

John Search's Last Words

Thomas Binney

Quinta Press

Quinta Press, Meadow View, Weston Rhyn, Oswestry, Shropshire,
England, SY10 7RN

The format of this volume is copyright
© 2019 Quinta Press

www.quintapress.com

For proof-reading purposes the line breaks are in the same place as
the original, hence the stretched text

JOHN SEARCH'S LAST WORDS:

WITH

A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND CHARLES JAMES,

LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

BY

THE EDITOR OF "WHAT? AND WHO SAYS IT?"
AND "STRIKE, BUT HEAR!"

"As an argumentum ad hominem addressed to evangelical Churchmen, showing, on their own principles, that Dissenters may be right in their conviction, and by their own example, that they are perfectly authorized in their mode of expressing it; viewed in this light, and in relation to these objects, I calmly and confidently DEFY ANY MAN—lay or clerical—of the Diocese of Worcester, or any other, TO ANSWER THIS BOOK."

"What? and Who Says It?" last sentence.

"Henceforth let no man trouble me."—Paul.

LONDON:
THOMAS WARD & CO., 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXXXIX.

WILLIAM STEVENS, PRINTER, BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Editor of "What? and Who says it!" having brought to a conclusion, not only the task which he at first undertook, (a task by him most unexpectedly undertaken,) but also that which arose out of it, begs, in parting with the public, to thank his readers *of all parties*, (for such he has had,) for their favourable reception of what he has attempted. It was gratifying to hear, from many quarters, that "What? and Who says it!" was always spoken of as singularly free from some of the prevalent vices of modern controversial composition. If, in the few pages with which he now winds up his labours, expressions should occur, somewhat stronger and sterner than what have hitherto been employed, he believes that, with those who have really gone, or will go into the examination of what it *is* that he rebukes, the wonder will be, not that he has spoken as he has, but that he could stop short of the most severe and withering denunciations;—that he did not at once adopt, (the "Record" itself would have defended him if he had,) the burning epithets employed by indignant, Incarnate Justice.

The writer is well aware that some of the things on which he has animadverted, are not in themselves of great bulk. Principles *have* no bulk. Truthfulness may be violated by a single word, as much as by a hundred,—and the *fact* of the violation is, in either case, the same. A lie is a lie, though conveyed by a monosyllable; and hypocrisy, misrepresentation, calumny, and craft, are—hypocrisy, misrepresentation, calumny, and craft, though huddled together in ten lines.

B

The public are not aware of the practices of many controversial periodicals; nor of the manner in which they injure, prejudice, defame, writers;—violate, evade, or deny, justice. The *principles* infringed by them may be illustrated in any one, however insignificant, by a portion of its articles, however small,—and from any such illustrations much may be learned. The principle of disobedience was as much displayed in the sin of Adam, as in the rebellion of Lucifer; and the intelligent universe was as much interested in those illustrated in the redemption of our race, as if the world and man had been millions of times bigger and bulkier than they are. Principles depend not on the bulk of any thing.

Throughout the whole of what he has written, the Editor of "*What? and Who says it?*" is not conscious of having taken an unfair advantage, or of having said an unfounded thing. He has not written with temper, nor with flippancy, nor disingenuousness. He found himself, indeed, engaged with men whom he durst not trust, and whom he could not continue to treat as high minded or honourable adversaries. This, in some things, may have had its effect. The most unsuspecting and generous nature, will learn caution from commerce with the crafty; and the wisest of men, may be obliged at times, "to answer fools according to their foolishness." That Being, who is himself infinitely Holy, adapts his conduct to the character he deals with:—"With the pure, I will show myself pure; with the *froward*, I will show myself *froward*." To do this, however, in a manner perfectly consistent with virtue, is probably the sole prerogative of God. He alone can be conversant with evil without danger. Mortal men are both "encompassed with infirmity," and exposed to peril from inherent corruptions. In thus closing his hazardous engagements, the writer would beg permission, therefore, to repeat two passages from his last work, as expressive of the consciousness he has, at once,

of his wish to do right, and of his liability to err. "May God pardon my transgression, if in this book I have either committed wrong, or imputed wrongfully its commission to another! and may he cause the painful service which I have rendered to Truth, to contribute also, in its issues, to the advancement of charity."—"Breathing myself this infected atmosphere, and engaged in this blinding and perilous controversial occupation, I dare not affirm that, in relation to the 'Observer,' I have fallen into no error. I may have wronged and misrepresented you—in my late work—in my former communication—in this letter; but I do not know that I have. If I have, *I beg pardon of God and you.*"*

If, in the present publication, it should be thought that the porch is too large for the building, let it be remembered, that the Letter to the Bishop of London is to be regarded as the dedication of the *three* pamphlets as *one book*. What gave rise to the first, ought long since to have passed away, but his lordship and others will not let it; some, therefore, might like to bind together the pieces it has produced, to meet, in the future sons of the church, what they will certainly inherit from their spiritual "FATHERS."

Besides, the recent proceedings† of the Bishop appeared to demand the notice of the writer; first, as the name of his client fell, it is said, from his Lordship's lips with peculiar contempt; and, secondly, as his Lordship's conduct, added to

* See "Strike, but Hear!" p. 49 and p. 41.

† The writer will be understood to refer to the Bishop of London's late interference with the CITY MISSION. The particulars have not *officially* transpired: but they are enough known both to warrant the writer's allusions, and to make them intelligible. The Committee of the Mission, in justice both to itself, and to its catholic supporters, in and out of the Establishment, will probably feel it necessary to give them to the-public, through the medium of its monthly publication; or, if not, at the first public meeting of the Society. Some are expected, in connexion with their present noble determination, to leave no family in the metropolis destitute of the Scriptures.

other things, led him to abandon the expectation he had expressed of the Episcopal Church,—an expectation, which, in spite of its not being common with Dissenters, he had hitherto always both indulged and declared.

The Editor of "*What? and Who says it?*" can truly affirm that it was painful for him, at first, to have to rebuke persons, many of whom he believed to be good though prejudiced men; and that it has been any thing but pleasant to expose the faults which that rebuke led others to commit. He has had many apprehensions lest the name of Christ should be evil spoken of from his public notice of the sins of his servants. He has doubted whether he ought not to have "suffered wrong"—suffered it in silence, rather than incur so serious a danger. He can add, however, with perfect truth, that he has proceeded to these, his *last words*, and has allowed himself a license—in speaking both of the *little* and the *GREAT* in the Church—hitherto unusual with him, from the deep, and daily deepening persuasion, that there is so much that is morally bad, and so much that is ecclesiastically portentous, in the present state and aspect of affairs, as can neither be cured nor provided for, by either "saying soft things," or "hoping the best."

The writer has only to add, that, as to the *authority* of his books, he is not a believer in the authority of names. "*WHAT is said?*" not "*WHO says it?*" is the thing to be thought of. The shameless violation of this principle in the case of Mr. Binney, by men *committed to the import of his sentence*, alone occasioned his writing at all. And now, "what he has written, he has written." Let those who think, read and judge.

27, Paternoster Row.

TO THE
RIGHT REV. CHARLES JAMES,
LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

MY LORD,

THE following pages, although written under the shadow of a distant cathedral, by one not a resident in your Lordship's diocese, cannot, I think, be presented with such propriety to any individual as to your Lordship; I beg, therefore, to submit them—with *the previous pamphlets to which they refer*—most respectfully to your Lordship's attention: the *entire series* of animadversions which I have been led to put before the public eye, I thus venture to lay at your Lordship's feet;—I shall proceed to specify some of the reasons that induce me to do so.

Your Lordship is well aware, that, for some years, no name has been so frequently in the mouths of Churchmen as that of a certain Dissenting Minister, who is supposed to have "asserted," that "the Establishment destroys more souls than it saves." He has not been condemned for merely holding an opinion adverse to the existence of ecclesiastical establishments; but for having given utterance to the daring idea, that the Established Church could *destroy souls*. Now, my Lord, if it can be shown, that *this mode of expression* is quite familiar to certain Churchmen themselves,—this, while it will prove nothing whatever, as to whether either they or the Dissenter are right,—and nothing, as to which may be

the wisest,—he who would remove, or they who would mitigate the acknowledged evil,—it *will* prove, that *both parties have alike given utterance to the execrated opinion*; and that, therefore, the virulent condemnation of the one by the other, must spring from ignorance, fraud, hypocrisy, or worse.

Churchmen, my Lord, after what they have said about this matter, and are STILL SAYING, (*you know this, my Lord,*) are bound in honour to look it fairly in the face; Dissenters have a right to demand that they should do so, for all have been insulted in consequence of an individual's supposed sin. *Some* Churchmen, more than others, are liable to be called upon for this act of justice; I think it may be shown, that in this number your Lordship stands.

Your Lordship will remember that you joined in the outcry against Mr. Binney, by attacking him in the notes to your Charge, published in 1834. I have shown, my Lord, that, if you condemn the Dissenter, and treat him with insult, for what he said, you must enlarge the sphere and compass of your contempt, until it include many whom you little suspect. It is very probable, indeed, that your Lordship wrote and felt as you did, without reading or knowing any thing on the subject, as, in the very publication to which I refer, you gave your deliberate "RECOMMENDATION" to a book, of which CHARITY, my Lord, compelled many to think you could know nothing; a book, the author of which has just found, at the impartial hand of public justice, an appropriate home in a public prison.

Your Lordship is the friend of Dr. Chalmers; you selected him as one of the writers of the "Bridgewater Treatises;" you accepted the dedication of his work when completed; you were present, I believe, at one, at least, of his late controversial lectures in London:—I have shown, my Lord, that, if Mr. Binney sins, he sins with the sanction of Dr. Chalmers.

Your Lordship presides over the metropolitan diocese; all London may be said to be your parish; all its clergy are under your control; the friends of the church, connected with the press, look to your Lordship as presiding over them:—I have shown, my Lord, that, if Mr. Binney sins, he sins countenanced by many, who, under the very eye of your Lordship, are plying their trade of weekly or monthly advocates of the Establishment.

Your Lordship, in a recent affair, the particulars of which are getting abroad, again condescended to make allusions to Mr. Binney—allusions which betray how tenaciously you remember, and how bitterly you feel, what is supposed to be his solitary sin. I have not attempted, my Lord, to show that he has not sinned. I have no wish to do that: I have a wish, however, that you, my Lord, and others, who continue to condemn and calumniate my client, as if “he were worse than all the Galileans,” would just take the trouble to acquaint yourselves a little with the real truth; I have a wish that you would open your eyes, my Lord, to the simple fact, that certain of those who “dwell in your Jerusalem”—your own clergy—are exposed, with the Dissenter, to the same condemnation. If the one has done any thing worthy of death, in the name of Justice let him die; but if others are proved to participate in his guilt, why, my Lord, condemn him to perish alone?

Your Lordship, as a Christian Bishop, is not only bound to exemplify in yourself all virtue; but to rebuke, for open offences against it, the inferior clergy under your control. Times of ecclesiastical discussion and conflict try the principles both of churches and men; and often betray, to a wondering world, “what manner of spirit they are of.” No service demands higher qualifications, moral and spiritual, in those who engage in it, than religious controversy; and

no other seems so lightly undertaken, or so recklessly conducted. You, my Lord, are yourself a controversialist. You feel it necessary to notice, occasionally at least, those who differ from your Lordship in opinion, and you occupy a very distinguished office, in a church at present eminently *militant*. As for your clergy, my Lord, *some* of them, I fear, though clergymen by profession, are controversialists *in trade*. I can make many allowances;—allowances *for* many, and for much in them; but it is really time, my Lord, that the matter was considered by those whom it may concern, and that the higher and more severe of the virtues, were brought into exercise in connection with a duty, the most dignified that mortals can render to Truth. Your Lordship is aware that you are by no means sinless as a controversial writer. You have had to submit to a public rebuke,—merited, if ever such a rebuke was merited by man,—for condescending to the employment of low language—language “which never ought to have fallen from the pen, or to have been found in the pages of a Christian prelate.” As for your clergy, my Lord, I *know* some of them that can stoop to the most dirty and despicable things; and have seen proofs of what I could not but describe as “meanness, craft, hardihood, and duplicity.” I cannot but hope, my Lord, that the various observations in my second pamphlet, intended to reprove and purify the controversial press, will not be without their use,—especially to those who venture to touch so perilous a thing. My own position at first, was that, merely of a “looker-on;”—I came forward “as the interpreter and expounder of the real opinions of certain parties on both sides, who did not, or would not, understand each other.”* I regret that this should have led to the subsequent perpetuation of so much that is bad in one of them. I confidently trust, however, that my exposure of, and remarks upon it, will not be lost to

* “What? and Who says it?” first paragraph.

your Lordship or your clergy—Dissenters, or myself,—(we all need occasional monitions): I am sure they will not, if we will “read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them.”

Such, my Lord, are some of the reasons which induce me to present my labours to your Lordship. I might have added, indeed, that, after writing the following pages, I thought it not worth while to proceed to their publication, but was induced to do so by the *last but one* of the considerations above enumerated. Your Lordship has a claim to the notice of a writer, the fruit of whose pen, *but* for your Lordship, would have withered where it grew.

One reason, however, still remains—a serious and important one—with the statement of this I shall have done.

In my first pamphlet a passage occurs, which I had occasion to insert, with some remarks, in my second. It here follows as it appears in the latter work. I take it from that, because, what the falsehood of the Observer provoked me to utter, describes, I believe, the feelings of a *class*, not only without, but within the Establishment, whom the conduct of your lordship is calculated either to exasperate or estrange.

For having written a book free, as I affirm, from the bitterness of controversy, “I am coolly described as the writer of a ‘*violently* anti-church pamphlet!’—Sir, I am neither violent nor young—a blusterer nor a boy. I wish to carry nothing by ‘violence.’ I claim nothing, indeed, on the score, and could effect nothing by the force, of cleverness or talents; but I *do* claim something for fairness, temper, and moderation. I have lived long enough to alter some of my opinions; to put off some prejudices; to find out that no person or party is perfect; to look with some degree of impartiality upon all; to discover that good men may be mutually mistaken in each other; and to be as willing myself to suffer for Candour and Catholicism as for Truth. Turn to the P.S. of my letter, the last page of my pamphlet—ponder, and penetrate, if you can, the following passage:—

“With respect to the diffusion of the Gospel throughout all nations.—the grand object for which the church should live, which should be dear to every Christian and to every community, and which forms a test for the trial both of systems and men—there are ‘facts and reason-

ings,' perhaps, which go far to prove that the principle of a National Establishment is *opposed* to it, and the principle of some nonconformist systems *inadequate*; and that the adherents of both have most blessed the world when they have practically done homage to what they have deemed the errors, but, in reality, the excellences, of each other.—To all these matters, and many more, I had intended to advert, in a course of observations, different in kind, indeed, from the preceding argument, but perfectly consistent with it; and it would afford me more pleasure to aid in removing mutual misconceptions, and thus to inspire reciprocal respect, than merely to 'put to silence' the clamorous 'ignorance of foolish men.' As, however, space does not permit, nor necessity demand, my present attention to these matters, I content myself with what I have attempted. I have sought to expose the ESTABLISHMENT, *but I regard the CHURCH as likely to become ONE OF GOD'S MOST DISTINGUISHED INSTRUMENTS FOR BLESSING MANKIND.* I have defended that body of Dissenters who are principally attacked in modern controversy, but I have my own views as to the wisdom, the working, and the probable prevalence of *some* of theirs. *I wish different churches could be persuaded to acknowledge and combine the portions of truth which they respectively hold; but, alas! how can this occur, while each thinks every pin of its own tabernacle apostolic, and the whole building of its neighbour a blunder! Extreme views on either side are wrong; the candid and catholic of both parties think more alike than they suspect, or more than they AVOW—some being fettered by the DEAD, and some by the LIVING.*

"Are these, my brother, the words of a '*violent*' man? Could a mere ultra, prejudiced, blind partisan, express himself thus? Are the '*violently-anti*' pamphlets of either party written by persons who calmly survey both sides, and who weigh and measure their words after this fashion?"*

This passage, my Lord, or rather the PROMINENT SENTENCE in it descriptive of my expectations from the Episcopal Church, *I must now beg leave to modify or withdraw.* Since it was first written, the state of the Church has rapidly changed; your Lordship, too, seems determined upon conduct, which, if it do not "drive wise men mad," will very much tend to make moderate men desperate. I much fear, my Lord, that I and others have been dreaming,—dreaming of days that can never dawn. If we go on dreaming however,—wherever the blame may have rested hitherto, it can rest henceforth only on ourselves. Your

* Strike, but Hear! p. 42, 43.

Lordship, at least, *has delivered your soul*. You are doing every thing you can to awaken us. A lover of peace, my Lord; an advocate for catholicity; attaching little importance to minor differences where the truth of the Gospel is maintained and loved; anxious to see the various bodies of Christians leaving to each other the quiet possession of their respective forms of ecclesiastical government, but amicably uniting in benevolent agency—religious, and even sacramental services; admiring many things in the episcopal community—reckoning much on the education and habits of its clergy as a body, and on the exemplary zeal, simple piety, and scriptural doctrine of not a few—I *had* hoped, my Lord, great things from *the* future influence of this community *as a church*, in spite of what is said, *by some of its children*, of the “ruinous” results to “the souls of men,” of the working, *through it*, of the present Establishment. I had hoped, my Lord, that the Establishment might have been gradually mitigated, and the Church freed from her splendid vassalage to the state; and that then, competent to deliberate and decide for herself, *as a purely spiritual and independent body*, her episcopacy might have become less despotic—her canons and offices really purified from whatever, in either, is exclusive or intolerant—popish or unscriptural. I had dreamed of these things, cherishing the hope that pious men of all churches might come mutually to recognize their brotherhood, and ministry; might acquire and use the privilege of displaying it; and thus, as “co-workers” in a common cause, meet together “in heavenly places”—fight together “the good fight”—and think far more of converting the world than of contending with each other! In such a state of things, my Lord, I could not but think, that to such a body as the Episcopal Church, *a great and mighty influence would attach*; and that, instead of being the victim of a pernicious Establishment—at once confined and corrupted by it—she would

stand forth, fair and free,—absorb into herself, or lead in her wake, minor communities,—and, from blessing her country, advance onwards throughout all the earth,—THE CHIEF MINISTER AND MISSIONARY OF MANKIND!

My Lord, I begin to doubt the propriety of such expectations. The Church, I fear, as distinct from the Establishment, has within her the elements of incalculable evil. Her mere apprehensions of the shaking of the Establishment, has led her to betray, that *these very elements* are just the things that she loves most—which she identifies with herself—and will die in defending, rather than relinquish. The rise and prevalence of the Oxford party—in many respects, the most consistent churchmen: the defection of many deemed evangelical, by their profession of recently revived errors; their diminution in numbers and influence as a body, and their extremely sore and sectarian spirit: the growing fashion among the younger clergy to dread what is denounced as *Ultra-Protestant*, and to advocate much that is all but Popish: your Lordship's public patronage of such men, in spite of your prudential silence as to the system; and, what is most recent, *the direct attach which you have lately made on the benevolent co-operation of different sects in one of the least exceptionable of all possible modes of attempting to do good*; nay, your “forbidding” your clergy not only “to speak to *men* that they might be saved,” *in company with Dissenters*, but “forbidding” them, in such company, to “speak EVEN UNTO GOD” TO SAVE THEM! these things, my Lord, so painful in themselves, so opposite to whatever is Christian and catholic, yet so consistent, I fear, with the genuine spirit, the canonical commands and assumptions of the Church—these things, compel me to abandon my expectations respecting it, and *to recal the hopes which I once expressed*. Until God not only send down “the healthful spirit of his grace,” more generally and copiously than

it has yet descended, “on all our clergy, bishops, and curates but, until he take away the *deadly spirit of the “MAN OF SIN,”* which, it is now obvious, pervades and animates the Anglican system, I much fear, that the Church, as such, would become to the country, in comparison with the Establishment, what Rehoboam was as the successor of Solomon.

Some of us, my Lord, have always repudiated the ungenerous opinion, that it was necessary to have a State Establishment of religion, to bribe the indolence, and secularize the ambition of the clergy, and to control and limit the power of the Church. We have been disposed to regard such statements as the calumnies of infidels—disliking the idea that the Church of Christ, in any of its branches, should be thought to require either the gifts, or the grasp of the hand of the State, to keep it in tolerably good behaviour—to render it harmless, by robbing it of the power of activity for evil. In all our speculations, therefore, on the Establishment-question, our confidence in the virtue of the Church, *as a church*, has led us to wish to *aid its emancipation* from the trammels of the State, thinking that independence—spiritual independence—would promote in it apostolical purity and zeal. The tithes and endowments, and whatever it possesses in the form of property, *we supposed it might still possess and enjoy*; and we trusted that they would be used for holy purposes, when the Church was relieved from submitting, on the ground of them, to political interference, and from allowing them to be played with by secular patronage. I fear, my Lord, we have been equally wrong in what we have rejected as an audacious calumny, and in what we have welcomed as attractive truth. Oxford, and your Lordship, are making all men see, that it would not be safe to have a spiritual despotism, in a free country, extended and organized—compact and powerful—without the possibility,

on the part of the State, in some way or other, of keeping it in check. As the least of two evils, some may think it right to *purchase* this—to give to the Church, riches and honour, as the price of its submitting to be “under authority.” Some may think differently, believing that while this cannot be done, in any form, without, in some measure, upholding the Church’s pretensions, such pretensions will always be comparatively harmless, especially in a free and enlightened age, if unconnected with the secular power. All men are beginning to see, that with respect to the subject of NATIONAL ECCLESIASTICAL ENDOWMENTS, *these never can be permitted to be retained by a community permitted to exist in a state of independence.* Endowment is a privilege—a privilege granted to the Church by the nation; granted, on the expectation of something in return; and the power to control it cannot be given up. The revival of the spirit of Popery in the Church, may lead, my Lord, an inquiring and reflecting people to very serious surmisings upon this subject. It may come to be asked, whether it is not high time for a generous nation to recal its favours, when the men who enjoy them seem bent upon insulting the mass of the community? There can be no doubt that the wealth of the Church gives to its ministers incalculable influence; as a Reformed Church, if not a Protestant one, it owes what it possesses to the will of the nation, and holds it at its pleasure. If, my Lord, the different Christian communities of the country are to continue to be exposed to the insulting things which your brethren teach, and which you *do*, it may come to be asked—asked with indignation—asked by righteous and religious men, a large proportion of a people the most patient in the world under oppression and wrong—it may come to be asked, whether it really *be right uncomplainingly to pay and to patronize a Church for the mere pleasure of being insulted in return?*

Your brethren, my Lord, are teaching the country, that the mere circumstance of being established, in other words, possessing the endowments of the state, is no proof in itself of the "true" Church, (for this would prove that of Scotland to be so;) and that *your* Church, which *is* the true one, would exist in all its apostolical integrity, if every thing that the State secures to it were withdrawn. My Lord, as on this principle the true Church *may* exist in contempt and poverty, men may begin to think, that, perhaps, some of the despised sects *may be that Church*,* rather than the community which seems to have so much in it of the "true" spirit of the "Mother of abominations." But if not, it may still become a question, whether it would not be well to add the apostolical attribute of poverty, to the other primitive perfections of an Institution, which holds from the nation all it has, and takes from the nation all it can get, and repays it by returning cursing for blessing; by refusing to masses, the most religious, their claims to be Christians—denying their safety in relation to God,—and affixing on them a brand in the estimation of man. In these days, my Lord, men may come to ask themselves whether this is to be *endured*? whether a Protestant people shall continue to suffer it? whether they shall sanction your continuing to hold *what they have a right to withdraw*, when it seems merely to give point and poison to the arrows you throw at them? And, finally, in plain words, whether it might not really be the best thing that could possibly happen, both for CHARITY and TRUTH, that every shilling of property, and every thing in the shape of pre-eminence and privilege, should be resumed by the State, and the "truly apostolical"

* See "The Call to Hear the Church examined, by the Rev. John Ely; of Leeds." The Author cannot forbear recommending Mr Ely's work, entitled "An Appeal to the Religious Community on the Disputed Questions of the Times; Sacramental Efficacy; Apostolical Succession; and Church and State." It is a very vigorous and admirable production.

placed on an EQUALITY with other churches—churches which now, *as apart of the nation*, have the expense of upholding its pretensions against themselves? I repeat, my Lord, that these questions may come to be asked. I have hitherto shrunk from entertaining them myself. I think some of them go on a wrong ground; but most of them are natural to a Protestant people—all of them are dangerous to a presumptuous priesthood. I should be sorry, my Lord, to witness some of the consequences to which they might lead. I frankly confess, however, that if things go on, in theory and fact, speculation and action, as they have done recently, I shall not wonder at any thing of the sort I may hear or see, however deeply or much I may lament it.

I am, my Lord,
Your Lordship's humble servant,
JOHN SEARCH.

27, PATERNOSTER ROW,
December, 1838.

*** The above questions, however, are *not* wrong as to the *political* ground on which they contemplate Church-property as the property of the nation; and any class of ecclesiastics entrusted with it, as employed by the State, and liable, of course, at any time to be cashiered. This is the view involved in the reasonings of what the Observer calls Dr. Chalmers's late "admirable lectures"—admirable, certainly, for the eminent service they rendered Dissent. The Doctor not only insists on the right of a Government to take into its pay any whatever of the Christian sects, but on the *ability* of a number of educated Englishmen, assembled together as a British Parliament, fully to comprehend the *theological* reasons on which a Popish Church should *not* be chosen as that of the nation, and on which, of course, it should be sent adrift, if, by former Parliaments, it had. His Presbyterian thrusts, too, at "the transcendental claims and pretensions" of Episcopacy, give a direction to his reasonings at the present time, very dangerous to "*Our Zion*"—a time, when there is so much of what has been styled, "Treason in the Church," but which, it is feared by some, is nothing hut the genuine loyalty of Churchmen. It is impossible, I think, but that the Bishop of London must have greatly disapproved of many of Dr. Chalmers's principles and reasonings. Condemnation, however, or even contempt, must fall very lightly from the lips of a man, whose praise, *by his own public acknowledgement*, is actually dispensed in such a manner, as to render it, to the individual "commended," *not worth the picking up*.

JOHN SEARCH'S LAST WORDS.

THE Editor of the "Christian Observer" having ventured again to refer to my publications, I intend to bestow upon him one or two remarks, and, with them, to part with him for ever.

I have no ambition to have the last word; I have reasons, however, for informing my readers when I have uttered my last.

Controversies are seldom concluded. They come to an end, indeed, but not generally because they have *arrived* at it. In most cases, nothing is arrived at,—nothing definite, on either side. The only thing clearly made out, frequently is, that the writers have lost their temper, and the public its patience. I purpose, in this paper, to show what I have aimed at, and what I have done.

My first pamphlet was entitled as follows:—"WHAT? AND WHO SAYS IT? *an Exposition* of the Statement, that the Established Church 'Destroys more Souls than it saves.' By the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh; the Right Rev. the Bishop of Calcutta; the Rev. Samuel Charles Wilks; the Rev. Henry Budd; the Rev. Charles Bridges; the Rev. Henry Melville; the Editor of the Record; the Editor of the Christian Observer, and others; *in a Letter to 'One of the Clergy who signed the late Requisition to the Archdeacon of WORCESTER,' edited by JOHN SEARCH.*"

I have no hesitation in giving this title in full, as it is impossible for any thing to express more precisely the contents of the book. Its *object* was, to rebuke the inconsistency

with which some of the clergy joined in the cry against a Dissenting minister, for expressing it as his "belief," that the Establishment worked in the way described. This rebuke was administered, by my simply bringing together a number of extracts from the writers enumerated, from which it appeared, that some of them had, again and again, *asserted* the destruction of souls by the Establishment; that they not only expressed it as an *opinion*, which Mr. Binney had done, but affirmed it as a *fact*, and expounded, moreover, how it came to pass,—illustrating by their remarks, the grounds and reasons on which Dissenters believed it. With the "Record," for instance, it was shown to be a "momentous truth"—so momentous as to require to be stated, "without circumlocution"—that a great "body of the clergy," ("an overwhelming majority"—"ten to one,") "were leading their hearers down to the chambers of death." The editor of the "Christian Observer," in addition to much that he said himself, was proved to have boasted that Dr. Chalmers had "clearly shown," that the working of *certain parts only* of the Establishment, had been "most ruinous to the souls of men."

In arranging the extracts of which the pamphlet consisted, and adding of my own what was necessary to connect them, I scrupulously avoided every thing like harsh or unchristian language. The book, indeed, was thought "tame" by some, for its want of spirit—for its want, I flatter myself, of what is called, sometimes "spice," sometimes "the devil." The truth is, that calmly conscious of the undeniableness of the fact, the proof of which, I was engaged in producing, I had no temptation to indulge in flippancy, blustering, or violence.

After some months, the editor of the "Christian Observer" alluded to the book, and gave of it an account and character, which, including substance and style, I do not hesitate to

say, was at once false, calumnious, crafty, and hypocritical. I was exceedingly shocked by its disingenuousness and dishonesty. Though apparently a trifle, and consisting only of a few lines, it involved a great deal of editorial deceit, critical injustice, and controversial immorality. Still, believing the man to be what he claimed *me* for—"A Christian brother and willing to refer much of what I lamented to the infelicity of his circumstances; to the poisonous atmosphere of an editor's room,—the haste and prejudice inseparable, in these days, from the directing head of a party publication, however pious and upright the individual may be in his private capacity;—believing these things, and hoping the best, I determined to take him on his own ground—seriously to put before him what he had done, and to summons his conscience both to listen and to look.

This led to a correspondence, in which, I am sorry to say, the communications I received from the editor of the "Observer," were any thing but either "Christian" or manly. Proof after proof appeared of small-mindedness, and—something worse. The business at last issued, in the publication, on my part, of "STRIKE, BUT HEAR!" being the greater portion of the correspondence itself. The object of this pamphlet was two-fold:—first, to present the evidence of "What? and Who says it?" in a condensed form, explaining the *exact point* it was intended to make out, that there might be no mistake in the composition of "a very convincing reply;" secondly, to direct public attention to *editorial and controversial morality*, partly by touching on some offences against both, of which it seemed to me that the "Observer" had been guilty; and partly by such general remarks on the subject, as seemed suitable to our "evil times and evil days."

This pamphlet, I presume to say, was written with the same sort of "tameness" as the first. It dealt neither in

“flippant airs nor noisy asseverations,” “round abuse,” nor vulgar “violence.” As, however, I had been led to perceive so much of the moral defectiveness of the “Observer,” and had to expose enough to make it questionable whether it was not a “*pseudonymous*” publication, I certainly did not hesitate distinctly to convey my impressions respecting it, and to use words which *meant* something, and which I intended should. Still, both books, (let who will, read and judge,) consist of an appeal to the reason, not to the passions.

To these books, after a silence of six months from the publication of the last, the editor of the “Observer” ventures to refer. On this reference I proceed to offer one or two words, after which, I shall leave its author, for all-coming time, to say what he likes about JOHN SEARCH, with perfect impunity.

I. Let it be remembered, then, that the *entire* “burden” of the first pamphlet, and the *half* at least of that of the second, was simply to show what might be meant, on *evangelical principles*, by saying that the Establishment “destroyed souls and to adduce the opinions and testimony of *Churchmen*, in exposition of the statement, and declaratory of the “belief.” I had nothing to do with giving an opinion on the subject myself; I had merely to show what, on their own principles, must be, and *was* the opinion of others. Whether the Churchmen, and the Dissenters who agreed with them in their judgment on this matter, were right or wrong, was nothing to me;—all I proposed was, to prove *that they agreed*. Now, that this *was* proved;—this one point, that Churchmen themselves, and the advocates of Establishments, have sanctioned and said all that Mr. Binney has been persecuted for expressing;—that this was *proved* to their confusion and discomfiture—made so palpable that they “cannot deny it,” without denying their own

words, may be conjectured from the circumstance, that the Christian Observer, in his recent remarks, *never once makes the most distant allusion to the terrible truth*. He tells his readers, that the "*burden of my pamphlet*" is—what he knows it is *not*; while, what is the *entire* object of the one, and the *first* of the other—the "*burden,*" in fact, of both—that, to prove which I took the trouble to write it all; *this* he never ventures to hint at or refer to! I produced the language of Churchmen,—language as bad as, *aye worse*, than that which they condemned in a Dissenter; I gave the passages, referring to their works, and asked for an explanation of their rage and rancour against an individual for uttering an opinion *the echo of their own?* To this appeal, and to the passages in question, the Editor of the Observer replies nothing. He has nothing to reply, *There they are*—some of them his own words,—his own words, "*asserting*" as a fact, "*clearly*" demonstrated *by Dr. Chalmers*, what he condemned Mr. Binney for expressing as his "*belief,*"—words, taken from the *very articles* in which his inconsistent condemnation is contained. The *real* "*burden*" of my books he has not touched, and he dare not. I defy him, or any man, "*of the diocese of Worcester, or any other,*" fairly, and without equivocation, to meet the case made out in "*What? and Who says it?*" and the argument involved in it, as distinctly explained to him in "*Strike, but Hear!*"★

II. The last named pamphlet, I have already stated, was intended, in addition to its primary purpose, to direct attention to *editorial and controversial morality*. I have stated also, that it touched on certain offences against both, of which I thought the Observer had been guilty. That the *probability* is, that I had good ground for what I advanced; that the Editor has rather added to his delinquencies than repelled my accusations; and, that it is really high time the

★ See, especially, pages 22, 23, 35, of the latter.

public knew something of the monthly manufactures they purchase and patronize: all this may he judged of, perhaps, by the following statement:

In the Appendix to "Strike, hut Hear!" No. 1, p. 50-53, I place side by side, one passage from Mr. Binney's address, and two passages from the Christian Observer; and, from the comparison of *the whole*, deduce certain things not credit table to the latter work. Well; in his late observations, the Editor gives the *full enumeration* of the *things deduced*,—things, the ground of which was the *entire whole* of the compared passages; he then adds, "Now, if *all these crimes* had really been committed against Mr. Binney, it would be a *solemn duty*, even thus late, to endeavour to make amends. Let the reader then judge, &c." Of course, the reader would suppose that he *could* judge,—judge of the *whole* case, by having it *all* fully before him—all the evidence, as well as "all the crimes." What is the fact? Just this; that, instead of fairly giving the different passages, on the comparison of which my allegations rest, he *actually omits*, of his own *two*, the *WHOLE* of one, and *PART* of the other! I do not wonder that he should wish to conceal what he omits: for the first betrays a want of faith in God; and the second is the employment of awful language, to convey an unfounded charge against man: I do wonder, however, that even *he* should permit himself to do what I have described. Whether such be "Christian," or merely controversial, morality, I shall not determine. This, however, I will assert, that any man, who will carefully consider the *whole case* as fully presented in the pages referred to, will find, that what the Observer calls "crimes," are apparent and palpable. What his "solemn duty" may be, I care not to inquire.

As to the insinuation conveyed in the phrases, "thus late," "even thus late," &c., I beg to remark, that I should never have thought of writing, or of bringing up the subject of Mr.

Binney's "belief," *if Churchmen would have let the matter rest*, if they, "even so late" as months and *years* after the delivery of the "celebrated sentence," had not been as "exceedingly mad,"—as violent and vituperative, against its author, as at first. Time seemed to produce upon them no improvement; increase of age no understanding. "Their *hatred* was fresh in them; their bow (*and arrows*) were renewed in their hand. They spread out their roots by the waters of *bitterness*: and the dew of *deceit* lay all night upon their branch." But for this, or for what this language is employed to express, the *local circumstances* that awoke my pen should have passed by me without notice.—"*Even thus late!*" as if the "conductors of the Observer" did not *know*, that editorial morality provides for the refusal of justice *at first*: as if they did not *know* that the very men, who can extenuate their own sin by referring to its *age*, continue to "harp" on the sin of another *although older*: as if they did not *know*, that they themselves paraded it, this time twelvemonth, in their advertisements of a new series, as a *clap-trap* to increase the circulation of their work! The fact is, that the feeling of hostility, and the practice of injustice, towards the minister of the Weigh-House, is as intense and as frequent as ever. The spirit that sustains them continues, "even thus late," to "peep and mutter" in private society; to revile and calumniate in periodical publications; nay, to show itself, at times, in the very temple of God, and to flash and fulminate from the eyes and lips of dignified diocesans! If this last particular be doubted, ask the interior of London House; interrogate the walls of a certain room; let them give the history of what they have heard only within *this very month of November*, in the year of Grace, *eighteen hundred and thirty-eight!* "even thus late" indeed!*

* This was the only allusion at first intended, to what, on resolving on publication, I thought proper to enlarge upon.

III. The last thing I shall notice is the following passage: "A dissenting writer, calling himself John Search, who, by a deceptive title-page, beguiled not a few Churchmen into buying his wares, under the impression that they were purchasing a series of extracts to prove, in opposition to Mr. Binney's dictum, that the Church of England is a blessing and not a curse; and who, in a subsequent pamphlet, is obliged to acknowledge the fact; his own bookseller having declared, (for the writer having adopted a fictitious name, the aggrieved parties could not apply to himself), that several clergymen [not one in many probably of the defrauded purchasers,] had brought their copies to him, wishing their money returned, and complained that they had bought it under a mistake; [this same John Search] so far from feeling grief or shame at the trick, much less to refund the money, tells how much he was amused at the circumstance."

Now, I might content myself with saying on this passage:—let any man of common candour and average ability, read pages 11–14, of "Strike, but Hear!" and weigh well the remarks there made on anonymous writing,—the account given of the adoption of my signature,—the import of my title,—page—and the manner in which I employ the word "amused and then, let him try, if it be possible, to help pitying the man, who, after having such remarks addressed to him, could stoop to the composition of such stuff as the above.

The passage, however, involves some things, which, in these days of discussion and controversy, when so much is demanded of what is honest, manly, and magnanimous, in those who engage, on either side, in the thickening conflict of great principles—ought not to be passed unobserved, especially in one, who lives by meddling with every matter in dispute.

The reader will remark, that the mere circumstance of writing under an assumed or fictitious signature, is here con-

demned; condemned, be it be remembered, by a man, who is every month helping the progeny of such writers into the world! whose family of "Sigmas," "Veraxes," and such like, is perfectly patriarchal! and who himself "lives, breathes, and has his being," in the composition and publication of what is unauthenticated!

But this is not all. Churchmen and clergymen, it appears, and that "not a few," bought "What? and Who says it?" under the impression, that they were purchasing a capital slap at the Dissenters; they fell into the mistake of thinking it was something *on their own side*. In the words of the Editor, in his letter to me, (see "Strike, but Hear!" p. 9) "*they thought John Search was THEIR FELLOW CHURCH-MAN,*" and, *therefore*, purchased "his wares."

Was there ever, in the whole history of controversy, a more monstrous and shameless acknowledgment? It comes, then, to this, the *Christian Observer* being witness, that Churchmen have no objection to a fictitious writer *if he happens to be one of themselves*. An assumed name is nothing then! John Search, if an advocate of Establishments, is to be welcomed and bought; if a Dissenter, he is to be put down *on principle*. While thought to be "a fellow Churchman," he may call himself what he likes—he shall not lack patrons; the "mistake" being discovered, anonymous writing is seen to be a sin! What precious hypocrisy! And "Christian" men have the face to avow this: aye, and "cunning men" the folly to let it out!

Nor is *this* all. Certain clergymen, it seems, thought by the *Observer*, to be very numerous, bought my book, expecting to find that it condemned Mr. Binney; discovering their mistake, they beg the bookseller to return their cash; and, because it is supposed they did not get it, the Editor of the *Observer* pities them as "beguiled;" commiserates them as

“defrauded and holds them up as worthy objects of public compassion.

Two questions occur here, the one particular, the other general.

Certain men belonging to a class, who for years have been attacking a particular individual, find themselves in possession of something, *not* re-asserting what that individual had said, but merely showing, that *churchmen* themselves had either said or sanctioned it. Well, instead of manfully meeting the matter, they come blubbering to the bookseller like disappointed children, beseeching to have back again their eighteen pence! Now, I just ask, whether, supposing Mr. Binney had ever thought it worth while, personally to “expound” or illustrate his supposed “dictum,” *such men, or any of their class, can be conceived of for a moment, as doing him the justice to purchase or peruse what he might have written?* NEVER.

But this suggests a general inquiry. Are we to understand, then, from this specific instance, that the clergy and Churchmen act upon the principle of reading only on their own side? Is this the way they conduct controversy? Are these the methods by which they acquire their knowledge of dissenting opinion, and dissenting publications? Is it thus that truth is to be elicited?—thus, that justice is to be done to the claims of systems, or the characters of men?—Is it to be borne, I ask, that persons are to proclaim that *their* mode of discussion is, *to say what they please against their opponents, to say it as often, as long, and as bitterly as they like;* BUT NEVER TO READ WHAT MAY BE WRITTEN IN THEIR DEFENCE, OR TO LEARN FROM THEMSELVES WHAT THEY BELIEVE OR SAY? This is what is involved in the fact in question. This is the language of the *conduct* of the Christian Observer’s clerical clients. This is the principle which his own remarks

sanction and defend. And these things are done and advocated by "Christian" controversialists, and in a work professing to be pre-eminently "*Christian*."

GOD OF ETERNAL JUSTICE! dost thou still reign, or do thy creatures believe it!

I return, for one moment, to the charge against me of anonymous writing, and with a remark upon that, shall terminate my task.

The Editor of the Christian Observer may be thought to have a right to condemn this; for, it may be asked, did he not give you his name—his real name, when you wrote to him at first? He did: but what for? To stifle discussion; to prevent exposure; to take an advantage; to keep from the public a public writer's flagrant fault, and to confine its acknowledgment, as much as possible, to the calumniated individual's "own eye." It was a manœuvre—and a mean one.

What did I do? This. In his letter to me referred to in "Strike, but Hear!" p. 46, he indulged in insinuations, which obliged me in my reply to express myself to him in these words:—

"This passage *forces* from me the following statement.—*I do not wonder at your fears*; for I can believe that you are conscious that you have sometimes stooped to acts of a very questionable kind, and have taken low advantages of your correspondents. I have seen a note in your own handwriting, the handwriting of you * * * as Editor of the Christian Observer, which, on comparing its professions with your concurrent public conduct, left on me the impression, that, to any high principled and just mind, it would cover with disgrace your official character, and convict you of ****—
**** ***** ***** * * *****."

To this, in the DEDICATION of "Strike, but Hear!" I referred

in the following manner, addressing myself to "the Conductors of the Christian Observer —

"Gentlemen, in the last letter I addressed to your Editor, you will find a passage beginning with—'I do not wonder at your fears,' and ending with FOUR WORDS, which I will not repeat. Are these words strong? they are. Are they ungentlemanly, or unchristian? Let us distinguish:—no other words would clearly convey the 'impression' of what you *did* (I identify you with the acts of your official representative); if it be ungentlemanly or unchristian to call bad things by their right names, *what must it be to do them?* I wrote those four words calmly and seriously; I selected them as the most appropriate; I transcribed them; I sent them; they have reached your hand and met your eye;—the charge they contain against you, I here distinctly and deliberately repeat. My view of your conduct may be erroneous; but what it *is*, I have said. If you have any reverence for public opinion; if you have any self-respect; if you have any value for character, which you say is 'your all,' you will be ill at ease under such imputations, 'even from an anonymous or pseudonymous writer.' Purchase, then, the privilege of clearing your character by defence, or of retrieving it by contrition, by making an attempt to answer the charges which *I* have preferred. When you have done this, then, with calmness and dignity, without either 'flippant' airs, or noisy asseverations, demand the production of the document from which I gathered the 'impression' I described, and—*you shall be obeyed*. I am authorized to state, that it shall be given to the public *under the signature of the gentleman in whose possession it is.*"

Here, then, was the offer of *a name*, even by the "dissenting writer calling himself John Search," "fictitious" and "pseudonymous" though he might be! The offer of a name,

not like the Editor of the Observer's sending his to me, to stifle investigation and stop publicity, but in a manner adapted to promote both. Of this offer nothing is said. "The Conductors of the Christian Observer" have chosen to lie for six months, silent and still, under certain serious charges against them,—charges which never would have been made but as a reproof for fresh offences,—and which, when made, were open to have their proofs demanded on *personal* authority. It is no use their saying that they could not stoop to notice any such offer from a "fictitious writer;" and that if they had, it might not have been possible to enforce on him the fulfilment of his own conditions. To the latter objection, I merely reply, let my books prove whether the writer was likely to make such an offer out of mere bravado; and to the former I remark, that it is high time editors should be taught that if they will stoop to "strike" a writer, they must further stoop to "hear" him too; and that if, *when anonymous*, he is not beneath their notice, he ought not to be beneath it when he offers a *name*, whether another's or his own. It *is* true, however, that men owe something to themselves. To himself, therefore, every writer, even an anonymous one, owes something; and more especially so when contending with a number of *the same description*, banded together for the prosecution of their purposes,—and thus adding, it may be, conspiracy to concealment. It would not consist, therefore, with what I owe to myself, to permit "the Conductors of the Christian Observer" to neglect with impunity a challenge like mine. The affair can not be suffered to remain where it is. After waiting so long, I am entitled to declare, and accordingly do declare, that I shall hold myself in future under no obligation to produce the individual, who *would* hitherto have appeared as I proposed. I terminate for ever my controversy with men, of whom the more I have learned, the less I have respected. I shall never notice any thing they may say *of* me or *to* me. And I hereby give them full "au-

thority" to calumniate as they please the *memory* of a writer whose *ghost* only for the future can disturb them.

In the preceding notice of the *Christian, Observer's* recent remarks, I have fixed only on a prominent point or two, and have purposely abstained from exposing the absurdities which pervade the whole. As a whole, (as is usual with him, when writing, at least, on dissenting subjects,) they are characterized by petty quibbling, undignified flippancy, false analogies, mistakes of the question, inconsistency with himself, and so on. It would be quite endless, and not edifying, to waste words upon such matters. I have already, indeed, wasted too many on the latter part of this controversy, and feel something like shame at having given importance to a work which I find is now generally disregarded. Having done what I designed when I began to write, and done it successfully, I have nothing left to detain me at my desk. By the spontaneous acknowledgments, not only of Dissenters, but of Churchmen themselves,—publicly stated, or privately conveyed to me—I have not only silenced and shamed, out of their own mouths, many who were loud in their denunciation of an individual, but I have been honoured, under God, to direct the thoughts of some to the *religious* aspect of the question of Establishments,—the bearing of such institutions on what is *evangelical* and *spiritual* in a church—saving and sanctifying to a nation,—the light, in fact, in which Non-conformists are led to regard them, involving considerations far more important than any mere questions of property or politics. Insignificant in itself as the *Observer* may be, it retains some respect from its former character; and hence it was not without reason, that it was thought to be appropriate to illustrate, *through it*, the subject of editorial and controversial morality. This subject has not yet received the attention it demands. I have reason to know that my remarks upon it have not been in vain. It must come, however, more than it has done, under

the observance of "Christian" public opinion; and men, whose office it is to judge others, must be taught the duty of keeping a conscience themselves. Editorial, reviewing, criticising, controversial Morality, is of incalculable importance in these days—days of agitation, discussion, and dispute—days in which every thing seems likely to be sifted and fought for—in which the Church of England is more than ever divided within herself—she and the sects severed from each other—all things coming to be keenly contested that in any way relate to the support, or ceremonies, or principles of religion:—days, too, in which the mass of the people, too busy or too prejudiced to read for themselves, depend for information on those who profess to "observe" and "record" for them. In such days, periodical publications, conducted with haste, with party zeal, with sectarian animosity, in wilful ignorance of the opinions they oppose, and with hearty hatred of the men who hold them,—such things can do nothing but mischief, and are nothing but noxious nuisances to mankind. By whomsoever conducted—by Churchmen or Dissenters—nay, even if in the main *right* in their objects, still it is true. What is right, may be advocated in a wrong spirit; a good cause may suffer in the hands of bad men; Truth may be injured by the monthly immoralities of mendacious advocates. I have done my part to direct attention to the subject described, and now return my pen to its place of repose. Having laid open—with sufficient clearness for the few who think—the sin of a particular and prevalent form of moral and literary evil—evil, bad in all men, enormous in "Christians"—having done this, I leave the matter to the meditations of the reflective, and the verdict of the conscientious, and vanish myself into thin air!

"Go forth, my books, from this my solitude—
 I cast you on the waters—go your ways!
 And if, as I believe, your vein be good.
 The world will find you after many days."

JOHN SEARCH.

*** Some of the inconsistencies and mistakes referred to above, are sufficiently ridiculous. The following are specimens:

The Observer insists, at great length, on Churchmen's knowledge of the distinction between the *Church* and the *Establishment*, and the importance to *them* of that distinction being marked. He soon after speaks in the following *clear and consistent* manner:—"Our National Ecclesiastical *Establishment* is * * *, (What think you, reader?)—*a visible branch of Christ's Universal CHURCH!*"

He says. Dissenters, in speaking of the Establishment and Dissent, "compare a church with a non-entity—Now, the real state of the case is, that they compare two things, *neither of which are churches at all*, but merely *two modes of acting towards* a church—any church,—Episcopal, Presbyterian; Protestant or Popish.

He says. Dissent is a "negation," a "*no-thing*." Of which "*no-thing*" I had shown him to make the following declaration,—"*as a SYSTEM* we believe it to be an evil greater than we can express."

He compares the Clergy and Dissenters to "farmers and rick-burners whereas, the analogy is, between two sets of farmers, each of whom, if honest, are conscientiously contending for the best methods, in their apprehension, of securing to the country the greatest quantity of good corn.

In all these matters, however, and throughout his whole piece, he entirely forgets *my* business. Dissenters or Churchmen may be right or wrong—farmers or rick-burners—entities or non-entities—that's all nothing to me. It is not enough either to assert or to demonstrate, that Churchmen distinguish between the Church and the Establishment; it is not enough to put on a swelling, puffing air, and to exclaim, "*We confidently tell* John Search and his friends," that if the *Establishment* were done away with to-morrow, the *Church* would remain whole and entire. I quietly reply—"Calm yourself, my dear Sir—calm yourself; you may be quite right in what you "tell" me; but,—you make a mistake:—*my* question is. Do not Churchmen *say* of the *Establishment*—say themselves,—whether they believe it or not—or wish others to believe it or not,—or whether it is true or not, is not the question—but, *do they not say*, what sanctions and countenances all that they condemn and denounce in a Dissenter?" It is not enough to tell me. Sir, of "farmers and rick-burners;" *my* question is,—do not the farmers *AGREE with the rick-burners*. In their descriptions of the state of

their farms,—their barns and buildings, if you like—as infested with what is “RUINOUS,” “poisonous,” and “destructive?”

It is but fair to state, that, in one particular, the Observer appears to something like advantage, in consequence of my using the word “assumed,” instead of “ascertained,” which I at first thought of. I took the milder phrase, “assumed fact,” to avoid dogmatism; not to intimate that the Dissenter was not satisfied that the thing in question *was* a fact, but to express it in a way the least offensive to those who might differ from him. I must now, however, request the reader to substitute the rejected word, and read “ascertained fact”—meaning, *ascertained by the experience of centuries, and admitted by the acknowledgment of Churchmen.*

One thing is worth observing,—especially in connexion with the Editor’s jibes on the “new light” which Dissenters occasionally obtain, and his repetition of the everlasting calumny of their union with Papists, Infidels, and so forth.

He says, “The full expression for the Church of England, or the English National Church, would be—‘*that branch of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church legislatively established in England.*’” Now, I wonder what he would think of the following, given, in both my pamphlets, as a quotation from a Church of England advocate, *compressed* but the *exact sense* retained:—“Our state, the English people, like the Jewish, is,” as Hooker remarks, “not part of them the Commonwealth and part of them the Church of God, BUT THE SELF-SAME PEOPLE WHOLE AND ENTIRE—BOTH.” Do these two things, then, taken together, mean, that, “*that branch of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church legislatively established in England*”—is—the “people” of England, “whole and entire,” Radicals, Papists, Political Dissenters, Deists, Atheists and all? If we are not to understand this, what *are* we to understand? Which of the two statements does the Observer believe? The latter quotation was taken by me, from *the very self-same tract which the Observer quotes from* in his recent remarks on my publications, and which, though *he* does not mention it, was, as *I* said, written by the Reverend Samuel Charles Wilks. This has nothing to do, however, with the point before us. But it *is* to the point to ask, whether Churchmen, too, are liable to illumination?” Whether, as a body, they find a “new basis,” now and then, for the Church, so that Hooker’s analogy, which satisfied “seven years ago,” will not do in 1838?—I must follow my Reviewer’s example here, and as he leaves Dissenters, and *Robert Hall*, to settle matters between them as best they may; I must leave Mr. Wilks, and the Editor of the Observer, to settle together, as satisfactorily as they can, the quotations taken from both, and the questions addressed to one of them.

“Henceforth let no man trouble me.” No man, not even the Observer, has a right to trouble me, by demanding any thing at my hands;

and, most assuredly, I have no intention of troubling myself, whatever I may receive at the hands of others. In "*What? and Who says it?*" I came forward to do a small service for an Individual and for Truth, which certainly ought to have been sooner performed. How it came to pass that it was left unattempted, till I undertook it, seems almost unaccountable. It is now done, and has had its use. Henceforth,—however I may be attacked myself, I shall do nothing, unless, indeed, it can be called *doing* any thing, to sit at a distance from the "strife of tongues," and, applying "the ear of faith" to the visible Church, even as a child may apply his to "a smoothed lipped shell," hope to find, that *it* too, as well as the "Universe," can impart, through, or in spite of, its "murmurings,"

"Authentic tidings of invisible things;
Of ebb and flow, and ever during power;
And *central peace* subsisting at the heart
Of ENDLESS AGITATION."

ERRATUM.

Page 16, line 9, *after* "all men," *insert* "however."

The reader is also requested to insert the following passage between the first and second paragraphs of page 9.

Your Lordship has spoken, at times, very handsomely of the Wesleyan Body, and has appeared to be disposed, like some others of your order, to do tardy justice to the wonderful man through whom it arose. I have shown, my Lord, that if Mr. Binney sins by the language he employs, he is OUT-HERODED, beyond all dispute, by the venerated Father and founder of Methodism. John Wesley shunned, like the "Record," "all circumlocution." I have proved him to have used a double epithet, which, decency, my Lord, compels me to put at the bottom of the page. It is said, however, that the participle in it belongs to the rest [verb] which your Lordship, "in your haste," actually substituted for the milder term, when you lately repeated the memorable "sentence." But this introduces my next observation.*

* "SOUL-DAMNING clergymen."