

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1993 -- 2005 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this disc (CD or DVD) by any means is forbidden,
and copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this disc.

METHODIST PROTESTANT HISTORY IN MARYLAND
Compiled by Thomas Hamilton Lewis

A Digital Publication created from:
"Historical Record Of The Maryland Annual Conference
Of The Methodist Protestant Church"

From the First Session, 1829
To the One Hundredth, 1928

Compiled By
Thomas Hamilton Lewis

Fourth Revised Edition

* * * * *

Digital Edition 04/11/2005
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

CONTENTS

Introduction To This Digital Publication
Explanatory Preface

- 01 -- Maryland In Methodism
- 02 -- Organization
- 03 -- The First Session
- 04 -- Trial
- 05 -- Controversy
- 06 -- Work
- 07 -- Benevolence
- 08 -- Public Questions
- 09 -- Review

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION TO THIS DIGITAL PUBLICATION

The title for this digital publication is mine, and -- I elected to include only the historical part of the source-book from which this file was created. In addition to the data in this file, the source-book also included three anniversary sermons and an abundance of statistics. I suspect that much, if not most or all, of the historical and statistical material in the source-book for this file is already in the HDM Digital Library in the following publications: "History Of Methodist Reform, Vol. I" -- hdm0428, and "History Of Methodist Reform, Vol. II" -- hdm0725, by Edward J. Drinkhouse. I refer the reader of this short sketch to these lengthy publications for an extensive study of the early history of the Protestant Methodist Church. -- Duane V. Maxey

* * * * *

EXPLANATORY PREFACE

The history of this publication is very simple, and may be given in a few words mainly by quoting from the minutes of the Maryland Annual Conference.

* * *

FIRST EDITION, 1879.

1. At the session of the Conference held at Centerville in March, 1879, the Fifty-first session,

"T. H. Lewis offered a paper proposing to publish with the minutes a record setting forth in chronological order the history of the ministers, churches and conference meetings of the Conference for the past fifty years, which was referred to the Committee on Literature."

The Committee reported as follows, and the report was adopted:

The committee on Literature, to whom was referred the proposition of Rev. T. H. Lewis respecting the publication of the minutes of this Conference for the present year, in a form and with such additions as must tend to make them more than usually interesting to the church and valuable as a historic record of the Maryland Annual Conference, beg leave to express their hearty approval of the plan, and recommend that he arrange with the Conference Steward, the present Committee on Publication of the Minutes, for their publication in the form proposed on the condition that Brother Lewis shall furnish copies of the same to the Steward for distribution to the different Stations, Circuits and Missions, according to the amount contributed by them, respectively, on the basis of sixteen cents per copy, he (Brother Lewis) assuming all risk of publication, it being understood that he will be permitted to sell copies enough to reimburse himself all expenditure in this behalf incurred.

* * *

SECOND EDITION, 1903

2. At the session held at Centerville in April, 1902, the following resolution was adopted:

"In view of the fact that we will meet next year in our Seventy-fifth Annual session, we believe that it ought to be suitably celebrated, and we suggest (among nine other items) Second, That Dr. T. H. Lewis be requested to prepare a continuation of the historical minutes of 1879, and that they be brought down to date."

In pursuance of these instructions a second edition was published of what was called "The Historical Record" separate from the Minutes this time, making a pamphlet of 162 pages.

* * *

THIRD EDITION, 1918.

3. At the session held in Lynchburg, Va., April 1913, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas, the great assistance and unbounded satisfaction derived from the Conference Historical Record, as last revised by Dr. T. H. Lewis and brought down to 1903, leads us to express our high appreciation of his sacrifice and work. Therefore be it resolved, that Dr. T. H. Lewis be and he is hereby requested to continue the compilation of that Record to date, 1913, in time for publication in the Minutes of 1914."

Unfortunately this very gracious resolution was not accompanied with any provision for meeting the expense of the publication. At the Conference of 1914 it was referred to the Board of Finance to provide funds for the publication, but no report was made by the Board. Finally, however, the matter being brought to the attention of the Conference by the secretary, at the session of 1916, "Upon motion the Committee on Publication of the Historical Record was instructed to proceed with the said publication and present the bill for the same at the 1917 session of the Conference. The undersigned, not being present at Conference when this resolution was adopted was in ignorance of it until too late to comply with the instructions in full. However, it is perhaps better that the publication was deferred so as to include the record of the ninetieth session, and be ready for distribution with the minutes of that session in 1918.

I am therefore taking final leave of a work which has occupied more or less of my time for the last forty years. It is a very simple piece of work, requiring no faculty save patience and accuracy in copying figures, and yet, since it has proved acceptable to members of the Conference generally, I must not depreciate it. I have known some more pretentious literary labors sink into oblivion in a much shorter time. This publication will in all probability live as long as the Conference lives. When the one hundredth session arrives there will be a demand for another edition of it. I trust the editor of that edition may be able to present it in such a form as to enhance its value and secure its permanence. As for myself I can sincerely repeat a sentence of the preface of the second edition "I have worked among these names and figures with a real pleasure, and while it is not expected that the reader will find the pleasure he would get from a history, he may find useful and suggestive information here in a convenient form."

Westminster, Maryland
T. H. Lewis
April 3rd, 1918.

* * *

FOURTH EDITION, 1928.

The President of the Maryland Conference, Rev. E. C. Makosky, D. D., in his annual report to the Conference held at Starr Church, April 6th, 1927, made the following recommendation, which was adopted by the Conference:

"When in 1918 Doctor Lewis brought down to date the 'Record in Chronological order of the ministers, churches, delegates and meetings of this Conference', he used the following words in the closing paragraph of his explanatory introduction: 'I am therefore taking final leave of a work which has occupied more or less of my time for the last forty years. When the One Hundredth session arrives there will be a demand for another edition of it. I trust the editor of that edition may be able to present it in such form as to enhance its value and secure its permanence'.

We are grateful to Almighty God and give devout thanks that Doctor Lewis is here among us, preserved in mind and body, and eminently fitted for the task he thought would have to be committed to other hands.

I therefore recommend: That Doctor Lewis be requested by this Conference to continue the compilation of that record, bring it down to date and have it prepared in such form as to enhance its value and secure its permanence; and that the expense to do this be met from the funds in the treasurer's hands for Conference expenses".

In obedience to this request, I herewith present the fourth edition of what we have been calling, not altogether accurately, "The Historical Record of the Maryland Annual Conference". For lack of a better name, and because the publication has established its identity under the name given it at first, it is again published under the old name.

Whether its value has been enhanced in this edition, I must leave the readers to judge. But the fact that this edition celebrates or at least, co-incides with, the Centennial year of the Church, it has been thought it might be pleasing to enlarge the publication by including a reprint of a little book published in 1882, called a "Historical Sketch of the Maryland Annual Conference for its first fifty years", prepared by Rev. J. T. Murray, D. D. and Rev. T. H. Lewis, D. D., and now long out of print.

And since the Conference celebrated its Semi-Centennial, its Diamond Jubilee, and its Centennial Anniversaries by requesting the preparation and delivery of sermons, and afterwards printing them, the first by Rev. J. K. Nichols, D. D., the second and third by Rev. T. H. Lewis, D. D., these sermons have also been included in this edition.

The remaining part of the book contains the same records as before, bringing them down to the last Conference, held in Lynchburg, Va., September 12th, 1928.

If I were disposed to boast, I suppose I might say that I am the only Methodist Protestant that ever published a book in four separate editions, each edition by special request, and the last edition fifty years after the first. But I would have to go on to say, if I would be frank, that each edition was very limited in number, and practically none were sold, the copies being distributed as the minutes are.

However, it does not lessen my satisfaction, pride, if you will, that my life has been spared through so long a period, and especially that it has fallen to my lot to live up to the Centennial year of our Church, and to participate in the joyous celebration of it.

I have spent a considerable portion of time and labor altogether in getting these records together and seeing them through the press. I have never received any financial profit or remuneration from the publication. I have not printed a word in it that could give anybody pain, nor one that I could wish to retract. There may be typographical errors in it, but facts and figures hurt nobody, and this is a book of facts and figures.

We Maryland Conference people are rather provincial folks; we think there is no Conference like ours. And what I have done in this publication many other members would have been equally able and glad to do. The Conference is larger than it has ever been, and will go on increasing, conquering, and to conquer. May God preserve it to another Centennial, at least; and keep its facts and figures unspotted from the world!

Washington, D.C.
Thomas Hamilton Lewis
September, 1928.

* * * * *

01 -- MARYLAND IN METHODISM

Maryland was the headquarters of the original Methodist Church. Here Methodism crystallized into its organic mold. It was introduced into this State almost simultaneously with its beginning in New York City, in the preaching of Philip Embury. The Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in their account of the rise of Methodism, in their preface to the Discipline, in 1790, say, after alluding to the labors of Embury, that "about the same time, Robert Strawbridge, a local preacher from Ireland, settled in Frederick county, Maryland, and preaching there, formed societies." He emigrated to this county in 1765. He settled on Sam's Creek; the country then had been but recently wrested from the savages. He opened his house for preaching, and, not long after, built the Log Meeting-House, on Sam's Creek. It is claimed by some that this was the first Methodist meetinghouse built in America. It was a rude structure, twenty-two feet square. It has long since gone to decay, nothing of it remaining but the canes into which some of its logs were converted, and preserved as holy relics by the pious Protestants who despise the relics of Popery.

Richard Owen, one of the converts under the preaching of Strawbridge, in Baltimore county, was the first native local preacher of the continent. He afterwards became an itinerant.

Among the preachers raised up by Strawbridge was Richard Webster, of Harford county, grandfather of the Websters of the Maryland Conference; thus we establish the unbroken line of succession!

John King, who came to America in 1769, "first threw the banner of Methodism to the people of Baltimore. His first pulpit there was a blacksmith's block at the intersection of French and Front streets. His next sermon was from a table, at the junction of Baltimore and Calvert streets; his courage was tested on this occasion, for it was the militia training day, and the drunken crowd charged upon him so effectually as to upset the table and lay him prostrate upon the earth." -- Stevens' History.

The first Methodist chapel in Baltimore was on Fell's Point. It was built of brick, and was forty-one feet six inches in length and thirty feet in width. It was commenced November, 1773. The first American Methodist Conference began in Philadelphia, on the 14th of July, 1773. The aggregate of Methodists then was 1160; and 500, or nearly one-half of these, were in Maryland. William Watters' name appears in the list of appointments made at this Conference; he has the distinction of being the first native American itinerant of Methodism, and he was a native of Baltimore county, Maryland.

The first General Conference, known as the Christmas Conference, was held in Lovely Lane Chapel, Baltimore, beginning December 24th, 1784. Then and there Episcopal Methodism was ordained and established. Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D., ordained Francis Asbury deacon on Sunday, elder on Monday, and on Tuesday "consecrated" him Superintendent.

This review of "first things" illustrates the prominence of Maryland in the history of Methodism. The seed sown on Maryland soil, reproduced in marvelous increase, has filled the whole land with its fruit.

Maryland sustains a like relation to the reformed system of Methodism, known as the Methodist Protestant Church. The Reformers of Maryland are prominent in the general history of that Church; more of them figure in it than those of any other single Conference. In Colhouer's History of the Founders of the Methodist Protestant Church, of the eighty-one selected by him for biographical notice, thirty-one, or more than one-third, are Marylanders. The first Union Society, membership in which was the cause of expulsion from the old Church, was formed in Baltimore. The first to feel the persecution encountered in the cause of reform, in its direst form, was a Maryland minister, Dennis B. Dorsey, the victim of that "labored deed of hard-earned infamy," as Henry B. Bascom, afterward Bishop, termed it. At the Baltimore Conference of 1827 he was deprived of his right to an appointment, and at the next session expelled. William C. Poole also was expelled at the same time. Then followed the expulsion of the members of the Union Society in Baltimore: eleven ministers and twenty-two laymen. The venerable father, Thomas McCormick, is the sole survivor of the number.

At the General Convention of 1828, Nicholas Snethen, afterwards first President of the Maryland Conference, was the President. Dr. Samuel K. Jennings, of Baltimore, was chairman of the committee who prepared the Conventional Articles for the government of the Associated Methodist Churches. Four of the five members of the committee appointed by the convention to prepare the Constitution and Book of Discipline were Marylanders. Of the first General Conference, and of seven out of thirteen that have been held since, the President was from Maryland. In Maryland was formed the first Methodist Protestant Church, December 1827, and in Maryland was formed the second Annual Conference, April 1829, the history of which it is the object of this work to narrate.

* * * * *

02 -- ORGANIZATION

It would not be possible, within the limits of the present work, to review at length the causes that led to the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. Nor is it necessary. Their history is the common property of Methodism. It is not too much to say that the action of our fathers under those causes is becoming the common admiration of Methodism. They made complaints against the use of arbitrary power, and there has never been general manifestation of it since. They asked for guarantees from those possessing arbitrary power, and, though refused then, they have been given one after another ever since. And so are our fathers vindicated. It will be sufficient for our purpose to give simply the order of events in the organization of the Church in Maryland up to the first session of the Annual Conference.

Such members of the Methodist Episcopal Church as were favorable to reform in the government of the Church had formed themselves into "Union Societies" since 1824, in different parts of the country, but with no intention of severing their connection with the M. E. Church. When it became apparent that their appeals were resulting only in persecution and expulsion for themselves, these societies elected delegates to a General Convention, to meet in Baltimore, November 12, 1828, "to deliberate upon the course which is now to be pursued by the friends of reform." At that convention a new Church was organized, with articles of association, under the name of "The Associated Methodist Churches," and which in 1830 received the name it still bears: "The Methodist Protestant Church."

The Mutual Rights, a paper supported by the Union Societies, in its first issue after the convention says: "The eventful crisis is now past, and conventional arrangements are made. It now remains for the several Union Societies and bodies of reformers to call meetings for the purpose of examining the proceedings, and to adopt or reject them, accordingly as they correspond, or not, with their views."

In accordance with this suggestion, the Reformers in Baltimore, who had been in fact a Methodist Protestant Church since December, 1827, met and adopted the Articles of Association. This society was organized at first by twenty-two laymen and eleven ministers who had been expelled, and of forty-seven females who had withdrawn from the M. E. Church. When they met to adopt the Articles of Association -- some time in December, 1828 -- "upwards of fifty persons were admitted into the society, most of whom had withdrawn from the M. E.

Church since the Convention." With the advice and generous aid and hearty co-operation of John Clark, a member of St. John's P. E. Church, Liberty street, that building was secured as a Methodist Protestant Church, and became the "Old Home" of Methodist Protestantism in Baltimore.

Georgetown, D. C., was perhaps the first society in the Maryland District to adopt the Articles of Association. The first meeting to consider the matter was held in the old Presbyterian church on Bridge street, Dr. Balch, pastor. Dr. Balch was the father of Dr. Thomas B. Balch, who maintained during life such intimate intercourse with our preachers and Conference. This meeting was held December 2, 1828, at which time twenty-two males and eighteen females determined to secede from the M. E. Church and adopt the Conventional Articles. The document setting forth their purpose and the reasons therefore, is still preserved among the archives of that Church. It bears the autographs of those original members; it is one of the most venerable and valuable papers connected with our history. The Georgetown Society first worshipped in the Lancasterian schoolhouse, Alexander McCaine preaching them the first sermon. In the summer following, St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church being without a rector, our society accepted the use of that church, so kindly offered them, and continued to worship there until their own church was dedicated, which event occurred November 24, 1829. As the church was organized seven months before the first Annual Conference, the society secured the services of W. W. Wallace, of Philadelphia, as their pastor.

Washington, D. C., Station was organized in the year 1829, under the fostering care of Georgetown. The original church was built in 1832, and first occupied in December of that year. A more commodious house being needed to represent our cause at the National Capital, the General Conference of 1834 was memorialized to endorse the project and recommend it to the aid of our fellowship, which was done accordingly. The building of Ninth Street Church was the result; it was dedicated in July, 1835. The building cost \$4500, and the lot \$800. After all the money that could be raised at home and abroad had been applied, there remained a debt of \$3000, for which two brethren gave their notes. To meet these, James A. Kennedy sold the house in which he lived for \$1200, and mortgaged the one into which he moved to raise an additional thousand dollars. This property was so deeded that if the society became extinct, the General Conference has the power to direct the disposition of the proceeds of its sale. Contributions were made by the churches throughout our fellowship, to aid in relieving the debt.

Reisterstown Circuit was organized by Rev. Eli Henkle early in December, 1828. He first organized a class at Providence, then at Sandy Mount, both appointments now belonging to Finksburg Circuit. Then Westminster and Reisterstown, and two other classes in adjoining territory. This circuit was of sufficient strength at the Conference of 1829 to take two preachers, and Isaac Webster and David Crall were sent.

Deer Creek Circuit was also organized by Rev. Eli Henkle. In January, 1829, he visited Harford county, and formed classes at Log Meeting-House, Wesleyan Church, Waters' Meeting-House, Abingdon, Calvary and Union Chapel. At the ensuing Conference he was sent as the supply to this circuit.

Pipe Creek Circuit was organized by Rev. D. E. Reese, St. He entered upon his labors here in the first week of January, 1829. In one month he had fifteen preaching places and nine societies. This circuit embraced parts of Frederick and Carroll counties. At one of the appointments, Uniontown, the whole membership of the M. E. Church joined the new movement, and there has not been a Methodist Episcopal Church in the community since. Rev. Daniel Zollickoffer was the leader in this movement, and by his personal influence and exertions made principles that were popular, almost powerful.

Eastern Shore. The work in this territory began in Centerville, Queen Anne's county. At the M. E. Church on Sunday, December 14, 1828, after preaching by Rev. Mr. Reed, remarks were made explanatory of the views and purposes of Reformers, and an invitation given to those desirous of uniting with them. Twenty-four males and twenty-nine females came forward and were received. In Kent Island, Chestertown, Easton and adjoining territory, societies were formed and of these a circuit was made, called "Eastern Shore Circuit," and supplied at the Conference of 1829 by Revs. J. S. Reese, M. D., R. T. Boyd and Charles W. Jacobs. In 1830 the circuit was divided into three circuits, bearing the name of the county in which they were respectively located. In 1831 Kent remained distinct, and Queen Anne's and Talbot were united, and Caroline added to them. In 1832 they were restored as at its beginning. In 1834 they were again divided into three circuits. In 1840 Queen Anne's and Talbot were united. In 1841 Queen Anne's and Talbot were again divided, and this was the end of the united arrangement of these original fields on the Eastern Shore. Out of them have grown numerous pastorates. From Kent: 1, Chestertown Station; 2, Chesapeake Circuit; 3, Kennedyville; 4, St. James. Extending above and around Kent are also several circuits since organized. From Queen Anne's: 1, Centerville Station; 2, Kent Island; 3, Crumpton; 4, Queen Anne's Circuit. From Talbot: 1, Easton Station; 2, St. Michael's; 3, Talbot Circuit; 4, Caroline Circuit; 5, Preston Circuit. We may reckon at least thirteen pastoral charges, employing fourteen preachers in the bounds of this one original circuit; a membership of nearly two thousand, twenty-seven churches, thirteen parsonages, and church property valued at over ninety-one thousand dollars. We owned not a single meeting-house in this territory at the beginning.

To the local preachers, the Church owes much as pioneers of the cause of mutual rights. Often in advance of the itinerants, they organized societies and prepared fields for them to enter. Among these useful and honored men, the venerable Thomas McCormick was prominent at the beginning, and he still lingers with us, the only living link connecting us with the beginning of the Conference. We are indebted to him for the substance of the three paragraphs next succeeding.

The itinerants being too few to meet the demands for the rapidly increasing organizations, the local preachers, especially those in Baltimore, were subject to frequent calls, to which they responded at great personal sacrifice. Bro. McCormick visited the Navy-yard, Washington, on the occasion of the organization of that society, and held service for them. They organized at Odd Fellows Hall; it was the same day on which Rev. John L. Gibbons read the whole party out of the M. E. Church. Visiting the brethren at Georgetown, W. C. Lipscomb accompanied him to the Navy-yard in the evening; it was on this occasion he urged upon his dear friend Lipscomb the duty of preaching the Gospel, thus interpreting the Divine call, which was confirmed by the blessing of God upon his long and useful services in the Church.

Soon after the organization in Baltimore, it fell to his lot to visit the neighborhood of Savage Factory, his response to an intimation from Nicholas Dorsey that some of the people there were in sympathy with our cause. He there made his first public address on the subject of Reform. An appointment was made of a subsequent day, when a class would be formed. Bro. M. being sick, could not go, but William Kesley went and formed the society. The members, in part, were Nicholas Dorsey, Thomas Marriott, William Bamber and Berry Roby, and their families. Soon after, the class was removed to All Saints Protestant Episcopal Church; a church built for Alfred Dashields, son of the rector of St. Peter's Church, for whom St. John's Church, Liberty street, was built. Both these churches came into our possession. A new church of better appearance, now occupies the site of the old All Saints.

William Bawden, a local preacher from England, having united with us, was sent to prepare the way for organizing societies in Anne Arundel and Montgomery counties. Bro. McCormick removed to the neighborhood of Brookville in the spring of 1830. Bro. Bawden had been there, but there was not a single member in the place. The first class at Brookville was formed in 1830, composed of Bro. McCormick, daughter and wife, and her sisters, Hannah and Maria Martin. Soon after, Sarah Griffith and Rebecca Vinsey were added. A class was also formed by Alex. McCaine at Hezekiah Linthicum's, near Roxbury Mills, which was the beginning of Union Chapel, which has had such prominence in the history of our Church, of which James B. Mathews, Bazil Cripster, Dr. Owings, the Dorseys, and other well-known laymen, were members. Bro. Mathews is perhaps the only survivor of the prominent men of its early days.

Bro. McCormick mentions Holly Run and Magothy, in Anne Arundel, as among the first organizations there. And then Owings' School-House. Linthicum Chapel has superseded the latter. Sweetser Linthicum furnishes the following: "Holly was finished in the spring of 1829. The first Mass was held at John R. Thomas's, composed of Abner Linthicum, Sr. and Jr., John R. Thomas and wife, William Shipley and wife, Matilda Linthicum and Hester Thomas.

The first preacher was William Bawden.

* * * * *

03 -- THE FIRST SESSION

The Convention of 1828 provided for the organization of Annual Conferences in every State by the following: "Article VI. There shall be in each State, so soon as may be, one, or not exceeding two, Annual Conferences, to be composed of all the ordained ministers and an equal number of lay delegates."

To carry this into effect, it was also resolved to appoint agents to travel through the territory and organize churches and conferences. The following were named for Maryland: Nicholas Snethen, Alexander McCaine, Eli Henkle, W. C. Poole, S. Linthicum and D. Chambers. These were empowered to appoint two others to assist for the Eastern Shore.

We have seen from the preceding chapter what these agents accomplished from the time of their appointment until the first of March.

In The Mutual Rights, of March 5, 1829, the following notice appeared, without signature, but, of course, from the authorized agents of the Convention:

"MARYLAND CONFERENCE. -- The Annual Conference of the Associated Methodist Churches, for the State of Maryland, will commence on Thursday, the second day of April in the city of Baltimore."

On the appointed day the following persons assembled in St. John's Church, Liberty street, duly accredited as ministers and delegates to organize the Maryland Annual Conference:

MINISTERS: Nicholas Snethen, Alexander McCaine, S. K. Jennings, James R. Williams, D. B. Dorsey, Thomas McCormick, J. S. Reese, L. J. Cox, D. E. Reese, Sr., Jonathan Forest, Eli Henkle, W. C. Poole, Benjamin Richardson, Isaac Webster, John Davis, William Kesley, J. B. Ferguson, J. C. French, Kendle S. Cropper, John Fernon. This roll includes all ministers, whether itinerant or local, as they were entitled to membership on account of ordination. But in 1830, and afterwards, only itinerant ministers were accounted members of Conference.

LAY DELEGATES: John Chappell, George Evans, Wesley Start, J. J. Harrod, John Rose, R. A. Shipley, George Northerman, R. B. Varden, J. H. Kennard, T. W. Hopper, P. B. Hopper, W. Harper, Jr., W. H. Bordley, James Parrott, Rowland Rogers, Abelard Stevenson, Christopher Owings, Jasper Peddicord, James Mather, Thomas Mummey, John Eliason, George Collard, John May, James Moore, Daniel Peregoy, Dennis A. Smith.

The following were the itinerants at the first Conference, those ministers signifying their willingness to travel and those received into the itinerancy; N. Snethen, D. E. Reese, St., F. Stier, Isaac Webster, J. S. Reese, Joseph Scull, T. McCormick, W. W. Wallace, David Crall, James Hanson, R. T. Boyd, W. Bawden, C. W. Jacobs. Dennis B. Dorsey and W. C. Poole were by resolution entered on the journal as traveling preachers.

Rev. D. E. Reese, St., was elected President pro tem, and P. B. Hopper, Secretary. The permanent officers were: President, Rev. Nicholas Snethen; Secretaries, Jas. Parrott and L. J. Cox.

The sessions of the Conference were not open to the public, it being the custom of those days to sit with closed doors. The doorkeeper was instructed, however, to admit all members of the Church and persons known to be friendly to reform. And in a short while the Conference threw open its doors to the public and began the custom which now obtains among all Methodists.

The manner of stationing the preachers was the subject of much deliberation, and finally the method which still holds was adopted: the appointments being made by the President, subject to revision by a Committee of Appeals. At various times in the history of the Conference,

motions have been offered to have the appointments made by a committee, but the proposition has never received much favor.

The question which has given so much trouble to State and Church, and now happily no more a living issue, was noticed in the short and decided sentence: Resolved, That we are as much as ever opposed to slavery. It may be of interest to show the sentiment of the Church on this subject, as expressed a little further on in its history. At the session of 1831, a committee was appointed "to inquire what measures it may be necessary for this Conference to adopt on the subject of slavery." The committee reported, and the Conference adopted a resolution that "holding in slavery men, women and children, or selling them so that they may be enslaved for life, is irreconcilable with the rules of justice laid down in the Gospel." In its later deliverances the Conference was conservative, and no trouble in Maryland ever came of the agitation of the vexed question.

The ritual of ordination of the M. E. Church was modified to agree with the principles and order of the new Church, and the following persons elected to orders and ordained:

ELDERS: D. E. Reese, St., J. R. Williams, S. Linthicum, J. S. Reese, L. J. Cox, T. McCormick.

DEACONS: William Bawden, R. T. Boyd, Charles Rigby, David Crall, Robert Scott, James Hanson.

The following was the first plan of appointments: President, Nicholas Snethen. Baltimore Station, F. Stier.

Reisterstowa Circuit, Isaac Webster, David Crall.
Deer Creek Circuit, Eli Henkle.
Pipe Creek Circuit, Daniel E. Reese, Sr.
Anne Arundel Circuit, William Bawden.
Georgetown Station, W. W. Wallace.
Mount Olive Station, James Hanson.
Eastern Shore Circuit, J. S. Reese, R. T. Boyd, C. W. Jacobs.
Philadelphia Circuit, Thomas Dunn.
Missionary for Pennsylvania and New Jersey, John Fernon.
Missionary for Eastern Shore, Joseph Scull.

Two incidents of this Conference are worth recording. The first relates to the oldest member of the body, Rev. Jonathan Forest. "He had entered the traveling connection in 1783; had been a Methodist for sixty years. At the love-feast held during the session, he stated that he had seen the commencement of the First Methodist Church, and that God had now permitted him to live to see the second Methodist Church in her infancy; and that he believed God would bless this also with His choicest blessings."

The ether incident relates to the youngest member, and is from Dr. J. K. Nichols' semi-centennial Sermon:

"In contemplating the organization of this Maryland Annual Conference, a beautiful incident floats up in vision to the mind. It is that of a ruddy-faced youth -- a boy of 17 years -- standing at the door of Conference, knocking for entrance, that he might preach the Gospel of Christ. Those grave men look at him thoughtfully, and whisper to each other with doubtful inquiry -- 'Can one so young and so slight of form sustain the hardships and responsibilities of Itinerant life?' They shake their heads significantly, and hesitate about his reception. One of their number, a man of benevolent countenance and a rotund figure, is eyeing him closely. Rising, he approaches the youth, and they leave the Conference room together. He enters into conversation with the youthful preacher, and is struck with admiration and wonder. He finds him a prodigy of intellectual strength and culture--a mere boy in years and physical development; but in maturity and breadth of intellect, a man of more than ordinary cast of character. He returns to the Conference-room, smiling all over his face, exclaiming as he enters, 'We'll take him, Mr. President, we'll take him!' The youth was received without further hesitation and assigned to Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot, with that noble man of God, Rev. Dr. J. S. Reese. That ruddy-faced youth was Charles W. Jacobs, of precious memory; and that man of the benevolent countenance was Hon. P. B. Hopper, the able jurist and Christian gentleman, one of the fathers and founders of the Methodist Protestant Church."

But it was not a Conference of sentiment and incidents, pleasing as there are to remember. It was a stern, business-like grapple with difficult problems; it was the profound deliberation of men, confident they were right, but knowing they must prove their faith by their works. Theirs was the task to prepare for the founding and nursing of a new ecclesiastical organization; to do this with no model, and to do it in spite of incessant antagonism. Who will deny they did it well?

Who will question the practical and far-reaching wisdom of these men, who proceeded to prepare at once those institutions which still remain, and which have never been materially improved nor increased?

The first Conference! How insignificant in numbers, how destitute of material resources; no meeting-houses, no parsonages, no chartered fund, no schools; with obstacles in its way which none but those nerved by the sublimest heroism could hope to conquer. But they were heroes, every one of them; strong in the righteousness of their cause, proving the purity of their motives and the worth of their principles by the reproach they were willing to bear, the hardships they were willing to endure, and the obscurity into which they were willing to go for their sake. Even had they been in error, "their very errors would have challenged the admiration of mankind." With the same spirit inspiring their hundred-and-fifty successors in the ministry, stationed and unstationed; their fifteen thousand spiritual offspring, with three-quarters of a million of church property, and multiplied millions of private property, how immeasurably the prosperity of the Maryland District would be increased!

* * * * *

It is with no desire to perpetuate bitter feelings in the old, nor awaken them in the young, that the present chapter is written. The time has come when we can survey the period of trial, not without emotion, indeed, but without bitterness. We can read the evil prophecies of those early days without apprehension, and therefore without anger. We can look upon the severe and active opposition without a thought of preparation for war -- for the smoke of all such hostilities is cleared away. What the beauty and truth of our principles could not extort, the stubborn fact of our assured success has won; we are respected. And with sincere thanks to Almighty God, it may be recorded today that, among all Methodists, harmony and mutual good feeling prevail.

But still such a chapter as the present ought to be written. Fidelity to the truth of history demands it. Fidelity to the memory of our fathers demands it. In no other light can their work be properly estimated. What they accomplished was great, under any circumstances, but under the trials that beset them, and the opposition that hindered them, their work was wonderful.

To begin with, there was the hardship of their expulsion from the M. E. Church. It is difficult for us of the present day to realize the experience of the man who, in 1828, found himself, without cause, expelled from Methodism. He knew nothing but Methodism, loved nothing so well as Methodism, yet Methodism refused him the honor of her name and the comfort of her communion. Where should he go? In those days the lines, both doctrinal and formal, were much closer drawn than at present between the various denominations. Hence Methodists were driven to the formation of a new Church. But, of course, the odium of expulsion clung to them. The ministry of the M. E. Church would not fraternize with expelled preachers; the laity would have no association with expelled members. Thus driven out, with no share in churches they had helped to build, and their claim to the name of Methodist denied, they started upon the mission. Alas! if God had not gone with them!

To this was added the charge of schism. The radicals were trying to establish another sect, and thus unnecessarily injure Christian unity. The inconsistency of this charge is exposed by Hon. P. B. Hopper, in *The Mutual Rights*, January 20, 1829: "Our brethren of the old Church now blame us for doing the very thing which they advised us to do. Have they not all along told us, if we did not like the government, to withdraw and set up for ourselves? And now they denounce us because we have taken their advice."

Not only so, but the organization of this new Church was held up as an ungrateful rivalry against the mother Church. Dr. J. S. Reese, writing to *The Methodist Protestant*, says: "Has it not been published that some of us owe an 'immense debt of gratitude' to another Church? Yes, indeed, gravely a debt of gratitude truly immense -- such as the young lion owes to the dam that brought it forth and left it amid the winds and storms of the desert."

It was not long, however, before the opposition took a more active form. Loss of favor was freely threatened by the authorities against those who sympathized with reformers. Rev. Thomas Melvin, of Caroline county, writing to *The Mutual Rights*, says: "Only such as have strong feeling in regard to religious liberty will come out boldly when the rod of power is shaken over them by the preacher; for they say their members must not go to hear reformers." And again, in another letter: "Our old side preachers treat us with as much contempt as if we were highwaymen. One of them has forbidden me and others going to their (the M. E.) meetings; and I

am informed that the other has publicly declared that, if we do go, he will have us put out of the house."

But it was soon seen that such proceedings did more harm to themselves than to the reformers. Thus, in St. Michael's, an agreement was made between members of the M. E. Church and reformers for the joint use of the church in that place. The preacher "forbade the bans," and because of this twenty-eight of his members withdrew and joined the reformers. Heated by this, he preached against reformers, "comparing them to rotten bricks, tumbling out of a wall; to rotten fruit and broken branches, falling from the trees; and finally, to dogs and smooth-faced devils." Immediately after this sermon, a second secession took place of twenty-seven members.

Evidently it was time to try another plan. Accordingly, reform began to be talked down. Prophecies of failure, born of the desire, were uttered by the seers of those days. The speedy extinction of the Church was predicted. To this we find frequent allusion in the writing of the fathers, Rev. Robert Wilson, who had received over a hundred accessions from the old Church on Williamsport Circuit, settled the point in the following conclusive sentence: "Whenever there shall be more Methodist Protestants going over to the M. E. Church than there are more Methodist Episcopalians coming over to us, I shall think differently of this going down doctrine." Nevertheless, the talk went on until 1859, when an opportunity occurred to meet and crush it in a public and effective way.

Conference was assembled at Georgetown, and one of the daily papers reported Rev. Henry Slicer as saying, in a discussion of the subject of lay delegation, in the East Baltimore Conference, that "Methodist Protestantism has proved a failure. Their itinerancy has degenerated into a local system, and their preachers are in the market waiting for hire." This stirred the indignation of the brethren, and was the occasion of several eloquent and manly speeches, which were reported by J. T. Ward and Ulysses B. Ward, and published in *The Methodist Protestant*.

L. W. Bates began the discussion by saying: "I was born naturally in the Quaker Church, but spiritually born in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and while I have a high respect for every evangelical church in Christendom, and am fully prepared to fraternize with her ministers and members, I am not for hire at the hands of any man. I read these remarks while seated in the midst of a Methodist Protestant Conference composed of nearly one hundred and fifty ministers and lay members, and yet we are published to the world as a defunct Church. They are false, and I wish that I could believe that he does not know them to be false."

E. Y. Reese said: "The old cry of failure is wearing out. It is too late to oppose lay representation with that cry any longer. Besides what is all this ado about lay privileges in the old Church today, but an evidence of our success? The answer is plain; our principles are successfully budding there, despite the effort to crush them. He says our ministry has degenerated into a local system. Is there any man here entered as an itinerant who is not truly so? Was not one of the most valuable congregations in Baltimore sundered from us because our itinerancy was inflexible, and because it was determined that the original landmarks of Methodism should be preserved?" Repelling indignantly the charge that our ministers were for hire, he said Mr. Slicer "ought to be ashamed of that speech, and the members of his Church should blush for him that he made it."

Josiah Varden followed: "When this Conference met in Philadelphia I made a speech, and the newspapers reported that a quaint old fellow from the backwoods made some remarks. I am not a quaint old fellow from the backwoods, for I was born in Washington city, raised religiously in Baltimore, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church in the beginning of its career. Therefore I have a right to say whether the Methodist Protestant Church has been a failure or not." He then compared the features of the two Methodisms in extenso. "And for advocating these liberal principles, the reputation of the advocates is to be blackened, and not a word of defense is to be made? Never, sir, while his head is warm and this heart throbs, will I suffer them to be trampled upon -- never will I look upon their green graves, without a word to rebuke any that would dishonor them. Talk about radicals! Sir, I venture to assert that a more venerable, a more high-minded, pious, nobler set of men and women than those who formed the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church, were never found in any community upon earth. Gone to nothing! What do you mean? When I came to this town (Georgetown), the foundation stones of this church were lying here. I inquired of a colored man if he knew where the church was situated? 'Why, sir, if you go up that street, there is the foundation of the radicon church just laid.' We began with this one church, and one in Alexandria, and besides these we had scarcely a roof over our heads; and now, when we have over \$280,000 worth of church property, our opponents state that we are going to nothing."

W. A. Lipscomb uttered his amazement at the speech of Mr. Slicer, and said: I hope to see this infant Zion of ours live until she shall tell to the world the triumph of the principles that have constituted the strength of our organization; that it is destined to live when my gray head shall be laid low beneath the clods of the valley."

It is impossible to convey, in the brief space allotted, an adequate idea of these speeches. We have given a mere outline of the report.

This was the last of "the going down doctrine," and, indeed, the last of positive opposition to the new Church. Even Mr. Slicer came to know and appreciate our ministers, between whom and himself there were very cordial relations and the interchange of professional services.

As we said in the beginning, these things are recalled, not that we may remember evil, but that we may worthily estimate the peculiar surroundings in which our fathers had their work to do. They were opposed, but the men who opposed them thought they were doing right. At any rate, they did only what all human beings are very prone to do. They thought the reformers were disturbing, unnecessarily, the peace of the Church and should be silenced.

Now that they have met in the skies, let us emulate and enjoy the "peace on earth" which they know in heaven.

* * * * *

In more than fifty years of intimate association, the Maryland Conference has had but one serious difference of opinion among its members, and that occurred early in its history. It is known as the Mission Controversy, and shall be faithfully recorded here.

The Mission Controversy was in relation to the true interpretation of "The Restrictive Rule," or "Iron rule," so called. The "Itinerants," as the disputants on one side called themselves, contended that the rule applied to Missions as well as Circuits and Stations; that a mission was simply a circuit or station in a formative state, and therefore the minister must be removed, at farthest, at the expiration of the third year; that a construction which allowed a missionary to be appointed to the same mission for the fourth year was an evasion of the law, and an act of favoritism tending to the destruction of the itinerancy. The "Mission men," as brethren who took a different view of the subject, were styled by their opponents, contended that the word mission was omitted from the law for a purpose; that the law recognized three distinct divisions of the Church -- Circuits, Stations, and Missions -- the two former of which, by express terms, were restricted to three and two years respectively in the reception of the same ministerial supply; but missions not being named in the law, Missionaries might be returned, at the discretion of the Conference.

After several unsuccessful attempts to establish our Church in Philadelphia under the rule, Rev. Thomas H. Stockton was appointed as a Missionary, and succeeded in building the church on the corner of Eleventh and Wood streets, to which the Conference returned him, year after year, without regard to the restrictive rule.

Some time in the year 1842, St. John's, Liberty street, divided by mutual agreement of the members. There had been a division of sentiment in this church for some years previously. A portion of the members of whom Wesley Starr was the most conspicuous, favored the retention of old usages, such as free seats, lining the hymns, strict itinerancy, and the revival measures familiar to Methodists. Another portion of the membership, of whom John Clark was the reputed leader, favored the pew system, singing without lining, greater reliance upon pastoral effort as a means of building up the Church, and consequently a longer period of service than two years. The brethren remaining at Liberty Street paid to the retiring brethren, as an equivalent for their interest in the property, the sum of \$6000. The latter "built a house of worship on the corner of Green and Lombard Streets, and were recognized, after their organization, as West Baltimore Station. The brethren at Liberty Street expended about \$9000 in the improvement of their church, and were recognized, at the ensuing Annual Conference, as Liberty Street Mission. It was hoped, after the division, that both churches would move on peacefully and prosperously, and the District would hear no more of bickerings among brethren.

When St. John's, at the Conference of 1843, held in East Baltimore Station, asked to be recognized as a Mission, the reason of the request was well understood. There could be but two reasons for desiring this relation: 1. To receive pecuniary assistance from the Conference. 2. To retain the pastor, if desirable, longer than two or three years. It was evident that S. John's was not seeking pecuniary aid from the Conference. The only reason, therefore, why it wished to assume the relation of a Mission, was that it might stand precisely as the church in Philadelphia. If any one could have doubted this, the doubt ought to have been removed by a colloquy between Rev.

Frederick Stier and Rev. Augustus. Webster (in open Conference), ending in a significant remark by the former.

Rev. Augustus Webster was appointed Missionary to Liberty Street, and Rev. Thos. It. Stockton Missionary to First Church, Philadelphia, at that Conference, Rev. Levi R. Reese being President. This was Brother Stockton's fourth successive appointment to the same church. On the 17th of December of that year, the improvements having been completed, St. John's was re-opened. The Baltimore Clipper, of the 15th of December in announcing the dedication, to take place on the following Sabbath, said: "We understand that the Rev. Augustus Webster, late President of the Maryland Annual Conference, and at present editor of The Methodist Protestant... will be the pastor of the congregation worshipping in this church, to be removed only at the pleasure of the members."

The President of the Conference preached the dedicatory. After the sermon, the Missionary made some remarks about the history, condition and prospects of the church, intimating that under the new arrangement "the frequent rupture of the tender pastoral relation will be avoided." To the statements concerning the pastor connection the President took exception, and addressed a note to Mr. John Clark, demanding a correction of the error of the Clipper. Mr. Clark declined. Thereupon the President published a statement in the Clipper, to the effect that the law of the Church would require the removal of Rev. A. Webster at the end of the second year. Mr. Webster replied to this in a brief note, stating that he had been appointed as Missionary; that Mr. Reese, at the same Conference, had appointed Mr. Stockton as Missionary to the same charge for the fourth successive year; and finally, that Rev. Mr. Reese's only official connection with him, as in the case of any other Pastor during the recess of Conference, is to see that he (Mr. W.) "enter upon and continue in the faithful discharge of all his official duties."

It would have been well if the discussion had ended here. But the President, conceiving that his duty required him to warn the District against what he regarded as an act tending to destroy the itinerancy, prepared an article on the subject, and presented it for publication to the editor of The Methodist Protestant. Mr. Webster being editor, declining to publish the article on his own responsibility, submitted it to the Book Committee. The Book Committee also declined, three of the members being excused from voting. The President then published his article in pamphlet form, and circulated it throughout the District. In this pamphlet he exhorted the charges to elect delegates who would sustain the enforcement of law as interpreted by himself. The result was great excitement throughout the District, and the formation of two distinct parties.

March 1844, Conference met in First Methodist Protestant Church, Philadelphia. It was the stormiest session ever known. That we shall never have another like it is profoundly to be wished. Objection has been made to the official character of the Presidents, based on the publication of his pamphlet. The President had read a "demure" written in anticipation of charges being presented. A stormy resolution of censure had been offered, and the yeas and nays had been called. It is not probable that it would have carried, at least the President expressed himself as feeling assured that it would not. But, before the roll had been called through, proceedings were arrested by a paper presented by the President, in which he acknowledged that a better course might have been pursued by him. This was accepted as a compromise, and it was agreed that no record should be made of any of the proceedings connected with the case. The President

was re-elected, and a peace measure was adopted, in the form of a resolution, that neither First Church, Philadelphia, nor Liberty street, Baltimore, should be supplied by the Conference, until a supply was asked, by the officiators of the churches respectively. Rev. T. H. Stockton and Rev. A. Webster, by this arrangement were to be left without appointment, at their own request.

But the arrangement did not prove a measure of peace. Philadelphia and St. John's were satisfied; the "itinerants," so called, were not. It was contended by a number of the latter that the action of the Conference was unconstitutional. They were not disposed to let it stand at the Conference of 1846, held in West Baltimore, resolutions were offered to undo what had been done in Philadelphia. A warm discussion arose; but ultimately, a resolution offered by Dr. John S. Reese, who had often acted in the capacity of peacemaker, prevailed. It was substantially a reference of the whole matter in controversy to the decision of the next General Conference, which body was requested to review the action of the Maryland Conference, and determine whether it had acted constitutionally. In the meantime, the Philadelphia arrangement was to stand.

We must here supply an omission in the earlier part of this narrative. It was affirmed by some of the "itinerants" that Liberty Street was not a bona fide Mission; that it was simply St. John's Station, under a new name. On the other side it was affirmed that it was essentially "a new enterprise." That while the old building, and a part of the old membership were retained, it was essentially a new organization, an "experiment," as it was regarded even by some that were not in sympathy with it, and fairly entitled to be treated as a Mission, under the law. This view was entertained by what may be called a third party, as well as by the "Mission men." This third party, or "Moderate men," as they were sometimes called, while not favoring the conversion of a Circuit or Station into a Mission to evade the operation of the restrictive rule, held that inasmuch as the Conference, with full knowledge of the purpose of St. John's, had granted a Mission relation to that church, and thereby encouraged the brethren to expend a large sum of money upon their experiment, it should either re-imburse the church,* or allow it to go on its chosen way. This third, or balance-of-power party, generally had influence enough to prevent the adoption of extreme measures.

[*St. John's would have been unable to carry on its work but for the liberality of Brother Clark, to whom it was then indebted.]

No reference was made to the subject at the Conference of 1846, held in the Ninth Street, Washington, Church. But at this session Rev. Thomas H. Stockton and Rev. Augustus Webster withdrew, the latter remarking to a friend that he supposed no one would question the lawfulness of an unstationed preacher remaining in connection with the same church. This was in reference to the continued agitation of the question, which had not only been a source of annoyance to St. John's, but had excited angry feelings, distrust, and uncharitable remarks throughout the District, to such an extent that loss of members and of influence, alienation of friends, and a feeling of sadness on the part of many, of discouragement on the part of others, succeeded the two very prosperous years preceding the beginning of this controversy, which had been among the brightest of our whole history. In the two years preceding there had been gains: of 1598 the first and 2366 the second. In the first succeeding a loss of 462, the second 529, the third a gain of

151; followed in 1847 by a loss of 2116. The decrease continued until 1850, when the tide turned with a gain of 1100.

The General Conference of 1846, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in compliance with the request of the Maryland Conference, declared the action of the former in the matter of leaving the churches in Philadelphia and Baltimore without a supply until it should be asked for by the officaries of these churches, unconstitutional. But it also reconstructed the law on Missions, putting it in such form that no one ever since has questioned the lawfulness of continuing a Missionary at the discretion of the Conference.

March. 1847, Conference met in Easton, Md. Various resolutions in reference to the controverted question were offered. The "Mission men" and "Moderate men" united being in the majority, resolutions regarded by them as unfriendly to St. John's were voted down, and resolutions calling for a fraternal address to the officaries and pastor, inviting them to resume relations with the Conference, were adopted. It was thought that the way to reconciliation and peace was now clear.

The General Conference had defined the law in accordance with the views entertained by St. John's, and the Conference was at liberty to gratify the church. But the time for reconciliation had passed. The brethren at St. John's, remembering the feeling against them on the part of some, and the disturbance to which it had given rise, were in no mood to listen to a friendly overture. Indeed, there is reason to believe that, for want of better information, they did not regard the overture as friendly, though unquestionably it was. It has been stated (with how much truth we know not) that the very kind and respectful letter of the Conference was never read to the Church. Certain it is that the Conference never received a syllable in reply.

At the next Conference, held in Georgetown, D. C., it was declared by resolution that, by the act of Liberty Street Mission, official connection between that Mission and the Conference had been severed. This, so far as the Conference was concerned, was the end of the "Mission War."

But the story would be incomplete without further reference to the Church in Philadelphia. Brother Stockton, having withdrawn from the Maryland Conference, appeared at the General Conference, in Cincinnati, as the representative of certain churches in Philadelphia, asking for the erection of a separate Conference, to be known as the Philadelphia Conference. The request was granted. Brother Stockton returned to Philadelphia, but, differing in opinion with a number of the most active and spiritual members of his church, he addressed them in terms which they regarded as leaving them only the option of silent submission or withdrawal from the church. They chose the latter, forming an organization known as the Bethlehem Methodist Protestant Church, the history of which would bring to notice some noble men and lovely women; but it would show, also, that disaster sometimes results from mistake and hesitation, and that sentiment, however exalted, will never, in this practical world, be a substitute for business sagacity, prompt action, and willingness to venture a good deal for the securement of a greater benefit.

Some time after the withdrawal of the brethren referred to above, Brother Stockton went to Cincinnati, and Rev. J. T. Ward became Pastor of the First Church, Philadelphia. The new Conference seemed to get on well for awhile. But it lacked preachers, and had to depend on Maryland, in part, for a supply. The Maryland preachers were unwilling to be transferred, and a portion of the membership in the Philadelphia Conference were dissatisfied with their new relation. In consequence, the question of reunion was mooted in their Conference, and finally determined by the General Conference in 1850, from which time the territory has been included within the bounds of the Maryland Conference. The action seemed wise at the time, but the wisdom may be doubted now. The First Church became the Free Protestant Church, soon afterward; the church in Kensington, of which Rev. J. G. Wilson is Pastor, became independent also; troubles increased -- failure after failure occurred -- today not one of the many churches planted and watered, and for a time flourishing, in Philadelphia remains. But for St. Luke's, which came to us last year, Methodist Protestantism would not have "a local habitation" in Philadelphia. In all this desolation we may trace the fatal influence of the Mission controversy.

* * * * *

06 -- WORK

Having completed our brief survey of the organization, the composition and the circumstances of the Methodist Protestant Church in Maryland, we are prepared now to follow the history on, that we may know what this Church has done, and what remains as the product of fifty-three years of existence. It has often been said against us -- sometimes, alas! among us -- that we are a Church of splendid pretensions; that we boast continually of great principles; that we feed upon an idea, but that it is not worth while to possess great principles unless they produce results commensurate with their greatness. The insinuation will be deprived of all sting by a simple setting forth of the work of the Church.

Let us then read together the records of these years, with no previous boast nor prejudice, and let the conclusion be as the facts impel.

One thing, however, ought, in all fairness, to be remembered at the beginning: that such a record as we can furnish, to say nothing of the limits of the present work, must necessarily be imperfect from two causes: 1. That much of the work every Church does cannot, in the nature of the case, be put in figures and words. We can drop our thermometer in mid-ocean and find the Gulf-stream, demonstrate that it is there, but we are unable to calculate the extent of its effect upon the surrounding sea; we cannot tell precisely how greatly it disturbs the natural climate of those lands over which its warm breath is swept. And so, many of the influences of every Church, in any given time and place, are insensible; they cannot be weighed nor measured, nor even labeled. 2. In the particular case before us this difficulty is increased by the marked lack of data upon which a report of some things might be drawn up. The proper recording of Church progress and activity is a modern science. Fifty years ago it was almost entirely neglected; so that one may go over the files of the official paper year after year, and, while reading much that is called "Church Intelligence," will find little that can be put in exact terms. A "glorious meeting" is reported, but how many were saved is not. Indeed, some of the workers of those times seem to have felt that to give any such exact information would be in as bad taste, as

pretentious, as to record the number of prayers offered in the closet. Thus, one pastor writes an account of a campmeeting held on his circuit. He gives the number of tents, the probable attendance, the behavior, the religious enjoyment, and adds: "As it is the prerogative of God alone to convert the souls of mankind, and to judge of the character of the work of grace wrought in their hearts, I shall not presume to state what numbers were converted at this meeting." Others, again, were deterred by the fear of seeming to boast and exaggerate. They were continually charged with this, and the greatest pains were taken to repel and falsify the accusation. Thus, another pastor writes that at a certain meeting there had been "forty-six conversions." The printer made him say "ninety-six," and in the next issue no less than three -- the writer, one of his members, and the editor -- appear in print to explain the mistake.

But these things are mentioned only by way of explanation. We are not pleading before the evidence. The *raison d'etre* of our Conference can be fully established by such records as we have and such as we intend to give.

And, first, before we come to particulars, it may be claimed for this Church, as a general result, that it has made its principles popular and accepted, in a more or less modified form, by all Methodists.

But, what came to pass more quickly, it started and diffused over the laity of all Methodism a more intense interest and a more active participation in the welfare and activities of the Church. It is unquestionable that Methodism had always been more or less a work done by preachers among laymen. In no other way is it so easy to explain how preachers first acquired and then claimed absolute control of the administration of all the affairs of the Church. The preachers were expected to revive the Church when cold, to increase it when declining, to be, in fact, the originators and responsible actors in Church work. But when reform agitated the Church, the laymen were roused to unprecedented activity. It was necessary to take sides, and having done this, to maintain the position taken.

The laymen who desired more power, and left one Church and helped to form another that they might get more power, felt themselves constrained by the demand of consistency to stand ready to do more. Those laymen who remained in the old Church did so because it was good enough for them; they had all they desired, and opposition to the Church they loved awakened their energies to demonstrate their love. Hence, it used to be claimed by M. E. writers that whenever a secession took place a revival broke out. However this may be, as to the old Church, it is certain that every secession wrought an increase of spiritual activity and power in the new organizations. And since but few itinerants cast in their fortunes with the seceders, it became necessary for laymen to take the lead.

It can never be regretted that it was so. Those men who were told that a Church administered by laymen was an absurdity, that it could never succeed, sprang to the work with the ardent and firm resolution that it should succeed. They took up the pen, and a new corps of writers for the religious press came into existence. Side by side with the arguments, the appeals, the reports from ministers, were seen from laymen articles equally intelligent, equally earnest and equally spiritual. They did more than write. They instituted and conducted revivals; they traveled from charge to charge, responding to calls upon their time and means to an extent

hitherto unknown. And for the first time in the history of American Methodism it was clearly demonstrated that laymen could do something in Church besides pay the current expenses. A new army had been enlisted in the cause of righteousness. The movement thus begun has never changed its direction. The sphere of lay workers has steadily widened, and the influence of laymen shapes the policy of Methodist Churches more and more.

But we desire to speak more in detail. There are three general divisions under which we may arrange the record of our Church to the advantage of order and distinctness of impression. We shall, therefore, present the EVANGELISTIC, the MISSIONARY and the EDUCATIONAL work of the Church.

* * *

EVANGELISTIC.

To "preach the Gospel to every creature" is the first and great business of every Church. That body of men, that institution, in which this is not the most prominent of all its successful efforts, may be doing a very worthy and useful work, but it is not a Church. Moreover, it is clear that nothing is gained, but much is lost to the cause of Christ when men leave one Church to form another, and build up the new by drawing away the material of the old. To take men from one Church and put them in another, even a better, is no substantial gain. The business of the Church is to take men from the world and bring them to Christ. Unless, therefore, a Church can demonstrate its ability for this business, it has no right to exist as such.

What then has the Methodist Protestant Church in Maryland done towards saving men? The answer we can give to this great question will determine our right to the name we bear as a Church of Christ. That answer is briefly this: In the fifty-three years of its existence, the Methodist Protestant Church in Maryland has raised up, trained, sent out and supported nearly three hundred preachers of the Gospel; it has called into service and furnished opportunities to as many more local preachers; it has built over two hundred churches, at an expense of seven hundred thousand dollars -- at least that is the present number and valuation; it has turned "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," more than fifty thousand souls.

That we may not seem to be speaking at random, anyone can verify these last figures who will take the pains to go through the Minutes and add together the accessions of each year. This, of course, only accounts for those converts who have united with us. It would be only fair to add one-tenth of this number, or five thousand, as a low estimate of those who have joined other Churches after having been converted among us.

But did not great numbers of these come from other Churches, notably the M. E. Church? Can it be shown that these were conversions? In answer we submit the following :

1. From November, 1828, when the Convention was held that organized the new Church, to April, 1830, when the first report of the number of members in Maryland was made, it appears that eighteen hundred and seventy-four persons had joined the new Church. There could not have been, therefore, anything like a general secession, even at the beginning.

2. But we do not grant that all of even this number (1874) were seceders. In the months of August and September, 1829, the Reformers held ten campmeetings, resulting in three hundred and thirty-eight conversions. That accounts for more than one-fifth as the result of two months' work. What was being done in the remaining fourteen months? The Reformers established sixty regular preaching places, and preached almost every day in the month. If we suppose only ten conversions at each of these points as the result of constant efforts during this whole period, we will account for half the whole number of accessions, viz: 938.

3. We have indirect evidence of this sort: that after 1830 it is the exception to find in our official paper reports of accessions from the M. E. Church. There would surely have been every reason to make it known if these had been frequent; that from this time the cry begins that the reform movement is going down because there are so few members of the M. E. Church going off to the new Church; one M. E. preacher boasting publicly that the reformers have to "build their churches from the materials of the world."

4. We have direct evidence. Rev. F. Stier, Pastor of Pipe Creek Circuit, with 435 members, writes March 16, 1832, as follows: "I think twelve persons from the M. E. Church have, in the course of 23 months (the time of his pastorate on Pipe Creek) left that fellowship and joined ours." In the same time his membership had doubled. In 1842 there were 2366 accessions in the Maryland District. Dr. A. Webster was President of the Conference, traveled the district, was familiar with all the churches, and distinctly remembers that these accessions were the result of twenty-one camp-meetings held that year, and other revival services.

It remains, therefore, that in the earliest period of the history of the Church there were few additions to the membership except by conversion, that the growth of the Church then was similar to what it is now, and that its work has been truly and almost entirely evangelistic. Whether other Churches have done better is not the question. Our records are not produced as a challenge. But has not this Church done the right kind of work, and done it well?

Has it not on that account a right to be?

* * *

MISSIONARY.

The question of sending the Gospel beyond the limits of these Circuits and Stations claimed the attention of the Maryland Conference from the beginning. The Missionary enterprises of the Church have always been of a two-fold character, and in giving the details it will be convenient to trace the history of the Foreign and Home work separately.

1. Foreign Missions. At the Conference of 1830 the work of the Colonization Society, of which more will be said further on, was endorsed and collections ordered in its behalf. This was essentially a Foreign Missionary movement. At the Conference of 1834, a communication was received from Halifax, Nova Scotia. The nature of the communication and the action of the Conference will be best understood by the following extract from the minutes:

"The committee to whom was referred the application of sundry inhabitants of Halifax, Nova Scotia, beg leave to report that they have had that subject under their most serious deliberation, and are of opinion that it would be expedient for this Conference to take the said persons under its watch and care. The committee recommended that a friendly epistle be written by this Conference to the said persons, recognizing them as a Christian Church, in fellowship with the Methodist Protestant Church. The committee therefore offers the following: Resolved, That the President of this Conference address a suitable letter to the brethren in Halifax, in conformity with this report. Resolved, That this Conference recommend to the General Conference to take charge of the society or societies in the province of Nova Scotia as a missionary station."

At the Conference of 1837 the "Maryland Conference Missionary Society" was formed by adopting a constitution whose first article declared the object of the Society to be "to aid in the work of the Home and Foreign Missions, under the direction of the authorities of the Methodist Protestant Church." It provided for the formation of auxiliaries in every charge and for public collections, the amount raised to be distributed between the Foreign and Home work. (The "authorities of the Methodist Protestant Church" in charge of Foreign Missions at that time were a "Board of Missions" organized by the first General Conference, consisting of twelve persons, to be located at Baltimore, with Dr. S. K. Jennings chairman.)

At the Conference of 1851 Rev. David Wilson was loaned to the Board of Missions, to be sent as a Missionary to China, but arrangements were not completed. At the Conference of 1873 the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That this Conference recognizes the importance of the work of Foreign Missions, and as we have no channel of our own through which the contributions of the Church may be made available in foreign mission fields, we recommend the cooperation of the Church with some sister Church engaged in such work.

"Resolved, That we have a high appreciation of the management and operations of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and recommend the formation of Societies auxiliary thereto in our churches, or cooperation with the Society now existing in connection with East Baltimore Station."

This action bore good fruit and started a new interest in the subject, which has steadily increased to the present time. At the Conference of 1877 two ladies, officially connected with the W. F. M. S. of the M. E. Church, were present by invitation, and, by resolution, the evening of the first day was set apart to hear addresses from them. Two years later, when the Conference met at Centerville, letters were received announcing the formation of a Board of Missions and the appointment of a Corresponding Secretary of the Methodist Protestant Church; also that in Pittsburgh, on the preceding month, a Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the M. P. Church had been organized. A Standing Committee on Foreign Missions was ordered, and the Conference had the pleasure of a visit and an address from Miss Guthrie, who afterwards was sent as our first Missionary to Japan. But, in the providence of God, she was not permitted to

reach the field where her heart lay and to which the Church designed her. She died at San Francisco in the summer of 1880, on the eve of her departure.

At the Conference of 1881 the subject continued to receive special consideration. One evening of every session was set apart for special services and addresses on the subject. The duties of pastors in this connection were defined and pressed; such as preaching on the subject, enlisting the Sabbath Schools in it, taking up the collections and holding Missionary meetings. Certain sisters were also named, who were requested to form the Maryland Conference Branch of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the M. P. Church, which was done in the following month. The Church has now entered upon a new era in this work. Having two Missionaries in the field, Miss Brittain and Miss McCauley, regular and efficient Boards to carry out the wishes of the Church, the people are easily persuaded to respond with contributions. Maryland has so far taken the lead in the amount contributed, giving to the Board about seven hundred dollars a year, besides the contributions to the W. F. M. S. The amount assessed at the last Conference for this purpose in Maryland was nearly fifteen hundred dollars.

2. Home Missions. This feature of Missionary work has ever been with us prominent and successful. For, though hindered so long from realizing its early hopes as to foreign lands, the Conference did not despise the duties less lofty that lay nearer. It heard the Master calling to fields already white, and it gladly entered, knowing that

"If you cannot cross the ocean
And the heathen lands explore,
You can find the heathen nearer,
You can help them at your door."

At the first Conference we have seen two Missionaries sent out to travel through the State and preach and found churches where none existed. These were supported by contributions from the district.

At the Conference of 1831, on motion of Rev. W. W. Wallace, it was resolved to establish a Home Missionary Society. That Society has existed ever since; becoming in 1862, by act of Legislature, an incorporated body. It holds the title to some five or six churches, built or supported by its aid, but has no vested fund, and no income except the annual collections taken in the churches. These aggregate for the fifty years, about sixty thousand dollars.

It would be difficult to state accurately the results accomplished. Many of our best churches were begun under its fostering care. It has cared for and supported from five to fifteen preachers every year to enable certain localities to hear preaching that would otherwise have been deprived of it.

In 1857 the work became a substantial factor in our Church enterprises. Collections rose to a respectable sum. They fluctuated in value from year to year. Appropriations increased until they reached as high as nearly \$4,000; they exceeded the available resources, and funds were borrowed at different times. A reaction came on, and there was impaired confidence in the wisdom of management of missionary interests. The system, in the course of years, was well

nigh broken down from various causes: 1. Want of harmony in some prominent mission stations. 2. The large sums available seemed a temptation to some established fields to seek mission relations to get help, which was destructive of self-reliance and only tended to their own depression. 3. Appropriations were made rather as an accommodation to the plan of appointments than to bona fide missionary necessities. At least this idea obtained, whether correct or not, and worked to the prejudice of our Missionary collections. The Conference entered heartily into the work of reform, and soon succeeded in restoring confidence in the usefulness and importance of this work.

In 1879 the Conference abolished the anniversary meetings of this and the Superannuated Fund Societies. These were held at Conference, and the main business was to increase the fund for distribution. But as they more often burdened those whom it was intended to relieve, the wisdom and justice of doing away with them became apparent.

* * *

EDUCATIONAL.

Our Conference was long prevented from doing what was thought desirable in the educational work by the lack of means, and also of information as to the best methods. But it never failed to recognize the fact that this was a part of its proper work as a Church. It desired especially a place where some training and help could be given to such as contemplated the ministry, and as early as 1835 the Conference appointed a committee to consider the expediency of establishing a seminary of learning. The committee reported in favor of a seminary on the manual labor plan, but it does not appear that anything ever came of it. The matter of education continued, however, to engage the thoughtful attention of almost every Conference.

The Committee on Orders did what it could to supply the want, by arranging a schedule of studies to be pursued by those applying for admission into the itinerancy or for orders, and a board of examiners which met at each Conference. In 1864, by resolution, the name of this Committee was changed to "The Faculty of Instruction." At the same session, Rev. H. P. Jordan was appointed a committee to apply to the Legislature of Maryland for a charter incorporating certain trustees, "under the name and title of the Maryland Annual Conference College, which said charter shall constitute the present Conference Faculty of Instruction, de facto, the aforesaid College, until such time as the above trustees shall be able to erect suitable buildings and increase the professional chairs." This charter was obtained, and Rev. S. B. Southerland, D. D, is at present the President of this Maryland Annual Conference College. But "to erect suitable buildings" was a more difficult task. Various attempts were made by the Conference to this end. Windsor Institute, under Dr. Francis Waters, was established. Some of our ministers were trained in this school, so admirably conducted by that distinguished scholar and divine. Madison College, at Uniontown, Pa., received liberal support from the Maryland District, and was presided over by two of its ministers, Dr. Waters for a few months only, and Dr. S. K. Cox. Lynchburg College also received its encouragement and aid. But all these efforts to build up literary institutions were disappointing to the Conference. And these were discouragements in the way of the later enterprise of Western Maryland College; an institution which has struggled

into life, risen to eminence, and stands upon a stable foundation, notwithstanding all the history which stood as a prophecy of evil against its success.

Our possession of Western Maryland College came as an incidental thing, rather than as a project originally designed. Prof. Fayette R. Buell had established a school at Westminster, which he desired to place under the patronage of the Conference. About the same time, Rev. J. T. Ward purchased property in the city, which he expected soon to take possession of as his residence, and it was proposed to enlist his talent in the school. A meeting of the members of the church at Westminster encouraged the plans of Prof. Buell. He accordingly laid his plans before the Conference of 1866, and the institution was recommended to the patronage of the Church. His projected College building was also commended to the favor of the Church at large.

The foundation of the present building was begun August 27, and the cornerstone laid Sept. 6, 1866. The building was first occupied and college exercises commenced Sept. 4, 1867.

At the session of 1867, Conference accepted the proposition of Prof. Buell, to take supervisory control of the College, and appointed a Board of Directors, viz: Augustus Webster, John J. Murray, R. S. Norris, P. L. Wilson, Daniel Bowers, James T. Ward, John Smith, Michael Baughman, J. W. Hering, A. Zollickoffer, John S. Repp and Samuel McKinstry. This board met in July, and arranged for the issue of the first annual circular, announcing F. R. Buell, Proprietor of the College, and J. T. Ward, Principal of the Faculty. A charter was obtained from the legislature, and approved by the Governor, March, 1868. The trustees named in the charter met in Westminster, June 25, 1868, and elected John Smith, President, J. T. Ward, Secretary, and J. W. Hering, Treasurer.

On the 7th of August, 1868, the board agreed upon terms of purchase and transfer of the property to the board. The purchase was ratified by Conference at the session of 1869, and the College "heartily endorsed as an INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH under the management and control of a Board of Trustees and Faculty having our entire confidence."

The College being now recognized as an institution for which the Conference was responsible, the serious problem of how to relieve it of debt was to be solved. The various plans and their fruits we have not space to notice. Finally the plan of raising enough to pay the entire debt, and not applying any of the money until the accomplishment of this end was assured, was endorsed by the Conference of 1878. This plan has succeeded in relieving the property of all liens, and giving the Conference, in connection with its incorporated Educational Endowment Society, a claim upon the building amounting to \$24,000, which is virtual ownership of the property. During the twelve years of its existence (1881) the College has had an average attendance of 116 pupils, 73 males and 43 females. Ninety-four have graduated with A. B., and forty-five have studied with a view to the ministry, and nearly all of the latter are now engaged in the ministry in the Methodist Protestant Church.

At the Conference of 1881 a committee was appointed with instructions "to mature some plan by which systematic theology may be taught the graduates of Western Maryland College who are preparing for the Christian ministry, and report the same to the next session of this Conference." This contemplates the establishment of a Theological Seminary in the near future.

We have dwelt at considerable length in detailing the work of this Conference. But this is the greatest part of its history; this alone gives it claim upon our attention. We have found great enjoyment in the preparation of this chapter, and we would fain believe that it will not be tedious to any lover of the Church.

* * * * *

07 -- BENEVOLENCE

Under the title of this chapter we shall give the history of those schemes, organized and operated in the Maryland District, which have for their object the distribution of money upon a basis of benevolence.

1. Superannuated Fund Society. -- This Society was organized at the first Conference, 1829. The following was proposed by Rev. Luther J. Cox, who was not himself an itinerant:

"Whereas, the members of this Conference are deeply sensible that our brethren who enter upon the arduous duties of the traveling ministry deserve our warmest support, and believing it to be the duty and interest of the churches to render them and their families, while actively engaged in the work of the itinerancy, and also when they are no longer able to do the effective work of an itinerant minister, as comfortable as possible, therefore, Resolved, that this Conference earnestly recommend the members of the Associated Methodist Churches, that in every Circuit and Station within the bounds of the Conference, they form themselves into societies, auxiliary to a society that shall be formed in the city of Baltimore, the object of which shall be to provide a fund for the support of the superannuated and worn-out traveling preachers, their wives and children, having a special regard to the education of the children of brethren so employed."

This was the foundation of an institution still existing, and extending its usefulness more widely every year. At the Conference of 1834 the matter was pressed to a more practical result by the appointment of a committee to receive and invest such funds as might be raised; another committee "to prepare a plan for the permanent settlement and proper distribution of said fund"; each pastor was required to take collections for this fund, and it was made a test of official character. At the Conference of 1835 a constitution was reported, and adopted substantially as it still remains. At the Conference of 1837 the name under which the Society is now known was adopted, and the managers directed to apply for an act of incorporation, which was done in 1839, and again in 1844.

At the Conference of 1838 the managers made their first report of the amount of the invested fund, \$1203, and the income at the disposal of the Conference, \$75.12+. Since that time there has been no action necessary on the part of the Conference, and therefore we find only the usual reports of collections from the district and of income from the invested fund, both being distributed annually to persons on the superannuated list. For many years it was customary to hold at Conference an Anniversary of this Society, at which addresses were delivered and collections taken, but this in 1879 was abolished. A motion was offered in 1881 to assess the

district for this interest, as is done for the Missionary cause, instead of simply asking a collection, which lately has failed to yield much revenue. This motion was laid over for consideration at the next Conference.

The history of this Society, therefore, becomes a history best told in figures, and we append the amounts disbursed annually during the forty-four years of its existence, which will show an aggregate of nearly one hundred thousand dollars, and an average for each year of twenty-two hundred and twenty-seven dollars: [I have omitted that appended list of figures. -- DVM]

The invested fund of the Society now amounts to \$76,000.

2. Phebean Society. -- A meeting of female members of the Associated Methodist Churches of the City of Baltimore convened, agreeably to previous notice, in St. John's Church, January 20, 1830, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of instituting a society, principally in view of aiding those itinerant preachers of the Maryland Conference who shall not have received the allowance necessary for their support. A constitution was adopted, providing for raising money by fees of fifty cents annually for membership and other matters of organization. At the Conference of 1830 -- two months subsequent to the above meeting--thanks were voted the Phebean Society for \$230 contributed in accordance with the object of the Society. In the minutes of succeeding years are found further acknowledgements of a similar character. The Society continued in existence until within a few years ago, when it turned over its assets to the Superannuated Fund Society. It wrought a good work, and its help was as timely as it was generous. Now, however, that the salary of the Itinerant is rarely deficient, the same need for such a society no longer exists.

3. Pipe Creek Benevolent Society. -- This Society was organized in 1843. The design was to create a fund in aid of the religious and benevolent enterprises of the Methodist Protestant Church in the Maryland District. Its control is in the hands of a President and Board of Directors, elected annually. Its funds are raised by annual contributions of members (fifty cents) and bequests. In 1846 Miss Barbara Saum left it about fifteen thousand dollars. Its distributions have been mainly made to the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, to superannuated ministers and to special cases of ministers engaged in the work. It disburses annually from \$800 to \$900. Its affairs are managed and administered with business-like care and conscientious benevolence. The invested fund now amounts to \$15,855. Since its organization the Society has distributed about \$24,000.

4. Jefferson Benevolent Society. -- This Society was organized to receive a bequest of Miss Ramsburg of about nine thousand dollars. The intention of the bequest was to aid the Home Missionary work of the Maryland Annual Conference. The income is now -- some losses of capital having been sustained and some of it expended -- about \$225, which is used to pay the current expenses of Jefferson Circuit.

5. Mutual Relief Association. This Society is composed entirely of the preachers of the Maryland Conference and their wives. The object is to provide a fund for the family of deceased members. This is done by assessing every member five dollars when a death occurs and paying

the amount so raised to the heirs of the deceased member. The number of members at present is sixty-five.

* * * * *

08 -- PUBLIC QUESTIONS

At the Ecumenical Methodist Conference, held in London, September 1881 Mr. H. J. Atkinson, J. P., member from London, said:

"I consider it was a most providential thing that the origin of Methodism was such that it was free entirely from all political party bias, and I believe the blessing of God has been upon it in great measure through that circumstance. I wish to say that it is my most solemn conviction that the blessing of God, so far as the progress of Methodism is concerned, is in some measure dependent--so far as it can be dependent upon anything that is merely human--upon our keeping to that point, and not mixing up political and party bias with anything that affects the work of God in connection with Methodism."--(Official Report, page 53)

While pursuing this policy strictly, the Maryland Conference has not looked with indifference upon matters of State, nor kept silence when the cause of God demanded speech.

It declared in no uncertain language its opposition to Slavery, even in its first session, as has been seen. It not only has now a standing committee on Temperance, thus designating it as one of the prominent subjects of deliberation and action, but it has always had one. And at the session of 1830, a time when the use of ardent spirits was far more prevalent than now, being freely admitted to the tables even of prominent Christians and ministers, attention was called to the subject in a public general address to the churches. It refers to "our general rule which treats of this important subject," and declares that it binds "every Methodist to pursue a course as strictly self-denying in this particular as is required by the most rigid regulation of any temperance society."

The Colonization Society, whose object was to form a settlement in Africa, by "persons of African descent from the United States," that they might furnish a home to which slaves surreptitiously imported might be returned, received from the Maryland Conference, the same kind of support it received from the United States Government, viz., endorsement and an appropriation. But this was strictly a policy of non-interference with legislation.

Entirely consistent with this policy was the course pursued during the Civil War. Throughout that strife the Conference made a truly Christian record. At no period of its history did it require more wisdom, prudence and courage. The trials which beset its struggle into Church life were those of ecclesiastical opposition and wholly from without, but now there was the peril of political persecution from without and disaffection at its policy from within. The Churches North and South were carried along with the current of the passions of the day, and, whether from high Christian motive, or the subtle influence of worldly policy, were recording in the minutes of their representative assemblies resolutions full of sectional variance and strife, and many of their ministers were preaching another gospel than that of peace and good will to all

men. Not to join the multitude in this was to be suspected of sinister motives, and certainly to be deprived of the temporary advantages of sailing before the popular breeze. But neither courting favor nor fearing reproach, the Maryland Conference was true to its convictions of right. Its spirit was expressed in this and similar resolutions: "Recognizing as the high and exclusive mission of the Gospel ministry the preaching of Christ crucified to our perishing fellow-men, we will continue to devote ourselves with renewed zeal and energy to the one work to which we have been called." And the preaching of the ministers was in harmony with this resolution of the Conference.

As citizens, the members of Conference were not wanting in any duties to the government under which they lived; and as ministers they knew nothing among men but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. In political sympathy the Conference was perhaps balanced; and it is to the lasting honor of those who supported the policy of the existing administration of the government of the country, that, having the opportunity and the temptation thereto, which was too powerful for weaker men in other connections, to afflict their brethren who differed from their views, by forcing a political expression from the Conference, they never attempted it. How majestically they towered in Christian magnanimity and true patriotism above the time-servers who were so ready to "crook the hinges of their knees," at the bidding of carnal policy, "where thrift would follow fawning."

As a consequence, when the war-cloud was driven away by the motion of the wings of the angel of peace--

--"the war-drum throbbed no longer,
And the battle-flags were furled,"--

and the States were left one federation, but, alms! the Christian denominations all rent and sundered; the Methodist Protestant Church -- though a little Benjamin among the tribes of Israel--was, as much as before the war, one and inseparable. From distant Texas and Louisiana, from North and South Carolina, Virginia -- everywhere, where a society of our people was left, came old, blessed brotherly salutations to the Methodist Protestants of Maryland. Even the spirit of estrangement of those who in '54 had withdrawn from the general church was softened and turned into yearnings for the reunion of the old household. Maryland conservatism was the magnetic scepter which, stretching to the North and the South, the East and the West, brought all the several links of the chain of brotherhood again into a blessed and beautiful unity.

Through this trying period, the support of our Church paper depended almost entirely upon Maryland. The death of the lamented E. Yeates Reese, the editor, occurred in the first year of the conflict. Diminished patronage left it without the means to employ a salaried editor, and the Baltimore pastors performed the editorial work as a labor of love. The fidelity of the Maryland Conference in keeping the old standard aloft, and not suffering any strange device to appear upon it, was acknowledged with lively emotions of gratitude by the sister Conferences when once more the long banished weekly messenger, bearing tidings from all the churches, was restored to them. During all this period the periodical maintained the character of a purely religious journal. In view of this, Hon. E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War, gave permission for it to pass the lines to its patrons in the South.

* * * * *

09 -- REVIEW

We have traversed the path of history of the Conference from the beginning. The review shows the important relation of the Maryland Conference to the other Conferences of our ecclesiastical federation; in many respects that of an elder brother, loved and honored, and whose counsel and example have had much influence in shaping the course, animating the zeal and inspiring the hopes of the brotherhood. The original organization, the root out of which the noble trunk with wide spreading branches has grown. The trials, within and without, which have been borne with fortitude, met in the spirit of Christian manliness modified by its meekness. The grand work it has done -- Evangelistic, Missionary and Educational-the policy it has pursued in regard to public questions and the benevolences of the Church.

From thence it appears that the Conference has recognized the essential elements of a Christian organization; the demands of the age upon it. It hence demands its passports in common with all other well organized and fully equipped Churches. Though it may yet be weak in some departments, they are nevertheless organized, and are exhibiting activity.

We have been embarrassed by the necessarily limited number of pages of this book, therefore been compelled to hug close to the central point of the Conference sessions. We could not take up details of parish annals, nor introduce names of many individuals who have had prominence in them. Our information also beyond printed documents was limited. Otherwise we might have given more individuality, life, color and magnetic attraction to the narrative. The view is like that of a city from some distant height, whence many prominent points are recognized, but individuality is merged in the group; and though the general effect is imposing, it does not reveal what the city is in its personal and material detail or aggregation.

But so much of history as we have gathered and put into shape is worth preserving in permanent form. It has been to us a labor of love, and not for our own sakes, but for the Church. It has profoundly impressed the writers with the grandeur of our ecclesiastical edifice; its founders and foundation, its symmetrical development, the glorious work which has been wrought within it for God and humanity, and the glowing prophecy of the future as written in its past history.

The fathers had confidence that their sons would appreciate the ecclesiastical inheritance bequeathed to them. This confidence has been justified. The latter in turn having become the fathers, and looking to the time when they, too, shall pass away, will bequeath the inheritance, enlarged and enriched, to their successors with equal confidence in their appreciation of it, and their competence and determination to magnify it far beyond the achievements of their predecessors.

An isolated point of observation does not give a correct estimate of the Church. The retrospect is indispensable to a true prospect of the future of our Conference. To leave off the past is diminishing by so much the power of the telescope by which we would survey the field

before us. From eighteen hundred and eighty-two, look along the vanishing lines of perspective to eighteen hundred and twenty-nine. How small that point -- how widely the lines run out to the present! Ten itinerants and appointments then; no churches or parsonages, or schools or chartered funds; a precarious and inadequate support for its ministers. Now, one hundred and more itinerants, eighty-six pastorates, two hundred and ten churches, and fifty-nine parsonages, nearly seven hundred thousand dollars of church property. A fund for superannuates, with added current collections, yielding three thousand dollars a year, to which is added eight or nine hundred dollars from the Pipe Creek Society. A College raised up by the Conference, in which we have a moneyed interest of twenty-four thousand dollars, and where our young men are being educated for the ministry. Surely the progress is encouraging. Look at a few figures. From 1838, there has been paid from the Superannuated Fund an aggregate of ninety-seven thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight dollars; from 1854, to Home Missions, fifty-four thousand three hundred and fifteen dollars; for Executive office, forty-eight thousand nine hundred dollars; and for salaries to ministers since 1858, seven hundred and seventy-five thousand seven hundred and twenty-three dollars; an aggregate of nine hundred and eighty-five thousand five hundred and eighty-four dollars. Averaging the amount for the years not reported, and adding the year '81, gives an aggregate of over one million of dollars. The increase of Church property in that period was four hundred and eighty-three thousand seven hundred and thirty-five dollars. These figures show over one million and a half dollars contributed by the Church in Maryland for these items in the last thirty years. This does not include the support of Sabbath Schools, of which we now have 188; nor the incidental expenses of the Churches, the Church paper, college, ministerial education, foreign missions, Bible and tract cause contributions, which would swell the aggregate to at least two millions of dollars.

The benevolence of the Church and its material prosperity make an exhibit truly gratifying; but the crowning glory is the spiritual fruit now gathered on earth or garnered in heaven. As we have said in the forward pages of this volume, the spiritual seed of this body cannot be computed. A large number of those converted through its instrumentality have been registered in other Churches, and only the Lamb's Book of Life can disclose how many are among the great multitude before the Throne. Our present membership is fifteen thousand, and since its organization over forty-nine thousand members are known to have been received into the Church, and it is probable that the statistics do not give the full number.

This is arithmetic. Men measure success by numbers, but God does not. Figures, however, serve a purpose, when we discriminate as to their significance. Arithmetic is too indigent, and of the earth, earthy, and does not satisfy us. We have tried to imagine a picture of the rise and progress of the Conference, and have fancied a beautiful and prosperous city growing up where the founders of our Conference first pitched only a tent and built an altar; and truly "the little one has become a thousand, and the small one a strong" city. But the science of numbers and the conceptions of imagination are blind and halt when employed to convey an idea of spiritual achievements, No finite capacities can compute the results of the Christian activities of the Maryland Annual Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church.

With humble gratitude to Almighty God, and with joyful contemplation of the results, we exclaim, "What hath God wrought!" And inspired by the history of the past, we "THANK GOD AND TAKE COURAGE."

* * * * *

THE END