

2584

33

“Tell it unto the Church!”

For Library Use Only

DO NOT CIRCULATE
THE CASE

OF

WILLIAM PASSMORE,

“

PRESBYTER OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW JERSEY,

AGAINST

JOHN SCARBOROUGH, D. D.

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW JERSEY.

1882.

Press of W. A. Church, 127 South Third St., Philad'a.

J283

P288c



HAMMONTON, N. J., JANUARY 16TH, 1882.

To all of my Brethren in Christ: to whom, in the uncertain course of future events, this pamphlet may be sent by me for the Lord's sake, and for the sake of Truth and Righteousness in the Church; Greeting:—

BRETHREN:—Our Blessed Lord, on one occasion, said to his disciples: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone. If he will hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And, if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."—Matt. XVIII: 15-17.

That, as I told Bishop Scarborough when I saw him last—Aug. 24th, 1881,—is the rule by which I act, and to all of my "brethren" alike, whether they be Bishops, Priests, Deacons or Laymen. And, as that is the divinely-appointed rule upon which we all ought to act, I have every reason for thinking that it is infinitely superior, both in its spiritual and worldly wisdom and efficiency, to anything that man can possibly devise, whether it be by canons or ecclesiastical courts, and whether those courts be of original or of appellate jurisdiction.

And, the only reason why anybody should not like the rule, is, that it cuts off as much as possible all chances for concealment of the truth,—and so the guilty will not like it. And it prevents, as far as possible, all secret injustice in "packing" courts and juries and suppressing evidence and in taking advantage of legal forms and quibbles to do wrong, as the wicked rulers of Church and State are often able, as well as willing to do. And so the wicked High Priests and Chief Priests, and the Scribes and Pharisees of modern days, will never favor it, but will stick to the canons and to the ecclesiastical courts alone to the last, and trust to them, because by them they can more easily deceive the whole Church by their scheming and falsehoods.

But it is because the rule is so open and fair for all, and so merciful, as well as just, to the wrong doer, and so good for all who love truth and righteousness, that I love it. And, I have adhered to it, hitherto, so far as I could, in all of my dealings with all who have ever trespassed against me and with Bishop Scarborough among the rest. But, the Bishop would not even "hear" me, though I have, since December, 1879, to this day, repeatedly tried to get him to do so in the hope of "gaining" my brother from sin unto righteousness.

I therefore told him—August 24th, 1881,—that if he would not hear me by word of mouth, as he ought to have done, that I would write to him all that I thought that I ought to tell him; and that I have now done, having mailed to him the last sheet of what I had to tell him, November 1st, 1881.

But, though in what I have written to him I have not only stated, but proved, by his own written words and by Mr. Gordon's own written words and by his own admissions to me by word of mouth and by Mr. Gordon's admissions to me by word of mouth, in how many and how great things he has trespassed against me, still the Bishop has made *no response at all*. He "would not hear me," first or last.

Therefore, I have taken "one or two more" as "witnesses," according to our Lord's direction in such cases. For as the Bishop, at the very first, would not deal with me directly, but through Mr. Gordon only, I took Mr. Gordon

himself as a witness, in 1879, and told him all about the case, so far as I could, as his letter to me plainly shows. And I told the Bishop at that time that I had told Mr. Gordon everything, and had also shown him my letters to the Bishop and the Bishop's letters to me,—both of date 1879, as my letter of December 18th, 1879, to the Bishop, plainly proves—up to that time.

Besides, I took the Rev. Mr. Fiske as another witness, September 3d, 1881, and told him of the case up to that time, in a general way, and read to him what I had written to the Bishop. And I informed the Bishop of that fact a very few days afterwards.

Therefore, I have done all that our Lord required, and all that can be done by me, except to "tell" the case "unto the Church." That, I now propose to do. But, I shall here merely state the origin of my issue with the Bishop, that the reader may have some idea of what the case is about, leaving a full statement of the whole case to be given later, after first noticing what ought to be noticed previously.

My grounds of complaint against Bishop Scarborough are: 1. That he entered into a wicked conspiracy with Mr. Gordon, the Rector of the Church at Hammonton, to induce me, either by force or by fraud—for they tried both—to receive the Communion from them, and that not righteously and religiously, as the sacred nature of the Sacrament required that it should be both administered and received by all of the parties engaged in it, but merely for form's sake and for outward appearances' sake only; and 2. That the Bishop began this conspiracy and has continued to act throughout all of the various events which have followed from it, not only contrary to the dictates of religion, but contrary to the dictates of right and justice, and of truth and of reason as well. For he has acted throughout with a degree of trickery, and of deceit, and of falsehood, and of hypocrisy, and of every other kind of wickedness that it was possible for him to introduce into it, to a degree that was positively horrible. Of all these things I now distinctly charge him—and that the charges are all but too true, this pamphlet will abundantly prove. Alas! that it should! God only knows how sincerely I wish that it could not do it, if only the facts were not as they are

But, the Bishop "would not hear me," though I have so often and so urgently appealed to his reason and conscience to do so; and therefore it is that I have had to appeal to "the last resort" that our Lord has left to us: "Tell it unto the Church." I have been slow to do this; I fear now, too slow, for the Bishop does not—perhaps he cannot—appreciate my forbearance. For, as long ago as November 1st, 1881, I notified him that if he had not done what it was right and proper that he should do by December 31st, 1881, I would then print and publish all that I had written to him and would send a copy of the printed pamphlet to every clergyman and to every lay delegate to the Convention of the Diocese, that the Convention of the Diocese of 1882 might be able to take action in the case. It is, therefore, by the Bishop's own default, that "all this evil is come upon him."

For there is now clearly no other possible way left, either to bring the Bishop to account for his past wrongs or to keep him from future wrongs, not only against me, but against others who are more completely in his power than I am. But, his greatest wrongs are not those which he so wickedly practices against those whom, he thinks, he can dare to injure and then to defy, but against the whole Church, whose highest ministry he has defiled and polluted by his pride and tyranny, and falsehood and hypocrisy; but most of all against that Holy God, whom he has injured and defied by his multiplied and unrepented acts of impiety and sacrilege, by profaning his own sacred office and the Most Holy Sacrament, and by his contemptuous defiance of truth and of righteousness.

For when my Bishop will, whether from the suggestion of one or more slanderous brethren, clergymen or laymen, (as I have reason to believe to be the fact,) or from the mere suggestion of the Devil, or of his own foolishly proud and wicked heart, without any previous provocation on my part, but in spite of the most friendly and even cordial treatment of him by me, for four or five years previously, and without one word of warning to me, that he had ever heard, or thought, anything against me, treat me as Bishop Scarborough has done; and that, too, after repeated and urgent remonstrances with him, and after repeated and earnest requests to him to come and have his own threatened "long talk" with me, and when, instead of being reasonable and righteous, and honestly religious, and religiously honest in his dealings with me, as his "fellow-servant" in the house of our common Lord, according to his sacred obligations, not only to me, but to our common Lord Himself, and when, instead of repenting and amending his evil course of conduct, he still persists in his cruel and unjust and proud and wicked refusal, not only to do what is right, but even to "hear" my cause at all, and when he then adds falsehood to wrong, and defiance and contempt to falsehood and wrong, and that not only for me and for my cause, but for all truth and righteousness as well, and also for all of the sacred obligations of his holy office, and of his duty towards God and the Church, then it becomes my solemn and sacred duty to God and to the Church, and to the soul of the Bishop himself, as well as to my own soul, that I should "Tell it unto the Church," as our Lord directs. For, having tried everything else, to no purpose, the last resort becomes obligatory.

MY REASONS FOR PRINTING.

But, it may be asked by many: Why not tell the case to some of the most influential of the clergy and laity first, and see if they cannot influence the Bishop to do what is right? Or why not tell it, by word of mouth, at the Convention, so as to avoid, as much as possible, the publication of a great scandal?

To these I would answer that there are several reasons, either one of which would be sufficient to settle the matter; and why I should do just what I have done, rather than anything else that I might have done, if the circumstances had been different.

1. In the first place, I am an invalid and my case is a very long one, and a very complicated one, and it would be absolutely impossible for me to tell it all, exactly as it should be told, by word of mouth, to any one person, unless I had plenty of time to tell it in, and plenty of strength to tell it with; which, however, I cannot ever have again on earth. I have tried it several times with brother clergy who have been staying at my house with me, and I never could get half through with it. How absurd it would be, then, for me to think of going about the diocese to try to tell it to a number of persons! But, it is equally impossible that I should write out copies of it all, to send them about to those whom I would wish to consult. Indeed, it has almost killed me, several times, already, to write out all that I have had to write, even in doing as I have done.

And so, if I could not tell it all by word of mouth, even to a single brother who was staying at my house, I could not tell it by word of mouth to the Convention. Indeed, even if I was well enough, and strong enough to do so, the chances are ten to one that I could not get the Convention to give me time enough to hear me. For, there would be a powerful combination that would try, and most likely successfully, to prevent me from being heard.

In the first place, the Bishop, who would not hear me even in private, and before there was any serious issue raised between us, would not wish to hear me now, and that, too, before the whole Convention. Neither would my other guilty

fellow-clergy, whose religion seems to consist, like the Bishop's, in a mere outward and formal performance of the external rites and ceremonies of religion, without having any regard at all for the spiritual or even the moral obligations that the Christian religion imposes upon us all. Neither would the Ecclesiastical Machine Politicians, who go for the Machine without regard to the rights or the reasons of those who wish to stop the Machine, when wicked men wish to make it do wrong. Neither would those weak-minded or weak-kneed Christians, well-meaning though they be, who would rather cover up and conceal a corrupting and dangerous sin than allow the scandal that would result from the exposure of the sin. Neither would those purely selfish or worldly-minded brethren, who would prefer that their "craft" shall not suffer in the eyes of the world, than that the Church of God shall be made clean and holy, in God's sight.

In such a case as this, all of these different sorts of men would all combine together, and by fair means or by foul—or, rather, by foul means only—they would do all that they could to influence their personal friends, and all other persons over whom they could exert any influence of any kind, to prevent the hearing of the case. They would "pooh pooh" it all, as the Bishop did in his letter to me. And, the chances are not only ten to one, but an hundred to one, or one thousand to one, that among them all they could induce the Convention not to hear the case at all; or, they might even pervert the whole effort, so as to make the Convention believe that I was the guilty one, as my Bishops and fellow-clergy have done out of Convention for the sixteen or eighteen years last past.

That would only be doing now, what the High Priest, and the Chief Priests and the Scribes and the Pharisees of ancient times knew how to do then, for they deceived not only their own "Council," but all of "the people," so that they "crucified the Lord of Glory" and "saved Barabbas." And so have Ecclesiastical Councils been deceived and led astray from Apostolic times, almost. For, as the Council of Tyre, A. D. 335, deposed Athanasius and restored Arias, so also a great Council of Bishops at Ephesus, A. D. 449, by adding injustice and cruelty to falsehood and wrong, and by acquitting the guilty Eutyches and condemning and scourging and so killing the just Flavianus, they earned for their Council the name of "Latrocinium," or, the "Assembly of Robbers." And so, down to this day, Councils have been often the means of enabling the wicked and the robbers to escape, and even to bring the just to reproach and condemnation.

And so, by such an union of all who "love darkness rather than the light, because their deeds are evil," by some scheming, or even by any false statement which I could not hear and which, therefore, I could not answer, they could make my appeal to the Convention a failure, without the "good men and the true" even suspecting that there was anything amiss. I speak of what I know and of what history informs us has often occurred already, in Church Councils, in every part of the Church, just as they occur now in Political Machine Conventions. For all of these reasons, I have thought that printing was the only proper course for me to take.

2. But, there is another reason to which I have just alluded. I am deaf—so deaf, indeed, that I cannot hear a word unless the speaker's mouth is placed close to my left ear; and, sometimes, I cannot hear even then. I would, therefore, stand no chance at all in a Convention, where the simplest objection or contradiction that the Bishop, or anybody else might see fit to make would be unheard by me; and, therefore, could not be answered by me. That would be to put myself into a position such as that of a blind man, who would begin to fight with a host of people who could see; or, like that of a man bound hand and foot, who would challenge to combat a host of people who were free. It would be mere insanity for me to think of such a thing, even if it were possible for me to go to the Convention and to get a hearing, and to be free and able to

speaking at such length as would be necessary, which, as I have already said, are impossible.

Indeed, any other course than that of printing what I have to say, would put me and my cause at an infinite disadvantage. Whereas, by printing it, every man, good or bad, can have a copy; and every "true man" can not only know and understand the whole case, but can judge intelligently of what he, himself, ought to do. And it will be impossible to ignore the printed pamphlets without subjecting every man who tries to do so, to the criticism and condemnation of the Church at large, as his conduct may require. And instead of spending the last remnants of my life and property in a way that might do more harm than good—by increasing and prolonging the evils that I am now trying to end—it will effectually cut off my scheming and deceitful and wicked brethren from covering up and concealing what ought to be made known.

Therefore it is that I have thought that by printing what I have to say—as is done in courts of equity—so that every word can be established by the closest scrutiny of every word and fact, and so that there can be no error or mis-conception that cannot be brought to the test—that that would be the surest and the best way for me to take.

THE SCANDAL ARGUMENT.

3. But, the objection that may be made on the score of the scandal that may result from my printing of the case, is but a fallacy, for the scandal would be much the same, whether the facts were disclosed by word of mouth or by printing. And besides, the scandal is not the main thing that is to be considered in this case, nor is it even any part of the main thing. It is the sins and the wrongs that have been done, and that ought to be checked and corrected. They are the things to be considered; and if scandal follows, that is not the fault of him who is only trying to do his duty, according to our Lord's own express commandment, but it is the fault of him, who, after "having been often reprov'd," has only "hardened his heart," and by defying—contemptuously—every other possible means of making him respect the rights of others and the obligations of his high and sacred office, has made the scandal necessary.

For, sometimes, scandals are really "necessary." For God does not regard scandal as man does. Men have a fear and horror of scandal, because it may either directly or indirectly concern themselves, or their friends, or some cause that they may have at heart. It is also because they fear "the reproach of men" more than they do "the reproach of God."

That is worldly and human wisdom, undoubtedly. But it is not what God calls wisdom, but "foolishness." For man, by his way of doing, does what he can to make himself and others believe that scandal is worse than sin, and that to have regard to the opinions of their sinful fellow-creatures is more important than to have regard to the opinions of God. And so, like Adam and Eve, they try to cover up and to conceal their sin and shame by a full suit of concealment, if that be possible; but with only a fig leaf, if they can do no better. And then, in their folly, like the ostrich that sticks its head into the sand and thinks that because it cannot see itself, that others cannot see it, they think that man must consider, them pure—and even that God must do so also. Is not that "foolishness?" For, is that not the very way to make sin to be less feared and hated, and so to become more dangerous and more hateful and to give it every opportunity to penetrate to the very vitals?

It is like concealing the leprosy, or any other foul and consuming disease. And, therefore, it is, that God, who wishes the sinner to be cleansed from his leprosy of sin, has always required that sin shall be exposed—unless the sinner

should repent of his sin, and so be cleansed, before any exposure becomes necessary, for the safety of others.

And hence it is that He, whose great end in revealing Himself and His attributes to us, is that we may know Him, and love Him and His attributes; loving righteousness and hating iniquity, so that we may be fitted to live with Him forever in Holiness and Righteousness, He who sees all of the sins that are ever done upon earth, and who knows all of the scandals that ever arise from the, comparatively, few sins that ever give rise to any scandals at all, He takes no account at all of the scandals unless they are false and malicious, and therefore sinful. He regards the sin alone, and He regards that just as much, even if there is no scandal at all made about it, and even though it be covered up and concealed from the knowledge of all men as completely as was Achan's "wedge of gold" and "goodly Babylonish garment."

And, what is more, He not only visits the sinner who has concealed his sin so that none but God can know it, but He has often punished "the whole congregation" of the people if the congregation did not do its duty in exposing and condemning the sins of its rulers especially, and sometimes even of those of very inferior degree. And in some cases He has done this even when the congregation did not even know of the sin that had been committed and had been covered up and concealed in their midst. So it was in the case of Israel in regard to the sin of Achan. Read the chapter (Joshua VIII). And so it has been in the Church, even in the Apostolic age, as we see (Rev. II, 5) when in the message which God sent to the Bishop of the Church at Ephesus, He not only warned him of the judgment that was suspended and ready to fall "quickly" upon himself but where his See itself would be broken up and removed for his sin (and that only because he had "left his first love" to God) if he would not repent and do his work as he had done at first.

And so it is to this day, for God visits the sins of the rulers upon the nations and upon the churches if they will not when they see or know of their rulers' sins, bring their guilty rulers to account. And so it is that an unfaithful Bishop like the Bishop of Ephesus who has only "left his first love" and not done anything especially wicked so far as we are informed, and much more that a wicked bishop who has been guilty of very many and of very heinous sins against God as well as against his "fellow-servants" may bring about not only his own ruin but the ruin of the Church over which he presides.

And so reasonable and righteous is this course on the part of God that it is only a wonder that everybody does not recognise that the Church is responsible for the character of its Bishops as well as that the Bishops are responsible for the character of the Church. We cannot, like Cain, ask "Am I my brother's keeper?" without having like Cain, the answer of God, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." We are all of us our brother's keepers. We must warn and check and even rebuke and correct each other, or the sin lies at our door as well as at the door of him who did it.

And it is because this is not heeded that God not only withholds the fullness of the blessings which the Church would otherwise receive, but the Church itself becomes weak and sickly and unable to do the work for which it was established. For there is plenty and to spare of the Lord's silver and gold, and there are plenty and to spare of those who name the name of the Lord, to conquer the whole world for God in the course of a very few years with God's blessing and help, if only the Church were "sanctified" as Joshua sanctified Israel, when he discovered the sin of Achan, and "put away" the sin from Israel.

And so now, if every bishop and priest and deacon and layman would only be faithful to God by bringing to light and condemning the great sins of those "in high places" whose conduct has most to do with the spread of sin, they

would soon put away "the accursed, thing"—sin—from its place of pride and power.

Therefore, as God himself has commanded us not to cover up sins but to expose them, where the exposure of them is necessary to the putting away of the sins, we ought not—the reader of these lines any more than the writer of them—to let any fear of the scandal that may arise—that crafty and deceitful plea of the world and the devil—deter us from doing our whole duty, whenever God's holy laws of truth and righteousness are at stake. "Tell it unto the Church" is the best way of curing the leprosy of sin in the Church whenever and wherever it may appear. The Apostolic Church proved that, in far worse times than these upon which we are fallen.

And God has not only commanded us to do this but He has set us the example how to do it. He did not make examples of merely wicked men or of people of low condition in life. Indeed those are the ones he has not taken often, but he has taken his examples from the best as well as from the highest in station. It is the patriarchs and the anointed prophets and the judges and the high priests and the kings and the governors that He has taken for examples. And He has held them up to the condemnation of all men, not merely when they had sinned and when He was punishing them, but He has published their sins by His prophets and apostles and evangelists hundreds of years after the sinners were dead and after they and their sins had been utterly forgotten. And He has done this from the time of the very first man to the very end of the Scripture period of the New Testament, the Book of Revelation, publishing, as I have just shown, the sins of the bishops of some of the Churches of Asia. And so God himself published the sins of Adam and of Noah, of Reuben and of Judah, of Lot and of his daughters, of Moses and of Aaron, of Miriam and of Samson, of David and of Solomon, of Eli and his sons, and of Jonah, and of the apostles, Judas and Peter, and of Ananias and Sapphira, and of numberless others of whose sins those published of the persons I have named are merely specimens.

These all were published by God for good and all-sufficient reasons, sometimes for the sake of the sinners themselves, to bring them to repentance, sometimes for the sake of those who were about the sinners, that they might be saved from the evil influences and wrongs and examples of the sinners, and sometimes for no other reason that we can see except to make the sinners examples and warnings to all those who should come after them, "even to the years of many generations," as they have been to our forefathers for thousands of years past, and as they are now to us thousands of years after the death of the sinners, and as our children and our children's children will continue to hear them and read them for thousands of years to come, if the world shall last so long, or at any rate until the end of the world, whenever that may come.

And yet these scandals that God himself has published in the Bible were not only about sins that were committed by the heathen, or by the ungodly, or by people of low degree, but about some of the best and most righteous and most exalted in station, both in the Church and in the State. So little does God care for scandal as compared with sin.

Hence, while I would never publish a scandal unnecessarily if I could help it, I would never hesitate a moment to do so after I had once come to the deliberate conclusion that truth and righteousness required that it should be published. I would take the risk of human laws and of human censure rather than fail of what I owed to God and to the right, God being my helper.

4. But there is still another reason why I should have all of this case printed, and that is because I do not know how much further it will have to go, for, if the bishop would not "hear" me when I wished to tell him everything in private, and that even before he had wronged me so terribly as he has since done, most certainly he will not hear me now if he can help it. Neither will my slan-

derous brother, who, I have every reason to believe was the one who slandered me first to Bishop Odenheimer and to the rest of my fellow clergy and has done the same wicked thing since to Bishop Scarborough. Nor will any of those who think more of "appearances" than they do of truth and of righteousness. None of these would wish to hear me now or to let others hear me if they could help it. Yet all of these will combine, it is now certain that they will, unless the power of God should humble them very speedily, to get the Convention to ignore the case if possible, and if they should succeed in doing that then I shall feel bound to present the case to all of the bishops and clergy and to all of the most prominent of the laity that I can hear of throughout all of the United States, that the general Church may have the last chance to bring the guilty Bishop to account.

And if that should prove to be necessary, then I would wish to present the whole case in the identical words, even, so far as that may be possible, in which it was first presented to the Bishop and to the Church in New Jersey, that the whole Church may be able to see for themselves who has been on the Lord's side and who has not, and who has been faithful to the claims of truth and of righteousness, and who has not.

For I hold it as a self-evident principle, as well as a christian principle, that nobody ought ever to be allowed to do a wrong without at least some rebuke or check, and that only idiots and children of very tender age or capacity ought to be allowed to escape, not only all punishment, but all reproof or shame for their wrongs, and that the higher the intelligence of the wrong-doer and the more eminent and influential his station and the more sacred and influential his office, so much the greater is his sin of wrong-doing as well as his power to wrong and injure others, and that for these reasons every person ought to be made to feel that his responsibility is exactly commensurate to the dignity and power and sacredness of his position or office. And if he does wrong and is remonstrated with on account of it, if he still continue not only impenitent, but, much more, if he then becomes defiant and contemptuous, then he needs and he should receive prompt and exemplary rebuke or punishment according to the nature and extent of his offence. There is no such thing as "divine right to do wrong," or, having done wrong, to claim a right to escape with impunity.

But, having now cleared the way of all preliminary considerations, I will proceed to state the whole of my case, as briefly as possible, consistently with fullness and clearness of statement, afterwards considering the last part of it with which alone Bishop Scarborough is connected, in minute detail, giving at last the letters and other proofs of Bishop Scarborough's guilt.

This course is necessary, for unless the whole of the case were stated, the last part of it could not be so clearly understood.

MY CASE IS THIS :

For the past twenty-two years I have been an invalid, and all of that time I have lived at Hammonton, New Jersey, and for the past sixteen or eighteen years I have been having troubles with my Bishops and with some of my fellow-clergy who have been in charge of the Churches at Waterford and Hammonton, adjacent and associated parishes, and all of these troubles have been more or less connected together, having been begun, continued, and as I have every reason to believe, brought to their present pass through the slanderous wrongs of the original wrong-doer.

For, the first that I ever knew of anything being amiss as against myself, was by reason of a question put to me some sixteen or eighteen years ago, by an old lady friend of mine, who asked me : " Why don't you want to have a Church at Hammonton ?" I expressed my great surprise at such a question, when

she told me that "Mr." — (naming a clergyman) had told her so. That, I felt, was a fair call upon me to tell her all that I knew about it, so I told her that "that clergyman had spoken to me about his coming to hold services at Hammonton and that I had given him no encouragement to do so, but rather the contrary." And I told her my reasons for doing as I had done. I told her that I knew personally that that clergyman had shamefully neglected his former parish and that I had the fullest possible proof that he was at that very time shamefully neglecting the Mission Stations, where he was in charge, and that I felt assured that he would do more harm than good if he came to Hammonton.

But I told her also that so far from my not wanting to have a Church at Hammonton, I had been doing all that I could to get one here ever since the day I first came here to live, and in proof of this I instanced these facts: 1. That I had procured a beautiful lot of three acres for the church within a very few weeks after I got here, as the date of the deed plainly proves. 2. That I had had three different lay readers appointed by the Bishop himself for Hammonton and Egg Harbor City, as the records of the diocese ought to be able to prove now, and all these were appointed within two or three years after I came here. But it was not by my fault that these lay readers did not get up a Church here, for the first, after having read but one Sunday, was found that same week, one summer's day, black and bloated in the middle of the road—dead by act of God. The second read but three or four times when it became known that he had engaged himself to marry two different young women at the same time, so that I had to notify him that he could not act as lay reader any longer. And the third, after borrowing a considerable number of valuable books from me, after a few weeks left for parts unknown, taking my books with him.

All of this experience had given me a wholesome lesson, and had taught me that God did not favor the plan of taking up with anybody that chose to offer his services.

But after a year or two more an invalid clergyman of good repute came to Hammonton from Connecticut for the benefit of his health, and having improved much in a short time he was so pleased with the climate that he offered to bring his family and settle here and officiate if we could only contribute enough to eke out what was wanting for his support beyond his own private means. I then wrote to the Bishop to tell him what we could do (which was then very little), and to ask what the diocese could do. But the Bishop replied that the diocese at that time could not contribute anything. Therefore that effort also fell through.

Soon after this the clergyman who afterwards slandered me to my old friend proposed to me that he should come as General Missionary for this part of the diocese, but, as I said before, I gave him no encouragement to do so but rather the contrary, and it was on that account that he saw fit to slander me to my old friend, for that what he said was a "slander," all of the facts that I have just recorded plainly prove.

All of this I told to my old friend at that time, and all of this I have now put on record here, that all who read this pamphlet may know of the facts in full.

But from all of the facts that followed from that time to this I am convinced that my slanderous brother slandered me at that time and since, not only to my old friend but to Bishop Odenheimer also, and to everybody else to whom he ever talked about me from that time to this. For, from that time Bishop Odenheimer and others of the clergy treated me not only coldly but uncivilly and and unjustly, and all the time the Bishop and my slanderous brother were very intimate with each other. And the Bishop having before that time appointed him General Missionary, they both seemed to feel that as General Missionary he had full jurisdiction over all persons and places where he had never held any services, as well as over the few places where he did hold services, either by lay readers or in person. That was a very unfortunate idea, not to call it a very

erroneous one. But even if they did have that idea, my slanderous brother could have come to Hammonton and held services as he might see fit, and neither I nor any one else would ever have said or done anything to hinder him. But I could not in conscience do anything to help to get him here. All that I wished to do was not to have any of the responsibility for his coming here, or for his acts after he came here. But what I said to him gave him no right to slander me, either to my old friend or to the Bishop or to any body else

But "tall oaks from little acorns grow" and so the slanders that my slanderous brother told soon grew apace, for they induced the Bishop to set himself against me, so that without even seeing me or writing to me as he should have done to get an explanation of my conduct, he took a blind stand against me, and that soon brought trouble, as that way of doing things always will.

For, very soon after this, while my slanderous brother was still officiating at Waterford—but not at Hammonton—the Vestry at Waterford, who had become thoroughly disgusted with him, united with the people of Hammonton to secure the services of a wandering clergyman who had consented to come and officiate for both places for whatever sums they might feel able and willing to give him; and they engaged him to officiate for them, temporarily. But, I had no hand in that, and did not even know that they had had such an offer until after the whole thing had been settled. At that time, Waterford had been for some time organized as a parish, and Hammonton had just become so.

Seeing what had been done, the General Missionary, not wishing to let Waterford slip from his control, tried to engage the new clergyman to unite with him, and to serve the two Parishes under him. That, the clergyman was not willing to do; neither were the Parishes willing to have the General Missionary over them, in any way, his previous neglect of duty at Waterford having set the people there and at Hammonton very strongly against him. The General Missionary then appealed to the Bishop, to get him to interfere and to subject both the clergyman whom the two Parishes had engaged to officiate for them, and the two Parishes themselves, to himself, as General Missionary. And, that the Bishop did, without having had any previous consultation with either of the Vestries and without even sending any word to them of what he wished to have them do, and without assigning any reason for what he did, but merely notifying the clergyman whom they had engaged, that he was, thenceforward, to consider himself under the General Missionary's jurisdiction.

That was an arbitrary and unjust and unlawful decree, for the clergyman at Waterford and Hammontou was in Priest's orders and was a much older man than the General Missionary, and the two Parishes had vested rights with which neither the Bishop nor the General Missionary had any right to interfere. Therefore, as soon as the two Vestries heard of this decree, they were stung to anger at the sense of its injustice and wrong, and at the meanness that had brought on the wrong, and, at their request, I wrote to the Bishop, informing him of the facts and requesting him to revoke his decree, telling him also that there would be trouble unless he did so. I told him also what I, as well as all of the people of Waterford and Hammonton thought, of the unfitness of the man whom he wished to set over the Parishes, as well as of the illegality and wrong of the decree itself.

But, the Bishop, in his pride and self-confidence, chose to take offence at me because I wrote to him as I did, and he did not even answer my letter. When that became known, the Vestry at Waterford, in order to checkmate both the Bishop and the General Missionary, immediately elected their temporary clergyman as their Rector, and the Vestry at Hammonton would have done the same thing if I had not dissuaded them from it. But, they passed a resolution that the General Missionary should not be allowed to have anything to do with the Church at Hammonton.

In consequence of this state of things, the Bishop became furious, and he laid the blame of it all upon me, whereas, everything was done by the Vestries themselves, except where I dissuaded the Vestry at Hammonton from their hasty and improper way of gaining their end.

But, the Bishop, instead of coming to see me, or of writing to me, as he should have done, telling me of anything that he thought was amiss, on my part, and especially so, as I was one of the most battered and shattered of the Church's Missionaries, who had been broken down by fifteen years of hard work, both at the North and at the South, while doing the Church's work in all weathers and supporting myself by my own private means at the same time, he chose to take the unjust and unchristian and high-handed course of writing to another clergyman—a tool of his—appointing him a "Commissioner," and directing him, if he concurred in the Bishop's view of the matter, to summon me to appear before him on a certain date to be fixed by him, and to produce "legal evidence" in proof of my "charges" against the General Missionary.

That was going too far, even for me to stand it any longer, notwithstanding my very high views of the duty of respecting the "rightful" and "godly" directions and even "counsels" of my Bishops. For, I had made no formal charges against the General Missionary, such as would be absolutely necessary to bring him to trial,—which, however, was not the Bishop's design—or to authorize the Bishop to set up a quasi court, which was his design, contrary to the canons of the Church "for all such cases made and provided;" though I might fairly have brought distinct and formal charges against him if I had thought it well to do so. 1. First, for his having openly slandered me, and 2. For his "gross neglect" of his duty at Waterford and elsewhere

But, I had only done what every man,—clergyman or layman—has a perfect right to do in every case of that kind, when he or his family are concerned, and which every Presbyter is in duty bound to do, when he sees any unjust and illegal attempt made, whether by his Bishop or by anybody else, to subject either himself or any other persons, in whose behalf he may see fit to act, to any authority that is not legal and rightful.

Therefore, instead of complying with the Bishop's hasty and improper and unjust decree, by which he hoped either to "bluff" me into silence and submission to his arbitrary and unjust misuse of his authority, or to give him or his confederate tools and conspirators against me a chance to say that I had not brought before this secret "Star Chamber" Court—which the Bishop had tried to set up—such "legal evidence" as he or his Commissioner might choose to think sufficient, and so be able to clear my slanderous brother and to convict me, both falsely, I took the slow, but sure way of denying the authority of the Bishop or of his Commissioner, to act in the manner proposed; but, I wrote to the Commissioner to tell him that I did this, not from any fear that I could not produce all of the "legal evidence" that would be required, but because I was not willing to recognize any illegal and unjust jurisdiction over me. And, in proof of the truth of this, I told him that I would now make distinct and formal charges against the General Missionary, and would send them to him in writing; and that I did. And, I told him where I wrote, of my own personal knowledge, and where I wrote anything that was not of my own personal knowledge, I named my authorities for what I charged. And, I told him that when he had read all that I had written that I would demand, as a right, for the fulfilment of which I would hold him personally responsible to me and the Church, that he should transmit all that I had written to him, to the Bishop himself, that he might at least have the opportunity, even if he would not use it, to read all that I had written, and that, after he had read it, he might hand it to the General Missionary, that he might read it also; and that then, if either the Commissioner or the Bishop or the General Missionary wished it, they might have their wishes gratified by having a legally

constituted Ecclesiastical Court appointed, and that I would instantly attend the summons to it and bring all of the "legal evidence" and much more, too, than any of them would desire; or, if they wished to try me, they might prepare their charges, and with a legally constituted court to try me, I would respond promptly.

But, I added to this, that if the Bishop persisted much longer in his most unjust and most un-christian way of doing things, I would print and publish to the Church all that I had already written about my scandalous brother and himself, and as much more as might seem to me to be desirable; and that, in that case, all three of them, the Bishop and his Commissioner and my slanderous brother, would have plenty of time—as long as they lived, indeed—to repent of their folly and wrong.

In fact, I did then just what I have been doing now, with Bishop Scarborough. But, Bishop Odenheimer was wiser, at least in that particular thing, than Bishop Scarborough has been, for he took the warning that I had given him and I heard no more either from the Bishop or from anybody else about *forcing* either myself or the parishes at Waterford and Hammonton into submission to wrong.

On the contrary, the General Missionary soon ceased to be General Missionary, and things were left to take their course at Waterford and Hammonton just as they were settled by their respective Vestries.

But this trouble was soon succeeded by another. For the Bishop, though he did nothing more against me "openly," did "secretly" talk against me to the clergyman that he had so lately tried to quash, and whom I had done what I could to protect from wrong. And he did so also to *all of the other clergymen who succeeded him at Waterford and Hammonton*, telling them all that I was "a hard man to get along with," but not adding what was necessary to make his words true in fact as they were in letter; that it was only with great and persistent and impenitent transgressors that I was "a hard man to get along with." And so he prejudiced all of the clergy who ever came to Waterford and Hammonton—and I have reason to believe throughout the Diocese—against me so far as he could. And so he encouraged them all at Hammonton to believe that he would stand by them and against me, whenever they might wish to do anything that I thought was wrong.

And this was soon proved. For, our wandering clergyman, in whose behalf I had done very much, and who ought to have felt that I was the very best friend that he had had hitherto, and whom the Bishop had tried to injure and wrong, was at once—on the Bishop's failure to make me submit to tyranny and wrong—taken into the Bishop's favor and was used by him as a weapon against me. For, from that time, this cunning and crafty and wicked brother, thinking that the Bishop's favor would be worth more to him than my favor, even though my favor would be accompanied by the favor of God if he would but "do the thing that was right," while the Bishop's favor would be accompanied only by the wrath of God, if he would not do the thing that was right, began to do as he pleased, and as if he was Rector, and more than Rector, at Hammonton, though he was only our temporary supply at Hammonton, notwithstanding he was Rector at Waterford.

So he undertook to act at Hammonton, not only as if he was Rector, but even in a way that a Rector would have no right to act. For he undertook to act in the temporal concerns of the Church, in utter disregard of the rights of the Vestry, and of the Building Committee, to whom the Vestry had committed the whole business of building the new Church. I was one of that Building Committee, as well as the Treasurer of it. I therefore told the temporary supply that in contracting for stone and in ordering lumber from Camden, in the name of the Church at Hammonton, he was passing beyond his proper limits, and that he was wronging, not only the Building Committee, but the Vestry and the whole Church likewise, and that he must not attempt to do the like again, or his contracts would be repudiated, and he, himself, would be held accountable for his wrongs. He then be-

came very bitter against me, telling everybody in Hammonton—outsiders as well as Church people—that I was “a hard man to get along with,” the very words, which one of his successors told me afterwards, when I had detected him in wrong and rebuked him for it, that the Bishop had used about me, to himself.

But our clergyman then undertook to collect money for our new Church, in New York and Philadelphia, as well as in New Jersey; and I gave him private letters of introduction to a large number of my personal friends among the clergy and laity, many of whom had voluntarily told me that they would be glad to contribute when we began to build the Church.

But, our clergyman, after weeks of absence, collecting, never brought in much money, and gave as his excuse that “people would not give.” I then asked him if he had called on those persons to whom I had given him letters. He replied that he had called upon some of them, but that he had not been able to see some of them, and that others had said that they would give later, &c. I felt sure then that something was wrong, for I knew that many of them he could see at any time, for that they were always at home or at their places of business, and that they all could give, and would give, as soon as they had read my letters.

But it kept on in the same way for some weeks longer, until the workmen stopped work upon the Church because they could not get their pay according to agreement. And, winter was at hand; and if the walls were not finished and the roof put upon them, the walls would be injured by the frost. I therefore became importunate with the clergyman, asking him every time I saw him if he had been to call upon my friends. And he always made the same, or like excuses. I then felt sure that he was lying, and perhaps defrauding. I therefore told him that I was going to Philadelphia, and that I would call myself upon all those who lived there. He, then, seeing that his falsehoods and wrongs would certainly be exposed, said to me: “Mr. Passmore, I will show you something in confidence,”—and he drew from the breast pocket of his coat two papers, one of which he handed to me. I took it and opened it, and instead of its being the subscription paper for the new Church—which I afterwards found he was holding in his own hands—it was a paper requesting subscriptions for the purpose of purchasing a glebe for the Church at Waterford, and that to that paper were appended the signatures of every one of my friends to whom I had given him letters, not one of whom had given less than \$25, and some of them as high as \$50 each.

I saw at once what had become of the money, and in running up the figures as I held the paper in my hands, I saw that the total amount was from \$400 to \$500. I was so disgusted at the man, as well as at his crime, that, a crowd being about us at the time, I would not stay to talk with him, but turned my back upon him and walked away.

The next morning early he came to my house in terrible distress, and made all kinds of humble confessions and of appeals to my mercy, and spoke of his poverty and of his family, and of their wants, and that he could, if there was a glebe, support them by his own labor; and, that the Bishop had approved of his collecting money for the glebe, &c., &c., and promising, if I would not expose him in the Church papers, as a fraud and a swindler, that he would make restitution, &c., &c.

I then told him to pay the money over to me as the Treasurer of the Building Committee, as he had been doing, in driblets, all along. He then said that he had not got the money, that he had already paid the money and had got the deed for the land. I then asked him for the deed, but he said he did not have it with him. I next asked him to whom the deed was made. He replied that it was made out in his own name, but that he would give a mortgage for the amount. He was so utterly broken down that I then told him, that I would not publish him in the Church papers, as I had at first thought of doing, but that I would report his case in full, to the Bishop, and let him take such steps as he saw fit. And that I

did. But, the Bishop did not even answer my letter, and he was, apparently, more of a friend of the guilty clergyman, than ever. But, I myself knew nothing of what had been done by them, until some time afterwards, when I heard that the swindling brother had given a mortgage for \$400 to the Church at Waterford, on the land which he had bought. To that amount, and more also, he had "robbed" the Church at Hammonton, and the Bishop was privy and "consenting" to his "robbery."

But, that was not all. The clergyman made no more collections, and if the Bishop had forbidden him to do that—a thing which I do not know—it is only what he ought to have done, and I sincerely hope that he did so. And the Vestry, —not the Building Committee—for I would not consent to assume a responsibility that I saw no means of meeting—engaged to have the roof put on, on credit. And the clergyman, to raise money for that purpose, undertook to get up a Bazar. But, not one single woman belonging to the Church at Hammonton, would have anything to do with it, for he had had a fair held by them about a year before, when my wife was the only woman that would have nothing to do with it, and where there were raffles, and cheating even in the raffles, and opera bouffe on a small scale, and rebukes, and back-bitings, until every woman in the Church at Hammonton, for one reason or another, would have nothing to do with the "Bazar."

But, the clergyman, nothing daunted, "went out into the highways and hedges," and gathered together all, as many as he found, who were willing to disgrace the Church and to have a frolic, and his Bazar was furnished with hands. And, he himself went to Philadelphia, and purchased things for the Bazar, in the name of the Church at Hammonton, the bills for which were sent into the Church after his death, which bills I myself paid, for the Lord's sake, and to save the Church at Hammonton from the shame of its clergyman's sin. But, the the clergyman secured the co-operation of these, by what they considered his liberality, in thinking his own people evil, and the people who would help him good, and they were all members of some of the various sects about us, or of people who did not care for any religion, or Spiritualists, or young men and women, who would have re-enacted a Belshazzar's Feast, in the new Church, if they had been allowed to do so.

For, this Bazar, our clergyman proposed to hold in the new Church. When I heard of that, I went and told him that he could not have it there. He said that he could—he had consulted a lawyer about it. I told him, that when I gave the deed for the land upon which the Church was built, I had stipulated in the deed itself, that neither the land itself, nor any of the buildings to be erected thereon, should ever be used for any profane or common purpose; that I could prevent his using the Church for the Bazar, and that I would do so. That if he would not take my word for that, that I would first call upon the Trustees whom I had appointed, to forbid him to use the Church, as he proposed. That if that would not do, I would write to the Bishop, and call upon him to forbid it. And, if that would not do, I would apply to the Courts for an injunction.

But, he scoffed at me, and said that he would have it in the Church. I then formally notified the Vestry, the Trustees, and the Bishop, of what he meant to do, and of what I meant to do, in the last resort, and called upon them all to forbid, and to prevent, this prostitution and violation of the Virgin Church—the symbol of the Spiritual Bride of Christ. And, they all forbade him. He had resolved to defy the Vestry and the Trustees, but the Bishop's prohibition he did not expect. He had thought that the Bishop, at least, would have allowed him to do as he pleased, especially, as the Bishop was my enemy, and as I was the only one who had shown any real desire to stop him.

He therefore was not only surprised and disappointed, and vexed at his failure to have his own way, but he became so angry, that he fairly "gnashed his

teeth" with rage. And, all this was at the end of Lent, and even in the very middle of the Holy Week. For, the Bishop's letter did not reach him until Good Friday morning, or the evening before—I do not remember which. At that time, we were renting the Presbyterian place of worship, for our services, and our clergyman held service there on Good Friday morning. And, when the service was over, and before the congregation had all dispersed, he began to speak to the people who were still there, of that of which his heart was full, which was, not the crucifixion of our Lord, of which he had been reading and speaking for an hour or two before, but the "Bazar," which was to be opened on Tuesday in Easter week, at 2 o'clock P. M. And, then he publicly slandered me, and denounced me as his enemy, saying that I thwarted him, and crossed him, in every way that I could, and that I had tried to injure him, by writing to the Bishop against him, and by trying to prevent the success of the Bazar. And, he wrote a letter to the Bishop, to the same effect.

At that time he was in high health. And so he was on Easter Sunday, holding three services on that day, one at Waterford, one at Hammonton, and one at a school house between Waterford and Hammonton. And so he was on Easter Monday morning, when he went out to the land which he had "purchased with the reward of his iniquity," and began to burn the brush, to prepare the land for cultivation. It was on that day, and at the very hour that he had gone out upon that land, that I heard of his wicked falsehoods and impiety on the Good Friday previous, and I wondered to myself, how it was, that God had not stricken him there, on the spot, as He had done in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira! Indeed, my faith had almost failed me. I began to have misgivings whether the Lord "reigned" now, as He did in times past. But, I did not have long to wait to find how weak I had been, and how wrong I had been. For, the next morning—the day on which the Bazar was to have been opened, in the new Church, I heard how God had dealt with my wicked brother. He had spared him, at the moment of his wicked and impious falsehoods, on Good Friday, only to allow him to go out to the land that he had so wickedly bought, and while he was there engaged in burning the brush, the fire got beyond his control, and the flames enveloped him, and he in his fright and excitement, overpowered by heat and smoke, he fell upon his hands and knees, and there, amidst smoke and flames, and in torment of body and spirit, like that of the wicked in hell, he howled incoherently, like a wild beast, in his agony, and tore up the ground with his finger nails, and fell dead.

So God visited him for his falsehoods, and for his treachery, and for his impious and wicked robbery, and sacrilege.

But, before his death, he had announced the Bazaar to open on Tuesday in Easter week, at 2 o'clock, P. M. He died on Easter Monday morning, on the "field of his iniquity," at the very hour that the Bishop wrote his letter to me informing me of his having received the wicked brother's letter to him, and demanding an explanation of my conduct. That letter I received on Easter Tuesday morning, just at the time that I heard of the wicked brother's awful death,—and only about three hours before the hour fixed for his funeral,—which was at 2 o'clock, P. M.—*the very day, and the very hour of the day*, that he had himself fixed, and which he had so wickedly resolved to carry out, ^{his purpose} against all prohibitions from God or man, to prostitute and to defile the virgin Church, and to make it a "den of thieves." So he died, and so he was buried. Is it any wonder, that I should think, that God had done all this, designedly? Was it not as much a Divine judgement upon him, as was the death of Ananias and Sapphira? I think that it was.

But, as I have said, before his death, he had written to the Bishop, accusing me of being his enemy, and the Bishop had written to me to demand an explanation, I then wrote to the Bishop, to say that "owing to the solemn fact that my ac-

^{then}
 cuser was ~~the~~ dead, and not yet buried, I would not write just then,—even in my own defence,—but I would write to him shortly, and would give him all of the facts in the case.” And that I did, only a day or two afterwards—after I had become fully informed of all the circumstances of his death and burial. And, in my explanation, I wrote all the facts that I have given here. But, the Bishop never replied to my letter, and I then heard no more from him for some time.

But, after the death of the clergyman, of whom I have just written, the Bishop, without consulting the Vestries of the two Churches, as he ought to have done, appointed another clergyman to take charge of the Parishes, at Waterford and Hammonton. That clergyman was an old man, and not able to take the duties at the two places, and he did not mean to do that, when he proposed to the Bishop to take charge of them. But, being a man of property, he intended—as he and the Bishop both thought that he could—to bring the Church at Hammonton to submit to his control, however arbitrary and unjust his proceedings might be. For, the lovers of mere authority, and of mere outward compliance with the behests of those in authority—whether those behests be just or unjust—have, in all ages, thought that that was essential. I have always thought differently. I have always thought, that when God commands one thing, and man commands another thing, directly opposite to what God commands, that “we ought to obey God rather than man.” God commands Truth and Righteousness and when man commands anything contrary to Truth and Righteousness, then we are bound to take our stand, and to take all of the consequences, no matter how grievous they may be, to the natural man. And, that is the explanation of all of my conduct, in all that I have ever done. I have never sought anything for myself, but have risked everything, and that often—and that ever since I entered into the ministry—life, property and reputation, all together, for the sake of Truth and Righteousness. And so, I have risked my reputation here—though in less formidable outward appearances—for the sake of Truth and of Righteousness. And so, with God’s help, will I ever do, so long as I live. And, therefore, if I had to have trouble with my Bishops or other clergy, until I died, whether it should be for sixteen years, as it is now, or for sixty years, if God should keep me, alive so long—I will always “withstand” them, one of them at a time, or all of them together, whenever they try to abuse their power, by practicing injustice and wrong.

Acting upon those principles, when the clergy came to my house, which at that time, as well as from my first coming here, was always the home of the clergy, I treated them all like brethren, Low Churchmen, or Broad Churchmen, just as frankly and as cordially as I did High Churchmen, or Catholics. And so I treated, at the time under consideration, the brother whom the Bishop had sent to take charge of the Churches at Waterford and Hammonton. When they did well, I not only did not “withstand” them, but I helped them, to the utmost of my power. But, when they did wrong, I opposed them in that particular thing, in which they were wrong, but in that thing only. But, in regard to this old clergyman, I did nothing, except to give my opinion of what it was proper to do, when the Vestry at Hammonton applied to me for advice.

Therefore, when the Vestry at Waterford elected this last clergyman their Rector, and when the Senior Warden at Hammonton asked me what I thought the Vestry here had better do, I told him that, in consideration of the fact that the fraud and robbery of the dead clergyman, had left the Church with a debt of some \$700, which the people here were utterly unable to pay, and which ought to have been paid to the contractors for the work, long before—and for which they were not willing to wait any longer—a state of things dishonorable to God, and to the Church, and to Religion itself, I thought that they had better not elect him Rector, if he would expect the people of Hammonton to contribute anything to the clergy whom he would send here; but that as he—the Senior Warden—

was a regularly appointed Lay Reader, he might keep the Church together by Lay Reading, and let all that the people could contribute go towards paying off the debt upon the Church, unless the new clergyman would give some assurance that could be depended upon, to do what he could to pay off the debt.

It was a question of life or death for the Church at Hammonton, and we were not only bound to respect our duty to God, and to our neighbors—to do what we could to meet our own just obligations,—but we were also bound to make others respect them also, if we could.

But, the new clergyman—whether he knew all this correctly, or not, I cannot say—when he found that I had advised against electing him Rector, without some proper assurance that the Church should not be left in danger, he also took up the general cry, that I was “a hard man to get along with.”

But, all he chose to say to the Vestry was, that they need not trouble themselves about that. If he had frankly said, that he would attend to that, all would have been satisfied, for he could easily have paid all that was needed, out of his own pocket, without ever missing it,—as he has since shown.

But, he did not say that, and, at that time, nobody had any reason to think that he ever would have done so. He then proposed to the Vestry at Hammonton, to send out a clergyman every Sunday, at so much per Sunday, promising that if they would agree to do so, that if they found any one that they thought would suit them, they could then elect him as their Rector, and that the new clergyman could then collect money, to pay off the Church debts.

The Vestry, though not liking this plan altogether, agreed to try it for a little while, and did so. But, not one of the clergy who were sent out to us for a month or more, would have taken the place, if they had been elected. They were all old or super-annuated, except one young man who was insane, and who was afterwards deposed from the Ministry, and placed in an Insane Asylum.

But, the creditors became more pressing, and the Vestry remonstrated against this bad way of doing things. The very next Sunday—I believe it was—a clergyman came, who was willing to come, and whom all of the people liked. The Vestry accordingly met, immediately after the service, and elected him Rector, and they notified the clergyman and the Vestry, at Waterford of that fact. By return of mail, there came a letter from the clergymen there that they “could not have that clergyman,” though he gave no reason for his writing as he did. And yet, that was the very condition agreed upon originally, that they “could have him.” And now he was not only elected as Rector, but had accepted the call. Our Vestry wrote back to the clergyman at Waterford, for information as to his reasons, for writing in that manner. He replied that he “would not give his reasons,” but that they “could not have that clergyman?” And he added, as if for the very purpose of adding insult to injury, that if they would not yield to his authority, he would leave them in the lurch; adding “Waterford can get along without Hammonton, but Hammonton cannot get along without Waterford.”

It is hardly necessary to say, that Hammonton did not want to have anything more to do with that clergyman, and the Vestry notified him to that effect. Will it be believed, that he also felt himself to have been “aggrieved?” Yet, that was the fact, and he became very angry, because of what he was pleased to consider the Rebellion and Ingratitude of the people of Hammonton. And the Bishop sided with the clergyman at Waterford, and again slandered me as “a hard man to get along with,” though in this whole matter, I had taken no part at all, except to advise the Senior Warden, as I have already stated, and that at his own request.

But, in a short time, Hammonton engaged a Deacon, on her own account, and he proved from the very first to be utterly good for nothing, except to play croquet. But he was thoroughly devoted to that game, and played at it every day, and a great part of every day. But he never even attempted to go about among

the people, or to do anything else that he could possibly avoid. Indeed, he said publically and repeatedly, that the "people of Hammonton were a low set, and that he did not want to have anything to do with them." Of course the people of Hammonton, seeing and hearing what they did of him, formed their opinions of him, also. And, the result was, that he was utterly despised by everybody, and that nobody would contribute one cent to his support, except those few who had pledged themselves to contribute a certain amount, before he came. But, they all kept their promises, though they all felt that, but for their promise' sake, they would have done as the others did, and given nothing.

Of course, when the year expired, no one was willing to subscribe anything for another year, and so that clergyman took his leave, with the bad reputation of being a liar and a swindler, as well as a good for nothing generally. He was afterwards deposed from the ministry.

But, after he left, the crisis came. Everybody was depressed and discouraged. "Many Pastors had destroyed the Vineyard," (Jer., XII, 10.) They had tried so many clergymen, and every one of them had done so very badly, that they feared to get another one, without having some assurance that he was a man of good character, and of common sense, and of a real Christian spirit. So they made no effort to get one, but concluded to keep the Church open with Lay Reading, and to take all of the money that could be raised, towards paying off the Church debts, which were still about \$700. But the payment of those debts could now be staved off no longer. The Church would now be sold, to a certainty—unless something was done. The Senior Warden therefore consulted with me, as to what they had better do. I told them that they had made a mistake in organizing as a Parish, when they did, and that the only thing that I could see that would get them out of their difficulties, would be to put the Church into the hands of the Bishop, and to let him appoint a Missionary.

That advice they followed, and wrote to the Bishop, telling him—so I found out afterwards—that it was by my advice that they did it. I also wrote to the Bishop at the same time, telling him that I was now no longer able to do anything, my troubles with him, and with my other wicked brethren having affected my heart so seriously, that that had brought on an attack of Paralysis, about a year or two before. I also told the Bishop, that the debt on the Church would now surely be collected, even if the Church had to be sold for it, and that all of the trouble was, for the want of that money that we had had a right to count upon, but of which we had been defrauded by our deceased wicked brother, and which he himself had "consented unto," by "consenting" to have a Mortgage for the main part of the amount given to the Church at Waterford, without ever having done anything towards making good our loss. I therefore told him that if he did not now come forward, and help to pay the debts, the loss of the Church would be laid to his charge, as well as to that of all the others who had wronged us.

It so happened, that, at that time, God's merciful chastenings had so humbled the Bishop, that he took my letter in good part, and he wrote to me a kind and friendly letter, in which he promised to see that the Church at Hammonton should receive as much money as would make up for that of which it had been robbed. And he kept his promise. And, he kept it promptly. And, he sent all of the money to me, that I might pay off the debts. I then wrote to him to thank him for what he had done, and for the manner in which he had done it. And, from that time, the Bishop treated me with such evident kindness and confidence, writing me to call and see him, and even expressing his "love" for me, that as the time came around for his last visitation to Hammonton, before going to Northern New Jersey, I wrote to him, and invited him to be my guest when he came to Hammonton. And, when he came to Hammonton, he came to my house, as my guest.

But, he was so broken down in bodily health, and so completely broken in

spirit also, and withal so humble and penitent, for all of the wrongs that he had done to me in the past, that I could not then, as a merciful man, even for the whole truth's sake, or for Righteousness sake, require of him, that he should make that "official" reparation, which was not only my own due, but which was due to all persons who were participators in the wrongs against me, or who were privy to them. I therefore, demanded nothing from the Bishop, though I had been "beaten openly and uncondemned," with the rods of falsehood, and had been "cast into the prison" of suspicion, by him, and by my wicked brethren of lower degree.

But, at his parting with me,—while he was holding both of my hands, in both of his—with the tears in his eyes, and on his cheeks, he ended what he had to say, with these words: "Mr. Passmore, you have been doing good, here at Hammonton." Not being able to control his emotions, he then turned and went to the carriage that was waiting for him. That was the last I ever saw, or heard, of Bishop Odenheimer. And I write this here—that what I have felt compelled to write about him heretofore, may not be allowed to count against him, at the last. And, I write this now, with the deepest gratitude to God,—not because the Bishop did me justice at the last, for that does not concern me at all, but because it enables me to show to others, what I myself feel, that the Bishop's repentance for his sins and wrongs, was true and sincere.

THE REV. MR. FISKE.

The course I recommended having been adopted by the Vestry at Hammonton, and the Bishop having concurred in it, the Rev. George McClellan Fiske next came to Hammonton, as the Missionary of the Convocation of Burlington. I thank God that I can write his name in full, and with the assurance that not I only, but that every body else in Hammonton, can have but one opinion of him. He was respected and beloved, from the very first, for he went to work like an earnest Christian, and in all things, conducted himself as a clergyman should.

He revived the Faith, and Hope, and Charity, of all. He it was who really laid the foundation of the Parish. He it was, who built up the Parish. "All that ever came before" him, were as "thieves and robbers." But, he was a true Pastor, and the sheep heard his voice, and followed him. And, to this day he is esteemed and beloved, by all of the Church people at Hammonton, and his teachings and practices, have been fully accepted, as the established "custom" of the Parish. That is all that I need say about Mr. Fiske.

The next clergyman that came, after Mr. Fiske left, was Mr. Gordon. I write his name, not as I did Mr. Fiske's, but because he is implicated with Bishop Scarborough, in the present case, and as his name will have to be mentioned often at any rate, there can be no good reason for my suppressing it here. He came with good testimonials, but he did not do honor to his testimonials. At first, everybody thought well of him, and they gave him credit for being an humble and good man, though inefficient. But, in time, seeing that he did not go about much among his own people, and avoided all conversation upon religious subjects, and seemed to care nothing about them, but was, at the same time, very intimate and jovial with all sorts of people who did not belong to the Church, he lost the respect of most of the congregation. But no person ever, so far as I ever heard, suspected him of being what I afterwards found out that he was, i.e.—a man utterly devoid of all regard for truth, as opposed to falsehood. And, to this day, there are very few people, who know what I found out against him,—for I have forbore to speak about him for several reasons. And, in his case, I did not even write to Bishop Scarborough about him, because the Bishop himself had been the instigator of Mr. Gordon in all of the wrong that I had discovered in him. And, until I had reason to think that the Bishop had repented, and was

really likely to do his duty, I could not—as a man of sense, or as an honest man—report the case to him. Indeed, as the Bishop had, by that time, already proved himself to be a thousand times worse, than I had yet proved Mr. Gordon to be—as this pamphlet will prove—it would have been not only absurd, but even a sham and a deceit in me, to have pretended what I could not feel, that I should have reported Mr. Gordon to him, as if I had any confidence in him. Therefore, I did not do it.

THE CASE OF BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

But, the case, as respects Bishop Scarborough, now begins. In October, 1879, the Bishop made a visitation to Hammonton, and after the services, on his way to Pleasant Mills, he stopped for a few minutes at my house, treating me with such an appearance of cordiality that I really began to think that he was a friend to me. But, just as he was leaving, he said "I am coming down soon, to have a long talk with you." That struck me as doubtful. It might be out of love and good will, or, it might be, that he had heard some of the old slanders, that my former Bishop and fellow clergy had circulated against me. Perhaps my manner, or my looks, may have shown this to the Bishop, and had made him feel that he had made a mistake, in speaking as he did, for I am a man who never try to conceal my real feelings, whether they be favorable or unfavorable to the persons, or things, under consideration, and so he concluded not to come, and to have the "long talk" which he had given me to expect.

But, I assented to the Bishop's proposal, even though it may have been in such a manner as to have left him doubtful, how far he had done well, in saying what he did, without saying more. For, if I had been in the Bishop's place, I would have told the person frankly, what motive I had for making a special trip to see him, and for having a "long talk" with him. Still, I soon forgot the matter, and left it to the Bishop to come when he pleased, and to talk as he pleased.

About a month after that, one day when my wife and daughter came from Church, my wife told me, that Mr. Gordon had told her, that the Bishop had told him, that he should tell me, that he "would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me."

If I had been shot through the heart, I could not have been killed more instantaneously, than I was by hearing that. It was so very improper a thing, in itself, to send such a message at all, to any person, without ever having had any previous knowledge of the person's views, or character, and without ever having had any previous communication at all, with the person concerned, upon the subject, or with any person, on his account. And it was so very improper a "form," in which to send any such a message—it showed such an utter disregard for all of the kindly human feelings, as well as of all the religious and spiritual feelings, that ought—always—to be so prominently made manifest, even when there is the most perfect understanding between the parties, that they are both acting religiously and righteously, in the matter, and it was also so exceedingly improper, in the "manner" in which it was sent. For, it was not only sent without one single word of kindly, or of religious feeling, but in the most hard and harsh manner possible, and in such an uncivil, and careless, and round-about, and slovenly and irreverent a manner,—like that of throwing a bone at a dog while professing to be intending to feed him—out of Christian charity and in the name of Divine love. Altogether, it shocked me terribly. I never, in all my life, ever heard or read of such a thing before, and I trust that I may never hear of anything like it again. For, the shock that it gave to me,—to mind, and soul and body, all together—made my blood to recoil with such violence as to cause a very severe attack of Engorgement and Paralysis of the Heart, during which I lost all consciousness.

But, after my return to consciousness—after thinking the whole thing over—for a little while, I could not believe that any Bishop, of whom I was beginning to think so well as I did of Bishop Scarborough, could possibly have meant anything amiss. And then, I acted accordingly. I therefore told my wife what to tell Mr. Gordon—whom the Bishop had chosen to be his medium of communication with me—when he came out to receive my answer. I told her to tell him that “I thanked the Bishop for his offer, and that I would prepare myself to receive the Communion at his hands.” I also added to her: “I believe that God has put it into the heart of the Bishop to make that offer, though not in the way he did it.”

But, Mr. Gordon did not come out to see me for a day or two, and, in the meantime—though I was steadfastly preparing myself to receive the Communion from the Bishop when he came—I could not rest day or night for thinking of all that was amiss, not only in the “form” of the message, but also in the “manner of sending it.” And, the more I thought of it, the more I was convinced that there was something wrong about it, though I did not then even think of suspecting how much of wrong was in it. But, I felt then, as I feel now, that if the Bishop had only made his offer in a kindly, and feeling, and religious manner, as became the subject of his “offer,” and that after a full and frank conversation with me upon the subject, it would have been the most graceful, and the most Christian-like, and the most winning thing that he could possibly have done. Whereas, his having done it all without any previous knowledge, either of my views or of my character, for I have lived here, like a hermit, for nearly a quarter of a century, and no human being, out of my own family, knew anything at all about my religious state—was wrong,—very wrong, as regards his duty to God, to the Church, and to me. And, to do it in the “form” and “manner” that he did, was not only unchristian, but it was inhuman. It was worse—it was brutal, and it was wicked. And so, what might have been, and what would have been, the very best thing that could have been done, for both of us, became the very worst thing that could have been done, for the Bishop, at least, if not for both of us.

So did the Bishop’s foolish and wicked desire to gratify his wicked pride, and love of power, lead him astray. But, it is not in vain, for the hand of God is over-ruling everything. And, now that things have come to this pass, even though the Bishop himself may have to have a very severe and bitter lesson, other Bishops and other clergy may learn from his example, to avoid the sins and errors into which he has fallen.

But, to go back to the narrative. I then told my wife, that if Mr. Gordon should come while I was away, not to give him the answer that I had first told her to give, but to tell him “that I would give the Bishop a cordial welcome to my house, and was ready and desirous to have his promised “long talk” with him, which, however, must prove satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Communion from him.”

That answer Mr. Gordon reported to the Bishop, and the Bishop then chose to get very angry at me, because I did not see fit to accept, what he then called his “offer,” at once, and with thanks, and unconditionally. And, he showed his anger, by writing to Mr. Gordon, instead of to me—as he ought to have done, and by writing in a peevish and petulant manner, and by writing what was false, and hypocritical, at the same time; and Mr. Gordon informed me of the Bishop’s answer, in a letter to me, that is printed with this statement. In that letter Mr. Gordon writes: “He,” (the Bishop) “says that your reception of his offer, which in his opinion, ought to be sent through the Rector of the Parish in which you reside, makes him shrink from what he supposed would be a pleasure to you, as well as a comfort and a blessing, and he must now wait for a request to repeat his offer, before making it again!”

That extract from the Bishop’s letter—illustrated by his wicked letter that

he wrote to me about a fortnight later,—and by his own declaration to me by word of mouth—on August 24th, 1881,—when he himself declared that he had tried to “force” me to receive the Sacrament from him, as an act of authority merely, “because he thought that if I was able to go to Philadelphia in the cars, I was able to attend the Church,” proves everything that I have charged against the Bishop, as will appear in the succeeding pages, where in my letters to the Bishop I reviewed all of the facts, for the Bishop’s own conviction, out of his own mouth and by his own written words.

But, on reading that letter of Mr. Gordon’s, I sat down at once and wrote a letter to the Bishop, in which I showed him that he had not only misjudged my feelings, about receiving the Communion from him, if all was right, but that he had even disregarded the plain, and necessary, meaning of my words, as repeated to him by Mr. Gordon—as Mr. Gordon’s letter to me, and which will be found further on, plainly proves. I also wrote, pointing out to him the extremely improper “form” and “manner of sending” of his message, especially when the subject matter of that message was considered, and when he had never had any previous communication with me, upon the subject, or, with anybody else, on my account, and when he himself knew absolutely nothing of my views and feelings. I also showed him what a “wretchedly vicious opinion” he had taken up when he thought that he “ought” not to offer the Communion “to one of the old and invalid Presbyters of his Diocese, except through the Rector of the Parish in which he happened to reside.”

For, a Bishop “ought” always to deal directly and personally with his Presbyters, if he never did so with anybody else, and, any attempt to subjugate any of them,—even a younger one to any older one—was illegal and wrong, while any attempt to put an old and experienced one under a young man who had yet everything to learn, was absurd, as well as wrong. There is no such absolute power vested in Bishops, even if they were wise enough always to use their power well. Where they are unwise, or wicked, it would be the destruction of the Church to allow them to use such an authority.

I told the Bishop also, that the “message” that he had sent to me, and the “form” in which he had sent it, and the “manner” of his sending it, had all combined to give me such a shock to my feelings, that they had brought on an attack of Paralysis of the Heart, short, but severe, and painful and dangerous.

I then read what I had written to my wife, and she then told me that Mr. Gordon had told her that the Bishop had told him, that it was “because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese, that the Bishop had sent to me the message that he did.”

That was a falsehood that either the Bishop or Mr. Gordon had coined and uttered for the sake of deceiving me. But, at that time, I did not think of such a thing as possible. Therefore, the moment that I heard that, I felt that I ought not to have any doubts, any longer, about the Bishop’s good faith, or good feelings, or good intentions, however badly I might still have to think, of his methods. For, it never entered my head at that time, to think that either the Bishop or Mr. Gordon could have said that with *the express intention of deceiving me*. But,—that I have found out since—they did do, both of them. For, as the evidence of the Bishop himself shows, he had entered into a “conspiracy” with Mr. Gordon to bring me into subjection to them both, either by force and intimidation, or by fraud—if force or intimidation should fail.

But, when I heard that, I wrote another letter to the Bishop, telling him what I had heard, and also, that it was only because of that statement of Mr. Gordon’s, that I could overlook the very improper “form” and “manner of sending” of his “offer.” I then thanked him “most heartily” for having sent me his “offer,” and I “requested” him “to administer the Communion to me, when

he came to Hammonton, after the Holidays." I added that "I would continue to prepare myself to receive it at his hands."

THE BISHOP'S LETTER TO ME.

In reply to that letter, the Bishop wrote to me, a letter dated December 31st, 1879, which will be found in this pamphlet.

But, that letter was so diabolically wicked, and deceitful, and mean,—in almost every sentence of it—that I could no more have received the Communion from the Bishop, after reading it, than I could from Judas Iscariot, or from Satan himself. For, that was an "official" letter, and it was written by the Bishop in his "official" capacity as Bishop. It was, and it is, a marvel to me, how any man, but more so, how any Bishop could, without any provocation, have so utterly disregarded the very simplest dictates of common sense, and of common decency, to say nothing of the religious obligations of his sacred office, as to have written that letter, even apart from the wickedness and hypocrisy that characterized it. I never saw, or heard, of anything that I could put in the most distant comparison with it.

But, as that letter will appear later, where it is reviewed minutely, in what I wrote to the Bishop, I will say no more about it here.

But, when Mr. Gordon came out to see me, a day or two after I had received it, I read it to him, pointing out to him all of its wickedness, and telling him that I had so completely lost all confidence in the Bishop, that I could never believe him, or trust him, for anything, until I had good reason to believe that he had thoroughly repented for his sins.

That, I have every reason to believe, Mr. Gordon told to the Bishop, though at that time, he was no longer the Bishop's intermediary between us, for we were then corresponding with each other, directly. For, trusting to the Bishop's "official" promises, that he would come "soon" to see me, and again that he would "administer the Communion to me," when he came to Hammonton "after the Holidays," I concluded not to write again; but to wait until he came, so that we could have the "long talk" that he had warned me of; and that that "long talk" "would have to be satisfactory to both parties," in a much larger and more important range of topics than I had expected, when I first sent that answer to him, "before I could receive the Sacrament from him."

But, the Bishop never came to fulfill either one of his "official" promises. Nor did he write to me to say why he did not come, or why he would not come, nor to call me to account for what I had said to Mr. Gordon; nor did he do anything else, that any decent man, or any honest Christian, but above all, what every Bishop—even if he was a very poor and mean Bishop—should have done. But, the reason is, he was *afraid* to do anything, for fear his Pride and his Power should receive a rude shock. He knew that he had been guilty of meanness, and injustice, and wrong, and of falsehood, and of deceit, and of treachery, and of hypocrisy, and of tyranny and of sacriligious impiety, and he did not care to come near me, or to send any word to me, or to keep his "official" promises to me, or to do anything that he thought would get him into any further trouble. And, he had not the manliness, nor the christian fidelity, to do what was right and proper under the circumstances; i. e.,—to humble himself, and to confess his errors and wrongs, and to ask for forgiveness. In a word, he was not truly *penitent*. He was proud and self-conceited still. And, that is where the trouble is, even to this day.

So, he allowed more than a year and a quarter to pass, before he ever came to Hammonton at all—and, when he did come, he did not come near me. Nor, would he have ever taken any notice of me, if he had not met my wife at Church, whom, as he himself told her, "he had not expected to see," at the night services,

as we lived so far away in the country. But, she asked him, if he was not coming out to see me, and then, the Bishop,—not knowing, perhaps, what else to say,—told her that he “would make a special trip to Hammonton to see me,” and proposed that I should write to him, to let him know when it would be convenient for me to receive him.

The very next morning, early, I wrote to the Bishop expressing “my deep thanks,” not only to God, but to him, that he had “at last, after so long a time, come around to first principles, and had concluded to begin at the beginning, and to do things in the order, and with the consideration that was proper, in all such cases.” I also asked him, when he came, to come direct to my house, and to make his arrangements so that we could have the “long talk” that he had promised to have with me, promising him to give him “such rest and refreshment as we might be able to provide for him, as well as to give him such full and free opportunity to catechise me—as to my Faith, Hope and Charity—as any reports he might ever have heard of me, or as any imaginations of his own mind, might have ever given him reason to think, ought to be explained.” I added: “At the same time, Bishop, I shall have much—very much—to say to you, not only of my intercourse with my old Bishop, and with a number of my fellow clergy, but also concerning yourself. And, as a “man’s a man for a’ that,” whether he be a Bishop or a Presbyterian, a slave or a beggar, I shall feel compelled to tell you plainly, where you have wronged me, and where you are in duty bound, to right the wrongs that you have done.”

And then, in a Post Script, I added: “I have but one more request to make, in regard to your coming to see me, and that is, that you should come at the very earliest date possible. The neglect to fill your “official” promises, for so much more than a year beyond the time that you yourself had fixed—and that too without one word of apology—has already been a great loss, not only to you and to me, but also to Mr. Gordon, and to Mr. Gantt, and so, perhaps, to the Church at large. Come at once, Bishop, if you wish to end the reign of wrong, and to begin the reign of Righteousness and Peace.”

But, to that letter, the Bishop sent me no answer. Neither did he make his “special” trip, to see me—according to his “official” promises. Nor did he come to Hammonton at all, until he had to come (Aug. 24th, 1881,) to consecrate the Church. And, even then—though he did come to see me—he sent me no “due” notice, as he had “officially” promised to do, nor any notice at all, until after the Services were over, and just before he made his appearance. And, when he did come, almost his first words were, that he “had but a few minutes to stay,” so that there would be no time to have the “long talk” which he himself had first threatened me with, nearly two years before, and which I had repeatedly requested from him since, with the plainest notice that such a “long talk” had now become necessary. But, the Bishop chose to avoid having the “long talk,” and so to prevent any proper settlement, or any settlement at all, of the difficulties, that he had himself originated.

But, when he did come, and had informed me, that he “had but a few minutes to stay,” I did not lose a moment. I therefore asked him,—at first, and at once,—as soon as we were seated—What he had against me? He replied “Nothing.” I then asked him what he had ever heard against me? And, again he said “Nothing.” I then asked him, What he had ever seen, or heard, or imagined, that he thought ought to be explained? And, again he said that he had never seen, or heard, or thought, that there was anything, that ought to be explained.

I then asked him, Why he had attempted to force me to receive the Communion? And, he then said, “Mr. Gordon told me that you were able to go to Philadelphia in the cars, and if you were able to do that, you were able to attend the Church.”

THE SECRET OUT.

At last, the secret was out. For that one answer of the Bishop's made all clear, and proved everything that I have charged against him, and it made every particular circumstance, not only intelligible, but *as clear as day*. For it proved his motives, and designs, in everything that he had done. And, it proved, that not only at the time he was doing his wrongs, but for years before, he had been practicing deceit. And, it proved, that not only when he began to do his wrongs, but, throughout the whole course of them, and down to that very moment, when he made his answer, the Bishop had been guilty, of a long, and connected series of great and wicked, and shameful acts. For, that answer proved: 1. That he *had* tried to *force* me to his will, and that he *had* thought amiss of me. 2. That he *had* "heard" something against me. 3. That he had "judged" me, not only unheard, but without ever having even told me, that he had ever heard anything against me. 4. That he was not "willing" to hear me—even after I had demanded it, as a right. 5. That he had practiced "deceit" against me, from the first and through the whole of the years that had passed, since he began his wrongs, and to the very last moment. Also, that those wrongs, included among them 1. Conspiracy; 2. Trickery; 3. Force and Intimidation; 4. Deceit and Falsehood; 5. Impiety and Sacrilege; 6. Hypocrisy; 7. Impenitence, and without naming them all, every other wrong that is able to make such wickedness possible. Honesty, Good, Faith, Religion, everything had been Sacrificed to Pride, and to the desire to feel and to make me feel the Bishop's Power. And, then, after he had found that he had got himself into a difficulty, he continued to practice all of these wicked things, to avoid doing what would make it appear that he was concealing anything.

The proof of all of these things appear, in the very statement of them, and will appear further in the last part of this pamphlet, in what I wrote to the Bishop, commenting on his admissions to me by word of mouth, and upon his letter to me, and upon his letter to Mr. Gordon, and upon Mr. Gordon's letter to me, and upon Mr. Gordon's admissions to me, by word of mouth.

But, that answer of the Bishop's, as I have said, made everything clear. It showed, not only that he had tried to use Force and Intimidation, but that he had entered into a conspiracy with Mr. Gordon, to deceive me also, and that it was not any religious or spiritual motives that induced him to act as he did, but that he did what he did, merely for appearances sake, that there might be an outward compliance, at least, on my part, with what the Bishop thought fit to require.

But, even if the Bishop were right and myself wrong, that was not the way to do such things. He should have come to see me, and the more certain he was that I was wrong, so much the clearer was his duty, to come and confer with me, to point out to me, where he thought that I was wrong, and to warn me, if he found me unreasonable, of the consequences of continuing in wrong. But, instead of doing anything like that—which was his plain duty to do—he resorted to those two detestibly mean and wicked ways, force and fraud. As if either one, were not sufficiently wicked, he chose to use both.

But, thank God, neither the one nor the other, of the two traps that he set for me caught me. On the contrary, the setters of the traps both fell into the traps, that they had set for me.

Was not God's hand in that also?

But, in the conversation that I had with the Bishop, (Aug. 24th, 1881,) he had told me a long string of new and downright falsehoods, in order to cover up his old deceits and frauds, just before he made this statement that exposed them all. Is it any wonder, that at the moment that all of this wickedness was revealed, that I ceased to treat the Bishop with any respect at all, and that I spoke to him sternly and severely? Or, is it any wonder, the Bishop being still

Proud and Impertinent, that when I went on to ask him more questions, ~~that~~ he became confused and angry, and could not answer some, and would not answer others, but got up and left me, refusing to hear me, even for the very few minutes that he had allowed himself?

No, all of these things were but the necessary consequences, of such sins and wickednesses as those of which the Bishop had been guilty, and of which he was still too proud and too wicked to repent.

I then told the Bishop, before he left me, that as he would not "hear" me, I would take the trouble to write out all that I had to say to him, and that I would send it to him, and that I would earnestly advise him, to read carefully, all that I should write to him, and that, not for my sake, but for his own, though, if he chose to do so, he might throw what I should write into the waste-paper basket, or into the fire, or he might send it all back to me unopened, if he saw fit to do so, without even reading it at all; but, that I had a duty to perform—as a man, as a Christian, but that above all, as a Presbyter of the Church,—and that, if after I had sent to him, all that I thought that I ought to say to him, he did not then do, what it was right that he should do, under the circumstances, I would print what I had written, and would distribute the printed copies, to the clergy, and laity of the Diocese, that they might take such action in the matter, as the case required. That promise I have now fulfilled. For, I have written all to the Bishop, and the last sheet of that writing was mailed to him November 1st, 1881. And, in the last sheet, I told him that I would give him until December 31st, 1881, to make such repentance and amends for his wrongs, as he could, promising not to print what I had written until after that date, that he might have abundant time for repentance, and for "doing works meet for repentance." But, I told him also, that if he had not done what he ought to do, by that time, that I would then feel compelled to have everything published, as soon after that date as possible.

But, the Bishop having chosen not to take any notice at all of anything that I wrote to him, and having defaulted up to the time stipulated, and even to this present time—what is here printed is due to his default.

This is an outline of the whole of my case from beginning to end, up to this date. But, the evidences of the worst wrongs—which are many and various, so far as Bishop Scarborough is concerned, will be found in my letters to the Bishop, written since August 24th, 1881, to convince him that his sins have not only been found out, but that they are proved also, and that not by the testimony of others, but by his own testimony, by his own written words, and by his own words spoken to me.

What follows, in this pamphlet, is: 1. A copy of the several letters that have been written by the several parties concerned, with some short comments of my own on the earliest of the letters; and 2. What I have written to Bishop Scarborough, in five long letters, all of dates between August 24th, 1881, and November 1st, 1881.

So that the Bishop has had—first and last—no less than seven distinct and powerful calls to repentance since December 18th, 1879,—all in writing—in addition to the one that I gave to him, by word of mouth, August 24th, 1881. And, he has had plenty of time to have repented, and he has not repented.

I might well be excused, if I referred to the words of "Wisdom" (Prov. 1: 20-23,) to show that it has not been for the lack of abundant invitation and warning, that the Bishop has suffered "all this to come upon him."

LETTERS.

I. MR. GORDON'S LETTER TO ME.

HAMMONTON, N. J., December 13th, 1879.

Rev. and Dear Brother.—In reply to my letter, the Bishop writes me that as he cannot be here on Wednesday before evening, he will defer his visit until after the holidays. He says, too, that your reception of his offer—which, in his opinion, ought to be sent through the Rector of the Parish in which you reside, makes him shrink from what he supposed would be a pleasure to you, as well as a comfort and a blessing, and he must now wait for a request to repeat his offer, before making it again.

This is only the natural result of the non-acceptance of the Bishop's offer. I have told you the substance of the Bishop's letter, so far as it relates to yourself. It was that you would give him a cordial welcome to your house, and would be willing and desire to have the promised "long talk" with him, which must prove satisfactory to both parties, before you could receive the Sacrament at his hands.

I hope I did not misrepresent your conversation with me. It was my endeavor simply to show that you neither accepted nor rejected his offer, without first seeing him. I could not say that you accepted the offer, but I must write something. He plainly expected a glad acceptance of what he offered, and any other reception of it must make him fear that he was suspected of an intention, or desire to thrust his services upon you, and I would waste words in the endeavor to persuade him otherwise.

With this feeling, he could take only his present course. You will understand that these are merely my inferences. If they are correct, you will not deem it strange, that I regret that you were led, by reflection upon your bitter experience, to withhold your first answer.

Your frank conversation enables *me* to see how you justify your course, but of all this the Bishop is ignorant. So far as I know him, he is an earnest and indefatigable worker, anxious to discharge his duty, and promote the spiritual welfare of all committed to his care. Consequently, I trust him, and credit him with pure and sincere motives, without waiting for proof. Before I can believe him actuated by other motives, or even suspend my judgment balanced between the two, I must have some proof of insincerity, to create a doubt in my mind.

I have not had your sad experience, and do not know how I would act with it. I am willing to believe that its effect upon your mind, renders your course natural and necessary, and should receive consideration. But, only those can take this view, who have some knowledge of your past intercourse with the clergy.

I do not know whether matters will be so arranged, that you will have the Blessed Sacrament administered in your house by the Bishop. I sincerely hope for that result. Let me, however, take this opportunity to say, what I trust is not necessary, that as it is my duty, so it will also be a holy pleasure to me to administer to you the Blessed Sacrament, whensoever you may desire it, or think it necessary to your spiritual welfare. Expecting to call on you soon, I write this now, that you may not have to wait longer for a knowledge of the Bishop's plans. With many prayers for your welfare, my dear brother, I am yours in Christ.

THOS. H. GORDON.

This letter, though a loose, and jumbled, and meddlesome one, is important, because it shows several important facts. 1. That my answer to the Bishop's notice—notwithstanding the great impropriety of the notice itself, as well as of the "form" of the notice, and of the "manner of sending it," and, notwithstanding the painful and dangerous shock to my feelings, and even to my life, which it caused me, was kind and "cordial," and respectful, and that it only expressed my "desire," first to have the Bishop's own voluntarily promised "long talk" with him, with the notice that that talk "would have to be satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Communion from him."

That certainly, I not only had a right to ask, but I had good reasons for asking. And, the Bishop, if he had been a man either of good sense, or of good feeling, ought to have seen and felt that it was so, and he ought to have assented to it, willingly and gladly.

But, instead of that, he got angry, and he wrote pettishly and foolishly, and he tried to make it appear that he had only made his "offer," from a desire to do my soul good, and not as an act of authority, and that I was wanting in regard for the Sacrament, and that I had treated both him, and his offer disrespectfully. That was Hypocrisy, and Falsehood, as well as Injustice,—on the Bishop's part,—though I did not know it, or even suspect it, at that time.

But, with the additional light that I now have, I can see that all that the Bishop wrote there, was hypocritical and wicked, to the very highest degree, for the Bishop knew then when he wrote those words, that he had not only tried to force me, or to intimidate me, and to deceive me, so that I would receive the Communion from him, and so submit myself unconditionally, to his mere authority, but he knew also, that he was writing those very words, at that very time, with the express intention of deceiving me still further. And, he was angry, not because I did not do what he pretended that he had done, only for my soul's sake, but because both of his traps—force and fraud—which he had so wickedly set to catch me, had snapped without catching me.

2. The letter also shows that the Bishop, at that date, asserted, that "in his opinion," such an "offer" as his ought "only" to have been sent "through the Rector of the Parish in which I reside," and he wrote that *after* he had heard from Mr. Gordon, that I thought he should have given it to me directly, either in person, or by letter. His letter to me, written only a fortnight after he wrote this, admits that "Mr. Gordon had told him" so. Yet here he says that he *still* thought *after* he had had the truth presented to him plainly, that his *original* plan was the right one. Yet in his letter to me, written a fortnight later, he says, that his "offer" would have been sent to me directly, "*if the thought had occurred to him sooner.*" There is a flat contradiction, in terms, and, it is a falsehood.

The fact is, that the Bishop said, whatever—at the moment—he thought would be a possible excuse, whether it was true or false. But, unfortunately for him, the falsehoods would not keep down. And, hence his troubles.

3. This letter also shows that Mr. Gordon's loose talk about his own confidence in the Bishop, was all deceit, and hypocrisy. For at the time that he wrote this letter, he knew positively that both the Bishop and himself had "conspired" together to "deceive" me, by declaring, as they did that the Bishop had "offered" to administer the Communion to me, "*because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese,*" whereas the true reason was, that they wished to make me submit to their authority merely, without giving me any chance even, to have any previous conversation with the Bishop, a thing that would have been accorded by any heathen, if he had any sense of Justice.

And, it all shows, that neither one of them cared a penny for my soul, for they did not even care for their own souls, or they never could have been guilty of such detestable wickedness, as they were then engaged in.

For, if the Bishop had cared anything about my soul, he would—neces-

sarily, when he thought that I had been remiss—have resorted to reasonable and spiritual influences, to induce me to do what he thought that I ought to do, and not to force, or intimidation, or to fraud, and afterwards to *neglect*.

But, when I received this letter of Mr. Gordon's, I still had no suspicion of the treachery and falsehood, that he and the Bishop, were practicing against me. But, subsequent events, the Bishop's own letter to me, and Mr. Gordon's admissions to me, and the Bishop's own admission to me, and finally, the Bishop's refusal to "hear" me, together with his neglect to keep any of his "official" pledges, and his neglect of his duty, towards me as Presbyter, and his many falsehoods, in which I have since detected him,—all of these things,—with the plainest possible proof of these, as facts, have made the case transparent. It is as clear as day.

MY FIRST LETTERS TO THE BISHOP.

HAMMONTON, N. J. Dec. 13th, 1881.

Bishop:—I have just received a note from the Rev. Mr. Gordon, informing me that you would not keep your appointment, for the 17th inst., but will defer your visit to Hammonton, until after the holidays.

In that note, he informs me also, what he had written to you, as my reply to your "offer," viz: that I "would give you a cordial welcome to my house, and that I was willing and desirous, to have your promised "long talk," with you, which, however, must prove satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Sacrament at your hands."

He gave my answer correctly, so far as the general meaning of it goes, but he did not word it as I worded it, nor did he give you the impression, as I would have wished, as my giving you a "cordial" welcome to my house, is sufficient to show. The words "at his hands," I did not use in this connection, but in one entirely different. As used here, they might be derogatory to you. As I used them, they could not be so.

In Mr. Gordon's note, he also writes—what purports to be the substance of your reply, viz: "That my reception of your offer which, in your opinion, ought to be sent through the Rector of the Parish in which I reside, makes you shrink from what you supposed would be a pleasure to me, as well as a comfort and a blessing, and that you must now wait for a request to repeat the offer, before making it again."

Now, Bishop, I am truly and deeply pained, that any of this most unfortunate misunderstanding should have taken place. Mr. Gordon gave the main substance of my reply, but not my reply as I gave it. And, you have entirely misconstrued my words, even as Mr. Gordon reported my answer. You were not wrong, when—in asking Mr. Gordon to deliver your message—you "supposed that it would be a pleasure to me, as well as a comfort and a blessing" to receive the Sacrament at your hands. So far from that, when Mrs. Passmore came from Church, and told me the message that you had sent to me through Mr. Gordon, and which he had sent to me through Mrs. P.—that message being "that you would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me,"—though my first feeling was only a terrible shock, at the message coming to me in a form and manner so diametrically opposite to what I felt to be right and proper,—still, after recovering from the effects of that shock, and after a few moments of meditation upon the subject, with my heart all bared to God, and over looking all that I thought and felt to be amiss, both in the "form" of the message, and in the "manner of sending it," I called Mrs. Passmore to me, and said, "I will be away from home, on two days of this week, and if Mr. Gordon should come while I am away, tell him to say to the Bishop that I am thankful to God, and to him, for his offer, and that I will prepare myself to re-

ceive the Sacrament at his hands." Mr. Gordon doubtless remembered my using the words here, when I told him all of my feelings and words about the case, and, in that way, I can understand how he—unfortunately—transferred them to my reply to you.

After telling Mrs. Passmore what to say to Mr. Gordon, I said to her, "I believe that God has put it into the heart of the Bishop, to make that offer."

But, Mr. Gordon did not come to see me, for two days after I had received your message, through Mrs. P., and in the meantime, after thinking everything over, again and again, and with much prayerful meditation, and weighing every particular circumstance most ^{thoroughly} strongly, I told Mrs. P. that if Mr. Gordon should come, while I was away, I wished her not to give him the answer, which I had told her at first, but that one which Mr. Gordon gave to you afterwards. But, from the very day that Mrs. Passmore gave me your message, and after I had sent you the answer that you received, and even now, since I have received your notice that you have with-drawn your offer, and that you will only be willing to repeat it after you have received a request from me to do so, I have been steadfastly preparing to receive it.

For, from the time that I received your offer, I have regarded it as God's intention, that I should now receive it, as my "viaticum." And I am still preparing to receive it, with precisely the same solemnity that I would, if I knew, positively, that my death was close at hand. For that is now my permanent state. I am walking, daily, hand in hand with Death. And I feel that, at any moment, and without any warning at all, I am liable to fall, dead.

I told Mr. Gordon that also, but, evidently, he has forgotten it, or thinking it no part of my answer, he has not thought it right, to say anything about it.

These facts, Bishop, I think ought to convince you, that I did not make light of your offer, but that I tried to make the very most, that I could, of it, and that I have, really, made a very great deal of it—"all of the circumstances to the contrary, notwithstanding."

But, Bishop, I think that these facts ought to convince you of something more than this. I think that they ought to convince you of the very great importance, of a Bishop, when he makes such an offer as yours, to one of his old and invalid Presbyters—making it, personally, if possible,—unless his previous personal intercourse with his Presbyter, and their mutual knowledge of each other's characters and feelings, would warrant him in sending so abrupt, and bald a message, as you sent to me. For, as things stood between us, I thought, and felt,—and I still feel and think—that you might, and you ought, to have given your message to me personally, either when you saw me at my house last, or when you came to see me, on the 17th,—or, if you wished me to be prepared to receive the Sacrament when you came, on the 17th, then you might, and you ought, to have written to me, your offer, and not have sent me such a message as you did, through any third person, without ever having had one word of communication with me, previously, upon the subject,—or, indeed, upon any spiritual subject, whatever.

But, when your message itself came, couched in such a curt and unfeeling—and even hard and harsh form—as if you were sending me a mere official notice, that you were coming to call me to account, for not attending upon the public worship of the Church, or for not receiving the Communion from the Priest in charge of the Church here, which even then should have been very differently given, then, Bishop, I, like the proverbial child, who has been burned, and that not once only, but three several times, and very badly burned at that, and that too, by his "Right Reverend Fathers in God,"—your predecessors in the See of New Jersey—and also by four or five of his brethren of the clergy, who during the last fourteen or fifteen years, have had charge of the Churches at Waterford and Hammonton. I, thinking that there might be "fire" hidden

under your offer, thought that I had better not be precipitate, and just yet, thank you, and accept your offer.

That conclusion, was the result of your own way of doing things. For, you did not give your offer, as a kind and loving Spiritual Father should have given, or sent, such an offer to a son, who, he thought, needed the Bread of Life,—i. e., in person, when that was possible, or by letter, if time pressed, and, in a kind and affectionate form. You gave no explanation either—in your message, or by your messenger—why you did not take one, or the other, of the usual, and most direct, and most satisfactory ways of doing such things. I submit that this course was calculated, to make any person, not to appreciate your offer so highly as regards your personal part in it. And, with the sad, and bitter, experience that I have had, it gave me not only warrant, but command, first to “prove all things,” and then to “hold fast that which is good.”

[Signed] WILLIAM PASSMORE, PRESBYTER.

MY SECOND LETTER TO THE BISHOP.

THURSDAY, December 18th, 1879.

Bishop.—The above letter was written on Saturday—13th—just after receiving Mr. Gordon's note, informing me that you would not keep your appointment for yesterday, and that you had retracted your offer. Since then, I have not seen Mr. Gordon. But, I read what I had written, to Mrs. Passmore, and she then told me, that she had told me more than I had ever heard, or known, before, which requires that I should now write more to you, and that I should change my way of regarding your offer, so far as your personal feelings were—or rather “might have been”—concerned in it.

But, let me frankly say, that they do not, at all, change the opinion that I have already formed and written,—in regard to the “form” or the “manner of sending” your offer.

But, I will now state some more facts, both as to how I received your message, and with what results, that you may see, still more clearly, whether I have been to blame, or whether your own way of sending your message has not been the original cause of all of the trouble.

But, first, I must prepare you to understand what I write. I am very deaf, as you know. Sometimes, very much more so, than you have ever found me. I think that I have spoken to you of my Paralysis. At any rate, I have been partially paralyzed, for many years, ten years, or more. Besides, my heart is diseased. But, all of these ailments are the results of Paralysis.

Ordinarily, I can never feel the pulsations of my heart. It is only when the body is warmed, and the nerves excited, by vigorous bodily exercise, that I can feel my heart beating. But, any strong emotion,—and, more particularly, any sudden surprise of strong and exciting feeling—sends the blood back to my heart, with a violent and over-powering shock. So much so, at times, that not only the nerves of the heart, but of the whole body also, are so much affected, as to paralyze all of the vital organs, and to suspend, for a time, the use of all of my faculties. I am, generally, conscious, at such times, but not always cognizant of what is going on about me. And then, after standing, or sitting, or lying—in a sort of living death, or dead life, for a minute or two—the circulation, and nervous action begin again, and I am gradually restored to my ordinary state of life.

This is the Preamble, that will enable you to understand what I shall now write. The facts that I would record, are these:

On Sunday P. M. Dec. 7th, when my wife and daughter came from Church, I was lying on the sofa, in a more paralyzed state than usual. After removing their wraps, Mrs. P. came and knelt down by me, and told me what Mr. Gor-

don had told her, viz: "that the Bishop would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me." That is all that I heard then. The shock to my feelings had stunned me. And, I never heard anything more than that, until Saturday last, when after receiving Mr. Gordon's note, I sat down and wrote the letter to you, which you find on the first two pages of this sheet. I then read what I had written to Mrs. P., and then learned from her, for the first time, that Mr. Gordon had added "if I wished it" to your offer. She also told me that Mr. Gordon had told her, that you had told him, that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese," "that you would like to administer the Communion to me, if I desired it." She also added that she had told me these things, at the time that she gave me the message. But, when she had got far enough to tell me these things, I had lost the ability to hear them. So the telling of them, was all lost upon me.

But, with these new lights thrown upon the whole subject, I can, I must, I do, regard your offer very differently. Your personal feelings in making your offer, will henceforth, never be a question with me. Neither will the "form" or the "manner of sending" of your message, ever give me any further trouble. But, Bishop, from the merest sense of duty—in a matter that may concern others of your aged and invalid clergy,—and which involves not only the true rights of your own Episcopal office, and your true relations to your clergy, and their true relations to you, but also, the rights and prerogatives of your clergy, as against any illegal subjection of one to the other, I beg of you to consider, what a wretchedly vicious opinion you have taken up, when you think that you ought only to offer the Communion to one of your Presbyters, through the medium of the brother clergyman, in whose Parish he happens to reside, as if any Presbyter could ever be put under another Presbyter, without his own consent, or, simply, because he happens to reside in the Parish of another Presbyter.

But, now—Bishop, while I think none the less badly, either of the "manner of sending" of your message, or of the "form" of your message,—I will now thank you, most heartily, for having sent me your offer. You have retracted it, it is true. And, you have said that you will not renew it, until you have been requested to repeat it. But, that request I will now make to you. I request, therefore, that you will administer the Holy Communion to me, at my house, when you come to Hammonton, after the holidays. I shall continue to prepare myself, to receive it at your hands.

If you have any misgivings, as to whether I would receive it "worthily," I beg you, either to satisfy your own mind and conscience, when you meet me, or, if you cannot satisfy them, to say so, frankly. For good, or for ill. I wish for nothing, but that the right and the truth should prevail, and that too, with frank and manly openness.

For ten years, or more, I have been self-suspended from the Holy Communion. And, in that long time, the good God who has supplied all of my bodily wants, has also supplied all of my spiritual wants. He has fed me, day by day, with Heavenly Manna,—not with the Body and Blood of our Lord, in the Holy Communion,—but with the little grains of spiritual food, that I pick up, from day to day, as I Commune with Him, in the hours of light and labor, or, at night, when in my waking hours, He sends His Spirit to cheer and to comfort me.

I shall not feel hurt, Bishop—no matter how all this may end, for I cannot help feeling, that God has some good purpose in view, or, that he will over-rule it all for good. If it will only help to make you change your mischievous opinion, of how a Spiritual "Father" in Christ, should treat his sons in Christ, I shall be more than satisfied.

I remain, Bishop—with a sincere prayer for your welfare, and for your wise, and happy administration of your Diocese,—your loyal well-wisher and Presbyter,

[Signed]

WILLIAM PASSMORE.

P. S.—I ought to mention that Mr. Gordon has been to my house this morning, and that I read to him, what I have written to you. In one thing that I have written, he has told me that I have been mistaken—viz: in having told him, when he came out here to receive my answer, that I was preparing myself to receive the Communion from you, when you came. That, he told me, I had mentioned to him the next day, after he had got my answer, and after he had sent my answer to you. I remembered that I had told him of that and thought that it was on the same day that he received my answer. But that is an immaterial point. The fact stated, was true.

Another thing, that I found out when he was here, was, that he had not only commented upon your reply to my answer in his letter to me, but had also commented upon my answer to you, when he sent my answer to you. That kind of meddling helps to muddle matters. What he wrote to you, helped to wound your feelings, and very improperly so, too, as well as to make me feel that you and I could both have done much better, had we communicated directly with each other, without his intervention.

That is my double letter to the Bishop, in full. And I sent them both, that the Bishop might see all that I had thought and felt, first and last.

And, here I will call attention to several points in it, which ought to be noticed here,—although they will be found more minutely commented upon, in the letters that I have written to the Bishop, and which will be found in this pamphlet, a little further on.

The first point, that I shall here notice, is, the very respectful and feeling manner, in which I told the Bishop, "that I was truly and deeply pained, that any of this most unfortunate misunderstanding had taken place." That was at the very beginning of my letter, after the mere statement of the facts which ought first to have been made known. That shows, how little I desired to give the Bishop any trouble, or even to show anything like anger, though, as the letter itself shows, the Bishop's very improper way of sending his message to me, had wounded my feelings, and injured me, to such a degree, as even to imperil my life. It shows too, how very wrong he had been, in mis-judging my feelings, when he thought that I had made light of his "offer," to administer the Communion to me. It showed him also, what a great mistake it was to call it by no harder a name, when he sent such an "offer" to one of his old and invalid clergy, in such a "form" and "manner," as he had done to me. It showed, too, that the fault, or blame, of all of the misunderstanding that had occurred was only the natural "result of his own way of doing things." It showed too, that the very moment that I heard of Mr. Gordon's statement, which I then believed to be the truth, but which the Bishop himself has since declared to me, was not the truth,—i. e. that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid clergy of the Diocese, that the Bishop had sent his "offer,"—I wrote directly to the Bishop, and "thanked him most heartily for his offer." And, instead of delaying a moment to "prove all things," as I might fairly have done, and as I see now, that I ought to have done, I told the Bishop, that though I thought "none the less badly" either of the "form" of his message, or of his "manner of sending it," neither of these things should ever give me any further trouble. Neither would they have done so, if the Bishop himself had not, out of what seems to me to be the very spirit of the Evil One, put himself out of the way, and taken particular pains, to show that he did not wish to be Just or True, but only to claim, and to exhibit, what he considered his superiority, and that too, not by legitimate methods, but by trickery and deceit, and falsehood. Also, though he had retracted his "offer," and though that had been done peevishly and improperly, and with insinuations that I did not care to receive the Sacrament, I at once and with the utmost frankness, asked him to come, and to administer the Communion to me,

when he came to Hammonton; even "begging" him, at the same time, if he had any doubts as to whether I would receive it "worthily," to satisfy his own mind and conscience, when he came to Hammonton. I really think, that there was nothing, that I ought to have done, under the circumstances of the case, that I did not do. And, I did a great deal more than I needed to have done, and what no man who was not perfectly frank and utterly fearless of the consequences, would have done; for I told the Bishop, that "for ten years I had been self-suspended from the Holy Communion.

That was putting myself in a very bad light; especially, when I left that statement unexplained; a thing that I did, on purpose, to make the Bishop see, and feel, that he must now come to see me, and to get a full explanation of my case. But, even that was all in vain; so little did the Bishop care for my soul, or for the purity of the Church, or for the honor of God. And so, he allowed nearly a year and a half to go by, without seeking any explanation, and he "would not" hear me, even to this day, even when I demanded an interview as my right, and as due to God, and to the Truth.

But, these two letters of mine, were such as ought to have elicited at least a decent letter, from any decent man,—who had wronged and injured another, as much as they had shown to the Bishop, that he had wronged and injured me,—by his improper "message," and by his "form" and "manner" of sending it. As I wrote, afterwards to the Bishop, a very little exhibition of common sense, and of mere ordinary human feeling, would have ended all of the trouble, at this time, just as they would, if shown in the first place, have prevented any trouble from arising at all. As I said "a few words of regret that you had caused me the painful and dangerous shock to my feelings, and to my life, a few words of confirmation of Mr. Gordon's statement, that you had made your "offer," "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese,"—a frank acknowledgement, and expression of regret,—that you had mistaken not only my feelings, about receiving the Sacrament, but even the plain and necessary meaning of my words,—as repeated to you by Mr. Gordon,—and also an admission, that your "opinion" of how a Bishop "ought" to offer to administer the Communion, at least to the old and invalid clergy of his Diocese, was a bad one, and that you could now see that it ought not to govern you, in the future, would have ended all of the trouble. But, the Bishop was too Proud, and Self-willed, and too Self-confident, to write such things. And so he wrote to me, this letter:

THE BISHOP'S WICKED LETTER TO ME.

TRENTON, N. J., Dec. 31st, 1878.

My Dear Mr. Passmore.—The matter to which your letter alludes, will not require many words of explanation. After Mr. Gordon and I had left your house that Sunday, and I had partly promised to come and see you before very long, it occurred to me, that it might be a proper thing for me—if you choose—to administer the Holy Communion. Mr. Gordon promised to get your views, and tell me. That is all I know about it.

He did tell me, that you thought that the offer should have come directly to you, from me. So it would, if the thought had occurred to me sooner. I did not dream that there would be anything in such a proposition to shock or surprise you. But I did not know that ten years had elapsed, since you had received the Holy Communion. I took for granted, that as oft' as you could you had received that Blessed Feast. Will you be surprised if I tell you, that I am the one who ought to feel aggrieved? Whatever grounds of complaint you have against any of my predecessors, you certainly had none against me, and you have permitted five years to pass, without even intimating that you would like

to receive the Holy Communion. I am at a loss to know how this could be with a Priest of the Church, who in theory certainly holds high Sacramentarian views.

I am not yet able to fix a day for my visit to Hammonton, but I hope it will be early in the New Year. I will give you due notice of my intention, and if you are prepared for it, I will be most happy to partake of the Lord's Supper with you.

My best wishes for the New Year to you and yours, and believe me ever your friend most truly,

[Signed]

JOHN SCARBOROUGH.

After reading that letter the shock that I received, was far worse than the one that I felt, when I first received the Bishop's notice. But it was not the same kind of a shock. That shocked my sensibilities and my nervous system, but this letter shocked my very soul,—and the pain that it has caused me, continues to this very day, and it will continue to do so, as long as I live,—for that letter killed, outright, every spark of faith or trust in me, so far as Bishop Scarborough was concerned. And, to this day, I can never look upon, or even think of that letter, without the words of St. Paul to Elymas the sorcerer, coming into my mind:—"O, full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the Devil, thou enemy of all Righteousness, will thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" It is marvelous, the subtilty, and adroitness, and the power, as well as the will, to deceive, which this letter proves.

I know that what I here write, will surprise, not only some, but all of those who have just read that letter for the first time. Every single person who has read that letter, has doubtless felt that it was not only an innocent letter, but even a good letter, and such as it befitted a Christian Bishop to write. And coming from a Bishop against whom they as yet know nothing, except that I have charged him with being wicked,—which charge they know might be, as things are in this world, false or malicious—they might well say, that they cannot believe that there is anything wrong in it, unless I can prove that there is. I admit that. For, I myself would have taken that very same view of the case, if anybody else was in my place, as the accuser of the Bishop, and if I was in any body else's place, as the one who had to judge, of the truth or falseness of the charges.

But, I hold myself responsible for my charges, and for the proof of them. And, it so happens that I am taking no risk at all, in either case. For, I happen not to be in any other person's place, but in my own place, like a man whose hand writing has been counterfeited, and a forgery committed upon him where the work of the forger has been so very skillfully done, that no one but the innocent victim could ever know that it was a forgery, or could even suspect it. But the innocent victim of the forgery would know—even if he could not prove it,—that it was a forgery, and he might know something that the forger did not know, or did not think of, at the time he committed the forgery, that would *prove* the forgery to be a forgery, and other circumstances, would then prove who was the forger, and that he perpetrated the forgery, maliciously, or wickedly.

And, that is just the case at present. For, I knowing all that had previously passed, between the Bishop and myself, and having retained Mr Gordon's letter, and copies of my own letters to the Bishop, and the Bishop's letter to me, I was not only in the position to know, but also to prove, how far the Bishop, in his letter to me, wrote, according to the facts and according to the testimony. That, the Bishop had, evidently over-looked. Or, strong in the sense of his Pride and Power, and Position, he felt that he was so much greater and stronger than I was, that he could dare to defy me—as Goliath did David.

But, like Goliath, he forgot that in disdaining David, and in defying the power of the living God, he made God his enemy, and that God could "bring to

light the hidden things of darkness," and could raise up another David, who would despise all of the giant's greatness, and strength, and all of his arms and armor, and all of his host of backers, and with a simple sling, would go forth alone,—in the name of the Lord,—and would send the "stone" of truth crushing through his armor of brass, and into his proud and wicked forehead, so that he would fall headlong, and dead. "Whosoever shall fall on that stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

Therefore, knowing what I did know,—I had read but a few lines of that letter, before I saw, and felt,—that it was the most wicked letter that ever I saw in my life. And before I was done reading it, I felt that it was a perfectly Devilish letter; for it was one continuous string of deceits, and falsehoods, and hypocrisy, and of meanness, and of impudence, and of wickedness, from the very beginning of it, to the very end of it. And, having been written as it was, by a Bishop in the Church of Christ, writing in his "official" capacity, as the Representative of God,—and upon so sacred and holy a subject, as that of the Consecration, by himself, of the Holy Communion, and of the administration of the Sacrament, by him to me, and of his participation of the Sacrament, with me,—while, all the while, he was desecrating not only his sacred office and profaning the Sacrament,—“Crucifying the Son of God afresh,” or, like Judas, “betraying Him with a kiss,”—and betraying me likewise; and while he was desecrating everything, at the same moment, by his falsehoods, and hypocrisy, and sacrilege, it proved not only the letter, but the Bishop himself also, to be so impiously wicked and horrible, that nothing but the word “Devilish” can, at all, express the idea.

I hold myself responsible, as I have said, not only for the charges that I have made against Bishop Scarborough, but also for the language that I have here used. I hold myself responsible for it all—not only to the Church on earth,—but to God Most High, at the Day of Judgement. And, if it is not proved beyond the possibility of a doubt, in what I have written to the Bishop, and by what will be found further on in this pamphlet, then “let me bear the blame forever;” and “God do so to me, and more also,” if I have not written every word of this, not to bring “a railing accusation” against my Bishop, but only to set forth what I know, and feel, in the *only* words that can, at all, express my thoughts and feelings, truly.

That letter, of course, ended my preparation of myself, to receive the Communion from the Bishop,—at least, until I had perfectly convincing proof, that he had not only “truly repented him of his former sins”—if, after such wickedness as I saw in that letter, Repentance was possible for him,—^{and} until he had “done works meet for Repentance.” But, as that proof has never yet been forthcoming, but as, on the contrary, the Bishop has been constantly going on from bad to worse, by continually adding sin to sin, from that time to this; and has even chosen to defy God's righteous anger, by his long-continued defiance and contempt of Him, as well as for Truth and Righteousness, and for any of the consequences that may come to him, from God or man, for his defiant and contemptuous wickedness, I have felt bound to take the stand that I have now taken, and I am now doing all that I am doing, in the midst of weakness and weariness, and of grief of heart, at what I find in the Church, and from a sense of duty alone.

But, I have not been in any haste to do this. And, if I did not see God's hand over-ruling and guiding me in all things, by bringing out the proofs of the Bishop's guilt, and by making it clear to me, that any longer delay would be wrong on my part, I would feel that I had been too slow. But, I waited, first, until the Bishop should come to Hammonton, to see what he would do,—when he would neither keep his “official” promises, or even write to me, to tell me why he did not do so. Therefore, for nearly a year and a half, I never made a sign

of any movement. And when—at last—in April, 1881,—he came and went, without coming to see me, I would then have written to him, to bring the issue to a point, if he had not then told my wife, that he “would make a ‘special’ trip to Hammonton, to see me,” and then, instead of doing what I had fully intended to do, at that time, I wrote to him the following letter:—

MY THIRD LETTER TO THE BISHOP.

HAMMONTON, April 22d, 1881.

Bishop.—Mrs. Passmore, on her return from Church, last night, gave me your notice, viz: That “you would make a special trip to Hammonton, to see me,” and that you had proposed “that I should write to you, to say when it would be convenient for me to receive you.” She also told me her reply, viz: “That you had better write to me, when you would come, as any time would suit me, if I only knew, a couple of days beforehand, when you were coming.”

I write now, to express my deep thanks—to God, and to you—that you have, at last, come around to “first principles,” and have concluded to begin at the beginning, and to do things in the order, and with the consideration, that are right and proper, in all such cases.

Also, I write to express my full approval of Mrs. Passmore’s answer to you. I shall be at home, always,—as I always am—except an occasional trip to Philadelphia, and if I can only know, a couple of days beforehand, when you are coming, I can so regulate my own affairs, as to be on hand, on whatever day you may name. Come direct to my house, Bishop, and make your arrangements to have the “long talk” that you promised me, and we will give you such rest and refreshment as we may be able to provide,—as well as such full and free opportunity to catechise me,—as to my Faith, Hope and Charity—as any reports you may ever have heard of me, or as any imaginations of your own mind, may have ever given you any reason to think ought to be explained. I have nothing to conceal, for “all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do,” and as my life is regulated for His eye, I do not “fear what man can do unto me.”

At the same time, Bishop, I shall have much—very much to say to you, not only of my intercourse with my old Bishop, and with many of my fellow-clergy, but also concerning yourself. And, as—“a man’s a man for a’ that,”—whether he be a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a slave, or a beggar, I shall feel compelled to tell you plainly, just where you have wronged me, and where you are in duty bound, to right the wrongs that you have done. Not that I care for my own rights, and wrongs, now. I used to do so, as all men do, naturally. But, I am now “dead unto the world,”—and the world “is dead unto me,”—and “my life is hid, with Christ in God.” But, I stand for Right, and against Wrong, still—because Right is Right, and because Wrong is Wrong—and because the All Holy God requires of us all, that we should all not only love Right, and hate Wrong, but when necessary, that we should do, or dare, for the Right, and against Wrong. If you will meet me in this same spirit, it will be better for both of us, and it will be vastly better for the Church at Hammonton, perhaps, for the whole Church in New Jersey, or, even for the whole Catholic Church; for “where one member suffers, all the members suffer with it.” And where a Wrong is done, all of the members not only suffer for that wrong, but no human being can ever conceive the extent, to which the sin, and the sorrow, and the suffering may spread.

With these suggestions, I am, as ever, Bishop—with loyal fidelity to you, so far as you are loyally faithful to Christ and to the Right, but with loyal fidelity

to Christ and to the Right, *against* you, when you yourself are not loyally faithful to Christ and to the Right,—your Presbyter.

WILLIAM PASSMORE.

P. S.—I have but one more request to make, Bishop, in regard to your coming to see me, and that is, that you should come at the very earliest date possible. The neglect to fulfill your promises, for so much more than a year, beyond the time that you yourself had fixed; and that too, without one word of apology, or sign of care to keep them, until last night, has already, been a great loss, not only to you and to me, but to Mr. Gordon and to Mr. Gantt also, and so, perhaps, to the Church at large. Come at once, Bishop, if you wish to end the Reign of Wrong, and to begin the Reign of Righteousness and Peace.

That letter also, everybody can see, was not only perfectly respectful, to his office, but even kind and considerate, to himself, personally, though, at the same time, it was perfectly plain, and straightforward, and honest, in telling him that he had wronged me, and that I held him responsible for his wrongs.

It also encouraged him to come, and to come quickly, that he might “end the Reign of Wrong,” and “begin the Reign of Righteousness and Peace.”

It also gave him formal notice,—notwithstanding my abhorrence, and detestation of his wickedness,—that he could catechise me to his heart's content, so that he could test me, and try me, to “see if there was any way of wickedness in me.” It also gave him, fair warning, that I would have much to say to him, and that I would feel compelled to say what I had to say very plainly, because of his own wicked letter, and because of his long-continued, and unjust, and cruel, and wicked way, of neglecting and disregarding all of my previous remonstrances, as well as his own “official” promises. And yet, that letter showed him, that I did not care at all, for his wrongs to me,—so far as I was personally concerned,—but that I only demanded what I had a right to demand, for the sake of Truth and of Righteousness. It gave him fair notice also, that it would be better for both of us, as well as for the Church, if he would meet me in the same spirit that I would meet him, i. e.,—with an eye, and a heart, bent only on righting whatever was wrong, and of doing only whatever was right, and that, not for our own sakes, but “because Right is Right and because Wrong is Wrong.”

I do not see how I could have treated any man, who had been guilty of so many and of so great wrongs, not only against me, but much more against God, and against the Church, and against all Truth and Righteousness, more kindly, or considerately, than I did the Bishop, in that letter. Anything less than I did say, would have been to have made myself unfaithful to God and to the Right. Anything more than I did say, would have been deceitful and hypocritical. At any rate, I tried to do my duty—not only faithfully, but, in as kindly a manner as possible. And, I only did, what I was in duty bound to do, as a Presbyter in the Church of Christ. Indeed, I only did what any man, Christian or heathen, clergyman or layman, ought to have done, i. e., “in any wise,” to “rebuke” our “brother” when we saw him guilty of sin and wrong, “lest we should allow sin upon him.” (Lev. xix: 17.)

But, again, it was all in vain. The Bishop neither made his “special” trip to see me, according to his “official” duty, and according to his “official” promise, but he did not even write to me, to let me know what to expect. His Pride, and his self-sufficiency, induced him again to neglect everything that he ought to have done. And so, I never saw, or heard, anything from him, until he came to Hammonton, Aug. 24th, 1881, to consecrate the Church. Then, he did come out to see me, but not to have the “long talk,” with which he himself had threatened me, and which he had said, nearly two years before, that he would “soon” come to give me. And, he had repeated that promise, early in the

Spring of 1881, and I had repeatedly requested, and even urged, and "begged" him, to come and give it to me. But, he came,—as he told me at once, "only for a few minutes," saying that "he had not time to stay longer," and evidently desirous, and even resolved, that there *should* be no consideration of the case, on its merits. What he wished was, to say "Peace, Peace," in the hope that he could get Peace for himself, without allowing me to be heard. But, in a case such as this, the time for overlooking all of the wrongs that had been done, had long gone by. And, there could be no such thing as "Peace," without such a mutual hearing, and understanding, of all of the important facts in the case, as would enable us both to know, and to trust, and to respect, and to love each other, as we could have done before any of these troubles had occurred. But, that would require that all of the facts should not only be heard, and understood, but that they should be weighed in the balances of Justice and of Truth, and that wherever wrong had been done, it should have been acknowledged, and such redress, as was possible, should be accorded. But, that the Bishop would not agree to. He wished to have all of his own wrongs overlooked, but he would not even hear of the wrongs that he and others had done to me, and to God.

Therefore, when I found that the Bishop "would not" consider the case at all, and that he would not even tell me the truth,—but only falsehoods,—when I asked him "What he had against me?" as the last resort, I told him, that I would then write to him, all that I felt that I ought to say to him, in the hope that he would repent, and amend. But, I also told him, that if after I had written to him all that I thought that I ought to say to him, he did not then repent, and "do works meet for repentance," I would then print what I had written to him, and would publish it "to the Church." And if, after I had told it "to the Church," he did not repent and amend, I would then "let him be unto me as a heathen man and a Publican," as our Lord enjoined that we should do; for that rule applies to all of our brethren alike, whether they be Bishops, or Presbyters, or Deacons, or Laymen, and the higher the office, the greater the sin, and the greater the need for the exposure of the wrong.

That is the end of my comments upon these letters, except as they are to be found in my letters to the Bishop, which will be found immediately following these remarks.

This pamphlet, therefore, is the last fact in the history of this case. And, it is the result, not only of Bishop Scarborough's first wrongs, in trying to force me, or to intimidate me, or to deceive me, into receiving the Communion from him, not religiously or righteously, but as a mere act of arbitrary authority, without allowing me even a chance to have any conversation with him, previously, as both God and man would require, if I should desire it; but it is—much more—the result of his continued, and repeated, and contemptuous, and defiant wrongs and outrages against all Truth and Righteousness, even to this day. It is intended to "rebuke" him publicly and before the Church, to induce him to repent, if that still be possible for him. Or, if his sins are—as I truly fear that they are—of that deep and damning sort, as "have never forgiveness," because they are sins "against the Holy Ghost," then it will bring his case before the Church, and then it will depend upon the Church's fidelity to God, whether they will allow such a wicked, and unjust, and impenitent Bishop, still to desecrate the holy office that he holds, or whether he shall be deposed from "that office and ministry," which he has so deeply disgraced, and have—like Judas—"another" to "take his office," "from which he by transgression fell."

But, now that I have fulfilled my duty to God, to the Church, and to my own soul, I have no more concern, personally, in the event of all this trouble, than any other Christian ought to have. But, if I had not done what I have now done, I would have felt that I would have been unfaithful, and would justly have been held accountable by God, not only for my own unfaithfulness, but for a

large share of the Bishop's unfaithfulness, if I had allowed him to continue in his sin, unrebuked.

WILLIAM PASSMORE.

Five Letters to Bishop Scarborough.

The pages that follow, are made up of five letters, written by me to Bishop Scarborough, between Aug. 24th, 1881, and Nov. 1st, 1881.

In them will be found: (1.) A Review of My Interview with the Bishop, on August 24th, 1881, and (2.) My Review of his most wicked letter of Dec. 31st, 1879. In these letters, all of the facts are considered minutely, and the proofs of the facts charged, in the "statement of the case," are plainly set forth.

And now, may God have mercy on the Bishop's soul, if indeed, "the door" is not already shut against him.

That is my last word, in this case.

WILLIAM PASSMORE.

HAMMONTON, NEW JERSEY, Jan. 16th, 1882.

:o:

THE FIRST OF MY FIVE LONG LETTERS TO BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

HAMMONTON, N. J., September 11th, 1881.

Bishop:—Sunday though it be, I cannot—now that I am again able to write some—postpone beginning to copy off what I have written to you, that I may be able to send it to you as soon as possible.

I finished all that I had to write, upon our interview of August 24th, before the end of last month, and read it to the Rev. Mr. Fiske, on the third of this month. But, I have since been sick, broken down by weakness, the fatigue of writing, and the intense heat. And now, for the first time, for a week, do I feel able to sit down and copy.

But, I am still very weak, and I have written a very long statement, and comment thereon. And, as I shall have to make two copies—one for you and one for the printer—it would be impossible for me to do it all soon, if ever. I will therefore do it, in parts, and from time to time, as I may be able, and will send you what I have written in parts.

If the connection of the parts should not always be very evident, if you trust only to memory, you will easily be able to recover the thread, if you will keep all the parts, as you receive them, and then refer to the earlier ones, when you receive the later ones.

In the mean time, may God keep you, and sustain my strength, until this my present work is completed.

WILLIAM PASSMORE.

COPY OF WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN.

HAMMONTON, Aug. 25th, 1882.

Bishop.—You have been, and you still are, a most unjust and cruel Bishop to me, as this, my very writing to you now, plainly proves. For, only yesterday, after nearly two years of wrong and injury, done by you to me, you not only refused to have your "long talk" with me, when you might have heard my cause, but, you showed so strongly your impatience, and your wish to get rid of the whole case, without even "allowing" me to hear what you had against me, or from whom you had heard anything, or what you had ever thought, was amiss in me, and without giving me even a chance to tell you, what I not only thought; but knew, was amiss in you; that I was, at last, obliged to tell you, that "if you would not hear me, then I would write to you, and tell you all that I had to say to you, and that if you did not choose to notice my letters, you might throw them into the waste-paper basket, or into the fire, or that you might send them back to me unopened.

But, Bishop, I would now earnestly advise you, to read what I write to you, *now*, nor even to destroy it now, after you have read it. And, that advice I give you, not on my own account, but on your own account, and on the Church's account. For, to me, personally, it is as St. Paul says it was to him, in all such cases, but a "very small matter," what you, or anybody else, may think of me, or of my doings. But, it will be a very great matter, not only for you, but also for the Church, if you neglect to read, what I now write to you, or, to read it, for the first time, after it has been printed, and given to the Church.

"A word, to the wise, is sufficient." To the unwise, many words avail nothing. But, Bishop, in this matter, at least, I hope you will be wise; for I must do my duty, "whether you will hear, or whether you will forbear."

But, the case is now clear. You have been guilty of so much shameful and wicked dealing towards me, that, in your Pride, you did not want to have all of the facts in the case considered, and for that reason, and for that reason alone, you would not consent to have your own promised "long talk" with me. You did not want to have—because you did not dare to have—an open, and honest, and frank examination of the whole case, so that a righteous settlement might be effected, and so that mutual confidence and respect might be restored. You wished to have Peace for yourself, but without doing Justice to me, and to daub over, with the "untempered mortar" of concealment, or evasion, the corruption, and demoralization of your own character. Whereas, any honest Christian, or any wise ruler—even if he were a heathen—might have known, that that way of merely covering up wrong, was only a delusion, and a snare. For, in such a case as the present, nothing could ever do, after all that has passed, but to have a full and fair examination of the whole case, and, when you were proved to be wrong, then you not only ought to acknowledge your wrong, and to show that you were sincerely sorry for it, but also to render such redress, as was possible.

But, it is only because of your determined refusal to do any of these things, that now—in my weakness, and weariness, and painfulness,—I am compelled to write out, and copy twice over, at such times as I may be able to do so, and that too, for weeks, or months, to come, what might have been said, and mutually settled, much more satisfactorily, to both parties, in a conversation of an hour's duration. Yes, Bishop, you have been, and you still are, a most unjust and cruel Bishop to me.

But, like the "poor widow"—of whom our Lord has told us—I will not let the "unjust judge" shake me off,—especially, as in this particular case, "the unjust judge," was the original wrong-doer, also, and because I have a duty to perform, as a Presbyter in the Church of Christ. My duty towards God, and

towards the Church, and even towards your own soul, Bishop—as well as towards my own soul—forbids, that I should allow such deliberate and wicked injustice and wrong, to be practised by my Bishop, to the injury of his “fellow-servants,” in the house of our common Lord—to the grievous wronging and dishonoring of God, to the shame and the injury of the Church, and to the extreme peril of your own soul—if I can prevent it.

And, be well assured, Bishop, that God now sees, and notes, not only all that we both have done in the past, but also all that we both are doing now, and that as in the case of “the unjust judge,” and of the “poor widow,” He will not only see that Justice is done, to both parties, at some time or other, but that if you try to delay doing Justice, much longer, God Himself will interfere, not only to humble you, and to punish you, but to “avenge” me, “speedily.”

RECORD OF MY INTERVIEW WITH THE BISHOP, Aug. 24th, 1881. WITH COMMENTS THEREON.

You cannot fail to remember, Bishop—confused though you were, at the time—how, when you were at my house, yesterday, I tried to get you to tell me, of anything, that you had ever heard, from anybody, against me, or, of anything that you had ever seen, or heard, or imagined, that you thought ought to be explained, or corrected, so far as I was concerned. You know too, that I could get nothing out of you, except that you had never heard anything, from anybody, that had ever led you to think, that there was anything, that ought to be enquired into, or corrected, and also, that you yourself had never felt, or thought, that there was anything against me.

After repeatedly questioning you on these points, under different forms of questions, and after your repeated assurances to the contrary, you will remember that I expressed my great surprise at this; and that I even went so far as to give my reasons for my surprise, viz:—That “some of the persons were still in the diocese who, years ago, had gossiped about me, and slandered me, and that, only because I had detected them, or their friends, in wrongs, and because I “withstood” them in their wrongs.”

I might have added—though I did not do so—that many of those to whom my scandalous brethren had told their falsehoods, and who had never heard the truth of the case, were still here, and that some of them treated me still, as if I were the one who had done the wrongs, and had wronged those who had wronged and injured me.

But, you still assured me, that what you had said was so. For very shame's sake, I could not have questioned my Bishop's word any further, at that time. Therefore, though it was against my own judgment, at the time, I felt that I ought to accept your word. And, I did so, as you will remember, with the statement that it was “not because I did not wish to be convinced, that what you said was so, but because I could not account for what had occurred, in any other way.” I then accepted your statements as true; hoping though it was with misgivings, that what you had told me was the truth.

I therefore felt that I had settled the first point, which, in my letter to you of April 22d, 1881, I told you that I thought ought to be settled, viz: What you had against me? I therefore acquitted you of having, or of ever having had, or even of your ever thinking that you ever had any reason even for thinking, that there was anything in me, or in my conduct, that ought to be explained or corrected. I then told you that I would pass on to the second point, that I had told you in that same letter, ought to be settled. That was

“WHAT I HAD AGAINST YOU!”

Or, why you had treated me so very shamefully as you had done? I therefore asked you, “Why you had attempted to *force* me to receive the Communion from you?” You replied,—and your eyes gleamed as you said it—as if you thought that what you said was not only a perfect justification for you, but, also, as if you thought that what you said was a point against me, that I would find it very hard, if not altogether impossible for me to answer: “Mr. Gordon told me that you were able to go in the cars to Philadelphia, and therefore, you were able to go to Church, if you wished to.”

Bishop, that answer which, at the moment you made it, you thought so good, was the very worst answer that you could possibly have made. For, it did not hurt me, in the least, as you thought that it would, and as I will show you later. But, it killed you, and your accomplice also, as quickly as a flash of lightning could have done it; and that I will show you—partly here and partly later—where the minute consideration of all of the facts will be more in place. But, so far as your character, as an honest man, and as a faithful Bishop, is concerned, that answer “killed” you. For, by that answer you proved very many things, and all of them against yourself and against your fellow-conspirator. It proved to me that you had been lying to me,—deliberately and repeatedly,—just the moment before. It proved ^{also} 1. That you did try to *force* me, and 2. That you did try to *deceive* me into receiving the Communion from you. It proved, also, that all of my doubts and misgivings, when I first received your very improper message, by Mr. Gordon, were correct and well-founded. There *was* something amiss, as I was then afraid, there might be—“*force*” and “*fraud*.” It proved, also, what at that time, I never even thought of suspecting; viz: That Mr. Gordon was associated with you in a “conspiracy” “to do all of these unlawful things,” as well as very mean, and contemptible, and wicked things. It proved also, that when, at the very moment, before you made that answer, you made those repeated declarations to me—“that you had never heard anything, from anybody, that had ever led you to think that there was anything amiss in me, or anything, that you thought ought to be enquired into or corrected,”—that you were asseverating to me the most downright falsehoods. It proved also—by recalling forgotten facts to my remembrance—that it was *not* what you had heard from Mr. Gordon—as you tried to make me believe that it was—that first led you to think that there was something amiss in me. For you knew then, at the time that you made that answer, what I also knew then, though you did not know that I knew it, and I myself did not recollect it at that moment, viz: That you had heard that I did not go to the Church, or receive the Communion from Mr. Fiske years before Mr. Gordon told you so. And, you knew, too, that Mr. Fiske had told you, what he had told you, not of his own accord, but because you had interrogated him, and in such a manner, as to draw his statements from him. And you knew, too, when Mr. Fiske was here, and years before Mr. Gordon told you what he did, that I went to Philadelphia, in the cars; for so long ago as when Mr. Fiske was here, you yourself rode with me, from Hammonton to Philadelphia, in the cars, sitting on the same seat with me, and talking with me all the way, as we rode together.

And, from what I know of Mr. Gordon, and of your way of interrogating Mr. Fiske, years before Mr. Gordon told you what he did, I have every reason to believe that Mr. Gordon did not tell you what he did, of his own accord, any more than Mr. Fiske had; but that you propounded questions to him, as you did to Mr. Fiske, and to Mr. Gantt afterwards, and that Mr. Gordon only answered you according to the tenor of your questions.

Your answer proved, also, that while you were visiting me, as a professed friend, and while you were partaking of my hospitality, as an honored guest, and

while you had abundant opportunities to tell me of any reports, or charges, that you had ever heard against me, you not only did not do so, as a friend, but above all, as a Bishop ought to have done, that your love might be true and "without dissimulation" to God, and to the Church, and "without dissimulation" to me, but you kept what you had heard, to yourself, and you harbored suspicions against me, and you even judged me, on the strength of what you had heard, and you even condemned me at that, not only "unheard," but even deceitfully and treacherously. You acted like an "unjust Judge," as well as like a wicked Bishop, in everything. And so, your answer has proved—so that not only I can see it—but so that all people, to whom these facts shall ever become known, can see it, that for years past, you have been playing a dishonorable, and a dishonest, and an unjust, and a cruel game with me. For, you began it,—as your questions to Mr. Fiske prove—years before you undertook to act out your Proud and wicked effort to "force" me to receive the Communion from you, or to "deceive" me by means of your mean, and tricky, and deceitful, and sacriligious plot and falsehoods; by which you perverted the Sacrament from its sacred and holy purpose,—that of being a strictly religious, and spiritual act of Communion, between God and man,—into an instrument of your own proud, and wicked, and tyrannical abuse of your sacred office and ministry.

Yes, Bishop, when you made that answer to me, you killed your own character. For, any person who is not an absolute idiot, cannot fail to see, how that answer proves—not only your own falsehood, and treachery,—but also your willingness, and your desire, and your actual effort, to profane the most sacred and holy things, for the sake of attaining your own proud and wicked purposes.

For, "force" and "fraud" are both so utterly hateful when brought into connection with the Lord's Supper, that it is hard to say, which God or man should most detest. And yet, as if either one of them was not bad enough, to sink the man who dared to use it, into hell, you could not be satisfied, without resorting to both of them.

It sickens me to the very soul to have to feel, and to know, that all is this true, of my Bishop, and that all that I can now do, is to pray for you, as I have been doing now, nearly every day and night, for more than a year past; and, oftentimes, very many times in the course of a single day or night; and to write to you, as I am now doing, to show you plainly what I fear you have never allowed yourself to see,—how very base and wicked you have been; and to implore you, as I now do, to repent, and that most deeply, and at once. So far as you have wronged and injured me, personally, I not only do forgive you now, but I have forgiven you, long ago—more than a year and a half ago. And, all that I have ever said, or done,—even from the very first—to check you in your wrongs, or to reprove you for your wrongs, or, as now, to bring your conduct to the notice of the Church, in case you will not humble yourself and repent, is from a most solemn sense of duty, and from that alone.

MY OWN CASE.

But, I will now go back, to the consideration, of what took place between us, at our interview of Aug. 24th, so far as to reply to what your words,—“Mr. Gordon told me, &c.”—seem to call for, at my hands. I might, if I chose to do as you do, dodge, and evade, what seems to make against myself, and which, as I said, you seemed to consider a full excuse, for your conspiring with Mr. Gordon, to force me, or to deceive me, but, in any wise to catch me, in your traps, by deceit, and falsehood, and by baiting your trap with the Holy Communion, to induce me, or to frighten me, or to force me, to receive the Communion, at your hands.

But, as I scorn all such ways of doing things, but far more, and above all, because I now still recognize,—as I always have recognized—not only the right, but the duty, of every Bishop, not only to enquire of, but in a manly and honorable way, to enquire about, all those—clergy or laity—who are under his spiritual oversight, and jurisdiction; and because I also recognize his right, and his duty, where the case calls for it, to “reprove,” to “rebuke,” and to “exhort” them, and further still, when they are charged with wrongs, which they cannot, or will not, disprove, and for which they show no penitence, to “try” them, and in the case of those who have been fairly and fully convicted, to “pronounce, and to execute judgement,” upon them, and all this, as an absolute requirement of “godly discipline;” therefore, I feel, that,—now that my Bishop has called my attention to what he has heard, and to what he has thought, and still thinks, against me,—though he has not done his duty, in coming to me, and enquiring of me what I had to say for myself,—nor, has he done his duty, by telling me, even yet, all that he has heard about me,—but has only told me falsehoods, instead,—and though he has never told me, of all of the persons from whom he has ever heard anything, but only of one person, whom he had every reason to believe that I already knew had told him that much,—as I did know it,—and whom therefore he thought it safe to name,—and though I might, and that rightly, demand, and under ordinary circumstances I would demand it, not only as my right, but chiefly, because it is one of the most essential requirements of Right and of Justice, that such charges, and the names of the accusers should be given to the accused, before he is called upon to defend himself; still, under the present circumstances, I will waive all of my rights, and all of the securities that the Laws of Right and Equity, require for protecting an innocent man, or any man, until he has had a fair knowledge of what is charged against him, and of who are his accusers, and has been called upon to answer,—to give an account, of all of my doings, as a clergyman, from the date of my return to this Diocese, in 1859, to this day.

Twenty-two years ago—after an absence of twelve years—I returned from Texas, to the Diocese of New Jersey, and on the nomination of Bishop Doane, made only a few days before he died, was elected Rector of St. John’s Church, Camden, at a merely nominal salary of \$400. The Church was in a sad plight. It was split into two parties, and was a “house divided against itself.” The people were very poor, and the Church was crushed to the earth, with debts that it could not pay. It was “a desolation,” financially, as well as spiritually. But, bad as the case was, indeed, I only took it because it was so very bad, and yet so promising a field for Christian work, that I thought that I could not find a place that would need my services more. I took it to save it if I could. And, I succeeded, and at the same time I gave a Sunday Service at Stockton, once a month without having any Missionary appointment there, and without any compensation ever promised, or received. I even walked, in all weathers, the two miles there and back (four miles in all) without ever even hinting to the people, that they ought even to provide a conveyance for me. This work I carried on for seven months, from Sep. 1859 to April 1860, and in that time I re-united the opposing parties in the Church, and doubled the congregations, having made the Church a free Church. I also paid off all of the floating debts, about \$800, and had the Church repaired and re-painted, paid for the paving of the streets and sidewalks, around the Church lot, &c., &c.

But, at the end of those seven months, owing to over work, with a constitution not yet recovered from the effects of the yellow fever which I had in Texas, and to the exposure, in all weathers; I then broke down, with a serious attack of inflammation of the lungs. Then, by the advice of my physicians, I came to Hammonton, then a wilderness, to get into the sands, and pines. And, here I have been, ever since, now more than twenty-one years. When I came here,

there were very few settlers, and of Church people, few, or none. Then, neither I, nor my family could go to any Church, even if I had been able to go, for there was no Church here. But, even then I procured a lot of three acres for the Church, just adjoining my own residence, in the hope that some day, I might be able to officiate, if the Church should be so near to my residence, that there would be but little exposure, in bad weather, while serving it. But, such a time never came. So, even from the first day that we were here, I set up the Church "in my house." We had our daily family prayers, and on Sundays, the regular Church Services, in the mornings; Sunday School, for my child and servants in the afternoon, and singing of "Psalms and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, at night." In fact, "the Church in my house" was the first Church at Hammonton, and I was the Rector of it. And, though not in union with the convention, it was just as truly a "Church," as was the first Church in Rome, i. e.—"the Church that was in the house of Priscilla and Aquilla," which was not in union with any Convention either. And, for twelve years, the Church "in mine own house" was the *only* Church in Hammonton. I had a right to belong to that Church then, and I cannot see that I have ever forfeited my right to belong to it still.

But, after twelve years, a few more Church people came in to our settlement, and then I tried, with the others, to get up a Church for the town. Did that action, on my part, cut me off from grace? I trow not. So, we rented from the Presbyterians, the use of their place of worship, and engaged a clergyman to officiate. But, I could not attend the services, for my lungs and throat were still in very bad condition, and I felt that I ought not to go. Did that cut me off from grace? I trow not. But, seeing the prospect hopeful, we concluded to try to build a Church of our own. But, the town had began to grow up near the R. R. Station, and not where it was, originally, supposed that it would be, so that the lot that I had secured for the Church twelve years before, was not eligibly situated, and I therefore gave three building lots near the station, worth at that time \$800. And, I have since given three other lots, not far from the Church, worth when they were given, \$400, for a Parsonage. All of these lots together, are now worth from \$1600 to \$1800, without counting the large lot of three acres, near my house, which will make a most desirable burying ground.

But, by the time the new Church was begun, in addition to my other infirmities, I had become so deaf that I could not hear a word, in any public service, nor even the half of the tunes, as rendered by the organ, or voices. And, not being able to read the services,—my lungs were still too weak for that,—I could only have gazed, and that at a very slovenly and careless service, if I had been able to go to the Church. But, even that—as I have said—I could not do. But I did what I could do, and I did that willingly and gladly. As, from the first, so even unto this day, I have done what I could. 1. To build up the Spiritual building, by word of mouth, in private, by distribution of Church papers, the "Spirit of Missions" and tracts, and by loaning books from my library. And so from the very first, I did what I could to promote the building of the material building; for I not only gave them all of the lands that were needed, or that ever will be needed, but I also contributed of my own money, not only far more than any other person in Hammonton, but I think that I would not be wrong in saying, more than all of the people of Hammonton put together. Besides, I went to New York, where I have many friends, and collected money, so that between what I gave, and what I collected, I provided much more than half of all of the money that was used in building the Church at Hammonton. Did my doing all this, to get up another Church in Hammonton, cut me off from grace? I trow not.

But, I broke down, while collecting, and had to give it up—or I might have been able to say, that I had collected *all* that was used in building the Church—for, up to that time I had collected *all* that had been given.

I had therefore—per force—to put my collection book into the hands of our clergyman, and let him finish, if possible, what I could not finish.

But—

THE CLERGYMAN DEFRAUDED THE CHURCH,

for he appropriated to his own use, nearly \$500, that he had collected; and nearly all of it, by means of my letters of Introduction, to personal friends of my own; and through the Testimonials in my favor, in my subscription book, which I put into his hands, with a commendatory introduction of him, as my representative. Out of this money, so raised, he purchased for himself forty acres of land at Waterford. He also made purchases in the name of the Church at Hammonton of things that he had no right to buy, in the Church's name; and some of these things, the Church at Hammonton never got. The clergyman had disposed of them, in some way or other; but in what way I cannot say. And, after his death, for the Church's sake, I myself paid these debts, when the bills were sent in to the Church at Hammonton.

But, the troubles that were originated by this clergyman, as well as on account of him, both before and after his death,—by the Bishop, and by a number of my other fellow clergy, had so disgusted me with them all,—that I could not have gone to participate in the Services and Sacraments of the Church, administered by them, if I had been perfectly well and strong.

So, that, for moral reasons, even if there had been no physical reasons, I felt that I was only doing my duty by *not* attending the services, and by *not* receiving the Sacraments, from such wicked clergy. For I felt,—as David did,—that they who ministered in holy things, should do so “with clean hands,” and “with pure hearts.” And, like David again, I felt, that I ought *not* “to sit among the ungodly,” or “to have fellowship with the deceitful.”

But, when the crimes of the clergyman, in defrauding the Church, and in robbing God, and in lying unto God, and in lying to me, and in lying about me, were punished; and that too, by God Himself, by the sudden and awful death of the guilty clergyman, on Easter Monday, only three days after he had—on Good Friday; in the Presbyterian meeting house—publicly lied about me to the assembled congregation, immediately after he had finished the Good Friday Services,—and, by fire to his body, and with despair in his soul, on the very land that he had “purchased with the reward of his iniquity,” and upon the very first occasion of his ever having gone upon that land, after his horrible falsehoods, and after his still more horrible profanation of holy things; and all, because I had detected him in his frauds, and had compelled him to make such amends as he could, and because I had prevented him from prostituting the Virgin Church,—symbol of “the Bride,” “the Lamb's wife,” the Holy Mother of us all—by holding, in it a fair, got up by sectarians of all kinds, to whom that wicked clergyman had paid wicked court; then, the Church at Hammonton was, for a time, completely broken up. And, it was burdened with a debt of some \$700, which the congregation could not pay.

The Church was then on the point of being seized and sold for debt, for materials and labor expended upon the building. And then, all would have been lost, if I had not again done what I could for it.

I therefore went on to New York again, to collect money; and I wrote to the Bishop, to tell him that we would have to look to him, for help; and at last, with the Bishop's help, which he then gave liberally, I got the money, and paid off the last cent of the debt.

I also gave and collected, enough money besides, to fit up the Church so that it could be used; wainscoting the lower part of the walls, building the Chancel platform, and putting in the Chancel railing, procuring the alter, font, lecturn,

seats, stoves, front doors, &c. &c., and put it into the condition in which it was, when you first saw it. At the same time, I made my house "the house" of all the clergy who ever came here, and I contributed—at that time—to the salary of the clergyman, more than any other individual in Hammonton.

But, with all that, I have never been present, in that Church, at any single service.

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter.

THE SECOND OF MY FIVE LONG LETTERS TO BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

HAMMONTON, N. J., Sept. 16th, 1881.

Bishop.—At the close of that part of my statement, which I mailed to you yesterday, I told you plainly, that I had never been present, in the Church at Hammonton, at any single service. Does that look, as if I was afraid to have you call me to account for it? Or, does it not show you, that I am perfectly ready for that, as I always have been; and as my very first letters to you, of Dec. 1879, plainly prove? What I objected to then—as now—was what I indicated in those same letters—viz: the very improper way you took, of doing what you did. But I will now give you

MY REASONS, IN FULL, FOR NOT ATTENDING THE CHURCH, AND FOR NOT RECEIVING THE COMMUNION FROM THE PRIESTS WHO HAVE BEEN IN CHARGE OF THE CHURCH AT HAMMONTON.

These were of two kinds—as I said in my last letter—either one of which would be amply sufficient to justify me, in the sight of God, and in the sight of all Just and Reasonable men. Only an arbitrary or tyrannical Bishop, or a Pharisaical, or bigoted clergy or laity, could ever object to either of them.

But, I will now show, what those reasons were, and are :

(1.) They were physical; the old ailments of the lungs and throat were still too great to admit of it; and the worry and excitement, of mind and of spirit, arising from my difficulties with my Bishop, and fellow clergy, who had done me wrongs; and of those others who had believed the slanders that they had uttered against me; but who, except the Bishop, and two or three others, had never heard anything of my side of the case; (for I had contented myself with telling everything to the Bishop, in writing, and then leaving it to him, to correct his own wrongs and the wrongs of those who were under him); had so affected my heart, which had long before been diseased, that it brought on an attack of Paralysis, which left me much worse off than before; increasing the previously existing Disease of the Heart, and the deafness; so that with the chronic weakness of the throat and lungs, and the absolute necessity of taking the most watchful care of myself, I could not have borne the exposure, to all of "the changes and chances," which would have had to been encountered, by going to Church.

(2.) But, besides, I felt, even if I could have gone, that I would have been doing much better, as things were, not to have gone. I felt that, by remaining at home, reading or meditating to myself, while all of the rest of my family, wife, child and servants, could go regularly, they, who had not my feelings, might all be profited, by going; while I, who was so shocked and disgusted, with the unprincipled conduct of the clergy, could not go at all, for moral reasons, even if there had been no physical ones; for I could not, conscientiously, have taken

any part in their services, or have received the Sacrament from them, without feeling, that, by participating with them, in what they were doing, with "unclean hands" and with "impure hearts," as I knew, to a certainty that they were, I would have been participating with them in their guilt and impiety. So I preferred to keep myself to myself and to God,—appealing to God as David did, (Ps. xxvi, 1-6).—"Be Thou my Judge, O Lord, for I have walked innocently; my trust hath been also in the Lord; therefore I shall not fall. Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try out my reins and my heart." "I have not dwelt with vain persons, neither will I have fellowship with the deceitful. I have hated the congregation of the wicked, and will not sit among the ungodly. I will wash mine hands in innocency, O Lord, and so will I go to thine altar."

And, I felt, that I was not only justifiable, in doing as I did, but that I was in duty bound to do so. For St. Paul teaches us (1 Cor. xi, 27-31.) just what the Church teaches us, in the Office for the Holy Communion,—where, when she directs her Priests to give "warning" for the Holy Communion—she puts into their mouths words, which really do "warn" all persons, and especially the "impenitent," that it is a highly dangerous, as well as a most wicked thing, for any person to "presume" to receive it "unworthily;" and that no one can receive it "worthily," except by first "searching and examining their own consciences;" and that "not lightly, and after the manner of *dissemblers* with God,"—but so that they may come "holy and clean," to such an "heavenly feast,"—"in the marriage garment"—of purity and truth—"required by God, in Holy Scripture."

And, at my ordination to the Priesthood, I made a most solemn vow to God that I "would always be ready," "with all faithful diligence," "to banish and drive away *from the Church*," "all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's words." And are not falsehood and treachery, and injustice and tyranny, and impiety and sacrilege, and profanation of a sacred office, and of the Most Holy Sacrament, whether taught by word of mouth, or by example and practice, "erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word?" Are they not indeed the very doctrines of the Devil? and the very ones that are *most* "contrary to God's word?" Certainly, they are. What then, have I to do, but to oppose them?—and that too, no matter where I find them,—or who it is that comes before me, to teach them, or to practice them? And, if I am bound to "banish them," and to "drive them away" *from the Church*,—if they are intruded into it by anybody, however humble in station, or in knowledge, or in character—how much more am I bound to do so, when they are brought in, and taught, and practiced, by my Bishops, and fellow clergy?

Yes, Bishop, the obligations of that vow bind me; and they bind all of my fellow Bishops and Presbyters likewise, to do their duty, in that matter, no matter who may be the person or the persons, whom we may have to oppose. And, if it is our own Bishops and fellow clergy, that we may have to oppose; then it is only so much the worse for our Bishops, and for our fellow clergy, and for the Church—that has the grievous misfortune (the result of the Church's own unfaithfulness)—of being under such Bishops and clergy.

And so again, in the Preface to the Office for the Holy Communion—the Church directs the officiating Priest—if he shall "know" of "*any*" person, it matters not whether that person be Bishop, Priest, Deacon, or Layman, who has *done any wrong*" to his neighbors, by word or deed, so that the "Congregation" be thereby offended; he shall "advertise" him, that he "presume not to come to the Lord's table," until he have "*openly*" declared himself to have "truly repented," and that he hath recompensed the parties, to whom he hath done wrong." Also, it directs, that, "the same order," the Minister "shall" use, "with them betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign;" not "suffering" them to be partakers of the Lord's table, "until he *know* them to be reconciled."

That, is not only very plain, but very positive, teaching. And, according to those directions, which are the only ones, that God, or the Scriptures, or the Church can allow, I would have been clearly "bound,"—if I had been in any position where I could have carried out the Church's orders, and my vow,—to have suspended from the Holy Communion, not only my late Bishop, and my wicked fellow clergy of his time, but you also, and Mr. Gordon; and so far as my action could have done it, I would have been bound to have *kept you suspended from it*, for your own soul's sake, that you might not eat and drink to your own "damnation;" as well as for the Church's sake; that you might not, by your own sin, and by your evil influence and example—to say nothing of your direct and wicked wrongs to individuals—bring the curse and wrath of God upon the whole Church; because it did not "withstand" you, and correct you, or "cast you out," as the case might require.

But, not being in any position, where I could have suspended you all from the Communion, I did what, at the time I did it, I thought was the *only* alternative; and that was, to "suspend myself," from any Communion with my wicked Bishop, and fellow clergy. That, accordingly I did, though—so far as the Church or the world, could see,—it made not one particle of difference, but all things went on, so far as outward appearances were concerned, just as they did before. But, God could see, what man could not see. And, God saw it all, and He saw that "it was all very good." And, He gave it to me, also, to see, "after many days," and even after many years, indeed, that, it was all for good. And, even now, with your renewal of the wrongs, I feel that, it will "all be for good;" your part of it, as well as what is long past and gone.

You will now see what I meant, when I wrote to you, that "for ten years or more I had been "self suspended" from the Holy Communion." Did my telling you that, on the very first occasion that you had ever given me, to say anything about myself, look as if I was afraid to be called to an account? Or, was there not, on the contrary, a very plain, and loud, call upon you, to come and do your duty? to come, and to enquire, and to examine into the case? That is what I meant it for, when I wrote those words. And that is what you ought to have taken it for, and what you would have taken it for if you had been a faithful Bishop. I wished to show you, that the "long talk" which you had told me that you were "soon" coming to have with me, and with which you had thought to frighten me, was just what I wanted; and just what you, Bishop, if you had been a faithful Bishop, ought to have held with me, years before; but which, you had now, no sort of an excuse for neglecting, after such a statement as I had then made to you. But, even that statement was all in vain. You never kept even your "official" promises to come, either "soon," or late; and to this day, though I have often urged and asked for it, you have never dared to accord it. The reason is, you have been guilty, of many, and of very wicked things, and you have been afraid to meet an honest man, with God to back him.

But, though my "self-suspension" from the Holy Communion was not a general one, but only a partial one; involving, as it did, only my Bishop and a few of my fellow clergy; it involved through the Bishop, acting as he did in his "official" capacity, my status with the whole Diocese, as a Diocese. And the Bishop's and my other fellow clergy's, slanders of me, throughout the Diocese has made,—I feel it—my Diocesan status, a very bad one. For, they all combined to slander me, and I did nothing, but remonstrate with the Bishop, and threaten to expose him, and all of the others, if they persisted in their worst and open wrongs. But their secret slanders, I could not prevent. Therefore, I put my trust in God, and "kept silent," while they still wronged me.

But, God was on my side, and, in his own good time, he proved it. For, when the Bishop had been sufficiently chastened and humbled, by the hand of God, he himself made the first advances, and then *sued* to me, for reconciliation

and forgiveness. And then, I gave them to him, personally. But, I have never yet had the case settled "officially." I was in hopes, when you became Bishop, that that might have been done. And, it might have been done, if you had chosen to do your duty, and administer "righteous judgement;" rather than to side with a few of the clergy, whose influence you desired, against one poor old and helpless, and friendless man; whose poverty and want of influence you dared to despise. That was a mean and cowardly, and contemptible thing to do; as well as an unjust, and cruel, and wicked one. And so, instead of coming to me in person, as you ought to have done, and instead of dealing with me openly and frankly,—as you ought to have done,—and in a kindly and Christian spirit, as you ought to have done, you chose to treat me like an out-cast, to whom you would send an order, as a master would to his slave; to make me see and feel, that you were "lord over me." That, Bishop, was your first *open* mistake. For, that way of doing things, made it *necessary* for me to "withstand" you. And, therefore, I have "withstood" you—just as I did my former Bishop,—when he undertook to "lord" it over me. So do "like causes produce like results," in all ages.

But, my justification of what I have done, is the express command of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. (Matt. v. 23-24.) He there tells us, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother has aught against thee, *leave* there thy gift before the altar, and *go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.*"

That I did,—or rather I tried to do it. But, my Bishops would not be "reconciled." They would not even "hear me," when I remonstrated with them. And yet, that rule of our Lord's applies to all persons alike, whether they be Bishops, or Presbyters, or Deacons, or Laymen. I have kept to that rule. But, how have my wicked Bishops and fellow clergy kept it? While, for fifteen years or more, I have borne such grievous wrongs 'rom them without "even telling unto the Church," what the Church ought, perhaps, to have been told before this; and have borne my wrongs quietly and "patiently," only *not communing* with those who had wronged me, or with the clergy at Hammonton, where I had been publicly slandered, a dozen years ago; and where I have been privately slandered ever since by my Bishops' slanders to the clergy who have come here, and by the clergy who have come here, and who have been influenced by my Bishops' slanders of me to them, as well as by their own dislike of a man, who would not suffer them to sin, without "rebuking" them for it, I have only abstained from partaking at the altar, at which they ministered. That is all. But, in defiance of our Lord's rule, they still went to the altar, to "offer;" although they knew that they had been guilty of great wrongs and injuries to me, and that they were not "reconciled," and were even adding new wrongs,—all the while. They did not "leave there their gift," and "go their way," and "*first be reconciled to their brother,*" and *then* go back and "offer their gift." They despised the law of the Lord, in that thing, as they did in other things. And, they have done so to this day. And they are doing so now, (our present clergyman Mr. Underhill, is not included in this statement, but the Bishops.) "O wicked and perverse generation, how long shall I suffer you." You *dare* to go to the Holy Communion with your souls foul and black, with unrepented sins, and then you try to "force" me, or to "frighten" me, or to "deceive" me into partaking of it with you, —and pretend to think, or at any rate to say—that you are doing it all *for my soul's sake, and for God's glory!* "O wicked and perverse."

Shame upon such miserable hypocrisy and wickedness! If you do not repent—if you can repent, after such dreadful impiety, and wickedness—"it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of Judgement than for you."

And, Bishop, you have been *the worst of the whole set,—by far the worst.*

For you have taken your stand against me, and "conspired" with others against me, and have "slandered" me to the clergy that have come to Hammonton, and you have "plotted" against me, to "force" me, and to "deceive" me, into submission to your unholy will and desires. And, you have "lied" to me, and you have done all that, *in your "official" capacity*. And by doing what you have, you have tried not only to cover up your own sins, by new falsehoods and deceits; but to cover up and conceal, the sins of all those who have gone before you. So that now I must either allow all of the sins of the present, to be piled upon all of the sins of the past—like "Ossa upon Pelion,"—or, I must take my stand upon the ground of Truth and of Righteousness, and denounce, and expose you all. There is no other alternative.

Therefore I have made my choice. I will choose Truth and Righteousness, and I will denounce and expose you all; if you, as Bishop, do not speedily, repent, and do what ought to be done, in this case.

I regret now, sometimes, that I allowed my last Bishop to go clear, without compelling him,—before it was too late—to make an "official," and "open" "reparation," for all of the wrongs that had been done. For, if I had done so, neither you, nor my other guilty fellow clergy would have acted as you have now done. But, this time, I will try to do my work thoroughly,—that this may be the last offence—so far as I am concerned.

But, as my last Bishop did not make his repentance known to me, until within a few months of his leaving this Diocese, and until after the Diocese was divided, and after he had formally resigned this one, and had elected to take Northern New Jersey, so that he was not, really, my Bishop then, but only nominally so, and as he was then broken down,—not only in bodily health, but also in spirit—so humbled indeed, that I could only pity him, I could not,—as a merciful man—insist upon his doing me "official" Justice at that time.

Therefore, having made a "personal" reconciliation with my late Bishop, I still lived on, just as before; bearing "patiently" the "reproaches," that he, and my other guilty fellow clergy had cast upon me, "wrongfully;" and which they themselves ought to have borne.

But, with the Lord's help, this has not been grievous to me; on the contrary, I could—if it were the Lord's will—still bear it "patiently;" together with all of the new wrongs that you could lay upon me, besides. For, I feel now, as I have long felt, that I am in the same plight, spiritually, that Paul and Silas were in, physically, at Phillippi. They have "beaten me openly, and uncondemned," and have "cast me into prison." The only difference is, that the Apostles were beaten and cast into prison, by heathen civil officers, and I have been beaten and cast into prison by my Bishops, and fellow clergy; who have "beaten me openly and uncondemned" with the rods of falsehood, and have "cast me into the prison" of suspicion. Once, I thought—after Bishop Odenheimer's repentance—that they had "let me go;" and then, thinking that all was over, I "stood not upon the order of my going," but went "at once." But, now that you and Mr. Gordon,—and whoever else has had a hand in this matter, have done the same thing over again, I am not inclined to repeat my old way of doing,—i. e., taking my unjust beating and imprisonment, as a matter of no account, because I do not care for it, and letting the wrongs go; or, to let the wrong-doers go—or even to let myself go, even if you were to send me word now, that *you* would "let me go." The time for letting things go, in that way, is over, with me forever, in this case.

Now, I am going on the principle, upon which Paul and Silas went,—i. e., to say, "Nay, but let them come themselves, and fetch us out." For, as the crime is so much the greater, as being done by a Christian Bishop, in his official capacity, as Bishop—as compared with the crime against the Apostles—done, as that was, merely by heathen civil rulers; so the "reparation" that is due, in my case

is much more obligatory, and shall be "openly" done. And, it is needed, as I now fully see, that other Bishops and clergy may be made to take warning, by your examples. Therefore, I shall now insist upon an "open," and "official" reparation, for being "beaten openly and uncondemned," with the rods of falsehood; and upon an "open" and "official" deliverance from the "prison" of suspicion, into which I have been cast; by the slanders and calumnies of my Bishops and fellow clergy. And, until this is done, I will never feel myself bound to receive the Communion, from any person.

Yes, Bishop that is what I now require; not at all, however, as an act of justice to myself, personally, though it would be that; for I am perfectly contented, to live on until I die, shut up in "the prison of suspicion," as I have been for many years,—for I am not now, and for years past, I have not been, any the worse off, personally, for any of the wrongs that have been done to me; for God has over-paid me, and that most abundantly, in spiritual blessings, for all that I have ever suffered unjustly. So that I am perfectly willing to live on until I die, just as I have now lived, for many years past. And so, as I have been none the worse off, personally,—except for a short time, when I first heard of them, and was stung with the sense of wrong—for the wrongs that have been done me in the past; so I cannot think that I will ever be any the better off, personally, for the simple recognition by the Church, either at Hammonton, or throughout the Diocese, that I have been most foully wronged in the past, by my Bishops, and fellow clergy. But, for God's sake, and for the Church's sake, I do wish to feel, that such injustice and wrong shall not be allowed, much less encouraged, in the future; even if it cannot be entirely prevented. And, I do wish, that those who have been guilty should learn the lesson, that they so plainly need to learn—viz: that the sooner they repent for what they have done in the past, and the sooner that they learn to do righteously for the future, the better it will be, both for the Church, and for themselves.

But, I know, and I rejoice that I feel it so constantly, just as David did, that God will, sooner or later, "make my righteousness as clear as the light, and my just dealing as the noonday." I may have to wait long, for that, perhaps, even to the Day of Judgement. But, that does not trouble me, for I can afford to wait, until that time,—and, in the meantime, I can not only comfort myself, but be comforted by God also, as in the times that are past. Yes, I *do* even "Rejoice, that I am counted worthy to suffer shame, for the Lord's sake." That is better than to be "popular." The "popular" man must seek to please men. He does so, and he gets the reward that he sought. But, that is all that he does get, and all that he will ever get,—except the "woe," that our Lord denounced against all those, who prefer to please man, rather than God. "Woe unto you, when all men speak well of you, for so did their fathers unto the *false* prophets." (Luke vi, 26.) Therefore, I have always feared, rather than desired, "the praise of men." I have therefore always preferred to please God, so far as I could, no matter how much I might provoke the hatred, and wrath, of man. And, I have done that of en, and deliberately, and have taken the consequences, not only willingly, but gladly. And, I am doing that now. But, so far from feeling that I am any loser, by doing as I do, I feel that I have a perpetual comfort, and even a fountain of delight,—in that Beatitude which our Lord gave to all who would be faithful, at whatever cost; "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my name's sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets, which were before you." (Matt. v, 11, 12.)

And, a sad thing would it be for the Church, if there were not men who would dare to do this, for the sake of Christ and of the Right; even against their wicked and unfaithful Bishops and fellow clergy—if need be.

That is not the world's way, it is true; for the world, which loves sin, but fears

only the scandal or the penalties that may result from sin, loves to "wink at" sin. It therefore prompts those, who prefer their own ease, or pleasure, to the Truth of God, or to the Purity of the Church, or of the clergy, to cover up and to conceal what is wrong; and to get out of any difficulty, in the easiest and pleasantest way that is possible, and to leave what is wrong to God. And, the Church, by reason of its having learned that bad lesson from the world, does likewise. But, that is not God's way. He requires, as He always has required, that "*the Church*" shall expose sin, and rebuke it, and cast it out. "Holiness"—the sanctification of man—is the very object of the Church's institution by God. And to disregard that, is to disregard God, and to disregard the highest duties that God has given to us, and to the Church, to do. And, it is an evil day—a most evil day—for the Church of Christ, when her Bishops, and clergy, not only do mean and wicked things, themselves—but when they can do them with impunity; and without much fear even, that they will ever be held to a strict account, even if they are detected in them. For so, they are not only encouraged to do wickedly, but, by their example and influence, they tempt and encourage others to do wickedly; and so, they do what they can, to make the Church, which God meant to be for the sanctification of mankind, to be, like the "synagogue of Satan," the means for the depravation of mankind.

And, if such things as have been done to me are done on "the green tree," i. e., while the Church in this country is yet young, and in the vigor, and health, of youth, what will be the state of the tree, when it becomes old, and has lost the health and vigor of its youth? Anybody can see that it would become a rotten branch, a very "stench in the nostrils of the Almighty."

We must therefore, my brethren, do what we can, to keep the Church, and her clergy pure, or we will have to render a fearful account to God, for our share of the neglect. That is how I view the case; and that is why, instead of concealing, and covering up, what I see to be so wrong, as are these high-handed and unrepented sins that I have denounced, I try to bring them to the light, and to rebuke them—as the Apostles did—and as the Apostles, and the Church, as well as our Lord, require that we all should do; and as the Apostolic Church did do, and as the Church, long after the Apostolic times did do; until, indeed, the union of Church and State, under Constantine, had so corrupted the Church by marrying it unto the world, that she became unfaithful to her Lord, by taking sin and sinners to her bosom; and learned to act upon worldly principles, and by worldly methods, as she does to this day.

But, while my Bishops, and fellow clergy, have been pretending to keep the Church's character in good standing, by "white-washing" her, and each other; as the Pharisees, in our Lord's time, white-washed the outsides of their "sepulchers," while within they are full of "corruption;" and while they have been combining to blacken the character of the man who "withstood" them, when they did wrong; and who threatened to expose them, if they did not desist from their wrongs; they still went on doing wrong "secretly," where I could not detect them; and so they allowed the poison of their sin to penetrate even to the vitals of the Church; until they even dared to profane the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as their own sacred offices, with impious and sacriligious wickedness. And, that they tried to force upon me also, with "fraud" and "falsehood" added to it.

What could I do, when things came to that pass, but to "withstand" them? And, that I have done, without a thought, or a care, for how many, or how great, adversaries I might raise up against myself.

I have none of the honors, or emoluments, of the Sacred Ministry, and I never did have, and never would have, any more of them than I could help. I have declined many, and tempting calls, as most people would regard them, to rich and great parishes; and I never would take anything but the hard, and diffi-

cult, and dangerous, or unpleasant work, that few, or none, of my brethren would take. So, at least, I escaped that dangerous snare which so many delight to be caught in—"the praise of men."

But, in the place of that, I have received from God, a far higher recompense. And though, by reason of my infirmities, and of my troubles with my Bishops, I have not received the Holy Communion, out of my own house, but once, in the course of the last ten, or twelve years; and that was at the Convention where you were elected Bishop, and where I went, not to vote for any particular person, but to vote against one who it was thought would be elected, but who I knew was unfit for the office; I *have*, however, received the Communion, which from time to time I celebrated, in my own house, with my wife and my daughter alone, as my fellow communicants. And, never, in any place, or under any circumstances, have I ever felt more the preciousness of our Lord's "unspeakable gift."

But, now, having lived, for many years, deprived of the Church's public services, and of frequent and public Communion with the Church, at the altar; and, having seen—as I have seen—so many pitiable proofs, that the partaking of the Sacrament "often" is not the only thing, nor even the main thing that is required of us; I have proved, and that by experience, (and by negative, as well as by positive, experience, and that proof most full and conclusive,) that, as the "natural" man "does not live by bread alone," so neither does the "spiritual" man "live by bread alone;" no, not even by the "Bread that came down from heaven" alone, not by the Sacrament alone. But, our spiritual life, and health, and strength, exist, and flourish, or decay, and die, just in the proportion that we give heed to, or do not give heed to, "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." I have proved that God does, indeed, give "the hidden manna," and supply with "angel's food," all those who truly "love him," and "keep His commandments," "*perfecting Holiness, in the fear of God,*" and who "*seek first the kingdom of God, and His Righteousness.*" I have proved, that He does know, and judge rightly, when there is "a willing mind;" and that He does "accept" us, "according to that we have, and not according to that we have not;" and that He does "prefer Mercy to Sacrifice." "Let me fall into the hands of God, but not into the hands of man!"

And so, I have gone on, ever since the Church was built here, just as I had gone on, for a dozen years before it was built; my infirmities increasing and multiplying from year to year; and having, for years past, "the world" so "crucified unto me," and myself so "crucified unto the world," that I have lived, and felt, as I lived, and as I saw what was going on in the world, and in the Church around me, as if it was the world, and the Church, that I had *once* lived in, but in which I lived no longer. I have felt, like the denizen of some other sphere; who is "in the world" but "not of the world," who "*was*" in the world, and in the Church on earth, *once*, but who *is* in it no longer,—so far as any personal participation in its duties, or pleasures is concerned. And yet, I am "living unto God," to a degree, that I never even conceived of, in past years; and when I joined in all of the worship of the Sanctuary, and in all of the work of the Lord. You may consider me a Mystic, or what you cannot understand, but I am what I am "by God's grace," and by my Bishop's and fellow clergy's wrongs, as well as by my own choice and acts; under the teachings of the Word of God, and by the influences of the Spirit of God.

And, so it is that I take no part, or personal interest even, in the things of this world. My whole body, and all of my senses, are half dead always, and, sometimes, they are almost wholly dead. Only my spirit still lives, and is strong. But for that, I should long since, have sunk under my "infirmities." And so it is, that what life I still have, is not a life "after the flesh," but "after the spirit," only. In the last ten years, I have not made ten calls upon any person. I do not mean upon any one person, but upon any, and all, of the people on earth. I

never go anywhere, off of my own lot, except as I feel compelled to go; and that is very seldom, almost never,—except when I go to Philadelphia, from time to time, for a part of a day.

I do not even meet, or have any intercourse with, any of the people who come to my house; except in the case of a very few dear friends, or when, in the winter time, the room in which I stay is the most comfortable in the house, and when the persons who call have been invited into it; and then, after excusing myself to them—I sit and read, while they talk and listen. It is really the case, as I said, that I am “dead unto the world,” and that “the world is dead unto me.” And the things of this world, which other people love, or fear,—the riches, comforts, pleasures, fashions, customs, honors, powers, praise, blame, evil report, or, good report, I care for none of them.

Here, Bishop, are the facts of the case. And, even now, under all of the circumstances of the case, as they exist between us, at present, I will leave you to judge, whether there is anything in these facts, taken in connection with all of the other facts that I have stated,—viz: that I have ever “loved the Church,” that I have “given myself for it,” until I broke down, while working for it; and that I have since freely endowed the Church at Hammonton with lands, and that I have helped, to the extent of my ability, and to the amount of much more than half of the whole cost, “to build us a synagogue,”—that could, possibly justify you—when you heard anything against me, for not coming to me, personally, as a Bishop should do, in all such cases, to hear what I had to say, for myself, for not attending the Church, and for not receiving the Communion, from the Presbyters that have been in charge of the Church at Hammonton.

No, Bishop, neither you, nor anybody else, can say that justly. On the contrary, if you thought—from whatever cause—and no matter how plain the case might seem to you, and no matter how bad the case might seem to be, as against me; or, that there was anything that even seemed to be amiss, as against me—your first duty was, to have done to me, what any high-minded, and honorable man would have done, naturally,—but what every Christian man, and, especially, a Bishop, is expressly commanded to do, by our Lord, Himself. He says: “If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone.” Have a private conference with the person—but do what you do, in a frank, and straight-forward, and Christian manner—telling him frankly, and at once, your reasons for coming and speaking to him; and giving your authority, *before you tell what you have heard.* But never approach him, nor any other man, for that matter, with guile, or deceit. Alas, for the Bishop, that needs to be reminded, of so elementary a principle, of Christian morals, or of Christian manners.

But, that I told you, when you were here, when I referred you to St. Paul's way of doing such things. He told the Corinthians, (1 Cor 1.-2.) “It is declared unto me,” “by them which are of the house of Chloe,” &c.; thus like a frank and honest Christian man, giving the names of the informers, before he told what they had told him; thus making the informers immediately responsible for the truth of what they had told, and giving the persons accused the best possible chance, for knowing before the things charged were told to them, to whose charges they were subjected; and then giving them a frank and honest statement of the charges made against them. And that is the only just, and honorable, and Christian way, in which such charges should ever be treated.

And so, in another case, where there was no person who made any charge upon his own responsibility; but where there was a “common report,” that such a person had done such a thing; St Paul did not do, as you did; but he informed the party who was “suspected,” that he had heard, that it was “commonly reported” (1 Cor. v.-1.) that he had done so and so; thus telling him frankly, and at the first *upon what grounds* he had acted; and giving the “suspected” person

an opportunity to confess, or to deny, or to explain, or to do whatever else he might think to be right, under the circumstances of the case. But, that is just what you did not do. You preferred to take whatever you may have heard against me, as not only true, in itself; but as conclusive evidence of my guilt, and that, not only without ever notifying me,—as you ought to have done—of who was my accuser, and of what I was charged. In doing that, you acted not only like an unjust Judge, but like a cruel tyrant, and not like a brother, or a Christian.

And, even after your open wrongs, in consequence of your unjust and cruel judgement of me; when I asked you what you had ever heard against me, and who was my accuser, you would not tell me the truth even then—but only falsehoods. And, you told those falsehoods to me, in your “official” capacity, as my Bishop. It is horrible!

HOW YOUR ANSWER CONCERNS YOURSELF.

But now, Bishop, having written all that I think your answer—“Mr. Gordon told me that you were able to go to Philadelphia in the cars, and therefore you were able to go to the Church”—called upon me to say, so far as it related to me; let me call your most serious attention, to the solemn and momentous bearing that it has, upon yourself.

It has not only “killed you” here, as I have said, so far as your character as an honest man, and as a faithful Bishop, is concerned; but it will kill you, everlastingly, if you do not repent. Not that what you said was not true, in itself. Unfortunately, for you it was but too true. It was its very truth that “killed you.” For, it was the truth that was in it, that proved all of your protestations and denials, that you had been making, just the very moment before, to have been willful and deliberate, and wicked falsehoods.

But, true as what you said, was in itself,—viz: that you had heard that from Mr. Gordon, you managed, with the subtle, and perverse ingenuity that you have shown in all of your dealings with me, to make a falsehood, out of that very truth. For, you said what you said, as if that was the whole of the truth; and not, as it was, a mere particle of truth, so mis-stated, as to make it a falsehood. For, what Mr. Gordon told you, was *not* the real reason, for your acting as you did. For what Mr. Gordon, told you, was only what you had heard from Mr. Fiske, years before. And, what you had heard from Mr. Fiske, you heard from him, only because you propounded to him such questions, as drew what he told you from him. And, those questions of yours to Mr. Fiske prove that you had heard the very same facts from somebody else, before you questioned Mr. Fiske, as you did.

And again, your answer was a mean one, as respected Mr. Gordon. For, by your answer, you tried to put the responsibility, for what you had yourself planned and done, upon Mr. Gordon. Whereas, if the truth were known, you would be found to have questioned Mr. Gordon, as, years before, you had done to Mr. Fiske; and as, after Mr. Gantt had come to Hammonton, you questioned him. And so, you had tampered with all of the clergy, who had ever come to Hammonton, since you had become Bishop; and had done what you could, to set them all against me, just as your predecessor had done, years before. May God, in His infinite mercy, chasten *you*, Bishop; as He did your predecessor, until you have the grace to repent. That is the best prayer that I can now put up for you, for it is now as clear as day, that when you made that answer, as well as when you made your false and wicked answers just the moment before, you were still doing, what you had been trying to do, from the very moment that you had sent me word, that you “would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me;” you were saying what you did say, and writing what you wrote,

and doing what you did, *with the express intention of deceiving me*. At first, you practiced your deceits, to make me recognize your authority and power. But, finding that neither your authority or power could bring me into subjection to your illegal and unjust, and irreligious will, you then sought to gain the same ends by your deceits and falsehoods. And then, finding that neither of your traps had caught me, but that you and your accomplices were fallen into them yourselves; then, rather than confess your wrongs, and humble yourself for your sins, as you ought to have done; you undertook to get yourself out of your difficulties, by the same deceitful and wicked means, by which you had got into them. That is the explanation of it all. And all of these things you did, in your "official" capacity, as my Bishop. May God have mercy upon you, Bishop, for you have been a most miserable sinner!

But, that answer showed (1.) not only that you had tried to "force" me, to receive the Communion from you, merely as an act of authority, on your part; and (2.) by means of "trickery and falsehood," in default of "force" being sufficient, but, it proved (3.) "conspiracy," with Mr. Gordon; (4.) "falsehood" on the part of Mr. Gordon, and yourself also, when he said, that you had told him, that "it was because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese," that you had thought it well to "offer" to administer the Sacrament to me; (5.) that your letter to me, of Dec. 31st, 1879, by ignoring that, was a falsehood also, for I had told you, in my letter to you of Dec. 13th, 1879, that that was my *only* reason for overlooking all of your bad methods. And, by your silence, you gave me to understand, or wished to do so, that I should consider what Mr. Gordon had told me was the truth. That was deceit, and acted falsehood, on your part. In fact, there was not a thing, that you said, or did, that was not brimfull, and running over, with deceit. And, that answer of yours, was *the only thing that was wanting*, to enable me to *prove*, that you had been acting with deceit and falsehood, from the very beginning.

But, I will not write more, in regard to that answer, in this place, as it will come up again, to prove still more against you. I shall therefore go on now, to notice

THE SECOND QUESTION THAT I PUT TO YOU.

That was, "Why, after sending me the notice that you did, at the first, by Mr. Gordon, "that you would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me;" and after receiving my answer, "that I desired first to have your promised long talk with you, and that that talk would have to be satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Sacrament from you;" why did you get angry, and, in a pet, withdraw your "offer," and send me word that you would not repeat it, unless you should first receive a request to do so?"

To that question, Bishop, you gave me no answer, at all. You sat perfectly silent, though I "paused for a reply." You were absolutely "speechless" then. And, you could not have made any answer, that would have done you any good; except to have said, "I have sinned." That would have saved you. Anything else, even silence, was only evidence that you felt that you had been guilty, but that you were too proud and wicked to own it; even when the proofs of it all were spread out before you. That Bishop, was the extreme, of proud and wicked impenitence. But, knowing, as you then did know, that what you had written, in your letter to Mr. Gordon, about your concern for my soul, was all false and hypocritical, as your answer to me, "Mr. Gordon said that you were able to go to Philadelphia in the cars, and if you were able to do that, you were able to go to Church," fully proved; knowing that, as you then did, and that what Mr. Gordon had said, viz.: that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese," that you, in your care for my soul, had thought that it

would be a graceful thing to "offer," knowing that all that was wickedly false and deceitful in itself, as your answer, just given, had proved that it was; no wonder that you did not feel like making any more rash answers, especially when you found that you were dealing with a man whom you could neither frighten nor deceive. And, as you were still too proud, and too wicked, to confess your wrongs,—and afraid to deny them, or to risk any more falsehoods—you sat silent.

But, after waiting until I saw that you did not mean to answer, I then began to talk to you. I then told you, that when I sent to you the answer that I did, by Mr. Gordon, I had not declined, what you called your "offer," much less had I rejected it. But, I had done, only what I had a perfect right to do, and what I was under an obligation to do, i. e., to notify you, that while I was "desirous" first to have your own voluntarily threatened "long talk" with you, "that talk would have to be satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Sacrament from you." I felt, and I knew, that I had not only good and sufficient reasons, for having your "long talk" with you first; but that those reasons were compelling ones. They required, that we both should know more of each other's reasons, and motives, for doing what we had each done, and for what you proposed to do; a thing which was rendered peculiarly necessary, by reason of my past difficulties with my Bishops and my fellow clergy; as well as by your own most improper "way of sending," and "form of message;" when you merely sent me so uncivil a message upon so sacred an act of spiritual religion, as that you "would be here on the 17th, and would administer the Communion to me."

I told you also, that, in sending you the answer that I did, I did not only what I had a perfect right to do, but just what I ought to have done; and what you, as a man of mere common sense, but much more, as a Christian man, and still more, as a Bishop in the Church of God, ought to have felt, and acknowledged to have been perfectly reasonable and right; and only what you were in duty bound to have accorded; and that too, not "grudgingly, or of necessity," but willingly, and gladly.

And that, Bishop, you would have done, if you had cared one snap of your fingers, either for my soul, or for your own—or even if you did not care one snap of your fingers—either for my soul, or for your own—you would have done, what was so manifestly right and proper, if only you had been acting honestly, and in good faith, in what you had been doing before; as you pretended that you had. But, as you had not been acting honestly and in good faith, in what you had been doing before, but had been guilty of proud and wicked abuse of your office and authority, and had been guilty of deceit and falsehood, as well as of injustice, and of hypocrisy, and of profanation of sacred things, you were afraid to have your own threatened "long talk" with me. And, that is the reason why you have never dared to have the "long talk" with me since. I told you then, that in acting as you had done, in withdrawing your offer, as well as in the peevish and petulant way in which you did it, you had done very wrong.

I then paused again, for your reply, but though I waited some time, you made no answer. Again, you were "speechless."

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter.

(Finished Sep. 26th, 1881.)

MY THIRD LONG LETTER TO BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

HAMMONTON, N. J., Sep. 30th, 1881.

Bishop:—My last letter ended, with your absolute silence; both to the second question that I had put to you, and afterwards, to my remarks upon your conduct, in the particulars referred to. I now proceed, to notice the third question that I put to you; and to what followed that question; and to make such remarks upon it all, as I think that the case requires.

MY THIRD QUESTION.

I then asked you, "How did you dare, Bishop, to break so sacred, and so solemn an "official" pledge, as that which you gave me, in your letter of Dec. 31st, 1879; when you told me that you would come and administer the Communion to me, "after the holidays," or "early in the New Year?" Again you did not answer. And again, I went on to talk to you. I told you, that you had not only not kept your promise, for nearly a year and a half, before you ever came to Hammonton at all; but that you had not even sent any word of apology for not coming; and that when you did come, at last, in the early Spring of 1881, at your regular visitation, you did not come near me then, nor send any apology for your not coming. Also, that when you had met my wife at the Church; whom, as you told her, at the time, you had not expected to see, as the services were at night, and we lived so far away in the country; and when she had asked you, if you were not coming out to see me; you then told her—and even that not as a message to me, but only as a resolve and pledge of your own,—that you "would make a special trip to Hammonton, to see me; and proposing "that I should write to you, to let you know when it would be convenient for me to receive you." And then—though I wrote to you the very next morning—urging you to come "at any time," but "the sooner the better;" you never kept that promise, nor sent any word or apology, as to why you did not keep it. And, you never came to Hammonton at all, until you had to come, to consecrate the Church. And then, you sent me no "due notice," as you had promised to do, in your letter to me, nearly two years before, that you would; nor any notice at all, until after the services were over, and just before you made your appearance at my house.—And even then, you did not come to have the "long talk," which you then *knew* to be *necessary*,—nor to administer the Communion to me—which of course I did not then expect, and could not have received, "at your hands;" nor to consider the case, upon its merits, but, as you said "just for a few minutes" call; and to see if you could not, by some bogus generalities, such as you wrote in your wicked letter to me, of Dec. 31st, 1879, make light of everything, and get me to overlook everything; without any regard to the requirements of the case; or to such a regard for my rights and duties, and for your obligations, as any man had a right to expect, from any other man whom the world would call a "gentleman;" but much more from any man who professed to be a Christian; but most of all, from a man who was, really, a Bishop in the Church of God—and who professed to have any sense at all, of his duty to his God, or to the Church, or to his brethren.

To that, Bishop, your answer was, to start up, in anger, from the sofa upon which you had been sitting, and to say: "I did not come here to listen to such things;" and you went, and took up your hat, to leave. But, I got up with you, and took your hand again, in love and in kindness, and I went to talking to you, and you stood and heard me; with shame, and without appearance of anger, but also, without any sign of penitence "after a godly sort" I then told you, that as you would not "hear me;" so that we might have the whole case fairly considered, and settled; I would write to you, and that I would, in that way, tell you

all that I thought that you ought to hear; for, that, in this case I have a duty to perform, as a Presbyterian of the Church, as well as a brother Christian, and that I should feel bound to do my duty, as our Lord required of us all to do. I then quoted to you His words: "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he will hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But, if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And, if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; and, if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a Publican."

That, as I told you, was the Divinely appointed way, for doing such things; and that it was the rule for all now to go by, whether they were Bishops or Presbyters, or Deacons, or Laymen. And as that was the Divinely appointed rule, it was not only obligatory upon us; but it was infinitely superior to any of the miserable substitutes, that man, in his vain pride and folly, thinks to be better than the Divine plan. I told you too, that I meant to act upon that rule, from first to last, if necessary; and that if, after having written to you all that I thought that I ought to say to you, you did not then do all that you ought to do, in the premises; I would then have all that had passed between us printed—and that I would, by or before the next Convention, send a copy of the printed pamphlet to every clergyman, and to every Lay Delegate, to the next Convention.

And, I may as well add here, that if the Diocese of New Jersey fails to attend to the case; that I will then send a copy of it to every Bishop, and to every clergyman, whose name is on the clergy list, and to every Lay Delegate to the General Convention, and to every prominent Layman in the United States, that I can, in any way hear of. And then, if they all should fail to do their duty; I will not only let you, and the clergy, and Laity of the Diocese of New Jersey, but also all of the Bishops, and clergy, and Laity, of the Church in the United States—be unto me "as heathen men and Publicans."

But, after telling you all of these things—and while still holding your hands, for by this time I had taken both of yours, in mine—I told you kindly, but solemnly, that "I did not wish to humiliate you, but that I did wish you to humble yourself; for, that if you did not do that freely, after all that had passed, God would Himself humble you." You then moved to the door again; and I went with you, still holding one of your hands; and while I shook hands with you, as you passed out, you showed, by your looks and manner, that you saw and felt, that when I said "Good bye, Bishop," it was said by me, in sorrow and in sadness, and not in anger.

So much for our Interview of August 24th, 1881.

REVIEW OF THE CASE—AT LARGE.

But, many things occurred before our interview, which have not yet been clearly exhibited; though many of them have been incidentally, and partially commented upon. And may God now give me grace, so to write of all things that I ought yet to notice; that there shall not be one word that I shall regret to have written, when I myself shall have to stand before my Judge, at the great day of Judgement.

But, it will be absolutely impossible for me to do my duty, without seeming to be both stern and severe. But, Bishop, I must write the truth; and I must write the truth so plainly, that even you will not be able again to make light of the words, or of the facts, that I shall write; as you did in your letter to me. Your past conduct proves to me, that this is *absolutely necessary*, in your case. With a man of less Pride and Arrogance, and with tender feelings, and sensitive conscience, I could write differently, from what I feel that I must do now when I write to you. Therefore, I will not dare to use one word even—if I can help it, that

will even seem to make "the Truth" less stern and less severe, than it is. To use palliating words, is the world's way of doing such things; and the world calls that "gentleness," or, "gentlemanliness;" but that is the Devil's, and the world's way of trying to make what is vile and wicked, to seem less vile and less wicked; and to enable those who are guilty of vileness and wickedness, to show their faces before decent people, and not to be ashamed. It is—I really think—the most deceitful, and dangerous, of all of the world's ways, of making people not to think sin to be so very sinful; or what is shameful, to be so very shameful. Therefore, in this case, I will have nothing to do with the world's, or the Devil's, way. But, I will take only God's way. Therefore, I will write what I have to write, in the language, as well as in the Spirit, which God has taught us to use, and which the Holy Ghost teaches. And, I will show you, as plainly as my words can state my ideas, and feelings, just what your acts have been, and just what they are; as seen and judged by the light of God's holy and moral laws, and as they must appear, in the estimation of all enlightened Christians, and even of all high-minded and honorable men; but most of all, in the sight of that Infinitely Pure and Holy God, whose anointed High Priest you are; and as whose servants, both you and myself will have to be judged. And, it will be a most blessed thing for you, Bishop, notwithstanding all of the humiliation and shame, that you will have to suffer; if what I shall now write to you, shall have that result upon your character, as a man and a Bishop, that it is my desire that it should have, and that it ought to have.

You will remember, Bishop, that after I had received from Mr. Gordon, (Dec. 13th, 1879) your "notice," through him, that you would not keep your appointment for Dec. 17th, the date upon which you had "notified" me, that you would come to "administer the Communion to me;" that notification having been made without your ever having had any previous communication with me, upon the subject,—or with anybody else on my account—and that abandonment of your appointment, being only because I had sent you word, that I "desired" first to have your own previously threatened "long talk" with you, and "that that talk would have to be satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Communion from you;" that I then wrote to you a long letter, dated Dec. 13th, 1879, but did not send it, until I could first see Mr. Gordon, to see whether I had rightly understood all of the circumstances; but that, before I saw Mr. Gordon, I read that letter to my wife, and that she then told me, that Mr. Gordon had told her, that you had told him, that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese," that you thought that it would be well for you to "offer" to administer the Communion to me, if I desired it."

Upon hearing that, I then wrote you another long letter, dated Dec. 18th, 1879, telling you what I had heard, and that on that account, and *on that account alone*, I felt that I ought to overlook all of your own bad methods, and thank you for your "offer," and "request" you, when you came to Hammonton, "to administer the Communion to me." And then I sent both of those letters to you, that you might see just how I regarded the whole case, first and last. In that long double letter, I also wrote to you upon a great many different things, which all had a material connection with, and bearing upon, the whole case. And all of these things, were not merely "alluded" to, but were very plainly stated, and even very strongly, and very pointedly stated—as they greatly needed to be. Among these many things, so stated, were these: (1.) "My deep regret," that you had not only mistaken the feelings of my heart, in regard to what you were pleased to call your "offer," but also that you had mis-interpreted the plain meaning of my words; (2.) The terrible shock to my sensibilities, and through them to my whole nervous system, producing, as it did, a painful, and highly dangerous—though short—paralysis of the heart; (3.) My explanation of my conduct, in not accepting your "offer," at once, and unconditionally, showing you, that I had "not only warrant, but command"

not to be precipitate;" but under the circumstances of your very improper "form" and "manner of sending," of your message, in connection with my own past unhappy experiences with my Bishops and fellow clergy, and that I was only waiting first to "prove all things," and then to "hold fast to that which was good;" (4.) Informing you, of what Mr. Gordon had said was your reason for sending me your "offer," and telling you plainly, and explicitly, that it was "only" because of that statement, that I could overlook the great, and manifest impropriety, both in the "form" and in the "manner of sending" of your "message;" (5. My own most strongly felt, and most plainly expressed, condemnation of your "opinion," viz., that you ought not to "offer" to administer the Communion, even to the old and invalid Presbyters of your Diocese, except through the Minister of the Parish, in which such Presbyter might happen to reside; (6.) My appeal to you, to give up, for the future, your "wretchedly vicious" and "mischievous" opinion, from which I myself had suffered so much; at least, in the case of the old and invalid Presbyters; that none of them might ever run the risk, of being made to suffer, as I had. There were also very many other things, hardly any, if at all, less important, or less clearly stated than these; which it would have been well, if not necessary, for you to have noticed, and even to have "explained," or apologized for; and more especially so, if you yourself had volunteered to make any "explanation" of what you had done, and of what you had left undone. And, in your letter you did "volunteer" this; I did not ask it of you.

But, when, in reply to that very long double letter, covering so many, and such distinct, and such important points, I received your letter of Dec. 31st, 1879, the shock that I then received was not one whit less painful, or severe, than was that at my receipt of your first message to me; on the contrary, it was much worse, and much more painful, and much more lasting in its painfulness; for the pain of it continues with me to this very day, every time that I think of you, or of your conduct. And it has done so, ever since I received that letter; so that it keeps me suffering sorrow and grief for you, and for the Church that has you for a Bishop; and that not only day and night, but every day and every night; and I fear that it will continue so to be, until I shall either be convinced, that you have "truly repented for your sins past," in regard to this case, or until it shall please God to call me away from this wicked world.

But, this last shock was not, like the first one, a shock to my sensibilities, as a man, and through them, to my nervous system; but it was a shock to my moral sense; and though bitter and painful to my spirit, it is not dangerous or painful to my body. But, it is lasting, and it is painful to the soul. And, it has been so constantly, and so unexpectedly, and so grievously, added to by you, from time to time; that I often feel as if I ought not to worry, or pain myself, any longer, by praying for you, or by hoping for you, but to give you up at once, as an utterly hopeless case. For, it really seems to me, that, if there is any such thing as "sin against the Holy Ghost"—and we are assured that there is—then you must have been guilty of that sin. For, you have been endowed with all of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which, so far as we know, are ever given to man upon earth in these days; at Baptism, in Confirmation, in the Holy Communion, and in your ordinations as Deacon and Presbyter, and in your Consecration to the Episcopate. And, if you have "sinned willfully," as you have, against all of the graces and gifts of the Spirit—that have been bestowed upon you so often, and in such manifold forms—what can that be but "sin against the Holy Ghost?" And, if so, then as St. Paul says (Heb. x, 26, 29) "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins," but only that "certain, fearful, looking for of Judgement," and of "fiery indignation, that shall devour the adversaries."

And, when I think of this, and that I must now do my duty, by openly accusing my Bishop, "to the Church," the pain is often fearful to my spirit.

But, it must be done.

Yes, Bishop, that letter of yours of Dec. 31st, 1879, is what has caused it all. It is the most wicked letter that I ever saw, or ever even conceived of, in all my life; taking into account all of the things that have to be considered in making up the estimate. For, that letter (1.) was written by a Bishop in the Church of Christ; (2.) It was written by him, in his "official" capacity, as a Bishop, and while he was professing to be writing in the faith and love of God; (3.) The subject matter, also, about which he was writing, was the administration by him, to me, of the Holy Communion; and yet, like Judas, at the very moment, as we may say, of dipping your hand into the dish with your Lord, and with your brethren, you had fully resolved to betray them both, and even to do it "with a kiss." Oh, Bishop, if this was not the sin against the Holy Ghost, what can be? "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses;" of how much surer punishment, suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the *Spirit of Grace.*" (Heb. x, 28, 29.)

Yes Bishop, to this day, I cannot look upon that letter of yours without my very soul loathing it. When I first read it, all of my instincts turned to indignation and anger, at such baseness and wickedness. But now, after nearly two years of suffering on account of it, I can feel only sorrow and grief.

I will show you now, how all this is.

When I first read that letter, I felt,—almost at the first moment, and before I had read five sentences—that it was ten-fold worse, than any ordinary false and fraudulent counterfeit. Before I was done reading it, I saw that it was millions of millions of times worse, than any ordinary rascality. For, as the God, in whose name you professed to be acting, is higher and holier than man; and as the office you held from Him, demanded of you a "sacro-sanct," or sacred and holy fidelity and truthfulness, in all that you said, or did, in your "official" capacity; so the treachery to God, and the profanation of your office and ministry, to deceit and hypocrisy, for your own personal pride and pleasure, was the deepest, and the most damning sin, of which I can possibly conceive; and yet, in that letter of yours—you were guilty of all the things that I have charged against you.

I sometimes, think that you do not yourself know, how very subtle and wicked you were, when you wrote that. I cannot help thinking that "Satan had entered your heart," as he had done before, into that of Judas; and that having once consented to harbor him he led you "captive at his will;" without your seeing, at the moment, how wicked your act was. But, the Devil does do that, and Judas did as you did,—and you did as Judas did.

But, having seen your look of triumph, when you told me, "Mr. Gordon said, &c."—when I saw you last—and while you were saying the very words, that *proved* all of your guilt, from first to last; so I can imagine how you looked and felt, while you wrote that letter. You, doubtless, thought, while you wrote that letter, just as you did when you made me that wretched answer, that "killed" your character.

And, the letter was so very skillfully worked up, that,—by itself—it was enough to "deceive—if it were possible—the very elect." But it did not deceive me. On the contrary, it opened my eyes so very widely, that I could not only see through all of your guilty deceit and hypocrisy, in that letter; but that letter itself proved to me, how all along, from the very beginning, you had been digging pits, and setting traps, for me; in a way that would have been utterly disgraceful, in the very lowest man upon earth; but which was most shocking, and abominable, in a Bishop, in the Church of God. Your letter was, indeed, well calculated to deceive; not only the unwary, but the wary also; and even those

who know how to detect frauds and forgeries,—as only experts can do. But, it could not obliterate “facts.”

And, to anyone who knew all of the “facts,” that had occurred before, as I knew them; the very first glance over that letter, showed plainly, that it was a “base counterfeit,” from beginning to end. And, the very skillfulness that was shown, in some of its parts, made me to feel, only the more deeply, what a dreadful thing it was; that a man to whom God had given such good abilities to serve him; should be so false to his God, and so wicked towards his brother man, as to write such a letter as that; and that too, after God had received him—on his own application—into the highest ministry, of the Church on earth.

For, at the very first glance over that letter, I saw plainly, that those parts, which at first sight, seemed to be good, were very far “too good” to have any sort of “fellowship” with those parts, which, at the very first sight seemed to be bad. Again, I saw, that those parts, which, at the very first sight, seemed to be bad; were, upon further examination, proved to be so very bad, that there could be no possible “communion,” with those parts which, at first sight seemed to be good. And, still further examination showed; that instead of some parts being good, and some parts bad, as at first sight they seemed to be; that all parts, and every part, of that whole letter, from beginning to end, were deliberately, and wickedly, and detestably bad. For, all of that letter; having been written by the same hand, and having “proceeded out of” the same head, and the same heart; it proved, that the writer of it had written it, the whole of it, from the beginning of it, to the end of it, with the one deliberate intention of deceiving me; and of escaping from all responsibility for his own wrongs, and for maintaining his own Pride and Authority; and in utter defiance and contempt, for God’s holy laws of Right and Justice, and “of Sincerity and of Truth.” And, as if that were not enough, that he even tried to shift the blame of all of his own wrongs, from his own shoulders, and to lay it upon the shoulders of those whom he had already wronged; so grievously, and so wickedly. And therefore, he tried to put the blame of all his own wrong methods upon Mr. Gordon; whom he had seduced or frightened into acting with him; and to put the blame of all of his own wickedness upon me; by impudently, and meanly and falsely asserting—after all of his bitter wrongs to me—that I had no right to feel “aggrieved” by what he had done; but that he had a right to feel “aggrieved” by what I had done.

Yes, Bishop, that was the general plan and purport of that letter to me. And, when you wrote it, you were pretending to be writing in the spirit of love, and of truth; which were required by your high and holy office; and which was due to me, as well as to God; and which was, (if that *could* be made more solemnly obligatory, which was already bound upon your soul and conscience, by the most sacred obligations; and which was made, at that very time, in the very highest degree obligatory upon you, by reason of the fact that you were then writing to me upon the very highest and holiest subject, that even a Bishop can deal with in this world; (the celebration of the Holy Communion by yourself, and its administration by you to me; as a pure and holy act of Divine and Christian fellowship,) and yet you used your high and holy office, and the Blessed Sacrament also, with most profane wickedness; by writing to me a letter, in which the words were, “softer than butter,” and “smoother than oil;” while your whole heart was full of “war,” and “hatred,” and deceit. You professed to be writing in good faith, while every word you wrote was in bad faith; and, your sole purpose, was to deceive me, and to maintain your own Pride.

And, in this case, you had not even any *excuse* for what you did. A few words of regret, that you had caused me the painful and dangerous shock to my feelings, and to my life; a few words, in confirmation of Mr. Gordon’s statement, that it was “because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese” that you had sent your “offer;” a frank apology for having mistaken not only

my feelings, but even my words, when you thought that I did not care to receive the Communion from you; a simple acknowledgment that your "opinion" of how you ought to send your "offers" to administer the Communion, at least "to the old and invalid clergy of your Diocese," was not a good one, and that you could now see that it ought not to govern you in the future; such a letter would have ended all of the trouble, then and forever.

But, you were too Proud, and too self-willed, and too confident in your own strength and greatness, to think of doing anything like that. And so you wrote that most wicked letter, that you did write; and, by that letter, you crushed to death the last spark of trust, and even of hope, that I ever had of anything like greatness, or goodness, being in you. And, what is worse for you, in this case is—that you cannot comfort yourself here—as you might have done in regard to your first transgressions—with the delusion that you were trying to get me to do, what you thought it was my duty to do; and so to lighten the force of St. Paul's words—(Rom. III, 7.-8.) where he so powerfully condemns all falsehood; even where it is perpetrated with a sincere desire, to advance the truth of God, by means of the falsehood. "For," as he says, "if the Truth of God, hath more abounded by my lie, why am I also judged as a *sinner*; and not rather, as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil that good may come; *whose damnation is just.*" No, Bishop, you cannot have even that bad excuse, which however, is the very best that any man could ever hope to plead, as an excuse for lying; for you lied when you wrote that letter, not "that the truth of God should more abound;" but that you might not even *seem* to yield, anything, of your proud claims.

But, I do not wish to discourage you, by showing you the heinousness of your sin. I am only trying to induce you to see the greatness of your sins, in their true light, that you may repent the more quickly, and the more deeply. For, in your case, the necessity for it is particularly urgent. For, as in the case of any man, who has been "overtaken in a fault," the lower his station, and the less his knowledge, the less do God and man feel it necessary to "impute" his sin unto him; so, the higher the station, and the greater the knowledge of the "sinner," so much the more do both God and man feel that the guilt of his sin is increased. Still, if any one high or low in station, or in knowledge, when his fault has been clearly brought home to him, will "confess" his fault, and "repent him truly," that he has been guilty of it, and if he will then freely make such amends for it as he can; then all men feel, as God feels, that such a man should either be forgiven, or, if Justice to others should forbid that, that he should, at least, be "beaten with fewer" "stripes," than if he had remained impenitent.

But, when any man, and especially a Bishop in the Church of God, "is overtaken in a fault," and when not only his fault, but also the proof of it, has been plainly brought to his notice; if he, even then, will not only not even confess his fault, but will, with brazen effrontery, add falsehood to wrong, like Gehazi, or like Ananias and Sapphira, in the hopes that he can lie himself out of his difficulty; and in the belief that, on account of his lofty place, and power, his word will be taken against the word of his inferior in rank, or in station; and if he then tries, as you have done, by new trickery, and deceit, and falsehood, not only to cover up his own past wrongs, but also to place the sin of his own wrong-doing upon the very man whom he has already wronged and injured, in order, if possible, to break the credit of his testimony; what else can be said of such a man, and especially of such a Bishop, than that he has proved himself to be both base and wicked, and that too, in the very highest degree; and that he would deserve, and, if he did not repent, but continued impenitent, that he ought to receive "exemplary punishment." Yet, Bishop, all of that is just what you have done to me; to say nothing of the baseness and wickedness of your attempt, in the very sly and deceitful manner that you did it, to lay the blame of all your own bad *methods* upon Mr. Gordon.

and yet, without daring to say that Mr. Gordon had not done what you had told him to do, and without even admitting to me, that what Mr. Gordon had said and done, was not what you had wished him to do. In that way you wronged him, as well as me. But, you wronged God and the Truth more.

But, I will now give you

A REVIEW OF BISHOP SCARBOROUGH'S WICKED LETTER.

and I will show you, that all this that I have charged against you, is the very truth. You began your letter of Dec. 31st, 1879, thus: "My dear Mr. Passmore." When I first read that address, I hoped for the best. But, I had read but one sentence before I saw plainly, that that address was "too good to be true." You had addressed me thus, not because you felt what you wrote, but from the hypocrisy of conventional politeness—which is, in many cases, mere hypocrisy—or, you wrote it with the deliberate intention to deceive me. If there was nothing in the letter, or in your own conduct to show which it was, I would, of course, give you the credit, as I would any other man, of having written it either truly, or else for mere form's sake, according to the easy way in which the Devil teaches people to become hypocrites. But, in this case, I am compelled to believe that you wrote those words, with the deliberate intention to deceive me. Your whole letter, and the whole of your conduct to me before you wrote that letter, and the whole of your conduct to me, since you wrote that letter, has proved to me, that in my case, at least, your inclination, as well as your action, is of so very perverse a nature, and so habituated to deceit, that you cannot say a word, or do a thing, that is not deceitful, and mean, and wicked. But, in any case, that address of yours was "too good to be true."

You had written that, however, consciously, or unconsciously, in order to delude me into the belief, that you were really inclined to be friendly, and that you were writing to me in good faith; whereas, you were writing to me in bad faith, with the simple desire to deceive me, and to wrong me, still further. But, as I said, the very first words of your letter undeceived me. I saw the trick, by which you thought to deceive even me; and I understood it all. And so, I read that whole letter, as the "facts" of the case required that it should be read, and not as you had hoped that it might be read. I will "*explain*" all this to you, and I will show you, in doing so, what an "*explanation*" really is.

You began your letter thus: "The matter to which your letter alludes, will not require many words of explanation. After Mr. Gordon and I had left your house that Sunday, and I had partly promised to come and see you before very long, it occurred to me, that it might be a proper thing for me, if you chose, to administer the Holy Communion. Mr. Gordon promised to get your views and tell me. That is all I know about it"

That is what you are pleased to call your "*explanation*." As an "*explanation*" it is something like your calling the exceedingly cruel and wicked "*notice*" that you were coming to "*force*" me to receive the Holy Communion, on a certain day, whether I was ready to receive it or not, an "*offer*." Your language, at least in these instances, is peculiar, not to say inaccurate. But, if what you here call your "*explanation*," is what you really think an "*explanation*" to be; then, Bishop, an "*explanation*"—according to your vocabulary—is a very marvellous piece of absurdity, as well as of jugglery, and of deception. It is, for all the world, to compare great things with little things, and high and holy things with earthly and common things—like playing the "Little Joker," as any "thimble-rigger," or mountebank, or gambler, or swindler does, when he puts the thimble, or the cup, over the ball, and says, "Now you see it," and then again, "Now you don't see it;" while, by his subtle adroitness, and sleight of hand, he does, really, first let us "see it," and then, when he lifts up the thimble, or the

cup, and we expect to see the ball, where we saw it just the moment before, we "do not see it."

If we were playing tricks, for the amusement of children, and not only avowedly, but really for that purpose only; and not with any further purpose, such as deceiving those we were amusing; and much less for the purpose of any gain, or for any other selfish or wicked end,—as sharpers do; then, Bishop, I could have admired your dexterity heartily, and I could have applauded you, to the echo.

Or if, as literary men, we had been trying to show each other how, by subtle tricks of language, we could, by the delusions of logical processes, or of dialectics, confuse, or even deceive a person; not however with the purpose to deceive any one, much less to take advantage of the trick, either to another person's loss, or to our own benefit, or, so that the person who does really know something to be a "fact" which cannot be disproved, first begins to doubt whether he has not made some mistake; and then, because he cannot discover where the fallacy lies, begins to doubt, whether the "fact," which he had before thought that he knew was really a "fact," or whether he had only deluded himself by thinking that it was a "fact;" in such a case also, I could have applauded your subtlety, and your adroitness. But, I would have felt, at the same time, that that was a highly dangerous kind of amusement; and one that never ought to be indulged in, simply as an amusement, but should only be permitted to be practiced in the presence of those who would not be likely ever to be injured by it themselves, or to injure others by it. But, as even that is taking a risk, I would have felt bound to have warned you against practicing your skill, without being particularly careful where, and when, you practiced it.

But, where the subjects under consideration, were about high and holy things; and where there was no pretense even, that you were trying to show your skill in jugglery; but where the very sacredness of the subjects at issue, and your own sacred and "official" relations to God and to me were concerned, and where anything like trickery and deceit would be—in the very highest degree—both wicked and abominable, and when you were professing to be acting religiously; then anything like an attempt to play the "Little Joker;" and much more the attempt to deceive by it; and still more, the attempt not only to deceive, but to deceive to another's loss, and to your own gain; would be in the very highest degree, both wicked and abominable. And yet, Bishop, that is just what you have done, in those few first sentences of your letter, that I have just quoted.

The very first words—"The matter,"—and the very next words—"to which your letter alludes"—are just as much a "juggle" and a "deceit," as the "Little Joker" is. And the very first sentence of your letter, contains no less than four distinct and different deceits and juggles, or falsehoods; and all so very cunningly and skillfully worded and brought together, in the very fewest possible words, and in the shortest possible space, that I really admire your ability; (but for that God deserves all the praise, because He gave it to you; while for the use that you have made of the ability that God has given you, you deserve all of the blame; because you have abused the abilities that God has given to you; and which you yourself had, of your own free will and accord, dedicated, and had consecrated to God, and to His service; while, in reality, you have abused them, to serve the Devil with them.)

But, the four deceits, and juggles, and falsehoods, which the very first sentence of your letter contains, are these: (1.) the use of the words "The matter," so as to try to make them cover, and include, all of the contents of my two long letters; full, as they were, of many and important propositions. (2.) Your writing of my having simply "alluded" to, what you called "the matter." (3.) Your declaration that "the matter," to which I had only "alluded," "would *not* require many words of explanation." These are *three* of them, on the very surface. Now, every one of those three things is a juggle, and a deceit, and a fraud. And

the *third* one, is not only a juggle, and a deceit, and a fraud, but it is a downright, and deliberate falsehood, as well; for you knew, perfectly well, when you wrote those words, that it *would* "require" "many words;" if you meant to "explain" all the many and various things which my letters contained; and which called for an "explanation;" and all of which you had comprehended under those words "the matter." And then (4.) your *pretense* that you intended to make any "explanation" at all, was another, and a *fourth* deceit, and fraud; and it also was a cunningly devised, as well as cunningly expressed falsehood, also. For you had not even a thought—much less any intention—of making any "explanation" at all; either when you began to write your letter, or when you had written so far as to give me to understand, that you were going to make one—as your very manner of writing, the very first words of your letter; "The matter;" and to which I "alluded,"—and "will *not* require many words,"—all go to prove.

And, besides, as I now see, you *could* not have made any "explanation," that would not have both accused and condemned, both yourself and Mr. Gordon also; and that was just what you did not *wish* to do, nor *intend* to do. On the contrary, that was just what you wished "not to do;" or, to have me do for you. And therefore, instead of wishing, or trying, to make any "explanation," you tried "*How not to do it.*" And, in that effort, you succeeded *perfectly*. In fact, you did it, *far too well*; for it was not merely the absence of *any* explanation, that first impressed me with the wickedness of your letter; but the very subtle and deceitful manner in which you went to work; after volunteering an "explanation, (1.) to muddle everything so that it *could* not be explained; and (2.) not even pretending to "explain" anything; and (3.) saying "that is all that I know about it."

But, when I understood your tactics, as all of these "facts" that I have noticed had revealed them to me; it was easy to see the motives that prompted you, to do as you had done. Those motives were: (1.) To conceal your own past sins and errors. (2.) To deceive me, so that I would still think as well as possible of you. (3.) That I should lay the blame of all that had been done amiss upon Mr. Gordon. And (4.) that I should consider myself as having been in no sense "aggrieved" by you; but rather that you had been "aggrieved" by me. Therefore, not being able to do these things by fair and honest methods—for the "facts" were all against you—you thought to gain your ends by unfair and dishonest methods; such as you had used towards me from the very first. And therefore it was, that you undertook to juggle, and to deceive me. Therefore, it was again, that you tried to include, under those very misty and murky words "the matter;" a very large number of very distinct and very important subjects for "explanation;" all of which sadly *needed* an "explanation," as you yourself could not help seeing, or you would never have written of them as you did, as "requiring" an "explanation;" nor would you have yourself "volunteered" to make any "explanation" of them, if you had not felt that something like an "explanation"—or that could be made to pass for an explanation, like a dummy for a man—was really necessary. Therefore, you concluded to try your luck; like the forger who presents his forged check at a bank, and who trusts as much to his brass in the first place, and to his heels in the second place, as he does to his forged paper.

But, it was a sad mistake Bishop, as well as a most wicked and detestable sin. If you had remembered, "Be sure your sin will find you out," you would never have done it.

But, not remembering that, you wrote what you did; not because you thought that all that those letters of mine contained—nor any one part of them even—could be ever recognized, much less "explained," by the course that you took; but only because you saw plainly, that *nothing* could be recognized, nor *anything* be "explained," in the way that you chose to go to work. And that is just

what you wanted. That was just what you aimed at. You did not wish to have any one even, of the many things that needed to be "explained," even *noticed*, much less "explained;" and so you played the "Little Joker." And so, after calling all a whole universe of organized and living issues, by the chaotic name of "the matter," you went on to speak of my having "alluded" to this "matter;" as if I *had* merely "alluded" to some one thing, or other; you did not indicate anything. That was a juggle and a deceit also; for that was trying to make me think, not only that you yourself had not seen anything in those letters that you thought it worth while to write about, in plain terms; but as if I had not done so either; and that therefore, as I had *not* written plainly about anything, that you were doing a very generous thing, in offering to write a few words of "explanation," in regard to something to which I had "alluded," perhaps accidentally. That was *all* trickery, and deceit, and fraud, and falsehood.

And then you went on to say, that this "matter," whatever it was, "would not need many words of explanation." That was a trick, also; intended to make me feel that I need not, and ought not, to expect *much* of an "explanation." But, it was a falsehood also. For you knew, when you wrote that, that if you included all that my letters contained, and that needed an "explanation," under that one word "the matter," that a very great "many words" would be required; as "many" indeed, as the "long talk" that you had promised me would have contained; or, as many as a real "explanation," such as I am now making would contain.

And then, you proceeded to give what you called your "explanation," of the whole "matter." And two sentences—or rather, *one sentence and a half*—contained it all. And here it is: "It occurred to me, that it might be a proper thing for me to administer the Holy Communion. Mr. Gordon promised to get your views and tell me." *That was all!* And then, to make sure that I should not think that you had made a mistake, by having begun to write an "explanation," and then having forgotten that you had not written anything but one sentence and a half of exordium, you had the kindness to add: "That is all that I know about it.

That was playing the "Little Joker" to perfection. It was, in effect, saying, "Now, you see those two long letters of yours, full of all sorts and kinds of important subjects for "explanation," and which I am now going to "explain" to you. "Yes, I see them, now for your explanation." "Presto! Now you don't see them." "There was nothing in those two long letters to explain, except this sentence and a half; and they explain not only themselves, but everything else also. That was perfect jugglery, so far as the "words" went; that I cannot deny. But, it was not *perfect* jugglery, so far as the "facts" were concerned; and that, Bishop, you yourself will hardly be willing to assert, by the time that you get done with that "explanation." Nor was it such, that you will ever again be likely to congratulate yourself upon it; for as an "explanation" it was not a success. Indeed, it ranks far above what, by universal consent, has heretofore been conceded to be "the very height of absurdity," i. e., to render the play of "Hamlet" with the part of Hamlet left out. But, Bishop, in your "explanation" you have given the world a new idea. That is, that to render "Hamlet" *perfectly*, you should not only leave out the part of Hamlet, but *all of the other parts also*; and that by repeating only two sentences, or rather, *only one sentence and a half*, and those the least important ones that you could pick out of the whole play, you could not only render the whole play *perfectly*, but you could, after only repeating that sentence and a half of the text, turn around to the audience, and gravely say to them, "There, you have not only a perfect rendering of the whole play, but also a full "explanation" of it besides.

It seems incredible, that it could be so! It looks like sorcery! It *compels* us to think of the "Little Joker." It is marvelous! Indeed it is!

But, it is marvelous, not because it is so perfectly full and satisfactory, as an "explanation" of everything in those two long letters, that "required" to be explained. It is marvelous for its sublime stupidity! Also, it is marvelous for its sublime impudence! And, it is marvelous, above all other things, for the sublimity of its wickedness!

Really, I cannot even conceive, how even Satan himself could possibly suggest anything that could show a greater contempt, for the God whom you profess to serve, and for the Religion which you profess to hold, and which you do really teach; or for the intelligence, or even for the common sense, of any person who can distinguish a self evident "fact," from a mere logical trick. And then, when you wrote "That is all that I know about it," you wrote your own *death warrant*. For, those words "embrace," and will "ever hold fast" all that you have ever said, or written, or done in this whole case; and they condemn you, and they prove you to have been acting like a shameless liar and hypocrite, as well as a proud and conceited, and impious and sacriligious plotter, and doer also, of everything that I have charged against you.

Yes, Bishop, those words, "That is all that I know about it," were your "*death warrant*," written by yourself. They constitute, not only a most stupendous falsehood, in themselves; but like those living creatures that contain an innumerable offspring of their own kind within themselves, that falsehood is the teeming mother of numberless other falsehoods, that live, and move, and have their being within it. That will appear, further on. For, by that answer, you tried to ignore everything that you ever had thought, or said, or written, or done in this case; and all that you knew, at the time that you wrote that sentence, that you ought not to have said, or written, or done. Also, by that answer, taken in connection with the sentence immediately preceding it, viz., "Mr. Gordon promised to get your views and tell me," you tried to make me believe that Mr. Gordon was the only one who was in fault, for whatever had been done amiss to me; and that what ever he may have done that was amiss, *you did not know anything about it*. That, Bishop, was another brazen and impudent falsehood,—as much so as any that was ever uttered by any creature, man or devil,—and you knew that, when you wrote that sentence. For, to refer to but one thing, out of very many, that I could here name, I had written to you, in my letter of Dec. 18th, 1879, telling you plainly, that Mr. Gordon had said, that you had told him, that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese, that you had thought it "proper" to "offer" to administer the Communion to me, on Dec. 17th, 1879." But, that was a falsehood, *in itself*; as your own answer to me, Aug. 24th, 1881, fully proved. For, by that answer, you declared that it was *not* "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese," that you had made your "offer," but that you did it because you "thought that it was a proper thing for you" to do, to "*force*" me to receive the Communion from you, as an act of Discipline; "because I did not go to the Church at Hammonton, or receive the Communion, from the Priests in charge here. And, that you did without either knowing, or caring, whether I could, or would, receive it "worthily," or not, and without even trying to find out, or even consenting to "hear" me, when I told you that I desired first to have your own threatened "long talk" with you, and that that must prove satisfactory to both parties, before I could receive the Sacrament from you. Yet, when, afterwards, I wrote to you, and told you, that Mr. Gordon had said what he did, you did not then, in your answer to me, deny that you had told him what he said that you had; as you ought to have done, if you had not told him so; nor did you tell me that what he had said was false in itself; as you knew then that it was, and as you ought to have told me that it was; especially, as I had told you, that it was what Mr. Gordon had said that you had said was your *reason* for "offering" to administer the Communion to me, that was the very thing, and the only thing, that had induced me to change

my opinion of your "offer." No; you did not even "allude" to any one of these things; though you knew all about them, and though you had your attention called to them most particularly, by me. But, you not only left them uncontradicted, and unexplained, but you even had the assurance to say, that you *did not know anything about them*. That was falsehood within falsehood; and it was stark naked falsehood, at that. And yet, you were as bold, and brazen, when you wrote it, as Satan himself could have been.

And, your treatment of Mr. Gordon, as well as of myself, was infamous. In the first place, you had seduced him, or frightened him, into being your "accomplice" in your "Conspiracy;" and here, after leading him into sin and trouble, you not only tried to make it appear that you were not only not responsible for anything that he had done, but as if it was a thing you knew nothing about; and then, not satisfied with that, you tried to make him the "scape-goat," to bear your sins also, as well as his own. I am truly sorry for Mr. Gordon, as I always have been, more or less; for I cannot help feeling that, but for you, he, as well as all of the other clergy that have ever been at Waterford and Hammonton, since you have been Bishop, might have done differently. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." And so, my Bishops have all along made mischief, not only for me to suffer, but for themselves, and for the clergy at Waterford and Hammonton, also; whom they themselves had first "corrupted," by their "evil communications."

But now, Mr. Gordon will have to suffer again; whereas, but for you, he might have escaped, not only the sins into which he was led, by your evil influence, but also this exposure of them, which my exposure of you now renders necessary. And so, but for your lies, and impenitence, all of the others who have done wrong in the past, but who may have repented before this, might have escaped this exposure. But, they will now, all of them, whether penitent or impenitent, have to thank you for their exposure, and not me. I have borne the wrongs "patiently," for sixteen or eighteen years, and would have borne them "patiently," even to my grave, but that you have sinned so very wickedly; and you have shown such shameless impenitence, that you have compelled me to "tell it unto the Church."

But, all of these evil things, are the results of your "explanation." That "explanation" was an unfortunate thing for all concerned. But, when a Bishop professes to make an "explanation," and then makes an "evasion," and a "dissimulation," and a "prevarication," and a "falsification," and an "abomination," out of all that he says, and writes, and does; then he must not be surprised, if he finds that the Lord's people, as well as the Lord Himself, regard his lying words, or his lies of any kind—whether written, or spoken, or acted,—as an "abomination." But, I see now, that it was not *possible* for you to make any "explanation," without both accusing and condemning both yourself and Mr. Gordon. I am sorry, Bishop, that you did not see that also. But, your Pride blinded you, both while you wronged me, at the first, and when you would not humble yourself, at the last. A frank confession of your "errors" only, would have saved you, at the first. But, after having written that fatal letter of Dec. 31st, nothing but a frank confession of your *sins*, as well as of your errors, could save you from all of this shame and humiliation, which you must now endure.

God grant that the "chastening," though it be "grievous," may result in yielding "the peaceful fruits of Righteousness," to all concerned.

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter,

MY FOURTH LONG LETTER TO BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

REVIEW OF HIS WICKED LETTER CONTINUED.

Bishop:—In my last letter I showed you, not only that you had not made any “explanation” of what was wrong; but only an “evasion,” and a most comprehensive “falsification” of everything, by what you called your “explanation.” Your omission even to notice, what I had so plainly told you, was the one, and only thing, that had induced me to over-look all of your own bad methods; with the many other things that ought to have been noticed by you; and your only repeating, and that so very carelessly and contemptuously, only two sentences—or less than two—out of all that I had myself written to you; and doing that with such an accumulation of trickery, and deceit and falsehood, as you had done; was false enough, and wicked enough, in all conscience. But, for you then to say, “That is all that I know about it,” was perfectly outrageous. For,—thanks to your answer to me, last August:—I have now the *proof* of the fact, by your own declaration of the fact; that you knew, at the time that you wrote your letter to me, all that I know now; and very probably, much more also. And, that you had been guilty of trickery, and deceit, and of secret acts of “evil communications,” against me, to the clergy at Waterford and Hammonton; and most likely to others also (just as your predecessor had done, for nearly a dozen years before you); and that you did these things, for years before you planned, and undertook to carry out, your wicked plots against me. For, you knew, when you wrote your letter—notwithstanding your assertion, “that is all that I know about it,”—(1.) that the reason which Mr. Gordon had given, for your making what you called your “offer,” was false, in itself. (2.) You knew also, whether you had ever said those words or not. (3.) You knew also, that if you had not said those words, then Mr. Gordon had ^{carried} as well as uttered, that falsehood; in order to help you in your “conspiracy” against me. (4.) You knew too, that you had heard some “evil report” of me, from some one else, before you had ever heard anything from Mr. Gordon; for you knew that you had heard the very same facts that Mr. Gordon had told to you, from Mr. Fiske. And, (5.) you knew too that you had heard them from Mr. Fiske, only because you had questioned him, in such a manner as to draw his answers from him; thus *proving*, that you had, before that time, heard “an evil report” of me, from some one else. (6.) You knew too, that you were highly displeased with me; because I never attended the Church at Hammonton, nor received the Sacrament from the clergy at Hammonton. (7.) You knew too, that it was that very displeasure with me, that induced you to conspire with Mr. Gordon, to “force” me to receive the Sacrament from you. All of these seven, moreover, are in addition to the very many things that I had written to you, in my two long letters; and I might add to the seven I have given a number more things, that I know—and can prove that you knew,—when you wrote your letter to me. But, these are enough, and more than enough, to prove what I said; that that one stupendous falsehood,—“That is all that I know about it,”—did contain within itself, as I have said that it did, an immense number of other falsehoods also. For, each particular thing that you knew in regard to the case, when you wrote those words—was a material fact,—and by those words you denied that you knew anything about it.

But, Bishop there is one of these particular falsehoods, included in that one great and most comprehensive falsehood, to which I must ask your attention again. That is, to the first one of the seven given above—viz: that it was “because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters of the Diocese,” that you had “offered” to administer the Communion to me. That, as you yourself *proved*, by what you said to me Aug. 24th, 1881, was a falsehood, *in itself*; for, as you told me then, it was *not* “because I was one of the old and invalid clergy of the

Diocese," but because you "thought it a proper thing to do;" to "force" me to receive the Communion from you, "because I was able to go to Philadelphia in the cars, and yet did not attend the Church, at Hammonton, or receive the Communion from the clergy here. Therefore, the reason first assigned, by Mr. Gordon, was a falsehood, *in itself*. And, you knew that it was a falsehood, in itself. And, you knew that it was, on the strength of that falsehood,—and of that alone—that I had thought it right to over-look all of your own bad methods. And yet, you not only did not even notice that one supremely important fact; but you went so far as to say, that you *did not know anything about it*, or about any other of the facts, in the whole case. If that was not as great a falsehood as was ever told, I would like to see or hear, of the one that could beat it.

But, Bishop, it is too late now to get out of your difficulties, except by the means of confession, and repentance, and amendment of life. For, it will make very little, if any, difference to you now, so far as you yourself are concerned,—whether you "evade," or "confess," or "deny,"—that you told Mr. Gordon, that it was "because I was one of the old and invalid Presbyters, of the Diocese," that you made your "offer." For, when I told you—in my letter of Dec. 18th, 1879,—that Mr. Gordon had said that, you, in your letter to me—of Dec. 31st, 1879,—did not deny that you had said it; nor did you tell me, as an honest man would have done, that what Mr. Gordon had said, was not true *in itself*. And both of those things convict you of being an "accessory" to the falsehood, even if you were not the original coiner of it, as Mr. Gordon asserted that you were.

But, one thing is perfectly certain—viz: that what Mr. Gordon had said, was a falsehood, *in itself*. And another is; that you knew that it was a falsehood. And another is, that it was coined either by you,—as Mr. Gordon said that it was,—and as you did not at the time deny, and as you have never yet denied; or else, it was coined by Mr. Gordon. And, as I cannot tell which coined it—though everything seems to prove that you did it; I will now show you (1.) What the consequences will be, as respects yourself, if *you* coined it; and (2.) What they will be to you, if Mr. Gordon coined it. And (1.) If you coined it, then it will follow, that you made up, and told to Mr. Gordon what you knew, at the time that you uttered it, was an absolute, and deliberate, and most wicked falsehood. And then, your purpose was, not only to deceive me, but to deceive him, as well. Or else, you were so brazenly wicked, as to tell Mr. Gordon that falsehood, when he, as well as yourself, knew that it was a falsehood. And then, your purpose was, to prompt him, to tell that lie; in order to deceive me. In other words, you played the Devil's part, towards Mr. Gordon, by prompting him to sin; and by teaching him how to sin—cunningly and craftily,—as you yourself do. And yet, at that very time, you were professing, and pretending, to be acting towards me, in the name of God, and in the good faith that was so imperatively required; both of you, and of Mr. Gordon, not only as merely honest men, but infinitely more so, by the sacred character of your offices; and by that most holy Sacrament, which was the subject-matter of all of your deceits, and frauds, and falsehoods; and which you so wickedly profaned.

(2.) But, if Mr. Gordon coined that lie, as well as uttered it, then while it will prove Mr. Gordon to have been guilty of one more falsehood, than I have as yet proved against him—which were some four or five—it will not make your share of the sin much,—if any—less, than if you had coined it yourself.

For, your "evasion" of that, in your "explanation," was a deceit and a fraud.

And, when you wrote, "That is all that I know about it," that was a most full, and perfect, and egregious falsehood, also. And, in doing as you did, you tried to cover up, and to conceal, your confederate's falsehood; and you did what you could, to help it to deceive me still. And, in doing that, you not only as-

sumed your full share in the deceit; but you did that with a view to have the lie *used* to carry out your own wishes. And you used it, for your own benefit; both to conceal your own sinful part in the conspiracy; and to "force" me, or to "deceive" me, into compliance with your will. In fact, you were not merely an "accomplice," but you assumed the role of the "receiver;" whom the laws, both of God and of man, account to be "as bad as a thief." You therefore "appropriated" your confederate's lie; and you were not only willing, but glad, to have me deceived by it, still. And, to make sure, that I should not suspect you, but put all of the blame upon Mr. Gordon, you not only omitted to say that you had asked, or directed, Mr. Gordon to say, what you had told him to say; but tried to imply that Mr. Gordon had *volunteered* to pull the chestnuts out of the fire, for you. And, as if that "evasion" was not enough, you then said—"that is all that I know about it." That was Devilish! That was, plainly, trying to put all of the blame upon Mr. Gordon.

But, Bishop, the result of all this is, that I cannot now believe either you or Mr. Gordon, in regard to anything that you may say, no matter how simple it may be. Indeed, I could not now believe either one of you, if you were under oath to speak the truth, in any Court of Justice. For, what oath could be any more sacred, or binding, than the vows and the obligations of your offices, or of the Religion that you profess? Or, what subjects could be more sacred, or binding,—for Truth or for Righteousness,—than that Holy Communion, which you have so sacriliciously profaned? No, Bishop, nothing but such voluntary and open humiliation of yourself; and such satisfaction—so far as you can make any reparation or satisfaction—for the heinous sins and wrongs that you have committed; can ever restore my confidence in you.

So much will suffice for that "explanation," of which you wrote so lightly, and so carelessly, and so contemptuously.

You next say, in your letter, "He" (Mr. Gordon) "did tell me, that you thought that the "offer" ought to have come directly to you, from me. So it would, if the thought had occurred to me sooner." That, Bishop, is another admission against yourself, followed by another falsehood. I will point out the falsehood first, as the admission is clear, and will fall into its place, without further notice. The falsehood is, "That you *would* have sent your "offer" direct to me, if the the thought had occurred to you sooner." And, that that is a falsehood, is proved by the following facts: (1.) That *after* "the thought had occurred to you" (as your "admission" that "Mr. Gordon had told you" what I thought, viz., that it should have come "directly to me, from you proves) you wrote to Mr. Gordon, to say that you would not keep your appointment for Dec. 17th, 1879, and you wrote to him *then, after* the thought had been presented to you, (with *proof* of the evil consequences of your original way of sending it) that "*in your opinion*" such an "offer" as yours *should only be made through the Rector of the Parish in which I resided*. There is as plain a contradiction in terms, as could possibly be made. And, the consequence is, that one statement, or the other, must be false. There is no escape from that conclusion. The question then comes up, which is the false statement? (2.) Bishop, the false statement was the one that you wrote in your letter to me, viz., that "so it would, if the thought had occurred to you sooner." You wrote that, also, on purpose to deceive me. But, I believe now, that while you wrote that falsehood, in order to meet the claims of the case, as they appeared to you at the time that you wrote it; that your other statement, in your letter to Mr. Gordon, was a falsehood also. For, I do not believe now, that you ever thought, that such an "offer" "ought" only to be made by a Bishop, through the Rector of the Parish in which I reside. I believe that that also, like the assertion in your letter to me, was another falsehood, got up for the occasion when it was written. For, to say nothing of the absurdity of the "opinion;" and the fact that it sets such a bar to your own love of Pride and

Power; I cannot help seeing and feeling, that, writing as you did at that time, in spite and anger, at finding that both of your traps, "force" and "fraud," had failed to catch me; and that unless you gave some reason for what you had done, your traps and your methods might be exhibited to your disadvantage; you then, in your anger, could think of nothing better than this, and so you wrote that that was your "opinion," because you *had* used that course, in my case. For, if there was no such reason as that for it, you would hardly have written as you did, *after* the thought had been so impressively set before you; by its having spoiled all of your plans, and after my objections to it. But, there is other proof also, against you. For, if you would have sent your "offer" directly to me, in the first place, "if the thought had occurred to you sooner;" and that, before you knew, or could know, that your way of sending it, would be the means of giving me a most painful, and highly dangerous attack of Paralysis of the Heart, as well as spoiling your plans; would you not, *after* you had heard of those results of your first way of doing things, have written to me, at once, to apologize for your most improper way of sending your "offer," at the first? Certainly you would, i. e., if you were a man actuated by Christian, or even by humane feelings. And, you would have apologized, in the most humble, and feeling manner, that you could. But, so far from doing that, when you did write to me afterwards, after I had myself written to you; under the belief that the falsehood that Mr. Gordon had told was the truth, you even then made no apology at all, for your first way of doing things, or for the injury, as well as the wrong, that you had done to me by it; nor did you retract your "opinion," of how you "ought to send such an offer," as an honest and honorable man would have done; but you took one of your peculiarly free and easy ways, of telling me another falsehood, viz., "so it would, if the thought had occurred to me sooner." And, you did that, in order to "evade" again, an honest and straight forward answer; such as Christian Justice and Charity, or even common manly feeling, would have required; to remove the unpleasant recollections of your original blunder and wrong.

But, Bishop, you have added sin to sin, and falsehood to falsehood, until I am weary of exposing them all.

"Oh! what a tangled web we weave;
When first we practice to deceive."

But, if any word that I can write will have any effect upon you, let me call your attention to that old adage, "Honesty is the Best Policy;" even if a man has not enough Honesty from Principle, to sustain him in Honesty. I would, therefore, advise you to be honest and truthful hereafter; even from mere motives of Policy, if you have not Principle enough to sustain you. It may be that the habitual practice of Truth and Honesty—even from mere policy—will help to strengthen your character, and help you to become a better man. It would, certainly save you from much sorrow. That is Christian advice, even though it comes so very far short of Christian principles. But, what a dreadful thing it is, that a Bishop, in the Church of God, should make it necessary, for one of his Presbyters to give him such advice as that; lest anything higher or holier, should not be appreciated!

The next sentence in your letter is this, "I did not dream that there would be anything, in such a proposition, to shock or surprise you." After all has been said, that sentence—in itself—is of but little importance so far as it concerns the meaning that it openly conveys. But, I believe that it is a falsehood, also. But, in the meaning which underlies it all, it is of the very highest importance. For, that sentence contains either a truth or a falsehood. And, it so happens, that whether it is true or false, it will be almost, if not quite, equally fatal to you. If there is any difference, it will be, strange as it may seem, that the *truth* of it will be worse for you than would the *falsehood* be. I will show you that this is so. For, if it is a falsehood, as I believe that it is, then it will only add one more

falsehood, to the very many of which you have already been proved to be guilty. But, if it is true,—then it proves that you have fallen to such a state of blindness of mind and of spirit; and to such a degree of hardness of heart, and of dullness of conscience, in regard to Right and Wrong; as would indicate total Paralysis of the soul; if not actual spiritual death. And, that may be worse, possibly, than all of your other deceits, and falsehoods, and sins, may yet have amounted to. I trust that it is so, and for your sake therefore,—but for no other reason—I would be glad to think that in that sentence, you wrote *what you knew to be false* rather than *what you knew to be true*. It is a very singular case.

But, for myself, I believe that it was a falsehood. For, that would only be following out, what you had been doing all along. And, you had the same motive, for writing a falsehood here, that you had had all along, and that was to excuse yourself, for your blunders and sins. But, even your falsehood could not do that. For you knew, when you wrote that sentence, that what you had done was not only wrong in itself, but that it was calculated to both shock and surprise any person. For you knew, that you ought first to have done, as the Church directs every Presbyter to do; when he has reason to think that any member of the Church is delinquent—i. e. to go to him privately, and by “private monitions and exhortations;” (see question in ordinal,) to try to bring him to a better mind. But, that you did not do. That is just what you *would* not do. That is just what you would not even consent to, or allow; even after I had told you that I “desired” to have your own threatened “long talk” with you, before accepting your “offer.” That was wicked.

You knew too—or if you did not know it, then it only shows how “very far” you have “fallen from original righteousness,”—that by taking such a course as you did, you would, naturally, and necessarily, both surprise and shock me. For, you turned everything upside down; for you were acting not only illegally and wrongfully, but indecently and insultingly; and with most arbitrary and tyrannical want of feeling, as well as want of Justice. You acted also, as if you thought that the Christian Religion consisted of nothing else, than of a mere outward compliance, with the external offices of the Church. Was not such a course of conduct calculated to surprise and shock any one; who knew that, sacred and important as the outward ordinances are, the inward and spiritual state of the Christian, is infinitely more important? And, ought you not, as a man of mere common sense; not merely to have “dreamed,” but to have known, and felt, not only that I *might* be surprised and shocked, at the course you took, but that I certainly would be?

It is perfectly true, Bishop, that you could not have foreseen, or known, just *how* the shock, and surprise might affect me. You, probably, thought that it would be a shock and surprise of fear; at the thought of being called to account; and that that fear of “withstanding” you, for your wrong, would induce me to yield quietly and at once, to your harsh, and wicked, and proud, and unchristian, notice. But, it will never do, to count beforehand, upon how the most quiet and peaceable man will take, what he feels to be a wrong. For, even if he should be the very weakest of men—in mind, body, or estate,—he may say some word, or do some act, that will attract the notice of God, to a certainty; and perhaps of man; and will raise up defenders for him, that will upset all of your calculations.

And, this is right. This is necessary. For, a Bishop is not to be allowed to do wrong, any more than any other man is. On the contrary, he is the very man—of all others in the whole world—who ought to be made to feel, that the very least wrong that he does, is far worse; not only in the sight of God and man, but also in its consequences; than is a much greater sin and wrong, on the part of any other person. And, instead, of a Bishop claiming immunity from responsibility, because of his office; the very fact that he abuses, and dishonors his

office, and wrongs those whom he is sworn to protect; only increases his guilt and infamy, and should also increase his condemnation.

But, from all of these considerations, I cannot help feeling, and believing, that you knew, when you wrote that last sentence, that you wrote what you knew to be a falsehood. Certainly, I have every reason for thinking so. And, I cannot think of anything—I have really tried to do so—that even suggests any doubt about it. It is certain, that I *ought* to have been both surprised and shocked, at receiving such a notice. And it is equally certain, that you ought not only to have “dreamed,” but that you ought to have *known*, to a certainty, that I would be both shocked, and surprised.

Your way of doing “*compelled*” such a result.

You then go on to say, “but I did not know that ten years had elapsed, since you had received the Holy Communion.” No, Bishop, you did not know that. Nor, you do not know that now; though you think that you do. For, thank God, I have received the Holy Communion sometimes, though not very frequently; during the past ten years. But, that was a mistake on your part. And I am the one who am most responsible for that mistake; for when I told you that “for ten years I had been self-suspended from the Communion,” I meant *at Hammonton* and with *my Bishop*, and with *some of my fellow clergy*. And, as I gave no explanation of what I meant by my words, it was quite natural, if not necessary, that you should understand me as you did. But, there was no intention to deceive you, as the very boldness of the charge against myself abundantly proves. On the contrary, I put my own case in the very worst light that I could; because I fully expected to see you in a very few days, and I thought that my writing what I did would make you see, and feel the absolute necessity for your coming as soon as you could; and for your having the “long talk” with me, which you had yourself threatened. But, when I wrote that, I fully believed—as I still believe—that if you had come to see me then, as you had promised to do; and as you ought to have done, even if you had not promised to do so; and had your “long talk” with me, without any foolish, or wicked Pride and self assertion, on your part, as there should have been none; our interview would have ended, as I then devoutly wished that it would, in my receiving the Communion from you first, as my Bishop; and afterwards from the clergy at Hammonton, as I might feel the need of it. But, you must also remember, that in writing as I did, I did no wrong, or injury, either to you, or to anybody else, unless it was to myself.

But, even my making my own case to seem so very bad to you, and so much worse than it really was, was all in vain. You did not care enough for my soul, or for the honor of God, or for the purity or good name of the Church, even to keep your “official” promises, or to fulfill your “official” obligations; or even to send me any word, as to why you could not, or would not, keep them. That was not only wicked neglect, and contempt of duty, on your part, but it was a most indecent and ungentlemanly thing besides.

But, I understood all that, now. You had some things of your own to conceal, and you saw that I had not. And so, you did not wish to do anything, with such a man as you found me to be, for fear that matters might go further than you wished. And so, you thought to drop the whole case; leaving me still to linger on, subject to your secret, or open, slanders of me, to the clergy at Hammonton, and throughout the Diocese; and keeping yourself out of trouble, at the same time.

But, this new starting up of old wrongs, on your part, made new action, on my part, necessary. And, from that beginning of these open and proved wrongs, on your part, all of these troubles have sprung.

Your letter then goes on: “I took for granted that, as off’ as you could, you had received that Blessed Feast.” That, Bishop, is another falsehood; and you

knew that it was when you wrote those words. For, it was precisely because you knew that I did *not* receive it "as often as I could,"—but did not receive it *at all*, and because I never had received it from any of the clergy that had ever been in charge of the Church at Hammonton, that you thought you could "properly" "force" me to receive it, from yourself. So, that that sentence also—like all of its predecessors, except the one that was a "mistake," was a falsehood also.

But, if you had only approached me privately, as you ought to have done; and in person, as you ought to have done; and frankly, and in a kindly and Christian manner, as you ought to have done; there would never have been any trouble. But, doing as you did, from first to last, was "only evil, and that continually." And, that makes mischief. And, it is because of such doings, on the part of my Bishops, and fellow clergy, all along, that things are as they are.

And, it is because of such doings, that things will continue to remain as they are, so far as I am concerned, so long as I live at Hammonton; or, until my Bishop sees fit, to make such amends as the case calls for; by repudiating and condemning "openly," the wrongs that have been, "openly" done to me; by "beating me openly and uncondemned" with the rods of slander and calumny; and by "casting me into the prison" of suspicion.

I do not demand that I shall receive any credit, either for what I have done for the Church at Hammonton, or for the patience and forbearance with which, for the past sixteen or eighteen years, I have borne the wrongs of my Bishops, and fellow clergy; who have slandered and calumniated me. But, I do demand, that this way of doing things shall now be stopped. I do demand that the Church at Hammonton, shall not be made "a den of thieves;" and that my Bishops and fellow clergy, shall not be the ones that make it such; as they have been for many years. And if they are guilty of "wrong and robbery;" of "impiety and sacrilege;" of "pride and worldliness," of "deceit and falsehood;" and in the case of the Bishops—of "injustice and tyranny;" which they practice in their "official" capacity, and in the name of God: then they may be sure, that I will not only remonstrate with them, while I have the strength to do so; but reprove them, or rebuke them, or expose them; by "telling it unto the Church," if necessary. That is what I now aim at, and what I wish to have distinctly understood, by "all whom it may concern."

Your next sentence is, "Will you be surprised if I tell you, that I am the one that ought to feel aggrieved?" Bishop, when I read that sentence, I became really angry; and, for a while, it was a "fierce anger;" such as God Himself felt, when he saw how "Many pastors had destroyed His vineyard." (Jer. XII, 10-13.) I really felt like "Cursing you, in the name of the Lord," as Jeremiah did, (Jer. XLVIII, 10) when he cried, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully." But, thank God, I did not curse you! And, in a little while, I prayed for you. And, I have continued to pray for you ever since; though, latterly, I seem to be praying without any hope, much less expectation, that God will hear my prayer, except to "return it into mine own bosom." I begin to feel, that you have really sinned the "sin that is unto death;" and that it is useless to pray for you, any longer. (1 John v, 16.) And even now, after so much thought and prayer over it; it seems so perfectly Devilish in you, to have written that sentence, under all of the circumstances of the case; that it seems as if the very Devil alone, and not a Christian Bishop, could ever have written it. But, Satan has "transformed" himself into "an angel of light."

In that sentence, under the form of a question, you have been guilty of deceit and of meanness, as well as of impudence and of wickedness, which, considering that you were writing it in your "official" capacity, as a Bishop, and while negotiating with me, for the celebration of the Holy Communion by you, and for your receiving it with me, makes what you wrote only fit for a Devil to

have written. You first "imply"—even the Devil would not have dared to assert such a lie, without some trick to conceal the lie—that I had no right to feel "aggrieved," by anything that you had done to me; and yet you knew, when you wrote those words, that you had not only wronged me very grievously, but had really wounded me, and injured me seriously, in body, soul, and spirit. That was not only unchristian, and inhuman, on your part, it was really Devilish. And then, as if that was not bad enough, you went on to do worse; for you then went on to "imply"—even you did not dare to say that except in the way of implication,—that you were the one who ought to feel "aggrieved." That was Devilish again. Instead of apologizing for the wrongs and injuries that you had done to me, in so many, and such unfeeling, and in such deceitful and wicked ways, as you knew that you had done, and as I have now already *proved* that you had done, and that you then *knew* that you had done; you had the meanness, and the impudence, and the wickedness to turn around, and say that I had "aggrieved" you! Is it any wonder that after reading that sentence, I thought of what St. Paul said, in righteous anger, to Elymas, the sorcerer; "O, full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the Devil, thou enemy of all Righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" (Acts XIII, 10.) Yes, Bishop, nothing but the word "Devilish" will at all express the character of your act, or the sense that I have of it. Falsehood alone is sanctity, compared with such wicked and cold-blooded injustice; and desire, and effort, on the part of a Bishop in the Church of God; first, to be guilty of such black crimes as you were guilty of, and then, to try and put the blame of all your own false and wicked doings, upon the head of the man whom you had already so basely, and so wickedly wronged, and injured. The Devil himself cannot do anything worse than that.

But, you seem to have *felt*, that that was a sentence that required to be propped up, if possible. So, you go on in your letter, to write what you thought would pass for a good reason why you should have written it; for you say, "Whatever grounds of complaint you may have had, against any of my predecessors, you certainly had none against me; and yet you have allowed five years to pass without ever intimating to me, that you would like to receive, the Holy Communion. I am at a loss to know how this could be, with a Priest of the Church, who certainly, in theory, holds high Sacramentarian views."

Bishop, if you had written all that to me, when you *first* heard that I did not ever receive the Communion from the clergy at Hammonton, all of that would have been wise and right. But, that you did not do. But, for you to have written those very same words, when you did, and when all of the circumstances of the case had been so completely changed, by your own misdoings; and as a means of extricating yourself out of the difficulties, into which your own misdoings had got you; and after you had wronged and injured me, as you had done; that was a trick, and a deceit, under the circumstances, as you wrote them. And it was a mean, and an impudent and a cruel, and Devilish trick also. It was trying, still, to get rid of the blame of your own wrong-doings, by trying to implicate me in wrong. It was foolish also—like trying to clear yourself from the charge of being a liar, or a villain of any kind, by saying, "You're another." Even if what you said had been true, that kind of an answer would not clear you. But, being false, and written with your usual cunning, in order to deceive; it became not only false, but mean and wicked also.

But, I will reply to what you wrote, as if you had not meant to deceive. And, my answer to what you wrote then is this: (1.) That I was not under any *obligations* to go to you, though I might have done so, as a *right*, if I had thought it right, or necessary for me to do so. But, I did not think it either right or necessary for me to do so voluntarily, under all of the circumstances of the case; and therefore I did not do so. And (2.) the reasons that influenced me not to do

so were, to my mind, good and sufficient reasons. They were (1.) That it was neither right, nor necessary, under all of the circumstances of the case, for me to do so. It was not *right*, because in order to make my case clear, I would have had to expose the sins of a Bishop, who had since humbled himself to me, personally; for the wrongs that he had done to me; and whom I had forgiven. Also, I would have had to dig up from his grave, so to speak, and to expose the sins and corruptions of a Presbyterian—whom God had promptly slain,—as he did Ananias and Sapphira, on the very field which he had “purchased with the reward of his iniquity;” and have re opened passed evils, unnecessarily.” I say “unnecessarily,” because to tell the truth plainly, and openly, I did not consider it “necessary”—as my second reason declared; that I should notify you, that I “wished to receive the Communion.” I had learned, as I have told you, that it was not the frequency with which any one received the Communion, but the preparation, and the recollection, and the fidelity, with which it was received and cherished, that made it to effect the good that it was intended to effect.

But (2.) there was another reason that influenced me, and that was, that it was your business to oversee me, and not my business to go and tell you what you did not seem to care to know. I was satisfied to abide God’s own good time, for vindicating me. If you were not satisfied with me, then it was your business to have told me so, and to have given me your reasons for it. But, that you did not do. That you did not *wish* to do. That you *would* not even *consent* to do, even after I found out that you were not satisfied with me. That you have steadily *refused* to do, ever since I have *requested* you to do so; and even *urged* you to do so. If there is any fault in that matter, I have fully proved that it is not on my side. You cannot do that. All therefore that you have written, as an excuse for your deceit and wickedness, only brings out more, and more, of your own neglects and wrongs. You had better have omitted those sentences from your letter.

But, Bishop, will you not now take, in good part, the solemn warning of one who wishes you nothing worse, than that you should repent and amend, as a new admonition to you; lest, perchance, He who is ever moving—by His Holy Spirit—~~away~~ ^{among} the “golden candlesticks,” and “overseeing” how those earthly “stars,” whom He has ~~tell~~ ^{sent} to shine with his Own reflected light; and for His Own glory; and not by their own light, or ^{for} their own glory; are shedding His heavenly light, upon the Church on earth; should pronounce against you, such a judgement as He threatened, against the “angel” of the Church of Laodicea? Oh, Bishop, read the warning of your Bishop, to the Bishops of the seven Churches of Asia; and take a new warning. It may be that this will be the last one that will ever be sent to you; and I do fully believe, that God Himself has put it into my heart, to send it to you. “He that hath an ear, let him hear, what the spirit saith unto the Churches.”

Your next sentence is, “You had no grounds of complaint against me.” That is not quite true, Bishop, even if I did not complain. And if I had only known a very little of what I now know; I would have had, as in reality I did have, though I did not know it, at first; abundant grounds for complaint. But, not knowing what abundant grounds of complaint I had, and not caring much about those that I did know that I had; I never did care for, much less feel “aggrieved,” about those that I did know that I had. But, the moment that I received your cruel and wicked “notice,” that you would be here on a certain day, named by you, and would administer the Communion to me—“*nolens volens;*” then I did feel, that I had abundant grounds for complaint against you. But, long before that, I did think that you were very careless and remiss; for *you* had “*allowed five years to pass;*” without your having made any enquiry at all about my health; or about how I came to live at Hammonton, or, how long I had lived here, or why I was not engaged in any Church work; or why I did not attend

the Church, or receive the Communion from the clergy here; or as to my religious views; or as to my spiritual state, or feelings; or anything else that a Bishop ought to have enquired about, and informed himself of. And, since receiving your shameful "notice," I have thought of all of these things, not only much oftener, but also much more feelingly. And, Bishop, I do so still.

The last thing to be noticed, in the last sentence quoted from your letter, is, "I am at a loss to know how this could be, with a Priest, who certainly, in theory, holds high Sacramentarian views." But, as I have written upon this subject before, it will only be necessary for me here to say that I do really, and not "in theory" only, hold very high views of the nature, and of the importance, of the Sacraments; though I do *not* hold, what you seem to impute to me, when you call my views "high Sacramentarian views." For, I do not think, as you seem to do, that the grace of the Sacrament is conveyed "ex opere operato," or merely by participating in the outward reception of the Communion; but only, and in the very same degree, as the Faith, and true Penitence, and the real Purity of Heart of the recipient enables him to "see God," and to "receive God." Indeed, my views of the Sacrament are so very high, that I never could receive it in the very careless, and presumptuous, and impenitent manner, in which my Bishops, and some of my fellow clergy, so often do. And, I would much rather err—if that is to err—by not receiving it "as often as I could," than to do as they do, who "rush in where angels fear to tread," without having on "the wedding garment," "which is required by God, in Holy Scripture," i. e., that "robe of righteousness," which is infinitely more important, than is the reception of the Sacrament, if that be wanting. For, no matter how reverent the external demeanor of the recipient may be, if it lacks that, it lacks the "one thing needful."

I now come to the last sentences in your letter. You say, "I am not yet able to fix a day for my visit to Hammonton, but I hope it will be early in the New Year. I will give you due notice of my intention, and if you are prepared to receive it, I will be most happy to receive the Lord's Supper with you. My best wishes for the New Year, to you and yours, and believe me, I am, always your friend most truly,"

JOHN SCARBOROUGH."

That last part, as I said in a preceding letter, does at first sight seem to be so very good, that you might well have been excused for thinking that it was "possible" for it "to deceive the very elect." But, Bishop, as I said then, it was "far too good" to have any sort of "fellowship" with all that you had written before; which was "so very bad," that it seems to me, more and more, the more I think of it, as if the very Devil himself must have suggested nearly every word that is in it. For, certainly, that Holy Spirit, by which a Bishop in the Church of Christ ought to have been inspired, "had no part, or lot, in it;" for "what concord hath Christ with Belial?"

But, even this last part, good as it at first sight, seems to be, has three falsehoods in it, which were not all falsehoods when they were written; but which you have made such since they were written, by your wicked neglect of your "official" promises, and by your violation of your own pledged word. These are (1.) Your promise to come to Hammonton, and to receive the Communion with me; (2.) Your promise that you would give me "due notice" of your coming; (3.) Your declaration that you were "always, my friend most truly." I know what plea you would enter for not keeping your promises; viz., that Mr. Gordon had told you that I had found out that you had been playing false with me, and that I had lost all confidence in you, and that you knew that I would not receive the Communion from you, or with you; until you had proved to me that you were truly penitent. But that plea, true as the different points of it all are, will not excuse you. You had "official" obligations resting upon you, which were *sacred* obligations. And, even if you thought that what had passed would make it *impossible* for you to fulfill *all* of your promises, or even any *one* of them; your

"official" obligations to me required that you should have given me an "official" notice, that you could not, or would not keep your promises. And, also, they required that you should have given me your *reasons* for not keeping your promises; especially where your reasons were such as concerned not only me as an individual, but as a Presbyter also; and where they concerned our mutual "official" relations to each other. And, they required also, that you should have had the whole case settled.

But, I have now had so much experience, of the very cool way in which you "frankly forgive" yourself, for all kinds of falsehoods and wrongs; and especially for saying and doing what is false, and for breaking your most solemn and sacred "official" promises; that in writing those last sentences in your letter; while you did not then expect to break them, you were merely putting on again the "sheep's clothing," which had got displaced while you were writing the previous parts of your letter to me; and that you were trying to get Christ and Belial to unite, to get you out of the "pits" that you had dug for me; but "into the midst" of which you had fallen yourself. Therefore it was that you put on again the "sheep's clothing." In other words, you did again, what you had been doing all along; you put on "the livery of heaven, to serve the Devil in."

Most bitterly, Bishop, do I lament, that I am obliged, by my sense of duty, to write in this stern and severe language. But, I do it, that you may see just *exactly* how your conduct appears to me, and how I feel about it. And, I do that, in the hope, though that now is very faint, that you may "see yourself as others see you;" and be induced to repent, if that be still possible.

But, Bishop, when you remember, that all of this wickedness, of which you have been guilty, has been perpetrated by you, not merely in your private capacity, as a man; despicable and wicked as it all would have been, even then; but that it was all done by you in your "official" capacity, as a Bishop; and while you were professing to be acting with that sacred fidelity, that is required by your sacred office; and that the Holy Communion was the subject matter of the whole transaction, and of all of your words and deeds; is it any wonder that I feel, as I have told you that I do feel; that that letter of yours was, really—by millions and millions of times—the most wicked letter that I ever saw, in all my life? It was so full of contempt for God, and for Truth, and for Right,—and it was so full of meanness, and of hypocrisy, and of profanation of the most holy things; as well as of the wrongs and injustice that were done by you to me; that the wrongs and injustice to me, many and great as they were, are utterly unworthy of being taken into the account at all.

Here ends my Review, of your letter to me, of Dec. 31st, 1879.

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter.

MY FIFTH LONG LETTER TO BISHOP SCARBOROUGH.

Bishop.—Having now reviewed (1.) the interview held between us, Aug. 4th, 1881, and (2.) your letter to me of Dec. 31st, 1879—those two events covering all that has occurred between us, personally, with the exception of the three shorter letters that I wrote to you—I will now proceed to notice what took place between Mr. Gordon and myself, since the receipt by me, of your letter of Dec. 31st, 1881. That will give you a complete knowledge of the whole case,—as all that had occurred before that date, had been discussed in my first two letters to you.

A day or two after I received your letter, Mr. Gordon came out to my house and I read your letter to him, passage by passage; commenting upon each passage, somewhat in the way that I have now written about it to you. And, I think that it would have been edifying to you, if you could have been present, to have seen and heard Mr. Gordon; as I called his attention, and he called my at-

tention, to the proofs of trickery, and deceit, and falsehood, and meanness, and impudence, with which your letter abounded; for he showed, not only very plainly, but also very feelingly, that you had not dealt any more fairly by him, than you had by me. Therefore, when I got to those words, "So I would, if the thought had occurred to me sooner," Mr. Gordon stopped me, by asking, very excitedly, "Did the Bishop say that?" I replied by handing him your letter, and saying "Read it for yourself." He did read the passage, and he expressed his feelings—not only in words that I could not hear, but by looks of anger and contempt which I could see; but which were so combined, that I could not tell whether anger or contempt predominated. But, that was all on account of the way that you had treated him; you having previously told him, that "in your opinion, your "offer" ought to have been sent through him." He saw then that you had been playing the "Little Joker" with him also. I then went on reading and commenting as before, and when I had got to that part where you wrote "Will you be surprised if I tell you, that I am the one who ought to feel aggrieved?" Mr. Gordon again interrupted me, with a look of utter incredulity, and asked, "Did the Bishop say that he had been aggrieved?" I again handed him the letter, and told him, as before, to "Read it for himself." He did read it, and his looks of indignation and contempt at what you had written; if not for you yourself; were all that I could have desired to see from anybody. But, while I sympathized with him, for the wrong that you did to him, as well as to me; I have no reason to think that he sympathized with me, for the wrong that you had done to me, as well as for that which you had done unto him. I have reason to fear that it was all selfish on his part; but that made his feeling none the less evidence against you, than it would have been if he had included my wrongs with his own; in his indignation and contempt, for your deceits and falsehoods.

But, having gone through your whole letter, in that way, I then turned back to where you had written "That is all that I know about it;" and I then asked Mr. Gordon this question: "Mr. Gordon, did not you and the Bishop have some previous conversation about me, before the Bishop sent me his message by you?" To that Mr. Gordon replied, as quick as lightning, "I don't recollect." His manner, as well as his words, convinced me that he was lying. I said therefore, "You have answered, without trying to recollect; indeed you have not given yourself a moment's time for recollection; even if you did not know, when you made that answer, that it was not the truth." I then asked him again, "Now Mr. Gordon, answer me truly," "Did you never have any conversation with the Bishop about me, before the Bishop sent his message to me, by you?" He answered me again, just as at first, as quick as lightning; "I can't recollect." I saw then, as plainly as could be, that he was lying; and I was so indignant at his shameless wickedness, that I said to him, angrily and sternly; "Mr. Gordon, don't answer me in that way, for you know perfectly well, whether you have ever had any conversation with the Bishop about me, before he sent that message to me, by you. I said too, that "I could see that he was trying to deceive me; and that, if he kept on in that way, he would get himself into the same sort of a trouble, as that into which you had already got yourself."

Mr. Gordon then quailed under my eye, and my words; and then he said, "I did not want to answer your question, in the way you put it; but I do recollect that I have had conversations with the Bishop about you, before he sent his message by me." That was enough for me. I did not wish to ask him any more questions; and I did not ask him any more. But, I talked to him, and I told him that I understood it all now; and that he would have freely told me all that he knew against you, but for two reasons—(1.) That he would have had to tell what would have compromised himself with me; and (2.) That he would have had to tell what would have compromised himself with you; and that, by com-

promising himself with you, as he would have had to do, by compromising you, he would have gotten himself into trouble with you; and that therefore, he had tried to deceive me, rather than compromise himself. And, he did not even attempt to deny, that it was so. I told him also, that I had now lost all confidence in him as well as in you; and that I never could put any confidence in either of you again; until I had good reason to believe, that you had truly repented of your shameful sins and meanness.

All of this, so far as it relates to my opinion of your letter, and of yourself, I have abundant reason to believe, that you heard, at that time, from Mr. Gordon; and also, that it was your knowledge of this—and that alone,—that induced you to break all of your “official,” and *sacred*, promises and obligations to me. But, the fact that Mr. Gordon told you all this will not justify you—(1.) for not coming to have your own promised “long talk” with me; nor (2.) for not coming to see me about my “self-suspension” from the Holy Communion; nor (3.) for not even writing to me, to tell me why you would not come; or (4.) for not asking for an explanation of what I had said to Mr. Gordon. For an official in the Church of God, has no right to ignore anything that is a wrong, and that it belongs to his “office” to have righted.

I would myself have written to you, soon after Mr. Gordon’s falsehoods—or, as soon after, as I had reason to believe that he was impenitent for his sins; to have reported his case to you; that you might, by your spiritual and godly conduct and advice, have restored our lapsed brother, if possible, to a life of Truth and Righteousness. But, under the circumstances of the case, what a burlesque upon Reason and Religion that would have been. It would have been like reporting him to Satan, that *he* might do a Christian Bishop’s part by him; by trying to reclaim him, whom he had himself just tempted, if not urged, into his sin; and who was still using him, as an instrument, for his own sinful purposes. For, Bishop, you were, yourself, the principal and leader, in the whole scheme of fraud and impiety; and Mr. Gordon was only your tool and accomplice. And as, at that very time, you were—and for months before, you had been,—and, for years since, you have been, trying your very best, to deceive me, still further. I then did again, as I told you when you were here Aug 24th, 1881, that I had already done before, in like cases: “I let the rats”—the little sinners—“run free,” leaving the responsibility for that to rest upon the Bishop; while “I took the bull”—the great sinner—“by the horns.” And, so it is, that I am now again compelled to contend with my Bishop; or else to be false to my God, and to the Church, and to that “Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.”

But, it is a sad thing, that I have to do. Indeed, it is so very disagreeable, and even painful a thing for me to do; that if my Faith was not so intelligently founded as it is, or if I were not so firmly assured, by my own experience, of the Divine and Exclusive claims of Christianity, and of the Church; I would have been driven, long ago, into a renunciation of them both; and have taken up with almost any other form of Religion, that would permit a decent and honest man to live according to the dictates of his Religion, without having to be associated with such wicked and impious people, as it has been my unhappy lot to find that my Bishops, and my fellow clergy at Waterford and Hammonton have, almost all of them, been. And, even now, I would rather; yes, far rather, be “cast out of the synagogue” entirely; as the poor blind man, whom Jesus had healed, was, by the Jews; and to be left to the “righteous judgement” of God, at the day of Judgement; than ever to receive the Holy Communion, at the hands of such shameless, and wicked, and impenitent hypocrites.

But, for some days after my interview with Mr. Gordon, above related, Mr. Gordon was in my thoughts constantly; and the door-bell never rang, without my thinking that it was Mr. Gordon, come to express his penitence. But, for

seven months after that, Mr. Gordon never came near me. But, in August, 1880, I was lying sick—at Death's door—and as I, and all about me thought, actually dying; when I was told that Mr. Gordon had called to see me, and was asked “if I would like to see him.” I answered “yes.” And, then, as soon as Mr. Gordon appeared, though I was so weak that I was barely alive, “the spirit” that was in me gave me the strength to speak to him, and I spoke thus: “Mr. Gordon, God has sent you here to-day, that I might speak to you once more, before I die. I have prayed for you by name, and very often, from the day that you sinned so greatly until now. Have you repented, now?” Mr. Gordon said, “I have not done anything wrong.” I said, “Do you consider lying no wrong?” He said, “I did not wish to deceive you.” I said, “You did wish to deceive me. You repeatedly *tried* to do so, and that even after I had warned you against it.” “Now,” said I, “I will try, once more, before I die, to induce you to repent.” I then referred him to the teachings of our Lord, and of the Apostles, and of the Holy Spirit, in the Book of Revelations; quoting a number of texts, showing God's intense hatred of lying and of all liars. Mr. Gordon then said, “I have done no wrong.” Again, my righteous indignation was aroused, and with the last strength that I had, I cried out to him, that “I would now call upon God, to be witness between us; and I told Mr. Gordon not to forget the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, or of Mr. Stewart at Waterford; and to beware how he undertook to lie now; for, if he did lie now, he would be lying not to me only, but to God also.” I then solemnly invoked God to be witness to what passed between us; and I then asked Mr. Gordon, “Do you dare to say now, as in the presence of God, that you did not do anything wrong, when you tried to deceive me?” and I looked him steadily in the face, as I asked him the question, and waited for an answer. For a minute, or more, he did not move a muscle—of eye, or lip, or tongue. Then his face began to twitch, and he leaned over me, as I laid in the bed, and said in my ear, “Mr. Passmore, pray for me.”

Instantly, I threw my arms about him, and burst into tears. I sobbed aloud. But, as soon as I could speak, I said, “My brother, I will pray for you; but my prayers will do you no good, unless you pray for yourself; and neither my prayers, or yours, will be of any use to you, unless your repentance for what you have done, is so deep and sincere, that you will never forget this day; and unless you watch and pray, that you may never fall into such a sin again; or, if you do, that you should not delay to repent of it, as you have done in this case.”

But, as in the case of Simon Magus (Acts VIII, 22) whom St. Peter warned, in like manner; I have no means of knowing, whether Mr. Gordon has ever “truly repented,” or not. I can only hope that he has done so, for he has never notified me that he has repented; and I have never seen, or heard anything from him, since that day.

That, Bishop, is what I have to say about your accomplice in sin. Do you wonder that I should think, and feel, that it is a thousand-fold better for me to live, and to die, entirely alone, if that should be necessary; rather than to attempt to have, or to allow myself to have, religious “Communion” or “fellowship” with such Bishops and Priests; while they are such wicked, and deceitful, and impenitent men as they are? If you do, I do not. On, the contrary, I will now say to you, what I have, for so many years past, said unto God, and to my own soul; and what David, “the man after God's own heart,” said to God, and to his own soul, so many centuries ago. “I will not sit among the ungodly,” “neither will I have fellowship with the deceitful.” And much less will I ever receive the Communion from them, while I know that they are defiling and polluting not only their own sacred office, but the Sacrament itself; while they are pretending to consecrate it, and to partake of it, not only with unclean hands, and with impure hearts, but with deceit and hypocrisy added to them.

But, Bishop, having now written all that I think I need, about this case, so

far as you are concerned; I wish to do what I can, to let you see, that I am doing now, in your case, only what I have been doing all along, towards my Bishops and other fellow clergy; when I saw that they not only had done wrong, but that they were bent upon still doing wrong, and were impenitent for the wrongs that they had already done. Also, that, in doing as I have done, I am not only justified by the obligations that rest upon me, but that I could not be justified, if I had not done what I have. Also, that I have not done anything that I have done, out of hatred, or malice; or from any desire to have my own way, or to gain any honor, or praise, or power or profit for myself. So far from that, if I had consulted only my own ease, or comfort, or interests, or reputation, as most people do, I certainly would *not* have done, as I now have done. But, I have done, and I have suffered, all that I have done and suffered, in behalf of God, and of the Church, and of Truth and of Righteousness; and not because I take any pleasure in strife and in contention. God only knows, how sincerely, and how deeply, I hate them both. But, I could not, in conscience, stand by, and see God dishonored, and His Religion profaned, and His Church polluted with sin, and His people robbed, and slandered, and tyrannized over; for fear of any trouble, or loss, or suffering, that the Pride and ill-will of my Bishops and fellow clergy could inflict upon me.

But, not only as a Christian man, but, much more, as a Presbyterian of the Church, I am in duty bound, to have done all that I have done. It is *my* "official" duty, to do what I can, in every case that comes up before me, to uphold Truth and Righteousness; and to withstand untruth, and unrighteousness. And, this is true, not only in regard to the poor, and ignorant, and to those in the lower stations of life; but much more so in regard to those who are neither poor nor ignorant; and to those who are in the higher, or even the highest stations, in the Church. For, whoever is guilty of wrong or injustice to me, or to any others in my presence; I feel that I am bound "in any wise" to "rebuke" him, "lest I allow sin upon him" (Lev. xix, 17); and that, no matter who, or what, the wrong-doer is. For, if the person who does the wrong, has done it in ignorance that his act was wrong, then I owe it to his *ignorance*, that I should enlighten him; that he may know better for the future; and not again, even ignorantly, do injury to his own soul, as well as to his fellow creatures, and to God. But, if the person who does the wrong does it knowing that his act is wrong, then I owe it to his *knowledge* that I should rebuke him; that he might not, by my silence, be led to think, that I, and perhaps others also, would not ever rebuke him, if he did the like wrong again. Also, I owe it, not only to the wrong-doer, but to the person to whom the wrong is done also; and I owe it to myself, and to the Church, and to God, and to society at large, as well as to the Church; but more especially to the weak and the helpless, that I should do what I can, to protect them, as well as myself, and those who are dependent upon me, from future, as well as from present, or past, injury, and wrong.

That, you may say is Quixotic, or that that was Jewish Law. But, Bishop, it is neither Quixotic, nor Jewish only. And, the way that now prevails, and which you would favor, and which the world favors, and which the Church has learned to favor, is not the right, and the Christian way. It is the world's way, and that is the Devil's way; but my way is God's way. And therefore it is that I will follow that way, instead of doing as the world does; and as the clergy have too often learned to do; that is, to overlook, as much as possible, everything except our own worldly interests, and ease, and comfort, and to get along as smoothly and pleasantly as we can; and never to risk our own earthly peace and enjoyment, if we can help it, no matter who does wrong, or who suffers wrong. That, is a mean, and selfish view to take of things. And even the world feels that it is so, even while it acts so itself. And that is proved, by the involuntary admiration which all men, even the worst of them, cannot help feeling; and show-

ing; when they see any act of generous and self-sacrificing action, or endurance, for the sake of what is good, and true, or in behalf of others.

But, it is not left to such evidence, strong as that is, that the true Christian way, is what I have declared it to be. For, our Lord Himself has taught us plainly, "If thy brother trespass against thee, *rebuke* him" (Luke xvii, 3.) And, that rule holds good against *all* of our "brethren," whether they be brethren by nature, or by grace; and, it includes "all sorts and conditions of men," whether they be Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons or Laymen. Our Lord then adds, "If he repent, thou shalt forgive him;" showing thereby, that the "rebuke" is intended to call our brother to repentance. And, as a means to that end, it is, indeed, one of the most powerful that can be employed; especially, in the case of willful and defiant wrong-doers. For, if a private rebuke is not regarded, then a more public one will be; at least, in some measure. And that is the very reason, why we *ought*, all of us, to "rebuke" our brethren, when they are wrong. It is not that we may give vent to our own ill-feelings; but, that we may do our brother good. And they who, with this good motive, "rebuke" their brethren, when they do wrong, will never be rebuked for it by God; however the world, or worldly minded Christians may regard it. On the contrary, God will bless them for it; especially if they do it, when they know, beforehand, that they not only may, but will, make for themselves bitter and malignant enemies, by so doing; and that they may have to suffer for what they do, from their open or secret, enmity; as I have done heretofore, and as I fully expect to have to do now.

But, I feel that if I were to allow "spiritual wickedness in high places," without "wrestling" with it, or "rebuking" it; I would not only "allow sin," but I would also make myself, in some measure, a "partaker" of the sin; both by "allowing" the past or present sin without rebuke, and by thus encouraging others to commit the like sins, in the future. And, all of this being so, it enables us to see—why our Lord *required* us to "rebuke" our brethren, when they do wrong; and why He required us to do it, in the way that he did. For, he elsewhere tells us: "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him *alone*. If he will hear thee, thou hast *gained* thy brother,"—showing again, the tendency of the "rebuke," to bring the wrong-doer to repentance. But, in case the private rebuke should not have its desired effect; then he tells us, to "take with us one or two more," as witnesses for us, and against the wrong-doer. "But, if he neglect to hear them" then to "*tell it unto the Church*;" thus making the "rebuke"—in the last resort,—as public as possible. That, except in the case of the most hardened in wickedness, and of those who are utterly unworthy of any further "rebuke," even; ought to end the matter. But, if any are so lost to all sense of Right, as even *them* to "neglect" to do what is right; then our Lord directs that they should be to us "as heathen men, and publicans;" and not as "brethren," any longer. That is equivalent to what St. Paul tells us (2 Thes., iii, 14.) when he tells us, that we should "note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." And yet, even then, that we should not count him as an enemy—to punish him—but to "*admonish him*, as a brother." That, Bishop is what I am now trying to do. I am trying to "gain" you—as a brother; and not to crush you, as if you were "an enemy." And, I am doing all that I am doing, not from anger, but from religious principle. And, all this, is just what I have done towards my Bishops, and my wrong-doing brother clergy, for sixteen or eighteen years past; having regard only to God's honor, to the Church's purity, and to the good of their own souls, as well as to my own soul; and in utter neglect and disregard, of what the consequences would be to myself, here on earth.

And, it is well for me that I did not look for any earthly reward. For, they have all "rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my good will. For, the mouth of the ungodly—yea, the mouth of the deceitful is opened upon me;

and, they have spoken against me, with false tongues. They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without a cause."

But, I am not so weak a man, as to care for that, unduly. Nor, do I wish to deal hardly, even with those who have injured me the most. I fully recognize the solemn fact, that all men are so full of natural, or acquired, "crookedness;" that not merely error, but sin, are common to all men; and that we all ought to deal charitably with each other. But, that does not mean that we must allow each other to do what we please; or to escape the proper consequences of our deeds, in case we are impenitent. Justice and Righteousness have their claims upon us, as well as Christian charity. And, as it is the penitence, or the impenitence of the sinner, that gives to charity its proper limits; so we must, in every case, take into consideration, his willingness to acknowledge his sin, and to make amends for it, so far as he can; and then to "sin no more," so far as that is possible. And, according to these evidences of true penitence, so accordingly must charity enlarge, or contract its scope. It is not charity to let the wicked go free, and to let them continue to wrong and injure the innocent and the helpless with impunity.

But, as "while there is life there is *hope*"—unless the sin be the "sin against the Holy Ghost,"—"which hath never forgiveness,"—we are not only bound to forgive them, if they repent, so far as our personal injuries are concerned; and so far as Justice and the Security of others will allow; but as their sin is against God, even far more than it is against us, so we must "pray for" them; that they may be enabled to repent "truly;" so that they may be forgiven by God also.

But, we must never forget, that even our forgiveness, and even our prayers for them, have but a very limited scope; unless they repent. We are forbidden to "avenge ourselves," or to bear "malice or hatred in our hearts." We are required also, to do "good for evil," within the limits of right reason, and sound judgement. But, we are not bound to trust those, who have proved themselves unworthy of being trusted; nor to have "Communion," or "fellowship," with those who are impenitent in their wickedness; or to show respect to those, who have proved themselves "unworthy of respect." Indeed, if we would be true to God, and to His Righteousness, we are not only not bound to do, any of these last things; but we are bound—morally and religiously—*not* to do them. That is the very "reason to be" that makes Suspension, or Excision, from the Communion, not only a Just and Right thing, but also a Religious and a Charitable thing; in the case of impenitent sinners. For, if we did not make any distinction "between the righteous and the wicked," "between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not,—that would be to make no distinction between right and wrong. That would be to "make evil good, and good evil," so far as we could. That would be to encourage everybody to take everything, and to do everything, that they chose to do, easily and carelessly; and themselves to do, and to let others do, either good or evil, just as they might, at any time, feel inclined to do. That would be to dethrone God and Right, and to set up the Devil and Wrong, as equal to—it would soon be as superior to—God and the Right. That would be to give over God, and the Christian Religion, and the Church of Christ, to the tender mercies of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil.

That is just what the Devil would desire. But that is just what every Christian should desire to prevent. That is just what I am trying to prevent.

THE EVIL EFFECTS OF NOT REBUKING WRONG DOERS.

And, all of this present evil, and all like evils in the Church wherever they exist are possible, and exist at all; only by reason of the general neglect, into which our Lord's wise and good command has fallen. Nobody, nowadays, seems

ever even to think of obeying it, as a fixed and permanent rule of duty; but only occasionally, when in anger; or when they expect to gain, or at least not to lose anything by it.

Those are reasons, that generally govern men nowadays; as likewise that bad conventional idea, that it is genteel, and polite, and refined, and generous, and nobler, to overlook, and not even seem to notice, anything that is wrong; until there is some popular outburst of natural feeling, and that then it is proper to side with the party that is most popular. O! foolish, and hateful, and wicked, way! How different would it be, if every Christian would do as our Lord has directed us to do; "in any wise" to "rebuke" our brethren, when they do wrong; not only to us, but also to others. It would not only enlighten, but it would quicken, and make sensitive, and true, the Conscience of the Church as a whole; and the result would be a perpetual, and universal "wrestling" with "spiritual wickedness;" not only in high places, but in low places, also. That would mean, not only a general but a deep and true revival of spiritual religion, and of moral, and religious sanctification, throughout the whole Church.

But, that is what you do not wish to have! You would like, well enough, to "rebuke everybody that you wished to, but you do not wish to be rebuked yourself; no matter how much you may need it, or how much you may have deserved it. You seem to think, that by virtue of your "office," you ought to be exempt from the common lot of men; and above the rebukes of other men. That is not only wrong, but it is foolish, as well. I believe, as much as you can do, in rendering unto all "their dues"—tribute, custom, fear, honor,—as they are "due;" either to men without offices, or to men with offices. But, unlike you, while I would render to the man in office, an additional honor, as being his "due," if in addition to his honorable private conduct, he adds another claim to honor, by reason of his "official" honesty and fidelity; so, in like manner, if in addition to his own wicked and dishonorable private conduct, as a man, he adds to his private claims to dishonor, by a dishonest, or dishonorable abuse of his "office;" then, his "due" is double, or ten-fold, or an hundred fold, or a thousand fold, or a million fold, or millions of millions of fold,—*dishonor and contempt*.—just in proportion to the confidence, or to the greatness of the interests, or to the sanctity of the office, and to the sanctity of the subjects, that the wicked officer has desecrated and profaned. And, no man ought ever, even to pretend to show any honor, or even respect, to any man who has ever abused a great and honorable, much less a sacred office; and the most sacred, even of all the sacred subjects of the Christian Religion; unless he has had reason to believe, that the guilty "officer," had truly repented, of his most shameful, as well as most wicked sin. For, if any one ever does do so, he will not be giving honor, "to whom honor is *due*;" but to one to whom *it is not due*; and that, no matter he still holds the office that he has dishonored, or not. That would not be giving him *his due*, but *the very contrary*.

In the kingdoms of this world, and in the armies of this world, and in the world at large, it is the custom, as we all know, to render honor to people, according to the "offices" they hold; or according to their station in life; or according to their wealth, or power merely. That is the world's way. That is the way that "man's wisdom" teaches men to do. But, that is not God's way. That is the Devil's way. And, it is one of his most successful ways, for leading not only the world, but also the Church itself, astray. For, by that means he blinds their eyes to the Lord's rule; and he deceives the multitude, by leading them to give honor to dishonorable men; and to honor dishonorable ways and doings. And, it is highly successful. For, as a matter of fact, nearly all mankind are, more or less, deluded, and misled, by this way of doing things. Some from fear, some from interest; almost all from an idea of policy, of one sort or another; are apt to fall, more or less, into this evil way of doing. And, in time, they even come to think, that

this is not only "worldly policy," which it is; but that it is actually the right way to do. But, that is a most terrible, and a most pernicious mistake. For, it is all wrong. And, it all tends to a much greater wrong; for it tends to demoralize, not only the whole world, but the whole Church as well. Whereas, God's rule, if it was only faithfully acted upon, would constantly tend; and that ever more and more, to reform, and to purify, both the Church, and the world. "Render therefore, unto all *their dues*." And, remember also, that each man's "*dues*" are to be decided, not by the "office" which he happens to hold, and which he may be abusing, to the almost infinite increase of his guilt and dishonor; but "according to his deeds," not only in his private life, but, also in his "official" life; and by rating his "official" wrongs at their proper value.

That, Bishop, shows you my reasons, for the manner in which I have acted; not only towards you, but also towards my late Bishop, and towards all of my other fellow clergy, when they have done wrong.

But, Bishop, let me now call your attention, to the original, and essential error, out of which all of this miserable trouble has grown. That was

YOUR PRIDE.

That it was, that gave you your mistaken, and foolish, and wicked idea, of your own *personal* greatness, and authority, and power; and of your right, as well as of your power, to order, or to disorder, the clergy; or, at any rate, such of them as you thought that you could safely order, or disorder; according to your mere will and pleasure. That has been at the bottom of it all. It was a great delusion; and it has led you into a great mistake. Still, that is not a new thing, upon earth; or even in "the kingdom of heaven," in that part of it which is here "militant" upon earth. It is a mistake, that is as old as Christianity itself; and which has been so common in the Church, from the year "*one*" of the Church, to this day, that history is hardly anything else—as it is ordinarily written—than a record of such mistakes; in the Church, and in the world, with an account of the terrible consequences that have followed from them. The fault lies in the weakness and sinfulness of human nature; and that the men that are guilty of the fault, whether in the world, or in the Church, have never truly learned the lessons that God and the Church have tried to teach them. And, as the weakness is in "human nature;" and as it can only be corrected by the grace of God, acting in concert with man's own conscience and efforts; and against the temptations of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil; we need not wonder that men who take Pride and love of Power into their hearts, do just as you have done. For, you have done what most men would *naturally* do, in such a case; if they were not promptly and properly checked, and corrected for what they do amiss. And, that is the very reason, why all men who do as you have done, not only need, but require, that they should be checked, and corrected; when they do wrong.

And that, Bishop, is not only my view of the case; it is God's view of the case also. And, we have the very plainest, and most impressive proof of that, in our Lord's own words, and actions. For He, as the Creator of man, knew, far better than we know, "what is in man;" and He also, for the same reason, knew also, far better than we could know, how to check, and to correct, these evil tendencies of our nature. Therefore, He has told us, and He has shown to us, both by His words, and by His actions, that the way to check, and to correct, this evil tendency, in those who show it, is to "rebuke" them for it, when they have done wrong; and to "resist" them, when they attempt to do wrong; and to "expose" them to the condemnation of the whole Church, or of the whole world; if they will not "cease from" their "evil," and "do well," under simple kindly teaching and advice.

Therefore it was, that He taught His Apostles, the very first of all men, that

they, above all other men, ought not even to *think*, much less to *desire*, to be great at all, in their own estimation; and that they must not expect, much less have, or exercise, or enjoy, any *personal* greatness, or honors, or power, in this world; as if their office was given them, with any view at all, to their own power or honor, or for their own pleasure, or profit.

At first, the Apostles could not understand this, as poor, weak, and conceited men, cannot understand it now. And so, not only Peter, but James "the Just," and John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and all of the rest of them "sought," and "questioned," and even "disputed" with themselves, "who should be the greatest." But, our Lord, "knowing their thoughts," called a little child, and set him in their midst, and said "Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself, as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." And, several times he "rebuked" them all, for even *wishing* to be great, in this world; while they were only His "servants," and while he had only chosen them to be His servants, in order that they might be "*the servants of His servants*;" servants to each other, as well as to Himself; and servants also to all of their brethren on earth, no matter how poor, and miserable, and even wicked, and debased, they might be. He did not even, at the first, give them to understand, though He did do that afterwards, that their greatness "in heaven" would depend upon their lowliness upon earth; and that while they could not have, and should not have, anything but "tribulation" and "persecution" here upon earth; and that too, *just in the proportion that they were true to their duty*, they should do their work here by *spiritual* means and influences only, and not as the rulers of this world do, by Power, or by Authority. Therefore it was, that He told them, "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 *minister*, and he that is chief, as he that doth *serve*. Behold, I am among you, as he that *serveth*." And, at a later date, He illustrated His words by His own lowliness of behavior, and of service, to themselves; when, like a *slave* of those days, He laid aside His garments, and girded Himself with a napkin, and washed their feet, and wiped them with the towel with which He was girded. And then, when He had taken His garments, and was set down again, He said unto them, "Know ye what I have done unto you? Ye call me Master, and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet; for *I have given you an example, that ye should do, as I have done unto you*." "If ye *know* these things, happy are ye if ye *do* them." And, "happy" indeed, it would be; not only for themselves, but for all of their brethren also; if all of the "successors of the Apostles," not only *knew* these things, but *did* them!

But, the writings of the Apostles show, that they did learn, in time, from these "rebukes" of our Lord Himself, this most important lesson. And, therein lies the real secret of all the greatness, that our Lord has allowed to His Apostles upon earth. All, of the other greatness that they claim, beyond what their actual duty requires of them, is mere personal assumption, and wrong; for their great business, and duty is, to "*minister*" to their fellow men; i. e., to "*serve*" them, and not to claim, or to attempt to exercise over them, any illegal or unnecessary authority; much less arbitrary and unjust personal power. And, if they ever do claim that, then it is the duty, and not the right only, of every true Christian to "withstand" them. Their claims to obedience, and to be allowed to do as they please, much more when they claim to be allowed to do wrong, and even to *enforce wrong upon others*, is wicked; and that to the very highest degree. Knowing what is right, and obeying our consciences, we must, if we would be faithful, "refuse" to follow even "an Apostle;" if, like Judas, he proposed to do what was wrong, or to force wrong upon us. St. Paul himself tells us this, when he says (Gal. i, 8) "But, though *we, or an angel from heaven*, preach any other

gospel unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And, for fear that we might not think that he quite meant, what his words would seem to mean, he immediately repeats his words, saying (v. 9) "As we said before, so say I now again; if *any man* preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

That ought to be considered plain enough; that not "any man,"—no, not even "an Apostle," nor "all of the Apostles put together," nor even "an angel from heaven"—is to be submitted to, or obeyed; if he *attempts* even, to "teach" us, much less if he attempts to "deceive" us, or to "force" us, to receive "any other doctrine," or practice, or law, than that which has been taught by Christ Himself, once for all. "Any man" may reason with us, and try to convince us, if anything that he thinks right; no matter whether it is right or wrong; reasonable or unreasonable. But the very moment that he undertakes to put any obligation upon us, that is not according to the doctrine of Christ, that moment we are bound to "withstand" him; and that too, persistently. That is what St. Paul tells us. And when he says of "any man," or "Apostle," or "angel from heaven," who will try to delude or to force any other person into submitting to their false claims—"let him be accursed,"—it seems to be only reasonable, that any man of sound sense should think it prudent—at the very least—not even to try to teach, or to preach; much less to "deceive," or to "force" any other person, to accept his teaching; when it is plainly contrary to that of our Lord Himself. It is for that reason, and for that reason alone, that I "withstood" you; when you tried to "*force*" me to receive the Communion from you; and that too, without even "*allowing*" me to have any conversation with you, previously, upon the subject. And yet, even now, in a matter where my mind and conscience approved of your teaching, or of your course of action, I would not only fight with you, but for you; and, God helping me, I would dare either to do, or to suffer—with you, or for you—in such a case, even unto death.

Yes, Bishop, it is not by Pride, or by Power, or by the desire, or attempt to exercise force, or authority, over their brethren; nor by the effort to exalt themselves above their brethren; but it is by the humiliation of themselves, to "minister" unto, and to "serve" their brethren; that the "successors of the Apostles," as well as the Apostles themselves, can ever become really "great" in the "kingdom of heaven;" whether the words "kingdom of heaven" be taken to refer to that part of the kingdom which is now, and ever is to be, "in heaven," or to that part of it, which is now, temporarily, upon the earth. That is our Lord's own plain teaching. And, he has elsewhere told us more than that; for He has also taught us, that "Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased;" and also, that "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

Yes, Bishop, and so it always has been, and so it always will be; so long as "the kingdom of heaven" has any part of itself upon earth. For, the more any "minister" of Christ's puts away from himself all foolish, and wicked notions of his own personal greatness, or power, or authority over his brethren; and the more he tries to influence his fellow men, only for their own good, and not for his own good; and the more he tries to do that only by showing to them love, and kindness, and courtesy, and consideration for all of their Rights and Feelings, and by appealing only to their reasons and consciences, and not to his own mere authority; much less to his own arbitrary, and tyrannical, and unjust, and wicked will; just so much the more will he himself be respected and beloved; and just so much the greater will be his own *real* authority, and power. And, all that, without his ever, or, at any rate, often having any need to assert, or to exercise, any authority at all. He will rule hearts, and minds, and consciences, by love and respect; and not by fear. And, he will then rule free, and yet willing subjects; instead of ruling over slaves, or parasites; while, at the same time, he makes those who

will not submit their souls, and their consciences, to injustice and wrong, his opponents, if not his enemies.

For, as Pride makes tyrants, so do tyrants make slaves and parasites, or else rebels. And, each of these—tyrants, slaves, parasites and rebels—make sin and sorrow, not only for themselves, but for all about them also. Thus Pride, which is at the bottom of all, makes deadly mischief; and that to all concerned. Therefore, it is, that wherever Pride reigns, tyranny, and flattery, and hatred, and malice, and rebellion also, likewise reign. Is it any wonder, that our Lord, knowing these things also, laid the axe to the root of the tree that bore such fatal fruits? And yet, with these things as the results of Pride and of Tyranny; bad as the fruits all are, Rebellion is the best of them. For, if there was no such thing as rebellion against the Pride and wickedness of tyrants; all of the evil fruits would grow together, and increase; until the whole mass, not only of the world, but also of the Church, would go to corruption. And, it is only because, from fear of the consequences, to themselves, or to those they love; that Pride and Tyranny are ever allowed by many the scope that they have. But, that is a weakness. It is not an honor. And I, for one, will not allow the fear of the consequences, to myself or to others, to induce me to bow myself to your Pride and Tyranny.

MY LAST APPEAL.

And now, Bishop, these things being so, will you not give these things a careful and prayerful consideration, if you still *can* do so? I have no other motive, in urging that upon you—God He knows—but your own and the Church's good. Will you not do, as the Apostles did, when our Lord showed them these very same things? Put away from you, your foolish and wicked Pride; for, it is only vanity and self-conceit, after all. And, I have not only a right, as "a man," under all of the circumstances of this case; but I am also in duty bound, as a Christian; and above all, as a Presbyter in the Church; to give you this advice; and even to urge it upon you. And, you have no right to feel "aggrieved," even now, notwithstanding all that I have written to you; for you have not only richly earned the "rebuke" that you have now received, but infinitely more besides. For it was *necessary*; you had proved that, beyond all question; that instead of writing to you, as I might have done, to any other man, I could not write so to you. Your contempt for right and truth, when it was stated in mild words, or even in plain terms; but where you could talk of everything as "the matter," and write of my having only "alluded" to that matter, has made it *necessary* that I should write what I had to say to you, in words that would express my thoughts and ideas, *just as plainly as words could be made to do it*. That was *necessary*; in order that you might not only understand all of the facts of the case; but also that you could not, possibly, help seeing how Christian morality, and manly honor, both alike, must regard your conduct.

And, it was necessary also, in order to impress upon your mind, the absolute certainty, of these two things besides: (1.) That you could not possibly carry out your own will, unless you chose to will what was right; and (2.) that you would only bring your office, and your authority, as well as yourself, into contempt; unless you gave up your wicked purpose to misuse your office, and authority; by your arbitrary, and unjust, and unchristian abuse of them.

There remains now, I believe, but one thing more that I ought to notice; and to that, Bishop, let me call your serious attention. It is this; that it is possible for you, even now, to recover all, and even more than all, of the respect and confidence that you have ever had, before you forfeited them, upon one condition; but, *upon one condition only*. And, that condition is, that you are not only able, but willing, to *repent*, deeply, and truly, for all of the wrongs that you have ever done; and to conquer your wicked Pride, to such a degree as that you will never be

guilty of like folly and sin, in the future. If you can do that, then you can "do works that are meet for repentance;" and you can make such confession of your wrongs, and such amends for your wrongs, as it may be in your power to make; and such as may convince me, that I will not be "consenting unto" your past sins, by not "telling" what I now know, "unto the Church." If you will do that, which it is your simple duty to do; then, Bishop, you will not only be a better man, than you have been; but you will also be a better Bishop, than you ever have been; and then you will deserve, and then too, you will receive, not only the forgiveness, but also the love, and the blessing, both of God and man.

That, Bishop, is now the one, and the only question, that still remains an open one between us. And, I am willing to leave that an open one between us, for a limited time—but only for a limited time—that you may have time to consider again, but now for the last time, what you can, or will do. To that end, I will now give you notice, that I will not print what I have written to you, until after Dec. 31st, 1881. You would have no right to complain, if I did so at an earlier day—even if I did it to-day—for you have already had plenty of time, and to spare; to have considered, and re-considered, twenty, or fifty, or an hundred times over, not only what you have done amiss, but what you ought to do, in the way of making amends for your sins, and wrongs. For, it is now nearly two years since you first began to do your wrongs, and it is nearly two years since I first called your wrongs to your notice; and I have now given to you no less than seven distinct and different calls to repentance, in writing; in addition to the one I gave you, by word of mouth, in August last. And, it will be two full years, by Dec. 31st, 1881, since you wrote to me your wicked letter; and you have been adding sin to sin, and wrong to wrong, ever since.

Therefore, Bishop, if, by Dec. 31st, 1881, you have not made such confession and reparation, as the case calls for, then I will have all that I have written to you, and as much more as I shall think it right and proper to write, and to print, printed; and that as soon after the date named, as I possibly can; and I will then distribute the printed copies, to whomsoever I may see fit, whether clergy or laity; that I may not "allow sin" to rest any longer, upon you, or upon myself, or upon the Church.

Therefore, Bishop, if you should, by God's infinite grace, be still able, and willing to repent; and if you wish to do your duty in the premises; it will not do for you to postpone making your first advances, until the time limited has nearly expired. It will take time to settle, and to do, what will have to be done. And, though I wish to go "slowly," as well as "surely," in what I have to do, and that for charity's sake, as well as for conscience's sake, I am not willing to put up with any more negligent, and willful, delays and omissions, such as you have made heretofore. So that, if you wish to stop the publication of what I have written to you, you will have to begin your part of the work in time, so that everything can be fully settled, by Dec. 31st, 1881, at the farthest. For, if the case is not fully settled by that date, then the publication will take place, and nothing that you could possibly do, not even your death, could prevent it.

For, now that things have gone so far as they have, after so many years of patient forbearance, on my part; and since it is so evidently proved, by what you have done, that the Devil and some of my wicked fellow clergy, have been taking such wicked advantage of my silence and forbearance; I feel that it is now absolutely necessary, that I should do what I can, to put a stop to the continuance of the wrongs. And nothing, that will not be something like an equivalent (by making it clear to "all whom it may concern," that their slanders, and calumnies against me must be discontinued) will, at all, meet the necessities of the case.

Here, Bishop, I end my writing; at least for the present. And, oh, may that Merciful God, who has already spared you so long, instead of cutting you off at once, in the midst of your sins, spare you a little longer; at least until Dec. 31st,

1881; that you may have the full time that I have conceded to you, not only to repent, but to make your repentance manifest; if, indeed, you can still repent; as I still try to hope, and believe that you may. But, even my belief in the possibility of this, is only because it is a natural, if not necessary, consequence of the fact, that I do myself believe, that it is by the prompting of the Holy Spirit Himself, that I am now writing to you, and giving you this, my last, and my most solemn warning.

But, Bishop, if you will not heed this warning, as you would not heed any of my warnings heretofore, then, at least, I shall have the comfort of feeling that, though you may "suddenly be cut off, and that without remedy," I will have done my duty by you, as well as to God, and to the Church, and to my own soul; and that God will, at least, hold me guiltless of your blood; and that He will also recompense me, for all that I have done, and borne, for so many years past; and that He will "return" my prayers, with blessings added, "into mine own bosom."

Whatever then may be the result of this whole case, as well as of this last appeal to you, "God's will be done."

I remain, Bishop, with continued good wishes, and with continued prayers for your welfare, both in this world, and in the world to come,

Your "brother," in the Church of Christ,

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter.

CONCLUSION.

—:O:—

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter.” “Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.” “For God shall bring every work into judgement, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.” (Eccles. xii, 13-14.)

Brethren.—Since this Pamphlet has been put to press, so that I cannot now alter what has been printed, I have come to the conclusion, that the course therein stated as having been fully determined upon, though that course is the usual one, in all such cases, will not be the *right* one for me to take, at present.

I think now that, for several reasons, it will be best that I should not, *at this time*, send this Pamphlet to the Lay Delegates to the Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey, as I at first proposed to do; but that I should now send it to the Bishops and clergy of the Church only; first, to all of the Bishops of the Church; next, to all of the clergy of the Diocese of New Jersey; and lastly, to all of the “Doctors” of the Church in the United States. This will give to the Bishops, and to the older clergy, as well as to the clergy of the Diocese of New Jersey, what I think it is right they should have, i. e., a fair opportunity to do what they can, to bring Bishop Scarborough back to reason and to repentance; by such private advice and influence as they may be able to exert upon him. For, that will not only be a thing right and proper in itself, but it will also be a mercy to the Bishop; and, if the Bishop will only “hear” them, it will be a mercy to the Laity, and to the Church at large also. For that would avoid doing anything unnecessarily; and, if the Bishop *should* “hear,” it will avoid the serious, if not fatal, injury to his future influence for good; which must of necessity, result, if the scandal of his conduct should now be published to the Laity. I wish to avoid all such evils, as far as possible.

But, if the Bishops, and the clergy of New Jersey, and the Doctors at large, will, individually and collectively, do their duty now, by communicating with Bishop Scarborough, as they ought to do; one or the other of two results must inevitably happen: (1.) Their appeals to the reason and conscience of the Bishop will bring him back to Truth and Righteousness; or (2.) They will not do so.

In either case, then, our future course of conduct will be made clear. For, if the Bishop will, with proper penitence for the past, do what the case now calls for at his hands, then the whole case will be settled at once, and in the very best manner. But, if the Bishop will not do, what it is now clear that he should do, then his refusal to do what is right will make it clear, not only to us but to all men, that only one possible course will then remain open to us. And that course will be to present him to the House of Bishops for Trial; with suspension or Deposition as his final lot, if his impenitence should continue.

It is for these reasons that I have now decided, that I will not at present send this Pamphlet to any of the Laity; except to a very few of my personal friends, who I feel ought to know the whole of my case, in full.

But, while I now engage not to publish the case to the Laity at present; I do most solemnly appeal to every man to whom this Pamphlet may be sent by

me, or to any others who may see it, that he shall consider earnestly and religiously with himself, as he will have to give an account of his conduct at the day of Judgement, what his own personal and "official" conduct ought to be in this case; and what he owes to God, and to the Church, and to Bishop Scarborough, as well as to me. Clearly, each man should do all that it may be in his power to do, to have this case settled as it ought to be settled; and that too, at the very earliest date possible. And, that sufficient time may be allowed for this, but also that no one may be able to think, or to say, that he meant to do what he could, but that he did not think it necessary for him to be in any haste about what he would do; I hereby give notice of what I will now do, and of what I may have to do.

At present I will do nothing more than distribute 1000 copies of this pamphlet, as I have just indicated. And, I will not do anything publicly, after that, before July 1st, 1882; (thus allowing plenty of time for the Bishops and other clergy to consult with each other, and with Bishop Scarborough, and with me, as to what it will be best, or right, or necessary that we should do) yet be it hereby known, to all persons concerned, that July 1st, 1882, will be *the latest date to which I can possibly consent to wait*. For that will leave me only three months, July, August and September, the worst months in the year for me, and those in which I am apt to be the most prostrated, in which to do all that I will then have to do, before the expiration of the "three years" limit; from the commission of the first overt act of wrong in this case by the Bishop. And, as I think that I ought not to leave one single point even open to question of any kind, if I can help it; so I think that I ought not to allow even the first step in this Conspiracy and Outrage, to be outlawed by the Canon of the Church, which is in this case a "Statute of Limitations."

Therefore, should I live to July 1st, 1882, without having received proper and sufficient assurances, either that the case has been settled, or that it will *certainly* be properly settled; then I shall feel that I can wait no longer; but shall again feel bound to do what I can to have it settled. And, though I do not think it right that I should pledge myself, so far in advance, as to what my course of action then shall certainly be; still, I feel that it is only right that I should now indicate, what at present I think that I then ought to do; that "all whom it may concern" may take due warning, and govern themselves accordingly. (1.) I now feel that it would then be right for me to prepare "Formal Charges" against Bishop Scarborough; specifying accurately all that I have to charge against him, giving dates, &c., and then attesting under oath the truth of all of the things charged in the "Formal Charges;" and also all of the "facts" stated in this Pamphlet; before some civil officer who is authorized by law to administer an oath; (2.) That I should then have those "Formal Charges" printed, together with the accompanying attestations; and that I should then send copies of the printed charges and attestations to every Bishop in the Church, and to every clergyman and Lay Delegate to the Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey for the year 1882, whose name shall be found in the Journal of the Diocese for 1882; and to as many other persons, clerical or lay, as I may see fit, whether in the Diocese of New Jersey, or in the Church at large; even to the extent of 5000 copies; (3.) I also feel that it would then be right for me also, to print 5000 copies more of this Pamphlet, with the sworn attestations to the truth of all of the facts therein printed; and then to send a copy of the Pamphlet to every clergyman in the United States, and to every prominent layman that I can possibly hear of, in the whole country; that every person that I can reach may have all of the information needed, and that all may have plenty of time for consideration and consultation; that, if the case is not taken up by the Bishops, or by the Diocese of New Jersey, before or by the Spring of 1883, it may then be brought before both of the Houses of the General Convention of the Church, in the Fall of 1883.

That, brethren, is what I now think that I ought to do, if the worst comes to the worst. It may indeed be, that I myself will be dead and gone long before this case is settled. But, if I have only done what I alone can do, then I will at least have done my duty; and even my death need not alter the course of things much, if any. For, the *proofs* of what I charge are all in writing, and in print; and therefore the evidence can always be produced whenever it is wanted; so long as the original letters and these printed pamphlets shall exist.

But, I do most devoutly hope and pray, that these last and extreme resorts may never become necessary; for that would be to increase and to prolong the evils that are already existing; and it would also prove the existence of such a degree of utter rottenness in the Church, from the highest even to the lowest in station, as I, with all my past sad experiences, would shudder to think possible.

For, brethren, I am not the only one who ought to try to stop the continuance and the spread of such sin and wickedness, as this Pamphlet reveals. Every man to whom I shall send a copy of it, is *at least* equally bound to do what he can to stop them. And, if any man will not do what he can to stop them, then may God have Mercy upon his soul; and chasten him *in this world* until he becomes wiser and better, "that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." For, in this case, Bishop Scarborough is doing, what for many years past he and others have been doing, i. e., all that he can well do to corrupt and to demoralize the clergy and the Church at Hammonton. And, if that is to be allowed here, it will have to be allowed elsewhere. But, whether it is to be allowed elsewhere or not, it has been so here; and God must "regard it." And, it may be, that it is because He has regarded it, that He has now "raised me up" again "from the dead," as it were; so that, like Abraham, I "should not consider my own body, now dead" (as indeed it has long been, and even now is, all of my senses being partially paralyzed, so that my body is dead in very deed, and not "in a figure only") but should testify against the Bishop, and do what I can to arouse the Church to "put away the sin."

Therefore it is—I firmly believe it—that "one as good as dead" is now "blowing the trumpet in Zion," and "sounding an alarm in God's holy mountain;" that he may "warn" all of "the inhabitants of the land," that "the day of the Lord cometh," that "it is nigh at hand." (Joel II, 1.)

For, as God thought it right, to visit with His "*fierce anger*," and with His "*fury*," the whole congregation of "Jerusalem of old," because of the sins of the "Shepherds," and of the "Pastors," and of the "Prophets," and of the "Priests," whom He Himself had set over them; when "*from the least of them even unto the greatest of them*," "every one was given to *covetousness*;" and when "from the Prophet even unto the Priest *every one dealt falsely*," (Jer. VI, 13) even so will it be now, unless there is a great and speedy change for the better. For, these are just the very sins, *in part*, which the "Bishops," and the "Priests," and the "Deacons" have been guilty of at Hammonton, for the past ten or twelve years, excepting only the Rev. Mr. Fiske, and the present Rector, Mr. Underhill. All the rest of them, "*from the least of them even unto the greatest of them*" have sinned those very same sins; neither have they healed, nor have they even *tried* to heal, "the wounds of the daughter of God's people;" no, not even "slightly." But, on the contrary, they themselves have been the very ones who have "beaten" her, and "wounded" her; and they have done that over, and over, and over again; and that too willfully and wickedly; and that too continually; and that too more and more the more she cried out to them, and besought them; that, for the Lord's sake, and for the Truth's sake, and for Righteousness sake, and for Mercy's sake, they should stay their hands, and "bind up her wounds." And, all this they did, while they were saying to her, and to the Church at large, and even to God, "Peace, Peace!" It all seems to me like that devilish wickedness, with which the Inquisitors of Rome used to harrow the souls as well as the

bodies of their miserable, dying victims, while saying to them, "Depart in Peace," at the very moment when they themselves were racking them to death. To me, it seems as horrible a sight as anything that Hell can show!

And yet, brethren, all of this sin and wickedness will rest now, as it did in Jerusalem of old, not merely upon the actual *doers* of the sins; but upon all those also who could have helped to put a stop to them, but who would not even *try* to do so.

Yes, brethren, it is in "Jerusalem that now is," just as it was in "Jerusalem of old." It is the "Shepherds," and the "Prophets," and the "Pastors," and the "Priests" of the flock, who are the guilty ones. And they have now fully earned God's denunciation against themselves. "*Woe unto the shepherds!*" For, they have *beaten* and *wounded* their brethren, the Lord's sheep, and that "openly and uncondemned," and then would not even "heal the wounds" that they themselves had made; but the more the sheep cried out for Justice, or even for Mercy, *so much the more* did they "*beat*" them, and "*wound*" them. Yes, "With *torce* and with *cruelty* have they ruled them," (Ezek. xxxiv, 4.) And, Bishop Scarborough has even added to all of these dreadful sins—which of themselves brought the curse of God upon the "Shepherds" of old—*deceit* and *falsehood* also, and other sins besides.

Oh! Brethren, it is high time that something was done, to put a stop to this state of things. For, if it is not stopped, God will either send some Jeremiah or Ezekiel to cry out against the "Bishops," and the "Priests," and the "Deacons;" as those Prophets did against the "Shepherds," and the "Pastors," and the "Priests" of old; or else, without any further warning than He has now given by me, He Himself will "smite the Shepherds," and "the sheep shall be scattered;" and He will execute His "*fierce anger*," and His "*fury*," upon them individually; and perhaps upon all those who have "*allowed*" such a state of things to continue in the Church.

To me indeed the Prophet's words seem to be continually ringing in my ears. "*Howl ye Shepherds*, and cry, and wallow yourselves in the ashes, *ye principal of the flock*;" for the days of your slaughter and of your dispersions are accomplished; and ye shall fall like a pleasant vessel. And the *Shepherds* shall have no way to flee, nor *the principal of the flock* to escape. A voice of the cry of the *Shepherds*, and a howling of *the principal of the flock* shall be heard, for the Lord hath spoiled their pasture. (Jer. xxxiv, 34-36.)

"Therefore, ye *Shepherds*, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord God, Behold *I am against the Shepherds*, and I will requite my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the *Shepherds* feed themselves any more; for I will deliver my flock from their mouth." (Ezek. xxxiv, 9.)

That is what God threatened, when the "Shepherds," and the "Pastors," and the "Priests" had "violated His law," and had "wounded His sheep," and had "profaned His holy things," and had "put no difference between the holy and the profane," and "between the unclean and the clean." (Ezek. xxii, 25-26.) Yet, all of these things, and more also, have they done here at Hammon-ton. And, Bishop Scarborough has done worse, than all who have gone before him put together.

Oh, brethren! *Is it* not "high time" for us all to do what we can, to "put away" such sins from the Church? In vain do we "weep" between the porch

and the altar, and cry unto God, "Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not Thine heritage to reproach," if we will not then rise up from our knees, and "do" *what we can, to put away the sin.*

For, that Penitence is not true Penitence, which does not do what it can, to "put away the sin" for which it repents.

WILLIAM PASSMORE, Presbyter. ¶

February 4th, 1882.

