

cates of Presbyterianism—that is, of the conceit that *presbyters* may have an *official right to ordain without the intervention of a bishop*—have been repeatedly challenged, and all without effect, to produce if they can ONE well authenticated instance of *such* ordination in the Church, during the first fifteen centuries, being regarded as a valid and true ordination. It is a FACT also that there is no historic evidence of any presbyter broaching so wild an idea *prior to THE HERETIC Aerius*, a SEMI-ARIAN, who, aspiring after being made a bishop, was disappointed in his scheme of ambition, and was cast out of the Church for his heretical views, both as to doctrine and discipline. It is also a FACT, notorious and indubitable, that no BISHOP, or, to use Mr. Berney's words, no "*regular successor of the apostles*" has ever yet conveyed to a Methodist, whether presbyter, or preacher, or teacher, the sacred commission and power to ordain; and consequently that the Methodist regular succession is NOT an "*apostolic succession*," and Methodist teachers, and Wesleyan Methodist ministers, are NOT "*the regular successors of the apostles in FACT*," however they may be so *in fancy*. Thus we see that the emphatic assertion of Mr. Berney is contradicted by *facts* that furnish evidence, incontrovertible and conclusive, against them "*who say they are apostles and are not*" in fact. There is another FACT which is in itself a plain proof that one of the grand apostles of Methodism, Dr. Thomas Coke, a man who would fain have persuaded himself and others, that John Wesley had consecrated him to the episcopate, was NOT A BELIEVER (after all his efforts to persuade himself into the delusion) IN THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDERS HE HIMSELF CONFERRED. He did *not* believe that he had that "*regular succession*" which would empower him to ordain as a bishop; and though really a presbyter, he could not swallow the presbyterian notion. He therefore applied to Bishop