



Rev. Charles Wesley. M. A.

SOMETIME STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

Engraved by J. Andrews from an original Print by J. Fisher A. R. A. London, 1793



Rev. John Wesley, M. A.

LATE FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A T A T I S B 7

Engraved by J. Andrews from an original Picture of the same Size engraved by J. Rutter, A. R. A. London, 1792.

THE
L I F E
OF THE
REV. JOHN WESLEY, M.A.

SOME TIME FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

COLLECTED FROM HIS PRIVATE PAPERS AND PRINTED WORKS; AND
WRITTEN AT THE REQUEST OF HIS EXECUTORS.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

SOME ACCOUNT OF HIS ANCESTORS AND RELATIONS;

WITH

THE LIFE OF THE

REV. CHARLES WESLEY, M.A.

COLLECTED FROM HIS PRIVATE JOURNAL, AND NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED.

THE WHOLE FORMING A HISTORY OF METHODISM, IN WHICH THE PRINCIPLES AND
ECONOMY OF THE METHODISTS ARE UNFOLDED.

BY JOHN WHITEHEAD, M.D.,

AUTHOR OF THE DISCOURSE DELIVERED AT MR. WESLEY'S FUNERAL,

(WHICH DISCOURSE IS INCLUDED IN THIS EDITION.)

—————In labours more abundant—————

A workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of Truth.—PAUL.

~~~~~  
WITH

AN INTRODUCTION,

BY THE REV. THOMAS H. STOCKTON.

VOL. I.

~~~~~  
SECOND AMERICAN EDITION:

WITH PORTRAITS OF REV. JOHN, AND CHARLES, WESLEY.

—————
PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM S. STOCKTON,

1845.

I hereby certify that this edition of WHITEHEAD'S LIFE OF WESLEY, stereotyped by me, is as accurate a copy of the original, as it was possible to execute.

GEO. A. CURTIS.

Boston, June 20, 1844.

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by
WILLIAM S. STOCKTON,
in the clerk's office of the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District
of Pennsylvania.

PRINTED BY J. KAY, JUN. AND BROTHER.

INTRODUCTION.

THE value of literature is determined by the truth it embodies. Erroneous records are lamentable. But false records are abominable—always were, will be, and ought to be. Their authors are traitors to the cause of knowledge and virtue; and deserve to be sentenced, by a just criticism, to capital execution and perpetual infamy. Every apologist for them should be abandoned to immitigable dishonour.

In particular, what merit has Biography—if there be reason to doubt or deny its truth? Surely, none—it can have none. It is a wrong, both to the dead and living. It matters not who is its subject, or author; nor what extended and controlling connections they hold with social institutions and interests; nor what varied attractions of character, incident, and scenery, are involved in the narrative; nor what artistic genius and skill are shown in its plan and style; nor what personal, partisan, or general purposes are subserved by its publication—if it be not essentially true—honestly, of set intent, and in despite of all perverting influences, made so—it is execrable.

The work we now introduce to the reader has occasioned no little controversy. Perhaps this fact is to be regretted. The dispute is not yet decided. It ought to be. It may be. Nothing is necessary to this but an understanding of the case, and the faithful application to it of the principles of righteousness. The present seems to be a favourable opportunity for doing something toward this desirable consummation. It appears, that sufficient evidence has accumulated to make the case plain; and we cannot believe that a righteous judgment will much longer be withheld.

To arbitrate the differences of the dead—of men with whom we had no personal acquaintance, and of whom, without the possibility of explanation from them, we must judge entirely by documentary testimony—to disclose, though it be only for the vindication of condemned innocence and the honour of obscured merit, the frailties of opponents, who are, and in many respects deserve to be, illustrious and revered—and so to reverse the popular sentiment, resulting from individual and party misrepresentation, which has long prevailed—is a matter so delicate, that, without claiming more than an ordinary share of sensibility, we frankly acknowledge a tendency to shrink from it. And yet, it often becomes our duty to sacrifice our sensibilities at the shrine of truth and justice; and seek, in elaborate and impartial review of the past, such lessons of wisdom, both spiritual and practical, as may enable us the better to improve the present, and prepare for a brighter and happier future.

The parties, in the controversy now to be examined—and which we hope will be fairly and finally adjusted—are: DR. WHITEHEAD, on the one side; and DR. COKE, MR. MOORE, and the CONFERENCE, on the other. We love to cherish respect for them all; and not for them alone, but also for the myriads on myriads of our pious, intelligent and useful cotemporaries, who, as regards the members of the latter party especially, manifest, in all the world, a filial concern for their reputation and influence.

Entering upon our task, in this spirit, let us first inquire into the HISTORY—CHARACTER—POSITION—TRUSTS—and CONDUCT of DR. WHITEHEAD.

I.—HIS HISTORY.

Mr. Myles, in his “Chronological History” of the Methodists, has given: “A List of All the Itinerant Methodist Preachers” who laboured in connection with Mr. Wes-

ley and the Conference, from 1739 to 1802—dividing them into three classes. In the “First Race,” we find the name of “Jn. Whitehead,” who entered the Itinerancy in 1764, and retired from it in 1769.” Of this race, Myles remarks: “They were greatly beloved by the people, who were witnesses of their piety, both in public and private.” From the Preface to the “Life of Wesley,” by Mr. Moore—who, it will be remembered, is one of the parties in this controversy—we derive the following paragraph, in continuance:

“He then married and settled in business at Bristol. From thence he removed to Wandsworth, in the vicinity of London, and opened a school. He there became acquainted with the late Dr. Lettsom, two of whose sons were his pupils. Under the Doctor’s direction he studied physic, and by his recommendation he obtained from the late Mr. Barclay, an eminent Quaker, the appointment of guardian to his son, who was pursuing his studies at Leyden, in Holland. Mr. Whitehead himself at the same time completed his own studies in that University, and returned to England with the diploma of DOCTOR OF MEDICINE. He had, some time before, joined the society of Quakers; and, by their influence chiefly, he obtained the situation of Physician to the London Dispensary. After a few years, he again joined the Methodist Society, and was received by Mr. Wesley with his usual kindness.”

In another passage, Mr. Moore states, that Dr. Whitehead applied, through him, to Mr. Wesley, “requesting to receive ordination from his hands, and to be appointed a superintendant;” but, that Mr. Wesley, though he “loved the man,—knew his versatility, and would not trust him again with so important an office.” Recently, it has been asserted, by a Methodist Episcopal Journal in this country, on the authority of the English “Wesleyan Methodist Magazine,” that he was afterward expelled from the Society, for alleged unfaithfulness, as a Trustee of Mr. Wesley’s MSS. We doubt this. In whatever way he left the Society, however, it is certain, as will be seen, that he was very soon afterward reunited to it; and, it is supposed, remained in its fellowship while he lived. He died in 1804.

These are the chief facts we have collected, in respect of his general history. We are indebted for them to his opponents. We have no doubt that such of them as were published to injure him—his temporary union with the Friends, his request for Ordination, and his asserted expulsion—ought to receive qualifications which would invest him with honor rather than reproach. And when the intelligent and candid reader shall be informed of the circumstances which are yet to come into consideration, he will be prepared, we think, to avow the same conviction.

II. HIS CHARACTER.

The “British Critic” for 1793, in a notice of the first volume of this work, describes the Doctor as “the sensible Editor,” and professes “great respect for his talents.” That he *was* “sensible”—that his talents *deserved* “great respect,” will be quickly perceived by the reader of his narrative. If any thing further be desirable, let him be compared with HAMPSON—COKE and MOORE—SOUTHEY—MOORE, alone—and WATSON—the other biographers. It will appear, we think, on examination, that he had a clear and strong mind; improved by the accomplishments of a respectable scholarship. His moral character—apart from the charges involved in this controversy, and which must be separately considered—seems to have been distinguished, in the estimation of the best qualified judges, for its honesty and simplicity. Mr. Moore acknowledges that Mr. Wesley “loved the man.” Mr. Myles, speaking of the Committee by which the Doctor was appointed to compile the “Life,” remarks, that they had “a high opinion of his integrity.” Indeed, in the language of the same writer, in another passage, “he was *much esteemed by all the parties.*” In a few words, the evidence represents a man of considerable natural and social advantages, hallowed by the acquisitions of Divine grace—a Christian, exemplifying and commending the religion he professed. If the investigations of the charges alluded to above shall result in his favor, it will be seen, in particular, that he was most

honorably devoted, in long-suffering and triumphant fidelity, to the just and true—that he regarded these as of infinitely greater moment than his affection for men or parties—and that it becomes us, now, to number him with “the RIGHTEOUS,” who, notwithstanding all efforts to prevent the fulfilment of the Supreme decree, “shall be in everlasting remembrance.”

III. HIS POSITION.

As a **PHYSICIAN**, his connexion with the London Dispensary is no slight proof of his qualifications and usefulness. Perhaps his influential acquaintance among the Friends, who, according to Mr. Moore, obtained the situation for him, had a similar appreciation of his personal character to that which Mr. Wesley manifested, when he declared:—“I am persuaded there is not such another physician in England.”

As a **PREACHER**, he appears to have been attractive and profitable. Scarcely any stronger illustration could be given of his high standing in this respect, than the fact, that he, a Local Preacher, was selected, in preference to any of the Itinerants, to deliver Mr. Wesley’s Funeral Sermon. There must have been something impressively appropriate in the general character of his pulpit ministrations, or this duty would not have been imposed, nor this distinction conferred upon him. The “Sermon,” itself, accompanies this edition of the “Life.”

As a **WRITER**, his Work is the best witness of his ability. The reader will form his own opinion of its arrangement, spirit and style. Its accuracy, it is presumed, will not be denied. It is believed to be as accurate as the Manuscripts and Correspondence of the Wesleys, and the Author’s personal knowledge, could make it. Indeed, as far as we have seen, his opponents never denied the authenticity of his materials, or the fairness with which he exhibited them; but censured him merely for keeping and using them against their will, and in violation, as they assert, of his obligations. At the time of his appointment, he must have had some reputation as a writer, or such a task would hardly have been committed to his hands. When his production was published, the “British Critic” not only expressed, in general terms, “great respect for his talents,” but especially commended his “zeal,” “sensibility,” and “indefatigable diligence”—the “circumstantial minuteness” of his “details”—his “honesty and truth.”

IV. HIS TRUSTS.

Having been trusted, under Providence, in preference to all other physicians in England, with the natural life of the two illustrious brothers—and trusted too at times of greatest solicitude to their relatives and friends; it might be expected, in recollection of these and other relations, that some further proofs would be witnessed of the confidence of the Rev. J. Wesley, and that of the family and friends of Charles. Such proofs are at hand.

By referring to the copy of Mr. John Wesley’s Will, the following items may be seen:—

“I give to Thomas Coke, Doctor John Whitehead, and Henry Moore, all the books which are in my study and bed-chamber at London, and in my studies elsewhere, in trust for the use of the preachers who shall labor here from time to time.”

And, again, this:

“I give all my MANUSCRIPTS to Thomas Coke, Doctor Whitehead, and Henry Moore, to be burnt or published as they see good.”

So much for the confidence of John Wesley. The confidence of the immediate friends of his brother, Charles, and, indeed, of the whole surviving Wesley family, was shown by the following additional trusts:—

The use of the PRIVATE DIARY of Charles Wesley; and

The use of the MANUSCRIPTS of the Wesley Family.

The confidence of the Preachers, Executors, and other friends of Mr. Wesley, at

the time of his decease, and, afterwards, of the Conference, is evident enough from their action :

In appointing the Doctor to preach the **FUNERAL SERMON**; and

In electing him to prepare the **BIOGRAPHY**.

It is proper to state, in relation to this last particular, that a formal meeting was held, in London—composed of the **EXECUTORS**, representing Mr. Wesley; the **PREACHERS**, representing the Conference; and **OTHER FRIENDS**, as if in representation of the Societies, at large—for the special purpose of selecting a Biographer. At this meeting, Mr. Rogers, the Superintendent of the London Circuit, within which our author resided and labored, proposed Dr. Whitehead for this office. He cheerfully agreed to serve; the meeting *unanimously* adopted the proposal; the next Conference *approved* the appointment, and added another distinction, by making him—though still a Local Preacher—a Member of the Book Committee. All this is stated on the authority of Mr. Moore, himself; and, in great part, in his own language.

V.—HIS CONDUCT.

In respect of the manner in which he discharged his obligations as Biographer, it may be well to regard, in the first place, his own testimony; and then adduce the judgment of a few other authorities.

The Author's own Testimony.

In his preface, Dr. Whitehead informs us, that he “determined to write, not only the Life of Mr. Wesley, but a History of Methodism, with the utmost impartiality: to describe things as they have been, and as they are, without the false colouring that the spirit of a party will always give to history.” Again, he declares: “My business has been, to guard my mind against any improper influence it [the controversy] might have on my judgment, in describing facts that have taken place in the establishment of Methodism, and to distinguish between the rational and liberal principles of Mr. Wesley, on which the Methodist Societies were founded, and the narrow and arbitrary conduct of a few individuals: *and this, by the grace of God, I hope has been carefully done.*”

With this explicit and solemn avowal on the part of the Biographer, we proceed to cite the judgment of the other authorities alluded to.

The London “Analytical Review.”

In vol. xvii. for 1794, page 382, of this established and influential work, the following paragraph occurs, in a Review of Dr. Whitehead's *first* volume:

“The Life of Mr. Charles Wesley, which forms the principal part of this volume, consists chiefly of extracts from his **PRIVATE JOURNAL**. It lays open the religious state of his mind, and relates the particulars of his public labours, through the course of a long life, with all those peculiarities of sentiment and language, by which Methodism is so strongly marked. These memoirs are entitled to particular attention from the sect of which he and his brother were the founders, to whose diligent exertions, continued with unwearied zeal and perseverance, through a long course of years, it in a great measure owed its extensive and rapid progress. They may also be perused with advantage by other classes of readers, as affording them many **AUTHENTIC MATERIALS**, from which a judgment may be formed concerning the spirit, character, and tendency of a religious body, which, from the smallest beginnings, about the year 1730, has risen to a degree of magnitude and consequence sufficient to demand the attention of the statesman and philosopher, as well as the divine.”

In vol. xxiv. for 1796, page 280, the Doctor's *second* volume is thus announced:—

“After an interval of about three years, appears Dr. Whitehead's second volume of the lives of J. and C. Wesley. The present volume resumes the Life of John Wesley, from the year 1735, when he went over to America. The narrative con-

tains an account in regular series of Mr. Wesley's indefatigable labours, and of the progress of Methodism, authenticated and illustrated by a great number of extracts from Mr. Wesley's public writings and private papers, from the minutes of the Conference and other sources. The work is a full memoir of the life of a man, who, during the greater part of the present century, enjoyed a more extensive popularity than any other man living; and who, amidst all the peculiarities of the sect of which he was the father, is certainly entitled to an honourable place in the tablet of merit, as a great Reformer. At the same time the work conveys a more distinct and complete view of the principles of Methodists, and of their internal discipline and economy, than had before appeared; and is well adapted to furnish the future historian with large materials for a very important chapter in the ecclesiastical history of the eighteenth century. The writer being an admirer and a follower of Mr. Wesley, it will, of course, be expected that the affairs of the Methodists and the conduct of their founder, should be placed in the most favourable light, and that the work should be considerably tinged with the spirit and language of the sect. The narrative, however, bears the marks of ACCURACY and FIDELITY; and as a RECORD OF FACTS respecting a religious body, which has for many years past materially affected the state of opinions and morals in this kingdom, it is of great value."

The London "Critical Review."

In vol. xii. for 1794, p. 207, of this work, a notice of Dr. Whitehead's *first* volume is concluded by this remark:—"On the whole, this work is ACCURATELY and WELL WRITTEN, but with a pen evidently favourable to Methodism."

The "British Critic."

In vol. viii. for 1796, page 636, a Review of our author's work closes thus:—"Dr. Whitehead is certainly entitled to the grateful acknowledgment of all those to whom MR. WESLEY'S MEMORY IS DEAR; and his work is of GENERAL IMPORTANCE TO LITERATURE, as containing the BEST and MOST REGULAR history of a sect, which, however erroneous in a few points, has produced a beneficial operation upon the minds of many individuals; and may safely boast of several within its pale, distinguished by their blameless manners and useful accomplishments."

Let it not be supposed that the respectable Reviewers, from whose pages the above paragraphs are cited, were unaware of the controversy. They knew this fact, and wrote the more distinctly and emphatically because of it.

Life of Kilham.

In the "Life of the Rev. Alexander Kilham, Formerly a Preacher under the Rev. J. Wesley, and One of the Founders of the Methodist New Connection in 1797," &c., it is said, in a note on page 97, in addition to certain other remarks, showing the injustice which has been done to our author:

"Dr. Whitehead's is the BEST and MOST IMPARTIAL account of Mr. Wesley which has hitherto been written."

Adam Clarke.

Dr. Clarke, whose own honesty is worthy all reliance, in his "Memoirs of the Wesley Family," published in 1824, copies frequently from Dr. Whitehead; acknowledges him as good authority; quotes his language; commends his treatment of subjects; and alludes to his access to ORIGINAL PAPERS, as giving him a decided advantage over all other biographers. Thus, on page 429, he observes:

"Mr. Charles Wesley's Life, in connection with that of his brother John, has been written by Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, by Dr. Whitehead, and lately by Dr. Robert Southey, Poet Laureat. OF ALL THESE, Dr. Whitehead's claims the PREFERENCE—as formed from Mr. C. Wesley's DIARY."

Richard Watson.

The Rev. Richard Watson—confessedly one of the ablest men in the history of Methodism—in his “Life of the Rev. John Wesley,” a work designed for general circulation, and which, therefore, omits the details interesting to Methodists alone, some forty times respectfully acknowledges his indebtedness to the authority of Dr. Whitehead, and copies whole pages from his work.

Dr. Thomas Jackson, also, in his “Life of Charles Wesley,” confesses Dr. Whitehead’s authority. So does *Dr. Southey*, in “Wesley, and his Cotemporaries;” although it is certain, from his statement of the resources employed in this production, that he had no knowledge of the *genuine edition* of the work. He gives the title of the *Dublin*, instead of the *London* edition. The Dublin edition was spurious and mutilated. Doubtless, Southey would have valued the original, highly.

The foregoing testimonials, as will be remembered, have relation chiefly to the COMPLETENESS and ACCURACY of this Biography. They illustrate the fidelity, diligence, and skill of our author. They show that his CONDUCT, in execution of his trust, in so far as the production of a FULL AND TRUE RECORD was concerned, was worthy the confidence reposed in him. Indeed, we have *not yet found*, and we note the fact as remarkable, and one which should not be forgotten, a *single denial of its faithfulness*. When, in connection with the abundant acknowledgments of his competency and general integrity; in connection, also, with the special and honorable responsibility of his appointment; in connection, also, with the richness of his materials—such as no other biographer has to this day possessed:—1. His Personal Knowledge; 2. John Wesley’s Manuscripts; 3. Charles Wesley’s Manuscripts; 4. The Manuscripts of the Wesley Family; 5. Their Correspondence; 6. His access to all cotemporary Living Authorities; and, 7. to the Current Literature connected with Methodism—and especially to all the publications of the Wesleys; when, in connection with all these things, we are reminded of the fact that he prepared his Work under the pressure of controversy, and knew that it would be subjected to searching criticism as soon as it should appear, we feel that he had every motive and every qualification to perform it well. Did Southey complain of some of the Wesleyan Biographers, that “they wanted *heart, or intellect?*” What then? Properly understood, his censures rest not on Whitehead—for Southey never saw his book. But here is the whole book, word for word, just as the author published it. Let any one read this—and say what is wanting.

Having thus noticed the points proposed, in relation to our Author, let us now consider the controversy in which he was involved, and do what we can toward a just conclusion of it. Here we propose to examine the SUBJECT and CAUSES of the Controversy; the CHARACTER of the other PARTIES in it; the MODE in which it has been CONDUCTED; and the PRINCIPLES and TERMS on which it ought NOW to be DECIDED.

I. SUBJECTS OF THE CONTROVERSY.

It is of the greatest importance to have a precise understanding of this point. Let it be remembered, then, that Dr. Whitehead was entrusted with the Manuscripts and Correspondence of the Wesley Family in general, to supply him with materials for his work. These must be divided into two classes, which were received from different sources, and on different terms. The *first* class consists of John Wesley’s papers, alone; the *second*, of Charles Wesley’s, and those of other members of the Family. John Wesley’s papers, as before shown, were left, by Will, to Thomas Coke, Dr. Whitehead, and Henry Moore, to be burnt, or published, as they should see good. These papers, with the consent of Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, were committed to Dr. Whitehead, alone. The others, of course, were in the possession of Charles Wesley’s relatives and friends. From these persons, Dr. Whitehead received them, not as a

bequest from the dead, but merely in manifestation of the confidence of surviving kindred. The *first class only* is involved in this controversy.

With this distinction, we proceed to state the subjects of controversy, according to the substantial agreement of the parties. They were the three following:—

1. The *Compensation* to be rendered Dr. Whitehead for writing the Life of *John Wesley*.

2. The *Right of Judgment* in the preparation of *John Wesley's Life* for the Press.

3. The *Right* to the *Possession* and *Use* of *John Wesley's Manuscripts*, when it was ascertained that the parties could not agree on the second subject, above stated.

It appears that the *first* of these subjects was withdrawn; Dr. Whitehead offering "to give them the **WHOLE PROFITS** of the work, if they desired it, in order to put an end to the difference."

The *second* remained. The difference, in relation to it, was this: The Conference party "required" that the Doctor "should publish nothing in the Life of Mr. *John Wesley*, but what should be approved by a Committee of the Preachers." The Doctor, on the other hand, while he "offered to read the manuscript to them as friends, and to consult them on particular parts of Mr. Wesley's life—insisted on the right of using" his "own judgment, if on any point" they "could not agree." This difference was never reconciled. The Doctor "could not in conscience" submit to the requisition; and his opponents would not abandon it.

The *third* subject, also, remained; being essentially involved in the *second*. The papers were already in the Doctor's possession. And just here, an important variance occurs, in the testimony of the parties. On the Doctor's side, it is asserted, that his Associate-Trustees "deliberately agreed that" he "should have the use of them to assist him in executing his work," and that they were "delivered **UNCONDITIONALLY** to him for that end." On the other side, Mr. Moore declares, that they were "deposited with him, under an **EXPRESS STIPULATION** that they should be examined according to the Will of the Testator, previously to any of them being published."

We confess a difficulty here. The parties are in direct opposition. How shall we overcome it? We might raise the question of veracity—which shall we believe, Dr. Whitehead, or Mr. Moore? But we have too much respect for both parties, to press this. We always have a horror of such appeals. What then? The difficulty must be left unsettled, or an error must be supposed. There are two reasons for the supposition of an error. The *first* is, that Dr. Whitehead acknowledges that, *after* the papers were "delivered unconditionally" to him, Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore "*changed their minds on that subject*"—i. e. became opposed to his unconditional possession and discretionary use of them. Now, if we may suppose that Mr. Moore *forgot* this fact—thought their opposition was manifested in the beginning instead of afterward—and that a stipulation was then actually made, instead of some subsequent efforts to secure one—the difficulty may be subdued. The *second* reason for supposing an error, is in favor of exactly such an error as has been described. That is, that while the Doctor's statement was published *at the time*, in the *freshness of the facts*, in the *presence of his opponents*, and, as far as we have seen, *without contradiction*—Mr. Moore's was not published until some *thirty years afterward*, and when the Doctor had been *twenty years in his grave*. Unless some such error be admitted, we must abandon this issue as indeterminable. If it be admitted, it is in Dr. Whitehead's favor.

It is evident enough, however, from the following passage, that Mr. Moore relied upon his statement, whether erroneous or correct. "But," he remarks, that which constituted "the Doctor's indelible dishonor, was his **ABSOLUTE REFUSAL** to suffer the **MSS.**, with which he had been intrusted, to be examined according to the Will of the Testator. This effrontery and injustice of the man utterly confounded those with whom he had entered into the former engagements." And yet, that his reliance may have been vain, is also evident from the manifest incorrectness of this charge. Dr.

Whitehead did *not* “*absolutely* refuse” to suffer the MSS. to be examined. His refusal was *conditional*. This is plain from the very *first item* in the “Proposals” presented to the Conference “to show the disinterestedness of Dr. Whitehead and of this Committee, and their desire of peace,” and to “make some sacrifices for the sake thereof.” It reads thus:

“That all the Manuscripts of Mr. Wesley shall be *fairly* and *impartially* examined by Dr. Coke, Mr. Moore, and Dr. Whitehead. Such papers as they shall *unanimously* deem unfit for publication, shall be burnt immediately; out of the remainder Dr. Whitehead shall be at liberty to select such as he thinks necessary for his work; and the residue to be given into the hands of Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore.”

The “Proposals” were rejected by the Conference; but, as long as they remain on record, the one above cited will utterly disprove the assertion, that Dr. Whitehead “*absolutely* refused” to suffer the MSS. to be examined. It was a *conditional* refusal; though we cannot but confess the condition was exceedingly stringent, and requires strong reasons to justify it. We shall see, ultimately, whether such reasons existed.

These, then, were the subjects of controversy. Dr. Whitehead, having got the possession of *John Wesley’s* Manuscripts, conditionally or unconditionally, to assist him in writing the Life for which he was pledged to the public, asserted his right to keep and use them, for that purpose, according to his own judgment—not even allowing an examination of them, by his Associate-Trustees, except on conditions to which they would not consent. Dr. Coke, Mr. Moore, and the Conference denounced this action on his part, as a flagrant violation of Mr. Wesley’s Will, and in all respects dishonorable. Now, therefore, let us proceed to the next point:

II.—CAUSES OF THE CONTROVERSY.

The reader will agree with us, we presume, that it would have been a silly plan to confine the proposed Biography to the character and course of John Wesley, exclusively. His brother Charles had nearly equal claims. Methodism, in whole, had claims. Dr. Whitehead was entrusted with the resources of all; and remembered all; and resolved to give place to all; and to exercise his own judgment in respect of all. If any were aggrieved by this announcement, who were they? The Methodists in general? No. The Wesley Family, in general? No. The relatives of Charles Wesley, in particular? No. The relatives of John Wesley? No. Who, then, were they? Dr. Coke, Mr. Moore, and the Conference. How was it that *they* were so aggrieved? If any of the Wesleys had been likely to suffer injury, were there no nearer representatives to show their sensibility on the occasion, and come forward to prevent the result? How shall we account for the fact, that they all remained silent, and, as far as we can judge, perfectly satisfied? Surely, if any detriment had been anticipated to the fair fame of their illustrious kindred, they would have appeared in their behalf. Would *they* not have demanded of Dr. Whitehead the surrender of *Charles Wesley’s Private Diary*?—and all the other *Manuscripts* which *they* had committed to his care? Does not the fact that they took no part in the dispute, imply that they saw no cause of offence!—that they had as much confidence in Dr. Whitehead as ever?—that they had no objection to his exercising his own judgment in the work? Why then, we again ask, were Dr. Coke, Mr. Moore, and the Conference, so much aggrieved that this same judgment was to be exercised upon *John Wesley’s* papers? Did they think he would falsify them? That never has been pretended. Did they think the papers themselves would bring reproach on Mr. Wesley? They had little reason for this—even if they had not known that such a sun might wear a spot and yet be a blessing to the world. Or, lastly, did they—or rather did some of them—one or more individuals—imagine that these papers might reveal something not altogether creditable to themselves?—something that would

interfere with their memories and hopes? This last inquiry, we think, will lead to an understanding of the truth.

It would seem that the Doctor's determination, as stated by Mr. Moore, "that he would write the Life of Mr. Wesley *as an independent man*," was the reason why "Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore changed their mind" in relation to his "discretionary use" of the manuscripts. The Doctor's own statement, as before quoted, was, that he "had determined to write, not only the Life of Mr. Wesley, but a *history of Methodism*, with the *utmost impartiality*; to describe things as they *have been*, and as they *are*, without the *false colouring* that the *spirit of a party* will always give to history"—to describe "*facts* that have taken place in the *establishment* of Methodism, and to distinguish between the *rational* and *liberal* principles of Mr. Wesley, on which the Methodist Societies were founded, and the *narrow* and *arbitrary* conduct of a *few individuals*."

Do not the above statements reveal the general cause of the uneasiness? If there were persons who had not yet become wise enough to love Christianity more than Methodism, and Christ more than men, and truth more than place, they had reason to be afraid, even of their Founder's MSS., and the honest judgment of his Biographer. Who the "*few individuals*" were, we cannot certainly say. It is remarkable, that "*a few individuals*" are almost always the wrong-doers and mischief-makers. It is plain, however, that Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore were among them. We suppose these to have been the principal ones. And, until the incidental confirmation of the fact, in the sequel of this inquiry, we can now only assert, in general terms, that the causes of the controversy will be found in personal and official improprieties which they and others were unwilling to have exposed. Before Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore shall be presented, however, for special contemplation, or the improprieties alluded to shall be particularly considered, it becomes us to notice the *mode* in which the controversy has been *conducted*.

III.—MODE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

It appears that Dr. Whitehead was not without friends. He mentions a "Committee, united with" him "to put an end to the dispute." Mr. Moore styles it a "Committee to advise, support, and defend Dr. Whitehead." By this Committee, the "Proposals," published in our Author's "Advertisement," were made to the Conference. We have no evidence as to the course they pursued after the rejection of these "Proposals." The Doctor's prosecution of the matter is to be gathered from his work—which he proceeded to complete. In his "Preface," however, he intimates that he was on his guard against the evil of impairing the permanent usefulness of the "Life," by introducing what ought to have been a transient variance. He thought his opponents tried to provoke such an injury, and therefore laid his task aside whenever he "could not write with that calmness and ease that he wished." Still, *in* the "Preface," he represented the opposition to him as "cruel," "malignant," "outrageous and indecent." And from the work, itself, it is clear, that he believed the causes of the opposition to be such as are stated in the close of the preceding section. Instead, therefore, of concealing these "improprieties," he has disclosed them. He has recorded his opinion of the ambition of a few of the leading preachers; the facts and documents confirming it; and the evil effects resulting from that ambition, and likely to be perpetuated and multiplied. He has showed how Charles Wesley retired from the Itinerancy, chiefly because of his aversion to the increasing inclination to independency, and the opposition of the ambitious projectors of that scheme to him, on that account; how these same persons betrayed John Wesley, in his old age, for the accomplishment of their purpose, into the chief inconsistencies of his life; and how, after the death of their Founder, the Government of the Preachers became oppressive to the People. Having stated, near the close of his Life of Charles Wesley, that the

latter foresaw the approach of the government of the societies "towards a system of human policy, that in the end could not be carried on without sometimes having recourse to the arts of misrepresentation and deception, which "he abhorred in all persons, but when practised under the mask of religion—always appeared to him more detestable"—the Doctor declares for himself, near the close of his *Life of the elder brother*, that—"What is still much worse than all the rest, is, that the present system of government among the Methodists, requires such arts of human policy and chicanery to carry it on, as, in my opinion, are totally inconsistent with the openness of gospel simplicity." He could not conclude the latter paragraph, however, without adding: "It is happy that the great body of the preachers do not enter into the spirit of it, and indeed know little about it, being content with doing their duty on the circuits to which they are appointed, and promoting the spiritual welfare of the people. And the hope is, that this mode of government will soon be altered." So rests the Doctor's management of the controversy.

The other party have conducted it in this manner: Determined not to sanction Dr. Whitehead's work, they appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore to compile a *Life*. This appointment was quickly fulfilled; the *Life* published, in advance of the Doctor's; and, according to Myles, one edition, of ten thousand copies, "sold in a few weeks, and another edition published when the Conference assembled." This was in 1792. It is further stated, by the same author, that in this work "no mention was made of" the "unhappy dispute, nor even a hint given of it." Mr. Myles, himself, however, in his record of the dispute, represents the Doctor as "unfaithful;" "extravagant in his demands;" taking "advantage" of the "Committee;" and submitting "Proposals" to the Conference, manifesting "injustice and total want of ingenuousness, as well as—unfaithfulness to the deceased." We copy from the Third Edition of Myles' Work, published in London, 1803. In 1805, it appears, that a spurious and mutilated edition of Dr. Whitehead's work was published in Dublin, "which omitted all those passages that were unpalatable to Dr. Coke and the high Conference party." The Author had died in the preceding year; and it would seem that the design was, as quickly after that event as possible, to substitute the perfect book by an imperfect one; and so suppress the testimony which it embodied. In the "*Life of Dr. Coke*," by Mr. Drew, published in 1817, we find the next record of the controversy; where it is so stated as again to discredit the honor of Dr. Whitehead. It is manifest, however, that Mr. Drew, in this particular, was merely the reporter of the party; not even having seen the genuine edition of our author's work. In 1824, Mr. Moore's *Life of the Wesleys* appeared. It will be remembered that he was united with Dr. Coke, in the hasty preparation of the *Life* published in advance of our author's. In the "Preface" to this later and deliberate work—a work published *twenty years after Dr. Whitehead's decease*—Mr. Moore revives the controversy. It is not too much to say that he abuses his long-buried antagonist, as if pleased with the opportunity and assured of safety. He represents him as having fallen into a mercenary "*temptation*;" as being "*indubitably dishonored*;" as guilty of astounding "*effrontery and injustice*;" as departing "*from simplicity and rectitude*;" as having "*awfully compromised his character*;" and, therefore, "under a feeling of the need of self-defence," losing "no opportunity of *defaming* the Preachers in the *Memoirs* which he gave to the world;" as hypocritically assuming language and sentiments at variance with his principles, to accomplish his purposes; and acting from a feeling somewhat similar to that of "*gamblers*, among" whom, "it is said, the *loser* is considered as having a privilege to rail." Is not all this, from such a man and at such a date, surprising? But we have not yet done. In the London "*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*," for January, February, and March, of the year 1825, we have what may be regarded as the Official Review of the above Official Biography. In the course of this review, Dr. Whitehead is described as having written his work "under the influence of a *weak-*

ened principle of honor"—and "*private pique*"—and a design of "*avenging*" his own "*quarrel* with a part of the preachers"—as being, therefore, "*desecrated*" for his task—as erring "not for want of principle, but for *want of temper*"—as having "*dishonorably deprived*" Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore "of a large portion of valuable papers"—as having composed "under *party bias*, and *not* with the best feeling"—as *not knowing* or *not choosing* to state the proper vindication of Mr. Wesley, &c. &c. And so the controversy has been brought down to the present time. Both in England and in the United States, the successors of the Coke, Moore, and Conference party, give similar representations of our author to this day.

Before we leave this section, we wish to show the circumstances under which this is done. If the Journal to which we have alluded, in connection with the HISTORY of Dr. Whitehead, was correct in the assertion—which we have not seen proved—that he was expelled from the Society for unfaithfulness as a Trustee of Mr. Wesley's Manuscripts—it is *certain* that he was received again and restored to his former standing; and this, as far as appears, without any acknowledgment, on his part, of guilt in the matter. Mr. Myles says: "In the year 1797, a *reconciliation* took place between the Doctor and his London friends, chiefly through the mediation of Mr. Pawson. He is *now* [i. e. in 1803] *united* to the Society, *restored to his office* of Local Preacher, and *very friendly* with his brethren." Mr. Drew, in his "Life of Dr. Coke," says: "The breach was afterward *completely healed*; and *both works* continue to be sold by the Conference." Mr. Moore is *silent* about this. As to "*both works*"—Coke and Moore's and Dr. Whitehead's—*continuing* "to be sold by the Conference"—we think Mr. Drew must have been misinformed. It is hardly credible that the Conference *ever* sold the *London*, or *genuine* edition of our author's work. Mr. Drew, as already stated, was not acquainted with that edition—at least, it is highly probable he was not. He must have referred to the *Dublin*, or *spurious* edition; and if he did, and if it be a fact that this has been always kept on sale by the Conference, the party by whom it was published is pretty well identified. These, then, are the circumstances to which we have alluded. Although Dr. Whitehead was reunited to the Society and restored to his office, and died in these connections; although his own work was suppressed—as the *sixth* item in his "Proposals" to the Conference, shows he was afraid it would be—and another, expurgated of offensive intelligence, substituted in its place, and, if Mr. Drew be correct, sold by the Conference as his own, as in demonstration of the fact that the "*breach was completely healed*,"—he continues to be thus berated to this hour.

In the height of the controversy, the Doctor thus addressed the Preachers:—"I therefore entreat you, for God's sake, for the sake of peace among the people, for the honor of religion in general, to desist from this arbitrary and illiberal requisition. If you still insist upon it, and make a breach on this account, I call the living God to witness between me and you this day, that I am clear; the mischief that may follow, will lie at your door, not mine; and *you shall answer for it, at the awful tribunal of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"

Now we have faith in a retributive system, already in operation; the agents of which are sometimes very humble persons. And it seems to us, that the time has come for a development of its equity and efficiency. Let us call up, therefore, Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, and see, on examination, if they are the men to cast dishonor on Dr. Whitehead.

IV.—CHARACTER OF THE OTHER PARTIES.

We proceed to the part of our duty now before us, with an awakening of the sensibility acknowledged in the opening of this Introduction. It is a pleasure to vindicate the memory of one unjustly reproached; but painful, however necessary, to do it at the expense of others—especially of persons deservedly revered. And yet, to the

student of human nature, it is but a primer-lesson, that the best and most useful of men may be subject to unworthy and mischievous infirmities. Is it not wrong for a Biographer to conceal these? Besides, as was said of the sun, in connection with Mr. Wesley, so here it may be said of the next great light—may not the moon show its spots and yet be a blessing to the world? But, further, suppose that injured innocence *requires* the exhibition of such infirmities, for its own justification—can any man, however charitable, be so unrighteous as to withhold them? Perhaps a *man* might—but a CHRISTIAN cannot. Let us, then, pass on:

1. *Dr. Coke.*

Since writing the preceding section, we have carefully examined the materials in our possession respecting the character of Dr. Coke. This examination reassures us of the correctness of our judgment in relation to it. His distinguishing infirmity was—*ambition to be a Bishop.*

That he was ambitious, is admitted by his friends and advocates. In the following sentence, the testimony of Mr. Drew is confirmed by Mr. Moore: “He was, as his biographer acknowledges, naturally ambitious and aspiring; and, for some years, had made great efforts to obtain preferment in the church; but finding himself disappointed, and at length shut up in the curacy of South Petherton, in Somersetshire, he became very unhappy, and felt the want of that real good, which, as yet, was unknown to him.” So, again, Mr. Moore affirms, that, in contemplation of his new field of usefulness, labor and suffering, “the ambitious stirrings which Mr. Southey has imputed to Mr. Wesley, (not only without, but contrary to, all evidence,) were realized in the active mind of Dr. Coke.” Now, we see plainly, that this natural tendency was sanctified, by the grace of God, to many glorious purposes. While we have reposed here, bodily, in our comfortable study, we have followed him, spiritually, through all his career, with increased wonder. Eighteen times, he crossed the Atlantic; nine times, traversed the States on our coast; and four times, the West Indies; besides all his journeyings in England, Ireland, and Scotland: visited France and Holland: preached everywhere; begged money from door to door; lavished his own liberal fortune; raised up Missionary Societies; flew away, and established missions in every quarter of the globe; was smitten by tempests at sea; captured by foes; set ashore, alone; hunted by ninety men at once; waited for, in ambush, by a deadly marksman; underwent all difficulties, and surmounted all—until, as though his soul, rather than his body, needed room for rest, the ocean opened to receive him. “To his enthusiastic admirers,” says Mr. Drew, “he seemed to want nothing but wings to become an angel.” Nay, he *had* wings, and *was* an angel. Neither Wesley nor Whitefield equalled him in their range of labors. In the language of Watson, “by his voyages, travels and labors, he erected a monument of noble and disinterested zeal and charity, which will never be obliterated.” In the language of Southey, “Having wholly given himself up to the Connection, the second place in it was naturally assigned to him; no other of its active members was possessed of equal fortune and rank in society; and all that he had, his fortune, to every shilling, and his life, to every minute that could be employed in active exertions, were devoted to its interests.” But, while we see so plainly that his ambition was sanctified, in great part, to noble ends, we cannot help seeing that it was also, in part, allied to little things—meanly and mischievously devoted to them. Among these, we specify these three: monumental distinction; literary authority; and Episcopal title and power. In respect of the first, we allude to *Cokesbury College*. It seems that this was planned on his first voyage to America; as Mr. Drew states, that, “the *establishment*” of it, he “had always kept in view from his first landing.” This institution was twice destroyed by fire—the loss amounting to about \$50,000. After the first burning, Mr. Asbury—whose name was nearly buried in its title—abandoned the enter-

prise, as one contrary to the Divine will. After the second burning, Dr. Coke did the same. This affair gave Mr. Wesley no little distress: not the burning, nor yet the building, but, the *naming*, and the *ambition* indicated by it. Said he, writing to Mr. Asbury, before the burning—"In one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid, both the Doctor and you differ from me. I study to be *little*; you study to be *great*. I *creep*; you *strut* along. I found a *school*; you a *college*! Nay, and call it after your own names! O beware! Do not seek to be *something*! Let me be nothing, and *Christ be all in all!*" In respect of the second specification—literary authority, we allude to the fact that he published works, *not his own, as his own*. The following list of works, composed, in part or whole, for him, and published with his name alone—"Thomas Coke, LL.D." as their author, is copied from the "Life, Character, and Literary Labors of Samuel Drew, A. M.," by his eldest son:—

A Commentary on the New Testament. 2 vols. 4to. 1807.

The Recent Occurrences of Europe, Considered in Relation to Prophecy, &c. 1808.

A History of the West Indies, Natural, Civil, and Ecclesiastical, &c.—3 vols. 1808—11.

A History of the Old and New Testaments (a part only published)—1809.

Six Letters, in Reply to Rev. Melville Horne, &c.—1810.

The Cottager's Bible, &c.—4to. 1810.

Besides these, actually published, Mr. Drew gives the titles of two others, in MS.—one, A Series of Letters, and the other, A System of Natural Philosophy. Of them all, he asserts, that his Father "was virtually or principally the author." Yet, ostensibly, the Commentator—the Historian—the Controversialist—the Philosopher—was no other than Dr. Coke. We have read the apologies for this course; but think they might as well have been omitted, as far as the judgment of honest men is concerned. We like better the honesty of Dr. Clarke, who, in the "Preface" to his own Commentary, states the simple facts, without apology, in relation to what is called Dr. Coke's Commentary—one of the works named, in part, in the foregoing List. Dr. Clarke says—"This is *in the main* a reprint of the work of Dr. Dodd"—"The *major part* of the notes and even the *dissertations* of Dr. Dodd, are here *re-published without the author's name*." Book-stealing, sermon-stealing, and all other *pious frauds*, we are under solemn obligation to expose, for the honor of "*pure and undefiled religion*."

In respect of the third specification, we allude to facts which few men will have the hardihood either to deny or approve. Only let it be remembered that Dr. Coke's friends acknowledge his "ambitious stirrings," and that Mr. Moore testifies that, "for some years" he "had made *great efforts* to obtain *preferment* in the church," but was "*disappointed*," and, therefore, "*unhappy*"—and how naturally do these facts follow! Our limits allow merely the briefest enumeration of them:

1. *The Bristol Ordination*. In a private chamber, in Bristol, England, and in a manner so studiously concealed, that even Charles Wesley, who was in Bristol at the time, "at his" brother's "elbow," had not the "least hint" of it; Dr. Coke, then about thirty-seven years of age, and only a few years a Methodist, received, in compliance with his own "earnest wish," from Mr. Wesley, then in his eighty-second year, and himself only a Presbyterian, an ordination or appointment, as joint-superintendent with Mr. Asbury, over the Methodists of America.

2. *The Baltimore Ordination*. In the same year (1784) and in less than four months from his own appointment, having crossed the sea, travelled extensively, and assembled a Conference at Baltimore, Dr. Coke ordained Mr. Asbury. The parties afterward assumed the title of *Bishop*, and the brethren in whole were organised as the Methodist *Episcopal* Church.

3. *The Application to Bishop White*. In a little more than six years from the time of the Baltimore Ordination, as though dissatisfied with his powers, Dr. Coke

applied to Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, substantially if not expressly, for re-ordination. He declared, in his letter, that the re-union of the Methodists with the Episcopalians, as proposed, would hardly be submitted to, if the ordination of the Preachers should be made to depend either on "the *present* Bishops" or "their *successors*." Of course, he meant that *he* should be consecrated; and, probably, he *alone*—for he stated his opinion that Mr. Asbury would not "easily comply;" adding, "nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it."

4. *Conduct on hearing of Mr. Wesley's Death.* While the above proposition was pending, the Dr. heard of Mr. Wesley's death. His biographer's account of his conduct, on this occasion, is marvellous. Let it be remembered, that one of Charles Wesley's fears, in connection with the Ordination of Dr. Coke, by his brother, was, that the Dr., after organising the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, would return to attempt a similar organization in England. Mr. Asbury was the acknowledged head in America; and deserved to be. There was no possibility of rising above him, unless by consecration from Bishop White: and even had that been certain, it is scarcely credible that the Methodists generally would have forsaken their old and fast friend, to follow Dr. Coke into the Protestant Episcopal Church. Besides, the Dr. would, doubtless, have preferred Mr. Wesley's place in England to Mr. Asbury's in America. When he heard of Mr. Wesley's death, he was at Port-Royal, in Virginia. He was informed of the melancholy fact, after preaching, at night. He had an appointment, some miles distant, at ten o'clock the next morning. Instead of fulfilling it, he started for the nearest port where he could find a ship sailing for England!—travelled so rapidly that he was made sick, and had to stop; pursued the coach, the next day, on horseback; the next day, was stopped by sickness again: and so lost the opportunity he sought. He then spent nine days in Philadelphia; heard of a vessel at New Castle; hastened thither, and embarked; left the ship, when near the English coast, and was put ashore at Falmouth, by some fishermen! No wonder even his Biographer adds: "*The supposed occasion* of Dr. Coke's arrival in England *at this particular crisis* of the Methodist connection, though *pleasing to some, was by no means gratifying to all the preachers.*" Mr. Drew, indeed, does not let the fact of this unwelcome reception pass, without extolling the Dr.'s general character; but even such of his readers as desire to be "children in malice," cannot make themselves such children "in understanding," as to confound a course like this with the truly glorious career of his subject in other relations.

5. *Letter to the Bishop of London.* Having failed in his application to Bishop White; and in his supposed expectations, on his return to England, after Mr. Wesley's decease; about eight years later, Dr. Coke applied to the Bishop of London, seemingly in hope of attaining his old and cherished object. "Securing the great body of Methodists to the Church of England," was the burden of the Epistle; and the means by which this was to be accomplished, was the ordination of "leading preachers," and, doubtless, himself, particularly, "to travel through the connection," "to administer the sacraments," &c. He was already a Presbyter; and, if re-ordained, could be so only as a Bishop. In this case, however, we confess the evidence is merely circumstantial. We regard it, in connection with what has gone before, and is to come after.

6. *Letter to Wilberforce.* Having failed in the latter, as in all former efforts—in England as in America, another and most remote region opened to his contemplation, in connection with the same object. It was about fourteen years after the letter to the Bishop of London, when he wrote to William Wilberforce, Esq. He assured Mr. Wilberforce that the interests of the "*Indian Empire*" had "lain very near" his "heart—for *at least twelve years.*" But, whether the disappointment on his return to England, after Mr. Wesley's death, had any connection with his *first* thoughts of India, it is manifest that these later efforts were prompted by "the observations of

Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons, concerning a *religious establishment* in India, *connected* with the *established church* at home." In this letter—which is one of the strangest we ever read, and which may be found in the 2d vol. of the "Wilberforce Correspondence," Philadelphia edition, page 114—Dr. Coke speaks plainly of his "appointment to the *Episcopacy* of India," and professes a readiness, in that case, to "return most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the Established Church, and do everything in" his "power to promote its interests," and "*submit to all such restrictions* in the fulfilment of" his "office, as the government and the bench of bishops should think necessary." This last, and also unsuccessful effort, was made a little more than a year prior to his death.

Now, what *can* we say in palliation of these things? Nothing. So far as Dr. Coke's confessed ambition allied itself to these little things—he is to be *pitied*, not approved. He saw the degradation; felt it; struggled against it; apologised for it, by the connection of better things with it; but, being mastered by it, could do nothing more, save *try to hide it*. This, he always did. In the case of the *Bristol Ordination*, he consoled himself thus: "Either it will be *known*, or *not known*; if *not known*, then no odium will arise; but *if known*, you will be obliged to acknowledge that I acted under your (Mr. Wesley's) direction, or suffer me to sink," &c.—See Letter, p. 256, 2d vol. this work. In the case of the *Baltimore Ordination*, notwithstanding he assured Mr. Wesley, in the letter just quoted, that he would go no "further" than he "believed absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the work," he afterwards confessed, in his letter to Bishop White, "I am not sure but I *went further*" than *Mr. Wesley* "did intend," at least: and good reason had he for this; for on his return to England, from that Ordination, Mr. Wesley gave him a cool reception, and the conference left his name off the "minutes" for the ensuing year—in part, it is believed, for this very fault. The feelings of Mr. Wesley, in relation to the matter, are evident enough from his letter to Mr. Asbury, in connection especially with the assumption of the name of *Bishop*—Mr. Asbury, in all probability, not being half as guilty as his associate:—"One instance of this, of your *greatness*, has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called *BISHOP*? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call *me* a knave or a fool; a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content: but they shall never, by my consent, call me *Bishop!*" &c.—This transcending of Mr. Wesley's intention was *hidden* before. So, in respect of the proposition to Bishop White, the Dr. stated: "I am conscious of it that *secresy* is of great importance in the present state of the business," &c.—and therefore *begged* the secret might be kept, and, if the proposal should not be improved, that the letter might be "*burnt*" and "no more notice" taken of it. So, in respect of the letter to Wilberforce, he appeals to the honor of that gentleman, to keep the matter quiet, lest the preachers should come to know it, and thus his usefulness be affected. He cautions him even against Mr. Stephen—the statesman's brother-in-law—lest, if mentioned to him, it should come to the knowledge of the Methodists. Let any one read that letter, and answer, if it does not show a balloonist, who, infatuated by the hope of rising to a tinted vapor, now floating in the sunset, but soon to grow dark and cold, throws out the ballast of personal dignity and worth. For such a man—a man of such unexcelled elements and influences, in many other respects—the "Xavier of Methodism," as Southey styles him, complimenting rather the Romanist than the Methodist by the title—for him so to demean himself under "ambitious stirrings;" and, after having vainly sought preferment in the church for years, in the beginning of life; and then left it in disappointment; to turn back to it again, for the same object, repeatedly, and even to the close of life; and so humble himself and strive to hide his humiliations; and this, when God had opened to him a field which the Archbishop of Canterbury might have envied, and given him

talents wherewith to occupy it, which the whole bench of bishops might have envied—surely it is pitiable enough.

But this statement of Dr. Coke's character seemed to be necessary to the vindication of Dr. Whitehead. Dr. Whitehead knew him; and, without citing all he says against him, it may be made plain enough that he did not admire him. If the reader will turn to the second volume of this work, and examine passages on pages 219, 253, 255, and 284, he will sufficiently understand in what light Dr. Whitehead regarded Dr. Coke. What Charles Wesley thought of him, may be gathered from his letter to his brother, page 265, vol. 2. "His 'Methodist Episcopal Church, at Baltimore,' was *intended*," says Charles, "to beget a 'Methodist Episcopal Church,' here." He was afraid of Dr. Coke's ambition, if not of his brother's.

What then? Is it right to hear only one side of a question? Who has been more abused than Dr. Whitehead? Perhaps not by Dr. Coke, personally. We take pleasure in reading Mr. Drew's remark, that, "from invective, acrimony, and asperity, all his pages are happily free." And yet, Mr. Drew has not informed us how many "all *his* pages" really are, nor where we are to find them. But the party, by whom Dr. Coke was supported, *have* abused Dr. Whitehead; one would think, to their heart's content. Mr. Moore, especially, has done this. We say, then,—ponder the character of Dr. Coke. And, although all the improprieties which have been noticed, were not to be found in the MSS. of John Wesley, let the reader form his own judgment, from what Dr. Whitehead has published, whether there was not reason why Dr. Coke should oppose his "discretionary use" of the MSS.—whether things are not here brought to light, which Dr. Coke—according to his habit—would certainly have concealed, had he been permitted so to do.

Now, then, let us pass on to a brief notice of his coadjutor.

2. *Henry Moore.*

A few words here will suffice. Mr. Moore we always regarded, until lately, as one of the most venerable of the Wesleyan Ministers. We mourn bitterly when facts reduce our veneration. But truth remains to be venerated; let its disciples dishonor themselves as they may. We repeat our design to say but little here—though this little may break upon many like unexpected lightning and thunder. **FIRST**—Mr. Moore is *the Abuser, par excellence*, of Dr. Whitehead. **SECONDLY**—Here is Dr. Whitehead's Work—two volumes in one—containing about 600 pages in whole. They have been carefully compared with Mr. Moore's Work—as it is called—and out of these 600 pages, there are only 133 which are clear of the marks of Mr. Moore's purloining. Most of them, in whole, or nearly so, "original documents," "references to MSS.," "notes, dissertations, reflections, translations," and facts and pronouns of "personal knowledge"—all, all are transferred from the Abused to the Abuser. For instance: if Dr. Whitehead says—"It appears from the account *I* have given of Mr. Charles Wesley," &c. — Mr. Moore copies it just as it stands, without acknowledgment, and presents it to the world as his own: "It appears from the account *I* have given," &c. — Now is not such conduct intolerable? In his "Preface," Mr. Moore remarks that Dr. Whitehead's "book is still extant, and should be *answered*, though he himself is no longer accountable to men." Is this the way to answer it? We have already noticed Mr. Drew's statement, that "the breach was afterward completely healed; and both works continue to be sold by the Conference." That was a mistake, for it was published before Mr. Moore's Life; and Dr. Whitehead's genuine work, we are persuaded, was never sold by the Conference. But now, wherever *Mr. Moore's* work is sold, it may indeed be said, that, substantially, *both* works are sold.

How *could* Mr. Moore expose himself to such charges as these? Does he not say that his old opponent's work is "still *extant*?" Certainly—but, perhaps, he imagined

so few copies to be in existence, that he would never be detected. We have mentioned the Official Review of his work in the London "Wesleyan Methodist Magazine," for 1825. The Reviewer tells a different story. He seems to let out the secret. "The *spirit of party*," he observes, "kept this work alive for *the time*; but it may be considered as *long since dead*." Was not this the real reason?

But a dead book, like a dead man, may live again. Buried, burnt, torn, its elements scattered over the world, its name forgotten by the world, still, like a man subjected to the same accidents, it may rise again. Nor only so: but, if a good book, it may rise, like a good man, in spiritual and imperishable power and glory. Do not the changes which have passed upon Dr. Whitehead's work confirm and illustrate these statements? *Born*—to preserve the figure—in 1793, it was declared, in thirty-two years afterward, "*long since dead*," and yet, twenty years after that declaration, in this rapid, stereotype succession of large, beautiful, and popular editions, we witness the wonder of its triumphant resurrection. And now, in the revelations of the ante-judgment, who is there to confront it, without fear and shame?

In one word, in view of what has been said respecting the two chief opponents of Dr. Whitehead—are they the men to cast reproach on him? If not—who are!

V.—PRINCIPLES AND TERMS ON WHICH THE CONTROVERSY MAY BE DECIDED.

We designed to dwell somewhat at large on these—so ardent is our desire for justice, mercy, and peace. But we are warned of limits that cannot be transgressed. What then? *Much in little* is our only resort.

Let the *facts* be settled, and the *truth* acknowledged, whoever suffers. It is merely a suffering of reputation, and that in one point among many which cannot suffer, and that, for the advantage of posterity. Our faith is, that Dr. Whitehead, Dr. Coke, and Mr. Moore, ascended, successively, to heaven; that they repose together there, in blissful release from the infirmities which spotted their orbs while filling their social circles here. We have thought of the living as well as the dead, of eternity as well as time, and have endeavored to do our duty. If anything has been mis-stated, the next edition shall correct it. We would not wilfully mis-state, for the world. It is plain, that though there were *three Trustees*, there were but *two parties*. Dr. Whitehead represented one; his Associates, the other. They wished to destroy; he, to save. They, to conceal; he, to expose. They had given him the materials, without knowing his design and firmness, expecting, it would seem, to control his work; he, understanding their character and purposes, refused to surrender his advantage. His work tells the rest. Did he right, or wrong? If even wrong, in that respect, is not his work still trustworthy? Shall he, then, be anathematised and his opponents sainted? Who does not see that the only way to settle the matter is, to make allowance for natural infirmities and party infirmities all round—give Dr. Whitehead equal representation in Wesleyan literature with the other Biographers—and let the Methodists and the world, on due examination, render their righteous judgment of his merits. We are sure, he will stand as highly, in such a result, as any of his compeers. His work has never been superseded; nor can it ever be. It is the *original* work—the *foundation* work, on which others have built—the *standard* LIFE OF JOHN AND CHARLES WESLEY.

January, 1845.