NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Bethesda, Maryland

CLERICUS, ESCULAPIUS, AND SCEPTICUS,

vs.

COL. M. JEWETT, AND HIS CHEMICAL PREPARATIONS.

IN TWO PARTS.

COMPRISING, IN PART FIRST,

THE CLERGYMAN EXAMINED.

IN PART SECOND,

The Examination continued, in a detailed Report of the recent

TRIAL OF COL. JEWETT AND HIS MEDICINE.

BEFORE A COMMITTEE OF THE

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

AT COLUMBUS, OHIO:

With occasional Illustrations and Pleadings, before the

BAR OF AN IMPARTIAL COMMUNITY.

BY THOMAS HERSY.

Search the History of the Church, through the long vista of all antiquity, and a parallel cannot be found, in which Clergymen, Physicians and Infidels were so combined, to exterminate an invaluable improvement in the Healing Art.

THE AUTHOR.

Inter arma leges silent.—*Lat. Prov.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

1835.

DISTRICT OF OHIO, TO WIT.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the 18th day of June, Anno Domini 1835, THOMAS HERSEY, of the said District, hath deposited in this office the title of a book, the title of which is in the words following, to wit:

"Clericus, Esculapius, and Scepticus, vs. Col. M. Jewett, and his Chemcal Preparations.—In two parts. Comprising in Part First—The Clergyman Examined. In Part Second—The examination continued, in a detailed Report of the recent Trial of Col. Jewett and his Medicines, before a Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Columbus, Ohio: with occasional Illustrations and Pleadings, before the bar of an Impartial Community. By Thomas Hersy.

Search the History of the Church, through the long vista of all antiquity, and a parallel cannot be found, in which Clergymen, Physicians and Infidels were so combined, to exterminate an invaluable improvement in the Healing Art.

THE AUTHOR.

Inter arma leges silent.—*Lat. Prov.*"

The right whereof he claims as author, in conformity with an act of Congress, entitled "An act to amend the several acts respecting Copy Rights."

Attest.

WILLIAM MINER,
Clerk of the District.

BR 1625

PREFACE.

When the first edition of the first part of this Work appeared under the title of "*The Clergyman Examined, &c.,*" nothing short of the spirit of prophecy could have anticipated the events that have since transpired. Persecution has whetted her fangs and glutted her rage against Col. M. Jewett; against his Medical Preparations more particularly, and of course against his friends, who sustain him in his arduous enterprise. The hostility that has been manifested, has been of the blackest cast. Search the History of the Church, through the long vista of all antiquity, and a parallel cannot be found, in which Clergymen, Physicians and Infidels were so combined, to exterminate an invaluable improvement in the healing art.

Little has been said on the extravagant pretensions of the Methodistical Episcopacy, on account of the high veneration the writer entertains for a large and respectable number of professing Christians, who wear submissively the yoke, and tug the chain that God has no where in his Word directed them to wear. The homage that *lay members, local preachers,* and all the *official characters,* under the control of an elder, deacon, or circuit rider, are accustomed to pay to those who have assumed to govern the Church with an absolute authority, naturally consolidates the body, as relates to its executive administration, into an inert mass; a merely passive reed, to be shaken by the first clerical wind that blows. A vast body of Methodists, in the United States, have shaken off the yoke which the Wesleyan Methodists of Great Britain have never worn. Episcopal Methodism, as it exists in the United States, appears to me as incompatible with our republican institutions, as it is at variance with the word of God. Our remarks on this subject have only been incidental. It is devoutly hoped that the lovers of truth will not be so wedded to their prejudices in favor of Episcopacy, as to blind their eyes against the discernment of that malign spirit that has been exercised to demolish the fair reputation of the humane and benevolent subject of our narrative, whose ex-

traordinary discoveries in the application of external remedies for the removal of disease, is about to establish a new era in the annals of medical science.

It may be said by some that we have been too censorious, and have rebuked with sharpness and severity; but the fact is, the occasion has appeared to call imperiously for pointed animadversions. It has appeared almost impossible to give a faithful detail of the transactions narrated in these pages, with all that smoothness which we know to be due to the humble followers of our meek and lowly Redeemer. When men let themselves down to a degrading level with our most offensive characters, and unite with them in making war against the saints; when, for instance, a Preacher allows himself to get angry and wrangle with his Class Leaders in the streets of our city; usurps extravagant, unscriptural authority, abuses his members, and loses that self-respect and humility Christianity enjoins; how can it be expected that perfect justice can be done to such a perversion of correct principles and such a flagrant disregard of truth and justice, without some rough handling? In fact, should the prominent actor in the tragedy ever come to his "right mind," we believe he could not refrain from giving full credit for the candor and impartiality of this review of current events, as they have transpired under his administration.

We feel unfeigned tenderness and hearty good will toward our Methodist Brethren. With a goodly number we have taken sweet counsel and gone to the house of God together, and, with our feeble efforts, aided in the services of the sanctuary.—Sometimes we have met with a different spirit. However, we rejoice and will rejoice in the firm stand Methodism has taken against the vices and immoralities of the day, and the great success that has attended its efforts.

For ourself, we wish to sit at the feet of our Redeemer, and to honor him in his members. The reader will notice we have not herein opened a battery against Methodist doctrines. If some shade of difference in opinion exists between us—if we do not adopt a sectarian creed, or use certain modes and forms of speech in fashionable use; yet we would not, on any account, intentionally hurt the feelings, or unnecessarily annoy the peace of the feeblest lamb in the fold of Christ. Whenever and

wherever the watchmen on Zion's walls are found faithful and successful in saving themselves and those who hear them, we greet them heartily in the name of the Lord.

Our aim has been to open the battery of God's inspiration against a usurpation of anti-Christian power and clerical pride which has been too frequently manifested, and has, for a long season been secretly undermining the Church, and casting off the spirit of humility, love, and Christian fellowship.

We have often read and reflected with devout admiration on the very memorable instructions given by our Savior to his Disciples, rebuking the pride and ambition of Zebedee's children and their vain-minded mother. In this instance, there was an aspiration after power, pre-eminence and distinction. "Jesus said, Ye know the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant; even as the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.—Matthew, xx. 25, 26, 27, 28.

While worldlings contend for pre-eminence and superiority, "disputing who shall be the greatest," and aspire to be called "Rabbi and Master," we would reiterate the language of the Son of God, "Be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man father upon the earth; for one is your Father who is in heaven. Neither be ye called Master; for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is the greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself, shall be exalted."—Math. xxiii. 8—12.

Would to God a spirit of reformation might every where obtain! Let judgment and justice commence in primitive glory at the house of God! Let teachers of righteousness, who labor in word and doctrine, lead the way, and be examples to the flock. We disclaim all intention of a harsh interference with the opinions and practices of Godly men, whether Episcopalians or Dissenters. We give no heed, however, to the pride of mere human opinion, when placed in competition with the Oracles of God. While surveying the glories of Zion; count-

ing her towers and telling her palaces, and seeing that God is known in her palaces for a refuge for sin-sick souls, who seek redemption in the blood of the Cross—the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of our Redeemer's grace; we would use an humble effort to rid the Church, in all its branches, of arrogance, pride, strife, and the pomp and glory of earthly grandeur, and the praise that cometh from a vain world. Just so long as Ministers, Preachers, Elders, or Bishops—for they are synonymous in the language of the New Testament—lord it over God's heritage, usurp dominion, and exercise unscriptural authority in the Church; so long will the ways of Zion mourn and the enemy come in like a flood, until God, in his Providence, (as he has in his word,) shall lift up a standard against him.

Oppressed, abused members will struggle for their rights while God's word proclaims liberty to the captive and opening of the prison doors to them who are bound.

One afflictive truth remains undeniable in this preposterous warfare for the chief seats, popular greetings, emoluments, power and honor that cometh of men—pure religion sustains much injury. Churches are disrobed of their best ornaments—humility and the love of God.

It must needs be that offences will come, but woe to them by whom they come. Blessed are the peace makers. "Hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, envyings, and such like," are ranked among the catalogue of blackest crimes, as being paramount to "witchcraft, idolatry and murder." "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." "Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another. In these religious wars—these deadly struggles for power, men have to contend against divine prohibitions. Heaven points a strong and irrevocable veto against the pride and wrath of man; but what He forbids in his Word, he often permits in his Providence. Still he has a hook for Leviathan, and can break the jaw-teeth of the infernal lion. The Lord reigns, and he reigns in righteousness. His wisdom is infinite; his power omnipotent. "The wrath of man shall praise him, and the remainder of wrath he will restrain." So, if religion now suffers by the indiscretion, or wickedness of one

or many, whose intentions are evil, God may have wise purposes. He may have intended it all for good—to show how providentially men's evil devices may be overthrown and carried headlong, and more abundantly to manifest the folly of human wisdom, attempting proudly to spurn at divine authority. We devoutly hope and confidently believe that God will overrule these events for the good of his people and the advancement of his declarative glory.

PART FIRST.

A CLERGYMAN EXAMINED.

A letter addressed to the Rev. E. W. SEHON: *with a Postscript of sundry Interesting Interrogatories; to which are appended, A Question Extra; the Benton Anecdote; the Sequel of the Story; and the Olney Kite.*

"He that walketh uprightly, walketh surely: but he that perverteth his ways, shall be known."—*Solomon.*

COLUMBUS, *March* 24, 1835.

SIR:

I hope to be excused by a candid community, in publicly intruding myself upon your notice. In this enlightened section of the world, the sanctity of a man's profession connot shield his conduct from strict investigation. I am aware the scripture saith, "Against an ELDER receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses." But the offence of which I complain is of public notoriety, and comes under that memorable rule, "Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others may also fear." Besides, having never placed my neck under the Episcopal yoke, I cannot approach you within the walls of that ecclesiastico-political CASTLE, where you and many others have taken sanctuary, and eluded the pursuit of a fair and honorable investigation of their devious courses.

Again, in a late Ecclesiastical *Judiciary*, or *ex parte* court, of your own arbitrary appointment, in which the decision was evidently controlled by your own immediate dictation, the reputation of several responsible witnesses was insolently reproached, their veracity implicated, and public opinion basely scandalized; and finally, I have felt my own reputation, as a man of truth, involved in the general issue.

I allude to the case in which the conduct of JOHN MILLER was made the subject of a partial, one-sided, sham examination, before a certain committee, got up for the express purpose, in the Methodist Episcopal church in this city, on Friday the 20th

instant. The most prominent circumstances, relating to this case, are briefly these: NANCY MILLER, the daughter of said JOHN MILLER, during the preceding season, had been cured, by the use of Col. M. JEWETT's Cerates, of one of the most extraordinary cases of scald head I ever remember to have seen. In the first number of "*Jewett's Advertiser*," page 11, we are informed of the fact as stated below:—

"The following certificate is signed by the father of the patient, and relates to one of the most extraordinary cases of cure to be found in the annals of medicine:

" 'Nancy Miller, a daughter of mine, aged 17 years, was, two and a half years ago, afflicted with *Scald Head*. At first, little sores appeared all over the head, and her hair came off. Drs. Wright, Parsons, and Sisson, attended her more or less for two years. Dr. Edmonston was twice called. All these physicians agreed, that in her case, there could be no effectual relief. One of these gentlemen said, that there was no physician in the United States that could effect a cure. In the month of June last, an application of Jewett's Cerate No. 1, was made and continued for a month, with favorable effect; then Cerate No. 2 was applied, (*with the powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett,*) with the most salutary effect. In two months from the commencement of these applications, a complete cure was effected. During the whole time of using the medicine, her general health remained good and unimpaired. It should be noted, that the whole surface of her head was affected to the thickness of a man's hand, spread over with numerous boils, attended with redness and great heat.

"JOHN MILLER.' "

You, sir, are fully apprised, that as soon as "*Jewett's Advertiser*" appeared, much excitement was produced. Several of the Faculty of this city, took umbrage at the preceding certificate. That a great cure had been effected, could not be successfully denied. To invalidate the veracity of Col. JEWETT, was an important desideratum. Accordingly, JOHN MILLER was waited on; and by what wily art of seduction he has been induced to deny the whole statement, and publicly to certify that he never signed the certificate given above, I do not pretend to know. One of the members of the Church, present on the trial, testified that he was present when Col. Jewett wrote the certificate, as it was stated to him by Miller, and also that

he saw Miller sign it. This witness, (Edward Mead,) had previously made oath to this important fact. Another witness, John C. Smith, who also was a member of your communion, testified, that although he was not present when Miller signed the certificate, yet he had heard him relate the circumstances, and tell over the story to the same amount. Being called upon to give testimony in the case, I stated that I was once present when Miller came into Col. Jewett's shop; that he told over the story of the cure of his daughter with peculiar animation, and, to the best of my recollection, made statements paramount to what had appeared in the Advertiser; that I recollect distinctly, that he asserted that Dr. Wright had said, that Col. Jewett's medicine had not cured the scald head of his daughter, but that it got well of itsself.

When giving my testimony, you, sir, presented me with a printed copy of the above certificate, the manuscript of which was lost, but the impression was obtained from the printing office, by yourself, from a quantity of matter that was still standing in type, that had been intended to form a part of the Appendix to a work recently published by myself, entitled the "Midwife's Practical Directory," the insertion of which was omitted, partly for want of room, and partly as not being essential to the general design of the work. This certificate, I told you and your committee, was copied from Col. Jewett's. By comparing the two, you found that the certificate published by Col. Jewett, containing this clause, "*the powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett*," read thus in mine, viz. "*Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian Medicine.*" Now, sir, you must know, for your own satisfaction, that the two statements contain precisely the same fact: "*Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian Medicine*," are the very "*powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett.*" Col. Jewett furnished me with the original certificate, which read as he has published it; but, sir, I had published a work that was specially intended for Thomsonian practitioners. In this work, I had frequently recommended "Dr. Logan's long course;" and it was I who had prescribed and furnished Nancy Miller with the medicine, as I had done for divers other patients. I knew the statement to be correct: the facts were the same, in both statements, though the words in this clause were different. The design in varying the words, was not calculated to pervert the meaning of John Miller, or mislead the reader, but to make the prescription to be intelligible to that class of readers I was endeavoring to instruct. They

might not know what was intended by "*the powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett*," but they would readily comprehend what was intended by "Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian Medicine." You appeared to be quite elated with your extraordinary discovery. With much self-complacency, you informed the tribunal that "you were raised in a Clerk's office, and understood the usual forms of law; that the variation of a word, in a legal point of view, was sufficient to invalidate the whole." This, sir, is, substantially, what you stated. How far the Ecclesiastical Court was edified and enlightened by such information, I am not prepared to say; but I understood the discovery was made for the sake of an impression you were calculating to effect. The logic of it was, in my estimation, something like this—that because I, in transcribing the original certificate, had told the fact, that "*the powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett*" were nothing less nor more than "*Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian Medicine*," *therefore*, John Miller never signed the original certificate, and was justifiable in denying the whole, as a mere fabrication.

We must recollect, that I was not drawing an indenture, bond, note, or mortgage, nor dreaming of penning down testimony to take effect in any Court of Justice. I am confident that I have done as great justice, in giving the real meaning of the original certificate, as the writers of the New Testament have commonly done in transcribing quotations from the holy men of old, to whose inspired authority they frequently appeal. If I had taken the certificate, and given a correct Latin version of the text, and appended the name of John Miller, I suppose your inference would have been the same. But, sir, you need not trouble yourself to rummage over the rubbish of a printing office unceremoniously, and without my permission ransack my manuscripts, if you could have found them, or to get a first impression of a page, that I had never seen:—of course, if any error had been committed, you impertinently deprived me of the opportunity of correcting such mistakes as might have occurred between the writer and the printer, never intended for the public eye. It certainly was an intrusion upon my privileges, which I hope your high sense of honor, justice and propriety, will prevent you from repeating upon myself or upon any other person.

Were it in your power to convert my innocence into crime of the blackest dye, pray what has that to do with the inquiry, Did John Miller sign the certificate published by Col. Jewett, or did he not? Has he made statements to others similar to

what is contained in the original certificate, or has he not? It has been proven to a demonstration, that he did sign the certificate, and that he has made similar statements to others. All this, John Miller flatly denies; and in this he is sustained by yourself in your ministerial capacity, and as the principal of the tribunal appointed to investigate the controversy pending between Col. Jewett, a citizen of good and established ruputation, and John Miller, whose intemperance and doubtful reputation for truth, have been too notorious to escape extensive observation. In this you have taken sides with certain persons, we now forbear to name, who have used some industry to get up this denial, and give publicity to it, that they may, if possible, deprive the Colonel of the credit, and abate the zeal of the people in seeking after and applying his remedies. Shall a man be known by the company he keeps? Then, sir, will you make bosom friends and confidential associates of sceptics, of infidel opposers of Christianity, and make war upon a faithful brother in the Church? I hope, for the honor of Christianity, as you value the peace of Zion and the general cause of God, you may never be so abandoned to temptation, as to excite laughter among your skeptical friends, or by inattention to truth and justice, give occasion to the enemies of the Cross to blaspheme.

The testimony of Mrs. Sellers was treated as contemptuously as that of Edward Mead, John C. Smith, and my own. I have thought proper to obtain a certificate from this venerable old lady, signed by her own hand, and confirmed by a solemn oath. This testimony was, substantially, before the committee. As I had not a copy at hand, I have called on her in person, and ascertained the following facts:

"I the undersigned, do hereby certify, that some time last fall, while I was living at the house of Mr. Runkles, John Miller came there, and on my complaining that I was much troubled with a pain in my back, said Miller said that he had a salve which he had got from Col. Jewett, which he assured me, would cure it—he, said Miller, also said that he had appled the same kind of salve to his daughter Mary's head, which had entirely cured it—that she had been afflicted with a seald head for a long time; that he had applied to all the Doctors, who did it no good, and he mentioned particularly that Doctor Wright had attended his daughter, and mentioned by name some other Doctor particularly, (but I forget the name,) as having tried to cure Nancy; he also said, that he had tried all the physicians

in Columbus, and that Nancy received no relief until he applied Col. Jewett's salve, which cured it. I felt anxious to know, certainly, who he meant by "Jewett," the person named by him, and he explained who he was and where he lived. Mr. Miller further stated, that he felt as though he would be willing to give the best horse he had, or even two horses, rather than not to have had the salve of Jewett, which cured his daughter's head.—I took some of the salve of him, applied it to my back as directed, which relieved me of the pain, and I have not had it since. Mr Miller at that time had a large plaster of Jewett's salve, as he said, on his breast, which he shewed me; he said that he had had a severe pain in his head, back, and breast, and that Jewett's salve had cured him.

HANNAH SELLERS.

CITY OF COLUMBUS, }
Mayors' Office, March 24, 1835. }

Then the above named Hannah Sellers personally appeared before me, and made solemn oath that the statement above written and signed by her respecting John Miller, is true.

JOHN BROOKS, *Mayor.*

This is a concise statement of simple matters of fact. You have the essentials of the story; but, as you were "raised in a Clerk's office;" "are acquainted with the usual forms of law," and determine that all changes of words make a change of meaning,—that "*caput*" is not "the head," nor "*manus*" "the hand,"—I may be accused of misrepresentation.

I must invite your attention once more, to the "powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett." Who knows any thing more by that declaration, concerning the materials of which they are coposed, than if they had not been mentioned. The matter is left in total obscurity, to all who are unacquainted with their composition. I have given to the same powders, the name of "Dr. Logan's long course," but this leaves the matter equally in the dark, to all but a certain class of citizens, who by previous advantages have made themselves acquainted with these powders, and the method of their administration. The variation of expression, in the copy of the certificate, clandestinely obtained, and which you would palm upon the world as having been given by myself, and disagreeing with the original, does not vary as to matter of fact, or operate to the pre-

judice of truth, or the invasion of the peace, interest, reputation, right or privilege of any man on earth.

In the case of NANCY MILLER, it is not pretended that any part of the cure, of the *local* malady, was effected, or even attempted, by any other means than the cerates of Col. Jewett. The powders prescribed, which by clerical legerdemain, are now transformed into *fulminating powders*, were designed exclusively for internal use, to secure the general habit from any morbid influence of the local affection, and to make some salutary provision against the danger of relapse, after the local malady should once be healed. You appear to have arrived at the conclusion, that there must have been some intention to deceive, and would gladly deepen the curtains that shrowd your pretensions of an honorable desire to disabuse the public mind.

Your elevation of feeling was clearly evinced, with such a super-*sang froid* air of consequentialness and egotistical emotions of sacerdotal importance, that I was utterly at a loss, whether to ascribe the querimonious paroxysm to symplicity of intellect, mental aberration, or turpitude of heart. I shall leave you and the subject for the present, enveloped amidst the fog, smoke, dust, and tumult, you have gathered around you. That JOHN MILLER has *lied*, is now a notorious fact. This is plain to the understanding of every candid mind. You, sir, have evidently taken sides in defiance of testimony, and sustain and fellowship him with all this cloud of guilt and shame, in which he is undeniably involved. Has not this management to darken a plain straight-forward business, resulted from that friendship of the world that is enmity against God?

I would just remark, that your unrighteous, partial, one-sided course, is now fairly before the public. I have been compelled to this unpleasant measure, from an unavoidable combination of incidents. I feel that I owe such an exposure as due to my own reputation, the reputation of pious and judicious friends, and to an inquiring and respectable community.

Testimonials and circumstances yet remain as matters of reference in case of necessity; but I should suppose the facts given in this case, have been abundantly sufficient to satisfy any honest man that I have taken tenable ground, and if you or any other man can beat down, and drag out, the testimony that sustains the truth in this case, to which you evince such a deadly aversion, you cannot be too quick about it.

The decision made under your immediate superintendence, to acquit John Miller of any offence against the truth, is of course

to implicate all the witnesses, and the voluminous testimony that charges him by direct inference, with falsehood and prevarication.

If in this decision, you have given a fair specimen of the influence of EPISCOPACY and its assumption of the *immoral claim*, of a right to trample with impunity on the inalienable prerogatives of the brother-hood of the faithful—then, behold a clerical, episcopal DIGNITARY—the Lord Corypheus of a cade committee—drilled and trained to accommodation service, prostrating, without compunction or remorse, the prerogatives of the citizens of Zion, and treading down their rights and previleges, as the dirt beneath his reverend feet. Let those who love to clang the chain of oppression, bow obsequiously to a priestly nod—and that too in a community where young men, by some extraordinary gift, are metamorphosed into ELDERS, though they be seldom able to get old heads on young shoulders. "*The Elder's but a novice still.*" Whatever rules may be adopted, or whosoever may bear rule in a wordly sanctuary, I entreat all the ministers of the true tabernacle, which the Lord has pitched, and not man, to unite in heart and voice, proclaiming genuine gospel, liberty to the unfortunate captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them who are bound with the strong cords of ecclesiastical imposition, clerical usurpation, and all the ghostly tribe of priestly superstitions.

I attach not any blame to the worthy brethren, composing the section of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, unless I be allowed respectfully to suggest the impropriety of an uncomplaining submission, to a kind of tribunal not recognized in the rules of Christian arbitration, as minutely prescribed by our Lord in his instructions to his disciples, Matthew xviii. 15, 16, 17, 18. The arbitrary, dictatorial, inquisitorial decisions of such courts of human contrivance, may set heavily on the minds of the credulous sons of superstition, but to the man who knows the scripture, and whose heart and conscience are governed by its precepts, the thunders of this new-modeled vatican have lost their terrors. I do not censure any one who has not participated in the late outrage against common sense, unless subsequent events evince a disposition quietly to sanction this presumptious assumption of absolute, irresponsible authority.

It would be a happy event if these recent transactions should rouse the spirit of inquiry, after the genuine law of God's house, and how the New Testament provides for the organization of a Christian tribunal. Would to God, the light of revela-

tion might prevail over the Sectarian darkness that beclouds the minds of thousands, and radiate their footsteps. God's revelation is a "sure word of prophecy." "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

One reigning passion, common in the soul of man, is a love of power. Absolute power among men is a dangerous investment; it will seldom, if ever, be invariably and impartially just. According to the prophet Daniel, the kingdom of God belongs to the saints—but modern clergymen claim the whole management for themselves. Alas! how often men get bewildered in the moral feelings of their souls, how strangely infatuated, deceiving and deceived, just by the possession of a little brief authority unwarranted by the oracles of God. In my closing remarks, I have reached a little beyond what I had at first intended, but these observations being incidentally connected with my main design, must stand in their place. No man regrets more than I do the strong delusion that has unfortunately seized you. A leading object of our life should be to "*follow truth* with all men"—to love mercy, deal justly, and walk humbly before God. The faithful in such a course will seldom be involved in such a labyrinth of difficulties, as that into which you have so deeply plunged.

Wishing you a good degree of enlightening and renewing grace, and that you may be recovered from all extravagant, unreasonable and anti-scriptural wanderings; I invite you beneath the standard of God's revelation, to stand fast and immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.—Your talents sir, are of a popular character—they are calculated to give you a strong ascendency in the minds of the people. A double portion of responsibility devolves upon you. I shall add nothing further, than to note respectfully the high esteem and respectful consideration of your friend and fellow pilgrim in the blessed hope of glory, honor, immortality and eternal life.

THOMAS HERSEY.

Rev. E. W. Sehon.

POSTSCRIPT,

Containing sundry interesting Interrogations.

Wishing to arrest your attention to certain interesting points, I have thought it to be an incumbent duty, at parting, to propound a few questions for your consideration.

1st. Do you remember, or do you not, that John Miller was inquired of before the committee, whether he had ever told any person, at any time, that he had ever applied to any of the doctors in Nancy's case, that they had not done her any good, and that Col. Jewett's Liniment had cured her?

2nd. Do you remember, or do you not, that Miller positively denied that he had ever made any such statement to any one?

3rd. Has it not been positively and unequivocally proven, that said John Miller has made such, or similar declarations, at different times, and in the presence, and hearing of different persons?

4th. Was not this fact fully proven before your favorite committee?

5th. Did you not hear Miller mention publicly, that in his own case, being troubled with a pain and lameness in his back, he had applied to two physicians in this City, who had unsuccessfully attended on him, and that he had been cured by Col. Jewett's Liniment?

6th. Do you not see, and begin to feel, that as far as you were concerned in the decision of the committee, that in acquitting Miller, you have committed an outrage upon the moral feelings, and plain common sense of community?

7th. Do you not feel conscious, that you have strove zealously to sustain a man of equivocal character, as respects veracity, trampled with imperious insolence, and consummate, unprovoked impudence, on the joint testimony of three or four individuals?

8th. Did not one of these witnesses testify, that he saw John Miller sign the certificate published over his signature in "Jewett's Advertiser," heard him recite the items therein contained, to Col. Jewett, who wrote the certificate as he told the story, viz: related the circumstances from his own mouth?

9th. Did not another witness testify that he had heard John Miller make a statement, equivalent to what was contained in the certificate, though he was not present when the certificate was given?

10th. These witnesses being both members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in good standing at the time of the trial, and one of them having previously sworn that he saw Miller sign the certificate published in "Jewett's Advertiser," can any honest reason be given, why their testimony should not have been received?

11th. Was there nothing in the testimony of Mrs. Sellers and myself, that plainly proved, that he had verbally made state-

ments in our presence, and in our hearing, paramount to the things stated in the certificate, which things he there denied having ever uttered?

12th. Was it not by your special contrivance that the Church was made Plaintiff and John Miller Defendent, in the recent examination had on the subject of the above named certificate and other incidental circumstances?

13th. Was not this manœuvering contrived for the purpose of perverting judgment with impunity, to heap censure on the innocent, to clear the guilty, by thus artfully arranging your project, so as to prohibit (*according to the rules of Methodistical Episcopacy*) the possibility of an appeal from your arbitrary and unrighteous decision, to any other, more conscientious, high-minded and honorable tribunal, such as it is charitably presumed the pending quarterly Conference will be?

14th. Do you feel securely confident that by clerical chicanery you will evade all responsiblity to your brethren, or by some episcopal finesse, secure protection from the hallowed arm of justice, paralize the tongue of enquiry, or escape the eagle eye of popular investigation?

15th. Do you imagine, Mr. Sehon, that the intelligent and respectable community of the Methodists, and their numerous influential friends in this City, will suffer such a flagrant abuse of the laws of honor, justice aud propriety to pass away like a fleeting cloud, and not hold you amenable to God or man?

16th. As you profess to be a preacher of righteousness, and a guardian and conservator of the public morals, have we not a right to expect, that, possessed as you are of talents of a distinguished order, you should exhibit a pattern of moral excellence and Christian virtues deserving of general imitation?

17th. Is it not high time that a man who can trifle with the feelings of responsible witnesses as you have done, consigning their testimony to contempt, should be dragged out before the world, and his private walk and public ways be subjected to an impartial investigation?

18th. Have you not been in the daily habit of neglecting to urge upon your female servants the propriety, or even inviting them to participate in the common priviledge of Christians, in uniting with your family, in morning and evening prayer?

19th. Have your domestics been of that debased, abandoned character, as not to be meet subjects of your supplications, that you have thus neglected their spiritual interests?

20th. If you have arrived at that conclusion, and we are thus to account for your negligence, how far is that accordant with

the cordial and fraternal salutations you are known to give, to some of the most dissolute and profane, not to say to the offending of your delicacy, swearers, black legs, and gamblers of our City, and familiarly and cordially accosting them by the endearing name of BROTHER?

21th. As an evidence of your standing with this class of society, are there not some of this hopeful character, applauding your conduct in relation to the Miller case, publicly proclaiming, "we will not let members withdraw from the Church without a trial?"

Finally, if one apostle "withstood another to the face, because he was blame, worthy," shall it be thought unreasonable, that these painful interrogations should be urged upon your serious consideration, or that I should inquire if this be the way you propose "to feed the Church of God," over which, according to your profession, the Holy Ghost has made you an Overseer.

Submitted by THOMAS HERSEY.

A QUESTION EXTRA.

We would respectfully ask of Mr. Sehon, whether he has reported that our young friend Edward Mead, was unable to determine which of the two certificates, that were presented on the trial, was signed by John Miller? Rumor, with her busy tongue, makes such a statement as coming from you. But sir, mauger all your zeal, legal knowledge and friendship of the world, it becomes you to know and acknowledge, that there is abundant testimony to sustain the facts, that he answered the question proposed relating to that point, promptly, and in terms too definite and unequivocal to be mistaken.—Did he not say distinctly, that "Miller signed the certificate that was published in the Advertiser?"

THE BENTON ANECDOTE.

If our Reverend friend insist on being exempt from all censure in the late decision in the Miller trial, and take refuge behind his favorite committee, we think the anecdote of Mr. Benton, recited on the floor of Congress in a late speech, in reply to

Mr. Calhonn's report, is strictly applicable. We give it as illustrative of our views of the subject.

"As Mr. Benton was speaking, Mr. Calhoun rose, and in allusion to some of his remarks, wished to know whether Mr. Benton meant to include *him* in the number of those who predicted a deficiency in the revenue."

"Mr. Benton said he would answer the gentleman by telling him an *anecdote*. It was the story of a drummer taken prisoner in the low countries, by the Videttes of Marshal Saxe, under circumstances which deprived him of the protection of the laws of war. About to be shot, the poor drummer plead in his defence, that he was a non-combatant—he did not fight and kill people; he did nothing, he said, but beat his drum in the rear of the line; and so he should suffer for it. Mr. Benton hoped that the story would be understood, and that it would be received by the gentleman as an answer to his question, as neither in law, politics, or war, was there any difference between what a man did by himself, or did by another." We presume on the sagacity of Mr. Sehon to make the application, and if he cannot feel its force he can but treat it as contemptuously as he has treated the testimony offered on the trial. Commentary would be useless.

THE SEQUEL OF THE STORY.

Immediately after the scandalous decision by which Miller was acquitted of all criminality, and the witnesses against him degraded, Edward Mead, whose testimony among others was consigned to infamy, addressed a card to the Rev. E. W. Sehon, under date of March 21st, 1835, in the following terms.—

Brother Sehon,—

I consider my feelings injured and my character impeached by the unjust decision of the inquisition formed of your choice pet committee, in the case of John Miller, and consequently demand that my name be erased from the Church Record. Yours respectfully,

EDWARD MEAD.

Our much esteemed friend Edward Mead, we understand was zealously importuned by the Rev. E. W. Sehon to take back his card, and on those terms received overtures of peace—but as he would not submit to clerical dictation, he was shortly after presented with the following note:

Charges preferred by Jonas E. Rudisill in behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Church,, against Edward Mead, for IMMORALITY.

1*st Specification.*—Imprudent conduct towards the *preacher* in charge.

2nd. Slander of the committee and preacher, for their course in the trial of John Miller.—The trial to take place at the Church, on Saturday next, at 2 o'clock, P. M.

E. W. SEHON, *preacher.*

March 26th, 1835.

Record of proceedings had on the above named occasion. Saturday afternoon.

EDWARD MEAD,

The committee appointed in your case met this afternoon; from the evidence produced, viz;—THE LETTER ADDRESSED BY YOU TO ME!! *they* unanimously found you guilty of the charges preferred against you—and I pronounce you expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

March 28th, 1835. E. W. SEHON.

In reporting this case, Mr. Sehon states, the committee were brothers Spurgeon, Kelly, and Hillery.

THE OLNEY KITE,

OR, "PRIDE MUST HAVE A FALL."

To be said or sung in closing these animadversions, as best suits the taste and talentst of the reader.

"My waking dreams are best concealed,
Much folly, little good they yield;
But now and then I gain, when sleeping,
A friendly hint that's worth the keeping:
Lately I dreamt of one who cried
"Beware of self, beware of pride:
When you are prone to build a Babel,
Recall to mind this little fable."

"Once on a time a paper kite
Was mounted to a wond'rous height,
Where, *giddy*, with its elevation
It thus expressed self-admiration:

See how yon crowds of gazing people
Admire my flight above the steeple;
How would they wonder if they knew
All that a KITE like me can do;
Were I but free, I'd take a flight,
And pierce the clouds beyond their sight,
But, ah! like a poor pris'ner bound,
My string confines me near the ground:
I'd leave the Eagle's tow'ring wing,
Might I but fly without a string.
It tug'd and pull'd while thus it spoke,
To break the string——at last it broke.
Deprived at once of all its stay,
In vain it try'd to soar away:
Unable its own weight to bear,
It flutter'd downward thro' the air;
Unable its own course to guide,
The wind soon plunged it in the tide.
Ah! foolish KITE, thou hadst no wing,
How could'st thou fly without a string!
My heart replied, "Oh Lord, I see
How much this *kite* resembles me!
Forgetful that by the I stand,
Impatient of thy ruling hand;
How oft' I've wish'd to break the lines
Thy wisdom for my lot assigns!
How oft' indulg'd a vain desire
For something more, or something higher!
And but for grace and love divine,
A fall thus dreadful, had been mine."

John Newton.

PART SECOND.

THE EXAMINATION CONTINUED.

The favorable reception of the preceding *examination*, by a Christian community, and the numerous and interesting events that have transpired since its first appearance, furnish an imperious call for a second edition, with a supplementary narrative of some peculiar incidents in relation to the farcical trial of Col. M. Jewett, with a view to which, it appears, the first commotion was excited in the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city. In the prosecution of this latter trial, " the Clergyman examined" and the author were treated with such marked and contemptible indignity, as to render some animadversion highly proper and almost indispensable. The Rev. E. W. Sehon, the principal actor in this preposterous affair, the Grand Sachem of the Coalition Tribe, intent on breaking down the reputation of Col. Jewett, was pleased to give the preceeding part of this pamphlet the appellation of a "dirty sheet," and the Miller certificate he had obtained from the printer, a "*base forgery.*"

In taking the certificate of Mrs. Sellers, I had used the precaution not to write it myself, lest I might be accused of being her prompter or dictator—accordingly, I took a gentleman of respectability to perform the service. I wished for an opportunity to name the circumstances on the trial ; but such was the noisy stream of verbose declamation, the criticisms, supercilious airs, and prohibitory conduct of this presiding officer, that it appeared impossible to have a patient and candid hearing. Mr. Sehon appeared to have marked out his course to suit his own views—to brow-beat the witnesses with a design to invalidate their testimony. Although he had declared that the committee before whom the trial was brought, was an ecclesiastical, and not a civil court; yet, I understood him to intimate that he had consulted some law character, and he certainly professed to quote some writer on civil jurisprudence, as authority in relation to the rules of evidence; the pith of which was, that no "testimony should be admitted affecting, or detracting from the reputation of the dead." The exact words of this very learned quotation are not now recollected. Facts and circumstances, to explain and justify certain sayings, affirmed to have been uttered by Col. Jewett, which constituted the matter of complaint, or criminality of conduct whereof he was accused, were, by his legal rules of evidence, adopted in civil cases, applied in this

trial for the suppression of all such explanatory and justifying testimony. It was amusing to hear with what zeal Mr. Sehon bore witness to the reputation of John Miller, and of his standing in the church as being as fair and as good as his own: he was pointed and specific in his assertions, and I have no doubt that among the multitude who heard him, a number gave full credit to his testimony; and should he hereafter shrink from the comparison, or find occasion to retract his own assertions, it is to be hoped he will not find fault with those who received his testimony without a murmer. He evidently appeared at every stage of this trial to have prejudged the testimony, and to have been determined to suppress every thing on the part of the defendant under the specious pretence of irrelevancy, and to proceed with the technical *finesse* of an artful pettifogger. In his attitudes, gate and gestures, the idea of a dandy, or a French dancing master, irresistibly crowded on the mind, the resemblance appeared stronger to many an observer, than any discernible likeness to that pious suavity, that chaste, humble and devout deportment that distinguishes a man of God. In the vast range of my acquaintance, in civil, military and christian society, from Presidents, governors and major-generals, down to negro meetings, I never remember to have seen truth and justice so wantonly abused, and Christian sympathy so fully consigned to the shade. His imperious, overbearing exercise of Episcopal power, and unceremonious abruptness towards his seniors, was incompatible with that meekness and humility incumbent on the disciples of the meek and lowly Redeemer. O that the mercy of God may reach so hapless a case.

Mr Sehon had been extremely officious in getting up this prosecution, and while it was progressing, he appeared to assume the various character of accuser, witness, presiding judge, contriver, attorney for the prosecution, out-runner and whipper-in; to say the least, this was the impression his conduct produced on many minds, or I am grievously mistaken. As soon as the committee had signed the decree against Col. Jewett, I would inquire of Mr. Sehon if he did not perambulate the streets, with the decree open in his hands, and with an air of triumph, present it to his infidel friends, congratulating them on his success and the victory he had obtained? The next night, I am informed, he held what is called a *general class*, and notwithstanding he had spent a portion of the day in traversing the streets, breathing out reproachful anathemas against Col. Jewett, alluring the attention of the dissolute and profane, he came forward before this general class, and stated that "for the last twenty

four hours he had been examining himself, and found that he was *in perfect peace* with God and all mankind." About twenty four hours preceding, he had signed his Episcopal *bull* against Col. Jewett, on which decision the Colonel had a right by the Episcopal Methodist Discipline, to an appeal to another and higher tribunal; he would not wait, but in the same hasty spirit in which he got up and hurried on the trial, proceeded, officially, to declare that Col. Jewett was expelled from the Methodist Church. O shame where is thy blush! Is it not candid to believe it was a hypocritical cant, in such a man, under such circumstances, to call upon God to bless the excommunicated subject of his clerical displeasure, when he had so *religiously* pursued his game, "as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains?"

Taking a full view of all his proceedings in this business, could it be any thing less than solemn mockery for this clergyman to assure his church that he had proceeded according to the Methodist Discipline in this case, and notwithstanding the industry and zeal with which he had labored to reproach his victim, to have the bold effrontery to tell his flock that "he prayed God to bless him."

The persecutions of Protestants, the burning of heretics, whipping of Baptists, hanging Quakers, the tales of Salem witchcraft, the history of the world can scarcely present a blacker scene, a more exceptionable course than has been pursued by a certain coalition of professors, physicians and infidels, to effect the prostration of a man of distinguished and honorable standing, extensively known in the United States for his enterprise, hospitality and christian integrity, who, through a long, active and useful life, has sustained an unblemished reputation. No evidence could be admitted on this nefarious trial to invalidate the testimony on the part of the prosecution—no reasonable time allowed to make a full defence.—In defining the charge of falsehood preferred against Col. Jewett, there were four specifications, each of which related to his *medical preparations*. While the witnesses on the first specifications were being examined, those witnesses whose testimony related to the other specifications only, were not suffered to be present. Thus studious was the presiding judge to escape the eyes of men, and wrap his offensive deeds in a mantle of darkness, apparently unmindful of that discerning eye before which the midnight shade and blaze of noon, are both alike.

CHARGES PREFERRED BY J. M. C. HASELTINE,

In behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against Moses Jewett, for immorality. The particular specification is for FALSEHOOD.

1st, In stating that he had performed a perfect cure in the case of the Rev. J. B. Crist.

2d, By publishing in his work, styled "Jewett's Advertiser," a certificate purporting to have been given him by John Whitzell.

3d, In publishing in the same work mentioned above, a certificate said by him to have been given by John Miller.

4th, In stating that he had cured an infant child of Mrs. Compson of the venereal disease; and also in further asserting that one of her children had died of the same disease.

J. M. C. HASELTINE.

Bro. JEWETT—You will please attend at the Methodist Church in Columbus, on Thursday afternoon, the 16th inst., at half past 4 o'clock, when a committee will meet in your case upon the above charges.

E. W. SEHON, *Stationed Preacher.*

Columbus, O., April 14th, 1835.

Christian benevolence would require, that when such heavy charges were made against so worthy a citizen, and much respected member of the church, that a reasonable time should be allowed to prepare for the trial. It is natural and reasonable to expect that a humane preacher, however absolute and irresistible his authority, influenced by the law of christian kindness, would cheerfully allow to the accused sufficient time to hunt up and notify his witnesses, and make every requisite arrangement to make his defence. The document here presented speaks for itself. The signal of despatch was hoisted in the van, and the whole trial was rushed forward in perfect accordance with this leading feature of the prosecution.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INCIDENTS PRECEDING THE TRIAL.

COLUMBUS, *Wednesday April 15th*, 1835.

Bro. JEWETT—I learn with astonishment, by Bro. Haseltine, that you refuse to be tried by any committee chosen in this station. This argues one of two things, either that you

have lost all confidence in the church, or that you believe the church have lost all confidence in you. I write this *hastily* to say, that I shall religiously attend to my duty.—Turn to the 89th page, section 7th, of the Discipline, and you will there find the course I shall pursue. If you do not acknowledge the discipline and administration of the church, it is time it was known. I hope you will rightly consider the subject, and attend to-morrow at the time appointed. The charges against you are indeed SERIOUS and AWFUL; and if true, they ought to be made appear so—if false, you ought to lose no time in their refutation. Remember in either case, "truth is mighty and will prevail." I now give you to understand, that by the hand of God, a consciousness of integrity of purpose, and the discipline of the church, I have been governed in this whole affair; and with these before me, I shall still act. I shall summon no committee from the country, nor depart in any other respect from a sense of duty, and respect due to myself and the church over which I am placed. May God direct you.

Yours, &c., E. W. SEHON.

In civil cases, on the principles of common law, either plaintiff or defendant, in certain cases, through fear of injustice, have privilege to change the *venire* in the call of jurors to adjudge a pending cause; but it is admitted. However reasonable such a course may be, I do not discover the existence of such a wholesome provision in the rules of discipline alluded to above. Here I will just notice that the defendant is referred exclusively to the *discipline*—no mention is made of the oracles of God. Would not an apostle have referred him to the scriptures as a more "sure rule of prophecy"—"as given by the inspirations of God?" "as profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works?"

Would it not have appeared more like a disciple of Jesus if Mr. Sehon had said, "search the Scriptures, you will there find the course I shall pursue."—In the course that has been pursued in the case before us, it is humbly conceived the Scriptures look the reverend gentleman sternly in the face. Zion's Lawgiver has determined, and who shall disannul, that the power of binding and loosing belongs exclusively to the congregation, called the church. The power of dealing with, concerning, trying, even to the rejecting, or excluding of members, appertains to the church, in her congregated capacity. This authority is not conferred on church officers, or committees and representatives, on preachers, or a number of individuals arbitrarily ap-

pointed by them. What saith the word? "*Tell it unto the church; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man or publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye, [the church] shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.*"

The apostle upbraids the conduct of the congregation at Corinth in very pointed terms.—1 Cor. v. 1. 2. I hear there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the GENTILES, and ye are puffed up, and have not rather humbled yourselves, that he that hath done this deed should be taken away form among you. In administering such punishment as the apostle prescribes, the church, as a body, are required to put away from among them the incestuous person.—He did not claim the prerogative of selecting a committee that might be induced obsequiously to subserve his own purposes.—He did not claim the distinguished privilege of being a presiding judge on the trial, or once suggest that a stationed preacher, a circuit rider, or elder of any description should preside over the deliberations of some select tribunal to be got up for the occasion—with power to proscribe testimony, and decide on the relevancy, or irrelevancy of testimony, act as prosecuting attorney for the church, with official pomp arrayed to plead against the defendent and prejudge the cause. Paul's direction is made expressly and directly to the church as a congregated body.—See 1. Cor. v. 7.

"Purge out therefore the old leaven, that you may be a new lump."—v. 13. Wherefore put away from among *yourselves* that wicked person." The co-operative unanimity with which this business was conducted is obvious—many persons were concerned in this transaction. If the incestuous person had been rejected or expelled by a committee of three, five or seven, under the immediate control of a presiding clergyman, the business would have been managed by a few, but the inspired historian remarks. 2. Cor. ii. 6. "Sufficient for such a one is the punishment [or censure] that was inflicted by many."

In the church, no individual by reason of official consequence and dignity is placed beyond the immediate authority of the church—elders, deacons and preachers of every grade offending against the laws of God's house are liable to censure or expulsion, according to the nature of the offence.—Paul instructs the Collossions IV. 1, "say to Archippus, that he take heed to his ministry, which he hath received in the Lord that he fulfill it." If such an one had been negligent and refractory would he not have been amenable to his brethren? That an accusation may be received against an elder, and acted upon in the church is evident

from the rule prescribed.—An apostle would not have given a rule for doing that which ought not to be done. "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses."—In the exercise of this authority, the church at Ephesus acquired a good reputation, Rev. 2. 2. "I know thy works and thy labor, and thy patience, and that thou canst not bear them that are evil, and thou hast tryed them that say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars."

The church at Pergamus would not have been so severely accused of suffering the doctrines of Balaam and of the Nicolaitanes to obtain among them if it had not been their own fault, and it could not have been their own fault if they had not full authority to call them to an account for their heretical doctrines and immoral practices, who had propagated such errors and polluted the church. "If thy brother trespass against thee &c.," "tell it to the church."

Do not elders, preachers or any church officers who place themselves beyond the reach of the church where they belong, virtually renounce their relation to the brotherhood? If a church officer, say an elder, is not accountable to his brethren, he is no longer a brother. Every brother, whoever he be, is required to be subject to this rule—when information is given to the church, she is bound to receive it, if a competent number of witnesses be produced. When the church has received the accusation she must proceed to act accordingly. The offender must be reclaimed or rejected. "Do not ye judge them that are within."

The Methodist Episcopal contrivance to place preachers in such a situation as not to be amenable for their conduct to those among whom an offence may have been committed, is calculated to oppress the innocent and protect the guilty. The Methodist Episcopal clergy are so sensitive and so easily alarmed at every attempt to reduce them to a common rule of judgment, it often reminds me of the exclamation of a criminal brought before a magistrate, with whom he had crossed the Atlantic in early life: The magistrate observing his anxiety, and hearing his deep drawn sighs, embraced an opportunity very quietly to console him, assuring him that he had not forgotten him as a ship-mate, and he might be sure that he should have ample justice on the trial; the prisoner replied—"may it please your worship, upon my honor that is the very thing I am afraid of."

We have detained the reader longer than we intended, and will now return to our narrative. After the above letter, "hastily written," was handed to Col. Jewett, he promptly forwarded to him the following reply.

April 15, 1835.

Brother Sehon: In answer to your note of this morning, I would observe that my objections to a committee from this station, are not that I have lost all confidence in the church, but that where there has been much excitement, good men may be led astray by previous impressions; and it is usual in similar civil cases, for the furtherance of justice, to appoint such men as that there can be no doubt of their impartiality. For the purpose of having an unprejudiced decision, I claim this privilege. There is another difficulty which I wish to suggest—the time of but little more than a day and a half is quite too short for me to prepare the case and collect my witnesses, as some of them are at a distance, and probably will not be where I can procure their attendance this week. I have to ask you to defer the trial until Wednesday next at one o'clock, at which time, if possible, I will be ready for trial.

Your ob't. serv't., M. JEWETT.

After forwarding the preceeding letter, Col. Jewett waited patiently until the next morning, when he presented him with the subjoined written communication.

Columbus, *April 16th*, 1835.

Brother Sehon: I have been laboring to get prepared, if possible, for trial on Monday next. I find much more labor than I had anticipated, as many witnesses that I want are not at hand. Brother Johnson has not returned, and his family say that they know not when he will be at home. In consequence of the great labor, I would ask of you the permission of counsel at the trial. As you say you are disposed to have a fair investigation, I presume you will not object to so reasonable a requisition. By your complying with this request, I shall be much more likely to be prepared for trial on Monday next. I can hardly suppose you would wish to press me into trial unprepared. Please to inform if you will grant my request.

Yours respectfully, M. JEWETT.

Rev. E. W. Sehon.

After receiving the above letter, the Rev. E. W. Sehon declining to make any formal reply, came personally to the office of Col. Jewett, accompanied by a certain Mr. Armstrong, as footguard and witness to all that could be seen and heard. Ebenezer Barcus and Edward Mead were present. Among other things he said "I shall not trust any more notes in your

hands, and I will not receive any more written communications from you. I will not *condescend* to any such thing. I will admit of no counsel in your case. This is not a civil court, it is an ecclesiastical one. I shall expect you at the trial on Monday. I will not defer it another hour." In this confabulation the reverend gentleman has drawn his own portrait to the life. This is an exhibition of Sehonic pomposity and consequentialness. A miserable display of episcopal assurance. Sehon decrees, and who shall revoke the immutable mandate?—"*I will not defer it another hour.*"

In the "Western Christian Advocate," there is an article written by an Elder who has long been in the ministry. In his 20th number of a series of essays, in a standard work zealously patronized by the Episcopal Methodist Connection, we find this remark: "In ordinary cases, as a matter of courtesy, let the right of choice rest with the accused, whether he will be tried by the society, or a select committee of them."

For one, I cannot see any right of choice in this matter. If the offended has visited the offender first *alone*, and not having been able to reclaim him, has with one or two more gone as a committee, or as persons authorized by Christ to examine into the business,—if the offender remain obstinate, there is nothing referred to human choice; the law is explicit and unequivocal—"tell it to the church." But the lenient feelings, the benevolent disposition of the writer, as presented before us in the quotation given, is worthy the attention of his junior brethren. With Mr. Sehon, all things touching clerical power, are absolute and vindictive. Col. Jewett can have no choice about it. He can have no lenity, not even time to look up witnesses and prepare for his defence. His language is, "I shall summon no committee from the country." You shall be tried by a committee of my own choosing, that I can manage to suit my own views, is the meaning of this assertion. "I will admit of no counsel in your case"—viz. if we may interpret his words by his conduct—you shall not receive the advice, or be indulged to enjoy the sympathies of friends on the occasion—you shall not have any earthly aid to assist you in breaking the meshes of that net in which I intend to entangle you. In the sequel, this construction appears to have been correct. For, on the trial, witnesses thought to be friendly to Col. Jewett, were not allowed to be present only to give testimony on those particular specifications to which their testimony related. Conscious that his conduct must appear ridiculous if fully exposed to a discerning community, he strove assiduously to evade the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.

Columbus, O., *April 20th*, 1835.

On this day the conflicting parties met at the meeting house in this city, called the *M. E. church.* The committee appointed for the trial of Col. M. Jewett took their places. The Rev. E. W. Sehon as presiding judge, took the chair in what is called the altar. These preliminary arrangements being made, and a number of witnesses present, the above named charges were presented. Mr. Sehon wished to have the last charge tried first, but the objections of the defendant were so strong and forcible, that he was induced to yield; and the charges were taken up in the order in which they had been previously handed to Col. Jewett.

The first falsehood of which he was accused, was "In stating that he had performed a perfect cure in the case of the Rev. J. B. Crist."

A reporter of the testimony was provided. Col. Jewett also had a ready scribe to perform a similar service. Here let it be noted, that Mr. Sehon contended through the whole trial, that he had an exclusive right to judge of testimony whether it was admissible or inadmissible, relevant or irrelevant; and on this assumption, refused to hear most of the testimony intended to be adduced by the defendant. He dictated to his stenographer what to minute down, and what to reject, in several instances that were distinctly noticed. From him, previous to the trial having fully commenced, Col. Jewett solicited a copy of the record, which he was willing to give; this also was forbidden by his reverence. If Col. Jewett's reporter has omitted any thing important, it has not been an intentional neglect. To give the sketch correctly, as far as practicable, was his exclusive object. From these minutes we transcribe, without any improper leaning or dependence on our own recollection.

First witness—Jesse Wixom, testified, "I think I did hear brother Jewett say he cured Crist of the dysentery."

Question by Mr. Sehon. "Do you remember distinctly?"

Answer. "Yes sir. Brother Jewett said he thought so; but I first heard it from other sources."

Ques. by Mr. Spurgeon. "What time?"

Ans. "I cant tell—Jewett did not say *perfect cure.*"

Second witness—Mrs. Ann Johnson. "I heard Mr. Jewett say he relieved Mr. Crist of the diarrhœa."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "What time?"
Ans. "Some time in February."
Ques. by Mr. Crist. "Did'nt he tell you since?"
Ans. "Yes, he said he had relieved him."

Third Witness. J. B. Crist. "When I was first summoned, I preferred my testimony might be on oath." [Not granted.] "For years I have been affected with dysentery. After preaching, was pained. After conference, on Saturday before it [Col. Jewett's liniment] was applied, I was ill; Sunday morning very ill. Mr. Sehon being away, the duty of preaching devolved on me. I sent word I could not preach. Brother Jewett came and said he had brought with him a certain cure for dysentery. I told him *I had tried other remedies without effect*, and preferred taking some which my wife was preparing, which sister Harvey had brought with her. Jewett told me of a number of great cures he had performed with his liniment, and insisted on making an immediate application to me. He, however, applied the liniment, and directly after left the house—said he would send up some medicine in a few minutes. The medicine was brought; I took it as he had directed, and it operated severely—it acted as a purge. In the afternoon brother Jewett came, and I believe found me up. I was disposed to be friendly to the article. In the evening brother Jewett called, accompanied by brother Cloud; they asked me how I was? I told them that though I was *free from pain*, I was very weak. Jewett told me another application was necessary. My wife left the room. The liniment was again applied in presence of Cloud. In half an hour she returned. Jewett and Cloud left; and Jewett told me it was necessary to try the liniment once or twice more, which would no doubt be sufficient. I applied it, and saw him next morning *after breakfast*. I walked to the store. I applied it again in the evening.

On Tuesday morning and night, I felt slight returns. On Wednesday, again, I *began* to feel the *dysentery* return. At night I had a severe attack. Next morning, [Thursday] I was as bad as ever. In the same week Jewett called in, and I told him in the presence of my wife, that I had the dysentery again, and *that his liniment had done me no good.* * * * * * While at Wooster, two or three weeks after, I was taken with a severe attack of bilious inflamatory fever. Although I was among

friends, I was anxious to get home; two medical men were called, and they were opposed to my going home then. At night was ill; took some medicine. *I was fearful the liniment had caused it.* However, *I tried the liniment again,* without effect. I was determined to get home as soon as possible. I set off; in four days I arrived, very ill. The third day after, brother Jewett called to see me, and after asking me some questions, asked me if I had used his liniment? *I said no.* He was surprised at this, and insisted on making an immediate application. My wife spoke to him thus—"You must not apply your liniment to my husband against his will—she told him plainly that his liniment had done me no good, but that she believed it had done me an injury."

Ques. by Jewett. Did you ever tell any body it had ever *relieved* you?

Ans. I don't think I ever did, though I was weak.

Ques. by Jewett. You recollect you were running constantly with the diarrhœa? [To this question witness hesitatingly made some reply, not distinctly recollected, but understood to be an assent to the fact.]

Ques. by Jewett. After you *first* applied the liniment, did you not tell me distinctly that you had no other discharge?

Ans. No! I don't think I ever did!*** I never said I was cured of the dysentery!!**** I told you on Monday and Tuesday that I was able to be about. On Sunday I was'nt free from pain altogether.

Ques. by Spurgeon. Did you not tell him it did you harm?*

Ans. Yes!***

Ques. by Jewett. Did you tell any body a week after that it had relieved you.

Ans. No!***

---

*Hark! how logs crash, rocks roll, and waters pour,
What demon shakes Scioto's peaceful shore?
Dark was the night—amidst the direful gloom,
The mob collected and the job was done!

Rumor with her busy tongue reports the disastrous tale, that nine years ago, this same M. S., then a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was actively engaged with a mob in destroying the mill dam of Col. Jewett, in Columbus.

And could a fire within his breast remain
So long, so hot, and burst and burn again?

Witness. E. W. Sehon. I would remark in giving testimony—however distant—I arrived in this city in September last, under circumstances of peculiar delicacy of health. I had not recovered from an attack of Cholera I had in Mississippi. I only state this to show how I became acquainted with Jewett. On the steps of *Noble's tavern* I was introduced to him by brother Reynolds. I told them I was in great pain. Jewett told me he had a *certain cure for pains.* He told me he could make a perfect cure in fifteen minutes—yes! I repeat it, in fifteen minutes. I avoided—[here the minutes leave a blank.] I conversed with brother Reynolds about it, who cautioned me against it. Reynolds told me that he [Jewett] had a paste for shoes, which he thought was good, but in reference to it as a medicine, he said he would not *take it*—he believed *it was an imposition.* Jewett came to me again and pressed me to go to his house and try it. He took me by the arm and hurried me down. He pushed me!***he forced me!***he dragged me down with him!!***** I told him I would not take any thing internally. His wife was there, and he began, his wife assisting him, to boast most *extravagantly, enormously,* of the wonderful cures he had performed; *and I am ashamed to acknowledge, that I consented to an application being made. Yes, I am ashamed to acknowledge it!* Jewett told me he had the certificate of thirty Methodist Preachers! Thirty Methodist Preachers! Among others brother Crist, who he said had one of the most awful attacks of dysentery, and that in fifteen minutes he had performed a perfect cure.

☞In the course of the rehearsal of the above glaring, flaming speech, Col. Jewett rose and objected to such kind of testimony—that it was not admissable—that the Rev. gentleman had refused any such privilege to him. His objections were indignantly repelled, and the exasperated preacher being filled with the spirit * * * * * of determined opposition against Col. Jewett's preparations; the spirit that gave birth to all this scandalous persecution and din of war, with a clerical circumlocution, assailed him at another point.

He proceeded. Some seven weeks ago brother Jewett was at my house, and in presence of Dr. Thomson, I told brother Jewett that he must never say he had cured me, as he had so

intimated. He remarked that he should not; and denied ever making such a statement to any one.

Ques. by Jewett. Did you ever tell me that sister Kent told you, that I had said that I had cured you?

Ans. I did not ! !?**

Ques. by Jewett. Did you ever tell me that sister Kent told your wife so?

Ans. I never did ! !

His reverence resumed his course, and proceeded to say—I told him that brother Crist denied positively that he had cured him—Crist was then in Virginia, and I told him that as soon as he returned I would have it attended to. I told him it would not do, if he had not performed a cure on Crist to assert it. He repeated that he had performed a perfect cure. This was about six weeks ago.

Ques. by Crist. Do you recollect asking my opinion about it?

Ans. I do.

Ques. by Jewett. How often as pastor of this flock, have you been in my house?

Ans. I shan't answer that question. I have my reasons for not going.

☞The testimony of Mrs. Crist was then read from a letter said to have been written by her, addressed to the committee. No previous notice had been given of such written testimony, carefully got up for the occasion—the defendant was not apprised of any such testimony being provided, until it was presented by Mr. Sehon. It would be declared admissible of course, when introduced by him who held the keys of the testimony to be adduced at his entire disposal, unamenable to any one. The testimony contained in the letter was about to the same amount as that given by Mr. Crist, with some little amplifications.

Witness. Mrs. Jewett. I heard that brother Crist was sick. In the evening *I* went to the Episcopal church, and after meeting I called to see him, and I found him up. I was surprised, and said to him, well, I expected to have found you in bed. O no, said he. I asked him if he was better? Yes, said he. Did the medicine help you? He said it had relieved him.

Witness. Edward Mead. I went to Mr. Crist's house with the medicine sent by Col. Jewett, which has been mentioned, I think about one o'clock. [Crist here rose and stated that it must have been in the morning that Mead took the medicine to him, because the cathartic had taken effect and done operating before evening.☞] Mead said, that he asked Crist if he had had another discharge? If the diarrhœa had returned? And that Crist said it had not; and that he considered that the liniment had cured him of the diarrhœa.

Witness. Robert Cloud. I recollect after meeting in the evening, of seeing brother Jewett, and I went down with him to Crist's house. I saw him make an application to Crist. I talked with Crist about it, for I was anxious to know what effect it had on him, that I might use it in my own family. He said it had relieved him in five or fifteen minutes, I do not recollect which, from pain, and that the diarrhœa was stopped. I afterwards met with brother Crist, and he told me that after another application, he felt perfectly free from pain, and felt as if he could lay and laugh all the time.

Ques. by Crist. "Did I say *perfectly* cured?"

Ans. I do not recollect as to the perfectly cured, but you said you were relieved from pain, and from diarrhœa.

Witness. Mr. Crist. Mr. Crist was extremely busy. He appeared in the character of accuser, witness, and examiner of his own testimony. At this stage of the trial he remarked, "I will say what I have said, I preferred to have my testimony taken on oath. I was better on Sabbath, and on Monday morning. When Jewett called to see me, I told him I was not entirely well. He then persuaded me to make another trial [of his liniment,] and, from the many wonderful cures which he said he had performed, I was induced to try it again. It was tried ineffectually."

In giving his testimony, Mr. Cloud's reputation, the explicit frankness, plainness and unequivocal firmness of his manner, gave emphasis and a resistless impulse to all he said. Mr. Crist looked chop fallen, and in our estimation quailed beneath the blows inflicted by the words that proceeded from the lips of this venerable witness. Mr. Cloud must have been an highly electrical cloud to the reverend gentleman, when, while he was sheepishly hanging his head, and partially covering his face

with his hands, he was pointedly addressed and promptly challenged, in these memorable words—"*Brother Crist, look me full in the face.*"—It is a fact that must have been distinctly noticed, that whatever degree of moral turpitude may have prompted him to such a disreputable course, he did not appear to possess that firmness of nerve, that brawny fibre, and the unblushing assurance of E. W. Sehon.

After Mr. Cloud had gone through with his testimony, and Mr. Crist had plucked up courage to shake off the horrors for a moment, he started up in his place, *tenacem propositi*, and with an air of affected triumph, looked round and exclaimed, "now I wish Dr. Thomson and brother Armstrong to be called forward!" Mr. Sehon had said they were present when he inquired about the certificate: but let me ask, what could be the intention of having them examined? They were not present when Mr Crist had the dysentery, and Col. Jewett cured him. Inquiry was made of Mr Crist, what he wished to prove by the witnesses he had named? He replied, that he wished to prove by them that he told *them* that "the liniment had not done him any good." Col. Jewett being aware that they had not seen him until several weeks after the event—until Crist had made his journey to the north and returned—immediately objected to this kind of testimony. Mr. Sehon then decided that the forthcoming testimony of these men would be found to be relevant. Did he hope to found an argument on their dissimilation or ignorance, to condemn the Colonel? By an *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, to confound the understanding of the committee, or draw a veil over his designs. What motives might have actuated the man, what secret machinations of evil might have throbbed in his clerical bosom, we shall not stop to inquire; suffice it to say, that Mr Sehon and Col. Jewett controverted the point for some time. About this time, Esq. Grubb, who was absent at the commencement of the trial, and had not yet taken his seat with the committee with which he had been appointed to act, made his appearance *in propria personæ*. Mr. Sehon referred to him for a legal decision of the question. He being a limb of the law, and probably recognized as one of the coalition, was hopefully and confidently looked to as paramount authority to adjust the dispute. In conformity to his extra-judicial opinion, the witnesses were called on for examination,

secundum artem. But before they could get fairly under way, Mr. Cloud arrested their progress for a moment. "I percieve," said he, "the object of bringing forward these witnesses, is to invalidate my testimony. If that be your object you are welcome to follow me back until you find me knee high. I utterly disregard all this." Mr. Sehon replied with a disdainful sneer, "*so do I!!*"***

It is curious to observe, that when Armstrong appears to testify before this tribunal, the first thrust is against Col. Jewett's medical preparations. The game commenced by an interrogation from Mr. Sehon: "Did you," said he to Mr. Armstrong, "*ever* hear Crist say he had no confidence in Jewett's liniment?" This was an artful question: "the words "did you ever hear," are placed in an ambiguous light. However, it was in the round of the examination, made to appear that this conversation took place on a certain Monday or Tuesday. As for this Monday or Tuesday, it was at first a little difficult getting any explicit and satisfactory information. Whether the questions and answers had been adjusted before hand, I cannot say. Mr. Sehon asked Armstrong and Thomson, "what time was it you talked with Crist?" They said "it was on Monday or Tuesday."

Mr. Cloud, percieving their willingness to leave this point in total darkness, urged Mr. Sehon to ask the witnesses, "what Monday or Tuesday?" "Whether it was after the first application, or after his retun from the north?" The witnesses then said, it was the Monday or Tuesday after Crist returned from the north.

The impression evidently intended to be made, was that this conversation related to the application of the liniment when Mr. Crist was sick with the dysentery at home—but it evidently took place about three weeks afterwards, and alluded to the use of the medicine when he was at the north on a visit. The answer made by Mr. Armstrong was, "I can't exactly state the words, but *I* think he said he had no confidence in it—that he *had tried it*, and it had done him no good." Mr. Crist then inquired, "Did you hear me say, that I told Jewett I would not try it again?" He answered, "Yes, I remember something of that kind—you said you was afraid your wife would offend, or drive him out of the house. This was after your return from

the north." Here then the secret was out. Admitting that this conversation absolutely took place in manner and form as stated by Mr. Armstrong, at the period of his return. Would this prove that he had not any confidence in the remedy when he was so marvellously relieved, that he laughed heartily for joy? This laughing was before he went to the north. The conversation with Mr. Armstrong was at a subsequent period.

"This" said he, "was *after* you returned from the north." Thus the veil is torn away.

WITNESS, *Mrs. Johnson.* "Mr. Jewett was at my house and told me about" [here witness addressing Col. Jewett said] you said you had stopped the disease, and that from some cause Mr. Crist was taken again.

Question by Mr. Crist to Mr. Sehon. "Do you recollect calling, in company with Armstrong and Eddy, that I told you that I had refused to apply the part, and was fearful it had done me an injury?"******

Ans. Crist came with Cloud into Reynolds' store. Reynolds and Armstrong were present and were laughing about Eddy's applying the liniment." Col. Jewett inquired, "did Eddy say he was cured?" To this question Mr. Sehon declined in making any reply.

Mr. *Sehon* proceeded and said—The day after the election, I came into Reynolds store and began *boring* Eddy about it. We all three *bored* each other. We *bored* Crist. Crist stated it had done him no good. It was either the day or the day after the election.

Mr. Cloud, remarked that this referred to Mr Crist's sickness after he returned from the north, that HE referred to Crist's first sickness.

Ques. by Sehon to Cloud. Did you hear Crist say to me it had not cured him?

Ans. I don't recollect.

Ques. by Sehon. Did you infer from brother Crist that he was cured or relieved by Jewetts medicine?

Ans. He told me he was perfectly calm.

Ques. Did he say he was cured?

Ans. I understood him to be cured from that attack.

WITNESS, Dr. Thompson. *Qust.* by Sehon. Do you recollect hearing Crist say he had tried the liniment and it did not cure him.

Ans. I inquired of him—I wished to know his opinion—I understood him he had used it, that it had done him no good—and he had no confidence in it—I remember this distinctly—He said he had an attack of dysentery, and that Jewett had applied his liniment, which he said did him no good. He had no confidence it—don't recollect at what time, but it was after he returned from the north—I had no acquaintance with him before.

WITNESS, R. Cloud. After Crist returned from the north, I asked him if he had made another trial of the liniment—He said he had, and it had not done him any good at all.

WITNESS, J. F. Wixom. I was in conversation with Crist, and we were talking about the liniment—Crist said, if he had not had a second attack on Wednesday, he should have believed the medicine had cured him, but having this, he had lost all confidence in it. Crist told me positively he believed he was relieved. *Note.* This related to his sickness at home before he went to the north.

We have now passed through the testimony given in relation to the first charge preferred against Col. Jewett. Abundance of testimony he wished to offer in his defence was overruled and utterly suppressed by the imperial nod of E. W. Sehon. The grand object of kicking up this bustle in the church, and bringing on the trial of Col. Jewett, was obviously designed to take effect in bringing his liniments into disrepute. In looking over the testimony and observing the management, it is impossible to conceal the prominent feature of this ludicrous exhibition from a discerning eye.

His external applications having acquired an astonishing degree of celebrity, had become a subject of much conversation—the regular physicians of this city in several instances had manifested much hostility. No artifice that can be devised; no positive assertion that can be made to the contrary, will convince the body of the people, that this flagrant persecution has not been gotten up and prosecuted under the joint influence and coalition of two Reverend Divines in this city, and certain infidels and medical gentleman who have been their advisers, aiders and abettors from first to last. After it was noised abroad that a trial was pending, in walking the streets you could see Mr. Sehon in close confabulation with some of the medical faculty, or their coadjutors who were publicly believed to be in the secret. We need only revert back to the testimony of Sehon and Crist—note their zigzag course, and how they managed the game to play into each others hands to find a disgusting mani-

festation of the intrigues and perverse management of Episcopal Tyrants, when invested with their disciplinary powers, and of the scorpion sting of clerical resentment.

Crist's own testimony bears witness to sustain all that is necessary to exhonorate the defendant from the infamous charge of lying, which Mr. Sehon has labored so assiduously to saddle upon him. Perhaps, in some conversation had among his reputed friends, he might not have used all possible technical precision, like some hair-splitting, nosological casuist, that glories in his abilities to make numerous distinctions, where others of less acumen in his art can scarcely discern a shade of difference.

The points of difference we refer to now are, that Jewett is charged with saying he had "cured" Crist:—when, as they contend, he had only relieved him. Crist, in his testimony, says, "I was *free* from pain." His words were uttered thus—"though *I was free from pain*, I was very weak." This was the effect of the liniment—he had "tried other remedies without effect." We cannot notice Crist's testimony too minutely.

In the evening, after the linament had been applied, Crist says, "Brother Jewett called, accompanied by Brother Cloud—they asked me how I was? I told them that though *I was free from pain*, I was very weak." Now, in common parlance, a man distressed with pain, when he is relieved—not only relieved, *but free from pain*, and remains so for several days—who would say it was not at least a temporary cure? if the patient was entirely relieved—was really "free from pain!" So far it was a perfect relief. The Colonel's liniments, it is well known, have astonished many, by their prompt and efficient relief of pain, and the suddenness and certainty with which they arrest the most violent forms of diarrhœa. When the patient is perfectly free from pain, and diarrhœa stopped, it is perfectly natural, though the patient may remain bodily and mentally weak, for any one to say he is cured.

It appears, by Mr. Crist's own testimony, that the next morning he eat his breakfast and walked to the store, and it was not until Wednesday, that he "*began* to feel the dysentery return." Let the reader pause and reflect with astonishment! This same Reverend gentleman, had just testified that he was "free from pain"—which must have been the effect of the liniment—for he had "tried other remedies in vain!" Yet, this same witness, being promptly interrogated by Col. Jewett, a few minutes a'terwards—"Did you ever tell any body that it

[the liniment] had ever relieved you?" He answered, "I don't think I ever did, *though I was weak!*" However weak the source from whence it springs, there is a prodigious strength in this part of the testimony. At one time he says, "I told them [Cloud and Jewett] I was free from pain;" or, more minutely, "though I was free from pain, I was weak." But, in a few minutes, in his zeal to put down Col. Jewett and degrade the reputation of his medicine, he wheels about and endeavors to explain away the force of his own concessions, by saying, "On Sunday I was'nt free from pain altogether." Now, if Crist told Col. Jewett and Mr. Cloud that he was "free from pain," and either of them reported what he had said, without an adjective qualification of the expression; or, instead of saying he was "free from pain," should say he "was cured:" wherein is any one to be found guilty of wilful and malicious falsehood, unless it should be the man that will deny his own words and contradict his own testimony?

Passing over the swaggering, pompous vituperation, and priestly consequence attending the testimony of E. W. Sehon; allowing it all the worth and importance that clerical dignity and consequentialness can impart, we will invite the reader's attention to the testimony of Mr. Robert Cloud, an elderly and much respected citizen of this city, and a worthy member of the Methodist Congregation in this place. He is a steady, honest man. He has no fopish airs. He does not give his hat the dandy cant, nor frequent the society of infidels. He is not a stranger among us. From his long-tried uprightness of character, who can suspect his integrity? Those who would impeach his veracity, have need to be well fortified. In looking at the testimony of this man, we discover a plain, honest, unvarnished tale. He states facts with an artless, unadorned simplicity, that give point and efficacy to the story. "I recollect," says R. Cloud, "after meeting, in the evening, of seeing Brother Jewett, and I went down with him to Crist's house. I saw him make an application to Crist. I talked with Crist about it, for I was anxious to know what effect it had on him, that I might use it in my own family. He said it had *relieved him* in five or fifteen minutes, I do not recollect which, *from pain*, and that the *diarrhœa was stopped*. He said he felt perfectly calm, and felt like laughing all the time. He said he was *perfectly* relieved and *free from pain*."

If we receive the testimony of Robert Cloud, and who will have the assurance to contradict a syllable of it? who can believe that Col. Jewett has intentionally perverted the truth, or

that he had not good grounds upon which to report a cure? Is there any thing in the long, extravagant tale of E. W. Sehon, about his being laid hold of *by the arm, hurried, pushed, forced* and *dragged* down to Col. Jewett's, that is relevant to the point? Any thing that proved that Crist was not relieved—was not freed from pain—that the diarrhœa was not stopped—that he said he felt perfectly calm, and felt like laughing all the time? When Crist made these concessions, Sehon had not yet seen him, nor had the opportunity to infuse the spleeny malignity of his hostility to Col. Jewett's medical preparations into his vascilating mind.

Sehon's testimony was undoubtedly calculated to take effect—to prepare the way to announce that he was ashamed to acknowledge that he had been rubbed over with the *paste*, as he tauntingly and with affected ignorance denominates the liniment of Col. Jewett. With the same design he tells the story of the frolic of the preachers, at Mr. Reynolds' store.

It seems that Mr. Sehon commenced the jovial *ruse de guerre*. "I came into Reynolds' store," said he, "and began," yes, he "began *boring* Eddy about it. We all three *bored* each other; we *bored* Crist." And what has been the effect of this clerical *boring* match? Why, it appears it must have operated. Mr. Sehon says, that Mr. Crist said "it [the liniment] had done him no good!" Does his saying so, when so severely *bored*, by so many clergymen, prove that he had not told Robert Cloud and others a different story? The whole farce reminds us of the evasive answer made by Mr. Crist to the question proposed by Col. Jewett—"Did you ever tell any body it [the liniment] had *ever* relieved you?" He answered—"I don't think I ever did, *though I was weak*." Query. Was he so weak that he could not, or would not, or did not tell the truth? But we will not *bore* him on this subject. He must feel sore by the *boring* already inflicted on him by his frolicsome brethren.

One instance of undeniable *weakness* in Mr. Crist, which probably is of an incurable character, is found in the following testimony of Mr. Wixom. "I was," said he, "in conversation with Crist, and we were talking about the linament. Crist said, if he had not had a second *attack* on *Wednesday*, he should have believed that the medicine had cured him." Of course, during the interim, from the time of the application to the time of the attack on Wednesday, he must have believed himself cured; and if he believed so, is it any thing strange that he should have said so? and, whatever might be the fears of Col. Jewett, of relating a story after him, after so long an acquaintance, I for

one, am not surprised that he should, *then*, tell the story of his success, as it fell warm from the preacher's lips, and had been heard by Mr. Cloud, whose established reputation, as a man of truth, is not to be shaken by the *boring* of clergymen.

It appears that Mr. Crist had been a long time subject to a chronic affection of the bowels, which would come upon him at particular seasons, when certain exciting causes roused the sleeping malady into action—he has called this complaint a diarrhœa, and then a dysentery, between which forms of disease, there is a greater radical difference than between being *freed from* or *cured of pain*. "The pain was relieved and the diarrhœ stopped; he was perfectly calm, and felt like laughing all the time." Surely he must have been highly delighted after having tried other means in vain, to be so suddenly and entirely relieved, in such a novel, simple way. The British spirit, for once, yielded the palm to this Yankee device. It was perfectly natural to laugh. "*There is a time to laugh*," and never a time more suitable than when amidst the tortures and agonies arising from the pains and distressing tenesmus attending a violent attack of dysentery: the patient finds himself in a few minutes perfectly relieved from pain—the purging stopped—the tenesmus gone—the system tranquilized to perfect calmness, by the simple means of rubbing a pleasant liniment over the abdominal region. Mr. Crist, when rubbed, laughed heartily. Mr. Sehon, when rubbed, felt a different impression. But, as Dr. Cullen remarks, that there is but little if any difference between the laughing and crying of highly hysterical women; it makes but little difference whether these hypochondriacal gentlemen, when rubbed, are induced to laugh or be ashamed—they will not confess that rubbing does them any good. In many cases it may be the physician's duty to prescribe—and then to abandon the patient to his own course. Could we believe the boisterous story of the priest-*boring* preacher, we should say that, for Col. Jewett violently to sieze a STRANGER "*by the arm*"—to "hurry"—"push"—"force," and drag him down to the house, and *rub* him there against his will, was rather impolite. The well-timed hospitality, politeness, and common civility of Col. Jewett toward strangers, is too universally known for such a preposterous tale to obtain general credence, even if a clergyman of more unequivocal reputation should attempt to confirm it. As Mr. Sehon has such a settled aversion to being rubbed, we will never attempt this mode of treatment unless in a case of extreme emergency, being reluctant to raise the blush of shame on his reverend brow.

I could have pointed to several other cases of recent occurrence in this city, in which diarrhœa, dysentery and cholera morbus have yielded immediately to this innocent, but efficacious remedy. One in particular was a woman about 40 years of age, who had labored under a dysentery for ten days—for several days confined chiefly to her bed—pain, constant tenesmus, and bloody stools, evinced the violence of the complaint. By an application of the liniment over the abdominal region, in twelve or fifteen minutes she affirmed she had not felt as easy from the first attack—it was about the middle of the day—in the evening she was able to be up and eat supper with the family. In twenty-four hours I found her about the house, engaged in her domestic business—she had had two natural motions of the bowels. I heard no more of the original complaint. I used no other remedy except a tea of Thomson's composition, and a cup or two of a tea of the *Polygonium Persicaria*, (smart weed.) Another instance was that of my step son, in a violent cholera morbus, attended with cramp and coldness of the extremities. His alarmed mother applied the liniment; he laid down on the bed, perspired freely, slept quietly over night, and was able to attend his business as usual. I have tried it in many cases of bowel complaints, and always with decided advantage.

That the reader may have some adequate conception of the power of Col. Jewett's liniment, in arresting disease and relieving pain, we will give a case of

PLEURISY PROMPTLY CURED.

On Tuesday the 28th of April, ult., at 11 o'clock, P. M., we were roused from our bed to attend on a neighbor, (Mr. Joseph Scates) in an uncommonly violent paroxysm of pleurisy, with which he had been attacked towards the close of the preceding day: the pain, soreness and anguish, were intolerable. Although the family had witnessed a number of former attacks, to which he has been habitually subject, they were at that time prodigiously alarmed, and were persuaded, that without relief, it was impossible that he could survive until morning. The sufferings of the patient, and the alarm and anxiety of the family, occasioned many unpleasant sensations. We knew the zeal with which the course we intended to pursue, had been persecuted in this city. We felt the full weight of the responsibility attached to us as a practitioner—we were determined, however, to have recourse to such means, as we knew by experience and observation, promised the most speedy and certain

relief to the patient: accordingly, as soon as his exquisite pain and soreness would allow, he was placed in a situation convenient for the application of Col. Jewett's liniment, No. 2. We commenced rubbing his side, stomach, and between the shoulders. At the commencement, the parts were so sore and tender that he dreaded to be touched. We had not continued the rubbing on of the liniment more than twelve or fifteen minutes, until the relief was so sensibly realized as to astonish him and his attendants. He had been wishing to be bled, and we had been called in for that purpose, that being the only means of relief he had been able to obtain on former attacks of the complaint. We protested against the use of the lancet, and applied the liniment, as stated above, which took effect immediately. A warm flannel was applied to the pained side, a warm brick to his feet, a warm tea of Dr. Thomson's composition, with the addition of colic root, was given him to drink: he rested tolerably comfortable through the remainder of the night. The next morning, there being some soreness remaining, and occasionally a little pain, we made a slight application of the liniment again, continued the drink, and the next night he announced himself cured. The pain and soreness were gone, the cough relieved. We recommended the liniment to be repeated at bed time, to confirm the cure and prevent relapse. On the 30th of the month he continued well, and his case is one among a great number of instances, in which cures, in desperate cases have been effected by similar means, with a promptness and certainty that has never been exceeded, and we greatly question if ever equalled, since the days of Apostolic miracles have flown away!

Mr. Scates has obligingly certified the principal facts in his case in a few words:—

To all whom it may concern:—Know ye, that the above statement of my case of a pleurisy attack, is strictly true. I was relieved and cured in this new way, much to my satisfaction. I never was as well, so soon after an attack, in my life before. I think the facts as stated by Dr. Hersey, are due to the public, that others under similar affliction, may find an equally sudden and effectual relief. Given under my hand this 30th day of April, A. D., 1835. J. S.

In presence of Mrs. Barrett.

The profuse perspiration produced in the above case, as in many others of a similar character, was truly surprising. The patient was not thereby debilitated, as he would have been by bleeding and the common depletive antiphlogistic treatment.

As this case has occurred since the trial, it could not have been adduced at that time. Many other interesting cases, equally good, could have been given on the spot; but as all such testimony was rejected as irrelevant, we have selected this case as being of recent date, and of more public notoriety, than some others; which, from certain delicate circumstances, we forbear to blazon to the world.

The certainty with which these preparations of Col. Jewett are known to arrest complaints of the bowels, particularly dysentery and the most violent forms of diarrhœa, are so well known as to be proverbially spoken of through the city. His persecutors alone affect to doubt, fools to laugh, while honest and unbiassed citizens admire and wonder at the astonishing effects that have been produced. The pages of "Jewett's Advertiser," abound with testimony, which has enlisted the malice, envy, and revengeful passions of his enemies, with demoniac zeal, to strive to invalidate the facts. We will here present another certificate from under the hand of a respectable citizen, who was at the time of the trial, a member in good standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church:

COLUMBUS CITY, *May*, 1835.

The undersigned does hereby certify that he had a bad dysentery, which continued with more or less severity for three or four weeks; in the mean time he made use of, and applied means that he had formerly found useful. The complaint was so severe, that medicine that had often been successfully used before, that had never failed in curing *him* of his former attacks of this complaint, then produced no beneficial effect. He was then induced to make trial of Col. Jewett's stimulating liniment, No. 2, and it suddenly produced the desired effect. He was, to his great satisfaction, relieved by the first application. From what he knows of its efficacy by personal experience, and believes on the testimony of others, he gives it as his decided opinion, that the liniment, about which there has been so much wrangling, and the Colonel exposed to unreasonable and cruel persecution, is the most certain, infallible and perfect remedy that has yet been discovered for that complaint.
Given under my hand, E. BURWELL.

Another respectable citizen, who was present at the trial, whose testimony was esteemed irrelevant and inadmissible, has furnished the following testimonial. The writer of this certificate is also in full communion and fellowship with the Methodist Episcopal Church:

"I certify," says he, "that I have used Col. Jewett's liniment, and have known of its being used in divers instances of bowel complaints, with the happiest effect. Martin L. Lewis had a child that had been afflicted for a number of weeks, so that the family were obliged to be up with it every night. Amidst many discouragements from the duration and severity of the complaint, and defective efficacy of the usual remedies, they finally applied the liniment over the bowels of the child, and for the first in many weeks, they were able to lay quiet and undisturbed through the night, without once having occasion to rise. I was myself laboring under a similar complaint, and found the liniment in my own case to be a safe, speedy and effectual remedy. Other instances have come under my observation, equally remarkable for the success of the liniment in arresting diarrhœa, relieving pain, and quieting intestinal commotion. For one, I believe it to be a medicine of extraordinary virtues, deserving the attention of community in all cases where such remedies are needed. The extraordinary excitement of which Col. Jewett's preparations have been the innocent occasion, is with me a subject of deep regret. I conceive, from good authourity—(my own experience, and the concurrent testimony of many competent judges,)—that they are justly entled to receive a good degree of popular attention, and promise to be of extensive service in alleviating many of the miseries incident to mankind. THOS. JOHNSON.

Extract of a letter from *Richard B. Pain*, Esq., member elect, of the Legislature of Ohio, from Preble county, addressed to Col. M. Jewett.

"A few days previous to my departure from Columbus, I purchased two small boxes of your liniment; before I got home, I accidentally lost one, which loss I much regret, because from the little use made of the one I have, I fear the loss is greater than I at first imagined. I think, from all the circumstances, that I have, by using the liniment, been relieved from an old and inveterate bowel complaint. For a long time I have been subject to a difficulty of the kind. About ten days ago I commenced the use of the liniment, agreeably to directions. I made the applications two nights successively. Although the following morning I was more than usually unwell, and voided some blood, and much that was of an offensive nature, some time in the afternoon the complaint ceased entirely; since that time I have had no return of the disease; no, not the least symptom of it." R. B. PAIN.

These certificates, and that subjoined, signed by Rev. John Rathburn, circumstantially evinced that Mr. Crist's acknowledgment of the relief obtained, was an acknowledgment of the truth, and confirms the testimony of Mr. Cloud and others, as being nothing less nor more than facts that must naturally arise from such circumstances. If others were so marvelously cured, why should not Mr. Crist have been relieved? If relieved, why should not he have told of it? If he told it, why should he not be believed? Why should not the story be repeated after him? These testimonials excite the natural inquiry, that "if Mr. C. was thus marvellously relieved, as he then acknowledged, why did he afterwards deny it?"

The following certificate bears date April 20th, 1835, and has been presented by the Rev. John Rathburn, a practising physician, a local preacher in the Methodist connection, a man of sterling integrity, who will never have the "weakness" to deny, as being false, what he has here advanced for truth:

"This may certify, that the undersigned was called upon some time in the last winter, to doctor one of Hannibal Pratt's children. The child had a high fever and diarrhœa. I applied Col. Jewett's liniment, and in a short time, perhaps two hours, the patient was relieved from the fever, and not another motion of the bowels occasioned by the complaint."

JOHN RATHBURN.

April 20th, 1835.

Is not testimony like this relevant to the case in hand? Col. Jewett had said that the Rev. Mr. Crist was relieved in fifteen minutes, and ultimately cured in a very short time of a violent diarrhœa, or rather a dysenteric complaint. Mr. Crist publicly acknowledged in his testimony given on the trial, in so many words, "*I was free from pain!*" alluding to the effect of the liniment no doubt: for he told Mr. Mead at evening, that "the diarrhœa had not returned," and that "he considered the liniment had relieved him." Mr. Cloud afterwards talked with Mr. Crist about it. Mr. Crist then said, the "liniment had relieved him" (in a short time) "from pain, that the diarrhœa was stopped"—that he "felt perfectly calm, and felt like laughing all the time"—that "he was perfectly relieved, and free from pain."

Is not the testimony we have given, calculated to corroborate the facts in his case, and to confirm the confidence of the wavering, in the truth of the assertions, partly acknowledged and fully proven to have been made by Mr. Crist? Who will

refuse to laugh with him, and "rejoice with those that rejoice!" But, alas for the frailty of poor human nature! Alas for that "weakness" of which Mr. Crist so aptly complains! And yet we think it must have required unusual strength in some respects, to wheel about and absolutely deny at one time, what he had stated so joyfully at another. This same man says, "I told him (Col. Jewett) that his liniment had done me no good." "Two or three weeks after, while at Wooster, he was taken with a severe attack of bilious inflammatory fever." He says, "although I was among friends, I was anxious to get home." "Two medical men were called—at night was ill—took some medicine"—to cap the climax, and to fully evince the "weakness" of Mr. Crist, (who by this time must feel as much ashamed of being *rubbed* as ever Mr. Sehon did,) we will follow the broken linked chain of his testimony a little further—alluding to his complaint, which was undoubtedly occasioned by the fatigues and exposures, and sudden vicissitudes of weather, which in our changeful climate are apt to induce inflammatory catarrhal affections, he had strength to affirm, "*I was fearful the liniment had caused it!*" "However," adds he, and oh what mental resolution, what intellectual courage, what an exhibition of the *vivida vis animi*, of a sanctified clergyman, intent upon the accomplishment of some important purpose, as though confident of success, after the fruitless efforts of two medical men, he has recourse to his former means, to a tried and proven remedy, that had before "relieved" his bodily complaints, pain and diarrhœa, and filled his soul with laughter—"I tried," said he "the liniment again!"

If in his former trials of the liniment it had utterly failed—if it had not done him any good, and he was now really fearful it had caused the complaint under which he was laboring, two weeks afterwards, he must have been "weak," extremely "weak," to "try the liniment again."

Dr. Thompson, a physician of this city, one of the faculty on whose account this whole farce has been played off, when asked by Mr. Sehon, "Do you recollect hearing Crist say, he had tried the liniment and it did not cure him?" replied, "I inquired of him—I wished to know his opinion—I understood him, that he had used it, that it had done no good, and he had no confidence in it. I remember this distinctly!!"

He said he had an attack of dysentery, and that Jewett had applied his liniment, which, he said, did him no good, he had no confidence in it.

Witness did not recollect what time, but it was after he

had returned from the north. He remarked, I had no acquaintance with him before.

The failure here alluded to must have been in his sickness at Wooster, and not to the time of Col. Jewett's applying the liniment, and curing him of the dysentery. This is no evidence that he had not said on a former occasion that "he was cured." Wherefore was this testimony of Dr. Thompson introduced? Mr. Crist, in telling Dr. Thompson that he had tried the liniment at Wooster for an "inflammatory bilious fever," (which might have been attended with dysenteric symptoms,) and that "it did him no good," that "he had lost confidence in it," does not prove that it did not relieve his pain and dysentery, and cause him in the exceeding joyfulness of his heart to laugh, or feel like laughing all the time, on the former attack in which the liniment was first applied. There is not a shade of testimony to prove that he did not make the concessions in favor of the liniment, contended for by the defendant. The confessions made to Mr. Wixom, that "if he had not had a second attack on Wednesday, he must have believed himself cured," proves that from the application of the liniment until Wednesday, he did so believe: so believing, it was perfectly natural for him so to report, to those who enquired during that period. It was perfectly natural and reasonable, that Col. Jewett, hearing from the lips of his patient a statement so highly favorable to the reputation of his liniment, and learning the result of the application in that case, to be in exact accordance with that uniform success with which its use had been attended in a multitude of other cases, should relate the story of the cure. The repetition of these remarks appears to be necessary, that a correct impression may rest on the mind of every reader, who wishes to know and to realize the weight of truth in relation to this business.

We shall indulge in some further remarks, as we pass along, on the rejection of testimony by the Rev. Mr. Sehon. We think we see clearly an unwarrantable assumption of authority, an abuse of Episcopal power. The scriptures have no where conferred such power on preachers of the gospel, that they should have the exclusive management of the church.

The testimony that was rejected was absolutely necessary for the administration of distributive justice—to sustain the individual rights of several persons whose reputation for veracity was involved in the general issue of the trial, to disabuse the public mind from false impressions, and to exonerate the defendant from that rude mass of opprobrium so zealously heaped upon him; also, that the ultimate decision might be made on the broad basis of impartial truth and righteousness.

Mr. Crist, with a view to invalidate Mr. Cloud's testimony, unfortunately cast a shade of deep obscurity over his own. By the concessions he had made before responsible witnesses, he had rendered it indispensable, in his attempts to "weaken" the testimony of another, to *cut close to the scribe*. Being a stranger in our city, and not having had time to acquire that permanent weight of character which the lapse of a few years might possibly have effected, it was necessary that the corroborating testimony should be adduced, that would afford strongly presumptive evidence of the truth of his concessions; that no weakness either natural or moral, of which he might be disposed to complain, or inclined to refer to, by way of apology, should be so interpreted as to involve a respectable clergyman in the charge of inconsistency or intentional ambiguity.

The reader must perceive by the general drift of the testimony adduced in behalf of the prosecution, it was designed to abuse, degrade and put down the medical preparations of Col. M. Jewett. Mr. Crist, by making the concessions in manner and form, so minutely and circumstantially, as testified by Mr. Robert Cloud, that had been measurably confirmed in the hearing of other witnesses, and which, it must be presumed, was all true, from his own testimony, making suitable allowance for his weakness, which induced him to tug hard at the oar of contradiction, placed the testimony he had given, in such a light as to require other testimony to disentangle the minds of those who listened to the story, from those doubts and suspicions in relation to matters of fact, which were inseparable from the intricate and complicated circumstances, which the wizzard wisdom of the prosecution had contrived to gather round them.

Let us indulge some very natural inquiries arising out of the facts, as they have been presented before us. If Mr. Crist had not been relieved of his bowel complaint; if he had not been cured for a season; if he did not receive the sensible benefits which it has been proven he said that he had received; it would have been the first instance within our knowledge of a failure or defeat under similar circumstances. While the enemies of Col. Jewett were anxious to make it appear that the liniment had not done any good in Mr. Crist's case, but was a real injury, and he himself then and there contradicted what other witnesses testified that he had absolutely said at another time, it was necessary, indispensably necessary, to make crooked places straight and rough places smooth, by proving the almost invariable certainty, and unprecedented suddenness with which painful and violent diarrhœas and dysenteries have been remo-

ved by the same means. Mr. Crist having spoken of the liniment in such high terms of commendation, he having been marvellously relieved in a very short time, it was important, not only to defend Mr. Crist from the suspicion of misrepresentation, but to exonerate Col. Jewett from the charge of falsehood, who had innocently reported the story as it fell from his own lips. To furnish unequivocal, corroborative testimony to confirm the faith of the wavering, if any doubt remained of the certain salutary effect that has been so extensively tested wherever the medicine has been properly applied. Its reputation has been so well established, that those acquainted with its real efficacy, while they see the stranger admire and wonder at the cures achieved by its use, would think it a far greater wonder that Mr. Crist should have used it as he did, and failed to receive the beneficial and happy effects which he had acknowledged it had produced. Many witnesses could have been adduced immediately, on the spur of the moment, to establish these important facts. A multitude could very readily have been found, could Col. Jewett have had any thing like a reasonable time allowed him to have made his defence. But this privilege was refused, and all testimony on the part of the defendant, insolently and impertinently rejected, as being totally irrelevant.

The venerable old Colonel—the patriot, the soldier and the christian—the man who never flinched in the embattled field, or wheeled with coward steps from the cannon's mouth, was now in the merciless hands of an Episcopal Ecclesiastical despot, under the castigating lash of a clerical stripling, who dashed on, *sans ceremonie*, in the exercise of a little brief authority wontonly assumed, and insulted his seniors with as little apparent compunction, as Tecumseh would have killed a white man.

In examining the certificates we have presented to the reader, they are but a small portion out of many about being laid before the public, without any ostensible regard, or designed reference to this trial, which we esteem as much of a burlesque on common sense, as it has been a flagrant abuse of the great law of christian equity.

The testimony we have presented on this first item of specifications, whatever may be the opinion of Mr. Sehon as to its admissibleness before his demi-pontifical tribunal, yet at the bar of public sentiment it may not be considered, under existing circumstances, as being altogether irrelevant. It is calculated to wipe away all reproachful suspicion and jealousy relative to the *weakness* of Mr. Crist. His weakness had not extended a

demoralizing influence to impair his veracity at the time when he so clearly and unequivocally bore his personal testimony, founded on his own experience and observation, of the salutary effect of the liniment in question, in a violent attack.

The writer of these pages was present a large proportion of the time, while Col. Jewett was being roasted at a clerical fire, before a select committee reflector. The fire glowed with an intense heat: 'twas blown to a devouring, withering flame, by the puffing and blowing of the Episcopol bellows. For one among others, I was not suffered to remain in the house, only while those specific charges to which it was presumed my testimony more particularly related, were being investigated. "*Sir, you can go out,*" was reiterated from the hallowed lips of this self-sanctified pedant. As I, with others, were refused the privilege of giving in the testimony referred to, we ask only for a candid, patient and impartial hearing, now it is spread before a discerning community, from the press. I will just state, that I have not any apprehension that any of the witnesses whose testimony has been rejected, will ever have the "weakness," *obscuris vera involvens,* to contradict their own assertions.

The testimony of Mr. Sehon, who was so remarkably officious on this trial, does not appear to require any further investigation. We are willing it should pass for what it is worth. Of his conduct and his motives, let an impartial community judge. If he has made it appear that Col. Jewett has lied, so let it be—we have no wish to clear the guilty. His burning zeal to establish the charge, was too apparent to be doubted by any acquainted with the circumstances. As we have no wish to "bore" him on the subject, we will pass along to the

Second specification against Col. Jewett, by which the charge of falsehood was attempted to be sustained; it reads thus,

"By publishing in his work, styled 'Jewett's Advertiser,' a certificate, said by him to have been given him by John Whitsill."

In Jewett's Advertiser, No. I, for January 1st, 1835, p. 12th, we find the following certificate:

"More than one year and a half ago, I was attacked with the dyspepsia; stomach and bowels much disordered; digestive powers impaired; dry skin; and despondency of mind. I had no hope of obtaining relief until six months ago, I applied Jewett's liniment to the surface of the body: In two or three days my skin became moist; a relaxation took place in my

system, and I directly became relieved. Soon after this application, I threw off from my stomach large quantities of the most offensive matter, which afforded me much relief. With this application alone, I have been "*cured*" of the disease, and have remained in health ever since."

JOHN WHITSILL.

It is remarkable that there is but one word in the certificate that the plaintiff complained of as not being perfectly correct. Mr. Whitsill admitted the whole statement to be correct with the exception of the word "*cured.*" That he "directly became *relieved*"—and that he threw of his stomach large quantities of the most offensive matter, which afforded *much relief*," and that he "has remained in *health* ever since," he did not pretend to deny; but, though he acknowledged signing the certificate, and admitted its general truth, he said the word "*cured*" was not in it. But we will give his own statement, before the Ecclesiastical committee.

Witness. J. Whitsill. "I acknowledge to the certificate until it comes to the "*cure*"—that I positively deny—and I positively deny ever telling any body so. I positively told Brother Cloud, at the time he took the certificate, I was not cured of the disease, but I was better."

Here let it be distinctly noted that Col. Jewett, being fully apprised of the gins, traps and snares his opponents were always contriving, to depose the reputation of his medical preparations, induced him to use a most scrupulous precaution in obtaining certificates. Accordingly, on this occasion he engaged Mr. Robert Cloud, an old citizen, of an established reputation, whose veracity none but the hardy sons of wickedness, innured to stratagems and crimes, would dare to impeach. By Mr. Cloud the certificate was taken, and by him it was handed to Dr. Wm. Hance, who made no alteration—he merely punctuated it and handed it to the printer. Mr. Glover, who printed the Advertiser, affirmed that he received it of Dr. Hance. Col. Jewett never saw the certificate until it appeared from the press. If there was any thing incorrect about it, he could not be to blame, for he had taken every reasonable precaution not to be involved in the responsibility attached to such papers. He knew that when such a flood of light should be shed among his

enemies, as the *Advertiser* was calculated to furnish, the report of the efficacy of his preparations, in arresting disease, going abroad from the press, and reaching certain characters in this city, would set them to screeching, like lettingthe noonday sun shine upon a nest of owls.

Mr. Hazeltine, like his Quixotic prototype, the Rev. E. W. Sehon, wishing to give a blow at the liniment, when he heard the confounding concessions of John Whitsill, and that his three *positivelys* did not reach the cardinal point in the mystic wheel of Episcopal prosecution, puts the question, (very relevant to be sure, Mr. Sehon being judge,) "Did you lay it [the cure, or betterment] to the use of the linament?"

Had he been like Mr. Crist, he might have said he did not know, or, "I was weak," and so evaded an answer. But the facts, in this case, were too glaring to get round them in this way. Mr. Whitsill, with a candor with which some men are utterly unacquainted, very peremptorily stated, to the confounding of the evil intended to be effected, "I could not lay it to any thing else, for I took nothing else."

Ques. by Mr. Spurgeon. "Who was present?"

Ans. "Brother Cloud took the certificate."

Ques. by Mr. Spurgeon. "Who was present?"

Ans. "My family."

Notwithstanding the candid and unequivocal manner in which the witness had said, "I acknowledge the certificate;" yet H. B. Harvey, one of the committee, querimoniously inquired, "Did you sign the certificate?"

Ans. "Yes sir—it was writtenwith pencil."

Ques. by Mr. Spurgeon. "Do you recollect distinctly that those words were not in it?"

Ans. "At the place where it says *cure*, it read, '*I was better.*' I told him the disease was not removed."

Spurgeon, no doubt seeing that Mr. Sehon had gotten his Brother Whitsill in the narrows—that he hesitated to go the whole extent of the matter aimed at—perceiving that finding fault with nothing except the word *cure*, and substituting the word "I was better" would not have read very smoothly, and thatto erase the word "cure," only, and retain the balance of the certificate, would seem to involve an inconsistency, he (point-

ing him to some certain place) spoke thus, "*This is the part which was not in.*" To this assumption of one of the committee we did not hear any reply. However, it is presumable that it had to pass for testimony. If Mr. Sehon should have said, "*it is admissible,*" who would have dared to object?

Ques. by Jacob Grubb. "Did you read the certificate?"

Ans. "I did not."

Ques. by Mr. Grubb. "You can read, can't you?"

Ans. "Yes sir."

The testimony of Mrs. Whitsill was thought to be necessary on the part of the prosecution. It was taken by Edward Mead. She was too much engaged, or did not feel sufficiently interested, personally to attend the trial. Accordingly, her testimony was taken at the house of Mrs. High.

In presence of several gentlemen, the Rev. E. W. Sehon read the certificate from Jewett's Advertiser: then enquired of Mrs. Whitsill, "Did you understand it so?" She said, "No, I did not understand it so—I understood by it that he was measurably better. I heard him tell Brother Cloud, on taking the certificate, that he was not cured of the disease."

In what way or manner had this testimony any bearing on the question at issue. The charge was against Col. Jewett, that "he had lied," by having Whitsill's certificate published in his Advertiser. But it was Mr. Cloud who took the certificate, gave it to Dr. Hance to punctuate for the press, and the printer received it from him unaltered. Col. Jewett had not any thing to do in this transaction. Twenty witnesses swearing that he did or did not sign the certificate, does not decide the guilt or innocence of Col. Jewett. It is evident to the most ordinary capacity, that Mrs. Whitsill's testimony was totally irrelevant. But Mr. Sehon must have his own way. Against such a king there is no rising up. And what could be the object of the measures so carefully concerted and so zealously pursued? Was it not by an artful *coup de main*, to prepare the way to bring the Episcopal artillery to bear on the venerable Robert Cloud? His testimony in the case was fully anticipated. It was virtually before the committee in the certificate, and it was all-important to ante-date his condemnation. The prosecutors knew the tools they had to work with, to raise a battery for a pending emergency. "*Keep dark,*" was undoubtedly the countersign of

the patrolling party. Openly to declare hostility against him, at so early a period, it was known, would have been an impolitic measure—but, like a cautious prince, they were determined to be in readiness and prepare munitions, *ante bellum*.

Mr. Spurgeon asked Col. Jewett, "Have you the original certificate?"

Col. Jewett replied no; it is at the printers."

Mr. Sehon asked Mr. Glover, (*the printer*,) "What became of the certificate?"

Ans. "I cant say sir."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Did you burn it up?"

Ans. "I took from the drawer all the papers, and threw them on the floor. I told the boy to put them in the stove.—He did so, and I suppose *that one* was among them. They had been there about two months. I supposed it was of no use to preserve them. About two days after, Brother Jewett came and asked for the copy."

Here note, Mr. Glover is one of the most peaceable, unoffending citizens of our city. He never dreamed of the storm that was brewing, or he would have carefully preserved every scrap of manuscript in his possession, that could possibly, at any period he employed for the development of truth.

Col. Jewett, who had never seen the original manuscript, knowing by experience that an ounce of precaution was worth a pound of cure, was intent to get hold of, and compare the original copy with the publication—for rumour had began to whisper round some malignant tales. Could he have succeeded in obtaining the original copy, no doubt, as relates to Col. Jewett, it would have gagged the cankered mouth of slanderous persecution, as far as the Whitsill story is concerned. While Mr. Glover was delivering his testimony, Mr. Spurgeon enquired, "Brother Glover, was the certificate written in pencil or in ink?" Mr. Glover replied, "I am not certain—I rather think it was written in ink—I did not set them up."

Ques. by Mr. Grubb. "Were they in detached pieces or all in a body?"

Ans. by Mr. Glover. "I got part of the copy for the *Advertiser* of Dr. Hance, and part from Col. Jewett. I was directed to do so by Col. Jewett."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "You don't know that the certificate having Whitsill's name was in pencil do you?"

Ans. "No sir."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Are you certain it was in ink?"

Ans. "I am not certain, sir."

Witness, Dr. Wm. Hance. *Ques.* by Mr. Hazeltine. "Do you recollect receiving any certificates from Mr. Jewett."

Ans. "Yes."

Ques. "Do you recollect it was in pencil?"

Ans. "Yes."

Ques. "Was there any alteration?"

Ans. "No."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Was it the same as in the Advertiser?"

Ans. "Yes, I have no doubt of it; the certificate of Mr. Whitsell was given to me by Mr. Cloud, and I gave it to Mr. Glover."

Ques. by Mr. Grubb. "I presume you only gave a copy?"

Ans. No, I didn't copy it. I punctuated it, and handed it over to Glover."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Did I understand you to say it was written in pencil."

Ans. "The certificate was in pencil."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "How long after you got it did you give it to Glover."

Ans. "About two or three days."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Are you sure Brother Glover got it in person?"

Ans. "I am not certain, but I am very confident he did."

Mr. Sehon, who evidently failed in his pettifogging attempts to entangle and confound the testimony, in the agony of his zeal, again banters Mr. Glover with the question, "Was the certificate written in pencil or ink?" Mr. Glover remarked, that "he would not answer that question again, unless the committee said so—as he had answered it twice, he thought that was enough. He did not wish to answer it the third time."

With all his priestly management to enlist the weak mind of Mr. Whitsill against Col. Jewett—he had acknowledged the certificate until it comes to the cure. But, as Robert Cloud, who took the certificate and gave it to Dr. Hance, would have to be heard in his testimony, all this flourishing, dashing and

blustering, was undoubtedly designed to blind the Committee, and to prevent the impression the substantial testimony of this venerable citizen must inevitably make on the public mind. To get rid of the word *cure*, was all-important. Whitsill, by his own verbal testimony, had admitted all he had said in the certificate, and all that Col. Jewett had published on the subject with the exception of the word "*cure*." The technical distinction between *relieved* and *cured*, would never have been thought of by Mr. Whitsell, it is presumed, unless his clerical, or rather his Episcopal wisdom, with perhaps the concentrated sagacity of some two or three medical coadjutors, had not radiated his mind with the legendary lore that long fermented in their classic brains. We will freshen our recollections by again reverting to the acknowledged certificate. We will dissect the items and place them before the reader in a tangible form.

First, then—What was Mr. Whitsil's complaint? It was, 1st, "dyspepsia;" 2d, "stomach and bowels much disordered;" 3d, "digestive powers impaired;" 4th, "dry skin;" 5th, "despondency of mind;" 6th, "no hope of obtaining relief." Here was a complicated malady affecting body and mind. Six months ago he applied Jewett's liniment to the surface of his body, and without the use of other remedial means, in two or three days it took effect. And what was accomplished by the liniment, as Whitsill still testifies? 1st, "his skin became moist;" 2ndly, "a relaxation of his system took place," which it seems he thought to be in a state of morbid rigidity before—or perhaps he alludes to an agreeably laxative state of the bowels, that might previously have been costive. The expression is ambiguous, but evidently intended to express a salutary effect produced by the liniment; 3d, he "directly became relieved;" 4th, he "threw off from his stomach large quantities of the most offensive matter;" 5th, "this afforded him *much relief*;" 6th, by all these benefits, his mental despondency must have been relieved.

Here let it be remembered that he had been failing for a year and a half. That his constitution must have been so impaired, that at his advanced age, if he received all the benefits named in the certificate, it would not be any thing strange, or unnatural for him to have accounted himself cured of his principal difficulties.

The course of time is onward. Medicine cannot restore

juvenile energy to a man of his advanced years; but we add, 7thly, the benefits received exceeded all his former expectations. "I had," said he, "no hope of obtaining relief;" but he 'directly became relieved;" it "afforded him much relief," and he "remained in health." If, in some six or nine months afterwards, he found some remains of his old difficulties returning—if he, at some subsequent period, felt a partial relapse of disease, is it reasonable, is it not irrational and ungrateful, to deny the cure which had been effected gratuitously, and to turn upon his benefactor, and endeavor to make him a public liar for publishing a certificate stating the facts, as reported by a man of veracity—to make a brother an offender of the blackest die, by raising an impertinent cavil about the word *cure?* The certificate does not say he was "*perfectly cured*," but simply that he was "*cured*." And that he was partially "*cured*," he still admits, and can never dare deny.

Witness. Robert Cloud. "I was requested by brother Jewett to see Whitsill, and get his certificate in reference to his cure. I stepped in and asked him if he was disposed to give a certificate? He said yes. I took my pencil—he requested me to write it—I did not wish to do it—I asked him in reference to his case—I wrote down a sentence, and then read it to him, and asked him if it was right? He said it was. I read one sentence at a time as I went on—I read it as I wrote it—he said it was right, and *he signed it.*

Ques. by Grubb. "Have you any recollection of the certificate? Is it the same as stated here?" (pointing to the Advertiser.)

Ans. "I cannot say positively, but on seeing it, I think every word is as I wrote it. I did not think of there being any thing there but what Whitsill had agreed to."

Ques. by Spurgeon. "Did brother Whitsill's certificate say he had been cured?"

Ans. "I recollect that he said he thought violent exercise had brought on some pain, and he expected the disease would return. I do not recollect distinctly, whether he said distinctly that he was cured. I recollect he said he expected the disease would return."

Note. The writer begs leave to inquire of the sapient prosecutors, how long we must wait after our patients are relieved

of any existing difficulty, before we may venture to say in common terms, they are cured? Can a disease be said to return, that has not been removed for a season? If a patient receives as extraordinary advantages from medicine, and is as effectually relieved as Whitsill was for eight or nine months, and then by "violent exercise" brings on a return of some of the symptoms, would it not be an abuse of the truth for the patient to deny the cure, and rob his benefactor of deserved reputation for affecting more than he had any hope of ever realising?

After the witness had replied to the last question proposed, Mr. Hazeltine inquired, "Was it the same (certificate) that you handed to Dr. Hance?"

Ans. "Yes."

Whitsill at that juncture appeared to come to his feelings and was evidently disturbed in mind, but he summoned the resolution to say, "I saw Glover, and he told me that it [the certificate] was written in ink."

Sehon, addressing the committee with remarkable emphasis, reiterated Whitsill's words, "Glover said it was written in black ink—the blackest kind of ink!!"

Whether he meant to insinuate that Glover told him so, or whether he wished to impress the committee more forcibly with what Whitsill had said, with his own amendments appended, I could not fully comprehend, though present and carefully attending to all that transpired; but whatever object he had in view, there was a complete abortion, for Mr. Glover, with christian meekness, and peculiar firmness of voice and action, flatly denied the whole. He said distinctly and emphatically, "I did not."

Witness. John C. Smith. As Mr. Smith came forward, he commenced, saying, "I was at work"—in an instant Mr. Sehon applied his Episcopal gag—refused to hear his testimony—without ceremony prejudged all he had to say as being irrelevant. The testimony of several other respectable witnesses was disposed of in the same summary manner. It is thus Episcopacy maintains its ascendancy over the minds and consciences of numerous thousands in these United States. It is due to Col. Jewett and to the public, that the rejected testimony in this case should be brought forward on these pages. If the conduct of Mr. Sehon can be justified, let him be justified: if truth and justice condemn him, he must stand condemned.

Since the trial, Mr. John C. Smith has obligingly furnished a certificate of the facts he was then and there willing to have testified relative to Whitsill's case, had he not been arbitrarily prevented.

Certificate of John C. Smith. "Some time last fall, or the latter part of the summer, I was at work in Col. Jewett's shop; I heard the Colonel and John Whitsill talking at the door about Whitsill's health. The Colonel wanted that he should come in and get some more medicine, but Whitsill declined, saying, 'he was well, and needed no more.' However, he came in, and spoke to me, and to the best of my recollection the following conversation took place, which I will endeavor to relate, with all the exactness in my power: 'Well Smith, said he, 'what do you think about it?' 'About what,' was my reply. 'The Colonel' said Whitsill, 'wants me to use some more of his medicine, but I don't need it, for he has cured me now—I am a perfectly well and sound man.' I told him I did not think it necessary for a person to doctor unless they were sick. He said again, 'I am not sick, I am a well man; the Colonel has cured me: I have lost all that depression of spirits, that I have had for a year or more past; I can eat heartily, my food digests well; I can work well, and sleep well; I am as well as ever I was in my life. I don't think it best to doctor any more; the Colonel has cured me completely.' I have frequently heard him make similar remarks to others, as well as myself. He has told me the last winter, several times, that he has enjoyed good health—that he considered the Colonel's remedies invaluable.

JOHN C. SMITH."

Among other rejected testimony, was that of Mr. Thomas Johnson, a respectable citizen in full communion with the Methodist connexion in this city. He has also had the goodness to place the following document at my disposal:

"I do hereby certify, that some time during the present month, I was in conversation with John Whitsill in regard to his health, and what he had said to John C. Smith. He said 'Col. Jewett had spoken to him, or called him as he was passing his shop, and that he said he ought to use more of the liniment, or that it was necessary he should use some more, but he said he told the Colonel there was no need for it, for he was well, and he said he did not use any more.' He further said, he went into the shop where John C. Smith was at work, and said to him, 'do you think that a man that is well needs medicine? He [Smith] said that he thought not:' He, [Whitsill] then replied,

that he was well, but that the Colonel wished him to use more of the liniment, but said he did not think it was worth his while.

Given under my hand, THOMAS JOHNSON.

Columbus, April 23, 1835.

"At the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established." Thus saith the oracles of God. In this case, facts and circumstances have accumulated, and acquired a force, strong and incontrovertible, that none but knaves or fools would dare to question. The last testimony we shall adduce on this item of *charges*, is from the pen of Edward Mead. A youthful, intelligent and exemplary professor of religion—an object, however, of Sehon's vindictive displeasure, has, (with that sacred regard to truth which influenced the minds of John C. Smith and Thomas Johnson,) voluntarily presented a certificate of what he knew, and would have testified in relation to the Whitsill accusation, had not the power, the resistless power of Episcopacy, as managed by E. W. Sehon, placed an absolute veto on every item of testimony, whereby the *accuser* might be detected in prevarication and falsehood, or the innocence of the *accused* vindicated. No wonder the Rev. gentleman was so uneasy at the presence of so many persons, whom he must have known would carefully notice and ultimately expose his conduct. No wonder he urged on the writer of this narrative, and all other persons who were summoned as witnesses on the trial, to absent themselves until the item of the charges to which their testimony might particularly relate, should be the subject of investigation. Thus coward guilt shrinks from the light, and dreads exposure to the observation of such as have independence and honesty sufficient, without connivance or dissimulation, to expose the nefarious works of darkness. Alas, how often men forget the piercing eye of Omniscience, that penetrates the inner chambers of their souls, accurately surveys the most secret wanderings of their evil imaginations, and they seem not to realize that there is no "darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves."

"*Certificate of E. Mead.* The undersigned was present at Col. Jewett's shop, at the time when John Whitsill appealed to John C. Smith to sustain his opinion of the uselessness and inconsistency of a well man taking medicine. I heard them conversing together; I did not pay a particular attention to all that might have passed between them, with any view to charging my recollection, as it was not any thing new, and I had often

heard them discourse on the subject before. Immediately after he had been talking with Smith, I heard him speak with Col. Jewett, describing his state of health, which, he said, was as good as he had ever enjoyed. he added, that he had been cured of the disease or complaint under which he had labored, by Col. Jewett's preparations, and by them only; "for," said he, "I have not taken any other medicine since I began the use of the same." In the mean time he was highly extolling those preparations, and dwelt with much emphasis on the immediate relief which he had obtained, by applying said preparations, from despondency of mind, declaring positively that he was perfectly well, and never was better in his life. I have heard him make declarations to the same amount at several other times. I was made to take particular notice of his conversation on the subject, by the peculiar animation with which he spoke, and the great applause bestowed by him on Col. Jewett's preparations, which he then declared to be invaluable.

Given under my hand, May 1st, 1835,

EDWARD MEAD.

What man, possessed of a single spark of honesty, will dare to say that the rejected testimony here produced was not in point? Can Mr. Sehon's dictatorial, tyrannical exercise of power, based on Episcopacy, turn our enlightened community stark blind? Could truth and justice be the objects of pursuit, when both were thus wantonly trampled in the dirt! Whitsill had said on the trial, "I acknowledge to the certificate until it comes to the cure"—and "that I will positively deny"—"and I positively deny ever telling any body so." Now for the relevancy of the rejected testimony.

Remark 1. In Col. Jewett's Advertiser, a certificate had been published over the signature of John Whitslll, in which he declares that "with this application alone I have been cured of the disease, and have remained in health ever since."

2. Whitsill denied this latter clause, or the word "*cured*" being in the certificate he had given, and also denied having ever made the statement verbally to any one, that he had been cured by Jewett's liniment.

3. On this ground Col. Jewett was accused of falsehood.

4. Col. Jewett, in his defence proved, that if the statement in the certificate had not been made by Whitsill, yet himself was innocent of any offence, as the certificate had been taken by Robert Cloud, and by him had passed through the hands of Dr. Hance, to Mr. Glover, the printer, and he had

never had any concern with it, only on the responsibility of Mr. Cloud he had suffered it to be published.

5. He had also proven the identity of the certificate published in the Advertiser, with that which had been given by Whitsill, as nearly as it was possible for the fact to be proven under the existing circumstances.

6. Whitsill having not only denied that the word "cured" was in the original certificate, but also having denied that he had ever told any body verbally that he had been "cured," Was not that testimony relevant which would prove that he had told the story of the cure to several persons, that he had acknowledged the cure, and that it had been effected by the liniment alone! Would not the establishment of the fact, that he had on the trial denied and contradicted what he had said to others about being cured, have gone to prove presumptively, independent of the strong and direct testimony of Mr. Cloud, that he had made the statement in the original certificate obtained by Mr. Cloud.

7. Would not the admission of the rejected testimony have gone far, in ratifying and confirming the truth of Mr. Cloud's testimony before the committee, and have demonstrated that, if there was any lying going on in relation to the concern, that it was to be looked for between Robert Cloud and John Whitsill, and that Col. Jewett was perfectly innocent?

8. Does not the rejected testimony of Thomas Johnson, John C. Smith, and Edward Mead, here given in the form of certificates, demonstrate to the satisfaction of every honest man, that John Whitsill has grossly committed himself? It devolves on him to reconcile such flagrant contradiction, instead of lending himself as a catspaw, a mere tool, to drag the innocent into the vortex of his own inconsistencies.

9. Who that reads and reflects with candor, can refuse to acquiesce in the concession of one of the members of the committee. We are advised that since the trial, one of the committee has stated his opinion explicitly, that the "doctors were the cause of all the difficulty—that the committee did not all believe that Col. Jewett had told a falsehood—that Mr. Sehon claimed the right to decide, and would not suffer the committee to consider the testimony on the part of Col. Jewett, as any thing in his favor."

10. Notwithstanding the high-handed usurpation and clerical insolence of E. W. Sehon, it is probable that under the existing economy his extraordinary course, should it be examined by the Conference, may be sustained, and his episcopal violence remain unrestrained.—We are sensible that men love power,

and should the Conference censure him, it would seem to be a drawback upon their own sovereignty. Men in possession of power, civil or ecclesiastical, are more inclined to go forward a mile in the road of oppression, than to recede a single step from the height to which they may have ascended. No reflection is intended to be cast on the worthy men who may compose that respectable body; but, admitting their disposition to be correct, such are the impediments in the way of justice, according to the usual process of episcopal prosecutions, it is scarcely possible that the full merits of such a case should ever be fairly spread before them.

11. One consolation remains to our abused and persecuted friend, whose extraordinary success in the removal of disease has astonished his friends, astounded his enemies, and compelled medical opposition to quail before him. The whole posse of clerical and infidel persecutors have not been able to blight his fair fame, tarnish his moral reputation, or impede the triumph of his discoveries. He continues his accustomed liberality among the suffering poor.

Intaminatis fulget honoribus. Avarice, envy, pride and malice, vainly combine to becloud his inroad, or pollute the unimpeachable correctness of his character. E. W. Sehon, John Miller, and Mr. Crist, are too weak and inefficient a *tryo*, to assault successfully the moral or religious reputation of Col. Jewett. In butting at him, they dash against a rock. In biting at him, the viper gnaws a file.

John Miller makes a distinguished figure in the third item of specifications of falsehood, which we will now give, *verbatim et literatim*, as presented against Col. Jewett, to substantiate the charge of falsehood.

3d. "In publishing in the same work mentioned above, a certificate said by him to have been given by John Miller."

This certificate we have given *in extenso* in the first edition of the first part of the "Clergyman examined;" but, lest the reader should loose sight of the facts connected with this Miller business, we will repeat or transcribe the same at this place; that, being fresh on the mind of the reader, he may more easily comprehend the mystery of iniquity connected with these infamous transactions. It reads thus,

"Nancy Miller, a daughter of mine, aged 17 years, was, two and an half years ago, afflicted with scald head. At first, little sores appeared all over the head, and her hair came off. Drs. Wright, Parsons, and Sisson, attended her more or less for two years. Dr. Edmonston was twice called. All these phy-

sicians agreed, that in her case there could be no effectual relief. One of these gentlemen said, there was not a physician in the United States could effect a cure. In the month of June last, an application of Jewett's cerate, No. 1, was made and continued for a month, with favorable effect; then cerate No. 2, was applied, with the powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett, with the most salutary effect. In two months from the commencement of these applications, a complete cure was effected. During the whole time of using the medicine, her general health remained good and unimpaired. It should be noted, that the whole surface of her head was affected to the thickness of a man's hand, spread over with numerous boils, attended with redness and great heat."

JOHN MILLER.

Witness against Jewett—John Miller. Miller came forward. and no doubt having been well drilled from some quarter, which we shall now forbear even to guess about, promptly and pointedly declared that he had never signed such a certificate, nor told any body verbally any such story. Notwithstanding these declarations by Miller, the restless spirit of E. W. Sehon was so intent on the downfall of Col. Jewett, that he led the way of interrogations, and inquired of Miller, "did you sign this certificate?"

Ans. *No, Sir, I never did.*" I never signed *any*, to the best of my knowledge."

Ques. by Grubb. "Did you ever"—[hesitatingly] "you never signed any writing did you?"

Ans. "Not to the best of my knowledge."

Ques. by Grubb. "Did you ever make any statements about physicians attending your daughter?"

Ans. "I never did," ****** "I believe·"

Ques. by Jewett: "Did you ever tell any body, at any other time, that the doctors had attended your daughter?"

Ans. "No, sir."

Witness. Mrs. Miller, wife of J. Miller. "I told Jewett that nobody attended her. Brother Cloud came—asked me about the doctors, and I told him none had attended her. I told him we put on Jewett's salve, and it made her head feel cool and comfortable."

Ques. by Mr. Grubb. "Did you tell Jewett when you first came, that no doctors attended her?"

Ans. "I did."

Again. "Was your daughter's head as stated in that certificate?"

Mr. Sehon continued the question, "covered over with numerous boils?"

Ans. "No, sir, and Jewett knows it"—"*it was swelled up in lumps all round, which would rise as thick as my finger, and they would break and run.*"

Reflecting persons will naturally inquire what bearing this kind of testimony has on the question, whether Miller had ever signed the certificate or not? Most certainly it is totally irrelevant. But it shows conclusively how much Mr. Sehon delighted to dabble in dirty water—how willing he was to fasten a stigma on Col. Jewett, by attempting to show that he had misrepresented the case.

It is curious to see, that while the witness contradicts the statement in John Miller's certificate, that her daughter's head was covered over with something which was called "numerous boils;" in the same, or next breath, she confirms the fact, and says, "it was swelled up in *lumps all round*, which would rise as thick as my *finger*, and they would *break and run*.,'

In this futile attempt to blacken the reputation of the defendant, who does not feel forcibly the truth asserted by one of God's ancient and afflicted servants, "He disappointeth the devices of the crafty, so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise. He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong. They meet with darkness in the day time, and grope in the noon day as in the night."—Job v. 12, 13, 14.

The prosecutors having sported with this irrelevant kind of testimony to the end of their string, and sinned, as the son of Amos would say, "as it were with a cart rope," they took courage to venture up a little nearer to the point.

Here the reader must recollect, that on the trial of Miller, as stated in the former part of this work, Edward Mead had testified that he was present when the certificate concerning Nancy Miller was taken, and saw John Miller sign it. He had also previously made oath to the fact before a magistrate in this city; and the certificate, confirmed by the said oath, had appeared in one of our public papers. John C. Smith, Mrs. Sellers and myself, had heard concessions from his own lips similar to what had appeared in the Advertiser. Miller had denied publicly and positively, not only that he had signed the certificate, but that he ever, at any time, had stated any thing of the kind to any one. The prosecutors were aware, that notwithstanding this array of testimony against John Miller, the committee appointed for his trial had acquitted him, in subserviency

to the dictation of Mr. Sehon. So heavily had public opinion set against such glaring absurdity and palpable wickedness, it now became necessary to revert back to Miller's trial, and justify the decision made in his case. In order to effect the object in view, it became necessary to invalidate the oath and subsequent affirmation of Edward Mead. Accordingly the committee who had made the decision, and on whom the reproach fell, and who felt a deep and restless interest in wiping themselves clean, were called forward. It was well known that on the charge then pending, the defendant would avail himself of the testimony that had been given on Miller's trial; of course the testimony of Edward Mead, who had sworn that he had seen Miller sign the certificate that had been published in "Jewett's Advertiser," was anticipated. Probably fearing that this latter committee would have more independence than the former, it was an all absorbing desideratum to invalidate its force, and prejudice the minds of the committee against the credulity of the witness, before he should be heard; for if this last committee should receive testimony the first had rejected, it would place the two committees in an awkward position in relation to each other. Should Mr. Mead's testimony be admitted without pruning or smutting, the decision of the first committee would exhibit all its inherent deformity, and subject them to the just rebuke of all honest and discerning men. These considerations must have presented powerful inducements to make a bold stand, a desperate effort, to evade the censure they must have foreseen was gathering round them. Mr. Sehon assumed to be their protector, in the exercise of his pontifical authority, determined that their testimony was admissable and relevant, and we agree, however unjust, it was, to say the least, a political precaution to take this step, and place it as a fulcrum to rest the lever of his power upon, to raise these men out of the horrible pit and miry clay. Mr. Sehon was all alive on this business. He had culled the copy of Miller's certificate, published in Jewett's Advertiser, and the copy that I had transcribed, but never published, which he had obtained from the printing office, *two certificates*. This was a distinction, I must candidly say, I did not understand, until after the labored explanation and eloquent disquisition of the reverend divine.—That which was published in the Advertiser had a clause, as we have noticed in a former part of this work, that read thus, "The powders usually prescribed by Col. Jewett." In the copy furnished by the printer, which had been intended for another work, (in order that it might be understood) in transcribing

it, it was rendered "Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian medicine;" which is precisely the same thing. The original certificate, which Miller had actually signed, had been lost or destroyed by the printer. When the question was proposed by Mr. Sehon, on Miller's trial, "which of the two certificates did Miller sign?" It was so proposed, and under such circumstances, that I must confess I did not readily comprehend the meaning or intention thereof. Mr. Mead, I thought, did not understand it. He could not properly be said to hesitate: though he made no instant reply, he appeared attentively to listen—the question was suddenly reiterated, and Mr. Mead promptly and unhesitatingly replied, "the one published in the Advertiser." Having made these preliminary observations, the way is prepared to introduce the testimony of Mr. Sehon's committee, viz. George McCormick, Wm. Armstrong, and Jonas E. Rudisill.

Witness. G. McCormick. "Armstrong asked him twice which certificate he saw Miller sign, and he [Mead] said he was'nt certain, but thought it was the one in the Advertiser."

Witness. Wm. Armstrong. "I asked the boy which he could identify, he hesitated, and said he wasn't certain."

Witness. Jonas E. Rudisill. "Edward Mead was asked by Armstrong, which of the two certificates he saw Miller sign; I sat very near to him, and I thought he said distinctly he could not tell, but thought it was the one in Jewett's Advertiser."

Thus these interested witnesses, aided and assisted Mr. Sehon in his vindictive course, by endeavoring to invalidate the testimony of Edward Mead, an intelligent and interesting youth, whose discreet behaviour and religious reputation, remain untarnished, even in the rude hands of those who appeared willing to assail, and even to assassinate his unblemished character.

On this artful, designing course, commentary is useless. Cicero's rule of decision is a good one, "*Non numero hæc judicanter sed pondere.*" It is not by the number of witnesses, but by the weight, or worth of their testimony, that these things are to be judged. On the part of the defendant, the first witness on this point was Robert Cloud. He said, "I sat further off than any of you, and I understood him to say distinctly, 'the one in the Advertiser.'"

Witness. T. Hersey. I was present at the trial, and when Mr. Sehon put the question to the lad, he did not appear to hear it understandingly; I recollect that he asked what it

was; it was repeated, and he answered promptly, and without the least hesitation, "the one in the Advertiser."

Witness. Edward Mead. "I do not recollect that Mr. Armstrong asked me that question; I do not deny that he did; but I don't remember any thing about it. When Mr. Sehon asked me, I answered, without the least hesitation, the one in the Advertiser. I knew nothing about the other certificate. I answered distinctly, and *you* (Mr. Sehon) *must know it.*"

Witness. Elijah Glover. "I was setting close to him [E. Mead] when the papers were held up, and Mr. Sehon asked him which one he saw Miller sign—he said the one published in the Advertiser. I considered that the question was put to entrap him—I looked him full in the face, and he answered distinctly."

Ques. by Jewett. "Are you confident?"

Ans. "I am confident."

It is worthy of remark, that Elijah Glover, whose testimony no decent man who is acquainted with him will have the assurance to contradict, was sitting in a seat immediately before Edward Mead, and was looking him full in the face at the time when he made the answer, and by no means liable to be mistaken as to the fact he has so clearly stated.

Witness. John C. Smith. "He [Miller] came into the shop sometime last summer, and inquired for Col. Jewett. He began talking about the doctors. He said that Nancy's head was cured by Jewett's salve. He said, he had just seen Dr. Wright, and he had told Wright that the Colonel's salve had cured his daughter's head, and the Dr. said it had not, but that it got well of itself. I cannot say whether Miller said the doctors had attended her or not—I don't know."

Witness. T. Hersey. "Now I am before the committee, I will just state the appearance of the head when I saw it. A large surface of scrofulous tumors appeared to be huffed up like a honey comb. I cannot say with certainty as to the thickness; but it was the worst case of scald head I ever have seen during a practice of more than forty years. I would not say that the statement made in the certificate, was much, if any thing exaggerated. It was much swoollen, and she complained of great heat. Some time afterwards, I was in the Colonel's office, and Mr. Miller came in; considerable conversation took place. He mentioned that the hair had began to grow prettily on his daughter's head; which I considered an extraordinary circumstance. He said, that Dr. Wright had said, that it got well of itself. When I saw the certificate, I was under a full impres-

sion that no exaggeration had been made in relation to her case."

Ques. by Jewett. "Do you remember that Miller said any thing about the doctors having attended her?"

Ans. "I don't know; but, from the manner in which he told the story, I felt confident that it was so. He told it with much animation; and all present appeared to be much pleased to hear it."

Ques. by Jewett. "Did you not hear Mrs. Sellars make her statements relating to it?"

Ans. I was present at the taking of her certificate, and when the oath was administered."

Mrs. Sellars' testimony was then read; but Mr. Sehon rejected it as being irrelevant, and accused her of saying things in a former certificate not mentioned in this. But nothing like a contradiction was discovered. Could I have had the privilege of seeing the other, I would have cheerfully transcribed it, and let the reader compare it with the one produced on the trial. The copy given on the 13th page of this work, was the one offered by the defendant, and which Mr. Sehon with pompous indignity cast away.

Witness. Edward Mead. "I was at the shop when John Miller came in to certify respecting the cure of his daughter. I saw Col. Jewett write the certificate from Miller's words; I heard it read to him, and I saw Miller sign it."

Here we have conclusive testimony that John Miller did give a certificate concerning the cure of his daughter. It was fully proven on the trial that he had given the certificate in question; that he had told others the same story; but he denied ever signing any certificate in the case, of any description, or that he had ever related the things therein certified, to any one verbally. But Miller's *ipse dixit*, notwithstanding the formidable array of testimony against him, the strong presumptive evidence of circumstances, to show his arrant falsehood, in denying not only his words but his signature, and to which should be added, his well known doubtful reputation as a man of truth, places the sovereign arbiter of the destiny of the conflicting parties, in quite a conspicuous point of light. This is the man that Mr Sehon sustains through thick and thin; whose moral reputation he so boldly announced to be as good as his own. And is it possible that E. W. Sehon, the sprightly, gifted, popular, *Episcopal* Methodist preacher, has let himself down to a level with John Miller and his wife, and the motley tribe of infidel opposers of Col. Jewett, who have been the instigators of this ridi-

culous persecution? What a group! *Miserabile vulgus!* And a reverend clergyman a leader of the whole pack; and he himself bays the defendant, and with a constant growl snuffs his track from door to door! What a hue and cry has been raised! The mountain labored and a mole was born!

After Mr. Sehon had enlarged so much on the goodness of John Miller's character, and peremptorily declared, "*without any hesitation*," that his standing was as good as his own, Col. Jewett then wished to bring forward testimony that would still further, if possible, invalidate what Miller had said on the trial. Mr. Joseph Hunter was called upon, or presented as a witness, to testify what he knew, and believed to be the standing of John Miller, as a man of truth. Mr. Sehon as naturally recoiled from such testimony, as the sensitive plant from the human touch; he did not wish to have a portrait of his moral features drawn by Mr. Hunter. There are others also who are well acquainted with John Miller, that could have unravelled a mystery of iniquity, that might have caused even Mr. Sehon to have shrunk from the comparison he had drawn; and if a blush of shame could have mantled on his face, testimony could have been produced, to give such blush a lively glow.

The words of Mr. Sehon on this point were to this effect, and I think I have them *verbatim*: "*John Miller's character is as good as Col. Jewett's, or my own, and he is in as good standing as either of us.*" But such is the fickleness of men's opinions and such the precarious tenure of assumed consequentialness, that if Mr. Miller should now let himself down to Mr. Sehon's level, and reverse, and reciprocate the compliment, his testimony, however incredible before, might, in the estimation of some, appear in the latter case more incredible than in the former.

The following certificate may serve to give the reader some further conception of the peculiar purity and excellence of John Miller's reputation for veracity:

COLUMBUS CITY, May 19th, 1835.

This may certify that the undersigned, always willing to do justice to all men, having heard with much disgust, that the testimony of John Miller had been received by the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, against Col. M. Jewett, to prove the charge of falsehood, I have thought proper, at the suggestion of a friend, to state the fact, that I have been acquainted with John Miller from the time he was a boy. His general character has been, that he was addicted to falsehood; that he was seldom to be believed, and he has been notorious for other

conduct, which, in my opinion, is equally dishonorable and wicked. I know that I would not be willing to take his word on any occasion where he could have the least temptation to shun the truth. Given under my hand,

JOHN REYNOLDS.

The credibility of John Miller's testimony, in relation to the case of his daughter, which has been admitted for the condemnation and excommunication of Col. M. Jewett from the M. E. Church, will appear in a very clear point of light, by a careful perusal of the subjoined certificate of John Fulton and his wife. Remember, that Miller as pointedly denied ever having made such assertions to any one, as he did the signing of the certificate. What a scale is here furnished for Mr. Sehon to graduate his own reputation! He has openly and publicly drawn the comparison, and if he turns away from the prototype of his own selection, he must work his passage through the numerous difficulties that surround his path, to the best advantage in his power.

(CERTIFICATE.)

About the first of August last, John Miller and his wife came to my house: during the time they were there, some conversation took place respecting Nancy Miller, the daughter of John Miller, having the scald head. Miller and wife both stated that Col. Jewett had cured it with his salve; that he had employed the doctors in Columbus to attend on her, but they could do her no good. I particularly recollect Miller to have mentioned Parsons and Sisson, as being the doctors; and he had paid more money to them for her, than all the rest of his family.

his
JOHN ⋈ FULTON.
mark

Witness: ELIJAH P. ZINN.

I was present at the conversation mentioned above. I recollect Miller and wife to have mentioned Parsons in particular, but the name of the other doctor I do not distinctly recollect.

her
MARGARET ⋈ FULTON.
mark

Witness. ELIJAH P. ZINN.

We now approach the 4th and last charge; the mammoth crime; big with the fate of Col. Jewett and his chimical compounds. As the Rev. E. W. Sehon wished to have the Colonel

tried on this charge first, though it was the last in the catalogue of accusations, it is plain that in his estimation it was the cardinal offence, the sheet anchor of his hopes of success against an unoffending citizen. As he announced the charge, he termed it a "*base slander.*" We saw the storm that was brewing; the cloud gathered and burst in loud vociferations. He had been so active in getting up the charge, and licking it into shape, he was determined to present the cub a full grown bear.

This fourth item of falsehood preferred against Col. Jewett, reads thus:

4. "In stating that he had cured an infant child of Mrs. Compson of the venereal disease; and also, in further asserting that one of her children had died of the same disease."

On hearing the above charge, curiosity was excited to know how the long sleeping rumor relative to this family disaster, had been again put afloat on the public ear. In attending to the sequel of the story, the reader will not wonder that a fragment of the parliamentary eloquence of lord Brougham, that lingered on our recollection, should be revived in all its native force and energy. This illustrious statesman once remarked in the British Parliament, "that the man who promulgates a *confidential* communication, whether he be enjoined to keep it a secret or not, is the most debased wretch in existence, utterly unworthy the character of a gentleman, and ought to be despised by every high-minded honorable man." Such were the dignified sentiments of that noble lord, whose strong, energetic mind, has given a powerful impulse to the general current of political affairs, and exercised a peculiar influence over the destinies of England and of Europe. The whole civilized world have long admired his talents, and felt, in some form, an impulse that his mighty intellect is calculated to impart to far distant objects. We cannot but feel the impression his eloquence has often infused among a listening auditory. The reader who cannot perceive how applicable the above quotation is to the present occasion, must be unfortunately blind. For illustration, we will just remark—My friend makes a communication to me concerning a neighbor; mentions some reports that are unpleasant, and disreputable to the individual or family; I know that he esteems me as a gentleman, an upright, honorable man; I know he places the most implicit confidence in my fidelity; he believes I have a high sense of propriety, and that my breast will be a faithful and safe depository of the deepest secrets of his soul; I am sensible that he would think he was offering an insult to my understanding, with a childish

scrupulosity to enjoin on me a pledge of secrecy: he would feel abased thus to suspect or impugn my moral feelings, by an indirect intimation that he thought me capable of violating the trust his high opinion of my good sense and apprehensions of propriety had induced him to repose in me; if under such circumstances, I would undertake to circulate the report as a "*base slander*," would I not be guilty of a dereliction of correct principles? Would I not be a base violator of the laws of civil etiquette?"

The following letter, under date of May 10th, 1835, will cast some light on the subject of our present enquiries:

"To Dr. HERSEY:

Sir, In answer to several questions which you have propounded, I hasten to give you the most concise and satisfactory information in my power. Suffice it to say, that I saw a list of the charges against Col. M. Jewett, in the hand writing of Mr. E. W. Sehon, immediately after they were put into his hand. I knew the writing to be Mr. Sehon's, though the charges, when made, were signed J. M. C. Haseltine. This was a mere formality, for the notice was countersigned below,

E. W. SEHON, *Stationed Preacher*."

After looking over the charges, and thinking seriously on the subject, as the last charge of falsehood seemed to purport that it had been preferred against the Colonel by Mrs. Compson, the most natural conclusion was, that she had complained of being slandered. Still I had my doubts. I had seen so many singular and exceptionable movements in the late prosecution of members of the Methodist Episcopal church in this city, I was determined to be satisfied in my own mind how things were going forward. Accordingly, on the next morning, I called on Mrs. Compson, resolved to ascertain the facts in relation to this charge. I told her that I understood that Mr. Sehon and Dr. Parsons had made her a visit the day before, to see about some reports that were circulating respecting herself and family. She replied, "Yes, Mr. Sehon and Dr. Parsons were here. Mr. Sehon told me that Col. Jewett had been telling some very bad stories about me and my family, and that he was trying to injure me all that he could. I was surprised, (said she) to think that Col. Jewett should try to injure me, as I had never done him any harm, and could not think what Mr. Sehon meant. I finally told him that Col. Jewett meant no harm by that, supposing (as I also inferred from her whole conversation,) that what Mr. Sehon had reference to, was Col.

Jewett's coming here, and frequently calling this little child, (alluding to the one present,) his child, as he often does in speaking of children; he often calls them 'my children,' 'my little girl,' or 'my little boy;' this he frequently does wherever he goes." "I knew that Col. Jewett did not mean to insinuate that he was the father of the child." "I told Mr. Sehon I thought nothing of that." "Mr. Sehon and the doctor soon went out and left me, and I was as much in the dark about the object of Mr. Sehon's visit, as I was before he came." Mrs. Compson remarked further, "I thought I would ask Mr. Sehon what he wanted, what the object of his visit was, but (said she) I neglected it; I was very sorry that I did not ask him more about it, that I might have known what he came here for." I remarked to Mrs. Compson, that Dr. Parsons said, "she felt very bad about it." She said, "she did feel very bad, for she could not think what stories Col. Jewett should have told to injure her." I then replied, that what she had been talking about, was not what Mr. Sehon meant; that he had preferred several charges against the Colonel, accusing him of falsehood; among these charges, there was one appeared as if it was made by her; it was a complaint of "*slander.*" She said, "she knew nothing about it;" and asked me, "what stories the Colonel had been telling." I told her, the charge was for reporting that "her child that died some time ago, and the one that he had cured, had had the bad disorder, (*venereal disease,*) in consequence of Compson having taken it in Cincinnati." She said "Mr. Sehon never told her any thing of the kind, and that then was the first time that she ever knew any thing about it, or that there ever was a report of the kind in circulation." She said, further, "that she did not know there were any charges against Col. Jewett in the church, or that her name had been mentioned at all," (in any of their concerns, was her meaning.) She denied Compson's ever having the disease at Cincinnati or elsewhere, for she said, "if he had had the complaint, she would have known it."

Before seeing her that morning, I used the precaution to see a gentleman who was with Compson at the time referred to, in Cincinnati—from him I learned the truth of the whole matter, relative to Compson.

Believing that this gentleman would be called upon to give testimony on the approaching trial, and from motives of friendship I had entertained for her and her deceased husband, and finding that she knew nothing about the matter, or the probable result; having a desire to spare her feelings, and wishing, if

possible to prevent the mortification of a public exposure of certain facts, which I thought would be sustained by testimony, I told her that I thought she had better see Sehon, and try and have that charge withdrawn, as it was very probable the Colonel would try to prove himself clear of falsehood; and that, if there was any evidence to be had, he certainly would have it. She asked me if it could be done, or if I thought it could be done, (viz. if the charge could be withdrawn?) I replied, that I thought it could be effected by seeing Mr. Sehon. She said "she did not want to have her name mentioned in their church trials." "She said repeatedly, that it was the first time that she had ever known that there ever had been any report of the kind in circulation, and she wished not to have any thing to do with it; the story was without foundation, and that the charge was brought without her knowledge or consent," or words to that amount. I then told her, that if I had been correctly informed, or that if the stories I had heard were true, there had been some base *lies* told about this business. I told her that it was very evident that Col. Jewett was not the first one who had reported the story; that it had been reported by others, a long time before the Colonel ever mentioned it; that I had been credibly informed that a physician had said the child's death was caused by the disease, in consequence of the father being very bad with it for some time previous to its birth. She, however, insisted that it was the first time she had ever any knowledge of it, and appeared to be surprised to learn that such a report was in circulation.

Among many other things, she said that Col. Jewett's salve helped the child; that it had done it a great deal of good; and if she had applied it as she ought to have done, she believed that it would have cured the child entirely; but, she said she did not apply it as she should have done, therefore, some time after the application had been made, the child broke out again, and she, not having any salve, applied to Dr. Wright, who gave her some medicine that cured it entirely.

In the afternoon of the same day, having been informed that E. W. Sehon and Wm. Armstrong had been to see her, and apprehending in my own mind, the secret purpose or object of their visit, I embraced an opportunity and called on her again, to learn by observation and her testimony, how these gentlemen were managing business with the woman.

At this interview, I said to her, "I understand that Mr. Sehon has been here again to see you?" "Yes," said she, (*in a very angry tone,*) "Mr. Sehon says that Col. Jewett told him,

and has been telling others, that Compson had the bad disease, and that was what ailed the child, and its a lie; I don't thank Col. Jewett for telling such lies about me and my family; I can't see what good it can do him; I have never done him any injury in my life, and" said she, "Compson never had the disease. There was Mr. ——— and Mr. ——— who were with him in Cincinnati, who would say that Compson was well the whole time he was there, with the exception of a day or two of sickness, which was in consequence of hard drinking." She said that she had told Sehon that I had said that "*he was a base liar;* and that Dr. Wright was the first one that reported the story." I then said that I had not told her so, and accurately repeated what I had before said, and she then acknowledged that I was correct: but her mind was so disturbed and confused upon Mr. Sehon's making her another visit, that I discovered she was in pretty much of a sweat, and hardly knew what to say. She informed me that Mr. Sehon told her that she must attend on the trial, and give her testimony in the case. As angry as she was, she said "she did not like to go, and would not if she could avoid it."

I told her plainly that I had seen Mr. ——— and Mr. ——, and that they had informed me that such and such were the facts relative to Compson. She rejoined that "they would not tell her so," and added, that "they had never told me so." I calmly told her that I had heard by several respectable old ladies, that such was the report a long time ago." At these suggestions, her wrath appeased, she said, "she wondered how it could be, and she not know it."

She again repeated that she could not see what Sehon came there for, the first time he came, and that she wondered why he did not tell her. She added, that she did not want her name to be brought in on the trial, for she wished not to have any thing to do with it, and if she could have the charge withdrawn, she would. After telling her what I considered the object of the persecution raised against Col. Jewett, and her anger having apparently subsided in some good degree, I left her to her own reflections. However, it should here be noticed, that on the same day J. M. C. Hazeltine visited her, for the purpose, as one might suppose, of sympathising with her for the late loss of character she had sustained; but, whether this was the case or not, it became very evident, that by some means, her wrath was again kindled to a blaze; she appeared at the trial against Col. Jewett. You must recollect that she testified on that day that "Col. Jewett's salve had not done the child any good;"

and further, "that if she had continued it, she believed the child would have lost the use of its limbs entirely, and that Dr. Wright cured the child by giving it medicine once only."

Yours respctfully, J. C. SMITH.

Thus has Mr. Smith endeavored, with all fairness and plainness possible, to give a full understanding of the workings of Mrs. Compson's mind in relation to this dirty business. We can easily make our own inferences. We can easily judge who it is that has raised all the noise, and got the tale of scandal revived, and caused it to be circulated in churches, public gatherings, tap room clubs, and the boring meetings of those who take an interest in keeping the ball of slander bounding from Dan to Bersheba.

Witness. Mr. Sehon. Mr. Sehon arose, and in a vehement exordium to his testimony, alluding to the offence named in the charge, called it a "base slander;" and proceeded to say, that "Ira Bronson said, that Col. Jewett said that he had not told any other person beside Mr. Sehon." He added, "some four months ago Jewett told me that Mrs. Compson's child had had an *hereditary venereal disease*, that he had cured said disease in said child, and that one of the children had died of the same disease."

Immediately on the recital of this testimony, Col. Jewett interfered, and stated that Mr. Sehon now appeared in his true character, as *prosecutor*, *witness* and *judge*. He protested against his remaining any longer as the presiding officer on the trial. At first the preacher, whose feelings were evidently touched in a sore place, appeared to quail beneath the lash thus warmly applied; for a few minutes he was evidently staggered in his course; reaction soon succeeded; his vindictive ire was again roused, and in the most peremptory manner, he ordered the Colonel to take his seat. He repeated the imperious mandate, "sit down," "I tell you to sit down," in a most authoritative manner. The Colonel, who by the way has a very good knowledge of human nature, availed himself of his weakness. He knew how to stir the boiling cauldron of his wrath, and keep his avenging passions warm. From the scene of confusion that prevailed on the occasion, we were ready to exclaim, as we gazed at the enraged and determined clergyman, in the language of the Avon Bard,

"Oh wad some pow'r the giftie gie us,
To see oursels as others see us,
It wad from mony a blunder free us
And foolish notion!"

Witness. Bela Latham, Esq. He stated that some time during the setting of the Ohio Legislature, Col. Jewett had stated a case to him of a young man at Mr. H's, and then stated the case of Mrs. Compson's child. He said it was healed up, but Dr. Wright had given it some medicine which had brought out the disease again. He observed, however, that no blame could be attached to the woman; that her husband had communicated it to her, and that he got it in Cincinnati."

Mr. Sehon, addressing himself to the witness, said, "Mr. Latham, he told you that the child had the hereditary venereal disease!!"

Mr. Latham modestly replied in much the same language he had stated before.

Esq. Latham's testimony, brought forward by the prosecution, clearly demonstrates the interesting fact, that Col. Jewett never had the remotest design to injure Mrs. Compson; so far from it, he exonerates her and her juvenile charge from the slightest imputation of crime; exhibits them as perfectly innocent. "He observed," said Mr. Latham, that "*no blame could be attached to the woman.*"

Witness. Chester Mattoon. "Jewett told me," said Mr. Mattoon, "that the child had the venereal disease, and he had cured it."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "Was it told in private confidence?"

Ans. "I did not think it so."

Ques. by Jewett. "Did I state I knew it, or, that it was so reported?"

Ans. "He stated that it had the disease, and he had cured it."

Witness. Dr. Wright. *Ques.* by Mr. Sehon. "Was it the venereal disease the child was afflicted with?"

Ans. "It was not, sir, to my knowledge. Mrs. Compson, I believe, had been well, and the child was also very healthy. Some three or four months ago, I was attending on a respectable person, who asked me if Col. Jewett's liniment had not cured a case of the venereal disease, and said that the Colonel had effected a cure; he had stated it to be a case of the worst kind. I told them it was a falsehood; that the child was at home and healthy. Mrs. Compson came to my office about two weeks after I had heard the report, with the child; it had then about half a dozen puscular eruptions on the feet and legs; I gave her some medicine; she sent for me; but I heard no more about it. I told her I thought it had been attended by Col. Jew-

ett. She said he came to see it; and persuaded her to consent to have it rubbed."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "I suppose, doctor, a child could not be born with the disease, without the doctor knowing it?"

Ans. "Well, I suppose not." **** [mirabile dictu!!]

Witness. Dr. Awl. *Ques.* by Mr. Sehon. "Could not a doctor be able to judge whether a child had the disease or not?"

Ans. "Any medical man could judge between perfect health and the venereal taint."

Ques. by Mr. Sehon. "You think they could distinguish?"

Ans. "Yes sir." [Listen for a moment! [*Tu quoque Brute!*]

Witness. T. Hersey. "About the commencement of the medical treatment of the child by Col. Jewett, I recollect that one Sunday evening after meeting, I met with Col. Jewett in the street as I was passing along; he observed to me that he had a little patient he wished me to see; that he suspected it to be afflicted with the venereal disease or taint; he mentioned that it had been commonly or currently reported that the father of the child had it pretty bad. He spoke cautiously on the subject. I recollect that he said the woman was not to blame, or had never been censured on that account, that he knew of. She was not to blame for his conduct." [Here my testimony was interrupted, and in one or two of the last sentences the minutes are very imperfect. I here name the facts, and further state that Col. Jewett mentioned that it was a delicate subject, and not to be publicly spoken of, as it might injure the woman; but she could not help what her husband had done. In passing along to the house we had a very particular conversation on the subject; he manifested tenderness and friendship toward the woman; said what he was doing he was doing gratuitously for the widow and the fatherless; that he believed it was a venereal complaint; the idea was, (though he did not speak with that technical accuracy that an accurate Nosologist might have done,) that the disease was an anamolous complaint, the effect of an hereditary taint. He appeared to entertain the idea that these effects were radically of the same nature with the original complaint, only the disease in this state assumed a new form or was differently modified. I was in the confidence of the Colonel. I received the whole communication confidentially, from the nature of the case, and the precautionary disposition that every honorable man ought to possess, as the only sure preventive of being enrolled among tale bearers and slanderers. I never developed a syllable of the conversation to any

one living, until this preposterous excitement was got up against the Colonel. All this, and much more, I could and would have testified, but for the untiring zeal and violence of Mr. Sehon, who overruled every thing to suit himself, in defiance of all the laws of honor, justice or propriety.] I recollect that I stated to the committee as stated in the minutes, that at the Colonel's request I attended him to the house of Mrs. Compson, to see the little patient; that I examined the child; that I thought it possible, and very probable, it was the effect of a venereal complaint; that such were my impressions; that I recollected distinctly the appearance of the sores when I first saw them, though I was informed they were not as bad in appearance as they had been. The sores were a scabby, watery eruption; they were encrusted or covered over with scabs, and had an angry appearance. I stated to the Colonel my impression at the time, and told him that I was more inclined to the opinion that it might be a venereal taint, from the very strong resemblance in the appearance of the eruptions to what I had witnessed in my practice in a family about 36 years ago, where the children were afflicted in a similar manner, which I then ascertained to a certainty, was a venereal taint. Here I was abruptly interrupted by Mr. Sehon. He told me "he did not want to hear western Pennsylvania, Virginia, nor Ohio stories; did you say it was the venereal disease?"

I replied, "I had seen cases so exactly similar, that from all the circumstances, I thought it possible, and highly probable, that it might have been the case in this instance."

As Mr. Sehon declined hearing Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Ohio stories, or any thing else that he did not think he could manage to the condemnation of Col. Jewett, and the degrading of his liniments, it was literally impossible that a fair, uninterrupted, unabused testimony, should be given on the part of the defendant.

Some time in the course of the preceding season, I called in with Col. Jewett to see the child, after it had got well; the child appeared healthy at that time. From the general tenor of the conversation had with Mrs. Compson, I was induced to believe that the application she had made of Col. Jewett's liniment, had in reality cured the child. I distinctly understood this to be her idea. Never suspecting that any dispute would arise in relation to the case, I did not feel that there could be any necessity of charging my mind minutely to recollect the precise words that were uttered on the occasion. She appeared disposed to apologise for having consulted Dr. Wright, and she

said that "all that Dr. Wright did for it was to give it some sulphur, and ordered her to wash the child in soap suds."

On retiring from the house, a conversation occurred similar to what I have stated above, that happened on a former occasion. The disposition of the Colonel towards Mrs. Compson, appeared perfectly friendly. He retained his former sentiments in relation to the nature of the complaint, and considered the case as furnishing additional evidence that his venereal preparation had reached far in curing so obstinate a complaint. With this success he appeared to be much elated. He rejoiced in the prospect of being able to extend relief to suffering humanity, in a way novel, easy and effectual. The conversation was of such a character, that I never breathed a syllable to any one. To me, the golden rule prescribed by our Saviour, was a sufficient prohibition.

Several of the preceding facts were named before the committee, but they were all ranked with Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Ohio stories, which the high priest did not wish to hear. It appears that such kind of testimony was thought to be irrelevant, while the sentences, "*It was not sir, to my knowledge*," and the "I suppose not" of Dr. Wright—with the opinion of Dr. Awl, that "a medical man could judge between perfect health and the venereal taint," was undoubtedly in point, and fully confirmed the character of Col. Jewett to be that of a wilful, malicious liar!—A "*base slanderer!*"

Witness, *Mrs. Compson.* "Col. Jewett did not cure the child. He gave me a box of salve, and that was all he did to it. I rubbed it on. Col. Jewett did not cure it. Dr. Wright cured it. The salve made it *ten times worse*, and I believe, if I had used it any more, the child would have lost the use of its limbs. I sent the child to Dr. Wright." [Dr. Wright said, "*Mrs. Compson came to my office with the child!*"]

Ques. by Sehon. "Did Jewett ever say any thing about the child's having that disease?"

Ans. "No sir."

Ques. by Sehon. "Had you a child that died of the same complaint?"

Ans. "I had a child died, but not of the same complaint at all. I believe, if I had continued using it, [the liniment,] the child would have been ruined."

Ques. by Sehon. "Did not Jewett come with some great man from the East, to whom he boasted of the great cure he had performed? and did you tell him he had not cured it?"

Ans. "I did tell him so, and I can prove it by Mrs. Seely."

Ques. by Sehon. "How long is it since your child died?"
Ans. "Three years last February, since it died."
Ques. by Sehon. "How old was it?"
Ans. "Three weeks."

The zeal and industry with Mr. Sehon managed this concern, was obvious to all. He artfully devised his questions so as to have the answers bear as heavily as possible against Col. Jewett and his preparations. The ghostly strength of all his priestly powers were put in requisition. He was chief engineer in marking out the road for his obsequious committee to follow. He and his runners had been busy with the woman. They had not visited a lonely widow so often without having some object in view. By some means her mind was turned into a new channel. She must have been well prepared for the course.

Though she had previously and repeatedly acknowledged the fact, of the happy effect produced on the child by Col. Jewett's liniment, and the report was received as true from the testimony of her own lips; yet, when she had been persuaded to believe that Col. Jewett was circulating a story implicating her reputation, her resentment was aroused. Who can doubt, from the repeated visits made her, that she in turn had been *irritated* until a cord was touched where feelings were born? Female sensibility, so exquisitely excited, could easily find an apology for extravagance and misrepresentation, especially when aided by a clergyman who had so *deeply* interested himself in her concerns, appeared willing to sustain the cause of the widow and the fatherless by *argumentum baculinum*. Thus far Mr. Sehon has been suffered, in our narrative, to draw his own portrait with his own pencil. If he be disgusted with the likeness, let him blame the limner, for no part of the responsibility will be assumed by any one. No man can wish to deprive him of the privilege while he continues to exhibit the original with such consummate accuracy.

Witness, *Thomas Johnson*. Mr. Johnson having observed the course that had been taken, readily perceived the fate that awaited the testimony he was prepared to give. He stated with peculiar candor, "that he did not know of any facts relating to the case that would come directly to the point;" but commenced by saying, "there was a rumor"—His testimony was instantly refused. Nothing to show that Col. Jewett had not been the originator of the slanderous reports. Nothing to extenuate the offence, or explain the ground on which the statements of the Colonel had been credited, was allowed to be relevant, or could find admission on the files of the church.

Witness, *Jacob Turney*. Witness stated that he did not know that the children had the disease, but about three years ago he was with Mr. Compson in Cincinnati, and knew that he had the disease.

His testimony was abruptly refused as being irrelevant.

We know not exactly what light might have been elicited by a thorough sounding of Mr. Turney's testimony. But, could these witnesses have been examined with a view to obtain the truth, and the whole truth, regardless of the single design of abusing Col. Jewett and his preparations, and a reckful ambition to demonstrate the resistless prowess of Methodistical Episcopacy, when arrayed against an unoffending individual, over whom it is resolved to exercise vindictive displeasure; we would cheerfully have told the story, however unpleasant might have been the effect on the mind of E. W. Sehon &c.

Witness, *Anson Smith*. "I saw the child," said Mr. Smith, "when it died—my wife was present—Esq. Martin was there—I was not certain it was the disease."

Here, *Mr. Grubb*, one of the committee, who appeared to take side with the prosecution, with peculiar wariness enquired, "Are you a judge?" and again, "Are you acquainted with it?" Mr. Smith, who makes no pretensions to medical skill, answered both these interrogations in the negative. But when asked by Col. Jewett, "Was the child broke out any?" replied positively, "*It was blotched all over*—'twas a premature birth."

Mr. Sehon felt the force of this remark—it evidently excited much uneasiness. The spleen that warnkled in his mind soon found vent and he exclaimed, "you need not go any farther sir—you may sit down—we shan't take your testimony."

Insulted and incensed at such glaring partiality as was clearly evinced, not only by the words spoken, but by the attitude, gestures and general manner in which the preacher conducted the whole concern. Col. Jewett arose and objected to the wanton favoriteism displayed by him on the occassion in relation to his rules of admitting testimony. He had no manner of patience to hear the correctness of his proceedings called in question. The latent fire of his vindictive wrath flashed in his eye and rumbled on his tongue, and in strains of clerical thunder, he commanded the Colonel to be silent. He exclaimed "you shan't gull me nor the committee:" vociferating in language loud and passionate, he made a bold stand for Episcopal supremacy, in a manner degrading to the sanctity of his high and holy profession. He drove on the trial with the rapidity of a tempest, and tore up all obstacles that could be presented to ob-

struct his course, with the resistless sweep of a tornado. He was himself the spirit of the storm and rode on the whirlwind, meditating destruction as he rolled along. In looking over this long list of testimony, and the variety of incidents embraced in the examination, who will not say that Col. Jewett was entitled to one full day to unravel the mystery of iniquity drawn up against him, repel his accusers and make the best defence in his power? But no! the spirit of fraternal affection had flown away—christian sympathy found no place in the dark and gloomy solitudes of his priestly cogitations. This tremendous storm has all been put in motion to aid some few of the medical faculty of the old school, in bringing the wonder working power of Col. Jewetts preparations into disrepute. To effect this it appeared necessary to prove that Col. Jewett had lied about cures that had been effected by his means. But they made a bad calculation who stirred up the fell spirit of opposition, without cause, and we might add, that in our estimation, all that ingenuity could devise or malice inflict, has been attempted, against one of our most humane, liberal and exemplary citizens, who has a clear conscience, and "can smile at the drawn dagger and defy its point."

So much has been attempted by Mr. Sehon to scandalize Col. Jewett as a defamer of Mrs. Comston, for stating that report had said, that Comston had the venereal disease when at Cincinnatti, and that he had communicated it at home, and lost an infant child in consequence, that we have thought it indispensably necessary to vindicate the living though we should step heavily on the ashes of the dead.

Under these impressions Mr. Anson Smith who was well acquainted with Comston, at the time alluded to, when he was in Cincinnatti, and well knowing to the fact of his having the venereal disease, has been consulted. He has informed us that when Comston left Columbus, in August 1828, he first went to Dayton, and from thence to Cincinnatti. He continued there he thinks more than a year. In the mean time Mr. Smith visited that place. In about six weeks after the arrival of Smith at Cincinnatti, it so turned out, that he and Comston, being of the same occupation, were working together. Mr. Smith, from certain observations he made, came to the conclusion that there must be something extraordinary affecting of him. His suspicions were so strong, that he finally accused him plainly of having the complaint we have mentioned. For several months Comston denied the charge and said it was not the case with him. But one event transpired after another to bring the truth

to light, until a circumstance occured unnecessary, and too tedious to relate at full length, but it so turned out that Smith followed him to the doctor's. After these occurrences and the detection that ensued, Comston fully acknowledged the fact.—After this disclosure of his situation Mr. Smith was occasionally with him at the house of the doctor from whom he received medical aid. Mr. Smith knew that he was extremely bad; for that, or some unknown reason, he would sometimes decline business entirely. According to his own statements, though at first made with some degree of reluctance, he must have labored under the filthy and ruinous disease, as mentioned above, for more than a year.

After Mr. Smith had discovered Comston's situation, he felt anxious for his recovery. About six weeks previous to his return to Columbus, he urged upon him the necessity of being cured, and pressed him to follow up the means, and went with him to the Doctor's house on that account. Smith tells a ludicrous story, predicated on the fact, that some few weeks before Comston's return to Columbus, one evening, as he was walking with him in the streets of Cincinnati, when they arrived at the west end of the lower market, Comston seized upon a street-walking female and beat her severely. The woman made such an outcry that Smith felt alarmed lest they should be brought before the civil authorities, he interfered and separated them as soon as possible, and urging him away from the place, enquired what reason induced him to use such violence upon the woman. He attempted to justify the rudeness of his conduct by saying, that woman is the ****** ***** that gave me the ***. Mr. Smith states that such was the imprudence of Comston, according to the statement made to him, that not more than four or five days previous to his return home to his family, he had farther sexual intercourse with one of those loose characters, by which means he must again have been exposed to much danger.

Whether he was well at that time, he could not possibly say; but he had been so bad, according to his own story, that, if he was entirely recovered, a cure must have been suddenly effected, considering the length of time he had been diseased, and the hold it must have taken of his system. The statement here made, was taken from the relation made by Mr. Smith in presence of several persons, before whom he declared that, to the best of his knowledge and recollection, it was strictly true, and that he was perfectly willing that the relation he had given should go to the public as his testimony relative to this case.

COLUMBUS CITY, *June* 4, 1835.

This may certify, that I have made the above statement, relative to the case of J. Compson, from my knowledge of the facts; and that the account given is strictly true.

Given under my hand,

ANSON SMITH.

Of the efficacy of Col. Jewett's Preparations, in the venereal complaint, I have had some experience, particularly in a certain case alluded to in one of our preceding pages. Reported cases of this kind are of too delicate a nature to be placed before every reader. Suffice it to say, I have the highest confidence in his anti-venereal unction. In relation to the remedy, and its effects in removing that form of disease, I will lay before the reader the following letter. It comes from a source too respectable to be doubted.

COLUMBUS CITY, *June* 1, 1835.

To Dr. T. HERSEY:

SIR—As you have expressed a wish to learn whether any one else had been as successful as yourself in proving the efficacy of Col. Jewett's anti-venereal ointment, in the *venereal complaint*, I take this method to inform you, that some time last February, a stranger arrived in this city, who, in his travels in the South, had the misfortune to be infected with the disease above named. When I first saw him, he had been laboring under the difficulty several months. From trials made with wonderful success in other forms of disease, and from what I had heard had been effected by others in this troublesome malady, I felt a particular desire to know for myself whether Col. Jewett's preparations for this complaint, really would succeed. I obtained some of the means for the use of the gentleman—gave him the necessary directions. He informed me that he applied the remedy as I directed, and, notwithstanding the deep hold it must have taken of his system, having for such a length of time been under the operation of its constant influence; he afterwards informed me that, in the course of from three to five days' use of the medicine, he found himself cured of the malady. I viewed it as an extraordinary instance of the efficacy of Col. Jewett's preparations, and a very novel, cheap and quick way of getting rid of the disease. You know the delicacy of people's feelings

is such, that we seldom meet with an individual that will not shrink from a disclosure of his case, when laboring under any difficulty of the kind. As I expect you will probably give publicity to this communication, I have consented to leave my name with you and Col. Jewett; so that any person wishing for farther satisfaction can be fully informed on the subject by making the necessary inquiry. Any farther disclosure from the press, under existing circumstances, would be highly improper; but every reasonable satisfaction will be given to every reasonable inquiry, by persons whose motives appear to be discreet and honorable.

A CITIZEN.

In relation to the venereal disease, it is well known that it often extends its ravages to the whole system. That a constitutional taint may be transmitted from parents to the detriment to their innocent offspring, will not be disputed by those conversant with the subject. When the system has been long treated, and highly charged with mercury, with a view to effect a cure, as in obstinate cases, troublesome eruptions of a peculiar character have often been produced. The *lepra mercurialis* is a form of disease of this description. No doubt remains but that, by such means, an hereditary habitude may be induced; the effects of which may sometimes appear in remote posterity.

Of mothers affected with the venereal virus, *Astruc*, describing certain virulent cases, says, "the children they bring into the world have an universal erysipelas, are half rotten and covered with ulcers." The degree of disease in the children, will very naturally be graduated by the degree and quality of constitutional malady under which the parent labors, whether it be a genuine syphilis, or some anomalous affection laggering in the system. The effect of the ravages of the disease on the system, where the venereal poison has been but partially subdued by mercurial poison, a morbid taint of a peculiar character may be transmitted from parents to children.

Dr. Thomas observes, "Although a child sometimes shows some appearances of syphilis at the time of its birth, still it more frequently happens that none are to be observed until after the expiration of at least ten or twelve days." Of course a child may be born with the disease, or with the effects of it in the system, and the attending physician not know it. He might not know but that the child was in perfect health; any thing in the opinion of Mr. Sehon or Dr. Awl to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dr. Thomas further remarks, "Although we may not be able to trace any marks of the existence of the disease in either the father or mother of the child, still it may possibly be derived from them." He also asserts what many physicians know to be true, that "parents may labor under some constitutional affection of syphilis without being aware of it."

When the disease arises from a constitutional taint, it commonly makes its first appearance in the form of an irrisipelatous efflorescence, which might baffle the skill of the most skilful physician, so to discriminate as to determine with certainty its true character. To this often succeeds various anomalous appearances. The scarf skin will sometimes appear somewhat eroded, and occasionally peal off. A thin, sharp, watery humor frequently oozes from the skin—red blotches rise about the britch, inside of the thighs and lower parts of the belly. It is a notorious fact that the whole exterior surface manifests a disordered state. Scabby, rough, semi-purulent eruptions appear. In these appearances, experienced practitioners are well aware that there is a great variety exhibited in different cases. After some discharges, as we have mentioned, the sores will commonly scab and scale off. Sometimes the sores and parts adjacent, put on a florid appearance; at other times they will look more pale, or of a purpleish livid color.

When young infants are affected in such a way, it is safest to indulge the suspicion of a venereal taint. Both parents may appear to be in health, but a constitutional taint may remain that shall affect their offspring. If the taint be not of a nature to propagate the genuine disease, in its original form, yet, in the diversity of morbid effects produced by the venereal virus and the mercurial poison, with which they may have been long treated, there may be entailed a train of morbid consequences of almost interminable duration. "The chain holds out, and where it ends unknown."

We shall proceed to notice the rejected testimony. Mr. Sehon insisted that it belonged to him *exclusively* to determine what testimony should be heard by the committee. It was his prerogative, like a civil judge, to judge of the law and the testimony by which the guilt or innocence of the accused was to be decided. The long, circuitous story told by himself, (the sweepings of Billingsgate, that had no bearing on the point at issue,) was forced upon the committee, who were not allowed to examine a witness unless he had first determined whether their testimony was admissible, but he assumed to act in several instances as accuser, witness and judge. If not formally, it was

virtually the case. Such a wanton stretch of clerical authority, exposed the abuse to which Episcopacy was liable, and shew how a preacher might domineer and travel rough shod over the liberties of his brethren.

Here I will just take the liberty to advert a moment to the discipline, commencing at the 7th section of the 89th page, to which Col. Jewett was referred, and by which the Rev. E. W. Sehon proposed most religiously to be governed. It reads thus: "*Ques.* How shall an accused member be brought to trial? *Answer. Before the society of which he is a member*, or a *select number* of them, *in the presence* of a *Bishop, Elder, Deacon, or Preacher.*"

The Tryers, whether they be the society, or a select number of them, are to be governed by this rule—"Let the accused and the accuser be brought face to face; but if this cannot be done, let the next best evidence be procured." Judging of *this section* of the Methodist Discipline, as I would any other chart, indenture, or constitution, rule or law; it appears to me it is the prerogative of the church, when a member is accused, to determine whether they will try him before the body or society usually meeting in that place, or appoint a select number to act for them. Bishops, Elders, Deacons, and Preachers, are allowed to be *present.* It is even required that the trial of the offender should be conducted "*in their presence.*" There is no provision made, or permission given, *in this section*, by which he proposed to be governed, for the exercise of any dictatorial powers, and sitting as umpire on the meaning of the law and the relevancy of testimony. "If the accused person be found guilty, by the *decision of a majority of the members before whom he is brought to trial*, and the crime be such as is expressly forbidden by the word of God, sufficient to exclude a person from the kingdom of grace and glory, let the minister or preacher who has the charge of the circuit, expel him."

Here note, first, that this form of rules for the trial of offenders in the Methodist Episcopal Church, *though* of human contrivance, a scheme of regulations and provisions devised by fallible beings, and destitute of the adjective character of being an inspired rule, there is something of fairness in the rule when fairly administered.

2d. The trial is by the *members* of a body, or representatively by a committee selected from among themselves. It is by the "decision of a majority of them," the question of the guilt or innocence of the accused is to be determined.

3d. The trial is to be conducted not *by*, but "*in the pre-*

sence of a Bishop, Elder, Deacon, or Preacher." To avoid all mistake, it is added, " *in the following manner.*"

4th. In reading the words " manner following," here referred to, we find nothing more than an executive power conferred on the preacher, by virtue of which he is authorized, first, to announce the sentence of expulsion against the *guilty*, whose crime has been adjudged by a decision of a majority of his compeers, to whom the trial had been assigned, sufficiently heinous to " exclude from the kingdom of grace and glory." Secondly, " If the minister or preacher differ in judgment from the majority of the society," we do not find that he has any casting vote, or any right to control the decision " of the society or the select number;" he can only, "in such a case," " refer the trial to the ensuing quarterly meeting."

5. This appears quite a salutary restriction on clerical usurpation. Well did the wise framer or framers of these regulations understand the frailty and perversity of human nature. How prone men are to indulge their partial feelings, and improperly involve themselves in the quarrels of their neighbors. They saw how easily an incautious preacher might be induced, from some particular prejudice, to take sides even against the innocent; and how effectually a preacher might, by a little imprudence, destroy his influence and usefulness in society. It was never designed that preachers should run round seeking occasions of complaint against members—stirring up strife—or that, on the trial of a member accused, they should assume and exercise the authority assigned to the *Tryers.*

6th. If the accused be found guilty by the society, or the select number appointed by the society for that purpose, the preacher is not to be precipitant in exercising his executive powers. He is not hastily to promulgate a sentence of exclusion, and make the offender an outlaw, putting him beyond the reach of any redress for any wrong of which he may have just occasion of complaint. This would be an unreasonable course, indicative of an irreligious, anti-christian spirit. A mere formal compliance with the letter of the law, in perfect accordance with its mild, pacific spirit, must be all that has been intended; for it is expressly said, " If there be a murmur or complaint from an excluded person, in any of the abovementioned instances, that justice has not been done, he shall be allowed an appeal to the next quarterly Conference; except such as absent themselves from trial," &c.

In the case of Col. Jewett, he was hurried to trial; hurried through a mock trial; sentence denounced forthwith, and ban-

died through the streets the same evening as public property—the victorious parson, frantic with joy to find that he had awed his committee into submission to his inquisitorial dictation, he triumphantly announced the guilt he had so wantonly labored to fasten on an innocent brother, as though anxious to make the world believe that hell was due to every charge.

The ferocity of this spiritual tyrant could not rest. On the ensuing Sunday he shocked his congregation, by publicly announcing from the pulpit that "Col. Jewett had had a fair and impartial trial, was found guilty on every charge, and was expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church."

This work of supererogation, extra-exofficial officiousness, reminds one of the determined zeal of the Catalonian Inquisition, who violated the sacred repositories of the dead, dug up the mouldering bones of the martyrs, to be calcined in funeral piles. The object was, *to reflect infamy* on those who had opposed the lawless march of clerical usurpation.

7th. In applying some remarks to the 7th section of the Discipline, by which this trial was so *religiously* conducted, we would suggest one rule of construction, by which all such instruments should be understood. The Methodist Discipline is their book of constitution—their rule of judgment in all cases. It decides all questions between *rulers and ruled*—governors and governed. A small proportion of the Methodist Episcopal Priesthood, viz. the itinerent ministry, exercise an absolute authority over the long ranks of subordinate clergy, and the docile, submissive multitude of the laiety over whom they most religiously domineer. Shall these clergymen—these self-created high priests over the house of God, be allowed to exercise any unconstitutional authority?

Whatever power is not given up by the people to the priesthood, is certainly a reserved power. What better rule can be adopted? This is a rule of construction admitted to be correct by our ablest politicians. The grand sentiment advanced in the republican Constitution of the United States, is peculiarly and forcibly applicable here. It reads thus: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain *rights*, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." Again: "The powers not delegated by the Constitution to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"

In applying this salutary, honest rule to the 7th section of the book of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we cannot find that any Elder, Preacher, Deacon, or Bishop, or any

other priestly character, is authorized to say whether the offender shall be tried by the church, viz: the congregated society, with which the person is more immediately associated, or by a select number. The question belongs to the church, in its congregated capacity to determine. Whichever way the offender be tried, though it be in the presence of an official minister of some sort, as therein named, yet, whatever power is not exclusively conferred on this official character, is detained by, and remains with the people—the society, church, *alias* congregation.

An English writer of celebrity remarks, that "it is found by experience, that whenever the unconstitutional oppressions, even of sovereign power, *advance with gigantic strides*, and threaten desolaton to a State, *mankind will not be reasoned out of the feelings of humanity*, nor will sacrifise their *liberty* by a scrupulous adherence to those political maxims which were originally established to preserve it. Therefore, though the positive laws are silent, experience will furnish us with a very remarkable case, wherein *nature and reason prevailed*. When King James the Second *invaded* the fundamental constitution of the realm, the Convention declared an abdication, whereby the throne was rendered vacant, which induced a new settlement of the crown." This is an illustrious precedent of the redress of public wrongs—a memorable instance of a noble stand against oppression. It furnishes a powerful admonition to deter the usurpations of despots, and warns them of danger amidst all the pomp and dignity or royalty.

The reasonings we have here offered, are not intended to communicate the idea that the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, no where guarantees absolute authority to preachers to kill or restore life. This same book is an artful contrivance, a stupendous project, a cunning device to confer exclusive power on a set of patented clergymen to *receive, try* and *expel* members, unamenable to any earthly tribunal. Let us venture up to this point, and see whether this is mere conjecture or undeniable truth. Turn then to page 39th, Question 1st of this little book.

Question. "What are the duties of the Elder, Deacon, or Preacher, who has the special charge of a circuit?"

Ans. "To receive, try and expel members, according to the form of the Discipline."

In the Western Repository, vol. 11, page 90, we find the following inquiry and remarks:

"Well, what is that? Why, as respects receiving members into the church, the discipline directs the preacher to 'give

tickets to none until they are recommended by a leader, with whom they have met at least six months on trial.'—Page 33. But does this invalidate our position? So far from it, it proves beyond a contradiction, that, with the *assistance* of a *single leader*, who is the preacher's *officer*, a preacher may receive a person into the church, *although all the members should oppose his admission*. The same may be said of keeping persons out of society. If the preacher does not think proper to admit the applicant, he can keep him out, the wish of the congregation to the contrary notwithstanding."

On the rule recorded, p. 89, sec. 7, in answer to the question, "How shall an accused member be brought to trial?" Our author remarks, "It will be kept in mind, that it is made the duty of the preacher to try and expel members; consequently, it lies with him, and not with the members, to determine whether the person against whom charges are exhibited, shall be tried before the society, or a select number of them." He adds, "Now, in every case, as far as his knowledge extends, the *preachers* have determined to try accused persons before a select number of the society, and have *themselves* fixed the *number*, and *selected* the *persons* who were to constitute the committee of trial. But it is said, 'should the preacher in any case abuse his power, the excluded person has an appeal to the following quarterly meeting conference.' We grant he has; but at the same time we would remark, that the members of the quarterly meeting conference, with the exception of the local preachers, are the *officers* of the preacher in charge," [the very tools of his own making, the instruments to subserve his purposes, the machinery by which he conducts his operations,] they have received their office at his hands, and hold it during his pleasure. So that the appellant seeks redress from the same authority that in the first instance condemned him," [this is the only alternative, the dernier resort of those Episcopal Methodists that are persecuted by an insolent, domineering preacher. This is a disgraceful, melancholy truth, that cannot be successfully denied.] The writer further remarks, "The people have no mode by which they can take a member out of the hands of the preacher and his officers; they can only participate in any trial as far as the preacher may think proper to suffer them to act as his *agents* in the business. And *the person who is tried is completely at the mercy of the ministry*. In vain does he claim his citizenship with the saints and of the household of God. His remonstrances will avail him nothing, he must submit to the ecclesiastical mode of trial, and if condemned, suffer eccle-

siastical punishment, inflicted by ecclesiastical hands.'' For one, I do cordially, ardently and sincerely esteem a goodly number of Episcopal Methodist preachers, who, like some God fearing slaveholders, have been providentially brought into an unfortunate preliminary, from which they know not how safely to escape. They fear to renounce Episcopacy, because in so doing they jeopardise their standing, influence and worldly prospects. They are in a magical circle, and know not how to get off from the enchanted ground. The god of this world, the demon of popularity, pride, and mere sectarian schemes, blind the eyes of thousands. My counsel would be, not to be entangled with such a yoke of bondage. Remember, kind reader, it is written, "His servants are ye whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey." Now, if you yield yourself up to the exclusive dictation of an Episcopal priest, or any other priest, to be subject to his control and prescription, so that you will not read any book, attend any meeting, or believe or do any thing in religion that he does not first recommend; if you be ruled by his obstinate authority while in the church, or submit to be pitched over the wall at his pleasure, I contend that under such circumstances, you must be the servant of the preacher, and it must be difficult for you to be a servant of the Lord Jesus, unless you have learned to serve two masters, which the WISDOM OF GOD assures us we cannot do.

The justly celebrated *Hooker*, in a work entitled "*Ecclesiastical Polity*," speaking of the presumptive course pursued by those who dictate the faith of christians, and bear rule, as "Lords over God's heritage," has this impressive remark, "It seemeth to me very strange, that these men should hold that the power of making ecclesiastical laws, belongeth to none but ecclesiastical persons only." "Hitherto," says Dr. Coke, "we have seen, since the death of Mr. Wesley, the most perfect *aristocracy* existing, perhaps upon earth. The people have no power."

We could multiply quotation upon quotation, from some of the ablest lights in Christendom. One more must suffice for the present.

"It is," says Mr. Towers, in his dissertation on the prophecies, "a strong argument against the existence of any hierarchies, that they not unfrequently debase the characters of those who belong to them; and whether they are in pursuit or in possession of eminent ecclesiastical honors, infuse into their minds an antichristian spirit of persecution and bigotry, which renders them the determined enemies of mankind."

If the scriptures have any where consigned to the elders, deacons and preachers of the Methodist Episcopal church, the exclusive prerogative of receiving, governing and excluding members, independent of, and contrary to the judgment and pious discretion of the brotherhood meeting habitually in one place, constitutiong a christian community, society, congregation or church, I say, if such exclusive power and authority be given to those preachers, it must be that they hold the keys of the kingdom *jure divino*, and of course they must be able to produce some credential from the lively oracles of inspiration. If there is any law of Heaven on this subject, it must be found in divine Revelation. "There is one lawgiver," and but one "who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?" Do not those Episcopal preachers, who first make laws for themselves, to govern others by, and place themselves above and beyond the reach of those rules of law by which they assay to govern others, find the inquiry, "who art thou that judgest!" looking them sternly in the face.

Were it not that the Methodist Episcopal clergy claim the prerogative of explaining their book of discipline, and contend that the administration of the church government belongs to themselves exclusively, we could get along with them more charitably. The "elder, deacon, or preacher," who is to "receive, try and expel members"—is required to do it, "according to the form of discipline." The form of discipline requires that an "accused member shall be brought to trial *before* the society of which he is a member, or a *select number of them*," &c.—Here appears to be a cloud of ambiguity and Episcopal fog, hanging round the provisions made in the discipline for conducting trials. Casuists on ecclesiastical jurisprudence might find a difficulty to untie this clerical knot.

There is a certain portion of the discipline, which, in the trial of Col. Jewett, and several other recent cases, appears to have been totally overlooked. This instruction was referred to by a member of the church, in a conversation had with Mr. Sehon; it relates to the preacher's duty. In the 22d edition printed at New York 1824, at p. 32, sec. 7, answer 5th, to the *question*, "What are the directions given to a preacher?" the answer is, "Believe evil of no one without good evidence; unless you see it done, take heed how you credit it. Put the best construction on every thing. *You know the judge is always supposed to be on the prisoner's side.*" Mr. Sehon positively denied the existence of such a clause in the discipline. After disputing him sharply, he was informed where he could find it.

It reminds me of Samuel Frost, the murderer of his father, and afterwards of Capt. Allen. When in prison, he was visited by the Rev. Dr. Austin. He remarked to the murderer that it was written, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Frost declared there was not any such passage in his Bible. On examination, he found that Gen. ix. 6, was torn out of his Bible sure enough. Whether Mr. Sehon had never read it, or if he had read it, had forgotten it, or had otherwise disposed of it, he positively denied the existence of such a rule or direction as being given to the preachers. His conduct in the late trials, especially in the trial of Co'. Jewett, has been most violent and despotic *against* the defendant.

The member in the conversation alluded to, remarked that the discipline said, "The judge is always supposed to be on the *criminal's* side;" whereas it reads on the "*prisoner's* side." There is no doubt that a man of Mr. Sehon's acumen, who knows so well how to make great distinction where there is but little difference, will no doubt find his apology for the denial of the passage, in the difference between the word *prisoner* and *criminal*. The idea implied in the expression is, that when a member is on trial before the church, or a select number of the members thereof, it is presumed that if the preacher errs at all, it should be on the side of clemency and mercy. If he sees they are not willing to hear the defendant in person, or by his friendly advocate, or appear disposed to proscribe or baffle the testimony on behalf of the defendant; if he observes any thing like unfairness or partial severity in the tribunal before which the accused member is brought to trial, the discipline presumes that it is the duty of the preacher to act the part of a judge advocate for the defendant, so as to secure to him as far as possible impart al justice.

There was not an individual, whether friend or foe to Col. Jewett, who was present on the trial, who will dare to say that the presiding judge, E. W. Sehon, could be supposed to be on the side of the defendant. On the contrary, he acted in the multiform capacity of law giver, accuser, prosecuting attorney, witness, judge and executioner. *O tempora! O mores!*

After this mock trial, by a base perversion of power, had been hurried on like an impetuous tempest, the spectators having chiefly, perhaps entirely withdrawn, and none but his obsequious minions round him, Mr. Sehon urged on Col. Jewett to stay and await the decision. This the Colonel utterly declined; as he was debarred the privilege of having time to prepare a plea of defence. He had no disposition to suffer himself to

be surprised by any contemplated *coup de main*, that might be preparing for him. He was not disposed to commit himself to be reported against, where he had none to bear witness but those who had appeared to be arrayed for opposition. Accordingly he withdrew from the scene of combat. No sooner had he withdrawn, than the faggots were prepared and the fires of death were lighted. True, the victim of their vengeance was not literally chained to the martyr's stake, but with vindictive wrath they pursued his reputation, and with wanton wickedness signed the death warrant that was to terminate his existence as a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Preparatory to this, Mr. Sehon claimed the right of judging on the law and the testimony relating to the case; he insisted that the committee should not receive the testimony offered on the part of the defendant. The committee did not all believe that Col. Jewett had told a falsehood. (It is doubtful whether one of them believed any such foolish tales, such "*old wives fables.*") But Mr. Sehon told them the testimony must not be considered as any thing in his favor. Thus the "judge was on the prisoner's side," to hang him right or wrong. Soon as the committee in subservience to Mr. Sehon's dictation, had signed the decree of death against Col. Jewett, by ecclesiastical excision, he began to traverse the streets of our city, and to congratulate even his infidel friends on the greatness of his victory. It is reported on respectable authority, as previously stated, that he announced it to be one of the greatest victories that he had ever achieved; and added, he would be willing to spend the last dollar he had, to have Col. Jewett prosecuted.

In the afternoon of the day following Col. Jewett's trial and expulsion, *instanter*, he received the subjoined note:

COLUMBUS, O. *April 21st*, 1835.

Sir—It becomes my duty to announce to you the decision of the committee appointed to *investigate and decide* upon the charges preferred against you by J. M. C. Hazeltine, in behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Upon the first charge, the committee, consisting of Brothers Spurgeon, Harvey, and Barkus, were unanimous in their decision, viz., that you are guilty.

Upon the 2d, 3d, and 4th charges, the committee consisting of Brothers Grubb, Taylor, Spurgeon, Harvey and Barkus, were unanimous in their decision, viz., that you are guilty.

I hereby, in conformity with my duty, as defined in the discipline, pronounce you *expelled* from the Methodist Episcopal Church. E. W. SEHON, *Stationed Preacher.*

On the evening of the same day, having called a general class, there Mr. Sehon publicly announced the expulsion of Col. Jewett. . Intent in pursuit of his victim, he follows up in his insatiable designs. Like the "hyena of the wild," whose jaws are drenched with the warm blood of its prey, rolls its death flashing eye around and looks for more; so this man, this accuser, witness and judge, to glut his insatiable malignity, keeps his grasp on the very throat of the defendant. On the ensuing Lord's day, he puts him on the Episcopal *spit*, to give him another roasting. He told his congregation that Col. Jewett had had a *fair, impartial trial;* that he had proceeded according to the Methodist Discipline, and that he was expelled, and with brazen insolence exclaimed, "that he was expelled for falsehood."

On the examination of the preceding documents, will the public be induced to believe there was any thing like genuine fairness in conducting the trial? Was "the judge on the prisoner's side?" Did he act religiously on the fundamental principles of the Methodist Episcopal Discipline? If he did, from such fairness "Good Lord deliver us!"

Was there any thing like impartial fairness in the rapidity with which he hurried on the trial? In the peremptory, rude and authoritative manner in which he rejected the testimony attempted to be adduced by the defendant? Was it to manifest his candid, fair and impartial feelings that he proclaimed the act of expulsion before the congregation, after having first trumpeted his triumphant conquest through the streets, and officially reporting the document containing the fact, in general class? Was not this a work of supererrogation? It is useless to enlarge. The facts speak for themselves.

In relation to the principal testimony adduced on the trial, we have relied chiefly on the record taken on the spot by Edward Mead. His minutes were copious, and to the best of our recollection surprisingly accurate, considering the embarrassing, and unpleasant circumstances attending the taking thereof. We have used the precaution to have several of the principal witnesses examine the record, who have approved thereof, as far as their own testimony is concerned, as being correct. Mr. Sehon would not allow his stenographer to furnish a copy of the testimony as he had taken it, to Col. Jewett. He also dictated what should be recorded, and what should not. He would have the record modelled to please himself. If any thing of importance has escaped us, it has not been a wilful omission. We believe the minutes kept by Mr. Mead, were as full and

accurate as could have been made out by any person? If any important testimony has been omitted, the prosecution must acknowledge the blame to be fixed at their own door. If in any thing we may not have been so minutely accurate as to suit the fastidious taste of the persecutors of Col. Jewett; if any material error can be made to appear, we will, when convinced of the fact, give a fair and honorable correction. We should have been glad to have obtained the stenographer's copy of the testimony, that we might have compared it with the minutes kept by E. Mead. With these two documents, aided by the recollection of the witnesses themselves, we should have been able to have prevented all cavils about the accuracy of testimony, as we have related it. Mr. Sehon has retained a record, such as he approved, and placed it exclusively at his own disposal. Beside, we must notice one fact relating to the labors of the stenographer, which some may think has not any direct bearing on the question of the fairness or unfairness, the partiality or impartiality manifested on the trial. Be that as it may, we will relate the facts as they have reached our ear. We have been told that a few Sundays previous to this trial, Mr. Sehon told his church that a report was abroad that the weekly collection went to pay his table expenses, but, said he, "It is not true." He said these collections were appropriated for the meeting house expenses. When he called for his stenographer's bill, report says the charge was from six to ten dollars. Mr. Sehon said six dollars was not enough, and paid him ten dollars, as Mr. McBaen himself acknowledges, which was no doubt paid from these same contingent funds.—These funds are collected by pushing the contribution bag round the congregation, which is unceremoniously poked under the noses of strangers, and often used for spunging small change out of the hands of boys and girls; thus milking the goats, to aid the preacher to carry on his unholy warfare against the members of his church.

On the 23d of April, only two days after the trial, a number of professors of religion providentially met at the house of Mr. J.***** in this city. One person was present who fills a conspicuous station in the church, who was deeply concerned in the trial, in short, one of the most respectable and conscientious of the committee, in whose "*presence* the trial was conducted. The question was proposed, viz., "*What do you think of Col. Jewett?*" "*Do you think he will tell a willful falsehood?*" This man answered, "*No, I do not.*" Again he was asked, "*What do you think of his religion? Do you think he would do so*

much for religion if he were a hypocrite?" He said, "he did not," that "he believed he was a good man." He was further questioned, "Do you think the committee thought he would tell a willful falsehood?" He replied, "No, I do not." He further said, "If he wanted a kindness, he would go to Col. Jewett as soon as to any man in this town." He added, that "the turning him out of the church would not keep him out of heaven." It was then said to him, "If you believed all this, how could you agree to turn him out of the church?" He then replied, "The testimony on the part of Col. Jewett was declared by Brother Sehon not to be to the point—a part of Jewett's testimony was rejected." He was further asked, "How then could you give a decision?" His answer was, "We had to decide on the evidence that was permitted to come before us." Speaking of the disturbance and difficulties that had occurred in the church, he remarked that "he believed the doctors had done the most of it."

Some short time after the trial of Col. Jewett, Mr. McBaen, a professed stenographer of this city, the gentleman who had attended, at the request of Mr. Sehon, to take minutes of the testimony, was at Col. Jewett's establishment on high street, when the following dialogue took place between him and John C. Smith. The whole was distinctly noticed at the time, and was carefully treasured in the recollection of the persons present.

McBaen, (addressing himself to J. C. Smith,) "Were you not at the trial of Col. Jewett the other day?"

J. C. S. Yes, I was.

McB. I thought I saw you there.

J. C. S. Yes, and a rascally trial it was.

McB. I understand the proceedings are about to be published. I hope they will be published correctly.

J. C. S. Yes, I expect they will be published, and that more will be published than what you took down. I expect the whole proceedings will be published from beginning to end.

McB. I hope there will not be any blame attached to me.

J. C. S. No—I do not expect any blame will be attached to you. Mr. Sehon was the one that was to blame. No one blames you that I know of. It just shows Sehon's rascality. He told you what to put down, and what not to put down. Any thing that suited him, he told you to put it down; any thing that he did not like, he would not have any minute made of it. I saw him point to you, and heard him say, "you need not put that down;" "nor that down." Again, he would say,

when any thing pleased him, "put that down."—Every one in the house saw it.

McB. I hope they will publish the trial correctly. I endeavored to take every thing down correctly.

J. C. S. There is no doubt of that: as far as you went I expect you have the proceedings correct; but you did not take down all the testimony that was given in.

McB. I hope they will not blame me, for I was employed by Mr. Sehon; I had to do as Mr. Sehon told me. When I am employed by any person, I would wish to please them, and do as they want me to do. [*Exeunt omnes.*]

The undersigned does hereby certify, that the above conversation, and as nearly word for word as can be recollected, actually took place between Mr. McBaen and myself,

June 1st, 1835. JOHN C. SMITH.

I, the subscriber, do hereby certify that I was present and heard the conversation, as stated above, between Mr. John C. Smith and Mr. McBaen: I know the statement made in the above dialogue to be substantially correct.

ELIJAH P. ZINN.

We can easily perceive how the way has been prepared to present the case before the next annual conference, should it, in any shape, ever come before that venerable body. Here we have a specimen of the candor, fairness and impartiality, manifested in the management of this business. It is possible that a majority may be so far under the influence of the Episcopal mania, or so attached to the privilege conferred by the discipline, of exercising an uncontrollable power, that all these highhanded measures may receive the sanction of their entire approbation. Mr. Sehon does not appear, even remotely, to guard against censure or remonstrance from any other tribunal. We have said it was even possible he might be supported. But in making the remark, far be it from the writer to cast a shade over the fair fame and christian reputation, of the many humble, faithful, peace-loving, God fearing individuals—those zealous and ingenuous Methodist preachers, who testify the gospel of the grace of God, and adorn, by an humble deportment, the doctrine of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

EPHRAIM BURWELL'S CASE.

On the 21st of March, 1835, immediately after the trial of Col. Jewett, it was evident that many of the members of the

Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, were sorely wounded at the extraordinary, unfair, and partial conduct of the presiding preacher; of consequence, a number withdrew, directing their names to be no longer enrolled as members thereof.—Among other individuals, was Mr. Ephraim Burwell, who addressed the following note to the preacher in charge:

Mr. Sehon:—

Sir, You will please to take my name and subscription from the list, as I cannot afford to help build a house for a preacher under the present circumstances of the church.

March 21, 1835. EPHRAIM BURWELL.

In a few days afterwards, he called to see Mr. Burwell; he told him, referring to the above note, that it was the greatest insult that he had ever met with, for a member of the church to call him "Mr. Sehon." He said he had not the power to take his name off, neither would he do it if he had.

From a variety of circumstances, and certain facts in his possession, Mr. B. felt himself fully justified in openly stating to class leaders and others, that Mr. Sehon had lied, and he could prove it. These statements were accompanied with the special request, that Mr. Sehon might be informed. No doubt but that some among the many to whom the assertion was made, rallied sufficient courage to inform the Rev. clergyman of the current report. Episcopal skill was put in requisition. Charges were brought, 1st "For neglect of class," (he having been twice absent;) John Miller had not attended class for a year and an half; but he is the preachers's favorite, and no doubt has received absolution. 2, "For abusing the administration of the church." Mr. B. consulted as intelligent law characters as any we have, to ascertain what could be meant by the administration of the church. One would suppose it must include the whole Episcopal authorities, from the Bishop, down, down, down to E. W. Sehon. It appears, however, to evade testimony, this equivocal ambiguous charge was conjured up, to make an outlaw of his antagonist, in the Episcopal court, by putting him without the pale of its jurisdiction, before he could have opportunity to prove the truth of his allegations. The short notice given to Mr. B., was in the following words:

"Brother Burwell, You are hereby notified to attend at the church to-morrow afternoon, at 4 o'clock, when a committee will meet for your trial, upon the following charges—1 neglect of class; 2, abuse of the administration of the church.

Your's &c. E. W. SEHON."

May 29th.

This notice was left on Friday—not seen nor heard of by Mr. B. until evening—Saturday at 4 o'clock, P. M. was the time appointed for the trial. Mr. B. used his best endeavors to have the trial deferred two or three days to prepare for his defence, as the witnesses he expected would be needed, could not be immediately collected. Mr. Sehon objected and said, that *the trial could not and should not be put off.* Mr. B. objected to the proceedings, objected to the committee, and left them and Mr. Sehon to themselves. This committee consisted of Luther Hillary, James Ford and Mr. Astin. After this Mr. B. met with Mr. Sehon in the street, and received the assurance that he should have an appeal; that he would give him every assistance in his power; that any time between then and the Friday of the quarterly meeting, would be early enough. After these events had transpired, Mr. Burwell presented the following lines to Mr. Sehon:

"Brother SEHON. This is to give you notice that I appeal from the decision of the committee appointed to try charges preferred against me, to the quarterly conference, as it has been understood between us. Your's, &c.

June 4th, 1835. E. BURWELL."

The above lines were presented on Friday to Mr. Sehon, as "it had been understood between them."

On Saturday, (the next day) Mr. B. met with Mr. Sehon at the steps of Mr. Armstrong's house, and the following conversation ensued:

Burwell. I have called on you to know what time the conference will set, that I may know what time to meet them.

Sehon. I have got your appeal, and I do not think it will be accepted. I am very certain it cannot, unless you will make some acknowledgments.

Burwell. What acknowledgments do you wish me to make?

Sehon. I am not willing to have it go to the conference that I had agreed to an appeal. Even admitting I did so agree, I wish you not to state it so, and to acknowledge that the appeal was not made by agreement.

Burwell. I shan't acknowledge any such thing as that; I had rather withdraw the appeal than do so.

Sehon. If you should make the acknowledgment, Brother Eddy is not here, and he will not be here to sit on your case; but if you will make the acknowledgment, you can have an ap-

peal, and you may have your choice of any of the preachers to preside at the trial of the appeal. I will not interfere for or against you.

Burwell. I shan't make any such acknowledgment.

(Mr. Sehon; (presenting the paper,) Burwell turned to go away.)

Sehon. Do you know where brother Cloud is? Have you seen him to day?

Burwell. Yes, I know where he is, he is at Col. Jewett's shop.

Sehon. I want to see him. I wish you would tell him to come here, for I wish to see him. I have written a letter to him, and have not received any answer. Do you think you will see him soon?

Burwell. I expect likely I may see him in ten or fifteen minutes.

Sehon. I wish you to tell him that I want to see him, that BROTHER EDDY IS HERE!!!

Immediately after this conversation, Mr. Burwell, astonished at the barefaced contradiction, retired and penned down the particulars, and has carefully preserved his memorandum. The whole conversation took place in perhaps less than fifteen minutes. What a reverend divine is here!

At the meeting on Monday evening it was publicly announced that Ephraim Burwell had been expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church for the crimes alledged above. At seven o'clock on Tuesday morning, Mr. Sehon sent a notice to Mr. Burwell, by Mr. John Kelly, that he could have an appeal at eight o'clock of the morning of the same day; giving him one whole hour to prepare to meet the charges of his clerical antagonist.

Any remarks on this subject appear quite unnecessary. The facts speak loudly, and in a manner not easy to be misunderstood. Several events have recently occurred, equally calculated to excite disgust in honorable minds. These we may have occasion to record at a future period, but for the present we shall content ourself with the belief, that the exposure made of the extravagant assumption of Methodist Episcopal authority, in the instances we have given on the preceeding pages, will plainly evince that a scheme of government, so well calculated to destroy every vestige of individual liberty, or social equality, cannot be of God. Episcopal pretensions to such absolute power in her clergy, under the imposing pretension of a divine warrant, thus to dictate and control the management of

church members, bears a stronger resemblance to the vassalage of the unfortunate African bondman, than to that state of high and distinguished privileges conferred by the Gospel on those who "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free!"

It is not probable that any remarks we have made, or may hereafter make, can reach the proud and callous feelings of Mr. Sehon, or excite any emotions of mind, save his reverend indignation, which he will manifest, either by a silent contempt of the writer, or by backbiting insinuations raise the puddle of his fury to a mighty storm. Mr. Sehon's sovereign contempt of all who doubt the high prerogatives he claims, is the palladium of his hopes—it is his knock down argument, against every one who dares to oppose him, in thought, word or deed. But suppose that *those* who question his divine *right* to trample on the civil and religious *rights* of his brethren, were really as base, mean, and contemptible as he would represent them to be, would that prove that we have misrepresented the story of his conduct? Would that turn faithful testimony into a falsehood; or transform a sound, logical argument, into a vagrant tissue of ranting sophistry? And where we stand, sustained on the immutable basis of divine inspiration, can any weakness on our part, or all the combined energies of Sehonic contempt, and the co-operative exertions of his co-adjutors, to look down opposition, "change the truth of God into a lie?"

Has there been any thing beside the lofty soarings of his *contemptuousness*, the sublime elevations of his clerico-episcopal consequentialness, that induced him to gag the mouth of witnesses, and reject all palliating and explanatory testimony on the part of the defendants, in the late trials had in his august presence? Was it contempt created the alarm, and excited the strong handed, but cowardly efforts, that have been made *to suppress the printing of this publication?***** Can the silent contempt with which he proposes to meet this exposure, evince the falsehood of the testimony we have adduced, which he declared to be irrelevant and inadmissible? Such dodging and shuffling to conceal or evade testimony, would, *even in a civil suit*, have fixed a blot on any man; but for a professed minister of the gospel of peace, to shuffle, squirm, and rage, to suppress and evade testimony, instead of attempting piously to elicit truth and justice, is a subject too awful for irony; and, in this instance, the flagrant abuse of correct moral principle has been so notorious, the case is too hapless to expect the offender to be soon recovered from the error of his ways.

SLANDER.

The following poetic effusion, from the pen of a writer of the preceding century, who has been often admired among the *amateurs* of metrical composition, is thought not to be altogether inapplicable to the present occasion:

Ye wise, instruct me to endure
An evil that admits no cure;
And how this evil can be borne
Upheld by envy and by scorn.
When scandal rankles in the breast,
The *innocent* will be oppress'd:
Too oft has envy's secret sting
A wound inflicted, which doth bring
An odium on the wise and good,
Though upright paths have been pursu'd.
Bare innocence is no support
When you are tried in scandal's court:
She, talents, worth, and truth assail;
With *fiend-like malice* would prevail.
Hold fast on virtue, envy'll fall
With execrations due from all—
Her utmost malice cannot make
Your head, or tooth, or finger ache:
Nor can ten hundred thousand lies
Make you less virtuous, learn'd or wise:
The most effectual way to balk
Their malice, is to let them talk!

POSTSCRIPT.

MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS.

At the close of these Examinations into the abuses of episcopal power, we think it will be conducive to the cause of truth to give a few extracts from some late publications that Providence has thrown in our way. Perhaps the assertions and reasonings of the writers may come in for their dividend of Sehonic contempt. Like the Pontificate of Rome, he raises superior to all law; human and divine, in governing the church, and demonstrates that Episcopacy—Methodist Episcopacy, has some prominent features that too plainly intimate its papal descent, to suffer the relationship to be honestly denied. In so saying, we speak humbly, sorrowfully, not contemptuously. Let such as are in the Episcopal connection, who fear God and determine, through grace, to work righteousness, take warning. The whole Christian world beside themselves, declare that, in this matter, they are grossly in the wrong. Saints and sceptics agree that their Episcopal form of government in the church, is a tremendous scheme of tyranny and oppression; a clerical aristocrasy, bold in its assumptions, most reckless, haughty and unrestrainable in its prosecutions, and in its ultimate influence over the civil institutions of the United States, we have more to fear than from all the combined powers of Europe, though they should be all in arms against us. The senior Bishop is but another name for Arch-Bishop, a distinguished character of the man of sin—The See of Rome cannot boast of an official dignitary of a higher grade—This priority of office and high unameanable authority and absolute power, belonging to the Pontificate of Methodist Epicopacy in the United States, proclaims, in accents and arguments awfully convincing that a fearful relationship exists to that head that wears a triple crown!!

FROM WOODWARD'S LECTURE ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

"We proceed in the second place, to examine the form of government contained in the discipline of the M. E. Church, as explained by their Bishop and General Conference; by which it will appear that they occupy ground foreign from, and adverse to the provisions of the New Testament, and usages of the primitive church, as proven by the authorities already quoted. But before I proceed further, you will permit me to digress for a moment, in order to rescue the venerable Wesley from an attempt that has been made, to fasten on him the authorship of Methodist Episcopacy, with all its concomitants, as it stands in their book of discipline. In the history of the use of Methodist Episcopacy, contained in the preface of the discipline, we are told that Mr. Wesley preferred the Episcopal mode of government to any other, and therefore they tell us that he sat apart, or ordained Dr. Coke, to the Episcopal office, &c. Now strange as it may appear, yet it will be found to be true, that the letter of Mr. Wesley, referred to as authority for his preference of the Episcopal mode of government to any other, has not the word Bishop in it, in reference to the American Methodist, and so far from choosing the Episcopal mode of Government, or any other, for the American Methodist, he declares emphatically that he dares not entangle them with it. His language is very pointed; he says—"As our American brethren are now totally disentangled, both from the state and the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again either with the one or the other. They are at full liberty simply to follow the scriptures and the primitive church, and we judge it best that they should stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free." See this whole letter published in the minutes of conference for 1785. And again, after the news had reached him, that Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury had assumed the title of Bishop, he shows how much he disapproves of it in his letter to Mr. Asbury, from which we quote the following language: "How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a 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 a Bishop—for my sake, for God's sake, and for Christ's sake put a full end to this."

See Moore's life of Wesley, a book published and sold by the M. E. Church, vol. 2d, page 284. In reference to the same thing Mr. Moore, the intimate friend and biographer of Mr. Wesley, from whom we have just quoted, says that he does know "that Mr. Wesley enjoined upon Dr. Coke and his associate, (Mr. Asbury,) in the most solemn manner, that it, the title of Bishop, should not be taken—that Mr. Wesley never gave his sanction to any of those things, nor was he the author of one line of all that Dr. Coke published in America upon that subject; his views on these points were very different from those of his zealous son in the Gospel."—See pages 270, 280. Now, if Mr. Moore and Mr. Wesley may be believed in relation to this matter, it will follow that Mr. Wesley neither chose the Episcopal nor any other mode of government for the American Methodists; but left them "simply to follow the Scripture and the primitive church." What a pity they had not followed his advice, for then they would not have been divided into so many parties as they are now! But we cannot blame the American Methodists for adopting the Episcopal mode of government; for, upon the testimony of Dr. Coke himself, they had no hand whatever in the selection, for he testifies that if they had been left to choose, they would have adopted the Presbyterian mode of government. In his letter to the Bishop of London, apologizing for his departure from Episcopal usages, Dr. Coke says, that "for a little time I had been warped from my attachment to the Church of England, in consequence of my visit to the States of America. But, like a bow too much bent, I have again returned; but I return with a full conviction that our numerous societies in America, would have been a regular Presbyterian church if Mr. Wesley and myself had not taken the step which we judged it necessary to adopt." See this, and also his letter to Bishop White of Philadelphia, published in Drew's life of Coke. Now I appeal to every man capable of weighing evidence, if the inference is not pretty strong that Dr. Coke and Mr. Asberry, (with a few perhaps of their pliant subjects,) did not palm the Episcopacy upon the American Methodists, without either Mr. Wesley's consent or their own;—but even on the supposition that Mr. Wesley recommended and sanctioned it, yet as great a man as he was, I humbly conceive that his name and authority does not furnish sufficient ground to justify a sys-

tem of government so directly adverse to the Scriptures and the primitive mode of church government, as we shall find the present government of the M. E. Church to be, and to the examination of which we now ask your attention. As the Bishop occupies the foreground in this system, we shall, in the first place make some remarks on the manner of his election and instalment into office. With regard to his election, the discipline provides that he shall be elected by the General Conference, which is composed of travelling preachers exclusively, who have travelled at least four years, and are full members of the travelling connection at that time.—See discipline, page 19. These are the representatives of the travelling preachers only, and not of the people, as is fully proved from the ratio of representation by which they are chosen, it being one for every seven travelling preachers in each annual conference, without any regard whatever to the number of members and local ministers that may be within the bounds of the conference.

In all cases where a people is represented, the ratio of their representation is proportioned according to the number of voters in each district. Here then the travelling preachers, who are exclusively the members of the annual conference, are the only voters, and of course the only people represented in the General Conference, who alone have power to elect a Bishop—page 24. The ceremony used at his ordination, without which he cannot exercise the office of Bishop, deserves attention; for it speaks volumes for his uncontrolled authority, and strongly indicates that he is thereby rendered infallible. It is this: the officiating Bishop places his hands upon the head of the person to be ordained, and says as follows: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—*Amen*. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness"—page 147.

This ceremony commences in the imperative mood, and proceeds throughout in the commanding voice, and at the end of the first division of the ceremony the word *Amen* is inserted, a term, which, when used at the end of a prayer, means *so be it*, but there is not a word of prayer in the whole of this ceremony,

it being a command from the beginning to the end of it. We cannot understand the word *Amen* therefore, as appended to a prayer, but as fixed to a command, and when used in this relation, Mr. Walker tells us that it means *so it is*, and in this sense it is obviously used in this ceremony; for, after the officiating Bishop has done commanding the Holy Ghost, and pronounced the *Amen*, he then addresses the Bishop he is ordaining in language evidently based upon the supposition that he had received the Holy Ghost as previously commanded, and says: "And remember that thou stir up the *grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands*," *&c.* This extraordinary ceremony may therefore be paraphased in strict accordance with the meaning of words, something after the following manner: "Receive thou" (imperative mood,) "the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *Amen*," [So it is—and now that I have given thee the Holy Ghost, and in as much as you have received it through the medium of the imposition of my hands,] "remember that thou stir up the grace of God which" [I have thus] "given thee by the imposition of our hands," [and as you are now inwardly and outwardly qualified for a Methodist Bishop by the Holy Ghost which I have given thee by the imposition of my hands, I now associate you with myself, and other Methodist Bishops, as such, and inform you of the high prerogatives to which we are entitled by this our Episcopal office,] "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love and soberness;" or the love of power and soberness, would perhaps express their dispositions more intelligibly. Now we read that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, to depart from evil, &c. and that Noah moved with *fear* preparing an ark; and we are commanded to have chaste conversation, coupled with *fear;* to pass the time of sojourning in *fear;* to submit ourselves to one another in the *fear* of God—and "blessed is every one that *feareth* the Lord" —"unto you that *fear* my name shall the sun of righteousness arise," &c. How these and many other declarations are interpreted by those who declare that "God hath not given" them "the spirit of fear, but of power," I am utterly at a loss to determine. But if they had told us that the discipline had placed

them wholly independent of the church over which they preside, and therefore, that they have no fear of the church authorities, inasmuch as all rule and all authority are in their hands, we could have understood them; for such is the fact, as we shall see presently.—The discipline recognizes no authority over them for any of their official acts; they appoint preachers to circuits, and presiding elders to rule over them, and "oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church"—page 25. In this and every thing else pertaining to their office, they do as seemeth good in their own eyes.—There is indeed a rule for bringing them to trial for immorality, which at first view would seem to hold a check upon them, but when investigated will be found like every other rule, to leave the power entirely in their own hands. This rule is on the 26th page of the discipline and reads as follows: "If a Bishop be accused of immorality, three travelling elders shall call upon him and examine him on the subject; and if the three elders verily believe that the Bishop is guilty of the crime, they shall call to their aid two presiding Elders, from two districts in the neighborhood of that where the crime was committed, and each presiding Elder shall bring with him two Elders, or an Elder and a Deacon. The above mentioned nine persons shall form a conference, to examine into the charge brought against the Bishop; and if two thirds of them verily believe him to be guilty of the crime laid to his charge, they shall have authority to suspend the Bishop till the ensuing general conference." In regard to this rule, we inquire first who are the judges or committee-men empowered to examine the Bishop on the subject of his guilt?" "*Three travelling Elders.*" And who are these Elders? Why, these Elders, as well as all other ordained ministers in the M. E. Church have pledged themselves in the most solemn manner at their ordination, that they would reverently obey their chief ministers or bishops, who have the charge and government over them, and follow with a glad mind and will their *admonitions* and *judgments*—page 133. In addition to this, they receive their appointment from the Bishop every year, and are annualy dependent upon him for comfortable and healthy situations, as well as the comforts and conveniences of life, both for themselves and families—see page 25. These Elders thus solemnly pledged to obey the Bishop, and wholly dependent upon him in pecuniary

matters, with this double check upon them, are the only persons authorized to examine into his moral conduct, and what is still more embarrassing, they are to "*examine him on the subject*" of his own guilt or innocence, for they are not authorized to examine any testimony except that with which he may choose to furnish them; and after all, there must be an unanimous concurrence of opinion before they can call to their aid any other, for the three elders must *verily believe* that the Bishop is guilty "of the crime." If two of them "*verily believe*" it, yet if the third dissent, the examination stops, but if they all concur, then they "*call to their aid*" six others equally pledged and bound to the Bishop with themselves, and *two thirds* of the entire number must *verily believe* him guilty before they can suspend him. But this is not all, for if the Bishop shall at any time "*admonish*" them to go about their business and let him alone, they are bound by the pledge given at their ordination to do so—and thus the whole investigation proves to be a perfect farce. And again, from the fact that the Bishop chooses all the presiding Elders by his own authoritative choice, and stations all the travelling preachers annually, it is evident from this as well as the pledge they have given at their ordination to obey him, that they are the mere agents of the Bishop, to execute his will in the different districts, circuits and stations, where he has appointed them, and as such we may next notice the power which they possess over those composing the membership of the church wherever they go. The presiding Elder is a kind of overseer over the travelling preachers, having an episcopal authority over them in the absence of the Bishop—page 27. We pass over them, and come to the power that the preacher in the charge of a circuit, or station, may exercise over the people:—and first, if the people want stewarts in the circuit or station where they live, the preacher must nominate the person to fill the office—page 116. If the people build a house to worship God in, and wish to have trustees to take care of it, they must go to the preacher in charge or the presiding Elder, and take such as he may choose to appoint—page 165. If a class leader is wanting, the preacher appoints him and changes him at will—page 38. If a person wishes to become a member of the church, the preacher in charge is the only authorized person to receive or reject him—page 38. If the class wants a person to receive their quarterly

contributions, the preacher appoints him—page 39. If a member shall habitually neglect to attend his class, the preacher may turn him out of the church without judge or jury—page 80. And for all this, and whatsoever else he may choose to do, he is not responsible to the people, but is amenable only to the annual conference, composed of travelling preachers exclusively—page 61.

There is indeed a kind of form of trial for disorderly persons in the church, by which it is provided that the person accused shall be tried before the society or a select committee, but the preacher has the power to choose that committee, and if they do not decide according to his wishes, he has the power to appeal the case to the quarterly conference, which he can modify or change at will by appointing and changing class leaders, &c., which generally compose a majority of the conference; and so execute his will upon the accused person in spite of him. Thus you see, the membership of an accused person in the church, as well as those who do not attend class, is solely dependent upon the sovereign will of the preacher in charge. That I am not mistaken in this view of the authority of the preacher, will fully appear from the testimony of Bishop Asbury, whose opportunity to know, and ability to explain the government of the M. E. Church, will not be donbted by any. His view of the preacher's authority, both to expel and receive members independent of the church, will be seen from the following extracts: "The power of baptizing," says Mr. Asbury, "is the power of the keys for reception into the church, the private members have not the power of baptizing, therefore the private members have not the power of the keys for admission, and it is most apparent in the gospel, that the keys for admission and exclusion were given into the same hands, and not one to the minister and another to the flock, therefore, the people, that have not the first have not the latter." —*See "Causes, evils, and cures of heart and Church divisions"* —page 100. This settles the point at once, and proves that the preacher in charge, not by the choice of the people, but by the appointment of the Bishop, has the power of excluding members from the church at will; the discipline indeed points out the *modus operandi*, but the result depends upon the sovereign will of the preacher, who holds the keys for admission, as well as exclusion from the church, independent of the people.

How very different is this mode of government from that recognized in the gospel and practised by the primitive church; in regard to which Dr. Moshiem tells us that, "The people were undoubtedly the first in authority, both in selecting their preachers or teachers, and punishing profligate and unworthy members, restoring the penitent to their forfeited privileges, *and in short, exercising all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with the sovereign power.*" Bishop Asbury is still more explicit, for, addressing himself to the private members of the church, he tells them that "you are not bound to know what the spiritual state of any man is, as he is joined in church communion with you, but upon your pastor's trust and word—whether their understanding be sufficient at their admittance you are not any where called to try, but the pastor is, and if he has admitted them, you are to trust in his judgment.—Whether their profession of faith be serious and credible you are not called to try and judge—but if your pastor has admitted them, he has numbered them with the visible church, and it is the credibility of the pastor that you have to consider, and by him you must judge of the credibility of the professor, and not immediately by your own trial."—And again, "it is no more your sin to communicate with such men, (viz. such as are wicked without your fault,) than it is to live and converse with fellow servants that are wicked, when it is not you but your master that has choice of them"—see pages 102 and 103.

This language is sufficiently plain without comment, to show that the preacher who carries the keys, not by the choice of the people, but by the appointment of the Bishop, does, or may do, whotsoever seemeth good in his own eyes, in relation to every thing pertaining to the church membership. He may fill the church with a set of ignorant and unholy wretches, or he may prevent pious and respectable persons from coming into the church, at pleasure, and the people can have no redress, he being amenable only to the Bishops and annual conference, where they are not allowed a representation

Hence you see, that to talk about *rights* in the M. E. Church, in reference to the laiety, if any thing else is meant thereby than the right to support and obey the Bishop and his agent, is to talk about a thing that does not, and never did exist: and the Bishop and members of the general conference of 1834,

have plainly declared it to the people who petitioned that conference for a representation in the general and annual conferences, claiming such a representation as their "unalienable birth right as Christ's freemen;" they plainly tell them they "*have no such rights*," that the institutions of Methodism comprehend no such *privileges*. In addition to this, the general conference of 1828, declares most positively that they "are the *divinely authorized expounders* of *God's word and moral discipline*, and that in these respects they will not be authoritatively controlled by others." This caps the climax, and shows that they have not only taken the liberties of the people from them, but they have taken the Holy Scriptures and the laws of God into their keeping also—for the Right Reverend Bishop Hoadley, Lord Bishop of Bangor, says, that "whosoever hath an absolute authority to interpret," [or expound] "any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the law giver to all intents and purposes—and not the person who wrote or spoke them." If this position of Bishop Hoadley be correct, and we challenge proof of the contrary, we see the Bishop and general conference of the M. E. Church, side by side with the Cardinals and Pope of Rome, in their claims to infallibility, and the keys of St. Peter. And to this high handed ecclesiastical authority, and high toned claims to infallibility, it is seen by their statistical reports, that upwards of *five hundred thousand* American citizens are willingly bowing their necks. Surely then it is time to sound the alarm, and to cry Reform! Reform! from Maine to Florida; for if be true that men are most likely to make their political views accord with their views of ecclesiastical government, the time cannot be far distant (if this state of things continues to exist,) when the pillars of our national liberty-temple will be shaken to their very foundation. It is these considerations that have led me to throw my humble influence in favor of reform. In the third place, I am to show you the dangerous tendency and destructive end to which this form of government if persisted in must lead, and in order to do so I beg leave to read you a few extracts from Dr. Clarke and Moshiem, by which you will see the various steps taken by the Catholic church in her departure from primitive usages, and in which you will also see how nearly the Methodist Episcopal church have followed her footsteps.

"That the sons of Zebedee wished for ecclesiastical, rather

than secular honors," [says Dr. Clarke] "may be thought probable, from the allusion that is made here to the supreme dignities in the great Sanhedrim [*Hanasi*] who sat in the midst of two rows of Senators and Elders; on his right hand sat the person termed *A. B.* [*the father* of the Sanhedrim;] and on his left hand the *Chacham* or *Sage*. These persons transacted all business in the absence of the president."—[The presiding elders oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church in the absence of the Bishops—Dis. page 28. Appoint trustees—page 165. Change and suspend preachers, &c.—page 27.] "The authority of this council was at some periods very great, and extended to a multitude of matters both *ecclesiastical* and *civil*. These appear to have been the honors which James and John sought. They seem to have strangely forgot the lesson they had learned from the transfiguration." The authority of the Bishops and the presiding elders is at this time "very great," controlling both the spiritual and temporal business of the church. (*See above.*) Against this identical power Christ has directed his authority. Will you hear? will you obey?

Having already quoted Dr. Moshiem's remarks on the government of the church in the first century, we shall therefore begin with the second century. "The form of ecclesiastical government," says Mr. M. "whose commencement we have seen in the last century, was brought in this to a greater degree of stability and consistency; one inspector or Bishop, presided over each christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voice of the people;" [not so in the M. E. Church, for their Bishops are elected by a few of the itinerant clergy, to the entire exclusion "of the whole people."] During a great part of this century, the christian churches were independent with respect to each other, nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bonds than those of charity. Each christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted or at least approved by the society—but in process of time all the christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interest of the whole."

"These councils, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of

the church, and gave it a new form; for, by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the Bishops greatly augmented. The humility and prudence of these pious prelates prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards invested. At their first appearance in those councils they acknowledged that they were nothing more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name and by the appointment of them, but they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their councils into laws, and openly asserted at length, that Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people authoritative rules of faith and manners."

One acquainted with the history of Methodism in the United States, would scarcely suppose it possible to describe its progress towards despotism more fully than Dr. Moshiem has done in this account of the second century. In the year 1766, Philip Embury, a local preacher, introduced Methodism into the United States. In the year 1771, Francis Asbury and Richard Wright, two travelling preachers, came to America; and in 1785 Mr. Asbury and Dr. Coke took upon themselves the Episcopal office, turned the local preachers out of the conference, and denied the private members a respresentation from their own body, upon the ground of expediency. In 1824 hundreds of them petitioned the general conference for a represention, claiming it as their unalienable birth right, to which theconference replied, "*you have no such rights*"—the institutions of Methodism "comprehend no such privileges." And in 1828 the general conference declares, that "the great head of the church himself has imposed upon us the duty of preaching the gospel, administering its ordinances, and maintaining its moral discipline among those over whom the Holy Ghost, in these respects, had made them overseers. Of these also, viz: of gospel doctrines, ordinances, and moral discipline, they do believe that [they] the divinely instituted ministry, are the divinely authorized expounders." How perfectly this language coincides with the language of the ecclesiastical despots of the second century; they declared "*that Christ had empowered them to prescribe* to their people authoritative rules of faith and manners." It would

seem that the general conference of 1828, had almost copied their language.

In the third century Dr. Moshiem says—"The face of things began now to change in the Christian church; the ancient method of ecclesiastical government seemed in general to subsist, while at the same time by imperceptible steps, it varied from the primitive rule and degenerated towards a religious monarchy. For the Bishops aspired to higher degrees of power and authority than they had formerly possessed; and not only violated the *rights of the people*, but also made gradual encroachments upon the privileges of the presbyters; and that they might cover their usurpations with an air of justice, and an appearance of reason, they published new doctrines concerning the nature of the church and the Episcopal dignity." Here again we see the irresponsible authority of the methodist Bishops pointed out in the clearest terms, after they had *violated the rights of the people* by denying them a representation in the general annual conferences. Yet, for a time, they acknowledged themselves bound by the decisions of the general conference, until the general conference of 1820, by a majority of more than two thirds of that body, passed a rule authorizing the annual conferences to elect their presiding Elders, which until then were appointed by the Bishops. This act of the general conference gave offence to Bishop McKendree, the senior Bishop, who immediately threw off all responsibility to the decision of the general conference, and openly asserted his authority to "*over-rule*" them; [See the address of the Bishop to the general conference of 1824,] and by interposing his authority, prevented the rule from being carried into effect, and upon the meeting of the general conference in 1828, he issued his mandate to them, asserting his authority to *over-rule* them, whereupon they rescinded the obnoxious rule and humbly *quailed* at his feet—and thus ended the authority of the general conference, to do any thing, or pass any rule contrary to the will and pleasure of the Bishops, who "*over-see* and *over-rule* them."

Concerning the fourth century, Dr. Moshiem says: "The Bishops, whose opulence and authority were considerably increased since the reign of Constantine, began to introduce innovations into the from of ecclesiastical discipline, and to change the ancient government of the church. Their first steps

were an entire exclusion of the people from all part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs; (this was also the first step of the Methodist Bishops; see above,) "and afterwards they, by degrees, divested even the presbyters of their ancient privileges, and their primitive authority, that they might have no importunate protesters to control their ambition, or oppose their proceedings; and principally, that they might either engross to themselves, or distribute as they thought proper, the possessions and revenues of the church." Nor are the methodist Bishops less careful to engross to themselves the possessions and revenues of the church; for, after they had excluded "the people from all part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs," and exacted a solemn pledge, from every presbyter at his ordination, that he would "reverently obey" them, [see discipline page 133,] and having assumed the power to *over-rule* the general conference, they require their agents to appoint trustees, to whom shall be deeded all the meeting houses, parsonages, lands and tenements, belonging to the church, throughout the United States, to be held by them in trust, for the use and benefit of the Bishops and General Conference of the M. E. Church in the United States—[See form of "deed of settlement," commencing on page 159.] These church "possessions," the Bishops "distribute" annually or oftener, as they think proper, to such of their preachers and agents as they may think worthey to take charge of them. In these appointments they are not bound to consult either the convenience of the preacher or agent, or the wishes of the people.

Of the fifth century Dr. M. says: "Thus were created in the fifth century, five superior rulers of the church, who were distinguished from the rest by the title of patriarchs." (The Methodists are ahead of them, for they have six.) "The patriarchs were distinguished by considerable and extensive rights and privileges, annexed to this high station. They assembled yearly in council, the clergy of their respective districts, in order to regulate the affairs of the church, &c. And lastly they appointed vicars, or deputies clothed with their authority." (Methodist Bishops assemble the itinerant preachers once in a year in annual conference, in which conference they, the Bishops preside, and of course "over-rule" their deliberations. Here, they also appoint presiding elders, clothed with their authority

in their absence, &c.) "The patriarchs began to encroach upon the rights, and trample on the prerogatives of their Bishops, and thus introduced gradually a sort of spiritual bondage into the church." (The Methodist Bishops, have carried this spiritual bondage to the highest possible perfection: 1st. By extorting an unqualified pledge of obedience to his opinions and mandates from every elder that he ordains, page 133. 2d. By appointing them annually, or oftener, to their field of labor; thus holding their pecuniary destinies at his disposal, page 25. 3d. They appoint "vicars or deputies," or presiding Elders, to oversee for them in their absence, pages 27, 28,) "and that they might invade without opposition, the rights of the Bishops" or presbyters, "they permitted the latter in their turn, to trample with impunity upon the ancient rights and privileges of the people."

How exactly this describes the state of things in the M. E. Church in the years 1825, 6, 7, and 8; when private members and local preachers by dozens were ex-communicated for belonging to Union Societies, and for patronizing the "Mutual Rights," a religious periodical devoted to the investigation of the principles of church government.

Having now laid before you a very rapid sketch of the causes which led to our separation from the fellowship of the M. E. Church, it is for you, my countrymen and fellow christians, to judge whether these causes are of sufficient magnitude to justify a measure of such importance as the formation of a separate and distinct church, holding the doctrines, modes of worship and moral discipline of the M. E. Church, and differing from her only in the form of government, ours being based upon scriptural, primitive and representative principles, provided with a constitution which, while it excludes the introduction of anarchy, secures alike the ministers and members of her fellowship, forever, against the encroachment of ecclesiastical despotism and anti-christian usurpation. Believing, as I do, that the cause of christian liberty is intimately connected with the success of the Methodist Protestant Church, I have endeavored to lay her objections to the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church before you in plain and intelligible language, without embellishment on the one hand or uncharitable invectives on the other. I have introduced incontrovertible testimony from their own acknowledged authorities, for every position

which I have taken, and if their own historians, biographers, church records, and discipline, have stamped upon their form of government a tyranical and anti-christian character, the fault cannot be charged upon me, since, as you have seen, I have merely acted as the compiler of the testimony, furnished by their own records. I am well aware of the method by which the advocates of Methodist Episcopacy endeavor to uphold their favorite system, first, by assailing the private character and impugning the motives of reformers, and secondly, by relinquishing for the time being, the exercise of those high prerogatives and powers, with which the discipline invests them. In regard to the first of these, I have only to say, that I cannot condescend to meet them on this ground, until they shall first satisfactorily disprove the positions I have taken, and answer the arguments I have advanced ; and until, in the second place, they show, that proving an individual to be of slender character or actuated by improper motives, will furnish a sufficient proof that an arbitrary and despotic form of government is consistent with the holy scriptures and the primitive usages of the church. In short, it must be seen, by every intelligent mind, that an attack upon private character in this controversy, is not only *anti-christian*, but is a tacit acknowledgment that the assailant is utterly dismantled of every vestige of argument by which he could support his sinking cause. But, as it is not so with us, you will not expect us to meet our opponents by recrimination. In regard to their relinquishing, for the time being, the powers and high prerogatives with which the discipline invests them, and from this circumstance raising an argument, or rather a sophistry, in support of their system, we can tell you, that they are not the original inventors of this "low cunning," for Cryspian, who flourished in the third century, is entitled to all the honor of originating this scheme for the support of ecclesiastical despotism.—Dr. Moshiem tells us that he " pleaded for the power of the Bishop with more zeal and vehemence than had ever been hitherto employed in that cause, though not with an unshaken constancy and perseverance, for, in difficult and perilous times, necessity sometimes obliged him to yield, and to submit several things to the judgment and authority of the church." Just so with the authorities of the M. E. Church. A few years ago, when their irresponsible authority was thought sufficient for all

purposes, they expelled members and ministers, as we have seen, for advocating representative principles and reading the "Mutual Rights," in consequence of which, "perilous times" arose. And now they privately advise against it, but do not expel the people for reading what they please, and in most cases they are permitted to choose their own class leaders, and in some instances, I am told they have condescended to let the people hold the right to their own meeting house. But this is only for the time being, which is evident from the fact that there is no alteration, for the better, made in the discipline, and no relinquishment on the part of the Bishops and General Conference, to the claim they made in 1828, to be divinely authorized law-givers to the church. This seems to say, in language sufficiently plain, that we will lay the saddle by, for the present, but as soon as the people are sufficiently ripe, (that is sufficiently ignorant) we will place it on them again and nail it there, as the successors of Cryspian did in the 4th century."

If this is not their intention, I ask to be informed why it is, that rather than expunge the tyrannical form of government, which we have been exposing, from their discipline, they first menaced and finally expelled the reformers for opposing it, until, literally driven out of the church, they were compelled to form a separate community? And why is it that they subject their members to the mortification and degradation of receiving from their hands, in the form of *privileges* and *indulgencies*, those high prerogatives and gracious rights which the great Head of the church has bestowed upon every believer as his inalienable birth right? Until these questions are answered satisfactorily, and their discipline altered, I must believe that their present mode of administration is dictated by policy, and not by principle.

It would afford me much pleasure to lay before you a view of the form of government under which our church is organized—but the want of time forbids it at present, and I must be content with referring you to our constitution and book of discipline, which is extant, and, by a perusal of it, you will find that we recognize the representative principle throughout; and in this, as well as every thing else, we have adhered closely to the landmarks sketched out by the pen of Inspiration, and practised upon by the primitive churches. And I am glad to inform you that, notwithstanding the overwhelming force by which we are opposed, our cause is progressing rapidly. Four years ago, the number of members in the Ohio Annual Conference of our church was about 1,700; the same conference district now

numbers upwards of 10,000; while other sections of the work have prospered in a similar proportion. We have now, if my memory serves me right, fourteen Annual Conferences, all in prosperous progress—and if we are faithful, and humble, and holy, which I pray God may continue to be the case, the time is not far distant, when the arm of despotic power, which is already paralysed by our movements, will be finally broken, and upon the ruins of which will be erected a government of mutual rights and reciprocal privileges, cemented by love to God and brotherly affection, which owns no Lord or lawgiver but Christ, the pure and undefiled one—to which I am persuaded every lover of religious and rational liberty will say, *Amen.*

From Springer's Review of the late decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio, which has went virtually to incorporate the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; or in other words, to incorporate eighteen hundred Itinerant Preachers, with the privilege of holding within the State, property to an extensive and indefinite amount, and which gives the Itinerant Preachers, virtually, full power to wrest away at pleasure, by ecclesiastical and legal processes, all the Church property of their membership in Ohio, amounting in valuation to $350,000, *more or less, &c.*

"When a cause floats with the stream it never wants advocates, but when it has to stem the current, none but the true men stick to their oars. This maxim has been exemplified in the history of this controversy. When the episcopacy awoke like the lion from its slumbers, and began to utter the thunders of excommunication, the timid and the fearful, and those who lacked principle, found it most congenial to their feelings to make their submission to the "divine authorites" of the church, rather than manfully to meet the gathering storm, and to atone for their former conduct by censuring and abusing their old frends who have had the firmness to act consistently.

"After the refusal of the conference of 1824, to pay any attention to the claims of the laity, a meeting was held in Baltimore, where the conference sat, composed of some of its distinguished members, and of reformers from different parts of the United States. This meeting resolved itself into a Union Society, the object of which was to obtain a representative government, and to prevent secessions from the church. It also determined to publish under its patronage a periodical, called the "Mutual Rights of the ministers and members of the M. E.

Church," "for the purpose of giving the Methodist community a suitable opportunity of entering upon a calm and dispassionate discussion of the subject in dispute."

"From this period, the opposition to the high claims of our clergy assumed a systematic method of operation. Numerous societies auxiliary to the one in Baltimore were formed throughout the connexion. The Mutual Rights spread the essays and arguments of reformers, from New Orleans to Maine, and from the coasts of the Atlantic to the borders of Erie.

"The enemies to a liberal modification of the government affected for a while, to treat these efforts with silent contempt: or contented themselves with a private opposition to the principles. They represented the leading reformers as a "set of backsliders,"—"restless spirits"—"designing men," &c. &c. whose conduct and principles meeting the public odium would soon sink them into disgrace. But notwithsanding this opposition, the march of principle was still onward. Majorities in Cincinnati—in Stubenville—in Pittsburg, and other considerable metropolises of Methodism, were known to exist in favor of a modification of the government.

"When the men in power saw that a private influence could not stop the progress of principle; but that their authority was in danger, and power tasting so sweet, they were resolved to retain it, at the risk of bringing public odium on themselves, and on religion in general, by putting a stop to the discussion of the subject altogether. With a view to this object a prosecution was got up against the editorial committee of the Mutual Rights, and others, evidently with the design of putting down the Reformers' press: and Dr. Jennings and his coadjutors were expelled from the fellowship of the church, not for what they had written, or for any charge of immorality, but for being the mere publishers of what had been written by others, principally travelling preachers, and for being members of the Union Society. Mr. Dorsey, an itinerant minister, had been charged and suspended by the Baltimore Annual Conference for reading and patronizing the Mutual Rights: and was ultimately expelled from the church."

"The tenure by which a man holds his membership in the M. E. Church, is not the will of his brethren, *but the mere will of the preacher in charge:* and of course, this is also the only tenure by which he holds his claim on his interest in the church property, now that the Supreme Court, by its late decision, has virtually incorporated the general conference. Such are the provisions and arrangements of the discipline, together with the

official decisions of the highest tribunals of the church, that a minister in charge, if he sees cause to exert his power, may expel just whom he pleases therefrom, and if he can only secure the protection of the Itinerant brethren of his own conference, to whom alone he is responsible for his moral and official conduct, he can pass with impunity. And experience shows, that when he acts in favor of privileges and prerogatives, in which they have a common interest with himself, he is sure of their protection.

"The mode of trial prescribed in the discipline, is, that "an accused member shall be brought to trial before the society of which he is a member, or a select number of them, in the presence of a bishop, elder, deacon or preacher." But the preacher in charge determines which of these two modes he will adopt. And if he be so minded he may select the enemies of the accuseed, and force him to trial before them. Or if he cannot get persons to suit his purpose in the society, he can do as Mr. Taylor did, in expelling the trustees above, go to distant societies for a committee, right contrary to the rule, and you have no check on him. But should not this jury of the preacher's own choosing, bring in a verdict of guilt against the culrpit, he has another chance at him, and can thus put him in jeopardy twice for the same offence, for he can appeal the case to the Quarterly Conference. A majority of the members of this court, having apellate jurisdiction, are class leaders. Men who are appointed to office by the preacher, and who hold their office during his pleasure; and of course on the general principles of human nature, would be inclined to act the good will and pleasure of their Creator. Besides, the preacher has it in his power to see all the members of the Quarterly Conference before the trial, and to use a personal influence against the accused, which, when put forth under any circumstances would be dangerous, but when connected with the tremendous prerogatives he possesses as a Methodist preacher, scarcely ever fails to be fatal.

"But to make this position (that the tenure by which a man holds his membership in the M. E. Church, is the mere will of the preacher in charge) still clearer, we will state facts; and facts are stubborn things. They come home upon the mind with more force, and produce a stronger conviction than all our abstract reasonings can possibly do. We have a large field before us, out of which we could make a number of selections but we shall confine ourselves to two cases, both of which happened within the bounds of this State. The first was transacted in the enlightened city of Cincinnati. The Methodist society in

this place before the division, was as pious, as intelligent, as wealthy, and as numerous as any other society of that order in the western country. And we wish it distinctly remembered, that there was a majority therein, who wished an abridgment of the power of the itinerant preachers. This fact was known by two important occurrences. The first is, there having existed a difference of opinion, about the comparative strength of the parties, which produced some excitement, it was mutually agreed that a meeting should be called to determine this matter.—When the Society convened for that purpose, the preacher in charge defended the claims of his brethren in the itinerancy, and A. Coleman the rights of the laity. And after the vote was deliberately taken there were more than two thirds present, who were favorable to a modification of the power of the travelling ministry. The second case is: the society being a corporation, had to meet annually in May, according to a provision of the law of the state, to elect their trustees. The reformers being the principal and business members of the society, were generally elected. But in the Spring of 1828, when the travelling preachers were about bringing matters to a crisis, with regard to those troublesome opposers of their prerogatives. Some of them managed to get up a ticket with a view of running out the old trustees. But in this they wree defeated by a handsome majority. We are thus circumstantial on this point, to convince the reader that there was a majority of reformers in the society at Cincinnati, so that he may see in the case we are about to produce, that a Methodist preacher with his discipline in his hand, can operate with as much ease against majorities, in those societies over which he presides, as he can against minorities or individuals.

"We shall now introduce the history of the case to which we allude. It bears that in 1828, John F. Wright was stationed in the city of Cincinnati—that after the general conference of that year had confirmed the Baltimore expulsions—and thus made it legal to exclude men for the freedom of investigation, he commenced his attack upon the reformers of that city, for the same offence; and procured, or receved charges against fourteeen reputable members of the society. He selected the committee to try the lay members from his own party—the accused objected to this committee because they had pre-judged their case, and demanded to be tried by the whole society, insisting that where there were two modes of trial given, as in the discipline, that the criminal should have his choice. But Mr. Wright over-ruled the objection; and forced them to trial before his selected jury—they of course were expelled.

"But say our prosecutors, these had an appeal to the Quarterly conference.' So they had. The discipline to keep up a show of fairness grants an appeal to an expelled member. But we have shown you already, that, the court having appellate jurisdiction in this case, is composed principally, of the preacher's own officers, who could be removed at pleasure. If therefore it had been necessary, Mr. Wright could have displaced all his leaders in a few hours, and put in their places such as would have suited his purpose. But, although there was a majority of reformers in this officialty such a course was not needed—he had another expedient that equally suited his design. He charged ten members of this conference with the same crime of "sowing dissentions" and "doing harm," because they were members of the "Union Society," and "supported the Mutual Rights," which " inveighed against the discipline;" and thereby disabled them from voting. This left his party in the majority; and he could have charged ten more had it been needful.

"The expelled members thought, to appeal to such a court as this, would only be inviting insult: they therefore protested against Mr. Wright's conduct, and followed him to the Ohio annual conference, to whom alone he was responsible for his official acts, with impeachments for mal-administration: and though the whole of this trial was only a farce upon judicial proceedings, yet that body abundantly sustained him in all his doings. And Mr. Wright was shortly after elevated, by the episcopacy, to the presiding eldership. The facts above stated we presume our prosecutors will not deny.

"The second case to which we allüded, as illustrating the power and control of the itinerant ministry, is the one which led to this prosecution, and which we have partly given in detail.—In this case the preacher in charge outraged his own rule to get at the people's property. Many other doings of a similar character have been acted over these United States, in the late contest with the travelling preachers: these facts show that they not only have the power to do, but the *disposition also!*—that they will *use* their power before they will part with their prerogatives.

"On the whole, we think it must appear evident to the reader, from the deed itself, and from the views and facts we have exhibited that the laity and locality of the Methodist Episcopal Church have no substantial claim to any property conveyed according to the provisions of that instrument. It conveys the property virtually to the travelling preachers. And we cannot see that the other members of the church have any more right

therein, than the slave of Virginia has in the property of his master. The deed recognizes none as members of the law, or rule-making department of the church, but, "preachers or ministers," and thus virtually denies to the laity the right of representation. The general conference has frequently denied the same right. When a voice is denied in the government to a portion of any community, those to whom it is denied are not *members* but *subjects*. Thus we say of a citizen of these United States, he is a *member* of this great community, and of a peasant in England, he is a *subject* of his majesty. So strictly speaking the laity and locality of the M. E. Church are not members of that community, but they are subjects of the itinerant ministry, and they are particularly subject to them in property matters. Every individual who joins the establishment, and all the property conveyed to it by the operations of the above deed, go but to increase the power and importance of this spiritual corporation.

"This hold the preachers have upon the property gives them a powerful grasp on the people. It is doubtful with us, whether if it were made to them in *fee simple*, it would give them any more control over the membership than it does under the present arrangement. They have it so managed as to render them all the influence and consequence that property could give, but yet in such a way as not to excite that suspicion and jealousy of the public, which it would, if directly conveyed to them. This doctrine has been exemplified in the history of our controversy.

"The principal portion of many societies have been kept from seceding from the old church, from the fact, that if they did, they would have to leave their meeting-houses: and probably were not able to build others. And these arrangements of the travelling preachers, are not the effect of chance, but of design: they have had the most vigilant eye upon these matters, always strengthening their system of power from the occurrences that happened in the progress of their government, that disclosed its weakness. For instance: Previous to the last general conference, there was no rule in the discipline, directing the method of appointing the original board of trustees in the deed; and of course the society would sometimes claim and exercise that prerogative. And they might occasionally put in fellows who would not be very manageable. The deed itself provides that in filling up the board, when vacancies occur, the appointment of successor shall be in the preacher, but that the remaining part of the board shall have a negative upon him. This was also found to be a troublesome provision; for the old

trustees would not always approve of the preachers's man, and he had no law to bring them to an official account for their stubbornness. And the spirit of investigation that had been abroad for several years, made them many difficulties of this kind: As in the case of Mr. Taylor, already related. But the general conference of 1828, have made provision for their unlimited control over these matters, by passing a rule that the preacher in charge, or presiding elder of the district, shall appoint the original board of trustees; and that these trustees, when thus appointed, shall be accountable to the quarterly conference for their official act. This quarterly conference, as we have shown you, is under the preachers's control, so that he can have things just as he wishes. Say now, if you can, that these regulations are not the effect of design.

"But we will do the itinerant ministry the justice to admit, that in all this they might have led themselves to conclude they were designing nothing wrong. They might have supposed that the more power they possessed, the greater would be their ability to promote the happiness of mankind. And they might easily persuade themselves, that as they aimed at nothing but doing good, this object sanctified all their measures. But the power to do good, is, throughout all agency, except that of absolute perfection, the power to do harm. And the acts and decisions of all legislators and jurists, should proceed upon the maxim, that when men have power in prospect they will take hold of it; and when in possession they will abuse it, if not properly checked. This maxim is sustained by the history of the world, as exemplified in both church and state. Like all other general rules, it has its exceptions, but they are very few, and confined to individuals, and not to public bodies."

"Whether there be any analogy between ecclesiastical and civil government or not, one fact is confirmed by experience, that whatever kind of government prevails in the church, it has a tendency to draw after it the same kind in the state. 'There is not a truth,' says Judge Story, 'to be gathered from history more momentous than this, that civil liberty cannot long be separated from religious liberty, without danger, and ultimately without the destruction of both. Wherever religious liberty exists, it will first or last bring in and establish civil liberty. Wherever it is suppressed, the church establishment will, first or last, become the engine of despotism, and overthrow, unless it be itself overthrown, every vestige of civil liberty." In confirmation of this doctrine we would invite the reader to look at the effects of the principles of the Roman Catholic clergy,

When they raised themselves into irresponsible power, and arrogated to themselves a 'divine right' to govern the church; their exertions and principles produced an influence which leavened all the civil governments of Europe, and the most perfect state of despotism was the consequence. On the other hand, when tyranny had reached its zenith, in the reign of Elizabeth, says the historian, the only remaining spark of liberty in England was among the Puritans. This spark was fanned and kindled, till it ultimately spread such a flame throughout the kingdom, as produced a revolution in favor of liberty, which still continues to benefit that nation. Though it is admitted, that when these religious Puritans fled from persecution in their native country, and settled in the northern wilds of America, and got the power in their own hands, that they tarnished their history with its abuse; yet, they have been at the head of almost every benevolent enterprize in our country. They took the lead in shaking off the yoke of British tyranny. It is among their descendants, that the several institutions which are now operating with such success through the community, in favor of religion and morality, took their origion. Their free schools have shed a rad ance upon the field of science—they have contributed largely to furnish, in the infancy of our State, every county with professional men—and we have not the least doubt but Ohio is largely indebted thereto for her present celebrity. All these effects have flowed as consequences from their *free* and *liberal religious principles*."

"We are well aware that when we give any intimations of an opinion, that the organization and principles of the Methodist Episcopal Church polity have a tendency to subvert the civil institutions of our country, that the friends of Methodist aristocracy blacken with indignation, and pour forth a torrent of denunciations against those who have the temerity to indulge in such suspicions. The conference, in alluding to this subject, express themselves with a great deal of asperity: 'attempts have been made,' say they, 'to excite against us the jealousy and suspicion of statesmen and politicians, and of the constituted authorities of civil government. This *low stratagem* we have always regarded as peculiarly deserving the rebuke of every generous mind; and we cannot believe otherwise than that it had its origin either in some *distempered mind*, or in some *perverted heart*.' Discerning men will see that all this is but the blustering of conscious guilt. The conference feels the force of the charge brought against them, and they have no argument to repel it; and says Goldsmith, 'the mouths that want

argument are filled with abuse.' Instead of uttering such severe censures, why did they not point out some instance in the history of the world, where a despotic church government had promoted civil liberty?"

"But we wish to express ourselves guarded on this subject. We do not intimate that the travelling preachers have at present, or ever had, any *design* to subvert the civil policy of our country. We only argue that their principles have this unavoidable *tendency*, whether they *design* it or not. The direct tendency of their system is to spoil and corrupt mankind, and ultimately to prepare them for any thing. See the doings of the last general conference. Eighteen hundred itinerant ministers claim the power by divine right, to exercise a government over 5,000 local preachers, and 500,000 lay members, which extends to matters of faith, property, and moral character, and they have finally expelled a number of their best, and most intelligent members, for employing against these assumptions, the freedom of investigation, under the pretext of preventing its abuses. Now contrast those high claims, and these extraordinary doings, with the conduct and principles of the forefathers of Methodism in this country, and then say whether there is not, in that body, a great dereliction of principle, in favor of that most bewitching of all the passions attached to the human heart—*the love of power.*"

"The primitive Methodist preachers were, in general, amongst the best of men. When they embarked in the service of the church, they had nothing to expect in *this world*, but poverty, toil and persecution; consequently, none would engage but from a sense of duty. Their zeal, honesty and simplicity of manners, introduced them to the public confidence. This public confidence opened the way for an extensive success. But, that their success in point of numbers, wealth, and influence, has had a deleterious effect upon their successors, we believe, is admitted by nine-tenths of their own members. It is to be feared that their college endowments, their book agencies, and their wealthy stations which afford so many good livings, have led some to flock to the altars, partly from other motives than those which induced the primitive preachers: and these being less under the influence of a sense of duty, would be, of course, more inclined to give toleration to those desires of human nature, which always enlarge in proportion as the objects of gratification present themselves."

"If the itinerant ministry had given any instance where they refused to take hold of power when it presented itself; or

where they had given it up to secure the peace and welfare of the church, we might be inclined to think that they would act, upon this subject, different from the rest of the species. But, so far, they have taken hold of every item of prerogative attainable, and hold it with the most tenacious grasp. Every institution, from their tremendous itinerent machine, down to their Sunday School Union, is taken under the direction of the travelling preachers. Then, as they have so far acted with regard to acquisition and retention of power, just like the sons of Adam in all their successive generations, have acted, may we not fairly conclude that they will proceed upon the principles with which they have set out? And as the march of power is ever onward, and its tremendous tendency to accumulation, that they will never rest satisfied until they shall have accomplished 'a nation of Methodist:' and until the principles of Methodist episcopacy shall have given direction to the affairs of state.—And should they ever effect these objects, we may justly imagine, that, human nature like, they would weep with Alexander because there was not another acquisition to make."

"Human nature in every age, and among every association of men, is the same. And he that presumes his age or sect is better, and will act with regard to the subject of power, different from the rest of mankind, betrays a lamentable ignorance of the question. The development of the human character, in relation to power, when placed in similar circumstances, has been so uniformly the same in the history of our race, that the science of government is reduced to maxims, which are well understood, and certain in their application. All that the well read scholar in human nature's school, wishes to know, is, how men are situated in relation to power, and he can predict to a moral certainty how they will act. If, therefore, you want to know how Methodist preachers, or any other class of ministers would act, in reference to this subject, see how the ministers of religion have acted, in the days of other years; for

'The proper study of mankind is man.'

And as those have acted, so will they, if not watched and restrained. Who among the sects at the present day are better than the primitive christians? Yet look a moment at the history of these olden times. When the great and benevolent Founder of our religion, established a visible church on earth, for the benefit of man, he distributed it into separate and independent congregations, each of which, without any foreign dictation, choose their own spiritual teacher. And as they

generally selected a man of years and experience, to preside at their deliberations for business, and to instruct them in religious matters, he was called an elder from his age; and a bishop or overseer from his office; but there was a perfect parity between these elders and bishops; these were only different names for the same officer. But the spirit of human nature was not satisfied with this arrangement; like the gas which fills a balloon, having a strong tendency to ascend, it raised a little, and called itself bishop—it took a second step up, and called itself arch-bishop—a third, and called itself metropolitan—a fourth, and assumed the title of patriarch; still as it raised, extending its jurisdiction over two or more of the inferior orders; but finally it leaped up into St. Peter's chair, and taking the appellation of Pope or universal Father, declared itself the head of the church. In this situation it swelled into vast importance, soon became infallible, and looking around it, saw the civil government in unsanctified hands, and being well persuaded that it could manage these political affairs much better than such men, it extended its jurisdiction to the civil and military, as well as the ecclesiastical department; and putting on its head a triple crown, emblematical of those three divisions of power, it enforced universal obedience. Then it was, that, in great clemency, kings were permitted to stand at its gate, and emperors to kiss its great toe."

"Now, it requires but little knowledge of the spirit and doings of the Methodist Episcopal church, to see, that human nature in that association, is fast striding upward. Mr. Wesley, the venerable founder of the sect, says, 'Lord King's account of the primitive church, convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters (elders) are the same order:' again, '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 A BISHOP.' But regardless of the entreaties of the father of Methodism, and every other consideration, old Adam's disposition in that church, has elevated itself in the character of a *presiding elder*, who has jurisdiction over several elders; and still a little higher in the character of bishop, who exercises a control over the presiding elders. And if we understand the regulations of the episcopacy, the senior bishop is now fairly arched over his colleagues: for should the bishops all be present at any one conference, the OLDEST has the right by seniority, according to usage, to station the preachers, or preside over the deliberations of the conference. He divides the duties with his associates by courtesy. When a preacher is to be stationed at a particu-

lar place—a presiding elder to be made—or any important matter to be decided, pertaining to the episcopal prerogative; he may call a meeting of the episcopacy, and determine by a vote of the majority, or he may not, at pleasure; and where is the rule that is violated? We find nothing in the discipline which relates to such matters at all—from our personal knowledge of their mode of doing business, we fairly infer the above state of things. If this inference be correct, the Senior is now to all intents and purposes an Arch Bishop. All he wants is the name. And if he has not *Arch*, he has *Senior*, affixed to his title, which is a distinguishing appellation."

"By these remarks, we do not mean to say that the episcopal preachers have a greater original thirst for power than their neighbors. They are men of like passions, and by nature neither better nor worse than the rest of their fellow citizens. For every man, no difference where he is schooled, as Luther says, 'has a pope in him,' and all he wants is to see St. Peter's chair empty, and he will be in it at all hazards. The only way to manage the matter, is so to construct governments, that there is no chair to be occupied."

"Every officer in the episcopal corps, from the presiding elder over his district, down to the leader over his dozen, is, by the arrangements of the discipline, held responsible to the bishops, either directly or indirectly, for their official acts. The leader inspects his class once a week, and reports to the preacher placed in charge by the bishop; the preacher in charge inspects his circuit once a month, and reports to the presiding elder; the presiding elder inspects his district once a quarter, and reports to the bishop; and the bishop in person reviews the whole once a year at the annual conference. This system of inspection and drill, has enabled the episcopacy to train both the laity and ministry, into such an implicit submission to ecclesiastical authority, as has no parallel in Protestant Christendom. To show the reader what this system is capable of, we will give the statements of the famous Report to which we have so frequently alluded. After saying, 'the ministers assembled in general conference, coming so recently from all parts of the great field of our missionary labors, and having had, throughout its whole extent, free and constant intercourse both with travelling and local preachers, and also with our lay members,' are 'prepared to give a correct judgment,' &c.: they then add, in another part of the same document, 'the great body of our ministers, both local and travelling, as well as our members, perhaps not much if any short of a hundred to one, still oppose

their wishes.' (That is, the *wishes* of those local preachers and laymen who called for the right of representation.) 'We believe this to be the result of a *deliberate attachment to our existing institutions and economy.*' The reader by this time must have some knowledge of these existing institutions, and this economy. He sees, that Methodist episcopacy is in miniature, what monarchy is in magnitude. He sees that the reputation—the ecclesiastical rights, and the church property of every member of their community, is under the control of the bishops. We think he will agree with us, that a better devised, and more ingenious despotism, could not easily be organized by the art of man. Yet, according to the testimony of the conference itself, (who tell us how well they are prepared to judge of this matter,) by the operation of this system, Methodist episcopacy has drilled and schooled eighteen hundred itinerant ministers, five thousand local preachers, and five hundred thousand lay members, (originally liberty loving Americans) with the exception of something like one to the hundred, into a '*deliberate attachment*,' to their 'existing institutions and economy.' They have so imbued them, with the spirit of the corps, that they '*deliberately*' love their fetters."

"Now, is not the operation of such a system, in a community like ours, a very dangerous engine? What could it not accomplish? For illustration: let us suppose that this episcopacy goes on increasing in numbers and wealth, for a length of time to come: let us also suppose, that, in some future day, the monarch of England should again make an attempt on the liberties of America: and let us still further suppose, that his majesty should make a compact with these Methodist bishops, that, if they would aid him by their influence, in turn he would reward them with privileges and emoluments in the government. And we think it a perfectly correct maxim, that legislators and jurists, should suppose mankind to be capable of any thing, and make their checks accordingly. Whoever confers a discretionary power upon any one man, or set of men, on the presumption that it will not be abused, betrays the very principles upon which the fabric of American jurisprudence is reared. Now, after the agreement of the temporal and spiritual monarchs above, see what an organization the episcopacy has, to carry its engagement into effect. A number of grades of officers; each trained up to the most implicit submission to their superiors, from the centre of action down. The bishops could commence drilling the presiding elders, the presiding elders the preachers, the preachers the leaders, and the leaders the peo-

ple. What would be the effect of this drilling? Would it be any very visionary thought to suppose, that they might impart such a spirit, and produce such an impulse, as would raise the shout, of '*O king live forever!*' from the centre to the circumference of these United States!—Such a supposition would imply no more than what the conference tells us has already been effected, by their drilling operations. After tacitly admitting the illiberal character of their government, by informing us there is '*no analogy*' between it and our civil polity, then claiming a divine right to rule the church, the conference tells us, they have trained up near 500,000 Americans, embracing a large amount of men, of the finest intelligence, and the finest integrity, to '*a deliberate attachment*' to their 'existing institutions and economy.' All this has been accomplished too, in the course of half a century! What could not such a system effect?"

"Suppose again, (for we do not know from what quarter danger may come,) that in some national dispute about politics, among ourselves, when party excitement ran high, that some daring chieftain, taking advantage of the turbulence of the times, should attempt to wrest away the liberties of our country. Suppose he should be able to draw around him, a party equal in strength to his opponents. In the doubtfulness of his struggle, he would naturally look around him for aid—his eye could not escape such a tremendous organization as Episcopal Metodism. Should he make overtures, and should they be accepted, Oh! how fatal in such a conjuncture might this engine be to American liberties—it might turn the scale against us forever!"

"We have no doubt, should these sheets ever pass in review, under the eye of a bishop, but, that he would feel in his breast the kindlings of an angry indignation, against what he thought to be such illiberal suppositions: and that he would be ready to exclaim with Hazael of old—'but what! is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great THING!' Yet, we invite him to be calm, and recollect that when Hazael was made 'king over Assyria,' and got the power in his hand, he did the very 'thing' at which his soul kindled with such angry resentment. This, and a thousand other cases, teach us that no man knows himself, what he will do, until he be tried. The adroitness of the human mind, to find arguments and reasons why it should go the way its interests or inclinations lead it, is proverbial. It was a knowledge of this principle, no doubt, that induced the poet to sing,

'An HONEST MAN's the noblest work of God.'"

"The facility with which the episcopacy have obtained the co-operation of both the ministry and the laity, in the work of death or expulsion, in which they have recently been engaged over the Union, gives but too lamentable proof of the efficiency of their drilling system. The bishops have never wanted for a set of trustees, or a committee, legally or illegally gotten up, to effect their purposes: though these purposes may have ever so much outraged the principles of the New Testament. We will give the present case as a sample. Here is a deed to be wrested out of the hands of John Springer, which, if done, will absolutely defraud the School out of its *right*. The circumstances of the case are all known to the presiding elder and preacher in charge; the one, the immediate, and the other the under-agent of the bishops. Will these be willing to engage in this work of dishonesty? Oh! that we could answer in the negative.—But if these agents are willing, they cannot act without the use of a set of trustees; surely, they cannot find any who will become tools for them in this dishonorable work. Ah yes! humiliating to tell, from their well trained disciples, they persuade a component number that it is their duty to engage in this ignominious enterprise. Men too, who lived in the neighborhood, and had a knowledge of all the circumstances before them. Now any set of men, who could thus suffer themselves to be made the dupes of a designing priesthood, to cheat a neighborhood out of its right, ought to be ashamed to look an enlightened community in the face. It will avail these trustees nothing, to say they have not at present, nor do they intend ever to turn the school out of the house; for they have contributed to place this property in a set of hands beyond their control, for whom they only hold it in trust. And should these preachers, in some future day, resolve on dispossessing the school, and should the trustees even be opposed to this measure, the preacher in charge could as easily dispose of them, as Mr. Taylor did of the old board."

"As the *effects* of these drilling operations may excite astonishment with the reader, he may probably want to know some little more about the manner in which *they* are produced. He will then bear in mind, that a large portion of those who attach themselves to the Methodist Episcopal church, are from the youth of our country; who have but little knowledge of the human character in general, and of the Episcopal government in particular: and

> 'Candid, and generous and just,
> Boys care but little whom they trust.'

The zeal manifested by the Methodist ministry, is suited to the ardor of youth—the excitement produced at their popular meetings, has a powerful tendency to enlist them into the cause of the episcopacy. The youth now enlisted under the banners of Methodism, has every thing to learn—experience alone is to make him acquainted with the practical operations of their system. While he serves his apprenticeship of six months, if he be a promising youth, he is treated with a great deal of tenderness as a lamb of the flock. His novitiate expires, and with all confidence in the establishment, he enters into full fellowship—not long probably, until he sees a flourish of authority played off on one of his brethren; but so strong is his faith in the concern, that he can scarcely believe his own senses, that there was any thing like an abuse of power in the matter. But, after a while, some appendage of the episcopacy treads upon his own toes—he now begins to flinch, and bristle up to something like an opposition; for it is a principle in government, that men will not act until they are made to feel; but as soon as the first ebullitions of resentment pass off, he settles down into a calm, and says no more. Supposing this to be the act of an imprudent individual, such as may never occur to him again. All this time he retains, to the full extent of their vigor, his independent American feelings. But in the course of time, some circumstance brings him full in contact with episcopal power. Some officer of the corps fairly mounts him. Like the horse just saddled from the forest, he is resolved to dismount the rider—he makes several fruitless efforts—finds that he is fettered with strong cords. He now begins to think seriously on the subject—sees that to resist may be attended with fatal consequences—perhaps he now has a family, and some of his children are members of the church—he may be a professional man, and his business under the influence of the ruling authority—the bread of his household may be concerned. At all events, his acquaintance; his friends; his attachments; are within the church of which he is a member. If he persists, these ties may all be cut off. Afflicting thought! He looses many nights' rest, reflecting upon the subject. At last he feels his American pride beginning to give way; and he humbles himself to his spiritual guide. Good cheer, and rejoicing, of course, is manifested at the return of an erring prodigal; and he is again restored to the confidence of his rulers. Having thus learned by the things he has suffered, he is more cautious in future—he makes his submissions before trouble comes upon him. His moral principle, and manly nature, being now impaired, he gradually sinks

down into apathy, and ultimately permits himself to be boxed and cuffed about (these words are used figuratively) at pleasure. If his services are wanted in a board of trustees, or on a committee, for the purpose of wresting away men's property, or driving them from the church, he is at the will of his clerical masters. He is now what is called 'a full blooded Methodist.' And should he be asked to sign a petition to the general conference, opposing the claim of representation, he 'deliberately' obeys. This explains the process, by which ninety-nine out of the hundred, are schooled into a 'deliberate attachment' to the 'existing institutions and economy' of Methodism.

"But we shall now direct the reader's attention to the progress of schooling, in the higher department. Mainly from the list of young men on the rolls of the church, the itinerant ranks are to be filled. And whatever may be true, of by-gone years, it is in vain to sing, at present, the song that men are called on to make sacrifices who engage in that service. A more bewitching and fascinating dream, could not enter into the brain of a youth of almost any description, than a proposition to enter on the itinerating career. The thoughts of an opportunity of improving his mind and manners by reading, and an intercourse with men of science; of gratifying his natural thirst for novelty by travelling, and an extensive acquaintance with the world; of receiving the caresses of his own people, and the attentions of the community at large; are considerations well calculated to bedazzle his mind, and to make him feel uneasy about his call to the work, other than what arises from the convictions of duty. And it may not be improbable, from the present prospects held out to young men in that church, that many on this subject mistake the *impulse* of desire, for the *voice* of the spirit. The difficulty, then, in filling up the ranks of the itinerancy, is not for want of offers, but in making the proper selections. The episcopacy, with its many eyes, scans and inspects the whole class of aspirants. If any one manifests the least insubordination, his path is soon obstructed. But where a person of a supposed suitable temper and talent is discovered, he is at once encouraged—made a class leader—given license to exhort—after a while made a preacher—and ultimately recommended to the annual conference, where he enters on a two years' trial. As he is now a candidate for a higher order, and of course a nearer approach to the episcopacy, he has to undergo a new course of inspection and discipline. Accordingly he is placed by the bishop, under a preacher in charge of a circuit, with whom he has to labor. The preacher in charge enters every

cabin he enters, and learns every thing he says. He also comes in contact with the presiding elder, at quarterly meeting, every three months, who is sure to give him an opportunity of showing of what kind of mettle he is made. The least indication of a rebellious, or revolutionary spirit, in this stage of his progress, might entirely blast his future prospects; for he is instructed in the discipline, that, any 'one on trial may be rejected without doing him any wrong.' But, if no untoward indications are discovered through his probationary term, and he is willing to promise to 'act in all things, *not according to his own will*, but, as a *son* in the gospel,' and 'to employ himself in the manner,' and 'work at those times and places that we (the bishops) shall advise,' he is received into full connexion, and is made a member of this great Methodist aristocratical monarchy: and he now has a vote in all the business of the annual conference. This satisfies him for the present. But as the general conference is the only body in the church that has even a nominal check upon the bishops, he is not permitted to approach that august assembly so easily; for he has to undergo two years more drilling before he is eligible to a seat therein; the discipline requiring him to have travelled, first, 'four full calendar years.' As soon as he is admitted a member of the annual conference, he is probably placed in charge of a circuit, and takes the oversight of all the preachers, exhorters, stewards, trustees, leaders, and private members within his jurisdiction. The very fact, that the bishop has reposed this confidential trust in him, sets him high in the estimation of the people. The power and influence he now possesses, makes every thing bow before him, and brings around him a great deal of adulation. He tastes this cup of sweets with pleasure; and if he has not a well balanced mind, will be thrown off his guard, and become more or less inflated. But, though he sees every thing below him, move to his liking, yet there are others mounted over him, that often give him pain. A presiding elder occasionally rides rough shod over his feelings. He wishes to be friendly with a bishop, but he finds him like a thorn bush, he can approach him from no quarter without running against a jagg. A repetition of such unprovoked treatment, at last makes him begin to feel sore; and if he still retain the spirit and sensibility of an American, he is sure, ultimately, to resent it. Yea, if he entertains a proper view of his responsibility to the great head of the church, who forbids him to call any *man master*, that is, to render a cringing and obsequious obedience to any man whatever, he will feel bound in conscience, to oppose such

lordly pretensions—such an unscriptural assumption of power. We now have him in a stage of his experience, that he is impelled to opposition, both from the feelings of a righteous resentment, and the convictions of duty. And if he be an honest man, he will set about the work, regardless of consequences. This many eyed episcopacy looks on his efforts with composure. Being conscious of its strength, it treats the whole with a kind of cool indifference But still, matters are put in train to chastise him for his temerity. A presiding elder takes occasion to admonish him, who begins with an attempt to refute his notions by argument; our hero having the best side of the question, soon foils him on that ground. But, as is usual, when the elder is run out of argument, he resorts to abuse. He lifts upon his countenance an air of Episcopal authority, and feeling very confident of his strength, he upbraids his underling with being an upstart—tells him that Methodism had taken him from the ashes, and made him what he is—that it is ungrateful for a child to rebel against its mother—and concludes with an exhortation to get more grace and humility."

"This attitude of authority, has the effect to intimidate many into a submission; but should the person, over whom it is exerted, happen to possess a proper manly and christian firmness, it would have no other tendency than to stimulate him to more vigorous efforts. Should he continue his opposition, he is soon placed in the ban, and on the back ground. At all popular meetings, the veriest novice is preferred before him. He is no longer entrusted with the charge of a circuit, but is placed under some insolent minion. This degrades him in the public estimation. Should a brother of a little more discernment than common, make inquiry of some of the managing spirits about this arrangement, and give his opinion that matters were not exactly right; this is met with an 'O yes! he is a man of talents, but—but—but: he has a good moral character, but—but—but."

> "Thus meditate a blow, and yet afraid to strike,
> Just hint a fault and hesitate dislike."

"At conference, when his character is under examination, should some friend, who has found him to be a man of the first moral and intellectual worth, wish to speak a word in his favor, the bishop with a frown gives him an indication to take his seat, and will hear nothing on the subject; he merely passes off without objection. But as soon as the man is examined, who can on all occasions mould himself into the image of the episcopacy, and reflect nothing but their sentiments and views; one pre-

siding elder after another is permitted to arise and say all they can in his praise; and after they have eulogized him, until decency has blushed and turned away, the bishop with a smile on his face, inquires, have you any thing more to say in favor of brother ******? But if no other expedient will drive the delinquent from the itinerancy, or force him into subjection, in the last resort a little circuit is made for his special benefit, in the swamps of ****** on which he must starve. We have now come to a place where submission or location is unavoidable. Some will pursue the latter course, but by far the most the former.—The general conference tells us the proportions are about a hundred to one, and we admit they 'are well prepared' to give an opinion on this subject. This is a sketch of the drilling process in the upper department.—We shall now add, that neither of these pictures are drawn from fancy, but from actual life."

"We do not mean to say, that every minister and member of the church has to undergo such a course of discipline as has been described. For as the vine, seemingly conscious of its own weakness, lays hold of the trunk and branches of the oak, and by its strength stands, and in its shade lives and flourishes, so there is a portion in every community, who being sensible of their own weakness, or indolence of mind, are willing to get through life by leaning on some superior. Such being inclined to submit implicitly to their guide, find no difficulty in the Methodist Episcopal church; but are 'deliberately attached' to her 'institutions.' But it is the man who feels himself able to stand alone—the man who thinks himself an equal amongst his fellows—whose doctrine is,

* * * * * * * this world, 'tis true,
Was made for Cesar, but for Pompey too."

This is the man who has to be schooled over again, until he so alters his creed, as to make it read, *this world was made for Cesar, only.* Bishop ***** once remarked to us, that, 'every minister of reading and enterprise, was apt to experience a time of disaffection to the government; but if he once got over that, he might be considered *safe.*' Safe indeed! from the fact, that after his moral principle and dignified nature are schooled into subjection, they become so weak and impaired, as to be incapable, in future, of any independent and manly efforts; and he sinks down, as a matter of course, into a state of tameness and docility: and then he is said to have 'more religion,' or 'every quality that constitutes a Methodist preacher.' "

"After the foregoing exposition of the Episcopal government, we need not say, to the enlightened reader, that the bishops are the authors and instigators of all those proceedings, which have so much afflicted and dishonored the church. This he perfectly understands, when he sees the structure of their government. He sees they hold the power that puts the whole machinery in motion; and that they can put it on to grind the people, or take it off at pleasure. It is true, that in all the ecclesiastical and civil trials, which have been instituted and prosecuted in this controversy, the episcopacy has not appeared to public view—it has kept concealed; yet, 'the well accustomed eye' has detected it behind the curtain, managing the wires, while the puppets have played their part upon the stage.—We have shown you that the discipline [page 25] requires the 'bishops' 'to oversee the spiritual and *temporal* business of the church.' If, therefore, these civil and ecclesiastical trials, which regard both these interests, had been instituted without their *advice and consent*, they have been criminally deficient in their duty, in not interfering to prevent them; particularly when it is recollected that the senior bishop, in an address he delivered to the annual conferences, a few years ago, argued that to '*oversee*' meant to '*over-rule*.' This very provision in the discipline, which requires the bishops to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church, holds them responsible to the public, for all these proceedings."

"The bishops have fixed strong guards to protect their power. On page 21 of the Discipline, the third restricting rule says, 'they, [meaning the general conference] shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to *do away episcopacy, or destroy* the PLAN of our itinerant *general superintendency*.' It is true that a proviso is made, 'that upon the joint recommendation of all the annual conferences, two thirds of the general conference may then alter any one of the six restrictions.' But should one conference dissent, (and some of them have under thirty members,) then it would be in the power of fifteen preachers to suppress a measure called for by the whole connexion beside, consisting of more than 500,000 persons. So that this system of '*general superintendency*,' or DRILL, is like 'the laws of the Medes and Persians, it alters not,' without the consent of the bishops; for there must be a great revolution in the character of man, if they, with their immense prerogatives, cannot hold a majority, in one conference out of 17, under their influence. Mr. Madison in discussing the civil polity of our country, declares against the 'absur-

dity of submitting the fate of twelve States to the perverseness or corruption of a thirteenth; from the example of inflexible opposition given by a minority of one-sixtieth of the people of America, to a measure approved and called for by the voice of twelve States, comprising fifty-nine sixtieths of the people; an example,' says he, 'fresh in the memory and *indignation* of every citizen who has felt for the *wounded honor and prosperity of his country.*' If Mr. Madison was so indignant at the policy, which gave one the control over sixty, what would have been his feelings at the illiberality of that system which gives fifteen the control over 500,000? Such then, in *theory*, is the system which guards the DRILLING operations of Episcopal Methodism."

"The Methodist preachers claim that their plan of government, and manner of spreading the gospel, is peculiarly Apostolical. Now, we should like to know of them, where Christ and his Apostles ever denied to the people the right of self-government. Or where they abused the confidence that the honest and simple hearted people reposed in them, by selling books for twice as much as they were worth, and by getting all the meeting houses and synagogues conveyed to them by an artful trust deed; and then taking advantage of this misplaced confidence, did force away the people's property by writs and prosecutions at law? Where is it recorded that the Apostles did any of these things? The great Shepherd and 'bishop' of souls, tells us, that 'the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the son of man hath not where to lay his head.'— This he could not have said if he had had $300,000 vested in a book speculation, and a grasp on all the meeting houses erected by his followers. Says an elegant writer, 'it is not in the nature of man to be irreligious; he listens eagerly to those who promise to lead him to salvation, and welcomes such as come in the name of the Lord, with the warmth of faith; which makes it the more lamentable that he should be so often deceived."

"The wealth of the Book concern is so rapidly increasing, that the conference is beginning to increase their Agents, and establish branches over the Union. They have now, four preachers in New York, superintending the interests of the establishment. They have a branch in Cincinnati, with two preachers overlooking it. And if they go on to accumulate wealth, they may soon have branches in every principal city in America. And when they shall have engrossed the book business, they may extend their capital to other branches of merchandize. The legislature of this State, is very careful when

incorporating religious societies, (and their principle is a correct one) to limit their annual income to from 3 to 5000 dollars. Their object in this course, is to prevent the accumulation of wealth in the hands of religious societies, which would give an influence that might be wielded against the interests of the community. Now, while they are guarding against individual societies, whose influence are limited and confined, should they not keep an eye upon such a tremendous confederacy as Episcopal Methodism? Who from their organization, independent of their wealth, are a formidable host."

"It is our clear conviction, that the Methodist Episcopal church exercises a greater influence in these United States, than all the other churches put together. And this is not because that church is more intelligent, or more numerous; it is not because they are any better, or because they are possessed of more wealth than the other churches; but it is because of their peculiar organization. This organization enables Episcopal Methodism to stand among the other churches, like the sturdy oak of the forest, which, out-topping the trees of the surrounding wood, treats with equal contempt the storms of heaven that beat upon its summit, and the reptiles of earth that crawl around its base."

"This organization is fitted for any enterprise whatever. Is a book speculation to be set on foot? Episcopacy has its agents spread all over the Union; and while the agents of other establishments have to sink a considerable portion of their profits in tavern bills and other expenses, its are supported by the people, free of cost to the concern. Is the Episcopal Press to be sustained? They have their agents, without cost, in every neighborhood, who can cry down every other periodical, and praise the Advocate.—Does any individual, or association of men, stand in the way of the interests of the episcopacy? See what an organization they have to blast their reputation, and sink them in the public estimation. They can commence with the Advocate, and in a few days hurl the shafts of defamation, all over the continent. This is the signal for the preachers to commence; and the 1800 itinerants, in a short time can carry the tale of slander into every parlor and cabin, containing there 500,000 members. Take the case of Mr. Hoyt, a brother in the church, for illustration. Had a person no other source of information than the Advocate, would he not infer from the episcopal 'bulls' therein, that Mr. H. was a monster in cruelty; that he was attempting to dry up the very fountains of 'charity.' But lo! when Mr. Hoyt's case is investigated before a tribunal

of their own church, it is ascertained that his great crime is, he has enabled the Methodist community to purchase for 37½ cents, what cost $1.12½ from the Episcopal press. And though Mr. H. has published his defence and 'acquittal,' it is probable that not 300 members of the Methodist Episcopal church have seen them; so that his character continues to bleed on the pages of the Advocate. How admirably is this system adapted to a political campaign; no difference whether it be for an officer of the county, or a President of the Union; for a law of the State, or a regulation of the general government. And the maxim is, when men have power, they will use it; or when advantages offer, they will avail themselves of them. It used to be a question with historians, whether or no the ancient Romans, from the establishment of their goverment, aimed at the empire of the world. But, it is now generally admitted, that in the commencement of their career, they had no such design; but, that as opportunity offered, they embraced it, until the East was made to bow to their sceptre, and the West to submit to their dominion. So in the outset of Methodism—there was no intention to use their system for any other purpose than the spiritual improvement of the community; but as opportunity offers, they are beginning to wield it for the purpose of gratifying interest and ambition. And there can be little doubt, but what these Methodist clergy will continue to gratify these passions to the full amount of all opportunity."

"The organization of Methodism, is an improvement on the system of the Jesuits. They have already entwined themselves around the political, the mercantile, and the professional interests, and exert over them an alarming influence. And what makes it the more lamentable, is, the public generally appear to be insensible of this state of things. But, if the public are insensible on this subject, these clergymen are not. They very well understand the strength and bearings of their system. And this has inspired them with a confidence in their own importance, which has encouraged them often to brow-beat and chastise public men, who may have come in contact with their dignity or interest. Many cases of this kind, have passed under our own personal observation, which might be adduced to illustrate the subject; but, as we do not wish to travel out of the records of the Advocate, we will give you Mr. 'Kent' and his 'Booksellers,' already alluded to. If a Methodist preacher had cut up such a swell as this, forty years ago, in the land of the Pilgrims, it is well if he would not have been hooted out of the village. But now, while Mr. K. administers his admoni-

tions, and gives his directions, these gentlemen treat him with a great deal of politeness and courtesy; and indicate their readiness to comply with his wishes. Political men, who are aspirants for office in the gift of the people, and who have alternately tasted the sweets of success, and felt the chagrin of disappointment, dread to come in contact with such formidable organizations as this; and are generally more or less under their influence."

"We do not wish to impeach the integrity of the honorable, the Supreme Court of Ohio. The reader will believe us to be sincere when we say, that, we consider them among the very first of our fellow citizens, for intelligence and integrity. They deservedly stand high in the estimation of that community, who have placed them at the head of the Judicial department of our government. But at last, their intelligence is the intelligence of fallible man, and their integrity the integrity of the erring sons of Adam. And, as they have ordered us to be recorded, in the Annals of our country, Tresspassers—violaters of the laws of the land, because we met peaceably to worship God, in a house that was erected by the personal exertions of our friends, and *originally* intended for their own use, no one ought to make objections to our using our constitutional privilege of bringing this matter before the disinterested portion of the community, for *their decision* also."

"It does appear to us, high time that the public would look into these matters. This Methodist organization lies at the root of the tree of American liberty, like the worm at the root of Jonah's gourd; and if it be not attended to in time, may some day blast and wither this fair and flourishing plant. We Protestants are ringing a great many alarm bells against the Catholics. But when a known enemy is about, there is not so much danger to be apprehended, from the fact, that we are on our guard. It is when we are with a supposed friend, that there is the most danger, for we sleep with confidence in his presence, and thus give him an opportunity to fasten the cords."

EXTRA SHEET.

At the commencement of this work, nothing was more foreign from our design than the introduction of any testimony, relating to the Medical Preparations of Col. Jewett, beyond what appeared indispensably necessary, from their relation to, or connection with the specific charges that had been preferred against him. The propriety and importance of exhibiting those documents must be obvious to all who realize the value of a good reputation, or have a heart to approve of the honest efforts of the innocent to vindicate themselves against the numerous aspersions of inveterate enemies. On mature reflection, we have thought it might serve some valuable purpose to advance a little beyond our original design. As this work may fall into many hands to which "The Independent Botanic Register," nor "Jewett's Advertiser" may never arrive, we have thought the public might receive some benefit by an exhibition of some few of the numerous testimonials in his possession. Some few extracts from letters, most of which have been already published in the above named periodicals, are here spread out before our readers, that those who are disposed to receive the truth into good and honest hearts, may possess their minds, unstained from the vulgar, profane, and priestly opposition of malignant persecutors, whose ribaldry and lies are destined to receive a condign reward.

FROM JEWETT'S ADVERTISER—No. 1.

DYSPEPSIA, PAIN AND COUGH RELIEVED.

Dear sir:—For your encouragement, and for the information of the afflicted, I would hereby inform you of the benefits I have received by the use of your stimulating liniment. Having been afflicted with a dyspeptic complaint, loss of appetite, a severe cough and pain in the breast for a number of months, which was increasing, by the advice of a friend I was induced to try the use of your liniment; I have used about one box and the effect has been to restore my appetite, my cough has ceased, the pain in my breast removed and my expectations are sanguine, that the use of the liniment for a few weeks will restore me to perfect health.

J. COURTNEY.

A CHOLERA CASE.

GRANVILLE CIRCUIT, OCT. 15, 1834.

After giving a number of interesting cases of relief by the stimulating liniment, our reverend correspondent remarks:—

"The most remarkable effect produced by the Liniment has occured near Etna, in Licking County, when the cholera was raging and had been unusually fatal in that village and its vicinity. Fatal cases of that awful disease were very frequent in the neighborhood, when a youngster of 12 or 14 years of age was severely attacked with the premonitory symptoms of that scourge of nations. A neighbor came to C. G.'s where I was spending the evening, and requested him to send to Granville, a distance of 6 or 7 miles for medical assistance. Believing that your liniment might perhaps be of some benifit, in this case, I gave them a small quantity, directing them how to apply it. The effect was truly astonishing, in a short time every dangerous symptom was removed, and the next day the boy was apparently well. This relief was more particularly fortunate, as no medical assistance could be obtained.

JAMES COURTNEY.

FROM JEWETT'S ADVERTISER—No. 2.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Samuel Rosamond, Hardaman county, Tennessee, Feb. 5, 1835.

COL. JEWETT:—I have tried the efficacy of two boxes of your Stimulating Liniment No. 2, and am truly gratified with the success I have had in its application, for pains of all kinds, canker sores, risings on the breasts of females, cramp cholic and external bruises. In fact I am so well pleased with the speedy relief the patient experiences on its application that I feel the want of it very much in my practice. Please send me 50 or 100 boxes if you can spare them.

Extract of a letter from Dr. M'Gowan, dated Coshocton, March 2, 1835.

COL. JEWETT:—Your Liniment No. 2, I have now partly tested in two cases of putrid or typhus fever of very alarming type. One of the patients is now going about. The other I feel satisfied will be equally well in a short time. This disease has proved fatal in many cases under the usual practice of depletion and minerals in this vicinity. I have likewise tried the Liniment in various cases of sick headache with decided effect.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Joseph Wilcox, dated, Harrison township, Licking county, March 1, 1835.

I have been affected for 10 years with a dropsical affection. Warm weather increased it, with a suppression of urine. Sometime in August last, I made a full and thorough application of your Stimulating Liniment to my bowels, and strange to tell, I was in a short time relieved. I consider myself now cured of the complaint. In my practice, I found the most decidedly favorable effect in cases of dyspepsia and pains generally, by the use of your Liniment.

CLEGYMEN'S CERTIFICATES.

Circleville, August 21, 1834.

I can with confidence recommend your Stimulating Liniment. I have for a long time been afflicted with indigestion, and by its application I have felt my pains and other disagreeable feelings removed. In short, I think myself well, with the exception of a little headache, which is directly relieved by an application of the Liniment. J. R. RYSON.

For nine months, I have been afflcted with the liver complaint, pains in my side, loss of appetite and general debility.—In one hour after I applied a plaster of you Liniment to my side, all pain ceased; and now, one month after the first application, my health is almost restored. P. K. WAMBAUGH.

Cleveland, September 19, 1834.

FROM THE SAME.

Cleveland, November 28, 1834.

I can now say I feel as well as ever I did in my life, as to my liver complaint. I have found it an excellent remedy for the sick headache. I am free to recommend it to the public, believing if it were generally known and circulated, it would be the means of saving thousands of lives, and restoring the general health of the people. P. K. WAMBAUGH.

Millersburg, November 14, 1834.

Your Stimulating Liniment has benefited me by releiving my pains, and removing the soreness in my sides. I believe it a highly valuable medicine.

JAMES BREWSTER.

I have used Col. Jewett's Vegetable Cerate in my family, in two cases wherein my children were burned. One of them with fire, on the hand, the other was a scald of boiling water on the hand; immediate application of the Cerate was made in both cases, which prevented blistering and soon effected a cure.—My wife has applied the Cerate to her nipples, when sore, which effected a cure in the course of one night.

S. MINNEAR.

Extract of a letter, dated, Granville Circuit, Oct. 15, 1834.

COL. M. JEWETT:—As you were so good as to furnish me with a box of your valuable Liniment for my own use, and having derived such an incalculable benefit from the use of it myself, and feeling a desire as far as I was able to alleviate the afflictions of my fellow men, I have been induced in a number of instances to recommend its use and divide the small quantity I had with the afflicted, and not one instance do I remember of its being used without producing the most salutary effect.

For your encouragement and satisfaction, I will mention a few of the cases. W. S. had been afflicted with a pain in the stomach for several weeks which had reduced his strength so much that he was scarcely able to attend to his daily labor, he applied a small quantity to his stomach, in a few minutes the the pain was gone. I saw him four weeks afterwards, his health was improved, and was better (he observed,) than it had been for some months.

Two severe cases of dyspepsia, have been remarkably relieved by it, and for this disease, I am inclined to believe it will prove a sovereign remedy. Several cases of the bowel complaint have been cured by it in a short time.

Your friend,

JAMES COURTNEY.

Last winter, I was taken with a pain in my left side, which moved round into my back, on the same side, which troubled me very much during the spring and summer. The pain at length got into both sides, and before and during a storm, or damp weather, it was so bad I cold scarcely contain myself, the pain was not deep but appeared rather superficial with a slight swelling of the side where the pain was seated, so that by pressing the finger upon the place where the pain was, there appeared a crackling noise or some yielding under the pressure, similar to pressing a broken egg shell. I do not know how to describe it better;—and this much I can say, that since the application of your liniment I do not know that I have had a symptom of that pain; if I have, it has escaped my memory. I do not hesitate in saying, that I verily believe that much human suffering may be saved by the use of the Liniment, or a similar preparation.

C. G. HEATH.

Sept. 1, 1834.

CASE OF WHITE SWELLING.

The following case of white swelling is perhaps one of the most extraordinary cures ever performed by any medicine, or mode of practice whatever. The history of it was given by the parents, and corroborated by the patient himself, an intelligent lad aged about 14 years. The indescribable pain and anguish which the sufferer had endured for months, without a single moment of alleviation or ease, and the extreme anxiety and unwearied attention of the parents, affords a theme which imagination can scarcely reach, much less the pen describe. But, suffice it now to say, the lad is restored, the parents relieved from their deepest cares and painful anxieties, of which the reader can form a better estimate after reading what follows.

Timothy Cochrane, Jr. born in Ireland, September 1820, was attacked in the year 1831, with a fever, by which he was reduced very low, and continued in a painful debilitated condition, until the spring of 1832, when a white swelling made its appearance on his right hip, or upper part of his right thigh.—The pain which he suffered from this swelling was of the most intolerable and excruciating character. It is impossible for any but those who saw him, to form any conception of his suffering, and he himself looks back with horror upon the dreadful scene through which he has passed. During the course of this painful malady, his attendants were obliged to resort to every means

which humanity could suggest, in order to afford the slightest mitigation of his suffering; and so extremely sensitive did he become, that he could not bear the weight of the lightest blanket, but was obliged to have some person constantly to hold the bedding loosely over him. In short, death would have been welcomed by him a thousand times as "a friend, the kindest and the best."

In the summer succeeding the attack of the swelling, his parents left Ireland for the U. States. The agonizing pains of the aweful malady accompanied him across the Atlantic, and deserted him not, when he landed in the city of Montreal. The best physicians in Ireland had attended him in vain and on his arrival in Canada, three surgeons of the British army at Montreal and Little York, were speedily consulted with no better success. From Montreal the family moved to Buffalo, where the advice of two eminent physicians from the city of New York was procured, who, as well as all others consulted, pronounced it a most desperate, if not an utterly incurable case.

In the fall of 1832, the family settled in this city, when he successively received the attention of all the principal physicians of the place and was successively abandoned by them all, as incurable. Somtime during the winter of 1832-3, it was deemed proper to open the swelling, which was accordingly done, the pain still continuing as severe as ever. In the spring of 1833, however, the pain in the hip abated, but he still continued extremely ill, very feeble and without an appetite for food. In July, of the same year, he took the ordinary chill and fever of this climate, and soon after was attacked with dropsical swelling of the feet and legs, gradually extending to the abdomen and then to the head. The swelling eventually became very large, the bowels were enormously distended, the head nearly double the natural size, and the neck measuring about as large in circumference as the head. His bowels, as usual in such cases, were extremely irregular, either obstinately costive or very much relaxed, his right leg had become very crooked and stiff, seven ulcers were located about the hip and groin, and all the attendant symptoms indicated certain and speedy dissolution.— It was in this most deplorable condition, that his situation became accidentally known to Col. Jewett, when he immediately reccommended the application of his Liniment No. 2.— Internal remedies were also used at the same time, amongst others one emetic. The other medicines were such tonics and purifiers of the blood as accompany Col. Jewett's Chimical remedies. The Liniment was applied daily to the whole or nearly

the whole surface of the body, particularly the bowels, hip and diseased leg at the rate of one box per week, and the powders in teaspoonful doses, twice a day. This course soon reduced the dropsical swellings, regulated the bowels, disposed the ulcers to heal, restored the appetite and general health, and made the patient comparatively comfortable and happy. Jewett's remedies were first applied about the 1st of July last, and now (about nine months since) all the symptoms of disease are removed, the ulcers all healed up and the hip appears sound and well.—The leg has become straight, and he has the use of the knee joint, though it is still weak and shorter than the other. He now enjoys perfect health in all respects; is able to cut wood at the door, balancing himself with the toes of the foot of the short leg, which when he stands up, bears sufficiently hard upon the ground for that purpose. The following certificate is from the parents of the patient.

We certify that the above and foregoing statement relative to our son, is strictly true, though falling far short of the dreadful reality of the case.

his
TIMOTHY ⋈ COCHRANE
mark
her
BRIDGETT ⋈ COCHRANE
mark

City of Columbus, Mayor's Office, March 21, 1835.

I certify that Timothy Cochrane and Bridgett Cochrane, parents of the boy alluded to, after hearing the above statement carefully and distinctly read to them, affixed their names to the same, by making their marks as above, and declared the statements there made to be true, and to have been dictated by them.

JOHN BROOKS, *Mayor.*

This may certify that I have been afflicted for about twenty years with a very severe and troublesome cough, and for a long time with many other bodily infirmities, distressing and dangerous. I have received medical aid, and such means have been made use of as is common in such cases, but without any benefit more than a partial relief from pain and suffering, until I

made use of Col. Jewett's remedies, which was on the 26th of January, 1835. The first box I made use of, relieved me from my pains which I had suffered for six years, and they have not since returned. The second day I used it, caused me to throw up much very offensive corrupted matter, which caused a great weakness in my back and breast. I had a plaster of the Liniment applied to my breast, which soon removed the weakness, and I have not suffered any from it since. I have suffered much from dyspepsia for three years past, the most of the food I eat, was either thrown up, or remained on my stomach only to distress me. I have suffered much as every one must know who has been thus afflicted. But now I can eat such food as is common, and it seems to nourish and strengthen me without any distress after.

I have generally been obliged to sit up hours every night in bed to cough, but now I can go to bed and sleep comfortably all night. I enjoy myself as well as I could wish, and if through the mercy of God, my health should be continued, the few days I stay on earth, as I now enjoy it, I trust I shall ever feel thankful, and pray that God may direct those who are suffering, to means that may prove as efficacious as those I made use of.— I am now rising sixty years of age, and having suffered so much I feel it my duty to continue the means that have relieved me, and to guard against disease and the infirmities of old age. It is now about two months since I began to use the Liniment, and I am using my seventh box. I trust when the weather becomes warm and settled, my food will be a sufficient stimulus, and that I shall be able to dispense with the Liniment.

MARGARET KENT.

City of Columbus, Mayor's Office, March 21, 1835.

I certify, that the above named Margaret Kent, is a lady of respectable standing in this city, and that she in my presence signed the foregoing certificate and declared it to be correctly stated agreeable to the facts in her case.

JOHN BROOKS, *Mayor.*

This may certify, that I have been afflicted more than three years, with a severe pain in my head, said to be the nervous headache, which rendered me unfit for business, and I was much of the time confined to my bed, and often beyond the hope of recovery. In this distressing situation, I had Col. Jewett's Stimulating Liniment applied to my head, which removed the pain in

15 or 20 minutes and I have not felt it since. I also suffered much from the dyspepsia and other distressing complaints. I had sought for help from medical aid, and made use of all the means within my knowledge, but nothing permanent could be effected. I was still a sufferer. It is now about six months since I first made use of the Liniment. The most of my difficulties are removed, and I enjoy better health than I have for many years. I have a good appetite and my food agrees with me, I am gaining in health and strength daily; am now able to take care of my family. I make use of the Liniment when I am exposed, or have any pains, and it soon relieves me. I should not be willing to be without it for any consideration.

LAURA ANN HARRIS.

Columbus, March 21, 1835.

Mayor's Office, City of Columbus, March 21, 1835.

I certify, that the above named Laura Ann Harris, made and signed the above certificate in my presence, and that she is a woman whose veracity is undoubted.

JOHN BROOKS, *Mayor*,

FOR JEWETT'S ADVERTISER.—No. 3.

No former period of the world's history has furnished evidence of so general, persevering, and successful spirit of improvement as the present. And when to this we add the pleasing fact, that a great portion of this spirit is directed to objects of a useful character, and which will mostly contribute to the advancement of human happiness, by mitigating either physical or moral evil, we shall certainly have good reason to congratulate ourselves upon living in an age extremely propitious to the destiny of man. How grateful indeed it is to the contemplative mind to view the present animated prospect of human affairs, and perceive that although selfishness may be the chief ruling principle in the great family of man, yet the strong tendency of enlightened human exertion is to meliorate the condition of our race. This is most emphatically the case in our own country, and the benificent spirit is spreading, promising ultimately to extend its blessings "from sea to sea; and from the rivers to the ends of the earth;" when the whole world shall be swallowed up in the ocean of universal happiness and felicity.

But my attention at this time is more particularly drawn to the improvement of the healing art, in which, like the civil world, revolution has succeeded revolution, and although all may not have directly advanced the cause, yet each has brought the grand consummation one stage higher, and aided science in her lofty flight towards the pinicle—at which she ever aims, though may never reach—of perfection. All knowledge indeed is progressive, and probably will ever continue so; but still how much more congenial to the human mind to look forward through the lengthened vista of time, and see new objects of investigation multiplying as we advance, affording fresh impulses to perseverance, than to stand on the lofty summit of perfection, and look around us without a single inducement to mental exertion, because there is nothing new to accomplish. If a perfection of human knowedge be possible it can scarcely be desirable, as anticipation is the pabulum of the mind, without which we should soon be overtaken with ennui, and lose the highest zest of existence. But to return from this digression.

Of late years, innovations in medicine have been more rapid and extensive than formerly, and it seems by no means improbable that the whole established practice of the schools will be materially influenced, if not radically changed, by the spirit of "reform" which now, to a great extent, pervades the public mind. For it makes but little difference whether a thing is right or wrong in the abstract, if popular opinion is once brought to oppose it, the learned professions themselves must yield obedience to the high mandate of public opinion, by sacrificing their independence to the popular feeling. I am one however, of the number who believe that errors exist in medicine, and rejoice at the discovery of any thing that promises or professes to add to the list of means of mitigating the afflictions of the human race. It is a correct idea, "that violent innovations or changes seldom occur, without an existing necessity, or the prevalence of mischievous errors and oppressive imposition! This, in connexion with the numerous medical innovations, most clearly show that medicine has not kept pace with the vast and rapid improvements of the age, and demands not only of medical men, but of the whole community, an investigation of its pretentions: For it is no less important to the practitioner, than to those practised upon, that a science so intimately connected with health and life as that of medicine, should be stripped of all its errors. The motto of medical men should be, "I am indifferent whither I am led, so that I follow TRUTH;" and when the community is convinced that it is his governing principle, the

physician will find his task very much abridged and his responsibility greatly diminished.

I have been led into the foregoing reflections, by a perusal of the first number of the *Advertiser*, in relation to the "*Chemical Remedies*," treated of therein. It is too apt to be the case that medical men overlook some of the most valuable discoveries, merely because those discoveries had their origin in sources to which professional pride will not condescend to stoop.—But how much they mistake their true interest, as well as the dignity of the profession, by thus undervaluing every thing of a non-professional origin, I will not stop here to enquire. Suffice it to say, in the language of an eminent medical writer, that however disparaging to medical erudition, it is but justice to confess, "that we are indebted to the bold enterprise of illiterate pretenders for the discovery of some of our most active remedies." I merely make this quotation to caution the reader against hasty conclusions with regard to new medicines, and not as applicable to the discoverer of the "chemical remedies." He is not only a man of science and sound discriminating judgment, but appears to have had the assistance of a few friends capable of rendering him important aid; and his remedies are every way worthy of the high popularity which they appear destined to obtain. I may here remark that I have made enquiry into many of the cases alluded to in the first number of the *Advertiser*, and astonishing as may be the fact, so far as my investigations have extended, the result even exceeded the statements therein contained. I am satisfied beyond a doubt, that the full value of those remedies are as yet but imperfectly known; and when the inventor carries his improvements to their utmost contemplated height, his preparations will then no doubt far transcend their present value. And why should any be so vain or unwise as to oppose so worthy a work? Does not suffering humanity need all the aids in the power of men to bestow; and should we not encourage rather than discourage those whose object it is to meliorate the condition of man? And what could be more consoling to the mind than a consciousness that we had contributed to lessen the sum total of human suffering, or extended the right hand of fellowship to those who were engaged in that noble work? I well know that the cold selfishness of a mercenary world is ready to treat with contempt and ridicule the pretensions of philanthropists of every grade and condition. But can the man who freely opens his hand to the poor and the needy, the widow, the fatherless and the afflicted, be obnoxious to such treatment? Can he who has furnished his remedies

without fee or reward, and even money with it, to the afflicted poor, be considered in no other light than a catch-penny speculator? I well know that the best motives are liable to be suspected, assailed, and impugned, because the selfishness of the sordid and mercenary can perceive no better motives in others than those which govern themselves. But a consciousness of honest intentions, of upright, moral rectitude, sustains the philanthropic mind under every embarrassment, and gives it a sense of inward satisfaction which the cold, selfish, cynical churl well may envy, but can never possess.

In conclusion, permit me to recommend "Jewett's Chimical Remedies" to the attention of all. They will be found useful to the physician, the farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, the illiterate, the learned—all may participate in the advantages of these useful articles. It is true, I have not tried them all myself, nor do those I have employed always effect cures; but I doubt not they are well worthy of a trial, and should not be rejected because they sometimes fail. W. HANCE.

Columbus City, Ohio, June 1835.

I am happy to have an opportunity to do justice to Col. Jewett, to furnish my testimony in relation to the extraordinary efficacy of his medical preparations for external use. It is now about four years since I had an attack of rheumatic pains. My limbs and nerves appeared to be much affected. I was sometimes much worse than at others, but during the whole period, I was never free from pain, neither could I take my natural rest with any good degree of composure. During the course of my second year of affliction, I was swelled in my ankles, knees, hips, and also my head, and my neck was distressingly stiff, so that it was with the utmost difficulty I turned my head; often I could not turn to look at any object without turning my whole body. The sinews of my limbs were swollen, and felt corded and tight like drum cords. My complaint was attended with nervous agitations and tremblings that were attended with death-like feelings and sleepless nights. In the course of this time, I made many applications for medical assistance. I got medicine of Dr. Parsons, and Dr. Thompson. Dr. Parsons recommended gum guiacum. Dr. Thompson prescribed calomel. I took the medicine as directed. While I was using the medicine, I sometimes thought I felt a little better, but in a

day or two I felt as bad as ever. I have been unable for business, and at no time, with the best medical aid I could find, could I obtain any thing like permanent relief. Two weeks ago I applied to Col. Jewett, who obligingly recommended washing the body in warm soap and water, then with salt and water, and I applied Jewett's Linament No. 2, and not only rubbed the body and limbs, but wore it also plasterwise. I have come to my natural feelings—breathe freely—pain in my side gone. I feel entirely relieved—have the natural use of my limbs, and during the whole four years, I have not at any time experienced any thing like the relief obtained by these means, aided by the use of Dr. Logan's long course of Thomsonian Medicine, as the Colonel prescribed. I appear to be free from my nervous affections and can get my rest comfortably at night, and enjoy the satisfaction of a good appetite and general health.

Given under my hand.

JOHN GLASSCOCK.

I was called on to doctor a child of Hannibal Pratt, some time last winter; the child had a high fever and diarrhœa. I applied Col. Jewett's Liniment. In a short time, two hours, the child was relieved from the fever, and had not another motion of the bowels or of the bowel complaint.

JOHN RATHBURN.

April 20th, 1835.

I certify that I have used Col. Jewett's Liniment in several cases, and found relief. In one instance when I had a pain in the head and back, and sickness at the stomach, by outward application I was relieved in a short time. I also had a severe fever for some time and had the liniment applied all over my body, and in a few moments my fever subsided, my appetite became good, and I had no more fever. I was also attacked with chill and fever, in which case I made use of the Liniment, and was clear of the complaint in three days. I also used it in a severe case of cholera morbus, and found it to relieve me in a short time, and in a seated affection in my hip, the use of the Liniment has eased me when the pain has been severe.

EBEN. BARCUS.

Columbus City, June 20, 1835.

Fairfield County, Ohio.

In the last spring, I was considerably afflicted with a pain in my shoulder, I applied Col. Jewett's Liniment No. 2, and was relieved in a short time.

THOS. M'NAGHTEN.

May 26, 1835.

My wife has been afflicted with the Salt Rheum for thirty years—all the applications during that period proved ineffectual until about nine months ago, she applied Jewett's Vegetable Cerate No. 1, which relieved her in about two days. She has had no return of the disease since, with the exception of a slight breaking out on the hands about six months after the cure.—This was removed by one rubbing of the Cerate.

EPHRAIM BURWELL.

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS.

From D. L. Terry, M. D. Professor of Materia Medica, Pharmacy, and the Principles of Surgery, in the "Reformed Medical College of Ohio.

C. L. JEWETT:

Dear Sir: I have used some of the stimulating Liniment No. 2, which you presented to me, and found it very decidedly beneficial. The first case in the treatment of which I used it, was a case of pain in the breast, of some considerable length of standing. The Liniment was applied three times a day over the whole anterior part of the thorax. In the course of about ten days from the commencement of its application the pain was removed entirely.

The second case was one of severe colic, and by rubbing the Liniment over the external surface of the bowels, for ten minutes, the pain was relieved, and did not again return. The sensible qualities of the Liniment are those of a strong and permanent stimulant. It relieves pain by restoring vital action, and the free circulation of blood to the painful part. It removes disease in accordance with the theory which makes disease to consist in obstructed circulation and diminished vital energy.

The fact that the doctrine of cutaneous absorption is very commonly acknowledged, and very popular, is not infallible evidence of its truth; yet I consider the evidence to support the doctrine to be so pointed, so clear, and so numerous, as to leave but little room to doubt of its truth.

It is well known that numerous medicines when applied to the skin, produce in a short time the same effect upon some particular organ to which they possess a kind of electrical affinity, as would be produced upon the same organ, were the same medicines administered internally. For instance, the Spanish fly, when applied to the skin frequently affects the neck of the bladder in the same manner as when given internally. So of Lobelia in tincture. Various cathartics do the same, and so do the poisonous tribe of narcotics. It may be said by the objector of the doctrine of absorption, that remedies produce their effects through the medium of nervous sympathy. To such an objector, I would propose the following questions:

1st. Is the skin possessed of a sensibility which makes it susceptible to the action of all stimulants? for it must be recollected that in cases of external remedial applications, the nerves of the skin must be first excited, first impressed; they must catch the peculiar power of the remedy, and then transmit the impression to its appropriate organ whose functions will be principally affected by its influence.

2d. If the skin possess so wide a range of sensibility, as to render it susceptible to the influence of all kinds of stimulants, why should it not take up the stimulating properties of various remedial articles, when these are applied in the solid form or in powder?

3d. If the doctrine of cutaneous absorption be false, why or in what manner does the urine become changed in color from the application of various kinds of coloring matter to the skin? Can coloring matter itself be conveyed through the medium of nervous sympathy?

4th. If this doctrine be false, how is the sensation of thirst relieved by the application of water to the external surface of the body? But even admitting these effects are produced through the medium of nervous sympathy, and that the doctrine of cutaneous absorption is totally false, yet the reasons in favor of the liniments would remain unimpaired; their merits seem to stand upon the evidence of actual experiment, and it is totally a matter of indifference whether they produce their good effects through the medium of cutaneous absorption or that of nervous sympathy. I am firmly of the opinion that the No. 2, Stimulat-

ing Liniment, will be found a safe and efficient remedy for many local diseases, and that its application as an auxiliary in the treatment of many of the severest forms of disease, might with great benefit become very general.

Yours, respectfully,

D. L. TERRY.

Worthington, June 13, 1835.

Extract from an answer to the foregoing letter, dated June 15.

I have taken the liberty of enclosing a small sheet of directions for the use of my Cholera Preparations, with a view of asking your suggestions on the subject.

In the first place I would observe that my Liniment No. 1, is the most stimulating compound I am acquainted with ; highly anti-spasmodic, and calculated, when rubbed with much friction and warmth over the body, to have a more ready effect than mustard poultice. My anti-spasmodic Lotion, for injections, possesses similar qualities, with sufficient emetic ingredients in ordinary cases to cause vomiting.

M. JEWETT.

Worthington, Ohio, June 16, 1835.

Dear Sir:—In yours of the 15th instant, I received a little printed bill, termed " Directions for using Jewett's Cholera Preparations." From the knowledge which I have been enabled to obtain from pretty extensive practice in the treatment of Cholera, and from reading various authors on this subject, I do not hesitate to give it as my opinion, that the means which you recommend, and the general course which you direct, in the treatment of this fell destroyer of our race, will be found eminently successful. And could this treatment be introduced into those places where the services of Botanic practitioners cannot be obtained, it would be the means of saving many valuable lives; lives which would otherwise fall a sacrifice to the ravages of Cholera, or what is equally as bad, to *blood-letting*, *calomel*, and *opium*. I rejoice to see the various causes in operation, which must ultimately place the Botanic practice, founded upon just, reasonable and immutable principles, beyond the

reach of successful controversy, and upon the ruin of that life-destroying and disease-creating system, to the advancement and further prevalence of which, *it* (the Botanic System,) already opposes an insurmountable obstacle. One of these causes, and that too not the least efficient, is to be found in your medical preparations, they will not unfrequently go where Botanic Physicians would not be employed. They will take prejudice by surprise, and fasten conviction on the mind, ere the dydra-headed monster, prejudice, shall have time to arouse from his needful slumbers. What they do will be done in modest silence, without ostentation; without even attempting the vindication of their merits, except by their good works, and by those let them be known. Though it is always desirable that all means for the cure of disease should be used by those who are well acquainted with medical science, yet it is well known that this advantage cannot always be obtained in cases of Cholera. From the reasonableness, simplicity and safety of the course directed by you, no man of ordinary resolution and benevolence, (provided we were furnished with the means,) would hesitate to employ them for the relief of one of his fellow beings, laboring under the agonies of Cholera. Should I have opportunity, I would be happy to give your preparations a further trial, nor do I doubt but the result would be my stronger confirmation in their merits. Yours, &c.

D. L. TERRY.

Col, M. Jewett.

Extract of a letter from Dr. John Haynie, formerly a resident of respectable standing in this State, dated Tuscumbia, June 10, 1835.

I have found, so far as I have tried your Liniment, that it proves satisfactory. In one case of a boy of mine, who was brought home from school with a high fever; I immediately ordered some water heated to give him a course of medicine on the Thomsonian System. While the water was heating I rubbed him all over with the liniment No. 2, and before the water was warm he was in a perspiration, and the fever had left him. I gave him a glass of composition tea and he has had no fever since.

I was called to visit a lady in the country, a few days ago; I found her on my arrival almost without pulse—extremities

cold—skin dry—extreme pain in the head and back. On enquiry I found she had been confined some six or eight weeks, had been under the practice of the *old school*, but had become alarmed, and finding herself growing worse, refused to take any more of their medicine. I rubbed her with Liniment No. 2, and proceeded to give her a course of medicine, which gave her *immediate* relief. Several other cases have been relieved. It answers well, and it is my firm belief, your preparations will be found a great auxiliary to the Botanic Practice.

JOHN HAYNIE.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Daniel Jordan, dated, Dayton, June 8, 1835.

I will here state that Liniment No. 2, is used with general success; Dr. J. M. buys of me, and makes use of it in his practice, says it is the best outward application he ever met with. The cerate, he says, exceeds all salve for healing wounds within his knowledge. My wife was attacked with a severe pain and stiffness of her neck. Liniment No. 2, was applied with severe friction, and in a very short time she was completely relieved. On the same day one of my daughters had a severe headache, the Liniment was applied, and in a few minutes she was cured. A neighbor of mine was taken with a severe pain in his side; a plaster was applied, and with twice rubbing a complete cure was effected. Another man, Frederick Hawken, had a pain and stiffness in his back of three weeks standing, I gave him a box, told him to rub his back and put on a plaster, and take some ginger on going to bed, which relieved him during the night, and he at this time remains well. Another man by the name of J. K. Mapes, subject to sick headache, applied Liniment No. 2, according to directions, and in half an hour he was completely relieved. I would give you many more cases of a similar effect of the Liniment, in curing my patients, but one more must suffice for the present.

Thisteen years ago, Mary Landis of Montgomery county, Ohio, was attacked with the piles, which has continued to afflict her ever since. She was also troubled with pains in her back, bowels, sides and shoulders, so much so that she was bed rid, and scarcely ever able to do the work of her family. She also had, as she termed it, a weakness and fluttering at the

heart, during the above time. On the 22d of February last, I applied your Liniment on plasters to her back and bowels, and by rubbing it on her breast and shoulders. I also gave her of the pile salve to apply on the afflicted part; by its application twice, and using the Liniment five days, she has been completely cured of all her complaints, and remains well at the present time. She has not for thirteen years past been so able to perform the work of her family. She told me her daughter was suddenly attacked with the pleurisy, quite severe—could scarcely breathe: she rubbed her side with the Liniment, and in a very short time the pain was removed.

DANIEL JORDAN.

We certify that the above statement, signed by Dr. Daniel Jordan, is correct and true.

SAMUEL LANDIS,
MARY LANDIS.

The following communication was dated Ithica, New York, July 8, 1835, addressed to Col. Jewett, by C. G. Heath, Esq., of that town. Mr. Heath was in Columbus about a year ago, on a tour for his health; he stated he had for eighteen years been afflicted with a dyspepsia and liver complaint; that various had been the means resorted to for his recovery, but without any essential effect. He further stated he had been for years unable to attend to any continued business. He was induced to make application of Col. Jewett's Liniment when he was here, and took some with him to apply on his return. The certificate stating his partial cure, which will be read in this work, was received the last year. He now states,

"I am very glad I can assure you to have received the liniment, as I have great confidence in its virtues and powers in healing and restoring. The Lotion may be equally good—*I shall try them.*"

"I was much pleased in receiving two numbers of your paper, as it contains many concurring proofs of the efficacy of the Liniment. I was, however, surprised to see my own. If I had thought of its being made use of in that way, I should have couched it in very different language; but as it is, let it go, I hope it may induce others afflicted in a similar way to try the same remedy. It seems the difficulty is completely or radically removed, as I have had no return of it since. I used it, and

my general healt his greatly improved: this summer I am from 25 to 28 pounds heavier than I was last summer"

"Wishing you success in all your enterprises, I subscribe myself truly your friend,

C. G. HEATH."

In 1824, I was attacked with the yellow fever, on the Island of Cuba, which arrived at a crisis in five days, but I did not recover any degree of health for three months. Since that period I have had one continued daily affliction of pains in my sides, back, and shoulder blades, frequently changing, but never relieved of pain. The pains at periods, were violent, accompanied with general nervous irritation. I continued in this condition until about the 16th of January, 1835, when I was induced to apply Jewett's Liniment, which gave me some relief the first day. I continued their application ten days, when all pain ceased, and my general health was restored. During the period of my affliction, I received the attention of many eminent physicians, without experiencing any permanent benefit.

PHEBE ANN JOHNSON.

Columbus, Feb. 2, 1835.

Three and a half years ago, I was severely attacked with the inflammatory rheumatism, with which I was confined between three and four months; and after my recovery, I was occasionally troubled with a pain in my side. The inflammatory rheumatism has returned upon me every winter, since my first attack. About three months ago I commenced using Jewett's Stimulating Liniment, which relieved me from pain. I have used four boxes of the Liniment, and at this time I am entirely relieved of the complaint. For some time I have had a glandular swelling on one of my arms, on which I applied the Liniment five times, which has nearly removed it.

TRYPHOSA LATHROP.

March 4th, 1835.

This may certify, that a servant girl living with me, has been afflicted, as she states, with a polypus in her nose, for two years; it extended some way up into her head; had been attend-

ed by a number of physicians without any benefit; was cured by the use of Col. Jewett's Stimulating Liniment, in about four weeks. The application was made by applying it to the inside of the nose, to the affected part.—We should think it advisable to apply it outwardly, at the same time.

THOMAS JOHNSON.

Columbus, March 19, 1835.

PHYSICIAN'S CERTIFICATES.

I hereby certify that I have used several of Col. Jewett's remedies, with the most decided advantage and astonishing success.

W. HANCE.

LIMA, August 15, 1834.

Having been afflicted with a pulmonary irritation, bleeding at the lungs, cough, and pain in the side and breast, I have been much relieved by your Liniment.

G. F. TOMPKINS.

From the same, August 29th.

My health is in a tolerable State, yet I feel some pain in my breast, which seems to increase since the discontinuance of your valuable Liniment. My cough is permanently relieved.

G. F. TOMPKINS.

December 22d.—I am now enjoying good health.

G. F. T.

A soreness in my breast, and difficulty of breathing, which rendered my nights sleepless and uneasy, were by one application so far removed, that every subsequent night I slept with comfort.

S. ROBINSON.

Cincinnati, January 4, 1835.

Columbus, December 2, 1834.

A lady under my care, laboring under remitting bilious fever for more than a week, accompanied with a profuse diarrhœa,

and delirious, was treated by an application of Jewett's Liniment, No. 2. In twelve hours reason was restored; and the next day she was convalescent, and able to attend to the business of the family. THOMAS HERSEY.

FROM MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE.

About the 20th November, 1834, I was taken with the rheumatism in one of my knees, which, in the course of one week, became much swollen and painful—so much that I could not get about without a couple of canes. I came to Columbus on the 29th of November, and on the 3d day after, I called at Col. Jewett's shop, and he applied his Liniment to my knee and leg, down to my foot, which, in a few days nearly relieved me of the pain in my knee; in eight or ten days I became entirely free from pain, and still continue free from all appearance of the complaint. WM. H. MOORE.

About two weeks ago, I was afflicted with the headache and foul stomach. I applied to my head and stomach Jewett's Stimulating Liniment, and in about four minutes my head ceased to ache, and without any other application, my stomach is restored to health. E. HATCH.

January 17, 1835.

NORFOLK CORRESPONDENT.

Dr. Thomas Nash, a scientific and reputable practitioner of Botanic Medicine, and *Principal* of the Infirmary at Norfolk, Va., in a letter addressed to Col. M. Jewett, of this city, under date of April 10th, 1835, remarks, "I am convinced of the great utility of your Liniments. In several cases they have acted like a charm. It is my firm belief, that, if fairly tested, they will prove even better than you have represented. With our Botanic practice they perfectly accord, so far as I have used them. I could at this moment send you several strong certificates—I shall do so, when I shall have gathered a number of others, which I am confident I shall be able to do."

VIRGINIA INFIRMARY,
NORFOLK, June 24th, 1835.

My Dear Sir: Your's of the 17th is at hand. The last invoice of your excellent Liniments have been received but a few days; long enough, however, to render important service in several critical cases. It is extremely gratifying to me, to be enabled, as I am, from experience, to forward renewed testimony of the Curative powers of your stimulating Liniments. So far, I have seen no bad effects from a very free use of the different kinds applied all over the surface of the body, as often as three or four times in sixteen hours; on the contrary, the more freely used, the quicker a reaction, and the more speedy the cure. I have *only very freely* used it, in *very low* cases, when steaming could not be applied, but with much difficulty; and I have not at all changed my internal remedies, but pursued, as usual, a straight forward Thomsonian course of treatment; always acquainting my patient with the fact, that I was responsible for the effect of the Liniment. My heart has been made glad often, at the speedy relief which a thorough application of the No. 2 Liniment has afforded several children in cholic, bowel complaints, measles, coughs, colds, swelling of the glands, &c.; and in one case, when appearances and symptoms argued a speedy dissolution, to gratify the parents of an interesting little boy of four years old, I applied the Liniment, and in ten days he was cured. I could get nothing into the stomach but a little composition. The cases so far are permanent.—As I before promised, individual certificates shall be forwarded to you.—I highly value your excellent liniments, and shall not feel satisfied without having by me a good supply.

In haste—Yours most respectfully,

THOMAS NASH.

To Col. M. JEWETT, Columbus, O.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Henry W. Hodges, dated
"LAWRENCE COUNTY, July 3d, 1835.

"By a few days detention, I am able to give the treatment of two cases, in which your Liniment, No. 2, has been principally relied on. The first is a case of bilious cholic, with affection of the liver and lungs, so that the patient could lie only on his back. When the paroxysms of cholic came on, he was thrown prostrate on the ground wherever it took him, and sometimes much cramped and spasmed. He used one of the half

boxes, and is so much improved in health, that he is better able to attend to his business than he has been for many months, bids fair to recover his health as well as ever it was.—The second is a case of chills and fevers, in a constitution where there is great predisposition to disease. The patient had been for three days unable to sit up, and had to be carried from one bed to another when her bed was made up. I sent the liniment, No. 2, with some anti-bilious powders, and directions how to apply and use them. In a short space of time after the liniment was applied to the whole surface of the system, and a dose of the powders taken, her pains left her, her fever was gone, and she fell into a gentle perspiration, and an action on the bowels produced; she rested well, and on the next day in the evening when I called to see her, she had been sitting up frequently, and had been able to walk about her room. She expressed herself to have been much relieved by my giving her medicine before, but never so as on this occasion. In many other cases of minor consideration, I have found the Liniment possessed of much power to relieve. I have found it very efficient in removing cold. By twice rubbing, I removed a considerable cold from my own system."

H. W. HODGES.

CONCLUDING PARAGRAPH.

Having passed in long minute detail, through the tedious, complicated testimony produced at the confused, abusive, tragi-comical trial of Col. M. Jewett, before a committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Columbus, Ohio, which committee was arbitrarily selected by E. W. Sehon, at whose instance the demon of persecution began to howl, we will just say, in concluding our narrative, that we have in the course of our remarks and animadversions, had occasion to introduce much testimony, that was then and there peremptorily rejected by Mr. Sehon, as being inadmissible and irrelevant—that many incidental matters have been brought up, some of which appear immediately, others to be more remotely connected with the real gist and pith of the points in controversy, under the several items of accusation respectively. These details, however wearisome to our patience, and sometimes unpleasant and disgusting, nevertheless appear to us to have such a relation and relevancy, as to render them almost indispensable for the defence of the accused: waving our reluctant feelings, we have

been constrained, by unavoidable circumstances, to present our readers with these multiform testimonials, *in extenso*, for truth and justice sake. However disagreeable, some parts of the testimony exhibited by the defendant, to individual feelings, the exhibition has not been made from choice, but from necessity. It has been an irksome labor to ourself. It has been a measure into which we have been irresistibly driven, by the strong and unrelenting arm of an Episcopal prosecution.

It was not the defendant that stirred up the controversy, or wilfully laid the foundation of these exposures. It was the implacable malignity of the persecutors of Col. Jewett, that first lifted the spade to raise the mouldered relics of the dead, and have dashed the worms and corruption of the sepulchre in the innocent faces of the living. It was they—yes, it was they, who put the reputation of an unoffending widow, and her innocent orphans in jeopardy!

It is Col. Jewett who has boldly asserted her innocence—he has, at every state of this unpleasant business, exonerated her from all imputation of blame; and fearlessly wipes away, with the placid hand of christian humanity, all imputation of criminality, or even suspicion of any thing blameable on her part, in relation to the subject which she never wished to have investigated. Yes, it is Col. Jewett that declares, unequivocally, that no reproachful stigma should rest on her. Yet the accusers, impleaders, prosecutors and persecutors of this man, would feign persuade her and a credulous world, that he has drawn the stiletto of a *reputation killer*, and aimed a murderous blow at the character of the widow and the fatherless.

As far as the facts relating to this business shall be known, no blame can be attached to Col. Jewett, worthy of death or of bonds. His persecutors have led this woman into a labyrinth of difficulties, and all attempts to excite popular sympathy, to the injury of the Colonel, is labor in vain.

Gladly would we have passed over these unpleasant scenes, and left the pitiful subject untouched, but the defensive principle is the primary law of our physical nature, and is connate with the moral faculties of the soul of man.

We hope not to make any individual an enemy, by exhibiting from the press, what they were neither afraid or ashamed to say and do publicly, at the time of the trial. If there has been any thing like a dereliction of correct moral principle in the zig zag course that has been pursued on the trial, it is unreasonable that they should require at our hands, that we should straighten every thing that others may have chosen, most perversely, to make crooked.

Gladly would we receive the salutations of peace and love, from reformed penitents. "The pride of man must be humbled, and the haughtiness of man must be bowed down." "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world," and must be exterminated. "The world passeth away, and the lusts thereof: but he who doeth the will of God, abideth forever." May the same mind be in us which was in Christ Jesus. Having his good spirit, being partakers of his divine nature, like the dear Saviour, we will pray for our enemies—for those that hate us, and despitefully use and persecute us—"Father! forgive them, for they know not what they do!" Cast their iniquities behind thy back! Sink them, like lead, in the mighty waters,

"Where Lethe flows,
And the black river of oblivion rolls!"

Dewitt Miller
Forest Glen
Maryland

Med. Hist.
WZ
270
H572c
1835
c.1