

nations, and it is at least very doubtful whether any of his disciples ever uttered it. And the early Church, too, did not speak directly of the divinity of Christ, but always of his divinity and humanity. "God-man," therefore, is the only correct formula even in the intent of the ancient dogma. In this phrase we have almost restored the mystery which according to the will of Christ himself was to remain in this matter. He made no secret of the fact that he was the Lord and Savior, and his disciples were expected to observe and experience the fact in his words and deeds. But how his relation to the Father arose he withheld from us and kept to himself. In my historical opinion, therefore, and according to my feeling in the matter, even the formula "man and God" (God-man-hood) is not beyond criticism, inasmuch as it has already begun to intrude upon a mystery into which we are not permitted to look.

But the formula may be allowed to stand because at bottom it does not pretend to explain anything, but only protects the extraordinary from profanation, just as does the expression "Son of God." The Pauline expression "God was in Christ" seems to me to be the last word that we are permitted to speak in this matter, now that we have liberated ourselves slowly and painfully from the erroneous notion of ancient philosophers that we can penetrate the mysteries of God and Nature, humanity and history.

"If ye love me, keep my commandments;" "In this shall every one recognise that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another,"—it is more important to meditate upon these words and try to live up to them than to put the incomprehensible and the venerable into formulas. The time is coming and even now is near when Evangelical Christians will join hands sincerely in the confession of Jesus Christ as their master and in the determination to follow his words, and our Catholic brethren will then be obliged to join with us to the same end. The burden of a long history of misunderstandings, of formulas that bristle like swords, of tears and blood, weighs upon us, but in it there is also preserved to us a precious inheritance. The two seem to be united inextricably, but nevertheless they are gradually separating, although the "Let there be light" has not yet been spoken across this chaos. Frankness and courage, honesty with ourselves, freedom and love—these are the levers which will lift the burden. And the Emperor's letter also is intended to aid in this lofty undertaking.

POPE LEO XIII. ON ONE OF THE HIGHER CRITICS.

Leo XIII. is perhaps the most liberal Pope that ever sat on the chair of St. Peter. What he thinks of Higher Criticism may be gathered from his attitude toward Renan, of which the following anecdote is reported, which may be true, and if not true may be considered *ben trivato* because characteristic of the Pontiff's attitude toward scholars of Renan's stamp. When told of Renan's death Pope Leo XIII. asked: "How did he die?" "Impenitent," was the reply. Leo XIII. reflected a moment and then remarked very quietly: "That is better." The prelate having expressed some surprise, the Pope went on to explain that Renan had proved by his end that his doubt was sincere. He would be judged by his sincerity, which, if it was thorough, might absolve him. A few moments afterward he observed that Renan had done more good than harm to the Church. He had aroused the theologians from their torpor. He had embodied the doubts of modern thought. He had marshaled its forces. The Church had been surprised; but could they believe that all this was not designed by Providence? And they might hope that particular indulgence would be shown to one who was the instrument of God's wrath.