Mr. Roy quotes Mr. Wesley's words against bigotry: "What "if I were to see a Papist, an Arian, a Socinian casting out "devils? (By this he means, turning sinners to God.) Yea, "if it could be supposed that I should see a Jew, a Deist, or "a Turk doing the same, were I to forbid him directly or "indirectly, I should be no better than a bigot still." The use Mr. Roy makes of this, and the meaning he attaches to it, are very extravagant, and beyond all reasonable license of There is nothing mysterious about Mr. interpretation. Wesley's meaning. He, in effect, says, "Be tolerant to all who differ from you, and encourage all who are trying to do good, however wrong you may believe them to be." Mr. Roy interprets him as if he said: "It is of no special consequence what men believe or preach. No preacher of any Church should be censured or hindered as long as he is conscientious in what he teaches; even though he may be a Papist or Socinian. Doctrines are of no consequence." Can any living man who knows anything of the history and teaching of Wesley believe that such an extravagant belief correctly represents his meaning? The whole work and teaching of John Wesley's life contradict Mr. Roy in his strained attempt to convict him of extreme laxity respecting doctrine. We might just as well argue that because he admitted that there had been many "truly religious" Romanists, such as Thomas à Kempis, Gregory Lopez, and the Marquis de Renty, Wesley "abandoned" Protestantism, as to argue that because he admitted that a man who held erroneous notions about the Trinity presented signs of piety, therefore he renounced the doctrine of the Trinity and the whole orthodox scheme of doctrine. It speaks badly for Mr. Roy's theological notions, that they require him to resort to so much unfair quotation and strained interpretation of the authors he quotes, in order to make them even appear to countenance his Socinian notions.