

the husband, I believe I am correct in saying that he is not a *communicant* in your Church, and can be said to be a "member of the Church" only with the same propriety as he can be said to be a member of the Wesleyan branch of the Church. He occasionally attends Church and pays something for your support: the same may be said of him in respect to us.—You are aware that, at the request of the father, I baptized the very child in question.

The version you give (p. 8 and 9.) of your interference of "bye gone days," is plausible, but unfortunately for you, not correct. Mrs Cunningham has authorized me to say, that when the "aged member of the Church" put into her hands Bishop Onderdonk's work on Episcopacy, she expressly said, *Mr Shreve wishes you to read it.* This Mrs C. thought was, on your part, an unnecessary interference—an effort made by you to unsettle her mind as to the validity of the ordination of the ministry of her choice. That it was your hope, that the reading of that work would so convince her of the divine institution of Episcopacy, as would induce her to abandon the *self-assumed* ministry of the Methodists, and return to the "*Holy Mother Church.*" I should conclude from your own representation of the case. She denies also ever having written the "illeberral remarks in pencil" to which you refer: but, as you had expressly requested her to read the work, of course hoping that it would convince her of her error, she thought she was perfectly justifiable in giving you in writing the result of the perusal. This she did, and you thought proper to enter into a "controversy" with a woman. After reading your letters, she expressed to you by letter, her determination to receive from you no more communications on the subject. In coming to this conclusion she was influenced by various reasons; one of which was, she did not then wish to have her mind disturbed by reading any thing more respecting the exclusive claims you put forth in behalf of episcopacy: but she is free to confess, that the principal reason was, that, in her view, your letter to her contained language so "harsh and indecorous"—language that no *gentleman*, to say nothing of a *clergyman* of the Church of England, ought to use to a lady,—that she could not bring herself for a moment to consent to receive any further communications from the same source. To your unqualified assertion, that she "afterwards expressed to her friends her regret for what had transpired" so as to inculcate herself.—"stated that she had been urged by others to write as she had done, and was desirous that all should be passed over, as though it had not been," she feels herself compelled by a due regard to truth, to give a *most positive, unqualified denial*—and, cannot but say, if no more reliance can be placed on the correctness of your other statements, and of your whole performance, than is to be placed in your version of her case, the truthfulness of the whole is to be regarded with the greatest suspicion.