

under the influence of the Neo-Platonist philosophy, and Abelard, Duns Scotus, and Aquinas, under the spell of Aristotelianism, attempted scholastic refinements, definitions, and subtleties beyond the reach of human intellect. But these are mere spots on the sun, slight defects in the noblest science in the universe, the science whose object is

To vindicate Eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to man.

In endeavouring to prove the alleged vagueness of primitive belief on the subject of the Trinity, Mr. Roy does us honour to make several quotations from our book on the Roman Catacombs, and makes the assertion that "the earliest records in the Catacombs show an utter ignorance of this scholastic theology, if they do not contradict it." Now, in his very citations Mr. Roy seems entirely to have misapprehended our purpose, which was to show, not that the doctrine of the Trinity was not held, but that the idolatrous carved or painted representations of the Trinity which disgrace later Roman Catholic art, had no counterpart in the art of the early Church. With regard to the doctrines of the Trinity of the Godhead and the Divinity of Jesus Christ we expressly say: "We know from ecclesiastical history that numerous heresies sprang up in the early centuries with reference to these august themes; but no evidence accuses the Church in the Catacombs of departure from the primitive and orthodox faith in these respects. Frequently, indeed, the belief in these cardinal doctrines is so strongly asserted as to suggest that it is in designed and vigorous protest against the contemporary heretical notions."* Then follow a selection of examples in proof of these statements. The believer is said to "sleep in God," "in Christ," "in the Holy Spirit." Quinzelianus is described in his epitaph as

"holding fast the doctrine of the Trinity." The divinity of Christ is most strongly asserted, as in the formulæ, "God Christ Almighty," "God, Holy Christ," "Christ, the one holy God." An engraving of a seal is also given, on which, doubtless in protest against the Arian heresy, it is expressly declared "Christ is God." The earliest doxologies, benedictions, baptismal formulæ, and liturgies of the Church all give evidence of the firm holding of these vital doctrines.

We think that it could also be shown that quotations from the other authors cited, and even from Wesley himself, equally fail to corroborate the view on behalf of which they are quoted.

One of the most objectionable sections of the entire pamphlet under review is that which discusses the question "Can 'orthodoxy' rest on the Bible?" The tendency of the whole section, we think, is to degrade the Scriptures as a rule of faith and conduct, to invalidate their authority, to eviscerate their very life, to unsettle the faith of unlearned Bible readers, and to loosen the very bonds that hold the Christian Church together. The difficulties of the different theories of inspiration and interpretation, and of the formation of the canon of Scripture, are so exaggerated as to prove, if anything at all, far more than we hope the author means. "When the 'Bible Revision Committee' have finished their labours," he asserts, "the people will have what will practically be two Bibles. These will not agree: Who will decide between the conflicting claims? Authority cannot; for both versions will have had authority in their favour. The masses cannot judge of MSS. or grammatical intricacies in dead languages. Common sense or reason will assert itself. We may as well prepare for this once."

There are, it is true, various reasons

* Withrow's "Catacombs of Rome," p. 449.