

infinite. And this creation, which exists under conditions of space and time, which is finite in its order, and finite in its possibilities, seems to demand for its due administration the government of a Deity adapted to its limitations. May it not therefore be that, to meet this need, the infinite Deity has, by an act of self-limitation, akin to that from which finite creation sprang, induced an aspect of finiteness, so as to ensure the due fulfilment of his purpose, and a system of close, harmonious, and intelligible relations between himself and his work? This surely is the truth enshrined in the obscure saying of Heraclitus: "Ἐν τῷ σοφῶν μόνῳ λέγεσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλει καὶ ἐθέλει Ζηνὸς ὄνομα.

No name or personality can rightly be given to that absolute unity wherein alone wisdom resides, but to the end that it may become in some wise intelligible to us, it "is willing, though it wills not to be called by the name of Zeus."

It may be said, however, that our conception of a personal Deity does not in fact relate to any objective reality, does not imply that there is any actual personal presentation of the Deity corresponding with it, but is merely a human device to provide an intelligible object for man's religious aspiration. Be it so; it is certainly an objection which cannot be disproved. But let us observe that, if it tells against the belief in a personal Deity, it tells also against the belief in a Deity at all. Neither belief is demonstrably true; yet each alike is attested by an almost irresistible tendency of thought; and if this is not to be trusted in the one case, there is no sufficient reason for trusting it in the other. But in truth we are under no obligation to discredit the validity of our belief in a personal Deity. Our knowledge is of course conditioned by our limited faculties, but a conception is not necessarily false because it is relative. As a well-known writer has pointed out:

Human knowledge, no doubt, is relative in a very genuine sense: it is *I* that know, else that knowledge were not mine. No doubt, also, man is to himself "the measure of all things," in the sense that he can understand only what he has the ability to understand. But the very point in question is, *what* has man the ability to understand? And it will not do summarily to exclude