

this immature state, views which Wesley subsequently renounced, and with which his whole subsequent career was inconsistent—to the second period, and represent them as Wesley's final opinions. Our answer is short. "The Wesley of the period before 1738 is not our founder. With him we have nothing in common; to him we owe no allegiance." Nay, we do not differ more widely from him than Wesley differed from himself. The action of modern Wesleyans is not more diametrically opposed to the views of Wesley in his first stage than was Wesley's whole career in the second and greater stage, when he became the founder of Methodism. Nothing is more certain than that, if Wesley had remained at the first standpoint, he could not have become the originator of the Wesleyan system. Even in the earlier period he was by no means the pronounced High-Churchman that would satisfy modern Anglicanism. As Dr. Rigg shows, he was much more mystic than ritualistic, and mysticism and ritualism are mutually exclusive. In Georgia he refused the Lord's Supper to a Moravian pastor, because the latter had not been canonically baptized. He says of this act afterwards, "Can any one carry High-Church zeal higher than this! And how well have I since been beaten with mine own staff!" Dr. Rigg says:—"He did not even in Oxford believe in any such doctrine as that of the supernatural bodily presence of the Lord Jesus in the consecrated elements, as now taught by advanced High-Churchmen."

As to the second period, which really represents the Wesley of history and of Methodism, dispute is out of the question. Dr. Rigg accumulates the evidence of word and act in proof "that he very soon and once for all discarded the 'fable,' as he called it, of 'apostolical succession,' and that he presently gave up all that is now understood to belong to the system, whether theological or ecclesiastical, of High Church Anglo-Catholicism." It is also clearly shown how Wesleyanism

is the logical and necessary outcome of Wesley's own teaching and acts and High-Churchmen ought not to object to a process of development. It would have been strange if Wesley had not leaned strongly to the church of his baptism and ordination. But by what right can those who have no such personal grounds of obedience and attachment be held bound to follow him in these purely personal inclinations?

We have little hope that Dr. Rigg's essay will prevent a repetition of the charges alluded to. The argument is too handy to be easily relinquished. But at least those who use it will be left without any excuse of ignorance. Only a few months ago we read a letter in a newspaper, in which a clergyman charged the Wesleyan authorities with mutilating Wesley's works. Dr. Rigg notices this old charge in a note on p. 120, characterizing it as "altogether untrue." Those who accuse Wesleyan Methodists of unfaithfulness to Wesley's teaching might just as well accuse the early Christians of unfaithfulness to the teaching of Paul the Pharisee before the Damascus journey, or modern Roman Catholics of unfaithfulness to the teachings of Newman the Anglican before the year 1845.—*London Quarterly.*

Littell's Living Age.

The number for the week ending April 5th begins a new volume of this standard periodical. It contains: The Reflection of English Character in English Art, *Quarterly Review*; An American View of American Competition, by Edward Atkinson, of Boston, from the *Fortnightly Review*; an instalment of a "Doubting Heart," by the author of "Castle Daly;" The Fohn, *Saturday Review*; Nostradamus, *Pall Mall Gazette*; A Medium of Last Century, a short story from *Blackwood*; Carnival at Nice, *Saturday Review*, etc., etc. The publishers make the announcement that a new serial story from the pen of Jean Ingelow will be begun immediately in *The Living Age*, from the author's