

ing Presbyterian's four letters published, as they are everywhere spoken of in terms of highest praise, abundantly prove that they are as satisfactory to Methodists as they are unsatisfactory to Layman and other High Church bigots.

Layman complains that "both Mr. L. and 'P.' have lavished a copious supply of abuse and scurrility upon" him, and then piously (?) quotes the words of the great Apostle—"but none of these things move me!" But what has he been 'lavishing' on us? Let the readers of the STANDARD answer. But for Layman's benefit I may say that the point of difference is just here: Layman made most insulting and groundless statements. We said they were so *and proved it*. He made similar charges against us, but *fails to prove them*. Hence his sad wail of discomfiture.

I now come to that part of Layman's letter which he calls "business," and then he so completely begs the question that if I were as free in using quotations as he is I should quote his own words and say, he writes "in a most silly and foolish way!" And just here I am again reminded of a remark by Mr. Wesley in reply to the Bishop of Exeter above referred to, namely, "It is well for you, that *forging quotations* is not felony," for I did not couple those words as he has them." He has simply stated as a fact that the Methodist Society does not constitute a Christian church, but he has sadly failed in giving proof. He has stated that her ministers are "priestly pretenders," but again fails in proof; and now, after having his insulting, abusive and unfounded statements so completely exposed and scattered to the winds by the letters of Presbyterian, so full of clear logic and solid fact, he still has the effrontery to ask me to read his pamphlet again and accept his statements as facts! Not

so, Mr. Layman; that is too much to ask of any intelligent person who has read both; and let me whisper in your ear that you have not yet heard all you will hear as to your own boasted ecclesiastical standing.

Layman tries to prove me incorrect in stating that "Methodism is throughout the Christian world recognized as a branch of the Christian church," by quoting 'statistics,' which a little farther on he seems to disparage, to show that some churches do not so regard it. I did not say they *all* did, but if I had it would have been as accurate as for him to try to make it appear that *none* in those churches he names do so regard it, for even the Church of England is divided on this point. Perhaps it would have been as well if I had said the *Protestant* Christian world, which would then have excused Layman and his section of the "Anglican" church.

With a desperate but ludicrous attempt at sarcasm Layman says: "In his extreme agony of soul he utters a cry of despair for me to apologize for the insult. What insult? For telling the truth?" This is all gratuitous, for my words were as follows: "He is in duty bound, as an honest man, either to prove his statement true or withdraw his unfounded assertion and apologize for the insult." It might cause 'agony of soul' and even a 'cry of despair' if of sufficient importance, for certainly I do not not expect him to do either—the one he is unable and the other unwilling to do.

The remaining part of Layman's letter is taken up with the subject of baptismal regeneration. I shall try, to be very brief in noticing his three columns on this subject, for two reasons; first, because I proved most conclusively in my second letter that Layman did give "garbled extracts of a very misleading character," and also because Presbyterian will answer Layman