

I. MR. ROY DENIES THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES AS A TRUSTWORTHY BASIS FOR
DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS OF TRUTH.

REFUTATING HIS OWN ARGUMENT IS FUTILE.

I maintain that every unprejudiced and intelligent reader of Mr. Roy's pamphlet must admit that this affirmation is justified by Mr. Roy's statements. The *Christian Guardian* alleged that Mr. Roy maintained in his pamphlet that the Bible is no certain standard as to what is truth ; and that he had labored to cover with doubt and distrust the foundations on which all the theological statements of religious truth rested. Mr. Roy, in a letter to that paper, denied that this was a fair construction of his statements. He said :—

“ When you represent me as teaching that ‘ the Bible is “ no certain standard as to what is truth,’ did you not forget “ my sentence on page 56, ‘ the Bible, as the highest known “ expression of that truth, gives a final decision on the facts it “ reveals’ ? Did you not also forget the sentence on page 61, “ “ Where the teachings of the Bible are clearly demonstra- “ ted, no scrutiny has found error in its leading doctrines’ ? “ Did you not also forget what is said on page 84 ?—Facts of “ Scripture alone should be insisted upon. These facts must “ be elicited by free criticism. They are summarized in the “ Apostles’ Creed.”

It must be obvious to every reader that these rather ambiguous sentences cannot disprove the charge against which they are quoted. Even had these isolated remarks been more explicit, they could not disprove an allegation based upon the import of an extended argument, intended to show that the Bible cannot be relied upon to settle what doctrines are true, or what are false. If a man uses several different kinds of argument to prove that a certain bridge is unsafe