

THE FACT

OF

INSPIRATION.

By

CLIFTON HARBY LEVY.

Presented to the Faculty of the Hebrew Union College

FOR THE DEGREE OF RABBI.

June 1890.

I N T R O D U C T I O N .

The subject which I have chosen for treatment in this paper was dictated by the importance, the very essential quality which it bears to the question of Revealed Religion of all kinds. It was with the express determination of careful and (as far as possible) unprejudiced investigation that the matter was approached, in the name of logical truth, to ascertain whether really there was any valid reason for the belief in Inspiration as a fact. Upon this I felt to depend the whole belief in Judaism as such. Without it I was forced to the conclusion that I must have recourse to philosophy alone for beliefs and teachings and I must acknowledge an intense relief at having been able to reach the conclusion at which I have arrived.

It was the first natural impulse that as I had been able to attain this end it might be of

the same value to many others in the same plight as myself, viz: wavering between the two extremes, belief and philosophy. Therefore I shall try to reproduce as exactly and as clearly as in my power lies the course of reflection by which I have arrived at the conviction that there has been and still is Inspiration from God.

If it is a fact (as I believe it to be) it will be conceded by every student of logic, that absolute proof is impossible, all that can be done is to bring the reader into immediate contact with that fact, or to show forth the perceptions by which the fact appeals to me, as such. As illustrative of the impossibility of proving a fact take the example so often given for explaining conceivability and inconceivability. If an inhabitant of Northern climes approach the native of the tropics and try to convince him that water under certain conditions becomes a solid, he cannot

succeed by any amount of argument or proof; the only method of convincing this native is to manufacture ice by some mechanical process. This must be done before the eyes of the native that he may not suspect some fraud, such as the substitution of a stone for the water, and the remelting of the ice will force the man in question to acknowledge that he has come in contact with a new fact, which while heretofore existing had not been conceivable to him.

So with the question in hand, if I can show that what we have of spiritual conceptions is traceable to Inspiration, is the congealed fact of Divine Spirit, if you cannot be deceived by the substitution of something else, call it phantasy or what you please, for Divine Inspiration, a fact has been proven, in as far as a fact admits of proof; and such I believe can be done and is shown forth below.

I must acknowledge that no small amount of thought and writing has been devoted to this subject by many men both for and against my Thesis, and it is but to be expected that I present briefly something of the gist of the thought which has been brought forward by Jewish, Greek and Christian writers. After the statement of my Thesis I shall give this account, dealing only with a few, and those the leading minds, of each class; thereafter presenting the arguments either collected altogether or partly originated by which I am led to the statement of this

T H E S I S .

THAT MEN HAVE BEEN INSPIRED BY GOD (MOST POWERFULLY EXHIBITED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, ESPECIALLY IN THE CONCEPTION OF GOD AND THE MORAL CODE THERE FOUND) AND THAT INSPIRATION STILL CONTINUES.

HISTORY OF CONCEPTION AND THEORIES.

Naturally the first source to which we look for an account of the idea of Inspiration is the Old Testament statements and what this idea meant to the ancient Hebrews must be gleaned from various sections of the twenty-four books which constitute its canon.

A discussion bearing quite directly upon the subject is that at present being argued by various scholars, those opposed to received opinions regarding the antiquity of the Bible record being the Dutch school, headed by Kuenen, Wellhausen and others. Their fanciful theories seem to

me to lack basis or even probability for many reasons, some of the best being those collected and presented by Dr. T. W. Chambers in a late collection of Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism, as follows :

1. That Sacred and secular sources support the tradition of authorship and time.
 2. If written later and by authors in collusion with each other why so many inconsistencies as they appear to be to us.
 3. That Moses by training received and all accounts we have was wise enough to have done it.
 4. That we have no valid reason to dispute the existence of a Priesthood.
 5. Why should literary production commence in exile and not before?
 6. That the non-observance of law proves the non-existence of laws is fallacious, as argued by the Critics.
 7. That the language is ancient and could not have been so well and consistently forged.
- I have only cited these statements as this is not the

place for their full argument, particularly as the work referred to is easily procurable.

We may then proceed on the assumption that the books may be accepted as they stand and pretend to be, at least until more positive or convincing proof is advanced confirming the opposite view.

Starting with the Book of Genesis we find an account of the revelation of God to Adam and Noah, but the content of these revelations is not sufficiently striking or clearly defined for us to compare them with our knowledge, as derived from other sources. When we come to the revelation to Abraham we reach what is really the first step in the distinctively Jewish conception of God, viz: Monotheism. From this point on to the revelation of the still higher God - idea to Moses in אלהים

אשר אלהים is, as it appears to me, an account of the preparation and growth of the people

to the plane needed for the reception of the more abstract idea revealed through Moses, i. e. God as the ETERNAL EXISTENCE. The revelation of the moral code at Sinai was but the natural sequence of the former revelations once they are granted. (The discussion will appear later). It is a point to be carefully noted that these revelations to Moses were never in dreams or visions, where a suspicion of mere phantasy is strongly supposed, but to a man awake, fully conscious of the importance of his inspiration and the act of reception. As a matter of fact there is not traceable, until comparatively late times, any such dream-idea in connection with the Inspiration regarding ideas unattainable otherwise, such inspirations are always introduced by such a phrase as "God spoke unto Moses". Now, according to the Mosaic conception of God, all anthropomorphism, i. e. as corporeal, was negated of God, only the spiritual

part of man was ascribed to God in an infinite degree; therefore this speech of God with Moses could only mean the influence of mind Divine on mind human and in that sense is and should be generally understood.

The next appearance of Inspiration appears in the prophet Samuel, and his schools of the prophets. Here seems the proper place for a discussion of the word prophet, what it meant for the Hebrew and the misconceptions which have been put upon it. The Hebrew word, **נָבִיא** is from the verb **נָבַא** to flow, as proven conclusively by a similar root found in the Assyrian inscriptions, therefore it primarily meant a speaker, a preacher, and while we find other appellations such as seer, watchman &c., applied to these men we never find them spoken of as predictors. Their office seemed to be the joining of the people to God and his Law, nothing more. It was an evidence of the wis-

dom of Samuel that he originated and founded schools of the prophets, for it must be constantly held in mind that the people formed a Theocracy, hence there was imperative need for schools in which men should be instructed in the Law so that they might teach the people. The office of the priests was merely sacrificial, that of the prophets was the Ethical and consequently it is from the ranks of the latter that the exhorters appear, who incite the people to patriotism, which for them meant devotion to their Faith. These were the men who derived their whole spiritual life from God, are devoted to his service and by power received from Him are filled with "lofty enthusiasm, profound knowledge of the true and excellent and far-reaching insight into the mind of God".

(Knobel: Prophetismns der Hebraer). Men such as Isaiah and Jeremiah preached that they were inspired of God, and if all inspiration could be as

easily proven to be in accord with the facts of the time my work would be soon over. But here I merely wish to put forth the conceptions of the people and the prophets themselves about their office. I wish to remark here that while Inspiration was at first directed to the forming of the theory of the Theocracy the office of the prophets was almost exclusively practical, to so great an extent was their work considered in the light of a commentary on the Pentateuch that the theory has been advanced with considerable force that there is not an ethical principle to be found in the Prophetical books which is not expressed or implied in the V hence we conclude that the real question of Inspiration should be asked first concerning Moses and if we find this a fact its succeeding appearance may be discussed. Undoubtedly the Inspiration of Moses was of the highest grade and from its great originality and basic quality

could never be equalled or surpassed. On this account the Rabbis of the Talmud and some of the philosophers of the Middle Ages seem to think that the inspiration of Moses was not only different in quantity, but also different in quality from any which preceded or followed him. Among these philosophers the most prominent are Maimonides, Jehuda, Halevi, and Jos. ~~Abbo~~, whose theories I here give in order, besides something of the conceptions of the Rabbis in this regard. Maimonides conceived the power of prophecy (or inspiration) as an efflux from the Divine Mind to the human mind which descended upon the pure, imaginative and intellectual man alone, and that too by the will of God, for a man might have all those qualifications and still not be a prophet, (v. Moreh Nebuchim Part II ch. 32 e. s.). This conception is traced by some to Alfarabi and Ibn. Sinna.

Jehuda Halevi held "Revelation is needed for modesty and humility and against over-reaching; to awaken in men's hearts love and holy reverence, not to be reached by speculation. It is like light streaming from God, a greater act even than creation. Before it all thought taught was a first cause, revelation, through inspiration had to teach God". (Eisler: Über die juedischer Philos. der Mittel alters).

Jos. ~~Albo~~ in his work "Ikkarim" seems to have an opinion somewhat similar to that of Maimonides. It differs in these particulars (v. Ikk. Part III ch. 8. e. s). That Inspiration is the means selected by God for informing man of acts pleasing to Him, that it comes by will of God and it is really unnatural that the purely spiritual should come to that being which is a combination of spiritual and corporeal.

The Talmudists had various opinions concerning the interpretation of those sections in the Bible treating of the circumstances of inspiration, Rabbi Ismael (in the 1st cent.) and Rabbi Jose (2nd cent.) followed a symbolic or rational interpretation. R. Ismael says (in Mechilta and Succa)

The Heavens belong to God (Ps. 115) neither Moses nor Elijah ever ascended to heaven, nor did God descend therefrom. Rabbi Akiba opposed him and advocated a literal interpretation of the accounts referred to. The later Kabbalists conceived that Inspiration came through a Metathron, having this idea from the Greek theories of Philo and Plato. Ben Zoma had the same idea and in the Talmud is said to have been crazed by his mysticism. The same metathronism is found in the New Testament: Hebr. 2: 3 Acts 7 : 53 Galat. 3, 19 Acts 7, 38, 30, 35. In the third cen-

tury Rabbi Levi, Rabbi Jonathan, Rabbi Samuel B. Nathan (in 4th cent.) Rabbi Idi (4th cent) considered God and the Metathron equal. A probable development of Greek and mystic ideas. But the majority of the Rabbis held to the Biblical idea that the requisites for Inspiration are full consciousness, maturity of mind, a high grade of wisdom, purity of life and height of aspiration.

(Hamburger: Real -- Wort.) An important thinker, being a combination of Jewish learning and Greek mysticism, was Philo, whose theory of inspiration might be of interest. Philo may be considered as half rational, half mystic. Sometimes he considers inspiration as an illumination of soul, at other times he introduces the as the means of Inspiration. James Drummond in "Philo Judaeus" gives the following as the position of Philo on the question: "The prophet is the passive instrument of a higher power, - - - -"

Communion with God is a permanent possibility of man -- every good and wise man is a prophet. He ascribes Divine enthusiasm to himself, in a higher sense to prophets. Moses most perfect and greatest of men, therefore of prophets. - - - - He has the idea that the human soul stretches upward to God or vice versa -- a mutual connection --that comes through powers or emanations for if God touched man immediately he would have full knowledge of God's essence - - - - This is impossible for souls bound to bodies".

The Greek conception of Inspiration is opposed to the Jewish in this respect distinctively, the utter passivity of the subject. Of course the Romans are considered as included with the former for from the Greeks were derived all of their ideas and modes of worship. The appellations given by them will serve as a key to their ideas. The Romans had the vates, prophetae, divinatores,

harioli; the Greeks had the

all terms pointing to absolute passivity of the prophets, some applying to the inspection of the entrails of sacrifices as indicative of future events. Their office was altogether that of predicting the future, something quite foreign to the Jewish idea. The translation of the Hebrew word into Prophet by the authors of the LXX has been the cause of the entire misconception to which much of Jewish theology has been laid open.

We now approach the conceptions of Christian writers on this subject. We find the orthodox belief to have been that of Plenary Inspiration i. e. verbal dictation, from which necessarily follows the doctrine of infallibility, the bene-

fit or injury of which is to be seen. We find that in the ninth century a discussion was held between Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons and the Abbot of Toulouse in which the former ridiculed plenary inspiration. Neither Melancthon nor Calvin give any theory of inspiration. Luther has no dictum on the subject. The Anglican Church limits inspiration to the subject matter. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland still follows plenary inspiration. Paxter conceived Scripture as an organism to be literally interpreted. Dean Henry Alford in VI Proleg. to Gospel says: "All inspired, but not containing one word from God. Beecher, as regarding other dogmas, did not believe it except liberally, he claimed inspiration for "all the true children of God". He said also "the inspiration of the Scripture is a great fact, but the inspiration of all the true children of God is a greater fact". In the North American

Review for 1878 the Rev. F. H. Hedge D. D. rejects plenary verbal inspiration, he says: "Infallible certainty is the end aimed at, but it is more probable that growth in knowledge by aid of reason is the true end". "The test of inspiration is the power to inspire, it is telescopic not microscopic", said by another author. Rev. Chancey Giles says "Inspiration is more than veracity; a revelation of the principles and laws of Divine life, of man's spiritual nature, and of the spiritual world in which he is to dwell forever". J. P. Newman writes "Inspiration is more than human enlightenment, it is divine illumination". Celsi and Spener in the eighteenth century declared the Scripture writers to have been active not passive and showing human peculiarity in writing. It appears from these citations that Christian authorities by no means agree in this matter, some advocating plenary inspiration, some rational in-

spiration, which one appeals to me will not be difficult to see from what follows. I may now remark however, that it appears from the foregoing that the liberal view of inspiration did not originate with the modern rationalists, but really arose when men's minds were applied to the doctrines of the Church at the Reformation, and even in isolated cases earlier.

ARGUMENT AND THEORY ADVANCED.

The statement is put forth by most writers in this field that there is a dual revelation to man, that of nature upon which he is to exercise both mind and imagination to gain some knowledge of God, creation being one manifestation of God; and the revelation by Inspiration to men. The second revelation is the one which we are to consider, but references to the former must be made at times as they seem to me to be mutually supplementary. Logically the question arises as to the definition of Inspiration. Etymologically it means the in-breathing, and as we apply the term to denote communication between God and man it means for us, if it is to mean anything, the in-breathing of God unto man. Originally this will apply to the first planting of the soul within man.

It does seem that our present knowledge points to the existence of the dual nature of man, i. e. the psychical and corporeal for up to date

the ultra materialists, the physiologists, the apostles of pure science as they term themselves have been forced to acknowledge that between mere activity and thought there is a "chasm intellectually impassable". Until this chasm is either bridged or filled up the honest thinkers are forced to admit that they have within their experience two classes of manifestation distinctly cognised, viz: the material and the spiritual. It does not alter the face of the present condition of thought on the subject whether certain nerve-excitations set up certain thoughts or vice versa unless it can be shown that one is the other in a different form and is not as it now appears, different in kind. Until this is done we are fully warranted in believing in the existence of an immaterial Soul and as a natural sequence we can account for its origin in no other way than by ascribing it to God as its source. Thus, to start with we have a univer-

sal Inspiration of the soul itself, the proof of which fact lies in our self-consciousness. In the introduction I stated that I desired to prove inspiration to be a fact by presenting the points of contact by which the perception of it came home to me, this I consider the first point, the existence of the soul itself, a fact of consciousness.

The arguments so often given of possibility and probability of Inspiration are not by any means weak, in fact they are the natural consequence of the perception of this act as a fact, but if the fact itself can be shown with any degree of clearness it is certainly much more convincing, more positive. It is not a mere matter of probability or possibility that since the soul is derived from God that communion with God continues, it is a logical consequence, just as it follows naturally that a father or mother who has begotten a child will not immediately there-

after sever all connection with the babe; if we find paternal feeling only natural is not Divine communion all the more so? But this, some will say, is not what is meant by inspiration in general language or thought, and they speak truly, but having first shown a primary and universal inspiration we come to the discussion of what has been called "Divine illumination", viz: what facts of experience have we to manifest the fact of God's ever having bestowed any ideas on human beings?

A natural query before discussing the question from our own standpoint is what have men heretofore thought about the matter, and with that end in view the historical portion of this paper has been penned; let us revert to it for a while. Omitting, for the moment, the discussion of the Biblical idea of Inspiration as there presented let us see into what classes its believers have

been divided. First we find those who accept the statements of the Bible literally; those are they of both Jewish and Christian thinkers who believed in verbal or plenary inspiration, that the words there written were dictations from God, that the writers were but passive agents. As the logical conclusion of such a belief Infallibility must be ascribed to the whole narrative. Now, there is a certain attraction in this doctrine for men, such a magnetic influence it was which drew John Henry Newman to the belief not only in an infallible Bible but also in an infallible Church. The basis of this attraction is the desire for something positive, certain, never open to the least doubt, and in the case of the church, precluding all possibility of latitudinarianism. The Catholic Church recognized this desire in its pretensions, and the Talmudists, though in a somewhat less degree tried to supply the same for the Jews; al-

though the spirit of the former was undoubtedly derived from the latter who claimed their right and authority to have been derived from Moses:

"The (Oral) Law was delivered to Moses" &c.

(v. Pirke Aboth Ch. I v. I). or regarding certain laws, הלכה למשה מסיני, a law from

Moses at Sinai, thus placing the oral law on the same basis as the written law, and only less as being traditional, not set down. The fullest strength of the doctrine of infallibility lies in the above, its weakness is apparent in the wide scope which it grants the critics. All Bible scholars admit that the manuscript of the Bible was in a more or less unauthenticated, and therefore fragmentary, state up to a comparatively late date (say the time of Ezra). Now not only was it probable that alterations and omissions should happen to its books, but our present version shows evidence of such in occasional inter-

polations, changes in chronological order, sudden breaks in the narrative, or misplacings of certain narrations, e. g. the story of the Golden Calf occurring in the midst of laws which it should naturally precede. The critics are quick enough to take up just such points and, of course, make the most of them. Thus they argue against the doctrine of infallibility and proving it untenable think they have demolished all Inspiration, which does not at all follow. John Fiske is one of the most modern who adopts this mode of procedure.

The Catholic Church with the doctrine of utter infallibility in temporal as well as spiritual matters was so often proven to have erred in the former that the quarrel between two Popes, each claiming infallibility, (1409 -- 1414) proved to thinking men the folly of the pretension, so that the Council of Constance really limited the Pope by the power of appeal from his decision to

an ecumenical Council. The real subversion of all such pretension came with Luther and the Reformation.

The question will then arise, if the Bible narrative is not infallible what are we to accept and what reject as Inspiration? The only answer which can be given is that furnished by the Rationalists in theology, and it is that the Bible stands on its excellence as such and those of this class who accept the belief in Inspiration state as their reason for such belief that the conception of God and the moral code found in the Bible are unattainable by any other medium save Inspiration. One of these has said, arguing somewhat in the same line as myself: "If there is anything spiritual it must come by Inspiration, it could not come by sense". The course of his reasoning is evidently this, that since we have something spiritual as distinguished from material, and

since our senses appreciate the material only, we must attain our spiritual knowledge by some other medium, viz: Inspiration. Grant the premises, that we have something spiritual and that our senses appreciate but material, and the conclusion must follow. This is another point of contact with the fact of inspiration as a fact.

The class of mystic-philosophic thinkers, to which class Philo partly belongs, and the Kabbalists wholly, derived much of their system from the idea of Plato and devoted their attention, for the most part, to explaining the media or methods of inspiration. Their use of emanation theories, Metathron &c., influenced even some Jewish thinkers, (as stated in the historical portion) but to us the question of media is unnecessary; once we have the fact of Inspiration it is of minor importance how it comes about. As a matter of general scientific agreement the

how of things has been declared unsoluble.. The chemist is forced to be satisfied with the fact that such and such substances when combined form an entirely new substance, not even a mere combination of the two ingredients, it is impossible for him to explain how this new matter has come into being; so we shall all be satisfied if we can prove inspiration to be a fact not caring how it comes about. It is indeed foreign to the matter of Theology to try to explain such mysteries as to the how of occurrences recorded, it is verging upon Theosophy with its infinite and at all times questionable vagaries of theory and fancy.

Justly is the question asked 'what is the necessity of revelation by special acts of inspiration if the results attained by that means might be attained by process of reasoning?' And the only answer to be given is that there would be no necessity for inspiration if the same conclu-

sion could be arrived at through the normal action of the mind, but we hold that by Inspiration and Inspiration only could man ever have formed the conception which he now has of God, or have formulated the moral code which is now the common property of civilized man.

This, of course is to be proved, and such is the aim of that which follows. First we shall see what the most advanced thinkers of the time have reached by reason alone, then we shall examine what additions not attainable by these men have been given us through Inspiration, i. e. since reason only could not give us these concepts and since we still have them, they must have reached us through some other means, and no other means save Inspiration is known to us.

First, let me premise, that the possibility of Inspiration is deniable by the atheist or pantheist alone. To the theist, no matter what

the ground of his theism, the possibility of the communication of ideas by God to man must be admitted. With the atheist and pantheist it is almost impossible to reason with any hope of ever proving our side of the question, for, to use the old simile, he ever pushes himself away from the fact and says "I do not feel it". Put among theists there are very many who seem to have an abhorrence of anything, whether theory or fact, which savors of the supernatural. To them I should say, it is just as repugnant to me to follow the old course of reasoning and say that since God is Omnipotent He can break the laws of nature whenever He thinks it to be necessary". While that would necessarily follow from the premise of His Omnipotence, it does not seem possible to me for a Good and Wise God to set men the example of breaking the laws of Nature which He has made. I can not see the necessity for any such violation, for nat-

ural means are so infinite in power and number that a use of them and of them only would be all sufficient to accomplish any seeming miracles. It may seem that I am trespassing somewhat on Theosophy by giving any theory of the method of inspiration, but one so natural and simple has occurred to me that I must needs present it, if for no other reason, to show that we need not have recourse to angels, emanation theories &c., as has been done in so many instances by Maimonides, Albo, Philo and the Kabbalists (v. supra Hist. part). It appears from late investigations into psychological phenomena that there is good ground for the belief in thought-transference as shown in experiments by mind-readers; now, if such action is natural between men is it asking too much to believe that some such method may be followed in inspiration. This is not meant as a proof of the fact but as an explanation of a natural method by

which this fact may have come to be. Let us see, now, what ultimate ratiocindtion, pure and simple is said to give us. Mr. Spencer may be taken as an apostle of the ultra-rationalists and while some would call him an agnostic and he so believes himself to be, he seems still to have a hankering for a sort of pantheistic-theism (if such could be) by his use of the term "Eternal and Infinite energy". He says that reason can not extend further than the "Unknowable", that he believes in a power but can assert nothing whatever about "It". Mr. Frederic Harrison in a late magazine article (XIX Cent. Mch. 1884) shows how very satisfactory such a state of mind must be by suggesting that Mr. Spencer represent his "Power" by the algebraic symbol $(x)^n$, x being the "Unknown", raised to the nth, or to infinity. It may be said that this is only controversial satire, but even if we admit that, the very cuttingness of the statement is a

proof of the unsatisfactoriness of Mr. Spencer's theory. But besides, Mr. Spencer's logic has often been questioned at this point; by what right does he believe in an "Energy" at all of which he can affirm nothing, or even if he does so believe what good does it do him? If he believes in an "Energy" simply because he can not otherwise account for nature, he is but little better than the pantheist; it is true he has gone that one step beyond spontaneity as a cause of the Universe but his blank, cipher Energy is of less value than is Nature to the Pantheist. Surely no one will object to Mr. Spencer's being selected as the representative modern thinker in these lines when so many men, even wearers of the cloth, have so filled themselves with his theories as to be gradually making their Gods = (x^{th}). (v. also Mr. F. Harrison's article). Look back over the history of religious thought and count, if you can, the num-

berless theories concerning God and the moral code. As to the former, look at the followers of Zoroaster; relying on reason and observation what will appear a more plausible theory than his of the two opposing powers, Ormuzd and Ahriman, light and darkness, virtue and vice? Zoroaster looked about him and saw positive evil, not merely absence of good, and seeing the alternate triumph of good and evil over each other, what more natural than his conclusion that there were two equally great divine powers, one All-good, the other All-evil? And yet we laugh at his theory; we read Cicero's "De Natura Deorum" and smile over the wild theories there laid down of a "circular God, because such was the most perfect figure and infinite". But would not Plato, Socrates, Cicero, Lucretius or Zoroaster have laughed to scorn our worship of (x^n), the Infinite "Unknowable", the Eternal Plankness? As we would deride their cir-

cular God they would laugh at Mr. Spencer's circular Energy, which deprived of content comes to be a mere cipher.

Mr. Spencer was right, reason alone can only bring us to the "Unknowable", he was far more correct than some of his critics who said that inasmuch as he called the Unknowable an Infinite and Eternal Energy he must and does predicate something of it; why not say, since Mr. S. can attain the Unknowable only, by his method he must be satisfied with agnosticism, and claiming so to be can give no ground for those who claim to be Theists. If they insist upon being Theists, if they hold, as many do, that Theism alone can satisfy their souls, it must be on another basis than that of reason, it must depend upon revelation by Inspiration.

The glance at past theories concerning God teaches one thing, at least, and that is the in-

stability, the everlasting variability of the human mind; when we find the theories of each preceding age overturned by those of the succeeding era we are forced to seek some absolute standard, no longer to rely on the merely relative. What is to be proven is, that Inspiration has given us this absolute idea of God, that the concepts which we now have are not a mere development from polytheism upward to monotheism, that by Inspiration we have attained the absolute, all further advance being a coming into as full a relation with that absolute as it is possible for the human mind and soul to come.

I have referred previously to the moral code as being another point at which we come in contact with the fact of Inspiration, and here I wish to look back over the field of ethical theories which have arisen, and fallen one after the other. Take, for instance, the principle of

government which is based upon the ethical question of the right of man over man, or rather the duties of men as social beings forming communities for mutual benefit. History again shows us a picture of the subversion of idea after idea; it does seem as if the growth towards democracy was truly a development of ideas, but I hold that to-day, we are not one step in advance, nay, we are still behind the ideal which inspiration gave to the ancient Hebrews.

Another question in ethics is the aim of man, the motive for doing his duty. In this respect both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mill (J. S.) are swimming about in the sea of Utilitarianism and are being ducked most unmercifully by many critics. "The highest good (or happiness) of the greatest number", does not seem to most men a very safe criterion of action. Something more specific, more certain is needed and such a series of

rules for action appears to have been laid down some thousands of years ago by Moses. What must be proved is that these laws would fill all requirements better than any other system now at hand, and that they were received by Moses through Inspiration. Thus I have set down two tasks -- first to prove that the Mosaic conception of God was an absolute one, hence an Inspiration, and as absolute never to be surpassed, only to be comprehended more and more as we develop spiritually. Second, to prove that the Mosaic code of morals was also absolute, inspired, and that all advance in that line is but a growth in Understanding and Applying that code to life.

Both of the above concepts, the Mosaic God and Mosaic morals we have; if they are supreme, Absolute, not attainable by reason, they come from Inspiration, if it is shown to be a fact the first part of my Thesis is proved. Now can I prove it?

Let us see from the following.

We must again call attention to the conception of Inspiration by the Hebrews. The idea of infallibility appears in the Bible, is claimed by its author, in regard to isolated passages alone introduced by such a phrase as "God spoke as follows". That this infallibility attaches to the Bible as a whole is not claimed in any way or what would be the use of calling the special attention of the readers to certain passages by such introductory words as "God spoke" &c? Never is the position taken that the prophet is no longer a man, that by his inspiration he ceases to err, i. e. to be human. Of Moses, even, certain sins are recorded. Hence we are justified in concluding that while Inspiration was a moving of the feelings, an illumination of the reason, a heightening of the imagination the personality of the agent was in no way lost. It may be likened to the blast

through an instrument, the air originates elsewhere but the sound produced depends upon the form and material of the instrument. So with the prophets, the inspired ideas were put into their souls, but the expression which they gave to these ideas was colored by their own past experience, their capacity at the time and very largely by the audience and its status. Upon the last consideration much depends, both in explaining the preparation of the Israelites for receiving Revelation and in the choice of them.

According to the Biblical record Abraham was the sole ancestor from whom the Hebrews sprang, the preparation began with him by the revelation of the Unity of God. This, while a tremendous step in advance of his time, was but a preparation for the God-idea which was presented by Moses. It must be noted that there is not the slightest

hint of a development through the various stages which would be necessary for evolving the idea of Monotheism from idolatry. Abraham's father and relatives (all save Lot, his first convert) were idolators unqualifiedly. The first step necessary for him was to leave his father's house, to start in a new land both his family and the spread of his revelation. He made no attempts at converting the heathen nations around him, he recognized the fact that the only certain method of preserving his revelation was to entrust it to his own family, instructed in it and it alone.

We see that during several hundred years this idea was allowed to gain strength by being fostered in the hearts and minds of his descendants. They were thus made ready for the next step in revelation, the God-idea of Moses. That idea it is which cannot be surpassed for height and purity of conception in the present day. It

is the most abstract and spiritual idea which the human mind can compass: Pure and Eternal Being, as expressed by Moses in "Eheyeh asher Eheyeh"

אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה , "I am who I am", or "I shall be who I shall be". This was expressed by the name "Jahveh", the Tetragrammaton, יהוה, the holiest name by which the Hebrews knew God. This is the unsurpassable conception beyond which none can go, up to which few can climb. That it was not fully understood by the people, even after their centuries of preparation, appeared on more than one occasion, but to us of the 19th Century it is almost as hard to grasp. That Moses could have conceived it by reason alone would be difficult for us to believe when we find the most advanced mind of modern days reaching only the "Unknowable". But there appears to me another reason why we are forced to say that this conception is an absolute one and not a relative or evolved

idea. It is analogous to an anti-evolution argument often presented (v. Conn: "Evolution of To-Day"); viz: that since man during the whole period of history has not changed or become evolved that we may infer that he never was evolved from lower animals. My argument is that since the Mosaic God-idea has not been improved upon within these several thousand of years that it is an absolute conception, through inspiration, and not a relative conclusion arrived at then, since there has been no further development since. To the anti-evolution argument has been replied that so many millions of years have been necessary for the evolution of man that the fact of no noticeable change having taken place during the historical period does not prove the impossibility of a pre-historic evolution. That reply is hardly a very satisfactory one as the former exaggerations by geologists in regard to the time necessary for the

upbuilding of the world have been considerably modified, and it may still appear necessary for the evolutionist to show some evolution of man during historic times to prove his theory. But no analogy to such a reply could be given to my argument for the absoluteness of Moses' idea of God, for the intellectual life of man has been most active and productive during these centuries since the announcement of Moses' conception, and if any improvement were possible surely we should have expected it during this time. Some may say, 'What then do you call the advancement among men in civilization and thought life?' And I should reply that it was but the growth of the human mind to the recognition and acceptance of the Mosaic concept, first through the daughter religion, Christianity, and now as the Greek and heathen accretions which were foisted upon the original Jewish pure idea of God are being removed by the most ad-

vanced sects of Christian believers (e. g. Universalists and Unitarians) the elevated and abstract concept as presented by Moses is being appreciated and believed in. The objection will be raised at this point (if not before) to my presentation of the Mosaic God-idea, it will be said: "That is all very well and perhaps true but you do not give us the whole of the idea of God which Moses presented; when we read the Bible we find it filled with anthropomorphisms corporeal and psychical". That I will admit, but a few pages back I was careful to state that the ideas received by Inspiration were colored by both agents and audience. Moses, perhaps, by his careful training might have spoken to the people in more abstract terms than he did, but could they have understood him, even with their special preparation which seemed as yet a mere unifying of previous and surrounding polytheistic ideas? But even further, can any man deal

with pure abstractions? Try as we may the human mind can only think in terms of its own consciousness and it is the 'suicide of reason' to persuade ourselves that any other terms are possible for us. Anthropomorphism must enter into all our concepts, as long as we are men, but our advance in thought beyond the savage or the child is that instead of conceiving God as a gigantic man we attribute to him human psychical qualities, only in a heightened degree. Besides, we are warranted in so doing for as heretofore remarked we are both soul and body and since that soul has been breathed into us or (if that is too corporeal an idea) is a divine "spark from God" we have every warrant for attributing the qualities of the soul to God, the All-Soul, only in the highest degree which we can imagine. We have no such choice as Mr. Spencer would give us "not between personality and something lower, or personality and something higher",

as long as we are merely human we have to choose one of two alternatives, either utter negation, i. e. the "Unknowable", or personality in its highest sense. The term personality has been so misused and abused that many have made it connote a larger copy of man, but in the sense in which it should be applied to God by it is meant those eternal faculties which man possesses raised to infinity, viz: consciousness, becoming all-consciousness or Omniscience; self-consciousness; and volition becoming Omnipotence. These attributes must be affirmed of God by every Theist and these were proclaimed by Moses. Whatever other anthropomorphisms occur in the Pentateuch are often, on the surface, merely figurative or may be easily proven so to be. Many indeed have attempted to show that the doctrine of Monotheism was taught by others or borrowed by Abraham, but Mr. Max Müller in the first volume of his Essays (Leipz 1869)

finds no reason to question the originating of the idea with him. In a work called "Judaism at Rome" by Frederic Hildekopfer (N. Y. 1887, 7th ed. p. 391) I find the following on this subject.

"The people among whom Monotheism originated ascribed it, not to their own wisdom, but to a divine communication.-- No community void of belief in revelation has ever been monotheistic. ---

History of man renders intensely improbable that any pretended revelation, in a previously heathen community, should have been mainly addressed by its author to our moral sense". This same thought has been often expressed (v. Philipson's Religionslehre Vol. I), but never more to the point, viz. that the people of Israel themselves would have certainly claimed their religion to have been the product of their own wisdom if such a claim could have been sustained -- the only way to sustain it would have been to show the steps by

which the climax was reached, but in the absence of such development no account was possible. As to what the author quoted states regarding the "appeal to the Moral sense", that is a matter to be spoken of in the discussion of the moral code itself which is to follow next in order. There are many passages in the Scriptures which show that Moses' idea of God was a purely spiritual one for in all of his times of inspiration or communing with God he speaks of the action of the elements about him, but never ascribes any appearance to God, in fact, when he implores God to let him see His face he is answered "No one can see me while yet **alive**"; that is the sum of his teaching on the subject, that the corporeal man cannot grasp a full conception of God, that he cannot think in those pure abstractions which such a knowledge would necessitate so he must be satisfied to think of God in terms of human conscious-

ness if he would think at all. What then appears to be the fact from the preceding matter? That the Mosaic God-idea is the highest conceivable, that it cannot be attained by unaided reason, that therefore it is the result of Inspiration. Now this conception is the only one with which man's soul and mind can feel satisfied, when we begin to grasp it we first feel that the intellectual demand is satisfied, without it we are forced to resort to the "Unknowable" and the 'suicide of reason', therefore we, as Theists are obliged to have recourse to this Mosaic idea of God, we do satisfy ourselves by accepting it and as it is the product of inspiration we have found another point at which we come in contact with the fact of Inspiration. The question regarding the origin of the Mosaic Moral Code, whether it was a product of mind acting normally, or was the result of inspiration is the matter next in order to be consider-

ed. We must notice especially that the whole tendency of the sacrificial culte was a moral one; it did not prescribe sacrifices as mere religious rites, but every offering had a special significance for the sacrificer, e. g. sin-offerings, free-will offerings &c. This moral feature alone (as mentioned by F. Hindekopfer quoted above) is a distinctive one and deserve careful consideration. This alone would not be sufficient to warrant any conclusion as to an inspired source, it is but the first step in examining the moral code itself for internal evidence that it was absolute and not developed and that our present moral codes are found there as a whole; i. e. that our progress in morals is but a coming to the full understanding of the principles laid down by Moses throughout the V. Prof. Gardiner has said much on the subject, but no one has stated the general claim and warrant of the V better than he in the following.

"It (the Moral Code) is not a splendid philosophic conclusion sewed on to a practical worship of a different kind, and it is not a surmise of a dimly seen underlying truth; but it is of the very fibre out of which were woven all laws and ordinances of worship, and duties and providential dealings with their national life". By the Moral Code is not meant merely the Ten Commandments, for while it may be, as some say, that every moral principle is contained in them there is no reason why we should put aside those verses in which these principles are more clearly set forth. The spirit of the laws is to be grasped for it is this underlying idea alone which inspiration could have produced, the special demands of time and circumstances gave special forms to the ideas, e. g. the laws concerning slaves in Ex. XXI are out of force for us, but the humanity running through them of treating these slaves with consideration and jus-

tice, often with kindness, is an eternal principle which must last in all circumstances. The objection has been sometimes raised that we have in the Pentateuch many laws but that laws do not constitute a religion, not even an ethical code, for ethics at all times considers motives, law only the overt act. But on a better consideration of this point we see that the overt act is the only medium by which we may know the inner thought of a man, or judge him; as soon as man tries to go behind the acts to the motives a "Reign of Terror" follows in which suspicion and opinion become the greatest despotism. But while the law may stand "Thou shalt not kill" it follows naturally that the very desire for killing should be put aside, thus behind every law stands an ethical principle. We have before stated that we should take up two points for discussion in this portion of the paper, viz: the idea of government and the motive for

virtue. It does appear remarkable when we examine the system of government laid down by Moses that in the midst of despotisms, the most absolute, tyrannies the wildest, there should have appeared a theocracy, a government by representatives. It was impossible for Moses to have obtained this system from the Egyptians or Assyrians, representative government was not only unknown to them but in no country outside of Palestine was there anything like equality before the law down to the revolutions of Switzerland, Holland and in 1688 in England, although then it was only a semblance of it. Whence did Cromwell draw his inspiration, what were the Roundheads but the Bible-reading Puritans, and was not the driving out of James merely a consequence of the Protector's teachings? Once the idea was presented, once the minds of men were turned to the rights of the people, every political advance in every civilized country became a step towards the

highest ideal of government, the Theocracy. This idea was behind the conjunction of church and state, but it was a failure under Kings, as such a government was never in accord with the plan laid down.

The people of Israel were warned against raising up a King and it was by and through kings and rival kingdoms that the nation was so weakened as to be destroyed. Time and again did the kings weaken the people. The Mosaic system was a peculiarly free and at the same time, well regulated one. There were six of the wisest men taken from each tribe to act as Judges, or a common council. The leadership of the people by some chief executive he only considered necessary in time of war and so that this might never be hereditary we find him appointing Joshua as his successor. A period which shows the working of the system best was the time recorded in the book of Judges. Moses, re-

cognizing the need of a centralizing idea and place had the tabernacle which was to be the rallying place of the people; this was superseded by the Temple at Jerusalem to which every male Jew was obliged to come three times a year. The priest-hood never had the least temporal power and was kept within a single tribe for the preservation of the purity of the culte. During the time of the Judges, when for the first time the people were really settled there seemed to be no need for government, "Every man did what was right in his own eyes" and we hear nothing of internal disturbances. So it might be even now if we could take the inhabitants of any given country, educate them in the moral law and so leave them. When the people were attacked by other nations men arose, as they always do, who led the people to victory. It was only by the ascension of Kings, asked for by the people, that troubles began.

It is at present in accord with the most advanced ideas of government that the less the state or national government interferes with the people, the better. It is an ideal state, to be sure, but it was realized many hundred years ago and may be realized again when the people have reached that moral height at which coercion is not needed to preserve order. And as to the Theocratic idea, when all the inhabitants of a country have reached such a plane of tolerance that they can be satisfied to worship the One God as they please and allow others the same right, the Theocracy is come again, the Millenium has arrived. Thus we have seen that the Mosaic idea of government is ahead of our present state, that what we have was taken from it, that it originated amidst directly opposing systems, and as it seems to be that towards which we are striving as the best possible system, it appears to be absolute, something

not merely human, but Divine and therefore only attained by Moses through direct Inspiration.

As another point at which to seize upon the ethical idea, nay, to take a crucial test, let us see what was the motive for men's actions, what was the authority given for the moral code, what was the obligation under which men lay for following it..

The question of the authority for the moral distinctions has been one pregnant with differences of opinion. Sir William Hamilton finds the origin of moral distinctions in the "Law-book of Nations". His critics object, that these laws were made by men and certainly it cannot be said that man first makes laws and then cites them as the source of his moral knowing'. To which from a mere logical standpoint we are forced to agree, but was Mr. Hamilton so very far wrong? Let us see.

The old idea that conscience was a psychological faculty dictating to men what is right and what is wrong has been widely rejected of late years as it appears that those following their consciences have often erred; the definition has been changed to that of "Moral form", or the impulse to follow the good and shun the evil on which the judgment has decided. Now the question which is put is, what is the standard by which the judgment must guide itself? Mr. Hamilton and some kindred minds would have it from "general agreement"; Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mill would have it depend upon that which will contribute to the greatest happiness of the greatest number". The critics say to the former school, "where did this agreement originate?", to the latter "Who are to be your judges to decide what is virtue and what vice?

To the Theist the question comes frequently "What is my standard of virtue and whence is it

derived?"; he will have the choice of three sources, within himself, from nature, from God. The first has been tried by the dependence on conscience alone, and has failed; the second seemed to present somewhat more material, i. e. from seeing the action of animals to one another, or the sensibilities of plants we might learn to model human action, but the difficulty there lies in not knowing what is good for imitation, the very question of the moral decision comes from somewhere else. We have left but a single source, God, and from Him must our canon of moral criticism be taken. For when you examine the distinction between virtue and vice you have nothing positive, nor ever can have, except it be the will of God which makes these distinctions.

How many systems of morality have been formed, based on utility, pleasure, science or whatever you please but not one stands the test of

time and use like the Mosaic system. It ever claims its authority as being simply derived from the will of God, e. g. "Ye shall be holy for I, the Lord your God am Holy", and in fact the conclusion of all the laws found in Leviticus, Chapter XIX, giving as the reason for obeying them "I am the Lord thy God". In this Moral Code as found throughout the V lies the inspiration of the world's morality, the source from which every nation coming in contact with the Hebrews has drawn a full draught as the laws of the nations, from Rome down to modern times show. What of this motive which the Jewish law sets forth, is the ideal too low, is it not up to our highest grade of altruism? Act virtuously for the sake of that virtue which comes from God. Let sceptics and fault-finders sneer at that as a "religion of wages", if they can, where do they find any incentive beyond the virtue itself? They would re-

ply in such passages as the command, "Honor thy father and mother that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee", this section and similar sections refer to a natural law of retribution which is thus made known and is proven by our own experience, i. e. if we do not honor our parents we shall not be honored in our time and not only will suffer on that account, but our memory will be cut off.

If you wish to get a full idea of the Hebrew Ethics look at Ex. Chap. XX, Lev. ch. XIX, Deut. chs. XXII, XV, VI, XXX, and the expansions of these as found in the other books of the Bible. The influence exerted by these Ethics is generally admitted, but a striking proof of their power lies in the writings of the Jewish Scholars from Talmudic times down to the present day, especially during the midnight-gloom of the Dark Ages, when though driven from pillar to post, persecuted with-

out stint or mercy, shut up in prisons and hunted with hounds, the despised Jews poured forth poems and philosophic writings filled with purity and beauty, all directly attributed and traceable to the Mosaic Ethics (v. Dr. Zunz "Zur Geschichte und Literatur). The powerful influence we have considered, that as yet we have had no moral system to equal or supersede this one has also been apparent, that it was impossible for Moses to get his system of government or morals from any of the surrounding nations. That, moreover, we could find no positive rule of virtue anywhere but in God, that the Mosaic system has proven itself to be such a system since it has never been proven faulty in any way as Moses meant to say would be the case when he wrote "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, nor shall ye diminish aught from it &c" (Deut. IV:2). Now if this law is thus proven absolute, if we can obtain the abso-

lute from an absolute source only, that source as the definer of all virtue must be God, therefore it is a product of Inspiration and we possessing this law or code of morals and using it daily come just so often into immediate contact with the fact of Inspiration.

It is a notable fact that may be seen in regard to the Mosaic morals as well as the Mosaic God-idea that no nation had such an elevated code or idea as the Hebrews before them and that since that time those and those only who derived these same from the Israelites ever possessed either the code or the idea. That just these nations who have taken up these treasures constitute the civilized world would point to these principles having been active agents in producing this constant advance. That in government we have not reached the Jewish ideal, but that every step forward seems to be in that direction is a point of no lit-

the importance and may well make it worth our while to give some special attention to the polity of the ancient Hebrews.

Thus the second part of our Thesis seems to be proved, viz: that Inspiration is most powerfully exhibited in the Old Testament, especially in the CONCEPTION of GOD and the MORAL CODE there found.

It remains now to take up briefly the last part of our thesis, that Inspiration still continues. Here as before we are to see if we have sufficient proof of the fact of present Inspiration, always bearing in mind that the only possible proofs of a fact are the finding of points at which our minds may come in contact with the fact, by our perceptive powers, be it of reasoning or of observation. Our observation in this connection can be of use only as pointing to the underlying thought or motive of which any act appears to be

the consequence, from which we can make some deduction as to the state of the subject viewed. So much by way of introduction, now what points to the fact that

INSPIRATION STILL CONTINUES ?

Here we must refer to what was said previously, viz: that each soul must be considered an inspiration, and in that sense it would logically follow that Inspiration still persists, inasmuch as men now are gifted with souls as they were formerly. It should, in fact, follow all the more logically that inspiration in the higher sense, the influencing of man by God, the transmission of ideas from God to man should still continue, for with the same faculties as the ancients and supposing, as is only natural, a continuance of the relation of man to God, Inspiration must follow. But we have not heretofore attempted to prove anything, nor shall we so try now, by that Metaphysical reasoning which must at all times be unsatisfactory and fail to convince the most willing minds. It is generally a course of circular argument and open to the grossest fallacies. But

it is not a mere metaphysical argument to look to the facts of human life and see what there is extraordinary in the life of almost every man. It may be in a seemingly insignificant space of time, but to almost every man or woman comes some thought which can be accounted for in no other way than as an inspiration added to that universal inspiration, the Soul, and to each man such comes in proportion to his preparation and aspiration. In fact prayer is but the expression of that aspiration. The question of inspiration comes then to be one of degree and we can no longer ask what man is inspired, but in how far he is inspired and what has he done to deserve it. This is a matter of experience, on authority which the most sceptical is loath to question.

Following our previous method let us find, if we can, any other manifestations which point to something higher than a mere human source of ac-

tivity. If there are facts of human thought which cannot be accounted for by the action of the normal human mind we must have recourse to some higher source, God.

Mr. Jno. Fiske has warned us against "wrongly terming rare or admirable kind of normal mental action inspiration", and we never could do so if it were purely normal, but if it were so, how comes it that it is "rare or admirable". By normal we mean that which could be accomplished by ordinary men if their attention is bent upon this end. How many bending their attention upon the object yet fail to attain it. And these are so many that we can not ascribe the failure to the fact of the faculties being less than normal. But what manifestations are there at the present time which seem to pass beyond the merely human? The ever recurring phenomena of noble men -- not

merely the men who are unselfish or charitable, for these traits might be the consequence of training, but the men who penetrate life and thought to the core, and teach it. What place then, may be asked, will I give to genius? Wherein lies the distinction between the genius and the inspired man? I should reply that genius seems to be the gift of a certain faculty or certain faculties of a higher order than most men, but inspiration is the pouring of ideas into the mind human by the mind Divine in some natural way, as before suggested. How then shall these be distinguished? By the lines in which they flow, e. g. the mathematical genius or the mechanical genius; the inspired speaker or writer. This will appear to be a natural distinction if you consider that the mathematician or mechanic merely advances by hypotheses or combines old ideas; the poet or orator brings forth either new ideas or puts a newer

and larger meaning into the old. Both of these may be combined, e. g. in the artist who has the genius for depicting, the inspiration of conceptions. The true artist must have both for with all the technique possible if there is not a powerful prevailing idea the picture is nothing as it expresses nothing. It may be said that many poets, orators and painters have been far from good men, but that would be no refutation of the possibility of their having received ideas Divine; but as a matter of history it is not only the men great in ideas, but also great in goodness whose works and memories have not died with them or soon after them. The men of the world have been its earnest and noble men. Will it be said that their productions are those of normal minds? Why do they stand out in relief, but because they were many degrees higher than the surrounding masses and from that very great superiority it would be contrary

to science to attribute a like source to great and small. The very power of endurance of their works seems to point the Divine origin, for the small spirituality normally present in men would be an insufficient motive force. Therefore putting together all these evidences of the super-human manifesting itself in the shaping of the world's thought and history we are forced to the conclusion that we have reached a point of contact with Inspiration as still prevailing.

Now, if this conclusion is correct, and I have no valid reason for questioning it, the query may arise, since Inspiration still continues how are we to obtain our share? The Prophet Samuel answered the question when he organized the schools of the prophets and Maimonides states in Moreh Nebuchim (Part III ch. XXXII) that a man must be holy and intellectual and have the desire for Inspiration, but that even with these requi-

sites God may not will that he should receive it. Now we might state our requisites as something the same -- that a man must be spiritually elevated i. e. have his passions under full control, must be mentally cultured and must have the aspiration for inspiration. The reason why Maimonides says that God may or may not grant this inspiration is that he fears it would seem to be a limitation of God's will if the fitness warranted the inspiration. But to us such a fear would seem uncalled for, since we regard God as Benevolent and therefore willing to inspire fit men when they are so fitted. This being our conception it becomes a matter of Preparation and Aspiration to obtain Inspiration, and the history of men points to such having been the case. The inspiration of most great men is only partial because their preparation and fitness are only partial and as these requisites increase in purity, just so great an

advance in Inspiration may be looked for. This may appear to be somewhat fanciful, but fancies are not made of logical necessities and once we have granted the Fact of Inspiration either ancient or modern the rest follows by natural and necessary gradations. Modern inspiration is necessary for the fuller understanding of the ancient inspiration and the men of inspiration of every age have been the means of spreading this understanding, or rather increasing the desire for inspiration in succeeding ages, and just as Moses wished that 'All of the people were prophets', so the inspired men of history have tried to make the men contemporary with them or following them partake of the same desire and consequent preparation.

As infallibility was for a long time the stumbling block to the acceptance of ancient or Biblical inspiration so in modern times misconceptions and pretensions have stood in the way of

receiving the doctrine of modern inspiration. Nervous excitement and all sorts of legerdemain have advanced their claims to Inspiration and the consequent exposures of the lack of foundation for their claims have caused many to reject the teachings altogether, but as Madame Roland said "O Liberty what crimes are committed in thy name!" so might be said of Inspiration -- "O Inspiration to what pretensions hast thou been subjected!", but that does not diminish one jot from the power or excellence of Liberty, the truth or prevalence of Inspiration.

And so the third part of the Thesis stands before us, proven as much as such a fact admits of proof. The grandeur, the nobility, the advance of man pointing with an unerring finger to God as the source from which all that is greatest and best in the world proceeds.

The consequent obligation of preparation fitting the Inspiration which men aspire is the "Writing on the wall" for us to note so that with each generation it may burn less and less brightly and men shall no more be "weighed and found wanting!"

It remains for me to sum up briefly the line and content of the foregoing arguments and my labor is completed as to the entire Thesis.

R e s u m é .

Glancing back over the pages devoted to this subject I find it necessary to recapitulate the heads at least of the preceding discussion. The method adopted was that of proving by contact with the Fact of Inspiration that it is a Fact, by taking the water of the world's conceptions and making them solid and again melting the congealed thought we have found that no other account for the facts is sufficient except the Fact of Inspiration. This method was never pursued as a means of strengthening belief, but as laying the foundation for belief and such I believe has been solidly and logically done. We have seen the theories and conceptions of Inspiration held by Jew, Christian and Pagan; we have examined the theory of "Infallibility" and found it too weak to support us. Many say that there is no choice but between "Infallibility" and "Latitudinarianism",

to which I heartily say Amen, but the latter has no horrors for me. I believe that by that very freedom of thought, that unbinding of the mind that the truth will finally be attained, and in no other way. As long as the thinkers are sincere opposition can only serve as a mutual check and among civilized men should produce no ill effects. According to my mode of procedure we have come in contact with the Fact of Inspiration at certain points, the principal being these. a. The fact of consciousness of a soul, the first and universal Inspiration. b. The bestowal of spiritual conceptions, the first acts of special inspiration, also universal. After which was set forth that the methods of Inspiration need no explanation, as such would be mere theosophy, liable to be superseded by a dozen other explanations in turn.

c. The revelation of Monotheism to Abraham and its Inspiration in a higher content in the

Mosaic God-idea, all of which is ours, and therefore a fact of mind. The limits of ratiocination having been shown to be the "Unknowable", as exhibited by Mr. Spencer.

d. The moral code of Moses, the Theocratic idea, and motive for virtue which we have from him and is alike not to be accounted for on philosophical grounds since philosophical systems have no standard for virtue, nor can have any.

e. That Inspiration still continues as the logical consequence of men's souls and as exhibited in the acts and thoughts of man which daily enter into our experience and therefore cannot be questioned. That normal human nature does not sufficiently account for the acts of men and we can account for them by recourse to Inspiration alone.

