

phrases they use. And as no constant aim, no true development, can be attained by capricious, inconsistent, inconsequent action, by instruments incoherent, part with part—for the gratification of Nature's appetite, for the fulfilment of her desire, and the attainment of her purpose, a constancy and fixity of method are essential which are never interrupted, save where the Divine power modifies the instrument for its own good purpose. Thus the uniformity of Nature is based upon the wisdom of God, and the wisdom of God is manifested in the uniformity of Nature. St. Thomas has said: "*Proprium est naturæ rationalis ut tendat in finem quasi se agens et ducens ad finem.*" And again: "*Necessitas naturalis inhærens rebus, quâ determinantur ad unum, est impressio quædam Dei dirigentis ad finem, sicut necessitas quâ sagitta agitur ut ad certum signum tendat, est impressio sagittantis et non sagittæ;*" that is, the necessity, or may we not say the uniformity of Nature, is a career impressed upon it by the Divine archer, who never misses His mark; it is not the arrow which determines that career, but the archer who points and who dismisses the arrow in its flight. But St. Thomas goes on: "*Sed in hoc differt, quod id quod creaturæ a Deo recipiunt est earum natura, quod autem ab homine rebus naturalibus imprimitur præter earum naturam ad violentiam pertinet.*" Dr. Ward will correct me if I am wrong, but I interpret this as meaning that if what men engraft on lower creatures is spoken of by the angelic doctor as doing them a certain violence, altering, I suppose, their mere involuntary qualities by infecting them with a certain human purposiveness not their own, how much more is it evidently open to the Divine purpose to engraft on this uniformity of nature a supernatural bent of its own, to open it, as it were, to the power of miracle, to infuse it with the significance of revelation?

Dr. Ward, I thought, winced a little when this appeal was made to him; whether it was that he differed with the Archbishop as to the drift of the passage quoted, or whether he regarded the Society as in general too little educated in philosophy to appreciate arguments derived from the teaching of