

in the British Empire, yet, in no one instance, has that influence been exerted in any way against the Establishment. On the contrary, when almost all others have united against the Church, and have endeavoured to separate it from the State, and, in fact, to lay it prostrate, the Wesleyan Conference has taken a most decided stand in its favour. The Wesleyan body still respects the Established Church: it still believes and teaches the doctrines found in her Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy; and both in England, and also on the foreign stations, either the Morning-Prayers, Mr. Wesley's Abridgement, or at least the lessons are read in all our chapels on the Lord's Day.

It surely, therefore, is not too much to expect of Churchmen, that they will not continue to attack those who have ever shown themselves to be their friends.

That *Diocesan Episcopacy* is a prudential form of church government; and that the English Church is one of the best constituted national churches in the world, are positions that we feel no disposition to controvert. But to assert, that Diocesan Episcopacy, as now observed in the Church of England, is of *divine institution*; that this divine institution has passed down *unimpaired and uninterrupted* from the days of the Apostles, amidst all the convulsions of kingdoms, the difficulties, prosperity, corruption, and Reformation of the Church; that all who do not believe this dogma are schismatics and not members of the Church of Christ; and that all ministers, however holy and useful they may be, who have not received Episcopal ordination, are only intruders into secret things, *deceivers*, or "wolves in sheep's clothing," are doctrines that ill suit the enlightened character of Britons in the nineteenth century.

The reason for the publication of the work now before us, is given in the advertisement. From this it appears, the Rev. Mr. Shreve had asserted, "That THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND is the *only true Apostolic Church*, and its ministers the *only truly qualified ministers* of the Gospel, in the British Empire." And further, that "he had stated to a member of the Methodist Society, that Baptism performed by Methodist Ministers is not valid, and had spoken of Methodist Ministers in terms calculated to convey the idea that because they had not been *Episcopally ordained* they were not true ministers of Christ."

This produced a note from Mr. McLeod to Mr. Shreve, and no reply having been received for a few days, Mr. McLeod addressed his congregation on the subject. Some time afterwards a reply was sent to Mr. McLeod, in which reply it was said, "I stated expressly that Methodist Ministers had no more *right to baptize children than any laymen,—no more right than a woman possessed.*"

A considerable part of Mr. Shreve's letter was, however, taken up, in the vain attempt of proving the divine origin of Diocesan Episcopacy, and what is called the uninterrupted succession. Mr. Shreve requested Mr. McLeod to read his reply publicly. This however, Mr. McL. refused, but has published Mr. Shreve's letter, with his strictures thereon, in eight letters.

Mr. Shreve's first attempt at proving the divine origin of Diocesan Episcopacy, is not by a question from the Bible, but from St. Jerome, a man who lived in the fourth century. "What Aaron, his sons the priests, and the levites were in the temple, the same are Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons in the Church." We conceive this to be a singular way of proving a thing scriptural; Saint Jerome's opinion is no more scriptural, this is the opinion of the Rector of Guysborough.

Mr. Shreve proceeds, "While Christ was upon earth, he took the entire management of the affairs of his Church, he called the twelve, he ordained the seventy. *Here are the three orders*; but the Apos-

ties exercised no authority while Christ was upon earth." p. 5.

To this fanciful analogy Mr. McLeod replies,—

"You in effect say, Christ himself was the *first order*, and whilst on earth took the entire management of his Church; he called the twelve—(*the second order.*) He ordained the seventy—(*the third order.*) "Here," you say, "are the three orders." Do you mean to say, that Bishops stand in the place of Christ—Presbyters in the place of the twelve—and Deacons in the place of the seventy? If so, we may very naturally expect the former to perform works similar to the latter, which is absurd. If not, why institute the comparison between them, or rather rank them on an equality." p. 16.

Mr. Shreve's second attempt to prove his point is by a simple reference to three texts in Scripture without any effort on his part to show their meaning. "In St. Mark's Gospel we notice that three distinct times Christ ordains, sends forth, and commands the Apostles to preach the Gospel. Some reason must be assigned for this, some importance must be attached to this."—*Vide Mark, iii. 14. vi. 7—xvii. 15.* p. 5.

It is true, in one of those texts, Mark iii. 14, the word *ordained* is found in our common English version; but if Mr. Shreve had referred to his Greek Testament, he would not have found the same word used there as occurs, in Acts xiv. 23, and rendered, "And when they had *ordained* them elders in every Church." In the latter text the original word is "*Cheirotoresautis*," which comes from *Cheir*, the hand and *teino* to extend, to stretch out; and is by all understood as an appointment to an office either by *lifting up the hands* or by the *imposition of hands*; but in Mark iii. 14, the word is, "*epoise*," which has no such meaning as the *imposition of hands*; but simply means to make, appoint, or constitute.

To the above remarks of Mr. Shreve, Mr. McLeod replies,—

"No doubt the reasons of our Lord's conduct in this matter were both important and worthy of notice; but as important and worthy of notice as they were, I cannot perceive, that they cast even the slightest favourable glance on the establishment of three distinct orders in the ministry, and on three distinct ordinations, &c. For in the first place there is but *one* ordination mentioned; and from this you cannot logically infer the propriety, nay, the necessity of *three*. In the second place, the reasons of that ordination are assigned, 'that they should be with him,' as intimate companions or friends, to bear witness against things which, after his departure, would be needful to be testified to the world; (see also, Acts i. 21 22) 'and that he might send them forth to preach.'"

In the third place, he sent them forth but *once* before his death; and doubtless this was to prepare the Jews (for their labors were expressly limited to these) for the perfected system of Christianity, the same as the preaching of John was designed to prepare the way for the preaching of the Lord." p. 20.

Mr. Shreve's last attempt to maintain his position from Scripture, is thus expressed,—

"If you attentively consider the power with which Timothy and Titus were invested, you will discover that it was superior to that which was granted to Presbyters,—they had *authority to reprove Presbyters*, and to *ordain*,—a power which is only given to superiors. When there were a number of Presbyters at Ephesus (*vide Acts xx. 17*) St. John was directed to write to the *angel* of that city. He must have been considered superior to all others residing there, by the manner in which he is addressed, and the directions given to him. He is looked upon as the responsible governor and minister of that church." p. 6.

What with a primitive ed that "the to who mits th of the menbe nor;" clergy was a term.

To Mr. M

"T

they w

getists

who a

tion;—

dain

but ge

to ther

it is c

"Apo

numbe

suited

Mr.

of Di

and b

his let

tor of

church

stitute

tians

admitt

consid

text of

to pro

Mr.

prove

fore o

"I an

to be

and in

letter.

Mr.

of sal

vo, we

in fac

statem

God."

We

quick

to pro

that

Jesus

of mi

then

that t

its co

pacy

tian O

direct

wheth

to pro

The

the B

days

My

onne