

peculiar circumstances. The sufficiently intelligible inference of the Editor of the *Church* is, that "the schism commenced by Mr. Wesley and continued by his followers," admits of no other prospect than a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation.--We utterly repudiate alike the conclusion, and the premises. Separation from a particular section of the professedly Christian church—and the Church of England is *only a section* of it—is not, under all circumstances, *schism*. She separated from the Church of Rome; is she therefore a *schismatical* body? The separation of the Wesleyan Methodism from the Anglican Church was *not voluntary*, but *compulsory*. There was one condition only on which, so far as Methodism is concerned, it could have been prevented, namely, by obeying men rather than God. In its entire structure, spirit, and course, Methodism is the very converse of what the word of God condemns as schism. Into the ecclesiastical position which it now occupies, *it was compelled*; by the unkind and repellent treatment of others. Approving of the maxim of Burke,—that the wounds of a parent ought to be approached with trembling solicitude—we have no inclination to enter into the dark details which more than establish this point, unless they should be imperiously called for. Late events, however, afford ground to believe, that this separation has been permitted by the wisdom of Divine Providence, for the accomplishment of most important objects. But for the spiritually-conservative influence of Methodism during years long gone by, and that which she now exercises upon both Church and State, what, ere this, would have been the condition of the boasted bulwark of the Reformation? Not unlikely, more corrupt if possible than when Wesley commenced his Apostolic labours, if not under the withering ascendancy of the Great Apostacy, doing penance

for having ever presumed to question the universal supremacy of St. Peter's Successor.

3. Our opponent, in his reply, endeavours to neutralize the force of the argument in favor of the validity of Presbyterial ordination, derived from the book, entitled "*The Institution of a Christian Man*," signed by the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy, by alleging, that the same book contains many of the heretical doctrines of the Romish Church.—We confess ourselves at a loss to imagine how this allegation even *were it established*, can be justly regarded as deducting from the weight of our argument. The fact, that the Reformers, at a time when their knowledge was so imperfect, that they only "saw men as trees walking," had light enough to discover from the new Testament that bishops and presbyters, as to order, are identical, only strengthens our position. But we are not confined to *one* or *two* historical facts. In addition to those stated in a note, page 14, many more, supported by unexceptionable evidence might easily be adduced. Is it not an historical truth, that in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, many ministers were employed in the Anglican Establishment, who had received only presbyterian ordination, among whom were Travers, lecturer to the Temple; Whittingham, dean of Durham; the celebrated Wright of Cambridge, and Knox, the Scotch reformer? Nay, did not Martyr, and Bucer, Ochinus and Fagius, foreign reformers, come over to England at the invitation of Edward; and without *re-ordination* occupy most honourable and influential positions in the English Church? The assumption of the superiority of bishops, *jure divino*, to presbyters, was, in truth, one of the first steps that marked the *retrogression* of a large portion of the English establishment *from* the principles and spirit of the Reformation. The London Christian Observer