

ence. These three terms are doubtless equally significant and of similar importance, yet the one which most clearly indicates the plurality of persons in the Godhead, and at the same time divine personality itself, is the last. Impersonal love is nonsense, so that, love being allowed as a definition of God, it follows that God is a person or persons. But again, love is a social virtue in God prior to the thought of any inferior being towards whom it came in time to be exercised. If God dwells in love, it is not in the love of seraph and cherub, angel and archangel, but in His own infinite abiding love wherewith the Father loved the Son before the world was. Other religions have or had their spurious trinities, but so far from the trinities becoming more definite when the religions reached the philosophical stage, they were virtually merged in unity. Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto, Osiris, Isis and Horus, Brahma Vishnu, and Siva, never dwelt together in love. No such concept ever entered the mind of man, nor was it even given to the Old Testament prophets to grasp the lofty thought. With the Great Revealer the truth became known, and placed within the compass of the least in His Kingdom of Heaven.

The duty God requires of man is virtually given in the answer to the question, 'What is man's chief end?' or *Summum Bonum* as the old philosophers called it. John answers this question in the simple words, 'We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is, that is, like Christ who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person, in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' Our duty, therefore, is to make progress in the divine likeness by all the means placed within our power. This the atonement of the Son, and the regenerating and sanctifying efficacy of the Holy Ghost make possible. But, what a destiny, to be like God! True, the Buddhist seeking perfection in the

path of life, hopes to be a Buddha in some future stage of existence, hopes to be a man-made god, the equal of Brahma or Indra, or the great Gotama himself. His system is an evolution from within, not without many struggles and vicissitudes, and there is a grand dignity in it as compared with Brahmanism. It represents the highest point that atheistic evolution has touched or can touch, so that, if a man is bound to deny the divine existence, he cannot do better than adopt it. But, what warrant has he for the belief in the existence of these Buddhas of the past and future, that the Christian has not in immeasurably higher degree for his belief in the existence of the One Living and True God? They are as unsubstantial as the gods of paganism, with many of which they are identical, for the theological dictum of Buddhism is simply this 'Gods are self-deified men.'

Christian Ethic rests upon the Christian conception of Deity, inasmuch as its *Summum Bonum* is the divine likeness. That other religions systems have apprehended features of that likeness is not to be denied, for such are all the points of philosophical Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Parseeism, of Mahometism, even of Confucianism, which commend themselves to the Christian consciousness. But Confucianism and Buddhism, being virtually destitute of theology, have no divine ideal on which to mould human character, no external and supernatural aid to the evolution of spiritual light out of natural darkness, which does not comprehend or embrace the light. The pantheistic deity of modern Brahmanism is so vague as to have no moral character whatsoever. Then, when we come to the modern Jewish, Mahometan and Zoroastrian systems, we find indeed a god, but a god who constitutes morality by his objective will, a god resembling in this respect the intemperate parson who said, 'You must not do as I do; you