

History of
Episcopal Methodism
by
George W. Peurifoy

Sch.R

287.6

P514

Sch. R.

Cl. 287.6 Bk. Q 514

Trinity College Library
Durham, N. C.



Rec'd

Old Library

THE TEKEL OF METHODISM.

HISTORY

OF

EPISCOPAL METHODISM,

IN WHICH ITS CLAIMS

TO BEING A CHURCH OF CHRIST

ARE INVESTIGATED.

BY

ELDER GEORGE W. PEURIFOY,
OF ORANGE COUNTY, N. C.

"I believe, therefore have I spoken."—DAVID.

P/2, 265

CHAPEL HILL:
PRINTED AT THE GAZETTE OFFICE.

1858.

HISTORY OF EPISCOPAL METHODISM.

INTRODUCTION.

THERE are various denominations claiming to be the Church of Christ. Their claims are not all valid, for the God of heaven never "set up" but one Church or denomination of Christians.

1. It is contrary to reason, that the Almighty should set up, or favor the organization of antagonistic denominations. He is not the author of one to advocate Episcopacy, and of another to oppose it; of one to practice immersion, and another to oppose it, and practice sprinkling; of one to oppose infant baptism, and another to advocate and practice it; God is not the author of both Baptist, and Pedo-baptist Churches. If Pedo-baptist Churches are of God, Baptist Churches are not. If Baptist Churches are of God, Pedo-baptist are not.

2. That God is the author of but one Church or Christian denomination, is evident from his word. No one will assert, or believe that the Saviour and the Apostles, organized more than one Church or denomination. At that time "the God of Heaven set up a kingdom," Daniel 2, 44. If he set up divisions in his kingdom or Church, if he set up antagonistic Sects, he acted with less wisdom and precaution, than any sensible earthly being would. No human sovereign would be guilty of setting up antagonistic parties, in his Kingdom, neither has God done any such thing. Did not our Saviour say, "A Kingdom divided against itself cannot stand?" Who then, will say, he divided his Kingdom, into antagonistic Sects? He never did any such thing. the divisions that exist, are not of God, but of Man.

Instead of dividing his people the Saviour prayed that his people might "be one," this he did *four times*, See John, 17, 11, 21, 22, 23, who will assert, that he who prayed that his people might "be one," that is, remain undivided, is the author of more than one denomination?

Divisions in, or of the Church of Christ, are expressly forbidden, and those that cause them are to be *marked* and *avoided*. Paul says, "Now I beseech you brethren, *mark* them which *cause divisions*, and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and *avoid* them." We are not to encourage them in any way whatever, see also 1, Cor. 1; 10, Eph. 4; 14, Pet. 3; 8, 2 Cor. 13; 11, and Titus 3. 10.

That from the days of the Apostles until now, there has been *in visible existence*, the Church which the God of heaven set up, will not be denied by any believer in the Bible.

By the *kingdom set up in the days of these kings*, is meant the Gospel Church, of which it is said, "it shall never be destroyed, it shall stand forever," Dan. 2, 44. The Saviour said, "On this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16; 18. This, and the preceeding passage, refer to the setting up the visible Church, and prove that it was to have a perpetual existence. The only question, is, where was this true Church, and who composed it, during the dark ages of Popish persecution? Catholics say it was with them. This cannot be, for they were the *persecuting party*.

By reference to Rev. 12; 6, 14, it will be clearly seen where the true Church was during the great Romish Apostacy, the reign of "the Man of Sin."

"And the woman [the Church] fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand and two hundred and three score days," (that is 1260 years.) "And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time from *the face of the serpent*."

From the rise of "the Man of sin," the serpent," that persecuted the *woman* until the Reformation, the true gospel Church was in the wilderness, fled from the persecuting power of papal Rome. This Church had been in the wilderness for 1260 years, and in existence at the time of the Reformation, and has continued ever since.

Dr. Samuel Miller, (Presbyterian,) says of Matt. 16, 18: "This promise seems to secure to his people that there *shall be, in all ages, in the worst times*, a substantially pure Church; that there shall *always be a body* of people more or less numerous, who shall hold just

the *doctrines and order of Christ house*, in some good degree, in conformity with the model of the primitive Church. Accordingly, it is not difficult to show that, ever since the rise of the 'Man of Sin' there has been a *Succession* of those whom the Scriptures Style 'Witnesses for God,' 'Witnesses for the truth,' who have kept alive 'the faith once delivered to the Saints;' and have in some good degree of faithfulness maintained the ordinances and discipline which the inspired Apostles, in the Master's name committed to the keeping of the Church," —*Recom. Letter to Dr. Baird* p. 1.

President Edwards, (Presbyterian) Says, "In every age of this dark time (Popery) there appeared particular persons in all parts of Christendom, who bore a testimony against the corruptions and tyranny of the Church of Rome. There is no one age of antichrist, even in the darkest times, but Ecclesiastical Historians mention by name, those who manifested an abhorrence of the Pope and his idolatrous worship, and pleaded for the ancient purity of doctrine and worship. God was pleased to *maintain an uninterrupted succession* of many witnesses &c." —*His. of Redemption*, p 205.

Who composed this "uninterrupted succession," "who bore a testimony against the corruptions and tyranny of the Church of Rome," who constituted the "pure Church," the "witnesses for God," and "maintained the ordinance and discipline of the Church" &c.. during "the dark ages" while the Church was hid, or "fled into the wilderness," for 1260 years previous to the Reformation?—What denomination of Christians has *descended* from the "uninterrupted Succession of many witnesses?"* That there has been an "uninterrupted succession" of the true Church from the Apostles until the present time, separate and distinct from the Romish Apostacy, no true protestant will deny, God's word is pledged for the perpetuity of his visible Church, See Dan. 2, 44, and Matt. 16, 18. This being admitted, it becomes an exceedingly interesting subject of enquiry, which of the present denominations has the best claim to *identity with*, and *descent from* the true and witnessing Church. This is a momentous subject, with the ability of protestants to meet it, depends in a great measure, their success in a contest with Roman Catholics. It can be

*For an answer to the preceeding questions, the reader is refered to my *Dedication Sermon*, from Daniel 2:44, a large edition of which has just been published.

fully and triumphantly met, but not by Pedobaptists, for Catholics can give *the day when each of them seceded* from her, or from her offspring.

Having shown, that God is the author of but one denomination, or Church, that divisions are forbidden; and that the Church which he "set up," was never to be destroyed," was to "Stand forever," and that it "fled into the wilderness," and was persecuted even unto death for hundreds of years before the reformation, and *still has existence*. I shall enter at once into an investigation of the claims of the so called "Methodist Episcopal Church" to be a true Church of God.

SECTION I.

I shall now proceed to the History of Episcopal Methodism, and examine its claims to be a true and Scriptural Church of Jesus Christ.

1. *In its origin*, there is nothing that entitles it to be considered a gospel Church.

Methodists date the rise of Methodism in A. D. 1729. Discipline 3 The *origin* of Methodism was as follows: "In November 1729, at which time I, (says Mr. Wesley,) come to reside in Oxford, my brother and I, and two young gentlemen more, agreed to spend three or four evenings in a week together. On Sunday evening we read something in divinity, on other nights the *Greek and Latin Classics*."

"On Monday, May 1st, our little Society began in London. But it may be observed (says Mr. Wesley) "the *FIRST RISE of Methodism*, so called, was in November 1729 when four of us met together at Oxford."—*Wesley's Works*.

There is nothing in this *first rise* of Methodism, that has the least resemblance of a Gospel Church, *four unconverted Students* met three or four times a week, there was no preaching, no ordinances, and not a converted person among them. At that time it was not a Church, and did not claim, to be one.

2. "The *SECOND RISE* of Methodism" (says Mr. Wesley) "was at Savannah, in Georgia, in April 1736, when twenty or thirty persons met in my house. After the evening service, as many of my parishioners as desire it, meet at my house, (as they do on Wednesday evening) and spend about an hour in prayer, singing and mutual exhortation. A smaller number (most of those who desire to communicate the next Sabbath) met here on Saturday evening; and a few of these

come to me on the other evenings, and pass half an hour in the same employment."

In this *Second rise* of Methodism, as described by Mr. Wesley, there is nothing that entitles it to be called a gospel Church, it did not claim to be a Church. When Mr. Wesley got into a difficulty, in consequence of his arbitrary and overbearing disposition, and left Savannah, for England at 8 o'clock in the night, with an indictment hanging over him, every vestige of Methodism left with him. Thus ended the second rise of Methodism without the formation even of a Society!

3. The *THIRD RISE* of Methodism, (says Mr. Wesley) was at London on May 1st 1737, when forty or fifty of us agreed to meet together every Wednesday evening, in order to have a *free conversation*, begun and ended with singing and prayer."—*Wesley's Works* v. 7. p. 348.

Again says Mr. Wesley, "In 1739 our *Society* consisted of about sixty persons. It continued gradually increasing all the year. In April I went down to Bristol, and soon a few persons agreed to meet weekly, with the *same intention* as those in London."—*Wesley's Works* v. 7. p. 349.

In this *third rise* of Methodism, there is no appearance of a Church. They met weekly for a *free conversation*, and opened and closed by singing and prayer. There was no preaching and no ordinances. It *was not*, and did not *claim to be a Church*. No intelligent Methodist will say it was a Church at this time.

Mr. Wesley never called *his Societies a Church*. He did not allow his preachers to administer the ordinance of baptism or the Lord's Supper, until he was in the 82nd year of his life! His Societies were merely of a social nature designed for *classical* and Spiritual improvement, without any Church organization.

For a period of *fifty five years* (from 1729 to 1784) Methodism never claimed to be a gospel Church.

Mr. Inskip, (a Methodist,) in his History of Methodism, p. 37, 38, says in the *beginning* Mr. Wesley did not conceive the idea of a Society at all. Afterwards, however, he consummated such an organization as he found to be suitable and necessary. But this organization *was not a distinct sect*, holding a particular formal creed, or prescribing any exclusive method or ceremonies of worship. It was a *Society in the Church*, (of England.) Hence those connected with the Societies, were earnestly and repeatedly warned of the *evil* of separating

from the Church," that is, the Church of England. Remember it was "he" John Wesley, not the Saviour or the Apostles, that formed these Societies! Remember also that Inskip says, they were "not a *distinct sect*," but was "a Society in the Church" of England, and were warned of *the evil of Separating from the Church*.

Even as late as 1780, the conference held in Baltimore, Maryland, in April, by a resolution urged their ministers to "continue in *close connexion* with the Church (of England) and press *all our people*, to a close communion with her." In N. C. C. Advocate April 16, 1857. "For a period of *fifty-five years*, Methodist Societies were composed of members mainly, who were *in the Episcopal Church*, this is overwhelming proof that the Methodist were not then a Church for they were Societies *in the Church of England*. Methodism, as such, did not administer the ordinance of Baptism or the Lord's Supper from its rise in 1729 to 1784, a period of fifty-five years! According to their own definition of the Church of Christ, they were not a Church, from 1729 to 1784, a period of 55 years.

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered see "Discipline, p. 16. The ordinance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were not administered in their Societies, until 1784, fifty-five years from its "first rise," consequently, by their own definition, they were not a "visible Church" from 1729 to 1784. In fact they have *never claimed*, that they were a Church, until 1784. This no intelligent Methodist will deny. If they were not a gospel Church *then*, they are not one *now*.

SECTION II.

That Mr. Wesley's Societies have no claim to be called a Church of Christ, is evident from the fact, that those who belonged to them, might at the same time be a regular member of another Christian denomination. I have already shown that they were mainly members of the Church of England, from 1729 to 1784, (55 years.)

Mr. Inskip, (a Methodist,) in his History of Methodism, p. 35, says, "one circumstance more is peculiar to the people called Methodists: that is, the terms upon which any person may be admitted into their Society. They do not impose, in order to their admission any opinions whatever. Let them be Church-men, or dissenter, Presbyterian

or Independents, *it is no obstacle*. The Presbyterian may be a Presbyterian still; the Independent or Anabaptist (Baptist) use his own mode of worship; so may the Quaker &c." Such a mixed Society as this, is no Church of Christ. God's Church does not keep such a disorderly house as this. He opens no such door of admission into his Church. He sets no such drag-net.

SECTION III.

Up to Sept. 10, 1784, fifty-five years after the first rise of Methodism, Mr. Wesley did all that he could, to keep *his Societies* both in England and America, in close connexion with the Episcopal Church.

In his letter of Sept. 10, 1784, Mr. Wesley says, "for many years, I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise the right, by ordaining part of *my* travelling Preachers. But I have still *refused*, not only for peace sake, but because I was determined as little as possible, to violate the established order of the Church *to which I belonged*."

Here it is conceded by Mr. Wesley, that there was no Methodist Church in England or America at the date of this letter, (1784.) *His Societies, his Preachers, and he*, (John Wesley) still belonged to the Church of England! Mr. Wesley lived and died a member of the Episcopal Church, he never separated from it. Although the father and founder of Schismatics, he never became one himself! Methodist generally think Mr. Wesley was a Methodist in the same sense that they are. He *never was* a member of the so called, "Methodist Episcopal Church." His societies in England have not to this day, assumed the style and name of a Church, they are still *called Societies*.

The announcement of the fact, that Mr. Wesley never was a Methodist in the same sense that they are, will be strange news to Episcopal Methodists! What! Old Bro. Wesley never an Episcopal Methodist!? I thought he was the father and founder, and just such a Methodist as I am! Not he! Mr. Wesley lived and died a member of the Church of England. In a sermon "on Schism," Mr. Wesley says: "I am now, and always have been from my youth, a member and minister of the Church of England. And I have *no desire, nor design to separate from it*, till my soul separates from my body." He kept his purpose. Wesley's Sermons, v. 2, 386. So far was Mr. Wesley from

being a Methodist in the sense that persons are *members* of the Methodist Church, he was actually *sorry* the separation of his Societies from the Church of England ever took place! Dr. Coke, in his letter to Bishop White (*which is now before me*) says. "And this I am *certain* of—that *he* (Wesley) *is now sorry for the separation!!*" This letter of Dr. Coke to Bishop White, was written after Wesley was dead, but before Coke heard of it.

SECTION IV.

If the Church of England in which Mr. Wesley lived and died, was a true Church of Christ, Methodist had no right to *leave it*, and found a new sect. It was causing *divisions*, for which Paul tells us to "*mark*" and "*avoid*" them, Rom. xvi, 17.

If the Episcopal Church is a gospel Church. Methodist are unwarrantable Schismatics, John Wesley being judge. By Schism is meant, separating from the gospel Church.

Mr. Wesley says of Schisms. "For how little a thing soever it may seem, and how innocent soever it may be accounted, *Schism*, even in this sense, (leaving the Church) is both *evil* in itself, and productive of *evil* consequences." Sermon on Schism v. 2, p. 334. Again Mr. Wesley says, "to separate ourselves from a body of living Christians with whom we were before united, is a grievous breach of the law of love." Ibid.—Again says Mr. Wesley "Take care how you *rend* the body of Christ by separating from your brethren. It is an evil in itself. It is a sore evil in its consequences &c." Ibid.—Again says Mr. Wesley, "Suppose the Church does not require me to do any thing which the Scripture forbids, or to omit any thing which the Scripture enjoins, it is then my indispensable duty to continue therein. And if I separate from it, without any such necessity, I am justly chargeable with all the evils consequent upon that separation." Ibid v. 2, p. 387. If it be an evil to separate from the Church, how much greater the *evil* when we add to that, the setting up of a new sect, or denomination!

Mr. Wesley believed the Episcopal Church to be a gospel Church, for he lived and died a member of it, and Drs. Coke, Asbury, and their coadjutors believed the same, and yet they *separated* from it, became guilty of Schism, and then added to this evil, a still greater one, that of originating a *new sect*, and calling it a Church! If then the Episcopal Church is a true gospel Church, Methodist, are to be "*marked*"

and "avoided" for causing a division by leaving it, and forming themselves into a Methodist Church.

If, however, the Church of England is not a true gospel Church, it follows that its offspring, Methodism, cannot be. "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit." The *Sprout* will partake of the nature of the root. "Who can bring forth a clean thing out of an unclean?—Not one." Job. xiv, 4. No stream can rise higher than its fountain.

The Episcopal Church as it is called, is a daughter of Rome, it is undeniably the offspring of papal and apostate Rome. "The Methodist Episcopal Church" as it is called, is the daughter of the Episcopal Church. Who set up the Church of England. Henry VIII, or the God of heaven? Who set up Methodism, John Wesley, or the God of heaven? That the God of heaven set up neither of them is evident.—He never set up but one and that was to "stand for ever," Dan. ii, 44. Jesus Christ is the head of his Church, see Eph. ii, 23: Col. v, 10.

Henry the VIII declared *himself the head* of the Church of England, when he threw off the Roman Catholic yoke, and organized the Episcopal Church.

If we admit that the Episcopal is a true gospel Church, Methodists are to be "marked" and "avoided" for leaving it! If it is not a true Church, its offspring, Methodism cannot be!! Either horn of this dilemma, is fatal to the claims of Episcopal Methodism, Consequently they are not a true Church of Christ.

SECTION V.

Methodism, though introduced into the United States in 1766, was not *called a Church*, and did not exercise the functions of one, until A. D. 1784.

The first Methodist Society was established in the City of New York, in 1766. The *first* preacher was Philip Embury, though he was a preacher when he left England, upon reaching this country and finding no Methodists he *relapsed*. Soon after, an Irish woman who was a zealous follower of Mr. Wesley, came to New York; and hearing of Mr. Embury's *declension*, fired with indignation she entered the room where Mr. Embury and others were assembled, and *snatched the cards* with which they were playing, and threw them into the fire. She then turned to Mr. Embury and said, "you must preach to us, or we shall all go to hell together." Mr. Embury, then passed from the card table to the pulpit, and formed the first Methodist Society that

was ever in the United States! See Cook's Estimate of Methodism, p. 231. In England, Methodism was introduced by Mr. Wesley *nine* years before he claims that he was a *converted man*! In America the first Society was raised by Mr. Embury, who as has just been shown, passed by the admonition of a woman, from the card table to the pulpit, and soon formed a Society!!

Up to this time there was no Methodist Church, either in England or America. They were merely Societies in the Church of England. Even to the present day, Methodism in England, *does not claim to be a Church*.

Dr. Bascom, afterwards a Methodist bishop says, "I will not dwell on the *fact* that the Methodists have never assumed the style of a Church in Europe." In the Mutual Rights. That God ever employed unconverted men to set up a gospel Church in his name is an idea too absurd to be believed. Yet if Methodism is a Church of God, it was commenced by unconverted men!

The first regular conference held in America, convened in Philadelphia July 4, 1773, but *as yet*, it did not claim to be a Church.— They were still members of the Church of England and received the ordinances there.

SECTION VI.

The *fourth rise* of Methodism took place in 1784, on the 25th day of December, in the City of Baltimore. At that time, there *Societies* were *transmuted* into "Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States."

Before this day, such a thing as the Methodist Episcopal Church was never heard of!

Mr. Inskip, a Methodist historian, says, "at this Conference in 1773 the *authority* of Mr. Wesley, and the *doctrine* and *discipline* of the Methodists, were formerly recognised and adopted. They also, continues Mr. Inskip, "agreed unanimously not to administer the sacraments, and all were exhorted to attend the Church (of England) and to receive the ordinances there," History of Methodism.

Notice, 1. As yet, they did not claim to be a Church, for Mr. Inskip tells us, they, (Methodists) did not administer the sacraments.

Notice, 2. They received the ordinances, (Baptism and the Lord's Supper) in the Church of England.

Notice, 3. Methodists still recognised the *authority* of Mr. Wesley.

Notice, 4. The doctrine and discipline of the Methodists, were recognized and adopted.

Notice, 5. Before this we hear nothing, not even one letter, syllable, or word, about a Methodist Church, we are simply told "the Methodists" did thus and so!

Notice, 6. "The Methodists" had no ordiances! No, not one, in 1773!! Even as late as December the 24, 1784, there was not, and never had been seen or heard of, any such organizations as "the Methodist Episcopal Church." Up to that day, no human ear ever heard the sound of these words! But listen! In the course of the next day, December the 25th 1784—What sound is that! Hark! It is the sound of "the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States!" "For on that day, then and there, did about Sixty of Mr. Wesley's traveling preachers (from whom every local preacher and private member was shut out) by a mere vote, transform themselves into "the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States!"

Did this make them a gospel Church? Does not every person know that naming a thing does not create it, or change its character?

After this *magic vote*, did they possess any principle, or any scripture warrant, that they did not before? Not one! They had adopted their *doctrine and discipline* eleven years before, and yet by voting themselves at *this time* into what they called a Church, *concedes the fact*, that in *their own estimation, they were not a Church before!* I have already proved that they never claimed to be a Church until this *magic vote*, in 1784. Does, or can any reflecting person, believe that a true gospel Church, was ever *voted into existence?* Lest the *uninitiated*, should think I am *jesting*, when I assert that it was by a *mere vote* of Sixty preachers, that "the Methodist Episcopal Church" as it is called, come into existence, I will prove it. "At this conference (1784,) we formed ourselves into a regular Church, by the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church."—*Lee's His. of Methodism.*

In his published *Journal*, Mr. Asbury, says, "Friday 24th (December) rode to Baltimore where we met a few preachers; it was AGREED to form OURSELVES into an Episcopal Church."

Notice, two Methodist witnesses say, we formed ourselves into a Church &c., that is the Conference. Every local preacher and private members was left out! If this was not a sham Church organization, it is hard

to conceive of one that would be. It was no more a gospel Church after this vote, than before. It is no more a true Church of Jesus Christ, than it would be if a Bible, Temperance, Missionary, or tract Society was to *vote itself* into a Church, and call itself the Bible, Temperance, Missionary, or Tract Episcopal Church of the United States!

The only difference that existed before, and after, this *magic vote*, was, that before Mr. Wesley sent over Dr. Coke with instructions to ordain preachers and administer the ordinances, by *Mr. Wesley's authority* they were not allowed to administer the ordinances! Afterwards, by *Mr. Wesley's authority, and his alone*, they had this privilege granted! See Mr. Wesley's letter of recommendation, dated Bristol, Sept. 10, 1784. For fifty five years Mr. Wesley kept his preachers from administering the ordinances.

☞ It cannot be denied, that the SAME AUTHORITY that *forbid*, and *prevented* the Methodist from administering the ordinances, from 1729, to 1784, gave them authority, in 1784 to administer them! ☞

There is not one word in the Bible that warrents John Wesley to *set up Societies*, in the Church of England, and after remaining there for fifty five years; for about sixty of his travelling preachers with Dr. Coke and Asbury at their head, to *form themselves* into a gospel Church, with the high sounding title of "the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States."

The gospel Church was set up by the God of heaven, one thousand seven hundred years before John Wesley was born! The gospel Church was set up by Christ and his apostles about A. D. 33, of this Church it is said "it shall never be destroyed, it shall stand forever," Dan. ii, 44.

The forming of Societies, in the Church of England by Mr. Wesley, and afterwards changing them by a *vote* into the so called "Methodist Episcopal Church by Mr. Wesley's preachers, seems to imply that in *their* estimation, the Church set up by the God of heaven, had *become extinct*, that the *gates of hell* had *prevailed against it*, or that *they* could *make an improvement upon it*!

The success of the American revolution, which resulted in freeing this country from England, brought about the organization of "the Methodist Episcopal Church," as it is called.—See *Wesley's Letter*.

It is a little remarkable that *this event* brought about this organization, when it is a known fact that during this war the traveling preachers were generally *Tories*. All, but *one*, that come from England.

went back upon the breaking out of the war. Such were their tory propensities," that they had to fly from the country—Mr. Asbury who figured so prominently afterwards among the Methodists, *concealed himself* for a season in the State of Delaware." Methodist Prot. Manual, p. 56. Mr. Wesley spoke and wrote against the American Revolution, he justified the tax on tea, &c., and proferred to *his Majesty, his services, to raise recruits for his army!*—See *Southey's Life of Wesley*, p. 306, in *Cooke's estimate of Methodism* p. 67.

As soon as Independence was obtained, and the Church of England ceased to be a national establishment, Mr. Wesley sent over Dr. Coke to ordain Ministers for the Societies and act as Superintendent. This was done in Sept. 1784, See Wesley's letter of Sept. 10.

Upon the arrival of Dr. Coke *in this country*, he and Mr. Asbury, together with about *sixty* of Mr. Wesley's travelling preachers as has already been shown, met in Baltimore, and VOTED THEMSELVES into "the Methodist Episcopal Church."

What Special qualification or *authority* had these sixty of Mr. Wesley's preachers to found a Church? Under whose authority did they act? From whom did they receive their commission? Answer, from John Wesley*. In 1784. Dr. Coke and Asbury as joint Superintendents, were *clothed with Mr. Wesley's authority to ordain ministers for the Societies, &c.*

Did Mr. Wesley authorize Dr. Coke and Asbury to convert his Societies and Ministers, into a Church? With Mr. Wesley's letter of recommendation before me, I say he did not. They were authorised to act as joint Superintendents to supply the people with preachers, that he did not authorise them to set up a Church, is evident from the following part of his letter, "whereas many of the people in the Southern provinces of North America *who desire to continue under MY CARE*, and *still adhere* to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England &c."

Dr. Coke in his letter to Bishop White says, "I am not sure but I *went further in the separation of our Church* in America than Mr. Wesley from whom I received my commission, DID INTEND." Again says Dr. Coke in that letter," "I am certain that he (Mr. Wesley) is NOW SORRY for the *separation*." Again says Dr. Coke in that letter, "In Europe, (England) where some steps had been taken tending to

* See Dr. Coke's Letter to Bishop White.

a separation (of Mr. Wesley's Societies from the Church of England,) all is at an end. Mr. Wesley is a *determined enemy of it.*"

By setting up a Church they violated their instructions in two particulars. 1. This took the people from under *the care* of Mr. Wesley. 2. It deprived them of the discipline of the Church of England.

3 Dr. Coke admits, that he went further than Mr. Wesley intended.

4. Dr. Coke informs us, that Mr. Wesley *was sorry* that the Separation had taken place!

He had cause to be sorry, for he had set on foot an *awful Schism*, his coadjutors had perfected it! they had assumed a prerogative that belongs to God. He alone has the right to set up a Church. Wesley and his preachers, had no more divine right to found a Church than *Lady Huntingdon*,* *Ann Lee*, or the Irish woman, that frightened Mr. Embury from the card table to the pulpit.

SECTION VII.

That the Methodist Episcopal Church is not a true Church of Jesus Christ, is evident from the fact that it is of *human origin*.

By most Methodist writers, Mr. Wesley is acknowledged to be the "father and founder of Methodism," four years after Methodism claimed to be a Church, Mr. Wesley, in his letter to Asbury, said "I am under God the *father* of the whole family."

"At this conference, (1784) *we formed* ourselves into a regular Church."—*Lee's His. of Methodism*.

Mr. Asbury, says, "It was *agreed to form* OURSELVES into an Episcopal Church."—*See his Journal*.

It is here conceded, that *they formed themselves* into a Church, it is consequently of *human origin*.

Rev. A. McCaine, a Methodist, says, "It has been universally admitted, that Messrs. John and Charles Wesley were the FOUNDERS of that religious denomination of people, called Methodists" Defence of the Truth &c., p. 11 As the Wesley's are the founders of the denomination called Methodist, it is of human origin.

Isaac Taylor a Methodist, in his work on "Wesley and Methodism," p. 199, says, "Wesleyism is a *Scheme*—it is the *product of uninspired intelligence*, and therefore *has its defects*."

*Lady Huntingdon, and Ann Lee, did become the leaders and founders of religious sects or denominations. Each of them had as good a right to found a new Church, as John Wesley Coke, Asbury & Co., and so had Joe Smith. Every person that sets up a new religious sect and calls it a Church, assumes the prerogative of God, who alone has the right to found a Church.

God's Church is not a human *Scheme*, it is not the product of uninspired intelligence, it has no defects. As Methodism is composed of *all three* of these, it is not a true Church of God.

Again says Mr. Taylor, p. 214, "But Wesleyism (Methodism) is the *work of man*."

Dr. Hinkle, a Methodist, in his "Platform of Methodism" says, "Methodism has from the beginning been in a most striking manner the child of Providence. Nearly all its peculiar characteristics were adopted without any previous design on the part of the instrumentalities by whose agency it was brought into existence, as *circumstances* seemed to require, and without any expectation of their becoming elements in a permanent ecclesiastical constitution."

God's Church was not dependent upon "circumstances" in its setting up—Methodism was, therefore it is not of God, but of man. God did not set up his Church by accident, "without any expectation" of it—Methodists did, therefore it is not a Church of God, but of man. The Church of Christ was not set up without any previous design"—Methodism was, therefore it is not of God, it is of human origin, an accident.

Mr. Inskip, a Methodist, in his History of Methodism says, "As a creature of Providence, Methodism, in her peculiar external organization, *has adapted herself to the exigences of the times * * ** and hence though *constantly changing*," &c.

The Church of Christ in its organization did not "adapt herself to the exigences of the times;" the Methodists did, therefore, their's is not a Church of Christ, it is of human origin.

The Church of Christ is not "constantly changing," the Methodist Church is, therefore it is of human origin. Their discipline is subject to change every four years. Again, Mr. Inskip says, "To meet the emergency &c. God raised up a company of great men—and *inventive genius*."

After mentioning J. Wesley, Whitefield, C. Wesley, Coke, Asbury, Clarke, and Benson, Mr. Inskip says, "*These men devised* this powerful instrumentality &c," that is Methodism.

The God of heaven set up his Church by *inspired men*. The Methodist Episcopal Church, was set up by men of *inventive genius*, therefore it is not a true Church of Christ.

The Church of God was "devised" by Himself, the Methodist Church was "devised by men of *inventive genius*," consequently, it is of human origin, a *human Society*. Again, on p. 65, Mr. Inskip says, "A more wise or better arranged system of religious and *moral enterprise*, could not have been conceived. Of course like all other *human institutions*, it has its *defects and imperfections*."

Here it is admitted by a leading Methodist Historian, that Methodism was "conceived" by man, that it is a "human institution."—Methodism is a "human institution," therefore it is not a Church of God. It is only a "*moral enterprise*."

On page 39, Mr. Inskip says, "Methodists are *the followers of Wesley*." The members of the Church of God, follow Christ. Methodists "follow Wesley" therefore they are not a Church of Christ.

Dr. Bangs in Original Church, p. 99. Says, Methodists acknowledge "Mr. Wesley as their spiritual *father and founder*."

Mr. Gorrie, a Methodist, in his History of Methodism, p. 217, says, Mr. Wesley "was the *founder—expounder—and originator* of much that is peculiar to the ecclesiastical polity &c., of the great Methodist body in the world."

Consequently it is of human origin.

In the North British Review, it is said "Wesley did not profess to be organizing a Church, on a *Scriptural basis*. His Institute (Methodism) was the *product of his own wisdom and sagacity*, and must be subject to the fluctuations and instability of *all merely HUMAN THINGS*."

As Methodism is merely a "human thing," it is not a Church of Christ.

As Mr. Wesley was the "*head*" of Methodism, and was gladly acknowledged by "his followers" as their *founder and rightful director*, it is not a true Church. No gospel Church, will admit as its "head," "founder" or "rightful director," any human being, Christ is the only "head, founder and rightful director" of his Church.

Rev. A. Stevens, in his Church Polity, published by the Methodist Book concern: says, "At the *head* of this system (of Methodism) stood Wesley, *gladly acknowledged* by the increasing thousands of his *followers*, as the *founder*, and *rightful director* of the whole."

Again Mr. Stevens says: "Methodism pretends to NO DIVINE RIGHT." I have fully established the fact, that Methodism is of *human origin*, *human* and consequently is not a Church of Christ.

SECTION VIII.

The organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church; is *too modern*, to be a Church of Christ.

The Church of God was, by Him, set up "in the days these kings" Dan. 2: 44, that is, of the Roman kings. The Jews were under tribute to the Cæsars, at the setting up of the gospel Church, Mark. xii: 14.

About A. D. 33, the God of Heaven set up the Gospel Church.— About one thousand seven hundred and fifty years afterwards, "the Methodist Episcopal Church" was *voted* into existence by *sixty* of Mr. Wesley's traveling preachers!

It dates as Methodism, from 1729, and as a Church, from 1784, just seventy-four years ago! Unless Methodists can show a *Scripture warrant*, that Drs. Coke, and Asbury, and the *sixty* of Mr. Wesley's preachers, who *voted themselves* into a Church, were authorized to set up a Church in 1784, their claim to be a true Church of Christ, is not valid. Instead of showing a divine warrant to organize a Church. Dr. Stevens says, "It *pretends to no divine right*." consequently it is not a Church of Christ.

SECTION IX.

The lineage of "the Methodist Episcopal Church" is unfavorable to its being a true Church. Mr. Wesley, its "father and founder," was a member of the Church of England, ~~and~~ He lived and died a member of it. ~~The~~ The Episcopal Church is a daughter of the Church of Rome, and "the Methodist Episcopal Church," is a daughter of the Episcopal Church.

The only way that it can claim descent from the Church set up by the Saviour and his apostles, is, to admit that Methodism, as a Church, dwelt in the Church of England from A. D. 1600, to A. D. 1784, a period of 184 years, and that it dwelt previously, in the Romish Apostacy, for at least 1300 years. That Methodism did dwell in the Church of England for fifty-five years, has already been shown. Methodism, cannot prove descent from the witnessing Church that fled into the wilderness from the persecuting power of Rome. Methodist had no existence before the Reformation, and none afterwards as a Church for 260 years.

All know the day when Henry the VIII, out of love for the beautiful Anne, threw off the yoke of the Pope, and took upon himself the

title of "the supreme head of the Church," in consequence of a quarrel between him and the Pope, about his marriage. Again, all know the day when Mr. Wesley's societies came out of the Church of England, by a vote of sixty preachers, and by that *magic vote* became known as "the Methodist Episcopal Church!"

As the Church of England came out of the Church of Rome, and the Methodist Episcopal Church came out of that, the unfavorableness of its lineage, to be a true Church, is fully established. Methodists can claim no other descent, for their "father and founder," John Wesley, was a member of the Church of England, and so were Methodists generally, from 1729 to 1784, a period of fifty-five years.

SECTION X.

In many respects, "the Methodist Episcopal Church" resembles its parentage, in its doctrines, ceremonies, &c.

Dr. Bond, a Methodist, in his "Economy of Methodism," p. 20, says, "Our doctrines are avowedly those of the Episcopal Church."

Mr. Wesley, in his letter of Sept. 10. 1784, says of the American Methodists "They desire to continue under *my care*, and still adhere to the *doctrines* and *discipline* of the Church of England."

Again, Mr. Wesley, in a subsequent letter, addressed to Drs. Coke, Asbury, &c, says, "I have prepared a *liturgy*, little differing from that of the Church of England, which I advise all the preachers to use," &c.

That the Episcopal prayer-book is of Popish origin, that their rites and ceremonies are taken from Rome, and that the Methodist doctrines, ceremonies, &c., are borrowed from the Church of England, is an incontestable fact.

Rev. E. T. Wirkler, in his letters on Episcopacy, in the South Western Baptist of 1853, says: "The prayer-book was compiled from the Romish Missels," &c. Indeed, almost the entire table of collects, now contained in the prayer book, is *identical* with that of the Roman Sacramentary, &c. In the Bible, the xiv Psalm has *seven* verses, but the prayer book, following the old Romish service, gives it *eleven*."

That the Methodist have compiled their articles, ordination service, matrimony, service for baptism, the Lord's supper, changing rites and ceremonies, fasting on *Fridays*, &c., in a good degree, from Rome, through the Church of England will not be denied by any that will

compare them. That none may take my *ipse dixit*, I will give an example :

Romish Service for Marriage.

THE VOW.—“ I, M., take thee, N., to be my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part, if holy Church will permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth. ”

Methodist Service for Marriage.

THE VOW ;—“ I, M., take thee, N., to be my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death do us part, according to God's holy ordinance ; and thereto I plight thee my faith. ”

Reader, did you ever see a more striking likeness between *mother, daughter and granddaughter*, than exists between the marriage service of the Romish, Episcopal and Methodist denominations ?

SECTION XI.

The Church government of the Methodist Episcopal Church is unscriptural, Anti-Republican and Anti-American.

1. It is unscriptural. The New Testament knows nothing of *courts of appeal*. In the government of the Methodist Church there are courts of appeal. An appeal may be taken from a circuit rider to a Quarterly Conference, from that to the Annual Conference, from that to the General Conference. The New Testament furnishes no example of any such ecclesiastical Courts of appeal. An appeal from the decision of an individual Church to another body, has no scripture warrant, yet this is one of the great peculiarities of Methodism ! The only great ecclesiastical body that assembled in the days of the Apostles, was at Jerusalem when the Church at Antioch sent to them for *advice*. They carried up *no case of appeal*, they *had made no decision*. When this advisory counsel met, it consisted of the Apostles, Elders and *the whole Church*, they all sat together and deliberated upon the question before them, and they *all voted*, private members, Apostles and Elders. “ Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders, *with the whole Church* to send *chosen men*, &c,” Acts, xv : 22. How unlike this apostolic counsel, is a Methodist Conference ! In the former, ministers and private members were *seated, deliberated and voted together*. In the latter, every *local preacher*, and *private member* is excluded ! !

The sight of a local preacher, or private member that ever held a seat in a Methodist Annual or General Conference, would be as effectual in curing King's Evil, (Scrofula,) as the touch of Kings ! The sight of a private member or local preacher, that ever *voted* for a delegate to the Conference, would be as effectual in curing the consumption, as the "Cherry Pectoral," or "Wister's Balsam of Wild Cherry !"

In the apostolic age, all the churches were *independent bodies*, and each one exercised discipline, independent of any other Church, or ecclesiastical body, its own decisions were final, there were no courts of appeal, for proof of this, see Matt., viii : 17 ; 1 Cor., v : 18.

The Apostolic Churches were independent bodies, each congregation, or individual Church exercised discipline for itself, and was an independent Church, hence we read of "Churches of Asia," "Churches of Galatia," each congregation of Baptized believers, was a Church, there was no such consolidated Church as the *Church of Asia*, the *Church of Galatia*, but "*the Churches*," from which it is evident that each congregation was a Church of itself. How unlike this is the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States." "The Methodist Episcopal Church, North," "The Methodist Episcopal Church, South." At first, there was but *one* Methodist Episcopal Church, for the whole United States ! Now since the division, there are *two* ! ! There is not a Methodist Episcopal Church in North Carolina ! There is in the *whole State*, but a *piece of one* ! ! For it takes *all* of the Annual Conferences of preachers, the local preachers, and members of the *societies*, to constitute "the Methodist Episcopal Church, South ! ! " The Scriptures know nothing of such a Church as this. They know no gospel Church, where each baptized believing congregation, is not a Church of itself.

There never was a "Methodist Episcopal Church," as it is called, organized or constituted in this State ! A *great to do*, is made of the *Dedication of a New House for Worship*, among the Methodists, many announcements of this kind are made in their "Advocates." But no one ever saw it announced that a "Methodist Episcopal Church" was to be *constituted*, at any time or place in North Carolina ! Neither has any such *constitution ever happened*. After it was over I have seen it announced, that at such a time and place, "*a class*," or "*society*," was *formed* ! A class or society, is not a "Methodist Episcopal Church," and does not claim to be. Methodists do not consider, or style, a *class*, or *society*, a "Methodist Episcopal Church."

2 The government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is anti-republican.

The private members have no *vote*, or *voice*, as to who shall preach for them, or how much they must pay them, their part in the system of Methodism, is to PAY and OBEY. *Obe*y all that Conference puts in the discipline *every four years*, and *pay* the preachers, and other expenses, without even *one vote*, as to whom they shall pay, or how much! The private members are *taxed* without the right of representation.—this is tyranny. It is anti-republicanism.

Dr. Bascom, afterwards a bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church, says, "It is a little remarkable, that there is no Church on earth, totally rejecting the representative principle in matters of government, except the Romish and Methodist Episcopal Church. It may indeed appear invidious to institute a comparison between the Pope of Rome and his cardinals, and the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the traveling Ministry, but the resemblance, so far as legislative prerogative is concerned, is EXACT. If this be denied, we invite the friends of the reigning state of things to point out the dissimilarity—"

Mutual Rights.

Dr. Bascom asserts that the *likeness* between the legislative prerogative of the Romish and Methodist Churches, "is exact." This will not appear strange, when it is recollected, that the parties are somewhat related.

This anti-republican feature, is of its "father and founder," John Wesley, and those staunch *Britons*, Coke and Asbury, who were the *leading spirits* in its formation. John Wesley denounced John Hancock, President of the American Congress, as a "smuggler," and a "felon." He says: "I do in this respect—I compare every smuggler to a felon—a private smuggler to a sneaking felon, a pickpocket—a noonday smuggler to a bold felon, a robber on the highway. And if a person of this undeniable character, is made President of a Congress, I leave every man of sense to determine what is to be expected of them."—*Wesley's Works*.

Again, Mr. Wesley says: "The supposition that the people are the *origin of power*, is in every way indefeasible. You (Americans,) profess to be contending for liberty, it is a *vain empty profession*. No governments under Heaven, are so despotic as the *Republicans*; no subjects

are governed in so arbitrary a manner as those of a commonwealth."

Wesley's Works.

From the following words, Mr. Wesley seems not to have been more friendly to religious liberty, than to civil. Let it be remembered that Mr. Wesley was a member of the Church of England, and that all American citizens were *taxed* to sustain it. Speaking of the American Independence, Mr. Wesley says, "Probably that *subtle spirit* hoped, by adding to all those other vices, the spirit of Independency, to have *overturned the whole work of God*, as well as the British Government in North America." Mr. Wesley evidently attributes the spirit of Independence that freed us from the tyranny of England, to the *devil*! See his Sermons, vol. 3, p. 406.

It seems to me, that he considered the "whole work of God," to be confined to the established Church, and his *infant child*, Methodism, that was then nourishing itself in the bosom of that establishment, under the name of Mr. Wesley's Societies, but still members of the Church of England! No wonder, as has been seen, Mr. Wesley offered his services to His Majesty, to recruit the English army, to murder our forefathers!

Many of Mr. Wesley's preachers, during the Revolutionary war,—were Tories and fled to England, or took refuge among the Tories,*

See Wesley's Life of Asbury.

No wonder that Methodist *traveling* preachers, have such an abhorrence of Republicanism, as still to *tax* their people *without representation*.

In 1790, six years after Methodism came to its maturity by the *magic vote*, of sixty uninspired preachers and was known as a Church but about *one year before his death*; Mr. Wesley writes to Mr. Mason as follows "As long as I live the *people* shall have no share in choosing stewards or leaders among the Methodist. We have not, nor never had any such customs. ~~See~~ *We are no republicans, never intend to be.*"—*Wesley's works*. v, 7, p. 98.

In the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as it is called, there is no representation, the traveling preachers are a *self appointed aristocracy*, have *no constituents*. The traveling ministers meet in conference and make, alter, amend or annul, such laws, rites and ceremonies

*Among the local preachers, there were some Whigs.

as suit themselves, and then publish them in the Discipline, making it a criminal act for any local preacher or private member, to "inveigle" against them, under the penalty of being reprimanded, or excluded; while at the same time, the local preachers and private members are not represented, and have no *vote* or *voice* in said conference!

Perhaps it will be said, if the local Preachers and private members, are satisfied to remain members of this self-appointed aristocracy and be *taxed* without representation, what is that to me, or any other person? There are various reasons, but at present I will confine myself to one, This self appointed aristocracy and self-created Church, claims that it is a Church of the living God, that it is entitled to be recognized as such, by all mankind. It *demand*s that its claims be admitted, at the peril of our being charged with being unchristian, selfish, and incorrigible bigots. This being the case, I have a right to investigate its claims, and state my objection to it.

That the ministers in General Conference assembled are *legislators without constituents*, was clearly proved by the Methodist Church South, in the trial for their part of the Book fund. In the United States' Court, Judge Nelson presiding, Mr. Lord and Hon. Reverly Johnson, were counsel for the Church South. Mr. Johnson, in the defence of their suit, said, "They (the preachers) *admit NO CONSTITUENTS. They resolve for themselves alone*, as the possessors of all ecclesiastical power known to the Methodist Church, to carry out the particular organization *authorized by John Wesley**, without *any other AUTHORITY* than *his*, and their *own conviction* that the good of the Church demanded such a special and particular organization."—Church Property case, p. 328. Reader, if you are a Methodist, seriously consider the preceeding and following extracts :

Again Mr. Johnson says, "The Methodist Episcopal Church, as regards its government, has been absolutely, since the days of Wesley, an *Aristocracy*. *Laymen* have had and now have *no voice* in it. If there is a layman within the sound of my voice, he knows he has *no voice now*."

Again, Mr. Johnson, says, "It is a body *UNLIMITED* in the *authority* to *CREATE*, equally unlimited in the *authority* to *DESTROY*, responsible

* *Authorized* by John Wesley, not by the God of heaven.

only to *their consciences* for the manner in which either authority is exercised."—*Church Property, case p. 331.*

Here it is conceded by able counsel that "the Methodist Episcopal Church," is an *aristocracy*, in which no private member, or local preacher, ever had a voice, "they the preachers admit no constituency."

It is also asserted by Mr. Johnson that the General Conference is *unlimited* in its power to "*create*," or "*destroy*." It has by a *vote* CREATED ITSELF, by a *vote*, it has *divided itself*, by a *vote*, each of these divisions *may divide again*, or if they choose they may by a *vote* annihilate their Church organization! For Mr. Johnson says, their power is "*unlimited*," both "*to create*" and "*to destroy*." By a mere vote, they may exist to day, to morrow, they may not be!

No such institution as this was ever set up by the God of heaven, it is the "product," the "scheme" of men of "inventive genius." Can any reflecting and unprejudiced mind believe, that a religious Society, that is *unlimited in its power to create, or destroy*, is a true and Scriptural Church of Christ?

The Word of God asserts that his Church "shall never be destroyed," "shall stand forever" that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against it." If the gospel Church is unlimited in its power to create or destroy, it could blot out its existence by a mere vote!!!

Mr. Lord, who was instructed by the same committee that Mr. Johnson was, said. "If that body (the Conference in December 1784) had chosen to become *Socinion*, if it had chosen to adopt the Presbyterian or Baptist forms either of government or doctrine, it *was in their power to do it*. There was *no limit*. They represented the Church; THEY WERE THE CHURCH. * * * The laity were not known &c."—*Church Property case p. 153.*

Mr. Lord tells us, the preachers, the conference, "are the Church." "The laity were not known."

That freborn American citizens can consent to belong to such an aristocratic, anti-republican system of Church government is a *mystery*. Many of them are getting *ashamed* of their *degraded* position in the system of Methodism, they are beginning to awake up, and soon will teach their ministers a lesson that they will never forget. The days of ministerial despotism are numbered. The laity have too much intel-

egence to submit to a hierarchy, that has "no constituents" and where "the laity are not known."

SECTION XII.

With the preceeding and other testimony before me, I am warranted in saying the private members are not in a Church at all.

In order to obtain their part of the Book concern, which amounted to nearly half a million of dollars, it was necessary for the Church South, to prove that the embodiment of Methodism was in the General Conference, that *it was the Church*, and had power to divide independent of the laity. By proving that they had *no constituents*, that the "laity were not known" they gained their suit. As the ministers in General Conference assembled, "are the Church," "have no constituents," and where "the laity were not known," how can it be said that the private members and local preachers, who have no seat, vote or voice there, are in a Church? Perhaps it may be explained in this way, A. B. is asked, "is your family well?" He includes in his answer, all that live with him, whether they occupy apartments in the *Big House*, or in the *Kitchen*.^{*} The travelling preachers, including the Bishops, are the "aristocracy," and compose "*the Church*," the local preachers and private members compose the *Classes and Societies*. A class or Society, is not a Church, and private member have no membership any where else. *The private members have never been organized into a Church.* When the "Methodist Episcopal Church," was organized there was not one private member present; for Mr. Asbury says, "We met a *few Preachers*; it was agreed to form *ourselves* into an Episcopal Church."—*Asbury's Journal*.

It was a *few preachers*, and not the members of the classes and societies that formed themselves into a Church.

Again Mr. Lee, in his "History of Methodism," says, "we formed *ourselves* into a regular Church" i. e. "we" the preachers formed, *ourselves*."

The fact, that private members and local preachers are in the bounds of an Annual Conference, and belong to a *class or society*, does not prove that they are members of the Church, for it has been shown that "they (the General Conference) are the Church," and "have no constituents." "The laity were not known."

^{*}Please pardon this homely and common place illustration.

It is however said, the bishops, conferences, traveling and local preachers, and laity, all taken together, constitute the Methodist Episcopal Church, and consequently the private members are in the Methodist Church. I have already shown, that *by proving the reverse* of this, the Church South gained nearly half a million of dollars! When Methodist are striving for *dollars and cents*, the conference, the ministers "are the Church," and "have no constituents" the "laity are not known," but when they want *members*, &c., they have *constituents*, the Societies are known, and recognised as members!! Even if it were admitted that the laity are members of the so called, Methodist Episcopal Church, it would avail them nothing, for I have abundantly shown that *it*, is not a Scriptural Church, that it is of human origin, and was devised by men of "inventive genius" &c.

That private members and local preachers are not in a Church, is evident from the following case. In the 18 chap. and 15, 16 and 17, verses our Saviour gives direction for the settlement of private offences; when other means have failed, the offended brother is directed to "tell it unto the Church." Can a private member of the so called Methodist Church obey this command? Can he find the Methodist Church? His class is not the Church, his society is not, his preacher is not, the quarterly conference is not, as for the conference it has "no constituents," there the "laity are not known," they have no seat, vote or voice there! Methodist cannot obey the Saviour's command, "tell it to the Church," consequently they are not in a Church! All that are *in a Church* can easily find it.

If the members of the classes and societies, are members of "the Methodist Episcopal Church," as it is called, it is somehow in this way, they are *tyed to it by a long rope** that reaches from the General Conference, "the Church" where "the laity are not known," to the *classes*. At the *paying and obeying* end of the rope (System) the private members and local preachers are *fastened in the first knot*. The *second knot* contains the *class leaders*, immediately *over the people*. The *third knot* contains the *Circuit Riders*, *over the class leaders*. The *fourth knot* contains the *Presiding Elders*, *over the circuit Riders*. The *fifth knot* contains the *bishops over the Elders*, circuit Riders &c. The *sixth knot*, contains the Annual Conferences headed by one bishop, which regulates

*Please pardon this *unclassic*, figurative illustration.

all the knots below. The *seventh knot*, ties the bishops, Annual Conferences, travelling preachers, class leaders, local preachers, and laity to the General Conference.

SECTION XIII.

The unscriptural membership of "the Methodist Episcopal Church" is not favorable to its being a true Church of Christ.

The Scriptures represent the Church as composed of persons who are "born again," new creatures, "lively stones," "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son." "Made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light," "believers," &c.

On the day of Pentecost we have a full development of the Church of Christ. See Acts, ii, 37, 38, 41, 44.

1. The word was preached. 2. The people were powerfully awakened. 3. Peter said to them repent and be baptized &c. 4. They that gladly received his word were baptized and added to the Church. 5. "*And all that believed were together.*"

This Jerusalem Church, evidently consisted of believers only, for we are told, that "*all that believed were together.*" As only believers "were together," it is evident the Church consisted of believers.

In addition to believers, Methodists add to *their Societies*, seekers and unconscious infants, for neither of which, is there a command or example in the New Testament. *In every case*, the passages that are referred to in the New Testament to prove the right of infants to baptism, fail to speak of *both* baptism and infants; if the passage speaks of *infants*, it says not one word about *baptism*! If it speaks of *baptism*, it fails to say one word about *infants*!! This is a significant fact. The passages that are referred to, as proving the right of seekers to join the Church, or come to the Lord's Supper, are in the same dilemma. The New Testament gives no command or example for the admission of seekers or penitents, to the Church or to the communion.

Their main argument is, joining the Church, and partaking of the Lord's Supper, are *means of grace*, and that some have been converted soon after joining the Church, or at the communion table. As this is not a Scripture argument, and it is not known whether the cases referred to were genuine cases of conversion, I shall not stop to consider it.

The definition which Mr. Wesley and the Discipline give of the Church of God, excludes unconverted seekers.

The Discipline p. 16, defines the Church as follows: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men &c." By *faithful men*, *believers* are meant, for Mr. Wesley says, "By faithful men the compilers meant, men endued with *living faith*. This brings the Article to a still nearer agreement to the *account given by the Apostle*." Sermon on the Church.

Mr. Wesley was speaking of the 19th Article of the Church of England, from which the definition of the Church in the Discipline, was taken. This definition of the visible Church, "a congregation of faithful men" that is of "men endued with *living faith*" is a bar to the right of mere seekers or penitents to the Church.

The description which Mr. Wesley gives of those "that are properly the Church of God" excludes seekers &c., from the Church. He represents the Church as consisting of "those whom God has *called out* of the world," "The saints, the holy persons." Again he describes those who compose the Church as follows; "In whom there is *one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism*."—Sermon on the Church.

In those who properly belong to the Church, there "is one Spirit." "Does a believer and a seekers possess *one spirit*? Do they possess *one hope*? and *one faith*? If they do not, seekers have no right to membership with believers, John Wesley being judge.

The Acts of the Apostles report quite a number of revivals, and conversions, but not one instance is recorded of an Apostle advising a penitent, or seeker, to join the Church, or go to the Lord's Supper as a *means of grace*. They invariably gave very different instruction. It was reserved for men of "inventive genius," to learn that joining the Church and partaking of the Lord's Supper were "means of grace" to the unconverted!

On one occasion at least, *seeker* membership has been advocated for a very different reason, than its being a means of grace. An old gentleman of Wake County, N. C., now deceased, who was a reliable man, stated to a Baptist Minister who now resides in said County, that "soon after the close of the Revolutionary War, he was in a class meeting, the Minister present invited seekers to join the Church. Some ob-

jection being made, the Minister remarked, the United States have now obtained their Independence and some denomination will be established by law. *We are trying to increase our numbers as fast as possible, in order that ours may become the Established Church.*—It was very natural that they should incline that way, as they had been nourished in an Established Church for fifty-five years!

The following case related by Rev. Wm. Annan, gives some idea of the false impressions that seeker-membership and seeker-communion engender in the minds of those who are brought under its influence, “on a Methodist communion season, where seekers were invited to partake as a means of grace; at the close of the communion, a young man from the back part of the house came forward and stepping up to the minister, said: “I came here to get religion, but I liked to forgot it.”—The sacrament was administered to him.”

There is nothing in the Discipline that requires that members shall be true believers, or converted persons, a whole class or society may exist without necessarily including a converted person. That they receive true believers, is admitted, but still their Societies may exist without them. In the Discipline p. 23, the term of admission is as follows: “*There is only one condition* previously required of those who desire admission into these Societies, “*a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins?*”

The New Testament opens no such door of admission into the Church of God. It requires faith, if “*thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.*” “*And when they believed, they were baptized both men and women.*” There is no identity between the door of admission into the Church of God, and that of the Methodist Societies, consequently their terms of membership are unfavorable to their being a Gospel Church.

☞ The New Testament knows nothing of a *six month probation*, before full membership. ☞

SECTION XIV.

The 1st section, in the first chapter of the Book of Discipline, is *not in accordance with facts.*

1 It states that Mr Wesley “*preferred the Episcopal mode of Church government to any other.*” Is this true? If so, how are we to reconcile it with the following facts?

In *early life*, Mr. Wesley zealously espoused Episcopacy. In 1764 a gentleman was travelling in England who claimed to be a Greek Bishop, and styled himself ERASMUS *Bishop of Arcadia*. Mr Wesley "strongly pressed this supposed Greek Bishop to consecrate *him a Bishop at large*."* It is also said this supposed Bishop *did ordain* a few of Mr. Wesleys preachers, who officiated in, and dressed as clergymen of the Church of England! The reason that Mr. Wesley failed of being ordained a universal Bishop, was, as stated by Erasmus, that it required the presence of *two* Bishops, to ordain a Bishop.

Soon after this, as will soon be seen, Mr. Wesley *changed his opinion* upon this subject.

That Mr. Wesley *did change* his opinion, and give up his preference for Episcopacy is evident. At the time of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as it is called, Mr. Wesley *did not prefer* the Episcopal mode of Church government.

1. Mr. Wesley says, "Lord King's account of the Primitive Church *convinced me* many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters, are the *same order*" *Wesley's Works* v. 7 page 311.

With this opinion, how could Mr. Wesley "prefer the Episcopal mode of Church government?"

2. In his Notes on Phil. i. 1., Mr. Wesley says, the names Bishop, and Presbyter, or elder being promiscuously used in the first ages &c."

How could Mr. Wesley, *prefer* Episcopacy and make it a *higher order*, when he says, it is the same as presbyter or elder?

3. Mr. Wesley says, "that it (Episcopacy) is *prescribed in Scripture*, I do not believe." This opinion, which I once zealously exposed, I HAVE BEEN ASHAMED of, ever since I read bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*. — *Wesley's Works* v. 7.

With these words of Mr. Wesley before him, who can—who will believe that in 1784, he preferred the Episcopal mode of Church government?

4. When Mr. Wesley heard that Messrs. Coke and Asbury, had assumed the title of bishops, he wrote to Mr. Asbury as follows; "How can you dare suffer yourself to be called a bishop? I shudder at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a Scoun-

*For proof of this, see Toplady, and other writers.

drel and I am content, but they shall never by my consent call me a bishop. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ sake, put a full end to this."

Can any person read this and believe the truth of the declaration in the first chapter of the Discipline, that Mr. Wesley 'preferred the Episcopal mode of Church government?"

5. Mr. Wesley styled *bishops*, of *higher order* than *Presbyter* or *Elder*, *heathenish priest* and *mitered infidels*. He says, "For these *forty years* I have been in great doubt concerning that question, "what obedience is due to *heathenish priest and mitred infidels*," * * * Some obedience I always paid to bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land, * * * I still submit to *mitered infidels*,"—*Wesley's Works*.

With these words of Mr. Wesley before him, who will, who can believe that he "preferred the Episcopal mode of Church government?"

2. Again, the bishops in the first chapter of the book of Discipline say, Mr. Wesley "set apart Dr. Coke, for the Episcopal office, and delivered to him letters of Episcopal orders," and commissioned and directed him "to set apart Francis Asbury for the same Episcopal office," and that "Mr. Asbury was set apart for the same Episcopal office."

Are these things true? Did Wesley ordain Coke a *bishop* of a *higher order* than a *presbyter*? Did he intend to set him apart as a bishop of the *third order*, and superior to a *presbyter*? If so, he conferred upon him the title of "heathenish priest and mitred infidel." For this is what he styled, *prelatitital bishops*!

The evidence that I have just submitted, to prove that Mr. Wesley *did not prefer* the Episcopal mode of Church government, also proves that he did not set apart Dr. Coke, as a bishop, and deliver to him, letters of Episcopal orders &c. In Mr. Wesley's letter of appointment, there is not one word about a *bishop*, Episcopal office, or instructions to set apart Asbury to the said Episcopal office.

In this letter setting forth the appointment of Dr. Coke, Mr. Wesley says, "I have this day set apart as a *Superintendent* &c., Dr. Thomas Coke." He does not call him a bishop, or use any word that implies that he set him apart as a bishop and superior to a *Presbyter*.

For the preceeding fifty five years, Mr. Wesley had withheld from his preachers, the right to administer the ordinances. He sent over Dr. Coke to ordain ministers, supply the Societies with the ordinances, and at the same time act as *Superintendent to keep the people un-*

der the care of Mr. Wesley. In this letter of appointment Mr. Wesley says, "Whereas many of the people &c., who *desire to continue under MY CARE, &c.*"

Dr. Coke was a Superintendent *under* Mr. Wesley, and derived his authority from him. How could he be a bishop, and still be under Mr. Wesley, who was only a presbyter? The idea of a Presbyter, ordaining a man bishop, to keep the people *under his care*, is absurd in the extreme! Mr. Wesley never intended to put Dr. Coke in a higher office than he (Wesley) held himself. Mr. Asbury said, "Mr. Wesley and I, are like Cæsar and Pompey,—he (Wesley) will bear no equal, and I (Asbury) will bear no superior."*—See Wesley's Letter of Oct., 31, 1789.

No man knew Wesley better than Asbury, he tells us, Wesley "will bear no equal." Asbury being judge, Wesley never intended by setting apart Dr. Coke a superintendent, to put him in an office *equal to*, much less, *superior to himself*!

If Mr. Wesley ordained Coke a bishop of a higher order than a presbyter, the *less power, created the greater*.

Even if Mr. Wesley had intended to ordain Dr. Coke, to the Episcopal office, it would only have been a *Spurious* Episcopacy, for he was only a presbyter himself! If he created Coke a bishop of higher order than presbyter, Wesley put a greater official power over his followers than he possessed himself! That he did not do this is evident from the fact, that he, as Asbury says, could "bear no equal," much less a superior and that upon hearing that Coke and Asbury, had assumed the title, and were exercising the office of bishops, he remonstrated, and said, "For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this," telling them at the same time "I am the *father* of the whole family,—you are the *Elder brother*." Wesley was perfectly shocked at the idea of an "elder brother," having more *power and authority* over his "children" than he possessed! That I am not mistaken, is evident, from Mr. Wesley's own words in a letter dated London Oct. 31, 1789. He says, "I was importuned to send some of *my children* to America &c., &c. I was therefore a little surprised when I received some letters from Mr. Asbury, affirming that no person in Europe knew how to direct those in America. Soon after, he (Asbury) flatly refused to receive Mr. Whatcoat in the character I sent him."

How cruel! what base ingratitude!! How could Asbury treat father Wesley so ungratefully?" Let him answer, "I will bear no superior."

That Mr. Wesley set apart Coke a superintendent *under him*, and did not create him a bishop is evident from the fact, that Mr. Wesley says, "I have appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to be *joint* superintendents over our brethren in America." This explains the whole mystery. Asbury was set apart in 1772 and Coke in 1784, the office was the same, Asbury was set apart with the title of "General Assistant," and overseer under Wesley. An American Methodist says, "In appointing Mr. Asbury a general Assistant, he (Wesley) constituted him the head of all the preachers and societies in America, but under

*There is a world of truth in this.

the general direction of Mr. Wesley, to whom he (Asbury) made regular reports." No one is at a loss to know what kind of an office Asbury held *under Wesley*. No one will assert that Asbury was a bishop while acting under Mr. Wesley as general Assistant, from 1772 to 1784, a period of twelve years. Asbury was set apart in 1772, Coke in 1784 and yet Mr. Wesley says, "I have set apart Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to be *joint superintendents*." If the appointment of Asbury by Wesley in 1772 did not make him a bishop, the setting apart of Dr. Coke in 1784 did not make him a bishop, for Wesley says, "I have appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury, to be *joint superintendents* over our brethren in North America."

It is said Dr. Coke set apart Mr. Asbury, to the Episcopal office.—He only set him apart as a Superintendent, but this was a work of Supererogation, for Mr. Wesley says, ~~and~~ "I appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to be joint Superintendents." ~~and~~ They were *equal in office* by Mr. Wesley's appointment. If Coke was a bishop, so was Asbury, if the ordination of Asbury by Coke *raised him any higher than he was before*. Asbury was *one degree* higher in office than Coke! while Coke was bishop, Asbury was Archbishop!!

It is said superintendent and bishop mean the same thing, that the appointment of Superintendent, was the same as bishop. A superintendent is not necessarily a bishop, a superintendent is one that acts for another, as Coke and Asbury did for Wesley. This *quibble*, about these words meaning the same thing, is decided by Mr. Wesley.

If he understood the words to mean the same, and did set apart Coke to the Episcopal office, as the bishops in the first chapter of the Discipline say he did, why did Mr. Wesley write to Asbury as follows? "One instance of this *your greatness*, has given me great concern.—How can you, *dare*, suffer yourself to be called a bishop? I shudder, I start, at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content, but they shall never by my consent, call me a bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ sake, put a full end to this! See Wesley's letter to Asbury.

Rev. A. McCaine a Methodist Prot. says, "If Mr. Wesley did approve of the proceedings of Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and the conference of 1784, let the evidence of it be produced. If Methodist Episcopacy had Mr. Wesley's approbation, it will be strange if nothing of this approbation, can be found among all of Mr. Wesley's, Dr. Coke's, or Mr. Asbury's papers. To produce *documentary and explicit* evidence of this fact, I challenge the world!—*Defence of the Truth &c.* p. 84, in reply to Emory.

I have now fully proved that Mr. Wesley did not prefer the Episcopal mode of Church government" and that he did not set apart Dr. Coke to the Episcopal office.

3. Again, the bishops in the first chapter of the book of Discipline, say, "*At which time* (Dec. 25, 1784) the general Conference held in Baltimore, *did unanimously receive* the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury, as their *Episcopal bishops*," Do facts sustain this assertion? *They do not*. Instead of the conference receiving Coke and Asbury as bishops at this time, (1784) by unanimous vote, as the bishops say, it

HISTORY OF EPISCOPAL METHODISM.

was not done until several years afterwards, and then not "by unanimous vote."—This I will prove by Methodist testimony.

☞ It was done by Coke and Asbury in 1787, and then connived at, and allowed to remain by the next conference! ☞

Perhaps it will be said, this is a *hard saying*, at all events it is *true*.

Mr. Lee, a leading Methodist, in his *History of the Methodists*, says, "in the course of this year (1787) Mr. Asbury reprinted the general Minutes; but in a *different form* from what they were before. The title of the pamphlet was as follows: "A form of Discipline for the ministers, preachers, and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America &c," there were 31 sections, and 63 questions &c, the third question in the second section, and the answer reads thus:

Question, Is there any other business to be done in Conference?

"Answer. The electing and ordaining the *bishops*, elders and deacons."

This is the *first time* (says Mr. Lee) that our *Superintendents* ever gave themselves the title of bishops. They (Coke and Asbury) CHANGED THE TITLE THEMSELVES, *without the consent of the conference*. And at the next conference they (Coke and Asbury) asked the preachers (Conference) if the word *bishop* might stand in the minutes; saying that it was a *Scripture name*, and the meaning of the word bishop, was the same with that of superintendent."

"Some of the preachers (continues Lee) opposed the alteration and wished to *retain the former title*; but a *majority* of the preachers agreed to let the word bishop remain; and in the annual minutes for the next year the first question is "Who are the *bishops* of our Church for the United States?—See *Short History*, &c., page 127.—See *Musgrove* p. 43,

Rev. A. McCaine, a Methodist, says:—"It is now well known, that term (bishop) was not used until 1787."—*Reply to Emory*, p. 119.

I have abundantly proved that the Conference in 1784 *did not at that time*, "unanimously receive Coke and Asbury as their bishops," as the bishops assert it did.

4. Again, the bishops, in the 1st chapter of the discipline, say:—"The Conference was *fully satisfied* of the validity of their Episcopal ordination."

☞ How can this be true, when, as we have just seen, the name bishops was not given to them, until three years afterwards? At which time Coke and Asbury surreptitiously introduced the word bishops in the place of superintendents, and asked the Conference, as has just been shown, to let it Stand! ☞

If the conference was "fully satisfied with the validity of their Episcopal ordination" it is more than can be said of Coke and Asbury.

Dr. Bascom, afterwards a *bishop* in the Methodist Episcopal society, says, "Dr. Coke, in a letter to bishop White of Philadelphia doubts the power of Mr. Wesley to confer *legitimate Episcopal authority*; he does the same in a letter to the bishop of London, written subsequently, in both of which, he modestly asks for re-ordination."—See Dr. Bonds *Econ. of Meth.* p. 117.

In his letter to Bishop White, Dr. Coke not only asks for re-ordination for himself, but says, "our ordained ministers will not, ought

not, to give up their right to administer the sacraments, I don't think the generality of them perhaps *none* of them, would *refuse to submit to a re-ordination!**

Dr. Coke was familiar with, and knew the minds of the preachers upon this subject, he was dissatisfied with his own ordination, and says *the generality of them would submit to a re-ordination!* As the conference was composed of Coke, Asbury, and *these same preachers*, who will believe that the conference was fully satisfied with the Episcopal ordination of Coke and Asbury?

SECTION XV.

As the Episcopacy is *spurious*, and was *surreptitiously* introduced into the so-called "Methodist Episcopal Church," it cannot be appropriately called, and recognized as a Church of Christ.

That Mr. Wesley did not prefer and establish the Methodist Episcopacy, and that it is *spurious*, and was *surreptitiously* introduced, will appear from the following additional testimony:

Dr. Bascom, afterwards a Methodist bishop, says: "Mr. Wesley seems not to have contemplated an Episcopacy, in any shape. It is, to be sure, asserted in the preface to our Book of Discipline, but the oldest preachers in the United States, with whom we have conversed, and corresponded on this subject, *never saw the warrant*. It has been called for by friends and foes, for *thirty years*, but it is not yet forthcoming! If such a warrant exist, why is it, that we can never hear anything about it? But until such a document is found, I, as an individual, must of necessity *continue to doubt* the historical *probity* (honesty) of the preface to our Book of Discipline, in relation to this particular. I am, (continues Bascom) the more confident that no such document exists, because Mr. Wesley has expressly, in a letter to bishop Asbury, now before the public, *ridiculed his pretensions as a bishop*, in a way that plainly says, Mr. Wesley never intended that Mr. Asbury to be one of the type he was. Mr. Wesley definitely disowns his belief in the validity of a *third ordination* differently from that of presbyter. Finally, as Mr. Wesley was only a presbyter himself, he could not, if disposed; have conferred a third and higher ordination on Dr. Coke; and directed him to confer the same ordination on Mr. Asbury.—*I Dr. Bond's Economy of Methodism.*

Again says Dr. Bascom: "If our bishops, &c., would yield and distribute, &c., that part of their power that has come into their hands *surreptitiously*, it would, &c."

Dr. Bond's Economy of Methodism, p. 117.

In 1827, Rev Alexander McCaine, a Methodist, wrote to each bishop of the Methodist Episcopal society, as follows:—

"I candidly say, then, I cannot believe, from the testimony of any or all the documents which I have been able to peruse, that Mr. Wesley ever recommended the Episcopal mode of Church government to the American Methodists. I cannot believe he ever gave any counsel to create a *third order* of ministers, as distinct from, and superior to

*Rev. A. McCaine, in his reply to Dr. Emory gives the whole of this famous letter. It is before me.

the order of presbyter, but I am *forced to believe* that the present form of government was *surreptitiously introduced*; and was IMPOSED upon the societies under the sanction of Mr. Wesley's name.

Bascom and McCaine, both leading minds in the Methodist convention, demanded of the bishops whose names are to the preface of the discipline, *the proof*, that Wesley *preferred*, or *recommended* the *Episcopal mode* of Church government, and ordained Dr. Coke a bishop, &c. But they could never get any reply. They both, as has been seen, affirm that the Episcopacy "was SURREPTITIOUSLY INTRODUCED!"

Again, says Bascom, "In the preface to our book of discipline, the adoption of our present form of government, is attributed to the express instructions of Mr. Wesley; but the venerable Wesley has unequivocally disowned the honor, and no one has ever shown or quoted the document, paper or verbal instructions of Mr. Wesley. It is now nearly a year since all our bishops were respectfully invited to furnish information on this subject, if they had any to furnish. They have not even deigned a reply of any kind, passing by the uncourteousness of such an act, and the insult it offers, to the thousands, who it is known to the bishops, feel a deep interest in the subject. I shall plead their apology, by taking it for granted, that they would have replied, if they had been able to do so, without defacing the beauty of their 'institutions received from their fathers,' many of whom are still living; or perhaps, like the Chinese historians, 'they are unacquainted with their own origin, because their living fathers conceal it.'"

See Dr. Bond's Econ. of Methodism, p. 116.

I have now adduced sufficient proof to sustain me in saying the first section, in the first chapter of the Book of Discipline, is not in accordance with facts, and that it is an imposition, and a fraud upon those who are induced to believe its truthfulness.

Should it be said, I speak disparagingly of great men, my apology is, deception and fraud are to be rebuked in high, as well as low places, especially, when an attempt is made, in this way, to palm off upon the world a *spurious* and *surreptitious* Episcopacy. I have said nothing more severe, than the distinguished Bascom said of his predecessors.

Dr. Bascom, *afterwards* a Methodist bishop, says: "Thus the reader will perceive that our 'fathers' acted a *palpably inconsistent* part in the introduction of Episcopacy, among us, and have been under the necessity, (created by their own indiscretion) of acting an *equally awkward*, and I fear posterity will think *ridiculous* part, in defending themselves against the charge of *reckless usurpation* of warranted power."—*In Bond's Econ. Meth. p. 117.*

Again, Dr. Bascom calls them "self-created bishops," and their system an "enormously mis-shapen system of aristocratic government."

"It was the undivulged project, the favorite scheme of a *few master spirits*, who meeting *in secret conclave* and *excluding the junior members*, even of *their own body*, (as living witnesses declare) acknowledging no constitutional rights, and comprehending no legislative privileges as belonging to any except themselves; proceeded to the pres-

ent plan of government among us, and UNBLUSHINGLY palmed it upon posterity, as the offspring of Mr. Wesley's wisdom and experience."

In Mutual Rights, June, 1827.

The terms "self-styled," "self-created," "palpably inconsistent," "reckless usurpation and unwarranted power," "enormously misshapen," unblushingly palmed, "aristocratic," "spurious," "surreptitiously introduced," "ridiculous," &c., are the words of their beloved Bishop Bascom.

In the face of all the preceeding testimony,, and much more that is known to them, Methodists still affirm that Wesley did create *three orders* in the ministry—did establish Episcopacy!

Dr. Emory says:—"In whatever sense distinct ordinations constitute distinct orders. In the same sense Mr. Wesley certainly intended that we should have *three orders*, &c."

Emory's Defence, Section 7.

Drs. Bangs and Emory say: "*Three orders* of ministers are recognized, and the duties of each clearly defined."

In Buck's Theol. Dic., Ed. of 1825.

The reverse of what Drs. Emory and Bangs assert, I will prove by Mr. Wesley's own words.

Mr. Wesley says: "Lord King's account of the Primitive Church convinced me many years ago, that *bishop* and *presbyter* are the *same office*," That it (Episcopacy) is prescribed in Scripture ~~and~~ I do not believe ~~in~~ this opinion which I once zealously espoused, *I have been ashamed of*, ever since I read bishop Stillingfleet's Ironicon."

Mr. Wesley said he would sooner be called "a knave, a fool, a rascal, or a scoundrel," than a "bishop." He calls bishops of a *higher order* than presbyter, "*heathenish priests and mitred infidels*."

Who, then, dare affirm, that Wesley introduced a *third or higher order* than presbyter? Would he do a thing that he had *long since been ashamed of having advocated*?

The reader is now in possession of some of the reasons for not recognizing the "Methodist Episcopal Church," as a Church of Christ.

SECTION XVI.

Those who have heretofore had the courage and firmness, to question the validity of their Episcopacy, and the authority of Wesley, and his coadjutors to form a gospel Church &c., have received unmeasured abuse. The whole vocabulary of abusive epithets has been exhausted upon them, and disreputable means resorted to, to blacken and blast their private character, In confirmation of this, I need only refer to the abusive unchristian, and ungentlemanly epithets that have been heaped upon Ross, Annan, J. R. Graves, Henderson, Parsons, Cooke and others. A discerning public knows how to appreciate such a course. Dr. Parsons Cooke, a minister of the Congregational Church, takes the position that the "Methodist Episcopal Church," is not a Church of Christ. He says, "Methodism is not a branch of the Church of Christ."

Etimate of Methodism.

From this, it will be seen, that the Baptists are not alone in rejecting the claims of the so called, "Methodist Episcopal Church."

If Baptist writers or speakers, dispute the validity of their Episcopacy, and the right of Wesley and his followers to set up a gospel Church &c., Methodists seem to think, that they have fully met the case and established the validity of their claim, by asking: "Did not John Wesley have as good a right to found a Church, as Roger Williams? The validity, or invalidity of one denomination, does not establish the validity of another. It is not lawful to try two suits at once, yet Methodists, in order to divert attention from the invalidity of their Church organization, are for trying both Wesley and Williams at once, or rather, they are for trying Williams to prevent Wesley from being tried! As a matter of *courtesy*, however, I will accommodate them.

I deny the right of both Wesley and Williams, to found a Church of Christ, and demand of Methodists the divine right of Wesley and his followers to organize a Church of Christ, or admit that they have no Church!

As I deny the right of Roger Williams to found a Church, I have no defence to set up, and would here rest the case, but for the fact, that Pedo-baptists regard Mr. Williams as the founder of the Baptist Churches in America.

That Roger Williams, a Pedo-baptist, embraced Baptist sentiments, and was baptized in March, 1639, by a layman, and *is said* to have organized the first Baptist Church in America is not denied. That Williams *did* organize the first Baptist Church in the United States, and that there is a succession of Baptist Churches, or ministers, whose baptism can be traced to Roger Williams, is *not admitted*. The mistake which Benedict, and other Baptist writers, have made, relative to the Roger Williams' Church, being the first and oldest Baptist Church in America, is to be attributed to the fact, that they confound the *present first Church* in Providence, with the Roger Williams' Church. This is a serious mistake, and places the Baptist Churches in America, in a false light.

1. Roger Williams *did not found a new denomination*, (Mr. Wesley and his co-adjutors did.) Williams' organization did not bring into existence a *new sect*. He only embraced the principles of a Church that was already in existence. To organize or constitute a Church, of the same faith and practice, and in fellowship with one already in existence, is not *founding* a Church; it is only an extension of one already in being.

2. The Baptism of Roger Williams *was not the beginning* of the Baptist in America. In 1633, *six* years before the Baptism of Williams, Handsard Knolleys a Baptist minister came from England. "He was the first minister ever settled in Dover, New Hampshire, where he preached from A. D. 1635, to 1639. In 1642 he returned to England."—Encyclopedia of Rel. Knowl. p. 724.

From this it will be seen that Handsard Knolleys a Baptist minister was settled in Dover, N. H. *four years* before the baptism of Mr. Williams.

Joseph Belcher, in his History of the Religious Denominations in the United States, p. 171, says, "and *four years before* the baptism of Williams, though unknown to him, the Rev. Hansard Knollys a distinguished Baptist minister in London, arrived in Boston, where he remained some time diffusing, as he could, Baptist principles. He was the first minister ever settled in New Hampshire. He *took charge of the Church at Dover* in 1635 and *resigned* in 1639. His character was injured by some Historians in New England; but was vindicated by Drs. Cotton, Mather and Neale. Seeing little hope of organizing Baptist Churches, he returned to England."

From this testimony it is evident, there was a Baptist Church in Dover, and Mr. Knollys had "charge of it from 1635 to 1639. *Pedo-baptist persecution* severed his connexion with this Church, and he returned to England. The irregular baptism of Williams was the effect of *Pedo-baptist persecution*.

Just before the baptism of Williams the organization of a Baptist Church *was prevented* in Massachusetts, *by persecution*, as will soon be seen. *Pedo-baptist* should blush for shame whenever they taunt the Baptist, with the baptism of Roger Williams. It is a memento of their persecuting proclivity. There is not a *Pedo-baptist* denomination that existed before the baptism of Roger Williams, that has not persecuted the Baptist, Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians and Episcopalians have all persecuted Baptist *unto death* for conscience sake. The Baptist is the only denomination that existed before religious toleration was established, that has not persecuted others. Bishop Hughs in his Orol Discussion with Dr. Breckenridge" p. 521, say of the Baptist, they have never "been guilty of persecution for conscience sake. Their robes are as yet unstained with this crime."

Roger Williams was *banished* from Massachusetts by *Pedo-baptist* intollerance, he founded the State of Rhode Island, *here he could have retaliated*, but instead of this, he immortalized his name by establishing the first government in the world that gave religious toleration to all!

3. The Newport Baptist Church was organised in 1638; *one year before the baptism of Mr. Williams*. El. David Benedict in his History of the Baptist says, according to *tradition*, the Newport Church was organised in 1644, Elder S. Adlam, Pastor of the Newport Church has proved, *not by tradition*, but by *irresistible proof*, that the true date of the Newport Church is A. D. 1638, one year before the Baptism of Williams.

The *century sermon* by El. John Callender, was preached in 1738 just *one hundred years* after its organization. This, of itself, is proof that the Newport Church was organized in 1638, *one year before* Williams was baptized, which was in 1639. From this, it is evident that the *Newport Church is the oldest Baptist Church* in America.

4. There were Baptist in Massachusetts for a considerable time before the baptism of Williams. Benedict says, "Some of the *first planters* in this State (Mass.) were Baptist." His. of Baptist, p. 368.

5. At Weymouth, Massachusetts, an attempt was made to form a Baptist Church *a short time before the baptism* of Williams.

They were all arraigned before the general court at Boston, March 13th 1639 some were *fined*, some *imprisoned*, &c."—Benedict's His. of Bap. p. 369.

6. Roger Williams, was a Baptist only *four months*. He embraced the opinion that there was no *true Church, or ministry*.

Thomas Lechford who visited Rhode Island in 1640 or early in 1641, says, "Here lives M^{rs}ter Williams, and his *company*, of divers opinions; most are anabaptist: they hold there is *no true visible Church* in the Bay, nor *in the world*, nor any *true ministry*."—As quoted by El. S. Adlam.

Here is the testimony of an eye witness an English Episcopalian who was on the ground in less than two years after the baptism of Williams. From his statement of the case, there was no organized Church at that time in Providence. Williams and company believed says Lechford, "there is no true visible Church in the world, nor any true ministry." With this opinion they were not a gospel Church, they did not profess to be a Church. Lechford does not call them a Church, but a "*company of diverse opinions*." It is by no means certain, that Williams and his company were even constituted into a Church, if they were, it soon *died out*. This is evident from the testimony of Cotton Mather, in his *Eccl. His. of New England*, p. 7. He says of Williams and his "*Company*." "There (in Providence) they proceeded not only unto the gathering of *a thing like a Church* &c., after this, he (Williams) turned *seeker* and *Fanalist*, and the *Church came to nothing*."

Mr Lechford calls it a "*company*," and Mather calls it "*a thing like Church*," and adds it "*come to nothing*."

7. Elder S. Adlam, who has thoroughly investigated this subject, says, "I find *no trace* of a Baptist Church in Providence, after the *failure of Roger Williams*, till after 1650. The *first intimation* of a Church there, I find in the fall of 1651."

8. In 1652 there were *two* Baptist Churches in Providence neither of which had a house of worship. "The first House of Worship was built by Elder Pardon Tillinghast, in A. D. 1700 at his *own expense*. Before that, they worshiped in a grove, and in private houses when the weather was inclement."—Benedict's, His. Bap.

One of these Churches (in 1652) was a *five* principle Church under the care of El. Thos. Olney, the other a *six* principle formed in 1652 by Brown, Dexter and Wickenden. These Churches were not in fellowship with each other. In 1682 Thos. Olney died, after which, that Church *died out*—became extinct.

The Church organized by Brown Dexter and Wickenden in 1652 still continues, and is known as the first Church in Providence. The Roger Williams and the Olney Churches, became extinct, the one organized in 1552, is the one that become "*a fruitful mother*." The Williams Church became extinct, leaving no successor. All who wish to see this matter fully, fairly, and satisfactorily discussed, are referred to Elder S. Adlam's treatise upon this subject, to be found in

"the trials and sufferings for Religious Liberty" and published at Nashville Tenn. by the "South Western Publishing House."

The great body of Baptist in the United States have descended from the English and Dutch Baptist, and not from Roger Williams as has been erroneously supposed, confounding the Church organized in 1652 by Brown, Dexter and Wickenden, with the Roger Williams and Thomas Olney Churches, has done the Baptist great injustice. That the Newport Baptist Church, is the Oldest in America, that the Roger Williams Church, *became extinct*, and that the present first Church in Providence, R. I. was organized in 1652, Elder S. Adlam has proved by incontestible evidence.

SECTION, XVII.

Instead of proving the *divine right* of Wesley and his co-adjustors to found a Church, the validity of their Episcopacy &c. Methodist appeal to *their success*—their great increase &c., and say, that is evidence enough for us, that we are a true Church, where in the word of God has he made *this* a test of a true gospel Church? *This test*, like their Church and their Episcopacy is of *human origin*. This is the well known boast of catholics and of *errorists* generally. To say nothing of Mahomitmism, Catholics &c, look at the *rapid increase of Mormonism*. Let the *rapid spread* of this monster of iniquity, this pest of civilization, put to *shame* all religionist, who refer to their *great increase*, as a warrant, of the divine origin of their sect. *Other denominations have revivals* and great increase, Baptist are blest with revivals and rapid increase. That ministerial and denominational success does not prove that the minister is a member of the true gospel Church, is evident from the fact that when Narni, a Catholic minister, preached in Rome, we are told that, "half the city went from his sermons crying along the streets, Lord have mercy, upon us, Christ have mercy upon us."

However plausible this test may seem to be, it can avail Methodist nothing at all. In their Tract No. 99, they have admitted that God blesses the ministry of those who subvert the order of his Church.—"How then are we to account for the *fact*, that the *blessing of God attends the ministry* of those whose *practice tends to subvert the order of his Church*? God does *evidently bless* those who *strive against the established order of his visible kingdom*, and *set at naught* the testimony of his witnesses. It is not the *ERRORS THEY PREACH AND PRACTICE*, that God blesses, but the truth, men may preach ignorantly and *absurdly*, and form *BASE MOTIVES*; and yet if they *preach Christ crucified*, God will convert sinners."—Methodist Tract, No. 99, Printed at the Conference office.

Who can read this extract, from the Methodist Tract No. 99, and not confess that they have debared themselves from the right to claim that they are a true gospel Church because their ministry is blessed with revivals, and their Societies with increase?

They admit that men may preach "*absurdly*" and form *base motives*," that "they may *strive against the established order of God's visible kingdom*," and yet "if they *preach Christ crucified*, God will convert sinners."

It is nothing that is peculiar to Methodism, that God blesses, it is the *preaching of Christ crucified*.

The preaching of Christ is no peculiarity of Methodism, Christ had been preached for 1700 years before men of "inventive genius," "devised" Methodism. If the Bible, Temperance, Odd Fellow, or Masonic society was to send out ministers, and they were to preach *Christ crucified*, God would convert sinners under their ministry, Methodist have virtually conceded this in the extract just given from the Tract No. 99.

It is *God's word*, the doctrines of the cross of Christ that he blesses, not the person that speaks them. God does *not send* men, who "preach absurdly, or from base motives," to preach the gospel, yet he does evidently convert sinners under the ministry of some who are unconverted, and preach "from base motives."

Again in justification of the existence of this spurious and superstitious Episcopacy, and Church of human origin, it is said, it has been instrumental in doing much good, that thousands have been converted under the ministry of the Methodist denomination.

The good that has been done, and the souls converted under the Methodist ministry have been by "the preaching of Christ crucified," and not by any thing that is *peculiar to Methodism*. It was not their errors, their "striving against the established order of God's visible kingdom," in setting up Methodism as a Church, that God blesses, but the "preaching of Christ crucified."

It is not in evidence that the same or a greater amount of good might not have been accomplished, had Methodist ministers labored as zealously in connexion with the Church that previously existed, and was set up by the Saviour, as they have in the sect that was set up by John Wesley, Coke, Asbury & Co.

This will more fully appear, when it is recollected, that the *picture* of Methodism, has *two sides* to it, the *good* and the *evil* it has done.—When the evil is deducted from the good, the preponderance will be in favor of their having labored in connexion with the Church that was previously set up.

Perhaps it will be asked, what *evil* has Methodism done? To say nothing of their peculiar doctrines,* and discipline, of their Spurious and surreptitious Episcopacy and the human origin of the Church, &c., there are many other evils.

*The leading doctrine of Methodism, *Armenianism*, Mr. Wesley determined not by the Scriptures, but by *casting a lot*, he was for a considerable time undetermined as to whether he would teach *Calvinism* or *Armenianism*, at length he *cast a lot*, and came out "preach and print" *Armenianism*. Rev. Geo. Whitfield remonstrated with Wesley for determining the mind of God by lot casting, instead of his inspired word. Mr. Augustus Toplady says, Mr. Wesley determined whether he would be a *Calvinist* or an *Armenian* by the *tossing a Shilling*. Tails fell uppermost, "and Mr. Wesley became an *Armenian*! Mr. Toplady adds, "Forgive us, if we as implicitly determine our faith by the Scriptures, as you (Mr. Wesley) determined yours by the *fall of the Splendid Shilling*." Toplady's Letter to Wesley, p. 3, 9. When Methodists are in the act of *glorification* over their *Armenianism*, they should not forget to tell the people, "We are right, our doctrine is true, for Mr. Wesley our father and founder, found it out by *tossing a Shilling*—the Scriptures are *mysterious*—but when a shilling is flipped, and tails fall uppermost it is pure gospel truth, *preach and print!*"

1. To set up a *new sect* without any authority from God, and in violation of his revealed word, is an evil of itself. - It is *causing divisions*, which are expressly forbidden, and those that cause them are to be *marked and avowed*. Rome 16, 17.

Mr. Wesley in his sermon on *Schism* speaks of the *evil* of separating from the Church as follows. "For how little a thing soever it (causeless separation from the Church) may seem, and how innocent soever it may be accounted, *Schism*, even in this Sense, is both *evil* in itself, and productive of evil consequences." Again, he says, "As such a separation is evil itself &c."

Again, he says, "Such is the *complicated mischief* which persons separating from a Christian Church or Society, &c."

Again says Mr. Wesley, "If I separate from it (the Church) without any such necessity (that is, requiring him to do, or omit, something the Scripture forbids or commands) I am justly chargeable, whether I *foresaw* them or not, with *all the evils* consequent upon that Separation" Again says, he, "Take care how you rend (divide) the body of Christ by separating from your brethren.

It is a thing evil in itself. It is a sore evil in its consequences."

Again says Mr. Wesley, "O beware, I will not say of *forming*, but of *countenancing*, or abetting, any *parties* in a Christian Society, *never encourage*, much less *cause*, either by word or action any *division* therein."—Wesley's Sermons, v 2. 384, 5, 6, 7.

If it be such an *evil* to separate from the Church, as Mr. Wesley in the preceding extracts affirms, how much greater the *evil* of *founding* a *new sect*, or denomination, and calling it a Church of Christ!

If the Episcopal is a true Church, (and Methodists admit it is) the Methodist are guilty of a double crime, 1 *Schism*, and 2, Setting up a new sect or party!

2. The contentions and perpetual warfare between them and other denominations, has been and still is a source of *incalculable evil*. If they can prove that they are the Church set up by the God of heaven in the days of Christ and the Apostles, or that Wesley, Coke and Asbury and sixty preachers, in 1784 had a *divine warrant* to set up a new sect or party, and call it a Church of Christ, they are not responsible for the evil that has grown out of their organization. If however they cannot prove this, and were set up by Wesley and his coadjutors, they are responsible for this evil. That they were set up by Wesley as Societies in the Church of England and remained there for *fifty-five years*, and in 1784 were *voted* by *sixty* of Wesley's traveling preachers into what is called "the Methodist Episcopal Church," has been fully proved.

3. Another evil of Methodism is seen in the rivalry in Churches, Schools, &c., which causes an enormous outlay of money, in towns, villages, and in the country where Churches, Schools, &c., already sufficiently exist.

That they have been pioneers, and have built up Societies and Schools where preaching was needed is admitted, but it does not follow from this, that they might not in connexion with the Church of God that previously existed, have done the same thing. A minister in order to

preach the gospel does not necessarily have to be a Methodist. If he does, the gospel was never preached before the days of John Wesley, and them for the first *nine* years by an unconverted man!

4. That Methodism is *an evil*, is seen in the divided and antagonistic *front* which the christian world presents. A large proportion of which Methodism has produced. Methodism is a *prolific mother*. It is the mother of "Wesleyan Methodists," "Primitive Methodists" and "the Calvinistic Methodists," of England; and of "the Methodist Episcopal Church." "The Okelleyites first called "Republican Methodist" and afterwards "the Christian Church," of "the Protestant Methodist," &c., in America.

If Mr. Wesley had a *divine warrant*, to found a Church, he and his co-adjutors are not responsible for these divisions, in Methodism; if they had no such divine right, he and his followers, are responsible for their existence. The same is true of all other denominations. If the God of heaven set them up, and others have seceded from them, they are not responsible for it. If they set themselves up, *by seceding from any other denomination*, they are responsible for their *own existence and all that have seceded from them*. No denomination is a true Church, that has seceded from any other denomination. Methodism as a Church seceded from the Church of England, the Okelleyite or Christian, and the Protestant Methodist, have seceded from the Episcopal Methodist neither of which can be true Churches, for two reasons.

1. If, as has been shown, the Methodist Episcopal is not a true Church, its *offsprings* cannot be.

2. If the Methodist Episcopal is a true Church. Okelleyites and Protestant Methodist, are *seceders*, and have caused divisions, for which they are to be "*marked*" and "*avoided*" Rom. 16, 17.

5. The evils of Methodism that have been specified, are not confined to England and America, but are spreading in *heathen lands*. Their ministers are teaching the benighted heathen that Methodism is a true Church of Christ set up by divine authority. It is there a rival of all other denominations, all the contentions, warfare &c, peculiar to Methodism here, is, and will be transplanted there! Will not this retard the success of the gospel among the heathen? In view of this fact, and the awful consequences attending it, the ministers and members of every denomination should seriously and anxiously enquire, by what right does my denominations exist? Is it of divine or human origin? was it set up by God in the days of Christ and his apostles or is its origin from fifteen to eighteen hundred years afterwards? What is its lineage, is it from the true and witnessing Church that fled into the wilderness and remained there until the Reformation, or is its decent from the great Romish Apostacy, the Catholic Church? No true Church has descended from Rome, or from any of her offsprings.

The time has come, when every denomination claiming to be a Church of Christ, should be put to a rigid test of its divine or scriptural right, to be acknowledged as a true Church of Christ. God is not the author of antagonistic sects. There are counterfeit Churches, as well as members, if any of us are, in a counterfeit, false, or Spurious Church we

ought to know and abandon it, very few have ever given this subject a full and candid investigation, they have taken for granted, what should first have been proved. Reader, are you a Church member? If so, have you ever seriously and honestly inquired into the origin of the Church of which you are a member? If you have not, for any thing that you know, you are a member of a counterfeit Church, gotten up and organized without any divine warrant. If the denomination of which you are a member, is of Roman Catholic descent, or if it has seceded from any denomination that is of Romish origin, if it *caused a division*, and thereby made a *new sect* or denomination when it came into existence you may know that you are not belonging to the Church which the God of heaven set up, for it did not descend from any other denomination, it caused no division. It was set up by him in the days of Christ and his apostles, and has had a *perpetual existence*. He who set it up, said, "It shall never be destroyed, it shall stand forever."

SECTION XVIII

Methodists asserts that "God thrust them out to raise a holy people."—Discipline p. 3.

These we are told, are the words of Charles and John Wesley.

Notice, 1. By saying "God thrust them out" they plead a divine warrant for their existence. How did the Wesley's ascertain that "God thrust them out?" The Bible is as silent upon this subject as the grave. If they found it out at all, I suppose it was by *casting a lot*, the "splendid Shilling" was perhaps flipped, or "tossed" and all was revealed!

Notice, 2. God did not "thrust them out," for they (the Wesley's) *lived and died members of the Church of England*, I have already proved that John Wesley died a member of the Church of England, and that he was "*sorry the separation*" took place between his Societies in America and the Episcopal Church.—See Dr. Coke's Letter, to Bishop White.

Notice, 3. They thrust *themselves out*. From 1729 to 1784, they were members of, and received the Ordinances in the Church of England, as has been shown. Mr. Asbury in his Journal, and Mr. Lee in his His. of Meth. say, "we *formed ourselves* into an Episcopal Church."

It was the *magic vote* of sixty of Mr. Wesley's travelling preachers that "thrust them out." God, who has expressly forbidden "*divisions*" in or of his Church, and commanded us to "*mark and avoid*," those that cause them, had no agency in settling up Methodism as a Church. It was done by men of "*inventive genius*," and consequently it is not a true Church of Christ.

Date Due

[illegible]

287.6 P514

P12265

SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Duke University Libraries



D01350705L