

tice not only of the episcopal churches of England, Scotland, Ireland, North America, Sweden, &c., but also of the Greek and Oriental churches." (*Barwick's Treatise*, p. 52.) You tell us that "Bishop Bancroft widened the breach between the puritan divines and the advocates of church uniformity." It is indeed to be regretted that the puritans should be offended by the plain declaration of a truth "*constantly* insisted on by the Church of England." What many of the puritans are becoming now I have shown you. They would now be as much offended with a plain declaration of the divinity of Jesus, as they formerly were with a declaration of the divine origin of episcopacy. But it would not be proper to withhold this all important truth even though it should be declared at the risk of giving offence to these degenerate puritans. Whatever your *opinion* may be, sir, I think it is plain and clear that Christ instituted one and only one form of church government—(I apply these words in a confined sense to the orders of the ministry.)—The methodists in the United States, call themselves the "*methodist episcopal church*," and they give us to understand that they have adopted the episcopal form of government, as "*the most excellent*." "But if the *most excellent*, we must conclude that it is apostolic and divine; for certainly Christ and his apostles established *some* form of ordination and church government; and if so, it has a strong tincture of irreverence to suppose that they did not choose that which is *most excellent*. It is absurd to presume they established *two different* forms." (Banner of the Cross.) "But then" says bishop Taylor, "are all ordinations invalid which are done by mere presbyters, without a bishop?—What think we of the reformed churches? For my part I know not what to think. The question has been so often asked, with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound, by public interest, to approve all that they do, that we have disabled ourselves to justify our own. For we were glad, at first, of abettors against the errors of the Roman church; we found these men zealous in it; we thanked God for it, as we had cause; and we were willing to make them recompense, by endeavouring to justify their ordinations; not thinking what would follow upon ourselves? But now it is come to that issue, that our own episcopacy is thought not necessary, because we did not *condemn* the ordination of their presbytery. Why is not the question rather what we think of the *primitive church*, than what we think of the reformed churches? Did the primitive councils and fathers do well in condemning the ordinations made by mere presbyters? If