

ings and trifling divergencies of text; but not a quarter as many as in the case of Homer or of any other ancient author, or even of Shakespeare, who wrote only three hundred years ago. And these various readings, with perhaps one solitary exception (1 John v. 7), affect no doctrine at all, but are mere unimportant matters of fact, as of chronology or enumeration. Each new revision of Homer or Virgil does not give us a new Iliad or Æneid. So the blessed Bible, which in over two hundred tongues is speaking throughout the world the infallible word of God, notwithstanding the slightly varying shades of thought in these different versions, is, in all the essential doctrines of salvation, a grand harmonious whole—the voice of God speaking unto men the word of life.

The *dictum* of Chillingworth needs to be strongly reasserted: "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants;" or, as Wesley's own Rules of Society express it: "The written Word, the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice." As for the selection of "common sense" or "reason," Strauss and the German rationalists have shown us what it means, when the miraculous or supernatural come into antagonism with modern skepticism.

In the section on Wesley's relation to "Orthodoxy," that large-minded man is shown to have held exceedingly broad and liberal views on religious toleration, far beyond those generally entertained in his own or, indeed, in the present age. Mr. Roy states in illustration the following passage: "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, I would to forbid him, directly or indirectly, I should be no better than a hypocrite still."

Mr. Roy claims that this liberal view has reference not merely to min-

isters of different Churches but to ministers of the same Church (page 82). If this view be correct, the passage quoted means (if anything at all) that the ministers of the same Church may be at liberty to play the *role* of Papist, Arian, or Socinian, not to say of Jew, Deist, or Turk, without let or hindrance by the authorities of that Church. This surely is proving too much. It is one thing to see a man, be he Jew or Pagan, "casting out devils" or doing good works, and to forbid him not, but rather to wish him "God-speed," and it is another, and very different thing to invest him with special authority, to endorse his character, and to share the responsibility of his acts.

The Methodist Church, we conceive, has no right to clothe with ministerial authority, prestige, and influence, and to appoint as teachers men who hold and inculcate religious beliefs strikingly at variance with those of the Church which they claim to represent, no matter how great the talents, how profound the learning, or how commanding the eloquence of those men may be.

The chapter on the Relations of Methodism to Modern Religious Thought and to Protestant Unity is a piece of brilliant rhetoric. But its very epigrammatic style and striking antitheses lead to an exaggeration of language unfavourable to the elucidation of truth. In discussing the question, "Are thoughts or systems of thoughts true because they are divine or divine because they are true?" Mr. Roy thus inquires concerning the central idea of Christianity—God is love,—“Why do you believe that to be true? Doubtless, some will say, ‘Because Jesus said so.’ But how do you know that Jesus spoke the truth? ‘Because of the attestation of His miracles.’ But how do you know the miracles ever took place? ‘Because the Bible says so.’ But how do you know the Bible is true?” And he refers to the difficulties about the