

to eat up his own words in the way he has done? But facts are stubborn things, and, as I have just shown, it is a fact that while in Layman's letter now under review he uses the word '*uninterrupted*' three times within little more than a dozen lines, italicizing it every time, and actually admits Wesley's statement that an 'uninterrupted succession is what no man can prove' to be 'an obvious fact enough,' yet in his pamphlet he most positively asserts in one chapter that 'the church' has an 'unbroken succession,' and in another chapter that she has an 'uninterrupted succession!' Surely it is 'an obvious fact enough' that Layman has stated what is not a fact either in his letter or his pamphlet since *the one flatly contradicts the other!* Layman talks of 'dilemmas' and 'choice of horns.' It is now my turn; so I offer him his choice. His pamphlet and his letter contradict each other. Which will he admit contains the false statement?

Again Layman returns to the task of attempting to prove that John Wesley believed in the succession theory, and actually goes back, not merely to the year 1745, but to the year 1739. Now, even if Wesley had affirmed his belief in that doctrine in the year 1739 it would be unfair to quote it as his matured opinion, as already pointed out. But what did he say in that year itself to prove it? He simply told a scolder named Nash who asked by what authority he preached, that it was 'by the authority of Jesus Christ, conveyed to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid hands upon him and said, Take thou authority to preach the Gospel.' Upon this sandy foundation does Layman rest his assertion that "Wesley never could have doubted the apostolic succession of the Christian ministry, as a literal fact; nor his own share therein." Still, I am sure no

one but Layman or those who look through his glasses would ever see 'literal apostolic succession' either interrupted or 'uninterrupted' in those words. They simply imply that he considered himself a duly ordained and properly accredited preacher of the Gospel. Any Methodist or other (non-episcopally) ordained preacher of the Gospel might use similar language, but certainly without any faith whatever in 'apostolic succession as a literal fact.'

Layman then refers to a quotation of mine from John Wesley's letter to his brother Charles in which he states his belief that he is 'a Scriptural *Episcopos* as much as any man in England, or Europe.' He leaves it, however, to find fault with me for not quoting farther on in the letter about 'remaining in the Church of England.' Thus does he again try to deceive your readers, giving the impression that I had omitted something that ought to have been given, but which anyone can see was not relevant to the subject then under discussion. Layman himself did not give the whole letter, but only two sentences. The fact is it is too long, by far, for either of us to quote in full, even if desirable. Still, as Layman seems to think I did not quote enough of it I will give him a little more as follows: 'I submit still, though sometimes with a doubting conscience, to mitred infidels. I do indeed vary from them in some points of discipline: by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming societies.' In his reply Charles asks, 'might you not add, and by ordaining?' From which it is clear that Charles Wesley knew that John Wesley had performed the act of ordination, which Layman pretends to deny.

And just here it may not be deemed out of place to quote a few sentences from one of the Church of England's