

literally, that God and Christ are one being. You ask him how two beings can be one being, and he answers that he does not pretend to explain it. It is a mystery, and must be received notwithstanding its repugnance to reason. But he would not allow the Catholic to make the same plea in favor of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The Unitarian goes on to apply reason to the interpretation of *this* passage also. He inquires if the same writer do not employ the same word in cases where no identity of being is intended. He reads on a few chapters, and he finds the Saviour praying for his disciples in these words,—“that they all may be one.” And in the next verse he specifies the sense in which they were to be one to be the same with that in which he had applied the same expression to himself and God,—“That they may be one, even as we are.” If the expression be allowed to prove that God and Christ were numerically one, then the same expression must be allowed to prove that God and Christ and the disciples were all one being.

The only difference, then, that there is between the Unitarian and other Christians is, that he applies reason to the interpretation of *all* the Scriptures, whereas they do only to a part. Without the use of reason, revelation would be useless; for we could never know what was revealed and what was not revealed, what was figurative and what literal. If it be meant by placing reason *above* Scripture, that, when reason and Scripture come in conflict, we believe reason in preference to Scripture, we deny that any such case ever happened or ever can happen, for we affirm that the Scriptures teach nothing that is not perfectly reasonable, when they are properly interpreted.