

arbitrarily  
s possible  
st antici-  
parable in  
divide us  
circum-  
etch, even  
philosophy ?  
er similar  
thers have

scheme of  
comings, is  
e, we must  
e must put  
se lectures  
gnise that  
ecause, till  
all beliefs  
that they  
t only that  
resent able  
gnise that  
different.  
ries or con-  
required for  
vidence and  
systematic

philosophy has so far found no great use. These terms, it must be owned, are now a little the worse for wear. Defaced and battered by centuries of hard usage, they have suffered the fate which the current coin of popular discussion cannot easily avoid. But they have merits negative and positive, which make them peculiarly apt for my present purpose.

In the first place, they do not suggest a philosophy of the universe. They openly evade the great problems of theological metaphysics. No one, for example, would employ them in discussing the essential nature of an Absolute God, or His relation to time, to the act of creation, to the worlds created. They belong to a different level of speculation.

In the second place, they concentrate attention on the humanistic side of Theism, on the relation of God to man, and to man's higher spiritual needs. Divine "guidance"—the purposeful working of informing Spirit—is the notion on which emphasis is specially laid. The term "Providence" suggests this in a broad and general way. The term "Inspiration" suggests it in the narrower sphere of beliefs and emotions. And do not complain that no endeavour is made to explain the mode in which divine guidance works either on