

BX 8334
MAR 24

A

LETTER

TO THE

REV. G. W. MUSGRAVE,

"BISHOP" OF THE THIRD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF BALTIMORE,

BEING A

REPLY

TO HIS LATE WORK, ENTITLED

"POLITY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE
UNITED STATES," &c.

~~~~~  
BY DAVID MEREDITH REESE, A. M., M. D.

A LOCAL PREACHER IN SAID CHURCH.  
~~~~~

Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus MUS!—*Horace.*

Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.—*Acts v. 38, 39.*

~~~~~  
BALTIMORE:

AR. ST. LONG & BERRY AND ISAAC P. COOK.

WOODS & CRANE, PRINTERS.

1843.

BX 8334  
M9R4

Gift

Henry Breckinridge Truett

1921

## R E P L Y .

---

REV. G. W. MUSGRAVE,

*“Bishop!” of the Third Presbyterian Church of Baltimore.*

REV. SIR—In opening a correspondence with a gentleman so proudly eminent as the title “Bishop” would imply, and especially failing to prefix “Right Reverend” to my salutation, which by conventional usage appertains to the “order” of Episcopacy, a double apology would seem to be in place, in view of your own peculiar affection for the title, and your habitual repetition of it in application to yourself. In dispensing with this formality, I therefore take occasion to say, that though not having the honor of a personal acquaintance with your reverence, I regard the Book you have lately published as an ample introduction; and I hold myself excused from recognizing your Episcopal title by the official example of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, who in a corrected copy of your former pamphlet, which they have cut down into a “tract,” have signally rebuked your pretensions by reducing you from a “Bishop” to a level with the other *Pastors* of your denomination.

It does indeed pour contempt upon the title, when such a “weak brother,” as you must be regarded in the judgment of charity, should take the liberty to wear it, even after the disapproval of your ecclesiastical superiors and fathers in the ministry, evinced in their late act to which I have alluded. Still, however, though you are self-styled a “Bishop,” I have not heard of any one bearing the order legitimately, or sustaining the office conventionally, who has condescended to dispute your right to glorify yourself by wearing the mitre, at your pleasure.

But, Rev. Sir, the object of my address, is not to question your pretensions to the Bishopric, though it will become my duty to show you that the book you have published demands a recantation of its calumnies, and a retraction of its slanderous accusations, if you would hope to regain the more unpretending titles either of a Christian or a gentleman. The style of my exordium will convince you that your publication has forfeited



my respect for you in either of these relations ; nor can I extend any courtesy to an "accuser of the brethren," though he be a "Bishop," who under the garb of sanctity awarded to a Christian profession, outrages candor and truth by so flagrant offences against both, as those of which I shall convict your book, and for which I shall here hold you responsible before the Christian community.

And in the onset of this letter, Rev. Sir, I wish you distinctly to understand that my controversy is with yourself, *not with the Presbyterian church*, either in this city or elsewhere. With the pious ministers and people of that denomination, we are at peace ; and the mutual interchange of kind offices, and the reciprocal recognition of Christian character, are regarded by Methodists as both a duty and a privilege ; nor in what I shall be constrained to say, shall I intentionally exhibit any hostility to your denomination, or wound the feelings of any individual among its clergy or laity.

The set purpose you betray to identify the Presbyterian church with your book, has been frustrated *by authority*, as I shall take occasion to show, by exposing the ingenious device you employ to make a contrary impression.

On page 10 of your book, after alluding to your publication of two lectures on the Divine Decrees, in which you became the assailant of Methodism, by a gross and wanton attack upon our Polity, implicating the intelligence and integrity of our ministers and people, and which you most strangely and incongruously smuggle into these Doctrinal sermons, you append a note in the following words.

"\* An edition of these Lectures has been more recently issued at Philadelphia by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, and copies may be had in this city at the store of the Presbyterian Tract Society."

Now, Rev. Sir, this note, as is obvious to every reader, was intended to make the impression, that "these lectures," had been officially adopted by authority of the Presbyterian church, and with all their offensive matter had been issued as a tract by the Board of Publication.

But what will your honest readers think of your veracity, Rev. Sir, when they learn that in the edition issued as a tract by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, "these lectures" have been *expurgated*, by authority, of *every line and word* which contained the offensive assault upon the Methodist polity, and of which complaint had been made ; and which is obviously equivalent to a disclaimer and repudiation of your libellous attack, that Board thus refusing to assume its responsibility even though endorsed with your name ? The exposure of this

artifice against your own denomination, notwithstanding this official act, and your attempt to implicate them in your unprovoked and unjust assault upon the Methodists, by the insertion of the foregoing note, is a humiliating task, though my present duty demands it. It will prepare the reader for the subsequent impositions attempted to be practised in your war against Methodism, by similar "dishonorable means."

That the whole subject may be before the reader, I here insert the offensive paragraphs as found in your own edition of your Lectures, p. 38, every line of which was *expurgated* by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, before they consented to issue those lectures in a tract.

"With regard to the GOVERNMENT and DISCIPLINE of those who have so violently and wantonly assailed our Church, it would be easy to show,—that the origin of *Methodistical* EPISCOPACY is perfectly ludicrous;—that the *government and discipline* of that sect are ANTI-REPUBLICAN and TYRANNICAL;—that *the entire control of all church property* BY THEIR CLERGY, amounting as it does to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and annually increasing, is both UNJUST TO THE PEOPLE who contribute the funds, and DANGEROUS IN ITS TENDENCY TO PUBLIC LIBERTY;—and that, notwithstanding their ungenerous and invidious comparisons, they are, *indirectly, but substantially and really*, BETTER PROVIDED FOR, AS TO TEMPORALITIES, than the clergy of other christian denominations.\*

"But, as I said, my object is not so much to expose the errors and faults of others, as to *defend* the doctrines of our venerable church; and therefore, for the present, *I forbear*. I am not fond of religious controversy; especially with any Evangelical Protestant denomination; and would much rather live in peace with my neighbours, if I can do so without the sacrifice of christian principle, or a dereliction of public and official duty. If, however, they persist in misrepresenting our doctrines, and continue their efforts to impair our influence and usefulness,—we shall hold it to be our duty, however painful, to expose their errors both of Doctrine and of Government; and the brief intimations that we have just now given of these, may serve to show that we shall not be without *materials* for the work! And if we should be forced into OFFENSIVE operations, they may learn to their cost the wisdom of the adage—that '*those who live in glass houses, SHOULD NOT THEMSELVES THROW STONES*'!"

\*"Those who desire to see the Government and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church fairly examined—and the positions which I have mentioned, irrefragably established by documentary proof, are referred to "*Annan's Difficulties of Arminian Methodism,*" letters 7 and 8; third edition. The work can be had at the book-store of Owen and Son, in Market street, a few doors east of Gay street."

As these extracts, Rev. Sir, contain the original and unprovoked assault upon the Methodist Episcopal Church which you perpetrated more than a year since, accompanied by an insolent threat of "OFFENSIVE operations," and an insulting boast that you had the "materials," to carry on a war against both our "Doctrine and Government;" it is superlatively ludicrous for you, after this, to pretend, as you do in your book, that you have been very "reluctantly forced into this *offensive* controversy," and even to prate about being "driven into the publication of your book in self-defence." It would be both more manly and more honest to confess the truth, that you were goaded to this attack upon the Methodists, by a sense of long continued and oft repeated provocations from that denomination, which though wholly fanciful and imaginary, by being ever present in your thoughts, had become to you as real, as though they had a visible and tangible existence. The bad advisers, who seem to have surrounded you, are responsible for tampering with your morbid sensitiveness on this particular subject. For your own sake, Rev. Sir, I could wish that you had fallen into better hands. That you have been the victim of these morbid imaginings, and might have been preserved from your present "bad eminence," by better advisers, will be obvious as I proceed to notice the

#### "ORIGIN OF THE BOOK."

The origin of your recent work, as related by yourself, was on this wise :

"One of their [Methodist] controversial tracts on the subject of election, was left on a Sabbath morning at my *private* residence! *This* I could not but consider as a *personal insult*, and as an *impudent challenge* to a defence of the doctrine as held by our church! Accordingly I informed my people of what had taken place! and announced my determination to commence on the following Sabbath an exposition and vindication of our belief on the subject of the Divine Decrees," pp. 9 and 10.

Here, Rev. Sir, it will be apparent to every reader, that you distinctly avow the motive which has prompted you in this publication, viz. *vindictive resentment* for an imaginary "personal insult," and an *indignant response*, to what you tortured into an "impudent challenge." That you could have been so easily thrown off your guard by so trivial an occurrence, or "frightened from your propriety," by a "little tract," even though on the mooted doctrine of "election," is absolutely incredible, unless you had been previously suffering a morbid sensibility,



which predisposed you to suspect a "gunpowder plot," when this single leaf from the tree of Methodism was left at your door. Hence your whole book exhibits the proof, that you have been enduring for a series of years, a vivid though delusive impression upon your imagination, that the Methodists were engaged in hostile demonstrations against you personally, against your diocese in Eutaw-st. and even against the Presbyterian church in the United States. It is thus alone, Rev. Sir, that your friends, however kindly disposed, can explain the explosion of wrath, envy and all uncharitableness into which you have been betrayed in your late publication.

Do you soberly allege, Rev. Sir, that the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church had no right to issue a controversial tract on the subject of election, lest "Bishop" Musgrave should regard it a "personal insult and impudent challenge?" Preposterous as is this position, it is a fair inference from the first sentence in your book, which is no less silly than it is untrue.

"For many years, and without the slightest provocation, the General Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, under the care and control of the General Conference, have been issuing hostile and offensive publications against the Presbyterian Church."

Now, Rev. Sir, you will forgive my abrupt contradiction of your reverence thus early, when I assure you that no tract has ever been issued by any authority in the Methodist Episcopal Church, either against the Presbyterian church, or against any other evangelical denomination; so that this, your first slander, and first sentence in your book, has not even the semblance of truth; though you affirm that this offence has been repeated "for many years." For your own sake I wish you had made a better beginning, although if you had, it would not have been a fair specimen of your volume; and the reader may here award you more candor than discretion. But in the same paragraph, you charge upon the Tract Society and the General Conference, that the circulators of our tracts have "*tampered* with the members of your flocks and employed various *dishonorable means* to seduce them from the church of their fathers."

This is a grievous matter truly, if true, but it strikes me, Rev. Sir, that you must regard the members of your flocks of very "easy virtue" if they could be "seduced" by the "tampering" of tract distributors; and they must be estimated by yourself as indeed "weak brethren and sisters," which we do not regard them, if their "seduction from the church of their fathers," and also from their beloved friend and "Bishop!" is to be apprehended by the "dishonorable means" you impute to the Methodists.

But the truth is, Rev. Sir, you have "taken counsel of your fears rather than your judgment, and "drawn upon your imagination for your facts." Let me console your reverence, by the assurance that neither the Tract Society, General Conference nor any of our tract distributors, have ever before thought of "Bishop" Musgrave, nor his diocese in Eutaw street, much less has there been a wide-spread conspiracy throughout the whole heaven and earth of Methodism against you and your flock, for this would have been indeed

"An ocean into tempest tost  
To waft a feather, or to drown a fly."

Still, however, you tell us that all this conspiracy was "patiently borne," until the "personal insult and impudent challenge" were offered your reverence in the shape of "*a tract on election left on a Sabbath morning, at your private residence!*" This deed of darkness was indeed too much I confess! it was not only intolerable! it was absolutely awful! I do not marvel that you exclaim with pious horror! "On the same day, I informed *my* people of what had taken place!!" and you might fitly have apostrophized thus, "Ye that have tears! prepare to shed them now!" I almost fancy I see you standing in the sacred desk on that Sabbath morning, announcing the catastrophe to your people! Surely they must have been shocked at the astounding intelligence! at least all of them who were not in the secret. Forgive me, Rev. Sir, but I shrewdly suspect that it was one of your own flock, whose anxiety to provoke from you a sermon on the Divine Decrees, which by your own confession, you had scrupulously avoided for eleven years, prompted him or her to give you a gentle hint by leaving the tract at your door, which by a strange "tempest in a teapot," you construed into a "personal insult and impudent challenge."

Let me assure you, Rev. Sir, that neither our Tract Society nor General Conference had any foreknowledge that their "tract on election" would ever find out "Bishop" Musgrave! much less that it should have had the "impudence" and profanity to visit you "on a Sabbath morning." And if the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States could only have foreseen the "terrible tract-oration" to which that portentous event has given "origin," and being in the shape of so formidable a book, it would have been "discretion, the better part of valor," never to have "roused this lion from his den." But it is now, too late to give this explanation, for the deed is done! and we must endure as we may, the consequences of the misapprehension into which your morbid sensitiveness has betrayed you.

All we can now hope is, that for the future, all other tract distributors may take warning by our fate, and not by any mishap allow any unlucky wight to leave a tract at your episcopal mansion, even by mistake, especially on "the subject of election" which subject being settled by your sermons on the Divine Decrees beyond all controversy, is henceforth *contraband!* Of this "decree," let all tract distributors take notice and govern themselves accordingly!

### "OCCASION OF THE BOOK."

Having thus disposed of the origin of your work, we are next instructed into the occasion of its publication. It seems that the "expurgated paragraphs" of your lectures already cited, having appeared in the edition of your lectures, published by yourself, were taken exception to at the time by a writer in the *Clipper*, one of the penny papers, calling himself "A Methodist." This you regarded almost as great an insult and challenge as that dreadful "tract on election," for it resulted in a controversy which is reprinted in your book, and the reader who will peruse it, will be amused at the tremor into which you are thrown by the anonymous writer, who dares to doubt your infallibility, and challenges you to the proof of your allegations against Methodism. And when he presumes to remind you that the Rev. Mr. Annan's book, the only authority which you seem then to have relied on, was unworthy of being found in a clergyman's library, you are absolutely shocked, and forthwith threaten a pamphlet, but subsequently issue a volume, exposing "the errors and falsehoods of Methodism." For these you seem to feel prodigious concern, so that on this topic you may be said to be "under exercise of mind." I trust after circulating your book, you will "begin to entertain a hope," even for these reprobate Methodists, which is more than their creed allows for yourself, except on condition of repentance.

The origin and occasion of your publication being thus before the reader, I now proceed to examine your charges against Methodism, and for reasons which will be apparent, I hold you to the original terms of your allegations, and of which you profess here to have furnished the "PROOF." These charges are stated in the "expurgated paragraphs" of your lectures already quoted, and are repeated on page 23 of your book, and to these the first four chapters of the volume are devoted. But lest you should accuse me of omitting to reply to every thing you have said, whether great or small, whether old or new, I shall take a brief notice of each of your chapters in order.



I. "*The origin of Methodist Episcopacy is perfectly LUDICROUS.*"

On reading this accusation, every reader will suppose either that "Bishop" Musgrave knows something of the origin of our Episcopacy, which we do not know, he being better informed than the "illiterate Methodists," whether preachers or people; or that he holds that to be "ludicrous," which we, for lack of his superior discernment, are inadequate to appreciate as it deserves. Truly, Rev. Sir, you must abound in self-complacency and ought to be a happy man in the belief that "wisdom will die with you." I can fancy that I hear you soliloquize thus: "surely Methodist Episcopacy must go down when my book comes out, exposing its *ludicrous* origin! I dare not attempt to prove it *unscriptural* for then they might upset my own pretensions by turning my weapons against my own title of 'Bishop.' I will therefore only call it 'ludicrous,' which signifies that it is in my opinion ridiculous, and these Methodists cannot endure that I should laugh at their Episcopacy, while they see that I am myself a 'Bishop' and speak *ex cathedra*."

Well here comes the book, which is to enlighten the "illiterate Methodists" as to the origin of their Episcopacy, which their clergy and laity are presumed to be too ignorant to understand, or too illiterate to estimate, without "Bishop" Musgrave's instructions! And what proof, Rev. Sir, have you furnished in behalf of your ludicrous position except that Alexander McCaine says so! It is true that you fortify his testimony with long extracts from Dr. Jennings' exposition, and this, with McCaine's History and Mystery, constitute the whole of your argument and proof. But do you suppose that the Methodists were not aware of all that had been said, by these gentlemen, to whose productions you have given a resurrection after so long a sleep? Or is Bishop Musgrave so ignorant as to suppose that they have not been answered long ago, and must he be told that in Dr. Emory's "Defence of our Fathers" he may find the epitaph of his chosen witness and all his co-laborers? Indeed, Rev. Sir, you have made up this chapter by the wholesale use of the scissors, a ready method of doing a large business in book making out of a small capital. But not a paragraph or sentence can I find here of your own, containing a single idea, argument or proof which has any claim to either novelty or originality. Our brethren of the Methodist Protestant church may possibly give you thanks for giving permanence to their fugitive publications, especially as one so proudly eminent as "Bishop" Musgrave endorses their old arguments by reprinting them without note or comment. They would appreciate your commendation more highly, however, if you would sink your title, for the name



“Bishop” as well as the thing, is their peculiar horror. They will think your assumption of the title almost as “spurious, surreptitious and ludicrous as even Methodist Episcopacy.”

II. “*The government and discipline of that sect are ANTI-REPUBLICAN AND TYRANNICAL.*”

When I first read this charge, Rev. Sir, conveyed in terms so significant, and paraded upon your page with so much pomp and circumstance, I was prepared to see some “monstrum horrendum,” some “raw head and bloody bones” picture, which had never seen the light. Instead of which, however, we find nothing more formidable than a new edition of the numerous papers published in the “Mutual Rights” many years since, and answered through the “Itinerant” and other publications at the time. After copious extracts, taken bodily by consecutive pages from that periodical, we find a reprint of Dr. Schmucker’s letters from a Gettysburg newspaper, in his controversy with Rev. Mr. Young, some years since, and then Rev. Mr. Evan’s tract and catechism, &c. These are the sum total of the evidence you produce to sustain your heinous allegation, and on these alone you rest for proof that the system of Methodism is, “in its tendency, dangerous to public liberty and the free institutions of the land!”

Really, Rev. Sir, you do us honor overmuch, when you glorify Methodism by attributing to our system such tremendous power for weal or woe to the nation and the world. But the contrast! yes! the contrast! which you next exhibit will revive the hopes of the universe. The gravity with which you make the announcement is marvellous, and your self-complacency almost ludicrous! I cite a few passages, and commend them to the attention of statesmen in our own and other countries, as containing something “new under the sun,” Solomon to the contrary notwithstanding. Hark!

“Allow me to call the attention of the reader, *by way of contrast*, to the *truly republican!* and *liberal* principles of the government and discipline of the *Presbyterian church!*”

But the next sentence is rich!

“To the *Presbyterians*, under God, more than to any other people, *the world owes* whatever of *civil or religious liberty* it now enjoys!”

And the next! Hear him! it is perfectly unique!

“If any *aristocratical* or *monarchal* sect should ever attempt the destruction of public freedom! the *Presbyterians* of this country will rally to a man around the standard of *civil and religious liberty!*”

The gist of these passages might be thus rendered by a free translation :

“Know all men, by these presents! that when the time shall arrive when the Methodist Episcopal church, that ‘aristocratical and monarchical sect,’ as I have shown them to be, shall ‘attempt to destroy public freedom,’ of which there is great danger, as I have proved by Alexander McCaine and the Mutual Rights; then, and in that event, let it be proclaimed, that the Presbyterian church, and especially the little diocese of Bishop Musgrave in Eutaw street, will rally to a man around the standard of civil and religious liberty, and the liberties of the people will be thus rescued from these ‘anti-republican and tyrannical’ Methodists! by the interposition of that ‘truly republican and liberal sect, the Presbyterians!’”

Now, Rev. Sir, after this brief indulgence in rhapsody, let us just take a peep into one of your own authorities, Buck’s Theological Dictionary, under the article “Persecution,” and for your edification I cite a brief fragment of the history of this “truly republican and liberal sect,” the Presbyterians. It may serve to “stir up your pure mind by way of remembrance.”

“Nor were the Presbyterians, when their government came to be established in England, free from the charge of persecution. In 1645 an ordinance was published, subjecting all who preached or wrote against the Presbyterian directory for public worship to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds; and imprisonment for a year, for the third offence, in using the episcopal book of common prayer, even in a private family. In the following year the Presbyterians applied to Parliament, pressing them to enforce *uniformity* in religion, and to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, &c. but their petition was rejected; but in 1648 the Parliament, ruled by them, published an ordinance against heresy, and determined that any person who maintained, published, or defended the following errors, should suffer death. These errors were, 1. Denying the being of a God.—2. Denying his omnipresence, omniscience, &c.—3. Denying the Trinity, in any way.—4. Denying that Christ had two natures.—5. Denying the resurrection, the atonement, the Scriptures. In Charles the Second’s reign, the Act of Uniformity passed, by which two thousand clergymen were deprived of their benefices. Then followed the Conventicle Act, and the Oxford Act, under which, it is said, eight thousand persons were imprisoned and reduced to want, and many to the grave. In this reign also, the Quakers were much persecuted, and numbers of them imprisoned.”

Here we learn how England bled under the hands of bigotry and persecution inflicted by your “truly republican and liberal sect,” the Presbyterians, when their’s was the established church. Forgive me for doubting whether our “aristocratical and mo-

narchal sect," the Methodists, would have been any more "anti-republican and tyrannical."

Now you have almost provoked me, Rev. Sir, but I forbear, and will only remind you that if I were to reprove you here as you deserve, I should be in danger of grieving good men of your denomination, who are no more to be blamed than they are for what your brethren the Congregationalists did in New England, or for the burning of Servetus at the instance of your great progenitor. I expressly exonerate the present race of Presbyterians from any participation in this spirit of persecution.

But you must be as ignorant of the history of your own church, as you obviously are of Methodism, or you would never have exhibited this boasted contrast, and thus opened such a wide field for castigation. I shall content myself for the sake of others, with a few hints, which you will be able to understand.

Who was it that held a civil and ecclesiastical despotism over New England, and whose "standing order," the "orthodox" clergy, ruled with a rod of iron down to 1816? Certainly not the Methodists!

What sect was that which sold the poor man's cow to pay the priest's tax? Certainly not the Methodists.

Who arrested and fined the venerable Dr. Roberts, late of this city, when a Methodist Missionary in New England, for solemnizing matrimony, within one of their priest's parishes? Certainly not the Methodists.

What sect was it, that whipped the Quakers, men and women—cut off their ears—banished them from Massachusetts and Connecticut on pain of death—and under that tyrannical law, hanged four Quaker preachers, three men and one woman, for preaching the Christian perfection of faith and obedience, and so disturbing the peace of the elect who were at ease in Zion, or rather in Babel? Certainly not the Methodists, for our doctrine and practice have ever consistently taught that liberty of conscience and private judgment is every man's birth-right.

Nay! Rev. Sir, I challenge you to show in the whole history of Methodism, "anti-republican and tyrannical sect" though you call us, a single instance of persecution for conscience' sake, like those of which "Buck" convicts the Presbyterians; and of which the history of New England furnishes the proof against your brother Calvinists when they had the power both civil and ecclesiastical, being the sect established by law.

These reminiscences of veritable history, Rev. Sir, present a sad drawback to your Presbyterian boast of being a "truly republican and liberal sect!" and the contrast you attempt with those who you denounce as "anti-republican, tyrannical, aristocratical and



monarchal." It is in vain to say that it is not so now in New England, for we happen to know the reason why. After your brethren the Congregationalists had persecuted and trodden down the Quakers, Episcopalians and Baptists for so many years, these hated Methodists, for whom there was then no toleration, and is now no forgiveness, so marvellously increased, that uniting with the other oppressed denominations, they wrested from the Calvinists the civil power, by the political revolution of 1816, and thus emancipated all sects of religionists by an overthrow of Congregationalism and its intolerant despotism.

And yet, Rev. Sir, you have the temerity to prate of "true republicanism and liberality" being the peculiar inheritance of your sect, and dare to contrast Methodism as tyranny personified, presuming no doubt that we were too ignorant, to know, or would be too forbearing to reveal these historical details. Remember the wisdom of the adage you so arrogantly commend to us; viz. "Those who live in glass houses, should never throw stones."

III. "The *entire control of all church property* by their clergy, amounting as it does to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and annually increasing, is both UNJUST TO THE PEOPLE who contribute the funds, and DANGEROUS IN ITS TENDENCY TO PUBLIC LIBERTY."

It is my duty, Rev. Sir, to call the attention of the reader at this point to a quibble, which is really unworthy of you, and one of which a "Bishop" ought to be ashamed. I allude to the title of this third chapter, "CLERICAL CONTROL OF CHURCH PROPERTY," which you unaccountably substitute for "the ENTIRE control of all church property by the clergy." If you had frankly confessed in your book, that your original allegation of "entire control" could not be proved, and that all the control of our church property which can be alleged in truth, is a mere clerical or pastoral control, you would have pursued a manly and honest course, and I would have taken pleasure in ascribing such an act to magnanimity and discretion, qualities becoming in a "Bishop," but of the absence of which your book furnishes sad evidence, as in this example.

You record with your own hand an admission, in the first page of this chapter, that our ministry "have not the power to dispose of church property, or appropriate the proceeds to their private and personal use," which in itself proves that you knew that your charge of "*entire control*" was unfounded, and yet instead of retracting the injurious allegation, you clandestinely change the issue by adopting the terms "clerical control."

You quote Webster's definition of "control," but you are careful not to cite his definition of "*entire*," as this lexicographer



would have taught you that this adjective qualifies the noun to which it is applied in a sense which admits of no limitation. This was exactly what you intended in your accusation as is proved by your naming the monetary value of the property, and thence inferring "injustice to the people, and danger to public liberty," neither of which can be predicated of "clerical" or pastoral "control."

The language of the "deed of settlement" which you quote in your book and labor to mystify, explicitly defines the only control our ministry have of any of the churches, in the following words, viz.

"To preach and expound God's holy word, and to execute the Discipline of the church, and to administer the sacraments THEREIN, according to the true meaning and purport of our deed of settlement."

This is the "clerical" or pastoral control which was never denied or concealed, and to show how strictly limited is all the control possessed by our clergy, I take occasion here to record, that our ministers are not at liberty to invite a clergyman of any other denomination to occupy our pulpits, even in ministerial exchange, except the consent of the Trustees be first had and obtained, and these Trustees are invariably laymen. You, Rev. Sir, I am aware, knew when writing your book, that the "entire control" you had alleged, was thus contradicted by every document you was obliged to quote, and I only dwell upon it that the reader may see your Jesuitism, in still making a show of special pleading and casuistry to avoid the concession which even truth demanded.

Your insolent demand for the publication of the deeds of our church property in extenso, betrays an ignorance which, if you were not a "Bishop," we might expect could only be found in an "illiterate circuit rider." Let me enlighten you, Rev. Sir, by informing you that your reverence may find these deeds on record in every clerk's office, in every county of every state in the union, open to public inspection, and furnishing so many thousands of witnesses, all of which are so many standing records that the author of "Bishop" Musgrave's book is a wilful retailer of the scandalous libel, that "the entire control of our church property is in the clergy." And now if the Presbytery to which you belong, have any ecclesiastical discipline to punish slander and defamation against an entire christian denomination; they are authorised to consider this in the light of a public accusation, your book containing the specifications, every Methodist being a prosecutor, and every county court furnishing the proof.

But failing to make out your case against our clergy, in respect either to the meeting houses or parsonages, you next

stumble upon our chartered fund, and this, though for the benefit of the clergy, is under the control of laymen, so that you are still no nearer your object than before. And as to the flourish you make about our Book Concern, you ought to have known that this is the bona fide property of the clergy, and not church property in any sense, which can alienate its control from those to whom it belongs, so that you blunder on to the end of the chapter without being able to find any kind of church property which is under the "entire control" of the clergy. There is none such in existence, Rev. Sir, and this is the only reason you fail to find it, for your search has been as thorough as you could have made into our affairs, if you had been inquisitor general, with power to send for persons and papers, and even then the result would have been the same. The only difference is that if a popish inquisitor had made such diligent inquiry, and without finding any shadow of proof, if he were honest, and there have been instances of such honesty, he would have reported the truth, and relieved the accused from the suspicion. But you, Rev. Sir, have the honor of proving that a Protestant Jesuit, after failing to find any kind of evidence of the accusation he has recklessly made, leaves the accused not only without acquittal, but labors to make it apparent that if the clergy do not have the "entire control" which they deny, still they have the pastoral control, which he calls clerical, which is almost as bad. You remind one of the jury who, in the case of a man indicted for stealing a horse, rendered a verdict of wilful murder. The reason they assigned for it was that they could find no evidence of the crime charged, but they thought he ought to be hanged any how. So, Rev. Sir, having prejudged Methodism to be false and evil, you fore-ordain that it shall be condemned any how. The reader will appreciate your whole course, by reading this chapter in your book.

And yet this Book Concern, which is controlled by the clergy for the same reason that you, Rev. Sir, control any property which is strictly your own, and the profits of which are annually distributed among the superannuated preachers, the widows and orphans of deceased preachers, &c. seems to be an object of your godly jealousy, and pious horror, and you say, it "may hereafter become a tremendous curse both to the church and to the world!" I suppose, that the "awful tract on election left at your door on a Sabbath morning," and which was the "origin" of your book, was printed at this Book Concern, and I cannot marvel at your alarm, which might otherwise seem almost as "ludicrous" as "Methodist Episcopacy." You express, it is true, very religious apprehensions lest the control of the Book Concern should secularize the minds of our ministry and

divert them from their special work. But you forget that to "drive away all erroneous and false doctrines, contrary to God's word," both by the pulpit and the press, and by the same agencies to "spread scriptural holiness through the earth," constitute their special calling, and this dreaded Book Concern is one of the instrumentalities they are employing for these purposes.

Having thus disposed of all you say in this chapter, I must be excused from alluding to the standing witnesses you call up on every occasion, Alexander McCaine, Dr. Schmucker, and the Mutual Rights, for these have all been disposed of so many years since, that your attempt to galvanize them into life can only provoke a smile. Nor shall I at all criticise the contrast between your policy and ours in this regard, for as we manage our own internal affairs in our own way, I should esteem it impertinent to interfere with yours. And I take occasion to remind you that Methodists will regard it as an insult to their understandings for even "Bishop" Musgrave to admonish them on these subjects. They consider themselves capable of discovering any "injustice" perpetrated against them, and sufficiently enlightened to descry any "danger to their liberties" without your aid; and believe me, Rev. Sir, our people feel naught but contempt for your officious homilies or their author.

IV. "Their clergy are *indirectly* but *substantially and really* BETTER PROVIDED FOR AS TO TEMPORALITIES, than the clergy of other Christian denominations."

The point of this charge, as urged by yourself, is, that we have represented the fact to be otherwise, and are hence guilty of deception and falsehood, while at the same time we do injustice to other denominations.

If the allegation were true, abstractly, it would be honorable to our system, and the attempt to disparage us because of the superiority of our plans for "ministerial support," could only be prompted by a little soul. But when it is a fabrication, not only without evidence, but in the face of evidence, and when it is alleged, that by "ungenerous and invidious comparisons," our ministry have concealed or falsified the facts, our accuser betrays depravity as well as imbecility, and deserves rebuke and exposure.

I now proceed to the humiliating task of convicting you, by positive testimony, of having substituted a fiction of your own brain, for sober truth, and as the flagrant guilt of this act is apparent, I abstain from giving any epithet, and leave that to the reader. That you intended to deceive the public and wilfully slander the Methodists, it is unnecessary for me to say; your statements, tables of figures, &c. will speak for themselves. With your motives I have nothing to do, but your book is public property, and you will be held to your responsibility, now that



you have chosen thus officiously to meddle with the concerns of your neighbors.

I begin with the affirmation you make, on page 145, which it is unnecessary for me to call by the offensive name of falsehood, it will serve my purpose to be content with proving it such.

You here assert as the basis of your subsequent calculations :

“The Pastor of the Light-st. Methodist Episcopal Church, for 1842, received a salary of *twelve hundred dollars, exclusive of house rent!*”

Now, Rev. Sir, I neither know nor care upon what authority you make this statement, nor whether you were purposely deceived, nor whether you deceived yourself. Your assertion was *not true* at the time named, nor is it true now. The salary of the present pastor of that church is no more than \$800, and that of his predecessor was only \$850, exclusive of house rent, as the following document will show.

This is to certify that I was the preacher in charge, stationed at the Light-st. church in the year 1842, and that the whole amount of my salary was eight hundred and fifty dollars; including “allowance,” table expenses, fuel, and every thing else, except the privilege of occupying the parsonage belonging to the church, free of rent; and that this was all I received will appear by reference to the Stewards’ books. JOB GUEST.

*Balt. June 29th, 1843.*

I suppose your reverence will concede that this is plain dealing, now that we come to tangible matters found in your book. And I now call your attention, Rev. Sir, to the fact, that the only fault in what you say on this whole subject, is neither more nor less than this, *it is not true*. Still, however, your end is better answered than if what you say was true; indeed you knew very well that the *truth* would not have answered your purpose at all, as I shall conclusively prove. Hence you make this fictitious salary, which is *only* \$350 beyond the truth, the basis of a series of calculations and comparisons which are all necessarily as false as is this starting point of them all.

The object at which you are aiming is distinctly stated by yourself in these words, “The salary of the Methodist clergy is **GREATER** than that of the clergy of other denominations,” particularly those of your own church. This same statement you repeat in a great variety of forms, and with great frequency. And now, Rev. Sir, to prove beyond a peradventure, that with this object in view, the truth would not bear to be told, I have only to state the case hypothetically.

Let us suppose that you had *told the single truth*, that the



Pastor of the Light-st. church, in 1842, received no more than \$850, *exclusive of house rent*, as his whole salary, including "allowance," table expenses, fuel, &c. he having *a wife and family* to support; and *needing*, as you say, \$200 extra, to provide for clerical visitors. He may *need* this item, Rev. Sir, but including all his needs, he received no more than \$850.

Now let us suppose you had *once more told the truth*, that the ministers of other denominations, your own among them, are receiving from \$2000 to \$3000 per annum, exclusive of house rent! and then what would become of your assertion, so often made, that "the *salaries* of our clergy are GREATER than those of the clergy of other denominations?" and that they are "*better* provided for as to temporalities?"

These hypothecated sentences demonstrate that the truth would have utterly failed you, and hence you had the most pressing necessity for concealment and mystification, and in the emergency you were driven to the misrepresentation of facts, which I here expose, and upon the ethics of which, I hope your Presbytery will report for the sake of your conscience.

Truly, Rev. Sir, it would never do for you to record the truth that the Methodist preacher at Light-st. church received a *less salary* than you did *yourself*, for *this would have spoiled your book!* What then could you do when the *facts of the case were so stubborn?* for you are obliged to admit that your own salary, as a *single man!* is \$1200, and has been \$1500!

But you find it necessary, Rev. Sir, to conceal the fact, that if you, as a *single man*, were a Methodist preacher, and stationed in any of our churches in this city, the whole amount of your salary would be but \$100, exclusive of the estimate for your boarding, which has never exceeded \$200, making \$300 as its total amount. That there are several examples of this kind in Baltimore, is another fact equally well known to you, as I can prove when you deny it. And yet, while your own salary is \$1200, though a *single man*, you still persist that our clergy are "*better* provided for," and "*receive larger salaries*" than others. Your friends will blush for you every time they see you in the pulpit, or out of it, until you retract this preposterous and gratuitous calumny.

I can anticipate your intended defence in the event of your conviction of this gross exaggeration, by pleading that you were so informed by somebody who is nameless. This may be so, or it may not, but I have the testimony of "A Methodist," and also of the "gentleman" to whom he referred you, that neither of them gave you any such information, and moreover that your reference to them on this particular subject, is *wholly unauthorized*. They are the only persons to whom you profess to have applied, and they fail you! though with more charity than I can

command, they are willing to ascribe your unauthorized allusion to them, to your oblivious memory. Certain I am, Rev. Sir, that none but an enemy would have so egregiously slandered us; unless indeed some wag took advantage of your avowed character as a "busy body in other men's matters," and purposely misled you, rightly judging that it would be more acceptable than the truth. But Christian ministers, Rev. Sir, and especially a "bishop," should never state as a fact what they do not know to be such; and when they do, if it turns out to be a fable, the forfeiture of their character is the penalty.

But your "*probabilities*" are still more distant from the truth than your facts. The average salary of a Methodist preacher upon the circuits, you state at \$664 66 with amazing accuracy! while this sum is more than one such preacher in a hundred has ever received, even with a family. While the average in cities, you give at \$976, which is quite as wide of the truth, for in the city of Baltimore, the average is very far below that sum, and our pastors are as well provided for as they are any where by the Methodists. But my limits forbid me to pursue any further details on this point.

I am aware, that you may allege *mistake* in these several items, and those who can, may admit the plea. I am obliged however, Rev. Sir, to deprive you of this pretext in my next topic of remark, for here we have the proof of *design*.

On page 142, you affirm that "the PREACHERS THEMSELVES fix the amount of the annual 'allowance' to themselves, their wives and children, WITHOUT CONSULTING THE PEOPLE, and you then complain that by 'clerical legislation,' they have, from time to time, *increased* this amount according to their own sovereign pleasure!"

But why, Rev. Sir, did you not record the facts, which would at once annihilate the scandalous insinuation which this sentence contains? This technical "allowance" of which you speak was originally \$64 per annum, which was afterwards increased to \$80, and with the alarming "increase from time to time," which you depict as so frightful, the allowance itself has never exceeded its present enormous amount of \$100 per annum! which is the whole salary of every single man in our ministry exclusive of his boarding if stationed in cities; and if on circuits, his bare support among the people. And yet with the perfect knowledge of these facts, you substitute the sentence I have quoted, by which, with the aid of capitals and notes of admiration, you succeed in misleading the public. Your reason for this course is obvious, for had you told the truth, you would have proved that your own allowance *quadruples* that of any single man; and far exceeds that of any Methodist minister in the Baltimore Con-

ference, however large his family! You thus afford demonstration here, that even "figures" are not to be relied on in the hands of a Protestant Jesuit.

But, Rev. Sir, I am not yet done with your flagrant perversions of the facts in reference to this "allowance," of the "increase" of which, by "the preachers themselves, without consulting the people," you make such a monstrous enormity. The largest family of a preacher among us, cannot by possibility receive much more than \$300 per annum as their allowance. For at the present highest sum to which it has ever been "*increased*," a *married* preacher is "allowed" \$100 for himself, \$100 for his wife, \$16 for each of his children below 7 years, and \$24 for each of them above 7 and under 14 years of age. Hence a preacher who has 7 children under 14, four of whom being under 7 years of age, would have an annual allowance of \$336! For married preachers, in addition, an estimating committee of laymen appropriate a sum sufficient in their opinion to provide table expenses, fuel, &c. which is regulated proportionably to the size of the family. The amount of this estimate, being added to the "allowance" provided in the Discipline, is the aggregate salary which the stewards are expected to raise. I give you these items, Rev. Sir, that the enormity of your offence against truth and justice, may be more fully in view to yourself and the reader.

Your Jesuitism, however, is not yet fully exposed, for on the next page, you attempt to show that "house rent, furniture, fuel, and table expenses," are included in the "allowance," fixed "by the *preachers themselves, without consulting the people*;" while you knew, as your book elsewhere proves, that these "items," as you significantly call them, are fixed by the *people* themselves, without consulting the *preachers*! Indeed on page 81 you state, that "the *stewards estimate* the table expenses, &c., of the preachers," and then you make a lamentable outcry about the preachers nominating the stewards to the Quarterly Conference, a body made up chiefly of lay members, and who elect these officers on such nomination. But you blunder, Rev. Sir, as sadly here, as when you represent the preachers themselves to fix the estimate for table expenses, fuel, &c., for the stewards have no more to do with making this estimate than the preachers, and neither of them have any more share in it as such, than "Bishop" Musgrave himself. By your own extracts from the Discipline found in your book, it is shown that a committee of lay members, appointed by a body composed chiefly of lay members, is chosen annually to make the estimate according to their own judgment, in which they cannot be controlled by either preachers or stewards. The latter board are directed to pay the estimate



thus made by the committee, *if* they can collect a sufficient amount by class and quarterly collections, over and above the "allowance," which in multiplied examples they fail to do. In this case, the preacher can only report his deficiency to Conference, and receive the pittance which may there fall to his share, and which is ordinarily but a trifling per centage on the amount of his deficit.

After dwelling upon the scanty provisions of the Discipline for the support of superannuated preachers, the widows and orphans of deceased preachers, &c., in a strain of hyperbole, which apart from its heartless inhumanity, perverts the facts in the case, you wind up with the following startling declaration :

"We confidently affirm, that there is no body of clergy in this country who receive while living *so ample a support!* or whose *families* after their decease are *so liberally provided for!!*"

Now, Rev. Sir, I might leave the reader with the facts before him as here exhibited, to characterize this affirmation as it deserves. It is not becoming in me to call a "Bishop" hard names, but I content myself with proving that you deserve them. I envy not the head or the heart of the man who could believe you after this statement, even if you spoke the truth.

In respect to the living preachers, Rev. Sir, I have already shown that no minister of our church in Baltimore, even *with a family*, receives a salary equal to that of "Bishop" Musgrave, he being *a single man!* Indeed your own salary contradicts every thing you say on this subject, although yours is the *third* Presbyterian church in Baltimore, in *more senses than one*. You confess that your salary has gone up from \$ 800 to \$ 1500, and that during twelve years it has averaged \$1033 33 precisely! This I "confidently affirm" to be *more than any pastor in our church* ever received in the United States, even *with a family*, during twelve successive years;—and *more than three times as much* as any *single man* like yourself, ever had in our church even in the largest cities. And I need not refer you to the salaries of your brethren of your own denomination in this city, two of whom are so far beyond you in their salaries, as they are your superiors in meriting them. For you admit that in "some half dozen of the principal cities, Presbyterian ministers do in general receive *larger* salaries than the Methodist ministers stationed in the same places. And you know vastly more than you admit, that in the numerous cities where the salaries of Methodist pastors scarcely ever exceed \$1000, their Presbyterian brethren have from \$2000 to \$4000, and so of other denominations. And yet you over and again repeat that our clergy have *larger* salaries,



and are "*better* provided for" than those of your own and other denominations. And here you affirm that "there is no body of clergy who receive while living *so ample a support*" as ours!

Justice to the character of the self-denying men who labor in our itinerancy with so inadequate a support, has constrained me to make this humiliating exhibition, to defend them from the rank injustice and foul misrepresentations of your book. And if I were to institute the comparison between our circuit preachers and your ministry, settled in the country, the shameful wrong you have inflicted upon them, and upon the truth, would be still more apparent.

I complain not, Rev. Sir, that any of your ministry are too well paid, and so far as my knowledge extends, your charges against our denomination for stigmatizing you for getting large salaries, is as fictitious as the rest of your allegations. I believe the general regret among our people is, that they cannot equal your denomination in providing for their ministers whom they regard equally worthy.

But not content with misrepresenting the living, among our preachers, you assail their widows and orphans, when husbands and fathers are dead, by equal injustice; for you add, "there is no body of clergy in this country whose *families after their decease are so liberally provided for!*"

I recite a few facts here, Rev. Sir, not because you do not know them, but because you do, and that others may see the enormity of your guilt in so grievously outraging the truth.

The widow of a Methodist itinerant preacher, has a nominal claim on the Conference, during her widowhood, for one hundred dollars per annum, and *no more!* Her children in like manner, to the allowance of sixteen or twenty-four dollars annually, according to their ages until they are fourteen years old, when it ceases. When the receipts from all the sources you magnify and mystify, come into Conference, a rateable division is made among the claimants, and at the last Baltimore Conference, *twenty-five per cent. only*, was the amount of the dividend; so that the widows received the pittance of twenty-five dollars! and their orphan children four or six dollars each for the whole year! and in many of the Conferences a less dividend than this is often made. And yet you heartlessly and "confidently affirm," that they are "liberally provided for!"

I owe it to truth, Rev. Sir, that I should here record the painful fact, that the "ample support" of which you speak as received by our clergy, has always been so scanty, that after a life of toil in our itinerant ranks, when they become superannuated, or fall in the work; multitudes of them have been unable to save enough

to give them a becoming interment, much less have they a surplus for their dependent families; and this, notwithstanding the personal and domestic economy for which, as a body, they have been proverbial. Many of them have been obliged to expend their own patrimony, and often that of their wives, the annual expenses of their families being more than the "*ample support*" which though found in your book, they never found anywhere else. Hence it is, that a large proportion of the widows and orphans of our deceased preachers, and a majority of our superannuated preachers have little or no dependence other than the pitiful "allowance," and of this they can too often obtain but a trifling pittance. I say nothing of your insulting their poverty by taunting them with being "liberally provided for," but leave you to the comfort you can derive from it either living or dying.

If our ministry were as "amply supported" while living as *you* have been for twelve years, they would not need to have their families "liberally provided for" by the church, after their decease. It is the deficient support of our clergy while living, which has led to the attempt in our system to provide for the continuance of the "allowance" *merely* to the widows and orphans of our deceased preachers, which has but partially succeeded.

#### V. *Financial measures, or mode of raising supplies.*

This is the title of your fifth chapter, in pursuance of your threat to "carry the war into Africa," after the "provoking challenge" in a newspaper of this city had constrained you "very reluctantly" to enter upon this offensive controversy. And though your readers may marvel what you have to do with our domestic and internal affairs for sustaining our ecclesiastical system; yet the wonder will cease when he finds you betraying the true motive of this officious intermeddling, by contrasting our system with that of the Presbyterian church, and pre-eminently in your diocese in Eutaw street, which is the pattern you would recommend for the whole universe.

After a tirade against our class-meetings, utterly unworthy of notice, and a lamentation over the "tax"\* imposed upon our people by weekly class collections, you attempt to argue in proof that free seats cost the members more than pewed seats, and you cite your own church in Eutaw street by way of illustration, where you proffer to rent pews very cheap! and where pew-holders would seem to be in demand!

Let me enlighten you, Rev. Sir, into one fact, which seems never to have occurred to you, and it is this; the "illiterate" Methodists are perfectly aware that they must pay more to pro-

\* There is no such thing as a "tax" in our system, *voluntary contributions* being received, but never exacted.

vide free seats, that "the poor may have the gospel preached to them," than to provide seats for themselves in pewed churches. Indeed many of them had learned long before your book was published that there were "pews to let" in your church, and that they were *very cheap* too;—but even this consideration has never tempted them to leave their free churches which cost them more, but where, on terms of perfect equality, "The rich and the poor meet together, the Lord being the Maker of them all."

I doubt, Rev. Sir, whether you will find any success in proselyting Methodists, by offering seats in your pews at "six cents per week for each person, seventeen cents per week for a half pew, and thirty cents per week for a whole pew, where they can be 'comfortably accommodated,'" i. e. insured against a crowd. Not that we find fault with the price, for they are marvellously cheap, nor would we insinuate that at this price, any body pays more than they are worth; but our people would rather pay the "tax" you warn us of in our "class meetings, love feasts," &c. which you say is ten cents a week upon an average. This is about as far from the truth as the rest of your book, but serves your purpose so much the better.

Nevertheless, Rev. Sir, I confess that this mode of "tampering" with our people to "seduce" them from "the church of their fathers" is vastly more civil than abusing them as in the former chapters. But still I apprehend you will succeed no better by telling them on page 197 of your book, that in "the third Presbyterian church in Eutaw street, there are seventy-two pews! which rent at a still lower price, so that in many of these pews you inform us that "a family of three persons can have half a pew at between seven and eight cents per week! and *for each person LESS THAN THREE CENTS A WEEK!!* The capitals, italics and notes of admiration!! are yours, and on the same page, you sum up the amount of your proselyting proclamation, in this attractive announcement, viz.

*Few members of Methodist classes pay less than three cents a week! and yet, for this amount any individual may obtain a rented seat in a Presbyterian church!!!"*

Surely, Rev. Sir, if the only reason people prefer the Methodist churches to your's, consisted in the amount of the "tax" which each of them may impose, your "list of prices" ought to put competition at defiance, for nobody can say that your pews are not *cheap* enough. And if your church in Eutaw street is not soon filled, it must be for some other and weightier reason, for no one can object to the price. Indeed I like your next paragraph vastly, for you benevolently say, that there are many poor people who pay three cents a week in the Methodist churches, who if they would only "attend your church would be welcome to occupy seats literally and truly *free!*"



In thus running your "opposition line," I would give you a hint which may be useful, and you might try the expedient in your next edition. If people will not take seats in your pews when offered so cheap, and will not take them even when free, there is no telling what effect it might have in raising a congregation, if you would try the experiment of *paying them* a small stipend of "three cents a week" for occupying these "vacant pews;" which sum you might spare out of the surplus of your salary, and even then have *more* than any Methodist pastor in Baltimore.

After your gratuitous assumption that every Methodist pays on an average ten cents weekly in "class, love feast, and special collections," you calculate the "immense revenues" derived from these sources. And on page 199, you affirm that the whole of these collections, are "divided among our four thousand preachers, their widows and orphans!" This stupendous fiction you palm on your readers, though you knew perfectly well that "the love feast collections" are exclusively distributed among the thousands of the poor among the laity, by the officers of the church, who are laymen, and cannot by any possibility be received by our clergy. And as to the "special collections" these are for benevolent objects of various kinds and always specified, so that these, which in your estimates amount to little short of a million of dollars annually, in no case reach our ministers, but are managed exclusively by the laity.

Now, Rev. Sir, it cannot be denied that you knew better when you made this sweeping charge against our ministry, and yet, if true, it would involve them in the guilt of wholesale fraud and robbery, and ought to cover them with infamy. And yet this is but a specimen of scores of similar outrages upon truth and decency found in your book, meriting the execration of all honest men, and will receive naught else from such men, in the ministry and membership of the Presbyterian church.

But the pewed system seems to be the "god of your idolatry," for you declare, that the Methodists would generally adopt it if they could only "*realise as much MONEY as they at present do from their weekly class-meetings;*"—and you allege our free seats to be a measure of policy to which we are prompted by the *revenue* they yield, which you say is larger than that derived from "the rented pews of the Presbyterian churches." Pray sir, what connection is there between our free seats for the public at large, and weekly class collections which are derived from communicants only? So far from free seats being a source of revenue, they impose a heavy tax on our church, which you have yourself alluded to when you say that the free seat system costs the communicants more than pewed seats, and which I have frankly conceded. Your absurd and inconsistent flourish on this subject is unworthy of refutation.

You conclude this chapter by announcing the interesting intel-

ligence, that in your church in Eutaw street, a committee of your Trustees stand at your doors to conduct strangers to eligible seats, so that nobody need be afraid of entering because it is a pewed church. You then announce that if any family who are poor will consent "habitually to worship with you, they will always be able to find *vacant seats*," a fact, which I am not disposed to doubt; and that upon application, they may have "*particular pews gratuitously*." Whether this novel mode of proselyting, in an octavo volume, will serve to raise a congregation to occupy your vacant pews, cheap as you offer them, remains to be seen. The poor, however, let me inform you, Rev. Sir, will not be favourably impressed with your offer of *particular pews gratuitously*. They do not like to be thus *labelled* in the house of God, and this is one objection to your system. I regret to say that with our numerous churches and chapels in this city we are not able to promise vacant seats at all times to any, except to those who will attend in time to secure them, nor have we any "*particular seats*" for the poor. Our churches, thus far in Baltimore, like the gospel we preach, are free to all, without money and without price.

VI. Practical Methodism—its moral machinery, religious character and fruits.

The foundation on which you build this chapter of your book is none other than the vulgar caricatures of Methodism, published in Dr. Green's periodical at Philadelphia some years since, by a writer who was *nameless*, for a reason which was afterwards disclosed in the withering reply which was published at the time. I forbear to say more, except that the author of those anonymous slanders, wrote the epitaph of the paper in which they appeared, which is long since defunct; nor could Dr. Green's endorsement, and that of Bishop Musgrave's superadded, rescue their author from the infamy due to that anonymous slanderer. But even he, though concealing his name, did not descend to the scandalous libels of your book, for it has been left for "Bishop Musgrave" to find a still "lower deep;" for even *he* did not load the name of Mr. Wesley with the reviling epithets, into the use of which your envenomed hate has betrayed you, much less did he impute to our denomination the hypocrisy, dishonesty, deceit, and iniquity; or disgrace himself by the railing and mockery of sacred things, which abound in your book. That you have thus "out-heroded Herod" in your foul abuse both of Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, I now proceed to show.

On page 219, you record, "I am free to say, that such instances of *gross and slanderous misrepresentation and defamation*, go very, very far, to impair my confidence in Mr. Wesley's general sincerity and piety." And this, after quoting a sentence from his sermon on "Free Grace," which hyper-Calvinism can never forgive, and which can only be answered by railing abuse.

Again, on page 221, you not only impute to Mr. Wesley, "blasphemous caricatures and shameful misrepresentations," but on page 223, you characterize that venerable minister of Christ, as a "*vulgar and malignant blasphemer!*" I need not tell you how your vilification of this eminent scholar and divine will be estimated, even by the better informed and pious men in your own denomination, whose Christian candor has led to the just estimate of his piety and usefulness. You already know, that neither with this loathsome vituperation, nor in the other malignant railings of your volume, have your own brethren, even in Baltimore, either sympathy or fellowship. With them and similar Christian ministers of the Presbyterian church, our ministry and people are on terms of mutual love, and the interchange of pulpits is reciprocally practised. And though you have heretofore occasionally introduced into your pulpit our ministers, to whom you then found it expedient to make a show of courtesy and recognition; yet you have here betrayed the long pent up bigotry and uncharitableness, which you have until now concealed. That you will be henceforth appreciated in your true character, you will have ample evidence.

But I now transcribe a few sentences, out of a great multitude of kindred character, to exhibit the spirit and temper, as well as the chosen language in which you vilify the Methodists. On page 230, you say:

*IF religion consisted in wearing a broad brimmed hat, a plain bonnet, or a straight coat; in assuming a sanctimonious countenance and air; in using certain cant expressions; in singing and praying vociferously, as if the Almighty were deaf; in shouting, clapping and dancing; in crying Amen! Glory! Hallelujah! in swooning or laughing hysterically; in dreams and visions, and fanatical impressions and impulses. IF the religion of the God of decency and order consisted in phariseism, fanaticism, confusion and uproar! then I grant it might be easy to prove that there is not only more of the 'power of godliness' in the Methodist than in other churches, but very little, comparatively, among the other sects, except, perhaps, the Shakers, who, notwithstanding their denial of the Deity of Christ, &c. can shout and shake and dance, with prodigious noise, 'power' and agility!'"*

Now if this paragraph be not unblushing impiety and vulgar profanity, rivalling the infidel slang of Thomas Paine and Fanny Wright, I know not where it is to be found. But this is not its worst characteristic, for your reckless depravity has here alleged against the Methodists as a body, ministers and people, that they substitute for the "power of godliness," the senseless follies of Shakerism and similar excesses and extravagances; and you are thus self-convicted of a dilemma, upon the horns of which I leave



you; you either *knew better*, or you *did not*; if the former, you may yourself give to your conduct the appropriate epithet, for I scorn to write it; and if the latter, then you are the victim of intellectual imbecility, and should be taken care of by your friends.

I confess that, in candor and truth, I dare not say that the following sentences are to be ascribed to the latter source, for they exhibit such proof of malignant design, that charity itself has not a mantle large enough to cover them, or conceal their moral deformity. On page 231, you say:

*"However great may be their (the Methodists) self-complacency, I can assure them that the pretensions of many of them to superior piety, are pretty well understood by the intelligent and observing, and particularly by many who have acquired some experience in their commercial dealings with such saints! And if they have any doubts concerning their general reputation, let them go upon 'change,' or enter the counting houses of any of our intelligent merchants, and try how far their straight coats, long faces, and cant expressions will procure them credit! Or if they allege that mere worldlings are no proper judges of the 'life and power of Methodism,' let them test the value of their loud amens, &c. among the 'knowing ones' of their own brethren, and see how far they will trust them, without other security than that of their Methodistical profession!"*

In these foul and gratuitous imputations against the honor and honesty of the *Methodists of Baltimore*, for of these you profess to speak, see page 230, you are pleased to admit that they are not *all* equally "*hypocritical and irreligious*," yet you affirm all this of "*multitudes*;" and your exceptions are only designed to bribe us into silence, by laying the "*flattering unction to our souls*," that you do not impeach any individual character or credit. But you need not hope thus to escape the responsibility of your heartless calumnies.

Do you mean to say, Rev. Sir, that your Presbyterian "*saints*" obtain "*credit*" on "*change*," or in commercial dealings, by giving the security of their Presbyterian "*professions*?" Do you think *they* will relish this insinuation? Or do you mean that the Methodists alone use their religion, in the market or on '*change*,' as a basis of credit? The Methodist merchants of Baltimore, who share largely in the commercial dealings of the city, hurl back this vile slander, indignantly upon its author; and if you dared to make it against any of them individually, your clerical character would not give you impunity from the punishment of the misdemeanor, in our courts of justice. Their commercial character and credit as a body, are beyond the reach of the envenomed pen of "*Bishop*" Musgrave, they are "*living epistles*" of a "*general reputation*," which protects them from your puny sectarian assaults, though not acquired by vaunting their "*Methodistical professions*!"

Even the respectable members of your own church will feel a becoming humiliation, that you should have thus become the unprovoked assailant of men, whose integrity is known and appreciated by this whole community, and make haste to disclaim the suspicion of a participation with their pastor, in this deed of injustice and wrong.

It will not do for you to prate of the exceptions you make in your book, and disclaim any intention to impeach the intelligence and commercial integrity of the Methodist merchants of Baltimore as a class. I hold you to your own language, which I cite for your benefit. On page 230 you say :

*"In this city, (Baltimore,) as I have abundant evidence to know, nothing is more common than for many Methodists to boast of the superior piety of their own church, and at the same time to disparage that of other denominations."* And then after the additional grave slanders I have quoted against these Methodists in their commercial character, you account for it by alleging "false notions of the nature of true religion, and the very small degree of piety they themselves possess." See page 232, and on the next page you say, they (the Methodists) being "wholly destitute of piety themselves, nothing but the excitation of their *natural sensibilities* can make them conscious of *any feeling* in the house of God! On another page you say, "there is no class of Protestant Christians so *generally* ignorant of the Bible, or of the connection and bearing of its solemn and eternal truths as the Methodists," and the reason you assign for this, is the "illiteracy of their preachers, and the little value they place upon evangelical truth as a means of conversion and sanctification." And after thus endorsing the foul calumnies of Dr. Green's nameless correspondent, you say, speaking of Baltimore Methodists, "*The same pharisaical, bigotted and proselyting spirit is constantly manifested by many of them in this city!*" and the preceding sentence characterizes the "spirit" you thus impute, as a "preposterous exhibition of *avarice, hypocrisy, falsehood and impiety!*"

But it seems by the record you make on page 241, that some years since you were in the habit of occasionally inviting Methodist ministers to occupy your pulpit, and were *sadly disappointed in your object*, when you were not invited to preach for them in turn; for you say, you *did* wish to live on friendly terms with them. Now, Rev. Sir, if the half you say of the Methodist ministers were true, or if you surmised it to be true, you committed an outrage upon your people by inviting such men to preach for you. And if their people are what you represent them to be, you should be ashamed to confess a desire for Christian fellowship. I give you a few extracts for your edification, all referring to these *Baltimore Methodists*. After a sneering and vulgar tirade against camp meetings and revivals, which latter you call "*portable machines!*" thus adopting the slang of profligates and infidels, you say :

"I predicted after the delivery of *my lectures on the Divine Decrees*, and before their publication, that soon after their appearance in print, a *Methodist revival* (portable machine) might be expected in my immediate neighborhood—and *so there was!* I now predict, that unless this exposure shall prevent it, soon after this work makes its appearance, we shall have *another, perhaps more 'powerful,'* to prove that all that is said concerning their polity, &c., is untrue, and that they are the *very best Christians on earth!*"

Believe me, Rev. Sir, you have no claim to being either "a prophet or the son of a prophet," because you predicted the Methodist revival of which you speak during the last year, nor had your lectures on the Divine Decrees, any thing more to do with its "manufacture" than the publication of the Almanac for that year. With the exception of "A Methodist," whose notice in the Clipper was the "occasion" of your book, I do not believe that your published lectures were ever read by any of our denomination here or elsewhere. And you may safely predict a "Methodist revival," whether you publish a book or not, for a succession of them have been vouchsafed to us thus far in our history, and unless the glory shall depart from us, revivals will still as ever, by the Divine blessing, accompany the means of grace, in proportion to the diligence and faith with which they are improved. Nor need you flatter yourself that "*this exposure will prevent it!*" for after a becoming reply to your slanders, we shall pursue the even tenor of our way, as undisturbed by your book as though it had never been written, and as indifferent about its circulation as of the idle wind. For your own sake, and that of your people, many of whom will concur with us, we wish it had never been written, as we have hope that you will yourself devoutly wish when your own "exposure" shall be made in this community, and when you shall be brought to repentance, for which we sincerely pray, as we are taught to do for all, and especially for our enemies who "curse and despitefully use us, and say all manner of evil against us *falsely.*" Believe me, Rev. Sir, this is our rejoicing, under the vituperations of your book.

The exhibit you give of your own "diocese in Eutaw-st." is humiliating indeed, in contrast with "Methodism in the neighborhood," of which you complain. See page 286. You have been "Bishop" of that church for twelve years, and until you came there, nothing, or rather worse than nothing, as you say, was done. Indeed you seem "for several years to have laboured under great disadvantages," as the following sentence proves. "Many a time have I lectured on a week day evening to two or three persons, and preached on the Sabbath to fifteen or twenty individuals!" I suppose it was about those days, that you invited the Methodist ministers to preach for you. But it seems that you



have been doing better of late, for "between thirty and forty have been added to the communion of the church every year!" How far these are "the fruits of your own ministry," as you denominate them, would have been more apparent, if you had stated *how* these were added to the church, whether by letter from other Presbyterian churches, or on recent profession. You had reasons, no doubt, for silence on this point, and I shall waive so personal a subject, lest I be led to share in your spirit. You are careful to say, that you had *no* "revivals" or "new measures" or "*Methodistical machinery*," but several "interesting seasons" during the twelve years which were so productive! To exhibit your estimate of "revivals of religion," you scoff and mock at serious things after this sort on p. 234. "Feeling begets feeling, *just as naturally as laughing begets laughter, and gaping begets gaping!*" I do not envy you all the fellow feeling you will find among pious Presbyterians in this profane jest, nor indeed any where else except from those who have with you "taken the seat of the scornful, are standing in the way of sinners, or walking in the counsel of the ungodly."

#### VII. *New Measures for promoting Revivals of Religion.*

As this chapter is made up of the article on "New Measures," from the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," which has reference to the clumsy imitation of "*Methodistical machinery*" among Presbyterians; and the insertion of two letters from Dr. Sprague's work on revivals, of kindred character; I deem it uncalled for in the present critique upon your book, to give to these more than a passing notice. My own estimate of these documents is, that in matter and spirit they constitute by far the most respectable portion of your volume, and of Methodism they say nothing which might not be expected, or which is unworthy of their authors as Presbyterian ministers, or degrading to them as men. Indeed the excesses and extravagances they condemn, deserved rebuke in many instances, and their error consists in identifying them with Methodism, to which they are no more analogous than the pretended miracles of the magicians in imitating those of Moses,—or the vain attempt of the sons of the Jewish high priest to cast out devils "in the name of Jesus whom Paul preached." One of your own blunders consists in fancying these new measures are "*Methodistical*," and then railing us because some of your ministers have brought "strange fire to the altar of God."

You tell us on page 286, that for eight years before you came to your present diocese in Eutaw street, that church had been "*revived and re-revived*" by these "*new measures*," until it was "*nearly revived to death*." You say "that church was *like a good cow—milked but not fed*," by these "*revivalists*." But pray, Rev. Sir, what had Methodism to do with the "*high pressure system*" which you reprobate among Presbyterian ministers.

Our estimate of some of these "new measures" may not differ from your own. Do you hear of any Methodist church in your neighborhood being "revived to death?" though you say they "manufacture" a revival every time "Bishop" Musgrave publishes a book!

But so far from "shielding yourself from the horrible imputation of having deliberately borne false witness against your neighbor!!" as you have attempted, you have added "confirmation strong as Holy Writ." In what you call the proof of your original allegations, you have compiled all the stale calumnies of the enemies of Methodism, from pamphlets, newspapers, periodicals and other fugitive publications issued during many years,—and not content with republishing these, with your endorsement, though long since refuted, you have superadded new and unheard of accusations, involving the character not merely of the system of Methodism, but with inconsiderable exceptions, the moral and religious standing of our entire denomination. You have thus constrained us either quietly to succumb to your libellous assaults, or to throw ourselves upon our individual and collective reputation before the community by a public reply.

But you have not only attempted to instruct our brethren in the ministry and membership in what you call the "evils and falsehoods of Methodism," presuming that without *your* superior wisdom, we are incapable of discerning our ecclesiastical rights, or discovering the "despotism" of which we are the *dupes*; but you have elaborated a tissue of false and premeditated calumnies, such as never before were fabricated against any portion of the christian church. You have placed our entire denomination before the American people as though we were a band of conspirators against the liberties of the nation;—members of an aristocratical and tyrannical sect, the tendency of whose system is to destroy this fair fabric of American freedom; in short, a vast and irresponsible company of traitors against human rights, endangering the peace and security of the government of these United States!

Such are the insane excesses to which your sectarian bigotry and vindictive rage against Methodism have betrayed you, that if I could for a moment believe that you were yourself the victim of the stupidity upon which you hope to operate by such ludicrous and harmless thunder; I should regard you worthy rather of pity, than blame, and better entitled to commiseration than censure. But believing as I do, that your unbridled temper and unprovoked resentment have prompted this melancholy exhibition of frenzy, and that you have written and published it before your excited passions have allowed a sufficient pause for an estimate of its consequences upon yourself; I have treated you and your book, as I think both deserve. And, as a member of that communion which is the object of your bitter reviling, for many years, I thus



publicly call on your Presbytery, to deal with you as with other wilful and deliberate offenders against the ninth commandment of the decalogue. And if you shall attempt to shelter yourself under your exposition of the Divine Decrees, and that your book is one of those events which has been "fore-ordained from all eternity," and that you are thence to receive impunity for its flagitious libels; then you will recollect that the truth and plain dealing of this reply, is to be regarded as *equally* included in the Divine Decrees, and could neither be more or less than it is, a fearless exposure of "Bishop Musgrave's" bill of abominations, and a defence of Methodism against his assaults.

You have the assurance to solicit from your Methodist *brethren* a "temperate and candid review," and you say "this is our undoubted right." We shall be our own judges as to our "undoubted rights," without your dictation, as also with the "temperance and candor" with which to repel your slanders. I have thus "withstood you to the face, because you are to be blamed," according to the apostolic example. And though we recognize as "brethren" the other ministers of the Presbyterian church in this city and elsewhere, they having never forfeited our esteem and affection by unbrotherly and unchristian railing, yet henceforth the Methodists everywhere will disclaim this relation to "Bishop" Musgrave, until he brings forth fruits meet for repentance, for we have high authority to "Mark them which cause divisions among you, and avoid them." Much less can we acknowledge you as a "Bishop," having convicted you of being a "*brawler*," which Paul specifies as a disqualification for that office. Hence you will perceive that we cannot appreciate or accept your proposition to receive from you the right hand of fellowship, though we reciprocate this token of our Christian regards to the ministers of the Presbyterian church in this city, who are not partakers with you of your evil deeds, because they have "another spirit" in them. So also our brethren of your denomination, and those of your own church in Eutaw-st., we still regard worthy of our esteem and love; nor do we believe that you can succeed in utterly estranging their hearts, even by the caricature of our faith, our experience, or our conduct, into which your unguarded and misguided zeal has betrayed you.

Finally, in taking my leave of you, Rev. Sir, whom I have never seen, and of whom I have no knowledge but by your book, I have a duty to you personally, which I would fain discharge before concluding this reply. For though I have been constrained to arraign you before the Christian public as an offender against both Christian courtesy and heathen morality, and publicly impeach both your intelligence and candor; yet, if haply I may "convert you from the error of your ways," I have been taught, that I may hope thus to "save your soul from death," and hide even "the multitude of sins," of which I have convicted your book.



"It is the part of wisdom to be willing to be taught even by an enemy, how much more to heed the admonitions of a friend."

Believe me, Rev. Sir, the private griefs and personal wrongs of which you complain on so many of your pages, as furnishing you the provocation for the censorious spirit and temper you have indulged, have no existence but in your imagination. The conspiracy your disordered fancy has conjured up as existing among the Methodists in your neighborhood, against you and your charge, is but the dream of a distempered brain. And as to "*proselyting*" from your little flock, we have neither the motive nor the inclination to invade your sheepfold, nor would our ministry or people countenance the attempt to estrange any of your people either from your church or your sabbath school. Nor has there ever been on the part of the Methodists any effort to disparage, misrepresent, or detract from your merits, be they great or small, as a man, a Christian or a minister; much less has there ever been heard a whisper against your salary, though of all these grievous offences you accuse us.

Surely you must have been surrounded by "whisperers or backbiters," to whom you seem to have lent a ready ear, else your own common sense would have protected you from such morbid visions. Is it not wonderful that no such conflict has ever been engendered between the Methodists, and the very respectable pastors of the other Presbyterian churches of this city, neither of whom has ever encountered the plot against the peace of their respective charges, which you have strangely conjured up in relation to your church? Can you conceive of any reason why you and your flock should be selected as the peculiar and exclusive object of our proselyting covetousness or sectarian jealousy? Depend upon it, you have been the victim of delusion, and haunted for years by a ghost which has led you to give

"To airy nothing, a local habitation and a name."

And so also of that terrible "*tract on election left at your private residence on a Sabbath morning!*" the Methodists of this city are guiltless of any agency in that grievous transaction, much less is the Tract Society or the General Conference implicated in the deed. I have already intimated what I suppose was the real source of that "personal insult and impudent challenge" which you impute to the Methodists. But suppose, Rev. Sir, that one of your flock were to perpetrate a similar outrage upon one of our ministry, by leaving "Bishop" Musgrave's "controversial tract on election at his door on a Sabbath morning!" would this be a justifiable "origin" for a volume of resentment against the whole Presbyterian church in the United States!" for an act, which, in the nature of the case, must have been an individual indiscretion? And yet thus you have acted, and in the very title



of your book, you have violated even the dictates of good manners, for it implies that there is in the "Polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church," some hidden and vile iniquity which we are either too ignorant to know, or too depraved and dishonest to reveal; and hence the propriety of your "Exposure!"

And now let me ask you, Rev. Sir, suppose it were even so, and *you* felt it your conscientious duty to make the disclosure, is your's the style to do good with? Is the spirit and language of your book any approximation to what is becoming in a Christian minister? What, think you, will be the impression made upon the minds of your readers, touching the character of a religion, which exhibits you to such, indulging a temper which is as far from the "spirit of Christ," as is that of a brawling politician or raving demagogue? Let reason and conscience answer.

The limits to which I have restricted myself in this pamphlet, have precluded me from amplifying on any single point of your accusations, and constrained me wholly to omit some others, in which you are equally vulnerable. I am the more reconciled to this deficiency in my humble performance, by the hope that a more detailed defence against your book will be prepared, by another and an abler hand, to which this may be regarded as but a preface or forerunner.

I feel it to be as much my special duty to reply to your book, as it was your special duty to write it; and with my motives,—supremely important to myself,—I have every reason to be satisfied, though with the manner in which I have discharged this duty, I confess myself far less content. Indeed, such is the vituperative style of your book, that, by contact with it, I may have been, at times, exceptionably severe, for "Happy is he that condemneth not himself, in that thing which he alloweth." Nevertheless, I feel that a *calm* refutation of some of the railing accusations of your volume would be criminal in me, professing to be set for the defence of the truth. But whatever others may judge of the severity of my *manner*, you cannot surely complain, for in contrast with your book, I am *grievously in fault*. And you will remember that I write in *SELF-DEFENCE*, against an unjust and unprovoked volume of abuse which you have written against the church of which I am a member.

Deeply as I have felt the injustice you have inflicted upon Methodism, my indignation has been vastly more excited by your numerous offences against the majesty of truth. For the former, I can forgive you, now that I have repelled it; and for the latter, while I expose you, "more in sorrow than in anger," I can devoutly pray, "Lord, lay not this sin to his charge."





**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**



0002208205A

