

square contained by four infinitely extended sides, but he cannot *think* it; i.e., he cannot make a mental image of it true to his language concerning it. And this fact is so fundamental, that its mere restatement in other terms is all the demonstration it requires and admits. The square that fits so easily to our thoughts excludes as well as includes space, the other excludes none: for its area is infinite, and this infinity subtracted from itself leaves a naught for the remainder. The real square has four angles: the containing sides of the other being infinitely extended, never meet, and failing in that particular thing, neither exclude nor include any part of space whatever, and the square they contain is as much like Euclid's as the tune of "Greensleeves." In other words, the *unimaginary* square which every schoolboy can talk about without the slightest difficulty, includes the absurd and impossible, and by the mysterious and *natural* operations of our own minds we are compelled to exclude it from the list—the very long list—of realities. And—to put the point softly—it will be as well to get through with *that* list before we worry with any other.

Now let us look into the theological square, and, taking our multiplication table with us, test one of its sides, say "omnipotence." When a man, or Deity, just able to carry two bags of flour on his back, shoulders one, he puts out just one-half his strength. In this case the two-bag line separates, and by separating correlates and *unites* the two attributes, *ability* and *inability*, i.e., the positive and negative sides of a mental image which constitutes the only possible handle for taking up the problem. Shift this correlating line to the millionth bag. Then with one or two bags on his back the carrier will have "lots" of strength to spare, but under the whole load, not an ounce. But, wherever we shift the dividing line between "I can" and "I can't," the correlation holds good. Now, let us say that the number of bags to be borne is infinite, and that the carrier, being omnipotent, shoulders the whole lot. In this case, we expunge the correlating line, and by so doing we extinguish the correlation itself, i.e., the apprehensible image of a compound positive and negative condition. We also reject one of the terms of the correlation, inability, and retain the other; but now the word "ability" is perfectly void of thought; and it is just as empty if we enlarge it into "omnipotence." Of the two factors in the strength correlation we make one a cipher and we call their product "Almighty God." In short, as in Euclid's square, where there is no exclusion of space, there can be no inclusion of area, so in the theological square, where there is no exclusion of ability, there can be no inclusion of power; and the imaginary side disconnects itself from the mystery and drops plumb into the limbo of things which are not. This point is vital, therefore let us look at it under another aspect: A man, or god, exerts his power to overcome resistance or difficulty, and the amount of resistance overcome is the exact measure of the power put forth. Now, omnipotence does not stagger with a million, or even with a billion bags of flour on its back

there
no d
is no
idle, f
where
culty
up to
discha
simple
undert
load on
Spac
square
adulter
anthin
from t
Thus th
tions, h
with th
contigu
is so t
operate
religiou
been ex
specime
1. Pa
solution
to say th
at all; a
doctrine
sea-wate
theory, b
2. Sor
Professo
attempt
for the n
look dee
But we a
complex
fore, to n
the same
i.e., their
the subst
3. Aga
science of
we do no