

highest authorities, which certainly favor the views of Wesley on Episcopacy, etc. and the course he pursued, far more than the narrow views of Layman on these subjects.

Hooker says :—

"There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reasons to allow ordination without a Bishop. *The whole church visible being the true original subject of all power*, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than Bishops alone to ordain. Howbeit, as the ordinary cause is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily yet allowably two ways admitted into spiritual functions in the Church. One is when God himself doth of himself raise up a way ; another, when the exigency of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the church which otherwise we would willingly keep."—Ecclesiastical Polity vii.14.

Again : "Let them [the Bishops] continually bear in mind that it is rather the force of custom whereby the Church having so long found it good to continue the regiment of her virtuous Bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that respect than that any true and heavenly law can be shown by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed Presbyters forever to be under the regiment of Bishops.—Ibid vii.5.

I will now quote the whole of Layman's next paragraph, which is as follows : "Thus, then, so far as we have proceeded, Wesley's testimony leaves modern Methodism not only without a leg to stand on, but *without any legs at all.*"

I have reproduced this as a literary curiosity. Let the reader notice Layman's italics which are just as I have given them. He fancies he has

left modern Methodism not only without a leg to stand on, but *without any legs at all !* I venture the opinion that no living writer (but Layman) would undertake the task of trying to explain the difference between being left 'without a leg' and being left *'without any legs at all.'*

'One other matter,' says Layman, 'and I am through with Mr. L.' He refers to the parable of the tares to prove that the Methodist discipline is wrong in describing the church as composed of 'men having the form and seeking the power of godliness.' Layman contends that this is a 'delusion and directly contrary to the Scriptures,' and that the parable of the tares shows that the church is composed of a mixture, of good and bad. I reminded him that God's people are called in the bible 'a peculiar people,' a 'separated' people, 'washed,' 'holy,' 'sanctified,' and, that in the parable of the tares, notwithstanding that our friend Layman says the field is the church, our Saviour said 'the field is the world.' Layman does not like this and so tells your readers I was 'unable to grapple at close quarters with the fact that God intended His church to be a mixed body—to be composed of the wicked as well as the good,' &c.

Now, as I have 'grappled,' as Layman repeatedly styles it, at such 'close quarters' with nearly all of his two long letters in reply to mine, I have had to be more brief toward the end ; still, I must 'grapple' a little with this matter, as it is of more importance than some of those points already discussed.

First, I will enquire of Layman, 'What is a church?' Doubtless he will allow me to quote what John Wesley gives as 'a true, logical definition,' the twentieth article, namely, "A particular church is 'a congregation of faithful people among whom the