

FAITHFUL REBUKE,

NOT

“UNREASONABLE BITTERNESS;”

*had*

SHOWN IN

A REPLY

TO THE

“REVEREND DR. TYNG’S”

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON THE

PASTORAL LETTER

OF THE

SYNOD OF MICHIGAN.

---

DETROIT:

PRINTED BY A. S. WILLIAMS.

1844.

*Detroit, January 30, 1844.*

REV. GEORGE DUFFIELD,

Pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church, Detroit:

REV. AND DEAR SIR—A small tract, entitled “Unreasonable Bitterness,” is being industriously and extensively circulated in this city; the evident object of which is to impeach the motives, and impugn the character of the Synod of Michigan, (and more especially of yourself,) in relation to their Pastoral Letter lately published in the New York Evangelist, and certified by you as Stated Clerk of that body. The tract professes to be from “an Episcopalian,” and consists mainly, after some prefatory remarks, of an extract from the Synod’s Letter, and comments thereon, taken from the Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, and said to be from the pen of Dr. Tyng, one of the Editors of that paper.

Permit us to inquire whether you have seen the Tract and the article in the Episcopal Recorder, and if so, whether you have taken any notice of them? We feel confident that the Synod have not acted or spoken with “unreasonable bitterness,” nor yet without sufficient reasons, in their judgment, to justify their Letter; but be that as it may, we cannot refrain from expressing our indignation and surprise at the selection of your name, and the evident indication of a desire to make an attack upon you personally, as the author of that letter; for surely, neither the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder, nor “An Episcopalian,” can be so grossly ignorant of the organization of ecclesiastical or popular bodies, as not to know that the stated Clerk of Synod, or of any other deliberative body, is not responsible for the acts of the body.

Rest assured, dear sir, that such insidious attempts to render you obnoxious to the charge of wantonly or *ungratefully* assailing Episcopacy or its Bishops, cannot in the least avail the sub-

the agitators, among the intelligent citizens of Michigan. We who are familiar with your private views and feelings, know full well your disinclination for controversy when it can safely be avoided, and that you engage in it only from a sense of duty when constrained so to do, in vindication of truth, in defence of religion, pure and undefiled, or to refute and expose bombastic and arrogant pretensions to *exclusive Apostolical descent!!!* and thus to repel the assaults so frequently and imperiously made on the Presbyterian and other Evangelical Churches.

The whole thing as concerns this Tract, appears to be a weak and malicious (not to say worse,) attempt to injure you, and interrupt the harmony, and hitherto friendly relations, of this community. Be assured, however, that this base attempt has, in no way, diminished our esteem for you, either as a Pastor or friend, and we earnestly request that you will, if you think proper, put us in possession of any information, which may enable us to present the whole matter to the public, in exact accordance with the facts in the case, so as to counteract the designs of the anonymous calumniator, as well as the animadversions of the Reverend Editor.

We are, Reverend and dear Sir, with respect and affectionate esteem, your friends and obedient servants.

BENJAMIN F. LARNED,  
A. SHELEY,  
THOMAS J. OWEN,  
HORACE HALLOCK,  
Z. PLATT,  
FRANKLIN MOORE,  
JOHN HULBURT,  
MARTIN WILLSON,  
DAVID FRENCH,  
W. A. HOWARD,  
JONATHAN KEARSLEY,

ROBERT STUART,  
THOMAS ROWLAND,  
SHUBAEL CONANT,  
EDWARD BINGHAM,  
S. A. HASTINGS,  
Z. CHANDLER,  
JAMES F. JOY,  
J. M. HOWARD,  
JOHN WINDER,  
ROSS WILKINS.

TO MESSRS. ROBERT STUART, THOMAS ROWLAND, SHEVAEL COMANT, and others

MY DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHREN—I have received your friendly communication, and cordially tender to you my thanks, for the confidence and kind feeling you express toward me; especially, when I perceive, that it has been in direct opposition to efforts, designedly, and both publicly and clandestinely made, to exhibit me in a light altogether unworthy of such regard.

A friend in Philadelphia forwarded me a copy of the Episcopal Recorder, containing the attack made upon *me, personally*, by the Rev. W. Suddards and S. Tyng, Editors of that paper. Which of these two gentlemen was the author of the animadversions, so freely, and after the fashion of most childish weakness bestowed on me, I know not; but as their names both stand at the head of that paper as its editors, I was bound to regard it as their joint production. Whether it originated with either, or was suggested by others, who might feel more especially condemned by the Synod's letter, I cared not to inquire. But I was not a little surprised to find, that before communications could have been exchanged between this city and Philadelphia, after the appearance of the Episcopal Recorder of the 30th of December, in this place, the anonymous tract to which you refer, was put in circulation here, in which it is affirmed that Dr. Tyng had written the article. This circumstance has led me to think, that some correspondence must have passed between one or other of the editors and some one in this city or vicinity on the subject, by which that fact had become known. If the thought of such an article originated here, or was suggested from this place, and previous assurances were had, that Dr. Tyng would prepare something of the kind in due season, to counteract the effect of the Synod's letter, the mystery is solved; and it becomes obvious, how Dr. Tyng could be so confidently announced as its author. Should its preparation have

been suggested, or solicited from this region, it is rather a round-about and curious way to meet the effect of the Synod's letter.

The open, manly and magnanimous course, would have been, for that portion of the Episcopal Church, who were referred to by the Synod, to come out at once and disprove their statements if they could. This done, they might justly animadvert on the Synod's letter, and conduct in the affair. Such a procedure would have corrected the Synod, if they were under a mistake, and placed the Episcopal Church of this State, not only on vantage ground, but back again in the confidence of the Synod. The Synod need not my defence; they are able to attend to it themselves. Had this course been pursued, I should have thought it was all right, nor have felt myself called upon to do anything in the matter, by virtue of any relation I bear to it, either as a member, or their Stated Clerk. Or should the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder, or of any other Episcopal paper, have felt themselves called upon to repel the statements and fears expressed by the Synod, and have challenged the Synod to the proof, although the latter could not have acted till October next, holding as they do, but an annual meeting, I should have thought it was but a manly and appropriate course, for them to meet the serious things affirmed in that letter. But when I found that my name was particularly and exclusively selected from those of J. P. Cleveland, Moderator; E. Child, Recording Clerk; and W. Page, Chairman of the Committee, and all the animadversions directed personally against myself, who as the Stated Clerk of the Synod, am officially bound to copy their documents, I was truly surprised. And still more so, when the writer of the animadversions sought to array me against "the Bishop of Michigan," as though I had originated that letter, and had been, not only affected by "personal pique," but actually guilty of "abuse" of him!! Having had no agency, whatever, either in the original suggestion, or the actual production, of that Synodical letter, or any part of its contents, it immediately struck me, on reading the editorial animadversions, that the "pique" must be in another quarter. The "*abuse*" has certainly been rendered *against* ME, instead of *BY* me.

I frankly confess to you, gentlemen, that of all petty warfare, that appears to me to be the meanest and most cowardly, as far removed from common decency, as from Christian courtesy, which conscious weakness and malice are so apt to adopt, when *motives* are impeached, malignant feelings attributed, and prejudices excited and directed against an individual, especially if among any particular class of persons he may be obnoxious. The whole article in the Episcopal Recorder, is an attack, as you say, personally on myself, in which, motives of the lowest and basest sort are attributed to me. If Dr. Tyng and his associate editor or advisers, can reconcile such conduct with sound morality, not to say the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I do deeply deplore the state of things in the Episcopal Church. That those, whom I have accounted among its best members, should be so widely in error, and practically ignorant of the requirements of the Gospel, and the prerogatives of God, who alone searches the heart and tries the reins of the children of men, should excite the earnest desire and prayers of every friend of truth and piety, that, instead of canonical laws, rubric and ritual prescriptions, so much valued and tenaciously adhered to, a higher standard of morality and religion, might speedily be inculcated, and appreciated among them. But I am willing to believe, and do hope, that the violent and totally unfounded attack on me, has been the result of excitement, and of some particular state of irritability, appropriately referable to the present peculiarly agitated and perturbed state of the Episcopal Church. A sneer at "the interior of New School Presbyterianism," comes with bad grace under such circumstances. So far as I know my brethren of the Synod, and I think I can safely appeal to you, that so far as you know me, we seek to inculcate a very different sort of morality and religion. We deprecate the idea of attributing malicious and censurable *motives* to fellow professors, as being totally at war with the profession and obligation of that charity which forms the very root and cement of Christianity, and is an indispensable evidence of christian character. Whatever is wrong in *act*, we feel ready and bound to condemn; nor do we admit that a wrong act can be

made right by a good motive. If our brethren of the Episcopal Church by their high exclusive pretensions to be "the Church" of Christ, have thrown us all out of the pale of His visible church, and therefore think that the obligations of charity, forbidding all impeachment of motive in judging of conduct and character, extend not beyond those in their fold, it is only proof of the deleterious influence of such pretensions. The obligations of the law of love, the law of Christ's House, cannot be thus restricted by canonical regulations. We do not charge this upon them, but we do say that it is not an uncommon thing to impeach our motives and condemn us for things we know not. In what the Synod have stated, they have not impeached motives, but asserted facts—facts not founded on general reasonings, but actual occurrences.

You have a specimen of this impeachment of motive, in the prefatory remarks in the tract to which you refer, prefixed by some one styling himself "An Episcopalian," and who evidently contrasts the spirit and motives he has attributed to the Synod, with what he believes to be a better state of things in his churches. The writer says, "He thinks the reader will be surprised to find, that such a spirit as is developed in the extract could exist in any professedly religious body. It is a melancholy exhibition of the effect of passion and prejudice, and of the want of the meek, kind and charitable spirit of our adorable redeemer. It is even more—it clearly indicates that the opportunity and power are only wanting to call into fearful exercise, the spirit of persecution." The Synod said in their letter, that the influence of Satan was developing itself in the world, in the anti-christian spirit which attaches essential consequence to forms of Godliness—exalts the ritual above or to the level of spiritual religion. The influence of this spirit, they say they have reason to fear, has betrayed itself in the Episcopal Church, and that even the Low Church portion of that denomination, are found, "in connection with it," under such circumstances as to make that Church the means and occasion of mischief more to be feared, than if it could not hide itself behind their personal piety and worth. If low churchmen will, directly or indirectly sanction the things which the Sy-

nod designate, viz: "The doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, exclusive sectarianism, and Jesuitical proselytism, opposition to temperance and revivals of religion," as prosecuted and prevailing among our churches, and "a dependance on forms and successions," then does the Synod pronounce their influence through their church to be injurious to the cause of salvation. The doctrine of apostolic succession, as taught by High Church Episcopalians, the Synod considers the very element of Puseyism and Popery. Against these things the Synod lift up their warning voice, and call upon their Churches to be upon their guard. Where is the *passion* and *prejudice* in all this? where the persecuting spirit, and "the want of the meek, kind and charitable spirit of our adorable Redeemer?" He condemned in strong terms, substantially, the same things, pouring utter contempt upon the religion of forms, inculcating the necessity of a change of heart, and cutting off his hearers from all dependence upon their descent from Abraham, from all self gratulation in the thought of being "the temple of the Lord," "THE CHURCH," and called them very hypocrites who inculcated these things, and plead "the traditions of the Elders." The Synod have not spoken of these things with half the severity of the Saviour. Who will impeach his motives? Certainly we have liberty to condemn like things, though not having His omniscience, it would ill become us to style men hypocrites. The Synod has said that such things are facts, and seek to discharge a duty of christian fidelity to their Low Church brethren. I will not say that it has been done in the most felicitous manner. But who has a right to impeach their motives and charge them with "unreasonable bitterness," if such things be true? I have had occasion to see this thing done, sometimes to such an extent in a community, as perfectly to overwhelm innocence, by getting up a crying fame against a man or men who dared to speak out in condemnation of what they judged to be wrong and mischievous, so that scarcely any one would lift a voice in their vindication, and yet in process of time the Providence of God vindicated these same persons as truly upright. The Saviour was himself thus brought to the cross. But such things recoil on those who perpetrate them. Had the Synod impeached motives, attributed malice,

or any other evil passion to the Low Church party, or High Church party, or Episcopal Church, they had justly deserved rebuke. But they state frankly, fearlessly, and fully, their apprehensions, and the reason of them, affirming facts which they are able, I doubt not, to substantiate.

It affords me some consolation to know, from your letter, that you, gentlemen, have appreciated my position, and that the efforts to which you allude, made to render me obnoxious to this community, as a pugnacious man and disturber of the peace, as fond of controversy, as hostile to other sects, have been understood by you. At the urgent request of most of you, I reviewed the discourse of the Bishop of Michigan, which after having been preached round the State, was published, in which the arrogant and anti-christian doctrine of "the apostolic succession" was taught in the most offensive form, and pressed so far in its application and results, as to set before the community all ministers not ordained by a Diocesan prelate, as "gross imposters." Self-respect, under such circumstances, rendered self-defence indispensable. Respect to you, required it also. The cause of truth and christian liberty, demanded it, and I felt myself called, not only by your voice, but by still higher authority, to give the subject a thorough examination. The discourse was preached at a precious season of divine influences among us, when many were inquiring what they should do to be saved, and when my whole thoughts and time had been occupied in the business of preaching the gospel night after night to perishing men. The effect of that discourse, by reason of the intermingled state of society, was exceedingly "mischievous," producing a distraction of mind, and an interruption of the state of feeling so favorable for the preaching of the gospel, which had for some time previously existed among us. Not, however, till the indications were plain, that further effort, beyond the stated preaching of the word, was no longer called for, did I feel myself justified to cease from my work, when, in compliance with your request, I prepared and published my "Letters" addressed to the author of that discourse, preferring this course to the introduction of the subject into the pulpit in a series of discourses,

In doing so, I carefully avoided every discourteous epithet and expression, as I did every improper emotion, rather pitying the weakness and error it betrayed, than experiencing any other feeling. Its false assumptions and erroneous historical statements; its false theology and incorrect reasoning, I felt myself at full liberty to expose. It was a legitimate theme of severe criticism. Had I lived at a distance, it might have been done without bringing the author directly and constantly into view; but living beside him, and being in common with my ministerial brethren called by him "gross imposters," so distinctly and unqualifiedly, as to prevent all *explanation* that could ever take away the offensive import of the language, and atone for the "mischievous" attack, I had no manly, consistent or christian course left, but to address himself. The attempt was quickly made thereupon to excite the belief that there was a personal quarrel, and to throw odium on me by the impeachment of my motives. Insidious slanders were circulated, and the cry of persecution raised. With whom they originated, or by whom they were circulated, I cared not to inquire. It gives me some consolation to know that my "private views and feelings," and "disinclination for controversy," are known to you, and that you understand not only the character of the only replies made to those letters, but the reasons that called for the letters and the motives which induced them.

The cry now is, and has been for some time, that any thing and every thing said against the absurd and arrogant pretensions of prelaey, is an attempt "to interrupt the hitherto friendly social relations of this community." Yet still individuals of that sect introduce the subject among our professors, revile our system of government and views, and talk as arrogantly as ever, even as if they had *proved* the divine right of prelaey, and that they and they only, were "the Church." The sin and the shame of disturbing the social harmony, be on them and their exclusiveness. The moment that they will cease from their exclusive pretensions, be willing to have religious intercourse and christian fellowship, cooperate in efforts for the advancement of religion, and recognize the fact that our churches, and ministers, and ordinances, are as truly the churches and ministers and ordinances of Jesus Christ.

as their own, they will find us willing to forgive their assaults and dwell in peace. But we understand too well our obligations to our Divine Master, to be quiet and refrain from repelling their assaults and testifying against their errors and exclusiveness, as long as they occupy the ground which renders, as the Synod has so truly said, the church that will sanction and foster such things, "a mischievous establishment." I rejoice to know that there are not a few Episcopalians that disbelieve the doctrine of "apostolic succession," as taught by many of their leaders, and do fraternize with other denominations as churches of Jesus Christ. With such we have no controversy. I honor them, and pray that like some noble spirits among them who have set an example worthy of all praise, they may maintain their steadfastness, and save their church from falling into the apostacy and corruptions of Rome. They understand, that opposition, to the dangerous errors taught among them, and to the influence brought to bear for propagating them, and particularly for pouring contempt on other churches, as mere voluntary societies and not churches of Jesus Christ, is not hostility to persons, and can be maintained in perfect consistence with, yea, be evidential of christian affection and faithfulness. A religion that understands not this thing, and practically assuming infallibility to itself, will not bear, but repels and reviles as unchristian and malicious, any testimony against and rebuke of what error may cleave to it, needs greatly to be reformed. We feel bound in duty to God, to ourselves and to society, to seek and cultivate a better, and cannot be imposed upon by the self laudatory professions of those who exalt their sect to the exclusion of others, and above what the word of God and the history of His providence will justify.

With these remarks, I submit to you two letters which I have forwarded to the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder—the first, in answer to the article which has been circulated here, in the tract to which you refer, and the second in reply to the remarks made on that letter, which they did not publish, but kept *in retentis*, which last I have prepared since this letter to you was commenced.

Excuse the length of this communication, affording me so appropriate an opportunity to unfold to you the motives and princi-

ples by which I have been actuated, and which it gives me great pleasure to perceive, you were ready to attribute to me. Rest assured, beloved brethren and friends, that next to the approbation of God and my own conscience, I esteem none more than yours, whom I love and seek to serve in the Gospel of our common Lord and Saviour.

Sincerely your friend and servant, in the bonds of Jesus Christ.

GEO. DUFFIELD.

Detroit, Feb. 3, 1844.



THE TRACT ALLUDED TO IN THE PRECEDING LETTERS.

---

UNREASONABLE BITTERNESS.

---

“An Episcopalian begs leave to present to the christian community, the following extract from the Pastoral Letter of the Presbyterian Synod of Michigan. He thinks the reader will be surprised to find, that such spirit as is developed in the extract, could exist in any professedly religious body. It is a melancholy exhibition of the effect of passion and prejudice, and of the want of the meek, kind and charitable spirit of our adorable Redeemer. It is even more—it clearly indicates, that the opportunity and power are only wanting, to call into fearful exercise, the spirit of persecution. He hopes, however, that the members of that Church, who have been thus wantonly assailed, will not return evil for evil; but like their Divine Head and Master, pray for those who despitefully use them, and make renewed exertions to overcome evil with good.”

---

*An Extract from the Pastoral Letter of the Synod of Michigan,  
October 12-14, 1843.*

“Now we warn you, brethren, beloved, to beware of Satan’s devices. Never be satisfied with the mere form of godliness. Beware, we beseech you, of that spirit of Antichrist which has grown up within these few years to such giant strength, in a denomination of religious people, which we have been accustomed to consider as evangelical, but which we fear must hereafter be treated as fundamentally erroneous. We now refer you in plain English to the Episcopal denomination. We likewise exhort you not to be deceived with regard to the fatal tendency of these most palpable errors, which have taken possession of even what is ter-

med the *Low Church* portion of that mischievous establishment. Even *that* portion, in our estimation, has in connection with it no little false theology, and exclusive sectarianism, and Jesuitical proselytism; together with opposition to temperance and revivals of religion, intermingled with forms and successions; all of which we consider highly injurious to the cause of human salvation. And surely the people of that establishment cannot with propriety complain, if in the midst of all *their* disownment of others, we just point the eye of our Churches to errors among themselves, which we honestly regard as most ruinously heretical. We warn you to beware of their influence. Wherever this doctrine of Apostolical Succession obtains, on which they insist so importunately, you have the elements of Puseyism and Popery, of highest caste. If we understand truth, although there may be less of error, and more of piety among the Low Churchmen of Episcopacy than exists within the ranks of the highest toned, and the more unchristian; yet so long as the doctrines of Baptismal regeneration and Apostolic descent prevail, we must regard them as little less dangerous in the kingdom of God, than their more arrogant and abusive brethren. When they will come out like the first fathers of the English Church, to labor side by side, in loving fellowship, with Christ's disciples of other names, to advance the genuine interests of His kingdom, then, and not till then, will they cease to be the objects of our decided rebuke and sleepless suspicions."

(Signed,)

GEO. DUFFIELD,  
*Stated Clerk.*

---

The following remarks upon the above extract are taken from the Episcopal Recorder, published in Philadelphia, of December 30, 1843. They were written by the Rev. Dr. Tyng:

"We are very unwilling to enter upon the consideration of assaults which seem so unreasonable and undue. The first and natural feeling in reading them, is indignation and contempt. But we would try to remember that "two wrongs do not make a right," and endeavor to consider the subject in a more proper and Christian light—rather with pity and regret.

We cannot but remark upon this document, however, that it is rather an extreme instance in temper, of those assaults upon the Episcopal Church which are now multiplying so rapidly around us: and as it comes forth in the very deliberate and solemn shape of a Pastoral Letter, from an avowed Christian body, it assumes even a more remarkable aspect of severity and ill-feeling.

In regard to its actual application to those against whom it is directed, we do not suppose that any persons of ordinary intelligence in the Synod who adopted this Letter, and still less, the well informed person who signs himself their Stated Clerk—really believed the truth of the statements which are here made. They are so manifestly inconsistent with known, and very manifest truth, that we can only suppose it to be an instance of the occasional dominance of passion over judgment, which, even in really good men, is sometimes witnessed, as a sad infirmity.—The assertions are so extravagant, and so against the convictions of the great body of Christians around, by all of whom, we believe, it will be acknowledged, that more faithful preaching of the Gospel is no where to be found, than from these very Clergymen here distinctly specified—that we cannot suppose any other impression to be generally made by them upon the minds of others, than their evident untruth. To characterize such men even among our Bishops, as Griswold, Moore, Mead, McIlvain, Johns and Henshaw, to add no enumeration from inferior Clergymen, as enemies to revivals of religion, under whose ministry, for a long succession of years, most remarkable revivals have been seen and known, is, in the mildest view of the act, a statement of what the whole Christian community know to be false. And we must be permitted very seriously to say, that no one knows this better than the person who has signed his name to this paper.

In regard to the effect of such vituperations, they manifestly overshoot their mark. They awaken attention to the body thus unjustly reviled, and are the means of giving a greater increase to it, than any other instrument that could be employed. We would venture to say, that two out of every three of the numerous Presbyterians, who have, within the last few years, united themselves with the Episcopal Church, have been first moved by

these evidently unfounded assaults upon its character—many instances of this are within our reach. For ourselves, we ask for no better praise or surer prosperity, than is to be derived from such unreasonable attacks. We shall renounce no single doctrine of the Church in which we minister, under their influence, nor we hope be driven to any reprisals of unchristian hostility by their violence. We are sure no better method can be taken to build us up, than the one which has been here adopted.

In regard to the origin of this instance of such abuse, we can only say, it opens a sad view of the interior of New School Presbyterianism, if this is the spirit of their Synods, and the fruit of their private consultations. If an Episcopal Convention should thus address our Church, in regard to Presbyterianism, we believe there would be but one opinion in our whole body, of the undignified, self-derogatory, and mischievous meddling spirit which was thus displayed. But little reverence could be had from our body, for a Pastoral Letter of this character. And we doubt if there is much of any other opinion, among respectable Presbyterians, of the act and passage now before us. If, when professed ministers of the Gospel come together with prayer, they can find or attain no better state of mind than is here displayed, they could hardly have, or give better evidence that the Spirit of the Lord is not in their midst.

In regard to the local application of the assault, we suppose it to arise from personal pique at the manifest and remarkable increase of the Episcopal Church in Michigan. With the Bishop of that Church, we have ever had the affectionate intercourse of brethren mutually beloved. He had our cordial confidence as a faithful, pious man, when he moved in and out among us as a Presbyterian in this city. He has given to us, as a Bishop, a free and affectionate commendation of our paper, as indicating his own views and sentiments, and expressive of his confidence in us.—He has been known by his faithful address to the students of our General Seminary, for which he was censured by those whom, perhaps, “The Synod of Michigan” hates even more, if possible, than the “Low Churchmen of this mischievous establishment.” The last sermon we heard from him was one of the most faithful,

and Evangelical, we have ever heard from any one. Now, though we have heard from those who are about as worthy of credit, as "The Synod of Michigan" proves itself to be, that he has changed his views, and his stand in his defence of Gospel truth, we have no real evidence of the fact, and no belief of it. Our opinion of him, therefore, is yet unchanged, and we shall sustain and defend him to our utmost, as a friend and brother, esteemed and beloved. The Rev. George Duffield, we have never heard except on one occasion, when, curiously enough, he was invited by this same Bishop, with that courtesy which is his inseparable characteristic, to officiate in his own house, at the funeral of the Bishop's sister, who was a member of the Presbyterian Church, though there were several Episcopal Clergymen present, and for which act of kindness and respect to Mr. Duffield, we know not that he was ever censured by any of his Episcopal friends. And now we find this same Mr. Duffield signing his name to a public and most unfounded abuse of the Bishop of Michigan, of the falsehood of which we feel compelled to say, he could not but be aware. We suppose the effect will be in Michigan as elsewhere, that the assault will justly help the Bishop and his Church, and harm only the persons who have been guilty of it.

But vain are the assaults, as well as "the help of men." For ourselves, we have no taste for these matters of earthly dispute, and rarely feel willing to refer to them. Our readers, however, have a right to know something of the state of things around.— And though we desire habitually to show them a more excellent way, and long ourselves to walk in it, we will not withhold all notice of what appears to us facts, which, like the present, ought to be regarded and understood, even though they are painful.

We are perfectly content to be represented as specifically "the Low Church portion of that mischievous establishment;" or any thing else that shall better please the bitterness of other men, and had far rather have Mr. Duffield and his companions, while they are in such a temper, abuse us as foes, than attempt to unite to us as friends. We feel satisfied ourselves, and would humbly suggest to our friend, the Bishop of Michigan, and our brethren the clergy there, our respectful doubts, whether such

“precious balms” will “break their heads.” We trust they will not provoke either of us, ever to “return railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing.” One possible evil effect of such an assault may be the provocation to notice it in pulpit references to its authors. We trust the Episcopal pulpits will be guarded, in preaching the Gospel of Christ in connexion with the Church of Christ, from going out of the way, to know or to ask, whether even such persons exist in Michigan, as New School Presbyterians.”

FIRST LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE EDITORS OF THE "EPISCOPAL RECORDER."

---

*Detroit, January 8, 1844.*

REVS. WILLIAM SUDDARD and STEPHEN H. TYNG, D. D.

REV. GENTLEMEN AND BRETHREN—A friend has just put into my hands, your editorial comments on an *extract* from the Pastoral Letter of the Synod of Michigan, with my name appended, found in your columns under date of December 30th ult. I address you as Christian brethren, in the exercise of the rights and liberty, as well as in the discharge of a duty, of Christian brotherhood. It is not my province to judge the heart; nor will I attempt to assign the motives, which may have induced you to connect my name, exclusively, with that extract, and to direct all your animadversions personally against or towards *myself*.—Others, perhaps, will do it: I shall not, any further than Christian charity can assign those in keeping with the estimation in which, though, personally, unknown to me, I have regarded you, both as Christian men and ministers of Jesus Christ. God will judge if there have been other. But there are some *acts* of yours in this matter, which speak for themselves, and which no motives can justify or excuse.

1. IN RELATION TO MYSELF.—You have selected my name from three others, viz: of the Moderator, the Recording Clerk, and the Chairman of the Committee, the last of whom is known and understood, always, according to usage, to be the writer of such a letter, or report, as the case may be, submitted for the adoption of the body appointing. My name is appended and signed as *Stated Clerk*, who, I presume you know, according to the usage of such bodies, is simply the organ whose business it is to transcribe their documents, make extracts from their minutes, and authenticate the same by his signature. I cannot suppose you were ignorant of such a common usage, not only among

Presbyterians, but similar deliberative bodies. Why, then, did you attribute to me such especial prominence, when you undertook to pen remarks evidently written for censure, if not *ad invidiam*? My duty, as the officer of the Synod, required me to authenticate the document, by my signature, even though I should not have accorded with them in their judgment. You do not know if I had any, or what part, in the production of that letter; whether I voted for it or was even present at its adoption. It was, as I have reason to believe, the exclusive production of the Chairman of the Committee; although not belonging to the Committee myself, and having no knowledge of their proceedings, as a Committee, I cannot be positive even about that. You say yourselves, "We do not suppose, that the well informed person who signs himself their Stated Clerk, really believed the truth of the statements which are here made." Yet have you animadverted on the extract, in such a manner as to hold me up virtually, not only as its author, or, at least, prominent in its production, but as being affected by "personal pique, at the manifest and remarkable increase of the Episcopal Church in Michigan." Now you evidently mean, that *my* "personal pique" has been excited through the labors of the "Episcopal Bishop of Michigan," for you speak of him personally in commendation, and immediately contrast me with him, as excessively deficient in that courtesy, for which you justly commend him, and intimate that deficiency to exist in a most censurable degree in me; because, after your having noticed an incident, too tender and sacred for me to quote in the manner you have referred to it, and omitting an important and essential fact, you add, "Now we find this same Mr. Duffield signing his name to a public and most unfounded *abuse* of the Bishop of Michigan, of the *falsehood* of which we feel compelled to say HE COULD NOT BUT BE AWARE!" Brethren, you said you would "TRY to remember that 'two wrongs do not make a right,' and ENDEAVOR to consider this subject in a more proper and Christian light, with pity and regret," &c. It is truly with "pity and regret," that I perceive your "*endeavor*" has been so abortive. But I must add, that so far from "personal pique," affecting me or my brethren of the Synod, "at the *manifest* and *remarkable* increase of the Episcopal Church

in Michigan," it is a fact of which we were not before aware. Still more am I ignorant of the "ABUSE of the *Bishop of Michigan*," to which you refer. I have read the extract over again, and *tried* to put on your glasses; but really I cannot see any *abuse* in it of "the Bishop of Michigan;" nor can I see in it any thing which is false; and, therefore, I am utterly at a loss to know by what rules of logic, or by what code of morals, you charge me publicly and personally, with THE LIE DIRECT, or, in your own language, a "falsehood of which (you) feel compelled to say (I) *could not but be aware.*" If you, brethren, were asked to define a LIE, I presume you would say, it is *a falsehood, which the utterer knows to be such.* Neither cowardice, nor reluctance, nor courtesy, I will not say which, not even all, have kept you from making against me the charge, which no gentleman, much less a christian brother, will, on mere constructive grounds, make against another. I am sorry you did not restrain the "indignation and contempt," which you confess was your "first natural feeling in reading" the extract, and that you have not furnished a better proof of not being provoked to "return railing for railing, but contrariwise, blessing;" when, in the close of your remarks, you endeavor to suggest to "the Bishop of Michigan," and the "Episcopal pulpits," some good and wholesome advice. If there had been any thing wrong in the Synod of Michigan, you certainly have retaliated with full as "remarkable a degree of severity and ill feeling" as you have attributed to them. My complaint is made to yourselves, that you should have so gratuitously selected me as the scape goat for your retaliatory "vituperations" against the Synod; and thus, virtually, (you know whether designedly or not,) appealed in an *ad captandum* effusion, to feelings which, I am confident, your sober and better judgment will condemn, and fomented a strife, which, personally, does not exist, and shall not be excited (if I can prevent it,) between the Bishop of Michigan and myself, although he has, I believe inadvertently, called us all "gross impostors." Whatever severity I felt justified in indulging in my "letters," towards the argument of his sermon, and the sentiments it advanced, and in repelling the High Church doctrines and pretensions—for which I stand prepared at any moment

hereafter—when urged to the injury of souls or society—there is no personal quarrel or “pique” known to me between us, which you so ungenerously affirm. Are you, brethren, aware that there is such a thing as condemning error, opposing systems of error, and even criticising severely the arguments in support of it, and yet cherishing entire cordial *good will*, and becoming the charity “which hopeth all things,” towards those that are in it? If not, then I am not surprised at your misconstruction of the Synod’s Letter, nor at your ignorance of “New School Presbyterians,” and of “the interior of New School Presbyterianism.” So much for myself!

2. IN RELATION TO THE SYNOD.—You head your article, “UNREASONABLE BITTERNESS,” and then prepare your readers’ appetite for the repast you have furnished. Whether the extracts be such or not, I will not now say; but you certainly know, that conduct is capable of very different constructions, praiseworthy, or censurable, according to the motives alledged to have induced it. Had it been my duty to write the letter, I should have preferred and adopted another style of speech; nor would I have given the same prominence, if perhaps, any notice at all, to the evils, which I believe are incident to any and every Hierarchy, where such sentiments and doctrines prevail, as those on which the Synod has animadverted; because I have yet to learn that they are *very rife* in this State beyond the Papal Idolators. But my brethren judged otherwise; and facts were stated in corroboration of that judgment; such as that while our Presbyterian ministers had been ever willing, to welcome to their pulpits, and to throw open the doors of their places of worship to Episcopalians, and had even sometimes given up their services and united with them, and would be so still for the preaching of the Gospel, yet had they been made to regret, very deeply, their liberality. I use the language of more than one brother, ready to substantiate the facts by abundant evidence, and who have said, that when they gave their houses, for the use of Episcopalians, and gathered in their people to worship with them, they were insulted by hearing the *exclusive* claims to the ministry of Christ, asserted for those who had been ordained by a Diocesan Bishop, and their own ministry;

ordinances, and Churches, by implications plain and obvious, denounced as impostures, and sacrilegious, as well as by hearing doctrines taught, entirely at war with the gospel of Christ, and injurious to true piety, such as baptismal regeneration, apostolical succession, the Church Episcopal the only ark of safety, and the like. They judged that they had reason to believe some of these dangerous and unscriptural doctrines were taught, even by those among them called Low Church, whose reputation for piety had induced them to throw open their houses to Episcopalians, and generously afford them facilities in towns and villages, where they had no churches of their own in which to preach the gospel. Moreover, they lamented to declare, that contempt had been poured upon the revivals of religion, which had occurred among their own people, during which precious seasons, abundant souls had been gathered into the fold of Christ, having been denounced as wild excitements, spurious things, mischievous in their character and results, and ought to be discouraged. The hearts of some, too, were made to bleed, by instances of one and another, awakened and concerned about the salvation of their souls, having been approached in the Spirit of proselytism, and by teaching and influence, which they judged erroneous, having had their convictions abated, were either thrown back into the world or induced to attach a dangerous importance to mere ritual observances, such as Baptism and Confirmation, and the Lord's Supper when there lacked evidences of a radical change of heart. Still further, they had found that the very brethren whom they occasionally welcomed to their pulpits, were sometimes standing in the way of the efforts made by Temperance Societies, to arrest the growth of intemperance, and that Episcopalian members, often, by withdrawing from Temperance Societies, and sometimes by sanctioning the use of wines intoxicating in their nature, were actually frustrating the good they sought to do among their people, and in society around. In view of such things, the Synod judged themselves called upon to lift the voice of warning. Brethren of the Synod, both clerical and lay, averred them to be facts, and they have stated their estimation of them in their Pastoral Letter. What made these things worse, was, that they had been dis-

covered among those reputed Low Church, which circumstance led them to express their fears, that the tendencies of the Episcopal Hierarchy towards the anti-christian developments witnessed in the Puseyite doctrines and proceeding, taught and had in Episcopal Churches in the United States, were beginning to render dangerous to the souls of men, the influence even of Low Churchmen, who did not avow their disapprobation of them, and who, refusing all co-operation and ministerial intercourse with Evangelical Churches around them, and requiting, as above stated, their liberality, actually strengthened and contributed to the growth of the fatal heresy, in the Puseyite doctrines and modified Popery, over which you yourselves have lamented. There is nothing, in what the Synod has asserted, unsupported by the facts above stated; nor has their assertion gone farther. I quote their words for your reconsideration—"Even *that* portion, in our estimation, has *in connection with it* no little false theology, and exclusive sectarianism, and Jesuitical proselytism, together with opposition to temperance, and revivals of religion, intermingled with dependence on forms and successions, all of which we consider highly injurious to the cause of human salvation." The Synod does not charge *all Low Churchmen* with these things, but some Low Churchmen are to be found in connection with them. The false theology they particularize, viz: Baptismal regeneration, and apostolical succession. These, they unhesitatingly pronounce to be injurious to the cause of human salvation. Just in so far as these doctrines are taught and admitted by any portion of the Low Church, the Synod warn their people against being injured by their influence. They make no assaults upon *men*, but condemn the system. The Synod further believe and maintain, that as long as any Low Church men, *directly or indirectly*, sanction *these* doctrines, and act upon the exclusive principles of High Church men and Puseyites, and *will not have ministerial intercourse and fellowship with Presbyterians, Methodists, and other evangelical ministers, not ordained by Diocesans*, they are incidentally contributing to support an "establishment" which proves itself to be truly "mischievous" by *thus* violating the law of Christ's House, binding all Christian brethren to have fellowship

one with another. We believe that you, brethren, by your exclusive pretensions to be "the Church" of Christ, by disowning our ministry, and by refusing to have intercourse and co-operate with us in benevolent plans for the salvation of sinners, if you personally do these things, are sinning against God, and Jesus Christ, and the members of His body. The estimable brethren you have named, the Synod never imagined were guilty of such arrogance and exclusiveness, or that they were enemies to revivals of religion. I certainly never dreamed of thus accusing Bishop Johns, the very dear and early friend of my youth, always beloved, and greatly beloved still, though for years, in the Providence of God, we have not been permitted to meet or renew the happy intercourse we once had; nor even you, gentlemen, remembering the noble stand, as we thought, you took for sound doctrine, and against High Church arrogance, and especially your animadversions on the discourse of the Bishop of Michigan. But the Synod did think, if such estimable brethren will exalt their canons, *rules of their own enactment*, ABOVE THE LAW OF CHRIST, and directly, or indirectly, sustain the exclusive sectarian spirit of High Church and Puseyite Episcopalians, and thus, virtually unchurch Presbyterians and others, treat us as "the concision," of whom Paul says, "without are dogs," refuse ministerial intercourse with us, while they have in their connection, and have fellowship with, those who teach baptismal regeneration, apostolical succession, and are opposed to revivals of religion, as they occur in our churches, it behooved them to put their members on their guard against an influence that might prove the more dangerous, because of the worth still attaching to them.

You have wronged my brethren by the impeachment of their motives, and myself especially by the undeserved prominence you have given me. The tone and spirit of your remarks, have led me to conclude, that my brother who wrote that Synodical Letter, had much keener discernment than myself. I speak to you the truth in love; and will not be repelled by any violence, vituperation, or villification of motive, from saying to you, that there is ANOTHER LAW, by which you and I will be judged, than the CANONS of YOUR Church; and woe betide those who offend one of

Christ's little ones, or put an occasion of stumbling in their way, whether they be Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, or private members!! Such stumbling blocks are put in the way, by the arrogant claims of High Church, the errors of Puseyites, and the things which the Synod say they have observed, and which endanger the vital piety of their members, and the salvation of souls. I trust you will never apologize for evils among you, such as the Synod have designated, and know to be endangering some of their members and Churches. I submit these things to your sense of justice, and ask no other *amende honorable* than your consciences will dictate.

Your injured brother,

GEO. DUFFIELD.

COMMENTS OF THE "EPISCOPAL RECORDER," OF THE 27TH JANUARY,  
LAST, ON THE FIRST LETTER ADDRESSED TO THEM BY REV. MR. DUFFIELD.

---

The Episcopal Recorder of the 27th ult. contains the following editorial:

REV. GEORGE DUFFIELD.—We have received from this gentleman a long letter, in reference to our notice of "the Pastoral Letter of the Synod of Michigan." The writer complains in very strong terms of the injustice of our course; but he does not in the least degree alter the ground on which we proceeded, and therefore, allows us no room to change the course of remark which we felt ourselves constrained to make. Mr. D. complains that we have selected his name from those of three others, &c. Now we have never seen any other name than his appended to the document, nor have we heard any other mentioned in connection with it, and we have used his name simply and wholly, because it was the only name that had ever met our eye in this connexion. We have not attributed directly the writing of this offensive document to Mr. Duffield, although we certainly supposed from his office that he did write it. But this he denies. Yet at the same time he assumes, and justifies in this letter, the whole language of the Pastoral Letter upon which we commented, and affirms that even since the reading of our remarks, he is "led to believe, that his brother who wrote that Synodical Letter, had much keener perceptions than himself." We have not the remotest wish, nor that we know, the least motive, to do injustice to Mr. Duffield. But we must truly say, that his letter to us is very far from making his case better in our estimation, in regard to his connexion with it. We have no opportunity, therefore, with truth and honesty, to retract or to qualify a single remark which we made, upon his own relation to this matter. We avowed the passage to which we referred to, very unfair and very scandalous,

We affirmed that Mr. Duffield must have known it to be so when he appended his name to it. If we had seen any other names, we should have referred to them also. Mr. Duffield chooses in his private letter to justify and maintain the language to which we referred, though he says he was not the author of it. We are therefore shut up to the necessity of holding Mr. D. more distinctly responsible for this offensive language, than we were before disposed to consider him. And we cannot but deem it diverging a little from sincerity, when he affects to address us in private, in language of compliment, when he has thus publicly called our whole Church, "that mischievous establishment," and especially the portion of it in which he would choose to class us personally, as the practically offensive portion. With regard to "the Synod of Michigan," Mr. D. at some length, attempts to justify their course in this matter, and yet complains that they also have been treated by us unjustly. Upon this part of the subject we feel no wish to say any more. Our opinion upon the course of all who were concerned, is unaltered by all that he has said to us, except in the increased confirmation which it has received from the spirit and character of his letter.

SECOND LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE EDITORS OF THE "EPISCOPAL RECORDER."

---

GENTLEMEN AND BRETHREN—My Bible tells me, "thou shalt not suffer sin upon (thy brother,)" &c. Now, although you may accuse me of "diverging a little from sincerity," in addressing you as brethren after such an introduction, I shall not be deterred from discharging to you a duty of Christian brotherhood. Instead of publishing my letter, and suffering it to speak for itself, you keep it back, and yet put forth your comments!! Perhaps I should not have troubled you again, had you published that communication. Your comments might have passed for mere errors of judgment, of which your readers would be fully able to make a proper estimate. But the course you have adopted, requires me to speak seriously and plainly to you, although I may probably be again misjudged, and condemned more severely than you have already done. My object is to address you not as *Episcopalians*, but as CHRISTIAN MEN, AND MINISTERS of Jesus Christ. And to assure you, that whatever authority and influence as Editors, you may possess, and however you may seek to justify yourselves through the medium of sectarian sympathies and antipathies, there is a law and a Judge by which you and I will be tried in reference to this matter of difference between us, which know no such means of defence.

The special matter which I feel constrained to notice in your conduct in this transaction, is the manifest exaltation and indulgence of your *sectarian* attachments and preferences, above the obligations of Christian fellowship and love. The case is simply this. The Synod of Michigan, in their Pastoral Letter, have asserted certain things as *facts*, which, I admit, cannot but detract

from the high estimation, in which, it is natural, you would wish to hold your Episcopal Churches, and which certainly do not well comport with the high exclusive pretensions you make to being "the Church," par excellence, par eminence, or alone. The existence of these facts while that portion of your Church, presumed to be most likely to disapprove of them, does not condemn and counteract their influence, but on the contrary are found, as the Synod say, "in connection with them," has led the Synod to lift their warning voice, for the purpose of preventing their Churches from being injured by them, using what I admit to be a very strong expression, and one I would not, for fear of irritating, when they denominate the Episcopal Church, in which such things are found, "a mischievous establishment." What those facts are, I have specifically detailed to you, and the proofs of their existence within the sphere of the Synod's operations, they are ready to substantiate by giving names, places, and dates.

It is to me a matter of deep regret, first, that such facts should exist, and second, that it should have been judged necessary by the Synod to warn their Churches against their influence. But this has been done. If they are true, the Synod has but discharged a duty of Christian love toward your Episcopal Church, in doing which, I am free to confess other persons, had they been appointed to write their Letter, might, and probably would, have used a much more emollient style of speech. You are aware, that all have not the same temperament, and that but few can attempt reproof, without wounding sensibilities, and even exciting, in some cases, anger.

That you should have been irritated, is perhaps, not surprising. But I ask you, by what rule of morality or religion, are you authorized to assume *the falsehood* of the Synod's statements, and, appealing to the sectarian prejudices and antipathies of your Episcopal readers, endeavor to pour contempt and indignation upon the Synod? Suppose that you should become yourselves enraged, and enrage your whole denomination, and as many more around you, as might be affected by such contagious feelings, would that make it the less true? Would your *a priori* reasonings in the case, and attempts to prove it impossible, or gratuitous as-

sumptions, set aside the *a posteriori* or matter of fact argument which the Synod are prepared to furnish by testimony and depositions of not a few of their members? Moreover, upon what principle of Christian morality, are you justifiable in impeaching the motives of the Synod, and attributing to them the spirit by which you say they have been actuated? A mere negation of the facts, would have been appropriate, could such negation be made with a clear conscience and maintained. But you are certainly aware, that nothing is more common, or affords greater presumptive proof of the truth of the accusation, than for those whose conduct is cendemned, or to whom wrong is charged, to fly into a rage and impeach the motives of those that reprove or censure them. Perfect conscious innocence is not easily irritated. I would that you could disprove the things which the Synod have laid to the charge of your Church. It would exceedingly delight me if none of the things assumed by the Synod are facts. Against your Church and its members, I have no hostility. I trust I may say the same for my brethren. We would rejoice to meet you, and co-operate with you in the preaching of the Gospel, and in benevolent efforts for the salvation of man. Although we are opposed to the exclusive pretensions among you to be "the Church," and to the doctrine of apostolic succession, which I hold to be a "mischievous" and dangerous error, the key-stone of Popery, and to baptismal regeneration, and sacramental grace, as hostile to the holiness required by the Gospel, all which things, while your Church sets itself up as so much more apostolic, and having so peculiarly "the Covenant of God," render its influence in the community injurious to the cause of salvation; yet believing that these errors have not carried you into the fatal apostacy which they did the Hierarchy of Rome, we could bear and forbear; and would gladly reciprocate what we have so often proffered and practiced unreciprocated, both ministerial and christian fellowship. Let your Episcopal teachers and members cease from arrogance and proselytism, and you will find no sectarian jealousies and strifes to contend against with Presbyterians. Whatever you now complain of, as such, have been awakened by

the exclusiveness of your sect. They are efforts, not for Presbyterianism, but against error, and for the truth. We have consciences, and convictions of truth, and appreciate the rights and liberties guaranteed to us by Jesus Christ, as well as yourselves. You will not and cannot affirm that we are all heathen men and and publicans, and have not the presence and spirit of God with us in our assemblies and ministrations. Professions of love and charity which are common from you, while you refuse to have intercourse with us, and recognize our relation to you as christian ministers and brethren, I might retort to you in your own language, look very like "diverging from sincerity," but there is a precept of God's word more applicable, which I prefer, "My little children let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth." If you exalt your visible organization, and canonical regulations, as a Church, above the claims and obligations of brotherhood, pertaining to the members of Christ's spiritual and invisible Church, his only true mystical body on earth, and so talk, act, and preach, as to make the impression on men around, that our Churches and members are not Churches and members of Jesus Christ, whom you can recognize, and with whom co-operate as such, you have magnified your own sectarian peculiarities and errors above the law of Christ; and must expect to hear from us, and be told in all plainness and faithfulness, that you are sinning against God.

Having discharged my duty to you as a christian brother and fellow minister, I have some things to add by way of comment, on your remarks as Editors.

1. You say, "We have NEVER *seen* any *other* name appended to the DOCUMENT, nor have we *heard* any other mentioned in connection with it, and we have used his name *simply and wholly*, because it was the *only* name which has *ever* met *our* eye in this connection." This sort of looseness, gentlemen, will not do. You understand the meaning of terms better. What you published was not "the DOCUMENT," but merely an extract. Where, I ask, did you ever see my name appended to that extract? Or *exclusively* to the whole "document," the Pastoral Letter of the

Synod of Michigan? That Letter was published in the New York Evangelist of November 23, 1843, by order of the Synod. To it were appended the following names, and in this order:

WILLIAM PAGE, *Chairman*,  
J. P. CLEVELAND, *Moderator*.

E. CHILDS, *Permanent Clerk*,

(Attest,)

GEO. DUFFIELD, *Stated Clerk*.

I have never known, nor ever heard, that that Letter was published in any other paper than the Evangelist. I demand, therefore, where you obtained, and in what paper you saw the extract? You could not have seen it in the Evangelist and speak truth, as I believe you do in your explanation? Not till FIVE weeks or more after its publication in the Evangelist do you notice it!! Was the *extract* forwarded from this city or State? Did you, when you received the extract, neglect to refer to the original document? If so, "is not the hand of Joab with thee in all this?" (See 2d book of Samuel, xiv 19.) Your explanation viewed in connection with the fact that your article entitled "Unreasonable Bitterness," was published or circulated here in tract form, by "An Episcopalian," who affirms *Dr. Tyng to be its author*, and that too before letters could be interchanged between Philadelphia, and this city, has led to the suspicion, that the article was not spontaneous with you, gentlemen, but may have been suggested if not solicited, from another quarter than Philadelphia. Does your sense of editorial responsibility, and propriety, allow you to receive extracts you have not authenticated, and at others' suggestion comment on public *documents* you have never seen and read. If you saw but the extract, and took it from those who had parted it from its proper connection, and put their own version on it, I am not surprised that you should have misunderstood the temper and spirit of the Synod, and been betrayed into your present embarrassment.

2. You say, that you "certainly supposed from *his office*, that he (I) did write the Pastoral Letter." As editors, it behooved you to know better, the usages of other denominations. Practical indifference or contempt for them and their labors prevailing so far as to give occasion to such ignorance, but ill befits religious editors of any denomination.

3. You say "we avowed the passage from the Pastoral Letter to which we referred, to be very unfounded and very scandalous." Gentlemen you said MUCH MORE, calling it, most unfounded *abuse* of the Bishop of Michigan, of the FALSEHOOD of which we feel compelled to say he (I) *could not but be aware.*" A thing may be "*unfounded,*" and asserted through mistake or misapprehension, and the asserter not be guilty of "falsehood." It may also be "scandalous," the matter itself being such, the asserter of which though mistaken, may not be guilty of "falsehood." You have charged ME, not the Synod, with the LIE direct, and you cannot, therefore, and shall not dodge in this way from the charge I bring against you, of having violated, not only the law of christian brotherhood, but of good breeding.

4. You say you hold me "distinctly responsible for the offensive language" of the Synod. So far as the facts asserted by that language are concerned, I have no objection to this; for I rely upon the testimony of my brethren, who averred the facts, and stated the cases, proving that the Low Church portion of Episcopalians, "has, *in connection with it,* no little false theology and, exclusive sectarianism, and Jesuitical proselytism, together with opposition to temperance and revivals of religion, intermingled with a dependence upon forms and successions." If *other* proof is desired, it can easily be furnished. The *testimony* of the Synod as to matters of fact, is as good as that of any other body of men, and your attempt to meet that testimony by an impeachment of motive, and traduction of their spirit, will not avail you. It will not affect their irritability. For these things are admitted by some Low Churchmen, themselves, to be true of High Church and Puseyite Episcopalians. Their own writings furnish proof of it. You, gentlemen, will not, and dare not deny that you have it among your Bishops and Churches, and therefore "*in connection with you.*" Becoming angry, impeaching motives and spirit, and flaunting on this subject, are no *arguments.* Could you even hold up the Synod to scorn and execration, still the facts could not thus be disposed of.

5. You say, "we cannot but deem it diverging a little from sincerity, when he (myself,) *affects* to address us in private, in lan-

guage of compliment, when he has thus publicly called our whole Church that 'mischievous establishment,' and especially selected that portion of it, in which he would choose to class us personally; as the offensive portion." This is very courteous, to be sure. I have, for many years, observed, that when men begin to impeach the motives of others, and judge them by such means, they are very apt to tell tales upon themselves. I will not say this of you. But one thing is certain, that you assume it to be sufficient reason to suspect a man of hypocrisy, who personally speaks in kind and complimentary terms to, and of you, as reputed Christian brethren, if he will *dare* to speak evil of your Church, or intimate that its influence is or may be mischievous!! I was not aware that you had gone so far into High Churchism and Popery, as to assume the infallibility of "*the Church,*" your Church, the Episcopal Church, which you must, before there is any argument or logic whatever in your reasoning!!! The truth is, gentlemen, this is the thing that blinds you. You look through a prejudiced medium, and on things, therefore, in a wrong light. But you may call me hypocrite, or what not, for daring to dissent from you in reference to the character and influence of your Church; I will only reply in the language of Calvin to Luther, "Though Luther call me Devil a thousand times, I will still say he is an excellent minister of Christ." I can forgive your pettishness and make allowances for irritability.

6. You are very sparing in your remarks about my defence of the Synod; nor have you intimated the least idea of the ground on which it rests. It would have been much more becoming, to have stated what the Synod avers to be facts, expressed your disapprobation of such things, and exhorted your Bishops, ministers and members, to give no occasion of offence in the matters complained of. Throughout all you have written, you have not made one remark showing your disapprobation of them. The great effort is to traduce the Synod for daring to say that there are such things among you. This thing is very well understood.

7. In a subsequent paragraph, you express your surprise, that it should be said there is any opposition to revivals of religion, among some reputed Low Churchmen. The revivals of religion

of which the Synod spoke, are those occurring in their own Churches. These have been traduced. That your ministers are opposed to what are called revivals of religion in some of your churches, the Synod meant not. Such ingatherings as take place by the rite of confirmation, where persons give no credible evidence of a change of heart, and quickly after will be as worldly and gay, and fend ef balls and dancings, and worldly, vain, sinful amusements, as ever they were, and be seen in pursuit of them, though they may be judged by their pastors to be "fit for confirmation and communion," are not regarded, at least in Michigan, as worthy of the name of revivals of religion. Of some of your ministers and their labors and care to elicit proofs of genuine conversion, we love to think and speak. But we are firmly persuaded, while we give credit for the purest and best intentions, that, sooner or later, in every attempt made to exalt a pure spiritual religion upon ritual forms and observances, true, consistent, humble, devoted piety, in a word, evangelical religion will and must suffer.

In conclusion, I have only to say, that while I think you have erred, I assume not infallibility for myself; nor am I unwilling to have my errors pointed out. Meet me as I have met you; point out to me the things that are wrong; and prove them to be so from the word of God, and I will thank you. It shall be "an excellent oil, that shall not break my head." But as long as you go upon assumptions of your own, entirely untenable from the sacred scriptures, you will accomplish nothing for our benefit or the cause of Christ. We will not be put down by editorial, Episcopal, or any other authority, but the word of God. "Am I therefore your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" Our object is not to exalt ourselves, or our Churches, but the cause of Jesus Christ, and to promote the salvation of souls. Others may commend themselves and their churches. "But we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves; but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise. But we will not boast of things without our measure, but according to the measure of *the rule* which *God* hath distributed to us

a *measure to REACH, EVEN TO YOU.*" We seek not strife—we abhor all rivalry—but we do desire co-operation. The field of labor is wide and extended. The enemies are active and powerful. The souls of men are precious and multitudes are perishing. We feel that all that can be done, by every evangelical denomination, falls short of what should be done, and therefore, I may say, in the use of Paul's language, addressed to those who denied *his* ministerial character and office, and refused to recognize him as an apostle, "we stretch not ourselves beyond our measure, as though we reached not unto you; for we are come *as far as to you* also, in preaching the gospel of Christ. Not boasting of things without our measure, that is of other men's labors: but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly to preach the gospel beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand." Our motto is, "he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth."

Yours, &c.

GEO. DUFFIELD.

Detroit, February 3, 1844.

## CONCLUSION.

In review of the preceding pages, some things deserve, in our estimation, particular attention. The manifest dishonesty, not to call it by a still more appropriate name, of one part of the procedures which have been exhibited, has deeply affected us; and we feel constrained to ask the reader, carefully to notice it. The Synod of Michigan, ordered their Letter to be published by Mr. Duffield, their Stated Clerk, in the New York Evangelist. This he did, and it appeared in that paper of Nov. 23. It was signed by

WILLIAM PAGE, *Ch'n of Com.\**

J. P. CLEVELAND, *Moderator.*

E. CHILDS, *Permanent Clerk,*

(Attest,)

GEO. DUFFIELD, *Stated Clerk.*

*White Pigeon, October 14, 1841*

Mr. Duffield's name, was attached as Stated Clerk, authenticating by his "attest," the document. No other publication of that letter was ever made, that we have ever heard of.—The "extract" which was published in the Episcopal Recorder, and afterwards in tract form in this city, was a garbled extract, given without its relation to, and connection with, the remarks preceding it, which gave complexion to it and are necessary to be read, that the spirit by which it was dictated may be understood. To publish that extract, and attach Mr. Duffield's name *exclusively* to it, was in fact forging a document for special and evil ends against that gentleman. If it was prepared here or elsewhere, and sent to Messrs. Suddards and Tyng, who say they never saw anything else than the extract, as they published it, it was a cruel and wicked imposition on them. The editorial remarks, it appears, sprung not from those gentlemen's reading of "the Letter," but

\*Originally appointed to draft the Letter.

“the extract” to which Mr. Duffield’s name only, was attached. Probably, we may add, accompanying remarks made by those who furnished the extract to them, may explain the reason of Dr. Tyng’s severity, and the whole affair. The whole thing is stamped with the appearance, not only of disingenuousness, but of dishonesty, and is fraught with mischief alike to Dr. Tyng, who was improperly excited by it, and Mr. Duffield, who has been slandered by him. Should the extract have been furnished by the same person who wrote the remarks introductory to it, and to the editorial comments as published in “the Tract,” circulated here, we feel constrained to condemn the latter, as betraying any other spirit than that of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The above documents are submitted to the public from a sense of justice, and with a desire to counteract the insidious influence of calumnies industriously circulated. No little pains have been taken to make the impression that Mr. Duffield, who has been assaulted by “An Episcopalian,” and by Messrs. Suddards and Tyng, (probably at “An Episcopalian’s” suggestion,) is hostile to the quiet, the social interests, and harmony of this city, inasmuch as it is alledged, by those who make great professions of meekness and charity, that he is “fond of controversy,” “pugnaciously disposed,” and “ready to attack other religious denominations.” Such things have been said and whispered, not only among those not specially connected with any church, but even to our own members, and to their annoyance. These things have prevailed for some time, and have fretted the minds of not a few. Although noticed, they have not been resented. It has been hoped and believed that they were very few and weak minded persons, who resorted to such means of advancing the interests of their church. Mr. Duffield has never deviated from the principles he has inculcated from the pulpit, viz: To avoid all unnecessary impeachment of motive, to abhor the proselyting spirit, and as far as possible, to follow peace with all men. When the assault was publicly made upon him, in the manner which is exposed in these pages, we thought it due to him and to the cause of truth, to solicit from him a full statement of the facts in the case, so far as he was directly implicated. His communications with the

assault on him, are given to the public, from which the reader will perceive that the grounds on which the Synod had ventured to speak in their Pastoral Letter, were such as to free them from the charge of "Unreasonable Bitterness," in any thing they have said, and that even if the Synod had been culpable in this respect, Mr. Duffield had no other agency in it, than what, as the organ of that body, it became the duty of his office to do, in transcribing their document, and in executing their order for its publication. Mr. Duffield has in no instance since his residence amongst us, condemned other evangelical sects, or gratuitously assailed their peculiar doctrines; nor have we ever learned that he has done it in other places. He has been attacked personally and indirectly once and again, and has repelled the attack—not however, until he has been solicited to do so by members of his charge, or till circumstances publicly called for it. We say, therefore, to our Episcopalian neighbors and friends at home and abroad, in kindness, but in plainness—your teachers have cast the first stone—the exclusiveness and proselytism among you have irritated—the intermeddling and finding fault with our organization and measures, and the insidious insinuations that have been made to the wounding of sensibility and the interruption of harmonious intercourse, have not originated with us, or our minister. If these things have been repelled and have recoiled, we say, cease from all proselytism and petty warfare—be willing to meet us as a church of Jesus Christ, equally with yourselves, and co-operate with us—be at peace yourselves—talk not arrogantly, and you will have no occasion to accuse us, or our minister of a polemical spirit.

We intend not in the above remarks to condemn all Episcopalians. We know that there are some, who, from preference and choice are such, but exalt not their peculiarities, so as to unchurch other denominations, and who are willing to mingle in religious co-operation and effort as well as in social intercourse. We hope their influence may prove like leaven, and preserve their Church and the community from the spirit of exclusiveness.