

23
LETTER (No. 2.) TO THE REV. JOHN BORLAND.

Beloved Sir,

The Copy of your "Believer reviewed" which you had the goodness to send me, came duly to hand. A hasty perusal of the document satisfied me that it furnished the very best additional proofs I could offer in support of the general charge of inconsistency, as a writer, which I had preferred against you in my No. 1. and acting upon that conviction, I immediately addressed you a note, respectfully asking for fifty copies of it, and pledging 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 availing reply before every man who had seen the production you had honored with so many beautiful names, but you treated my application with "sneers and silent contempt." Unlaid, as you will no doubt conclude, 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 was 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 excessive solemnity—upon some occasions it is exceedingly difficult to be grave. *Pardon me, dear Sir, as you is written on mine?*

I had hardly expected you would deem me worthy of notice, and yet, I thought you could not very well afford to be silent, as judgment 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 *Harvard's Collection of Librarians*, it may be that the *Wesleyan* connection will be gratified by seeing a production from one of its most gifted sons.

That your graceful tribute to my character and abilities did not originate in a consciousness of love, is patent upon the face of the epistle, but it is indubitable, and with indubitable certainty, that my answer had reached its mark, inflicting a deep, yet I hope not incurable wound. Hence your cries of distress which, however, be it said in a whisper, for fear of offence, you have not seen the talent to state in decent English.

Your criticisms of my orthography and diction are in excellent laughing; with your other writings, I only regret you did not amply, for sounding as you do, every successive "phases" presents a new aspect of the ridiculous which, were it not very unkindly, would be infinitely entertaining. You address your letter to another self-headed friend, but unfortunately for your purpose, everybody is not prepared to accept nonsense, not so all your readers are foolish enough to gulp down all you say of me.

The question which follows—*is it necessary to make the necessity of saying it—contains an ostentatious, and those who know me best will stand aghast at your hardness.* "You see this here or he has been often seen by where under a banner of *Christianity*," unless you can bring witnesses, you must be regarded as a—bad man. I address another letter of contempt for truth, "is this up with moral?" expresses anything that fills from my pen with the wildest design of showing how incompetent I am to write, &c. Now Reverend Sir, you have that I have taken up your writings for the purpose of criticising them, and I come to *Wesley*. I should once or twice, in my correspondence with a *Wesleyan* paper—I doubt if I did it more than once—to the police-religious letters to *Wesleyan* Catholics you published in the *Quarterly*, but as to telling them up with exposure, with moral exposure, for the purpose of ridiculing, the statement is already and widely untrue: mark that Mr. Beland. Your *Wesley* letters is that has answered. I believe to a respectable sized volume, whereas all I ever said about them would not cover one-twentieth part of this sheet! Then you have printed orally pamphlets and a small book, all of them distinguished by grammatical inaccuracies, upon which I have never offered a remark, other than the one contained in my letter issued a few days ago. And yet you have the impudence to say that I *solely* up with moral exposure anything that fills from your pen, in order to show how it you write! Have you no shame? Have you so entirely forgotten the abundance of truth as to experience no qualms of conscience when you utter falsehoods of this magnitude? Your rejoinder for *conscientiousness* does not show very high in a certain place, and when you control your *various* *various*—*various* and *various*—I fear it will equally 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 so very weakly. Having been for twenty-two years in direct intercourse with *Wesleyan* Societies in this country, twenty as a member, and eight or nine as a *Class Leader*—I hold myself to be so competent a witness of the wages and habits of the Methodist people as the very Reverend Mr. Beland, and I deliberately re-assert that at this moment thousands of members neglect meeting in class without being brought under discipline. And will go further than in my first letter, and say, that in most cases of neglect, the reason is not lagged here.

With all your painstaking you have detected two typographical errors in my letter, which you present as facts of my own, and repeating one of them, you say I "*erred*" for the sake of effect, or, for the purpose of damaging you. You must that I did. Now Mr. Beland, it is true I have very little respect for you, but God forbid that I should descend to so mean an action as giving currency to a lie about you, or say truly else. My remark upon the passage in which the word "*reference*" occurs is as follows—"We have the *reference* of *Malachi*, and the *reference* to them by *Jeremiah* *Malachi*," of which phraseology you say "I will read it for your consideration." My reader will see that the *reference* is not based upon the *is* "*reference*," but upon the "*reference* and *reference*," so that you may drop the *is* (which was a typographical error) in the second word, without touching the force of the objection. You will gain very little credit by this unworthy stratagem.

Speaking of orthographical errors, allow me to tell you that I passed over several words misapprehended in your *Diagnosis*, which indicated pretty clearly that they had been wrongly written, and I find similar defects in your "*Believer Reviewed*." Please note the following:—*Epistle*, 2nd page, or *Prologue*; "*Phanphat*"; 5th page, "*agents*"; 7th page, "*supervise*"; (the repetition of this error is something like proof that you did not know how to spell that simple word); page 10, "*irresistible*"; page 14, "*several* and *pray*" &c. for *several*; page 19, "*Inconceivable*." The letter to your "*Dear Friend*" shows the following:—1st page, "*climates*"; 2nd page, "*indisparably*"; same paragraph, "*indisparably*" again! There are other mistakes which I do not mark as they are apparently due to the type-setters.

I come now to the one you have made of my unpublished note to yourself, and if I were to employ very strong language in reprobation of the act, I am sure no person of right feeling would hold me guilty of a breach of christian courtesy. My proceeding in sending you that note was dictated by a desire to avoid doing you injustice, but with a total disregard of potential propriety you have introduced the contents of a harlequin's scroll, which formed no part of the document upon which you were reasoning, in your reply. As to the withdrawal upon the note itself, was it necessary that I should tell the reader that the isolated word "*proof*" is used by printers and writers without the addition of "*copy*"? I would not touch any man of common intelligence by supposing it necessary, but for your sake I cannot reference to Webster. "*Proof*, No. 2, in printing and engraving, a rough impression of a sheet taken for correction; *phases* *phases*." And then as to the use of the word "*hums*," did you not know that that verb is both active and neuter, or transitive and intransitive? Your oval suggests that you do not even understand the most simple rudiments of grammar. See Webster, "*hums*, v. t., to pass or flow out, &c., &c." Legal processions, or may be "*ready to hum*," so may *debauch* or *sway* from Stock Companies; warrants from the Government; books and letters from the Press, &c., &c. Sir, your hypercriticism (don't mistake the word for hypocrisy) is worthy of your logic and grammar. When I tell you that I willingly take the risk of all your numerous criticisms you will excuse my 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 sentence of the Gospel your present strategy makes it especially necessary that you should act in good faith, in other words, like an honest man. This you have not done in your "*Believer*, &c." To witness and you have descended to a very dishonest art, you have misquoted me, as to be more explicit, you have withheld from your readers portions of some of my arguments which were necessary to their integrity. It was the wish integrity in its primary and best sense—wholeness. In proof of this charge I refer the reader to the 8th paragraph of my first letter, and to the 6th, 7th, and 8th of yours, also to my paragraph 14, and to the mutilation of your paragraph 10.

I charge you further with having unscrupulously represented your own writings! Your unfairness is equal 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, denounces himself as much as to falsify his own words for the purpose of getting out of difficulty? Now as any one who may choose to waste his time upon the perusal of your 1st Dialogue, down to page 7, will see, the discussion between Alpheus Southwell and Samuel Old-patcher, was regarding the propriety of making attendance upon class-meeting a condition of Church membership. Mr. Southwell held that it was not right to do so, Mr. Old-patcher, that it was. Old-patcher insisted that Mr. Wesley was wrong to the relaxation of the rule. Southwell maintained that Mr. Wesley had no idea of making attendance in 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 find 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 *former*? Was he not endeavoring to show that Southwell could not prove anything in favor of the relaxation of the rule, and did he not intend to challenge the admission of the evidence which he imagined his antagonist could not produce? But let us 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 hopeless task." Reverted Mr. I stated that you were "calling upon your opponent to sustain a proposition entirely distinct from, and antagonistic to, the one you intended to submit" to him, and I repeat the allegation. You were of course, desiring that he should furnish proof if he could, of what he had asserted, not of what you had asserted, but before he could do so, you told him that his "attempt would be the commencement of a very hopeless task." Yet you affirm in your letter, that you meant, to call upon him to prove that Mr. Wesley wished to increase the rigor of the rule! Is so saying you told an untruth upon yourself. (The reader will please refer to paragraph 6, in my first letter, and to the reply of Mr. Rutland, paragraph 8.) To proceed; I find yourself that in the interpretation of your own words, (see paragraph 7 of Mr. Rutland's letter) you have evaded yourself of the instructions I gave you at my paragraph 5. It establishes the better to bear up under the guilty shame which, on death in comparison to my perverse soul, you have heaped upon me, in the subsequent parts of your letter. I may as well tell you here that I had heard of the Devil of Settlement, and that it is just possible I may be as conversant with the history of Methodism, and with history generally, as yourself. Happily knowledge "wreaths its single page" is known as readily as to coordinate.

I do not know that there is much else to notice in your last "Literary effort," which, on present, he is said with due solicitation, in no doubt, your chief concern, for after the way the Dialogue had been honored, 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 microscopic discovery you have made, in respect of its derivation. The expression which has given you such intense satisfaction is the following—"I believe, and I think that most persons at all 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 slight hardly 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 Bureau. "2 pass, direct; conduct; a figure of syntax, by which one or more words are omitted, which the sense or context may supply." Where is your triumph? One of your criticisms, far more reprehensible, I passed over, reminding only that several words were wanted, but you could not afford to "do better."

If I were to pass over your funny remarks upon "serious organizations" and the "relief" of my first reason for non-attendance at class, some of my readers might think I had avoided the terrible sarcasms from a sense of inability to deal with them. Well, I know you intended to be very severe, and I almost shudder at the chastisement you would have inflicted upon me if your talent the inventive had been as great as your words, but happily nature has endowed you with reasonable facilities of mental force that, however inferior they may be, your indignation finds vent only in common-place scolding. Many a Mrs. Storm-away will give attention to conversations, in the way of abuse, the more original and amusing than any you have ever produced, and if you take my advice you will put a bridle upon your tongue, and in ignorance upon your hand, lest you should further degrade the position you occupy. The world does not require proof that there are really serious people who never can speak before others, and I doubt whether it will accept your sarcastic system of cure; still, as you are a rare sample, perhaps the sarcasm may take, if you advertise liberally. How would it sound in the paper? "Robert's Serious Discipline! an infallible cure for recalcitrant Methodists! Nine thousand nine hundred patients out of ten thousand, restored by faithfully following the prescription!!!"

Reverend Sir, the attention to the means of grace and the love of God immediately after your melancholy exhibition of morose looks, is almost as strong a dose of disgust, as you could have given to your readers. To conclude this part of my task: you confessed reserve or tactfulness, with nervousness; are you serious, or is it only another attempt to "believe" your "Dear Friend"? Give up such pretenses for they are too painful for men to indulge in.

O! I had forgotten your poetic conclusions. Have you never heard that the sentiment of the verse has been marvellously ridiculed, at a piece of folly? Then you are not the well-posted up man your admirers imagine. But did you go to the fountain of knowledge, and did you really drink large draughts thereof? Ah Sir, I have once wished you played you a severe trick and faked the spring! This will account for the very modesty of your thoughts. Go again, Dear Sir, perhaps on a second application you will find the waters more tepid.

I have an idea of publishing the correspondence between us in the *Scenes*. The whole Preface will thus be benefited by having in your writings a model of elegant and useful composition. Your field of operation is too narrow for a salaried guide, and the man who brings you forward will be entitled to public gratitude. What say you? At present you only appear in valuable pulpits and on non-political platforms, but the Preface has a right to your services. What say you? Shall I associate my own with your great name in the title?

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

You have indicated that the pressure of your post-mortem associations 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 maintain 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 fear of a second criticism you would not have taken into others openly given.

NEW GEMS FROM THE DIALOGUE.

Preface. "Owing mainly to the practical course of the Conference is abstaining from all existing reference to Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet, which has been maintained throughout the Methodist connection." Very well. "It has nevertheless been my conviction," you go on to say, "that sooner or later an allusion 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 truth. Forgive me now out of possibility? I think not. Back—if the practical course was to refrain from making reference to the subject, where is your goodness in bringing it forward in so catching a manner?

Preface again. "This I the more readily do as my views, Sir, and that I can supply them, &c." Same phrase, "Where we both agree is opposite to Dr. Ryerson," &c. As you both agree in opposition, or contradiction to Dr. Ryerson, it is certainly the phrase I cannot mean

that you and the other party agree to oppose the Doctor. Again, "His piety as a Christian; his habits as a pastor; his intelligence as a historian, gave assurance that the service would be well-performed by his hand. *AN ALLY to the cause so far as the main object of the pamphlet (Rev. Mr. Williams) is concerned.*" The reader will please observe that the piety, habits and intelligence of the Rev. Mr. Williams is the one so far as Church Meetings as a condition of membership, is concerned! *See a 14/2's*..... Page 3.—"You certainly are less acquainted with Mr. Wesley's writings than I thought you were, or (my word) that you ought to be." The rest of the sentence is very cheap. Page 7.—"The burden of proving the latter, rests with you my friend, and I assume 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 his attention to the disciplinary usage for the Church there (the United States) to find?" *See, my friend, that, &c.*, and yet the sentence will be true; indeed it is so badly constructed that it cannot be mended. Next phrase—"This one fact (the fact that Mr. Wesley borrowed no change in the discipline) is fatal to your argument drawn from such a source, and must therefore be abandoned." *Soft-head had drawn no argument from such a source; but mark! the very fact so triumphantly wielded to demolish the argument, must be abandoned!* Page 8.—"As to your proposition and its application, *See*, I must say it crosses." The two are in *See*. Pages 9 and 10.—"How you not read, *See*." "If so, has it not occurred to you," *See*. How could it if he had not read? Page 12.—"But if they are disciplined to feel and rule, are the members to be held by no obligation but that of their own good pleasure," *See*. Pleasure is not an obligation. Same page.—"The Apostle viewed the conduct of such absentees in a strong light." "Strong light" is not strong disapprobation. Light shines upon good as upon bad actions. Page 13.—"To surrender them, *See*, would spare them from their important use, be an act for recklessness and folly of which I trust we are not capable." This phrase is exceedingly rich.

1st.—Lamenting "their important use" out of the question, it would be an act for (or) recklessness and folly to surrender them! Now as they are only valuable because of "their important use" 2. still as we that retaining them apart from *See*, would be the act of recklessness and folly.

2nd.—"An act for recklessness and folly." One expects either a comparison 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. Hester, has a way of rounding off his sentences quite peculiar to himself, and which in his judgment is no sinnet, that were he to die for the dog that barks at it.

The same page, "but those rather whose spirituality is faultily below par," the author indicates only that the folks "below par" are more inclined to the change advocated by Hester, than the others, or that they are more likely of the two classes to desire such a change. Same sentence "who do not wish to be dogged but subjects for which they have no wish, *See*." How could they wish to be dogged into such subjects? (Note by *dogged* did you mean *headed*? well nobody likes to be headed.) Page 11, (let the reader mark the following.) "And yet "because their views are antagonistic to the demands of *Isidore Wilson* they are to act accordingly "1 they are to act according to the Councils of *Isidore Wilson* because their views are antagonistic to *Isidore Wilson*. I pass over other errors to come to the following, "and "because our Church wisely appoints them (Church meetings) no more according to your theory than is perfectly optional as to whether you "surrender shall attend them or not." Because the Church appoints them they are to be *surrendered*, was this Hester's theory?

I stop dogging in this place although the other holes (pages) are equally rich in grain.

In your letter you indicate that I had prepared my own with great care, but I can so well tell you that I have added written is such haste. I say this to account for having overlooked so many errors in the Dialogue.

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

GIVEN FROM THE REVIEW.

1st Paragraph. "I have both seen it and read it. One it is curious, "to having out one a copy of it for that purpose." Of its importance, "for that purpose," you state two purposes. Then it was unclear 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 triumph of vindictive feelings have plagued him," *See*. This is great punning, for where the plaid should be used you employ the *plague*, and the word. Same paragraph, "plugged him into a position." People are not plugged into positions, we are they changed into positions, but they may be plugged in position. Same paragraph, "close considerable," Thackeray Thackeray refuted. Paragraph 3, "will they fail to discern that while he smoothes them "with one hand he stabs them with the other." Reversed *See*, when they are stilled they will not require to be lulled off it by you.

I cannot pass over your amiable attempt to impose 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 promise you that I shall not relax in my honest efforts to do you justice. I have defended your "Order" by speech and by writing and have received as my reward, the hearty thanks of every Methodist, both individual and layman. You yourself know, that I once sent the *man de place* of that letter, when, as the friend of the Wesleyan Ministers in Lower Canada, I rebuked one of their zealous, who by the way, made you appear very small. The constancy of that meeting is a standing proof of the universal knowledge of the rule, and a disapprobation into the crux of the matter would be received by many members as a gross impudence. Though you are a minister, and have earned the sobriquet of "the lightning man of the District," you even would not undertake to "head" or dogmen but partially were members I look of. If I were not an *independent Society* I could give the names of persons whom, while their Pastor, you have brought under discipline for shaming from the class.

I perceive I have only gone to your third paragraph and there are sixteen others. A first survey perusal of the letter revealed error tacitly errors, and as in the case of the Dialogue, I verily believe a second examination would show a great many more, but I have not time to waste upon the thankless task, so I shall just point out one or two more.

Paragraph 4, "Colbert, *See*, was satisfied with what the writings of those collections also supplied." But he never examined other writings, or did he listen upon those as affecting his private collection, just as you suppose I have done with respect to yours? If he had lived could we be would have found another collector who would have supplied his of sources. Paragraph 7.—Here's an *Episcopal* with a vengeance. "Mr. Wesley never designed his Societies should become an organized Church, but ever remain an integral portion of the Episcopal Church." Before "ever remains" do words "on the contrary he intended that they should" can hardly be dispensed with, still I would not have objected to the sentence if you had not gone into evidence about one of my own slips. The last batch of blunders I shall serve up in the following, and although the word *jurges* has slipped you mightily, I cannot help saying that some *disgraceful jurges* that is committed in the two undisciplined sentences has seldom if ever been put in type.

"Further, that circumstances which he could not control, arose in the conduct of *See* and presently ministers of that church towards the members of his societies, and which, if apprehended, would lead to the very separation he was so anxious to prevent. Fearing, especially towards the close of his life, that this probability remained of his Societies being recognized and treated as a portion of the Church of England; or, that even they *See* as treated, they would have the spiritual culture bestowed upon them which they needed; and therefore, that that which he had intended against, viz: a separate church organization, would be accomplished—he "to some extent provided for it," by enrolling a *clerk* in Chancery; one important out of which being, to give the conference of his preachers such a legal status that when the thing forced because a necessity, they might be in circumstances to meet it."

I admit that in my first letter I used very plain language in speaking of your writings, but in the absence of disquisition I readily confess you are very my superior. If you had studied grammar as diligently as you seem to have hunted up terms of reproach and continually you would not have had the satisfaction of being held up to public gaze as a mere polemic. I close this communication with a vocabulary of

