

Who is Right,  
and  
Who Wrong?

Correspondence

BETWEEN

The Rev. Thomas Binney

AND

Mr. James Grant

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](http://www.quintapress.com)

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

WHO IS RIGHT,

AND

WHO WRONG?

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

THE REV. THOMAS BINNEY

AND

MR. JAMES GRANT,

(Of the "Morning Advertiser;")

ON

NEW ASPECTS OF THE CONTROVERSY ON IMPORTANT  
THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS;

INCLUDING

MR. GRANT'S "SUPPRESSED" REJOINDER TO MR. BINNEY.

LONDON:

W. H. COLLINGRIDGE, CITY PRESS, 1, LONG LANE.

1857.

---

## PREFACE.

THE interest felt in *The Controversy* extends and deepens with every succeeding hour; and if there could have been a doubt before, there can no longer be any,—that the most beneficial results will follow the exposure which has been made of the God-dishonouring and soul-destroying errors which prevail to so fearful an extent in the two Nonconformist denominations. New proofs are daily occurring, that though my representations of the appalling spread, in these bodies, of principles subversive of everything that constitutes the life and glory of the Gospel, were considered by some, when they were first made, of too sweeping a kind, the painful fact is now forced on the public mind, that they were—unhappily for the cause of truth—too well founded. If they had been groundless, *The Controversy* could never have acquired the colossal proportions it has done. My Pamphlet, instead of running at a rate unprecedented in works of the same class, through edition after edition, would have been forgotten within a few weeks of its publication. Matters cannot remain where they are, nor as they are. We must have a purification,—a severance between those who hold the truth as it is in Jesus, and those who hold it not. The storm was imperatively required: God has sent it in his own good time and way. We anticipate, with joy and rejoicing, the near advent of a happy calm resting on the solid foundation of a clear perception, a faithful exposition, and an earnest inculcation of the great doctrines of the Glorious Gospel, by those who are its ministers.

97, GUILDFORD STREET, RUSSELL SQUARE,  
JANUARY 20, 1857.

---

# CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN THE

## REV. THOMAS BINNEY AND MR. JAMES GRANT.

I HAD no idea, until three weeks ago, that I should have again to buckle on my armour for another conflict in connection with *The Controversy*, either with any of the "Fifteen" or anybody else; and those who have any idea of the vast, I may say incredible amount of labour which I have to go through as the Editor of the second morning paper in the world, will readily believe me when I aver, that nothing but a deep and solemn sense of duty to God and to His truth, could have prevailed on me to engage anew in controversial warfare.

On Wednesday, the 10th of December, a letter appeared from the pen of Mr. Hall relative to "The Controversy," a portion of which I felt it necessary to answer. The part of the letter to which I allude, will be found in my brief reply to it. The following is my letter in answer to certain statements of Mr. Newman Hall:—

### LETTER I.

#### THE REV. N. HALL AND MR. JAMES GRANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NONCONFORMIST."

97, Guildford Street, Russell Square, Dec. 13, 1856.

SIR,—It was only this afternoon that the Rev. Newman Hall's second letter to you was brought under my notice. His first I have not yet seen. So far as the theological aspects of "The Controversy" are concerned, I am willing that they should remain as they are; but there are two matters of fact in Mr. Hall's second letter to you, which it is right I should notice, as they involve questions of veracity and honour. Mr. Hall says that he has received a letter from Mr. Binney, stating that I had in my possession, on the 16th September last, a denial of the charge preferred against him of not having read the articles so severely denounced in the Protest, before putting his name to that document. I assert, in the most positive terms, that no such denial from Mr. Binney has ever been communicated to me up to this hour, verbally, or by letter, either by Mr. Binney or by any of his friends. Will Mr. Binney make his denial now? Will he send you a letter, stating in plain terms that he read my articles,

4  
 five in number, in the *Morning Advertiser*, before signing the Protest? If he will, I promise to notice his letter in the number of the *Nonconformist* following that in which it appears.

Mr. Newman Hall represents me as having done Mr Edward White an injustice in excluding a letter from my pamphlet, which he addressed to me, stating that he had read all my articles before signing the Protest, and which letter appeared in the *Morning Advertiser*. What will Mr. Newman Hall think, when he finds that the exclusion of Mr. White's letter from my pamphlet was in compliance with Mr. White's own wishes, he having written to me, on its appearance in the *Morning Advertiser*, that he was much annoyed at its publication at all, inasmuch as he only intended it for my own private information? So that, instead of not doing Mr. White justice in the way of publication, I have done him more justice than he wished.

With regard to Mr. Hall's frequent references to the sporting intelligence in the *Morning Advertiser*, he knows as well as I do, that *all* the morning papers have sporting intelligence; and if he did not know the fact before, he will not, henceforth, be able to plead ignorance of it,—that I have no more to do with the sporting intelligence department of the paper than I have with the advertisements—no more, indeed, than Mr. Newman Hall himself has. It does not go through my hands at all, and I never, by any chance, read a single line of it.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

JAMES GRANT.

The reference which I made in this brief note to Mr. Binney, was of a nature to which he could not well avoid replying. Accordingly in the next number of the same journal, the Rev. Gentleman published the following letter in answer to mine.

## LETTER II.

### THE REV. T. BINNEY AND MR. JAMES GRANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NONCONFORMIST."

*Walworth, Dec. 22, 1856.*

SIR,—In your paper of the 17th inst., there is a letter from Mr. Grant, the Editor of the *Morning Advertiser*, in which, after referring to a statement contained in Mr. Hall's letter of the previous week, he invites a communication from me. I have hitherto disregarded Mr. Grant's invitations to go into the *Advertiser*, and should not probably have thought it worth while to notice his appeals anywhere. In the present instance, however, accident has fairly entitled him to a reply.

The accident, or inadvertence, to which I refer, I must first be allowed to explain, in justice both to Mr. Hall and myself.

5

Mr. Hall wrote to me asking a question respecting the Second-of-Peter-Heresy imputation, to which he was going to refer. I wrote a brief note in reply, adding a few words on one or two other things. These additional words were not intended for public use, in any way. I omitted, however, to mark them "private." Very innocently, therefore, Mr. Hall supposed that he might refer to any part of my note. This was not my intention, or I should not have expressed myself in a way needing to be explained. The consequence was, that Mr. Hall both quoted and misunderstood my words. I do not wonder, then, nor do I complain, that Mr. Grant supposes them to express what they do not say, and were never meant to say.

The passage in Mr. Hall's letter is the following: "Mr. Binney also responded. In a letter just received from that gentleman, he says, 'Mr. Grant has several times in his paper charged me by name, with not having read *a word* of his articles before signing the Protest—and yet he had in his possession, and had lying before him, when he wrote an article on the 16th September, my *positive denial* of the fact stated by him.'"

Before noticing Mr. Grant's comment on this statement, I think it necessary to adduce some evidence in support of the first half of it, for to many it may appear incredible.

In a review of Dr. Campbell's pamphlet, entitled "Negative Theology," which appeared in the *Advertiser* on September 16, there are the following words: "Let the question be put to Mr. Binney, whether he did not sign a recent Protest *without having read* A SINGLE WORD of that which the document most vehemently and bitterly condemned." Again, "We tell him, in plain terms, that it *is broadly affirmed*, and what is more, *is believed*, that he did not read any *one* of the five articles alluded to." [The italicised "*one*" is Mr. Grant's.

To the tenth edition of his pamphlet, Mr. Grant wrote a preface, which is dated November 10. A copy of this preface was sent to me, on the day of its publication, by Mr. Collingridge—at least it came in an envelope stamped with the name of his establishment and his own. In this "Preface" occurs the following passage: "Since the appearance of the ninth edition of this pamphlet, some of the leading men among the Fifteen have been *publicly charged by name with not having read* A SINGLE WORD of the articles in the *Morning Advertiser*." Mr. Grant then goes on to refer to a pamphlet by Mr. W. Palmer, in which, he says, "will be found some strange, and even startling *revelations* on this subject."

I felt curious to see these "revelations." I looked through the pamphlet for them. I found none. "Revelations," as to matters of fact, must consist of *evidence* in proof; but there is nothing in Mr. Palmer's pamphlet but the constant reiteration of Mr. Grant's own questions and insinuations involving the above charge; in one

---

I believe, generally consider that there is always an *implied* confidence in private life which ought to be respected; and that such confidence would be violated by the public use, in newspapers and pamphlets, of what transpires there. Such violation is, in itself, not consistent with "honour but if it include the publication of what is incorrect, it *may*, also, not be consistent with "veracity." The matter thus adverted to stands prominently forth in Mr. Hall's letter; it is put, indeed, rather strongly; but Mr. Grant does not notice it. If he is to be judged by his own rules, his silence will seem to some very significant.

Mr. Grant's disclaimer of what appears to be imputed to him in the latter half of the first quotation given above, is now to be met. It is in these words:—"I assert, in the most positive terms, that no such denial from Mr. Binney has ever been communicated to me up to this hour, verbally or by letter, either by Mr. Binney or any of his friends." I quite believe what Mr. Grant says. I have not the slightest hesitation in receiving his statement. Nevertheless, the words used by me to Mr. Hall expressed what was true, or what *ought* to have been. If I was mistaken, the fault was not mine, but Mr. Grant's.

When Mr. Grant publicly justifies the use he made of my hospitality, and publicly communicates to me—as openly as I refer to Mr. Stoughton—the *name of the person* on whose authority he grounded the charge of my having signed the Protest "without reading *a single line*," or "*a single word*," of his articles, I will explain to him the meaning of what I have just said; and perhaps do something more. Mr. Grant delights in dealing in dark sentences, mysteriously intimating that he *could* reveal this and the other "startling" fact respecting so and so if he chose. I ask what is very simple—*who was it* that "broadly affirmed" to Mr. Grant what he believes, and has so perseveringly tried to make others believe? Let Mr. Grant tell me his secret, and I will tell him mine.

Before closing this letter, however, I shall advert to another point touched upon in Mr. Grant's. It will be seen, before I finish, that I have a right to do this. Mr. Grant disclaims having anything to do with the "sporting" department of the *Advertiser*. It is in other hands; he has never read a line of it. I confess I have sometimes thought that Mr. Grant has been hit rather too hard on account of the peculiar character of his Journal, but I have been obliged to acknowledge that he invited the blows. Mr. Grant's position cannot be supposed to be exactly to his taste; he would no doubt have preferred one in which none connected with him or it would need to pander to the gross propensities of a low class of readers, by giving details of their vulgar sports. He took his position, however, with the determination, it is said, of trying to raise the tone of the *Advertiser*, and to infuse into it a higher and purer spirit than was supposed to be in harmony with its



9

original pretensions. His task was onerous, his aim high; his success, measured by the increase of circulation, is understood to have been great. But, admitting all this, it unfortunately happens that the living soul, breathed into such a paper, must still go forth clothed and connected with a corrupt body, if not a somewhat putrid carcass. Publicans and pugilists,—the vendors and votaries of strong drink,—the admirers of the turf, the dog-fight, the ferret-hunt, the rat-slaughterer,—the attendants at Penny theatres, with those of similar classes, all concur, in a peculiar sense, to furnish an audience for the *Advertiser*; their tastes must be met, as no other paper is bound to meet them; and their tastes are met to an extent not characteristic of the higher order of daily journals. In proportion, therefore, to Mr. Grant's success in increasing the circulation of the paper, he extends the influence of what is bad in it. This is a great infelicity, and I should suppose must be deeply felt. Mr. Grant's best friends, I believe, sympathise with him in relation to that he cannot help. The evil done, however, is as real as the good attempted. I give Mr. Grant great credit for his aims and his exertions; but I venture to think that his peculiar position should not be forgotten. It should induce him to "go softly;" it should tone down his religious style. Any other man in his circumstances, would not talk much of spiritual experience, take charge of the theology of the country, or make himself out to be either saint or martyr. In spite of all that Mr. Grant can do or say, as one (to use his own language) "who has savingly experienced the power of the Gospel," it does so happen that there are things to which he gives his influence, that simple-minded Christians cannot understand. I can make allowances for an infelicitous *official* position, but they cannot. Mr. Grant never reads a line, he says, of the sporting intelligence. There are not only those, however, who do, but some of them obtain, it would seem, through Mr. Grant's name, access to places not better certainly than Epsom Downs. The following letter was sent to me, some three months since, by a member of my Church, and will be seen to bear on the present point. I allow the first paragraph to stand, though not belonging to the matter to be illustrated. The letter was addressed to myself:—

Being a constant reader of the *Banner*, my attention has been called to the ad "Controversy" which has so long been raging in our denomination. Having for many years enjoyed the privilege of your ministry, I have learnt to look up to you with too much respect and gratitude not to feel shocked at the manner in which Dr. Campbell has recently treated you.

Dr. Campbell is the friend of Mr. Grant, and approves his proceedings, as the antagonist of certain theological errors; but perhaps he is not aware that his friend's influence is used in a way very antagonistic to truth and holiness. I at least have reason to say so, for it has interfered with my own religious efforts; and the statement of the fact may show you and your brethren that there is a power acting in opposition to you, as ministers—a power used by Mr. Grant, which is not confined to this Lynch controversy.

10

I am a warehouseman in an establishment where about twenty men are employed; amongst them is a young man in whose religious welfare I have taken considerable interest; I have tried to prevail upon him to attend some place of worship; I have lent him books, and among others some of your works. I was not without hope that these works had made, and were making, some good impression upon him. But this young man has a brother (a low, profligate person, who for years has got his living by betting at races), and he came into the warehouse, a few weeks ago, when, after some conversation on racing matters, he said, "B—, will you go to the theatre? I have an order for the Surrey;" on saying which he took out the order from his pocket, and read as follows:—"Admit the bearer; signed, James Grant, Editor of the *Morning Advertiser*." One would hardly have expected that a person who could thus use his influence to give free admissions to young men to the theatre, would have such fine sensibilities to detect heterodoxy. I do not know much about this "Negative Theology," but surely it cannot be a worse thing than "Theatrical Theology," which Mr. Grant seems to patronise.

I must apologise for thus trespassing upon your attention; but the inconsistency of Mr. Grant's proceedings, with his great professions, so forcibly impressed me, that I thought it right to state the above fact. By the same pen with which he fights for God, he wields a power which helps the devil, and which may have endangered a soul I was seeking to save.

Sept. 9, 1856. P. S. T.

I do not give the name of the writer of this letter; but it is at Mr. Grant's service if he wishes it. Let him and his friends, then, seriously ponder the fact thus recorded. I have strictly interrogated my friend as to whether he is quite sure of the correctness of what he states. He positively affirms that he is; the only doubt in his mind being, that he *thinks* the order said, "The bearer *and friend*," or "friends," but he is not sure. I am well aware that it may be Mr. Grant's duty to give such orders to the theatrical reporters for the *Advertiser*; and his official position may confer on him the privilege of giving occasional free admissions to other parties; but it is fair to ask whether, with his professions, he should not devolve the *duty* on some man of the world, and, for the same reason, whether he ought to *use & privilege* which he must know would not be accepted by most men—especially in his own religious circle—who have "savingly experienced the power of the Gospel?" Only fancy a profligate "sporting" gent, flourishing an order for the Surrey, and tempting a hesitating soul thither, and reading aloud, as the key to admission, the name of Lord Shaftesbury, or Baptist Noel, or Newman Hall, or even those of Mr. Grant's friends, W. Palmer, or John Campbell! The above fact is very mournful, considering what may have been, I fear what came to be, its issue. It should not be forgotten, that there are other sins besides heresy, and ways to hell shorter than those of an imperfect creed.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

T. BINNEY.

## LETTER III.

MR. JAMES GRANT'S REPLY TO THE PRECEDING  
LETTER OF THE REV. THOMAS BINNEY.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NONCONFORMIST."

*December 27, 1856.*

SIR,—My reply to Mr. Binney's letter in your journal of Wednesday last, will be as brief as I can make it. It would be a waste of your space, for which I could offer no excuse, were I to trespass at any unnecessary length on the attention of your readers'.

Mr. Binney admits, in the fullest and frankest manner, that I spoke in perfect accordance with the fact, in your previous Number, when I said that he had never denied the charge to me—either directly or indirectly, by letter or verbally—of having signed the "Protest" without having read the articles of mine, five in number, which that Protest so severely condemned; and he ascribes the circumstance of Mr. Newman Hall having represented him as having made such denial to a mistaken construction which the minister of Surrey Chapel put on a letter of his (Mr. Binney's) to Mr. Hall, which letter was intended to be private, though Mr. Hall had "innocently" made a public use of it. Mr. Hall must feel that he owes to me an expression of regret that he should have preferred a charge against me, relative to Mr. Binney, which the latter reverend gentleman admits in the most explicit terms to have been entirely without foundation. We shall see whether Mr. Newman Hall will make the reparation to which I am entitled.

Let me pause here, by way of parenthesis, to beg your readers' attention to the fact, that not only does Mr. Binney correct the misstatement of Mr. Hall, that the former had furnished me, on the 16th September last, with a denial of the charge preferred against him of having signed the Protest without having read the articles which that document so vehemently condemned, but that he does not even *now* deny the justice of that charge.

There is one point in Mr. Binney's letter which is deserving special notice. It is that in which he represents me as having been guilty of a breach of confidence, inasmuch as he says, that, dining some years since, at his house, with a number of his friends, chiefly ministers of the Gospel—I think there were fifteen or sixteen in all—I grounded, on a private conversation, a charge against him of his regarding 2 Pet. ii., as an interpolation, and consequently not inspired, nor rightly forming any part of the canon of Scripture. Now, will it be believed, that in my pamphlet I not only never mentioned Mr. Binney's name, in connexion with this rejection of an entire chapter of Peter, but that

---

12

no human being ever did or ever could come to the conclusion that he was the party alluded to, until Mr. Binney chose to take the reference to himself? My words were simply these: "One of the Protesters rejects entirely 2 Peter ii." Who could come to the conclusion that it was Mr. Binney that I had in my eye in making this statement? No one. And the best of all proofs that none could do so, is to be found in the fact, that, although ten months have elapsed since the appearance of *my* pamphlet, and though its sale in all parts of the country has been immense, not *one* individual, in speaking or writing to me on the subject, ever fixed on the name of Mr. Binney as the party to whom I referred. But the most amusing part of the matter is, that even Mr. Binney himself, according to his own admission, did not, for a long time after the publication of my pamphlet, discover that it was to *him* that I made an allusion! So much for the preposterous charge of a breach of confidence. I will here add, as an act of bare justice to myself, that I have now been, for a long series of years, on the establishment of the *Morning Advertiser*; and during the protracted period that that journal has been entirely under my control, I not only never, though daily meeting confidentially with many of the very highest men in the land, have been in a single instance guilty of a violation of the confidence reposed in me; but Mr. Binney is the first person that ever even insinuated that I had divulged that which had been communicated to me under the seal of secrecy. Were, indeed, Mr. Binney to reflect for a moment on the matter, it would occur to him, that, if I could be capable of that which he imputes to me, I not only would be unfit for the high and responsible position which I have the honour to fill, but that my retention of that position for so many years would, on the reverend gentleman's groundless representation, have been an utter impossibility. Were capable of committing a breach of confidence, I could give a very different version from his of the conversation between us, as to the alleged fact of 2 Pet. ii., and, verifying my version by particular expressions employed, would leave it to the public to decide whether his testimony or mine, in that particular matter, was most entitled to credit.

I now come to a part of Mr. Binney's letter which I cannot contemplate without peculiar pain—pain, much more on his account than my own. I not only had always regarded him as a man of generous nature, though of impulsive mind and often hasty in his conclusions, but I said thus much of the reverend gentleman in my pamphlet. I am sorry that I am now constrained to change my opinion. Anything more ungenerous, more unworthy of one aspiring to the character of manliness, was never witnessed than that part of his letter which relates to theatrical matters in connexion with the journal which I conduct. But Mr. Binney's conduct in this case is not only ungenerous and

13

unworthy in the extreme, but he makes statements which are wholly at variance with the truth. No "penny theatre" is ever noticed in the *Morning Advertiser*, nor are other things to be found in its columns which he says there are. It is not true that any friend of his, or any one else, ever saw a theatrical order issued by me, with "bearer and *friend*," or "bearer and *friends*." It is true that the journal which I conduct devotes, as do all other newspapers, certain portions of its space at times to theatrical intelligence, and that in order to obtain this intelligence orders are given to the gentlemen on the establishment which procure them access to the quarters whence the information is to be had. There are, too, other parties officially connected with the establishment who have a right to these orders, and they can transfer them to any of their friends or acquaintance they please—but these are matters with which I have nothing to do. And, let me add, that Mr. Binney *knows* all this quite as well as I do. But I will say no more on this subject, because I am sure that there will be but one feeling of revulsion in the minds of all persons at the course Mr. Binney has pursued in relation to it.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

The sole object of the latter part of Mr. Binney's letter seems to be to convince his readers, that it is an act of the greatest enormity, as well as inconsistency, for the *Morning Advertiser* to express any opinion at all on theological questions. Mr. Binney was not always of this way of thinking. His own works are of an essentially *religious* character, and yet, will it be believed, that Mr. Binney has for years sent them all to me for review in the *Morning Advertiser*? And not only so, but he has, in various instances, accompanied them with friendly notes from himself, intimating how much he would appreciate a notice of the volume sent, and also expressing his admiration of the paper. There was no word about theatrical intelligence then—not a whisper ever came from Mr. Binney's lips, in our occasional intercourse together, in the way of fault-finding, until the *Morning Advertiser* exposed the Pantheism of the "Rivulet." Nay, more; will it be credited, that the gentleman who now asserts that the *Morning Advertiser* has no right to meddle with religious matters at all, has actually, on former occasions, chosen that journal as the medium of communicating his own letters on religious subjects with his name attached to them? Will Mr. Binney further permit me to ask him, whether he knows any eminent Dissenting minister who has been heard to say, that it was matter of great thankfulness to God, that they, "had such a man as Mr. Grant at the head of the *Morning Advertiser*?"—a journal, I may be allowed to add, which is second in circulation and influence only to the *Times*, and which is extensively read in the very highest classes of society, and in all the leading West-end Clubs. If Mr. Binney knows no such popular preacher as I have referred to, *I* do. If he does not know

14

any eminent Dissenting minister who, *before* the "Rivulet" Controversy, has said in writing, as well as verbally, that he preferred the *Morning Advertiser* to any other paper, and that he always found something interesting in it which he could find in no other journal,—if, I repeat, Mr. Binney knows no such minister of the Gospel, I do.

It is a most painful thing to find Mr. Binney, Mr. Newman Hall, and others of the Protesters—all ministers of the Gospel—making it a matter of grave reproach against the Editor of a morning newspaper, that he should expose and denounce theological error in questions of the very deepest importance, and should at the same time do all in his power to vindicate and inculcate Evangelical views. I should have expected, on the contrary, to have been encouraged and cheered on by those whose vocation it is to promote the interests of Evangelical truth. Little does any one but myself know of the number and nature of the sacrifices which have been entailed on me by my uniform and earnest endeavours to promote the cause of Evangelical religion. Probably there is no instance on record—I say it in no boastful spirit—in which any one has had so much to contend with as myself, in my efforts to be faithful to the convictions of my conscience. It was but two years ago that my anxiety to promote those very principles which Mr. Binney every Sunday inculcates from his pulpit, raised a storm of opposition among a large portion of the proprietors of the paper, which perhaps never had a parallel, and that, for many months, my adherence to my religious principles placed my position in the most imminent hourly peril. I was enabled, by a strength not mine own, to state in the most emphatic terms, and in the presence of several hundred persons in whose hands my destinies, as Editor of the second morning paper in England, were, that I was prepared to relinquish my situation rather than compromise, or even put in abeyance—for that would have sufficed to satisfy my opponents—my religious views. And yet, with a full knowledge of all this, Mr. Binney can pen the melancholy letter which appears in your paper of last week—the purport of which letter is to deter me from reverentially recognising, and labouring to extend, in the newspaper which I conduct, the great practical truths of Evangelical religion. And this from not only a Christian man, but a stated *preacher of the Gospel!* I should have thought that Mr. Binney, and indeed all the friends of Evangelical religion, whether ministers or not, would rejoice in seeing a newspaper, of extensive circulation and great influence—read by all classes of the community in every part of the country—earnestly and uniformly aiming to spread the principles of the Gospel. But no: with Mr. Binney this is a piece of presumption and a crime.

But I have done. Mr. Binney's letter altogether affords an affecting illustration of the truth of the well-known adage—"Evil

15

communications corrupt good manners." Since his association with "Silent Long," he has completely caught the spirit, and even adopted the very phraseology, of the author of "Songs Controversial." "Oh, what a fall is here! "How sad to see Mr. Binney the disciple of such a man as Mr. Lynch! That surely is the lowest depth to which Mr. Binney could descend; at least I know of none lower.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES GRANT.

It will be observed, that a passage has been omitted from this letter of mine. And in reference to its exclusion from the columns of the *Nonconformist*, the Editor of that journal appended to my letter this note:—

\*\*\* "We have omitted a paragraph in the above letter, conaiating entirely of abuse of Mr. Lynch. We do not think our columns ought to be made the vehicle, in this indirect way, of what we should indignantly repudiate.—*Ed. Nonconformist.*"

The inevitable conclusion to which the readers of the journal in which my letter appeared would come, on perusing this note, would be, that I myself had made a furious assault on Mr. Lynch. The paragraph is described as "*consisting entirely of abuse*" of that Rev. Gentleman; and I am represented as the party by whom he is vituperated. What will be the amazement of the reader when he is informed, that not *one* word of abuse of Mr. Lynch, from my pen, is to be found in the paragraph which the Editor bad thought proper to expunge, and which he characterised as *consisting entirely of abuse of the author of Songs Controversial?*"—The paragraph consisted *entirely* of an extract from a review of these "Songs," given on the 8th November last, with one or two words from me, merely calling attention to the fact that it was important to learn what a journal like the *Athenæum*, of a purely literary character, and consequently having no bias on either side of "The Controversy," said of the spirit and manner in which Mr. Lynch demeaned himself in the part he has played in the Theological conflict.

The Editor of the *Nonconformist* having refused to return the part of my manuscript which he had thus omitted, I cannot give my own introductory words exactly, but they are in substance what I have represented them to be. The extract from the *Athenæum* is as follows:—"The 'bitter bad' doggreel of this rhymster, is made repulsive by the *profane* frivolity with which he jingles together scurrilities, impertinences, and imbecilities, with things and names that are sacred. Having found *one* stanza which is not disgusting, but ludicrous, we quote it for our justification." Now, I ask whether there was not, on the part of the

16

*Nonconformist*, an insinuation of that which was altogether untrue, in representing, by implication, that with which I had nothing whatever to do, as coming from my pen? Anything more unfair, or more ungenerous, I could not imagine.

I wrote immediately to the Editor of the journal in question, asking him to substantiate, if he could, his charge that the paragraph of mine which he had expunged, "consisted entirely of abuse of Mr. Lynch," by producing the publication of the paragraph; or failing to do that, which, after the unjust and ungenerous treatment I had already received, I indeed expected would be the case,—to state distinctly that I had not abused Mr. Lynch at all, but had simply quoted part of a review of his Songs, which had appeared in the *Athenæum*. The paragraph was not published, and all that was done to repair the injustice, was to insert a notice to correspondents, to the effect that the paragraph was taken from the *Athenæum*. To this part of the affair I shall have occasion to refer again.

In the following Number of the *Nonconformist*, that is in the one for January 7, there appeared a second letter from Mr. Binney, which may be headed "Mr. Binney's reply to Mr. Grant."

## LETTER IV.

### MR. BINNEY'S REPLY TO MR. GRANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NONCONFORMIST."

January 5, 1857.

SIR,—I beg to be allowed a few closing words in settling my account with Mr. Grant, and taking my leave of him.

Mr. Grant, for many months past, has been using all his powers of abuse, ridicule, and inuendo, to injure me, *personally*, in the estimation of the public. I paid no regard to it, and did nothing against him. When, however, an accident gave him a claim to attention, I came forward and spoke. In doing so, I referred to him not only without bitterness, but in a way which, all things considered, was singularly forbearing. In spite of his remarks in the latter part of his letter, some of which are neither generous or manly, I maintain, that I said nothing inconsistent with any sentiments I may formerly have expressed, or anything I ever did. Mr. Grant avows a change of opinion with respect to me, as he has done of others. I might take, or might have taken, this ground in respect to him and his paper. But my words were such as these:—"I have sometimes thought that Mr. Grant has been hit rather too hard on account of the peculiar character of his journal." "He took his position with the determination, it is understood, of trying to raise the tone of the *Advertiser*, and to infuse into it a higher and purer spirit." "His task was onerous, his aim high, his success, measured by the increase of circulation, is understood to have been great." "I give Mr. Grant great credit for his aims,



17

and his exertions." Such were my allusions to the man who for months has been employed in blackening my character in every possible way. I spoke, in connection with these expressions, of is "infelicitous official position," and the "sympathy" felt by his best friends for him "in respect to what he could not help." I always understood it to be so; even when I thought, as I did very sincerely, that it was well that one with his views and objects, was placed over a paper which, in other hands, might have been issued without any redeeming element whatever; and I still think that the better portions of the paper were often distinguished for great *variety* of matter, and that thus, for a railway journey, the paper itself became a more entertaining companion than some others. I acknowledge that Mr. Grant's recent style of writing has lowered him in my estimation; and my attention having been directed to portions of the paper which I had not before so particularly noticed, is position has seemed to me more equivocal than I once thought it. Mr. Grant's lamentation over my degenerate style of writing, and its cause, I can not only leave to the judgment of your readers, but I feel that I can afford to smile at it. I shall say no more, therefore, in relation to the latter part of his letter; but I will introduce here the opinion of "A Looker-On," including an illustration of what Mr. Grant's "infelicitous editorial position" obliges him to countenance, or of what he might refuse to countenance, and, with his professions, *ought* to disallow, but does not.

On the evening of the day on which my former letter appeared, I received from a gentleman a note of which the following is a part:—

*Christmas Eve, 1856.*

REV. SIR,—I have just read your letter in the *Nonconformist*, touching the unhappy Grant. You treat him with more consideration than he deserves, taking council rather of your own principles than his merits; but after all that can be said of allowances which ought to be made, what help or hope is there for a man who is obliged daily to father such horrible stuff as appears in the *Advertiser*? He disavows it in the religious journals (so called), but read him in his own paper; read this cutting from last Tuesday's paper—the day when Grant was lamenting that Dr. Harris's death-bed "would not, it was to be feared, furnish those interesting details which we look for from the death-beds of eminent Christians." On that same day, an article, essentially, substantially, and formally editorial, appeared in the *Advertiser* on Jullien's masked ball. What the *Times* said of that wicked scene you know; the *Times*, essentially secular and often low-viewed, spoke of it as the interests of public morality demanded. The *Advertiser*, in its largest leaded type, vindicated it, described it, and recommended it to general patronage:—

"HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE.—M. JULLIEN'S BAL MASQUE.

"The seventeenth annual *Bal Masque* of M. Jullien was given last night within the walls of Her Majesty's Theatre, with a splendour, an excellence of arrangement, and a completeness of orchestral effect in the dance-music selected for the occasion, that made the last the most magnificent of the long series of entertain-

menu which the public owe to the enterprise, taste, tact, and management of the popular *maestro* who presided over the whole. The scene of last night, on entering the *vaat* area, entirely re-arranged, and re-decorated, as a tasteful ball-room of colossal dimensions, was most imposing, and showed, despite the shadow which vulgar imitators and plagiarists have cast upon the very name of *bal masque*, that this species of entertainment, under efficient regulations, and competent surveillance, is still *worthy of general patronage*. The dresses were more numerous and quite as varied as on former anniversaries, the stipulation of evening dress, or fancy costume being rigorously carried out. The dancing was spirited, and well sustained, and efficiently regulated by fourteen masters of the ceremonies. The orchestra, containing one hundred and ten musicians, need not be spoken of, comprising, as it did, the *élite* of the instrumentalists who have performed at M. Jullien's concerts during the season just ended. The refreshments and wines were above the average quality on such occasions. When we left the festive scene, the merriment and good humour of the revellers seemed still waxing warmer."

Grant's plea that he has nothing to do with what appears in these or those columns of the *Advertiser* may do for the religious public: but no man of the world will be deceived by it. I have been told to day by one who has probably made more daily newspapers—I mean selected their contents and authorised their publication—than any other man, that an editor's responsibility extends to every column, even to the advertisements. It is so held at the *Times* and *Daily News*.

In addition to the above, I may say, that I have had sent to me this evening, the account of the assassination of the Archbishop of Paris, which appeared in the *Advertiser* of this morning, in the letter of its Paris correspondent. It is dated "SUNDAY, six A.M." It begins by stating that "all the world went *last evening* to hear the Piccolimini sing in *Traviata*"—the opera, it will he remembered, which the *Times* denounced as immoral. I know not whether the *Advertiser* denounced it. Its correspondent, however, does not; but, besides this, he tells us, that after leaving it, "he repaired to the opening *bal masque* of the season," where he was "amidst frantic revelries, painted Jezebels, and wild debaucheries of every kind adding, "We all adjourned to the *Maison Dorée*, and there, surrounded by truffled woodcocks, flanked by flagons of iced champagne," he had the news of the archbishop's death confirmed. Then, having thus initiated "the day of the Lord," as Mr. Grant and we deem it, his correspondent sits down, at six o'clock on Sunday morning, and writes his article for the *Advertiser*! Mr. Grant will call it "ungenerous" in me to refer to this. But I told him before, that while "I can make allowances for his infelicitous position, others cannot;" the above obvious and painful fact struck the mind of a Christian man, who sends it to me. How Mr. Grant's religious friends, his W. Palmers and others, would like to be the colleagues of such *fellow-workers* as this correspondent of the *Advertiser*, cannot be doubtful; and, if they are not lost to all sense of decency, they must feel that Mr. Grant is an object of "sympathy," if not of something else.

19

Mr. Grant admits the signing of orders for theatres, not only for those who are "to obtain the theatrical information," but for "other parties officially connected with the establishment, who have a right to them, and who can transfer them to any of their friends." He very strongly, but very superfluously denies only that part of my correspondent's statement respecting which he was *in doubt*. Mr. Grant says that in referring to this matter, "the purport of my letter is, to deter him from *reverently* recognising and labouring to extend, in his paper, the great practical truths of Evangelical religion." No! it was not that. I only objected to his *want* of reverence—to his ferocity and assumption; and thought that his peculiar position should induce him "to go softly," and "tone down his religious style." I think so still; and I further think, that he should not labour to destroy the influence, and malign the character of Christian ministers, who are seeking, by their pens and their pulpits, to rescue and to save such unhappy individuals as he is habitually the instrument of sending to the teachers and the temples of "Theatrical Theology," as my friend termed it—affording the opportunity and furnishing the temptation, of their going to drink at a stream somewhat worse, certainly, than the waters of the "Rivulet."

The manner in which Mr. Grant meets my remarks respecting his charge against one of the Protesters, of denying the inspiration of a portion of the Second Epistle of Peter, is positively terrible, as illustrative of his ideas of controversial morality. He says that I "charged him with divulging that which had been communicated to him under the seal of secrecy." I did no such thing; I spoke of his disregard to the "*implied* confidence of private life." He says, "Will it be believed that Mr. Binney's name was never mentioned by me in connexion with the rejection of the chapter in dispute?" Why, both Mr. Hall and I had said so! He asserts that no "human being ever *did* or ever could come to the conclusion that he had me in his eye, till I took the reference to myself;" when I had said that, *before* I had thought of any such thing, a friend pointed it out to me. He boasts that "although ten months have elapsed since the appearance of his pamphlet, not *one* individual [the italics are his own] ever fixed on the name of Mr. Binney as the party referred to and this with my two statements before his eye;—the first in respect to the friend just mentioned; and the second, the fact that, some time since, he was spoken to about it by Mr. Stoughton, who "referred it to me," and that he, Mr. James Grant, acknowledged the correctness of the reference, hut justified it by saying, that the conversation at my table "was not *stated* to be confidential;"—it was "not under the seal of secrecy!" Then after going on in this way, ignoring facts, the record of which is lying before him, and trying to insinuate that the reference was *not* to me, he ends by representing that it *was*, and that the charge in it is *true*—saying, that "if he was capable of a

20

breach of confidence, he could give a very different version of the conversation at my table, and leave the public to decide whether *my* testimony or his was most entitled to credit." That is to say, he admits that the charge was based on what he heard at my table, and *did* refer to me—as it must have done, since none of the other Fifteen Protesters was there but myself—and he persists in the implication that the charge is correct. There never was such a tissue of inconsistency written by any sane individual in this world as the above—beginning with the denial of the reference, and ending with the acknowledgment of it—and something more!

The only thing that remains to be noticed is the way in which Mr. Grant treats the quotation given by Mr. Hall, which occasioned his letter. My words were meant in one sense, Mr. Hall took them in another, thus showing that they were capable of *two* interpretations. I admitted that Mr. Hall's construction was mistaken, and, so far, relieved Mr. Grant; but I re-affirmed the truth of my words, that Mr. Grant was in possession of my denial of certain charges against me when he wrote a certain article. I purposely expressed this in a way which required explanation, but I promised to explain it when Mr. Grant publicly gave me the name of the person on whose authority he advanced the charges which I showed he had so pertinaciously repeated. Of this he takes no notice. I gave him *Mr. Stoughton's* name as my authority for what I affirmed of *him*; I required him to act as openly by me. This miserable controversy which Mr. Grant and his friends have got up, has been distinguished, among other most dishonourable things, by the repeated betrayal and constant misrepresentation of private conversations. Mr. Newman Hall is asked a question; he gives an answer; the answer is misunderstood: forthwith, the intelligence is carried to Mr. Grant, and a public charge is immediately founded upon it! Some one comes into Mr. Allon's house; a remark is made, or a question answered; the remark or reply is misunderstood: it is immediately taken to Mr. Grant, and another public charge is founded upon that! In the same way, I suppose, some one or other must have misunderstood some statement of mine; the thing is carried to Mr. Grant, and week after week comes forth the statement, in various forms, telling me that a thing is "broadly affirmed" and "moreover believed," which I affirm to be a calumny. I was quite prepared to explain and justify my signing the Protest, having signed it with conscious uprightness and sufficient knowledge, and should have done so, had Mr. Grant produced his witness. He declines to do that. Then both may go on in their own way, the one in the light and the other in the darkness, for anything I care. Henceforth, I have done alike with Mr. Grant and "the informer," and shall not bestow another thought or another word on either.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

T. BINNEY.

21

Before giving my rejoinder to this letter of the Minister of Weigh-House Chapel, it may be well, first, for a moment or two, to re-introduce the Rev. Newman Hall on the stage. That Reverend Gentleman, as will be remembered, had thought fit to charge me with having, on the 16th of September last, been put in possession of Mr. Binney's denial of the charge so generally preferred against him of having signed the "Protest," without having read the articles which that document condemned in such terrible terms, and yet that, notwithstanding his denial, I had persisted in reiterating the charge. I at once explicitly and emphatically denied the truth of the accusation so preferred, and defied Mr. Newman Hall to produce even the semblance of proof in support of it. Mr. Binney, on this point, unceremoniously threw Mr. Newman Hall overboard, and confessed plainly that he had said that which was at variance with the fact, while I had spoken the truth. On this I naturally called on the Minister of Surrey Chapel to make me the reparation for the wrong he had done me, to which I was entitled. But, instead of, like a man, a Christian, and a minister of the Gospel, doing this promptly and generously, he addresses the following feeble and faltering letter on the subject to the Editor of the *Nonconformist*:—

REV. NEWMAN HALL AND MR. JAMES GRANT.

*To the* EDITOR *of the* "NONCONFORMIST."

SIR,—As Mr. Grant calls in question the accuracy of a Statement which I quoted from a letter of Mr. Binney's, allow me to say that Mr. Binney himself has replied to Mr. Grant—that while he admits the phraseology to be capable of two interpretations, he also maintains the substantial truth of the extract,—and that he offered to explain it to Mr. Grant on certain conditions, which have not been complied with. I, therefore, leave the question with Mr. Binney and Mr. Grant, and have requested Mr. Freeman to omit the controverted passage—from his pamphlet.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

*St. John's Wood, Jan. 5.*

NEWMAN HALL.

On this brief note of Mr. Newman Hall's, I make no remark. To Mr. Binney's letter I wrote the following reply, and forwarded it—to the *Nonconformist* office shortly after six o'clock the succeeding Saturday evening. From that time till the Wednesday following, not having heard anything to the contrary, I assumed, as a matter of course, that it would appear in the impression of that day. On the morning, anxious to bring before the public both the expunged passage in my second letter, and the third brief letter which I had addressed to the Editor, I wrote to him, asking him to return the manuscript of both. At one o'clock exactly—that is two hours before the publication of their journal—I received the following note in reply to my application:—

22

The Editor of the *Nonconformist's* compliments to Mr. Grant, and begs to say in reply to his note of this morning, that he is not in the habit of preserving rejected communications. But the Editor takes this opportunity of returning the MS. of Mr. Grant's *last* letter, which the Editor declines to insert on account of its length.

13, *Bowyer Street*, Jan. 14, 1857.

There are two points to which I ask the attention of the public here. First of all my application for two portions of manuscript which had not been used, is met with the statement that the Editor of the *Nonconformist* "is not in the habit of preserving rejected communications." The question in this case is not whether the Editor is in the "*habit*" of preserving such communications, but whether in this case, the one brief letter and the expunged part of another, were preserved? Will the Editor of the *Nonconformist* say, that they were not? Will he say that they were destroyed? I have a particular reason for asking these questions, and should be glad of a plain answer—an "Aye" or a "No."

In the meantime, let me observe that the words "not in the habit of preserving rejected communications," do not apply to both of my applications. There was no "rejected" communication in the one case. Only a part—a small part—of the letter was excluded, and consequently there was no rejection so far as it was concerned. Now, from my extensive experience as the Editor of a public journal, I assert that such a thing as destroying a part of a manuscript which is excluded, while the great bulk of the communication is inserted, is unknown. The pen is merely put through the passage to which exception is taken. Unless, therefore, the whole of the manuscript of the letter in question—which be it remembered was not rejected, but with the exception of fourteen or fifteen lines was inserted—had been destroyed, the part which I asked to be returned must have been in existence. It is not for me to impute motives, but until we are expressly assured of the contrary, no one can be blamed for coming to the conclusion, that the reason why the manuscripts were withheld from me was the hope, that thereby I would be prevented from publishing, in the one case, the part of my letter which had been expunged, and in the other, the letter which had been excluded. The Editor, it will be observed, does not say that my manuscript was, in either of the two cases, destroyed; all he says is, that "he is not in the *habit* of preserving rejected communications."

But leaving that part of the brief note from the Editor of the *Nonconformist*, in the position in which I have placed the matter, let me now invite the attention of my readers to the other part of the note in question, namely, the exclusion of my rejoinder to Mr. Binney, and which, as before remarked, will be immediately, in this form, sent before the public. First of all, it will be observed, that *this* "rejected" communication is returned, although, but

23

one moment before, the Editor had stated that he is not in the habit of preserving rejected communications. So that the habit is sometimes broken through,—which is just a confirmation of what I have said respecting the ground there is for surmise, that the real reason why the manuscripts I asked to be returned, were not returned was what I have said. There is something, certainly, which smacks of the Emerald Isle, in saying in the same breath, that the Editor of the *Nonconformist* “is not in the habit of preserving rejected manuscripts,” and that the “Editor takes this opportunity of returning the manuscript of Mr. Grant’s last letter!”

But let that also pass, and let me now come to the fact of my rejoinder to Mr. Binney being excluded altogether. That fact is certainly an extraordinary one in itself, and is made more so by the circumstances under which its exclusion took place. It was, on the face of it, an act of the greatest injustice to refuse me the opportunity of vindicating myself from the new charges which Mr. Binney had preferred against me. It showed that the prepossessions of the journal in question in favour of German Rationalism, —a system without even the *semblance* of a soul in it—can actually lead an Editor to do an act of flagrant injustice.

The length of the “letter” is the reason assigned for its exclusion. But does anybody believe, *can* anybody believe, that that was the true reason? If that had been the real ground why it was excluded, the reason would have been obviated, without the slightest difficulty, in one of two ways,—either the manuscript should have been returned to me for the purpose of being abridged, or the letter should have been divided into two parts, which is a thing of every-day newspaper occurrence,—one half appearing in the next impression of the journal, and the other in that of the week following. But there is one fact which, of itself, conclusively shows that the mere question of length could not have been the cause of the exclusion of my letter; and that is, that, in the previous number of the *Nonconformist*, there was as much space devoted to a letter of Mr. Binney’s, and that of another correspondent on the same subject, as mine would have occupied. Besides, had the length of the letter been the insuperable impediment to its publication, how did it happen that the manuscript was not at once returned to me. The length being the grand objection, the question of insertion or exclusion would necessarily have been the affair of a moment. A mere glance of the eye was all that would have been required. And yet the manuscript, instead of being returned to me immediately, was not sent back to me till the middle of the day, on the following Wednesday. This was a most unnecessary detention, on the assumption that the length of the letter was the real reason of its non-insertion. Not only was the delay at variance with all editorial courtesy, but it prevented me from taking any steps towards the publication of my letter, for more than two days, and consequently

24

gave Mr. Binney the advantage over me, of his charges being unanswered during that time.

And let it be further remarked, that there is no reason to suppose it would have been returned to me, even then, had not the publication of the paper, immediately afterwards, apprized me that it had been suppressed by the Editor of the *Nonconformist*. The affair altogether is most discreditable. Such conduct, I am happy to say, is wholly unknown in the journalism of this country. I do not envy the feelings of the man who could resort to an expedient so utterly unworthy, to gain an advantage for one of his own party, and to deprive an opponent of that to which he had a right. There cannot be a doubt that the discreditable device was had recourse to to serve Mr. Binney; and, so far as giving him the last word is concerned, he undoubtedly is a gainer. So is he by the delay in the publication of my letter, in its present form,—which is the result of the manuscripts not being returned to me for two days and a half after it might have been. We have lately had ample specimens of the character of *Negative Theology*; we are now presented with an edifying sample of what *Negative Morality, Justice, and Courtesy* are, as practised by the great weekly champion of the cold and heartless system of religious faith, which Messrs. Binney, Newman Hall, Allon, Harrison, and others, have commended to the Christian world, by their earnest and now renewed recommendation of the “Rivulet.”

But if the Editor of the *Nonconformist*, feeling that my rejoinder to Mr. Binney’s last letter, was one which would damage the cause of his “Fifteen” friends, and consequently that it was desirable to suppress it, and hoped that he would thereby prevent the publication of my letter, he has found, by this time, that he reckoned without his host. The letter which was thus meant to be kept from the public eye, and it was hoped, would be so, by shutting the columns of the *Nonconformist* against it, is as follows; and I venture to believe that its rejection by that journal, especially under such circumstances, so like the miserable expedients to which disreputable attorneys are in the habit of resorting,—will only have the effect of very greatly extending its circulation in the form in which it is now brought before the public eye.

I had written thus far before I had an opportunity of seeing the number of the *Nonconformist* in which I had expected my letter to appear. Under the head “Notices to Correspondents,” I found, when I glanced at its inside pages, the following reference to the Editor’s refusal to publish my rejoinder to Mr. Binney:—

“James Grant” must be pleased to impute the omission of his letter to its inordinate length. We were quite disposed to let him have the last word; but his prolixity puts it out of our power. We positively cannot afford him so much space. His MS. is left for him at our office. He can publish it in the *Morning Advertiser* if he pleases, or, if he prefers, we will give him *reasonable* space for a



25

last letter, much as we desire to close our columns to farther communications on the Controversy—but then his letter must be drawn up with a greater regard to our limits.

Before adverting to the tone and terms of this notice, it is right I should here remark that, so far from the view I have taken of the real causes of the *Nonconformist's* exclusion of my letter being changed, I am only confirmed in its justice. If the reason of the rejection of my letter was the length to which it extended, why not return the manuscript to me on Monday morning, for the purpose of my reducing its proportions. The distance to the *Morning Advertiser* office is not much more than a hundred yards. In that case, I could have abridged it, and sent it back to the printer, in an hour, and thus have given abundant time for its appearance in the next number of the *Nonconformist*; but that would not have suited the ends of this champion of a system of belief without a soul. It would have been one great thing to get me to emasculate my letter, and another to prevent the appearance of my rejoinder even for another week, daring which period the groundless charges of Mr. Binney would have a longer period for operating prejudicially on the public mind. That was doubtless the cunning calculation which this friend of the "Fifteen," and of Negativeism, made in his own mind. And, so far, he has succeeded; but, then, the success has been achieved by a species of trickery which every honourable mind would shrink from adopting.

The sneering suggestion, that I might publish this letter in the *Morning Advertiser*, or through any other medium, is of a piece with the rest of the Editor's unworthy conduct in connection with the exclusion of my letter from the *Nonconformist's* columns. As it was in that journal, and not in the *Morning Advertiser*, or any other paper, that Mr. Binney's renewed attack on me appeared, it did not need the spectacles of the *Nonconformist* Editor to see that it was only by giving publicity to my answer through the same channel, that that answer could have the desired effect.

Then there is the untruthful statement that my letter was lying at the time the paper was published, at the *Nonconformist* Office. It had been returned to me at least two hours before the paper was published. But it was necessary to the gratification of the poor petty spleen of the Editor of the Negative organ, that the statement should be made that my letter was left for me in the office. But where an annoyance is to be given or an injury to be done, what believer in the "Rivulet" Theology would too scrupulously inquire whether he was speaking in accordance with the fact or not. What barm, it would be asked, would follow from paltering with the truth, when the end sought to be accomplished, was to injure an opponent of the Christless theology, which the journal in question has so uniformly advocated.

On the spirit and taste which characterise the "Notice to Corres-

26

pondents," it is not necessary I should make a single observation. They speak for themselves. Suffice it to say, that from such a quarter I had no reason to expect anything better. Not only has the *Nonconformist* never, by any accident, penned a single generous word, nor contained a single benevolent sentence, nor betrayed in any form or way the slightest trace of *heart*, but it has always been remarkable, if not absolutely alone, among all contemporary journals, for its sour and snappish manner.

Latterly, however—that is, since I took up the case of the "Rivulet" and the Protesters, it has, in addition to its vinegar and virulence, become coarse in the extreme. Mere snarling will no longer satisfy it. Hitherto there was a certain sort of gentility in its spitefulness, but all trace of that is gone, and instead, we find a vulgarity which you will seek for in vain in those regions in the neighbourhood of London Bridge, which are regarded as synonymous with the coarsest vituperation. See, in proof of this, its notice of my first pamphlet.

But let me now lay before the public that rejoinder to Mr. Binney which the *Nonconformist* did all in its power to suppress.

## LETTER V.

### MR. JAMES GRANT'S REJOINDER TO MR. BINNEY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NONCONFORMIST."

97, Guildford Street, Saturday Afternoon.

SIR,—Mr. Binney not having even attempted or professed to reply to any one of the main charges in my letter of Wednesday week, but wandered away into matter wholly irrelevant to the important points at issue between us, my present communication will not be so long as might otherwise have been necessary; and, as he says in the conclusion of his letter, that he is "now done for ever with Mr. Grant," permit me to add that Mr. Grant, in that case, will be for ever done with Mr. Binney. Should, however the Reverend Gentleman change his mind, and re-enter the controversial arena, I shall not fail to be forthcoming. I shall again meet him in conflict, and do my best to vindicate those great truths which are so deeply involved in the important discussions of the last ten months.

Before I advert to a few things in Mr. Binney's present letter, let me recapitulate some of the statements which I made in my letter of Wednesday week, which he has not denied; and some of the charges I have preferred against him, which he has not only not disproved, but not even touched. The following are some of the statements and charges in question:—

1. The utter groundlessness of his assertion that Penny Theatres are noticed in the *Morning Advertiser*.
2. The equal groundlessness of the allegation that I write orders

27

for the theatre, with the words "Bearer and *Friend*" or "*Friends*," on them.

3. That, before signing the "Protest," he had not read the articles—five in number—which that document so vehemently condemned, although, in one of its earliest sentences, he solemnly said he had.

4. That, though Mr. Binney *now* is so unmeasured in his condemnation of the *Morning Advertiser*, because it contains, like *all* other papers, theatrical and sporting notices, he not only never did so before I detected and exposed the Pantheism of the "Rivulet," but eulogized the paper as one which he preferred to any other in London.

5. That, though now so energetic in his denunciations of the oumal which I conduct, he not only formerly eulogized it in the way I have described, but considered it "matter of thankfulness to Sod that such a man as Mr. Grant was at the head of the *Morning Advertiser*."

6. That he used to send me all his *religious* books for review in the *Morning Advertiser*, accompanied with friendly notes expressive of the great gratification which a notice of them, in our columns, would afford him.

7. That he has even written letters on *religious* subjects, with his name attached to them, in the *Morning Advertiser*.

Who that reads Mr. Binney's last two letters in your columns, could believe that any man could have acted a part so glaringly inconsistent as this? So long as favours in the shape of commendations, in reviews of Mr. Binney's books, or the insertion of communications from him were to be received, the *Morning Advertiser*, was the best of papers, and I a person worthy to be invited to his table, to meet some of the most eminent ministers of the Gospel in the metropolis; but when I detect and denounce the pernicious heresies of a friend, and even have the temerity to enter the arena with himself in theological warfare, the scene suddenly and completely changes. Mr. Binney discovers serious blemishes, if not something worse, in the journal in which before he could discover nothing but excellencies!

Mr. Binney commences his letter by representing me as having, for many months past, been using all my powers of abuse, ridicule, and inuendo, to injure him *personally* in the estimation of the public. There never was a more groundless charge. It is destitute of even the semblance of justice. With the exception of writing a preface to the Tenth Edition of my pamphlet on "*The Controversy*," and noticing two or three pamphlets on the subject, I have not, since the publication of the first edition of my pamphlet, *ten* months ago, made any reference, in any way, to the Reverend Gentleman. And the references I have made to him in that preface, and in these reviews, have related to one, and only one point, namely, to the positive assurances given to me, that he

signed the "Protest" without having read the articles—five in number—which that document so severely condemned. Where, then, is the "abuse," where the "ridicule" of which he speaks? They exist only in his own imagination. I challenge the Rev. Gentleman to adduce one single instance of the kind.

Mr. Binney gravely states that, during all this time, he has "done nothing against me." Can it be possible that, by some unaccountable lapse of memory, he had become, for the moment, oblivious of the Protest? "Done nothing against me! while he has proclaimed over the length and breadth of the land, with his name duly attached to the proclamation, that he had read my reviews of the "Rivulet" "with *pain* and with *shame*"—that he felt called "on to express his *utter hatred* of such modes of dealing with a man and a book"—and that he must express his conviction that "the spirit of the review, the conclusions and judgments of the reviewer, and the manner in which Mr. Lynch is personally referred to, are *most false and unrighteous*."

This, I repeat, is what Mr. Binney said of me, far and wide, and he did it as gratuitously as unjustly, for up till that moment I had never mentioned his name in connection with this controversy, and never on any other occasion, but with kindness and respect. If this be doing and saying nothing against me, *when* Mr. Binney does do and say what, in his own estimation is *something* against a man, that something must be terrible indeed.

Referring to his letter to you in your impression of Wednesday fortnight, Mr. Binney says, that when in that letter he "spoke," he referred to me not only "without bitterness, but in a way which, all things considered, was peculiarly forbearing." There is something supremely cool in this. None but Mr. Binney could have ventured, "all things considered," on such an assertion. It is not necessary I should present your readers with illustrations of what Mr. Binney considers as being "without bitterness," and "peculiarly forbearing," because, from beginning to end, his letter swarms with them.

Convicted of preferring entirely groundless charges against the *Morning Advertiser* with regard to Penny Theatres, and the alleged insertion of other matter, which never appears in that journal,—Mr. Binney is fain to flee for refuge to some friend who holds out a helping hand to him in his hour of need, under the signature of "A LOOKER ON." This correspondent of Mr. Binney's, begins by calling me "unhappy." Though Mr. Binney does not seem to see it, it must be clear to everybody else that "A LOOKER ON" is here ironical. He does not mean me, but Mr. Binney himself, when he uses the word "unhappy." The phrase should have been, not "unhappy Grant," but "unhappy Binney." Let any one read Mr. Binney's letters and mine, in connection with this Controversy, and then say which of the two is the most "unhappy" man. I said a few weeks ago, in the preface to the Tenth Edition

29

of my pamphlet, that there is no one act of my life on which I look back with greater satisfaction, than in the part I have taken in this Controversy. I now deliberately, and solemnly, though with all humility, repeat that statement. Will Mr. Binney do the same? Will *he come* publicly forward, and with no less emphasis, make the same declaration? Will he say there is no one act of *his* life on which he looks back with greater satisfaction than on the part he has taken in this Controversy? Will he even say, that he looks back on it with satisfaction at all? He will not, he cannot say either. At a meeting of nearly 200 members of the Congregational Union, which was intended to be private, he admitted and lamented the "mistake" he had committed in the course he had pursued in connection with this matter; and if the testimony of his friends may be relied on, he deeply deplores the position in which, by the adhibition of his name to the "Protest," he has placed himself.

Mr. Binney's friend and correspondent, quotes a paragraph from the journal which I conduct, relative to a *bal masque*. My answer to this is simple,—I never saw a line of the paragraph until, through the researches of Mr. Binney, or perhaps I should rather say Mr. Binney's friend, the "LOOKER ON," I read it in the columns of the *Nonconformist*. I know not that I could give a better exemplification of what I formerly stated, namely, that I have nothing whatever to do with theatrical or sporting intelligence.

Mr. Binney, however, will have it that I am responsible for every thing which appears in our paper, even down to the advertisements; and he affirms that the editorial control of the *Times* extends to all the advertisements in that journal. I wonder whether Mr. Binney can possibly himself believe what, on this point, he says. An editor of a daily paper knows no more than Mr. Binney, as to what advertisements are going to be in, or out, until the paper is in the hands of the public. The only case in which an editor is consulted about an advertisement, is when it is supposed to contain actionable matter. The thing bears, on the face of it, the impress of absurdity. My editorial duties are laborious and responsible enough without having anything to do with the advertisements. As it is, I never get to bed till between two and three o'clock in the morning, and I rise again at nine to prepare for my journalistic labours; but, if I had to read the advertisements as well, and decide on which should go in, and which be kept out, I should not get to bed at all.

But Mr. Binney carries his notions of editorial responsibility still further. He goes on to say that our Paris Correspondent sometimes writes his letters on Sunday, and that I am to be held responsible for that also. Really, I did not, after all that has passed, believe Mr. Binney capable of resorting to anything so utterly unworthy as this. Distressing, indeed, must he have felt his position to be, before he could have done so. As if I—conducting the affairs of the greatest newspaper establishment, with

30

the exception of the *Times*—in the empire, could, sitting in London, exercise a control over the actions of our correspondents in all parts of the world! My responsibility, both morally and journalistically, is, assuredly, great enough; and there is not an hour of my life—literally, not an hour—in which I do not feel it, sometimes with an almost overwhelming pressure; but I had yet to learn, until Mr. Binney enlightened me on the subject, that it extended to the *private* conduct of our correspondents in all portions of the globe!

I am happy to find that Mr. Binney has so great a reverence for the Sabbath day, and is so anxious to uphold its sanctity. My only regret is that, in expending his righteous indignation on others who would desecrate that sacred day, he has not one word of condemnation or rebuke to bestow on his Co-Protester—the one of the Fifteen—who has written a pamphlet in favour of opening the Crystal Palace on the Sabbath day!

After a sneering allusion to the Rev. William Palmer—whose acute and able pamphlet, "*The Protesters and Peace-Makers*," must have cut him and Mr. Newman Hall to the quick,—Mr. Binney proceeds to represent me as labouring "to destroy the influence and malign the character of Christian ministers," namely, the Fifteen. This is Mr. Newman Hall's thunder. It is a palpable plagiarism from the Minister of Surrey Chapel. In one of the three memorable letters which the latter Reverend Gentleman addressed to me ten months ago, and which will have a longer existence in my first pamphlet than will be pleasant to their author,—he accused me of destroying the characters of the Protesters. My answer to Mr. Newman Hall was, that their characters, as ministers of the Gospel, had certainly already been damaged to a very serious extent, and would be so still more if they persevered in the course on which they had entered; but I repudiated the idea, as being altogether at variance with the fact, that *I* was the cause of the disasters that had befallen their characters; and I proved that they themselves alone were the authors of all the mischief which had been done to their reputation as ministers of the Gospel. The same answer is equally applicable to Mr. Binney's allegation. It is all their own act and deed. Their own pens and speeches are the sole instruments of the damage which their, characters have sustained. It is the knowledge of this fact that galls them, and works them up into those paroxysms of anger of which we have such sad and sorrowful exemplifications in Mr. Binney's two last letters, letters in which he tramples on all tire courtesies of life, to say nothing of the utter inconsistencies of their language with the spirit of Christianity. That this is the general opinion entertained of Mr. Binney's style of writing may be inferred from the following extract from the *Glasgow Examiner*:—"The Rev. Thomas Binney," says our Glasgow contemporary, "instead of getting out of the

31

meshes of the Negatives, seems to be bound neck and heel to them. In a long letter in the *Nonconformist* of this week, he makes an elaborate attack on Mr. Grant, the Editor of the *Morning Advertiser*. *The letter is a disgrace to a gentleman, not to speak of a minister. It is full of low, contemptible insinuations, which will damage only its writer.*"

Mr. Binney re-introduces the affair of the assumed interpolation of the second chapter of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. But here I cannot understand him; he is all confusion. Who can wonder at this, when he admits that he "*purposely* expressed this in a way which required explanation." *Purposely* ambiguous! Is this becoming a minister of the Gospel? Is it becoming any man who loves and seeks to attain a knowledge of the truth? Jesuitry, then, is not confined within the pale of Popery. We can have meditated mystification, and calculating concealment, within the circle of Protestant Congregationalism. I affirm, in the most positive terms—not that Mr. Binney was *not* the Protester to whom I alluded, but that no one ever even conjectured, in writing to, or in conversation with me, that he was the party to whom I pointed. If any persons came to the conclusion that he was the Protester who repudiated the canonical authority of the chapter in question, that must have been either because Mr. Binney took the allusion to himself, or that the party had some other means of information on the subject. Why did *he*, any more than anyone of his fourteen Co-Protesters take it to himself? And having so taken it, what could be more simple than to say, with the view of removing any erroneous impression which might exist on the subject, that he unreservedly receives the chapter alluded to as part of the canonical Scriptures? Will he do this *now*? If so, I shall give to his statement all the publicity in my power.

In connection with this matter Mr. Binney again introduces the name of the Rev. J. Stoughton. It will have been observed, that I abstained from any allusion, in my last letter, to the conversation which Mr. Stoughton and I had on the subject, although Mr. Binney had in his first letter made a distinct reference to it. Now, however, that Mr. Binney again alludes to this conversation with Mr. Stoughton, I also am compelled to make a reference to it. About four months after the publication of my pamphlet, Mr. Stoughton and I chanced to meet at the Brighton Railway Station, and travelled together in the same carriage. I was accompanied by my niece, and the carriage was full, though all the others were strangers to Mr. Stoughton and myself. The chief topic of conversation soon became "The Controversy," and reference was made to the matter of the second chapter of Peter's Second Epistle. Mr. Stoughton did *not* derive his information from me, that the Protester to whom I alluded as denying the canonical character of that chapter, was Mr. Binney. It soon

32

transpired that he and Mr. Binney had conversed together on the subject; for he stated, that what Mr. Binney complained of was—not the breach of confidence, of which we have since heard so much—but that I had mistaken what he said of some one else having regarded the chapter in question as an interpolation,—as being his own sentiments on the subject. Mr. Stoughton, I am sure, will bear me out in this. Mr. Stoughton; in the course of our hour-and-a-half's conversation repeatedly expressed a wish that the leading Protesters, myself, and others who shared my views, should put all personal feelings in abeyance, and meet again as friends. A most commendable desire. But one in which I said I could not concur, unless the Protest was first withdrawn,—adding, however, that if it were so, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be again on a footing of friendship with those with whom The Controversy was going on. Let me add—which I do with reluctance, but Mr. Binney compels me—that Mr. Stoughton himself mentioned to me, what indeed was no secret, that *he* had been asked to sign the Protest, but refused on two grounds; first, that he had not read the articles which the Protest so severely condemned; and, secondly, that from what he knew of Mr. Grant, he considered him too amiable,—too good-natured a man, to write in the manner which the Protest described, that is, to write “falsely and unrighteously of a man and a book,”—to write in such a way as was calculated to fill the minds of Fifteen ministers of the Gospel “with pain, and shame, and hatred.” I repeat that I would rather not have referred to this conversation with Mr. Stoughton, but Mr. Binney has left me no alternative.

Mr. Binney asks me to give up the name, to use his own word, of my “*informer*,” in reference to the charge of his having signed the “Protest” without having read those articles of mine which called forth that denunciatory document, and consequently of having stated what was untrue, inasmuch as the “Protest” said he had read them. Here let me remark, parenthetically, that of the party who furnished him with information, he speaks as his “*authority*.” Observe his nice distinction between *informer* and *authority*! I beg to inform Mr. Binney that I have more than one “*informer*,” as he so delicately expresses it. I will not say that their name is legion, but they, at least, come up to the Scriptural number—“two or three witnesses”—deemed necessary to establish a charge. When he asks me to give up the name of my “*informer*,”—“*informers*” he should have said—does he not know, that that would be to do the very thing which he would be the readiest to condemn, namely, to commit a breach of confidence? But I will make this proposal to Mr. Binney:—Let him explicitly deny what, not I only, but a number of other persons, charge him with, namely, having signed the “Protest” without having read the articles which that document condemned, although he had solemnly declared, he *had* read those articles,—let him do this, and then I will ask my “*informers*,” as



33

he calls them, to come forward and substantiate their charge; and I have no doubt my application to them will immediately meet with an affirmative response. This is a mode of dealing with the matter about which there can be no mistake. Mr. Binney cannot fail to comprehend my proposal.

I now come to the conclusion of Mr. Binney's letter, and I am happy to say I am drawing near to that of my own also. Mr. Binney characterises this Controversy as a "miserable controversy, which has been got up by Mr. Grant and his friends." Was there ever so palpable a perversion of language? Was there ever so daring a disregard of facts? *Mr. Grant* and his friends got up the controversy! The man who can coolly and deliberately say this, may safely be set down as capable of saying anything. Why,—I have done nothing from the outset but defend myself and vindicate the truth, to the best of my ability, from the attacks of Mr. Lynch's friends, and especially the Protesters. All that I did was, to review the "*Rivulet*" when sent me for that purpose; and had my review been let alone, I never would have bestowed another thought either on Mr. Lynch or his book. But several of his friends came forward singly to controvert my conclusions, as to the character of his book; and I was then attacked by them in battalions. A formidable phalanx of Fifteen Rev. Gentlemen, some of them veritable Goliaths in the empire of Nonconformity, rushed furiously upon me, without any warning or intimation of their approach. The wonder was, that an unpretending layman like myself, was not annihilated in the first shock of the terrific onslaught. My annihilation, it is clear, was intended, and confidently expected. I leave it to others to imagine, what must be the mortification of these Fifteen doughty theological warriors, when they find that, though since reinforced by *Eclectics, Patriots, Freemen, Nonconformists, Christian Spectators*, and last of all, by Mr. Lynch himself, I am not only not left lifeless on the field, but have escaped without a scar, and am as ready as ever, in dependence on Divine assistance, to do battle again, single handed, if need be, with my Fifteen formidable foes.

And here, before concluding, let me ask the Fifteen, whether *they* have escaped unscathed from the scene of action? They will not venture to say that they have. They know and feel the reverse. They have suffered seriously. Their reputations are sadly mangled. The more eminent among them would give the world, were it theirs, that they had never entered the arena of conflict. Well may Mr. Binney, speaking the real sentiments of others, though they may not make the admission, say, that the "Protest" was a "mistake." A mistake, indeed! A fatal mistake; as they have already found it, and will yet still more find it to their cost. The sale of the works of the few successful authors among them, has, since the publication of the "Protest," undergone an alarming diminution; while their pamphlets, attempting to defend that

34

course they have pursued, have not sold at all, but had to be given away, gratis,—a begging appeal having been made to the public for funds for the purpose. And even, when given away, they not have been read. My Pamphlet, on the other hand, has had an immense sale. So have those of Dr. Campbell, and the Rev. Brewin Grant, on the same side. Surely, these are unmistakable indications of what the feeling of the public is on the subject.

One word more, respecting Mr. Binney, and I have done. On various accounts, which I will not specify, I feel for him more than for the others. It is very sad,—it must be even humiliating to his friends, to see him, not only the apologist, but the obsequious follower of such a man as Mr. Lynch. I had thought, that if ever he could bring himself to call any one master, it would not be the author of “Songs Controversial.” Yet, so it is, however much to be lamented. Even now, however, I will not despair of seeing Mr. Binney snap asunder the fetters which are so degrading to him, and re-appear, on the stage of public life, with the erect and dignified bearing of a free man. Neither do I relinquish the hope that he will, with a moral courage, which all will commend, confess the deplorable errors into which he has fallen, in connection with this Controversy—just as he has done with regard to his memorable declaration, that the Church of England had ruined more souls than she had saved. That rash, that awful assertion he has since explained away, and has expressed his sorrow that ever his words could have, even seemingly, been susceptible of the construction put upon them. Let him also confess and express contrition for his deplorable error in this case; and, if so,—I say it with all sincerity,—no one will be more delighted than myself to see him restored to his right mind, and to again recognise in him an able minister of the New Testament.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES GRANT.

Such was my rejoinder to Mr. Binney, which, so far as the *Nonconformist*—the organ of the Fifteen—could do it, was suppressed. But happily for the interests of evangelical truth, there are other mediums of publication than the columns of that journal; and though many who saw the rash and reckless way in which the Minister of Weigh-House Chapel assailed me, will not see the mode in which I have repelled his attacks, because of the flagrant injustice of the *Nonconformist* in excluding my rejoinder from its columns,—yet it is satisfactory to know that the religious community generally, will have an opportunity, through this channel of publicity, of judging for themselves as to *Who it Right, and Who Wrong?*

As regards Mr. Binney, personally, I will say nothing more than this,—that he had need of something which should somewhat abate his pretensions and abridge his assumptions. He has been a

35

kind of Protestant Pope in the kingdom of Congregationalism, and has played off airs towards men fully equal to himself in every way—some of them, indeed, in many respects superior to him—, which indicated unmistakably that had circumstances placed him in any ecclesiastical sphere, where the principles of religious equality were less understood than they are among Independents, he would have practically shown that the spirit of Popery is not peculiar to those who acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. As it is, it has often been to me matter of wonder that so many ministers who have a name and status among the congregational body; and so many laymen, too, of high position as men and as Christians,—could tamely submit to be treated in the cavalier-like way in which they have so often been by Mr. Binney, and of which they have so frequently complained, though lacking the spirit, at the moment, to withstand it. He and his fourteen coadjutors evidently imagined that I was to be put down by their Protest,—a document which, from beginning to end, is instinct with intolerance, and betrays throughout a disposition to brow-beat. In that expectation Mr. Binney and the Protesters have, by this time, as the Americans say, “found out their mistake.” It has indeed been the hard fate of Mr. Binney to be constrained to confess, that the Protest was a mistake—a huge and a fatal mistake, he might have added, in strict accordance with the fact. Mr. Binney needed this unpleasant discipline; and, I say it in all truth, that nothing would give me greater pleasure than to hear that instead of seeking hereafter to ride the high horse, he will, for the time to come, to adopt his own language, as applied to me. “walk softly.” He has played the part of Lord Paramount long enough. Let him now descend to the level of other men as good and as great as himself.

With regard to the general merits of “The Controversy,” matters remain precisely as they were. It is now nearly twelve months since, in the columns of the *Morning Advertiser*, I convicted “The Rivulet” of deadly theological error, and proved that there was not, from first to last, a single hymn, or even a verse of a hymn, which distinctly expressed any one of the great truths which constitute the life and soul of the Evangelic system. It is a remarkable and significant fact that, not only have none of the “Fifteen” been able to show that, in this position, I was wrong, but they have not even made any attempt to do so. They have diverged from the main points at issue, and in the absence of even the appearance of argument, have resorted to personalities. I repeat here, with all confidence—that no one will be able to gainsay my averment, that though I may, on particular points, have said things which the Protesters may deem severe, simply because they are just, I have not, in a single instance, had recourse to weapons of an unsanctified kind. Where the interests of truth seemed to me to imperiously require it, I have not hesitated

36

to obey the apostolical injunction, and to "reprove them sharply;" but beyond the faithful discharge of this duty, I have not consciously gone. I have from first to last scrupulously sought to abstain from personalities. If any one can convince me that I have, in a single instance, said anything which could admit of a construction being put upon it which could give it even the semblance of a personality, I should at once most readily cause it to be expunged. It is quite possible to be strong and emphatic in the employment of language, in dealing with an opponent, without degenerating into anything personal; and I have anxiously endeavoured not to transgress the laws of legitimate discussion. Mr. Binney, however, has chosen to adopt a personal style of warfare with me, partly by his own writings, and partly through his friend the "LOOKER ON," and others. Had I thought proper to resort to that mode of waging war, I should have had no lack of materials for doing it with success. But what else could Mr. Binney and his Co-Protesters do than have recourse to discreditable personalities? Like the unfortunate client, they had no case, and, therefore, all that could be done by them was to abuse Dr. Campbell and myself, just as counsel was instructed by the caseless client to abuse the attorney on the other side. And, to do them justice, they have abused us well. From the "Protest" downwards nothing but abuse has appeared from the pens any of the "immortal" Fifteen,—for immortal they have assuredly made themselves, just as the man of old immortalised himself by setting fire to the temple. There are various kinds of immortality and various ways of winning it. The Fifteen have hit on *one* way of gaining immortality. They will, one and all—even the obscurest among them—live in the "Protest" long, very long, after everything else they have ever said and done has been buried in the grave of utter oblivion.

In connection with the character of the Theology, or, rather, the Neology, which the Protesters, by their vehement commendation of the "Rivulet," have been doing all they can to extend far and wide—even "to earth's remotest bounds," should their voice reach so far—it is a very remarkable circumstance that, down to this very day, the 17th of January, 1857, on which day I am now writing, Mr. Lynch has never ventured to say for his own religious creed, what the Fifteen have so chivalrously said on his behalf. *He* has not said that he holds evangelical opinions—though *they* so energetically and in chorus say it for him. No one, as far as I know, has heard from his lips—no one has seen from his pen—an assurance that he believes, in the same sense as other evangelical Christians do, in the Trinity—in the perfect equality of the Son with the Father—in the proper Personality of the Holy Spirit—in the necessity and efficacy of the atonement, by Christ's death as our substitute—in justification by faith alone—in regeneration and sanctification by the Divine Spirit—and in

37

the intercession of Jesus. If he heartily, and in the ordinary sense in which they are received by all evangelical denominations, believes in and inculcates these doctrines, why does he not say so plainly and at once? Surely he must know his own religious belief better than others; and, therefore, ought to be the best authority on the subject; but all this time he is silent. The Fifteen speak for him. They vouch, nay, vociferate, for the perfect orthodoxy of his creed. But *he* himself makes no sign. *He* says nothing. In that respect he certainly has chosen a most appropriate cognomen. He is "*Silent Long*," and will doubtless continue till the end of the chapter to be "*Long Silent*."

But why waste a single word in reference to the theological character of "The Rivulet," whose religious principles the Fifteen have made their own? The necessity for argument has ceased to exist for some time past. The Unitarians as a body have, through their accredited organ, the *Inquirer*, solemnly and explicitly declared that there is not *one* line in that volume which they could not sing; and the only fault they find with the theology of the work is that it is *not spiritual enough for them!* This is a great fact. It is one which is not to be got over. It scatters to the winds all that the Fifteen, the *Patriot*, the *Christian Times*, the *Freeman*, and other journals professing to be evangelical, have said in favour of the evangelical character of the book. Mr. Spurgeon goes still further in his condemnation of the theology of "The Rivulet." In his own unrivalled and racy way, he represents it as fit only for the worship of absolute heathens, who never saw a Bible, and never heard of the name of Christ. Having previously remarked that, except by Mr. Lynch himself, there is scarcely an individual to be found who would use these hymns in public assembly, Mr. Spurgeon proceeds to characterise their theology as as suited only for the Ojibbeway Indians. "If," says he "I should ever be on amicable terms with the Ojibbeways, I might suggest several verses from Mr. Lynch as a portion of a liturgy to be used on the next occasion when he bows before the Great Spirit of the West Wind, for there are some most appropriate sonnets for the worship of the God of nature, which the unlightened savage would understand quite as well as the believer in revelation, and might perhaps receive rather more readily. Hark I Oh ye Delawares, Mohawks, Choctaws, Shoshonies, Blackfeet, Pawnees, and Dacotahs, here is your primitive faith most sweetly rehearsed—not in your own wild notes, but in the white man's language:—

"My God in nature I confess  
A beauty fraught with holiness;  
Love written plainly I descry  
My life's commandment in the sky;  
Oh, still to me the days endear,  
When lengthening life leads on the year."

38

One of the leading religious journals having quoted Mr. Spurgeon's opinion, that the theology of "The Rivulet" was fit only for the wild Indians, who worship the Great Spirit in the West Wind, Mr. Lynch, in the *Christian Spectator* of November, in allusion to the circumstance, breaks out into this burst of "fresh and earnest piety," and this ebullition of "an experience eminently *Christian*." "Poor Ojibbeways, perhaps there is a *lower hell than even theirs—that of those who have spoken falsely* in the name of the Lord." Instead of this being, as the Fifteen would call it, a bubbling up from the "spring of fresh and earnest piety, which greatly delights them," and "the utterance of an experience *eminently Christian*," I am sure my readers will concur with me in the opinion that it rather resembles a fearful imprecation,—one which it makes us shudder to read as coming from a minister of the Gospel.

I have referred to the damage which the leading men among the Fifteen have done, and are doing to their ministerial character by the unhappy course they persist in pursuing with regard to "The Controversy." They will learn yet more of that in their sad experience, as months and years roll on. Mr. Binney knows that a pamphlet was lately published accusing him of unsoundness on various points; and in March last, I myself heard him charged by one of the most respectable ministers of the Unitarian body, with denying the doctrine of the substitution of Christ; and holding in substance, if not expressing in words, the same views as the Unitarians do with regard to a vicarious atonement. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not charging him with the opinions to which I refer, but the charge was preferred against him, in my hearing, and in the hearing of about 300 persons, in a lecture delivered in the Homs Tavern, by the Rev. Mr. James, successor of the late Rev. Dr. Lant Carpenter, of Bristol. And the Rev. Gentleman quoted largely from one of Mr. Binney's printed sermons, in substantiation of the charge. Others of the Protesters, though belonging to a Calvinistic denomination, are well-known to be Arminians. Indeed, in private, they make no secret that they are so. Now, in the very nature of things, their adoption, indorsement, and recommendation of the "Rivulet" theology, must extend and deepen the distrust which is felt with respect to the soundness of their own creed, as regards some of their number.

I have already made a distinct allusion to the unmistakable proof which the few successful authors are daily receiving of the injury they are doing themselves, by the alarming falling off which has already taken place in the sale of their books. So great, indeed, has been this falling off, that some of their number speak of themselves as being living martyrs to their principles; that is to say, to their strong and stedfast adherence to the theology of Mr. Lynch. Does not that fact teach them—it certainly, at least, ought to do so—that however much forbearance, or even flattery,

39

they may *meet* with in their own respective circles, the great hulk of the religious community have a holy abhorrence of the cold, cheerless, heartless system of theology which Mr. Lynch has pronounced, and which they, as his Fifteen faithful followers, have done, and are doing their best, to spread through the length and breadth of Christendom? Nor are these the only facts which speak trumpet-tongued as to the aversion which the laity feel towards the German Neology of the "Rivulet,"—for the soundness and excellence of which the Protesters have chivalrously become sponsors. The condition of their organs in the press, contrasted with that of the journals which take the same side as myself, affords further confirmation, of the most conclusive kind, of the same fact. One of these journals—the *Nonconformist*—was appealing the other day, through one of those convenient persons, called correspondents, to the compassion of the public, by asking every subscriber to try and get some other subscriber; and that appeal was followed by an editorial article in which the flag of distress was fully unfurled; while sounds of dissatisfaction with the commercial state of matters, were uttered in a manner too loud not to be heard, and too distinct not to be understood.

As I mentioned, in my first pamphlet, it is painful to think that the *Nonconformist*, which was founded seventeen years ago, with funds furnished by persons holding evangelical principles, and loving evangelical truth, should now systematically seek to sap the very foundation of that faith which it was established to uphold and extend. Little dreaming of its deplorable departure from the principles which it professed in the first few years of its existence, but believing it would continue as it had commenced, an advocate of those doctrines which constitute the evangelical creed, some of those who advanced money for the purpose of setting it on foot, made over their shares, without any consideration, to the Editor. One of my own intimate and esteemed friends, gathered to his fathers some years since, was among the number who thus generously and unsuspectingly acted. So that, in the history of this weekly organ of a Christless creed, or rather, of a system, if system it can be called, which knows no creed at all, we have the counterpart of those purposes to which the liberality of some of the most excellent men in the seventeenth century, who built and endowed chapels for the preaching of evangelical truth,—were turned, when those places of worship, in the lapse of time, fell into the hands of Socinian ministers.

Certain other journals which have committed themselves to the Rationalism of "The Rivulet," bear upon their very visage, not only "the pale cast of thought," but the paleness and the sickly hue which indicate the rapid progress of decay, and the not distant approach of death. Witness, on the other hand, the almost unparalleled favour with which Dr. Campbell's newspaper, the *British Standard*, has been received by the religious public. Though but

40

the merest infant as to days, it is a perfect pant in size and strength, It already bears about it all the qualities, all the powers, all the energies of the most mature and robust manhood. Remember, also, as before remarked, that the various publications which appeared on the "Rivulet's" side of "The Controversy," have fallen still-born from the press, and but for the sums collected by mendicant appeals to the Geological portion of the public, for funds, must have "blushed unseen" in the dark and "desert air" of the printing warehouses in which they groped their way into existence. And even when they are gratuitously scattered about, as plentifully as blackberries, it is notorious to all that they are not read,—just as though one man may, as the proverb tells us, take a horse to the water, four-and-twenty men cannot make him drink. There is no necessary connection between *giving* a man a pro-"Rivulet" pamphlet, and getting him to *read* it. He cannot help your sending it to him by post, and placing it in his hands, or laying it down on the table before his eyes; but his reading it is quite another affair. The truth is, that publications which are *given* away are never *read*. Those which are not deemed worth purchasing, are not deemed worth perusing. Look, on the other hand, to the sale and success of the pamphlets on the Evangelical side of "The Controversy." No collections have been made for them—no begging appeals addressed to the public—no intimations given that the "smallest donation," or the largest either, or any donation whatever, would be "thankfully received." They have been brought out at the risk—of which, however, it was felt from the first there would be none—of the publisher alone. And as to their sale, suffice it to say, that *all* of them have gone through several editions, while the first of the series, "The Controversy," from my own pen, is now in its *Tenth Edition*, and evidently is not destined to make a lengthened stay there.

With regard to the spirit and style generally of the "Review of the Rivulet Controversy" by Mr. Lynch, in the *Christian Spectator*, I say advisedly that, for ferocity, ribaldry, and profanity, there is nothing in the annals of religion which can at all compare with it. I dare not, out of regard to the feelings of my readers, quote the most striking passages in proof of this; but I may give a few sentences as indicative of the animus and malevolence under the influence of which every sentence was penned. The editor of one religious journal is called a "goose," and another an "owl." A third gentleman, who has rendered signal services to the cause of evangelical truth, in every variety of form, is spoken of in these terms:—"He came forward softly at the first, much as if Satan should present himself in a dress coat; or, at least, *with his tail hid in the pocket*. In the prosecution of his truth-seeking and peace-making enterprise, he put his hat over *his horns*, but, though the brim was broad, the urn was high. Off went the hat, and the *well-known horns* were revealed." Of an eminent veteran in the cause of Christ, Mr. Lynch says—and I am sure a feeling of horror will



41

creep over the minds of my leaders, as the words come in contact with their vision—"He is hoary-headed in *iniquity*."

Of those generally who have exposed and denounced his pestilential heresies, he speaks in this wise:—"Their fussy 'service' to Theology, is like that of undertakers' men, who in dreary, faded black, attend professionally 'around a corpse.'"

Of course *I* do not escape the ribaldry and the revengeful expressions with which this article of Mr. Lynch's is so brimful. On the contrary, I come in for at least twenty pages of his best abuse. In one place he speaks of me in these calm and dignified terms:—

"This second article, or—to speak 'poetically'— the quality of this new 'tap,' was no whit inferior to the first, and Mr. Grant concluded by citing or inviting me to his court, asking whether I was prepared to assert this and that. So, having been 'condemned already,' I was to go and plead my cause, and that before a court that had no authority. The *impudence* of summoning to the 'bar' a Christian minister, and a man pretty widely known for works accessible enough for those who desire to ascertain his opinions, was a little remarkable. I suppose I might have had a cider barrel to stand on, and have brought my gown with me—I do not happen to wear one, however—in which to declaim."

Look at another gem of this protégé of Messrs. Binney, Newman Hall, and the rest of the Fifteen Protesters:—

"Does Mr. Grant think man's spirit is as dead as a brickbat, or, at best, that it should be a bagpipe, with one unvarying theological drone at bottom, and one unex-bilarating, controversial screech atop? Thank God, my spirit is something more than a wind-bag, with its pipe and drone; something more, too, than a barrel organ, which grinds one set of tunes till our teeth grind at the horrid discord into which they fall."

See smother bubbling up from the "spring of fresh and earnest piety," which "greatly" delights the Fifteen:—

"Like a character mentioned in the Scriptures, Mr. Grant 'raged, and was confident.' His articles made more noise in Fleet-street than all the waggons and omnibusses that nunble there. Each Press in the *Morning Advertiser* establishment became a Battery, and the 'devils,' grimy with theologic gunpowder, filled London with the echo of their explosions. The smoke, like fogs from Fleet Ditch, rolled out of town far into the country. Mr. Grant took everybody for slain whom he saw through the smoke of his own artillery i and imagining his victories, proceeded to celebrate them at once with huzzas truly astounding."

Hear yet again the man in whom the Fifteen have discovered so rare an example of "eminent Christian experience:"—

"I fear the Editor of the *Advertiser* does *more to jockey the saints* than he does to sanctify the jockeys. His paper may be divided into two departments—the 'ring' evangelical and the 'ring' carnal. Of course, in the Jerusalem and Newmarket nuptials these 'rings' are exchanged in mutual pledging. I prefer the 'ring' carnal. And of two bad things, I think the *honest* fist of the 'ring' carnal better than the 'leaded' fist of the 'ring' evangelical."

I ask, was language like this ever before known to come from the lips or the pen of one bearing the Christian name, much less

42

sustaining the character of a minister of the Gospel? Was there ever such profanity? Had Mr. Lynch been a professed pugilist, or the keeper of a betting-house, he could not have displayed a more thorough acquaintance with the phraseology of the "ring" and the "turf."

Who that reads the few extracts that I have given, can withhold his assent from the applicability to the prose writings of "Silent Long," of what the *Athenæum* so justly says of his "Song's Controversial," namely, as formerly quoted,—that "his bitter bad doggrel is made *repulsive* by the *profane* familiarity with which he jingles together scurrilities, impertinences, and imbecilities, with things and names that are sacred." For all this the Fifteen are morally responsible. They have made his style and spirit, as well as his theology their own. They have not only indorsed his divinity and emphatically vouched in public for its "soundness," but they have not, in one single instance, repudiated the tone and temper, the levity and the profanity, with which he writes. Nay, more, some of them have incurred a yet graver responsibility than this. According to a statement in the *British Banner* of four weeks ago, and to which no contradiction has yet been given, a meeting took place at Mr. Newman Hall's house, attended by a number of the fifteen, at which the "Song's Controversial" were read before they were published, and were received with peals of laughter at their wit, and with bursts of applause at their general merits. "That work"—the "Songs Controversial,"—says the writer in the *British Banner*, had Mr. Newman Hall and a goodly number of the 'Fifteen' for its sponsors." But I give the very words—They are very sad:—

"At an elegant *déjeuné*, given by Mr. Hall at his residence, to glorify Mr. Lynch, and to regale his guests with readings from the forthcoming 'bitter, bad doggrel,' the imprimatur of such of the 'Fifteen' as were present—among whom Mr. Godwin was especially prominent—was accorded to 'Songs Controversial.' The readings afforded infinite delight to such of the 'Fifteen' as had the good fortune to be present; the 'Songs' were applauded to the echo, and the idea of publication was hailed and approved by all, without exception. Mr. Newman Hall, and his guests of the 'Fifteen,' instead of attempting to mitigate the 'profane frivolity,' 'bitter, bad doggrel,' and the offensive 'scurrilities' of those miserable 'Songs,' stood round, patting their author on the back, and urging him to perpetrate the disgrace of publishing.

One word before I conclude regarding the "Fifteen." Down to the present time, only two of their number—Mr. Newman Hall and Mr. Edward White—have responded to the call which I addressed to them, time after time; first in the *Morning Advertiser*, and afterwards in my pamphlet, to deny the charge which was so generally preferred against them, of having in the strongest language condemned articles which they never read, with this grave aggravation of their conduct,—that they solemnly and explicitly affirmed they *had* read the articles in question. Let me entreat especial attention to this fact. Two only, I repeat, out of the Fifteen have denied the charge. Two only have responded to the

43

call, and given us their assurance that they had read the articles. Now I put it to any intelligent person, whether we are not driven to the adoption of the distressing alternative, however reluctant we may be to adopt it—that if the remaining thirteen had been in a position to make the same denial and give the same assurance as Mr. Newman Hall and Mr. E. White, they would also have done so. They would—at least so it might be supposed—have been but too glad to avail themselves of the offer which I had so readily and so repeatedly made to them. It is such a painful fact as that, and not what those who take the opposite side of the Controversy say of them, that does the grievous damage to their characters, of which some of them complain,—following as it did so hard on the heels of the Protest. But as if that had not done enough to injure their reputation and diminish their ministerial usefulness, they must needs make matters materially worse by the course they have subsequently pursued. Had they, after the melancholy mistake which they had committed—confessed to have been a mistake, by some of themselves—come forward, and by owning it, and expressing their sincere sorrow for it, proved to the world that they could in their own persons practice the doctrine which they preach relative to the duty of men's confessing their faults—I for one would most heartily have rejoiced at the circumstance, and helped to restore them to their former position in the religious world. But, instead of this, they have in their own persons disregarded their own injunctions when pressing on their hearers that when taken in a fault they ought to own it. They still persist in the attempt to brave public opinion. Vain attempt! Delusive hope! How men of intelligence and reflection, could ever have imagined that while doggedly refusing to retrace what they feel to have been a false step, they could regain their lost position, is to me, putting religion wholly out of the question, and regarding the matter purely as one of policy, utterly incomprehensible.

So far from there being any indications of a disposition to seek to undo, as far as may be, by retracing their steps, the mischief they have done, they seem determined, as if resolutely bent on making matters, already so bad, as much worse as it is possible for a perverted ingenuity to do. Seven of their number—Messrs. White, Harrison, Newman Hall, Spence, Allon, Vaughan, and Fleming—have just brought out a joint-stock production in which they, one and all, express their adherence to the Protest, and seek to vindicate the course they have adopted from the disastrous hour they put their names to the document until the present moment.

Mr. Lynch is still—so at least they say—the same exalted person he ever was; a man of “sound” theological views, in whom there is to be found “a spring of fresh and earnest piety which greatly delights them,” and of “eminent Christian experience.” And all this, be it remembered, after the publication of his “Rivulet” Review in the *Christian Spectator*—of his *Ethics of Quotation*—and

44

his *Songs Controversial*. They have one and ail incurred a responsibility, at the thought of which most Christian men tremble, in not having uttered one word in the way of condemnation of, or dissent from, the ribaldries, and profanities, language, at times bordering on blasphemy, with which Mr. Lynch's attempted defences of his "Rivulet" are instinct. Those of them, therefore, who have since written on the subject—and among these are to be found Mr. Binney, Mr. Newman Hall, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Spence, and Mr. Allon—are responsible for, as they tacitly acquiesce in, all the "scurrilities, profanities, and ribaldries," to use the words of the *Athenaeum*, which he has employed. They have, in other words, made his language their own on the well-known principle, that silence gives consent.

Acting in this manner, the last error of the Fifteen is, in some respects, worse than the first. They might have urged the plea of rashness, inconsiderateness, or something else in extenuation of their having signed the "Protest but that plea cannot avail them here. Ten months have elapsed since the unhappy day when they put their signatures to that disastrous document. That is a long time; it afforded them ample space for repentance. They have *not* repented,—at least they have not publicly confessed their fault, and thereby sought to do all in their power to repair the mischief which they had done. So far from this, they now aggravate the original error by a constructive identification of themselves with, and indorsation of, the ribald and revolting language which "Silent Long" has since employed in relation to "The Controversy." The day will come when they will deeply deplore the line of conduct which they have thought proper to pursue. They may try to keep each other in countenance now, but they will not be able to do so always. Conscience will have its perfect work. It will make itself heard; and it will speak in tones all the louder, and in terms all the more terribly faithful, because its voice has been hushed so long, and its dictates utterly disregarded. Even now they must have their qualms of conscience. They must feel that they are daily sinking deeper and deeper in the estimation of the Christian community. They have none to sympathise with them, or to share in their sentiments, but those who are the enemies of the cross of Christ. The approval of such persons must gall them more deeply, were that possible, than the condemnation of all who hold and love the truth as it is in Jesus.

---

---

## POSTSCRIPT.

JUST as the closing pages of this pamphlet were about to be put to press, information reached me of what had taken place at the meeting of the Congregational Union. I look on this circumstance as providential; for the manner in which Mr. Binney was received by the students in the gallery, belonging to New College, furnishes the most conclusive evidence which I could have wished, of the truthfulness of those charges which I had, in my first pamphlet, preferred against so many of the students in our Nonconformist Colleges. These charges were regarded by many as very greatly exaggerated. Since then, the state of things which has been disastrous at the Lancashire Independent College, under the Presidency of Dr. Davidson, who is convicted of denying the inspiration of the Scriptures, and of other serious heresies,—has fully justified, and more than justified, all I said, so far as that College is concerned. And now we have the students of New College, St. John's Wood, indicating in a way not to be mistaken, their Negative principles and predilections. "The Rev. Thomas Binney," says the report in the *Patriot* of Wednesday—a paper, be it remembered, which has committed itself to the theology of Mr. Lynch by its eminently eulogistic notice of his "Rivulet,"—"when he rose to speak [on the subject of The Controversy], was received with great shouts of applause, especially by the students in the gallery, which were repeated again and again." The fact speaks volumes. It is decisive of the question, as regards the religious views of the students at New College. Mr. Binney has been, latterly, the great champion of Mr. Lynch and of his "Rivulet," chivalrously vouching, under his own signature in the *Nonconformist*, in addition to what he had said in the "Protest," both for the personal piety and the soundness of the theology of the author of *Songs Controversial*,—and, the moment he gets up to assail Dr. Campbell, and those, including myself, who have taken the same view of the matter, he is received with "great shouts of applause, which were repeated again and again, by the students in the gallery." For those who had identified themselves with the opposite side of the question, these "advanced" youths had no "shouts of applause," at all, either "great" or small. I have no more to say on the subject. That is my case; and it is as complete as I could wish it to be.

I will only mention, in connection with the juvenile German Rationalists who are to be found within the walls of New College, that, some time ago, I was informed from a source on which I could rely, that a large number entertained heterodox views on the Sabbath question,—even going so far as to deny the Divine

46

obligation to keep that day sacred. Before giving publicity to what I had heard regarding a debate and division on this subject, I thought it right to communicate with the late Dr. Harris, President of the College, with whom I had for years been on friendly terms. A mutual friend undertook the task. Dr. Harris expressed his sense of the consideration I had shown in communicating with him on the subject before bringing the matter before the public; and said, that as he understood the thing—for he, of course, was not present at the discussion, as to whether the Christian Sabbath was, or was not, an institution of Divine obligation,—the conclusion come to by all, except one young man, was, not that Christians are not under a Divine obligation to keep the Sabbath, but that the fourth commandment does not constitute any such Divine obligation. Sven this—though I have reason to believe the thing was much worse—was certainly going far on the road to Rationalism. The very fact indeed of such a question as the sacredness of the Sabbath being made the subject of a debate and a division, in a college devoted to the training up of young men for the Christian Ministry, is “demonstration strong” of the deplorable condition of matters among the students of divinity in that institution. The solitary young man who was thus “faithful among the faithless found,” deserves all credit for the stand which he made on behalf of the Christian Sabbath. It is difficult to say whether we ought most to admire his creed or his courage. But what shall be said of the others who were present? These young men will all, in a few years, be ministers in the Congregational denomination. Sad prospect for Independency! But sadder still for those who shall hereafter be committed to their pastoral care. The case of such individuals will be pitiable indeed. In the meantime, though inquiries must be instituted into the condition of matters in New College, it is still to bear the name of an institution for educating young men in evangelical principles. And yet what we witness within its walls ought not to excite surprise when we know that one of its professors has publicly sanctioned the “Protest”—that another sits at the feet of Mr. Lynch—and that a third applauded in manuscript, “Songs Controversial,” and urged their immediate publication.

THE END.

---

GOSPEL REMINISCENCES IN THE WEST INDIES.

Price Threepence (Published at 6d.) each, Post-free, uniform with the "Labours of JOHN MEYER," Second Edition,

OLD NARGUOIS, THE NEGRO DRIVER.

ALSO,

THE CONDEMNED NEGRO; OR, MAN'S VICTIM GOD'S CHOSEN.

BY LEONARD STRONG.

"The love of God to the sinner, the gospel to the poor, the call from darkness here to light in God, from hopelessness here to the hope of glory there, and all so free, so fresh from die heart of the everlasting God of bond and free, signed and sealed in the gift and blood of His dear Son, was a message, or as they would say, 'A story good for poor Slave.'"

Price Sixpence, Post-free (Published at 1s.)

BY THE SAME AUTHOR, AND UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

A BRIEF AND SIMPLE RECORD

OF THE LORD'S GRACIOUS WORK AMONG THE INDIANS OF BRITISH  
GUIANA,

During four years and a half, by His servant, John Meyer.

"I desire, in the following pages, by the help of God, to set forth a brief statement of His own work, by His weak but faithful servant, JOHN MEYER, during a period of less than five years, among the Indians of British Guiana."—*Preface.*

18mo., Enamelled Cover, price Threepence, Post-free (Published at 6d.). Third Edition,

THE TAUGHT OF THE FATHER;

OR, THE GRACE OF GOD, IN ITS ELEVATING AND ENLIGHTENING  
POWER.

Illustrated in the Conversion of J. R., lost in a Snow Storm at the Cape of  
Good Hope, October, 1847.

BY MAJOR M. J. ROWLANDSON,

Author of "FRAGMENTS AND CRUMBS."

"In a day when men, rejecting the power and teaching of God the Holy Ghost, are looking to human talent, or energy, or authority, it may be of service to the Church of God to bring forward one more case, where one of naturally defective understanding found peace and joy in believing, being made a subject of that Divine teaching, which, whilst it enlightened, elevated, and renewed, also transformed his soul into the image of his Saviour God; whom, not having seen, he loved, and in whom he now sweetly sleeps till the day of his re-appearing."—*Preface.*

AN ILLUSTRATED GIFT BOOK FOR YOUTH.

Just published, for the counsel and encouragement of youth and young people generally.

Prettily illustrated. Price 2s. 6d., post free, entitled

"TRY!"

BY "OLD JONATHAN."

Tenth Edition, price Sixpence, post-free,

"WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?"

OR, BOTH SIDES OF

THE "RIVULET" CONTROVERSY:

With a Fourth Appendix for Mr. Binney's Letter to the Congregational Union.

BY THE

REV. BREWIN GRANT, B.A.

LONDON:

W. H. COLLINGRIDGE, CITY PRESS, 1, LONG LANE, E. C.

---

Just Published, price Twopence,  
**ANOTHER TRACT FOR THE TIMES!**  
**CUI BONO?**

Or, a Glance at some of the Beneficial  
Results of the "Rivulet Controversy;"  
and a Word to the Churches on the Course  
to be pursued at this crisis.

By VOLUNTARY.

London:—TALLANT and ALLEN, 21, Paternoster Bow.

[ALL POST-FREE.]

"A most important book for Preachers and Teachers."

Price 12s. 6d., royal 8vo., cloth; calf, 5s. extra, unabridged, 1032 pp., new Long Primer type,  
**KEACH'S (B.) Key to Open Scripture Types and  
Metaphors. In Four Books. To which are prefixed, Arguments to prove the Divine  
Authority of the Holy Bible; together with Types of the Old Testament**

\*\*\* This invaluable work for Ministers and Bible Students had become so scarce, that a copy  
could seldom be bought under £3.

"Is published at a very low price."—E. G. BARNSTABLE.

"A perfect miracle in modern theological publishing."—*Christian Cabinet*.

"A valuable legacy to those who read and search the Scriptures."—*Diadem*.

"It furnishes materials for thousands of sermons."—*A Preacher of long standing*.

"A book without which no Christian Minister's Library can be complete, and which may  
be very useful to every attentive reader and lover of the word of God."—C. DE COETLOGON.  
"I know not of any work that has treated the subject to such an ample extent."—GIBBONS.  
"A work of great labour and learning; abounds with the most interesting truths."—  
BENJAMIN FRANCIS.

"Of great utility to the theological student."—WILSON.

"The pleasure I have anticipated the last three months, in the perusal of the work, has  
been fully realised; and every time my attention is drawn to it, only enhances its value. I  
think it needs only to be known to be generally appreciated by the Clergy. To say the least  
of it, it is an extraordinarily cheap book."—Rev. T. R. VALPY, *Hingham*.

Price 2s., cloth, calf grained, 4s. 6d., uniform in size with "Hawker's Portions,"

**Ambrose Serle's Church of God: Essays upon  
some descriptive Names and Titles given in the Scriptures, by God the Holy  
Ghost, to the General Assembly of all True Believers in God the Son, or the God-  
man Jesus Christ, and denoting the Nature and Means of their Salvation, through  
the Everlasting Covenant made, by God the Father, with those Divine Persons in  
the One Jehovah. To which is added, CHRISTIAN HUSBANDRY; or, a  
Companion of the Christian in his Field or Garden.**

"A truly precious wedge of Ophir's gold."—*Gleaner*.

"Pull of grace and truth."—*Baptist Messenger*.

"Full of the marrow of the gospel."—*Primitive Church Magazine*.

"In purchasing, our readers will help forward a philanthropic work."—*Bucks Chronicle*.

"It must recommend itself to every spiritual reader by its own sweet savoury, spirit, and  
the mellow gospel tone of its voice."—*Royal Diadem*.

"The Church of God is here contemplated under forty different Scriptural characters or  
descriptions, and the various illustrations are generally interesting, instructive, and profit-  
able."—*Herald*.

"A beautiful description of the Church of God from the first moment of her generation,  
till safely housed in glory. \* \* \* Part II., under the title of CHRISTIAN HUSBANDRY, is a  
comparison of the various seasons of the year with Christian experience." *Zion's Trumpet*.

WILLIAM HILL COLLINGRIDGE, "CITY PRESS," 1, LONG LANE.