

method is seldom adopted, except where there is a consciousness that the proper kind of evidence necessary to a successful defence is not available.

My design in these brief notes is to point out some of the chief things on which, in my judgment, Mr. Roy's views are false and unscriptural. In the limited space to which other duties compel me to confine my remarks, I cannot attempt any formal refutation of these questionable theories, nor even so much as name all the points to which I take exception. But I shall "nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice." I do not publish these thoughts anonymously because I recoil from avowing and defending what I have written; but simply because I wish them to be read without favor or prejudice—without being hindered or helped by the name of their author. I ask a candid reading, especially from those who think Mr. Roy misrepresented and ill-used. And as he has publicly intimated that this is the case, and has denied the interpretation put upon his words by the Committee and the *Christian Guardian*, I design candidly to examine the import of Mr. Roy's teaching, touching very briefly upon its tendency, and the course pursued by Mr. Roy himself. It will not be expected that I should dwell upon many sentiments of which I approve, such as his antagonism to priestly assumptions, and his earnest pleading for freedom of thought, with which all true men will sympathize, though they may differ from Mr. Roy in the practical application of the principle. Let us inquire what heterodox views are taught by Mr. Roy, and what effect would the acceptance of these views have upon spiritual religion.