

tion of Israel and its two offshoots, Christianity and Mohammedanism, i. e., the Biblical revelation is still under discussion. Unless we maintain that our civilization is baseless, without confident support, of uncertain lights, is ignorant of all its whence, why and whither, is groping in the gloom of irredeemable superstition, sin and shame, unless we are willing to concede this and look for a divine revelation yet to come, we must maintain the possession already of a divine revelation, and this divine revelation can therefore be but that of the Bible.

Thus philosophy's very objection as to the *how* leads us to the *must*. But science intrudes a difficulty on the ground that revelation in this sense implies a miracle, i. e. a break in the continuity of natural law, and thus is not merely supernatural, but is opposed to nature—an act of God in violation of God's own order. If in answer to this the watch is resorted to for argument, it must not be confounded with Paley's exploded analogy. In a watch, when compared to the whole human race, it will not be unfair to take a minute as the equivalent of a century. In twenty-four hours there are thus 1440 watch centuries. Suppose the first quarter of an hour, that is, at the end of the fifteenth watch century, the watch is so regulated as to strike, and after that never to strike again during the remaining 23¼ hour, or the 1425 succeeding centuries. That striking would certainly be a miracle in the lifetime of that watch, but yet it would not be contrary to the watch nature, for it was foreordained in the very construction of that watch. And yet were the parts of the watch endowed with human intelligence the centuries preceding the striking could not foretell that striking nor could the succeeding centuries account for it having no data for comparison, deduction, etc., awaiting similar in all their preceding and succeeding observation. The after 1425 centuries would have to accept the fact on authority or deny it incredulously as being out of the line of their scientific observance. Science can note but the repeater, the regularly recurring. But the isolated is beyond its cognizance and science can but keep silent as to it. If it can not assist it surely must not deny the miraculous. The miracle is the isolated striking of the Deity in humanity and in nature. In this sense it may be beyond ordinary nature, hence supernatural. But unnatural, opposed to nature it need not necessarily be because of its single—and singularity, for strictly no more miraculous than any other natural or physical manifestation, its peculiar oneness may have been pre-ordained in our world's first creation. Long before our modern science with its grand scheme of law did the rabbis around and before the time of Christ already maintain that revelation and all attendant miracles, were created simultaneously with creation itself, i. e. at creation they were impatiently awaiting but the ripeness of time to make them actual.

You have a dream in which one man kills another. A number of others witness the slaying and seek to avenge the crime, but hesitate out of pitying regard for the murderer's family who are dependent upon him for sup-

port. In the dream still, you appear unto them urging at all hazards the punishment of the shocking act but encouraging their sentiments of mercy by counseling them to make some certain provision for the family's until it becomes at least self-sustaining. This manner of escape from their dilemma, as thus solved by you, you see them, still in the dream, putting on record for their own and their posterity's reference. Such dreams can and do occur. Suppose the dreamer had the power of creation and vivifying; that instead of dreaming he in his waking consciousness can conjure these animated creations to whose transient emotions he himself remains impassive except in so far as he imbued them with these emotional potentialities whose development and expression depend, but upon self-willed actions of these creatures themselves, and suppose this waking dreamer thus wholly without participation in the whole dream except when the need for counsel arises which is in the sleeping dream he now furnishes in the waking one. In this manner I conceive the universe, a self-conscious dream of the sleepless God; whatever difficulties it may present philosophically are not for present discussion except as an elucidation of this subject of inspiration. It answers three questions often urged as impediments to the acceptance of the article of inspiration, namely, why did not the revelation come sooner, why does it not re-occur, and why was it given but to a small handful of people? In the dream it was the emergency which prompted the inspiring interference. In the life of humanity it requires however the repeness of fulness of human conditions. Other nations and individuals lived but for their passions and ambitions, their physical interests and advance. Some lived, it is true, for the abstract ideal. But even this ideal partakes of the selfish, the interested, it is a conceit, a mental vainglory. It was but the Hebrew who purely, soulfully, humbly panted with a mighty thirst for God, and when the thirst grew to a keen, full consciousness of need for the Most High, then, and then only, was it ripe for that revelation to come, as it did. That revelation once full and complete it could be set on formal record and transmitted to others, as the same need waxed mighty within them. Its repetition was unnecessary and God's order is eminently economical. History manifests that as the nations grew dissatisfied with their high holdings of selfishness and self-confidence, this divine revelation reached them gradually, through human agency, in lights proportionate to their vision. Recurrences of the miracle were therefore superfluous, and the superfluous God is never guilty of.

In this connection I may remark that to the Jew who knows no such tenet as salvation by faith, the question of what becomes of those who lived before the salvation-bringing revelation presents no difficulty, for it is inapplicable to his view of revelation. Men live and are judged by their lights. This is what the Jew has ever held.

An investigation of the subject matter of Israel's revelation, however, presents what surprises me has been

considered one of the most cogent arguments against its divinity, namely that it contains nothing new that a proper harvesting, threshing and winnowing of humanity's productions the world over from the ancient times will yield all that the Bible contains. Man can know only that which lies within the possibilities of his nature and which is akin to him. That which is beyond and foreign to him he not only could not comprehend but could not be influenced by. To expect such a thing would be as absurd as expecting to educate a dog by learned lectures. Man arrives at a suspicion of God, but that suspicion he cannot clinch into a certainty. He recognizes moral obligations but cannot clearly and definitely determine what all should be and what all should not be his true moral guides. He requires spiritual influences, makes attempts at spiritual education but succeeds and fails in such admirably equitable proportions that he remains on the plane he originally was. It would be strange if in all his efforts and speculations he did not stumble on the true and the appropriate. But to know that true and appropriate, to be sure of it, to hold it free, the false, the deterring, the wasteful, the idle, the inefficacious, to have and keep it pure, to be unquestionably confident of base and support, to warrant energy of purpose, all this demands a chemistry beyond man, a divine alchemy to select, refine and collect all the good and the needful and to mould it into an harmonious ingot of pure metal or to sublimate and condense it into one symmetrical crystallization of beauty and clearness. This is the function of divine revelation, and this only.

We have finally arrived to the consideration of the Israelitish revelation proper and at the very threshold the objection confronts us that if this be truly divine, God would have taken means to have preserved it intact. This objection could be answered more categorically, but wishing to narrow down ultimately but to the Jewish position on this subject, it would perhaps be just as well to define the extent of that which the Jew claims to be divine. His Bible, besides rejecting the so-styled New Testament, is divided differently than the Christian. With him the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Chronicles belong not to divine inspiration properly so considered. They are writings merely of religious genius as prompted and educated by the inspired books, hence their value is but that of being the noblest human expressions of religion under the influence of that inspiration accessible to all men. In the Hebrew they are therefore called merely the "writings." The Greek has added to their importance by styling them the "Hagiographa," or holy writings, while we give them the full endorsement of divinity by including them in the one "Bible," although to the Jew it was originally a serious question whether it was permissible to embrace it in the same book with the Pentateuch. Judicially, therefore, they have no divine importance, neither of fact nor word. Likewise Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, must be judged by strictly human standards.