

This is a problem with which every philosophy of religion must grapple on pain of annihilation. I hope to do something in the sequel to solve it. Meantime, it may be pointed out that to claim knowledge of the Infinite is not to claim infinite knowledge. To say that  $3 + 2 = 5$  is certainly not to assume complete knowledge, and yet, if the judgment is true at all, it is true for all intelligences and at all moments, and in that sense is a knowledge of the Infinite. So if I say that "God is one," I express what is true absolutely, if it is true at all, no matter what the character of the "oneness" may be. The judgment means, that whatever else God is, He is *one*. Now, if this is true, we reach a conception which no possible extension of experience can possibly overthrow, though, with the increase of knowledge, it will no doubt receive further definition and interpretation. If God is "one," He may still be "one" in many senses; we may conceivably define His unity as the unity of a Substance, the unity of a Person, or the unity of Spirit; but, whichever of these determinations we may ultimately adopt, our original proposition, that He is one and not many, will remain intact; and, indeed, one test of the truth of different attempts to characterize His nature, will be, whether they are, or are not, consistent with the fundamental characterization of Him as one. No doubt, if we are challenged to prove the oneness of God, we shall have some difficulty in doing so; a difficulty, however, which will not seem insuperable to any one who sees that, by its denial, the whole of our experience is made inexplicable. Starting, then, from the comprehension of God as one, we may proceed to ask what further determinations are essential to the explanation of the facts of our experience. In this way we may, as I think, proceed step by step to define