METHODIST ABROAD: MATTHEW SIMPSON AND THE EMERGENCE OF AMERICAN METHODISM AS A WORLD CHURCH
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Introduction

As to temporal power, what have we to do with that in this country? We are not senators, congressmen, or chaplains; neither do we hold any civil offices. We neither have, nor wish to have, anything to do with the government of the States, nor, as I conceive, do the States fear us. Our kingdom is not of this world. For near half a century we have never grasped at power.¹

By the mid-nineteenth century, Francis Asbury’s assertions no longer held true. The Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC), along with the nation where it began, was growing and gaining power and respect on the world stage. Its membership boasted several holders of civil offices, and its episcopal leadership viewed church and state from a perspective quite different from Asbury. Matthew Simpson (1811-1884), a paradigmatic figure who shaped the character of American Methodism in the latter nineteenth century, was one such bishop. He was elected to episcopal office in 1852, eight years after the split between the northern and southern branches of the church over discipline and slaveholding. In 1857, he took his first trip to Europe as representative of the MEC. He visited Methodist missions and interacted with other ecclesial and national leaders. His observations reflect American Methodism’s relatively recently achieved status and its anticipated presence as a world church.

New Bishop for a New Era

When Simpson was elected to the episcopacy, the MEC, though less than 100 years old, had grown to be the largest, most representative denomination in the United States. Simpson had been reared in a church quite different from the one he would oversee. Growing up in Ohio, the west, Methodism was defined by camp meeting and conversion, by classes and societies linked by itinerant preachers. Asbury himself had baptized Simpson. By 1852, camp meetings were still held, but their character had changed. Sunday Schools and mission societies had emerged. Station preachers were becoming common if not the norm, and Methodists were beginning to erect church buildings that represented its more prominent position among the churches

of America. In Simpson’s history of the Methodist Episcopal church, published in 1879, he regarded these changes as progress.

The most notable feature of improvement was the commencement of the erection of the better class of church buildings. Prior to this time but little attention had been paid to tasteful architecture. Many of the early churches had been unwisely located in the suburbs of towns and villages, and the edifices were exceedingly plain. In Boston the Hanover-street Church had been purchased from the Unitarians, and was the most tasteful building at that time owned by the Church. Charles-street in Baltimore, and Trinity, in Philadelphia, were the most neat and beautiful churches, which had been erected by our congregations up to that date. Christ Church in Pittsburgh, was the first church erected of Gothic architecture, and fitted up in modern style. From that time forward, in all the principal cities, movements were made for the erection of handsome and commodious churches. Simultaneous with their erection, the Church began to give to its ministers a better support, and the general financial interests were more carefully considered.2

The General Conference of 1852 met in Boston, a city and region that, with its Puritan heritage and role in the revolution, made a strong case to represent American religion. Methodists had had difficulty gaining a foothold there and Simpson noted with some understandable pride that General Conference’s “reception presented a remarkable contrast to that of Jesse Lee, more than half a century before.” The delegates were “handsomely entertained” and “many courtesies were shown them by the officers of the city. . . . No efforts were spared to render their visit and sojourn in the ‘Athens of America’ both pleasant and interesting.”3

The conflict at General Conference that year resulted from the growing pains of an ambitious Church. “The question of pewed churches was brought to the attention of the Conference by an appeal from the action of the Ohio Conference in censuring one of its ministers”4: it was a social class and East/West divide with wealthier eastern churches generally favoring pews that could be rented or sold to finance the construction and maintenance of buildings to rival their religious competitors. Simpson represented the newer, “progressive” Methodism which some, especially in the West, resisted, and which weakened his chances for election. “The grounds of hostility were that I was tolerant on the pew question” wrote Simpson in his journal, “and that I had not travelled sufficiently as an itinerant preacher.” Simpson believed he “had the active and uncompromising opposition of nearly all the Ohio delegation and of the most of the North Ohio.” To these conferences “were joined Cartwright of Illinois and Phelps of Rock River and also Haney and probably Pilcher of Michigan.”5

According to his first biographer, George Crooks, Simpson favored a moderate position. He wanted “commodious” churches but without “pew

3 Simpson, Hundred Years of Methodism, 162-163.
4 Simpson, Hundred Years of Methodism, 164.
doors.” This was the compromise General Conference reached. “The rule forbidding [the] erection [of pewed churches] was rescinded, and another was adopted expressing the decided judgment of the Church in favor of free churches.” The controversy ebbed and “on the first ballot Levi Scott, Matthew Simpson, Edward R. Ames, and Osman C. Baker, were elected” bishops. Simpson recorded in his journal, “we were ordained Bishops of the M. E. Church, and invited to seats within the altar.”

Ecclesial Politician

The 1856 General Conference met in Indianapolis, “a point” as Simpson remarked, “farther west than any previous session had been held, and indicating the rapid and continuous spread of the Church over the western sections of the country.” There were international guests. “Drs. Hannah and Jobson attended this session as delegates from the British Wesleyan Conference.” John Hannah (1792-1867) had been Divinity tutor at the 22-year-old Wesleyan Methodist theological institution at Didsbury, UK, and had also twice served as president of the Wesleyan conference. F. J. Jobson (1812-1881) was a Wesleyan minister and architect “associated with A. Pugin in the revival of Gothic architecture in the kingdom.” These were likeminded men in whom Simpson took an interest. He wrote to Ellen, “The English delegates were introduced and I had an interview with Dr. Hannah at Gov. Wrights.” Four days later he “dined at Governor Wrights . . . with the English delegates and a number of others.” Simpson’s rapport with the delegates and with prominent Methodist layman and Governor Joseph Wright (1810-1867) paid off. He “and Dr. M’Clintock were selected to visit the British and Irish Conferences in 1857.

That honor was far from certain for most of the conference as Simpson was again at the center of controversy. The issue was slavery and pressure from holiness and abolitionists within the Church. Simpson wrote to Ellen on May 14, “We have prospect of much trouble on the slavery questions.” He calculated that those “in favor of making the General Rule [against slave-
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holding] more stringent were in the majority.’'15 Simpson, however, was
‘‘thoroughly opposed to the constitutional change advocated by the anti-slav-
ery delegates and sought to defeat it.’’16 He wanted to keep the church to-
gether and growing and not ‘‘embarrass unnecessarily [our] brethren on the
border, who were already severely pressed.’’17 He expressed concern ‘‘that
the Church will split [again], though I hope for the best.’’18
On the 21st he told Ellen:

I suppose I have pretty deeply offended the Northern brethren by saying I thought
their proposed action against slavery unconstitutional. But this will likely work well
and please you, for before this a large number of them said they were going to send
me to England. Now I think it will not be done . . . . Of this however you must say
nothing.”

Still, Simpson was hopeful for victory. “The slavery committee reported
today,” he informed her. “The minority will respond tomorrow, and then we
shall have a warm debate.” By this point though, he thought “the majority
will be against any ultra action, but I am not sure . . . . The warring question
will depend on ourselves.”19

Help came from Able Stevens (1815-1897). Stevens had been the editor
of Zion’s Herald since 1848 and The National Magazine since 1852. He was
also for architecture and opposed to the abolitionist party within Methodism.
On May 19, Simpson wrote to Ellen, “Stevens I learn arrived here Saturday
night but I have not yet seen him. This week we expect to have the slav-
ery question before us.”20 MEC Bishops could not engage in floor debate.
Instead Simpson and Stevens crafted an argument to be delivered by Stevens:

His argument was historical: the church from the early days, although strongly an-
tislavery in sentiment, had permitted slaveholding; in short, it had always been both
an antislavery and a slaveholding church, and to make it otherwise without the ap-
proval of the annual conferences would change the basis of membership, and would
therefore be unconstitutional.

The speech “swept the conference before him, scattering the abolitionists.”21
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With the abolitionists defeated, General Conference did indeed appoint “Rev. J. McClintock D. D. and myself to bring its fraternal greetings to the British and Irish Wesleyan Conferences.” McClintock (1814-1870) the chair of ancient languages at Dickinson College, and editor of *The Methodist Quarterly Review*. Since they would be travelling to Europe, “the Missionary Board requested us to visit the missions in Norway, France and Germany; and the bishops appointed me to preside at the German mission conference to be held at Bremen.” The two would also represent American Methodism at the Evangelical Alliance Conference in Berlin.

These duties were part of American Methodism’s expanding global presence. Bishop Edmund S. Janes wrote to Simpson in October, 1856, anxious to get the Methodists established in Bulgaria before other Protestant missions got involved. “The question of the Bulgarian mission must be settled. Other denominations will not wait longer.” He encouraged Simpson to recruit a suitable missionary.

Simpson also had grand plans for the transformation of Methodism. On December 23, 1856, he made notes in a private notebook under the heading “The future of Methodism involving probable changes.” The ideas mentioned, most of which did indeed come to pass, would have been considered progressive in his day and brought Methodist practice in line with other world Protestant churches. They included: “1. Lay delegates. 2. Extension of ministerial time. 3. Fewer presiding Elders and more Bishops. 4. Districts changeable but assigned Bishops. 5. Support of Bps made direct from people. 6. Use of Liturgy.” He continued:

22 Arguments Simpson considered regarding slavery and Church membership, are found in a letter from his mentor and uncle, also Matthew Simpson, written a month after conference. The letter begins, “My dear Nephew, I propose according to promise to give a few thoughts on the servitude or slavery authorized by the Old Testament scripture.” The last page of this extensive letter, presumably with the conclusion, is missing. However, the thrust of his argument seems to be that slaves were included in the covenant of circumcision and thus the sign of salvation, though they were lawfully bought as foreigners, and remained slaves. “And then what was required of Abraham and his seed? Ans. They should be circumcised together with every male among them whether born in their house or bought with money, that is all whom they could hold to servitude by any grant of law or authority of God, for “all their males” and “every male among them” surely includes all whom they could lawfully hold to labour or keep in servitude. But what included in this sign? Ans. the man who was circumcised came under an obligation to have the body of sin destroyed or to mortify the deeds of the body or the flesh and to live a life of holiness by keeping all God’s commandments and attending punctually to that for of worship which God should require of them.” See Matthew Simpson (uncle), Letter to Matthew Simpson (nephew), Wellsville, June 19, 1856. LOC. Man. Division. Simpson Papers, Box 3, Family Correspondence 1855-1858.


Are not these topics worthy of discussion that the plans may be shaped aright? Can a clear view be given of Mr. Wesley’s idea of a church distinct from comprehending societies, and societies as encompassed in a church? Also what changes in a church he might have desired, not in a society. What would be the effect of publishing a new edition of Mr. Wesley’s Prayer Book, with an introduction? 27

World Traveler

As Simpson’s trip abroad approached, tickets were purchased for him and his son Charles “in the Cunard Steamer ‘Africa’ to sail on May 13, 1857.” 28 Simpson had “contracted to supply travel letters to the Pittsburgh and the Western Christian Advocate” and “through his New York banker friend, Daniel Ross, established a credit of £500 with a Liverpool banking house.” 29 He concluded he episcopal duties “early in the spring . . . at the Kentucky, North Indiana, Western Virginia, and Pittsburgh Conferences.” Then, “three days from the close” of the Pittsburgh Conference, Simpson, his son Charles, and wife Ellen left for New York on May 8, 1857. They were accompanied by “Allen Kramer Esq. and Alexander Bradley Esq. and their estimable ladies.” 30 Kramer and Bradley were wealthy Pittsburgh Methodists and patrons of Methodist causes. 31

The group spent Sunday, May 10, in Philadelphia where Simpson preached in the morning “at Green St. on ‘Sanctify them by thy truth’ and at night at Trinity from prayer of Elisha ‘Open his eyes.’” In New York they “made a home with D. L. Ross, where we were most kindly entertained.” 32 While in New York, Simpson helped raise money for missions abroad and for the building of church buildings in America. On Tuesday he “preach a dedicatory sermon in the Scandinavian Bethel ship” and “a collection of $2,200 was taken in.” 33 That evening he “gave a lecture on the ‘Influence of the Bible upon Languages’ in Green St. ch. in behalf of the new church in Hudson City,” New Jersey. 34

The party was scheduled to leave on Wednesday, but “not having received [his] passports [Simpson] was obliged to go to the Mayor’s office to

31 Alexander Bradley was a manufacturer of ironware in Pittsburgh and banker. Allen Kramer had founded a banking house in Pittsburgh. Both contributed considerably to Methodist enterprises. See Simpson, Cyclopaedia, 130-131, 521.
make affidavits.” He needed greater financial assurances, which were supplied by his Pittsburgh friends. “I was laid under obligation to Mr. Kramer for a letter of credit which he unsolicitedly gave me. And also to Mr. Smith for several introductory notes.” With these in hand he got to the ship and “bade farewell to a host of kind friends who had accompanied me . . . . In a few minutes our noble steamer loosing its cables and firing its signal guns was sweeping around gracefully in Manhattan Bay.”

On Sunday, May 17, Simpson was given the honor of holding religious services. He was particularly pleased, partly because it meant the captain considered him equal to a Church of England minister. “According to the rules of the [ship’s] company the captain, if no minister of the Excellent Church of England is on board, must read the Episcopal service.” Because of stormy weather, “the captain who had before signified to some of my friends that he designed to ask me to preach, sent me word that its man could not be present. With that I could conduct services wholly in my own way.” Thus the ship had as its representative of the clergy a bishop of the MEC.”

On Saturday, May 23, Simpson saw the lighthouse and forts established at Malin Head in the north of Ireland “to guard against Napoleon in 1798.” A week later he was in London. He wrote to Ellen that he and Charles “have no acquaintances yet Methodistically, but are staying at a hotel sightseeing. Expenses are very high.” He had, however, “agreed to preach in City Road on Sunday.” By early June, he made his way to the continent. In Hanover he met with Ludwig Jacoby (1813-1874) to prepare for the mission conference of the German MEC. Simpson wrote Ellen that he was “at a loss of sleep with travelling, that accommodations exhausted me considerably and last night I was compelled to sit till from this morning arranging matters with Bro. Jacoby.” In another letter he mentioned his disappointment with German hospitality. “Last night we had a public reception meeting with brethren at the mission House of which some two hundred were present. They are very cordial but I have no invitation to any of their houses.”

**Ambassador for American Methodism**

After visiting missions in Scandinavia, Simpson brought fraternal greet-

---

39 Jacoby was born to Jewish parents and baptized in the Lutheran Church. In 1838, he immigrated to Cincinnati and heard William Nast preach. He joined the Methodists and became a missionary to German immigrants. After the democratic movements in Germany in 1848, he returned to Germany in 1849 and began gathering a MEC community in Bremen.
40 Simpson, to Ellen Simpson, June, 1857, Hanover. LOC. Man. Division. Simpson Papers, Box 3, Family Correspondence 1855-1858.
ings to the Irish Wesleyan Methodist Conference where he was well re-
ceived. He then continued to Liverpool for the 1857 British Conference of
the Wesleyan Methodist Church. There he “not only gave fraternal greetings
from the American church but defended its policy on slavery (the English
papers . . . had openly accused him of proslaveryism).” An account of
this speech from blind Methodist preacher and future chaplain of the United
States Congress, William Henry Milburn (1823-1903), is recorded by
Simpson’s first biographer, George Crooks.

There was a barrier to his success, for the hospitality of mind in his hearers was
tinctured by a slight distrust and undervaluation of him as an American; undefined it
might be but none the less real and potent. It was a trying moment for the great orator
who had achieved so many triumphs in his native land, and he, at first seemed almost
to falter, while the doctor [McClintock] and I, who sat near at hand, were tremulous,
even feverish, dreading lest our champion might fail. . . . The bishop was hampered
and ill at ease, or appeared to be so . . . . Just as we were giving up all for lost the
speaker seemed to forget himself for a moment or two, as a happy illustration fell
from his lips; . . . there was a murmur of “Hear, hear!” from all over the house . . . .
His voice lost its wavering inflections and uncertainty of tone; his sentences flowed
freely, in clearer and higher form. The speech became earnest, effective, poetic,
impassioned, thrilling.

The substance of Simpson’s defense of American Methodism was to
highlight the cost borne by the American church in resisting slavery. The
MEC had lost nearly half a million members. “By that one act of resisting
the progress of the spirit of slavery among us,” he said, “we lost more mem-
bers than you ever had in the Methodist body in Great Britain.” The official
response of the British Conference read:

We have been much gratified by the strong and manly avowal of sentiment, on the
subject of slavery, made by your Deputation; and by their noble repudiation of the
charge which some would lay against you, as a Church, of favouring that great evil.
Your strong hostility to it, as manifested in your General Conference and in your
literary organs, has our most earnest sympathy; and we rejoice in the belief, that you
will be enabled to bear not only a worthy but a chief part in attaining—what must
come—the relief of mankind from such a curse.

The bishop next travelled through Germany, en route to preside at the
German mission conference in Bremen. To Ellen he commented on the “nar-
row filthy streets of Cologne.” He visited Cologne’s “famed cathedral and
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to the Church of St. Ursula where they pretend to show the bones of 11,000 virgins, the story is too long to tell and I question whether you would believe it at any rate. They do show a good many skulls & bones, but where they came from I cannot tell.” He also mentioned the “pretty scenery” from Cologne to Mainz, “but not prettier than many spots on the Ohio or on the Hudson.”

From September 5-7, 1857, Simpson presided at the first Conference of the German MEC in Bremen. “This work had been commenced a few years previously under the superintendency of Dr. Jacoby . . . . He had established, at Bremen, a printing-press, publishing a weekly paper, and had issued several tracts and books in the German language.” Membership in Germany and Switzerland was small but growing. It totaled 534 (up from 465 the previous year).

**Ambassador of American Protestantism**

From Bremen, Simpson travelled to Berlin to represent the MEC at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance [EA]. The EA was a loose knit federation of Protestants formed in London in 1846. Its purpose was to provide “a definite organization for the expression of unity amongst Christian individuals belonging to different churches.” This did not exclude controversy. At its first meeting, British participants moved to exclude slaveholders from membership, but after six days of debate, the final constitution skirted the issue of slavery due to American pressure.

1857 was the first year the EA met on German soil, in the capital of the Prussian Empire. Prussia was a rising power. The defeat of Napoleon had enlarged its boarders to include the centers of the German industrial revolution, and Prussia now rivaled Austria for leadership of a unified Germany. “Second in size and in rank,” wrote a clearly impressed Simpson in an unpublished narrative of his journey, “Prussia is really at the head of the Germanic states.”

Its Princes have furnished much greater energy than those of Austria and the Kingdom has advanced much more rapidly in all the elements of a high Christian civilization. No nation can boast a more perfectly organized system of education. Every child, rich and poor, male or female, must attend a public school from five years of age until such time as the clergyman of the parish is satisfied that it has the education proscribed by law for its station.

---

50 German Mission Conference, 1857.
52 Catholic Austria had been forced to give up the imperial crown in 1806, under pressure from Napoleon, but controlled of the German Confederation, which was created by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to coordinate the German-speaking countries and replace the former Holy Roman Empire.
The King of Prussia gave special attention and encouragement to the Alliance meeting. Prussia looked to the EA as a model for unity among its fractious Protestant churches, a problem Catholic Austria did not have. The issue of religious freedom was complex. W. F. Warren, a young Methodist preacher who was studying in Germany and corresponding for the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, reported that Alliance delegates discussed the issue of religious liberty. However, they could only affirm it on “religious, as distinct from political, grounds” because the Prussian government would not allow an open discussion.

Warren focused his reporting on the impressions made by the Methodists in attendance. A major American presence at the meeting was the new United States Ambassador to Berlin, Methodist layperson and former Governor Wright, who had entertained Simpson and the English delegates at General Conference. Wright “had only recently arrived” in Berlin, appointed by President Buchannan, and Simpson likely owed his prominent place on the Alliance program to Wright’s influence.

Simpson wrote that Wright’s “presence . . . was to me, and to the Americans generally particularly gratifying.” He admired Wright’s American and Methodist sensibilities, which he seems hard pressed to distinguish. He noted Wright’s “determined adherence to republican simplicity in the midst of society governed by courtly etiquette.” This was “especially manifested in refusing to place wines upon his table at a dinner, which he gave during the Alliance.”

For this he was highly censured by courtly parasites, but he should have and will have, the higher regard from patriotic Americans . . . . No forms of flattery will cause [Wright] to sacrifice one iota of the rightful claims of the United States. If he err at all, it will be in an outspoken condemnation of the ridiculous etiquette and ceremonies enjoined by European courts.

Like Prussia, the United States was a rising world power and Prussia extended to the Americans and especially the Methodist delegation, every courtesy. The meeting was opened by the court preacher with a speech welcoming each church delegation. When he got to Methodism, he called it “the angel flying through the midst of heaven, summoning the dead churches to a new Christian life.” The next place on the agenda was given to

---

Ambassador Wright. McClintock commented, “it was a great gratification, too, to Christians of all lands, to see a man occupying so high a public position identifying himself with this movement of Christian brotherhood.”

Following Wright, Simpson spoke. Warren recorded the reaction of one German at the announcement that he would speak next.

“Who is that?” said a German gentleman near me. “Bishop Simpson of the Bischoefflichen Methodisten Kirche of America.” “Bischoefflichen Methodisten Kirche?” repeated he, dubiously; “Episcopal Methodist! Why, that is a contradiction in terms! What do you mean?” and he turned for enlightenment to another. How he succeeded, I do not know.

Simpson’s speech emphasized the benefits of united effort. “The great body of American Christians,” he said, “sympathized with the objects of the Conference as a union not of creeds, nor of organizations, but of heart and Christian activity.” Through such unity came prosperity and peace. “The little streams, rising among the hills—some flowing faster some slower—might, indeed, singly, quench the thirst of the passing traveller, but only in union could they bear the treasures of commerce, and so bring the ends of the earth together.” Simpson also compared the political structures of Germany with those of the United States. “As in Germany, so also in the United States,” he said, “the independence of the several sovereignties secured freedom of thought and action, while the confederation gave strength and power to the whole.” So it was with the Church. “Singly, the churches did great good, but when united in heart and activity, they offered a sublime spectacle to the world . . . . It was the desire of American Christians that all Christians, in all the earth, to be one in Christ Jesus.”

Afterward, representatives from the assembly were entertained at the King’s palace, Sansoussi. Warren remarked, “At three o’clock we betook ourselves to the Potsdam depot, white-cravatted and white-kidded, according to the irrefragable postulates of court etiquette, whence two extra trains conveyed us gratis to the ‘Prussian Versailles.’” There were thirty-two in the American delegation, which included Wright, Simpson, McClintock, Warren, and the Methodist missionaries to Constantinople and Athens. Wright was chosen to present the Americans. “When the King arrived . . . and seeing Governor Wright, he hastened forward, shook his hand most cordially, and expressed his lively pleasure at finding him there.”

After a little conversation the governor proceeded to present his countrymen. The king expressed great satisfaction in seeing his old friend Doctor Baird, held Dr. Dwight’s hand a long time, inquiring about his missionary success, did not forget to greet the native Armenian preacher who was in his company, begged to know of Bishop Simpson the name of his see (!), in a word, “did the polite and handsome” by us all; so much so that he excited the jealousy of more than one “nationality,” among the rest his own.

---

On Sunday, Bishop Simpson was given the further honor of preaching the English language service at the Garrison Church. McClintock reported to his American readers gleefully, “It was the first time that an established church in Prussia had been opened for the preaching of the gospel by an evangelical minister of the English or American churches and now it was opened for a Methodist Bishop.” Simpson again spoke on Christian unity from John 17:22:

True Christian union consists not in unity of belief, for this is not possible as long as minds and nations differ so widely; not in uniformity of worship, which is equally impracticable, even if desirable; but in union of fellowship with Christ, and of Christian activities and labors for the advancement of Christ’s kingdom.

Reaction was mixed. An Englishman said to McClintock, “‘Ah, sir, that was preaching; what a backbone of hard stout thinking was behind all that tenderness and unction!’” However, some German Lutherans were unnerved by seeing “American schismatics in the pulpit.”

American Tourist

The remainder of Simpson’s trip was devoid of official duties and instead taken up with tourism and pilgrimage. Simpson had long hoped “if life, health, and circumstances should permit,” to extend his travels in Europe “to visit the East.” In Berlin he met “Prof. Garver, a young Lutheran clergyman from Pennsylvania who desired to visit the Holy Land if he could obtain suitable company.” He also enlisted Warren, whom he had “met at the rooms of Governor Wright.” Finally, the party included “the son of Gov. Wright, the American ambassador [sic] at Berlin, a young man . . . whom [Simpson] had known almost from his childhood.”

The group agreed to meet up “in the city of Vienna, and start thence for Constantinople on the 2nd day of October.” They would then “proceed from Vienna by the Danube and the Black Sea to Constantinople that [they] might see as much as possible of the Turkish dominions.” In Constantinople, Simpson planned to visit the MEC missionaries he had encountered at the Alliance meeting and continue on to Jerusalem, Egypt, Italy, and then return home. His son Charles, “desiring to acquire a knowledge of the German language,” was put under the care of Jacoby, and attended a school “about

---

65 Doctor McClintock, in Crooks, Life of Bishop Simpson, 343-344.
71 Simpson, Hundred Years of Methodism, 167-168.
25 or 30 miles from Hanover.”

Simpson made the journey to Vienna alone. He wrote to Ellen that he had “been visiting the spots made interesting by the labors of Luther and Melanchthon,” though he began to grow weary of sightseeing.

I have seen the house in which Luther was born, and the house in which he died. I have seen the table at which he wrote, the gown which he wore and the beads which he counted while yet a monk, the room in which he first studied the Bible, the castle in which he was lodged for safety, and the wall at which he threw the ink stand to hit his Satanic majesty . . . . Battlefields, too I have seen and palaces, and paintings, and ornaments, almost without number.

When he arrived in Dresden, he “expected to meet two of my travelling companions but as they were delayed I turned aside . . . to visit the Moravian town of Herrnhut,” from “which [Wesley] drew some practical plans.” The General Council of the Moravians had met just before his arrival and “with some of their brethren from America [he] had crossed the Atlantic.” The visit confirmed his sense of Methodism’s superiority.

[Wesley] formed societies aiming to unite all the forms, regularity and system of the Church of England with the simplicity and religious energy of the Moravian Brethren. The question may arise to the thoughtful enquirer, why have the Moravians accomplished so little while the societies of Mr. Wesley have multiplied so rapidly and spread to the end of the earth?

On September 26, Simpson travelled to Prague in the Austrian empire where “Catholicism reigns supreme; and it is dangerous to question the most incredible narratives.” Catholicism represented European decadence and superstition, and he “had full opportunity to witness the splendor and pagentry of Papal ceremonies.” He commented on a Cardinal Prince conducting service, after which “the Cardinal passing from the cathedral had his long robes borne by attendants until placed in the carriage and attended by guards he drove away.” He noted the opulence of Catholic churches and shrines.

That of St. John of Napomuc is one of the richest in the world. It is said the silver amounts to thirty seven hundred weight . . . . The walls of the chapel of St. Wenzell are marble, rich in jewels, and fresco paintings have borders inlaid with amethysts, jasper, and other precious stones . . . . The cathedral is also rich in relics, which command the veneration of crowds of pilgrims. Among these are parts of the bones of

---

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a piece of the true cross, a part of the sponge, two thorns of the crown, the virgin Mary’s pocket handkerchief, and a host of articles of equal value. More substantial treasure than these is the church plate and robes prepared for the priests.

Simpson was however intrigued by the hold saints’ cults had over the people, and how gullible they seemed.

The extent to which abject submission to monkish superstition is carried is seen in the crowds, which gather around the images contained in the various chapels. The inscriptions upon the pedestals on which the images of the saints are placed, tell the efficacy of prayers offered before the statues. Some of these read “Good for diseases of the head,” others, “Good for diseases of the toes,” another, “Good for diseases of the eye,” and so on for all the different parts of the human body, while a card at another part of the chapel proclaimed an indulgence and remission of sins for all who should offer prayers there.79

Even so, Simpson maintained a hope for the triumph of Protestantism in Bohemia. An outdoor service to honor St. Wenceslaus “reminded [him] of camp-meeting in our own western land.”

Seldom have I heard more earnest addresses though I knew not the matter and seldom have I heard strains of music in which an audience of thousands joined with more apparent sincerity. Such a people preserving such habits must before long be accessible to Protestant effort.

It was his firm belief that “there yet slumbers however in the national heart of Bohemia a feeling of independence and a restlessness under the Roman yoke.” In the not too distant future, he wrote, “a flame shall ascend from the ashes of these early martyrs which shall spread until . . . Papal idolatry shall perish from the land.” He had heard rumored, “that a large proportion of the priests in Bohemia are anxious for deliverance from Papal domination.” Prague, he believed, could “become a center from which light should spread throughout the Austrian dominions.”

His next stop was Vienna. Vienna was the center of the multi-ethnic Austrian empire. On October 2, he wrote to Ellen, “Here in Vienna, though it is yet by the Danube and Black Sea 1,500 miles to Constantinople I find myself in the lands of the East. Many stranger languages are spoken here. Bohemian, Hungarian, Russian, Turkish etc., are heard in the streets.”

After difficulty finding the American mission in Vienna, Simpson, ever the patriot, noted:

American interests are not represented in foreign lands as the magnitude and honor of our country demands. Comparatively small would be the outlay to secure in each capital a permanent position from which the American flag should float and to which all eyes should be directed, as the center and safeguard of American institutions.

The most important of those institutions was religious freedom, which Austria rigorously suppressed. “In no other part of Europe save central and southern Italy has persecution been so effective in completely over-awing and destroying Protestantism.” “In Austria proper,” wrote Simpson, “such are the disabilities and such the persecution, that it is with great difficulty any Protestant worship can be conducted.”  

Simpson made his way down the Danube to Budapest, the Hungarian part of the Empire. In Budapest, he met with Protestants connected with the suppressed Hungarian revolution of 1848 and its leader Lajos Kossuth. “Having formed a slight acquaintance with one of the Protestant ministers at the Evangelical Alliance in Berlin,” he wrote, “we were invited to spend in his family the Sabbath evening.” Simpson and his company dined with two Protestant seminary “professors and a minister who was formerly a tutor of Kossuth’s children.” “We found,” he wrote, “a most cordial greeting and spent a pleasant evening conversing upon the condition of the Protestant church and the prospect of Hungary.”

Simpson later wrote an extended assessment of the Magyar cause and their prospects for the future, which reveals the assumptions of western imperialism. “The question may arise,” he asked, “was the suppression of this revolution an injury to humanity? Our sympathies were deeply enlisted for Hungary.” Simpson acknowledged “it has wrongs which deserve to be redressed. Its people are in many elements a noble race.” Yet despite his professed love for Protestantism and liberty, Simpson judged “that the interests of humanity are best sub-served by the government of Austria being maintained.”

Simpson continued by reflecting on the nature of empire and, what seemed to him, the inevitable progress of civilization.

Austria has been endeavoring to mold [several] nations into one homogeneous form. There is Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Croatia, Transylvania and the Italian provinces differing in language, differing in habits, and yet all under the sway of one central government. The Hungarian revolution was a contest not only for Hungarian freedom but also for the re-establishment of Magyar power, and the Magyar language. It would however be disastrous to the interests of civilization and the welfare of humanity if the various languages should be allowed to form the basis of separate and distinct governments.

From Simpson’s perspective, some nations and ethnicities were destined to expand. Others were, in the progress of time, destined to retreat. “The literature of the German language is far superior to that of the Hungarian or Croatian or that of the similar tribes embraced in the empire,” he wrote:

And though possibly for many years yet to come those languages will be cultivated, yet civilization is sweeping the less important languages an systems away. One after another these dialects are ceasing to be spoken and sooner or later the literature of the earth will be embraced in a few leading languages. Of these there is no reason to suppose the Hungarian will be one.

For Simpson, religious freedom was important, but not ethnic and political independence.

The revolution doubtless did good . . . in leading the crown of Austria to relax some of their bonds. Hungary will yet be comparatively free and Austria will doubtless yet see it to her interests to break the yoke of Jesuit power, to proclaim freedom of conscience and of form of religious worship to all her inhabitants. But when under constitutional restrictions and with freedom of religious worship Austria shall have placed herself among the freer nations of the earth, she will then be a great power to mold the heterogenous masses of which her empire is composed.

Empire, to Simpson, was something positive, even divine. Empire was the bringer of civilization, the bringer of peace.

The workings of Divine Providence evidently indicate in all of the great movements of the last few years that the day of small and separate nationalities and governments is at an end and that the nations of the nations will be bonded together, larger empires shall extend their borders until, parting out this earth under recognized limits, the strifes and discords which have so long prevailed shall principally be done away.

His final expectation was an approximation of the Kingdom. “It cannot be expected that the world shall be under one government, but when under a few leading governments all earthly power shall be held, then by a Congress of Nations, by the laws of the balance of power, wars may be rendered exceedingly [rare?]”

Conclusion

On October 16, Simpson wrote to Ellen, “After a tedious voyage on the Danube we reached the Black Sea on Saturday last . . . . We lay at Sulina until Monday and arrived in [Istanbul] on Tuesday evening.” He had reached the end of Europe and of Christian civilization. There he saw “the Seraphio (the old one), St. Sophia church a mosque, whirling dervishers, &c.” Yet seeing the East, he was optimistic about the prospects of European civilization. “The Greek & Armenian women look about like our own,” he told Ellen. “The Turkish are veiled in a kind of way, but with two or three exceptions, all I have seen are pale, feeble cadaverous-looking beings, that indicate the race is passing away.”

Simpson’s journey continued from Istanbul to Jerusalem and back through Egypt, France, and England. He visited missionaries and saw as
many of the sights as he was able. Somewhere in the Austrian Empire he had contracted what was probably malaria. His reflections are thus sparser from this on, and he gave up trying to write a travel narrative. He was too feeble.

Simpson was elected as bishop for a new era of Methodist expansion. He was a “moderate,” a “progressive,” a realist. He was also uncritical. He accepted that Western European civilization was part of God’s salvific plan, and that European and American Empire and the spread of Methodism were means by which this would take place.89 As a representative leader of American Methodism in the mid-nineteenth century, he was unaware that he had adopted the assumptions of his own imperialist age. This was true with regard to his “moderate” positions on pews, the issue of slaveholding, and ethnically oppressed minorities in Austria. A critique of his own contemporary culture grounded in the story of a Jew crucified by the most powerful European empire to date never occurred to him.

There is a reflection in a notebook Simpson labeled “Palestine.”

As my eyes caught the first glimpse of Sidon I almost involuntarily said, Can this be that ancient City the mother of Tyre and Carthage, and the center of commerce for the ancient world? The glowing descriptions of the old poets, and the bold graphic touches of prophetic pencils had brought up by my youthful fancy into a picture of grandeur and magnificence.

Simpson was disappointed. “There were no high mountains, no vast plain, no deep bay, no large stream, and one could scarcely conceive why a large and commercial city should have ever existed at this spot.”90 The rise and fall of Empires was before his eyes. For him though this was evidence of exaggeration on the part of ancient poets and the improved situation of Empires in his own day. It never occurred to him that he was witness to the impermanence of Empires—even ecclesial ones.

89 One could argue that Simpson was in line with John Wesley. Wesley argued that the American Revolution was unjust. The colonists had religious freedom. They should stop complaining about their lack of liberty and “honor the King.” See John Wesley, A Calm Address to Our American Colonies.