

from which *L'Echo de Paris* has reproduced, with comment, the more salient passages. We translate from the Paris paper, of date January 28, both quotations and comment.

*

'The object of the article,' says the *Echo*, 'is quite other than one would have expected from the party affiliations of the author. It is written to protest against the severity of the censorship, and to induce the Government to permit a free discussion of the conditions upon which Germany will make peace. De Zedlitz declares: 'It must be afflicted with a bureaucratic presumption and with an unlimited blindness, or else with an excessively timorous spirit, to desire that the existing situation should be prolonged right up to the conclusion of peace. The German people are not children. They have the right to insist that their voice shall be heard before the negotiations, and that due account of their views shall be taken throughout the pourparlers. If they are prevented by force from raising their voice at a time when it would be of some advantage, the intensity of their feelings would bring them to the state of an over-heated boiler the safety-valve of which has been closed. If one opens too late the safety-valve of free discussion in the press, one is not able to avoid the danger of an explosion. There is no need to point out that in such a case the public authority, and those in whose charge it has been placed, will be the first to be placed in peril.' De Zedlitz does not fix the precise date at which it would be desirable to open the safety-valve of which he speaks. He indicates simply that Germany must have first obtained complete victory *on one of the two fronts*. But he affirms that even before this period the Government ought to make promises of free speech in Parliament: 'It must be recognised that if the moment of a free discussion has not arrived before the next parliamentary session, some undertakings must be entered into with the Reichstag and with the Prussian Landtag.' In conclusion, de Zedlitz returns to his favorite and disquieting comparison. 'In default of such a safety-valve, the danger of parliamentary explosions would by no means be remote, even in full session. Whoever figures to himself the consequences of such a happening will acknowledge at the same time how fitting and opportune is the saying of M. Miquel: Give way in time.'

*

'The significance of this extremely curious article (comments the *Echo*) depends on the circumstances under which it was written: and on this point we are unable to do more than conjecture. If de Zedlitz is, in this affair, only in the position of a parliamentary leader who voices his personal view or the view of his group, it is without doubt a manoeuvre directed against the chancellor himself and certain of his colleagues. That would then be the sequel to the reproaches which the leader of the strict Conservatives, de Heyebrand, directed on January 18 against German diplomacy. If that is so, it would appear that confidence does not reign amongst the German authorities, and that instability of government is not a scourge from which Germany is exempt. There remains the other hypothesis: that M. de Zedlitz has written his article in agreement with the Government. The authorities in Germany perceived, then, that their country will not bear the burden of the war indefinitely, that the peace will be far from corresponding to the expectations and sacrifices of the nation, and that it is necessary to speak of all these things in order to soften the blow, and perhaps also to provoke in the foreign press controversies from which Germany would draw a supreme advantage. If that explanation is correct, our enemies are in rather a bad way.'

Why Christ Died

We should rather have headed this, Why, and in what sense, was it necessary that Christ should have died for the salvation of mankind? The question is worth discussing partly because there is room for clear light on the subject, and partly because in these

materialistic and pleasure-loving days there is urgent need to re-state and emphasise the great doctrine of the heinousness of sin, of which the Atonement is the practical expression. There is need for enlightenment even among those whose duty it is to instruct others, and to speak with knowledge and authority on the subject. Outside of the Catholic Church there is a large and growing school of clergymen who do not believe in the necessity, in any sense, of the death of Christ, and who deny the fact of the Atonement—that is, that the Saviour's death was offered in any sort as a satisfaction or expiation for sin. In a well-known work published by a New Zealand minister our Lord is described, in relation to His crucifixion, as merely 'an unconscious martyr.' Dr. R. F. Horton, one of the most representative of Nonconformist divines, declares that the traditional doctrine of the Atonement 'is shattered on all the salient points of the New Testament teaching.' Robertson, of Brighton, and other eminent Protestant authorities, have expressed similar views. And even amongst Catholics—we speak, of course, of the laity—while the fact and doctrine of the Atonement are believed and held without a question, there are many, and these not the least educated, who would experience some difficulty in giving an adequate and effective answer to the query: Why, or how far, was it necessary for Christ to die to provide a way of salvation for mankind? Being God, could He not have redeemed the world without shedding His own blood?

*

One such Catholic, a reader of the *Bombay Examiner*, non-plussed by these two questions, which had been submitted to him by a non-Catholic friend, passed the problem on to the editor, with the happiest results. Father Hull fairly revels in the exposition of these finer theological points; and his answer is so clear and apposite that we reproduce it in its entirety. 'There are,' writes Father Hull, 'two sorts of necessity, the one absolute, the other relative. Thus to take a simple instance, food and drink of some kind is an absolute necessity for a man's existence, because he is so constituted that without food and drink he must waste away and die. But it is not an absolute necessity for a man to wear clothes. In hot countries they are superfluous; and even in cold countries archaic man seemed to get on without them. But clothes have nevertheless become a necessity for most men, simply because they have got used to them and would suffer and possibly die of catarrh if they suddenly threw them off. This is a *relative* necessity. Another instance would be this: It is not absolutely necessary that a bicycle should have a bell. The necessity arises only from the police laws, which impose a fine on those who ride without a bell. This may be called a *consequent* necessity; that is, a necessity which arises in consequence of a law. With these ordinary instances to explain the idea, we can say that there is no *absolute* necessity for Christ to have died on the cross in order to deliver us from the bonds of sin. God could have decreed any other way of restoring us to His favor. He might have simply made a clean sweep of the effects of the fall, restoring His grace to mankind by a pure and simple act of bounty. When we say that the divine justice demanded some kind of satisfaction, we only mean that the divine justice could make such a demand if God so willed; but this demand could be waived by the divine mercy. Even if such a demand was made, theologians teach that this satisfaction could have been fulfilled by Christ without undergoing death on the cross. He could have secured our redemption by a simple wish, if the Father had been willing to accept that wish.'

*

In what sense then can the death of Christ be called a necessity? It can be called a necessity in two ways, first *relatively*, second *consequently*—as above explained. The death of Christ was necessary relatively to God's design in dealing with mankind. God wished to impress on our minds the heinousness of sin; and in no more vivid a way could this be done than by the picture of His own beloved Son dying on the cross as a