

They are records merely illustrative of Israel's prosperity and woe, in proportion to her national faithfulness to or disobedience of her revealed law. Their history is written with human pen; their sole value lies in the moral of fact which is presented here by the lights of inspiration. There thus remain the prophets whose whole divine mission consisted in their utterances of exposition and warning. Their speeches hence are divine; their teachings of unquestionable worth and indubitable truth. New commands, new laws they had no right to institute. They had no power, either, to annul old statutes and prohibitions. They were but to interpret the spirit of revelation over against the inane practices of a people who brake that spirit while adhering to the thus deadened letter. Thus as doctrine explications of purpose, motive and principle they are of God. As narrations of fact, etc., they have however in weight, when they therefore seemingly turn aside to recount events, that momentary narration must be judged by human standards, and it is for us to determine whether or not that narration be one of fact or be simply parabolic as in the case of Jonah. When they are undoubtedly historical this much must be absolutely conceded, namely that as to time and burden of presentation they are wholly truthful, that is, a given-out prediction is a prediction and not a mere retrospective utterance. By this consistent course, to which the Jew has ever held, it will be seen that though two prophets or more be merged into one book as in the books of Isaiah and Zachariah, or be they ever so unchronologically compiled, it affects not their doctrinal presentation, which thus preserves for us their sole needed and hence their only and whole divinity intact and undefiled.

Certainly the Pentateuch must come under different criterion for the Jew maintains it both in the letter and in the spirit of immediate divine authorship and in strict Jewishness do we hold that it has been kept intact and pure as it was in its original divine impartation. The canons of modern criticism I regard extremely superficial and misleading. In writing the very same man will at times employ and for a spell adhere in the use of now one, now another word of synonymous or nearly synonymous usage, either as his whim or his purpose may dictate. A historian or a y other writer may in two succeeding and certainly in two widely separate chapters repeat in different phrased presentation the very same narration. Life often presents different occasions evoking almost the same identical comments. Premonitions, presentiments often repeat themselves and the same kinds and manners of assurances and reassurances occur and reoccur. What force can there be then in such arguments for a twofold authorship, as the employment, now of the expression "Jehovah," now of the expression "Elohim;" or the repetition of stories, prophecies and promises? Should we not rather seek the purposes of the author in the Jahviatic and the Elohiatic passages? Needed Abraham not a manifold reassurance of the promise of his posterity's selection and greatness, when child he had not,

when his first vouchsafed child was rejected, when his nephew, his sole unrejected bone and flesh, was threatened with destruction? And why could not Jacob have twice justified his title to the name Israel? Why could not the beauty of Sara make the same lust in two different rulers and suggest the same cowardly ruse on two occasions unto the timid Abraham? Is it anything strange that the same litigation repeats itself in Abraham and Isaac's history? Or is the repetition of the creation's story needless when revealed first as an account of man's creation and then as an introduction to his strictly human history, and are not the differences of that repetition explained in this twofold purpose to instil man with the consciousness of his nobler formation and then to impress upon him his nobler obligations of love and labor?

In conclusion I must yet touch one point. The Jew makes a distinction between revelation and inspiration in divine analysis and abstractions of that law, the principles, the motives, etc. The "Prophets" contain the divine inspiration. The Pentateuch, however, is divine revelation. It is not only the fundamental assurance and exposition that there is a God—such as our reason and knowledge require; it is not only a complete and perfect system of correct moral principles, such as our ethical perplexity demands; but it is the expression of God to and in man by means of direct commands and prohibitions, to bring humanity under the divine control and influence which his need for spiritual moulding most urgently requires. Its object is thus to educate aspiration and thus to bring man under the lash (if so hard a metaphor may be used) of duty, to keep alive and put to constant work humanity's spiritual consciousness. This purpose accomplished man will have the superlative satisfaction which that conviction ever yields of living up to the best that is in us, of giving constant expression to our loftiest, our profoundest desires. If man is made as good, useful and happy as he can possibly become on earth, he need have no misgivings that if heaven await him he will be there other than fully as good, useful and happy as heaven can render him. The Jew is willing to rest satisfied with a revelation of duty. In the stern ought and must he finds the fullest nobility of purpose, and that nobility of purpose when realized into conduct, is his deepest and only sought for recompense. Of this Judaism which a revelation of reward would in my opinion infinitely spoil the beauty of—and beauty too is a quality of perfection—I am intensely proud; and hence, though I have a thousand other reasons, I must for this alone reject Christianity, which is but the revelation of resurrection or immortality—holding it without the law of Moses inadequate, which with that law it is wholly unnecessary.

I am now finished, except in so far as I should have liked to dwell upon the intrinsic testimony of subject matter itself and upon the extrinsic historical testimony in Israel, the vessel of preservation, to the immediate divinity of this revelation and inspiration, as contained in the Pentateuch and

Prophets. Likewise should I have liked to throw a broader gauntlet to Christianity. But I have already trespassed the time, for which, in making my bow, I ask your pardon.

The Rev. Mr. McNiece occupied a few minutes explaining why he was a Presbyterian, and why he believed in the Bible as a divinely inspired book.

Bishop Whitney spoke a few minutes on the Holy Scripture as the word of God. He was followed by Mr. Forbush, who very briefly touched on the Unitarian view of the Bible. The conference then adjourned until 2 p.m.

The principal feature of the proceedings of the Unitarian conference in the Jewish synagogue yesterday afternoon was an oral statement by Bishop Orson F. Whitney on the subject of "Mormonism" and its Purpose.

There was a good attendance.

BISHOP WHITNEY'S ADDRESS.

I was both surprised and pleased at receiving an invitation from our mutual friend Dr. Utter to be one of the speakers at this conference. I was not surprised at the courtesy of our friend, nor at the liberality of thought and sentiment so characteristic of him and of the society which he represents. But I was surprised that so unworthy a person as myself should be invited to represent my people and their cause upon this occasion. I felt that the choice could have fallen upon one much more able. And I was pleased that we were to be represented here, and that "Mormonism" would be permitted, like Paul before Agrippa, to speak for itself.

After listening to the eloquent and learned addresses delivered from manuscript by the gentlemen who have preceded me, a regret flashed through my mind that I had not committed my thoughts to paper; not that I hoped to convince you, or myself either, that I was worthy to be their peer in those respects, but I thought that I might thereby have rendered my discourse a little more compact, buckled on my armor more tightly, and left fewer places open into which might be thrust the javelins of criticism. Not that I expect to be harshly and unkindly criticised,—that would not be Unitarian; it would not be Christian. Nevertheless so great a heretic as myself could scarcely hope to go hence entirely unscathed, and the executioner, I suppose, must do his duty. If you will pardon me I will relate a little anecdote. Two Irish soldiers, it is said, were once practicing with a cannon, and in order to economize and not waste their ammunition, one of them while his friend stood at the breach of the gun waiting to touch it off, planted himself squarely in front of it, with a brass kettle in which to catch the ball. Said he to the man at the breach: "Touch it off alsy, Pat." And so I say to my critics: Gentlemen, if you must fire at me, touch it off easy, and if I cannot catch your cannon balls I will at least try to endure them.

I am expected to speak upon the subject of "Mormonism and its purpose." Let me first inform you that we do not recognize the term "Mormonism" as the proper title of our religion. It is only a nickname bestowed upon the faith of the Latter-day