

LETTER (No. 2.) TO THE REV. JOHN BORLAND.

Friend Sir,

The Copy of your "Baptist reviewed" which you had the goodness to send me, came duly to hand. A hasty perusal of the document satisfied me that it finished the very best additional proofs I could offer in support of the general charge of Intemperancy, as a writer, which I had preferred against you in my No. 1, and seeing upon that conviction, I immediately addressed you a note, respectfully asking for fifty copies of it, and plodging myself at the same time to address one to each of the parties to whom I had sent my own letter. One would have supposed you would have been glad to put your smacking reply before every man who had seen the production you had honored with so many beautiful names, but you treated my application with "cautious and silent contempt." Ungrateful, as you will no doubt consider, by a desire to do you simple justice, and being denied the opportunity of doing so by sending your Review to the persons who received my sheet, I am left to the alternative of printing a rejoinder, which I trust will be more satisfactory to you than my letter No. 1.

You will pardon me if I do not treat the subject upon which I enter with overmuch solemnity—upon such occasions it is exceedingly difficult to be grave. *Permisiō se debet sicut ea quae erit in rebus vobis?*

I had hardly expected you would dare so worthy of notice, and yet, I thought you could not very well afford to be silent, as judgement might then go by default. You have answered, and I have therefore the painful consciousness of having been instrumental in procuring to the Republic of Letters another great contribution from your pen. In the next edition of *D'Israeli's Quibbler of Literature*, it may be that the Wedgwood connection will be qualified by seeing a production from one of its most gifted sons.

That your graceful tribute to my character and abilities did not originate in exuberance of love, is patent upon the face of the article, but it indicates, and with tolerable certainty, that my name had reached its mark, inflicting a deep, yet I hope not insensible wound. Hence your cries of distress which, however, be it told in a whisper, for fear of offence, you have not even the talent to utter in decent English.

Your criticism of my orthography and diction is in excellent keeping with your other writings. I only regret you did not supply, for flavoring as you do, every successive "plough" presents a new aspect of the ridiculous which, were it not very melancholy, would be infinitely interesting. You address your letter to another self-hated friend, but understandingly for your purpose, everybody is not prepared to accept monosyllables, nor are all your readers credulous enough to gape down all you say of me.

The question which follows—*is not* necessary to be under the necessity of saying it—contains an outline, and those who know me least will stand agast at your baseness. "You see her here or lie her down after my stroke under a tumult of rivulets/valleys;" unless you can bring witnesses, you must be regarded as a—but man. I adduce another instance of contempt for truth, "He takes up with several" expresses nothing that this from my pen with the evident design of showing how incompetent I am to write, &c." Now Reverend Sir, you know that I never took up your writings for the purpose of criticizing them, until I came to Theology. I adduce once or twice, in my correspondence with a Methodist paper—I doubt if I did it more than once—in the political-religious letters to *Hannah Catharine* you published in the *Quaker Gazette*, but as to telling them up with contempt, with several vagrants, for the purpose of criticism, the statement is absurd and wickedly untrue! mark that Mr. Instead. Your literary labours in that line amounted I believe to a respectable sized volume, wherein all I ever said about them would set over one-twentieth part of that sheet! Then you have printed another pamphlet and a small book, all of them distinguished the grammatical inaccuracies, which I have never noticed a week, either for the one contained in my letter issued a few days ago. And yet you have the impudence to say that I "take up with several vagrants expressing that *sets* from your pen, in order to show how ill you write!" Have you no shame? Have you so entirely forgotten the sureness of truth as to expound no qualms of conscience when you utter falsehoods of this magnitude? Your reputation for conscientiousness does not stand very high in a certain place, and unless you control your surely modest—courage and desire honor—I fear it will fall terribly low here.

My statement with regard to attendance at this is one which cannot be truthfully contradicted, and all your show of indignation will be no wise available to it. Having been for many years in direct communion with Wesleyan Societies in this country,—twenty as a member, and eight or nine as a Class Leader—I hold myself to be as responsible a witness of the wings and habits of the Methodist people as the very Reverend Mr. Berwick, and I deliberately assert that at this moment thousands of members neglect meeting in class without being brought under discipline. April 1 and I will go further than in my first letter, and say, that in most cases of neglect, the reason is not inspired into.

With all your painstaking you have detected two typographical errors in my letter, which you present as faults of my own, and regarding one of them, you say I "erred in the rule of effect," or, for the purpose of damaging you. You mean that I did. Now Mr. Berwick, it is true I have very little respect for you, but God forbid that I should deserve to be even as serious as giving currency to a libel about you, or any body else. My research upon the passage in which the word "silence" occurs in *Malachi*—We have the silences of Malachi, and the "reproaches to them by Jehovah himself" of which plenitudes you say "I will read it for your consideration!" My reader will see that the objection is not based upon the *s* in "refraines," but upon the "silences and reprobates," *s* in *silences* you may drop the *s* which was a typographical error in the second word, without lessening the force of the objection. You will gain very little credit by this unctuous strangle.

Speaking of orthographical errors, allow me to tell you that I passed over several which subsisted in your Dialogue, which indicated pretty clearly that they had been wrongly written, and I find similar defects in your "Baptist reviewed." Please note the following—Page 4th, 2d page, in *Praefer*, "Plumpish"; 2d page, "sopitate"; 10th page, "separate"; 10th repetition of this error is something like proof that you did not know how to spell that simple word. Page 10, "irreprovable"; page 14, "mortal and pray do, for mortal; page 16, "Inconsciat." The letter to your "Dear Friend" shows the following—1st page, "silatites"; 2d page, "silagracias"; same paragraph, "indigencies" again! There are other instances which I do not need as they are apparently due to the type-setters.

I come now to the use you have made of my unpublished notes to yourself, and if I were to employ very strong language in reprehension of the act, I am sure no person of right feeling would hold me guilty of a breach of christian courtesy. By proceeding in sending you that note was dictated by a desire to avoid doing you injustice, but with a total disregard of potential property you have introduced the contents of a learned scroll, which formed no part of the document upon which you were consulting, in your reply. As to the wisdom upon the note itself, was it necessary that I should tell the reader that the technical word "proof" is used by writers and writers without the addition of "copy"? I would not much any man of common intelligence by supposing it necessary, but for your sake I quote reference to Webster. "Proof, No. 2, in printing and engraving, a rough impression of a sketch taken for correction; *proof-plate*." And then as to the use of the word "lame," did you not know that that verb is both active and passive, or transitive and intransitive? Your evil suggests that you do not even understand the most simple rudiments of grammar. See Webster, "lame, *v. t.*, to pass or flow out, &c., &c." Legal processes lame, or may be "ready to lame," as may defences or *repel* from Stock Companies; warrants from the Government; bonds and letters from the Press, &c., &c., &c. For, your hyperboleism (not whence the word for hyperbole) is worthy of your logic and grammar. When I tell you that I willingly take the risk of all your other numerous critiques you will excuse me giving them a more extended notice.

I have another serious charge to bring against you, and it is one which no writer having decent self-respect can afford to treat lightly. Taking a mixture of the gospel your presumed sanctity makes it especially necessary that you should set in good faith, in other words, like an honest man. This you have not done in your "Baptist, &c." To state as end you have descended to a very doubtful aim. You have unquoted me, or to be more explicit, you have withheld from your reader portions of some of my arguments which were necessary to their integrity (I use the word integrity in its primary and best sense—wholeness). In proof of this charge I refer the reader to the 6th paragraph of my first letter, and to the 6th, 7th, and 8th of yours, also to my paragraph 14, and to the translation of your paragraph 20.

I charge you further with having unscrupulously represented poor old *Wesley*!! Your unkindness in regard to my own words was criminal enough, but without using superlatives, how shall I characterize the conduct of a man, who, filling the sacred Office of Spiritual Instructor, dares to blazon so much as to baffle his own words for the purpose of getting out of difficulty? Now as any one who may chance to waste his time upon the perusal of your 1st Dialogue, down to page 7, will see, the discussion between Algernon Sofield and Stewart Old-patcher, was regarding the propriety of making attendance upon class-meeting a condition of Church membership. Mr. Sofield held that it was not right to do so, Mr. Old-patcher, that it was. Old-patcher insisted that Mr. Wesley was averse to the relaxation of the rule; Sofield maintained that Mr. Wesley had no idea of making obedience to such a rule a condition of membership at all. Old-patcher said, that so far from Mr. Wesley being disposed to make the rule less stringent, he was inclined to make it if possible more rigorous; and here are his words: "You did me no evidence, not the slightest, that he wished the condition of membership to be made less stringent, but the contrary rather. The burden of proving the latter falls upon you, my friend." Will any one say that Old-patcher did not write letter here instead of *forswore*? Was he not labouring to show that Sofield could not prove anything in favour of the relaxation of the rule, and did he not intend to enlarge the adduction of the evidence which he imagined his antagonist could not produce? But let me call attention to the very next member of the sentence, which is as follows: "I assure you your attempt at doing so would be the commencement of a very helarious task." Reverend Sir, I stated that you were "calling upon your opponent to sustain a proposition entirely distinct from, and antagonistic to, the one you intended to sustain;" to him, and I repeat the allegation. You were of course desirous that he should furnish proof if he could, of what he had asserted, not of what you had affirmed, but believing he could not do so, you told him that his "attempt would be the commencement of a very helarious task." Yet you assert in your letter, that you meant to call upon him to prove that Mr. Wesley wished to increase the rigour of the rule! In so saying you told an untrue open yourself. (The reader will please refer to paragraph 6, in my first letter, and to the reply of Mr. Bedford, paragraph 8.) To proceed; I find proof that in the interpretation of your own words, (see paragraph 5 of Mr. Bedford's letter) you have availed yourself of the instructions I gave you at my paragraph 5. It makes me the better to hear up under the guilty shear which, no doubt in compassion to my perverse soul, you have hemmed upon me, in the subsequent parts of your letter. I may as well tell you here, that I had heard of the Doctrines of Socinianism, and that it is just possible I may be as unconcerned with the history of Methodism, and with history generally, as yourself. Happy knowledge "assuages its single pangs" is known as readily as its contradictions.

I do not know that there is much else to notice in your last "Literary effort," which, as present, be it said with due adulation, is, in itself, your best. However, for after the way the Dialogue had been handled, I dare say you felt alive to the necessity of sustaining your growing reputation. Yet as you have rejoiced exceedingly over one of my phrases, I ought not perhaps to allow the opportunity to pass without complimenting you upon the microscope discovery you have made, in respect of its character. The expression which has given you such intense satisfaction is the following:— "I believe, and I think that most persons are still conversant with the early history of Methodism, believe 'with me, that in instituting the class-meeting, Mr. Wesley did the very best thing that could be done." Now a rigid but honest critic would possibly have said that the phrase had an elegant brevity, allowable, and that words having the force of the following, should have been added, "by him under the circumstances." The reference to "the early history of Methodism" was, as I thought, sufficient to render the meaning quite clear, and I think so still. The Imperial Dictionary thus treats of the *Barbers*. "2 genus, defect; omission; a figure of syntax, by which one or more words are omitted, which the hearer or reader may supply." Where is your triumph? One of your citations, far more reprehensible, I passed over, remanding only that several words were needed, but you could not afford to "do Justice."

If I were to pass over your funny remarks upon "arbitrary organizations" and the "refuge" of my first reason for non-attendance at class, some of my readers might think I had avoided the terrible sarcasm from a sense of inability to deal with them. Well, I know you intended to be very severe, and I should consider at the classification you would have inflicted upon me if your intent had been as great as your words, but happily nature has endowed you with a reasonable modicum of mental force that, however irksome you may be, your indignation finds vent only in common-place scolding. Many a Mrs. Stern-woman will give attention to conceptions, in the way of abuse, the more original and amusing than you have ever possessed, and if you take my advice you will put a bridle upon your tongue, and an injunction upon your hand, lest you should further degrade the position you occupy. The world does not require proof that there are really nervous people who never can speak before others, and I doubt whether it will accept your marvelous system of cure, still, as you are a rare oracle, perhaps the nation may take, if you advertise liberally. How would it sound in the paper? "Bedford's Nervous Discipline! as valuable care for狂躁 Methodists! Nine thousand also hundred patients out of ten thousand, restored by faithfully following the prescription!!!"

Reverend Sir, the affliction to the means of grace and the love of God lessened lately after your melancholy exhibition of snoring levity, is about as strong a dose of disgust, as you could have given to your master. To conclude this part of my task: you confined reserve to calamity, with nervousness; are you serious, or is it only another attempt to "befog" your "Dear Friend"? Give up such practices for they are too painful for men to indulge in.

Or I had forgotten your pastic conclusion. Have you never heard that the sentence of the verse has been mercilessly violated, as a piece of folly? Then you are not the well-posted up non-slavery abolitionists. Did old gen go to the fountain of knowledge, and did you really drink large draughts therefrom? Ah Sir, I fear some wicked wag played you a sneaky trick and flooded the spring! This will account for the very mouldy state of your thoughts. Go again, Reverend Sir, perhaps on a sound application you will find the waters taste liquid.

I have an idea of publishing the correspondence between us in the *Newspapers*. The whole Province will thus be benefited by looking in your writings a model of chaste and realistic composition. Your field of operation is too narrow for a sublimating genius, and the man who brings you flowers will be entitled to public gratitude. What say you? At present you only appear in unadmirable pulpits and on semi-political platforms, but the Province has a right to your services. What say you? Shall I associate my name with your great name in the *Bible*?

I now proceed to give a few more gems from the rich mine of your Dialogue on Class Meetings—observing, by way of preface that I have not the Faculty to compare myself with Cobbett, who, if he were living and had your writings to analyze would hardly put them on a par with those of the great men you have named.

You have indicated that the pressure of your pastoral avocations leaves you little time to expend upon literary efforts, and I can well believe that if you attend properly to your duties, you will find enough to do. But I venture that your errors were not those of haste; you did your best; you could not have done better if you had tried, or, under the frown of a second critique you would not have fallen into others equally grave.

NEW GEMS FROM THE DIALOGUE.

Profane. "Owing mainly to the prudent course of the Conference in abstaining from all explicit reference to Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet; quiet has been maintained throughout the Methodist connexion." Very well. "It has nevertheless born my conviction," you go on to say, "that sooner or later an antidote to Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet should be supplied." Here then we have two singular arguments. Conference having the truth on its side, had surely no reason to fear, yet you exhibit that body as in the attitude of apprehension. Do you believe in the maxim *Fortis wages out of præsumptio*? I think not. And—if the prudent course was to refrain from making reference to the subject, where is your prudence in bringing it forward in so exciting a manner?

Profane again. "This I have done readily do as you view, Sir, and that I can supply them, &c." Some plainer. "Where we both agree in opposition to Dr. Ryerson," Ay. So you both agree in opposition, or contradistinction to Dr. Ryerson, for certainly the phrase *discreet mens*

that you and the other party agree to appoint the Doctor. Again; "His piety as a Christian; his talents as a pastor; his intelligence as a historian, gave assurance that the service would be well performed by his hand." *At this is the one so far as the main object of the prophet (Rev. Mr. Williamson's) is concerned.*¹ The reader will please observe that the piety, talents and intelligence of the Rev. Mr. Williamson is the case so far as Class Meetings, or a condition of membership, is concerned! *It is not the case so far as the main object of the prophet (Rev. Mr. Wesley's) is concerned than I thought you were, or (my mind) than you ought to be.*" The rest of the sentence is very clumsy. Page 6.—"You certainly are less acquainted with Mr. Wesley's writings than I thought you were, or (my mind) than you ought to be." The rest of the sentence is very clumsy. Page 7.—"The burden of proving the latter, rests with you my friend, and I assure you your attempt would be the commencement of a hopeless task!" The attempt to prove, would be the task, not its commencement. The next phrase, "He called for an alteration in the disciplinary usage for the Church there (the United States) to fit," Rev. Mr. John, my friend, that, etc., and yet the sentence will be hence; indeed it is fully demonstrated that it cannot be material. Next phrase.—"This one fact (the fact that Mr. Wesley introduced no change in the discipline) is fatal to your argument drawn from such a source, and most eloquently he abandoned!" Self-head had drawn no argument from such a source; but mark! *he most eloquently so triumphantly wielded to demolish the argument, never abandoned!* Page 8.—"As to your prophecies and its application, Rev. Mr. John say it erases?" The two are as it, Page 9, and so—*Have you not read, Rev. Mr. John?* "If so, has it not occurred to you?" How could it if he had not read? Page 9.—"But if they are compelled to feel and rule, are the members to be held by no obligation but that of their own good pleasure?" etc. Pleasure is not an obligation. Same page.—"The Apostle viewed the conduct of such assemblies in a strong light?" "Strong light" is not strong damnation. Light shines upon good as upon bad actions. Page 10.—"To surrender them, Rev. Mr. John, would open from their important use, be an act for recklessness and folly of which I trust we are not capable." This phrase is exceedingly sick.

Int.—Luring "their important use" out of the question, it would be an act for recklessness and folly to surrender them! Now as we see only valuable reasons of "their important use". It strikes me that retaining them apart from it, would be the act of recklessness and folly.

Int.—"An act for recklessness and folly." One expects either a disjunction to be instituted between this act of folly, and other acts of folly, or an assertion that it would be without precedent in the annals of folly; but Mr. Borland has a way of rounding off his sentences quite peculiar to himself, and which in his judgment is so correct, that we be to the dog that barks at it.

The same page, "but those rather whose spirituality is far below par," the reader indicates only that the filers "below par" are more inclined to the change advocated by Self-head, than the others, or find they are more likely of the two classes to desire such a change. Some sentence, "who do we send to be dogged into subjects for which they have no relish, do?" How could they wish to be dogged into such subjects? [Note] by stopped did you mean bound? well nobody likes to be bound. Page 11, [let the reader mark the following.] And yet "because their views are antagonistic to the tenets of Infinito Wisdom they are to act accordingly?" They are to act according to the Commands of Infinite Wisdom because their views are antagonistic to Infinito Wisdom! I pass over other errors to come to the following, "and, "because our Church wholly approves them (class meetings) without according to your theory how it perfectly optional as to whether our members shall attend them or not." Because the Church approves them they are it is implied, was this Self-head's theory?

I stop digging in this noise although the other (other pages) are equally rich in gems.

In your letter you indicate that I had prepared my own with great care, but I may as well tell you that I have nothing written in such basic. I say this to account for having overlooked so many errors in the Dialogue.

I shall now give a very brief attention to the "Berlin." A few of its "elegancies" as general samples are all I can offer, the rest my readers can pick out for themselves.

GEMS FROM THE BERLIN.

Int Paragraph. "I have birth seen it and read it. Over it is crossed, "to having and see a copy of it for that purpose." Of its stupification, "for that purpose," you state the purpose. Then it was easiest to say that it had been sent for the purpose of being seen and read, as everybody knows that letters are usually sent that they may be read. Paragraph 2, "a result of vindictive feelings have plagued him." See. That's great garrulous, for where the place should be used you employ the singular, and also read. Same paragraph, "plagued him lots a' possum." People are not plagued into positions, nor are they plagued into positions, but they may be placed in positions. Same paragraph, "close considerer," Titlefort Titmouse refutes. Paragraph 3, "will they fail to discern that while he smoothes them" with one hand he stabs them with the other?" Reversed Sir, when they are stated they will not require to be followed up by you.

I cannot pass over your available attempt to impress upon simple people, by representing me as the Master of the Methodist Ministry. If I have taken you in hand it is because you richly deserve it, and I now perceive just that I shall not relax in my laudable efforts to do yet justice. I have delivered your "Order" by speech and by writing and have resolved at my reward, the hearty thanks of many Methodists, both understand and laymen. You yourself know, that I once used the *sic sic sic sic sic* affect of this letter, when, as the friend of the Wesleyan Ministers in Lower Canada, I rebuked one of their auxiliaries, who, by the way, made you appear very small. The countenances at class meetings is a standing proof of the vacuousness of the rule, and a direct imposition into the cause of schism would be resisted by many members in a gross impetuosity. Though you are a minister, and have earned the sobriquet of "the fighting man of the District," a man would not undertake to "bind" a dragon like potentially worse numbers I set off. If I were not an irreverberant I give the names of persons whom, while their Pastor, you have brought under discipline for schism from the class.

I perceive I have only got to your third paragraph and there are sixteen others. A final survey period of the letter revealed over twenty errors, and as in the case of the Dialogue, I verily believe a second examination would show a greater number, but I have not time to wade over the thankless task, so I shall just point out one or two more.

Paragraph 4, "Debtors, etc., was satisfied with what the writings of those celebrities elsewhere supplied." Did he never examine other writings, or did he fatten upon those as affording his private satisfaction, just as you suppose I have done with respect to yourself? If he had lived until now he would have found another celebrity who would have supplied him of resources. Paragraph 5, "Hark! an Eclipse with a vengeance." Mr. Wesley never designed his Societies should become so separated Church, but even remain as integral portions of the Episcopal "Church." Before "ever remains" the words "on the contrary he intended that they should" can hardly be dispensed with, still I would not have abridged to the omission if you had not gone into evidence about one of my own slips. The last batch of blunders I shall serve up is the following, and although the word jargon has offended you mightily, I cannot help saying that non-diagonal jargon that is contained in the two unjoined sentences has seldom if ever been put in type.

* Further, that circumstances which he could not control, arose in the conduct of vaguely and pretentiously ministers of that church towards the members of his societies, and which, he apprehended, would lead to the very separation he was anxious to prevent. Examining, especially towards the close of his life, that little probably remained of his Societies being recognized and treated as a portion of the Church of England; or, that now they were so treated, they could have the spiritual culture bestowed upon them which they needed; and therefore, that that which he had labored against, viz: a separate church organization, would be necessitated—he "to some extent provided for it," by enrolling a school in Clermont; one important end of which being, to give the evidence of his preachers such a legal status that when the thing *foretold* became a necessity, they ought to be circumstantially to meet it.²

I add that in my first letter I used very plain language in speaking of your writings, but in the absence of epigonosis I candidly confess you are vastly my superior. If you had studied grammar as diligently as you were to have learned up terms of reproach and contemptuously you would not have had the satisfaction of being held up to public gaze as a mere pretender. I close this communication with a vocabulary of

plainest terms, called from your comparatively short epistles to show the good Methodist people how one of their most honored Ministers can sneer and mock!

BABA, MR. BORLAND'S VOCABULARY OF JEWS.

You say I cherish "vindictive feelings"; that I have a "snarling spirit"; that I am "part"; that I "gratify a long cherished grudge," and "discharge a quantity of bile"; that I "degrade and libel" the Methodist Ministers; that I am a "victor segment"; that I am "vain"; that I "smooth with one hand and stab with the other"; that I am a "Judas," "a loathing detestful enemy"; that I am so confident as a thief "lecturing an knavery"; that I have an "obtuse mind and great ignorance"; that I am a "gentleman" (ironically). You ask why I am not acquainted with certain facts? and you answer "because——" and leave the rest to be disclosed by your dear friend; you did not exactly like to say "he is a fool," which on doubt you meant, for you had called me ignorant, obtuse, &c. before, and unless you meant "fool" or "ass," why did you leave the space blank. You then go on to say "infect with basing impertinence, mockery, &c." You accuse me of "superficial impudence," of being a "would-be-critic," of "malignant scurility" and of "going a long way below the standard of a "gentleman." You say I am a "Heller of Methodism"; that I had a "special intention of insulting and trifling you"; and that I "maligned" and insulted both the Ministers and people of our church" &c., &c., &c.

A VIVE TROTCHIE.

Once upon a time, in St. John's, New Brunswick, I got into a newspaper controversy with a party, who coming to the city with strangers, something like what you have exhibited, was notorious enough to retire from the field; but there, though not a Clergyman, he was a scholar and a logician, and finding he had the worst of the segment, he boldly abandoned his position. If I do not say you have been worsted in this battle, our readers will judge, but I do say that it is not at all probable you will ever acknowledge yourself beaten. I have a note by me from a thoroughly educated man in which those words occur, "have you seen Mr. Borland's rejoinder?" It furnishes the most satisfactory proof yet offered of the truth of your general remarks in regard to us. You harass that it is difficult to write with perfect correctness, or something to that effect, and I consent to the truth of the remark, but it is one thing to have a dozen doubtful phrases in a stately pamphlet, and another to mar almost every paragraph with mistakes as幼稚 and ungrammatical as to show an entire ignorance of the rules of composition. By the way there was one error in my letter you did not detect, and which I only observed after the document was printed.

I return to the subject of class-meetings. You say I gave three reasons operating against moving in class; and with a great flourish of language, you add that you and the other Sillibon could supply twice thirty-three, or eighty, but you forget to state, that I had anticipated you by saying that "many others that might be mentioned, were entertained to meeting in class by persons of ploy, or well-disposed to such religion"—another instance of your fulness.

Class-meetings were instituted by Mr. Wesley, whom we all agree to regard as a man of great moral and intellectual power; a man raised by Providence to perform a special task; in fact, a Reformer in the highest sense of the word. He did his work well, and "having served his generation, according to the will of God, he fell asleep." His work was, "to revive experimental religion in the land," and we may say, throughout the world. In the person of his holy widow, he did many things supplied by the then condition of society, and one of these things was preaching frequently in the open air, a practice which few of the preachers in our day dare to venture. It necessary to isolate. The people wholly ignorant of this religion, and given up to all manner of vice—idolatry almost unrestrained—reprobated "live upon love, and present upon prayer." Preaching hardly met these requirements. The exercises of ignorance are not remedied by sermons so effectually as by conversation; thus he did, and to meet the exigencies of the time he established Class-meetings, which are still peculiarly well-suited to the "instruction of the flocks and the teaching of babes," as well as to many other good purposes. That my former communication did not advocate the abolition of Class-meetings every child mind will cheerfully acknowledge, but by transcribing my words you have endeavored to make me responsible for the annihilation of such a desire. I carry not the man who can resort to such tactics. Mr. Wesley, by your own admission, saw the condition of things gradually changing, and saw it with regret, still (I reason on your admission) he adapted himself to the new phase as they occurred. He even (according to you) foreseen the necessity of a Church organisation for his societies, and provided for it. Well I infer from all this that first strongly as he was attached to the simple system he had called into existence, he was not much at a loss as to the possibility of its being improved, but prepared the way for the introduction of such alterations as he saw would become necessary. Time rolls on, and the lessons mind progresses. One after another the institutions of the past creumble and make way for others more in accordance with the actual condition of things. Some men, like Mr. Wesley, are in advance of their age, and their projects are realized, but for good ideas are irreversibly lost. The sower doth not always reap, yet the seed vegetates and finally fructifies. Impenitent souls, are always found in opposition, but "trefts, over leevy since the world began; the fee of syncretism and the fraud of man," prevail at last. The "condition of Wesleyan Church membership" is one of human infidelity, and therefore fairly avails no human reason. Every honest Methodist has an undoubted right to discuss it without being exposed to calumniated slanders and disparaging bluster which you seem to regard as the legitimate "weapons of your warfare." If truth is on your side what have you to fear? Don't imagine you are going to silence me at least your equals by your overwhelming eloquence. After the noise has subsided the question will come up again on its less results, and you will find that you have but won ground by the blustering you call a Dialogue, and the shade of shame you let fall a blot, then you will ever be able to argue. Radical changes and reforms are not accomplished in a day, and of this the advocates for the abolition of the "conditions of Membership" are quite well aware, but if you wish to afflict them unmercifully write a few more pamphlets, and if they are as powerful as the one I have shadowed you will be entitled to their thanks. You agitate the conscience; put the conservative arguments before the church in your incomprehensible style; baffle the people with "intelligible jargon," and you will see the consequence. Job in his anguish desired that his "sonny would write a book," and I assure you that your adversaries can desire nothing better for their cause than that you should write books. Now go to your study and "clear the red of smut and bitter ducus" and when they see the light I shall de myself the pleasure of giving them a patient attention.

In your next edition of the Dialogues I counsel you to put this at the head as a motto—

Envy me not my success—Horace.

Yours truly,

SCRUTATOR.