



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BX  
8334  
D86  
R45

A

16

**REVIEW**

OF

**"AN APPEAL TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC**

**"FROM THE**

**"UNPROVOKED ATTACKS**

**"OF THE**

**"REVEREND GEORGE DUFFIELD,**

**"AGAINST THE**

**"*Methodist Episcopal Church.***

**"BY A. G.**

**"*Elder, in the Methodist Episcopal Church.*"**

---

Who both killed their own prophets, and have persecuted us; forbidding us to speak.  
*St. Paul.*

Controversy is the safety-valve of theological zeal. The spirit of party is opposed to it; being too intolerant for discussion.

*Eclectic Review.*

---

**CARLISLE, Pa.**

**PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE**

**1828.**

The force of an argument, or the truth of a statement, accredited authorities being vouches, does not depend on the *name* of him who produces them. The Reviewer, therefore, content to let his remarks pass for what they are worth, does not choose to obtrude on public attention, an insignificant and somewhat obscure *name*. If he has asserted any thing which cannot be supported—its falsity will *not be determined by the success which may crown those ingenious inquisitors, who imagine that, as soon as an anonymous writer is known, his assertions and reasonings fall to the ground.*

The few scraps which our classical recollections have furnished, appeared to suit our design, and the uninitiated, who will lose nothing by not understanding them, will consider it a sufficient apology for their introduction, that they are intended only for the benefit of Mr. G. who can translate them for the information of the curious.

BX  
8334  
D86  
RAS

gift  
Tappan Presb. Co.  
2-24-1932

## REVIEW, &c.

---

4-18-32  
We were apprised, some ten days before the appearance of this pamphlet, that the Rev. Mr. G. was engaged in its preparation; and we entertained the idea, that, as the feelings of our Methodist brethren had been wounded, by the "unprovoked attacks" of Mr. Duffield, and they were triumphing in the certainty of a complete refutation, we should have had the "propositions" of that gentleman drawn out at length, and formally and unanswerably rebutted. This idea was confirmed when we read the lugubrious, yet polemical title page of the *soi-disant* rejoinder. But our expectation has been disappointed. We have not, nor, we venture to say, has any other person, perceived, in the "Appeal," aught except the writhings and desperate contortions of its author, under the galling stings which have so keenly lacerated his sore places; sores, to which the attention of the patient appears to have been directed, for the first time. However, we shall see, as we proceed, whether he has, always, been as restive under the like charges.

"The intelligent reader will bear in mind that the reverend author," "in approaching this subject," lays much stress on, and leads us to believe that his animadversions are chiefly to be confined to the following "bold and unquali-

ed declarations:—‘*In the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church there is still less of ministerial parity, and of security for the rights and liberties of the laity, with much more strongly marked monarchical features; yea, even despotic.*’” This is the whole of the “attack;” the ground-work of his “appeal.” It was this which he flatly denied in his own pulpit, a few weeks ago. We had *then*, a call for the “proof;” and long and loud our chanticleer did call. The trumpet sounded, the challenge was sent; but lo! the adversary had fled nor deigned to hear the defiance to mortal combat. And now, grown bolder, lest, by crowing only at home, “a tame submission and acquiescence” should be inferred, it is industriously circulated, that the stalwart and doughty warrior is about to leave his intrenchments, and “appear before the [pamphlet reading] public” with an “Appeal” that shall cause our ears to tingle. Well, after this dreadful note of preparation, (*mons laborat, &c.*) out creeps a “surely it cannot be required of us to prove a negative!” The ratio of the effect to the throes that preceded it, may be computed by the “generous public” for whose edification the bantling was produced.

The appellant, contented with a “present denial” throws upon the author of the sermon the burthen of proving. It is not our business to enter upon this task. We leave to Mr. D. the office, to which the “appeal” has elected him; and he may, if he please, prove, from the *Constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, “every count in the indictment.” The Reviewer may, possibly, toward the close of his observations, shed some ink on the *head and front* of the offence, purely to render the “darkness visible.” His immediate purpose is to notice several matters, on which the appellant rings his changes, by way of carrying the war into the enemy’s country; even, at the risk of “travelling out of the record.”

Perhaps the *internal evidence* of the pamphlet, might have led us to infer, that its author was “unaccustomed to public controversy.” It struck us that its conduct was not the *best* calculated to shew the appellant’s “aversion to strife and contention.” But he has *his way* of doing bu-

*siness.*"\* Experienced controversialists now-a-days argue: novices, whether they be ten years old or fifty, have devised an easier plan. It is more convenient, by inuendo and insinuation, often of the most illiberal kind, to impugn the motives, and, by calling "the attention of the public," to other "subjects unconnected" with the point at issue, to attain the moral character of an adversary, than to prostrate him by the main force of argument. We may, indeed, have mistaken, in the present instance; and so far from the appellant appearing to disadvantage, on this account, it is not unlikely, that, in troubling, with his mud-machine, the "waters which cast up mire and dirt," he is more properly to be regarded as a skilful manœverer, aware of the importance of forestalling impressions, and the sovereign virtue they possess of clouding the medium, through which *forth-coming proofs* are to be viewed.

Whatever skill, Mr. G. possesses, of understanding "*scripture* in the plain, vernacular tongue, interpreted by reason *and* common sense," he is singularly unskilful in the interpretation of Mr. Duffield's idea of "ministerial parity and ministerial qualifications." We have read the sermon, and do not recollect one word, which, "interpreted by common sense," and common candor, in the most remote degree, advocates the "*incorporation*, into the constitution," of any "article" providing for any kind of "*ecclesiastical establishment*:"—which at all, advocates the union of church and state, or deplors their separation. It is no new thing to use this cant: the ignorant and the prejudiced, and the irreligious have been caught by it before today, and Mr. G. is welcome to all the benefit and complacency and self-satisfaction his mind can receive from contemplating the share which he has taken with the enemies

---

\* We conceive that a better proof of this *aversion*, would have been a refutation of the charge against the despotic constitution of the church, by reference to the "Discipline," and a plea of "*non assumptit*" to the remarks, of a general nature, on human learning. This would have put an *end* to the controversy. All of us recollect the unanswered call for proof in the case of the Secretary of State, *si parva licet componere magnis*. He did not wait until the criers aloud chose to produce their "evidence;" with the means of defence in his own hands he condescended to "prove a negative." The cry of the calumniator was hushed. Did Mr. G. not think his own case as safe? If he did, his way was clear, his duty plain. *He* will not dispute the analogy.

of all religion, in heaping odium on a Christian Church, of all others, the least obnoxious to the bare suspicion of such a wish: a community which it has been *fashionable* to calumniate. No Presbyterian is liable to such a charge; no Presbyterian ever desired so abominable and ill-assorted an union. They are the last men who would ever submit to it. And their opposition, (for they will stand up for the eternal separation of church and state,) is perfectly consistent with the belief, that their ecclesiastical constitution, formed on the model of apostolic polity, is most consonant to the republican institutions of our Country; most suited to the genius of this people. Nor does any Presbyterian fear, that episcopacy, whether in the Church of England, or in the Methodist Society, can ever be "dangerous to the *rights and liberties* of the people," considered as the subjects of *civil* government; whatever influence it may have on the people, [the laity] considered as the subjects of *church* government. It is only when "establishments" are foisted on the whole people, that such can ever be the case, and the Presbyterians, taught by sad experience, would "resist unto blood," as they did when, for their Master's sake, they were "killed all the day long and accounted as sheep for the slaughter," that they might "stand fast in their liberty." The appellant might, then, have repressed his patriotic fervours, and reserved his tirade, including the pretty apostrophe to the shades of "Washington and Jefferson, our Adams and Franklin &c." to be used when he shall please to "appeal" from certain *episcopal*\* writers, of whom he may have heard as advo-

---

\* Our reviewer, of course, alludes to English writers, exclusively; unless such expressions as "the episcopal throne," and the like, should be held indicative of a desire for "incorporation." We have made the allusion, too, because this is about as suitable a place as any we shall find, for expressing our surprise, that Mr. G.'s perceptions were not as keenly alive, in regard to the "attacks," in Bp. Hobart's Consecration Sermon, (pp. 22—28.) as in the present instance. He has been guilty of an "obvious dereliction of duty." For, the Bishop's animadversions do not affect the *Protestant Episcopal* Church, in this diocese. The practices and "popular arts," he reprobates, are not, in all respects, confined to the *evangelical party*, (then undergoing censure,) in that body. In *all* respects they do not characterise the low church-party at all. For whomsoever intended, Mr. G. had a better right to *appropriate* them, and to "appeal," than any body we know, and that, too, with more reason, and probability of being the party "attacked," than is discoverable in Mr. D's sermon. We cannot account

cates of the "incorporation" system. It is a pity, indeed, that his ardour has been inflamed by a man of straw; he has certainly consumed this adversary: but that he has burnt any thing else, except his own fingers, will not appear from a perusal of the sermon. It is almost a pity, that Mr. D. did not give him a solid bone to pick; a *bona-fide* recommendation of the church-and-state policy, at once. Then Mr. G. might not have spent his labour of two weeks, in demolishing the card-house of *his own creation*. We have sometimes heard of people fighting the *air* and cracking their own crowns.

One would think that "these terrible methodists, who are spreading like an army of locusts,"\* were the *only* "enemies of wine bibbing and drunkenness," that are to be found. If this be not asserted as a peculiar characteristic, why is it asserted at all? And if it was not so intended, the allusion to their "locust-like" spread, would have sufficiently marked them out. Or was Mr. G. aware of the fact, that *eminence in numbers* is not always proof of *excellence*? But we shall not bandy words here. God grant that every individual member of that denomination may be a true member of Christ. We believe that God has "much people in this city," and we only desire *them* to believe, that He does not intend to *confine* His church, within the bounds of the Conference. We believe that there are many "out of every name," who are the true children of God, who, without laying claim to "superior spirituality," are behind none in vital piety; and that, even in the most cor-

---

for the obtuseness of his perceptions. Was it owing to a convenient catalepsis, of which he has lately recovered, or to his indestructible "regard" and eye to "future intercourse and co-operation," that instead of taking up the *cudgels*, he has been drawn, by his sympathies, into sweet communion and making "common cause," with high churchmen?

It is not long, since a manifesto, signed by eight notorious high churchmen, in this diocese, was published, charging the evangelical party with a design "to overthrow the ministerial office, by encouraging the ministrations of *unordained* men; to introduce into the church, the peculiarities of Calvinism or Methodism; to establish and cherish insubordination to episcopal authority, and to overthrow our unrivalled liturgy by the introduction of *extempore effusions* into the public services of the church."

\* We would not insinuate that this comparison is peculiarly indebted, for its aptness, to a certain prodigy in the Mosaic history. "And the land stank, so numerous was the fry."



rupt bodies, He has still reserved His "seven thousand to himself who have not bowed the knee to Baal." Again, we object to the allusion itself, *without* qualification; because we do *not* suppose that the information was given lest we should not "suspect" how numerous they are. The most obvious reason of it being made, is to insinuate, in the Presbyterian Church, a spirit of envy toward the increase of Methodism. This is unfair, unchristian. The *spirit of proselytism\** is not a characteristic of the "church of our choice." So far as party names are concerned, we would that they no longer *disturbed* the peace of the christian world. "Our heart's desire and prayer" is, that men may be the servants of Christ, without regarding, for one moment, or as of the least importance, to what ecclesiastical denomination *they* choose to attach themselves. "Go and do likewise."

The reverend appellant has marked, as a quotation, the following sentence: 'to encourage whom [the Methodists,] is so sad a delusion'. It is not in the sermon; nor any thing like it. We merely notice it, that *we* may put a "quere,"—was it marked thus for the *sake of inducing the belief* that *Mr. Duffield* had said it?

We say then, principally because we fear that Mr. G. will not otherwise "suspect" it, that the increase of any denomination of *Christians*, is a subject of pleasure to us: *He* perhaps cannot conceive how this can be. We regard their increase as a token of good, and so long as it is necessary, that there should be separate religious communities, (just as there are separate civil societies,) all agreeing in the foundation of their eternal hopes, and more akin in their general opinions than is commonly suspected, we care not whether there be one name or one hundred, whether we be called Presbyterian, or Episcopalian or Methodist.

But there is another place, in which the appellant has misrepresented,—we beg his pardon,—misunderstood the

---

\* Common rumour, (a somewhat mendacious lady, it is true,) has occasionally whispered to us the names of some who had a smack of this ingredient in their composition; whose zeal led them to "compass sea and land to gain proselytes," out of *other communions*. The plea was, that as there was *no difference in doctrines*, it were *better* for them to exchange their *cold associations*, for "the temple of the Lord!"

sermon. In determining the question of "ministerial parity," no mention was made of the propriety of an acquaintance with the sacred languages. It was, certainly, rather galling, in its legitimate connexion, but the transfer, which the appellant has made, is altogether unwarranted by the terms of the sermon. The "plain vernacular" is abundantly clear on the subject, and the Presbyterian practice will be sufficiently supported, if we will, like the honest old Bereans, "search the scriptures" in our "good old mother tongue."

Since we have adverted to this subject, it may be as well to remark, that, in the sermon, a controversy was being conducted, neither with the Protestant Episcopal, nor the Methodist Episcopal church: but with that portion of the former denominated high churchmen; the "confederacy" which proclaims, not, that "except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," but,—that, unless he receive sealing ordinances at the hands of a *priest* EPISCOPALLY ORDAINED, and have his "pardon negotiated with God," by *him*, he can neither be born again, nor, having thrown off the *only valid* ministry," possess any warrant to hope in the covenanted mercies of God! To expose the folly, pride, and contempt of the "grace of God, which bringeth salvation," that distinguishes this preposterous claim to be exclusive, *jure divino* "negociators,"\* got up to foster the ambition of a few arrogant usurpers of the apostles' seat, and almost of the mediatorial office,† the sermon undertook to prove the validity of Presbyterian ordination. In doing so, it vindicated the claim of the whole protestant world,‡

\* This word stinks in our nostrils. It came from the "sweet south," but over no "bed of violets."

† Vide Bishop Ravenscroft's "Doctrines of the church vindicated," and a tract, from the New York manufactory, mysteriously deposited in every pew of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in this place, some weeks since. These enlightened and scriptural bodies of divinity, drawn up in the very spirit of the most amazing philanthropy, lay a flattering unction to the souls of the faithful, but as for us "deluded followers of Korah, Dathan and Abiram," we are not the "children of the kingdom;" cast out, and condemned to see even those, who, having "sinned without law shall also perish without law," (by some yet unrevealed plan,) preferred to be "ministering spirits" while we "lie howling."

‡ Not only of the Presbyterian, Methodist and other churches, but even of the majority in the Protestant Episcopal church. They have as much reason to be "all their life time subject to bondage" through the fear of being insecure;

against the presumptuous pretensions of priestly arrogance, which would choke up the fountain of divine mercy, or impiously compel the grace of God to flow only through the channel of episcopal fingers.

*We* hold that men have the right of selecting such a mode of church government as they prefer; just as they have the right of forming their civil constitution.

The allusion to the constitution of the Methodist episcopal church, appears to be rather incidental and historical. Had the reviewer written the sermon, he might, or he might not, have made it. To do either was at Mr. D's election. The Roman Catholics may bask in the smiles of the scarlet lady, as long as they please; yet we must not be forbidden to speak out our real opinion of her administration; and so also is it the privilege of every Christian man, to raise his voice in proclaiming, what he conscientiously believes to be, truth. We need not go crusading:

---

even within this ark of safety, the pale of *the church*. For, the idea of apostolic succession being exploded, if that were the only ground of salvation, we should be "of all men the most miserable." One failure, in the whole chain of regularly consecrated "negociators," is sufficient to cut us off. Who would trust to such a tenure? "Miserable comforters are ye all."

Moreover, if the succession cannot be traced, how can we be certain that Bp. Hobart and Co. have ever got hold of the true "key of the kingdom of Heaven," which they pretend to have received as an heir-loom from Saint Peter. There is no little disputing among the successionists on this point. Papists, high-churchmen, *et id omne genus*, the Lamaites of the christian church, resemble, in their squabbles, those sects among the Mahometans, who were eternally contending about the *jure divino* succession to the Caliphate, by *invisible* Imaums. There was something to be gained by its establishment, and if there had been no temporal empire attached to the "valid" Imaamee, Ismail and Abbas would not have cared a rush for its theological interests. Those who are curious in such matters may make the application.

We recommend to these gentry the advice contained in the *Consecration sermon* of the *First Bishop of Ephesus*:—"Refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself unto godliness;" again, "neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is in faith; now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; from which some having swerved, have turned aside to vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputes of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness.

but if Martin Luther and Blanco White “speak evil of dignities,” in one communion, and doctors of divinity and “elders in the Methodist Episcopal church” assert that there is “something rotten” in *their* state, we protest against proscription for echoing what they say. They “speak that, they do know,” for their “eyes have seen and their hands handled,” they have “touched and tasted and handled the unclean thing” till they are sick of it, and we dare take up their words into our lips and repeat them, in either case. We say then that the “bold and unqualified declarations of Mr. Duffield” were *mere echoes* of those used by Methodists themselves,\* in reference to the government of their own church. That Mr. G. is aware of this, we well know. But we must not anticipate. *Est modus in rebus.* We “suspect” that Mr. G. had as well not neglected the truth in the remainder of the quotation:—*Sunt certi denique fines, quos ultra, citraque, nequit consistere rectum.* As we are not confined to the “discipline” and are not to be deprived of the benefit of “parole testimony,” we expect to shew, by the “evidence” of good men and true, that Elder G. has not now heard, for the first time,† the sort of language used by Mr. D.; that there is a probability of it having been used with his sanction; and some may think, from the “evidence,” that it is not the most improbable thing in the world, that Mr. G. has used such himself. But we are in danger of anticipating again.

To return. We do not “envy either the discernment or the candour of that man,” who could write the paragraphs on the fifth page of the “appeal.” *Where*, in the sermon, has “the author’s sense” appeared, that a “learned education” means a “Collegiate” one? *Where*, the inference that

---

\* Mr. G. will expect us to prove this. For his especial satisfaction, we shall produce the “evidence and arguments.”

† The bravado we are reviewing would to most men appear like the first burst of honest indignation, at a sudden and “unprovoked attack.” Mr. D’s unlucky potion has stirred up the “elder’s” gall, and reminds us of Ithuriel’s spear. Yet all this is but the ebullition of the appellant’s *esprit du corps*. We are irresistibly reminded of an anecdote. One of two Hibernians, who had agreed to have a little fun, in an amicable trial of skill, in the use of the Billingsgate “vernacular” suddenly saluted his companion, with a thundering box on the ear. Being reproached with a breach of the agreement, he “appealed,” saying “arrah! my jewel, you comed too near dhe thruth.”

there is "no medium between a *learned* education and *absolute* ignorance? *Where*, the assertion that he, who is destitute of such education is "necessarily a fool?" If they be not there, and Mr. G. knows they are not, why "involve" in a common "censure" the reverend gentleman and the 'witty South?" We will not say what Solomon declares of them that "*imagine evil.*" The appellant did "forget;" in charity we hope so. One of the "ministerial qualifications" noticed by Mr. D. was the propriety of ministers cultivating their mental powers. Yet human learning was to be considered, "an useful auxiliary and nothing more"\* It was not to be "disdained," however, "as the manner of some is."† Such, to whatever sect they may belong; are those, who lie most fairly exposed to the remark of the "witty South." That there are *none* such, even in the Methodist church, maugre those, who "read and study systematically and perseveringly" we do not altogether believe. We shall favour Mr. G. with the evidence of one of his own party. "We have proceeded *too far in our declamations against books, and learning, and mental improvement, and have given too much sanction and currency to the adage that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion.'* If we have leaned a *little too much toward Popery, why not be ingenuous enough to acknowledge it?*" This is the language of a Methodist clergyman, and, for aught that we know, of Mr. G. himself.

---

\* Strange, that Mr. G. should not understand the force of this sentence, in the sermon, and yet understand its full meaning, when he quotes and makes it his own, in reiterating the *very idea*, Mr. Duffield advanced. If he had been willing to suppose that Mr. D. meant, what his *words* so plainly express, this part of the "Appeal" would not have come under review; it never would have been written.

† We are a little surprised that Mr. G. should think the remark an "attack" on the *Methodist* clergy. It appears to be levelled only against those who "despise reading," wherever they may be found. If there be none such in his church, he might have saved himself the trouble he has taken to make the cap fit his own head; or rather to make the shoe *pinch* his toes. It was a random shot, and if he is determined to be, or to make his church, a target for all such, no one will balk him of his humour. Probably he affects fame in the controversial arena, and, having buckled on his maiden armour, *will* have it well tried and bravely hacked and belaboured. Desirous of shewing his numerous scars, as proof of victories obtained over the enemies of the faith, and earnest of future valour, he flies about the field and pierces himself with every arrow, he can lay hands upon. Rather than not be wounded, he even scratches himself with the horns and thistles that grow by the way-side. He sees an enemy in every bush.

We might add, that we have heard, in the preaching of some of these railers, the very "patches and scraps" with which some interlard their discourses, in order to catch the vulgar, and beg admiration for their wonderful learning.\*

An acquaintance with the sacred languages is necessary to the critical understanding of the Scriptures. Who are those that are "*mighty in the scriptures*?" that have been the bulwarks and defenders of our Holy Religion, against the insidious undermining of Universalist and Unitarian heresies, the assaults and cavils of deistical and infidel assailants, and the servile bondage of papistical sacraments; the crafty assumptions of priestly sectaries and the refined subtleties of ultra benevolism? Who are they that have rendered service to those unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek letters, by commentaries and criticisms? Mr. G. we presume has *some* obligations to the men who have spent their strength in the elucidation of the "plain vernacular" by comparisons with the original text; if to none other, at least to the "pretty good Hebrew and Greek Scholars," who are the ornament and boast of the Methodist Church. It does not look well, to kick down the ladder after its run-dles have raised us up.

That a man may not make an excellent practical preacher, without being accurately versed in them, we would not dare to insinuate. But it is still true, that it is just as necessary for *us* to understand these languages in the *exposition* of Scripture, as to Adam Clarke, or any person else whom Mr. G. may choose to claim as "one of *us*." We firmly believe that more scriptural knowledge, and better and more accurate systems of Divinity, are to be acquired from the diligent study of the original scriptures, than in any other way:—the "doctrines and discipline" not excepted.

---

\* One of these jack-daws, who used to display his assortment of peacock's feathers, every Sunday, was much addicted to the use of the phrase "wicer werser" [*vice versa*,] which led a punning friend to observe that the man daily grew *wiser and worser*. South's was a palpable hit.

Another, with an air of great dignity, came out with a *Cogito; ergo Sum*. Our friend denied that the "proposition" had any *vice versa*, for, said he 'altho' I should say to him, *Es*, I could not, in conscience conclude, *ergo Cogitas*.' We cannot offer Mr. G. the insult of translating these little "shreds and patches," because it is to be taken for granted "that he who quotes them himself, must understand them."

The quotation, with which we have just treated Mr. G., it may be thought, impugns as "*popish*" the *exclusion*, and not the *use* of Hebrew and Greek, as a means of "*mental improvement*."

The miraculous "*gift of tongues*" was intended, as the appellants rightly conjectures, to "enable the disciples to address every man in the language, 'wherein he was born.'" But none of these tongues is our "*vernacular*," and to those who have not taken the pains of acquiring the language, in which the apostles wrote, they speak through the medium of translations. Who would not prefer slaking his thirst at the fountain-head, to drinking from the stream passing away below? Moreover, this miraculous gift was in fact given as well that they might understand the "*mind of the spirit*." In truth, the spirit was first understood on the day of Pentecost, (or at the earliest, only a few days before, when Jesus "opened the understanding of the disciples that they might understand the scriptures," just on the eve of his ascension,) agreeably to the promise.\* The apostles, who had, for three years, been studying, in the best of all possible "*Theological Seminaries*;" in which Christ, the "*Lord from Heaven*" as "*professor*" (we speak it reverently,) had been "*prophesying*" upon them, were, until the gift of the Holy Ghost, ignorant of the real nature of the Messiah's Kingdom. The miraculous gift taught them the mind of the spirit; and to despise the study of the language in which that "*mind*" was communicated, is, to say the least of it, to despise an important means of usefulness, and betrays a degree, either of deplorable ignorance, or "*sad delusion*" indeed. Moreover, St. Paul speaks of the "*same Spirit*" imparting to some "*divers kinds of tongues*," and to others "*the interpretation of tongues*." This testimony directly placing them on a par, there is no objection that applies to the one, which must not be urged against the other. We need not carry out this argument further; for there is nothing to be rebutted by it. A *sneer* is not an argument.

Was there no account made of personal "*piety*," as a

\* Acts i. 7, 8.

“ministerial qualification,” in the Sermon? We had imagined that it was *not* “taken for granted.”\* In other respects, we cannot see that the Great Head of his church, has given less “power of selecting the candidates for a competent gospel ministry, to indulgent fathers” or “benevolent ladies” than to a methodist “class.” *These* “qualifications” were not considered in the sermon. But our appellant is a shrewd controversialist though “unaccustomed” withal. He waxes witty, and, in the fulness of his mirth, lugs in by the head and shoulders, *will he, will he*, the ghost of a miserable, done-over, thread-bare apology for a pasquinade. This *vox et præterea nihil*, speaks “clear and mellifluously.” We must really be indulged in a “quere” here. If the “more dollars” make the “louder call,” may it not be, that there are some, among our acquaintance, who after being selected and “presented by a *class*,” have given “satisfaction as to talents, prudence, spirituality of mind, and devotion and zeal in the cause of God,” are “elected to the office and order of an elder, and believe that *God* has called them to act in a larger and more extended sphere,” have, nevertheless *on account* of the *febleness* of the call, suffered themselves to be called back, and, “*their* imagination getting among the silver” obeyed the “louder call” in some other calling? We do think that people who live in *glass* houses should not throw stones.

The poverty of our blessed Redeemer has been most infelicitously brought into view. If “*He* had not where to lay His head,” we do not see the parallel between His circumstances and those of our Methodist brethren, to be a whit more accurate, than that which may be drawn in reference to any other denomination.† Something like half

\* Our presbyteries are as strict in their search for “unquestionable proofs of piety,” as any conference. Neither can judge the heart. We do not, however, think Mr. G. means to be hard upon *us* in what he has “taken for granted.” This is doubtless a sly hit at a certain Bishop, in this country, who admitted to holy orders, a young man, who had not yet given *these* “proofs” nor even outwardly participated in the ordinances of the church.

† The disparaging circumstances, in the Presbyterian and other churches, we assume to be adverted to, as indeed the tenor of the whole “appeal” warrants us, for the sake of being contrasted with the state of affairs in the M. E. C. There is no other supposable motive which will account for this illusory allusion.



a million of "dollars" annually appropriated to the support of the clergy within the bounds of the General Conference, ought to afford tolerably pretty pickings. The labourer gets his hire, and to make sure of it settles his own wages. He is not much harrassed with the question—'what shall I eat, or what shall I drink, or wherewithal shall I be clothed?' It is known that he has "need of these things" and they are provided for him. The reviewer, if disposed to enter the ministry, with a view to a comfortable livelihood, would, of all others, elect the Methodist itinerancy. It is not unfair to suppose that many, who have entered it, if they could divest themselves of the false consciousness, to which all men are subject, would find themselves to have been not altogether regardless of a promise to this effect; "take part with us of this ministry, and 'thou shalt have goats' milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household and for the maintenance of thy maidens." Who can "blame them?" We cannot. "They that preach the gospel should *live* of the gospel." It is the "principle" only of making odious and unwarranted comparisons that we are after.\*

---

\* Mr. G. is entitled to another extract from the writer we have just quoted.

"Indeed the Doctor [Armistead,] fairly admits though the travelling preachers may not thank him for the admission, that the *government of the [M. E.] Church is based on the LOVE OF MONEY, (a) and power, and that the temptation to associate them was so strong, that it could not be resisted by itinerant preachers themselves. (b).*

a "To the poor the gospel is preached' by us" is a boast we have frequently heard. In addition to, and supported by, the general strain of this writer, we remark that there is an effectual machinery in operation, which makes the *widow's mite* available; that *the poor pay more for the support of the gospel, in the M. E. church,* than in any other. We are credibly informed, (by a member,) that the sum of taxes paid, for this purpose, by hired servants and persons of that class, is not less than from four to six dollars a year!

b. How strongly, on this subject, does their anxiety, to "serve tables," speak. The *deacons' office* is now a sinecure. Witness the resistance made to a change: what a pious horror of impropriation!

Once more. A Methodist and Presbyterian preacher once defied each other, (so ran the story of one of the former sect,) to preach unpremeditatedly, on any text that might be given. The Presbyterian selected "And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass," from which, the Methodist made out Balaam to be a young Presbyterian preacher; his saddle, a snug fat salary; and the ass, the people of his charge. But when it came to the turn of the other to preach; on the text chosen by the Methodist, he failed.—Here, the editor of the *Christian Preacher* takes up the comparison and turns the tables. He observes that the young *Methodist Balaam* has the best of the bargain; inasmuch as, being

After all, the case of Christ does not apply here. He, Lord of universal nature, commanded the angels to minister to his wants, and the fishes of the sea to be his bankers, when he would pay tribute. And although "he became poor," it was that "through his poverty we might be made rich;" in the benefits of his "grace." If these "riches of grace" are the result of the "poverty," which Mr. G. understands here, then have we, all along, mistaken, the intention of the priestly office of the mediator. Moreover, this scripture, interpreted any way, still makes against him. For the lovers of the "loaves and fishes" finding it in a connexion, where liberality, in imparting worldly wealth, is commended by an apostle who is very explicit on the subject of "ministering 'in all good things' to the necessities" of "him that teacheth," might argue thus:—the poorer Christ was, the more right have we to be "rich." If there be any force in antithesis, this corollary, from such premises, would be just. We, of course, deny both.

"There is one other subject, unconnected with the ser-

tired of his trade, he can march into the pulpit, wearing the same shoes in which he left his shop, and is appointed forthwith to ride on a circuit, by the superintendent: whereas the Presbyterian, after expending much time and labour and money, during his preparation for the ministry, must wait until some congregation choose to 'call' him. The Methodist saddle too is softer and more commodious than that of the other; for, there is so much for self, so much for wife, so much for each child, a table furnished, and divers other little items, which swell to a tolerably comfortable aggregate: on the contrary, the Presbyterian clergy, except a few, who have large *nominal* salaries, get on an average scarcely four hundred dollars a year. N. B. The former, though not called a *salary* is much more *secure* and *valuable*. Again, *his* people are the ass to all intents and purposes; for, while the presbyterians can choose their own pastor and bring him to account for misconduct; and have a representation in the General Assembly, know all the transactions of that body, and are intimately engaged in the management of its funds,—the Methodists dare not say one word about the appropriation of *their* church funds, and are compelled to convey every meeting-house they build to the conference, which can turn them out of it if they are refractory; have, neither, a voice in the conference, which sits with closed doors, nor the right of selecting their own minister in sacred things, but are subject to one individual, who, like a little Pope, in his dominions, says to one, 'Go, and he goeth, and to another, come, and he cometh;' with power to appoint preachers to stations, and at his own sovereign will and pleasure, to remove them every year, whether the people like them or not.

Now which of these, they who direct their own affairs, or they who suffer themselves to be led by the nose by any man, be he Bishop or be he Pope, might, his mouth being opened, more pertinently ask "am not I thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day?"

mon, which *we* beg leave<sup>d</sup> to notice. The appellant has here, laid himself open to severe reprehension. "Was it kind, was it brotherly, to commit to the wings of the wind," so serious a charge, after having *ascertained* the facts related at Mercersburg? "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three *witnesses*."

Mr. D. in relating to the Presbytery, what was being done in Cumberland County, relative to the distribution of the Bible, observed "that the number of families destitute, had been found to be much greater than was anticipated; the average being one third of the whole number; that some had been found destitute whom no one would have suspected; and, among these, a '*Methodist exhorter*.'"<sup>\*</sup> He did *not* say, as Mr. G. represents him to have done, that he was "an exhorter of the *Methodist Episcopal church*." To what branch of Methodists, he belonged, Mr. D. did not pretend to determine.† Mr. G. was perfectly well acquainted with this, notwithstanding his want of "personal knowledge how these things are," for we know that Mr. D. communicated the fact to Messrs. Squire and Slicer, of whose visit and inquisition Mr. G. has taken notice.

The circumstance was first mentioned by Mr. Robert Clark of North Middleton, at a meeting where Mr. Duffield was present. Mr. C. stated that "he had discovered a Methodist exhorter, who on being asked 'whether he had a Bible?' answered 'No.'"<sup>\*</sup> A little afterwards, he said to some person near, while Mr. Duffield was engaged, that the man, being a German, had not a Bible in the language

---

<sup>\*</sup> Another instance of the "*qui capit ille fecit*." Mr. G. is *very* sensitive, indeed. His "mouth gapes like a poor's-box waiting for half pence," and thankful for any wind-fall. With his huge drag net he sweeps the bottom of the "vasty deep," and brings up, moving, all, at his command, a host of "blue spirits and white, black spirits and grey," to enact their several offices in his machinery; he overcomes them all, as were Virgil's ghosts by the golden wand of Æneas. He appropriates to the Wesleyan Methodists what may be the property of the Albright connexion, the Dutch Methodists, or even Winebrenner's Methodists. Some specimens of the sermonizing of a preacher of one of these connexions, (we think it was the *last*.) recall to mind an anecdote, which the newspapers contained a few years back. A young fellow, belonging to some of the "new lights" in England, applying to the proper authorities for a license to preach, was asked "if he could read?" "No," he replied, "mother reads and I 'splains and 'spounds."

† The distinction was well understood at Mercersburg.

in which he exhorted. Mr. D's statement was strictly true\* (and not made with any malicious or censorious intent; but simply to show how proper and necessary it was to inquire in every family whether a Bible was needed.) He was justified in making it, by the unquestioned veracity of Mr. C. and dismissing the matter, "this much we will state" that "Mr. Clarke of North-Middleton" being an eye-witness is more competent to give testimony, than Mr. G. whose *vaunting* does not quite amount to a *disproof*; neither impugning the respectability of the witness, nor effecting its intention of casting obloquy on the "reporter."

We have now gone through the "appeal." This we regard as a misnomer; the "three distinct propositions," being merely "for the present" denied, while the rest of the pamphlet is a sort of olla podrida, a dissertation *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*.† This is the honest judgment, we pronounce, in our capacity of reviewer, on the literary, logical and liberal character of the performance. Those, whose optics are clearer than ours, may find warranty for "appeal," in those parts of the sermon, which, Mr. G. thinks, attack his church. The same class of observers, will, we have no doubt, be equally skilful in perceiving the "*independent, manly*" and *powerful* ARGUMENTS by which these shadows have been put to flight by the appellant.

If he "was violently assailed," he has shewn his imperturbability, and freedom from the "slightest" emotion of "personal hostility," with a vengeance! We will not say that his "appeal," has produced in us, not "the slightest abatement of respect." We should be guilty of hypocrisy if we did. The want of "personality" in the sermon, is not a complaint that lies against the "appeal" and Mr. G. must not be offended if *his* "apple of discord," should set

\* We have indeed heard that Mr. G. has since admitted this, altho' he has not been candid enough to publish his conviction.

It does not appear from his "appeal" that he even inquired into its *truth*; but as soon as he had learned the "authority" on which it was given, out bolts a "denial" forsooth! just as if all that was necessary was to find out *who was the author* of the report, and, that ascertained, its falsity must follow of course. This sort of logic is not peculiar to Mr. G.

† This was once *freely* translated. "a rebus on all things and some others."

our teeth on edge. Reviewers have always borne the reputation of being cynical; and though *our* mordacity should be sneered and snarled at, we advise the appellant to "beware of dogs." They that play at bowls must expect to meet with rubbers.

We beg that if, in the heat of composition, the Reviewer has used any offensive expressions, his "plain vernacular" may not be *mis*-"interpreted" into disrespectful "attacks" on the Methodist Episcopal church. It is Mr. *G. himself* by whom we have been "provoked!" To the many "excellent ones of the earth," in that connexion, whom we have the happiness of knowing, we would bid 'God speed.'

---

Our promise of "evidence"\* comes now to be redeemed.

To open the case.—Our readers are aware, that, for some years, a controversy has been carried on, between two parties in the Methodist church, on several subjects, (one of them a lay delegation,) which, produced great excitement, and finally led to the expulsion of some of the most eminent preachers in the connexion, by a most high-handed and outrageous, persecution. The reformers, or *radicals*; united in establishing a paper, in the city of Baltimore, for the purpose of fairly discussing the whole matter. The publication was extensively patronized by the *new-side*-party, but proscribed by the *old-side*. Elder *G.* one of its patrons is *known* to belong to the former; and in one number of the papers, he and various others are represented to have been kept out of the General Conference, by intrigue, *on account of their disposition to reform*. "Among those who were excluded, by the species of management, to which we have referred, there were the Rev. W. Ryland, A. Shinn, A. Griffith, B. Waugh, I. Guest, &c. &c." (We have condensed this quotation to save room.) With the sentiments of the other gentlemen, we have no concern. Of Mr. *G.* we are certain. It is a general rule, admitted by all, that a public paper dependent on subscription, especially a proscribed and slandered paper, speaks the sentiments of its

---

\* See note page 11.

patrons, and communications are, most justly, supposed to emanate from them.

It follows then, that Mr. G.,—publicly advertised to be a friend of reform; known to be such in his neighbourhood; suspected of radicalism by the conference; a patron of the *radical* publication; having, for some time, been in the habit of reading, without “appealing,” virtually approving, if not originating, and complacently digesting the “bold and unqualified declarations” of an editorial board, consisting of ministers and laymen of the Methodist Episcopal church, uttered with the sanction of “hundreds” of the most respectable and pious “of the itinerancy” and thousands of the laity, in that society,—*is responsible for some part of the assertions of the OFFICIAL ORGAN of his own party.*

This catapult, aiming its missiles at the abuses, it wishes to subvert, uses among other epithets, the following:—“arbitrary;” “oppressive;” “unscriptural;” “destructive of religious liberty;” “monopolizing;” systematic and official persecution;” “not equitable;” “unfair;” “proscription of inquiry;” “aristocratic;” “awful sovereignty without inspiration;” “patronage over legislators;” “managed by a few men;” “absolute govovernment;” “no redress;” “usurpation;” “packed juries;” “popish;” “*incompatible with the republican principles of the United States* ;” \* “tyranny;” “irresponsibility;” “unqualified submission without representation;” “religious degradation;” “right of private judgment denied;” † “an establishment of priestly domination; ‡ &c. &c. to the end of the chapter.

It must be obvious that to give all the extracts, in which these are applied, would swell this article to a disproportionate length. A few communicated by local and “travelling preachers” and laymen will suffice.

“When we look over the rules of our church, we see a *few men* in possession of self-given and irresponsible power, and those *few struggling for the mastery*; in all this,

\* Why Mr. G. where were your spectacles? Poor man he has had a terrible *ophthalmia* indeed! † The “vernacular” might as well be “locked up.”

‡ Shades of “Washington and Jefferson, Adams and Franklin” !!!

Now is it not surprising that Mr. G. should have chafed at such a rate? The suspicion forces itself upon us, that he has himself stood in "danger of the judgment," and is now doing penance and making amends for his liberalism, [radicalism,] or is anxious to provoke Mr. D. to the "proof" for the sake of using as an argument, in effecting a change in the present government, the notices and reprehension which are bestowed on its glaring improprieties by other denominations. Our sagacity can peer no further than these two motives. The latter is perhaps the more commendable, and shews the appellant's skill. The former is always hateful, for men do not like to see converts abusing their *former principles* more vehemently than every body else.

We shall conclude with two extracts.

"It seems to me very strange, that these men should hold that the power of making ecclesiastical laws belongeth to ecclesiastical persons only."

*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.*

The second assuming this, places the exclusion of the laity in its strong light, and paints with the same pencil that Mr. D. has borrowed from him. The colouring must not be objected to. The limner is a Methodist of high standing—the late Dr. Coke who was the first superintendent ordained for the American Wesleyan connexion, by its founder.

"Hitherto we have seen, since the death of Mr. Wesley, *the most perfect aristocracy existing perhaps on earth.* The people have *no power, we the whole*, in the fullest sense that can be conceived."

*Dr. Coke's Letter from Antrim.*

One word at parting. Had the "Appeal" been written in the spirit of which it boasts, we should not have undertaken to review it. But, sent out without provocation, defying to battle, commencing the onslaught, and laying waste our territory, the saucy challenger was to be met, lest his unbridled license should "argue" justice on his side, and on ours, inability to repel the incursion. This is our *defence*.