"Israel did not scientifically predicate personality of God, he would not even have had a notion of what it meant," he asserts something which is quite irrelevant as proof, that they did not regard and treat God as a person.

We presume there are hundreds of Englishmen who know the author of "Literature and Dogma," who do not scientifically predicate personality of Matthew Arnold, and many of them would not even have a notion of what it meant.

3. It is assumed that while the idea of God is uncertain and indefinite, that of morality is clear and certain.

He informs us that "morality represents for everybody a thoroughly definite and ascertained idea—the idea of conduct regulated in a certain manner. Everybody, again, understands distinctly enough what is meant by man's perfection—his reaching the best which his powers and circumstances allow him to reach." (Page 39.) That which makes the ideas of morality and perfection definite and certain is that, unlike the idea of God, they are "drawn from experience."

In reply to this assumption, we maintain-

(1.) That the ideas of morality and perfection are not drawn from *experience*. If, therefore, the ideas of morality and perfection have no other foundation, they may be dismissed at once into the region of *Aberglaube*.

Arnold's reasoning proceeds upon a philosophy which we regard as radically unsound. It is based on the philosophy which teaches that we can know only phenomena, and as phenomena can be known only by experience, all real knowledge is due to that source.

Look at the case before us. It is quite evident that experience may occasion, but it cannot be the source of that idea of morality which we all possess.

When an act comes before us, for the first time, which involves a moral element, the mind pronounces judgment upon it with as much confidence as if it had been repeated an hundred times.

And experience can, at best, only make known the moral quality of past acts. It cannot pronounce on the morality of similar acts which lie in the future, so as to lead us to shun, or follow

t we olved

that

flu-

re-

e to d in

un-

that

hom

hcy,"

l and form, that is ad-

is deee disnly be
dividthink
of ten-

ary to ary to other ality.

in the which d can l says,