But this we know, that it shall be with power and exceeding glory; and that in the day of His coming, sin and death shall flee away, and the kingdoms of this earth shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and that He shall reign forever and ever, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. —*The Living Church.*

"THE NEW LEARNING."

That the subject of Biblical Criticism is now painfully exercising many minds is evident; and is what has long been foreseen and anticipated by thoughtful and educated people. The ordinary Protestant who rejected with scorn the idea of an infallible Church as the interpreter of an infallible book, replaced the infallible Church by himself, as he considered it his own duty, privilege, and perquisite to deduce from the pages of the Bible all that a Christian ought to know and do. That a great many equally infallible individuals of this type deduced discordant doctrines from Scripture, was, to the minds of quiet, thoughtful onlookers, destructive of the theory they advanced; for how could they all be right, when they often differed so radically and widely from each other? Yet each of them was perfectly satisfied with his own conclusions, and each probably believed that the others had not duly sought the guidance of the Holy Spirit, or in some other way had failed to fulfil the conditions of correct interpretation. Each and all claimed that the Bible taught what they severally held, no matter how far they diverged from and disagreed with each other. To people affected with the malady of thought, this was a puzzling and perplexing result; for, granted the Bible infallible, here were many persons explaining and applying it in altogether different and contradictory ways, yet each claiming perfection for his own interpretation. As a rule, many of these people were entirely ignorant of the history of the canon of Scripture, and but ill fitted linguistically to deal with it in the original tongues. They accepted the English Version as practically the original itself, and dealt with it irrespective of the fact that the Bible is a library much rather than a book, the composition of which extended over centuries; a library in which a growth and development are distinctly traceable, which reflects Eastern forms of thought, expression, manner, and customs embodied in the languages of the East. Of course the Holy Spirit could endow the student with all the qualifications necessary for its interpretation; but intraculous aid of this kind is not as a rule to be reckoned on, and ordinary mortals could not safely dispense with much long and

difficult preliminary training and study before they could hope to interpret Scripture with much success.

This view of the Bible just referred to was never the Anglican theory, and has of course ceased to be held by Protestant theological scholars of the advanced type, who recognized the necessity of acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek, and of the employment of all other aids to its exegesis that were available, such as the comparison of contemporary historical documents and anything and everything that bore upon and elucidated Eastern forms of thought and expression.

But now the matter has gone a long stage further; it is not with the explanation and application of Scripture that men of this type are satisfied; they have gone into, and are going into, the very structure of its separate, component parts; the Pentateuch is continually being taken to pieces and re-assorted—so is the Book of Psalms—so is Isaiah—so is Daniel. Nor have the Books of the New Testament escaped similar treatment. All this has naturally caused to many a great deal of alarm, and even consternation, and has been met in various ways—e.g., this "new learning" has been universally denounced and condemned by some as practically anti-Christian, at least in its tendencies, for it is held to set aside the testimony of our Lord to the authorship of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Book of Daniel; but it is evident that in the last result this controversy must be fought out, and thrashed out also, by competent men on both sides, on literary and critical grounds.

But having come so far, and as it must be admitted that the number, not only of the laity but of the clergy, competent to study the subject from this point of view, is so extremely small, let us inquire what ordinary Christians have to say in the presence of this controversy.

Some will say, We know this view is all utterly self-condemned; we shall, therefore, not consider or entertain it at all; we know the Bible is infallible, and we have the witness of the Spirit to its inspiration and truth. Others will wisely add, that in addition to the testimony of Scripture to itself—i.e., its own internal evidence, we have the voice of The Church as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ. We know and admit our complete incapacity as individuals to determine such a controversy as this for ourselves; but we know that The Church settled the canon of Scripture; and believing that she did so under the guidance of her Divine Head, we believe she will continue to guard and preserve it in the future as she has done in the past.

To others it will also occur that theories about the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament, now brought forward, are very late in the day; that it is very strange that literary compositions of an alleged much later date could have been successfully foisted on the Jews themselves, who would have been in the most favourable position to detect anything of the kind if attempted. That a large amount of speculation, or rather hypothesis, is required as a basis for theories of this kind—e.g., that the prophet Jeremiah was in collusion with Josiah about fabricating a copy of the Book of the Law, concealing it, and dramatically discovering and introducing this modern antique at the proper moment. The history of pious frauds could scarcely surpass this; but how could any critic in the present day offer this conjecture as a solid basis for a theory; what foundation has it beyond that of his own fancy? We are not writing for scholars, who have access to learned works on this subject; but we hope to produce in one more article a line of argument that may be useful to intelligent people not accustomed to regular theological study. The nature of the argument is this—The New Testament bears distinct and decided witness to the Old Testament, therefore proof of the genuine historical nature of the New Testament is also proof of the genuine historical nature of the Old.—*Irish Eccl. Gazette.*