

It is cold, heated, frozen, formalists. On such a theme it implies to be calm. Passion is reason, transparent, temper. Heat is reason, which gave us ardour, and has shown Her own for in us strongly, not distant. What emotion is in theology. Recumbent virtue, a duty, doctrine, preach. That poem of piety, a lukewarm, a state. His pleasure, a duty, doctrine, preach. Devotion when lukewarm is unbecom'g.

The writer of "Modern Methodism" has given us, under this head, an singular a specimen of his skill in interpreting Scripture as he before gave of his skill in logic. He informs his readers, (p. 20.) "That the Laodiceans were reprimanded because their works were not agreeable to their calling and profession; because they were not truly religious." Now the text says they were lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot; and that these phrases are appropriate enough to describe a certain state of the affections, every one will admit. But our author excludes all notion of excitement, and it follows that as their works, and not their tempers, are the subjects of reproof, these works admit of a three-fold classification,—the cold, the lukewarm, and the hot. Perhaps he will discriminate them more accurately in his next edition. While we are on this subject it may not be improper to notice another specimen of our author's talent in the same line. "We shall know nothing," says the Clergyman, at p. 11, "of the real effects of their ministrations till the day of judgment. Christ will profess, 'I never know you,' to many in that day who called him Lord, ay, even to those who had prophesied in his name." Let the reader turn to the text, and he will find in it a caution against false Prophets, "Beware of false Prophets;" then a test by which they may be discerned, "By their fruits ye shall know them," &c.; then a threatening upon the unfruitful, "Every tree that bringeth not forth," &c.; then a repetition of the rule, "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." The Methodist appeals to their fruits in proof that his teachers are not false Prophets. But the Clergyman instructs him that the fruits cannot be known till the day of judgment. So as the caution can only be in force when the test is within reach, and as the fruits of a teacher cannot be known till the day of judgment, it follows indisputably that the warning refers to that day, and to that day alone; and "Beware of false Prophets," must be understood to mean, "Take care that you are not imposed upon in the day of judgment. And thus the great Teacher is completely stultified!

3. That the writer of "Modern Methodism" should charge the Conference with bitterness against the Church is only natural;

4. All seems infected which the infected spy, As all seems yellow to the jaundiced eye.

But the charge of intentional deception cannot so easily be passed over. "Why," asks the Methodist in his dialogue, "do the Methodists stop at the fifty-third sermon?" The answer insinuates that the reason is found in the character of the fifty-fourth sermon; and that the Methodists do not include that in their standard writings, because they know it would condemn them. But does not this writer know, that so far from being reckoned among the standards of Methodist doctrine, the sermon he quotes was not included by Mr. Wesley in any collection of sermons published during his life? Does he not know, that Mr. Wesley, in the "Trust Deeds prepared by him, specifies the first four volumes of his sermons only, as constituting, with the "Notes on the New Testament," a standard of doctrine; and that it has not been in our power, even if we had had the inclination, to alter the contents of those volumes, seeing they were published before we were born? If he does not know these things, he is too ignorant to write on the subject of Methodism. If he knows them, and yet writes as he does, what is he?

5. Great fault is found with the writer of Tract No. 1, for presuming to speak of the Church as a divided Church. But let

* It will be seen, that this is a question of history. That the four volumes were comprehended in the "first four of those eight volumes" of sermons which Mr. Wesley published during his life. It appears that there are 64 in three. These were included in the first edition of Mr. Wesley's collected Works, as published by T. and A. in 1771 and are properly distinguished as the "series" of his Sermons in the last two editions of his Works, which have been ably and faithfully edited by the care and labour of the Rev. Thomas Jackson. It is necessary to give this explanation, inasmuch as the whole of Mr. Wesley's Sermons, which, at the commencement of this century, were only to be had in two volumes bound together, may now be obtained, either in two or three volumes octavo, or three volumes duodecimo.

us not be discouraged by hard names from inquiring into the truth of the case. And because we would save time in the inquiry, we will, for the present, put ourselves and all Dissenters out of view. Here, are, we will say, in London, two Bishops, Bishop Charles James Bonville, and Bishop Thomas Griffith. The writer of "Modern Methodism," we suppose, adheres to the former, but he admits the latter to be a true Christian Bishop also. These two Bishops, and their Clergy, worship at different altars; they have no religious fellowship; they exchange no tokens of mutual love; their creeds differ, their rituals differ. Bishop Griffith denounces Bishop Bonville as a heretic and schismatic; Bishop Bonville has subscribed a book which declares that Bishop Griffith's Church is a very foul, filthy, withered, old harlot. To ordinary persons, it would seem as rational to say, that the aforesaid Charles James and Thomas were one man, as that the Churches of which they are respectively Bishops are not divided. But if a Methodist ventures to say they are divided, it is equally untrue and impious, it even borders on blasphemy! Bishop Andrews and Bishop Taylor, in their devotions, are known to have prayed for the union of the Catholic Church; nay, the Book of Common Prayer itself contains "a Prayer for Unity," which was directed to be said in all the churches a few months since, and which expressly mentions "our unhappy divisions" as a subject of great regret. But perhaps what is truth in the mouth of a Churchman becomes falsehood when it is written by a Methodist. This is, at all events, the only hypothesis by which we can explain the fact that two entire pages of "Modern Methodism" are occupied with an attempt to prove that the Church is not divided.

5. It seems necessary to add a few words on the subject of ordination as now practised among the Methodists, since both the "Layman" and the author of "Modern Methodism" have fallen into mistakes concerning it. The last-named writer says, "The Conference have not assumed the power, nor used the ceremony of ordination longer than three years." In these two lines are no less than three mistakes. For, 1. The Conference has exercised the power of ordination fifty years; whether they have assumed it or not is a question into which we need not now enter, as it is sufficiently argued elsewhere. 2. The Conference has sanctioned the partial use of the appropriate ceremony of the imposition of hands in ordination for more than twenty years. 3. The Conference has itself publicly used that ceremony for the last five years. The "Layman" having somewhat more acquaintance with the subject on which he writes, is less positive in his statements. He "believes that no preachers were ordained for England, from the death of Mr. Wesley till the Conference of 1836;" but his belief on this point is as erroneous as on some others on which he treats in his letter; for it is certain that Preachers were ordained for England between Mr. Wesley's death and 1836, and with imposition of hands. But it is not material to our present purpose to insist upon this fact; we are more concerned with the note which he has appended to his statement, and which runs thus: "Lest it should be contended that the Methodist Preachers, previously to 1836, were virtually ordained by their public reception in a full connexion, it is necessary to state, that their recognition had no similarity to an ordination service, and was never so designated; besides, why has the former practice been departed from unless it was felt to be insubstantial?"

Now, if it was "necessary" to write on this subject, we might have supposed it to have been necessary, in the first place, to inquire concerning it. And the "Layman" would then have discovered that this statement was utterly incorrect. The Methodists have always understood that "recognition into full connexion" with the Conference was real and virtual ordination; they never supposed it insufficient to convey the full rights of the Christian ministry to the persons so received; nor did they depart from their former practice on any such ground. The Conference believed, that though many of its own members had been ordained without imposition of hands, yet circumstances might arise to render it expedient to add that scriptural ceremony to the form that was before in use; and

accordingly resolved, in 1836, that it should be so added in all future ordinations. And that "the recognition had no similarity to an ordination service," is a most unfortunate assertion for one who writes with a view to enlighten both Methodists and the public at large on the true character of our system, to venture upon. Ten thousand "Laymen" of the Methodist Church could have informed this writer, that previously to 1836, they had witnessed the "recognition" in question; and that it had so much similarity to an ordination, that a very large portion of the service appointed by the Established Church to be used at the "Ordering of Priests" was employed on the occasion. That the service was not "designated" an ordination, only shows that the Methodists have been actuated by a spirit of modesty and forbearance, and have had no desire to provoke controversy. The "Layman" is pleased to be severe on the indecorum which he has observed at some Methodist ordinations. "Preachers," he says, "have been so eager to assert the right to ordain, as to crush and push each other most indecorously, to reach with extended hands the head of their kneeling brother." He goes on to state, that a Minute of the last Conference was framed with a view to prevent the recurrence of this impropriety. All this is very possible. We neither admit nor deny it. But we inquire of the "Layman" whether much greater indecencies are not to be found in a sermons; and whether it is wise in those who dwell in glass houses to be very eager in throwing stones! It may be indecent for Presbyters to crowd one another in laying on of hands; but it is much more indecent for the parties ordained to rush the day of ordination by doing together at a hotel. Methodist Presbyters may sometimes have been too eager to assert the right to ordain; but Anglican Bishops have, in multitudes of instances, exercised their "right" upon the "young and profane," the ignorant and the covetous, the intemperate and the unclean. Greatly as the morals of the Clergy are improved, the race of what are called "gay" gentlemen is not yet extinct, and as long as it lasts, it will testify against the Bishops, and we caution to every discreet "Layman," not to boast too loudly against his quiet neighbours the Methodists. But we are warned that the phrase "Methodist Presbyters" will not be allowed. "You have not even Presbyterian ordination by successive transmission from Mr. Wesley," says our calm reprover, the "Layman"; while the author of "Modern Methodism" waxes hot against us, exclaims against our singular unlearnedness in contriving that our ignorant disciples may call us Presbyterians, while we dare not contend that we have Presbyterian orders, and closes with the terrific climax, "This is not honest. Let them at once avow the position they mean to take, and stand or fall by their ability to make it good."

Our answer need be but brief, as the Tract No. IV. has discussed at some length the claim of the Wesleyan Ministers to be regarded as true Ministers of Christ. It shall suffice to say, first, that we have never laid claim even to Presbyterian orders received by successive transmission from Mr. Wesley; a series of ordinations by imposition of hands having never been essential to the Church in our view of it. Secondly, notwithstanding this, some Churchmen have been of opinion that we possess a genuine Presbyterian ordination. Thirdly, our disciples are not so ignorant as to have scruples on this subject, nor do their consciences need to be quieted on a point of so little comparative importance, as whether ministerial authority may be most efficiently and completely conveyed by the laying on, or the laying on, of hands. Lastly, we take our position in the words of Mr. Wesley: "He is no physician for the soul who works no cures; but he is a true evangelical Minister whose ministers are to save souls from death, and reclaim sinners from their sins."—Wesley's Works, vol. viii, p. 479. Modern High Churchmen may declaim against the Conference as having no more right to ordain than so many women; but it is a comfort to Methodists while they resolve to stand or fall by their ability to make this position good, to be able to cite as a witness in favour of these principles, a venerable Archbishop of former days. "I would," said the martyred Craumer,* in a spirit that

strongly contrasts with the rigid formalism of some of his successors, "I would that I and all my brethren the Bishops would leave all our glorious titles and titles, and write the style of our offices, calling ourselves Apostles of Jesus Christ, so that we took not upon us the name vainly, but were even so judged; so that we might order our dioceses in such sort, that neither paper, parchment, lead nor wax, might be the letters and seals of our offices, but the very Christian conversation of the people, as the Corinthians were unto Paul, to whom he said, 'Our epistle and seal of our apostleship are ye.'"

6. At the close of his Tract, the author of "Modern Methodism" has inserted a list of Bishops, tracing the succession from the Apostles to the present Archbishop of Canterbury. Whether this document was considered an appropriate appendage to the misdirected arguments and elaborate fallacies of the pamphlet, or whether it is inserted in terror, in hope of frightening the presumptuous Methodists from their propriety, and preventing any attempt at reply, or simply because the vacant pages must be filled with something, we do not presume to guess. On the first supposition, its insertion was well judged; for, as a piece of history, it is in good keeping with the logic of the pamphlet. The author of the pamphlet backs it with the name of Mr. Palmer; but it will require higher names than even his to secure the credence of the Methodists. The general principles on which they repudiate such genealogies are well stated in Tract No. III. of this series; and we hope that those who have sworn themselves so very prompt in replying to No. I. will not allow No. III. to remain long without an answer; though we confess that, judging from the treatment which Mr. Powell's Treatise on the Apostolical succession has received at their hands, our expectations are not very sanguine. They have given Mr. Powell no small share of abuse, but nothing more. Perhaps, however, as a tract is not so formidable as a volume, and as this is the age of tracts, the "Summary of Objections" may not be suffered to remain three years without a reply. In the meanwhile, we will offer some additional questions, and beg that the answers to them (if Modern High Churchmen will vouchsafe us any) may be distinct and unequivocal.

1. We ask, Can a man be a bishop by divine right, who wants the qualifications which the divine word declares a Bishop ought to possess?
 2. Can a man transmit what he has never received? or not being a Bishop by divine right himself, can he make another such?
 3. When we are told by St. Paul, that a Bishop must be blameless, and find some of the Bishops whose names are here recorded heavily blamed even by High-Church writers, must we set them aside as not having been apostolical Bishops, or receive them as such, in spite of the Apostle?
 4. Assuming the historical correctness of the series throughout, we ask, whether it is not true that Stigand was notoriously covetous; that Boniface of Savoy "was a soldier, Captain of the Pope's guards," and as Collier observes, "better qualified for a General than an Archbishop?" whether Arnulph was not a rebel; and whether Cornwallis was not reproved by his Sovereign for not sanctifying the Sabbath as he ought?
 5. Whether, if these things are reported on credible testimony, it is wise to parade the names of these men, and many others like them, as having been the channels in which grace has come down to the Established Church in our days? and so to compel men to believe one of two things; either, first that personal piety is not an essential qualification of a Christian Bishop; or, secondly, that there are no true Ministers of Christ in England at this day.
- We repeat it, to one of these conclusions the maintainers of the "Succession" are shut up. If one Bishop, out of this list of one hundred and fifty-three, was not a true Bishop, they are without a ministry, and without sacraments! the Church has failed! and the Scripture is broken! But if every Bishop in the list was a true Bishop

* Letter cited, quoted in Manningford's Hist. Reform, p. 361.
 † Chertsey, Early Eng. Church, p. 275. Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. i, p. 221.
 ‡ Manningford's Hist. Reform, p. 44.
 § Ibid, pp. 171-217.