pelieve that the cause promoted by a calm ns of this discourse I erences between oury mark our position in

nn Christians we differ d name — in our doceny his supernatural

We believe in both ection of his character eaching. To us he is in his name and ree our privilege to sit at accounting it a higher in to occupy the proudost despotic throne on no affinity with unbes of experience. Infifrom the coarseness of skeptic, meets with no ustly, as we would treat man or devil, error or y our pity, our condemefully accept the records im, in holy admiration, iming as we hearken to ks as having authority;" ,-" who could do these nim;" and as we gaze his was the Son of God." ir faith by the ingenious theories or mystical discourse of some who affect to honor Jesus while they throw suspicion over his whole history. We cannot divorce the history from the Divine influence which it conveys. Spiritual Christianity needs historical Christianity as its basis. To separate the former from the latter, is as if we withdrew from the towers and spires of a lofty cathedral the support of the foundation which enables them to soar upwards in their graceful beauty. Of coarser material may that foundation be made and be partly buried in the earth, but its solid strength upholds the walls out of which those lighter creations of art spring towards the skies. So must the loftiest aspirations of faith spring from convictions that rest on the firm basis of the Gospel history. We repel the charge of promoting or countenancing infidelity. We warn those whose hearts are set in this direction, of the peril they run; we entreat those who have sought this as a refuge from superstition, to leave it for the stronghold of a Scriptural faith; and shall we, because we cannot join in heaping opprobrious terms upon the unbeliever or in pursuing him with maledictions, be accused of secret agreement with him? Our language is, "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," but the name of Jesus Christ; can the most unscrupulous ingenuity pervert this language into a symbol of unbelief?

As Unitarian Christians, we differ from Trinitarians of every Communion—in our doctrine concerning God. We adopt no such expressions as "Triune God," "blessed and holy Trinity," "three persons in one God." We find no such expressions in the Bible. There, as I have said, we read only of the Divine unity. We do not meet with a line or a word which represents Christ as sharing supreme