

extraordinary conclusion *that Wesley abandoned the Athanasian creed and the whole orthodoxy of which it is the highest exponent—including, of course, the doctrine of the Trinity*, which Mr. Roy evidently regards as the central truth of orthodoxy! On what ground is this assumed? Simply because Mr. Wesley says that it is the fact of the three-in-one and one-in-three that we are to believe; and not the mysterious manner in which it is so; and because of Mr. Wesley tolerantly says that while he accepts the Athanasian creed for himself, he could not insist upon others accepting it, nor believe that he who did not receive it would, “without doubt, perish everlastingly”; and because Mr. Wesley’s admission in his old age that a man was a pious man whose views of the Trinity were erroneous, must cancel his previous views of the Trinity! Never, in either Romish or Protestant theological literature, have I seen a more sweeping conclusion drawn from such small premises. It is like taking an army over a river on a bridge of gossamer. To remove the difficulties of doubters, and to help them to a belief in the Trinity, Mr. Wesley used the rather doubtful distinction that it is the fact and not the mystery that we are to believe—just as if the fact was not mysterious. On the strength of this statement Mr. Roy, by a concatenation of slenderly-jointed arguments, boldly infers that we have Wesley’s authority for maintaining that there is no obligation to believe or teach any mystery whatever! So that he has only to show that anything is a mystery to have a right to reject it. This may be ingenious; but it is certainly not ingenuous.

Still pursuing the same method of giving to another’s words the meaning that he wishes them to have, he uses Mr. Wesley’s expressions of liberality and toleration towards those whom he believes to be in error, as if they were expressions of indifference respecting the doctrinal soundness of those whom the Church authorizes to preach the Gospel.