

justly remarks: "Towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth, and in the beginning of that of James I., there sprang up a new school, widely differing from that of the reformers, and the tenets of which at length acquired the coherence of a system; and under the influence of Archbishop Laud, in the reign of Charles II., became widely prevalent. At the restoration they were resuscitated by the surviving divines of Laud's school; and they were, for the most part, embraced by the non-jurors." (See the No. for Feb., 1841.)

4. All this serves to show the fallacy of our opponent's mode of reply to us, when from *principles* and *formularies* he appeals to the *practice* of his church. Before this arguing can prove any thing, the perfect and uniform *coincidence* of these, must first be established. Canons, moreover, which regulate ecclesiastical administration *within* a church are one thing; and *anathematizing* differing communions, is quite another thing. The bold assertion of our opponent, that the "public formularies of the Anglican Church, pronounce excommunication upon every one within the realm dissenting from the Church of England," turns out, then, to be only another proof of his possessing, in no ordinary degree those qualities for which we have already given him full credit, viz., perverseness and pertinacity. Where is the consistency of the English Church's denunciation of the ordination of the Popes as conveying "*the spirit of the devil*, and not of God," and of the Popes themselves as "*Lucifer's successors*," entitled to no better reputation "among the servants of Christ" than "*the forerunner of Antichrist*,"—contained in the Homily for Whitsunday; while, in *practice*, she recognizes the validity of the ordination of Popish Priests? Aiming at the special benefit of *The Church*, we have thus met him again on *his own* ground, and shown that it is no better than yielding sand.

5. For the purpose of outnumbering the churches that practice presbyterial ordination, our foiled adversary rather imprudently betrays his latent tendencies, by calling in to his aid "the corrupt Roman and Eastern Churches." His apology for this is "the infidelity of the so-called Protestant Germany and Geneva." But has he lost sight of the fact that there are a goodly number of Socinians and neologists in the Anglican Church? and that orthodoxy in the recognized articles and exponents of faith, forms but a feeble barrier against error of the most deadly kind, when those who subscribe them cease to be animated with "*the love of the truth*." Here, however, Methodism stands upon vantage ground so high, as to repel alike assault and *insinuation*. No one, we presume, ever heard of so anomalous a personage as a *Wesleyan Socinian*.

After all our pains, it is not unlikely that our opponent will maintain, as it is natural for him to wish others to believe, "that his arguments have been left nearly untouched." And, understanding the term *arguments* in its conventional meaning, we have not much to object to this statement. We never professed to be quite ethereal enough to touch what is really *intangible*. But wherever we have found in his declamations, any thing that *looked like* an argument, we have certainly endeavoured to do something *more* than merely touch it; and whatever opinion either *he* or *I* may entertain of the result will not much influence the decision of a discerning public. For them it now remains to determine, whether the weapons we have employed in this controversy, by us unsought, resemble more the pointless darts of old Priam;—to which our antagonist likens them—or the winged shaft of Priam's son, which proved fatal to Achilles. The defence of the *truth*, however, not the achievement of a *victory*, has been our object.