

criticism, its elder sister, has been proved to be anything but scientific and by no means free from bias. Its once "assured results" have for the most part turned out to be non-proven. And the Faith of the Church in its New Testament books, which was said to have been shaken, has only been strengthened. Whether Old Testament criticism will run a like course cannot yet be determined. There are different schools and they differ widely among themselves. Already they claim to have reached "results" which, if they prove true, will largely modify our traditional views regarding the authorship and dates of different parts of the Old Testament. Few accept all those "results," few reject all of them. Mr. Gore provisionally accepts some of these "results" and indicates how the Church can accept them if necessary. Dr. Liddon considers that these results of criticism are incompatible with the claims of Christ and our faith in his knowledge and truthfulness. Mr. Gore thinks the claims of criticism in no way touch our faith in Christ—Hence the controversy.

When these "results" of criticism are all uncertain, and from some points of view appear extremely dangerous, why has Mr. Gore in any way countenanced them? Professor Sanday in the letter quoted above tells us, "Dr. Liddon's pen," he says, "is an extremely powerful one, but may he not have too complete a success? Are there not some who will accept the dilemma which he offers them, but will draw the conclusion which he would be the last to wish them to draw? He must have known, as I have known, men who have been wrecked altogether on these questions. Now, the scholars whose work lies behind the essay in *Lux Mundi* have been laboriously building up a middle position on which such men may fall back without surrendering fundamentals. Can it be well done to destroy, or to try to destroy this?" If the dilemma is Christ or "criticism," many who feel forced to accept the results of criticism will now have the weight of Dr. Liddon's logic with them in rejecting Christ. Mr. Gore, as we have seen, thinks that these results of criticism may be accepted without disloyalty to Christ, and, in answer to Liddon, clears himself from the reproach of disloyalty in a letter to the *Spectator*, April 9th. "If the present controversy is to be profitable, it is well, I think, to bear in mind that neither a fallible and fallacious Christ nor an inspired forgery are conceivable by Catholic Christians or postulated by literary criticism." Thus the case stands. But we must not forget that the Old Testament critics differ among themselves. It will take years to decide many of the questions in dispute. Meanwhile there are those who, accepting certain results of "criticism" as proved, have thought as Dr. Liddon thinks, that it is a case of Christ or "criticism," and have never thought that any defender of the Faith could accept with them these results of criticism. Accordingly they have given up Christianity. To these men *Lux Mundi* loudly cries, "the claims of Christ and the claims of criticism are not incompatible, we can accept both."

Mr. Gore may be right or wrong in his critical judgment. The results of criticism which he may be supposed implicitly to accept may be proved or disproved: and still his work may be welcomed. There are two classes of persons mainly concerned. First those who inclining to accept criticism think they are called upon to give up Christianity. These persons can now retire upon the position taken up in *Lux Mundi* and fearlessly accept Christianity and criticism. On the other hand there are those to be considered who it is supposed will be "unsettled" by *Lux Mundi*. But they need not be disturbed, for criticism has yet to prove those positions which in *Lux Mundi* are only accepted provisionally. Two possibilities lie before the Church. On the one hand criticism may fail to establish

its contentions, in which event *Lux Mundi* will be seen to have taken up a position which though not absolutely necessary was yet relatively useful. If on the other hand criticism is confirmed, then the Church will have to fall back on the position taken up by *Lux Mundi*. In either case patience is needed and charity is in order, and if Old Testament criticism is going to be as fruitful as New Testament criticism has finally proved to be, which we firmly believe, let Faith and Hope join hands with Charity and Patience.

Meanwhile let us bracket the questionable parts of Mr. Gores' essay, so that we may not be cut off from enjoying many things in this book for which all may be thankful.

There is a special significance in the fact that Oxford and not Cambridge is the cradle of *Lux Mundi*. The writers are the lineal descendants of the "Oxford movement." Did any of the younger followers of Pusey and Keble entertain the fear, lest the return upon the past, which marked the Oxford revival, involved a loss of sympathy with the 19th century? Perhaps they did. If so *Lux Mundi* will reassure them. This work is a pledge that a reversion to first principles is not necessarily a retrograde movement. In *Lux Mundi* intellectual breadth and Catholic tradition are linked together. In 1833 the need of the time was practical reformation. To-day intellectual re-construction is what is needed. The "Tracts for the Times" breathe the spirit of Western thought. *Lux Mundi* is animated by the spirit of Greek thought. The former were anthropological and dealt mainly with life. The latter is theological and deals mainly with thought.

To restore the traditions of the Catechetical school of Alexandria is the crying need of our day. The task which lies before the Church to-day is the exact counterpart of the task which lay before the Church then. The experience of Justin passing from one Philosophy to another and at length arriving at Christian Philosophy has many parallels in our own day. The work performed by Clement and Origen in the school of Alexandria, in bringing over the intellect of Paganism to Christian Philosophy needs doing again. Agnostics and Christian Gnostics pretty well divide our Western World. To commend Christianity as inherently reasonable, to declare that all men must hold some Faith, to show that the Christian conception of God alone can satisfy the requirements of Philosophy, to remove the antecedent improbability of such an event as an "Incarnation" by an appeal to pre-Christian history which awakens such an expectancy, to show that the Logos doctrine alone gives to creation the luminous basis which "Evolution" demands, to vindicate the necessity of right views if dogmas are synonymous with facts, to show that the law of solidarity is the condition of the possibility of an atonement, and sacrifice, an instinct of our nature, the ground of its reasonableness, to claim that the doctrine of the divine immanence is the true account of the processes of nature, that a society whose law is love is the true key to our social problems, that the doctrine of Sacraments will alone vindicate the sanctity of all life, and witness to the close bond which exists between the physical and the psychical that the Church should be the conscience and soul of the State, that Christianity is at last, the only secure basis of universal morality—These are some of the aims of *Lux Mundi*. In spirit it is eminently commendatory. All the provinces of life and thought are eagerly claimed as being only the adequate theatre for proving the claims of Christianity.

We need not stop to notice the debt which Oxford owes to the Cambridge school in this connection. It is enough that both schools court the criticism of secular thought, and boldly challenge the production of a single shred of evidence in History, in Philosophy or in Science which is subversive