

accountable being is better, the proof of its possibility.

As Unitarian Christians, we differ from the self-styled Orthodox of this and other lands—in our doctrine concerning the atonement. We believe in an atonement, and in *the* atonement; in an atonement needed by every sinner, by which he shall be reconciled to God, and in the atonement of which Christ is the instrument, by bringing the sinner to God, that he may be forgiven and justified. Nay, more; we believe that the atonement was the great object of Christ's mission, even as he said, "the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," and that in this purpose we find the solution of the mystery which overhangs his cross. But we cannot—and we thank God that we do not—believe in a vicarious atonement which would subvert our notions of justice, and teach us to look upon the Heavenly Father as an Infinite Despot. We *must* use strong language on this point. We reject with abhorrence a doctrine which despoils the Divine character of its glory, and takes from the Divine law its most urgent sanctions. We can call that a gracious Providence which hides instruction beneath chastisement, but we cannot call that a revelation of grace which shows us the Sovereign of the universe refusing forgiveness to contrite offenders except on conditions which they are utterly unable to fulfil, yet which are held to be fulfilled by a technical evasion that would be sanctioned by no court of justice in the civilized world. Our doctrine of the atonement is a doctrine of parental love; the popular doctrine of the atonement, if it were not con-