

another thing to argue from the s.d. by an analogy, for, it logically entails itself. It has no meaning in itself except as it is the effect in our own consciousness of something other than itself. Any the. arg. that would be valid in the ontological category is based upon that something else wh. is presupposed in the s.d. & is explanatory of it. We cannot argue from s.d. as that ev. of divine self-manifestation of wh. the s.d. is simply the precipitate in our own consciousness.

These considerations must apply also to the historical & moral arg.

## ii. The Historical Argument.

There is a certain sense in which it can be used. There is the undoubted phenomenon of the universality of religion. But this is simply the effect on the consciousness of man in gen. of the rev. wh. God gives in man & his cosmic environment. We cannot argue directly from this. We must always get back to that divine self-rev. of wh. the universality of religion is merely an effect.

## iii. The Moral Argument.

We must get behind the effect to the works of the law written on the hearts & lives of men.

## b. Those which reside in the world around us.

- i. The teleological argument.
- ii. The cosmological argument.

## E. Incomprehensibility of God:

### 1. God's immanency.

2. God cannot be comprehensively & exhaustively known by finite rational beings.

3. These two meanings are derived from two different meanings of the Latin verb; comprehendo:

- a) To contain