

I charge you further with having untruthfully represented *your own writings*!! Your unfairness in regard to my own words was criminal enough, but without using superlatives, how shall I characterize the conduct of a man, who, filling the sacred Office of Spiritual Instructor, demeans himself so much as to falsify *his own words* for the purpose of getting out of difficulty? Now as any one who may choose to waste his time upon the perusal of your 1st Dialogue, down to page 7, will see, the discussion between Algernon Softhead and Samuel Odd-patcher, was regarding the propriety of making attendance upon class-meeting a condition of Church membership. Mr. Softhead held that it was not right to do so, Mr. Odd-patcher, that it was. Odd-patcher insisted that Mr. Wesley was averse to the relaxation of the rule; Softhead maintained that Mr. Wesley had no idea of making obedience to such a rule a condition of membership at all. Odd-patcher said, that so far from Mr. Wesley being disposed to make the rule *less* stringent, he was inclined to make it if possible *more* rigorous, and here are his words, "You find no evidence, not the slightest, that he wished the condition of membership to be made *less* stringent, but the *contrary* rather. The burden of proving that *latter* falls upon you, my friend." Will any one say that Odd-patcher did not write *latter* here instead of *former*? Was he not labouring to show that Softhead could not prove anything in favour of the relaxation of the rule, and did he not intend to challenge the adduction of the evidence which he imagined his antagonist could not produce? But let me call attention to the very next member of the sentence, which is as follows, "I assure you your attempt at doing so would be the commencement of a very hopeless task." Reverend Sir, I stated that you were "calling upon your opponent to sustain a proposition entirely distinct from, and antagonistic to, the one you intended to submit" to him, and I repeat the allegation. You were of course desirous that he should furnish proof if he could, of what he had asserted, not of what you had affirmed, but believing he could not do so, you told him that his "attempt would be the commencement of a very hopeless task." Yet you assert in your letter, that you meant to call upon him to prove that Mr. Wesley wished to increase the rigour of the rule! In so saying you told an untruth upon yourself. (The reader will please refer to paragraph 6, in my first letter, and to the reply of Mr. Norland, paragraph 8.) To proceed; I feel proud that in the interpretation of your own words, (see paragraph 7 of Mr. Norland's letter) you have availed yourself of the instructions I gave you at my paragraph 5. It enables me the better to bear up under the godly abuse which, no doubt in compassion to my perverse soul, you have heaped upon me, in the subsequent parts of your letter. I may as well tell you here that I had heard of the Deed of Settlement, and that it is just possible I may be as conversant with the history of Methodism, and with history generally, as yourself. Happily knowledge "unrolls its ample page" to laymen as readily as to ecclesiastics.

I do not know that there is much else to notice in your last "literary effort," which *en passant*, be it said with due admiration, is, no doubt, your *chef d'œuvre*, for after the way the Dialogue had been honored, I dare say you felt alive to the necessity of sustaining your growing reputation. Yet as you have rejoiced exceedingly over one of my phrases, I ought not perhaps to allow the opportunity to pass without complimenting you upon the microscopic discovery you have made, in respect of its demerits. The expression which has given you such intense satisfaction is the following:—"I believe, and I think that most persons at all conversant with the early history of Methodism, believe with me, that in instituting the class-meeting, Mr. Wesley did the very best thing that could be done." Now a rigid but honest critic would possibly have said that the phrase, had an ellipsis hardly allowable, and that words having the force of the following, should have been added, "by him under the circumstances." The reference to "the early history of Methodism" was, as I thought, sufficient to render the meaning quite clear, and I think so still. The Imperial Dictionary thus treats of the *ELLIPSIS*. "2 *gram.* defect; omission; a figure of syntax, by which one or more words are omitted, which the hearer or reader may supply." Where is your triumph? One of your omissions; 2^d more reprehensible, I passed over, remarking only that several words were wanted, but you could not afford to "do likewise."

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

Reverend Sir, the allusion to the means of grace and the love of God immediately after your melancholy exhibition of meering levity, is about as strong a dose of disgust, as you could have given to your readers. To conclude this part of my task: you confound reserve or taciturnity, with nervousness; are you serious, or is it only another attempt to "befog" your "Dear Friend"? Give up such practices for they are too puerile for men to indulge in.

O! I had forgotten your poetic conclusion. Have you never heard that the sentiment of the verse has been mercilessly ridiculed, as a piece of folly? Then you are not the well-poated up man your admirers imagine. But did you go to the fountain of knowledge, and did you really drink large draughts therefrom? Ah Sir, I fear some wicked wag played you a scurvy trick and fouled the spring! This will account for the very muddy state of your thoughts. Go again, Dear Sir, perhaps on a second application you will find the waters more unimp.

I have an idea of publishing the correspondence between us in the Newspapers. The whole Province will thus be benefited by having in your writings a model of chaste and erudite composition. Your field of operation is too narrow for a sublime genius, and the man who brings you forward will be entitled to public gratitude. What say you? At present you only appear in unfashionable pulpits and on semi-political platforms, but the Province has a right to your services. What say you? Shall I associate my own with your great name in the *Globe*?

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

You have insinuated that the pressure of your pastoral avocations leaves you little time to expend upon literary efforts, and I can well believe that if you attend properly to your duties, you will. And enough to do. But I maintain that your errors were not those of haste; you did your best; you could not have done better if you had tried, or, under the fear of a second critique you would not have fallen into others equally grave.

NEW GEMS FROM THE DIALOGUE.

Preface. "Owing mainly to the prudent course of the Conference in abstaining from all exciting reference to Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet, quiet has been maintained throughout the Methodist connexion." Very well. "It has nevertheless been my conviction," you go on to say, "that sooner or later an antidote to Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet should be supplied." Here then we have two singular arguments. Conference having the truth on its side, had surely no reason to fear, yet you exhibit that body as in the attitude of apprehension. Do you believe in the maxim. *Veritas, magna res est prolebat?* I think not. And—if the prudent course was to refrain from exciting reference to the subject, where is your prudence in bringing it forward in so exciting a manner?

Preface again. "This I the more readily do as my views, &c., and that I can supply them; &c." Some phrases, "Where we both agree in opposition to Dr. Ryerson," &c. So you both agree in opposition, or contradistinction to Dr. Ryerson, for certainly the phrases do not mean