

I know that Mr. Roy, finding that his heresies have shocked Christian sentiment more than he expected, is very anxious to persuade people that his views are not Unitarian. He seems to forget that it is the verdict of the jury, and not that of the prisoner, that settles the question of guilt or innocence. When a man who has gathered up every available objection, by which he could weaken popular confidence in the trustworthiness of the Bible, turns round and tells us that he has not impugned its supreme authority, we must be very easily satisfied if we ascribe any importance to such a plea in arrest of judgment. In the same way, when he rakes up every possible objection against the Trinity—from Scripture, from history, from metaphysics—and in explicit language denies that there are three persons in the Godhead,—and then pretends to think himself misrepresented, because he is classed with Unitarians, we must question either his sincerity or his sanity. And all this, too, in the face of the fact that when he was before the committee, he explicitly declared that he knew of only one hypostasis in the New Testament; and also distinctly rejected the first article in “the Articles of Religion”; which declares that “*in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*” There must be some want of frank dealing in all this. If Mr. Roy has been misrepresented, why does he not come out of the obscurity of “scholastic” terminology, and say plainly to the people that he believes in three persons in one God? It looks very like as if he thought he had given the well meaning people, who have been mystified by his sophistry, as much “catholicity” as they can swallow for the present; and that he recoils from fully unmasking his Unitarianism to their sight, lest it should be more than those who have been defending his Methodist orthodoxy could bear. I cannot conceive how Mr. Roy can possibly