

tical tradition has invested them. 'But,' orthodoxy may reply, 'on this view of inspiration, you put Shakespeare or Shelley on a level with St. John.' By no means; the inspiration of Shakespeare or of Shelley was for a secular mission; that of John for a religious one. Both had their mission: 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' The Bible was meant to be *the religious Book of the world*; it is and will be so, and it lives in a sphere which sceptical criticism cannot reach. Only two things can weaken men's trust in its right use. Dishonest avoidance of criticism which every one knows to be irrefragable, the ostrich policy of hiding head and brains in the sand, and a theory of inspiration inherited from times when the European intellect was but half awake, and fatally bound up with scholastic notions which every student of every school now rejects.

Some sort of a New Reformation is inevitable as to this and kindred questions. Shall it come from the pulpit, from the press, or from the outside world which sympathises with neither?

A MAN OF THE PEOPLE.

REJOINDER.

My brief notice of a rather insignificant book, has, I find, been made a text for various comments. In the course of the commenting, the original subject of review has dropped out of sight, and Robertson Smith—with the whole of what is called 'Biblical Introduction' and its bearing on Inspiration—has taken its place. These questions are altogether too large to be discussed in an off-hand way at a Round Table. At the very least they should be based on a full review of Robertson Smith's Lectures, and—as 'A Layman' desires to hear again from me—I may attempt this in a succeeding number of the CAN-

ADIAN MONTHLY. In the meantime, I may be permitted to sum up the symposium with a few words. 'A Layman' is right in saying that it is not only a crime but a blunder for the clergy to ignore these topics. They cannot be ignored. When the ostrich hides its head in the sand, its doom is sealed. 'A Man of the People' is also right in saying that, as it is impossible for the general run of men to examine into the niceties of Biblical Criticism, it is necessary to get some broad statement—intelligible to the tone of modern thought—with reference to the nature and use of the Bible, on which men can stand, nothing doubting. I have not made up my mind whether 'Clerical Contributor' is in earnest or not. In his second paragraph he suggests a strong argument in favour of the position of the traditionalists; but the first paragraph is simply amusing or amazing, according to the state of mind in which we happen to be. Speculation is 'dangerous,' 'because the suggestion of doubt to the popular mind replaces an unreasoning faith by an equally unreasoning disbelief.' We must then be content with an unreasoning faith. To get a reasonable faith is wholly out of the question, it seems. Speculation must be stopped, or at all events kept out of the Church. That is, let there be an infallible Church for the people, and let thinkers live without religion, only 'let them take off their hats when they pass a church!' *Roma locuta est*. Again, he calls men who begin to depart from the old paths 'the Girondists of Theological Destructiveness.' Does that mean that constitutional reform is the parent of revolution? That the Girondists begat the mountain, and that the Reign of Terror is to be laid at their door? He cannot mean that: but if he does not mean that, what does he mean?

A THEOLOGICAL TEACHER.