

taste, we must confess, for this style of speculation at all. But as a specimen, let us mention a few of the things which are represented as being necessarily beyond the exercise of the Creative Power. God cannot, it is said, realize upon any substantive being, aught that involves in it either a logical or a mathematical contradiction. He could not, for example, make a thing to be and not to be at the same time—or he could not make a circle whose circumference shall be precisely three times its diameter. And so along with this it is imagined, that there might be certain physical necessities, which even the Force of Omnipotence, restricted as it is within the domain of possibility, cannot violate. It seems clear enough that He cannot give certain of His own attributes to the creature, as His Eternity, His Self-existence, His Independence—and hence do our Theorists proceed to the assertion that He cannot impart certain other of His perfections—not His Ubiquity, not His Omniscience, not his Infinity of moral perfection, and so not His impossibility of sinning. We feel inclined to proceed no further with these desperate fetches into the arcana of a matter that is inscrutable—these guesses into the mystery of things. But we would put the question, if we really know as much of a creative process, and of the laws and the limitations by which it must be regulated, as to warrant the affirmation that the existence of evil is at variance with the existence of a Being possessing all moral and all natural perfection—and whether is it safer to incur the risk of tremendous presumption in meddling with this high spe-