

deity with the Father. We do not read of a double nature in him, which enabled him to equivocate without a sacrifice of truth; — a moral, and literal impossibility, is it not? We say with all confidence that the doctrine of the Trinity is either unintelligible or self-contradictory, and that in either case it cannot be a subject of revelation. We do not hesitate to pronounce it injurious in its effects upon devotion, and pernicious in its connexion with morality. We trace its history back to the admixture of an impure philosophy with the primitive faith of the Church. And when we are reminded that it is now included in the faith of nearly all Christendom, we answer, first, that if the truth of opinions be determined by majorities, Christianity must cower before Paganism, and Protestantism humble itself before the majesty of Rome; and secondly, that the variety of explanations which have been given by the advocates of this tenet is a sufficient proof that the majority of the Christian Church are not agreed in any interpretation, and since we cannot find it in the Bible, we may at least defer a belief in it till they who esteem it so important have decided what it is which they wish us to believe.

As Unitarian Christians, we differ from all of the Presbyterian or Congregational name who adopt Calvinistic standards of faith — in our doctrine concerning man. We look upon him as fallen from his state of primeval innocence. Observation and consciousness tell us that he is corrupt. But not by nature. We cannot shut our eyes on human depravity, but we can believe neither in natural nor in total depravity. If man comes into life with a nature wholly inclined to evil, where is his guilt in obeying the necessity under which he is placed of doing evil? As