

We come next to the question of ordination. And again we repeat, the point now to be settled is, not the lawfulness of the thing, but the novelty of it. If Mr Wesley practised it, we have not departed from his principles in practising it also. It is now attempted to cast discredit on the history of his ordinations for England, though it is not denied that he ordained for Scotland and America. It might have been supposed indeed that there was no violent improbability in his following up these steps by such an act as he is alleged to have performed in ordaining for England, but the writer of a recent pamphlet in reply to the first tract of this series, says, that "the assertion, from other sources we learn, &c., &c.," is unworthy of credit, and will not be believed till those other sources are distinctly pointed out." There is also a note appended to the page, in which he states, "The public will expect a more convincing proof of this than the mere assertion of an interested biographer." Fortunately for the public, if they take any interest in the matter, a more convincing proof is at hand. A writer, who describes himself as a "Layman of the Church of England," and who also publishes a reply to the Tract No. 1, states that he has seen the original manuscript of the document given to Mr. Moore at his ordination. As this testimony is not likely to be questioned, it is needless to do more than remind the first-named writer, that in the Tract No. 1, there was other evidence adduced beside that of Mr. Moore—namely, that of Mr. Myles, who, not having been himself ordained by Mr. Wesley, can scarcely be said to have been an interested witness. But if he should insist that the Layman has been imposed on by Mr. Moore, and that the document in question is a forgery, it may afford him some satisfaction to know that the fact was not questioned by that accurate and elegant, though prejudiced, historian of Methodism, the Poet Laureate, but is stated in his life of Wesley, though it has a wrong date assigned to it, possibly through an error of the press. Mr. Crowther, in his "Portraiture of Methodism," Mr. Bradburn, in his tract, entitled, "Are the Methodists Dissenters?" and Mr. Pawson, in his Autobiography, all confirm the statement of Mr. Moore; so that it may be hoped that our cautious (not to say captious) opponent will now have full satisfaction, and will no longer be bound to believe that Mr. Wesley never did ordain Ministers of England." One of his reasons for disbelieving the statement of Mr. Moore is worthy of a passing notice. "Surely," he says, "if he had done so, he would have recorded the event in his Journal or elsewhere." But it deserves to be well noted, that in his Journal he is silent as to the execution of the Deed of Declaration, an act which exercised a more important influence on Methodism than even his ordinations. So that nothing can safely be argued from this circumstance.

It is now conclusively shown, that ordaining men to the work and office of the ministry is a practice for which the Methodists can claim the sanction of Mr. Wesley's example; and it follows that modern Methodism is not on this ground disqualified from taking the title of Wesleyan Methodism.

4. The last point need occupy us but a very short time; because if ordination was practised by Mr. Wesley, it was with a view to the subsequent administration of the sacraments by those whom he ordained. A few sentences from Mr. Bradburn's before-cited tract will answer all the purpose of a more lengthened discussion. "The sacraments were administered by several of the ordained Preachers before Mr. Wesley's death. That of baptism in various places without any ordination at all Mr. Wesley knew this; and they knew him not, or they belie their consciences, who say he could not help it. Nay, Mr. Wesley took Mr. Myles, who never was ordained, within the rails at Dublin, to assist him in giving the Lord's supper. Mr. Wesley designed the Lord's supper to be administered by the ordained Preachers, or why did he, at their ordination, ask them, 'Will you then give your faithful diligence always to minister the doctrines and sacraments as the Lord hath commanded? And why else did he deliver the Bible into their hands, saying these words, 'Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to administer the holy sacraments in the congregation?' You may say, 'This was for Scotland and America.' I say it was for no such thing. Messrs. Mather, Moore, &c., &c., were not ordained for Scotland or America any more

than I was. Therefore the people who desire it, having the Lord's supper from the Preachers whom the Conference may authorize to administer it, is no breach of the plan left by Mr. Wesley, nor the smallest infringement on the engagement of the Conference."

We have now concluded the first part of our allotted task; and proved the substantial agreement between modern Methodism and the plans and principles of Mr. Wesley, even on those points where it was affirmed that they were wholly at variance. In pursuing our vindication of the existing system, we may here advert to the question of Mr. Wesley's personal consistency. How, it may be demanded, could he say and do all these things, while he persisted in affirming that he did not separate from the Church? The true answer has been given, and repeated, but it is still disregarded, more especially by those who are anxious to perplex his followers. It is briefly this:—He used the term "separation from the Church" in a sense widely different from that in which most of his opponents used it. He would not allow that his irregularities at any time amounted to a separation. He wrote in 1795, "We have at present no thoughts of separating either, if we have separated at all. Neither dare we return to a closer union, if that means either prohibiting lay Preachers, or ceasing to watch over each other in love, and regularly meeting for that purpose."—Works, vol. xiii, p. 198.

It is clear, then, that the appointing of lay Preachers, and the holding of class-meetings, were not a separation in a view of the case. So with reference to the service in Church hours, including the administration of the sacraments in Methodist chapels, he wrote in 1791, as follows:—"About the year 1741, a Clergyman offered me a chapel in West-street, Seven Dials, (formerly a French church,) and I began to officiate there on Sunday mornings and evenings. We did the same (my brother and I alternately) soon after at the French church in Spitalfields as soon as it came into our hands. This we continue from that time; and no one in England ever thought or called it leaving the Church. It was never esteemed so by Archbishop Potter, with whom I had the happiness of conversing freely; nor by Archbishop Secker, who was thoroughly acquainted with every step we took; as was likewise Dr. Gibson, then Bishop of London, and that great man, Bishop Lowth. Nor did any of these four venerable men ever blame me for it, in all the conversations I had with them. Only Archbishop Potter once said, 'These gentlemen are irregular, but they have done good, and I pray God to bless them.' It may be observed, that all this time, if my brother or I were ill, I desired one of our other Preachers, though not ordained, to preach in either of the chapels, after reading part of the Church prayers.... A year ago Dr. Coke began officiating at our chapel in Dublin. This was no more than had been done in London for between forty and fifty years. Some persons immediately began to cry out, 'This is leaving the Church, which Mr. Wesley has continually declared he would never do.' And I declare so still. But I appeal to all the world, I appeal to common sense, I appeal to the 'Observer' himself, could I mean hereby, 'I will not have service in Church hours,' when I was doing it all the time? Could I even then deny that I had service in Church hours? No; but I denied, and do deny still, that this is leaving the Church."—Works, vol. viii, pp. 255, 256.

It is equally plain that even his ordinations were not considered by him as a formal separation from the establishment. "Whatever then is done," he writes in 1785, "either in America or Scotland, is no separation from the Church of England. I have no thought of this. I have many objections to it. It is a totally different case."—Works, vol. xiii, p. 243. When, after the lapse of three or four years, he ordained for England, he still persisted in declaring that he was not a separatist. His "Sermon on the Ministerial Office," and his "Letter to the Printer of the Dublin Chronicle," were both written subsequent to those ordinations. In the former he speaks of himself as being guided by two principles: First, I will not separate from the Church. Secondly, yet in cases of necessity I will vary from it." In the latter document he writes, "I did desire Mr. Myles to assist me in delivering the cup. Now, be this right or wrong, how does it prove the

objection now in question, that I leave the Church? Unless I see more reason for it than I ever yet saw, I will not leave the Church of England as by law established while the breath of God is in my nostrils."—Works, vol. xiii, p. 257. It has already been stated, that when he ordained the three Preachers in 1789, he gave them a charge to continue "united to the Established Church so far as to be blessed work in which they were engaged would permit," and it is clear therefore that he did not even then consider either himself or them separated from it.

If, then, neither the employment of Preachers not episcopally ordained, the holding of class-meetings, the permission of service in Church hours, nor the ordination of Ministers, amounted to a separation from the Establishment, in his view of the case, it may properly enough be inquired, In what did he suppose such separation to consist? The answer is, He believed that, in order to separate himself from the Church, it was required, first; that he should be deposed from his office, or, secondly, that he should wholly cease from using her officers, teaching her doctrines, and obeying her rubrics.

In order to constitute the Methodist societies a separate body, he judged it to be necessary, either that they should be excommunicated, or, if that were not done, that they should renounce all connexion with her, disown her doctrines, and refuse to attend her worship. Such a separation never took place in his life, and he was therefore consistent with himself. We may add, such a separation as he protested against has never taken place to this day. The Methodists have never yet, as a body, renounced all connexion with the Establishment; they have never disowned her fundamental doctrines, nor prohibited attendance on her services, nor made it binding upon their people to forsake her communion in order to belong to them. Nor have they ever been excommunicated. It has been already shown that, in so far as they practically separate, they have the sanction of his teaching and example. In this way, therefore, they are safe from the charge of departing from his principles. What he forbade, they have never done; what they have done, he allowed them to do.

[To be continued.]

THE SABBATH. (No. 1.)

ITS ORIGINAL AND GENERAL DESIGN. (From the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.)

While the institution of the Sabbath is a fence to the general interests of religion, and a bulwark thrown up to repress the floods of ungodliness, it also operates as a test to the children of men; discovering their love or their hatred, their loyalty or their rooted enmity, to Jehovah, their sovereign Lord. In proportion as nations, churches, or individuals, have risen in the scale of religion and morality, they have venerated and religiously improved this holy day; and in the same degree as they declined from the love of God, and the belief of his truth, they have despised and profaned it. The righteous call it "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable;" and they honour Him, not doing their own ways, nor finding their own pleasure, nor speaking their own words. But the ungodly say, "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" Some deny its moral obligation,—representing it as a piece of state policy, an invention of priest-craft, or a figment of the Jewish economy. Others admit that it is a holy, wise, and gracious institution; but on the score of public utility, want of time, or the heavy stake they have in the trade or commerce of the country, they pervert it, more or less, to purposes of secular toil, or of worldly pleasure. Many, among the working classes, spend it in roaming through the fields, in club-houses, or in tavern rendezvous; while great numbers avail themselves of the facilities afforded by steam-packets and railways, to visit tea-gardens and public-houses, in distant towns and villages. By these and other methods, the law of the Sabbath is made void, the house of God is forsaken by multitudes, the ordinances of the Gospel are despised, and practical infidelity, like a flood, spreads through the land. Convinced that the desecration of this blessed day is one of the national sins for which God is now chastening us, and that its sanctification is essentially

connected with the glory of God, and the permanent revival of religion, we invite the prayerful attention of our readers.

1. To its primeval and general design. The designs of the Most High are all worthy of himself; and, except when he purposely veils them in impenetrable mystery, it is no less our duty than our interest to search them out. As far as this institution is concerned, they are as obvious as they are gracious; and, being understood, they cannot fail to be appreciated by all who bear His name.

1. The Sabbath was instituted to commemorate the creation of the world, in the space of six days, by the word of Jehovah's power.

That the world was created, and that it was made of things which do appear, but was an actual creation, produced by the one living and true God, are fundamental truths in the scheme of revealed religion; and, by many, they are regarded as self-evident truths. Those who assume the latter position, however, err, not knowing the darkness and natural atheism of the human heart. Though the distinctions between mind and matter, deity and independence, finite and infinite,—between the living God and a thing, whether a sun, a star, or a stone,—are to us palpable; many of the wisest Heathens either could not, or would not, discern them. They believed that the world was eternal; and they worshipped the creatures of God, animate and inanimate, together with images and imaginary beings, who they supposed presided over the elements, and the destinies of men. God, who knew the end from the beginning, foresaw thus irrational lapse; and, to prevent it from becoming universal, to guard his people against the sin, and to crush the world with a standing demonstration of the falsehood and absurdity of idolatry, he instituted the Sabbath; which, by its weekly return, challenged for himself supreme and undivided worship, on the obvious ground, that the heavens and all their host, the earth and the sea, with all that is in them, were created by His power; and were, consequently, dependent on him for their continued existence.

Thus, "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line—"rule," or "direction," as it reads in the margin—"is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." In this passage David, with elegant propriety, and in perfect accordance with the principles of sound philosophy, represents heaven, with its sun, moon, and stars; the firmament with its vapours, winds, meteors, and winged fowl; day, with its radiance, and night with its darkness; as being vocal with God their Maker's praise, and responsive with instruction to universal man. The import of their adoring and edifying speech, or voice, was, "Sons of men, why marvel ye at us? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though, by our own power and holiness, we had made ourselves, or were able to bless you? No! we are creatures fearfully and wonderfully made; it is true, but still creatures. Jehovah is our Maker; he alone is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. Whatever beauty, power, or benign influence we possess, he has imparted; and he has imparted them to us that, as his instruments, we serve and benefit you. Therefore turn your eyes from us to Him; for He alone is 'God over all blessed for ever.'"

The testimony thus given, in expressive silence, to the supreme divinity of Jehovah, together with the wide-spread tradition of the creation, the sacredness of the seventh day, the fall of man, the divine institution of sacrifice, and the promise of a Saviour, constituted that "truth of God," which the fabricators of idolatry "changed into a lie;" and that "witness of himself," which God gave "to all nations;" and for the disregarding of which they were, in the emphatic language of the Apostle, "without excuse." The Sabbath, by thus commemorating the creation, evidenced the relation of God to our race, as our Creator and Preserver. It was a sign (Ezek. xx. 12) between him and them, which, while it proved his eternal power and God-head, evinced their obligations to worship him in spirit and in truth. Those who "did not like to retain God in their knowledge," who had become "vain in their imaginations," whose foolish heart was darkened, and who, though "professing themselves to be