

America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction ; in America there are none, neither any parish minister ; so that, for some hundreds of miles together, there is none either to baptize, or to administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end ; and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man's rights, by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest."

Here Mr. Wesley declares his right to ordain, and that in so doing he *violates no order*, and *invades no man's rights*, thus once more clearly showing that he firmly held the belief that 'bishops and presbyters are one order.'

But as I have determined, according to intimation in my third letter, to conclude the present series with this one, I must not quote further, but proceed to notice the remainder of Layman's letter. On glancing over it I see there is not much that is new to answer, as most of what follows is a sort of rehash of what has been answered already. For instance, he again questions Wesley's right to ordain, being only a presbyter, and again tells us that Wesley 'spoke on King's *supposition* (not proof) when he declared 'bishops and presbyters are the same order,' and consequently have the same right to ordain.' I have already so thoroughly exposed the weak and unsuccessful attempt of Layman at sophistry on this point that it is wholly unnecessary to do so again. Those who have candidly and intelligently read thus far will be able to appreciate the foregoing statement, and as for Layman I trust he is among the number ; if not, then the most conclusive evidence and logical proof, so far as he is concerned, are useless.

Next, Layman denies that Wesley ordained Dr. Coke, maintaining that he simply 'appointed' him. Now does Layman really believe this? If so,

how does he account for the following language of Mr. Wesley? He says: 'For many years I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise this right [bishops and presbyters being one order] by ordaining part of our travelling preachers.' And then, after stating that in so doing he 'violates no order,' he says, 'I have *accordingly* appointed Dr. Coke,' etc. Now if Layman knows the meaning of words he must know that the word 'accordingly' links together the request to 'ordain' with his acquiescence in having 'appointed' Dr. Coke. Wesley was too logical to write illogically and too truthful to write untruthfully. By his use of the words he certainly means them to be understood in the same way, as referring to the same thing, stating what he had been 'importuned' to do and why he had 'accordingly' done it. And surely Wesley knew what he was doing. I do not like to make such a comparison, but it is simply a question of veracity between Wesley and Layman, the former declaring he did do a certain thing, and the latter declaring he did not! I have no fear of the verdict of your readers, Mr. Editor, as to which should be believed. Wesley considered he did actually ordain; his brother Charles, not nearly so free from High Church notions, called it by that name, so did those who were thus ordained, and so have historians ever since, and it is now getting rather late in the day for a 'Layman' to expect intelligent people to discredit the fact simply because he knows no better than to deny it.

I may state just here in passing, that the act of ordination does not necessarily imply the imposition of hands, and has not always been performed in that way. Mr. Wesley ordained Dr. Coke, however, by 'appointing' him, and also by the imposition of hands and prayer. He