

and advocate of sound and salutary principles like these—when, purified from the sectarian rancour with which it is now so thoroughly saturated, it shall breathe “peace and good will towards men”—when, instead of habitually violating the paramount law of christian charity, and, in the recklessness of its zeal, totally disregarding even the precepts of conventional decency, by its contumelious and abusive treatment of other christian bodies, it shall throw away its “carnal weapons,” and take unto it “the armour of God”—when, in a word, instead of fomenting the mutual repugnancies that unhappily exist between the different portions of the Saviour’s fold, by scattering among them, in sportive malignity, “firebrands arrows and death,” it

shall employ its influence to pour into the wounds that have been ulcerating for ages, a healing unguent—then, and *not till then*, will it make good its “Apostolic boast,” and worthily represent, in doctrine and spirit, the ever-to-be-honoured instruments of the Glorious Reformation from Popery.

Hoping *against* hope, that a consummation so devoutly to be desired by every spiritually-minded Churchman, may be speedily realized, either by a change of its Editor, or (which would delight us immeasurably more) a thorough and blessed change in the Editor.

I am, Sir, your humble servant,

MATTHEW RICHEY,

*Wesleyan Minister.*

## POSTSCRIPT.

While these sheets are passing through the press, a reply by the Editor of the *Church* to the preceding Letters appears in the *Herald*. Any observations in the way of a rejoinder, must therefore be despatched with all possible brevity.

1. The most prominent part of the reply is a long extract from *Three Sermons on the Church* recently published by the Bishop of London, in which his Lordship is graciously pleased to “express a persuasion, or at least a *hope*, that those *national churches* which having once, *unavoidably and unwillingly*, lost the perfectness of ecclesiastical order, have not yet regained it, *possibly not having been able to do so*, are yet within the pale of Christ’s Church, so far at least as the being so is necessary to the salvation of their individual members.” To his *ex cathedra* mode of settling, or rather unsettling, the terms of a sinner’s acceptance with God, we can only say,—The Lord have mercy upon those whose hope of salvation rests upon no bet-

ter foundation than the courteous concession, or hypothesis, of *any* man, be he Bishop or Archbishop, Cardinal or Pope! We have not so learned Christ. Our faith standeth not in the *wisdom of men*, but in THE POWER OF GOD. When with a broken and a contrite heart, I tremblingly ask the *Apostles themselves*, “*What must I do to be saved?*” Their response, their *only* response is, “BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED.” Now, if any man come to me in *their* name, and *bring not this doctrine*, am I, in the face of the most solemn and explicit declarations of my Bible, to give credence to his *heresy*? “Though we,” says Paul, “or an angel from heaven preach unto you any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.”

2. But to even this *hypothetical* hope of salvation, the poor *Wesleyans*, it seems, can have no claim. The bishop’s theory is so constructed as to present an aspect of mercy to *national churches* only, and that under

pecul  
intell  
Chur  
by M  
follow  
than  
and  
pudia  
premi  
sectio  
—and  
tion o  
schism  
Rome  
The s  
from t  
tary, l  
dition  
is con  
namel  
In its  
Metho  
the w  
Into th  
occupi  
and re  
ing of  
wound  
with t  
clinati  
which  
they  
Late  
believe  
mitted  
for the  
objects  
tive in  
long g  
ercises  
ere thi  
the bo  
Not un  
when V  
bours,  
dancy