

my first letter I had pointed out the fact that it was only a *defence* against an "attack" by an Episcopalian. But of course he has not the manliness to acknowledge this though he cannot deny it.

I referred to Layman's very funny and gratuitous remarks about an "invisible church," the tract having mentioned no such thing. In his "rejoinder" he "advised" me to make a more "elaborate research," &c., and endeavored to make it appear to your readers that those words were actually there. This compelled me to charge him with "wilfully trying to deceive." This he did not relish, but had to swallow. He now acknowledges that those words are not there, (he might better have acknowledged that before), but in doing so he jumbles up words after this fashion, "no such an allusion" as "invisible church"—and by his ready use of quotation marks tries to make it appear I wrote them in that way, but which I certainly did not, as may be seen by referring to my letter. And just here, as Layman does not seem able to grasp the idea of the writer of the tract, I may remark that, while he acknowledges that "unity of faith and spirit is essential to a true church, but denies that there is any "scriptural authority for the Romish dogma, that corporate unity is an essential thing," he certainly does not mean that a true church is therefore invisible. Indeed so far from those words implying that, they cannot be so understood by any intelligent and unbiased reader. By using the words "a true church" the writer shows that he believes there is a true church, *yes*, that there are different true churches, and that *the* true church, i. e. God's universal church, is composed of all those who have this "unity of faith and spirit," even though they belong to different organizations so far as the "visible church" is concerned. It

may not be out of place just here to quote the words of Canon Wilberforce, who recently said that schism is not conscientious separation from any visible church, but separation from "the Holy Catholic Church, or Body of Christ, which is in its essence a spiritual and invisible body, existing wholly independent of its external manifestations and methods, which may be national, geographical, even almost climatic."

Now if Layman found "the subject of an invisible church" in the tract "Why I am a Methodist," what does he find in the foregoing extract from so eminent a clergyman of the church of England? Still, at the risk of exposing Canon Wilberforce to the terrible fate of the tract, which, according to Layman's boastful declaration he "turned inside out," (let pigmy Canon Wilberforce of London tremble before this giant Goliath of Pembroke!), I shall give a few lines more from this honored clergyman's pen, as follows: "The idea that the sin of schism is separation from the visible communion of the Church of England, when weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, and tested by the word of God, is found wanting, and may without loss, be consigned to the limbo of exploded fallacies."

In my first letter I also showed the absurdity of Layman's assumption in the 5th letter of his series that when the Saviour prayed, "that they all may be one," he was actually praying for "corporate unity," or in other words, that all might belong to the church of England! How does Layman "grapple," as he calls it, with this? Why he doesn't 'grapple,' with it at all; he wisely passes it by in silence. It is too silly to bear repetition. He knows right well that even the church of England is not one, and he has also acknowledged that it is only a "part" of the church, and therefore, according