

www.CreationismOnline.com

A

DISCUSSION

AMONG UPWARDS OF 250 THEOLOGICAL INQUIRERS,

Clergymen, Dissenting Ministers, and Laymen;

ON THE

UNITY, DUALITY, AND TRINITY,

OF THE

G O D H E A D :

WITH DIGRESSIONS ON THE

CREATION, FALL, INCARNATION, ATONEMENT, RESURRECTION,
INFALLIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES,
INSPIRATION, MIRACLES, FUTURE PUNISHMENTS,
REVISION OF THE BIBLE, ETC.



The Press corrected by RANLEY, the Reporter of the Discussion.

Time erases the Fictions of unfounded Opinions; but, confirms the Judgements which are in accordance with Truth.

CICERO.

Time is the nurse and breeder of all Good.

SHAKESPEARE.

Let Truth and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?

MILTON.

Differences of Opinion, when accompanied with mutual charity, which Christianity forbids to violate, are, for the most part, innocent, and for some purposes useful—they promote inquiry, discussion, and knowledge.

Archdeacon PALRY.

Whoever is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free Discussion, seems to me to be more in love with his own Opinions than with Truth.

WATSON, *Bishop of Llandaff*.

He who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving his own Sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving Himself better than all.

COLERIDGE.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER AND CO. 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1864.

100. w. 70.
141. b. 207.

[Chairman speaking when Reporter entered]

and, as I intimated to your Committee of Management, by letter, I now tell you personally, that much as I disapprove of so-called *Religious Discussions* in general,* I have been induced to take the Chair on this occasion, from a persuasion—or rather, *in the hope*, that the Opponents meet each other to elicit Truth, *not* to obtain Victory; [Hear, hear!] and as You yourselves have arranged preliminaries, my duties of Office are very simple: I have not anything further to do with the “Regulations” you have mutually agreed upon, and which I have just read over in your hearing, than to observe them myself, and to guard you against departing from them; and should the Discussion in anywise tend to settle the minds of any individuals composing this goodly assemblage, on the long-vexed question, I shall not regret the inconvenience I have experienced in being present at this Meeting. [Cheers.]

You, on my right hand, consider yourselves warranted, by Scripture, in maintaining the doctrine of the TRINITY—that “the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet, they are not *three* Gods, but *one* God—the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity”: while You, on my left, maintain, by Scripture, the UNITY OF THE GODHEAD—“One God and Father of all, He that is over all, and through all, and in us all”; and that “there is none other God but *One*—the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ”.

With earnest and honest-minded men, the doctrine of the Trinity, is, after due investigation, either sedulously upheld, or, unequivocally disowned—according to men’s different views of Scripture—but, persons in general, have never given it so much as an hour’s consideration; having clothed their minds, as they clothe their bodies—after the fashion in vogue: yet, though views and opinions may vary, and even run counter to each other, still, both parties may have credit in each other’s integrity, as well as in the

* “Differences of Opinion, when accompanied with mutual charity (which Christianity forbids to violate) are, for the most part, innocent, and for some purposes useful—they promote inquiry, discussion, and knowledge. *Archdeacon PALEY.*”

integrity of the Evangelists and the Apostles ; therefore, in the language of good old Herbert—

*Be calm in Arguing ; for, fierceness makes
Error a fault, and Truth discourtesy.
Why should I feel another man's mistakes
More than his sicknesses, or poverty ?
In love I should—but, anger is not love,
Nor wisdom neither—therefore, gently move*".

Thousands, and hundreds of thousands, of professed Christians, are *what they are* from sheer accident—mere Copies of those by whom they have, accidentally, been surrounded ; and might have belonged to any other denomination, just as easily and as thoughtlessly, as the sect to which they are now allied : for, whether their parents, nurses, and associates, had happened to be Romanists or Protestants, Calvinists or Arminians, Baptists or Quakers or Israelites, they would have been *professedly* the like—mere fractions of a mass, constituting any religious body whatever, wholly irrespective of its name or tenets ; believing anything, adopting anything, subscribing anything, swearing anything—emphatically, ANYTHINGARIANS ! for (alas) the Units on this nether world, are as rare as Comets in the heavens. [Hear, hear !] There are also *professed* Sceptics, and Infidels, and Atheists, who doubt, assert, and deny, *without* investigation.* But, trust me, all such mere professional dogmatists and iconoclasts, all such believers and unbelievers, rank no higher in the estimation of thinking minds, than simple ANYTHINGARIANS ; for, they know not *what* they believe, or disbelieve ; having, at best, a zeal without knowledge. [Hear, hear !] Rely upon it,

" TRUTH, whether in or out of fashion, is *the measure* of knowledge, and the business of the understanding ! Whatsoever is besides that, [Truth] however authorized by consent, or recommended by rarity, is nothing but Ignorance, or, something worse. LOCKE.

I hope the Speakers in this Discussion, may prove themselves *men*, not mimics ; *units*, not fractions ; and that we shall be presented with a variety of arguments on both sides, as brilliant and as cutting as diamonds. [Hear, hear !]

According to Lord Kames—Differences of opinion, make the Cement of society" ; and I heartily wish, that the Disputants about to encounter, may raise themselves in the appreciation and esteem of their Opponents, by a rich display of polemical skill, courteous address, and christian charity ; and that no one may have cause to be ashamed of Himself. [Hear, hear !]

You differ in Opinion ; and you have a *right* to differ ; for, as a staunch advocate of religious freedom has observed—

Doctrinal questions seem unsusceptible of general agreement, not from the abundance, but, from the want of premisses. The arguments by which different Sects defend their tenets, consist mainly of *texts of scripture*, which must be susceptible of various interpretations, since they actually receive various interpretations. The Trinitarians think, that *the eternal co-existence* of God the Father and God the Son is the scriptural doctrine. The Arians think, the Begetter must have existed *before* the Begotten. The Latin church believes, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from *the Father AND the Son*. The Greek church believes, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *ONLY from the Father*. Each of these opinions has been supported by hundreds

* In the *National Reformer* of 7th June, 1862, we have Mr. Holyoake's authority for stating, that He had not met with Ten men who could give a *sensible reason* for their belief in Atheism. *Editor.*

of learned, conscientious, and diligent inquirers. Each has been adopted by millions of enthusiastic votaries; each has been propagated by violence, and resisted by endurance; each has had its doctors, its persecutors, and its martyrs. *Edinburgh Review*.

Thanks to the progress of Civilisation, no one in this assemblage runs any risk of *martyrdom* on account of his Opinions, be they what they may; and I should rejoice exceedingly, had we already so far receded from Barbarism, that I could add, with equal truth—no Englishman runs any risk of *persecution* for the promulgation of his Opinions.* [Hear, hear!] Let us, however, my friends, be thankful, that, as a people, we are in a state of social, political, scientific, moral, and religious Progress—of which this Meeting affords proof positive; for, all you quiet, orderly, respectable gentlemen on my left, would, but a couple of centuries back, have been subject to the penalty of DEATH,† had you dared to give utterance to your conscientious sentiments! Happily, in 1864, we have Platforms, as well as Pulpits, throughout the length and breadth of the land; knowledge is strenuously eradicating ignorance, public opinion is loudly denouncing persecution, while the humane and fraternizing precepts of genuine christianity, are rapidly uniting into one family the hitherto bitterly contending Sectarists, teaching all classes of men that they are *brethren*! [Cheers] The stain of legal *martyrdom* for mere difference of opinion, is for ever blotted out of our Statute-books, and the still-existing crime of *persecution* for the exercise of private judgement, is becoming every day more and more odious in the sight of Britons, who are now learning, that the real Disturbers in a free country, are those who refuse to their fellow-men, that liberty of thinking, and uttering their thoughts, which cannot any longer be repressed! [Cheers.]

I make no apology for pausing in this Opening address, to pay a public tribute of thanks to the present Bishop of London, for the fearless and cheering utterance of his enlightened sentiments, in the very first Charge to his Clergy—sentiments as spirited and liberal, as they are christian and manly! [Long-continued applause] In the presence of so many Ministers of various denominations as are here assembled, I feel myself impelled, by a sense of justice and of duty, to offer this incidental token of respect to bishop Tait, for his intrepid and conciliating expression of the following sentences—

Nothing would be so likely to *spread* scepticism and unbelief among an intelligent Laity, as any crude attempts on the part of the Clergy to treat the difficulties arising from free inquiry, *without thoroughly understanding them*. Dogmatic denunciations—sweeping accusations as to the *corrupt state of heart* from which doubt and unbelief is supposed to spring—unwise and arrogant claims to an *unquestioning* obedience and submission of the understanding, I can conceive nothing more likely to irritate intelligent men, and excite the very evils we desire to allay.

But, the apprehended *dangers of free inquiry*, are not confined to Laymen; and here, perhaps, is the most difficult and delicate part of the whole subject. There is certainly a difficulty, as to the prosecution of *any very free inquiry* by those who begin by thus professing *their belief in FIXED FORMULARIES of doctrine*, and

* "Wherever you see Persecution, there is more than a probability that Truth lies on the *persecuted side*. Bishop LATIMER.

† See the *Act of Death* passed by the Long Parliament, in 1648. See also Act the 8th and 9th of William III. c. 32, "for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness", wherein Unitarians "shall also suffer imprisonment, for the space of three years, without bail or mainprize", etc. *Reporter*.

At the opening of the present century, England had about 200 different offenses entailing Capital punishment. *Editor*.

obtain the very position which gives them influence as Teachers, in virtue of this profession. Still, it would be altogether wrong, to exaggerate this difficulty. *It will never do to lay down, that a Clergyman is bound NOT TO INQUIRE.** [Hear, hear!

The authorities of our Church, under the leading of its best Divines, have ever deemed it wise *not* to spread the influence of unsound Teaching among a generous people, *by any the remotest semblance of Persecution*; and have rather sought ever to overcome the danger of HERESY by the manifestation of superior learning and acuteness, and a truer Christian spirit, than to prop up Truth *by the terrors of the Law.*

Even as the Declaration which the law of the land requires to be made at Ordination, I should be ready myself, *even now*, in spite of temporary alarm as to unsound Opinions, TO RELAX RATHER THAN TIGHTEN THE BOND. [Bursts of applause, especially from the Clergy of the Establishment] I hold, that in guarding the threshold of the Ministry, as elsewhere in dealing with the difficulties of an *inquisitive age*, the generous, confiding policy, is THE BEST AND MOST CHRISTIAN. We must not forget the kindly consideration with which archbishop Howley made allowance for the youthful scruples of Arnold. And certainly, most good men will allow, that the Church of England of this century would have been *maimed*, if Arnold had been scared from its ministry".† [Hear, hear!

For these, and similar sentiments since published, I consider our worthy and courageous Bishop of London, richly entitled to our public Thanks.‡ [Hearty applause from the whole assembly.

Agreeably with your "Regulations", I now, as Chairman, call upon the Unitarians to produce Scripture authority for their REFUDIATION of the doctrine of the TRINITY.

REV. J. ADDISON. Mr. Chairman—Ladies and Gentlemen! In the New covenant, there are 17 passages wherein the Father is styled *one* or *only* God; but, not a single passage in which the Son is so styled. There are 320 passages in which the Father is absolutely, and by way of eminence, called *god*—or, more accurately, *the God* [ὁ Θεός—ho Theos—the God] but, not one passage wherein the Son is so called. There are 105 passages in which the Father is denominated *the God* with peculiarly high titles and epithets; but, the Son is not even once so denominated. There are 19 passages declaring that all *prayer* and *praise* ought to be offered to the Father, and that everything ought to be directed, ultimately, to His honor and glory; but, of the Son no such declaration is ever made. Of the 1300 passages in the New covenant wherein the term *god* occurs, there is not one which necessarily implies the existence of more than *one person* in the Godhead, or, that such *one* is any other than the Father. The passages wherein the Son is declared, either positively or by the clearest implication, to be SUBORDINATE to the Father, *deriving* his being from the Father,

* "Let not the freedom of Inquiry be shackled. If it multiplies contentions amongst the wise and virtuous, it exercises the charity of those who contend. If it shakes for a time the belief that is rested only upon prejudice, it finally settles it on the broader and more solid basis of conviction. *WHITT'S Bampton Lectures.*

† "I am not afraid of those tender and scrupulous consciences, who are ever cautious of professing and believing too much; if they are sincerely in the wrong, I forgive their errors, and respect their integrity. The men I am afraid of, are the men who believe everything, subscribe to everything, and vote for everything. *Bishop SHIPLEY.*

‡ There is also a ring of the right metal at the close of the public letter from the Bishop of St. David's, of 13th April, 1861—

I am not aware of having refused to Others, any licence which I *ever* claimed for myself. And, if it please God, I shall *never* consent to the narrowing, *by a hair's breadth*, that latitude of Opinion which the Church has hitherto conceded to her Ministers".

Bishop Thirlwall, as well as bishop Tait, won golden opinions from the Liberal press, for the generous spirit evinced towards his brother of Natal. *Editor.*

receiving his power from the Father, *acting* according to the Will of the Father, exceed 300. [Hear, hear!] Now, Mr. Chairman, as these manifold passages prove, beyond rational contradiction, that—

Chairman. Order, order! Allow me, Gentlemen, to read over again, one of the “Regulations”; it is this—Mere assertions are not to be received as Proofs, on any disputable point; every argument, every assertion, must be supported, or, instantly supportable, by Scripture”. Mr. Addison says, that the passages he has just enumerated, “prove, beyond rational contradiction”—if Mr. Addison is prepared to furnish the Meeting with *chapter and verse* of the thousands of passages which he asserts are contained in the New testament—or, if he instance but a few of each, we can easily refer to them, test them, and, if accurate, accept them as *proofs*, and give him credit for the remainder; but, according to the “Regulation” I have just read to you, I may not, as Chairman, allow “mere assertions” to usurp the place of “proofs”. [Repeated applause.]

ADDISON. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, of the accuracy of my assertions; and also, of my being able to substantiate them, from the New covenant; though I am not, on the instant, prepared to quote “chapter and verse” of even a title of them—nor was I aware that any “Regulation” of the proceedings of this Meeting required anything of the kind. [Hear, hear!]

Chairman. Then, with all due deference to you, Mr. Addison, I am bound to call upon some other gentleman to take up the matter; as your assurances are *pre-judged*, by the Committee of Management, to be insufficient. It is not, Mr. Addison, that I, personally, doubt the accuracy of your statements (I know you too well for that) but, simply because you cannot *now*, “on the instant”, substantiate them, that I am compelled, as Chairman, under pre-arranged “Regulations”, to object against your proceeding with a string of “mere assertions”, however accurate they may be.

It is not enough, that You on my left know, that the passages alluded to exist in such abundance; your Opponents also must know them, and they, through me, *demand* them. [Applause.]

Is anyone else in a position to support Mr. Addison’s assertions, *with the requisite proofs*?

REV. S. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, with multitudes of proofs! [Cheers] I regret exceedingly, Sir, that our venerable father in the ministry, who has but just returned to town, had not due notice of this Meeting; in fact, Sir, we have not even had an opportunity of placing in his hands a Copy of the “Regulations” agreed upon: I met Mr. Addison, accidentally, on my way hither, and knowing him to be a tower of strength, I pressed him into service; requesting him, in my stead, to Open the Discussion; consequently, Mr. Addison appears before the Meeting unprepared, as it regards “chapter and verse”; nevertheless, Sir, we rejoice to have him in our midst; for, he is a second Apollos—“mighty in the scriptures”. [Cheers] However, Mr. Chairman, foreseeing, from the “Regulations”, that we should be called upon to support our assertions by scripture testimonies, a few of us undertook to divide the labor of collecting Texts, under separate heads;* and we have now, Sir, come prepared, to prove to you, to our opponents, to this highly respectable assembly, that the UNITY OF THE GODHEAD is one of the leading doctrines taught throughout the Bible. [Applause.]

* It does not appear that the gentlemen had taken the pains of running over their Examples together, previous to the public Meeting; or, we should scarcely have had any *unnecessary* repetitions of the same text, from different speakers. *Reporter.*

Not to occupy the time of the Meeting unprofitably, we have refrained from amassing Texts by scores and hundreds, in proof of any one point; we have commonly restricted our collections to half-dozens—amply numerous, as we conceive, to pose, and gainsay, and overwhelm, not only the formidable array of gentlemen opposite (who first proposed and most assiduously got up this friendly Contest) but sufficient to persuade and convince all the *thinking* Trinitarians in the universe. [Hear, hear!]

Of the existence of ONE SUPREME GOD, I shall present 6 texts from the Old, and 6 from the New covenant.

Deut. vi. 4. Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One Lord.

—or rather, Mr. Chairman, as it stands in the Hebrew, “Jehovah our God, is One Jehovah”.* We shall not, however, waste the time of the Meeting, by stopping to correct every inaccuracy of the translators; as our “authorized version” will generally answer our purpose—egregiously faulty though it be. [Hear, hear!]

Deut. xxxii. 39. See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no God with me!

1 Chron. xvii. 20. O Lord, there is none like Thee; neither is there any God beside Thee.

Isaiah xliii. 10. Before me there was no God found, neither shall there be Alter me!

„ xliv. 8. Is there a God beside me? Nay, there is no God; I know not any!

Hosea xiii. 4. I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt have no God but me; for, there is no Saviour beside me!

Mark xii. 32. There is One God, and there is none other but He!

John xvii. 3. Jesus said, This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the Only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.

1 Cor. viii. 4. There is none other God but One!

1 Thes. i. 9. Ye turned to the God from Idols, to serve the living and true God.

1 Tim. i. 17. Now, unto the King eternal, immortal, and invisible, the Only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever!

James ii. 19. Thou believest there is One God—thou doest well.

It would have been as easy for me, Mr. Chairman, to have noted down a hundred, as a dozen, such texts; but, it would neither have been agreeable nor profitable for this Assembly to have listened to a recital of them—besides, having quoted the words of such high authorities, declaring that there is but *One only true wise God*—not *Three*, nor yet *Two*—there cannot be any need to corroborate their testimonies. [Applause.]

A. COWLEY, Esq. It fell to my lot, Mr. Chairman, to instance 6 passages wherein Jesus teaches, that GOD IS THE FATHER OF HIS INTELLIGENT CREATURES; and I give the following—

Matthew v. 16. Glorify your Father which is in heaven.

„ 45. That ye may be the Children of your Father, &c.

„ vi. 9. Pray ye—Our Father, which art in heaven.

„ xxxiii. 9. One is your Father, which is in heaven.

Mark xi. 25. That your Father also, which is in heaven, may forgive You.

Luke xii. 32. Fear not, little flock; for, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

* “No name for God, but JEHOVAH, is ever found in Scripture where *the absolute essence of God*, without reference to created things, is indicated. The Jews therefore contend, that this is *the only PROPER name of God*, the other words by which He is designated being mere appellatives; and it is a truth, that the other names of God, are such substantives or adjectives—attributes in short—which seem appropriate to God when he is viewed in relation to created things, or, is manifested by their means. The word *Jehovah* is, of all words, *the most holy* to the Hebrews. SPINOZA.

From these, and many similar passages, we learn that Jesus taught his auditors, that their Father was *in heaven*; and as Jesus was *on earth*, while teaching this doctrine, it is repugnant to reason, we think, for anyone to suppose that our Lord wished to inculcate, or, that his hearers ever for an instant conceived, that Jesus on earth and his Father in heaven, were *One and the same Being*. [Hear, hear!]

REV. E. DARWIN. I think, Mr. Cowley, that I can produce scripture authority to *prove* that the Father and the Son are *one and the same person*; for, I read, in John x. 30, that our Lord himself declared, I and my Father are One". [Hear, hear! from many voices, on both sides.

COWLEY. Perhaps, Mr. Darwin, when you shall have read the sayings of Jesus more thoughtfully, you may better understand the passage you have now so very inappropriately quoted. However, I may not, at this stage of our proceedings, pause to debate the point with you—it would be against the "Regulations" which you, Mr. Darwin, took an active part in framing—[Hear, hear!] yet, I may probably be allowed by the Chairman, to read what your own great Dr. Adam Clarke, incidentally observes here in his Commentary under John viii. 19—

It is worthy of remark, that in all this discourse, our blessed Lord ever speaks of the Father and Himself as *two distinct persons*. Therefore, the Father is *not* the Son, *nor* the Son the Father—as some persons vainly imagine".

MR. SANDYS. Now, that's what I call a *tickler*, Mr. Darwin!

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Darwin has certainly been premature in presenting his objection, whether ill or well founded; as the "Regulations" prescribe, that the Unitarians shall *first* state their reasons for Repudiating the doctrine of the Trinity—*after* which, the Trinitarians will enter into Discussion. [Hear, hear!] Who follows Mr. Cowley, on the Unitarian side?

PROFESSOR ELLIOTT. Before presenting a few texts for the consideration of this Meeting, I wish, Mr. Chairman, to direct the attention of this auditory, more especially the attention of the theological Students, to the *PATERNAL* character of God, which was *first* revealed to mankind by Jesus, the pre-eminent Messenger of God.

I read, that in the world's infancy—or rather, Mr. Chairman, in what is received as *the Mosaic account* of the infancy of the world, the Creator of the Human race was styled (according to our "authorized version") the *Lord God*—in the days of the Patriarchs, I read of the *Almighty God* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—afterwards, of the *Great I Am*—of *Jehovah*—of the *King*, and of the *Governor*, of his people Israel—of the *Lord of Hosts*—of the *Saviour*, and also of the *Redeemer*—but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to have been reserved for the special messenger, Jesus, "*the Sent of God*", to reveal Jehovah as *the Father*.* The peculiar characteristics of God (if I may so express myself) seem to have been gradually developed, from earliest times down to the coming of Jesus, in admirable adaptation to the increasing moral and intellectual and spiritual advance of ever-progressing Humanity.

* "The highest consciousness of Deity that has ever existed in the breast of Humanity, was that of Jesus. Nothing is farther from scholastic theology, than the Gospel. The speculations of the Greek fathers on *the divine essence* came from quite another spirit. God conceived immediately as *Father*—this is all the theology of Jesus. It is probable, that from the first, He regarded himself as being to God in the relation of a *Son* to his *Father*. Here is his great act of originality; in this He is not like one of his race. Neither Jew nor Mussulman has understood this delicious theology of Love. The God of Jesus is not that fatal master who kills us when He pleases, condemns us when He pleases, saves us when He pleases. The God of Jesus is *Our Father*. *REXAN's Life of Jesus*."

Chairman. Do you, Mr. Elliott, mean to tell the Meeting, that the epithet *father* is not to be met with in the Old testament—or, do you conceive that the term *father* embodies an essentially different meaning in the two Testaments—or, more properly, the two *Covenants*, the Old and the New?* Be kind enough to elucidate.

ELLIOTT. I shall endeavour to do so. Moses and the Prophets but seldom use the term *father*; and when they employ the title, it is in a very different meaning to that used by our Lord, who emphatically gives it in *the Paternal sense*—assuring us, “Neither knoweth any man THE FATHER, save the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him”.

Every man’s God, Mr. Chairman, must, of necessity, bear a near affinity to each individual’s *notions* of God; and the histories of nations teach us, that such has been the case in all climes and all ages. Little minds cannot possibly have any adequate conceptions of a *Great god*; neither can elevated and expanded minds be satisfied with a *Diminutive god*: the capacious mind of Dr. Watts required

“An ocean of Infinities
Where all our thoughts are drowned!”

while Mr. Punshon’s tiny mind, is filled to repletion, with

“Our God contracted to a Span!
Incomprehensibly made Man”.† [Hear, hear!]

Some carry their Gods about with them (in their pockets, or, suspended from their necks) while others tell us, so great is their God, that the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him; some have a God of wrath, others a God of love—each according to the individual’s mental image of God. [Hear, hear!] The Adamites and Patriarchs had their “Lord God”, who walked and talked, eat and drank with them; the barbarous Israelites had their “Lord mighty in Battle”, David meeting Goliath “in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the Armies of Israel”; the more enlightened Prophets had their “Just God and a Saviour”, with “the High God their Redeemer”: Moses the legislator, and Ezekiel the rustic, and Isaiah the courtier, and Jesus the well-beloved son, differing immeasurably in their *conceptions* of God—nor can anyone *think* otherwise of God, than in accordance with his own personal intellectuality and education!‡

Our respected friends opposite, have *confused* notions of God; fancying the Divine spiritual Essence is constituted of different Parts, or, in some incomprehensible way, divisible into Persons; while we think of God as being an eternal, immutable, indivisible Spirit, a Whole without Parts—and we speak of Him, in human language, by the endearing name of FATHER, agreeably with the teachings of our Master, who is 120 times mentioned in

* The Chairman here incidentally corrected the improper term *testament*, by substituting *covenant*; but, without stopping to inform us, that the Greek language has but One word to express both *covenant* and *testament*. The translators of the Scriptures sometimes blundered in their renderings; for, in Heb. viii. 8, the Greek word is properly rendered *covenant*; but, in the following chapter, verse 15, it is preposterously translated *testament*. In Mat. xxvi. 28, as also in Mark xiv. 24, stands—This is my blood of the New *testament*!; instead of New *covenant*. And our calling the Scriptures, the Books of the Old *testament* and the Books of the New *testament*, is too incongruous to need comment. Reporter.

† Lines given out (from the Wesleyan Hymnbook, p. 560) by W. Morley Punshon, M.A. preparatory to his Doctrinal sermon, during the Conference held in Cornwall, 1862. Reporter.

‡ “Isaiah saw *seraphim* with 6 wings, whilst Ezekiel saw *beasts* with 4 wings; Isaiah saw God in white raiment and sitting on a royal throne, Ezekiel saw him as fire: each undoubtedly presumed he saw God in the way or likeness in which he was wont to conceive him. SPINOZA, *Tractatus Theologicus Politicus*. p. 57, Ed. 1862.

the New covenant as being the *Son of God*, and 56 times as the *Sent of God*—to reveal THE FATHER unto us.

REV. W. KNOX. All that you say, Mr. Elliott, may be well enough as far as it goes, which is but little more than "mere assertion"; but, where is your Scripture testimony? Where are your Texts to support and elucidate your assertions, as to the different meanings of the word *father*, in Holy Writ? Have you any passages *in proof*?

ELLIOTT. Of course, I have. Yet surely, you, Mr. Knox, are not so ill-read in the Scriptures, as to require any proofs—I had a higher opinion of you. [Hear, hear!

SANDYS. That's a flattering Compliment!

ELLIOTT. As textual elucidation is demanded, Mr. Chairman, I shall commence by observing, that the name *father*, though employed in a variety of meanings in the Hebrew scriptures, is not once applied to God in the same sense as that used by Jesus. [Proof, proof!] Well, you shall have *proof*; be but moderately patient.

SANDYS. I say, Knox, keep a sharp look-out!

ELLIOTT. "Jabal was the *father* of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle"; and "Jubal was the *father* of all such as bandle the harp and organ. Gen. iv. 20, 21. The term *father* is here put for *author*, or *inventor*, or *teacher*. When Abraham is denominated the *father* of many nations, all present know that it means *in faith*, "the father of the faithful". God is said to have made Joseph a *father* unto Pharaoh, in Gen. xlv. 8, signifying *provider* for his household and *governor* of his people. "Eliakim shall be a *father* to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah"; meaning *governor* of Israel. Isaiah xxii. 21. Elisha addressed his teacher, Elijah, as "my *father*, my *father*. 2 Kings ii. 12. In 1 Chron. iv. 14, we read of "Joab, the *father* of the valley of Charashim, for they were craftsmen"; that is, *overseer* of the craftsmen and *owner* or *governor* of the valley. Though David, in 1 Chron. xxix. 10, exclaims, Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel our *father*, for ever and ever!" yet we all know that the spirit of the Mosaic polity, limited the term, both in kind and extent, and that it could not be meant in the *paternal* sense. In fact, throughout the whole of the Pentateuch, the term *father* is but once applied to God—"Is he not thy *father* that hath bought thee? Deut. xxxii. 6, plainly signifying the *purchaser* and *deliverer* and *ruler* of Israel, who bought them out of Egyptian servitude, gave them a law, and "made" them a nation, as is shown in the context; and cannot mean their *individual*, their *paternal*, but their *national* maker and father. See also Isaiah lxiii. 16; Jer. iii. 4; and xxxi. 9; also Mal. i. 6; where *father* is used in similar meanings. For his practical beneficence, Job is mentioned as a *father* to the poor. xxix. 16. God promised to be a *father* to David, in the words, I will be his *father* and he shall be my *son*; if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men; but, my mercy shall not depart from him, as from Saul. 2 Sam. vii. 14. A like promise was made to Solomon, in 1 Chron. xvii. 13; I will be his *father* and he shall be my *son*, and I will not take my mercy from him". In these two passages, *father* evidently means their *special protector* as Kings, alluding to the stability of their thrones. In Mal. ii. 10, we read, Have we not all one *father*? hath not one God created us? Why deal we treacherously every man against his brother, profaning the covenant of our *fathers*?" which passage bears exclusive reference to the Jews, though commonly misapplied by Pulpit teachers; for, here the name *father* means Abraham, and *fathers* means the other patriarchs and teachers—in other phraseology, Mr. Chairman—Have we not all one father Abraham, from whom we descended? hath not one and the same God made us a nation? that is, given us a national existence—why deal we then treacherously every man against his brother? the Jew, or son of Abraham—not the Gentile. In Psalm lxviii. 5, we read of God as being "a *father* to the fatherless, and a judge of the widows"; signifying *protector*. *Father* in Psalm lxxxix. 26, occurs in what is held to be a prophecy of what the Messiah should say of God.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, even as God said to Moses [Exo. vi. 3] I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of *God Almighty*, but, by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them";* even so, I now venture to say of the Patriarchs, of Moses, and of the Prophets—by the PARENTAL NAME OF FATHER, was *not* God known to them! [Hear, hear!

I now proceed to give 6 passages, out of upwards of 60, wherein Jesus teaches, that THE GOD WAS ALSO HIS FATHER—

Matt. xviii. 10. Angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

" 35. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you.

Luke xxiii. 34. Father, forgive them! for, they know not what they do.

" 46. Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit!

John xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I.

" xx. 17. I ascend to my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God!

On which last passage, our prince of theologians [Milton] observes—If the FATHER be the God of Christ, and the same be our God; and if there be *None other God but One*, there can be NO GOD BESIDE THE FATHER".†

Apologizing for having occupied so much time, I return thanks for the attention with which I have been favored. [Significant tokens of approbation. SANDYS. I certainly could not have acquitted myself Half so well!

REV. W. FALCONER. After having collected a score of texts, I shall, Mr. Chairman, instance but 6, wherein Jesus teaches that THE GOD IS HIS GOD, as well as the God of men in general; and I shall present those only wherein our Lord limits the title definitely to the Father *alone*—[Hear, hear!

Mat. xix. 17. Why callest thou Me *good*? there is none good, but one—the God.

Mark xv. 34. My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken [forgotten] me!

John vi. 27. Him hath God the Father sealed.

* Notwithstanding this very plain declaration, I read, in Gen. xv. 6, 7, Abram believed in JEHOVAH [Lord in our translation] and He counted it to him for righteousness: and He said unto him, I am JEHOVAH, that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.

I read, in Gen. xxviii. 13—21, I am JEHOVAH, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou [Jacob] liest, to thee will I give it, &c. And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, &c. then shall JEHOVAH be my God.

I read, in xxxii. 9, Jacob said, O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac, JEHOVAH, which saidst, &c.

Here we have the name *Jehovah* occurring, as if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were well acquainted with it—in direct contradiction to the declaration in Exo. vi. 2, 3, by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them".

Colenso has accounted for this glaring discrepancy; not by attempting (like Kurtz, Kalisch, and others) to *reconcile* such flat contradictions, but simply by *explaining* them; and that without sacrificing Truth on the altar of criticism—showing that the *Elohistic* and *Jehovistic* writers of the Pentateuch expressed themselves differently—Behold! the Lord [accurately *Jehovah*] stood above it [the Ladder] and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham [I am *Jehovah*, the Elohim of Abraham] thy father, &c. Gen. xxviii. 13.

Yet Colenso is abused as a *heretic*, by the so-called *orthodox*; and the very heads of our Established church are now daily *persecuting* him for Opinion's sake! He, however, does not return "railing for railing", but "good for evil". *Reporter*.

The learned Spinoza informs us, that the Letters composing the Hebrew word *Jehovah*, express the *three times*—PRESENT, PAST, FUTURE.

And Rev. J. J. Tayler observes (in his Address, 12th Oct. 1863)

To the Supreme Being there can be no distinction of *past* and *present* and *future*. They lie before Him as *one* vast and present conception, wrought out in a continuous evolution of corresponding phenomena, and furnishing an exhaustless source of benevolent interest and affection".

† "Talk of Essence, and Substance, and I know not what;
God either *made* Christ, or else He did not:
If he did, Christ's a *Creature*—that's plain to our view;
If not, Christ's a *God*—and then, we have *Two*!"

John xvii. 3. This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the Only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

„ xx. 17. I ascend to my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God!

Rev. iii. 12. Him that overcometh, I will make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall no more go out; and I will write on him the name of my God.

MR. WORDSWORTH. That the Apostles testify to Jehovah's being the God of Jesus, everyone knows, who knows anything of -their writings; Paul and Peter sometimes making use of the very same words—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ!" [Ephe. i. 3, and 1 Peter i. 3] Consequently, unless our Opponents can prove that Jesus created Himself as well as all things visible and invisible; that he is God and Himself, and that beside him there is no God, I must repudiate his *Deity*. [Hear, hear!

REV. T. GRAY. I beg leave, Mr. Chairman, to offer a dozen passages from Paul, wherein the title *god* is applied to THE FATHER ONLY, while, at the same time, *separate* mention is made of THE SON—but, never as *the God*—

Rom. xv. 6. That ye may with one mind and one mouth, glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 Cor. iii. 23. Ye are Christ's, and Christ is the God's.

„ viii. 6. To us there is but One God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.

„ xi. 13. The head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is the God.

2 Cor. i. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of all mercies, and God of all comfort.

„ iv. 4. Christ, who is the image of the God.

Ephe. i. 17. That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom.

„ iii. 14. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 Tim. i. 1. Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God our Saviour, and the Lord Jesus Christ which is our Hope; unto Timothy, my own Son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord.

„ ii. 5. There is One God, and One Mediator between the God and Men—the man Christ Jesus.

„ v. 21. I charge thee before the God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things, &c.

Heb. xii. 23. To the God the Judge of all, and to the Spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New covenant, &c.

Of a truth, Mr. Chairman, it must be difficult for any man, using his reason, to withstand the conviction, that Paul considered the God and our Lord Jesus as *two* separate and distinct Beings. [Hear, hear!

T. HOOD, Esq. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to add half a dozen quotations from other Apostles, corroborating the dozen just given from Paul, who was not by any means singular in his *unitarian* views. [Hear, hear!

1 Peter i. 2. Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

„ v. 10. The God of all grace, who hath called us into his eternal glory, by Jesus Christ.

1 John ii. 1. We have an advocate with the Father—Jesus Christ the righteous.

2 „ 3. Grace be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ—the Son of the Father in truth and love.

Jude 1. Sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ.

Rev. xxii. 8. When I had heard and seen, I fell down to Worship before the feet of the Angel [Christ] which showed me these things: then saith He unto me, SEE THOU DO IT NOT; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy

brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book—**WORSHIP GOD!**

As in all the texts hitherto instanced, so in all other passages, *the God* is strictly limited to the Father *alone*—never in any one instance, is the Greek epithet, *the god*, applied to Jesus, whose distinguishing title is that of *lord*.

What means that shake of the head? Is my assertion disputed? Mr. Chairman! in the presence of this respectable—and let me add *learned* auditory, I here stake my reputation as a Gentleman, a Scholar, and a Man, on the accuracy of my statement; and I now challenge One and All the Trinitarians present to confront me! [Tremendous cheerings] I here undertake, Mr. Chairman, to produce, within a week, more than 1000 texts proving that *the God* is a distinct and altogether separate Being from *Jesus the Sent of God!* [Hear, hear!] And more than this, Mr. Chairman, I now challenge our Opponents to produce—not a hundred, not a score, not a dozen, nor yet half a dozen, but, Sir, I challenge all the Trinitarians present, to produce **A SINGLE TEXT** in the *Originals*, wherein Jesus is represented as *the God!* as *Jehovah!* as *the Great First Cause!* [Loud and long-continued cheerings.]

REV. E. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman! Will you kindly point out to our friends on the other side, as they proceed with their fancied proofs, a few of the most glaring of their blunders? [Hear, hear!] for, if allowed to go on quoting thus profusely, our Refutations will occupy much more time than such misconstrued texts are worth. Had it not been for the blinding power of prejudice, Mr. Gray could not have passed unobserved St. Paul's irrefutable expression—*God our Saviour*, while fancying that our Saviour is not styled *god* in the Bible. [Hear, hear!] Had you, Mr. Chairman, but set Mr. Gray right, at the time he heedlessly pronounced the plainly-expressed words—*God our Saviour*, your correcting him, might, probably, have prevented Mr. Hood from adding blunder to blunder. [Hear, hear! from both sides.] MR. PEELE. "O Patience, what a virtue art thou!"

Chairman. Were I to take upon me the *correction* of the Speakers, the Disputants, Mr. Irwin, might well accuse me of overstepping the province of *Chairman*; it is for the Oppositionists, not the Chairman, to detect errors and expose misrepresentations.

REV. W. CHAMBERLAYNE. Pray, Mr. Irwin, to whom do you conceive the words *God our Saviour* allude?

IRWIN. What makes you ask such a silly question, Mr. Chamberlayne? [Hear, hear!] To whom should they allude, but to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be sure!

CHAMBERLAYNE. And have you, Mr. Irwin, been such an unobservant reader of your Bible, as really not to know, that Paul, in writing to Timothy of "**GOD OUR SAVIOUR**", was associating the title *god* with that of *saviour* from the impression made upon his mind while reading the Jewish scriptures? Have you yet to learn, Mr. Irwin, that the Father, Jehovah himself, was familiarly styled *saviour*, ages and ages before the birth of Jesus? [Hear, hear!] Could you suppose, that God's favorite family of man was left without a Saviour until some 1864 years ago? or, did you never once think upon the subject?

IRWIN. I know of no Saviour but Christ crucified—nor will I know or acknowledge any other.

CHAMBERLAYNE. That may be; yet, surely the Psalmist could not have alluded to your "Christ crucified", when he said—They forgot *God their*

Saviour, which had done great things in Egypt." [Hear, hear!] But, Mr. Chairman, I forego discussing the point with One who has evidently never read his Bible with even common attention.

SANDYS. Another flattering compliment!

I. WATTS, Esq. It seems probable, Mr. Chairman, that Paul associated the term *god* with *saviour*, from the expressions he was accustomed to read in his favorite book, *Isaiah*—Paul having been a more retentive, as well as more observant reader, than our friend Irwin.

Chairman. I wish the Speakers would substantiate the opinions and assertions they utter, by Scripture testimony, conformably with your own "Regulations". Can you, Mr. Watts, furnish the Meeting with texts bearing upon the point now before us?

WATTS. Certainly, Sir. David's Song of Praise, for his deliverance out of the hands of his enemies, commences—

The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; the God of my rock, in Him will I trust: He is my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower, and my refuge—*my Saviour!* 2 Sam. xxii. 2, 3.

And in Paul's favorite author [Isaiah] we read—

I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, *thy Saviour*. xliii. 3. I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is *no Saviour*. xliii. 11. Verily, Thou art a God that hideth thyself, O God of Israel, *the Saviour*. xlv. 21. Thou shalt know, that I the Lord am *thy Saviour*, and thy Redeemer the mighty One of Jacob. lx. 16.

Have you plenty, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman. Plenty, Mr. Watts, plenty!

REV. MR. JAMES. Is the epithet *redeemer*, as familiarly associated in the Hebrew scriptures with God the Father, as you, Mr. Watts, have just shown that of *saviour* to be?

WATTS. Quite so; nor is the word *redeemer* ever once used in the New covenant: [Hear, hear!] it is invariably associated with God the Father—*never* with the Son. [Hear, hear!] Not only does the Psalmist pray—Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and *my Redeemer*"; but, in reference to the Israelites of old, he informs us—They remembered that God was their rock, and the High God *their Redeemer*"; while Isaiah familiarizes the title *redeemer* to all his attentive readers—

Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel, I will help thee, saith the Lord and *thy Redeemer*, the Holy One of Jacob—Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and *his Redeemer* the Lord of Hosts; I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God—Thus saith the Lord *thy Redeemer*, and He that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things—As for *our Redeemer*, the Lord of Hosts is his Name, the Holy One of Israel—Thus saith the Lord *the Redeemer* of Israel—All flesh shall know, that I the Lord am thy Saviour, and *thy Redeemer* the Mighty One of Jacob—Thy Maker is thy husband, the Lord of Hosts is his name, and *thy Redeemer* the Holy One of Israel—Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: Thou, O Lord, art our Father, *our Redeemer*; thy name is from everlasting".

MR. BEATTIE. I am shocked, Mr. Chairman, at the discovery of my long-continued lack of observation! and I confess, with shame, I never associated the words *saviour* and *redeemer* with any other Being than Jesus Christ—never with God the Father—though His unquestionable right to both titles, now flashes upon me! [Hear, hear!]

REV. C. COTTON. Are either of the epithets, *saviour* or *redeemer*, ever used in the New testament in reference to anyone besides the Lord Christ?

PEELE. Now, there's a pretty question for a Clergyman to ask! and that, but a couple of minutes after he has been told, by Mr. Watts, that the word *redeemer* is not to be found in the New testament! [Hear, hear!

A. WILSON, Esq. The question is, certainly, somewhat strange, coming from such a quarter. During many years, you have been in the habit, Mr. Cotton, of reading in your Church-service—My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in *God my Saviour*—did you never once, not even by accident, reflect, *whence* the words proceeded? or, can you, Mr. Cotton, for a moment suppose, that Mary called the Fruit then in her own womb, *her God and Saviour*? Your unadvised question, Mr. Cotton, is but another proof that men and ministers may read and read and read, from year's end to year's end, without ever once thinking on *what* they read! [Hear, hear! Pause.

G. WITHER, M.D. Mr. Cotton seems to be taken "quite aback;" yet, Mr. Chairman, a Clergyman ought not to be so easily nonplussed. Of course, Mr. Cotton, Mary called the Fruit then in her own womb, *her God and Saviour*—or, She would not have come up to the standard of even the present *orthodox* faith of the Christian churches. Rely upon it, Mr. Cotton, it is perfectly consistent with the time-honored creeds and doctrines of the Episcopal church, of which, I take it for granted, You are a worthy representative, that you should aver, openly and fearlessly, in conformity with the "Book of Common Prayer", that the Embryo in the Virgin's womb was its Mother's *God and Saviour*, the Creator of Herself, and of all things visible and invisible, the Omnipresent Omnipotent Omniscience!* [Hear, hear, hear!

REV. J. DYER. Mr. Chairman! A word or two, if you please, Sir. Paul's address to Timothy, which gave rise to this partial digression, doubly contradistinguishes *the God from Jesus*; first by characterizing the God as *our Saviour* and *Jesus as our Hope*, and afterwards, the God as *our Father*, but *Jesus as our Lord*: the words are—

Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of GOD OUR SAVIOUR, and the Lord Jesus Christ which is *our Hope*; unto Timothy, my own Son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from GOD OUR FATHER, and Jesus Christ *our Lord*".

To me, it seems little else than a waste of words, to prove by other passages of scripture, Paul's discrimination between *the God* as our FATHER and *Jesus* as our BROTHER—therefore, I sit down. [Cheers.

REV. J. KEATS. I shall not detain the Meeting long, Mr. Chairman; yet, I wish to remark, that Jude closes his Epistle, according to our "authorized version", in the following words—

Now, unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to *the only wise God our Saviour*, be glory and majesty, dominion, and power, both now and ever. Amen!"

According to Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge's version—

Now, to Him, who is able to guard you from stumbling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy: to *God alone our Saviour*, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and throughout all ages. Amen!"

But, according to Mr. Samuel Sharpe's admirable translation of Griesbach's superior text—

* It is unaccountable how Mr. Wither's satirical attack should have passed without comment from anyone! A dignitary of the Church, who sat behind me, ejaculated—"That's a pill for the *orthodox* to swallow!" *Reporter*.

Unto Him who is able to keep you from falling, and to place you in the sight of his glory, faultless with joy, *the only God our Saviour*, through *Jesus Christ our Lord*, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and throughout all ages; amen!"

In this beautiful doxology, Griesbach specifics and separates *the God* from *Jesus*; and the late Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) a staunch Trinitarian, remarks—

The name *saviour* is often applied to GOD THE FATHER, as the original author of our Salvation".

MR. LOVELACE, *Student*. I should like to know, Mr. Chairman, what in the world the Speakers are driving at!

MR. BARTON. We are not "driving" at anything, friend Lovelace; we wish to be led, as well as to lead others, to Truth: and if thy penetration has not yet descried our object, the object of this Meeting, I advise thee not to interrupt Investigations, by the obtrusion of thy injudicious sallies, for which thou art, unhappily, notorious—or, I shall have publicly to remind thee again today, of the apostle James's words—Be swift to hear, slow to speak"—a lesson thou art not quick in learning. [Hear, hear!

LOVELACE. I should like to know, what the Unitarians make of that text—Jesus Christ is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.

Chairman. Mr. Lovelace, I call you to Order! [Hear, hear!] Though we shall gladly listen to anyone and everyone, who may favor the Meeting with his views, questions, or critiques, the Speakers must not be abruptly broken in upon—either untimely or indecorously. You, Mr. Lovelace, first interrupt, and then obtrude an irrelevant question, dignifying it with the appellation *text*, though not to be found in the Bible.

LOVELACE. Not to be found in the Bible!

Chairman. No, Sir; not to be found in the Bible—though often heard from Pulpits. Many persons—

LOVELACE. I have heard it thousands of times; and I know— [Order, order! Chair, chair!

Chairman. Allow me, Sir, *as Chairman*, to speak without interruption. [Hear, hear!

Many persons, and, unhappily, Ministers of various denominations, are in the habit of lengthening or shortening, of altering and perverting, the Scriptures, to suit their preconceived notions; and none but critically experienced observers are aware, how very frequently, and to what a serious extent, the Scriptures are *falsified* by such unjustifiable deviations from the Text. [Hear, hear!

In 1 Tim. iv. 10, you may read—

We trust in the living God, which is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe";

which text is often perverted, as Mr. Lovelace has just now perverted it, in your hearing, to suit less Scriptural views—that is, transferring the person of the Saviour of mankind FROM THE FATHER—to the Son. [Hear, hear!] *Mercy is thy darling attribute, and punishment thy strange work*, is another very common pseudo-quotation—not from the Bible, but from an illogical Brain—for, the Deification of any one attribute of God, is simply the erection of an Idol. *As the tree falls, so it lies; and as death leaves us, judgement finds us*, is another Pulpit deviation. [Hear, hear!] Without instancing more examples, I would remark, that some minds seem so con-

stituted, that they may be said to be *incapable* of quoting accurately; and there are some men (I could name Ministers among the number) that *cannot* even read accurately—I am serious—who *cannot* read a chapter in the Bible, as it stands printed before their eyes, in a plain, bold type. However, be it known to all present, inaccurate readings are not likely to be countenanced, nor false quotations to be accepted, by this Meeting. [Cheers. WATTS. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to finish the observations I was busy with, when replying to Mr. James.

The word *redeemer* is a favorite Pulpit word, and constantly on the lips of religious babblers, who love talking more than thinking—the one being so much easier than the other. Prepossessed with the notion, that *Jesus is the Saviour of all men*, many, ay most of our Pulpits, expound the Scriptures in no other light—in fact, they cannot see the Scriptures through any other than their own false vision—reading the Scriptures through the spectacles of their individual theology—

SANDYS. "All seems *infected*, that the Infected spy;
As all seems *yellow* to the *Jaundiced eye*".

WATTS. And strangely as some gentlemen are now eying me, I hesitate not to declare, as fearlessly as truthfully, that, according to this inestimable volume, this Book of Books, God the Father, *not* Jesus his Messenger, is *the Saviour and Redeemer of the World!* [Hear, hear! frequently repeated] If this Record of God's dealings with mankind, this Bible, is to be our guide, there is *no Saviour, no Redeemer*, beside the Holy One of Israel, whose name is from everlasting! Dr. Beard may shake his head as significantly, and as questionably, as he pleases, my authority is infinitely superior to the *Home Missionary Board*; for, as I have already read in your hearing—

All flesh shall know, that I, the Lord, am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob!"

—or, more accurately translated—

All flesh shall know that I, Jehovah, am thy Saviour;
That thy Redeemer is the Mighty One of Jacob!

and if any man dares to give Jehovah the lie, let him be *Anathema Maranatha!* [Pause and Silence] Would men but follow our Master's injunction, would they but "search the Scriptures", and think, and judge for themselves, the Churches would not long be perplexed with *two* Saviours, and *two* Redeemers, and *one, two, three* Gods, worshiping them all by turns, and perversely calling the two *one*, and the three *one*, and the seven *one*; but, the sincere of heart would speedily learn the real meaning of Zechariah's prophetic words—

Jehovah shall be King over all the earth: in *that* day shall there be *one* Lord, and his name *one*". [Applause.

REV. J. LANGHORNE. Mr. Chairman! Even as Mr. Beattie has acknowledged his "lack of observation", I now stand up to confess before this assembly, that untill this hour, I have been blinded by the prejudices of my religious education. [Hear, hear!] I was taught *what* to think, not *how* to think;* for, notwithstanding the numerous texts quoted at this

* "The aim of Education should be to teach us rather *how* to think than *what* to think—rather to improve our minds, so as to enable us to *think for ourselves*, than to load the memory with the thoughts of other men. BEATTIE.

Meeting, have long been familiar to me, I never before received them, as I now apprehend them—I never saw them in the light in which they now appear. I was bred a Trinitarian, and have promulgated *trinitarianism* as a scripture doctrine; and I came hither, Mr. Chairman, to defend the TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD against what I conceived to be the untenable doctrine of the UNITY OF THE GODHEAD—in plain English, Sir, I have been mentally blind on this point, from Infancy upwards! * But, from this hour, I renounce my *idolatrous trinitarianism* for ever! [Prolonged cheering] Hundreds of times have I struggled against the entrance of Truth into my mind, not willing to be convicted of Error; quieting my conscience with soothing sophistry; but, Sir, such a flood of light has been poured in upon me at this Meeting, that I now most devoutly believe with Paul, that “the Lord our God is *one* Lord”; and I am already beginning to comprehend the meaning of those words which have sometimes perplexed me—I will *not* give my glory unto another! Isaiah xlvi. 2. [Applause.]

LOVELACE. Do you intend continuing in the church, Mr. Langhorne?

SANDYS. Do, somebody, shut that Student’s potato-trap!

Chairman, I again call you to Order, Mr. Lovelace! [Cries of James, James!] Your question, Sir, is not barely irrelevant, but, very unbecoming; and I cannot allow of any such disrespectful conduct. [Cheers.]

LANGHORNE. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, thanks! As to poor Lovelace, I pardon his indelicacy, in consideration of his ignorance. [Hear, hear!]

It is known to several present, that I have publicly reproached the Writers of “Essays and Reviews”, for remaining in the Church *after* they had openly forsaken the tenets of the Church, for the propagation of which they had entered into Contract. That they had a *moral right* to Change their opinions, I fully admitted, while I censured their continuing in the *pay* of the Church—therefore, I shall scarcely follow their example. † [Cheers.]

I have, Mr. Chairman, occasionally, come in contact with Unitarians, and have even heard as well as read some of their discourses; but, Sir, the strength of their position I never understood until today—or, I should have abnegated *trinitarianism* long ago. Hitherto, their writings have appeared to me incongruous; one author contradicting another on doctrinal points—in short, their views appeared to me—and I believe are in reality—inconsistent and irreconcilable, so that I felt but little inducement to make myself better acquainted with them, and I, consequently, gave them up *unexamined*.

DR. H. MORE. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that we Unitarians are not so truthful, nor so honest, ‡ as we might be, and ought to be; [Hear, hear!] not that we intend to transgress against Truth, but, that we do not take sufficient

* “By Education most have been misled;
So they believe, because, they so were bred;
The Priest continues what the Nurse began,
And thus the Child imposes on the Man. DRYDEN.

† In all probability, the Privy Council’s *reversal* of the Judgement, passed by the Court of Arches, may give greater scope to the conscientious views of many of our Clergy, on this very point. A friend of mine, who formerly *condemned* Colenso for not publicly, and at once, foregoing his Pay, and withdrawing from the Church; now, frankly admits the Bishop’s *moral right* to continue in his Episcopate, and to enjoy its emoluments. *Reporter*.

‡ Dr. More did not expatiate on the word *honest*; a word that has provoked many Comments during the last 12 months. On 26 Feb. 1864, the Rev. R. B. Aspland said—

We are perfectly free and fearless, and I will meet any man face to face, who says *Unitarians are not honest!*”
Let Mr. Aspland speak for himself, and not take up cudgels for *all* his fellows. However fearless

pains to make ourselves properly understood—and further—I must candidly admit, that there are many and essential differences among us, as a body. [Hear, hear !

We are in the habit of using Pulpit phrases and Biblical expressions, in senses altogether different from the usual meanings attached to them by other religious bodies ; and though *we* may know what we mean by what we say, yet, if our words and phrases are likely to be accepted in other senses than what we mean, and we neglect to explain ourselves, we are, in a greater or less degree, *misleading* our hearers and readers : for instance—when we speak of the *Inspiration of Scripture*, or, of our *Belief in the Bible*, the so-called *orthodox* receive our expressions in very different significations to those which *we* usually ascribe to them ; for, while we consider it our duty to “Search the Scriptures”, we do not, cannot believe *all* that stands in the Bible ; [Hear, hear !] because, we know of a surety, that many things recorded in those ancient books, could not possibly have been penned under the influence of *divine* Inspiration—[Hear, hear !] for, whatever is derogatory to God, God could not possibly dictate, nor inspire, nor approve. [Hear, hear !] When we talk about our *Saviour*, and about our *Redeemer*, we are very likely to be misapprehended ; for, *some* among us have no Redeemer, no Saviour, but *ЖЕHOBAH* ; and we have *all* of us abandoned the notion that we are to be saved from the wrath of God and redeemed from everlasting punishment through the merits of Jesus ; as we do not admit there ever was, is, or ever can be, any *wrath* in God, or any such thing as *endless* punishment ; [Hear, hear !] therefore, we ought to be more explicit than we commonly are, when employing words and phrases wherein we deviate from the *present orthodox* acceptations.* It is not enough that *we* know what we mean ; it is our duty to guard others against misconception—otherwise, we may be said to be guilty of deceiving our uninitiated hearers and readers. We are, thank heaven, perfectly *Creedless* ! and as long as we continue so, we shall have an unobstructed high-road to Progress. [Hear, hear !] Whoever acknowledges a Superintending Power, and believes Jesus to have been a special Messenger of God, sent to reveal our Creator as the *FATHER* of his intelligent creatures, is, to all intents and purposes a

he may be, absence of fear is not necessarily absence of danger ; and should he meet with his match, his *dishonest* brethren would only laugh at him if He got a broken head, on their account. All are not Israel that are called *Israel*.

The Rev. J. C. Means also took umbrage at the word *honest*, and “denied it” as being applicable to Unitarians—but, what is the denial worth ? I know Ministers who are *NOT HONEST* ; who do *not* believe the doctrines they teach ; who *dare not* preach what they believe. Let Mr. Means also, speak for himself. *Editor*.

* “*Orthodoxy* is a Greek word, which signifies a *right opinion* ; and hath been used by Churchmen as a term to denote a *soundness of doctrine or belief*, with regard to all points and articles of faith. But, as there have been amongst these Churchmen several systems of doctrine or belief, they all assert for themselves, that *they only are orthodox*, and in the right ; and that all others are *heterodox*, or, in the wrong : so that what at one time, and in one place, hath been declared *orthodox*, or, *sound belief* ; hath at another time, and in another, or even the same place, been declared to be *heterodoxy*, or, *wrong belief*. Of this, there are numberless instances in ecclesiastical history ; and we need only just take a transient view of the present Christian world, to perceive many more instances of it subsisting at this day. What is *orthodoxy* at Constantinople, is *heterodoxy*, or *heresy*, at Rome ; what is *orthodoxy* at Rome, is *heterodoxy* at Geneva, London, and many other places : what was *orthodoxy* here, in the reign of Edward VI. became *heresy* in the reign of his Sister Mary ; and in Queen Elizabeth’s time, things changed their *names* again. Various was the fate of these poor words in the reigns of our succeeding Kings, as the currents of Calvinism, Arminianism, and Popery, ebbed and flowed. So uncertain and fluctuating a thing is *orthodoxy*. Today it consists in one set of principles, to-morrow in another. Were the words *orthodoxy*, *heterodoxy*, and *heresy* employed, as they might be, in distinguishing virtue from vice, and good from evil, they would admit of no variation, and be

UNITARIAN, however much he may differ from other Unitarians on a variety of theological doctrines. [Hear, hear!]

REV. T. CAMPBELL. Were this a fitting occasion, Mr. Chairman, I should enlarge on the Doctor's remarks, and show by examples, that we Ministers do *not* agree among ourselves on even prominent doctrines; that we are far from thinking alike on what are deemed by some amongst us *absolute essentials*—such as the INCARNATION, the ATONEMENT, the RESURRECTION, MIRACLES, etc. But, Sir, being unfettered, free of all liturgies and confessions, all creeds and catechisms, all articles and beliefs, we cordially allow each other to differ, each according to his own individual persuasions.* [Hear, hear!] This liberty is replete with advantages. We can unscrupulously unite with other denominations in any good work; not feeling the least incongruity in mixing with Episcopalians, whether Romanists or Protestants, with Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Methodists, etc. among *all* which Sects, Mr. Chairman, despite the stringent and forbidding orthodoxy of their varied tenets, are many thorough Unitarians; † numbers of whom would readily confess themselves such, were it not for the opprobrium commonly attached to the Name—a Name as repulsive and as frightful to many in 1864, as the name *methodist* was in the last century—and, for Humanity's sake, I blush to say, thousands are ashamed to appear before a sneering world, what they really are—*Unitarians!* [Hear, hear! from the whole assembly.]

WORDSWORTH. Agreeing with Mr. Campbell's sentiments, I cannot refrain from noticing a capital blunder just committed by that common-sense minister, Rev. John Page Hopps, who has published what he entitles "A CONFESSON OF FAITH", which is (in his own estimation at least) *The Unitarian Creed*; for, it declares, not in the singular, but, in the plural—

We believe in God, as our Friend and Father—we believe in Christ as the Mediator between God and Man, as our Lord and Saviour, our Judge and Friend—we believe in Christ's Atonement, in the sense of Reconciliation—we believe, also, in Future rewards and punishments—and, lastly, we believe in the supreme importance of Conversion, of true religion in the Soul".

for ever taken in the same sense. But, as they are used to denote opinions concerning the most incomprehensible subjects, no wonder that their meaning should be so often mistaken, and occasion so many endless and bitter disputes. *REV. R. ROBINSON.*

The *Kramerian*, in an article headed "Orthodoxy versus Honesty", the ink of which is scarcely yet dry, tells us—

Orthodoxy, in its rampant state, never was bound by the laws of *Honesty*. It used to burn old women in Kent, for not *being* able to believe the Athanasian creed; it used to shoot down Covenantors in Scotland, for not answering the responses in the Liturgy; it used to hang priests in Ireland, for saying *Mass*; it used to keep Dissenters and Jews out of Parliament, by the blasphemous test of an oath; and now, in its *dotage* and *decrepitude*, it picks the pocket of the most useful and self-denying Scholar in England [Jowett] because he is supposed to agree in opinion with the Bishop of London and the Dean of St. Paul's".

And the castigating *Saturday Review* does not mend matters, by proclaiming—

Generation after generation has left the University impressed with the conviction, that *Orthodoxy* means narrowness of mind and a taste for petty tyranny". *Editor.*

* "That all men should be of the same mind, and agree in the same conceptions and apprehensions of things, is impossible, and no more to be expected in this life, than that all men's faces and complexions should be alike. As long as men have different educations, tempers, constitutions of body, inclinations of mind, and several interests to serve; as long as there are different degrees of knowledge and understanding in men; in a word, as long as ignorance and confidence continue in the world, so long will there be disputes and controversies about matters of religion, *even among those who yet agree in the same faith and profession.* DR. CALAMY'S *Sermons.*

† Orr relates, that a Gentleman who met J. Freeman Clarke, in a railway carriage, said to him—It seems to me, that you Ministers are in a curious condition; when I am in town, I go to a Unitarian church, but, in the country, I go to hear an Orthodox preacher; and the Orthodox man is more of a Unitarian than the other". *Unitarianism in the Present time.* 1863.

This *Creed*, Mr. Chairman, does not exactly tally with Mr. Campbell's boast of Unitarianism being "free of all liturgies and confessions, all creeds and catechisms, all articles and beliefs"; for, Mr. Hopps has most injudiciously and unwarrantably taken upon himself to compose and propagate the *Unitarian Creed* I have copied out of his inconsiderately-penned tract. [Hear, hear!] By what authority—scriptural, ecclesiastical, or moral—Mr. Hopps has issued his censurable Creed in the plural number, [We] containing a string of Beliefs which many Unitarians do *not* believe, and omitting other doctrines which many Unitarians do believe, I know not; but, one thing I know, Mr. Chairman, I neither accept nor approve of his *Creed*, but, condemn it as presumptuous, unwise, and mischievous! and I think it ought instantly to be repudiated by the Body, in some public and formal manner. [Hear, hear!]

Had Mr. Hopps published his Creed in the singular number, and written *I believe*, etc. he would not have been guilty of implicating *all* Unitarians in his schedule of Beliefs. I am a Unitarian, yet, I am bold to declare, I do *not* believe in all Mr. Hopps's beliefs; and, what is more, I protest against his proclaiming to the world, through the Press, that I, a Fellow-unitarian, believe in his *Pauline notions of either Jesus or of the Gospel of Jesus!* [Hear, hear!] What moral or religious right has Mr. Hopps (or anyone else) to affirm, in his unadvised and dogmatic "CONFESSION OF FAITH", that I am unreservedly of his Belief, of his Creed, of his Confession? when I am no such thing. [Hear, hear.] I consider the pamphlet, in its present objectionable *form, title, and phraseology*, pregnant with evil; calculated to do considerably more harm than good to *Unitarianism*; and I trust to Mr. Hopps's usual good sense, and still more to his conciliatory spirit, for his at once withdrawing the pernicious "CONFESSION" from circulation. [Hear, hear, hear!]

Let Mr. Hopps issue his own, his individual Creed, as freely as he pleases; but, let him not publish to the world, *what is not true*, that I (and others) are of his opinion in all things—for, that insufferable *We* stamps his obnoxious Document with the *apparent* sanction of the united body of Unitarians. [Hear, hear, hear!]

MR. M. GREEN. I think, Mr. Chairman, you are hardly giving Trinitarians fairplay; for, you have hitherto permitted our Opponents to have all the talk to themselves. [Vociferous cheering.]

Chairman. That, Mr. Green, is an accusation I could not have expected from anyone, after having read the "Regulations of the Discussion" in your hearing; and, certainly, of all persons in the Meeting, the accusation comes with the worst grace from Mr. Green, who personally placed the "Regulations" in my hand—"Regulations" drawn up and agreed upon among yourselves, *before* you did me the honor of sending the invitation to Preside. [Hear, hear! and True, true!] According to the Stipulations I hold in my hand, the Chairman was bound to commence his prescribed duties, by calling on the Unitarians to produce Scripture authority for their *Repudiation of the doctrine of the Trinity*, that the Trinitarians might be enabled to meet the arguments in consecutive order—such, at least, was the reason alleged by Mr. Green himself, for the prescribed mode of procedure. [Hear, hear!]

That certain Speakers have digressed, not kept strictly to the point at issue, I admit—and the Trinitarians were the first transgressors—[Hear, hear!] yet, I did not think myself authorized, either by my position or the circumstances, to press upon Speakers the absolute necessity of adhering

more closely to the subject of debate ; as nearly all that we have heard has borne, indirectly at least, on the matter under discussion. Besides, I have an aversion against the very appearance of any assumption of *authority*, seeing we are all so much on a level. If the Meeting thinks I am remiss in keeping Speakers to the point, or, that I willingly grant a shadow of favor to either Party, I am quite ready to vacate the Chair to a more able and rigorous President. [No, no, no ! and thundering applause.]

GREEN. Mr. Chairman ! I stand corrected ; and frankly acknowledge I was too precipitate ; accept my Apology for—

Chairman. Enough, Sir, enough ! Your zeal ran away with your discretion.

MR. ARMSTRONG. I'll tell you what strikes me, Mr. Chairman—Our sly Antagonists intended “to steal a march” upon us, by getting us to make the attack, while they rested on their arms ; [Hear, hear !] they little expected the volleys of texts we have been pouring into their encampment ; and they are beginning to find out that they are in imminent danger of being routed : [Cheers] they are already showing the white feather ; [No, no !] let them bring their great guns to bear down upon us ; we court the worst their arms can do ! [Cheers] They braved us to this Contest, let them not disgrace their standard ! [Prolonged cheering.]

Chairman. Let us, my friends, be observant of that Charity which thinketh no evil. [Hear, hear !]

DR. KING. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, we scarcely know *how* to attack our Adversaries, who seem not to have *any fixed principles*. If we could but get hold of anything distinctly defined, we might have some chance to cope with them ; but, as soon as we press them on one quarter, off they fly to another—as changeable as the winds, as uncertain as the waves.* It is no exaggeration to say, that Unitarians have as many, and as great a variety of whims, as they have had teachers from Belsham down to Parker. With your leave, Mr. Chairman, I would ask some Unitarian present, to acquaint this Meeting, *if he can*, in plain English, WHAT A UNITARIAN IS—what he believes, or, does not believe—as we are lost and confounded in the multiplicity and contrariety of their tenets. [Hear, hear ! Pause.]

ADDISON. [Eithusiastically cheered on rising] Mr. Chairman ! A Unitarian believes in *One God Only*—that *He is a God of Love*, and that *His love is Infinite*—that He is the Creator, Governor, and Preserver of all things, animate and inanimate, visible and invisible—the Father and inalienable Friend of the whole intelligent creation—that Goodness and the communication of Good constitute the immediate glory and perfection of His nature—and that not anything can have union with God, save that which

* This is just what the *Unitarian Herald*, in its Leader of 11 March, 1864, [the Day on which this Discussion had place] alludes against the opponents of Unitarianism—

We, as Unitarians, have labored under two great disadvantages. One has been, the difficulty of controverting opinions which we well know to be generally preached, and always at least implied, but which constantly assume quite different shapes when fairly challenged, and elude the grasp of those who would answer and refute them.

We are glad, therefore, on the whole, that Dr. Pusey and his friends are going to take a stand for a *definite orthodox theology*. We say so, because we count it the next best thing to the obtaining a distinct avowal of their position from those who privately share, to a large extent, the heresies of Dr. Colenso and the ‘*Essays and Reviews*’, to have before us the distinct public adoption, on the part of the great bulk of the High and Evangelical Church parties, of such views as those which Dr. Pusey’s *declaration* specifies. If we cannot ascertain who, in the ecclesiastical camp, are on ‘the Lord’s side’, it will be at least a gain to know, on the other hand, who are on the side of—Dr. Pusey. It will be interesting to see who, in these days, are willing to take their stand no longer on the vague ground of *the Bible being inspired*, but, upon the categorical declaration that it ‘not only *contains* but *is* the Word of God’. It will be still more interesting to see how many can deliberately affirm, ‘without reserve or qualification’, their belief in the absolute eternity of punishment”. No. 150, p. 86.

partakes of his Goodness: consequently, a Unitarian does not, cannot believe in a *God the Son*, in a *God the Holy Ghost*, or, in any other God than "the Father of All, who is above All, and in All"; and does not, dares not, offer either *prayer* or *praise* to the Son of God, to Angels, to Saints, or, to any other Creature.

LOVELACE. Protestants do not pray to any Creature! that is rank popery! that they leave to Catholics.

PEELE. Turn the Babbler out!

BARTON. Again thou hast forgotten the injunction of James. Leave the Catholics alone, friend Lovelace; they have their excellences, as well as we Protestants have our imperfections; don't throw stones, while living in a house of glass thyself: [Hear, hear!] when thou undergoest Episcopal ordination, thou wilt have to give thy "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled the Book of Common Prayer", and to a great deal of what thou now contemptuously callest *popery*—for, the Scriptures will no longer be thy authorized guide; but, as Dr. Lushington has adjudged, the Book of Common Prayer—wherein thou mayest discover many things much harder to be understood than anything in the New covenant. Protestants as well as Romanists, offer up both *prayer* and *praise* to other Beings than that august One who has declared, in express language—I am Jehovah: that is my name; and my glory will I *not* give to another! Isaiah xlii. 8.

Though it may be unknown to thee, friend Lovelace, it is known to many present, that thy future Guide is crowded with the phrase,

Glory be to the Father, *and* to the Son, *and* to the Holy Ghost!"*

And throughout the year, the congregations of thy Church are commanded to pray,

Christ have mercy on us!"

In the Liturgy of thy Church, which is but partially cleansed from the *popery* of our forefathers, stands—

O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us, miserable sinners!

O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father AND the Son; have mercy upon us, miserable sinners!

O holy, blessed, and glorious *Trinity*, THREE Persons and ONE God: have mercy upon us, miserable sinners!"

Yet, thou wilt seek in vain in thy Bible for any such *INEXPLICABLE INCONCEIVABLES* as *God the Son*, or, *God the Holy Ghost*, or, thy holy, blessed, and glorious *Trinity*; for, no mention whatever is made there of any such mythical, man-made, popish Beings: in thy Prayerbook are *three* Gods, in thy Bible but *one*; therefore, if thou art aspiring to Holy Orders, friend Lovelace, the less thou sayest about *popery*, the better. [Hear, hear!] In the New covenant, thou mayest learn, from many passages, as in John iv. 23, that "the true Worshipers shall worship *the Father* in spirit and in truth"—the Father, observe—*not* the Son, *not* the Holy Ghost, *not* that pagan and popish compound the Trinity—and thou mayest learn, that the Son *forbade*

* According to the trinitarian Dr. Mosheim, during the first two centuries, "the Christian system as it was hitherto taught, preserved its native and beautiful simplicity, and was comprehended in a small number of articles—the public Teachers inculcating *no other doctrines* than those taught in the Apostles creed". The Doctor also informs us—It was not until A.D. 529, the order was issued, that *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost*, was to be sung in Churches"—the prior doxology having been—"Glory be to the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit", &c.

prayer to Himself, and directed his followers to offer it to the Father; [John xvi. 23] and that when the Recorder of "the Revelation of Jesus Christ" fell down to worship him, Christ peremptorily *forbade* him, saying, in the remarkably emphatic words—

SEE THOU DO IT NOT! for, I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets—WORSHIP GOD!"

Friend Lovelace, I recommend thee to ponder on these things. [Hear, hear!]

PROFESSOR WILSON. Why surely, Mr. Barton, you cannot have read bishop Wilberforce's recent Charge; or, you never would have let such an eligible opportunity escape of complimenting your friend Samuel, for whom I know you have a certain kind of sneaking regard. [Hear, hear!] Why, the Bishop is not satisfied with Dr. Lushington's declaration, that the Prayer-book is *higher authority* than the Bible, in the estimation of our National church, but, He actually maintains—the Bishop of Oxford maintains—that "*The Church was and must be the Bible*."* [Hear, hear!] Have you not seen the Charge?

BARTON. No; nor have I any desire to see it. I have heard and read so many of Samuel's extravagances, that I have given him up as incorrigible. [Hear, hear!] As thou art better acquainted with his movements, than anyone here, perhaps, thou canst inform us, *when* He purposes putting on the Cardinal's hat?

WILSON. Happily, I am not his keeper.

MR. S. HAWES. Are we to understand, Mr. Addison, that Unitarians strictly confine their tenets to the fundamental principles you had already adduced, when Student Lovelace burst out with one of his tirades?

ADDISON. Not by any means! But, Mr. Chairman, I prefer being silent, to being interrupted in the middle of a friendly attempt to give a plain statement of our principles, at the Call of the Meeting. [Hear, hear! from all quarters—with, *Go on, Sir; pray, go on!*]

Unitarians are advocates for *freedom of thought*, and are, to all intents and purposes *Freethinkers*—though not in the repulsive acceptation of the term.† Unlike the members, more especially unlike the ministers, of our National church, who are *Bondmen of Subscription* to human articles, creeds, rubrics, and liturgies, Unitarians are UNSHACKLED; admitting persons of every sect and party to unite with them in religious exercises, leaving each individual to give an account of himself to God—fully persuaded, that the

* My curiosity has not prompted me to procure the Charge itself. In the *Dover Chronicle* I read—

The Bishop of Oxford in his late Charge, at Aylesbury, made some remarks which have excited much attention, especially amongst those who value the religious freedom and independence secured to us by the Reformation. In the first place, the Bishop laid down, in the broadest manner, that the authority of the Anglican Church is SUPERIOR to that of the Bible. "We should be unable", said the Bishop, "to maintain the *Divine authority of the Scriptures*, if we gave up the *authority of the Church*. The two are absolute correlatives. In the Church's sense of the word, we could have *no Bible*, if we had *no Church*, for the Church was its witness and keeper—THE CHURCH WAS AND MUST BE, THE BIBLE! It must receive the Bible, it must propound the Bible to each separate Soul, as the *Word of God*." *Editor.*

† "Whoever fears to examine the foundation of his Opinions, and enter on the consideration of any train of counter-argument, may rest assured, that he has some latent apprehension of their unsoundness and incapacity of standing Investigation. And as a fear of this sort is totally at variance with that spirit of candor and fairness which we have already seen to be the proper disposition for the attainment of Truth, no man should suffer it to prevent him from boldly engaging in the requisite examination. A good deal of invective has been leveled at *Free-thinking*. The only distinction worth attending to on this point, is, that between *accurate* and *inaccurate*, *true* and *false*. Thinking can never be *too free*, provided it is *just!* *Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, &c.*

Judge of all the earth never will, never can consistently with the rectitude of his own nature and divine perfections, condemn anyone for *not* doing what He never gave understanding and power to do. [Hear, hear!] Unitarians both "*think and let think*"; the liberty they take, they freely grant; and no more expect to meet Two minds alike in the same assemblage, than they expect to meet with Two leaves alike on the same tree;* for, Unitarians have not now to learn, that diversity, *not* uniformity, characterizes all that is Nature and Creature. If Unitarians but think any man's heart stands right towards God—or, if they but see his face turned Zionward, they do not hold him at arm's length because he happens to entertain different notions on theological questions—not so have we learned the lessons of our Master—but, we cordially give him the righthand of fellowship, as being a fellowworker unto the kingdom of God; for, as I heard Mr. Binney very justly remark, in his Bi-centenary discourse†—

There never *can* be unanimity of knowledge on religious matters".

One man may believe in the co-eternal Sonship, and another not; one may believe, on Prayerbook authority, that Jesus is the Saviour and Redeemer of the world, while another, on Bible authority, believes that the Father, the Holy One of Israel, is our Redeemer, and that beside Him there is no Saviour; one may believe in the Pagan notion of the Perpetuity of future punishments, and another in the Biblical doctrine of Universal restoration—such diversities of notions and opinions are manifold: yet, Unitarians do not reject, repulse, their fellow-sinners for holding even the most incompatible notions, or, unfashionable, heretical opinions; but, encourage all men to "Search the Scriptures"; persuaded as we are, that despite evident contrarieties and attributed heresies, "He that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him".‡ [Long-continued cheers.

MR. T. CAREW. Mr. Chairman! I hold two short extracts in my hand, which I beg permission to read *now* to the Meeting. The first is from Locke—

The man who after careful examination, arrives at a *wrong* conclusion, will be viewed with more favor by the great Judge of all, than He who without any examination, happens to stumble upon a right one".§ [Hear, hear!

The other extract is from that indomitable exposé of Church-abuses, bishop Watson, who was a thorn in the flesh of many Church-dignitaries—

The Father of the Universe accommodates not his Judgements to the wretched wranglings of pedantic theologians; but everyone who *seeketh* Truth, *whether he findeth it, or not*, and worketh righteousness, will be accepted of him".|| [Hear, hear!

* "I willingly concede to every man, what I claim for myself—the freest range of thought and expression; and am perfectly indifferent whether the sentiments of others, on speculative subjects, coincide with, or, differ from my own. Instead of wishing, or expecting, that *uniformity* of opinion should be established, I am convinced that it is neither practicable nor desirable; that varieties of thought are as numerous, and as strongly marked, and as irreducible to one standard, as those of bodily form; and that to quarrel with one who thinks differently from ourselves, would be no less unreasonable, than to be angry with him for having features unlike our own. Professor LAWRENCE.

† Delivered at Weigh-house Chapel, 24 August, 1862.

‡ "Whenever we cease to hate, to despise, and to persecute those who think differently from ourselves; whenever we look on them calmly, we find among them men of *pure hearts*, and unbiassed judgements; who, reasoning on the same data with ourselves, have arrived at different conclusions on the subject of the spiritual world. SIMONDI.

§ In *King's Life of Locke*, I read—He that examines, and, upon a fair examination, embraces an Error for a Truth, has done his duty more than He who embraces the profession of a truth (for, the truths themselves he does *not* embrace) without having examined whether it be true or not". *Editor*.

|| Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, b. 1737—d. 1816.

HAWES. Is this Meeting to understand, Mr. Addison, that Unitarians allow Trinitarians to unite with them in worship, in communion, and other religious exercises?

ADDISON. Have I failed to express myself intelligibly? [No, no!] I said "persons of every sect and party"—for, Unitarians, Mr. Hawes, judge no man; but leave everyone to be "fully persuaded in his own mind".* Speaking as a Unitarian—yet, *observe*, without implicating anyone else—I tell this Meeting, "in plain English", such as I hope our friend King may clearly apprehend, [Hear, hear!] that whatever trenches on religious freedom, whatever tends towards enacting creeds, whatever favors the present generation in becoming lawmakers, judges, tyrants, over future generations, setting up men, churches, convocations, to decide peremptorily on doctrinal points, I, Joseph Addison, TRAMPLE UNDERFOOT! [Cheers] Infancy, Mr. Chairman, must not be permitted to make laws for Manhood! nor must the present age be allowed to make its ignorance a soundingline to the wisdom of ages yet to come! [Hear, hear!] Our National establishment is groaning and pining and withering, under the restrictions and penalties enacted and registered, one, two, and three centuries ago! and those, Mr. Chairman, who are enlightened enough, and manly enough, to disregard the impolitic, tyrannical, unchristian Acts of Parliament, passed by such notorious "Defenders of the Faith", as Henry VIII. Elizabeth, Charles, and others, are in this *our* day, in Protestant England, in this Country of boasted *toleration* and *religious freedom*, stared at, pointed at, hooted at, by professed Christians; and even prosecuted for their religious opinions, in our Ecclesiastical courts, and eschewed, contemned, and persecuted, by Bishops, Priests, and Laymen, to the utter disgrace of our illiberal and intolerant Churches, to the crying shame of our lauded Land of Liberty! [Tremendous applause.]

A. HILL, Esq. Mr. Chairman! For the first time in my life, I am this day in public company with Unitarians; for, I have ever shunned them, as Pests to society; and I am astonished, beyond measure, to find them occupying such high positions among rational Beings! [Hear, hear!] Why, Mr. Chairman, they are an Age a-head of us; and though they may be a despised minority in 1864, their principles will swell them into a majority, as surely as light supersedes darkness and knowledge subdues ignorance! Clad in the panoply of Truth, they *must* prevail! [Hear, hear!] Such sentiments as I have heard at this Meeting, find an echo in my breast. Physically, scientifically, and politically, socially, morally, and religiously, England is now in a transitive state; old things are passing away, and behold all things are becoming new! for, the grand characteristic of the present age, is, a tendency, in all its chief movements, to participation, diffusion, expansion, universality—a state diametrically opposed to that spirit of exclusiveness, restriction, narrowness, monopoly, which has characterized all former ages: liberality of sentiment is bursting the contractedness of creeds; vital religion is expelling the decayed dogmas of theology; the right of private judgement is every day becoming more and more approved and publicly countenanced; while persecution for mere

* Orr writes—We [Unitarians] are liberal; disposed to respect every honest man, no matter what be his opinions: tolerant of differences within the Church, tolerant of differences outside. Our ecclesiastical system is constituted on the broadest basis: to no man who assumes the christian name, or, without any profession finds comfort within our communion, would we deny admission to our Church ordinances. Out of Non-Subscription came our Unitarianism. *Unitarianism in the Present time*. 1863.

difference of opinion, is everywhere reprobated by the wise and the good ! and if Philanthropists but continue issuing light from the Press, while Steamboats and Railroads and Telegraphs continue civilizing and fraternizing the nations, that glorious period, Mr. Chairman, is not far distant, when England and Europe and the whole Earth shall be changed, shall be socially revolutionized, shall be radically reformed—I already hear the Doves and the Turtles cooing down the Trumpets and the Drums ; I see the Pen vanquishing the Sword ; I feel that God hath made of one blood all nations of men ; and I know, as surely as Truth removes Error, that Humanity and Christianity combined, shall knit into One family and weave into One web, the affinity and brotherhood of all mankind ! [Loud applause.

“ There’s a Good-time coming, Boys,
 A Good-time coming ;
 Let us aid it all we can—
 Every woman, every man,
 The Good-time coming :
 Smallest helps, if rightly given,
 Make the impulse stronger ;
 ’Twill be strong enough one day—
 Wait *a little* longer” ! [Cheers.

Chairman. If I am not much mistaken, Mr. Addison was about adding something, when our ardent friend, Mr. Hill, opened out, so unexpectedly, upon us.

ADDISON. I was on the point of saying, Mr. Chairman, that we Unitarians have a steady reliance on the increasing knowledge, in the godlike capabilities of Man, and we have the fullest confidence in God’s love towards all his intelligent creatures, of every clime, irrespective of their diversified and conflicting opinions ! [Hear, hear !] We have strong faith in a comprehensive, progressive, permissive theology. We endeavour, to the utmost of our varied abilities, to rouse men out of lethargy, to teach them *how* to think and judge for themselves, to inspire them with Hope—God’s PLEDGE TO MAN OF HIS IMMORTALITY—and we trustfully leave the results to an Omniscient Omnipotence ! [Cheers.

W. S. LANDOR, ESQ. I trust, Mr. Chairman, it may not be exacting too much of our Trinitarian friends, in return for Mr. Addison’s very obliging replies to the calls of Messieurs King and Hawes, to request an unequivocal statement of WHAT A TRINITARIAN IS. [Hear, hear !]

GREEN. Were our Belief as undefined as that of the Unitarians, Mr. Landor might be excused requiring a formal statement ; but, as “the Apostles Creed”, commonly called *The Belief*, is given in both the Morning and Evening Services, we may, I think, be spared the pains of repeating it on the present occasion.

MR. TANNAHILL. What the Dickens are you about, Green ! Why, man, you are not going to shirk the question, surely ?

LANDOR. But, how about “the Creed of St. Athanasius” ? Are we to understand that all the Trinitarians here present, repudiate the so-called *Athanasian Creed*, and that they accept and adopt the Apostles Creed *only* ?

LOVELACE. Nothing of the kind ! We maintain the Athanasian Creed in all its force, beauty, and majesty, without abating one jot or one tittle of its sacred and saving contents ! We maintain that “the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshiped” !

T. VAUX, ESQ. “O Folly, worthy of the Nurse’s lap !
 Give it the breast, or, stop its mouth with Pap”. [Cheers.

M. GREEN. Though a Trinitarian, Mr. Chairman, I candidly confess, I cannot go the whole length of the Athanasian Creed; and heartily wish, in the words of one of our Archbishops, that "we were well rid of it!" [Hear, hear!]

LOVELACE. But, I wish no such thing! [Loud cries of James! James!] The Athanasian Creed is absolutely necessary to be held by all who profess the holy Catholic faith—"which Faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, *without doubt, He shall perish everlastingly!*"*

REV. E. FENTON. "Though thou shouldest bray a Fool in a mortar among wheat, with a pestle, yet, will not his foolishness depart from him".

W. HABINGTON, Esq. Mr. Chairman! though I sincerely congratulate those who are desirous of getting rid of the Athanasian Creed altogether, I am not willing to pass it over as a mere cipher in the account we have to settle with our Trinitarian friends; and though I shall not inflict on the Meeting a recital of the whole Creed, I must quote a few sentences.

You all know about the *three* Eternals, which are so illogically said to be but *one* Eternal—*three* Uncreates, called *one* Uncreate, and *three* Incomprehensibles, averred to be only *one* Incomprehensible—*three* Almightyies made into *one* Almighty, *three* Gods turned into *one* God, and *three* Lords reduced to *one* Lord—"and in this Trinity none is afore, or after other; none is greater, or less than another: but, the whole *three* Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal; so that in all things, as is aforesaid, the *Unity in Trinity*, and the *Trinity in Unity* is to be worshipped—He therefore that will be *saved*, must *thus think* of the Trinity".

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I cannot for the life of me, *so think* of the Trinity; if Athanasius, or, our orthodox Lovelace, happen to be my Judge, "without doubt, I shall perish everlastingly". Such doctrines, however, are as contrary to Scripture, as they are repugnant to Commonsense; for, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" and if we thus fulfil our duty, to the best of our power, despite the damnatory Athanasian creed, our heavenly Father will assuredly "guide us with His counsel, and afterwards receive us to glory". [Cheers.]

A. BROME, Esq. If, Mr. Chairman, if our Opponents were but open to conviction, and could be induced to read the late Bishop of London's "Five Lectures on the Gospel of St. John,"† as bearing testimony to the *Divinity* of our Saviour, I do not think there would be a single Unitarian left.

W. COLLINS, Esq. Yes, there would! for, I read the Lectures attentively, without being convinced, though "open to conviction"; I read them with much gratification, and admired the *generally* amiable spirit and tone in which they seemed to have been peuned; becoming the gentleman, the critic, the scholar, and the christian—forming a pleasing contrast to the usual attacks on *unitarianism*: and I earnestly recommend Mr. Brome to read the brief and pithy Reply to his favorite Lectures, in a Letter, dated 17 May, 1823, to Dr. Blomfield, by Rev. W. J. Fox; which Letter opened the learned Doctor's eyes, on several points, and greatly influenced his after-writings. Mr. Brome, if "but open to conviction", may discover

* "Gracious God! whence is it that men are so little conscious of the imperfection of human knowledge, in all Sciences; of the utter impotency of human reason, in whatever respects Deity; of the fallibility of human judgement, in everything; that they have so little humility as men, so little charity as christians, as not to blush at erecting their interpretation of Scripture into *AN IDOL*, which all men must either worship, or, perish 'without doubt everlastingly?' *Bishop Watson. Miscel. Tracts.*

† Five Lectures, by Rev. C. J. Blomfield, D.D. Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, and Archdeacon of Colchester—afterwards Bishop of London.

in the Letter,* that the Evangelist John (or, whoever else wrote the book) so far from advocating the *deity* of Jesus, was a thorough UNITARIAN, [Hear, hear!] and has been particularly careful to record our Lord's own repudiation of the title *god*—He claiming to be only *the Son of God*.

REV. DR. PARNELL. Do you, Mr. Collins, mean to assert, that the title *god*, is never given to Jesus Christ, in the Scriptures?

COLLINS. You, Doctor, know perfectly well, the essential difference between the two titles, *god* and *the god*; you know that the former is often given to mere men, while the latter is restricted to Jehovah alone; and I take it for granted, you are prepared to acknowledge, that though the latter title, *the god*, is used upwards of 300 times in the New testament, it is not even once given to Jesus. [Hear, hear!]

MR. CHARLES LAMB. Then, you confess, Mr. Collins, that the title *god* is given to Christ?

COLLINS. Of course, I admit that Jesus is called *god*; [Hear, hear!] but, I as plainly deny that He is ever called *the god*. [Hear, hear!] The title *god* is used on many occasions in the Scriptures in connection with *mere men*, in consideration of their Office; sometimes given to unjust and oppressive Judges, as well as to Hebrew princes and rulers. Jesus himself made reference to the custom, when he repelled the charge of *blasphemy*.

Chairman. I must again remind the Speakers of the necessity of substantiating assertions, by adducing Scripture testimony.

COLLINS. It shall be done, Sir.

In lxxxii. Psalm, we read—I have said ye are *gods*; and all of you are children of the Most High: but, ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." In Exo. iv. 16, we read that Moses shall be to Aaron "instead of *God*"; and in the first verse of viii. ch. we read—The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh"; and Paul writes, in viii. ch. of 1 Cor. We know there is none other God but *One*; for, though there be that are called *gods*, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be *gods* many, and *lords* many) yet, to us, there is but *One god*, THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; and *One lord*, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him". John, the Unitarian, characterizes a certain Being as *the god* no fewer than 123 times; [63 times in the Evangel, and 60 times in the Epistles] yet, not in a single instance was Jesus that Being, but, He whom our Lord emphatically designated THE ONLY TRUE GOD, by whom Jesus was sent into the world, was anointed, and sanctified, and glorified—that Being who was the object of our Lord's worship, to whose Will he yielded implicit obedience, and into whose hands he commended his Spirit—*two* distinct Beings these, Mr. Chairman—the Father and the Son, the God and our Lord—a marked SPECIALITY void of DUALITY! [Hear, hear!]

REV. DR. DONNE. We also read, Mr. Chairman, that Israel is *the Son*, and Ephraim is *the First-born of God*; yet, Sir, these, and similar epithets, are nothing more than distinctions of office, character, or privilege—not any distinction of *nature*. Even, Sir, *the only begotten*, so flourished by Trinitarians in our faces, amounts to nothing; for, we read, in Heb. xi. 17, of Abraham's offering up Isaac, *his only begotten son*, while his elder brother was still living. [Hear, hear!] Nay, even that remarkable title, *King of Kings*, given to our Lord on his exaltation to the right hand of the Majesty on High, this title, Sir, though held by Trinitarians as an irrefragable proof of his *godhead*, amounts to nothing; for, observant readers of their Bible know, that Nebuchadrezzar bore the selfsame title: yet, Mr. Chair-

* A Letter to the Rev. C. J. Blomfield, D.D. occasioned by his *Five Lectures*, etc. by W. J. Fox. Price 2d.

man, no one thinks of *deifying* the Babylonish Idolater on account of his being styled *King of Kings*, in Ezekiel.* [Cheers.]

MR. QUARLES. Besides this—if thou wilt permit a brief remark, Mr. Chairman—we read of other *Sons of God*, “which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God”—yet, none present will presume to say, they were *divine* persons. And what sort of a Deity do our friends opposite make of their *second* God? why, according to their own showing, He is *God the Son of Man!* the confessed recipient of knowledge and power; who could do nothing of Himself; who sought not the accomplishment of his own Will, but of the Will of his Father who sent him. Therefore, though our Master may be called *god*, like Moses and others, yet, for any thoughtful reader of Holy Writ to attach the definite, the emphatic title, *the god*, to any but the Great First Cause, would be nothing short of BLASPHEMY! [Applause.]

MR. GASCOIGNE, *Student*. And pray, Mr. Collins, how do you get over St. John’s knotty expression, *the God-Man, the Man Christ Jesus?* [Hear, hear! frequently repeated.]

COLLINS. Why, Sir, as I never stumbled against the “knotty” expression in John, I never experienced any difficulty in getting “over” it—nor did you, Sir, ever meet with such a ludicrous expression in your Bible: it is a Trinitarian phantasm, as false in principle as in fact; simply, one of your College-bred playthings. [Titteration.]

R.V. R. SOUTHEY. The compound term, *god-man*, was a bone of contention among the Fathers of the Church; for, Eusebius, [264—340] Bishop of Cesarea, writes—

The idea of a *God-Man* is monstrous; for, the distance from God to Man is *infinite*; and it is impossible for a perishable body to be infinite or eternal”.

MR. CLEVELAND. The term, however, may be found in Wesley’s beautifully poetic effusion, called *Wrestling Jacob*—the favorite Hymn of Dr. Watts—

And when my all of strength shall fail,
I shall with the *God-Man* prevail”. p. 138.

And this highly improper term, as unphilosophical as unbiblical, continues to be employed daily, by those who think not of what they are writing about. As one instance from among many, Mr. Chairman, a Contributor to *Public Opinion* (p. 410, Oct. 10, 1863) closes his fanatical remarks with the following period—

It is a pity that M. Rénan did not exercise his skill by endeavouring to overturn the truth of the history of Julius Cesar, or Napoleon Bonaparte, or some other famous character besides Jesus the holy *God-man*.

Enniskillen, Oct. 5th.

R. A. B. F.”

Reminding me, Mr. Chairman, of Sir Isaac Newton’s observation—

It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of *mysteries*, and, for that reason, to like best what they least understand. Horsley’s ed. Vol. v. p. 530.

S. ROWLANDS, Esq. In Newman’s “Phases of Faith”, I read—

In the Nicene age, the Bible was in people’s hands, and the Spirit of God was surely not withheld; yet, I had read, in one of the Councils an insane anathema was passed:

* This high-sounding title may be found among various nations; and it is, perhaps, worth a Note to record here, that, among other titles belonging to the present King of Burmah, we read “*the King of Kings*, possessor of boundless dominion and supreme wisdom, and Great King of Righteousness”. *Reporter*.

If anyone call Jesus *God-man*, instead of *God and Man*, let him be accursed*!

Surely, want of commonsense, and dread of natural reason, will be confessed by our highest orthodoxy to have been the distemper of that day. p. 74, Ed. 1850.

MR. RALEIGH. Mr. Chairman! John records that Jesus said—

The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but, the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works. xiv. 10.

Now, if these words of Jesus be true, *if true* that the Father supplied both the *wisdom* and the *power*, wherein, I should like to know, consists the *deity* of the Son? [Hear, hear!

REV. W. JONES. Mr. Chairman! I have just been looking over part of the x. ch. of John, wherein I find that the epithets *god* and *son of god*, were not convertible terms with Jesus, as they are with Trinitarians. When the Jews charged our Lord with *blasphemy*, for calling Himself *god*, Jesus instantly repelled the charge, asserting that *He was not the God*, but simply, *the Son of the God*. Be kind enough, Mr. Chairman, to turn to x. ch. and lend a patient ear to a running commentary on a few verses only, beginning at the 27th—

As I said unto you, my sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; [28] and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. [29] My Father which gave them to me, is greater than all; and no one *can* pluck them out of my Father's hand. [30] I and my Father are One—that is, One in design, One in purpose, One in love; *not* One in existence, One in person; for then, the sheep, the disciples, would not have that *additional* security expressed in the 29th verse, but simply the same as that in the 28th, wherein Jesus speaks of his delegated power; *adding*, in verse 29th, the guardianship of his Father's omnipotence. [31] Then, the Jews took up stones again to stone him. [32] Jesus answered them, Many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of these good works do ye stone me? [33] The Jews answered him, saying—For a good work we stone thee not, but, for *BLASPHEMY*; and because thou, being a *man*, makest thyself a *god*. [34] Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your Law—I said ye are Gods? Have you never read, never heard these words, *Ye are Gods*, when speaking of mere men? [35] If it [the Law] called them *gods*, unto whom the word of God came—and the Scripture cannot be broken—[36] say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, THOU *BLASPHEMEST*, because I said *I am the Son of the God?* I deny, that my saying *I am the Son of God*, is, as You alledge, making Myself *the God!** I never, in word or in thought, usurped or assumed my Father's titles; but, in all things, have scrupulously given Him the glory; for, as I have plainly told you, 'my Father is greater than I', and 'greater than all'. [37] If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; [38] but, if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in Him. [39] Then, they again sought to take him; but, he escaped out of their hand".

When arguments have been too strong to be refuted, Opponents have often had recourse to stones, scourgings, and imprisonments, to halters, blocks, and stakes; but, as these things are no longer fashionable in England, persecutors now-a-days have recourse to misrepresentation, slander, and lies: instead of putting "Searchers after Truth" into the Holy Inquisition,

* "We must place Jesus in the first rank of the true Sons of God. Jesus did not have visions. God did not speak to Him as some one without him; God was in him, He felt himself with God, and he drew from his heart all he says of his Father. He lived in the bosom of God by constant communication with him; He did not see him, but He heard him, without needing thunder or the burning bush, like Moses; a revelatory tempest, like Job; or, an oracle, like the Greek sages; a familiar genius, like Socrates; or, an angel Gabriel, like Mahomet. Jesus never once gave utterance to the sacrilegious idea that HE WAS GOD. He believed himself in direct relation with God, and believed himself *the Son of God*. BRYAN'S *Life of Jesus*."

our persecuting priests and prelates put men much cleverer than themselves into the Arches Court, and, in direct opposition to Christ's injunction, they prohibit their more enlightened brethren from proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus. [Hear, hear!]

Inquiries, investigations, and discussions, too commonly provoke heart-burnings, enmities, bitterness; and hence it is, that avowed difference of opinion brings forth *persecution*. Let any man, a Luther, a Strauss, or a Rénan, a Jowett, a Stanley, or a Colenso, but give publicity to what is accounted a *heterodox* sentiment, and a hue and cry is instantly raised by the willingly CREED-BOUND, though the heterodox sentiment may be the Truth itself. [Hear, hear!] The Jews would have stoned Jesus, for calling himself *the Son of God*; and Mr. Collins may expect to be traduced, though not incarcerated and hanged, for calling John *a thorough Unitarian*. But, Mr. Chairman, inquiries into the true meaning of Scripture passages, must necessarily tend to dissipate the irrational notions concerning a *Triune god*, and eventually leave the divine UNITY in all its simplicity and grandeur, as the clearly indisputable doctrine of Judaism, of Christianity, and of Commonsense! [Prolonged cheering.]

REV. E. SPENSER. I wish to observe, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding we have listened to a superabundance of texts, yet, Sir, we have not heard anything setting forth the *inferiority* of God the Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is declared in the Scriptures to be *Equal with God*, and who himself told his disciples, in the plainest terms, *I and my Father are One*. [Hear, hear!] In the "Dictionary of the Bible", edited by Dr. Smith, Canon Wordsworth writes—

Those persons who now deny Christ to be the Son of God, *co-equal* and *co-eternal* with the Father, are followers of the Jews, who, on the plea of zeal for the divine *Unity*, rejected and crucified Jesus, *who claimed to be God*".

MR. BURNS. Mr. Chairman! Without wasting the time of the Meeting with criticisms on Canon Wordsworth's unsound exegetical reasons for believing that the term *Son of God* means that Jesus was "co-equal with God"; without pausing to prove, that so far from Jesus's ever having "claimed to be God", as unwisely and falsely asserted by Wordsworth, Jesus *disclaimed* all right and title to be God; without troubling myself about anything that such an illogical writer as Wordsworth may propound; I rise, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of censuring the unbiblical phrase *God the Son*, just uttered, as if in bravado, by our Superintendent, Mr. Spenser, who ought not to have obtruded a phrase repulsive to many in this assembly, unless He is prepared to substantiate it by Scripture testimony, as required by the "Regulations of this Discussion". Though a Wesleyan myself, it provokes me to hear first one and then another of our Society, repeating such untenable—and let me add *blasphemous* expressions: [Hear, hear!] and I cannot refrain from making known my surprise, that You, Mr. Chairman, who at the very opening of the Discussion, not only called Mr. Addison to *order*, for not substantiating his assertions, but actually prohibited him from proceeding—that you, Sir, should permit others to assert just what they please; and I now, with all due respect to the Chair, demand of you, Mr. Chairman, for Truth's sake, to require of Mr. Spenser, the authority on which he grounds his unphilosophical and anti-scriptural phrase *God the Son*—require of him, if you please, Sir, from the Chair, "chapter and verse" wherein *God the Son* may be found in his Bible. [Cheers, thrice repeated.]

Chairman. Are you, Mr. Spenser, prepared to furnish the Meeting with any texts authorizing your expression *God the Son*? [Silence.]

T. SACKVILLE, Esq. It certainly is unseemly, Mr. Chairman, in our Opponents, to continue uttering Prayerbook terms and Denominational phrases, as if they were quoting the language of Scripture—and doubly are those censurable, who make use of terms and expressions which are opposed to Scripture, as Mr. Spenser has unwisely done; for, “thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts—I am the *first*, and I am the *last*; and *beside me there is no God!*” Away then, I say, with all the Trinitarian gods! gods of Man’s making, whether *God the Son*, or *God the Holy Ghost*, or any other *god* but One, “who is above all, and through all, and in all!” [Cheers.]

Chairman. Can any gentleman on my right, furnish the Meeting with any passages of Scripture warranting the expressions *God the Son* and *God the Holy Ghost*? [Silence.] Or, can anyone give the Meeting a single text? [Silence.]

SANDYS. “They are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark!”

REV. C. ANSTEE. What! not even One poor solitary text? Then, shame upon every Parrot who has been repeating by rote, phrases which have no place in the Scriptures! [Cheers.] Can you exonerate yourself from just censure, Mr. Spenser, for your indiscreet introduction of the idolatrous phrase *God the Son*?

SPENSER. I am waiting for a satisfactory reply to “I and my Father are One”. Were there no other text in the Bible to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, these six words would be amply sufficient for me; with this One sentence, I am perfectly satisfied.

PEELE. *Two* persons, Mr. Spenser, would be a *Duality*—you will require *Three*, to constitute a *Trinity*.

REV. R. BLACKMORE. You are really a very moderate gentleman, Mr. Spenser, to be “perfectly satisfied” with so very little; for, no one capable of rational inquiry, who will be at the trouble of reading the context thoughtfully, can persuade himself that the *Oneness* asserted in this favorite and sadly-misinterpreted passage, was ever meant to signify *oneness of being, sameness of essence, equality in godhead*; as it has not any relation or assimilation with the Unity, the Duality, or the Trinity of the Godhead. [Hear, hear!]

By mutilating the Scriptures, Mr. Chairman, by cutting out sentences, or, members of sentences, or, by adding words at pleasure, the Bible may be made to mean anything. Upon Mr. Spenser’s principle, I can prove from Scripture **THERE IS NO GOD**—as the Psalmist has recorded, that the Fool, in his heart, hath said so. [xiv. 1] By the aid of preconceived notions, backed by misinterpretations and false reasonings, some persons have managed to make each other believe, that the six words, *I and my Father are One*, intimate that *Jesus the Son of Man* and **THE INDIVISIBLE OMNISCIENT OMNIPOTENCE**, are *One and the same invisible infinite Spirit*, whom no eye hath seen nor can see; whereas, the *oneness* alludes to a unity of a very different kind, as explained by our Lord in the words—

Holy Father, keep through thy own name, those whom thou hast given me, *that They may be One, AS WE ARE*”.

I may now venture to ask Mr. Spenser, if he accepts the passage I have just quoted, as settling the question?

SPENSER. Not by any means. I still wait a reply.

BLACKMORE. Then, I must try again, Mr. Chairman; and, as Scripture is

the best interpreter of Scripture, I shall adduce 6 texts in illustration of the true meaning of Mr. Spenser's 6 misunderstood words—the 6 words *He understands* but does not *comprehend*. [Hear, hear!]

John xiv. 20. At that day ye shall know, that I am in the Father; and Ye in Me; and I in You.

„ xviii. 21. That they All may be One; as thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee; that They also may be One in Us.

„ 22. The glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given Them; that They may be One, even as We are One.

1 Cor. vi. 17. He that is joined unto the Lord, is One spirit.

Gal. iii. 28. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for, Ye are all One in Christ Jesus.

Heb. ii. 11. Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified, are All of One.

I trust that Mr. Spenser now apprehends the word *one* in its legitimate meaning, and that he now gives a different, a logical, a scriptural interpretation to his hitherto misapprehended text.

SPENSER. No, I am unmoved; I still entertain it in the same sense I ever did—as proving the truth of the Trinity.

BLACKMORE. Is it possible! However, Mr. Chairman, the meaning of the word *one*, whatever that meaning may be, is the same in all the passages I have quoted, and cannot rationally be associated with *the oneness of the Godhead*. Jesus was *one* with the Father in love and unanimity of Will, receiving everything from the Father, not only in his filial but also in his mediatorial character; all that Jesus possessed, was given him by the Father who sent him. Jesus himself declares, that his unity with the Father, is the very same as the unity of the Believer with God, the same as the unity of the Believer with Jesus, the same as the unity of Believers with each other; and has no more to do with the doctrine of the Trinity, than with Noah's ark, or, the Tower of London. [Hear, hear!] Words, Mr. Chairman, cannot be plainer—

That They may be One, even as We are One, and Ye are—All One in Christ Jesus”. [Applause.]

H. VAUGHAN, Esq. Whatever Mr. Spenser may conceive or not conceive of the 6 words, our great Theologian has observed on this *Oneness*—

It does *not* denote *unity of essence*, but only *intimacy of communion*. He declares himself to be One with the Father in the same manner as We are One with Him; that is *not* in essence, but in love, in communion, in agreement, in charity, in spirit, in glory. When the Son has shown in so many modes, *how* He and the Father are One, why should I set them all aside? Why should I, on the strength of my own reasoning, though in opposition to reason itself, devise another mode, which makes them *One in Essence?* or, why, if already devised by some other person, adopt it, in preference to Christ's own mode”?*

When Mr. Spenser shall have acquired but a thousandth part of Milton's theological knowledge, he will accept Christ's mode in preference to all others. [Hear, hear!]

REV. N. BRETON. Archbishop Newcome comments thus—

To snatch my true disciples out of *my* hand, would be to snatch them out of my Almighty Father's hand; because I and my Father are One; one in design, action, agreement, affection”.

And Calvin writes—

The ancients improperly used this passage, to prove that Christ is of *the same sub-*

* Extracted from Milton's "Last thoughts on the Trinity"; translated by Sumner (late Archbishop of Canterbury) first printed in 1828, by command of George IV. *Editor*.

stance as the Father; for, Jesus does not argue concerning unity of substance, but speaks of his agreement with the Father; so that whatever is done by Christ, will be confirmed by the Father's power".

Paul, in writing to the Corinthians [1 Ep. x. 17] has a similarly expressed passage—

We being *many* are *one* bread and *one* body: for, we are all partakers of that *one* bread".

Besides, Mr. Chairman, the Father and Son form but a *duality*; the omission of the Holy Spirit is fatal to Mr. Spenser's popish *trinity*, requiring *three* persons. [Hear, hear!]

MR. SHELLEY. We are wasting time, Mr. Chairman, in prolonging the Discussion over the meaning of the word *one*, in the passage instanced by Mr. Spenser, who must surely now apprehend its only legitimate meaning, although he pretends to be so enshrouded in obtuseness and impenetrability.

SPENSER. No, Sir; I cannot receive the word *one* as possibly including *two*; as that would be the very height of folly—sheer nonsense!

SHELLEY. It is, however, such nonsense as we are in the habit of receiving every day, Mr. Spenser; and that without scruple; for instance—We have not a more common expression in daily life, than "*Man and Wife are One*"; precisely similar with "*I and my Father are One*": yet, if you take Mrs. Spenser ever so lovingly on your arm to the Station, you will have to pay for *two*, on every Railroad in the Kingdom. [Hear, hear!] And more than that, Mr. Spenser; though you should take your New testament in your hand, and show the Stationmaster that Jesus himself said of Man and Wife, "*Ye are no longer Two*", and try to convince him that One ticket ought to serve for both, He would, in his turn, tell you, "that would be the very height of folly", and that you talked "sheer nonsense". [Titterations.

BURNS. I know not how to give Mr. Spenser credit for *sincerity*, in appearing so impenetrably dull; He surely must know better: for, it was but last night I heard him give out the lines—

Our souls, by Love, together knit,
Cemented, mixed in *One*;
One hope, *One* heart, *One* mind, *One* voice,
"Tis heaven on earth begun!"

SPENSER. Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced! I see it, feel it! the Light has burst in upon me, during the recitation of those lines; nor could a Sunbeam more instantaneously have illumined my mind! [Long and hearty cheerings.

Chairman. It is my duty to apprise the Disputants, that owing to the desultory turn which the Discussion has taken—the "*Regulations*" having been *broken* by the Framers—[Hear, hear!] we are, up to the present moment, busy with THE DUALITY ONLY, the Father and Son; the third Person in the Trinity not yet having been specially introduced.

REV. T. OTWAY. That excrescence on the Gospel of Jesus will die a natural death, Mr. Chairman, on our proving the non-existence of a *Duality* in the Godhead—besides, there is but one passage in the Scriptures which seems to allude to the *origin* of the Holy Spirit—[Several voices, Name it, name it!] John xv. 26; wherein we are distinctly told, that the "*Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, proceedeth from the Father*"—*not* as the Athanasian creed tells us, "*the Father and the Son*", making confusion worse confounded. [Hear, hear!]

I. WALTON, Esq. More than this, Mr. Chairman, the New covenant will not allow us to drag, neither suffer others to drag, the Holy Spirit into a participation of "the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity". Jesus, when intimating his own death, said to his disciples, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another* Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever—even the Spirit of Truth"; adding, shortly afterwards, "the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you". And, knowing the dullness of their apprehension, of which he complained again and again, Jesus returns to the subject, saying—I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go *not* away, the Comforter will *not* come unto you". And we read, in vii. John, "the Holy Spirit was *not yet given*, because, Jesus was *not yet glorified*". How the Fathers of the Church contrived, towards the close of the fourth century, to manufacture "a God the Holy Ghost", must be a puzzle to all who are tolerably well read in the New covenant, wherein there is not even the slightest intimation of any such anomalous God, of whose marvelous existence and operation it is said—the Disciples *first* received the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost", [Whitsuntide] when "about 3000 souls" were added to them: yet, "when Paul afterwards asked the disciples at Ephesus—Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit"—in short, Mr. Chairman, the men who managed to fabricate "a God the Holy Ghost", out of "the Spirit of Truth", must have been possessed with passing strange notions of God.* [Hear, hear!

OTWAY. But, Mr. Walton, let us get done with the incongruous *oneness* of a Duality, before we proceed to the still more heterogeneous *oneness* of a Trinity—the illogical, anti-scriptural, unphilosophical, and self-contradictory *One Tripersonal Godhead!* [Hear, hear!

MR. GLOVER. Mr. Spenser complained, that the *inferiority* of the Son has not been set forth; a complaint not easy to be understood, as it necessarily has been implied in all the texts showing the *superiority* of the Father: and whoever has ears to hear, must have heard repeatedly of both *superiority* and *inferiority* from several Speakers; however, though a work of super-erogation, I present the following texts—

Mat. iii. 17. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

„ xvi. 16. Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

John i. 34. I saw and bear record that this is the Son of the God.

Heb. v. 5. Thou art my Son; today have I begotten thee,

„ 8. Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.

1 John v. 5. Who is He that overcometh the world, but He that believeth that Jesus is the Son of the God?

• These 6 texts, Mr. Chairman, to which I am prepared to add 120 more, bear testimony to Jesus's being *the Son of the God*—not *the God* himself; and the following 6, constituting but part of a long list I here hold in my hand, teach us that the Son is SUBORDINATE to the Father—

* Umbrage was taken at Mr. Walton's having employed *holy spirit*, instead of *holy ghost*, as printed in our "authorized version"; and though I am unable to Report what passed, I heard Mr. Walton justifying the change, on the authority of Jesus, who spake of the *spirit of truth*, and of the *comforter*: nor would Mr. Walton admit of God's being a *ghost* at all, but, a *spirit*—the word invariably used in the Hebrew scriptures. He maintained that *ghost* is merely an archaism, introduced from monkish writings, and familiarized to our ear by its injudicious insertion and very frequent repetition in the Book of Common Prayer. *Reporter.*

- Mat. xx. 23. To sit on my right hand and on my left, is not Mine to give; but, it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.
- Luke xxii. 42. Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my Will, but thine, be done.
- John iv. 34. My meat is, to do the Will of him that sent me.
- " v. 30. I can of my own Self do nothing: I seek not my own Will, but, the Will of the Father which sent me.
- " viii. 42. I proceeded forth, and came from the God; neither came I of myself, but, He sent me.
- " xii. 49. The Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.

MR. TICKELL, *Student*. I have 6 passages, Mr. Chairman, showing that whatever Jesus did, HE DID BY THE POWER OF GOD COMMITTED TO HIM—

- Mat. xi. 27. All things are delivered to me of my Father.
- John iii. 35. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.
- " v. 43. I am come in my Father's name.
- " viii. 28. When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am [that I live] and that I do nothing of Myself; but, as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.
- " xv. 10. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.
- " xviii. 4. I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do.

REV. J. MACPHERSON. I also have 6 texts, Mr. Chairman, bearing on the same point; teaching us, that even in Heaven, our Lord is always represented as a *distinct* Being from *the God*—and always *INFERIOR*—standing, or sitting, at Jehovah's right hand—not at the right hand of Himself—[Hear, hear!]

- Mat. xxvi. 64. Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the Power.
- Mark xvi. 19. After the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of the God.
- Luke xxii. 69. Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the Power of God.
- Acts vii. 56. Behold! I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of the God.
- Rom. xviii. 34. Christ is even at the right hand of the God, who also maketh intercession for us.
- 1 Peter iii. 22. Jesus Christ, who is gone into the heavens, and is on the right hand of the God.

REV. J. DENHAM. I came prepared with a dozen texts; but, Mr. Chairman, our Opponents are probably now convinced of the Son's *INFERIORITY* to the Father—[Cries of No, no! and Go on, go on!] Well then, I shall give a dozen proofs of the *SUPERIORITY* of God the Father; first 6 from the Evangelists, afterwards 6 from the Apostles; and if any Doubter has ears to hear, now, let him hear!

SANDYS. Knox, my boy, look out for Squalls!

- Mat. xxvii. 39. O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt.

Here we have *two* distinct Wills; the one subject to the other; the Son desirous of avoiding the cup, yet, willing to take it, if pressed upon him by his Father: and, as a matter of course, those who have not the *same* Will, cannot possibly have the *same* Essence; and where the one Will is sub-

missive to the other, the submissive one must, indubitably, be *inferior* to the other. [Hear, hear!]

Mark xiii. 32. Of that day and that hour, knoweth no one; no, not the Angels which are in heaven; neither the Son; but, the Father.

Neither the Angels, nor the Son, nor any created Being, knew the hour, nor the day, of a certain future event, which was known to the Father—and as Matthew emphatically has it, “*the Father only*”; proof positive that the Knowledge of the Son was *not equal* with the Knowledge of the Father; the Father knew *more* than the Son: consequently, these *two* different degrees of Knowledge, testify to the existence of *two* different minds; the one possessing knowledge of an event of which the other was ignorant; the Father *omniscient*, the Son *not*; the one *superior*, the other *inferior*—that is, if Jesus’s representation be true. [Hear, hear!]

Luke x. 22. All things are delivered unto me of my Father.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, are *two* separate parties, not *one*; a Deliverer and a Receiver; one who gives, another who accepts.

John v. 19. The Son can do nothing of Himself.

As stated by the venerable Mr. Addison, in Opening the Discussion, there are 300 passages in the New covenant, of like import with this, all testifying that Jesus could not do anything without the aid and the power of his Father and his God; yet, Sir, there still dwell among us men, and even religious Instructors, who teach and preach that the Father and the Son are not *two* Beings, but *one*, and *one only*—despite the Son’s own plain declaration—I do nothing of Myself; the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works”. [Hear, hear!]

John viii. 42. If the God were your Father, you would love Me; for, I proceeded forth and came from the God; neither came I of Myself, but, He sent me.

Our Lord’s words are not hard to be understood, though there may be some difficulty in misunderstanding them; for, 56 times is Jesus recorded *the Sent* of God: and since there is one who *sent* and one who came, it is not easy for ordinary minds to believe that the Sender and the Sent could, by possibility, be *one and the same*. [Hear, hear!]

John xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I.

If one thing, or being, is *greater* than another, it seems but natural to infer, that one must necessarily be *less* than the other; and to most persons it must appear as impossible for the *less* to be the *greater*, as for the *greater* to be the *less*; and it will puzzle a Bishop to find out how it is, that both *the less* and *the greater* are *one and the same*. [Hear, hear!] If Jesus knew what He was talking about, when he said—“My Father is *greater* than I”, then, the Son’s *INFERIORITY* to the Father is as self-evident* as the Father’s *SUPERIORITY* to the Son; and to make any *comparison* whatever, as to greater or less, as to superiority or inferiority, as to father or son, there must, of absolute necessity, be *two distinct* beings—or, Mr. Chairman, I know not what I am talking about. [Hear, hear!]

1 Cor. xi. 3. The head of Christ, is the God.

* “The term *self-evident* is an emphatic substitute for *immediately perceivable*, or, what may be received without deliberation; correspondent with the familiar phrase, ‘that speaks for itself’, which cannot admit of a literal interpretation. COGÆ.

To me, this passage denotes both *inferiority* and *superiority*; nor can I, by any stretch of imagination, make them *one and the same*.

Ephe. iv. 6. One God and Father of All, who is above All.

Were there 3, or 300, or 3000 gods, if One be above *all*, it seems rational to infer, that all the others must be *under* that One who is *above* all—less than the God—nor can the 3000, the 300, nor yet the 3, be *one and the same* God—such incongruities cannot be admitted by logical minds. [Hear, hear !

Col. i. 15. Christ is the Image of the invisible God.

So am I; and so is every Human being; [Hear, hear !] for, herein I read—God created Man in *his own image*, in the image of God created He him; male and female created he them. Gen. i. 27.

We read, Mr. Chairman, that Christ was *visible*—born of a woman—laid in a manger—was hungry, thirsty, sleepy—eat, drank, slept—“grew, and waxed strong in spirit”—at 12 years of age, disputed with the Doctors—“increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and Man”—was, “in all points, tempted like as we are”—suffered hardships and persecutions—was insulted, mobbed, stoned, scourged, mocked, and put to an ignominious death! It was this special Messenger, that introduced a higher species of morality, and a more spiritual conception of the GREAT FIRST CAUSE, than ever Moses or the Prophets taught—He it was who *first* revealed the Father Almighty in his *paternal* character, teaching men and women that they were the Sons and Daughters of the God of heaven and earth—and He it was who *first* proclaimed, and by his Apostles propagated, those fraternizing precepts and ennobling principles now known under the appellation *christianity*—which is Judaism refined and outstripped—but, Mr. Chairman, that anyone of sound mind and of an investigating spirit should presume to call this Model of Humanity, *the invisible God himself*, is to me so shocking, so blasphemous, so—Sir, I prefer cutting the sentence short. [Cheers.

1 Tim. ii. 5. There is One God, and One Mediator between God and Man—the Man Christ Jesus.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we have a *Go-between*, a Mediator between God and Man; and this Mediator is Christ; Christ reconciling the World to God—not God to Mankind.* [Hear, hear !] Hence, Sir, we have clearly 3 distinct parties; MAN, who, through ignorance, is dissatisfied, and at variance with his beneficent Maker; CHRIST, who teaches Man that his Creator and Judge is Love; and GOD, whose tender mercies are over all his works, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, remembering we are but dust: yet, Trinitarians confound the Mediator with the Mediator's God—despite Paul's expressive words to the Galatians, when he tells them that “a Mediator is not a Mediator of One, yet, God is One”—and by reducing the 3 parties to 2 only—by making Christ himself God—our Opponents render this otherwise beautiful and logical passage, nothing but unadulterated nonsense. [Applause.

James ii. 19. Thou believest that there is but *one* God, thou doest well.

But, our friends opposite do *not* well, in believing that there is what they unphilosophically, as also unbiblically, call a *Trinity*, consisting of a

* “All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself, by Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. v. 18, etc. The teaching of the New covenant on the doctrine of *reconciliation*, is the very reverse of the Trinitarian dogma, which represents *God as being reconciled to Man*; whereas the Scriptures teach, that *Man is reconciled to God*. Editor.

God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy Ghost; as every child knows, that such pagan Trinity is made up of 3 distinctly separate Gods, whatever sophism may pretend or trinitarianism teach—or, I know not the meaning of the plainest words of my mother tongue. [Hear, hear!

In the Vedas of the Hindoos, it is written—

There is ONE LIVING AND TRUE GOD; everlasting, without Parts or Passion; of Infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of *all things*”.

In the works of Confucius I read—

When thou art in the secret places of thy house, do not say, *None sees me*; for, there is an Intelligent Spirit who seeth *all*: the Supreme pierces into the recesses of the heart, as light penetrates into a dark room; and we must endeavour to be in harmony with His light, like a musical instrument perfectly attuned”.

In the Zend Avesta of the Persians, it is written—

The heavens are *a point*, from the pen of God's perfection—the world is *a bud*, from the bower of His beauty—the sun is *a spark*, from the light of His wisdom—the sky is *a bubble*, on the sea of His power”.

In the Koran I read—

God hath commanded that Ye worship no one beside Him.

In the sacred writings of the Sikh Gooroos it is written—

Thou art in each thing, and in all places, O God! Thou art the One existent Being. My mind dwells upon One, Him who gave the soul and the body. Numerous Mahomets have there been, and multitudes of Brahmas, Vishnus, and Sivas; thousands of Peers and Prophets, and tens of thousands of Saints and Holy men; but, the Chief of Lords is *the One Lord*! CUNNINGHAM'S *History of the Sikhs*.

In Rev. J. J. Tayler's Address (12 Oct. 1863) I read—

If ever there were a *monotheistic* book in the world, it is the Bible. To call simple Unitarianism (as some have called it) *a Theological assumption*, is itself an assumption, till it can be shown that the onward progress of human thought from the *polytheism* in which it apparently commenced, is at any point legitimately arrested, short of a full recognition of the absolute Unity which infolds and consecrates all things”.

Christians in general know but very little—far too little, indeed, of the conceptions which rational beings of other countries entertain of the Great First Cause—the Father of all his intelligent creatures, in every clime, of every nation, people, and tongue. Jehovah has his worshipers in all places inhabited by Man!

It is, perhaps, not unworthy of a passing remark, Mr. Chairman, that in one of Mahomet's letters to a Syrian prince, written in 1611, the concluding paragraph runs thus—

I conjure you to believe in *one God alone*, and without Partners”.*
[Hear, hear!

Rev. i. 1. The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which the God gave unto him.

Our Pulpits usually talk about “the Revelation of St. John”, instead of “the Revelation of Jesus Christ”; just as they talk about “St. John's Gospel”, instead of “the Gospel of Jesus”, as recorded by John.

Originally, the book *Revelation* was called “the Apocalypse of John”, and it is held, by several biblical scholars, as being altogether *spurious*. [Hear,

* This Letter was recently exhibited amongst the extremely rare and very valuable Collection of ancient Manuscripts in Chancery Lane, London. *Reporter*.

hear! and Nonsense!] Is my assertion questioned? Why, Mr. Chairman, you can bear witness, that Michaelis has recorded and handed down the fact, that Luther not only repudiated the Apocalypse, but, in the Preface to his Bible (of which many Copies are still extant) after declaring the *spuriousness* of the so-called *Revelation*, He solemnly charged his Successors never to print his Translation of the book, without publishing his avowal of its *spuriousness*—a Charge not long respected: nor is Professor Newman surprised at their dereliction of duty—because, such (alas) is the habitual unfairness of ecclesiastical corporations.* [Hear, hear!]

Were this a fitting time, I should give a list of several Scholars known to fame, who have assigned weighty reasons for accounting the Apocalypse among the *spurious* writings of the early ages of Christianity—and certainly not by John.

To me, Mr. Chairman, the *superiority* of the Father and the *inferiority* of the Son, are manifest; and nothing but the “blinding prejudices of education”, can prevent anyone of but common understanding from seeing and acknowledging them.

Our friends opposite are driven to the necessity of catching a solitary Text here and there, which, from mistranslation, by perversion, or, with the ingenious aid of some fraudulent interpolation, is artfully made to countenance the false doctrine of the TRINITY; while we, Sir, can support the UNITY OF THE GODHEAD with scores, and hundreds, and thousands of Texts. [Long and loud applause.]

Mr. HURDIS. Besides, Mr. Chairman, Unitarianism can be expressed, fully, appropriately, and clearly, in the language of Scripture; but, neither in the Old nor the New testament, are such *orthodox* expressions to be found as *God the Son*, or *God the Holy Ghost*, or the popish *Trinity*—such monstrosities are not in the Scriptures! [Cheers.]

REV. J. MERRICK, a returned *Missionary*. True, Mr. Chairman, of the Trinity no mention is made in the Scriptures: yet, *Triune gods* existed in the imaginations of men of other creeds and other climes, ages and ages before the birth of Christ; and I am of opinion, Sir, from what I witnessed abroad, that we shall never succeed in converting the natives of India to Christianity, untill we get rid of a Trinity which is certainly inferior to their own Trinity.† [Hear, hear!]

The New covenant, Mr. Chairman, is the Christian's only Guide; and therein we shall seek in vain for such an abortion as a *Trinity*: it is, Sir,

* Among the second century writers, were Objecters to the Johanneic theory; some of them rejecting its every claim to Inspiration. Eusebius, Cyril, Gregory, the Laodicean Council, and others, do not admit the Apocalypse among the Canonical books. Luther (in his Preface of 1522) maintains that there is not any trace in *Revelation* that it is established by the Holy Spirit, neither being prophetic nor apostolic. Both Calvin and Beza prohibited its use in the Geneva church. Scaliger boldly declares that the Apocalypse was never written by St. John; and that strange compound, Dr. South, tells us—If the Apocalypse does not find a man *mad*, it leaves him so”.

The *Revelation*, breathing a spirit of revenge on the ungodly, was never penned by the writer of the Evangel and the Epistles, which breathe a spirit of love. In John's biographical account of his Master, there are *no demons*, *no witches*, nor even *any angels*, as in the other Evangelists; nor is any mention made of *sorcerers*, which are so prominent in the puzzling and “plaguey Apocalypse”; neither is the wonderful *transfiguration* scene related by John, though, according to the report of Luke and others, John was present. Query—Could John have been there, without his knowing it? *Editor*.

† The Hindoos, whose chronology gives 4,320,000 years as the period of their existence as a nation, have three Deities—*BRAHMA*, the *invisible* ruler of the earth; *VISHNU*, the *preserver*; and *SIVI*, the *destroyer*.

27 years b. c. Philo, the Jew, was born at Alexandria; and this *thinker* was familiar with the

of heathen origin, and is with us a popish gangrene, altogether unknown to primitive Christianity; therefore, the sooner we destroy the pernicious excrescence, the better will it be for Christendom. History, and Reason, and the Bible, alike condemn the heterogeneous doctrine of the now crumbling Idol of infatuated Trinitarians. [Cheers.]

REV. T. B. MACAULAY. Mr. Chairman! taking my position into consideration, I should not, perhaps, be justified in remaining wholly silent on this interesting occasion; yet, Sir, I shall not detain the Meeting many minutes. Neither in the Old nor in the New covenant, is there any such anomaly as "Three Persons and One God"; nor any such anomalies as a "God the Son", or a "God the Holy Ghost" to be found in either the Jewish or the Christian scriptures. I challenge all the Trinitarians present, to contradict me with a single plain and indisputable text! Clever biblical Scholars of every age, have repudiated the untenable *Trinity*. While Jerome, "who excelled all his cotemporaries in erudition", tells his readers, that "Those who confess the *Trinity*, must bid farewell to Science"; and whilst Luther calls the *Trinity* "a mere human invention"; Calvin writes—

The word *trinity* is barbarous, insipid, profane; a human institution, grounded on no testimony of God's word: the *popish god*, unknown to the Prophets and Apostles". [Hear, hear!]

The single-hearted Gilbert Wakefield, who had the genius of a philosopher with the simplicity of a child, pronounced the Trinitarian doctrine,

A preposterous accommodation of Evangelical Truth to the mysteries of Gentile philosophy".

And Hallam has shrewdly observed—

The doctrine of the Trinity, is *that* which Theologians call *inscrutable*, but which they do not fail to define and analyze with the most confident dogmatism".

The Christianity of the New covenant, Mr. Chairman, cannot be accused of countenancing any such idiosyncrasies and unintelligibilities as "One God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity"—even Infants tell their Catechists, 3 ones must be 3, and *cannot* be anything else; just as 9 ones must be 9; while Arithmeticians very significantly shake their heads, when told that "*Three is One, and One is Three*". [Cheers.]

MR. CHALKHILL. One of our cleverest Doctors of Divinity has written for our instruction—

Though *three are one*, may be bad Arithmetic, it is good Divinity".

MACAULAY. I know it; and I also know that another doctor of Divinity [South] has written—

What is *nonsense* on a principle of reason, will never be *sense* upon a principle of religion". [Hear, hear!]

three modes of thought, peculiar to the Platonist, the Oriental, and the Israelite. By distrusting the senses, discarding the reason, and taking refuge in faith, He gave Philosophy a determination towards *mysticism*, and united it once more to Religion. By a subtle process of dialectics, the Alexandrians came to the conclusion that the Deity consisted of a *Trinity in Unity*. This creed was in vogue when Jesus commenced his ministry; and His teaching that there was but *One true God only*, resulted in opposition being made to His more enlightened conceptions of a Supreme being. *Reporter*.

Mr. Lucas (of Gateshead-on-Tyne) in his thorough exposure of Rev. W. Newton, in 1863, observes—

The Jew, the Mahometan, the Persian, the Hindoo, and, we may add, the millions of China, will not be reached by the prevailing theologies. Unitarian modes of thought—or, the practical simplicity of the Gospel—cannot be accepted as the Christian religion, by these vast nations. The orthodox theology has proved the great difficulty to the progress of *mission-work*, wherever Christianity has been anticipated by the establishment of any other form of religion". p. 16. *Editor*.

MR. BROWN. Then, with Pope, I would ask,
Who shall decide, when Doctors disagree?"

C. SMART, Esq. I heard from the Pulpit, but last Sunday, that "the Trinity is truly an arithmetical enigma"; but, Mr. Chairman, when I read in the Book of Common Prayer—

In this Trinity, none is afore or after other; none is greater or less than another; but, the whole three persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal: so that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshiped. He, therefore, that will be saved, *must thus think* of the Trinity"—

I close the book, "more in sorrow than in anger", and ejaculate in the words of our Litany—

That it may please Thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with *true knowledge* of thy Word; that both by their preaching and living, they may set it forth, and show it accordingly"! [Hear, hear!

No wonder that archbishop Tillotson said to bishop Burnett, who had advanced all he could in palliation of the Athanasian creed—*I wish we were well rid of it!*" It has long been a stumblingblock to the thinking Laity, and a millstone about the necks of our investigating and conscientious Clergy.

REV. R. HEBER. Though confessedly a Trinitarian, I respect Truth more highly than a Creed; and I must frankly own, I felt pleased on discovering that Dr. Longley (our present Archbishop of Canterbury) is not a whit behind Tillotson in wishing the Athanasian creed "removed from our Church Service". [No, no!] My authority, Mr. Chairman, I give in Dr. Longley's own words, printed and to be read of all men—

If I were called upon to give my Vote upon the subject, it would be for its Omission". [Bravo, bravo!

PEELE. Then, Mr. Chairman, we have got the right man in the right place. *Nil desperandum!* [Pause.

MR. W. HAYLEY, a Student. As I was interrupted, when wishing to set Mr. Denham right, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you may now allow me to speak—unless you wish the Unitarians to have it all their own way.

Chairman. That, certainly, is not a very handsome compliment to your Chairman, Mr. Hayley. You alledge, that you were "interrupted"—that, Sir, is not a fair statement; You *would* have interrupted a Speaker, and were checked in your uncourteous attempt. If you wish to be heard in a public Meeting, you must learn to listen without interrupting others. [Applause] Now, Sir, the Meeting is ready to hear you.

HAYLEY. Mr. Denham said, "the Father knew *more* than the Son"; and I rose to correct him, but was not permitted.

Chairman. Again unfairly stated—but, no matter; go on, Sir, if you please.

HAYLEY. I maintain, that *Christ knew all things*; and as he knew *all*, I deny that his Father could know *more*. [Pause.

Chairman. Go on, Mr. Hayley; the Meeting is waiting for your *proofs*—your Scripture testimony, to support both your affirmation and denial.

HAYLEY. In Christ's discourse with his Disciples, shortly before his crucifixion [John xvi. 30] they felt themselves forced to acknowledge—*Now are we sure that Thou knowest ALL things*"—and on his asking Peter, for the third time, "Lovest thou Me?" Peter replied [John xxi. 17] *Lord, thou knowest ALL things, thou knowest that I love thee!*" How then, can Mr. Denham pretend that the Father knew *more* than the Son?

MR. LODGE. And would you, Mr. Hayley, have interrupted Mr. Denham, that you might have given vent to such puerile remarks? Such obtrusions, Mr. Hayley, are not patiently to be endured! It is evident, that you have not taken any pains to *prepare* yourself for taking an active part in this Discussion; for, you speak without thought, and, consequently, waste the time and mock the attention of the Meeting. [Hear, hear!]

DENHAM. True, Mr. Lodge; for, a few moments thought might have shown Mr. Hayley, that *to know ALL things*, was simply a hyperbolic phrase of everyday life, expressing in words *more* than it was intended to convey in reality—a very common mode of expression.

HAYLEY. Sir, I deny that the language of the Bible is hyperbolic.

DENHAM. You deny! and *who pray* are You? and how long is it since you left your mother's apronstrings? Your denial, Mr. Hayley, is one thing; facts another. Listen to the last verse in John, bordering on your own inappropriate quotation—

There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, If they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written*.

That, Mr. Hayley, is an *hyperbole*; for, all the books alluded to, could not possibly fill one of your Father's coalpits, much less the world. [Hear, hear!] The Bible is replete with *hyperbolic* phraseology; and sometimes, it seems prodigiously extravagant to us of the Western world.*

MR. PENROSE. Had Mr. Hayley consulted Grotius, or Rosenmuller, or even our own Macknight, Campbell, and others, he might have learned, that *to know ALL things*, does not imply Omniscience; had he read but his Bible observantly, he would have known it; for, in 2 Sam. xiv. 20, David is said "to know ALL things that are in the Earth"; and John writes to his fellowmen, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and *Ye know ALL things*." 1 John ii. 20.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, the weight attached, by Mr. Hayley, to the two passages he has instanced, falls to the ground; and it certainly would be more becoming in Him (and in other ill-read Boys like him) silently to listen and learn, than to obtrude immatured notions on a company like this, under the presumption of being qualified to instruct. [Hear, hear!]

SANDYS. A word in Season, how good is it!

CAREW. True, Mr. Sandys; but (according to Lavater) He who gives himself *airs of importance*, exhibits the credentials of Impotence*.

MR. W. CARTWRIGHT, *Student*. I wish to observe, Mr. Chairman, that St. Paul tells us, most distinctly, in Col. ii. 9, In Him [Christ] dwelleth *all* the fulness of the Godhead bodily"; therefore, Christ must of course be of the same substance with the Father, and his equal in power and glory.

* When the Spies returned from Canaan, how extravagant the language of their Report—

We saw the Giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight. Num. xiii. 32.

But the Tree spoken of by Nebuchadnezzar, outdoes the sons of Anak—

The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth. Dan. iv. 11.

Such hyperboles are common among the Eastern nations, and the Bible furnishes many such extravagances; yet, they but seldom mislead either hearers or readers of ordinary intelligence, who instantaneously make the necessary allowances—just as we English are in the habit of doing, in daily life; for, we express more than we mean, when we say—

I am your most obedient, humble Servant!
I would not live in London a month, for the world!
He is a clever fellow; he knows everything. *Editor.*

REV. J. FORD. Had you, Mr. Cartwright, attended to your favorite Teacher's advice,

"Be checked for Silence, but never taxed for Speech";* you would not have exhibited your ignorance of the meaning of the Text quoted, before an Assembly like this. That same apostle whom you quote, prays [in Ephe. iii. 19] that Christians "may be filled with *all* the fulness of God"—which means, according to your silly interpretation, that all Christians so filled, were "of the same substance with the Father, and his equal in power and glory"—What nonsense! [Hear, hear!]

W. GIFFORD, Esq. Gentlemen may declaim as earnestly as they please against our belief in a *Triune god*, and quote text upon text, and bishop after bishop, in the hope of persuading us that Christ was *not* God as well as Man; but, we are not left without some of the plainest passages to *prove* the very reverse of their infidel insinuations; [Hear, hear!] and, in the phraseology of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, I make a stand for THE GODHEAD of our Lord Jesus Christ—

Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: *God was manifested in the Flesh*, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory".

I now ask the Unitarians, if St. Paul does not here refer to Christ? if, in this passage, the Apostle does not plainly say—*Christ is God?* "God manifested in the Flesh"?

REV. MR. ROSCOMMON. Mr. Chairman! I am almost at a loss how to reply to Mr. Gifford; as there is nothing so indestructible as Nonsense. Paul, Mr. Gifford, was not such a blockhead as to commit the stupid blunder of making Christ *the God*; neither was Paul capable of inculcating the popish doctrine that "God was manifested in the Flesh"; Paul knew better, and has taught us better, in the memorable words—

To us, there is but One god, the Father—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ":

for, Paul was no Trinitarian; but, like John, and the rest of the Apostles, "a thorough Unitarian," as you, Mr. Gifford, may find out, when you become better acquainted with him: He never wrote the nonsense you quote—the thing is impossible!

GIFFORD. Here is the proof, Mr. Chairman; see the words for yourself—"God was manifested in the Flesh"—

ROSCOMMON. A moment's patience, if you please, Sir. I know, as well as you do, what stands in our "authorized version"; and I also know, that Paul is not answerable for the "pious fraud" in translating his words *falsely*. [Hear, hear!] I think, Mr. Chairman, one of the "Regulations" prohibits speaking or quoting any tongue but English—

Chairman. It is so stipulated, Mr. Roscommon.

ROSCOMMON. Well, I shall manage to acquaint Mr. Gifford with the meaning of his text, without infringing the "Regulations".

The word translated godliness, simply means *piety*, and piety there means *the discharge of a duty to God*, and has reference to Christ only; while the insertion of the word *god*, by the Trinitarian translators, is a most reproachful *falsification* of the original passage.

* "Love all, trust a few,

Do wrong to none; be able for thy enemy
Rather in power than use; and keep thy friend
Under thy own life's key: be checked for silence,
But never taxed for speech: *All's Well that Ends Well*.

In Sharpe's New testament (which no mere English scholar should be without*) translated from Griesbach's text, the Greek is thus rendered—

Confessedly, great is the mystery of godliness. One was made manifest in the flesh", etc.

It is thought by some Critics, that the Translators corrupted the text of set purpose; as they not merely inserted the word *god*, where *christ* was evidently meant, but, contrary to their usual mode of printing elucidatory words, they actually printed *god* in Roman, not in Italic type; grossly misleading the English reader, by inculcating human idiosyncrasy for God's truth! Such alteration of the text, is nothing short of a culpable propagation of a *falsehood*—"teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"! The Translators must have known, perfectly well, that it was *not* God but Christ; as corroborated by John, in his third Epistle—

For this purpose, *the Son of God* was manifested", etc.

the Son, *not* the Father, *not* the God. [Hear, hear!

MR. E. FAIRFAX. A similar dishonest rendering of the Greek, may be seen, Mr. Chairman, in 1 John iii. 16; where our trinitarian-minded Translators give us—

Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down his life for us"—

which is a contradiction in terms, as the ever-living God never laid down his life! All that the Greek tells us is this—

Hereby perceive we the love, because He [Christ] laid down his life for us";

clearly alluding to the Son, *not* the Father, of whom it is written—"the Lord is the true God, he is the living God".

Were it any part of my duty, Mr. Chairman, I could instance a variety of Trinitarian passages, *all equally false*; but, Sir, I leave to our Opponents the discreditable task of producing interpolations and dishonest versions—every one of which, Sir, we are prepared to confute, by rational arguments, and to refute, with unequivocal texts. We challenge our Antagonists, who braved us to this encounter, to bring forth a single *unfalsified* text from the Bible, showing that Christ is called *the God*; while we, Sir, can produce no fewer than 1300 texts from the Evangelists and Apostles to prove the contrary! [Applause] The doctrine of the Trinity is *not* of God, but of Man—purely of Man's invention; and what is more, IT IS AS INCONCEIVABLE IN IDEA AS IT IS IMPOSSIBLE IN FACT! [Prolonged cheering.

MR. CHATTERTON, *Student*. I cannot help thinking, Mr. Chairman, that some authorities ought to have been quoted by Mr. Roscommon, to have strengthened his opinion that Christ and *not* "God was manifested in the Flesh". [Hear, hear!

MR. BAYLY. Why, friend Chatterton, thou hast been napping, surely! Are not Griesbach, Sharpe, and John, sufficient authority for thee? or, is thy opinion to counterbalance them all? Hadst thou looked into thy Textbook, thy own theological guide, bishop Marsh would have told thee—

This reading [God manifested] is found at first hand, in *not* a single ancient version, except the Arabic, which is of very doubtful authority". [Hear, hear!

R. AYTON, Esq. Sir Isaac Newton, who is, perhaps, almost as great an author-

* The mere English student, who wishes for a more faithful Translation of the Christian scriptures, than that of our "authorized version", may procure a Copy of Sharpe's translation of Griesbach's text, for 1s. 6d. (by Post 1s. 10d) at J. R. Smith's, Soho Square, London. *Editor*.

† See "Historical account of Two notable Corruptions of Scripture"; of which there is an *imperfect* edition of 1764: but, bishop Horsley has given it intire, in Vol. 5, of Newton's Works, 1785. *Editor*.

ity as Mr. Student Chatterton, tells us,† that “all the Churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the Authors of *all* the ancient versions, Jerome as well as the rest, received 1 Tim. iii. 16, in the following acceptation—

Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the Flesh”.

But, Mr. Chairman, like all other dogmas, when once introduced, it is no easy matter to get it extirpated out of theological composition. In the *British Quarterly Review*, for October, 1863, stands the following period—

This is our Jesus, whom the Prophets had foretold, and whom the heavens have received, who lives now, and by His life imparts all life to his followers—*the living God, who was manifested in the Flesh*”.

And this illogical dogma may be read daily, in what is called *the Religious press*. When will men learn to observe, to think, to reason! and when will they have the manliness to quote accurately and honestly!

MR. SHADWELL. In Mill's Logic (p. 127) I read—

A fundamental error, is seldom expelled from Philosophy, by a single victory. It retreats slowly, defends every inch of ground, and often retains a footing in some remote fastness *after* it has been driven from the open country”—

and this truth may be applied with still more force in matters of Theology; for, when once the mind has been impregnated with a religious error—such as *Spirit* having been made visible in *Flesh*—and having become *Flesh*—it requires ages to get the error completely rooted out.

An unprejudiced mind needs not to be told twice, before it once clearly conceives, that as the Son was the brightness of his Father's glory, he could not be the Father himself; that the Son's being the express image of his Father's person, the Son could not be both the person and the image; that if the Son were the manifestation of God, the Son could not be both the manifestation and the God manifested: yet, as Lord John Russell, in 1855, told the Young Christian Men, in Exeter Hall—

Some there are, who shut their eyes to one truth, lest it should impair another they deem more sacred. But, one truth can no more quench another truth, than one sunbeam can quench another sunbeam. *Truth is One, as God is One*”.

To say that God, *an invisible spirit*, was *seen* of men as *material flesh*, is to say—God is both *what He is* and *what He is not*—and this (*alas*) is quite ORTHODOX in 1864!

MR. GRAHAME. Mr. Chairman! I entered this Meeting a Trinitarian—now, I am a Unitarian! [Hear, hear!] I was a Trinitarian by education—I am a Unitarian from conviction! The Wesleyan Pulpit, and still more the Wesleyan Hymns, *not* the Scriptures, impregnated my mind with Trinitarian notions; and, though nearly 40 years of age, I have never once examined the doctrine of the Trinity for myself! [Hear, hear!] During several years, I have been Leader of the Orchestra in our chapel, and am as familiar with our Hymnbook, as any Sailor with his Compass; I certainly can quote the Hymnbook much readier than the Bible: on the present subject, *God in the Flesh*, we sing—

God vouchsafed in Flesh to appear,
 Lord of Glory, Son of Man,
 Poor, and vile, and abject here. p. 191.
 Veiled in Flesh the Godhead see;
 Hail the incarnate Deity! p. 555.
 God in our Flesh revealed. p. 556.

Suffice for us that God we know,
 Our God is manifest below. p. 561.
 God in the Flesh below. p. 565.
 Ancient of Days, why didst thou come
 And stoop to a poor Virgin's womb,
 Contracted to a Span?
 Flesh of our Flesh why wast thou made,
 And humbly in a manger laid,
 The new-born Son of Man?" p. 603.

I have given but half a dozen examples (as that seems to be the order of the day) inculcating this dogma, to show how my mind has been impressed with an unsound doctrine; and I really believe, Mr. Chairman, that thousands of thousands are as thoughtless, unexamining, popish Trinitarians as I have hitherto been; but, Sir, I can truthfully say, "Once I was blind, now I see!" [Cheers.

REV. A. RAMSAY. I rise, Mr. Chairman, as a Wesleyan minister, to protest against anyone's introducing quotations from our Hymns into this Discussion! [Hear, hear!] We are met here, Sir, to prove or disprove the Unity or Trinity of the Godhead, *not* to discuss the tenets of Wesleyanism.

GRAHAME. Had I transgressed against the "Regulations" of this Meeting, I trust you, Mr. Chairman, would have called me to Order; but, Sir, so long as my observations remain within legitimate bounds, I consider myself as much entitled to give expression to my sentiments, as anyone present. [Hearty cheers.

Chairman. It appears to me, that Mr. Ramsay has taken a wrong view of the nature and object of this Meeting; it is not in anywise *sectarian*; all denominations are equally at liberty to express their sentiments and convictions; it is *not* as a *wesleyan*, but, as a *trinitarian*, that Mr. Ramsay must defend the quotations given by Mr. Grahame, who has instanced a few verses, such as have had a baneful influence over his mind, and which he has been in the habit of singing, for years, without perceiving the un-biblical dogmas they contain. Error may be diffused by Hymns, as easily and as fatally, as by Creeds or Liturgies; and if Mr. Grahame conceives he has discovered the grand source of his delusion, I am of opinion he is not out of Order in making it known. This Meeting has not anything to do with *methodism* or *wesleyanism*, though it has to do with Wesleyans who profess either *unitarianism* or *trinitarianism*. If Mr. Ramsay advocates the doctrine of the Trinity, this Meeting will respectfully listen to his defense of the lines quoted from the Wesleyan Hymnbook—*not* as a *wesleyan*, but, as a *trinitarian*. [Applause. Pause.

GRAHAME. Neither Mr. Ramsay, nor anyone else, can deny, that the propagation of *trinitarianism* is a prominent feature in Methodism—

"Him Three in One, and One in Three,
 Extol to all eternity. p. 225.
 Hail Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
 One God, in Persons Three. p. 320.
 A mystical plurality
 We in the Godhead own,
 Adoring One, in Persons Three,
 And Three in nature One. p. 246.
 One, inexplicably Three,
 One, in simplest Unity. p. 249.
 Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
 One in Three, and Three in One. p. 404.

Hail, Holy Ghost, Jehovah, Third
 In order of the Three;
 Sprung from the Father *and* the Word
 From all eternity". p. 493.*

But, Mr. Chairman, however mistaken the Wesleyans may be on some or on many points, and bigoted on others, they have been the honored instruments of an immeasurable amount of good in this country; [Applause] and, as a body, they are far better than what some of their dogmas would lead strangers to suppose—above all, Mr. Chairman, they have the virtue of *vitality* in their religion—and, as I have lived, I hope to die among them! [Cheers throughout the assembly.]

REV. T. WARTON. There is one particular passage, Mr. Chairman, which I have been taught to consider as being not merely our strongest proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, but, as being fairly unanswerable; [Hear, hear!] I shall, therefore, state it to the Meeting; and should anyone present undertake to confute it by Scripture, and refute it to my conviction, I may almost venture to promise this Assembly that I shall take up his view and forego my own—so confident am I of the unanswerableness of the passage. I refer, Sir, to that command given by our Lord to the eleven Disciples, in the xxviii. Mat. 19 v.

Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Ghost".

This, as you know, Mr. Chairman, constitutes our Baptismal form; for, the words we use run thus—

I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen!"

Now, the text instanced, Mr. Chairman, we maintain, not only indicates, but clearly *proves* the doctrine of the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy

* There was much more said, and many more examples quoted, than met my ear—thanks to the *inaudibility* of the speakers, who seemed not to know, that the first object of Speaking, is—*to be understood*. After the Meeting, I was made acquainted with much that had been inaudibly uttered; and I now give in a Note, what was communicated to me, without my vouching for the accuracy of every word having been spoken in public.

Someone expressed surprise, and even questioned the memory of Mr. Grahame, in calling the Holy Ghost by the name *Jehovah*; when a Stranger stood up, and repeated—

Hail, Holy Ghost, *Jehovah*, Third
 In order of the *Three*;
 Sprung from the Father *and* the Word
 From all eternity".

He continued—In like manner, Christ is *Jehovah*, on p. 240—and Christ is also made into the *Great I Am*—

God the invisible appears!
 God the blest, *The Great I Am*,
 Sojourns in this vale of tears,
 And *Jesus* is his Name". p. 559.

More than this, our Hymnbook not only clothes Christ, and the Holy Spirit, with the *Godhead*, but even frail and sinful *Man* himself—

More favored than the Saints of old,
 Who *now*, by faith, approach to Thee,
 Shall all, with open face, behold
 In Christ, the glorious Deity;
 Shall see and *put the Godhead* on,
 The nature of Thy sinless Son". p. 273.

Man is also said to be capable of containing the *Fulness of the Deity*, whom the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain—

Fulness of the Deity
 In Jesu's body dwells,
 Dwells in all his Saints, *and Me*,
 When God his Son reveals". p. 556.

Ghost—for, being commanded by our Lord himself, after his resurrection, to baptize in the *three* Names, it follows of course, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, just as the Father is God; which *three* constitute, beyond all contradiction, “the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity”.

Is there any Unitarian present, bold enough to controvert, or to attempt controverting, what I have now advanced as incontrovertible? [Pause.

MR. PERCY, *Student*. Mr. Chairman! As no one rises to accept the redoubtable challenge, though but a youth, I am, Sir, bold enough, with my sling and stone, to meet the defiant Mr. Warton’s “strongest proof of the doctrine of the Trinity”; [Cheers] and should I prove incompetent to the task, I rely on the support of those who are everyway able to controvert it.

If I apprehend you aright, Mr. Warton, you place important stress on the Son and the Holy Ghost being placed in immediate association with the Father; and you infer, that because they are so intimately connected with the Father, they are, therefore, equal with the Father, participaters in the Godhead: is it so, Mr. Warton? or, have I misconceived your standpoint?

WARTON. Just so; through their association and affinity, the *deity* of both Son and Holy Ghost are unassailably established! [Hear, hear!] It would have been nothing short of blasphemy, to join any Name with that of the Father which did not partake of *the Godhead*; therefore, I repeat, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, even as the Father is God.

And what is more astounding and revolting still, we Wesleyans sing of the Birth of the Great First Cause, as having *first* taken place about 1864 years ago—

Him the Angels all adored, [Jesus
Their Maker and their King;
Tidings of their humble Lord
They now to mortals bring.
Emptied of his Majesty,
Of his dazzling glories shorn,
BEING’S SOURCE BEGINS TO BE,
And GOD HIMSELF IS BORN!” p. 559.

I look upon Fanaticism as being a real disease, or, I never could have been guilty of singing such blasphemy as this, from year to year; and I cannot now but pity from my very soul, all those who are so hypochondriacally affected, as to Sing, in perfect unconsciousness of blaspheming against the ONLY TRUE GOD, such anti-scriptural doctrines as the following—

To God the Son belongs
Immortal glory too, &c.
To God the Spirit’s name
Immortal worship give, &c.
The undivided Three,
And the mysterious One”. p. 688.

In short, there is not any irrationality connected with the inexplicable and unbiblical Trinity, which our Hymnbook does not countenance! Our doxology is as follows—

Praise God, from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly host;
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost!”

These, and several other examples were given by the Stranger, to show that *trinitarianism* is propagated among Wesleyans in their Hymns. And when Mr. Ramsay rashly defied anyone to produce anything from the Hymnbook, which detracted from that Charity which thinketh no evil, Mr. Grahame instantly quoted,

The Arab thief, as Satan bold,
Who quite destroyed thy Asian fold!”

adding, and in the same *charitable* Hymn, we sing,

The Unitarian fiend expel,
And chase his doctrine back to Hell!” p. 416.

which caused considerable agitation in the Meeting; several evincing horror at such *uncharitableness*.

The Chairman remained perfectly silent during the somewhat turbulent conflict. *Reporter*.

PERCY. Your argument, Mr. Warton, (if argument it be) will not bear scrutiny, will not stand the test. I need not, I hope, quote more than a couple of texts, to convince you of the groundlessness of your inference. In Exodus, xiv. 31, it is written—"The people feared the Lord and believed Jehovah and his servant Moses"—and in Numbers, xxi. 5, I read—"The people spake against God and against Moses": therefore, Mr. Warton, according to your inference, MOSES WAS JEHOVAH; and if not, then, as you assert, it was *blasphemy* to join Moses with Jehovah in the expression of a people's religious faith and life. Do you not perceive, Mr. Warton, that I have taken away the foundation on which you build your dogmatic superstructure? The association of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father, in your quotation, no more proves them to be *co-equals*, than the association in my quotations, proves Moses to be a constituent part of the *Godhead*; or, that the association of Moses and Jehovah is *blasphemy*. With the Bible before you, Mr. Warton, you ought not to have been so reckless as to tell this Meeting, that the mere association of Names leads to any such results as *equality* or *blasphemy*.

WARTON. I see it, Sir, I see it! Yet, I know that the text I instanced so confidently, is considered by Trinitarians as irrefutable.

REV. J. HAMMOND. After complimenting our young friend Percy on his *first Essay*, [Cheers] I would respectfully intimate to Mr. Warton, that He is not so familiar with the writings of Trinitarians as I am; and I beg to quote a few lines, from celebrated trinitarian writers, on the text brought forward by Mr. Warton as incontrovertible—

Professor Le Clero writes—In consequence of the power which I have received from God, I appoint you to go amongst all nations".

Archbishop Secker writes—The phrase *in the Name*, signifies, in strictness, *into the Name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which word *into*, the New testament uses nine times in speaking of Baptism; whereas it uses a word signifying *in* but once besides".

Michaelis writes—We know how frequently this passage is quoted as a proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, by many indeed who do not believe this doctrine, and wish perhaps to undermine it. I must confess that *I cannot see it* in this point of view. [Hear, hear!] The meaning of Jesus *may* have been: Those who were baptized should, upon their baptism, Confess that they believed in the Father, and in the Son, and in all the doctrines inculcated by the Holy Spirit".

Parkhurst writes—To be baptized *into*, or, *in the Name*, is to be baptized into the faith or confession, or, in token of one's faith, and of one's openly confessing".

Blomfield writes—To be baptized *in the Name of anyone*, is, by baptism, to be bound to observe the religious observances instituted by Him".

These extracts from such Trinitarian critics, Mr. Chairman, show that, in their judgement, the meaning of the passage so confidently adduced by Mr. Warton, does not inculcate the doctrine of the *Tri-personal god*. And this, Sir, is another corroborative proof, that there is not a so-called *trinitarian-text* in the Bible, which celebrated Trinitarians themselves have not admitted to be wholly inapplicable for substantiating the unsubstantiable doctrine of the Trinity. [Hear, hear!]

REV. R. BLAIR. The baptismal *form* of our Established church, "in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost", does not affirm that the Three are *equal*, though ardent Trinitarians may choose to draw such inference. I conceive, Mr. Chairman, that we Baptize, because Jesus instructed his Disciples that Baptism should be performed; therefore, we obey: we baptize *in the Name* of the Father, who is "Our God, and the God and Father of Jesus Christ"; *in the Name* of the Son, who was "ap-

pointed by God" as our "Teacher"; and *in the Name* of the Holy Spirit, "the Comforter": but, Sir, I cannot discover from this notable and much canvassed passage, that the Three must necessarily be *co-equal*, or, all of them partakers of *godhead*. In 1 Cor. x. 2, we read that the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea"; but surely, it does not follow as a matter of course, from such Baptism, that Moses was God. Baptism was a rite once indispensably necessary, and we, in our Church, still continue it; yet, many enlightened Christians of our day consider it an abrogated ceremony.

LOVELACE. Abrogated! abrogated by whom, I should like to know!

QUARLES. By many wiser than thou art; by two great authorities in particular, with whom thou art not yet familiar: by Jesus, who fulfilled the Law; and by Paul, who, in writing to the Corinthians, says—I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius". [Hear, hear!] The Society of Friends believe, that the baptism of John was a *type*, which has long since done its office, and ceased to exist in the Christian church; and where it still exists among Christians, it is to be ranked among what Paul so aptly designates—"beggarly elements"; for, as Jesus put an end to types and shadows, "blotting out the handwriting of *ordinances* that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross"; the Society of Friends, enjoying the *substance*, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, have given up the *shadow* of water sprinkling and immersion.* [Hear, hear!]

LOVELACE. My opinion, Mr. Chairman, is this—

SANDYS. "A Daniel come to Judgement—Yea, a Daniel!"

LOVELACE. Whoever is *not* Baptized in the Name of the Father, *and* the Son, *and* the Holy Ghost, cannot be saved! [Hear, hear!] We all know, Sir, that the Disciples of our Lord, ever after his resurrection, invariably baptized the Converts in the Name of all the Three persons of the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity; as any other form of baptism would have been unavailable and of non-effect.

MR. J. BARBOUR. Lovelace speaks an infinite deal of *Nothing*—more than any man present: "his reasons are two grains of wheat, hid in two bushels of chaff; you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have them, they are not worth the search". [Hear, hear!]

BARTON. Friend Lovelace certainly gives himself a great deal of trouble, to expose his ignorance of the Scriptures. In viii. Acts, 14—17, I read—

When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost—for, as yet, He was fallen upon none of them; only, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus; then, laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost".

According to friend Lovelace, the baptism of these converts in Samaria was of "non-effect"; as they were baptized *not* in the Name of the Father, *nor* the Holy Spirit, but, in the Name of *Jesus only*; which baptism, friend Lovelace looks upon as a *mockery*, believing that not one of them could be saved! [Hear, hear! Pause.]

REV. T. WYAT. [Cheered on rising] Mr. Chairman! our Unitarian friends *do not, can not, or will not*, distinguish between Christ's being *equal* with God, when in his higher sphere, as *second* Person in the Trinity, wherein he is denominated *god* in the oracles of Truth, and when in his purely

* See Elisha Bates, and others, on the Doctrines of Friends.

Official capacity, wherein he is *inferior* to the Supreme. [Hear, hear, hear! from both sides] Before proceeding farther, I should like to know, what our Opponents have to remark on the distinction I have just pointed out, touching *the compound character* of Christ—God and Man. [Pause.

REV. T. MOSS. Verily, Mr. Wyat, you need not proceed farther; and, if I mistake not, you will soon find out, that you have gone too far already. As to Christ's ever being "denominated *the god* in the oracles of Truth", I here undertake, before all these witnesses, to procure you £1000 towards the erection of your New chapel and School rooms, for every text you can show me in the original, declaring **THE GODHEAD** of *the Son of God*. [Hear, hear!] With this undertaking, I dismiss the former part of your brief address, as beneath further notice; and shall now comment on the speciousness of the latter part.

As to the wonderful discovery you have made, that Christ is *inferior* to his Father in the *Official* capacity only, you have admitted, fully and conclusively, though probably not intentionally, all that Unitarians contend for; as we do not, cannot look upon Christ otherwise than in an *Official capacity*. Let us glance, Mr. Chairman, at the admission made by Mr. Wyat, and see what it amounts to.

Trinitarians admit, that as the **MEDIATOR** between God and Man, Christ assumed Humanity—or, as Paul has it, "Took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of Man: and, being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross"—that, Mr. Chairman, is what Mr. Wyat must admit to be in an *official* capacity. As the **PROPTIATER**, Christ gave his life for Humanity—or, as John expresses it, "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world"—"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but, that He loved us, and *sent his Son* to be a propitiation for our sins"—that also, Mr. Chairman, is what Mr. Wyat must admit to be in an *official* capacity. As the **INTERCESSOR**, John tells us, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father—Jesus Christ the righteous"—"It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us"—this again, Mr. Chairman, our wonderful discoverer, Mr. Wyat, must admit to be in an *official* capacity. In short, Christ's position is that of an *Official*, and an *Official only*—not of a God, but, what our Opponents themselves represent him when they talk of his being a *Mediator*, a *Propitiater*, an *Intercessor*—subject to the Will of the Supreme, who has peremptorily declared, "I am Jehovah; that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another!" [Hear, hear!

J. WOLCOT, Esq. I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman, that our respected friend, Mr. Moss, should contend for the *inferiority* of our Lord; as I recently heard him deliver a splendidly pernicious Sermon, on Rom. xiv. 12, Every one of us shall give an account of Himself to God"; when he cautioned his hearers against trusting too confidently to the *mediation*, *propitiation*, and *intercession* of our Lord; impressing upon us that text—"By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy works thou shalt be condemned". He moreover told us—

Chairman. Order, order! In the present Discussion, Mr. Wolcot, we have not anything to do with the particular doctrines Mr. Moss may have expounded from his pulpit. That his discourse was a *splendid* one, none present will question; that it was a *pernicious* one, some may entertain a doubt: yet, as his text was in the words of Paul, and his corroboration in

the words of Jesus, it seems somewhat presumptuous in you, Mr. Wolcott, so unceremoniously to condemn it. But, that matter apart—Were I to allow of such comments as yours, this Discussion could not be brought to a close in a month. We should have some other Speaker getting up and insisting that “Every one shall die for his own iniquity”; and another maintaining that “Every man shall bear his own burden”; and so on, until all the doctrines of Christianity, and all the doctrines palmed upon it, were canvassed, one by one—which would clearly be departing from the object of this Meeting.

In my judgement, the present assembly has not anything to do with *mediator*, *propitiator*, and *intercessor*, any farther than as they may incidentally occur; they do not constitute the points at issue, however nearly they may occasionally approach it: the Question before this Meeting, is nothing more, nothing less, nothing else, than the doctrine of *the Unity* or *the Trinity* of the Godhead; whether there be *Three* persons in the Great First Cause, or, whether that Cause be *One indivisible Spirit*—a Compound of Beings, or, a Whole without Parts—this is the Question to be debated at present. [Hear, hear!]

REV. L. HUNT. With your leave, Sir, it strikes me, that the whole matter lies in a nutshell—

SANDYS. Then, crack it, and give us the kernel!

HUNT. As we are all Protestants together, we have only to turn to our Creeds to decide the question. [Hear, hear!] Let us cleave to the wisdom of our ancestors*, [Titteration] and never shame our Christian profession. [Hear, hear!] All of us know and confess that there is a God the Father, a God the Son, [No, no!] and a God the Holy Ghost; [No, no, no! Nonsense!] which proves, beyond doubt, “a Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity”. [Signs of impatience from various quarters—with ironical Bravoes, and Hear him, hear him!]

Chairman. I am extremely sorry, Mr. Hunt, that by your coming so late, you have not heard the observations of many preceding Speakers. Permit me to apprise you, that according to the “Regulations of this Discussion”, mutually laid down by both parties, mere human authority is not to be considered decisive on any disputable point: therefore, Creeds, Liturgies, and Articles, of any and every Sect, are inadmissible, *as proofs*, in the present Debate—nothing but Scripture is to be acknowledged as *proof*, this Meeting ignoring all authority save the Bible alone.

Some parties present, look upon the past ages, as upon the infancy of the world; and consider “the Wisdom of our Ancestors”, as comparative Folly, when contrasted to the more enlightened views of our day: † for, as wisdom

* “Of all the authorities to which men can be called to submit, the ‘Wisdom of our Ancestors’ is the most whimsically absurd; we are an older generation than they, and since experience is the consequence of age, we must necessarily be wiser. They, in their successive generations, laid aside absurdities which had descended to them from their fathers; that was a piece of wisdom on their parts, which we might imitate with advantage. Our great grandfathers believed that the Earth was a broad platter on the back of a tortoise; our grandfathers threw overboard that blessed specimen of hereditary wisdom, and declared the Earth to be a ball, round which the sun and planets revolved; our fathers made a second change, their theory drove the Earth from its state of quietude, and sent it spinning through infinite space, while the Sun, which had hitherto capered with amazing velocity from one end of heaven to the other, was destined for the future to repose quietly in the centre of the system. Each of these alterations has been styled *atheism*, and the authors threatened with crucifixion by the Clergy, or, with St. Stephen’s fate by an ignorant Mob. No *improvement* of importance has ever been proposed, which was not, at the first onset, denounced as blasphemous, treasonable, and absurd. *London University Magazine*.

† “If the ‘Wisdom of our Ancestors’ had not taught them to recognize newly-discovered

is the result of experience, and as this is the oldest generation the earth has ever seen, many persons think that we ought to take shame to ourselves if our superior advantages have not qualified us to investigate more accurately, and to pass judgement less erroneously, than our predecessors. [Hear, hear!] Now, as we read of "God the Father", and of "One true and only God", in the Scriptures, but, never of "God the Son", nor of "God the Holy Ghost"; by the—

HUNT. I have read of them all my life long—[Loud cries of Order, order! Chair, chair! etc.

Chairman. Really, Rector, you are out of Order. Permit me, in the spirit of kindness, to tell you, that you ought not, must not, thwart the progress of this Discussion. [Applause] We are met to elicit Truth, if we can; and this Assembly is anxious to hear opinions and arguments on both sides: some of us have come from a considerable distance, and were here at the Opening—You, Rector, live within a stone's throw; yet, you have lost many valuable observations, by your not coming earlier; [A voice—According to custom, always late!] yet, you may still, perhaps, hear something worth your attention.

I was observing, that as we read in the Scriptures of "God the Father", and of "One true and only God"; but, never of "God the Son", nor "God the Holy Ghost"; by the "Regulations" you have mutually laid down, the former expressions are admissible in argument, while the latter, being only vague terms of man's invention, are liable to repudiation. Both parties, you on my right hand, as well as you on my left, hold, with Paul, [1 Cor. viii. 4] that there is "None other God but One"; so far you agree: but, when my left hand Disputants urge, with Paul, [1 Tim. i. 1] the distinction between "GOD OUR SAVIOUR and *Jesus Christ our Hope*"; and further urge, with Paul, [1 Col. i. 15] the *inferiority* of Christ, from his being only "the Image of the invisible God", and not the Supreme Majesty who has declared, "My glory will I *not* give to another!" then, you disagree. It is not for me to decide which is right, or, which is wrong. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing my regret, that certain venerable gentlemen present (Trinitarians and Unitarians) have not yet favored the Meeting with their matured sentiments. [Hear, hear, hear! and Calls for Messieurs Brooke, Drayton, Fletcher, Hamilton, Pomfret, Thomson, and several others—each Sect calling out for its own Ministers.

REV. J. THOMSON. [Cordially cheered] I came to listen, not to talk, Mr. Chairman; I came to witness how our Juniors, on both sides, acquitted themselves in a friendly encounter with their Antagonists; nor did I intend uttering a syllable, unless I saw any likelihood of our party getting the worst of it—of which I see no probability at present. Indeed, I am highly pleased with the pains they have taken to *prepare* themselves, both for attack and defense. [Cheers] However, as the Meeting, at your suggestion, Sir, has been pleased to Call upon me by Name, I shall briefly mention my surprise, that no one, when treating on the *superiority* of the Father and *inferiority* of the Son, thought of instancing Paul's special notice of the

truths, and to discard those errors to which ignorance had given birth, we should not have been indebted to them for the improvements, which, however well they may have served their purpose for a time, are destined to be superseded by still more important discoveries.

In the year 1615, a Florentine had the presumption and audacity to assert, contrary to the prevailing opinions of the learned, 'the great, the good, and the wise among men', and contrary to the conclusions of all preceding ages, 'that the earth revolved round the sun'; and, although he was threatened with Death for his *heresy*, Galileo was right. MORGAN'S *Letters*.

SUBORDINATE position of the Son, even when exalted to the highest pinnacle of his glory. [Hear, hear !

“ Then cometh the end, when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to the God, even the Father; when He [the Father] shall have put down all rule and all authority and all power: for, He [Christ] must reign till He [the Father] hath put all enemies under his [Christ's] feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed, is—Death. For, He [the Father] hath put all things under his [Christ's] feet. But, when He [the God] saith, All things are put under Him, [Christ] it is manifest that He [the God] is EXCEPTED, which did put all things under him. [Christ] And when all things shall be *subdued* unto Him [Christ] *then, shall the Son also Himself BE SUBJECT unto Him*. [the Father] that put all things under him [Christ]—that *the God may be ALL IN ALL!* 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

Our respected Antagonists, several of whom I have the pleasure, the honor, of ranking among my personal friends, frankly acknowledge a *Mediatorial kingdom*; that kingdom over which, Paul says, Christ reigns; and which kingdom our Opponents admit *shall have an End*, “ when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to the God, even the Father”: but, Mr. Chairman, who is the Man, who is the Minister, bold enough to say, that the Kingdom of Jehovah, shall ever have an End? Never! *Never! NEVER!* [Hear, hear !] Christ's reign must necessarily End, that the God may be ALL IN ALL; but, Jehovah's reign must necessarily be Endless, for, from everlasting to everlasting, He is the God! and who, Mr. Chairman, who, believing this, can possibly believe that *the Son and the Father are One and the same Being!* I CANNOT! [Long-continued cheering.

REV. M. DRAYTON. Mr. Chairman! In 1864, professed Teachers of the people ought to be *made* ashamed, if they do not in themselves *feel* ashamed, of uttering words and phrases which are not intelligible, either to themselves or anyone else. It is, Sir, a disgrace to Manhood, a stigma of public reproach to a Teacher, to pour out words and sentences altogether unapprehensible to persons of good understanding. Such an abuse of words, such a prostitution of language, is an insult to commonsense and a mockery of religion! All, Sir, must admit, that *father* and *son* are terms necessarily and inseparably associated with *prior* and *subsequent* existence; that *father* and *son* are not, never were, cannot become, convertible terms; that it is arrant nonsense to talk of a *son* being as old as his *father*; cause must precede effect: [Hear, hear !] and all who admit that Jesus is *the Son of God*, are bound to admit that He cannot possibly be *God the Father*; and if not the *supreme* God, whoever insists on Christ's being a God at all, is driven to the necessity of admitting that there are, at least, *two* Gods; and, if *two* be possible, then, may there be *three*, three hundred, three thousand, three millions, and so on, to an infinite number of Gods. Paul designates Jesus—or rather *Christ*, who better accords with Paul's peculiar notions and doctrines—“ the *image* of the invisible God, the *firstborn* of every Creature”——but, let me not get entangled in Paul's “ things hard to be understood !” [Hear, hear !] The grand principle of the Jewish religion was, and is, GOD IS ONE; that all the powers above, beneath, around, are His alone; and that all other Gods and Powers, are *idols* and *vanity*. The specific difference between Judaism and Christianity must not be sought in the mere doctrines, but, in the fact, that while Judaism was, and continues to be, a *system of teaching*, and little else, Christianity was primitively, and still is, a *new life*. “ The Law was given through Moses; Grace and Truth came through Jesus Christ”. The theology of Moses is repulsive as Barbarity, gloomy as Egyptian darkness, and fabulous as Mythology; but,

the theology of Jesus is sublime as Intelligence, beautiful as the Light, and true as God! [Hear, hear!] Jesus addressed himself direct to the conscience; touched the inward feeling; impressed the importance, value, and eternal destiny of the soul, on his hearers, preaching life and immortality—respecting which grand topics, Moses was silent; for, never in his whole Law does he teach the Israelites anything concerning a *future state*, or hold out any other inducements to obedience, than mere *temporal* rewards and punishments. [Hear, hear!]

With the agglutination of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I have no sympathy; I repudiate the heathenish notion and popish adoption, altogether: nothing can be more derogatory to the Supreme being, than such an idolatrous forsaking of the precepts of Jesus, who was sent to reveal the Father of all his intelligent creatures, to the Sons and Daughters of the great human family.

Depend upon it, my christian friends, though there may be things *beyond* reason, out of the reach of human apprehension, whoever embraces doctrines which are *contrary* to reason, is not entitled to be called a *reasonable being*—and here I leave it. [Applause.]

REV. W. HAMILTON. [Much cheered on rising, after repeated Calls] Mr. Chairman! I feel queerish all over. I am, what some folks in my county call *dumfoundered*; like “a man convinced against his will”: and though I have risen, in deference to the Call of the Meeting, I am fairly lock-jawed, as far as argument is concerned; I, therefore, beg some of the Clergy of the Established church to take up the question, and make the best they can of it, leaving me quietly to ponder on what I have heard, and may yet hear. [Hear, hear!]

TICKELL. Have you become a convert to our views, Mr. Hamilton?

Chairman. That Question, Mr. Tickell, is not before the Meeting.

TICKELL. Granted, Mr. Chairman; it slipped out inadvertently.

S. GARTH, Esq. I should like to know, whether or not the Deniers of the blessed Trinity believe, that God our Saviour shed his blood to ransom us from everlasting perdition—Will you, Mr. Chairman, be kind enough to put the Question to the Meeting?

Chairman. Perhaps, I do not thoroughly apprehend your question, Mr. Garth—do you associate the *shedding of blood* with “the Man Christ Jesus”, mentioned by Paul? or, do you, when speaking of “God our Saviour” allude to Him mentioned by Jesus as being a *spirit*? To put the Question to the Meeting, I must clearly ascertain your meaning.

GARTH. Of course, Mr. Chairman, “God is a Spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth”; but, I wish to know, if Unitarians disbelieve in the Immortal God’s having shed his blood on Calvary, to redeem us from eternal Death? [Hear, hear!]

Chairman. If you speak of *the blood of a Spirit*, and of *the death of an immortal God*, you had better, Mr. Garth, put the Question in your own way, lest I should misrepresent it—in fact, I know not *how* to put it.

GARTH. I am a Wesleyan, Mr. Chairman, and I read here in our Hymn-book, p. 32—

O Love Divine, what hast thou done?
The Immortal God hath died, for Me!
 The Father’s *co-eternal* Son
 Bore all my sins upon the tree:
The Immortal God for me hath died!
 My Lord, my Love, is crucified”.

And here again, on p. 41—

But, who is this, that comes from far?
Whose garments *rolled in blood* appear?
'Tis God made Man for Man to Die !'

Again I read, on p. 120—

Vouchsafe us eyes of faith, to see
The Man transfixed on Calvary!
To know Thee, *who* Thou art;
The One eternal God and true;
And let the sight affect, subdue,
And break my stubborn heart'.

From these, and similar verses, I learn, that my redemption has been effected *not* by a mere Man, but, by *the Blood of the One eternal God and true*, by "*God made Man, for Man to Die*"; and I wish to know, if Unitarians disbelieve in this; as we are expressly told in the New testament, that there can be no Remission of sins, without the shedding of Blood. [Pause of dead stillness.

Chairman. I do not feel myself at liberty to speak in reply to Mr. Garth; I must leave him in the hands of the Meeting. [Another Pause.

GRAHAME. Mr. Chairman, I venture to break silence, by observing, that Mr. Garth is another example of the baneful influence of our Hymns on the minds of our Congregations; and that He, like myself, is *not* a Bible but a Hymnbook trinitarian: [Hear, hear!] just as thousands are Prayerbook *not* Scripture trinitarians. Had Mr. Garth been present when I confessed my thoughtless adoption of the anti-scriptural doctrine of the trinity, a few minutes only before his appearance, he, probably, might not have addressed the Meeting. Our children, Mr. Chairman, are inoculated with *trinitarianism* by our Hymns, as fatally and indelibly, as the minds of Church-going children are inoculated by the dogmas in the Prayerbook; and not until persons begin to think and examine for themselves, will they overcome the prejudices of education.* [Applause.

RAMSAY. As Mr. Grahame is so well versed with our Hymns, I am surprised he has not indulged himself a little, by strengthening Mr. Garth's quotations.

GRAHAME. That I refrained from doing, out of mere delicacy and forbearance, not from inability; and without trespassing two minutes on the time of the Meeting, I shall instance another half-dozen specimens, merely as a set-off against Mr. Ramsay's uncalled-for and injudicious taunt—[Hear, hear!

The *Immortal* hangs his languid brow:
The *Almighty* faints beneath his load. p. 29.

Purchased by *the Blood of God!* p. 69.

Jehovah in the Person show,
Jehovah crucified! p. 126.

* "Prejudices are established by *education*, and Habits by *custom*. We are taught to think *what* others think, not *how* to think for ourselves; and whilst the memory is loaded, the understanding remains unexercised, or, exercised in such trammels as constrain its motions, and direct its pace, till that which was artificial becomes in some sort natural, and the mind can go no other. It may sound oddly, but, it is true, in many cases, to say, that if men had learned less, their way to knowledge would be shorter and easier. It is indeed shorter and easier to proceed from ignorance to knowledge, than from error. They who are in the last, must *unlearn*, before they can learn to any good purpose; and the first part of this double task is not, in many respects, the least difficult—for which reason it is seldom undertaken. BOLINGBROKE.

Washed in the sanctifying blood
 Of an expiring Deity. p. 244.
 The fullness of the Deity,
 He died for all mankind! p. 251.
 The Great Jehovah Dies!" p. 513.

Should Mr. Ramsay wish for a more extended exhibition of the unbiblical, as well as unphilosophical, and self-contradictory dogmas, inculcated by the unsound doctrines contained in our Hymns, he is heartily welcome to them—and they shall be produced on the instant. [Hear, hear!

N. ROWE, Esq. 'Pon my word, Mr. Chairman, that expression—"the Blood of God", is a startler! for, it is the *Blood of a Spirit*, the incongruousness of which, has sunk the Wesleyan Hymnbook very considerably in my appreciation—in fact, I was not aware that it contained so many examples of unsophisticated superstition. [Hear, hear!

REV. J. OLDMIXON. It pains me to hear a so highly respectable member of our Society express himself so recklessly; as he ought to have known that every phrase, every word, in our Hymns, is in strict accordance with Holy Writ.

SIR J. VANBRUGH. That I am bold to deny, Mr. Chairman; and I call upon Mr. Oldmixon to support his assertion, by Scripture.

OLDMIXON. Your *boldness*, Sir John, deserves a harsher name; you ought to have known your New testament better; for, therein it is written—

Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed *the Church of God*, which He hath purchased with *His own blood!* Acts xx. 28.

VANBRUGH. If that be Scripture, that also is downright superstition; *God's own blood* must be erroneous; for, *spirit* and *blood* cannot amalgamate; the one is *material*, the other *immaterial*, and how can *immateriality* be connected with *blood!* it is, and must be erroneous! and if *God's blood* stands in the New testament, there surely is some egregious mistake; as any connection between *blood* and *spirit* is an utter impossibility! I cannot, however, explain it. [Hear, hear!

REV. R. GREENE. But, I can, Mr. Chairman. [Hear, hear!] I shall first give you the original, as it stands in the best Greek text, and then—
 Chairman. No *Greek*, if you please, Sir; it would be contrary to one of the "Regulations of this Discussion"; but, Sir, you are at liberty to give your translation of the Greek text.

GREENE. Not I; for then, I may give any Translation, just to suit my own purpose. No, no; let Mr. Oldmixon enjoy the preposterous mistranslation, and revel in his revolting *Blood of God!* [Pause.

MR. T. HEYWOOD, *Student*. Without presuming to offer an opinion, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you may not disapprove of my reading a more accurate translation of the Greek text, than the self-contradictory translation quoted by Mr. Oldmixon, from our "authorized version".

First, I shall read the Translation as given in Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge's version, which I find on the table before me—

Therefore, take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock over which the Holy Spirit has constituted you overseers; to feed the congregation of the Lord, which he has redeemed with his own blood".

I shall now read Sharpe's more critically accurate Translation, from the most approved Greek text—

Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit

hath made you bishops [or overseers] to feed the church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood". [Hear, hear!

E. THOMPSON, Esq. Thanks, Mr. Heywood. You may perceive, Mr. Chairman, the evil influence of Trinitarianism, in the *false* rendering of this passage, as well as of several others. Yet, Sir, changing *lord* into *god*, was a blunder one would have thought the Translators incapable of making; for, however scriptural the *Blood of Jesus* may be, the glaring *Blood of God* could not possibly escape detection; as the *Blood of a Spirit* is, indeed, most incongruous. But (alas) fanatics offer up Truth itself on the altar of Superstition, and insult the God of Heaven by doctrines flattering to man's cherished prejudices! [Hear, hear!

MR. SHEFFIELD. For Truth's sake, Mr. Chairman, I declare before this Assembly, that I have hitherto been the slave of Prejudice; my mind so filled with prejudices, that there was not any room for Reason to find an entrance, or, for Curiosity to raise a doubt. I have, like thousands of my thoughtless companions, unconsciously imbibed my religious sentiments from my parents and associates; I have never yet *examined* into the truth or fallacy of what I fancied was my Belief; I am the creature of circumstances, the dupe of those around me—but, Sir, from this day, I hope to learn *how* to think for myself! [Cheers.

RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I am bound to Protest against anyone's quoting our Hymns in a public Discussion of this nature. [Hear, hear!

Chairman. But, Mr. Ramsay, your published Hymns are public property, and may be quoted with as much propriety in this Discussion, as the Augsburg Confession, the 39 Articles of the Church of England, the Writings of the Fathers, or, the Bible itself. If your Hymns contain the doctrines of your Society, they are equal as testimonies, to the Doctrines of Friends, by Bates, by Gurney, or anyone else; and if your Hymns contain either Trinitarian or Unitarian doctrines, they are quite in place here, as this Meeting pays no regard to *particular* Sects, knowing but two *general* ones—as I have said before, *wesleyanism* is out of the question.

MR. J. LYL. Mr. Chairman! I am a Wesleyan Preacher of 40 years standing; and I thank God that I was induced to attend this Meeting; although that inducement had no higher object, than the gratification of curiosity. I came hither, Sir, without the slightest intention of taking any active part in the Discussion, yet, in the full expectation of witnessing the discomfiture of the Unitarian party; but, Mr. Chairman, I can truly say, "the scales have fallen from my eyes", and I no longer "see men as trees walking"; for, the light which has been shed on my understanding, by preceding Speakers, has convinced me, "that there is none other God but One; for, though there be that are called *gods*, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be *gods* many, and *lords* many) yet, to us there is but One *god*, the Father, of whom are all things, and we for Him; and One *lord*, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him—howbeit there is not in all men this knowledge". I really believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Hymnbook is as blinding as the Book of Common Prayer; and our Trinitarian expressions as puzzling as the Athanasian creed itself, which no one can explain—simply because it is a mass of unintelligibilities. [Hear, hear!

RAMSAY. May I be favored with your Name and Station, Sir?

LYL. I am not an Itinerant, but, a Local preacher.

RAMSAY. Then, I *demand* your Address.

LYL. I am not in the Holy Inquisition, neither at the bar of the Wesleyan

Conference ; but, at a public Meeting, under the protection of the Chairman ; and I as independently refuse you my Name, as you, Mr. Ramsay, imperiously demand it. [Thundering cheers.

MR. J. LYDGATE. I know the Stranger, Mr. Chairman ; and know him to be every way Mr. Ramsay's superior. Mr. Ramsay would not have had the consummate assurance so to address a gentleman much more popular among the Body than he is himself, had he known who the distinguished Stranger is.

LYLY. I am neither afraid nor ashamed of my Name, Mr. Chairman, and there, Sir, you have it ; [Handing a Card] but, Mr. Chairman, I am not to be bullied into compliance by a man who would think himself *honored* by my acquaintance. [Cheers.

DEAN BEAUMONT. I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, of a thrilling speech by a fellow Dean,* delivered at a public Meeting, but a few years back, wherein he said, in his own energetic manner—

As a Clergyman I speak to you words, which, perhaps, you may think, ought *not* to fall from the lips of one of the Clergy ; but, I tell *you*, the Laity of every denomination—Let the Clergy of every denomination *know*, that they are *not* Lords over God's heritage ! There is a great contest going on in the world—we have not only to contend against Roman-papacy, but, we have to contend against Anglo-papacy—and when I speak of Anglo-papacy, I mean *not* the Papacy within the Establishment *only*, but, the Papacy which is trying to establish itself within each denomination !” [Applause.

Not with an unobservant eye, Mr. Chairman, have I mingled with Ministers of various denominations ; and the experience of half a century warrants my saying, that Ministers are *but men* ; and the best of men but Men, at the best ; and that in every denomination with which I am intimately acquainted, I have seen some Ministers grasping more eagerly after secular power, than ardently striving to instruct the ignorant, than sedulously comforting the distressed, than anxiously leading sinners to repentance ! [Hear, hear !] Therefore, I am not surprised at witnessing the same overbearing spirit exhibited at this Meeting, as is exhibited at the Wesleyan Conference, at our own Convocation, and at every other assembly of domineering priests, parsons, and preachers. [Applause.

In this *era of Inquiry*, stereotyped interpretations of Scripture are insufferable, unless conformable to the *tenor* of Scripture ; for, Reason, and Science, and Scholarship, are blowing away the mists of credulity and ignorance, scattering to the winds the dust of antiquated formulas. The English, as a people, are now, thank Heaven, resolutely bent on getting rid of “the wisdom of their ancestors”, demanding something more mentally nutritious than the dry bones of bygone dispensations and the sawdust of antiquated systems of beliefs ; they are crying for *bread*, Mr. Chairman, and Heaven be praised, they will no longer be satisfied with *stones* to eat ! [Tremendous cheering. Pause.

MR. A. PHILIPS. If we invariably tread near the central parts of our Circle, we can hardly expect to obtain an accurate acquaintance with its circumference ; neither can we extend the horizon of our knowledge : it is, Mr. Chairman, on the extremities of their Circles that the Searchers after Truth delight to ramble, whence they may enjoy expansive prospects and felicitate in glorious infinities ; nor are they terrified, if, occasionally, they stumble, or fall—true magnanimity consists not in never falling, but, in rising again after a fall ; and, rely upon it, those who are perpetually in fear of com-

* The Rev. Dr. Gilbert Elliot, Dean of Bristol.

mitting a Blunder, are not very likely to make a Discovery. [Hear, hear LOVELACE. But, Mr. Philips, you seem to forget—[From all parts of the Meeting was Lovelace assailed, for stopping Mr. Philips at the opening of his Address; nor could he be prevailed upon to utter another syllable.

REV. R. NICOLL. Though the son of a Dignitary of our Church, you richly deserve, Mr. Lovelace, to be turned out of doors, for your reprehensible conduct at this Meeting. [Applause] Mr. Langhorne very kindly “pardoned your indelicacy, in consideration of your ignorance”; but, were your Father present to witness it, as sure as your name is Lovelace, I would, in an instant, eject you into the street, by brute force! Your arrogance has deprived this auditory of what would probably have been the best speech at this Meeting. [Dead stillness.

PRELE. “A foolish son is the calamity of his father”. [Pause.

REV. J. SUCKLING. Has anyone, Mr. Chairman, yet broached the *Three heavenly Witnesses*? What can the Unitarians make of that formidable and unanswerable Text?

Chairman. The Three heavenly Witnesses have not been introduced, Mr. Suckling; though, of course, familiar to all present.

SUCKLING. Well then, I put it to the Unitarians to say, what possesses them, to deny the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so plainly made known in the New testament.

REV. H. BROOKE. I peremptorily deny, that any mention whatever is made of the incongruous Trinity in the Bible; I also deny that any mention is made in the New testament of the so-called *Three heavenly Witnesses*, to which Mr. Suckling so confidently alludes.

SUCKLING. Do you hear that, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman. Yes, Sir; distinctly.

SUCKLING. Why, Sir, it is the very cornerstone of the rock of my faith! I rest my belief of the holy Trinity, on that very foundation; on that very emphatic text.

MR. S. WESLEY. Then, we shall soon make a Unitarian of you, Mr. Suckling; for, instead of *rock*, you will find your foundation is resting on *sand*, which we shall speedily wash away from under you. [Hear, hear!

SUCKLING. My foundation, Sir, rests on God's own Word—

There are *Three* that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and *these Three are One*'.

This text is my proof, my incontestible proof, of the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity; “which Faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly!”

G. CANNING, ESQ. I hope not, Mr. Suckling; as I can never again believe in the Trinity, be the peril what it may. Happily, no mention is made of your pagan Trinity in either the Jewish or Christian scriptures; nor does any such popish and self-contradictory text as you pretend to quote, form part or parcel of the New covenant—the Christian's special guide. I presume, Mr. Chairman, the reason for its not having been brought forward at an earlier stage of the Discussion, arose from the general conviction among our Trinitarian friends, that the passage is *spurious*—an interpolation, an abominable falsification of the Scriptures, not to be found in any accredited Manuscript; a gross imposition on the credulity of mankind! and I trust Mr. Suckling may be the only religious Instructor present, who attaches any importance to the heterogeneous and foolish words. [Several tokens of dissent.

REV. E. VERE. Certainly not! I, for one, believe the text fully; and why should I not?

CANNING. Simply, because it is neither Scripture, nor agreeable to Scripture; but, diametrically opposed to the tenor of Scripture. It is, really and demonstrably, an *interpolation*—inserted, I presume, to deceive.

VERE. Not Scripture, Sir! not Scripture, Mr. Chairman! Here it is, word for word, as Mr. Suckling quoted it, in the 5th chapter of St. John's first Epistle, 7th verse.

CANNING. I know it stands in our "authorized version"; and you, Mr. Vere, should certainly have known, that it ought *not* to stand there; inasmuch as it does not stand in any one of the many ancient manuscripts.

VERE. And pray, Sir, on whose authority am I to believe your bare assertion, that the passage is not in the ancient manuscripts?

ADDISON. By your leave, Mr. Canning. [Cheers!] Mr. Chairman! Though not of an impetuous temperament, I cannot repress my indignation; I feel myself *impelled* to speak! [Hear, hear!] Mr. Vere, it is not to the credit of a gentleman professing to prepare Candidates for Holy Orders, that he should publicly be reproached for his unpardonable ignorance of the best Greek copies of the New covenant. [Hear, hear!] What sort of Proficients are to be expected from the tuition of those, who themselves are *uninformed* of what they profess to teach? You, Mr. Vere, are in the habit of speaking at public Meetings with the air and tone of one having authority; yet, Sir, how dare you have the effrontery to stand up in the presence of so many Scholars as you see here assembled, and presume to offer an opinion on a passage, a disputable passage, you have *yet to examine?* and with which—to your shame be it spoken—you are as shamelessly as shamefully unacquainted! [Hear, hear!] If the blind lead the blind, no wonder we hear so many voices croaking from the ditch. There, Sir, there is a Greek copy, Griesbach's text; if you can read it, point out to the Chairman, to this Assembly, the words which I fearlessly denounce A FORGERY! [Bursts of applause.]

Chairman. No one present, Mr. Addison, will presume to dispute your Scholarship, or, debate a Greek question with you; but, in this Discussion we are restricted, by the "Regulations", not to depart from the English language.

ADDISON. Be it so; I have done. [Pause.]

MR. J. SHIRLEY. I rejoice, Mr. Chairman, at the seasonable reproof our Vicar has just received from Mr. Addison; for, how can we expect Pulpits to be filled with efficient Teachers, while Instructors themselves are proved incapable of teaching? Mr. Vere's dogmatic manner of speaking in public, is known to many of us, and the worst I wish him is, that he may be lastingly benefited by the castigation just administered. [Cheers.]

REV. G. CROLY. I know not by what authority, Mr. Chairman, persons who are *not* in the Ministry, are allowed to trespass on this Meeting with their crude and unclassical opinions, on purely Theological topics—or, why they should be allowed to address the Meeting at all, as the subjects of this Debate belong exclusively to religious Instructors, to whom the Laity ought to listen in silence. [Hear, hear!] It certainly would have been better, more suitable, more becoming in every respect, had none but College-disciplined and University-bred gentlemen been permitted to express their opinions. [Cries of Bravo, bravo! and Well done, Croly! etc.]

PEELE. O Modesty! where is thy Blush?

SHIRLEY. Very graciously urged, Mr. Croly! whilst your remark is as delicate as it is profound; as edifying as it is evangelical: yet, don't you

higher-bred gentry sadly demean yourselves, by condescending to quote as authorities, those Fishermen, Tanners, and Tentmakers, known as the Disciples of Jesus the Carpenter? not one of whom ever saw a College, or, heard of a University? [Cheers] Some men, Mr. Chairman, are weak enough, and vain enough, to fancy *themselves* the legitimate Successors of the Apostles, in a direct line, from the mere "laying on of hands"; yet, bishop Watson has published to the world—

Laymen are as much interested in the truth of Christianity, as Churchmen are; and, in this enlightened age, are as capable of seeing *what* is revealed in the Bible". [Applause.

REV. C. WOLFE. Thanks, Mr. Shirley, for the Bishop of Llandaff's reproof of Mr. Croly's pompous assurance; for, though the world-wide celebrated Unitarians Milton, Locke, and Newton, never underwent the solemn rite of the "laying on of hands", I challenge Mr. Croly, the aspirant to a Bishopric, to produce such a triumvirate of intellect, wisdom, learning, and piety, from the bench of Bishops in our day! * [Prolonged cheering.

MR. MICKLE. Honor to whom honor is due! The venerable Bishop of Lichfield, Dr. Lonsdale, is reported to have raised himself to an unwonted degree of eminence, through the *supernatural revelations* obtained from the famous astrologer Zadkiel's wonderous crystal-ball—having received satisfactory *proofs* that St. Luke had made himself so familiar with the English language, as to use it quite freely. The venerable prelate, the Right Reverend Father in God, was seen to peculiar advantage, in the Witness-box, at the Trial of the action brought by Zadkiel [Lieutenant Morrison] against Admiral Sir Edward Belcher; [29 June, 1863] and it is reported, that the Bishop's brother, Dr. Colenso, has composed a masterly Sermon on the occasion—selecting for his Text that part of Deuteronomy which declares that whosoever "*useth Divination*" (Bishop or no Bishop) is "*an abomination unto the Lord!*" † [Hear, hear!

M. BRUCE, ESQ. It seems somewhat invidious to single out the Bishop, while other Clergymen were also in the habit of attending the Astrologer's coteries. The Master of the Temple, the Rev. archdeacon Robinson, also figured in the Witness-box, as well as the Rev. George Stokes—reminding

* "It is commonly reported, that the present Episcopal Bench is *not* very remarkable either for its great learning or intellectual ability; rather, perhaps, the reverse. With the exception of Dr. Tait, bishop of London (the only occupant of the Bench who seems to have behaved with spirit or dignity in the examination of this *heretical* book) the Bishops of Hereford and St. David's, the Archbishop of Dublin, and, perhaps, two of the Puseyite (or Patriotic) bishops—not One of them has any reputation for Scholarship, high culture, philosophical acumen, or literary gift of any kind. Rev. S. F. MACDONALD, on *Essays and Reviews*.

† To the credit of the Bishop of Lichfield, I copy the following paragraph from *The Inquirer*, of 7th Nov. 1863, headed *The Bishop and the Rector*—

At the public dinner which took place in the Town Hall of Burslem last week, to celebrate the laying of the foundation-stone of the Wedgwood Institute by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the chairman, Lord Granville, proposed the toast of '*The Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese and the Ministers of other Denominations*', coupling with it the names of the Bishop of Lichfield and the Rev. J. Blackwell, a Dissenting minister. The Bishop of Lichfield, in responding, said he felt proud to be coupled in the toast with *the ministers of other denominations*, and he was also glad to acknowledge the good which those ministers were doing in places where even the Church of England clergy could not reach the people. These liberal views of the good old prelate called forth expressions of the most hearty concurrence from the company, and they were cordially reciprocated by the Rev. J. Blackwell. At this stage of the proceedings, however, the apple of discord was thrown on the scene by the Rector of Burslem. Mr. Woodall, the secretary of the committee, said he had now a duty to perform, rather than discharge which he would gladly have exchanged places with the policeman at the door; for, he had to announce *a protest against the toast*, from the Rector of Burslem, on the ground, it was understood, of the association with it of '*the ministers of other denominations*'. The announcement called forth very strong expressions of disapprobation, and it was ultimately decided that the communication did not merit even the courtesy of being read! The secretary, therefore, gladly withdrew from the indignity which he expressed himself subjected to in being requested to bring it before the meeting". *Editor*.

us, Mr. Chairman, of those believers in Ephesus, who, *before* their conversion "used curious arts"; but who, *after* they believed on "the Lord Jesus, brought their books together, and burned them before all men".

MR. NUGENT. And yet, such men as these, have the audacity to persecute and prosecute their fellow-Clergymen, for entertaining more enlightened views than they themselves, on the doctrines of *Inspiration, Eternal punishments*, and the like!

PEELE. It is to be hoped, that the Essayists and Reviewers, as well as Maurice, Stanley, and Colenso, may make these Reverend associates of Astrologers thoroughly ashamed of themselves! [Hear, hear!

REV. R. SOUTHWELL. Mr. Chairman! You, of course, remember the Scripture simile of a "Cage of every unclean and hateful bird"—SUCH IS UNITARIANISM! [Hear, hear!] Unitarianism, Sir, is Negative theology carried out to perfection! for, it declares that Man is *not* a spiritual wreck—that Man requires *no* regeneration, *no* justification by faith in the work, or blood, or righteousness, of Another—it denies the Godhead of Jesus, and, by consequence, His offices of prophet, priest, and king, the head and ruler of his people—it denies the Personality and Godhead of the Holy Ghost—and the plenary Inspiration of the Bible! What else, then, is Unitarianism, but the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird! *Unitarianism*, Sir, is the very essence of Devilism, and its Propagators ought, one and all, to be banished the Kingdom, as enemies to the country and pests to human society! [Hear, hear, hear!

MR. J. SCOTT. Well, friend Southwell, it may truly be said of thee, thou art *moderate* in thy desires, when compared with certain fanatics of whom I have read, in an old book with which thou art evidently not acquainted; for, they would have called down Fire from heaven to consume their supposed Opponents, whilst thou wouldest be satisfied with Banishment merely: and as all the censure they received from their considerate and indulgent Master, was the mild ejaculation—"Ye know not what Spirit ye are of!" I shall not think of anathematizing thee for thy unclerical, unmanly, and disgraceful speech. [Hear, hear!

Chairman Gentlemen, have you not strayed away from the point at issue? You were debating the *genuineness* or *spuriousness* of the passage embodying the *Three heavenly Witnesses*.

MR. BLOOMFIELD. Thanks, for your admonition, Mr. Chairman. Luther, who made his translation from the Greek, not from the Latin, has *not* the passage; as He could not translate what did not exist: yet, the indomitable Reformer was scarcely in his grave, before the Trinitarians wickedly *inserted the forgery* into his Bible! Similar impositions on the public may be produced from other sources—as if Truth were less welcome than Falsehood. [On a book being pushed along the table] What have we here? [Reading aloud] A Translation of the New testament, from the original Greek, by Doctors Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge"—three worthy men and accredited scholars! What do these Trinitarians make of the passage? You shall hear—

There are Three who bear testimony: the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these Three agree in One".

REV. H. WOTTON. Why, Mr. Chairman, that is evasion! a falsifying of the text, by not giving the passage in its integrity. [Hear, hear!

BLOOMFIELD. I scorn it, Sir! I am not afraid of Truth, whatever you

may be. To prove the injustice of Mr. Wotton's ungentlemanly accusation, I shall, Mr. Chairman, read both Translations, that you, Sir, and He, and all present, may mark the difference—

Authorized Version, 1611.

Verse 5. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? 6. This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is Truth. 7. For, there are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these Three are One. 8. And there are Three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these Three agree in One".

Campbell, etc. 1852.

Who is he that overcomes the world, but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he who came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by the water only, but by the water and the blood. And it is the Spirit who testified, because the Spirit is the Truth.

Indeed, there are Three who bear testimony: the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these Three agree in One".

I think, Mr. Chairman, you will admit, that I have been unjustly accused of *evasion*, and that the *falsification* of the text is solely attributable to the trinitarian-minded Translators, who knowingly sacrificed Truth to a favorite pagan doctrine. [Hear, hear!] If we turn to the versions of other celebrated scholars, who made their translations direct from the Greek, we shall be confirmed in the belief that the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, so-called, are a gross imposition on the christian church; and we shall feel ourselves constrained to denounce the anti-scriptural doctrine of the popish Trinity, as thoroughly irrational, preposterous, and absurd. Happily, Mr. Chairman, the reasonableness of THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD, and the utter untenableness of THE TRIPERSONAL GOD, are becoming more and more apparent to the various religious communities throughout Christendom; and though we, Sir, may not live to see Christianity re-established in all its primitive simplicity and excellence, yet, we live in glorious times! Light is rapidly dispelling Darkness, and Truth banishing Error! Still, as bishop Watson has observed—

Christianity has been so corrupted, that it will be a work of ages to restore it to its original purity". [Hear, hear!]

Thank heaven, the restoration has begun! and *trinitarianism*, among other excrescences, is fast mouldering away! [Much cheering.]

MR. P. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman! I should be glad to hear from Mr. Addison, or Mr. Butler, a definition of the terms *arianism*, *atheism*, *deism*, *monotheism*, *rationalism*, *sabellianism*, *scepticism*, *socinianism*, *theism*, *trinitarianism*, and all other *isms* used by writers of the present day, in connection with *unitarianism*: as also the distinctions they make between one *ism* and another.

BUTLER. In other words, Mr. Fletcher, you now wish to get at the legitimate meaning of certain terms you, and such as you, most inappropriately have employed (in *The Quiver*, and other periodicals) while pretending to instruct the Public in matters you do not so much as *understand*, still less *comprehend*. [Hear, hear!] Your own Articles, Mr. Fletcher, under the heading—"Unitarianism not the Truth", are simply exposures of your *inability* to handle the subject; and I trust the Chairman may not permit the time of this Meeting to be occupied in teaching You the right meaning of technical words, and enlightening you on topics which are irrelative to the question before us.* [Cheers.]

* As the author of "John Sullivan" does not seem to have access to any Dictionary, wherein he can learn the meaning of the terms he employs, in his Essays in the columns of *The Quiver*,

Chairman. The time of the Meeting has been too much occupied already, with irrelevant topics; and I trust the discretion of the Speakers may spare me the unpleasantness of discarding subjects which are not closely connected with the *Unity*, the *Duality*, or the *Trinity*, of the Godhead. [Applause.]

REV. MR. LEWIS. I hold a Book in my hand, Mr. Chairman, which I take this eligible opportunity of recommending to all present; confident as I am, that no one can read it without for ever being convinced of the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of Christ and the Holy Ghost. [Hear, hear!] This volume, Sir, is entitled,

The Christian Verity stated; being a Summary of Trinitarian Doctrine especially adapted for the present Times: by Walter Chamberlain, M.A."

It is the second edition, 1862, and I hope it may pass through many editions; as it is a most convincing and unanswerable work: and, among other important matters, it proves, beyond all dispute, the authenticity of the *Three heavenly Witnesses*. [Hear, hear!]

I shall copy out of Worcester's edition of Webster, the definitions therein given of a dozen words such as he has instanced—

"**ARIANISM**—the doctrines of Arius". But, what were they? Arius denied the *equality* of the Father and Son; but, maintained that Jesus, the Sent of God, was the greatest of created beings.

"**ATHEISM**—the denial or disbelief of a God".

"**DEISM**—the doctrine or creed of a Deist; belief in the existence of God, coupled with disbelief of revealed religion".

"**MONOTHEISM**—the belief in only *one* God".

"**RATIONALISM**—the principles of Rationalists; adherence to *reason*, as distinct from revelation; interpretation of Scripture on the principles of human reason".

"**SABELLIANISM**—the doctrine of Sabellius". And what was that? Why, he denied the distinction of Persons in the Godhead, and held the scheme that has been known, in modern times, as that of the *Modal trinity*.

"**SCEPTICISM**—an ancient system of philosophy, founded by Pyrrho, which introduced universal doubt, or, suspension of assent, with respect to *all* grounds of knowledge: tendency or disposition to doubt; universal doubt; doubt of the truths of revelation; infidelity".

"**SECTARIANISM**—[often, but absurdly, written *sectarianism*] State or quality of being a *Sectarian*; devotion to a Sect".

"**SOCINIANISM**—the tenets first propagated by Socinus". But, what were they? There were two of this name and belief, Uncle and Nephew, who, in the 18th century, denied the *divinity* and *pre-existence* of Christ.

"**THEISM**—belief in the existence of a God, as opposed to *atheism*—it does not imply a denial of revelation, and in this respect it differs from the common, modern meaning of *deism*".

"**TRINITARIANISM**—the doctrine of *three persons* in the Godhead".

"**UNITARIANISM**—the principles of Unitarians". That is true enough; but, the author of "John Sullivan" knows not *what* they are, as may be seen in the pages of *The Quiver*. He must, therefore, be informed *what* a Unitarian is; the Dictionary before me tells him, that a Unitarian is "One who, in distinction from Trinitarian, holds that God exists in *one person only*; one who allows *divinity* to God the Father *only*; an anti-trinitarian".
Reporter.

The *New York Christian Inquirer*, in an interesting account of the *Universalists* of America, observes—

We are often asked the difference between *Universalism* and *Unitarianism*. The difference is accidental rather than essential, historical rather than actual, of degree rather than kind. *Unitarianism* was an outgrowth from Puritan Congregationalism; *Universalism* was a protest against the Calvinistic creed. *Unitarianism* was the re-action of Reason against the scholastic doctrine of the Trinity; *Universalism* was the re-action of the Affections against the Pagan and Pharisaic doctrine of Endless punishment. *Unitarianism* commenced among educated classes, and represents the culture and scholarship of the land; *Universalism* originated among common people, was first preached by self-educated men, and represents the common sense of thoughtful masses of men. *Universalists* are *Unitarians*, and most *Unitarians* are *Universalists*; they build their faith, however, upon principles rather than proof-texts, and lay greater stress upon the retributions of God's government than its results, the attainment of holiness than the happiness that will attend it, character than destiny. *Universalists* believe that the Salvation of *all* souls is distinctly revealed, and give that glorious consummation prominence in their preaching. The former lay more stress on *the laws*; the latter on *the love* of God. The first think more of duty, the second more of destiny".
Editor.

MR. J. WESLEY. Are you sure of that, Mr. Lewis? Have you read the work yourself?

LEWIS. To be sure, I have; and it clearly proves the *fallaciousness* of Unitarianism and the *verity* of Trinitarianism. [Cheers.]

WESLEY. Are you quite sure, that You have read that book thoroughly and thoughtfully?

LEWIS. Certainly; and I have repeatedly recommended it to my Parishioners.

Chairman. Again I must remind Disputants, that mere human authority is not, can not be considered as decisive on any open question. Who or what Mr. Chamberlain is, or, what he writes, is destitute of authority here.

WESLEY. I have read the trumpery thing, Mr. Chairman; a mere accumulation of texts, *forced* into unnatural and irrational meanings; with a multitude of assumptions, wholly void of logical and scriptural corroboration—a very capital book for an uninquiring, slothful, prejudiced mind. [Hear, hear!]

LEWIS. I deny it! it is a masterly performance, and *proves* that the most celebrated Scholars are agreed as to the verity of the *Three heavenly Witnesses*.

WESLEY. No such thing! With your permission, Sir—[Taking up the volume] Here, Mr. Chairman, on p. 146, Chamberlain writes, concerning the 7th verse, which Mr. Addison has so emphatically denounced A FORGERY—

So far as I have been able to study the question, my conviction is, that the weight of authority remains in favor of its acceptance, in the sense of its being still printed in the text of our Bibles".

This is what Chamberlain writes—not as Mr. Lewis asserts, *proving* the verity of the *Three heavenly Witnesses*; but, telling us what Chamberlain's conviction is. Now, the fact is this—Mr. Lewis, with all his talk, knows not the contents of this paltry volume; and Mr. Chamberlain, with all his pretensions, knows nothing about the *Three heavenly Witnesses*! [Hear, hear!] All that Mr. Lewis's puffed-up writer does, is to make an idle assertion, unsupported by a shadow of proof; he gives us what he calls his "*conviction*" about "the weight of authority"; but, who or what his authorities are, he has left his readers to find out—if they can; as he does not quote any, does not mention any. This trashy compilation is not a mere Tract, but, as you see, Mr. Chairman, a Volume of 500 closely-printed pages; and if Chamberlain had *any authorities*, he was bound to insert them, in confirmation of his own utterly valueless opinion. Now, Mr. Lewis, I have just as little respect for your opinion, as for that of your friend Chamberlain; and if He be not present to hear me, I trust you may tell him, from me, that I have sought for his boasted "weight of authority" in vain; and that if he has any writers to countenance his *false Witnesses*, that I know, of a certainty, Milton, Locke, and Newton,* are *not* among them; Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin, are *not* among them; archbishops Newcome, Tillotson, and Whately are *not* among them; bishops Lowth, Marsh, and Blomfield, are *not* among them; Ewald, and Griesbach, and Michaelis, and Scholz, and Lachmann, and Tischendorf, and Tregelles, are *not* among them; nor Whitby,† nor Bentley, nor Waterland,

* England's greatest living Benefactor (the encyclopedic Brougham) has put it on record, that "No man knew more of scientific truth, than Newton; of intellectual truth, than Locke and Pascal; of physical truth, than Sir H. Davy; or, of legal evidence, than Sir M. Hale—and yet, all of these were firm believers in Revelation". *Editor*.

† There was a passage inaudibly instanced from Whitby, countenancing Chamberlain's false view of the *Three heavenly Witnesses*; but, that passage was shown, by Mr. Butler, to have

nor Porson, nor the two Clarkes, [Samuel and Adam] nor a whole catalogue of other learned clerks and biblical critics. [Hear, hear!] Then, Mr. Chairman, let the passage be repudiated by every lover of Truth! let it be stigmatized as an abominable fraud! let it be branded as a trinitarian falsehood, a popish cheat on Christendom! and let all impudent supporters of these "pious frauds", such as Chamberlain, Lewis, and Co. be treated as arrant impostors! [Considerable agitation.]

QUARLES. Friend Wealey waxes warm, and seems to be losing his usual calmness.

WESLEY. "On such a theme 'twere impious to be Calm!"

QUARLES. Well, I have but little objection to thy warmth, provided I may remain cool. These gross impositions, sometimes very placidly designated "*pious frauds*", are really what the Edinburgh Review calls them—"the deliberate DISHONESTIES of the learned". There must, however, have been a sad dearth of common honesty in those "*pious*" imposters, who framed and inserted the *Three heavenly Witnesses* as constituting a portion of Holy Writ; for, it is not to be found in any one of the Uncial Manuscripts! [Hear, hear!] And, Mr. Chairman, there are too many impositions of a like kind, to leave us in doubt by whom such "*pious frauds*" were perpetrated—by Trinitarian-minded fanatics, "Who changed the Truth of God into a Lie, and worshiped and served the Creature more than the Creator".

[Applause.]

F. FAWKES, Esq. Mr. Chairman! As you have allowed the introduction of Chamberlain's bepraised book into the Discussion, you cannot object to my introducing a reference to the Weekly dialogues issued in *The Quiver*, commencing with No. 114, on 19 Dec. 1863. Cassell's publication carries on its Titlepage, "*Defense of Biblical Truth*" and "*Religion in the Homes of the People*"; and as Unitarianism does not exactly square with the notions of the writers in that Periodical, the author of "*John Sullivan*" has exposed his ignorance of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, in attacking the *Unity of the Godhead*. I have not read farther than to the middle of the second dialogue (No. 115, Dec. 26) where the following so-called *illustration* of the *Unity in Trinity* occurs—

Take the very common illustration of the *Flame of a Candle*. We look at it, and see it to be One. Yet, there are united in it *Three* distinct things—*fire, light, and heat*. *Heat*, we know, may exist without either *light, or fire*; as in a man in a fever; *Light* we behold in the moon, without feeling any *heat*; but, in the *Flame of a Candle*, we behold these *Three* distinct things united, and all forming only *One flame*". p. 205.

PEELE. Why the *Three-cocked-hat* beats that simile, out and out!

FAWKES. How the Conductors of *The Quiver* could publish such nonsense, surprises me; as the illustration is as pitiful as the *Three-legged-stool*, or, the more favorite similitude, the *Three-leaved-shamrock*. [Hear, hear!] Cassell himself will be disgusted with the puerility and gallimaufry of the Dialogues, if ever they come under his eye; as they are, in a literary point of view, a disgrace to any publication aiming at respectability. Cassell will detect, in an instant, that the pseudo-illustration is no illustration at all—unless the bepraised writer can show, by some new species of logic, that the *Fire is the Flame*, the *Light is the Flame*, and the *Heat is the Flame*, and that they are *not Three flames*, but, *One flame*! [Hear, hear!]

been penned in early life: and as Mr. Butler argued, whatever *change* takes place in any man's opinions, we are bound to abide by the latest opinion, as being the most matured. Many (like Dr. Whitby and Dr. Watts) who long ranked amongst Trinitarians, became Unitarians in their riper years. Reporter.

Having read quite enough to convince me, that the author of "John Sullivan" knew not *what* he was writing about, I cast his rubbish aside.

T. MIDDLETON, Esq. I must not let this "eligible opportunity" escape, of recommending "a Book in my hand" worth a houseful of such books as Mr. Lewis has recommended "to all present"—it is entitled :

The Unitarian Handbook of Scriptural Illustrations and Expositions :
by Robert Spears".

It also is the second edition, 1862, Mr. Chairman ; "and I hope it may pass through many editions"; as it gives, as one part of its contents only, "Explanations of 300 Scriptural Texts advanced to sustain Unscriptural Doctrines"; and adduces a considerable number of celebrated Triunitarian writers, who unequivocally maintain, that the constructions which such men as Chamberlain have put upon a variety of passages *supposed* by them to countenance the Doctrine of the Trinity, are forced out of their natural meanings, and are (by Chamberlain and others) placed in an illogical and unscriptural light—and I confidently recommend it to the attention of TRUTH-SEEKERS, whether Trinitarians or Unitarians. Bound in Cloth, for One Shilling, at 178 Strand, London, and all other Booksellers—a fifth of the price of Chamberlain's "Christian Verity Stated", which I pronounce *a bundle of gross MISSTATEMENTS!* [Hear, hear !

J. PHILIPS, Esq. Happily, Mr. Chairman, the tenableness of the Unity and the untenableness of the Trinity, are becoming, day by day, more conspicuous to most denominations ; and, Sir, I am morally certain, that the Unitarians at present existing in other bodies of Christians, far outnumber the Unitarians frequenting Unitarian chapels. [Hear, hear !] Though I expected that several Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers, would support the Unitarians in this Discussion, I did not anticipate that Wesleyans would so openly have renounced their deep-rooted Trinitarian prejudices.

REV. W. SHENSTONE. I hesitate not to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Wesleyan who will give up the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, is unworthy of the name *wesleyan!* has not a particle of real *methodism* in him ! is a renegade from our Society !

MR. NABBES. Gently, friend Shenstone, gently ; for, I know several Wesleyans, god-fearing men, of irreproachable characters, who have long since cast the *Three heavenly Witnesses* "to the moles and the bats"—some of them real ornaments to thy Society—men who have very elaborately and convincingly shown, that the *Three heavenly Witnesses* must be numbered among the "pious frauds" and "dishonesties" already spoken of ; and they certainly ought to be struck out of thy Bible as well as out of thy Head. [Hear, hear !

SHENSTONE. I don't believe it, Sir—That is, I don't believe that any man deserving the name *wesleyan*, disowns the *Three heavenly Witnesses*.

NABBES. Friend Philips, just turn to Adam Clarke's Comment on the passage, and read to the Meeting his matured opinion respecting it.

PHILIPS. I am now busy with it, Sir ; but, it is a very elaborate comment, of several quarto pages : I shall, therefore, read but a few of the pithy parts, and leave the inquisitive to read the rest at leisure. The learned Doctor informs us, that—

113 Greek MSS. are extant, containing the First epistle of John ; and the text in question is *wanting* in 112. [Hear, hear !] It only exists in the *Codex Monfortii* (a comparatively recent MS.) already described".

NABBES. That, friend Shenstone, is 112 to 1 ; and that One not an accred-

ited Manuscript. But, go on, friend Philips, I shall not interrupt thee again. [Philips resumes]

All the Greek Fathers omit the verse".

All is it! yea, *all*; all the highest authorities the Christian church can boast; not One of them acknowledges the *Three heavenly Witnesses*! [Hear, hear!]

The *first place* the verse appears in Greek, is in the Greek translation of the Acts of the Council of Lateran, held A.D. 1215".

So, so; then 1200 years had rolled away, before ever the *Three heavenly Witnesses* made their appearance; yet, our Pulpits speak of them, as if they had existed 1800 years; whereas they are but 600 years old, and no one knows where they sprang from. The erudite Doctor has investigated the subject thoroughly; I read here, that He examined the Greek MSS. with his own eyes—that is more than I have done, or, you either, Mr. Shenstone—he presents his readers with a *fac-simile* of 1 John v. 7, 8, 9, from the Codex Montfortii, deposited in Trinity College, Dublin; and here is another *fac-simile*—but, Mr. Chairman, "it's all Greek to me", and so I shall not read it. [Hear, hear!] I can manage the English, however, and shall therefore proceed—

Though it is found in many Latin copies, yet, it does not appear that any written previously to the *Tenth* century, contains it". [Hear, hear!]

Upon my word, Mr. Shenstone, the Doctor seems to be going very hard against you; and He is, as you know, the very tip-top of our erudite authorities.

It is *wanting* in all the ancient versions, the Vulgate excepted: but, the more ancient copies of this, have it *not*; and those which have it, *vary greatly* among themselves, as may be seen in the specimens already produced".

Here, Mr. Chairman, we see, and cannot but admire, the Doctor's insuperable love of Truth; for, though bred and born a Trinitarian, a preacher of Trinitarianism, and a Trinitarian writer throughout his learned and masterly Commentary, yet, he has for ever demolished "the Text on which the doctrine of the Trinity stands, as on a rock immoveable!" Further—

It is *wanting* in the first edition of Erasmus, A.D. 1516, which is, properly, the *editio princeps* of the Greek text.

It is *wanting* also in his second edition, 1519; but, he added it in the third, from the Codex Montfortii.

It is *wanting* in the editions of Aldus, Gerbelius, Cephalius, &c.

It is *wanting* in the German translation of Luther, and in all the editions of it published *during his lifetime*.

It is *inserted* in our early English translations, but, *with marks of doubtfulness*, as has already been shown.

In short, it stands on no authority sufficient to authenticate any part of a Revelation professing to have come from God". [Hear, hear, hear! Hear, hear, hear!]

So much, Mr. Chairman, for Dr. Clarke's opinion; and if Mr. Shenstone, or anyone else, can gainsay it, now is the time. [Rounds of applause.]
REV. G. CHAPMAN. Let not the Bishop of Manchester's recent declaration be altogether lost on the present assembly, wherein he declared—

The very foundations of our Faith are taken from us Christians, when *one line* of that sacred volume is declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy!" [Hear, hear, hear!]

—for lo! instead of *a line*, the most renowned scholars and biblical critics of Europe (who have *examined* and commented on the *Three heavenly Wit-*

nesses) hesitate not to declare a *whole verse* of our "authorized version", as utterly "untrustworthy"; an interpolation, a trinitarian forgery! an undeniable *proof* that the "Infallibility of the Bible", is but an idle dream! a stumblingblock to Truthseekers! [Applause.]

MR. DODDRIDGE. Mr. Chairman! If any believer in the so-called *tripersonal*, or *triune* Deity, can but impart to us in plain, intelligible language, *what* He conceives the Trinity to be; surely, Sir, some among us might be able to apprehend his meaning; but, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me, that our Trinitarian friends are in a complete maze; and by their abortive attempts to elucidate, only add to the puzzling confusion of perfectly unintelligible names and expressions. In *preparing* for this Discussion, I met with a variety of Trinitarian epithets, a few of which I noted down, and shall now read them to the Meeting, as *specimens of folly* in departing from the language of commonsense. The Trinity is, by trinitarian writers, said to be—

Three substances, three divine hypostases, three essences—a trinity of divine personalities, principles, and perfections—three divine persons in a sense metaphorical—a unity in pluralities, and pluralities in unity—three priorities and co-equalities—a God distinguished according to three considerations—a triunal distinction—three distinct relatives or relations—three different modes of subsistence—three divine intelligences, existences, beings—three impersonations existing under finite conditions—three somewhats"—

together with a long list of equally unapprehensible, not to say nonsensical and ludicrous epithets and expressions, anything but creditable to those who employ them, since men of sense cannot form any clear conceptions of such idiosyncratic vagaries. [Hear, hear!]

MR. PRINGLE. That child of genius, Jeremy Taylor, the Son of a Barber, and Bishop of Down and Connor, one of the brightest ornaments of our Established church, has given us his opinion on the Triune god, in his own quaint but expressive way—

He who goes about to speak of the *mystery* of the Trinity, and does it by words and names of Man's invention; talking of essences and existences, hypostases and personalities, priorities and co-equalities, and unity in pluralities; may amuse himself, and build a tabernacle in his head, and talk something. *He knows not what*: but, the good man, who feels the power of the Father, and to whom the Son has become wisdom, sanctification, and redemption; in whose heart the love of the Spirit of God is shed abroad; this man, though he understands nothing of what is UNINTELLIGIBLE, yet, He alone truly understands the Christian doctrine of the Trinity". [Hear, hear!]

REV. J. MAYNE. As a Unitarian Minister, I would briefly say, many of us are of opinion, that the doctrine of the Trinity is altogether at variance with the Bible, with Reason, and with Commonsense; that it is quite as reasonable, and certainly less mischievous, to believe in Transubstantiation, in Priestly absolution, or, in Satanic ubiquity, than to believe that *Three* distinct persons can be *One*, or, that One supreme God can admit of participation in his Godhead. We feel it an insult to our understanding, for anyone to attempt persuading us, that a Son can be as old as his Father; that any Being can be *his own Father, Himself, and his own Son*; that a Being who was Born into life, Lived, and Died, was, or could have been, Uncreated, Eternal, Immortal—such incongruities and contradictions and impossibilities, we Unitarians tread under our feet, worshipping and acknowledging but One God, as taught in the Jewish scriptures, and but One Father, as revealed to us by our Brother Jesus, according to the Christian scriptures—and we look upon and denounce all other Gods as *Idols!* [Cheers.]

Truth, however, demands that I should state distinctly, *all* Unitarian ministers are *not yet* so far advanced, as to be consistent with their professions. [Hear, hear!] We have among us several god-fearing men who do not yet see the gross incongruity, the fatal mistake, of professing to believe in the *Unity of God*, and, at the same time, addressing Him, *not direct*, but through Christ. [Hear, hear!] Yet, to every thinking mind it must be evident, that whoever has a *second* Lord, *another* Master, destroys, in reality, the moral value of his professed belief in *One only true wise God*. [Hear, hear!] However firmly, positively, and vehemently, we may declare that Christ is *not* God—that Christ is *not* an object of worship—so long as we continue introducing Christ's name into our Prayers, seldom or never approaching God but through Christ, so long shall we be debarred from communion with God. [Hear, hear!] Those of us who cannot address our Father, except through the medium of Christ our Brother, cannot have *direct* access to the throne of grace; neither can God be our all in all. Before we shall be Unitarians indeed and of a truth, *One God Only* must be our sole moral Lord, our present Teacher, our future Judge; and, between Him and us no *secondary* being must intervene, whether Saint, Virgin, or Christ. [Hear, hear!]

SHENSTONE. I don't care a straw for all your Unitarian ridicule, disbelief, and infidelity! [Hear, hear!] I maintain the Faith as it was delivered to the saints, and I will uphold the Trinity as it stands in God's holy Word—There are *Three* that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these *Threes are One*!

"Soon as our pardoned hearts believe
That thou art pure, essential, Love,
The proof we in ourselves receive
Of the *Three Witnesses* above;
Sure as the saints around the throne,
That Father, Word, and Spirit, are One". p. 250.

MR. MAY. It is clear to me, Mr. Shenstone, that you are so horribly afraid of departing from the *faith*, as you call it, that you have not the moral courage to depart from your prejudices; your mind, Mr. Shenstone, like the pupil of your eye, becomes more and more contracted as every additional ray of light is thrown upon it; and, believe it or not, you are in a fair way of becoming stoneblind: [Hear, hear!] for, there cannot be much hope of anyone, who, on the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, rejects the conclusion of your own Dr. Adam Clarke. [Cheers.]

REV. R. HERRICK. Dr. Clarke was a Dissenter, therefore, I care very little for anything such a heretic may say, however highly the Methodists may prize him; and as to the Unitarians, our own great Doctor South tells us (in his Sermons)

They are "impious blasphemers, whose infamous pedigree runs back, from wretch to wretch, in a direct line to the Devil himself; and who are fitter to be crushed by the civil magistrate, as destructive to government and society, than to be confuted as merely heretics in religion". [Hear, hear! with Cheers and Hisses.]

REV. CANON CRASHAW. [Much cheered] Mr. Chairman, I shall not long either occupy the time, or, try the patience of the Meeting.

Mr. Herrick, I think it my duty to remind you, if you have forgotten it, or, to inform you, if you never knew it, that several of the Heads of our own Church have written as decisively against the admission, or rather, against the reception, of the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, as the eminently

learned, and highly to be esteemed, Dr. Clarke; such, for instance, as "the politest scholar of his age", our biblical critic, Dr. Lowth, bishop of London, who gives his judgement on the passage, in the following noteworthy sentence—

We have some Wranglers in Theology, sworn to follow their master; who are prepared to defend anything, however absurd, should there be occasion; but, I believe, there is no one among us, in the least degree conversant with sacred criticism, and having the use of his understanding, who would be willing to contend for the *genuineness* of the verse 1 John v. 7. [Loud applause.

I shall not trouble the Meeting with quotations from other writers belonging to our Established church; I give bishop Lowth, who is a host in himself; and I shall only add, as my own opinion—and I give it as fearlessly as sincerely—the man, the Clergyman, who is so ignorant, or, so hoodwinked, as to receive the *Three heavenly Witnesses* as Scripture, deserves to be contemned as a Dunce, or, hooted as a Dissembler; since none but a knave or a fool can be ignorant of its *spuriousness*! [Applause.

SANDYS. That is a bone for our Rector to pick.

W. BLACKSTONE, Esq. The *Three heavenly Witnesses* is one of the "Two noted corruptions of Scripture", of which Sir Isaac Newton wrote the "Historical account", already mentioned by someone at this Meeting. I shall not quote any of Sir Isaac's remarks on the passage—as the worthy Canon has rendered further testimony superfluous; but, I would give a single sentence only, Mr. Chairman, relating to such fraudulent interpolations: Sir Isaac writes—

Whilst we exclaim against *the pious frauds* of the Roman church, and make it a part of our religion to *detect* and *renounce* all things of that kind, we must acknowledge *it is a GREATER CRIME in us* to favor such practices, than in the Papists we so much blame on that account; for, *they act* according to their religion, but *we* contrary to ours". [Applause.

SHENSTONE. Mr. Chairman, as I have an engagement, I wish, before leaving, to make known to this Meeting, that notwithstanding all that has been said, all that may yet be said, or, can be said, I do *not* believe in the Unity, but, in the ever-adorable Trinity!* [Hear, hear!

NABBES. And would not believe, though one rose from the dead to convince thee! [Hear, hear!

REV. G. LYTTELTON. It is very plain to me, Mr. Chairman, that the 7th verse, containing the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, which so many present would willingly expunge, must for ever remain there; and for this reason—

"All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we are taught in God's word, that "All Scripture is given by divine Inspiration"; and as the *Three heavenly Witnesses* are in the Bible, if anyone take away the *Three heavenly Witnesses*, "God shall take away his part out of the book of Life"—for, such is the Word of God.

REV. W. DRUMMOND. Really, Mr. Chairman, it is enough to make an intelligent Baptist blush, to hear a fellow-member, and a minister to boot, publicly uttering such "bald unjointed chat" in the presence of so many

* "An obstinate man does not *hold opinions*, but, *they hold him*; for, when he is once possessed with an Error, it is, like a devil, only cast out with great difficulty. His understanding is hardened, like Pharaoh's heart, and is proof against all sorts of judgements whatsoever. BUTLER.

Ministers of various denominations. As a Baptist, I beg this Meeting not to judge of the knowledge and acquirements of our Ministers, from the samples we have had at this Meeting. [Hear, hear!] Had Mr. Lyttelton acted prudently, he would have been an attentive and silent Listener, and not have obtruded his unfledged notions and boyish fancies on an Assembly like this; for, he knows not, that he has committed an egregious mistake in supposing that "*all* Scripture is given by divine Inspiration"—misled, perhaps, through the little but important word *all*, which, by the bye, is not in the original text, but, is verily an *interpolation*. [Hear, hear!] He knows not that the words he quoted from the Apocalypse, bear reference to *that one book only*, and not to the whole Bible, containing 66 Books, without the Apocrypha. He knows not, that the Scriptures simply contain *the Records* of Revelations, but are *not* the divine Revelations themselves. [Hear, hear!] He knows not, in short, that he is a perfect novice in biblical learning; a dogmatist in the propagation of his College-lessons, many of which are demonstrably anti-scriptural. [Hear, hear!] We have, however, Mr. Chairman, many well-read, thinking, investigating men, in our Body—especially among our Lay-members, many of whom are far in advance of the generality of our young Ministers; and, I am happy to say, as a Body, we are progressing in knowledge and intelligence; and, I would fain hope, in personal goodness and in charity towards all men. [Applause.]

M. AKENSIDE, Esq. Mr. Chairman! It is reasonable to suppose, that had any such doctrine as a *Duality of gods* been proposed to the earliest Christians, the Jews (who at that period firmly adhered to their belief in *One only God*) would have stoned the Proposers to death, as the desert of their Idolatry.

REV. MR. LEYDEN. You seem not to know, Mr. Akenside, that India, Greece, and Rome, had *their Triune gods* long before the birth of Christ.

AKENSIDE. I spoke of "the earliest Christians"; the Christians during Christ's ministry (before they bore the name *christian*) nearly all of whom were Jews, who had no other God but One, the one JEHOVAH—Christianity was born of Judaism, and the gospel of Jesus was implanted, and had its earliest growth, and first fruits, in Jewish soil—it could not have originated anywhere else, nor at any other period of the world's existence than in the early part of the Roman empire—and no such doctrine as a *Duality of gods* was ever heard of among the followers of Jesus, untill long after the introduction of Christianity—not untill about the middle of the *second* century, when "The Word" became identified with "the Son of Man"—adding another fatal *corruption* to many previous corruptions of the doctrines of Jesus. [Hear, hear!]

We Protestants, Mr. Chairman, have far more of Popery in our forms and tenets of religion—and we Christians have far more of Judaism in our political laws and religious ceremonies—that is, we have considerably less of the Gospel of Jesus among us, than One in ten thousand is prepared to admit.

In the few books of the Christian Scriptures which have been preserved and handed down to us,* are several records of Discourses delivered to the people, by the earliest disseminaters of Christianity; yet, neither of a *third*,

* "That the Bible is a compilation of *fragmentary* Scriptures, culled out of the sacred writings of several different nations, by 318 bishops of the Catholic church, who convened for this purpose at Nice, in the year 325, being convoked, for ambitious ends, by the most arbitrary and unscrupulous Tyrant of the fourth century, to whom the civil power of Rome and the ecclesiastical authority of all Christendom became at once subservient; that these Censors of the Holy Ghost,

nor yet of a *second* Divine person in the Godhead, is any mention made—because, both the *third* and the *second* were equally unknown: had they, or one of them, existed in the time of the great Founder of christianity, or, during the time of the Evangelists whose writings we possess, such DUALITY as well as TRINITY would have been stamped indelibly and unmistakably on the writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles. It would not have been left questionable, to be guessed at, to be inferred; but, would have been rendered as clear, obvious, and questionless, as the crucifixion of Jesus, the stoning of Stephen, or the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. *Dualism* was unknown to Jesus, *Trinitarianism* was unknown to the Apostles; yet, without their knowledge neither the one nor the other could possibly have existed—therefore, Mr. Chairman, we know of a surety, they existed *not*, but are, indubitably, the excrescences of later ages. [Hear, hear!]

CAMPBELL. The simplicity and purity of the Gospel of Jesus, was too pure and too simple to remain long uncorrupted by even his avowed followers; and of all the corrupters we read of, Paul certainly bears away the palm. [Hear, hear! repeated again and again] The Gospel of Jesus is one thing, the Gospel of Paul is another; for they are demonstrably *not the same*. [Hear, hear! with murmurs] Paul, who was a believer in Jesus at secondhand only—for, Paul never heard him, never saw him, never—[Here Mr. Campbell's voice was drowned, by cries of Proof, proof! etc.]

I am taken by surprise, Mr. Chairman; and I am at a loss, whether to desist, or, go on. [Go on, Sir; go on!] If the Ministers here present, are of Paul's opinion, that "We can do nothing against the Truth, but, for the Truth", surely no one need be alarmed at any remarks I may make on a theological question, even should they disapprove of my views. [Hear, hear!] I take the Scriptures for my guide, and they are my authority for what I have already said, and which seems to have been either ill-expressed or not perfectly understood—or rather, not perfectly *apprehended*. If what I have said, or may yet say, be disputed, let my observations be controverted by argument, not cried down by clamor. [Hear, hear! and applause] Whatever opinions You or I may entertain, of this we may rest assured—Religious truths never can suffer either loss or injury, by passing through the crucible of *investigation*; and if what I say cannot stand the test of *examination*, "throw it to the dogs!" [Cheers.]

Paul's writings are tenfold more voluminous than those of the other Apostles—or rather, of what we possess; for, many of the Epistles, as well as Gospels, were destroyed by the cursed hands of the fanatical Bishops who sat in Council, at Nice, under the presidency of that archbigot Constantine, in A.D. 325. [Hear, hear!] Before I point out the marked differences between the Gospels of Jesus and of Paul, it may be well just to glance at the means Paul possessed of becoming acquainted with either the spirit of Jesus or the precise nature of his doctrines. [Hear, hear!]

Paul's first knowledge of Jesus, is represented as having taken place during the notable Vision which made him a convert; and of which

as well as all human authorship, having determined that *four* out of about *fifty* narratives of the Life and teachings of Jesus, together with now and then a parchment, and here and there an excerption of Hebraic, Arabic, Chaldaic, and Egyptian, Holy Writ, were worth preserving, *fashioned and finished this text-book* of Divine Revelation in such wise as their own wits suggested; and that the same has been subsequently turned into English, and accepted by us *as the Word of God*, because the people have generally supposed it was, because all the successive Functionaries of the Church from then till now have so taught, because the Council of Nice so decided, because Constantine so dictated: all this is as true as anything in history. *The Mistake of Christendom.* p. 118.

remarkable incident we have no fewer than 4 accounts—not 2 of them alike. [Hear, hear!] We have one account from Luke, in the capacity of *historian*; [Acts ix.] a second from Luke, as a *reporter* of Paul's speech to the people at Jerusalem; [xxii.] a third *reported* by Luke as having been spoken by Paul to Agrippa; [xxvi.] and a fourth from Paul himself, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians: and those of you who may think Paul's own account as trustworthy as Luke's—that Paul (who was present) knew better than Luke (who was absent) *what* took place and *how* it took place, will have to give up, *as fiction*, the whole of the external and marvelous part of the conversion, as related by Luke (who was not on the spot) for the more rational and reliable account of Paul himself, who speaks of an *internal* revelation only—"when it pleased God to REVEAL HIS SON IN ME, that I might preach him among the Heathen", etc. [Hear, hear!]

This, Mr. Chairman, is a point of much more importance, than may appear at first sight; for, those who cannot believe all the 4 accounts with equal confidence, may have their doubts as to the real nature of the Vision—as to its being *mental* or *external*, or, neither the one nor the other. [Hear, hear!] Keep in mind, I am not giving you any individual opinion of my own, but, placing the occurrence of the Vision before you, as given in the Scriptures. Luke, in his *historical* narration, does not intimate that the supernatural light was *seen* by Paul's companions; yet, Paul, in his speech to the Jews, tells them it was. Luke says that Paul's companions *heard* the voice; which Paul [Acts xxii. 9] as plainly contradicts, at Jerusalem. In Acts xxii. 10, Paul speaks of the voice referring him to *future* conferences, at Damascus, for further instructions as to his Calling; but, in his Defense before Agrippa, he says [xxvi.] that the voice gave him his commission *on the spot*. Can you believe all these different accounts? and can you believe them with equal confidence? If you can, then, great is your Belief! [Hear, hear! and murmurs.]

Remember, that in Paul's own account, the *external and supernatural* is altogether ignored; while Luke's 3 accounts are contradictory and wholly irreconcilable. [Hear, hear!]

But, Mr. Chairman, now comes the most important question—*How* and *whence* did Paul receive his knowledge of Jesus and of his Doctrines? [Pause—in profound stillness.]

Did Paul acquire his knowledge in the usual way, from communications made by the Apostles? or, was he honored by a special and private revelation from heaven? Some, think the one, and some, the other; but, what think You? In this matter, Luke and Paul are at variance. In the Acts of the Apostles, penned by Luke, it is distinctly stated, that Paul immediately on his conversion, during his stay with the disciples at Damascus, was instructed in the doctrines of Jesus; and that Paul, then and there, entered on his calling as Missionary. Now, Mr. Chairman, according to this statement, Paul received his instructions at *secondhand*; but, Paul himself contradicts the statement of Luke, in the plainest terms, and on several occasions, declaring he did *not* receive his instructions from any of the disciples, but, from the Lord Jesus himself, by direct *supernatural* communication. [Proof, proof! with murmurings.]

Turn to the first chapter of Paul's epistle to the Galatians, and there you may read with me the following words—

I wish you to know, brethren, as to the Good Tidings which were preached by me, that they were *not* after Man; for, I neither *received* them nor was *taught* them by Man, but by *the revelation* of Jesus Christ. [Hear, hear!] When it pleased God, who called

me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; immediately I went into Arabia, and again returned to Damascus. After 3 years, I went up to Jerusalem, to inquire for Peter, and I abode with him for 15 days. And I saw not any other of the Apostles but James, the Lord's brother. Now, as to what I am writing to you, *behold, BEFORE GOD, I lie not!* After 14 years, I again went up to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, taking also Titus with me".

Hence, it seems but rational to infer, Mr. Chairman, that Paul had a good deal of the *self-taught* man about him; he seems scarcely to have had any acquaintance with the disciples who had personally known and been taught of Jesus: and to his defective knowledge of the doctrines of Jesus, is to be attributed several *new* doctrines propagated by Paul, to which Jesus never gave countenance. [Hear, hear! and loud murmurings.

Mr. Chairman! Other speakers may do as they please, but, I do not choose to continue addressing an auditory that receives my remarks with murmurings—I cut my observations short, adding but one sentence more: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures!" [A scene, not necessary to be reported, took place on Mr. Campbell's resuming his seat; nor could he be persuaded to continue his address.

MR. PORTEUS. The Bible is a remarkable book, Mr. Chairman; for, the hundreds of Christian sects, all go to the Bible for the substantiation of their various and contradictory tenets. Romanists and Protestants, Calvinists and Arminians, Trinitarians and Unitarians, all prove, or, attempt to prove, the Truth of their doctrines, from the Bible. The fact is, when men in general go to consult the Bible on the truth or fallacy of any doctrine, they take their prejudices along with them; and, reading the Scriptures through their own peculiarly-ground spectacles, they discover, or fancy they discover, the notions and tenets which possess their several minds. Some can read their favorite doctrines distinctly, and at once; others only by study, or inference: not that the Scriptures are so very dark and intricate, but, because men are hoodwinked or poreblind. The plainest commandments, whether in the Old or the New covenant, are quite unintelligible to all who are pre-determined *not* to understand them. For instance: though Moses says distinctly—*Thou shalt not Kill*; though Jesus plainly commands—*Swear not at all*; there are hundreds of thousands of Christians who have not the remotest conception of the real meaning of the words. [Hear, hear!] The Archbishop of Canterbury very gravely and devoutly draws up a form of public Thanksgiving to the beneficent Creator of all men, for the Christian slaughter of 30,000 deeply injured Heathens; while men of integrity and honor, are daily constrained to take an Oath, in a Christian court, that they will "speak the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth", about a Donky, or a Pig, they may have happened to see walking in some field, garden, or lane.* [Hear, hear!] Each of these Commandments is expressed in Four monosyllables, such as Infants can readily understand; yet, these plain words have been so mystified by ecclesiastical and judicatory learning, that of all our English denominations of Christians, the Society of Friends alone, seems to have succeeded in getting to the bottom of their only Scriptural signification. [Burst of applause.

With whatever theological whim in his head, a man sits down to read

* Though sanctioned by Moses, all Swearing is strictly and most emphatically forbidden by Jesus—the Teacher whose doctrines Christians *profess* to follow.

Oaths are required on so many occasions among us, and are so carelessly and playfully administered, that they have lost nearly all their solemnity and efficacy. It is stated by Price, that oaths

his Bible, he will be sure to find (or make) Texts to give it countenance. [Hear, hear !

F. GREVILLE, Esq. Many men, Mr. Chairman, are fond of what they call "a thorough good argument", or, "a fine-drawn inference"; and would not give a fig for a doctrine which cannot bear twisting upside down and turning inside out. It is by dint of *argumentation* and *inference*, that Trinitarians construe so many texts into meanings never intended. Notwithstanding the doctrine of God's *duality*, or, *trinity*, is not so much as hinted at in the Bible, yet, by dint of argument and inference, they maintain the existence of such monstrosities. [Hear, hear !] Where can any unprejudiced mind discover *the Deity of Jesus*? certainly not in the New testament—yet, some contrive to infer it from their own arguments. It is by argument only, they set up their man-made doctrines. They cannot quote the Scriptures as we do, producing plain, unmistakable texts, by scores, hundreds, and thousands; but, they draw out their cherished doctrines by inferences: yet, Sir, their inferences are false, because their premisses are not true! Jesus says, *I am the Son of the God*; but, our friends opposite say, *No, not so; Jesus is God the Son*; and attempt to prove it by argument. In his address to his Father, Jesus calls him *The only true God*; but, our friends fancy they have found one or two more; and off they fly to argument and inference.

We read, Mr. Chairman, of Cleopas's speaking "concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people"—of Peter's proclaiming "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God"—also of his telling the Jews, "Moses truly said unto the fathers, *A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren*, like unto Me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever He shall say unto you"—and of Jesus's saying unto John, "I am thy *fellow-servant*, and of thy brethren the prophets"—but, nowhere in the Bible is Jesus ever called *the God*—the title most blasphemously given to him by uninquiring Trinitarians. [Hear, hear !

H. K. WHITE, Esq. As you know, Mr. Chairman, I have been a diligent reader for many years; and I see, from certain nods and signs, that I am expected to express my sentiments on the present occasion—I shall not trouble you long.

Not one of the Evangelists, not one of the Apostles, not one of the

in courts, oaths of office, oaths at elections, customhouse oaths, etc. justify his assertion—that about a million perjuries are annually committed in this christian kingdom.

Many of our so-called *national oaths* are as ridiculous and preposterous as they are silly and sinful. For instance, the oath of *Abjuration of the Pretender*, &c. which (with other foolish oaths) continues to be administered in the present day. In June, 1858, Lord Campbell publicly expressed his hope, in the Court of Queen's Bench, that such "*Profane mummeries* would soon be done away with".

In the beginning of January, 1864, Mr. Holyoake was summoned to serve as grand juror at the Clerkenwell Sessions; he appeared, and stated in court, that he was quite ready to serve, but, the oath being a *confession of faith* he did not hold, he must decline to take it, *as an act of good faith to the court*. Mr. Bodkin (the assistant Judge) said, He must fine Mr. Holyoake, and he might petition the Treasury respecting it!

Thus is an Atheist persecuted, by a Christian, *for opinion's sake*, in 1864—Out upon all such Christianity! the corrupted Christianity of the Churches.

Mr. Holyoake writes, in a letter to the Daily papers—As the matter stands, I am refused the privilege of serving on the grand jury, and fined ten guineas for *not serving*—that I am told is the amount. The law disqualifies me, and then fines me for being disqualified. This is an extraordinary example of justice. If any private person served me so, and the case came before this same Judge, he would direct the jury to regard it as a fraud of an aggravated description".

Yet, our wise men in Westminster Palace, governed by the "wisdom of our ancestors", refuse, year after year, to amend the Law! *Editor.*

earliest Christians, had even the most distant idea of either a popish Duality, or, of a pagan Trinity; they were, one and all, Unitarians. [Hear, hear!] During his life, Jesus eat and drank; fasted, prayed, and gave thanks; worked at the Carpenter's bench, and associated with his fellow-men; at 30 years of age, He entered on the Ministry, made choice of certain Disciples, who afterwards became Fellowworkers; yet, not one of these daily companions had the slightest idea of his being the God who made them, the Creator of all things visible and invisible, the uncreated Solipotent who governed all in heaven and on earth—never did such notions enter one of their heads; their whole conduct towards Him demonstrates the contrary: they never believed, never once thought, that He had a particle of participation in the Godhead; for, they one and all forsook him—even sturdy Peter, who said "Lord I am ready to go with thee, both into prison and unto death", denied all acquaintance with him, and swore *He knew not the Man!* [Hear, hear!] In their most endearing friendships with him, in their most enthusiastic moments, they simply believed that He was what he represented Himself to be—the *Son of God, the Son of Man*; the whole of their behaviour towards him, as well as his behaviour towards them, shows that not One of them ever for a single instant believed, or once thought, that *He was God!* [Hear, hear!]

MR. J. CUNNINGHAM. One moment, if you please, Mr. Chairman, to corroborate Mr. White's view. We do *not* read in the Scriptures, that any one of his own family had the slightest idea of Jesus's being a *God*, or, that Jesus had, or pretended to have, any participation in *the Godhead*; neither his father, nor his mother, nor his brothers, nor his sisters, nor any of his relations, ever uttered a syllable about either his *divinity*, or his pretence to divinity: He neither assumed Deity himself, nor did his family and acquaintances ever attribute it to him. [Hear, hear!]

Chairman. Once more, I must refer to the "Regulation" requiring testimony to support assertion.

CUNNINGHAM. I had said all I purposed saying, Mr. Chairman; but, as you demand corroboration from the Scriptures, just turn to the xiii. ch. of Matthew—

When he [Jesus] was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said—Whence hath this Man this wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's Son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then, hath this Man all these things?"

In Mark (considered by many of the learned as being *the first* written of the four Biographical and Historical accounts of Jesus) we read, in the iv. ch. of his hearers saying to each other—

Is not this the carpenter?* the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him. But, Jesus said unto them—A prophet is not without honor, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house. And *he could there do no mighty work*", etc.

In the iv. ch. of Luke we read, that after Jesus had spoken in the synagogue, the people who had heard him, said—

* "Amongst the ancient Jews, every father was bound to do four things for his son—1, to circumcise him; 2, to redeem him; 3, to teach him the law; 4, to teach him a trade—and this was founded on the following just maxim: 'He who teaches not his son to do some work, is as if he taught him robbery!' It is, therefore, likely that Joseph brought up our Lord to *his own trade*.
ADAM CLARKE.

Is not this Joseph's Son?"

And, in the vi. ch. of John we read, that the Jews said—

Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?"*

Yet, Mr. Chairman, neither in any of these passages nor elsewhere, have we the least intimation that anyone of his own family, or acquaintances, ever thought of His being a partaker of the Godhead—but, Sir, we have a formidable intimation to the contrary, in the vii. of John, 5 v.

Neither did his brethren believe in Him". [Hear, hear!

Should these corroborations be deemed insufficient, I shall not trouble myself to adduce others—I am done. [Cheers.

REV. W. MASON. But, Mr. Cunningham, you ought to have known, that the *brethren* and *sisters* of our Lord, were not what we understand now-a-days by *brothers* and *sisters*, but only family relations, male and female, as Mary never bore any other Child.

CUNNINGHAM. Did an Angel from heaven reveal that piece of intelligence to you, Mr. Mason? or, how did you come by it? But, no matter; I am done. [Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN. As you are a Wesleyan, just listen, Mr. Mason, to what Dr. Clarke writes upon the words quoted from Matthew—

Verse 54. When he was come into his own country] Probably *Nazareth*, where his parents lived, and where he had continued till his thirtieth year, though it appears he had a lodging in Peter's house at *Capernaum*.

They were astonished] It appears, hence, that our blessed Lord had lived in obscurity all the time above specified; for, his countrymen appear not to have heard his doctrines, nor seen his miracles, untill now.

Verse 55. Is not this the Carpenter's son?] Seven copies of the old *Itala* have, *Is not this the Son of JOSEPH the carpenter?*

Is not his mother—Mary, and his brethren, James, &c.] This insulting question seems to intimate that our Lord's family was a *very obscure one*; and that they were of small repute among their neighbours, except for their *piety*.

It is *possible*, that brethren and sisters *may* mean *near relations*, as the words are used among the Hebrews in this latitude of meaning; but, I confess it does *not* appear to me likely. [Hear, hear!] Why should the children of *another* family be brought in here to share a reproach which it was evident was designed for *Joseph* the carpenter, *Mary* his wife, *Jesus* their son, and *their other children*? Prejudice apart, would not any person of plain commonsense suppose from this account, that these were *the children* of Joseph and Mary, and the *brothers* and *sisters* of our Lord, *according to the flesh*? It seems odd that this should be doubted; but, through an unaccountable prejudice, *Papists* and *Protestants* are determined to maintain as a doctrine, *that*, on which the Scriptures are totally silent, viz. the *perpetual virginity* of the Mother of our Lord".†

* It used to be a *puzzle* to me, and is still a puzzle to many, *how* Jesus could be the Son of Joseph, or, the Son of David, or, the Son of Man, if he had *no human* Father; and though I have surmounted the difficulty, it is a *mass* out of which some of our Bishops cannot get extricated. In the New covenant Jesus is called a *man* 40 times, and 80 times the *son of man*. It was not untill after his Death, that superstition converted him into a God.—But enough! let the Bishops get out of the mass as best they may. *Reporter*.

† It is difficult, without exhausting superlatives, even to unexpressive and wearisome satiety, to do justice to our intense love, reverence, and admiration for the character and teaching of Jesus. We regard Him *not* as the perfection of the intellectual or philosophic mind, but, as the perfection of the *spiritual* character—as surpassing all men of all times in the closeness and depth of his *communion* with the Father. - In reading his sayings, we feel that we are holding converse with the wisest, purest, noblest Being that ever clothed thought in the poor language of humanity. In studying his life, we feel that we are following the footsteps of *the highest ideal* yet presented to us upon earth. GREG'S *Creed of Christendom*. p. 209. Ed. 1863.

† "MASS OF THE CONCEPTION—Rejoice, O Virgin Mary, thou alone hast destroyed all heresies. Who didst believe the words of Gabriel the archangel. Whilst a Virgin thou didst bring forth Him that was *God and Man*; and after child-birth didst remain a pure Virgin. O Mother of God, intercede for us"!

Now, Mr. Mason, I have done ; and leave you to settle the matter with Dr. Clarke, the most learned of all the Commentators your Society can boast. [Cheers.

MASON. All Wesleyans, Mr. Chairman, do not think so highly of Dr. Clarke, since his controversy with Mr. Watson, on the *Eternal Sonship* of our Saviour ; the Doctor, Sir, has lost caste among many of us, as we think Mr. Watson decidedly right, and the Doctor decidedly wrong.

REV. W. DAVENANT. That, Mr. Mason, may be your opinion ; but, it is *not* mine ; nor is it the opinion of the most intelligent of our Preachers, or, the best educated of our Members. I am sorry thus publicly to oppose you, but, I cannot permit a Wesleyan minister to throw a slur on the greatest and most erudite chiefs of our Connection, without another minister's speaking to his honor—and I surely have as good grounds to speak in exaltation of Dr. Clarke, as you can have to speak disparagingly of him. [Cheers] Dr. Clarke was far in advance of the Preachers in his day ; many of whom could not pen a page of passable English ; they could not appreciate him ; and because his independent spirit and manly conduct were thorns in the flesh of those who would gladly have turned the Methodist Conference into a Popish Inquisition, Dr. Clarke was aspersed, calumniated, and traduced, by a few Would-be-Popes, and is still barked at, by the mongrels of the clique. [Loud Cheerings.

D. LYNDSEY, Esq. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the best way of preventing a battle royal between our Wesleyan friends, will be, to read a brief statement of the Doctor's views, which I find here in his Comment on the 35 v. of the i. ch. of Luke ; after which, the Meeting can hear Mr. Mason on behalf of Richard Watson, and Mr. Davenant on behalf of Adam Clarke——

SANDYS. "Rome and her Rats are at the point of battle ;
The one side must have bale. *Coriolanus*."

—I trust I may be permitted to say, with all due respect for those who differ from me, that the doctrine of the *Eternal Sonship* of Christ, is, in my opinion, anti-scriptural, and highly dangerous. This doctrine I reject, for the following reasons :
1st. I have not been able to find any *express* declaration in the Scriptures concerning it.

2dly. If Christ be the Son of God as to his *divine* nature, then, he cannot be *eternal* ; for, *son* implies a *father* ; and *father* implies, in reference to *son*, precedency in *time*, if not in *nature* too. *Father* and *son* imply the idea of *generation* ; and *generation* implies a *time* in which it was effected, and *time* also *antecedent* to such generation.

3rdly. If Christ be the *Son* of God, as to his *divine* nature, then, the *Father* is of necessity *prior*, consequently *superior*, to him.

4thly. Again, if this *divine nature* were *begotten* of the *Father*, then, it must be in *time* ; i.e. there was a period in which it *did not* exist, and a period when it *began* to exist. This destroys the *eternity* of our blessed Lord, and robs him at once of his Godhead.

5thly. To say that he was *begotten* from all *eternity*, is, in my opinion, absurd ; and the phrase *Eternal Son* is a positive self-contradiction. *ETERNITY* is that which has had *no beginning*, nor stands in any reference to *TIME*. *SON* supposes *time*, *generation*, and *father* ; and *time* also antecedent to such generation. Therefore, the conjunction of these two terms, *Son* and *Eternity* is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially different and *opposite* ideas".

More I need not read, Mr. Chairman ; let Mr. Mason and Mr. Davenant now have a fair set-to, striking as much Light out of each other as possible, that we may be enlightened by them. [Cheers—and a Pause.

MR. O. GOLDSMITH, *Student*. Mr. Chairman ! As neither of the gentlemen seem disposed to show fight, I would observe, that it is universally admitted, that there cannot be more than One *eternal* ; and if but One *eternal*, that

eternal must necessarily be God; it then follows, of course, that there can be but One *god*, there being but One *eternal*—so, at least, it seems to me. REV. G. FLETCHER. [Enthusiastically cheered] Mr. Chairman! Though I resisted the temptation of answering the Call of the Meeting, I am moved to attempt a reply to our young friend, who, otherwise, may probably be passed over in silence.

I commence by observing, that it is not *universally*, but, *commonly* admitted, that there is *only One eternal*; and as I think I know of more than One, [Impossible, Sir!] our young friend shall have the benefit of my thoughts; which may, perhaps, be suggestive of others.

I shall state my views as clearly and concisely as I can, on the spur of the moment. Four *eternals* present themselves to my mind—yes, four—GOD, DURATION, SPACE, MATTER—all these exist of necessity; must, of necessity, have ever existed; and will, of necessity, for ever exist. How shall I best make my views apprehensible? [Silence.]

I shall begin, Mr. Chairman, by supposing SPACE to be filled with an infinite globe; it would then be *space filled*: strike that globe into non-entity, and it would be *space empty*; yet, empty or filled, SPACE is and must be *eternal*—not created. [Continued silence.]

Though the revolutions of suns and worlds had never marked its periods, DURATION must ever have been rolling, from eternity to eternity—the mind of man cannot conceive a period when DURATION was *not*; therefore, it is of necessity *eternal*. Hence, Mr. Chairman, as neither You nor I can possibly conceive a *contrary* of either SPACE or DURATION, they are, to us, absolutely *eternal*—endless Duration being the age of Jehovah, and boundless Space his empire. [Continued silence.]

Out of *what* did God create the myriads of worlds now moving in the immensity of Space? Out of Nothing? no; that is impossible! It is sheer absurdity to say, in an unlimited sense, “All things are possible with God”; for, Omnipotence itself cannot do anything contrary to its own nature and perfections; neither could God create a *something* out of Nothing.* Did God create the universe, animate and inanimate, out of Himself? No; even that He could not do, though Almighty itself; for, “*God is a Spirit*”, while the countless orbs revolving in Space, are, all of them, *material*, and must, of necessity, have been made out of *primeval matter*—a notion communicated in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, who states [xi 17] that the Almighty “made the world out of formless matter”—consequently, MATTER is *eternal*, having, of necessity, existed before the Creation of any creature—whether inanimate atom, or world, or living creature! *That Matter* may have been Electricity (as invisible as God himself) or, it may have been a species of Matter still more approximate to *Spirit*; what it *may* have been, I shall not pause to inquire; it is sufficient for my present purpose, to show that *material* worlds must have been formed by the Creator, *not* out of Nothing, *not* out of Himself, but, out of *primeval matter*—as *materiality* could not possibly be produced from *spirit*.

* Treating on the Resurrection of Christ (in his Discourses on the Apostles creed, Stevens (Chaplain to the House of Commons) says, on p. 82—

No one can consistently say, that the *restoration* of Life from the grave, is a greater miracle, than its *production* out of Nothing”.
—of course not; the one is just as silly as the other; neither of them logical; neither of them tenable. *Reporter*.

Surely friend Hopps, though usually wide-awake, must have been napping, when he penned the following absurdity—

A creation out of *nothing* seems the most probable, as it is also the most orthodox interpretation. *The Truthseeker*. p. 78. *Editor*.

And now, I pause to ask Mr. Lovelace before this highly respectable Assembly, *what* he has found in my remarks, to giggle at? and also to demand of Mr. "Impossible", *what* he has to propound to this Meeting, in opposition to the Three *eternals* I have endeavoured to substantiate? [Profound stillness.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not so far forget myself, as to attempt *proving*, either by argument or inference, the Fourth *eternal*, the Ever-living God, the Great First Cause.

Though no one can conceive of God aright, who does not conceive of him *as a Spirit*; yet, that which we call *nature* shows to us many visible Images of the invisible Creator and Governor of the universe, whose goodness, and beauty, and grandeur, are rendered so conspicuous to human vision and to human intellect, that even professed Atheists themselves, when they *think* of the realities of Nature, are mentally constrained to ejaculate, **VERILY, THERE IS A GOD!** [Marked approbation.

PEELE. "The Fool hath said in his heart, *There is no God!*"

MR. W. ALEXANDER. I am surprised, Mr. Fletcher, that you have not added a *fifth* Eternal, in the person of Jesus Christ; as the Scriptures are explicit on that head. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to advance half a dozen texts in proof of my conception—

Isaiah ix. 6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be laid upon his shoulder: and his Name shall be called *Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.*

Micah v. 2. Thou Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet, out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings-forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

John i. 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

„ viii. 58. Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.

„ xvii. 5. O Father, glorify thou Me, with thy own Self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.

„ 24. Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world.

To me, Mr. Chairman, it is as evident as is the sun when in his meridian glory, that these 6 texts *prove*, most conclusively, that Christ existed from all eternity—that He not only lived before Moses, but, prior to the Creation, as he not merely made the worlds, but, "without Him was not anything made, that was made". [Hear, hear!

FALCONER. If I am not misinformed, you, Mr. Alexander, are a stanch advocate for the verity of what is called the *Immaculate Conception*—Is it so?

ALEXANDER. I am. After having well-studied the subject, I am firmly of opinion that the Mother of our Lord was a Virgin, and that the Holy Ghost was his Father. Is not that your opinion also?

FALCONER. Not now; I got cured of that piece of superstition some time ago: and having carefully examined the subject for myself, I believe Jesus to have been the Son of Joseph, and *not* the Son of the Holy Ghost. [Hear, hear!

ALEXANDER. And so you have renounced the religion of your fathers, and gone over, I suppose, to the heretics? Scandalizing your respectable family, by publicly avowing your disbelief in all the Prophets and Evangelists and Apostles!

FALCONER. Not so; for, I have taken the New testament for my guide.

ALEXANDER. That cannot be, when all the Evangelists and Apostles inculcate the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception.

FALCONER. Nothing of the kind! It is certainly mentioned by Matthew and by Luke, but, by them only, and without its being ever referred to afterwards by either of them; nor is it so much as once alluded to by any other writer in the New testament. [Hear, hear!] We have no Scripture evidence whatever, that Jesus knew anything about it, or, that his Disciples ever so much as hinted at it, in all their preachings and conversations; and it was on *hearsay* only, that Matthew and Luke reported it—if it was indeed ever reported by either of them: [Hear, hear!] for, it is mentioned in the Prefixes to their books only, *not* in the books themselves. In all probability, the whole affair of the Miraculous Conception is simply one among the many “pious frauds”, foisted into the manuscripts when guarded by priestly hands. [Hear, hear!] In fact, the Miraculous Conception (imported from Paganism) is stamped with *imposture* in the very document given to prove Jesus to be the Son of David; for, if Joseph was *not* his natural father, Jesus was neither the Son of Joseph, nor the Son of David, nor the Son of Man—and his genealogy is as farcical as it is false! [Cheers.

ALEXANDER. But, you must allow, that the Evangelists never admit of our Lord's having *two* earthly Parents—only *one*—the Mother of God.

FALCONER. When you, Mr. Alexander, shall be at the pains of reading the New testament observantly, you will assuredly meet, in Luke, with the expressions—

When the *Parents* brought the child Jesus, &c.

His *Parents* went to Jerusalem every year, &c.

His Mother said unto him—Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy *Father and I* have sought Thee sorrowing”.

Besides, all the four Evangelists tell us of Jesus calling himself *the Son of Man*; and as he could not be the Son of Man, unless a Man had been his Father, I cannot arrive at any other conclusion, than that Joseph, and *not* the Holy Ghost, was the natural Father of Jesus. [Hear, hear!]

Have you anything further to urge, Mr. Alexander?

ALEXANDER. I am waiting Mr. Fletcher's reply.

FLETCHER. I waive reply, Sir; I came as a hearer, not as a talker; nor should I have spoken at all, had I not been provoked to it, by the slight the Meeting seemed to put upon our young friend Goldsmith.

I am not to be drawn into Debate; but, had you, Mr. Alexander, consulted the best of your own Trinitarian expositors, you would not have instanced *any one* of the 6 texts you have read; as you would have discovered that not one of them has any reference to Christ's *pre-existence*. I decline Discussion—some gentleman at the table, may probably take it up.* I say, with Swedenborg—

It is no proof of a man's understanding, to be able to *affirm* whatever he pleases; but, to be able to *discern* that what is true *is true*, and that what is false *is false*—this is the mark and character of Intelligence”.

G. HERBERT, Esq. As Christ is designated by the very same Names and appendages as his Father, he must necessarily be One with the Father and

* I have, in vain, attempted to collect *what* was said, by 3 provokingly inaudible Speakers, in controverting the interpretations given by Mr. Alexander, to the 6 texts instanced by him as bearing testimony to Christ's *pre-existence*. If public speakers will not, or can not, so speak as to be understood, it is their duty to be silent. I gathered from a Student, that the expression, “before the foundation of the world”, applies to every one of us, as well as to Christ, as Paul testifies [Eph. i. 4] that God *hath chosen us* in Christ “before the foundation of the world”, &c. *Reporter*.

being equal with God, He is, must be, equally *eternal*. Mr. Fletcher's not *choosing* to reply, I interpret into Mr. Fletcher's not being *able* to reply. [Hear, hear !

FLETCHER. Anything you please, Sir ; immaterial to me *what*. When I shall perceive, Mr. Chairman, that my duty calls upon me to speak, I shall not keep silence. [Cheers.

REV. S. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman ! As Mr. Fletcher refuses, for reasons best known to himself, to debate the question before us ; and as Mr. Herbert's unceremonious mode of ascribing Mr. Fletcher's silence to *inability*, is not the most courteous way possible of returning thanks for his interesting speech on the Four *eternals*, [Hear, hear !] I shall endeavour to lower Mr. Herbert's towering pretensions, by such Scripture testimonies as he will find himself at a loss to gainsay.

We read that Hezekiah prayed to *the only* God, in the following words—

2 Kings xix. 19. O Lord our God, I beseech thee, save Thou us out of his [Sennacherib's] hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know, that Thou art the Lord God, even Thou only.

We read of *the true* God, in

Jer. x. 10. The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King.
John xvii. 3. This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.

1 Thes. i. 9. Ye turned to God from Idols, to serve the living and true God.

We read of *the only wise* God, in

Rom. xvi. 27. To God only wise, be glory, through Jesus Christ, for ever. Amen !
1 Tim. i. 17. Now, unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory, for ever and ever.
Jude 25. To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and for ever.

We read of *the living* God, in

Joshua iii. 10. Hereby shall ye know that the living God is among you, etc.
Ps. xlii. 2. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God.
Hosea i. 10. Ye are the sons of the living God.

We read of *the everlasting* God, in

Gen. xxi. 33. Abraham planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God.
Isaiah xl. 28. Hast thou not known ? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary ?
Rom. xvi. 26. According to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.

We read of *the God of Heaven*, in

Ezra vii. 23. whatsoever is commanded by the God of Heaven, let it be diligently done, etc.
Neh. i. 4, 5. I sat down and wept, and mourned certain days, and fasted, and prayed before the God of Heaven, and said—I beseech Thee, O Lord God of Heaven, the great and terrible God, etc.
Jonah i. 9. I fear the Lord, the God of Heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land.

We read of *the Mighty God*, in

Deut. vii. 21. The Lord thy God is among you, a mighty God and terrible.
Neh. ix. 32. Our God, the Great, the Mighty, and the terrible God, etc.
Jer. xxxii. 18. The Great, the Mighty God, the Lord of Hosts is his name.

We read of *the Almighty God*, in

- Gen. xvii. 1. I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. [*pious*.
 Job. xi. 7. Canst thou, by searching, find out God? canst thou find out the
 Almighty unto perfection?
 2 Cor. vi. 18. Ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

We read of *the God* and of *the Lord of Hosts*, in

- 2 Sam. vii. 26. Let thy name be magnified for ever, saying, the Lord of Hosts is
 the God over Israel.
 Ps. lxxx. 7. Turn us again, O God of Hosts, and cause thy face to shine; and we
 shall be saved.
 Amos v. 27. Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith
 the Lord, whose name is the God of Hosts.

We read of *the Most High God*, in

- Gen. xiv. 19. Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and
 earth: and blessed be the Most High God, which hath delivered thy
 enemies into thy hand.
 Ps. lxxviii. 56. They tempted and provoked the Most High God, and kept not his
 testimonies.
 Dan. iii. 26. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, ye servants of the Most High God,
 come forth!

We read of *Jehovah*, in

- Exo. vi. 3. I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of
 God Almighty; but, by my name Jehovah, was I not known to them.
 Neh. ix. 6. The Levites said—Thou, even Thou, art Jehovah alone; thou hast
 made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host; the earth,
 and all things that are therein; the seas, and all that is therein; and
 Thou preservest them all.
 Ps. lxxxiii. 18. That men may know that Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art
 the Most High over all the earth.
 Isaiah xii. 2. The Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; He alone has become
 my salvation.
 „ xxvi. 14. Trust ye in the Lord for ever: for, in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting
 strength.
 Zech. xiv. 9. Jehovah shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be
 One Jehovah, and his name One.

Let me now ask—Is there a thoughtful individual in this assembly, who
 can conscientiously believe, that the august Being you have just heard
 designated as the *only* Lord God, the *only true* God, the *only wise* God, the
living God, the *everlasting* God, the *God of Heaven*, the *Mighty* God, the
Almighty God, the *God of Hosts*, the *Most High God*, the *One Jehovah*, ever
 was, is, or ever can be, *identically the same* Being who was born of a Woman
 —who sucked milk and eat pulp—who grew in wisdom as well as in stature
 —who fasted, prayed, groaned, wept, and in his agony sweat as it were
 great drops of blood—who was hungry and thirsty, weary and faint—who
 had not where to lay his head—who was tempted, persecuted, and stoned—
 dragged to the judgement-seat and tried for his life—sentenced to be cruci-
 fied*—was mocked, scourged, buffeted, and spat upon—forsaken by all his
 friends and followers—and who expired on the cross, in bodily and mental
 agonies, a harrowing spectacle to all beholders? [Pause.

* The following is alleged to be a Copy of the Sentence passed on Jesus—

In the 17th year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, and on the 26th day of the month of
 March, in the most holy city of Jerusalem, during the pontificate of Annas and Caiaphas; Pontius
 Pilate, intendant of the province of Lower Galilee, sitting in judgement in the presidential seat
 of the prætor, sentences Jesus of Nazareth to death on a cross, between two robbers, as the numer-
 ous and notorious testimonies of the people prove—1. Jesus is a misleader. 2. He has excited

No, Mr. Chairman, no; the thing is impossible! no one here believes it; no one *can* believe it— Yet, Sir, my language may, perhaps, be too strong, too condemnatory—[Hear, hear!] for, though I *cannot* possibly believe it, I must not presume to set bounds to another's belief;* neither may I judge others, lest I be judged. [Hear, hear!]

I shall be treading on safer grounds, if I say—It is utterly impossible, that the Great, the Only, the Living, the Everlasting, the Almighty, the Most High God, the One Jehovah, ever became Man, ever toiled at the Carpenter's bench, ever died an ignominious death—this, I may safely call *impossible*—for, Spirit *cannot* become Flesh; Immateriality *cannot* become Material; Infinite *cannot* become Finite—therefore, God *could not, never did* become Man—never died the Just for the Unjust; nor does he now require more at our hands, than that we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Him; for, “when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive”—or, this sacred volume [Holding up the Bible] mocks us all! [Hear, hear, hear!]

DR. BUCHANAN. Who would have thought, so much fire could have been struck out of our friend Daniel? He has electrified me; and I am much obliged to Squire Herbert's uncourteous speech, for the treat I have enjoyed—the more agreeable, because quite unexpected.

the people to sedition. 3. He is an enemy to the laws. 4. He calls himself the Son of God. 5. He calls himself falsely the King of Israel. He went into the Temple followed by a multitude carrying palms in their hands. Orders the first Centurion, Quirilius Cornelius, to bring him to the place of execution. Forbids all persons, rich or poor, to prevent the execution of Jesus. The witnesses who have signed the sentence against Jesus, are—1. Daniel Robani, Pharisee; 2. John Zorobabel; 3. Raphael Robani; 4. Capet. Jesus to be taken out of Jerusalem through the gate of Tourne. *Notes and Queries.*

* Some desultory conversation took place, as to what people meant by *belief*; when quotations from Coleridge and others were given, which I could not possibly hear: the following, from archbishop Secker, was audibly pronounced—

Indeed, let any proposition be delivered to us as coming from God, or from man, we can believe it no farther than we *understand* it; and, therefore, if we do not understand it at all, we cannot *believe* it at all*.

Some men, however, tell us, that they *believe* things, because they *cannot understand* them. This is surely another and a very different sort of *belief* to that intimated by the archbishop. *Belief* seems to be a very difficult thing with some persons, and a very easy thing with other persons—

“Believe! and all your Sin's forgiven;
Only *believe*, and yours is heaven!”

The orthodox Tertullian, glorying in the principles of the Christian faith, enthusiastically exclaims—

I reverence it, because it is contemptible; I adore it, because it is absurd; I believe it, because it is impossible”.

In the “*Essays on the Formation of Opinions*”, I read—

It may be remarked, that whatever we *believe*, may be thrown into the form of a proposition; and when we say of such a proposition, that *we believe it*, it is equivalent to saying, that it *appears to us to be true, or, probable*. The expressions are exactly synonymous, or, convertible; for, it would be a manifest contradiction to assert, that *we believed* a proposition which did *not appear true to us*, or, that a proposition *appeared true*, which we did *not believe*”.

In the *Entertaining Magazine*, the subject is presented differently—

To Believe *without examination*, is no Belief in reality, but, merely an *assent* that such and such things are Believed by others; and is, in fact, only *Believing that we Believe*”.

We have all heard of the “pious old woman”, who, when asked—Do you really *believe* that a whale swallowed Jonah?” replied, Believe it! to be sure I do; is it not printed in the Bible? and if the Bible told me that Jonah swallowed the whale, I should Believe it!” This anecdote is often instanced as a specimen of admirable *Faith* in whatever stands in the Bible. *Reporter.*

Reid teaches us—Reason is the principle by which our Belief *ought* to be regulated”; and, according to Lord Brougham—When *evidence* is presented to the mind, Belief is not a voluntary, but, a necessary consequence; so, that it is quite impossible that the mind should Believe otherwise than as evidence *is or is not discerned*”. *Editor.*

Mr. Daniel might have gone farther, and shown, that even if Jesus were designated with all the Titles given in Scripture to his Father and his God, *that* would not be any proof, nor yet a shadow of proof, that Jesus was *equal* with God. [Hear, hear! and Proof, proof!] Be not clamorous, my good friends; rather "Let your moderation be known unto all men". [Hear, hear!]

In my Bible, I read of a man named ELLI, which, being interpreted in plain English, means *My God*—but, do any of you think that the Name constituted the Man *a god*? Here is one named ITHIEL, which means *God with Me*; another is named ABIEL, which means *God my Father*; yet, the Men were not *immortal gods*. There is HIEL also, which means *The living God*; but, the Man was not *the living god*, because he was called so. The well-known name GABRIEL, means *the mighty god*; yet, we do not confound the Angel with Jehovah. We read "JEHOVAH VISITED SARAH"; but, that Jehovah was simply an angel. "JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS" in Jer. xxiii. 6, refers to Zerubbabel, not to *The invisible God*. Jonathan addresses David (1 Sam. xx. 12) O JEHOVAH, GOD OF ISRAEL!" still, not one of us believes in the *deity* of David. When Gideon saw the Angel (Judges vii. 22) he exclaimed, ALAS, O LORD GOD!" but, that exclamation with that title did not convert the Angel into *the Great First Cause*. [Hear, hear!]

Our friends opposite should learn to read their Bibles more attentively, more observantly, more thoughtfully; they would not then advance such pitiless texts, in defense of their untenable dogma. They would then learn, Mr. Chairman, to distinguish between THE GOD and all other *gods*, whether in heaven or on earth. Calling a Man *a god*, does not change the *nature* of the man; he still remains human. In the Scriptures are several examples of *bad* as well as *good* Men being called by the imposing title *god*—such as Princes, Rulers, Judges, and Magistrates; yet, were we, Mr. Chairman, like many Bible-readers, to receive the title *god* in its usual English acceptation, we should make pure nonsense of the passages. Both Artaxerxes and Nebuchadnezzar were styled KING OF KINGS, without raising them to the eminence of *Deities*. In like manner, calling "the Man Christ Jesus" by the name *god*, or, any other name given to his Father and his God, does not constitute Jesus and his Creator *one and the same Being*; for, "God is a Spirit, whom no man *hath* seen, nor *can* see, neither hath any man heard his voice at any time, or, seen his shape". [Hear, hear! and Cheers.]

MR. PROCTER, *Student*. "The Man Christ Jesus", is a degrading expression, Doctor; why not have spoken of *the God-Man Christ Jesus*? for, that—
CHAIRMAN. Mr. Procter, I cannot permit the time and attention of this Meeting to be occupied frivolously. You first enter the Meeting after the time it was expected to disperse; and you are no sooner in your seat, than you bounce up to expose your incapacity to address such an Assembly as the one before you; fancying I suppose, that you are in one of your Debating clubs. Had you been present at the Opening of the Discussion, as you ought to have been, you might have heard your unadvised observation from the lips of another, and have heard it summarily dismissed, as worthless.

MR. LOGAN. [Holding Procter down] Now, sit you still, and don't trouble yourself to reply, my good fellow; for, we know all about your *God-Man*, who has been introduced to this Meeting, and turned out: so, take your place by your friend Lovelace, who can sympathize with you—for, he, poor fellow, cannot make head at all among the present Speakers. [Hear, hear!]
PROCTER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that—

Chairman. No, Sir, you don't *think*; or, you would not obtrude yourself on the Meeting. [Applause] As I have before said, much of our time has been frittered away, by listening to unprofitable *repetitions*. Gentlemen have introduced topics, over and over again, which had been before the Meeting prior to their entrance—at least one third of the time has been thus wasted; and I cannot allow a forward youth to annoy the present Assembly with his crude and uninformative remarks. [Applause.]

BUCHANAN. For Mr. Procter's special information, I would say—His *God-Man Christ Jesus*, is both unscriptural and absurd; my *Man Christ Jesus* is a New testament expression: Jesus himself makes use of the epithet *man* when speaking of Himself, in John viii. 40—Ye seek to kill me, a *Man* that hath told you the Truth, which I have heard of the God". 40 times is Jesus called a *man* in Scripture, upwards of 80 times the *Son of Man*, 19 times a *prophet*, 56 times *the Sent of God*, and about 120 times the *Son of God*—but, not once, not even by mistake is he once called *the God*—this title having been rigidly preserved to the Father only, "whose name alone is Jehovah", and who has emphatically declared, "My glory will I not give to another!" [Cheers.]

HERBERT. Mr. Chairman! I am bound to acknowledge, and I confess it most unreservedly, that Mr. Daniel and Dr. Buchanan have withdrawn a thick veil from before my eyes; and, without a figure of speech, I may say, *they have opened my understanding*. [Hear, hear!] Still, Sir, I do not feel fully satisfied; and it may, probably, be some time before I shall be able to see clearly, much of what has been so suddenly revealed to me. I omitted, however, mentioning the most emphatic of all the epithets given to Jesus, that of *the Messiah*, or, *the Lord's Anointed*, a title given, I think, to our Lord alone, and which could not, I conceive, be given to anyone else.

BUCHANAN. Without trespassing further on the time of the Meeting, allow me, Mr. Herbert, to recommend to your observant perusal, the book of *Isaiah* (so-called) and, as an inducement to your reading it carefully, I promise, you shall find in it that Jehovah very distinctly calls Cyrus his *Anointed One*—or, *the Messiah*! [Hear, hear!]

TANNAHILL. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, there are other *eternals* than those instanced by Mr. Fletcher; for, there is *eternal blessedness*, and there is *eternal misery*: and I challenge Mr. Fletcher to get out of the difficulty in which I have placed him. [Hear, hear!]

FLETCHER. Without commenting on the uncourteousness of anyone's persisting to drag, or, to drive me into debate, after what I have already stated to the Meeting, I shall only observe that Mr. Tannahill is evidently not qualified to argue the question he has imprudently introduced; he does not perceive the essential difference there is between one sort of *eternals* and another; [Hear, hear!] he evidently is not conscious that the *eternals* I instanced are infinitely more extensive than the two *eternals* he has so unfortunately brought forth; for, both of his *eternals* have a beginning: yet, he cannot point out a *beginning* of God, of Space, of Duration, of Matter; he is not even aware that there are such *eternals* spoken of in the Bible as have neither beginning nor end, and others which it would be simply absurd to call either *beginningless* or *endless*—in short, Mr. Chairman, he has not, at this moment, penetration enough to discern that some so-called *eternals* are *limited*, and must necessarily have an end, while others are *illimitable*, without end—some *eternals* temporary only, while others are ever-during, never-ceasing, endless. [Hear, hear!] In truth, Mr. Chairman, were I ever so much inclined for controversy, I should not contend against such a

man of straw as Mr. Tannahill, whose superficial knowledge is but an apology for ignorance—for, He who does not discriminate between the different meanings belonging to our English word *eternal*, is certainly not prepared to argue the debatable question of the *eternal* bliss of the righteous and the *eternal* misery of the wicked—the one limited, the other endless. [Hear, hear, hear !

WOTTON. No question in theology, Mr. Chairman, could be more interesting at present, than the one now before us; it is the very question on which the Rev. Doctors, Canons, Deans, Bishops, and Archbishops, have so very recently published their views, and which is daily agitating the public mind. Since the publication of the opinion of Convocation—since the Reversal of Dr. Lushington's judgement—since the Meetings at Oxford—our Newspapers, both in town and country, have been busy publishing the opinions of Dr. Wordsworth, Dr. Pusey, Dr. Longley, and others; and without quoting their several communications, it must be perfectly well-known to you, Mr. Chairman, and, perhaps, to every individual present, that they, one and all, contend—If the future punishment of the wicked shall have *an end*, there will also be *an end* to the bliss of the righteous; because, as our Archbishop of Canterbury maintains, they “rest exactly on the same ground”, and “they must both stand or fall together!” [Hear, hear !

FLETCHER. Our Archbishop is in error—“not knowing the Scriptures”. [Hear, hear !] Though I am fixed in my determination, Mr. Chairman, not to Debate the question, at this Meeting; in return, Sir, for the challenges wherewith I have been challenged in your hearing, I now, Sir, challenge the three learned Doctors—Longley, Pusey, and Wordsworth, to meet me, singlehanded, on any public platform, to Discuss the question of *eternal* punishments and blessedness. [Hear, hear !] They may bring with them as many supporters as they please, the whole Convocation if they like, with all Oxford and Cambridge to boot; I ask no other support than the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. [Tremendous cheerings.

WOTTON. That wont do, Mr. Fletcher! and you must not think to sneak out of your present dilemma, by putting off your discomfiture to a future day—which, of course, you hope, may never overtake you.

BUTLER. Such language, Mr. Wotton, is not barely uncourteous, it is offensive; as ungentlemanly as it is unchristian. [Hear, hear !] You, Mr. Wotton, are no match for Mr. Fletcher, who disdains crushing a butterfly under his heel. If you are a believer in the Mediatorship of Jesus, you, of course, believe that God gave all things into his hands, and that *all* which was given him by the Father, shall come to him—that none shall be missing, none lost, none destroyed, when he shall give up the Kingdom to the Father, that God may be *all in all!* [Hear, hear !

WOTTON. I hope, Mr. Chairman, I may be allowed, without having *offensiveness* attributed to me, simply to state, briefly and fully, the irrefutable argument on which our learned Dignitaries ground their belief of *the like endurance* of the blessedness of the righteous and the torments of the wicked—it is simply this: Christ has expressed *the two* by one and the same word, in Mat. xxv. 46—

These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment: but the righteous into life *eternal*”.

—this, Mr. Chairman, is the unmistakable Text which fixes the continuance of happiness and misery of *equal duration*; [Hear, hear !] for, no one will have the hardihood to say, that *the same word* can rationally be interpreted

in the same verse, as having both a limited and an unlimited meaning; that cannot be; nor can any Text be instanced from the Scriptures wherein both meanings can possibly be attached to the same word. [Pause.

ADDISON. Mr. Wotton, "not knowing the Scriptures", errs in his assertion, and errs in his inference. [Hear, hear!] In Hab. iii. 6, I read of Jehovah, that—

He stood, and measured the earth: He beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the *perpetual* hills did bow: His ways are *everlasting*!"

Where now, Mr. Wotton, is "the irrefutable argument, on which our learned Dignitaries ground their belief of *the like endurance* of the blessedness of the righteous and the misery of the wicked"? and what becomes of your bold assertion, that the same word *cannot* "rationally be interpreted in the same verse as having both a limited and an unlimited meaning"? Are the mountains *everlasting* in the same sense that Jehovah is *everlasting*? [Hear, hear!]

In our "authorized version", both the mountains and the ways of Jehovah are translated *everlasting*, and the hills are rendered by the word *perpetual*; but, Mr. Chairman, in the original, the word *gnad* is applied to the mountains, and the word *gnolam* to the hills and the ways of Jehovah: but, Sir, whether we argue from the original or from the translation, it does not matter a straw; for, the question is—Are the Mountains or the Hills *eternal* in the same sense that the Ways of Jehovah are *eternal*—*eternal* and *everlasting* being one and the same word, [*aionion*] translators using sometimes the one word, and sometimes the other—

"These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment: but, the righteous into life *eternal*. Authorized Version.

These shall go into *eternal* punishment, but, the righteous into *eternal* life. Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge's Translation.

These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment, and the righteous into *everlasting* life. Sharpe's translation of Griesbach's text.

If necessary, Mr. Chairman, I can adduce a variety of similar Texts, to prove that the *meaning* of words must be determined by the *nature* of the subjects; and that our Dignitaries are groping in the dark. [Loud applause.

REV. R. JAGO. Mr. Chairman! when I entered this building, I could not have conceived it possible, that the religious principles and prejudices in which I was brought up, could have been so destructively shaken. [Hear, hear!] The notions in which I was educated, and which I have conscientiously propagated, both in and out of the Pulpit, are vanished, as clouds before the winds. I stand before you, Mr. Chairman, a thoroughly converted man; no longer a Trinitarian, but, a Unitarian. [Hear, hear, hear!]

I am considerably advanced with a Treatise entitled—A concise Exposition, and Refutation, of the Assumptions, and Sophistries, of the Arch-unitarian, Theodore Parker"—[Hear, hear!] and had I not been so fortunate as to attend this Meeting, in a couple of weeks hence, you might have read, in a shilling pamphlet, a precious exhibition of my own prejudices and misconceptions, based on false premisses. [Hear, hear!]

As there are many Unitarian Ministers present, and as they differ very essentially among themselves, in their views of several prominent theological dogmas—such as the *Incarnation*, the *Atonement*, the *Resurrection*, *Miracles*, etc. I may now incidentally acquaint them, that I have been at some pains in collecting and arranging the contradictory theological statements of living

Unitarians, from their published Sermons, Lectures, and Speeches; for the express purpose of exposing their *want of uniformity*: [Hear, hear!] but, Mr. Chairman, having discovered at this Meeting, that Unitarians "agree to differ"; that they are not bound by creeds and confessions and subscription to articles; that, with Paul, they say, Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, knowing that Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God"; all my collections are abortive, and my labor is intirely lost.

The differences of opinion among Unitarians, I must now attribute to the different sorts and degrees of Light illuminating their different minds; and nothing can be more charitable, more admirable, more christian-like, than uncomplainingly allowing each other to think and act according to the Light individually enjoyed. [Cheers.

MR. MONTGOMERY. In the well-written Preface to the best edition of Parker's works, now publishing in London,* the able Editor has drawn out a Summary of the great Theologian's principles of Belief, expressed in 4 lines—

An ever present God who is absolutely Good.
A moral Law written in the Consciousness of Man.
The Immortality of the Soul.
The reality of Spiritual prayer.

This is the intire theology of Theodore Parker. It contains no doctrines of a Fall, an Incarnation, a Trinity, an Atonement, a Devil, or a Hell—no Original sin, and no Imputed righteousness. Its MORALITY is summed up in the Two great Commandments of the Law, and its 'Theory of Reconciliation' in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

To this religion, at once spiritual and rational, Parker gave the name of *Theism*

* "The collected Works of Theodore Parker; containing his Theological, Polemical, and Critical writings, Sermons, Speeches, and Addresses, and Literary miscellanies. Edited by Frances Power Cobbe. London, Trübner & Co. 60, Paternoster Row. 1863".

Such an edition of Parker's works, in 12 volumes, could not have been undertaken, with any probability of success in England, but a dozen years back; yet, so expansive is the light which has recently burst in upon this country, that the abused, misunderstood, misrepresented Parker, is daily becoming more known and better appreciated by Theologians of various sects and parties; and theological Students of several denominations are beginning to think it their duty, to know for themselves (whatever their creeds may be) the religious views and sentiments of the man whose Writings are revolutionising the religious world.

So great is the influence which Parker has already obtained over the public mind in England, that Longman & Co. have actually published his *Life and Correspondence*, in 2 vols. 8vo, at 30 Shillings! though 30 Pence would have been too high to have insured a Sale, only a dozen years ago. *Reporter*.

In the *Unitarian Herald* of 11 March, 1864, I read, that Rev. T. L. Marshall, in his Address (as Chairman) to the Auxiliary Society of Sunday School Teachers, on 2 March, said—

Though I do not sympathise with *all* the theological conclusions of that great and noble man, [Theodore Parker] yet, I think we might learn many and very important lessons from his life and writings".

The fact is, most of the Unitarian Ministers have yet to learn *what* Parker's "theological conclusions" really were; their writings, as well as their speeches, bear testimony to how *little* they know of Parker.

The *Patriot*, in a long Review of the Life of Parker, among other things, says—

Parker was a Samson in his way, very strong and very blind; very terrible to his fo, but, resting his great strength in the lap of Woman. He did not know where to limit his destruction; he had none of the conservative element of a true Reformer—he sought to destroy much that had the blessing of the world in it. But, Parker was perfectly sincere. He did not, like Hume, *play at being an Infidel*; his unbelief had a kind of earnest religious feeling about it. This was the one great redeeming excellency of his Infidelity".

The snarled-at, but nevertheless, talented *Saturday Review*, considers Parker as the most remarkable Theological, Political, and Moral writer, that has appeared in North America since the generation which achieved the Independence of the United States passed away. Then, without quoting another word from any Critic whatever, I say to everyone—read Parker for your-
self. Editor.

—a name antithetic to *Atheism* alone, and comprehensive of every worshiper of God; a name not understood, like the elder *Deism*, to signify the *exclusion* of Christianity, but, the inclusion of it in *One Great Absolute Religion*. Preface. p. xxi.

We however—I mean we Unitarians, must be content to follow, as best we may, in the rear of our Miltons, Lockes, and Newtons, our Lardners, Channings, and Parkers, who, after many years of deep inquiry, study, and reflection, have far surpassed their cotemporaries in becoming intimately acquainted with the Scriptures and with God. [Hear, hear!]

In a letter on Theodore Parker, by a Minister whose head seems to be rightly screwed on, I read as follows—

It seems to me, no Articles and no Reviews, whether orthodox or heterodox, have done justice to the great American. The most favorable have hesitated, pitied, and lamented, when there was nothing wrong; and criticized the words of an inspired man, as conventional Hebrew religionists might criticize the plain-speaking of Isaiah, or, sentimental theologians Christ's cleansing of the Temple and denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees.

Birkenhead, Feb. 29th, 1864.

WILLIAM BINNS".

REV. W. HARTE. I think it my duty, Mr. Chairman, thus publicly to protest against Theodore Parker's being classed among *Unitarians*; [Hear, hear!] for, as Orr maintains—Parker left Unitarianism for the ranks of Infidelity!" [Hear, hear!]

W. H. ROBERTS, Esq. Is what you state, a fact?

HARTE. Here is the work from which I quote—

Unitarianism in the present time; its more important Principles, its Tendencies, and its Prospects: by John Orr. London, Whitfield, 178 Strand, 1863".

—and a well-written work it is. On page 35, he writes:

The attractiveness of Parker's doctrines has rendered them popular with Unitarians, notwithstanding the signal and lamentable deficiency apparent in their foundations".

On p. 92, he writes:

The career of Theodore Parker is well known. Born in a Unitarian home, and educated for the Unitarian pulpit, he came in the end to doubt the authority of Christianity: he became a Theist, believing only in *nature* and *the human consciousness*, as Sources of religious knowledge".

And here, on p. 93, stands the passage I quoted:

Parker left Unitarianism for the ranks of Infidelity!"

ROBERTS. Mr. Orr is, unquestionably, an intelligent man and an able writer; but, there is one lesson he has yet to learn—

"It is as great a point of wisdom *to hide* Ignorance as *to discover* Knowledge". [Hear, hear!]

MR. SMITH, *Student*. In our Rev. John Scott Porter's Lecture on the *New Theology* (delivered in the Church of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, on Sunday, 8 Feb. 1863) Parker is classed among the most notorious writers against Christianity; [Hear, hear!] and, in the *Appendix*, to his published Lecture [at 178 Strand] He neither minces matters with Parker nor his admirers. In the Lecture itself Mr. Porter expresses himself thus—

Strauss and Theodore Parker have advocated their tenets in a new way, have brought forward new arguments in support of their opinions, and placed their opinions in a new light. But, their opinions upon the main question, *the Divine origin of the Gospel*, are identical with those which were broached by Collins and

Tindal, by Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Paine; and which were upheld in France by Voltaire, Condorcet, and Diderot. p. 16.

MR. C. WESLEY. Mr. Chairman! this surely is a Digression, and ought to be dismissed; [Hear, hear!] yet, Sir, in justice to the memory and tenets of so great a man as Parker, let me first quote two Unitarian ministers who are of a very different opinion to the two Unitarians last quoted; this seems but fair. [Hear, hear!] I have here "A Discourse, occasioned by the Death of Theodore Parker, delivered by P. W. Perfit, in South Place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday, 27 May, 1860", from which I shall read a few sentences—

The loss of Theodore Parker, will be felt by every liberal mind, learned in the history of modern religious thought. He was the champion of liberty, in every noble sense; but, especially, of freedom in the religious world. p. 4.

As a Boy, he had abandoned the notion of Eternal torments; the doctrine of the Trinity, had no place in his belief; he found no evidence of the *supernatural* birth of Jesus; he did not accept the ordinary theories of Inspiration; and, although undecided about Miracles, he was not content to believe them without better evidence than any he had then met with. p. 6.

It is not for me, so late in the day, to speak in praise of 'A Discourse upon matters pertaining to Religion'; even the most bigoted have been compelled to recognize its manliness, its true beauty, and its earnest piety. Liberty and Religion are seen hand in hand upon every page; not an orthodox or unorthodox Minister in England or America, into whose hands it has fallen, has failed to *use up* many of its pages. It is a fountain of religious Freethought, a well-spring of pious sentiment and manly virtue; and it would be utterly impossible to name a single religious work, produced within the past thousand years, which is worthy to stand by its side. p. 9.

The Preacher who advances beyond the circle of ideas current in his denomination, is most unmercifully criticized by those he has left behind. p. 11.

The satire of Swift, the invective of Junius, and the terrible logical power of Erskine, lie in his speeches, and, in some senses, are rendered poor beside many passages in his 'Defense', in his 'Daniel Webster' and in his Discourse upon 'The New Crime against Humanity'. p. 12.

He lived to honor God, by laboring to elevate, and make Humanity noble and free". p. 23.

And, Mr. Chairman, not to detain the Meeting longer, I shall quote but one sentence more—a sentence from one of our "*advanced*" Unitarians—from Professor Martineau:

Honor, then, to the manly simplicity of Theodore Parker! Perish who may among Scribes and Pharisees—"orthodox liars for God"—Parker, at least, has delivered his Soul!" [Applause.

MR. SAVAGE. I have read, Mr. Chairman, of Bunsen's having styled Channing, "One of God's great Prophets in the Nineteenth century"; and as Channing's works were translated into German, in 1851, and more recently into French, I am bound, Sir, to look upon Channing's writings, with no small degree of suspicion; [Hear, hear!] for, if the French and Germans approve of his writings, it argues ominously for Channing's tenets: [Hear, hear!] nor are my suspicions in anywise allayed by the following panegyric from the pen of T. Starr King, a Unitarian minister in America—

Unitarianism has done more for the human race, than all the good which 50 Revivals can accomplish, by putting Dr. Channing's influence into New England, and his thought into the literature of the English tongue".

MR. NICCOLS. Have you read Channing's works, Mr. Savage?

SAVAGE. No, I can't say that I have—at least, not all.

NICCOLS. Do you, at this moment, remember any particular Work of his, that you have read?

SAVAGE. I have read some Extracts, from time to time; but, I should never think of reading the works of a man of Channing's stamp. [Hear, hear!]

NICCOLS. I thought as much, from the acuteness of your criticism, and the profundity of your views; and you must allow me, Mr. Savage, to compliment you on the penetration of your judgement: you remind me of an expressive couplet in Pope—

Some, judge of authors' *names*, not Works, and then,
Nor praise nor blame the Writings, but, *the men*".

Perhaps, Mr. Savage, you never read Parker's works intirely through—

SAVAGE. I never read a page of Parker in my life, and don't intend.

NICCOLS. Right, Mr. Savage; perfectly right; have you nothing to do with a man of Parker's "stamp"; he would not suit your taste at all: keep you in "the good old beateu track", and stick close to "the wisdom of our ancestors"; Parker and you, Mr. Savage, have not anything in common; no sympathy whatever; therefore, leave him alone—that's my advice. [Hear, hear!]

MR. CONGREVE. It was an evil day for England, when Parker's pernicious writings were introduced amongst us; [Hear, hear!] and it makes me shudder to hear them favorably spoken of in a Meeting like this, where so many young persons are present. I would not read them for the world! [Hear, hear!]

REV. MR. POMFRET. I am ashamed of you, Mr. Congreve! I am ashamed at your standing up in a public Meeting, to condemn Writings you have never read; to pass judgement on a Writer you have never examined—"Judge not, lest ye be Judged". [Applause.]

REV. G. GRANVILLE. But, Mr. Pomfret, if Parker excludes the *Fall*, the *Incarnation*, and *Atonement*, how can you, a Wesleyan preacher, say one word in favor of Writings which strike at the very heart of our religious Belief? As a Society, we have no doctrines more common, more vital among us, than those of the Incarnation and Atonement; without these, *methodism* would cease to exist. Is it not written that "God was manifest in the Flesh"?* [No!] and is it not written, "If any man Sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous"? "He is the Propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also, for the Sins of the whole world". I believe, as you believe, and as all sound Methodists believe, that the Blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. [Hear, hear!]

POMFRET. I am not here to applaud, nor yet to defend *methodism*, but, to imbibe Truth—if I can. [Hear, hear!]

C. MARLOW, Esq. Sir Isaac Newton predicted—

The time will come, when the doctrine of the Incarnation shall be exploded, as an absurdity equal to Transubstantiation. *Letters to Calvinists.*

And I read (in *Theol. Doubts*)

This prediction has long since been verified; for, in every view of the

* This Wesleyan ought surely to have known what Dr. Clarke has observed—

Instead of *god*, several MSS. versions, and Fathers, have *which* or *who*. And this is generally referred to the word *mystery*—Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh".

The Doctor then accounts for the improper insertion of the word *god*. *Editor.*

subject, the Incarnation of God is not less absurd and ridiculous than the Impanation of God, or, God in a bit of bread!"

Belsham tells us, the Unitarians reject the Miraculous Conception of Jesus, "as a fiction equally absurd with that of Jupiter and Danaë". While Evanson denounces Christ's Incarnation, "when a Virgin Daughter produced her Father, and a Creature her Creator, a *blasphemous impiety*".

Men who thus think of the doctrine of the *Incarnation*, if honest men, are bound to give utterance to their thoughts. [Hear, hear!] Truth, Mr. Chairman, is dearer to me, than the approbation of my fellow-men; and as archbishop Sharp writes—

Where a man is mistaken in his judgement, even in that case it is always a *sin* to act against it. Though we should take that for a Duty which is *really a sin*, yet, so long as we are thus persuaded, it will be highly criminal in us to act in contradiction to this persuasion: and the reason of this is evident, because, by so doing, we wilfully act against the best light which at present we have for the direction of our actions. So that, when all is done, the immediate guide of our actions can be nothing but our conscience, our judgement, and persuasion. *A Discourse concerning Conscience*. 1687. p. 18.

DEAN SWIFT. One of the most widely-spread of all the religious ideas of antiquity, was that of Propitiation by sacrifice, as you, Mr. Chairman, must know perfectly well. An animal, in some countries a human being, was slaughtered upon the altar of the Divinity addressed, and the *death* was held to *propitiate* the Deity and to *expiate* the Sins of the people. Unhappily, Christianity did not escape this barbarous idea, though at first intirely free of it.* [Hear, hear!] Like all religious reformers, Jesus was obnoxious to the Priesthood, and was, as we read in the New testament, put to death as a blasphemer and subverter of the Law of Moses. Not long after the Crucifixion, the old Hebrew and Pagan elements began to show themselves in Christianity; for, the *pure heart* which Jesus had proclaimed, and the *holy life* which He had inculcated, were not considered sufficient to render Man acceptable to God: the Deity, as of old, must again be propitiated in some *material* manner; and, as the victim in the olden time, was chosen without spot or blemish, what Sacrifice so fit, as the noblest specimen of Humanity, the pure-minded Jesus, who had died in the assertion and maintainance of his ennobling principles? Hence, Mr. Chairman, the doctrine of the *Atonement* became incorporated with Christianity, and, as a corollary, the *Communion*, in conformity with invariable custom. Waxing in reverence and admiration, as time went on and numbers increased, the followers of Jesus next assumed him to have been a *god*—as the Heathen gods, in human shape, Bacchus, Hercules, etc. and the *Son of God* was transformed in the conceptions of his professed followers, into *God the Son*—an Incarnation of Deity—whence the further corruptions, derived from Paganism, of the *Miraculous Conception*, with all its baneful concomitants! Aptly and justly has Macaulay observed—

Christianity conquered Paganism, but, Paganism infected Christianity; the rites of the Pantheon passed into her worship, and the subtleties of the Academy into her Creed". [Hear, hear!]

* "The doctrine of Sacrifice, or, Vicarious punishment, is the most universal, and yet, the most absurd, of all religious tenets that ever entered into the mind of man; so absurd is it, that how it came to be so universal is not easy to be accounted for. That there should be any manner of connection between the miseries of one being and the guilt of another; or, that the punishing the innocent, and excusing the guilty, should be a mark of God's detestation of sin; or, that *two acts of the highest injustice* should make *one act of justice*, is so fundamentally wrong, so diametrically opposite to commonsense, and all our ideas of JUSTICE, that it is equally astonishing that so many should believe it themselves, or, impose it upon others. W. BURTON.

T. STANLEY, Esq. In that strange work, penned by an Indian Officer, at Calcutta, and published in London, by Manwaring, 1861, "AWAS-I-HIND, or, a Voice from the Ganges; being a Solution of the true source of Christianity", is a mass of Truth and Error curiously amalgamated, containing certain *heretical* doctrines, which are likely, Mr. Chairman, ere long, to become *orthodox*—for, as knowledge progresses, the *heterodoxy* of one age is accounted the *orthodoxy* of another; and a better acquaintance with the Bible, will render many notions prevalent among various Sects in 1864 mere doctrines of Men, bearing evidence of "the Wisdom of our Ancestors".
[Hear, hear!

As a specimen, I beg leave, Mr. Chairman, to read the xvi. Chapter (a very short one) on the *Last Judgement*—

Jesus, in describing the Last Judgement, explains to his disciples the qualifications requisite for admission into heaven; and we find them all of a practical nature, all depending on good works, and not a word of *Original Sin*, or, the necessity of an *Atonement*.

'Then will the King say to those on his right hand—Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for, I was hungry, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

Then will he say also unto those on the left hand—Depart from me, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels; for, I was hungry, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into everlasting life'.

Here, according to the Gospel reporters, we have the sum and substance of Jesus's religious views, and *all* that is required to be an inheritor of life eternal; and the reader will observe, that not One of those doctrines that have bewildered mankind for the last 2000 years, is touched on, or even remotely alluded to.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion, that all those doctrines of which *modern* Christianity consists, and which are not found in the exhortations, sayings, and prayers, attributed to Jesus—but, were introduced by Paul and other innovaters afterwards—may be called *Christianity*, but *not the religion of Jesus*.

We take His religion, *not* from the fancies of Paul or Apollos, but, from the instructions found in the Gospels, and attributed to Jesus. If we do not find it there, then, we may fairly conclude that the Religion of the present day, is *not* the religion taught by Jesus. It is, as the philosophic Bentham truly designates it, '*of Paul, not Jesus*'.

Let the reader but compare the Instructions in the Gospels, as to the requisites in a Seeker after the kingdom of heaven, with the *mystical* and *incomprehensible doctrines* laid down by Paul and others, in the Epistles, and taught by *modern* Christians, and he will see that Paul has erected quite a *New religion* (under the name *Christ*) on the basis of the simple precepts of the Gospels; and that *modern* Christians have no pretensions to be considered *the followers of Jesus*, but, are the promulgaters of doctrines that *never emanated from Him*, and are not to be found in the Gospels". pp. 87 and 88.

Farther on in this "Voice from the Ganges" I read—

It is now universally acknowledged, that the *Epistles* were written before the Gospels;* and that, at the time the Epistles were written, the Gospels were not in existence. Modern Christianity is therefore the religion of the Epistles, and contains

* Higginson also tells us, in his not easily overlauded "Spirit of the Bible" (which clever work, in 2 vols. 8vo, 1863, every lover of the Scriptures ought to read with more than common attention) that—

Some of St. Paul's letters were, no doubt, *the earliest* written books of the New testament. While

very few of the religious views of the Gospels. For, the sum and substance of the religion of the Gospels is simply a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, with a change of heart, and baptism.

The Epistles of Paul and others, are therefore only deserving of notice, as containing the principal doctrines of *modern* Christianity; and in these are to be found *the origin* of all the strange and anti-christian doctrines that have mystified and disturbed the world for nearly the last 2000 years, under the names of the innumerable and conflicting Sects that have sprung up amongst us—all professing to be followers of Jesus, and *all* differing widely, both from his doctrines and from each other. To Paul the world is indebted for the doctrines of the Divinity of Jesus, the Trinity, Original Sin, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, Predestination, Reprobation, Free Will, and Election—all of which, with perhaps the exception of the last, were *unknown in the time of Jesus*. [Hear, hear!

Belsham, in his work on Paul's Epistles, pronounces him to be 'an inaccurate reasoner, an incorrect writer, and a superficial metaphysician; and his insincerity often too apparent'. pp. 199 and 200.

When a few more years shall have rolled away, Mr. Chairman, the teachings of Jesus will supersede the teachings of Paul, and religion become simple, pure, and godly. [Hear, hear! and a Pause.

POMFRET. Those words of Macaulay, quoted by Mr. Swift, are words full of meaning to spiritually educated minds; though probably without significance to the untutored masses of professed Christians, who are so contaminated with the superstitious notions of the Pagans of old, that the great ideal of the religion propagated by Jesus, is a thing almost unknown among many of the Churches in our day! But, Sir, Intelligence and its offspring Science, are now, in 1864, effectively appealing to the *ever-existent* Revelation which God makes of himself IN THE MIND of man; for, all things seem converging towards a new and vital Reformation. The religious Philosophers of our day (such as our Essayists and Reviewers, such as our bishops Colenso and Tait and Thirlwall* and Browne, such as our learned doctors Davidson and Alford and Stanley, with a long list of others) however much

he was addressing these to various churches and individuals, on occasions arising out of his own ministry, the four Gospels were still *unwritten*; and if (as is very likely in itself, and seems clear from the opening verses of Luke's Gospel) there already existed some more or less full records of the life and actions, the instructions and miracles, of Jesus Christ, which had been compiled and preserved by his personal friends and disciples, these were *not in general use* at any rate, nor were they *the means* by which the Gospel was in those days chiefly promulgated. The early Christian churches learned their Christianity by *hearing*, not by *reading*. The apostles *preached* the history of Christ, before any of them wrote it.

Dr. Lardner regards the Epistles to the Thessalonians as *the earliest* written books of the New testament, dating them A.D. 52. The rest of St. Paul's letters he refers to the period from 52 to 62; the Hebrews he dates 63; the epistle of James 61 or 62; those of Peter 64. He places the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and Luke's history of the Acts of the Apostles, about 63 and 64; Jude's epistle 64 or 65; John's gospel 68; his first epistle about 80; and his second and third between 80 and 90; and the Revelation 95 or 96. I am not aware that more modern criticism has done anything to invalidate the general correctness of this chronological scheme. *Spirit of the Bible*, Vol. ii. p. 242.

The rotation in which the Epistles of Paul stand in our "authorized version", is very unsatisfactory; the order in which they are placed by Conybeare and Howson, aids the reader in rightly apprehending them—

Epistles to the Thessalonians—Corinthians—Galatians—Romans—Colossians—Philemon—Ephesians [?] *perhaps* Laodiceans—Philippians—Titus—Timothy.

Then follow, Epistle to the Hebrews—of James—Peter—Jude—John—and the Apocalypse. The Evangelists, Mark, Matthew, Luke, John.

Acts of the Apostles was written by Luke *after* his Gospel of Jesus; as may be seen in the first verse of the Acts. *Reporter*.

* The spirited and manly Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, just published, has taught his own Clergy, and every Clergyman of the Established Church, that He is not the man who would persecute his brother for Opinion's sake; and whatever doubts some may have entertained of bishop Thirlwall's mental independence, his open censures of *Coneocation* for having so dogmatically condemned the Bishop of Natal's writings, will remove every doubt from every mind,

they may differ on a variety of doctrines, are, all of them, re-asserting the ABSOLUTE RELIGION taught by Him who spake as never man spake. Infallibility and Dogmatism are vanishing before the rising light of the Gospel of Jesus, which, for ages, has been obscured by the corrupted Christianity of the Churches—Priestcraft having done its best (or rather, its worst) to separate Man from God. Light, Mr. Chairman, simply puts out Darkness; and Truth, however objectionable to men of Creeds, is prejudicial to Error alone. [Hear, hear!]

It has already been observed, that Man is a socially, morally, and religiously progressive Being; and that if we of 1864 are not more capable of apprehending clearly, and judging less erroneously, all matters pertaining to Religion, than our unlettered, unscientific forefathers could possibly be, the greater would be our shame, and the greater our condemnation. [Hear, hear!] Thanks to the increased and increasing intelligence of the age, the Newspapers are now preaching up the necessity of vital Religion, and are writing down the irrationality of the Dogmas held forth by our over-paid Dignitaries. [Hear, hear!] The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Oxford, and others, received their due reprehensions in the columns of the daily and weekly Sheets of 1863, on the subject of our *Popish Lent*, etc. our Newspapers charging our Religious instructors with ignorance of the true meaning of Paul's words—

After that ye have known God, or rather, are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe Days, and Months, and Times, and Years: I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain". [Hear, hear!]

MR. MOORE. In the *Nonconformist* of 16 Dec. 1863, under the Heading, "The Bishop of Rochester", I read—

This right rev. prelate has issued a pastoral Circular to the rural Deans of his diocese on the importance of instructing the Laity with reference to the *authenticity* and *inspiration* of Holy Scripture, and the solid grounds of Christian faith. His lordship refers to the sceptical objections and perverse criticisms put forth of late, and although he considers that these attacks on the Truth have materially failed in their intended effect, He considers that they are calculated to direct attention to a department of practical instruction which has been much overlooked. Special *Lent Lectures* are suggested by his lordship as likely to prove an effective means of counteracting error".

Dr. Wigram ought to be informed, that the only effective and lasting counteracter of Error, is TRUTH—Truth with the least possible mixture of superstition.

POMFRET. Thus it is, Mr. Chairman, that age after age, our Bishops, instead of advancing with an advancing people, go back to the dry-as-dust notions of their Predecessors; and call upon the Clergy under their charge, to enlighten the Laity, with the doctrines prevalent in past centuries: our Bishops evidently not knowing that the Laity of England are very far in advance of the generality of the Clergy; [Hear, hear!] and that thousands upon thousands now, far surpass in mental endowments, and theological acquirements, the very men who centuries ago drew up the formulas still propagated from Episcopal Pulpits and Readingdesks. [Hear, hear!] With-

placing Dr. Thirlwall unmistakably among the *Episcopalian pioneers* of this advancing age—a friend to free inquiry and an enemy to prosecutions.

I dare not venture on giving quotations from this stirring and christian Charge, as I should not know where to stop; let every reader interested in the daily increasing importance of the *rights of private judgement*, procure the Charge itself; and, if not impervious to reason, if not utterly destitute of commonsense, a rich treat awaits him. *Editor.*

out going so far back as to cite those Bishops who of necessity authenticated their clerical documents with a \times , to which the Clerk appended the words—"the Bishop his Mark"—I am bold to declare, that most of the 26 Bishops now sitting on the Bench, are deplorably behind thousands of our Philosophical, Scientific, and Theological writers among the Laity. [Hear, hear!] Knowledge, Sir, has made its escape from the bondage of Churches, and is blessing the whole nation with Light, Power, and Truth! [Cheers. REV. T. TUSSEK. In *The Christian Observer*, is a Letter, criticizing bishop Wilberforce's recent Charge; the criticism being from the pen of "S. E." who informs us that he is a "Clergyman of the Evangelical school, whose painful lot it is to be placed in the diocese of Oxford", of which he gives a very sad account, declaring—

Our diocese may be said to be UNPROTESTANTIZED. The popish dogma of *baptismal regeneration* is now [in 1864] so widely preached, that I fully believe *not one in twenty* of the Clergy would venture to tell any of their baptized people, that they must be *born again* before they can enter the kingdom of heaven".

MR. STORER. In support of Mr. Pomfret's views, I would observe, that in Simpson's "Plea for Religion and the Sacred Writings", after stating that He had not any expectation "from the Bench of Bishops of the smallest concession towards a Reformation in the ecclesiastical part of our constitution", He adds—

To me, however, what we usually call *holidays*, appear in the light of *very serious evils* to the community. Let a man conscientiously observe the Lord's-day, and I will excuse him every other Day in the calendar".*

Such was this excellent Clergyman's opinion of *Lent* (and other "time-honored" holidays) published in the last century—but, not one step forward has our bench of Bishops yet taken!

GRANVILLE. Mr. Pomfret, I shall assuredly Report you, as being tainted with infidel principles; and—

Chairman. Order, order! Such language, Mr. Granville, is not admissible here. [Loud cheers] Every Speaker is entitled, by the "Regulations of this Discussion", to give free utterance to his thoughts; and I am bound, as Chairman, to silence every individual that would intimidate a Speaker in the delivery of his sentiments; therefore, Sir, repress your threats, as they are altogether out of place at this Meeting. {Applause.

* This quotation from Rev. David Simpson, of Christ Church, Macclesfield (a man of singular penetration and piety) gave rise to a very warm debate between two Clergymen; but, the in-audibility of the one gentleman and the boisterousness of the other, rendered their speeches *unreportable*. What I gathered worth preserving, I insert in this Note, as being a *part only* of what was said, and not, perhaps, given in the precise words uttered—

If the Apostle's reproof was applicable to the early Christian churches, how much more applicable in our day, when the so-called *fasts* and *festivals* and *holidays* have been multiplied to an extent unknown among even the ceremonious Jews—a yoke, which the Scriptures inform us, neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. Look at our Calendar, and you will see it studded with *holidays*, appointed by Priests, who, contrary to Apostolic teachings, have put shackles on men's minds. Superstition, not Scripture, appointed *Easter* to commemorate the visit of the Wise men who came from the East to Bethlehem; it extends to Four weeks, called the *Holy-days*, or, *Time for Recreation*. Shrove-tuesday, Ash-wednesday, Good-friday—Ember-week, Lady-day (Virgin Mary's day) Lammass, Candlemass, Martinmass, Michaelmass, Christmass, and many other mis-called *Holy-days*, have not anything in them or about them that is *holy*—they are, all of them, *priestly*—not One of them authorized by Scripture! Even Protestants, not satisfied with the farrago of Popish inventions of *holidays*, have, from time to time, added new ones; and, strange to say, they occasionally reduce the *Holy-days* to *Common-days*—such as *Gunpowder-plot*, the *Decapitation of Charles I.* the *Restoration of Charles II.* *Waterloo-day*, &c. We, the partially reformed *Catholics*, called *Protestants*, have about 60 of these priestly days; not One of which is to be found in the Bible, but, *One and All*, condemned in Scripture, over and over again!" Reporter.

REV. T. G. SMOLLETT. I greatly fear, that brother Pomfret, like other brethren present, is becoming weary in well-doing, and growing ashamed of Methodism ; but, let who will be ashamed of Christ before men, I confess him openly as my Brother and my Saviour and my God! [Hear, hear! PEELE. O superstition, superstition, superstition!

W. COWPER, Esq. I am shocked, Mr. Chairman, at the irreverence of the last Speaker, who so impiously calls Christ his *Brother and his God*. [Hear, hear!] The words were so distinctly uttered, that I cannot have misunderstood them; and I should be glad to learn from Mr. Smollett, that he was not conscious of what he was saying.

SMOLLETT. O yes, perfectly conscious, Sir; for, *Christ my Brother, is the Lord Jehovah my Saviour!* [Murmurs.

COWPER. Why, surely, Mr. Smollett, you must be beside yourself, or, you never could look upon the Son of God as *your Brother*, and at the same time as *the Lord Jehovah your Saviour!* It is frightful, Mr. Chairman, to hear a worm of the earth presuming to call the Creator and Ruler of the Universe, his *brother*—I am amazed!

MR. SIDNEY. Alas, Sir, our *irreverence* has been more and more on the increase, ever since the time of the Conference in Cornwall, in 1862; during which period, our popular, and partially idolized preacher, Mr. Punshon, after his doctrinal Sermon, to upwards of 1000 hearers, commenced his concluding prayer in the startling, and too frequently echoed words—

O Christ our Brother, thou art the Great God our Saviour!"

which to me, though many years accustomed to the extravagant outbursts of our illiterate and thoughtless members—to me, Mr. Chairman, the gross irreverence of the address was perfectly astounding; and I could not refrain from descanting on its flagrant impropriety, in the very first Sermon I preached afterwards. [Hear, hear!] Mr. Smollett, who is a great admirer of Mr. Punshon's rhapsodies, has, as you have heard, the bad taste to copy the blasphemous phraseology of his clever but injudicious Model-preacher. [Hear, hear!] You may form some notion, Mr. Chairman, of the *doctrines* Mr. Punshon endeavoured to inculcate on that occasion, from the first verse of his opening Hymn—

Let earth and heaven combine,
Angels and men agree,
To praise, in Songs divine,
The incarnate Deity;
Our God contracted to a Span,
Incomprehensibly made man!" p. 560.

Before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express, very distinctly, the great obligations I am under to several Speakers in this Discussion, who have opened my eyes, thoroughly, to the fatal errors of Trinitarianism, with which, Sir, I no longer have a particle of sympathy—therefore, I now publicly repudiate it, as anti-scriptural, anti-christian, and blasphemous towards God! [Bursts of applause.

DR. BYROM. I also am a Wesleyan, Mr. Chairman; and though I read the Article which went the round of the Papers at the time, recounting parts of Mr. Punshon's sermon and prayer, the impiousness, which I now discover, did not strike me then; and its being brought forward so prominently at this Meeting, may probably induce Mr. Punshon to re-consider his words and his doctrine. [Hear, hear!

MR. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman! There certainly is something bold, and,

it may be, something startling to weak minds, in Mr. Punshon's perfectly scriptural address; [No, no! and Hear, hear!] still, I think, Sir, that previous Speakers have been guilty of disrespect towards Mr. Punshon; for, if Mr. Punshon, like Mr. Smollett, and others, really believes Christ to be both his *Brother and his God*, why should he not avow it before the whole world? Many in our Society, look upon Christ in his humanity as our *brother*, while in his spirituality we look upon him as our *god*—as the *God-Man* revealed—

Chairman. Mr. Sylvester, I am constrained to interrupt you; I cannot allow you to proceed. All that you have to say on that head, the Meeting has already heard. You come in late, you know not what has been said, and have not the discretion to remain silent. [Applause.]

SMOLLETT. I protest, Mr. Chairman, against your prohibiting anyone from speaking his mind, at this Meeting—[Interrupted by many voices; and, after unseemly commotion, the most turbulent sat down.]

Chairman. "God is not the author of confusion, but, of peace." [Cheers.]

DR. ETHEREGE. Mr. Chairman! I have been an attentive listener from the very opening of this Discussion; and as I am known to the majority of Speakers present, I need not apologize for asking a few minutes attention. [Hearty cheerings.]

England's greatest genius tells us—There is no Darkness but Ignorance"*—consequently, whoever addresses a mixed assembly like this, and fails to impart light, is more to be pitied than censured; as he unwittingly exhibits the paucity of his own knowledge, and his destitution of good sense.

It has just been whispered in my ear, Mr. Chairman, that although "Mr. Punshon and superior Preachers" may, very properly, be allowed to employ the words of his address to Christ (which I need not now repeat) it would be highly improper to allow the more illiterate of the Society, to follow his example, "lest their uncooth utterance should render the words revolting". This allowance and prohibition, is what I cannot away with; as it would make God a respecter of persons. [Hear, hear!]

SMOLLETT. Clearly, Doctor; you are quite right! I claim, and I am sure Mr. Punshon would claim the like privilege for the most illiterate of our Society, to address Christ as their *brother* and their *god*. [Hear, hear.]

ETHEREGE. During the whole Discussion, Mr. Chairman, I have never in any way, interrupted any Speaker; and as I wish to put this matter in a striking, in a not-soon-to-be-forgotten light, before this Meeting, I trust the courtesy I have shown to others, may now be shown to me, and that I may be permitted to express myself without further interruption. [Hear, hear! and Cheers.]

If any man believes there is *One God Only*, and if he believes that *Christ is God*, and that *Christ and He are Brothers*, it follows, of course, that the individual believes himself to be brother to that Invisible Being who is clothed with honor and majesty, who covereth himself with light, as with a garment, who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters, who maketh the clouds his chariot, who walketh upon the wings of the wind—Brother to Him who chargeth his angels with folly, while the heavens themselves are not clean in his sight—Brother to Him whom no man hath seen, nor can see, neither hath any man heard his voice at any time, or seen his shape, and whose ways are

* And, in 2nd Part of Henry VI. he tells us,

Ignorance is the curse of God;
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven!" *Reporter.*

past finding out! A belief, Mr. Chairman, as presumptuous and impious in Man, as it is profane and blasphemous towards God! [Hear, hear, hear! from many quarters.

I have just now jotted down in pencil, half a dozen phrases, Mr. Chairman—that being the favorite number today—for the sole purpose of setting Mr. Punshon's blasphemy in a proper light; that I may in some measure thwart the spread of such gross familiarities with the Godhead, now too common in our Prayer-meetings: and I particularly request, that I may not be interrupted during the delivery of the 6 examples; as I apprise you of *my object*, and solemnly declare my own unqualified *disapproval* of all such irreverent familiarities—

I. Do you purpose going to Exeter Hall tonight? I understand the Great God our Saviour's brother, Mr. Punshon, is to address the Young Men's Christian Association, on the *Reverence due to the Deity*.

II. As you return home, look in at Mr. Smollett's—you know who I mean, the brother of the Invisible Spirit of Truth, and ask him how many sacks of Potatoes we are to send him in.

III. When the Lord God Almighty's Brother, Mr. Sylvester, arrives, show him into the back-parlor, and hand him a Cigar and a Newspaper.

IV. Call upon the Brother of the Uncreated Majesty on High, Dick Watson, and tell him to send my Slippers home before dark, or, he shall never have another job from me.

V. When you happen to see the Brother of Omnipotent Omniscience, Jim Rogers, threaten him with a County Court Summons, if he does not pay you the Seven and Ninepence he owes me.

VI. Go you direct to Jehovah's Brother, Harry Lewis, and order a ton of Coals, to be delivered before breakfast.

These 6 examples, Mr. Chairman, are, all of them, the legitimate results of Mr. Punshon's unwarrantable, inexcusable, and highly censurable irreverence. [Hear, hear, hear!

SMOLLETT. I call upon you, Mr. Chairman, to reprimand Dr. Etherege for his unjustifiable and shocking language, while turning sacred things into contempt and ridicule.

Chairman. It certainly is painful to listen to such harrowing examples as Dr. Etherege has given us, in the administration of his severe reproof of those who boast of their *Brotherhood with Deity*; and I am persuaded the utterance has not been less painful to himself. [Hear, hear,!] Fortunately, the Doctor prepared us to expect something revolting, or, this Meeting never would have suffered him to give one repulsive example after another. I cannot see, Mr. Smollett, that it is any part of my duty to reprimand Dr. Etherege for the employment of language which we all know to be abhorrent to himself, and which never would have passed his lips, but to reprove You, and all who like you speak irreverently, degradingly, and most outrageously of the Godhead. [Hear, hear!] First take the Splinter out of your own eye, Mr. Smollett, before you set about taking a Mote out of your neighbour's eye. [Applause.] You and Mr. Sylvester, have, in the hearing of all present, attempted to justify, what appears to this Meeting generally, the grossly improper and disgustingly familiar phraseology of Mr. Punshon, who cannot have any veneration for Him who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance. [Hear, hear, hear!

ETHEREGE. Mr. Chairman! I am too well known to have any apprehension of my sinking in public estimation, from having given the 6 blasphemous

examples you have just heard—given from a sense of imperative duty, not as a matter of choice—

“Who know God’s power, His grace who prove,
Serve Him with awe, with reverence love!” [Hear, hear!

REV. W. WARNER. Mr. Punshon had the indiscretion, the profanity, to address *Christ as God*, in a congregation of “about 1200 persons”, notwithstanding our Lord himself, when wrongfully accused of having assumed the title *god*, instantly refuted the accusation, declaring Himself to be only *the Son of God*: and though Messieurs Smollett and Sylvester have repeatedly heard at this Meeting, that there are 300 passages in the New covenant, wherein the Father, and the Father alone, is called *the God*, without Christ’s ever being once so called, still, Mr. Chairman, still these two Idolaters persist in offering up prayer and praise to Him who imperiously forbade anyone to worship him! [Cheers.

Thanking Dr. Etherege for the castigation he has given the idolatrous ministers, I resume my seat. [Pause.

MR. DIBDIN, *Student*. Mr. Chairman! after having made the Trinity a matter of study, it appears to me, that it can be *proved*, beyond dispute, from the first chapter of Genesis. [Hear, hear!

Chairman. As the time of the Meeting is fast passing away, allow me, Mr. Dibdin, to suggest the becomingness of your giving gentlemen of matured judgement an opportunity of addressing the Meeting, if so inclined. [Hear, hear!] You may be a gainer by it.

DIBDIN. By all means, Mr. Chairman! [Bravo!

REV. R. LLOYD. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, of proving the existence of the Trinity from the first chapter of Genesis.

REV. T. NASH. Do you accept the narrative of the Creation *literally*, or, *allegorically*, Mr. Lloyd? I ask the question respectfully, not out of sheer curiosity; as I think the Meeting will hardly be disposed to spend much time on the consideration of any passages whatever, contained in the symbolical account of the Creation—though there are passages supposed by some, to have reference to the Trinity, but which they certainly have *not*. [Hear, hear!

LLOYD. Well, upon my word, Mr. Nash, that’s cool! amazingly cool! But, Mr. Chairman, I intend to show Mr. Nash and his friends, *first*, that the Mosaic description of Creation is reconcilable with Science; and *then* prove that the doctrine of the Trinity is deducible from it. [Hear, hear!

NASH. And I hope you may desist from attempting anything of the kind, Mr. Lloyd! Spare us that infiction, I beseech you; and refrain from exposing yourself to the lash of a severe criticism on your own ignorance regarding *the only rational* interpretation of the most magnificent symbolical narrative ever conceived in the mind of Man—whether that man was Moses, Ezra, or anyone else! [Cheers—and Go on, Go on!

The first Record of the Creation, runs from the opening of Genesis to the close of the third verse of the second chapter—another, and a very different Record begins at the fourth verse, and continues to the end of the third chapter—two distinct, and irreconcilable Records; and both of them utterly irreconcilable with Science! [Go on, Sir; pray, Go on!

Take the first account of the Creation, and after having compared it with known facts, demonstrable facts—you will be constrained to acknowledge, that Geology, and Astronomy, and Nature itself, stand in wholly *irreconcilable* antagonism to the *literal* description of the Creation as recorded in

the opening of the Bible :* but, what of that, Mr. Chairman? Are we to discard that transcendently beautiful account, as nonsense, as indefensible, because a few parsons, preachers, and professors, have not had the wit to discover, that when taken *literally*, it constitutes an absurdity and an impossibility, though when taken *allegorically*, it presents one of the grandest symbolical representations to be met with in the whole range of literature, from earliest time down to our own day? [Go on! Go on!

All the attempts of doctors Buckland, Chalmers, Pye Smith, Kurtz, and others, as well as all the attempts of such laymen as Coleridge, Hugh Miller, & Co. to reconcile *the letter* of Scripture with Science, have proved signal failures; and no wonder: for, they attempted to reconcile the stubborn *facts* of Science with the *myths* of the evident *symbols* of Almighty-ness and Truth. [Hear, hear!] These would-be Reconcilers of *irreconcilables*, ought to have had more reverence for the venerable fragment of antiquity, stamped, as it is, with the commanding signet of Intellectuality; for, the Brain which struck out that splendid picture of Creation, in the opening of Genesis, was *not* the brain of an Idiot, or, a Dunce, placing (as our learned Doctors have stupidly done) effect *before* cause, and wasting material *before* requirement; no, Mr. Chairman, no! it was a brain flashing with the inspiration of Genius, boldly and majestically elevating into the dignity of a *new order* of thought, the cruder conceptions of earlier ages. [Go on! Go on!

Our reconciling-gentlemen missed the mark, Mr. Chairman; for, the admirable Mosaic record does not speak of *periods* of thousands or millions of years, but of *days*—because, it meant days, *not* periods; it speaks of *seven* days, because such was the symbolism of the Jewish era in which it was written; it introduces a *day of rest*, because the Sabbath was then already a national institution with the Israelites, derived from the same source as the traditions which the sacred penman was so fascinatingly and symbolically recasting in his richly imaginative mind: and it was not only unwise, but, presumptuous in the extreme, for our Doctors and Reconcilers to attempt reducing to their frigid, prosaic notions, the matchless and glowing sketch of a transcendently towering Genius—why, Mr. Chairman, it was immeasurably worse than would be our submitting Milton's "Council in Hell," or, Byron's "Lament of Tasso," to the emendations of the town-crier, or, a street ballad-monger! [Cheers] Let us, my friends, gratefully accept the magnificently grand and wholly unparalleled description of the Creation as it has come down to us, in the beginning of Genesis, in the very same light in which the inimitable Penman portrayed it; let us indignantly deprecate every Tinker who presumes to mend it, and fearlessly hoot every Quack who dares to attempt reconciling it with the recent discoveries of the truths of Science! for, the divine drama has been produced in a Unity of time and place, with all the dignity befitting the supreme majesty of Omnipotence, and the profound reverence of Man!† [Loud applause.

If, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Lloyd persists in attempting to reconcile what I declare to be *irreconcilables*, and to deduce the doctrine of the Trinity

* Professor Martineau says—The language of the elder Theology, respecting the Creation of the heavens and the earth, the origin and the fall of man, the beginning and the end of death and sin, was indigenous to a *lesser world* than ours, and has a strange and *childish* sound in a universe opened by the Telescope, on an earth interpreted by the Geologist, and in face of what we now see of the great drama of human Growth and civilisation". *Reporter*.

† See "The Battle of Science", in No. 11 of that unrivaled periodical *The Future* (edited by the greatest thinker and most elegant writer of the present time) temporarily suspended from—*Lack of Funds!* to the disgrace of the Scientific world. *Editor*.

from the symbolical narrative of the Creation, I shall, in return, defend the peerless Symboliser of old, against every anomalous and depreciating attack on his lofty genius, and prove to this enlightened auditory, by incontrovertible Scientific facts, that a *literal* interpretation of the Record, drags it from heights of superlative grandeur, into the depths of incongruity, non-sensicalness, and unqualified absurdity! [Long-continued cheering.]

LLOYD. Mr. Chairman! Of all this assembly, no one is more obliged by the admirable and instructive speech of Mr. Nash, than I am; and I cordially tender him my unfeigned thanks, for his invaluable lesson. [Cheers.]

REV. C. CHURCHILL. At any rate, Mr. Nash, you have exposed your own *heterodoxy*: for, it is clear you do not believe in *plenary* Inspiration—I mean, you do not, in accordance with your “assent and consent”, believe in the *Infallibility of the Bible*.

NASH. Have you but just now found that out, Mr. Churchill? I gave you credit for more discernment; and I should have expected, you would have given me credit for not being quite a blockhead. [Hear, hear!]

As to *heterodoxy*, know you not what bishop Warburton declared? namely,

My doxy is *orthodoxy*, your doxy is *heterodoxy*!
—while bishop Watson asks, very pointedly—

What is this thing, called *orthodoxy*, which mars the fortunes of honest men, misleads the judgement of princes, and occasionally endangers the stability of thrones? In the true meaning of the term, it is a sacred thing to which *every* denomination of Christians lays an *arrogant* and *exclusive* claim, but, to which *no man, no assembly of men*, since the Apostolic age, can prove a title. It is frequently, amongst individuals of *the same sect*, nothing better than self-sufficiency of opinion and pharisaical pride, by which each man esteems himself more righteous than his neighbours”.

Give me the Truth, and take you, Mr. Churchill, all the *doxies*. [Cheers.]

REV. T. SOUTHERNE. Perhaps, Mr. Nash, you possess temerity enough, to say before this Meeting, that many of what Colenso *calls* discrepancies, and contradictions, and absurdities, are so in *reality*?

NASH. Of course, I do; [Hear, hear!] and I should be ashamed of myself, had I searched the Scriptures so long and indefatigably, without discovering many inaccuracies, and many things contrary to the commonsense of the age we live in: [Signs of turbulence] but, Mr. Chairman, so far are these discrepancies from lessening the Scriptures in my appreciation, in shaking my faith in their authenticity, I am, by them, strengthened in my belief that the Bible contains the indisputable Records of God’s dealings with a portion of Mankind! The very discrepancies in the Scriptures, are, to me, among the strongest confirmations that *the Truth is in them!* Those stumblingblocks to others, are my guarantees for the fundamental Truths recorded in the Bible! [Hear, hear! and Applause.]

REV. D. MALLETT. Why, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, as if Mr. Nash were talking in riddles; and if I had not known him previously, I should have been induced to question the soundness of his understanding, so madly does he talk. [Hear, hear!]

NASH. I am not mad, most noble Chairman, but, speak the words of truth and soberness. [Cheers.]

REV. A. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and christian friends! As, at the earlier part of this Discussion, one of the Leaders of the Unitarian denomination was called upon for elucidations—to which He courteously and ably replied—I will, with the approbation of the Meeting, now, very respectfully,

call upon our clerical Associate and accredited Scholar, Mr. Nash, for a communication of his views on the Bible. [Immense cheerings.

MR. T. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I protest against Mr. Nash's being permitted to communicate his views regarding the Scriptures, to this Meeting; as he is evidently tainted with Infidel principles. [Much commotion.

ARCHDEACON MAITLAND. [Rapturously greeted] Mr. Chairman! Those who are afraid of Truth, also those who are afraid of Error, ought not to attend Discussions of this kind; but remain by their own firesides, to nurse their superstitions. [Hear, hear!] I should be ashamed of myself, Mr. Chairman—nay, I should despise myself, as a moral coward, were I afraid to listen to any man's views, on any theological topic whatever! [Hear, hear!] The grand object of my life, is the acquisition and propagation of Truth—

“ And Truth alone, where'er my lot be cast,
In scenes of plenty, or, the pining waste,
Shall be my end and aim, my glory to the last!” [Cheers.

I am in search of Truth, Mr. Chairman; and when it comes to me unsought, I embrace it: nor care I whence it comes, whether from infidels or christians; whether from books or men; whether from pulpits or discussions! [Hear, hear!] Truth has reached my understanding while within these walls, and from sources where I should not have thought of seeking it! [Hear, hear!] If Mr. Nash has anything to propound, any elucidation on the truth or fallacy of the Bible, either in whole or in part, which meets my reasonable acceptance, I shall embrace his views; but, if his sentiments do not recommend themselves to my understanding, I shall as unceremoniously reject them.* [Cheers.

As one grown old in the study of the Bible, allow me to repeat to such of my juniors as have at this Meeting manifested more zeal than knowledge, the words of Jesus to the Sadducees—

Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures”. [Applause, and many Calls for Mr. Nash.

NASH. As the Bible is not one book, but many books, penned by variously-gifted writers, during a period of nearly 1600 years, containing Histories, Codes, Policies, Psalms, Songs, Prophecies, Proverbs, Biographies, Parables, etc. communicated in poetry as well as prose; it is so far from being, what some suppose it—the simplest and easiest of all volumes to be understood and comprehended, that I consider it the most complex, the most difficult to be apprehended, of all the volumes extant in the English language.†

MR. H. KNOWLES, *Student*. That, Mr. Nash, is—— [Instantly put down by the Meeting.

NASH. Mr. Chairman! If I am interrupted, while endeavouring to impart the result of years of patient inquiry into intricacies beyond the grasp of such puerile minds as the Boy who has just now so reprehensibly broken in upon me, I shall at once desist.

Chairman. I cannot, Mr. Nash, prevent anyone's interrupting you, but, I

* “They who speak Truth, however discovered, have a right to be heard—they who assist others in discovering it, have the yet higher claim to be applauded. PARR'S *Spital Sermon*.

† “To examine into all the difficulties of Scripture, or even of Paul's writings alone, would be a task to which, perhaps, the whole life of any single individual would be scarcely adequate. **WHATELY**.

Never in the world's history was there another instance of a Book so widely circulated as the Bible, yet so little known. Used as a textbook at our schools, to be found in almost every house, not one in a thousand has more than the most superficial knowledge of its contents. At school it is read by rote—at home it is splendidly bound, but seldom *studied*. *Editor*.

venture to pledge the authority of this Meeting, instantly to have the next interrupter turned out of doors. [Warmly supported.]

NASH. The so-called Sceptics, Infidels, Atheists, are *not* the parties who have brought the Scriptures into disrepute, contempt, and ridicule; but, the over-zealous, weak-minded, Bible-worshippers. Thousands, and hundreds of thousands of daily Bible-readers, have not any clear conception of its contents, of its principles, precepts, doctrines; are not conscious of the superior excellence of one book over another, but, esteem all alike, from Genesis to Revelation; calling the Chronicles, and the Psalms, and the Song of Solomon, and the Evangel, and the Revelation, indiscriminately, *the Word of God*; fancying them of equal importance, equal authority, equal verity; all alike *inspired*, and all equally profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; thinking as highly of the story about Jonah in the whale's belly, as of the parable of the Prodigal son; as highly of the prophetess Deborah's inspired psalm to the honor and glory of Jael's perfidious murder, as of the Founder of christianity's sermon on the mount of Olives; as highly of the books of the Old, as of the books of the New testament—believing one thing just as blindly as another; because, forsooth, “*it stands printed in the Bible*”! which, without any discrimination, without judgement, without any reasonable pretext whatever, they blasphemously call *God's Word*! [Evident commotion.]

Observe, I employ the word *blasphemy* in its legitimate English meaning—whatever is derogatory to God, is *blasphemous*; therefore, if I meet with anything which detracts from the goodness, or justice, or mercy of God, no matter whether I meet with it in the Bible or elsewhere, I call it by its legitimate name, *blasphemy*. Ascribing deceit, or impurity, or human-slaughter, to God, either directly or indirectly, is sheer *blasphemy*; calling anything recorded in the Bible the *Word of God* which is in itself derogatory to God, is nothing short of *blasphemy*—such, for instance, as the Imputation of Adam's sin to the whole of the Human race—such as the doctrine of Endless punishment for the errors of a Finite life—such as representing a God of Love, as being a God of Wrath, and Vengeance, and Fury—for, as archbishop Tillotson has observed, “*these harsh doctrines have no manner of foundation, either in Reason or Scripture*”.

Were it not, Mr. Chairman, that all well-read persons are fully aware, that the masses of Religionists throughout Christendom, have not yet *learned to think*, it would meet our apprehensions as something incredible were anyone to assert,

Among all denominations of Christians in 1864, most of them believe in the *literal, verbal, and plenary* Inspiration of the whole of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures!

—and yet, Sir, it is an indisputable fact; and I should not be at all surprised, to hear more than one religious Teacher in this Assembly, declaring, in sincerity of heart, that they really, at this moment, believe in the *plenary* Inspiration of all that stands in our “*authorized version*” of the Scriptures—for, despite all our boasted enlightenment, *Thinking* still continues to be the least-exerted privilege of even cultivated Humanity!*

Persons in general, when they talk about the Bible, seem to lose sight of

* “*Thinking* leads man to knowledge. He may *see* and *hear*, and *read* and *learn*, whatever he pleases, and as much as he pleases; he will never *know* anything of it, except that which he has *thought* over, that which, *by thinking*, he has made the property of his own mind. Is it then saying too much, if I say that man, *by thinking only*, becomes truly man? Take away *thought* from man's life, and what remains? PERSTALOWSKI.”

a very important fact ; which is, **THE SMALL PORTION** of the Scriptures that is devoted to the *Spiritual concerns of Mankind*—and surely, with no other portions can *divine* Inspiration have connection. Reflect but a moment, *what sort of subjects* constitute **THE LARGEST PORTION** of what we possess in our 66 books (without the Apocrypha of either the Old or the New testament) *all* of which, according to the extravagant notions of unthinking minds, were *verbally* Inspired by God—the principal parts of the Historical books relate to such ordinary events as usually make up the bulk of all histories ; while mere human thoughts and feelings and actions, constitute by far the greater portion of the rest of the books. How inconsiderate then, how unphilosophical, how preposterous, that Christians, who have been specially enjoined by their Master to *Search the Scriptures*, should know so very little of *the nature* of their contents, as to fancy that *All Scripture* has been given by *divine* Inspiration !* [Hear, hear !

With me, Mr. Chairman, there is no question whatever of men having both spoken and written, under the influence of the Holy Spirit ; but, it does not necessarily follow, that I am to believe *all* that they ever wrote and spoke, was spoken and written under the immediate influence of *divine* Inspiration : the Inspired writers themselves, teach the contrary ; [Hear, hear !] and, in addition to this—though the Bible may contain *the Records* of divine Revelation, that does not, cannot of itself, constitute an *inspired Record*—the Record is the sole work of the Penmen who recorded the things which were revealed or inspired ; and every Revelation was, necessarily, liable to mutation, to misrepresentation, in the very act of the Penman's *recording* it—also in *copying* it, and still more so in *translating* it into other languages. The Scriptures, therefore, are *not* the Revelations themselves, but simply records, or copies only of the records of the Revelations : consequently, this Book of Books, the Bible, is *not* the WORD OF GOD, but, the volume wherein may be found the Records of God's dealings with some of his intelligent Creatures, during a period of about 1600 years. [Hear, hear ! on all sides.

What though it is affirmed, in the *Helvetic Confession*, that every *word* and every *letter* of the Bible, was dictated by God himself ; and that even the *vowel points* were attached by Divine authority to the Hebrew text : persons of good sense in our day, regard with indulgence the superstitious weaknesses of former times, and feel thankful that additional light, resulting from modern education, does not allow us to believe in any such frivolities and childish nonsensicalities. [Hear, hear ! frequently repeated. Also cries of Proofs, proofs !

On the question of Chronology, Mr. Chairman, it is well known to Biblical critics, that the Samaritan Pentateuch contradicts the Hebrew, while the Septuagint does not agree with either of them. The Hebrew has 1656 years to the Deluge, the Samaritan drops to 1307 years, while the Greek Septuagint rises to 2242 years. Surely, all three cannot be right ! Similar discrepancies are met with in the Chronology from the Flood to the birth of Abram ; the Hebrew gives 292 years, the

* "A great part of the events related in the Old testament, has no more apparent connection with our Religion, than those of Greek and Roman history.

The numbers, migrations, wars, battles, conquests, and reverses, of Israel, have nothing in common with the teaching of Christ, with the way of Salvation, with the fruits of the Spirit. They belong to a totally different order of subjects. They are not to be *confounded* with the spiritual revelation contained in the Old testament, much less with that fulness of grace and truth, which came by Jesus Christ. Whatever knowledge we may obtain of them, is, *in a religious point of view*, a matter of absolute indifference to us. *TRIMWALL, Bishop of St. David's, 1864.*

Samaritan 942, and the Septuagint 1072 years—but, are we to believe these, and all suchlike contradictions, as equally and *infallibly* accurate? * [Hear, hear!]

In that instructive volume, “A Plea for Religion and the Sacred Writings, addressed to the Disciples of Thomas Paine,” the pious author replies to one who thinks that no reasonable man can be so weak as to suppose the Bible can be *The word of God*, as follows—

No intelligent Christian will distinguish it by *that* name, without a large restriction of its contents. All we assert respecting it, is—that it is a Collection of writings, containing a history of the *divine* dispensation to our world, and that *the proper word of God*, with numberless other particulars, is *interwoven* all the way through these most ancient and invaluable Writings”. †

Let us suppose a case, Mr. Chairman—let us suppose that all the Writers of the books of the New testament, were *divinely* inspired to Pen the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (and less than this would not meet most men’s notions of *divine* inspiration) then, as a matter of course, *all of them*, in telling the same tale, would tell it alike: that is—

Matthew would not write of *two* blind men being cured, and Mark and Luke of *one* man only; nor would Luke write of the cure as having taken place when Jesus was *going into* Jericho, and Matthew and Mark write of its being performed as Jesus was *leaving* the city. Now, Sir, though it be of no consequence to us, whether the cure was effected on *one* blind man only, or, on *two* blind men; whether it was effected as Jesus *went in*, or, as he *came out* of Jericho; yet, the disagreement of the Three narrations is of consequence to *prove* that the Three discordant Writers could not have been *divinely* inspired to write down that same tale of the same cure.

Matthew represents Jesus as *ascending* a mountain, and *sitting* thereon, during the delivery of his famous doctrinal Sermon; while Luke states, that Jesus *came down* and *stood on the plain!* and the Sermon itself differs very considerably as recorded by the two Disciples.

Had the Evangelists been under the influence of *divine* inspiration (so much insisted on by fanatics) they could not have differed so widely as to the time of day when Jesus was crucified; one recording it as the *third* hour, another the *sixth* hour, and another the *ninth* hour of the day.

In Matthew we read—Behold there was a great earthquake: for the Angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and *sat upon it!*”; but, Mark, Luke, and John, differ from Matthew, and all four differ from each other, three of them not mentioning either the rolling back of the stone, or the more remarkable event of there having been an earthquake: Mark tells us, that the Angel was *within* (not outside) the sepulchre, *sitting on the right side!*; Luke tells us of *two* angels, both *standing!*; while John tells us they were both

* At the close of Smith’s Introduction to his “History of the World” (published 1 Dec. 1863) is a valuable Note of 3 pages, on *Scripture Chronology*; from which is extracted the following Table, showing the variations of Six of the principal Dates, as given by Six of the leading modern Chronologers—

	Short System.			Long System.		
	Ussher.	Petavius.	Clinton.	Hales.	Jackson.	Poole.
Creation	4004	3983	4138	5411	5428	5421*
Flood	2349	2327	2482	3155	3170	3159*
Call of Abraham	1921	1961	2055	2978	2923	2982
Exodus	1461	1531	1625	1648	1593	1652
Foundation of Temple	1012	1012	1013	1627	1014	1010
Destruction of Temple	588	589	587	588	586	586

* Or, each of these two Dates may be 60 years lower.

† See also the Fourth letter of bishop Watson’s “Apology for the Bible”—and scores of Authors besides. *Editor.*

sitting, one at *the head* and the other at *the feet*! As to the Women, John gives but *one*, Mary Magdalene; Matthew mentions *two*, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; Mark states *three*, the two Marys and Salome; Luke swells them into *several*, the two Marys, Joanna, and "certain others with them".

If the four Evangelists had been *divinely* inspired to write down the *supercription* which Pilate placed over the head of Jesus, on the cross, they could not have written it (as recorded) in *four* different ways—not two of them alike.

The accounts of the catastrophe of Judas are quite irreconcilable, and must sadly disconcert those who would wish still to believe in *plenary* inspiration. Judas of the *Gospel* repented, but, Judas of the *Acts of the Apostles* did not repent; Judas of the *Gospel* despaired, but, Judas of the *Acts* triumphed in his iniquity; Judas of the *Gospel* returned the money, but, Judas of the *Acts* kept it; Judas of the *Gospel* bore testimony to the innocence of Jesus, but, Judas of the *Acts* did not; Judas of the *Gospel* gave back the money, to the priests, who deposited it in the treasury, but, Judas of the *Acts* bought a field with it; Judas of the *Gospel* hanged himself, but, Judas of the *Acts* died by accident—Matthew states, that the priests purchased the field "to bury strangers in", but, according to Peter, the field was "purchased by Judas", and was called *the field of blood*—but, enough of Judas!

Had the Apostles been *divinely* inspired to that degree which Bible-idolaters believe (and many of them conscientiously) it certainly would not have been necessary to send Paul, Barnabas, and others as a Deputation to the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem, to settle the controversies about the ceremony of Circumcision; nor would the Apostles when met in Convocation at Jerusalem, with James as Chairman, have experienced such difficulty in arranging the matter, had the Apostolic members of the Synod been *plenarily* inspired.

I have, Mr. Chairman, designedly selected examples of such differences as are of no consequence to us, which are right or which are wrong; and such discrepancies and contradictions are much more frequent in both the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, than unobservant readers are aware of—for, I can quote them by scores and hundreds; [Hear, hear!] yet, insignificant as these differences are in themselves, they unequivocally *DISPROVE*, and completely *OVERTHROW*, the mischievous and pernicious doctrine of *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration!* [Hear, hear!] Now surely, Mr. Chairman, with these examples of discrepancies before me, and the hundreds I know besides, there cannot be any presumption, any impropriety, much less any irreverence, in my declaring to this Meeting, that it is sheer mental-weakness for anyone, whether Clergyman or Layman, whether Bishop or Sexton, who can read, and think, and judge for himself, either to believe or say, that every word in our Bible has been either dictated *by God*, or, penned under the influence of *divine* Inspiration! [Hear, hear, hear!]

REV. R. CORBET. You say, Mr. Nash, that the Inspired writers themselves teach, that *not* all that they wrote and spoke, was spoken and written under the immediate influence of *divine* inspiration—now, Sir, I defy you to substantiate what you say.

NASH. It is not because I am unequal to the task, Vicar, but because I have already occupied so much time, and, perhaps, tried the patience of my auditors, that I *waive* reply—I leave you in the hands of the Meeting. [Hear, hear! Pause.]

PROFESSOR SOMERVILLE. You may thank your stars, Mr. Corbet, that you are so mercifully left in the hands of the Meeting; for, had Mr. Nash replied

* Disbelievers in the Bible invariably pounce upon the unscriptural doctrine of *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration, held so firmly by zealous and ignorant Believers; and, taking up the Bible, its Antagonists speedily *prove*, beyond all reasonable contradiction, that, tried by this Standard, the Scriptures fail utterly in carrying out the silly pretensions of poreblind zealots, who, instead of raising, sink the Bible in the appreciation of those who are not disposed to fall down and worship it. *Editor.*

to your injudicious defiance, I would not have been in your clothes for sixpence: and I congratulate you, Vicar, on having an Opponent so gentle, mild, and indulgent as myself. [Hear, hear!]

It is painful for me, Mr. Corbet, to reproach a Minister of your standing with a discreditable deficiency of biblical knowledge; as you ought to have known by this time, that though you may occasionally light upon a phrase which may seem, at first sight, to countenance the irrational doctrine of *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration, yet, the tenor of Scripture forbids your belief in any such childish notion, however strongly supported by Confessions of Faith and Acts of Parliament, however strenuously insisted upon by certain of our short-sighted Bishops. [Hear, hear!] You must have read, Mr. Corbet, though, like other inattentive and thoughtless Ministers, you have not observed, that Scripture writers, without any Supernatural assistance, put down what they had *seen*, and *heard*, and *read*, and by *inquiry* had ascertained—[Cries of Proof, proof!] Mr. Chairman, I hear there are more unobservant readers present, than Mr. Corbet; for, I am called upon for *proofs*: they have forgotten how frequently Paul tells them that what he occasionally writes, he writes of Himself—not by Inspiration. [See 1 Cor. vii. 12, etc.] And even if he had never given us a single hint (though he has given several) we should have known it from the very nature and subject and object of the greatest part of his writings. [Hear, hear! and Proof, proof!]

When Paul tells Titus, the first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians, that Bishops should not be “given to Wine”; and when he writes to Timothy, the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians, “Be no longer a Water-drinker, but, use a little Wine for thy stomach’s sake and thy frequent weaknesses”; it would be lowering our conceptions of the dignity of *divine* Inspiration, were anyone to attempt forcing upon us the belief, that Paul was moved by the Holy Spirit and taught of God to pen such domestic advice. [Hear, hear!] How you, Mr. Corbet, an *intemperate* supporter of the Temperance movement, can manage to square accounts with Paul, who recommends the use of Wine for the stomach’s sake, I know not; but*—

CORBET. I beg to say, I am no longer a Teetotaler.

SOMERVILLE. You surprise me! However, I would still have you follow Paul’s advice—Let your moderation be known unto all men”. [Hear, hear!] Perhaps you are now a frequenter of the Theatres, also; and—

CORBET. Sir, I never was in one of those hotbeds of Hell in my life, and never shall be!

SOMERVILLE. Then, you are not qualified to preach effectively against the evils prevailing there. [Hear, hear!]

* A desultoreous, and for the most part inaudible confab here took place, among temperate and intemperate Teetotalers; the pith of which I give in this Note—

The oft-repeated assertion, that 60,000 Die annually in England from Drunkenness, was met by the statement given by Beggs (the Teetotal lecturer) who, after examination of the question, first published in *The Great Teacher* (I think in 1801) declared that 6000 would be a very large amount, while 60,000 was “*simply absurd*”. Periodicals were then quoted on the point (most of which are but Copies of Copies) and, among others *The London Journal*, which avers—

About *one* adult person *is ten* dies in this country through over-indulgence in intoxicating Drinks!”

—when the silly statement was conclusively met by the production of Statistical documents, proving the utter falsity of the representations given from Teetotal platforms, the last document quoted being that of 1861 (first published in 1863) wherein we are informed—

524 men and 133 women died of Alcoholism!”

—that is 657 during the year 1861: a number sufficiently frightful, but nothing like the extravagant and altogether *false* representations of our intemperate Teetotalers. *Reporter*.

But, what do you say, Vicar, to Paul's quoting Plays, and making his quotations part and parcel of those Scriptures which you fancy were *all* dictated by God?

CORBET. This, Sir, is not a fit season for jesting.

SOMERVILE. Jestings, Vicar! Do you accuse Paul of jesting, when he inserts passages from Plays in his writings? In Luke's narration of Saul's sudden conversion, in the Acts of the Apostles (ix. 5) and also in Paul's Defense before Agrippa (xxvi. 14) stands a most expressive sentence, which you may find in Eschylus, and in Euripides, and in Terence—and what is more, that classic sentence is given as proceeding out of the lips of Jesus himself, addressed to Saul, who was exercising his utmost hostility against the early Christians—*It is hard for thee to kick against the Pricks!*"

Paul, as you know, Vicar, was a highly-educated man; and he scrupled not, after his conversion, to introduce into his writings, words and phrases which he felt to be appropriate and expressive—no matter where he had learned them: thus, we find him quoting a fragment of Menander, the Grecian Comic Poet, in the 33 v. of xv. ch. of his 1 Epistle to the Corinthians—*Evil communications corrupt good manners*.*

And if you, Mr. Corbet, were to introduce into your Sermons, a few telling passages from our Poets, you might convert part of your choking loaf of fossil sawdust, into the bread of life. [Hear, hear!] Dissenters enliven, invigorate, ornament their discourses, whether Lectures or Sermons, with elucidatory and recommendatory extracts; and why should not Episcopalians do the like? Truth will not be the less acceptable for being presented in an agreeable dress. Take Dr. Adam Clarke as an example—he has enlivened, and illustrated, and enriched his Commentary on the Bible, with numerous quotations from the Poets—Shakespeare being his favorite; from whose Plays are many beautiful and appropriate passages. [Hear, hear!] And why should not the Clergy of the Church of England ornament and enliven their Sermons, by following Paul's example in quoting Heathen Poets, and also Poets of any age or nation?

But, Mr. Chairman, it is about time that I should ask Mr. Corbet, what

* "That the system of morals professed in the New testament contained no maxim which had not been previously enunciated, and that some of the most beautiful passages in the Apostolic writings are quotations from Pagan authors, is well known to every scholar. But, to assert that Christianity communicated to man *moral truths previously unknown*, argues, on the part of the asserter, either gross ignorance, or else, wilful fraud. BUCKLER. Vol. i. p. 164.

This is strikingly exemplified in *The Lord's Prayer*, which might have been used by Plato, Pythagoras, or Socrates; by Jew, Gentile, or Deist, without compromising any of their principles. It deals in mere temporal things, avoiding spiritual things altogether.

"Wetstein says, It is a curious fact, that the Lord's Prayer may be reconstructed, almost verbatim, out of the Talmud, which also contains a prophetic intimation, that all Prayer will one day cease, except the Prayer of Thanksgiving. MACKAY'S *Progress of the Intellect*.

Rev. Joseph Mendham, in alluding to the similarity between *The Lord's Prayer* and certain portions of the ancient Jewish prayers, tells us, that if the corresponding passages were collected together, they would nearly produce *The Lord's Prayer*: witness the following—

"*Our Father which art in heaven*; Maimonides, in Tephillot—*Thy name be sanctified*; Capellus, ex Euchologiis Judæorum—*Thy kingdom reign*; Drusius, ex libro Musar.—*Do thy will in heaven*; Bab. Berachoth—*Forgive us our sins*; in nearly all their prayers—*Lead us not into the hand of temptation*; In libro Musar. apud Drusium—*Deliver us from Satan*; In precibus Judæorum—*For thine is the kingdom, and thou shalt reign gloriously, for ever and ever*; in their Liturgies".

Redford writes, on *Extempore Prayer*—

Prayers, strictly formed on the above model, would be considered by all orthodox Christians, as extremely deficient, and by no means an adequate exhibition of the principles of Christian devotion. It does not contain one recognition of *the medium of acceptance*, nor, in short, of any doctrine peculiarly Christian. It is materially deficient, as a Christian prayer, on the doctrine of *the Spirit's influence*, which is one of the distinguishing tenets of the Gospel dispensation—Strictly speaking it is a Jewish Prayer'.

It is, what Pope has called it—A UNIVERSAL PRAYER. *Editor.*

he thinks of the *divine* Inspiration in connection with quotations from Profane authors? Will our Vicar turn tail upon Paul, because he quotes Comic poets and Tragic writers? Yet, Sir, Paul was a remarkably clever man, though not quite so orthodox as Mr. Corbet. [Hear, hear!

Now, tell us plainly, Vicar, do you really, at this moment, believe that *every word* in our Bible was inserted there by the direct influence of the Holy Spirit?

CORBET. I sha'n't tell you what I believe!

SOMERVILLE. That's pretty well, for the present; we shall hear more, when you become possessed of a little more moral courage—Rome was not built in a day.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would wish it to be clearly understood—I am of opinion, that Inspiration is *in the Things recorded*—not in the Record itself; and though there may be many things in the Bible which have been penned under the influence of the Holy Spirit, by far the greater portions of the Scriptures which have come down to us, are mere human compositions, necessarily partaking of the imperfections of human nature; and that as Civilisation advances, the Scriptures will become clearer and clearer, and the two Covenants rise more and more in the appreciation of all good men. [Cheers.

REV. DR. SEDLEY. In the columns of the penetrating *Saturday Review*, of March 5, 1864, stands the following sensible remark—

There is no question of Theology upon which less unity of belief prevails, than upon this point of *Inspiration*. There is none which sets the fetters of dogma more obstinately at defiance. To determine with logical precision, the exact nature of a mysterious mental process, strange to ordinary experience, and only revealed by implication, is a task that may well baffle the minutest reasoner, or, the stoutest partisan”.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding all the light which has been thrown upon the subject, during the controversies which are not yet closed, many of our Dignitaries continue enveloped in impenetrable darkness. I hold Dr. Pusey's Letter to Mr. Maurice in my hand (still wet from the Press) wherein the patristic Dr. writes—

I believe the Bible to be very dear to the People of England, and that they will be much *re-assured* to find that their Clergy do, as a body, with one heart and one mind, receive the Bible as the INFALLIBLE WORD OF GOD—not as *containing* that Word only”.

Now, Mr. Chairman, though I will not yield to Dr. Pusey in reverence and love for the Scriptures, I neither believe nor wish to believe, that the Sun, while moving at the rate of many thousands of miles an hour, stood still at the command of a Man who was upwards of 90,000,000 of miles distant from it, and the sound of whose voice could not reach it till after the lapse of several years! [Hear, hear!

Dr. Pusey and his patripassian associates may believe, if they can, that an Ass remonstrated, in the Hebrew language, against a Prophet's cruelty to animals; but, Mr. Chairman, the reason which God has given me, forbids my believing any such thing—I should be a Donkey if I did. [Hear, hear!

As to the turning of Water into Wine, at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, where Jesus is reported to have furnished the guests, *after* they had “well drunk”, with 135 gallons more—upwards of 43 dozen English bottles—the story is so obviously fabulous, that all the misapplied ingenuity of Commentators has failed to give it even a distant show of either

probability or possibility. Dr. Pusey may believe it, or not, just as he pleases; but, commonsense discards it at once, as an unmistakable and very clumsy fiction—as derogatory to Jesus, as it is ludicrously absurd! [Hear, hear! and murmurs of disapprobation—during which, the Rev. Doctor sat down, and would not continue his observations.

BUTLER. I regret exceedingly that the Doctor should have met with any token of discourtesy, as we are thereby deprived of what probably might have been one of the most telling and instructive speeches delivered at this Meeting. [Hear, hear!] The doctrine of Miracles is always a ticklish subject; yet, whether we accept it or reject it, we ought to have sufficient command over our feelings, not to interrupt the expression of anyone's opinion, whether we agree with it, or not. To my Juniors I may venture to say—Neither accept any doctrine, nor except against it, merely on the score of its novelty; for, though all that is New, may not be *true*, much that is Old, is *false*: [Hear, hear!] and, in the phraseology of Sir James Mackintosh, I may add—It is time that men should learn to tolerate nothing ancient that Reason does not respect, and to shrink from no novelty to which Reason may conduct". [Hear, hear!]

It is well known, that Unitarians are very far from being of one mind on the doctrine of Miracles; but, I did not anticipate that any Unitarian Ministers could so far forget themselves, as publicly to evince their unwillingness to listen in silence to expressions with which they do not coincide—more especially when proceeding from the lips of one so able to instruct, and with whom not one of the Dissentients is qualified to hold controversy.* [Hear, hear!]

T. MOORE, Esq. Mr. Chairman! We have more than once heard something, not very intelligible, about *barbarism* and *civilisation*; can the Speakers mean to insinuate that England is *not* a highly-civilized country? if not, then I should like someone to explain wherein *civilisation* consists, and where Englishmen may look for it.

* At the 48th social Meeting of the London District Unitarian Society (held on 26 Feb. last, at Badley's Hotel) the Rev. K. B. Aspland said—The feeling against Miracles, is a reaction against Bibliolatry"—and Rev. J. C. Means said—What we want is a little more forbearance with one another; but, there is great uncharitableness in those who do not feel the need of Miracles, wanting to do away with them. We want charity, not only to persons, but to opinions"—while the Chairman, Rev. S. Bache (who is *very sore* on the point) said—He durst not allow Miracles to be put on one side; He did not condemn anyone who differed from him, but, he must not be untrue to his own convictions; and he could go over to the Roman Catholics sooner than join in partnership with men who put away the Miracles of Jesus Christ"! [And some who heard it, "said in their hearts", *then, the sooner You go the better*—but He heard them not.

The fact is, but very few persons have ever examined, *thoroughly*, the Doctrine of Miracles; nor are Ministers in general, able to communicate, in definite language, *what* they conceive constitutes a Miracle. Is a Miracle a suspension or violation of the regular course of Nature, at the command of an Individual? or, is it not? and if not, *What* is it? If anyone cannot answer the question to *his own satisfaction*, let him *suspend* his judgement, heedless of what Locke, Doddridge, Paley, Babbage, Parker, Greg, or anyone else may have said or written on the subject; it is not (I think) a doctrine on which Salvation depends. When examined (while under examination) be sure *not* to overlook ~~THE CONSEQUENCES~~ its acceptance or rejection entails.

I could mention several Unitarian ministers, who are "puzzled" with the doctrine; who know not "what to make of it"; who, instead of boldly expressing *their own* views, tell what such and such a one thinks about it. Out upon such *shall-i-shall-i* expounders of the Scriptures! Let all who are undecided, say so; and not be ashamed to confess their indecision; for, rational *doubt* is better than blind *belief*.

When the four redoubtable Reverend Editors of the *Unitarian Herald*, undertook to Review (14 Aug. 1863) "Miracles the Credentials of the Christ" (5 Lectures, by S. Bache) they said, with fear and trembling—

We think that Mr. Bache expresses himself *a little too strongly* when He affirms, that "They who deny the Miracles, must, in all consistency, reject the Christ".

The doctrine of Miracles is a stumblingblock against which Ministers are perpetually breaking their shins. *Editor,*

W. R. SPENCER, Esq. Mr. Chairman! As my friend Somerville communicates, by a significant nod, that he expects me to speak, I shall commence by observing, that there are degrees in Civilisation, as there are degrees in Perfection; for, although on the scale of comparison, the English of 1864 may allowably be termed *civilized*, when contrasted to the more *barbarous* Israelites, and Romans, and our own Countrymen in past ages, nevertheless, as a people, we are as yet but progressing *towards* Civilisation! for, however far we may have receded from Barbarism, the distance between our present advanced state and perfect Civilisation, is immeasurably farther. [Hear, hear!]

Civilisation, Mr. Chairman, does not consist in mere intellectual culture, refinement of taste, excellence in criticism, eloquence, and philosophy; neither in the pre-eminence of poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and the like: these *may* be the concomitants, but, they are not the essentials of Civilisation; for, the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, far excelled us in several of these attainments: yet, compared with the community now existing in this country, *they were uncivilized, barbarous* nations—they lived and died under the tyranny of *selfishness* and *terror*; their popular amusements, their gorgeous exhibitions, their magnificent amphitheatres, their gladiatorial feats and pastimes, were *barbarous*; inasmuch as they were selfish, cruel, and inhuman, replete with lust, hatred, and revenge—for, in my judgement, Mr. Chairman, to denominate a *SELFISH* people a *civilized* people, or, a *FIGHTING* nation a *civilized* nation, is sheer absurdity, pure ignorance of the right meaning of words. [Hear, hear!]

Man, to be perfectly Civilized, must be wholly rescued from the tyranny of selfishness, lust, hatred, revenge, terror, cruelty, and superstition—doing unto others as he would have others do to him; and until this shall be fully accomplished, Society will not have reached that pacific, beneficent, moral goal, *towards* which it has been steadily advancing ever since the discovery of the Art of Printing. [Hear, hear!]

Man will *then* first be thoroughly Civilized, when all the powers of his animal, intellectual, moral, religious nature, shall be fully developed in subordination to his ultimate, his eternal destiny; and Society will *then* first be completely Civilized, when all the members, in their respective places, stations, and conditions, shall receive and reciprocate all the humane feelings and expressions and acts of benevolence, brotherly-kindness, and charity, dictated by refined sensibility and governed by elevated judgement. [Hear, hear!]

England (alas) is not yet freed from Capital-punishment, Flogging, and Witchcraft;* from Cockfighting, Otterhunting, Badgerbaiting, Ratworrying, Steeplechasing, Prizefighting, and other species of cruelties and selfish-

* In the Newspapers of the day, the reader may see that such men as Rev. Newman Hall, supported by the chief advocate for the *Abolition of Capital Punishments*, the long-tried Friend of Humanity, Charles Gilpin (who has, during the last 20 years, traversed the whole country to rouse the Nation to a sense of the enormity) are again agitating the important question; and it is to be hoped they may never cease, until that National disgrace shall be numbered among the Barbarities which *were*.

Flogging is another barbarity, not to be tolerated by a People claiming to be ranked among *civilized* nations; yet (according to the Parliamentary Report of today's *Times*) in last night's Committee in the House of Commons, 45 voted for FLOGGING, and but 42 against it! while 80 voted for retaining the still more brutal punishment of BRANDING, and but 50 voted against it! So precious was "The Wisdom of our Ancestors," in the judgement of this nation's wise Representatives, on the memorable 10th March, 1864! *Reporter*.

The following is but a mild specimen of the *majestic* style of Flogging human beings, still carried on in this boastedly *civilized, christianized* country of ours—

Precisely at half-past seven on Monday, the 27th instant, the Crew of H.M.S. *Majestic* were

ness ; neither have our public festivities got rid of gambling-booths, fortune-telling, grinning through horse-collars, jumping in sacks, climbing greased-poles, and similar degrading sports ; [Hear, hear !] and when we add to these remnants of Barbarism, our reproachful Sanitary condition, our abominable lack of a Code of laws,* our scandalous religious persecutions, our crying want of National education,† our flagrant injustice towards the whole of our Female population,‡ and suchlike enormities, crimes, and monstros-

summoned to muster on the starboard side of the main deck, to witness one of their fellow-men fastened to a grating, for the purpose of receiving forty-eight lashes ; to which he had been sentenced by a court-martial, for attempting to rescue a prisoner from the hands of the master-at-arms, or, chief of police, and also for striking a petty officer. Silence having been obtained, the Captain proceeded to read aloud his warrant ; at the close of which, he, in a stern voice, called the boatswain, who immediately stepped forward. 'Give that man one dozen lashes', commands the Captain, and the boatswain seized the cat-o'-nine-tails, and commenced inflicting the dreadful punishment. Lash after lash fell heavily upon the unfortunate man, which caused him to give utterance to the following ejaculations : 'Oh, my mother, my mother ! what would you think of your poor son now !' and, 'O God, what have I done to deserve this !' and turning himself to the Captain as much as he could, he said, 'O Captain, have you no pity ? think of your own sons ; I did not merit this from you !' at which the Captain was distinctly seen to smile ! All this took place during the time the first dozen were being inflicted. The Captain then ordered one of the boatswain's mates to 'Give that man one dozen lashes', which order was instantly obeyed. The severity of the lash having rendered him insensible, the poor sufferer seemed totally void of feeling, for, as lash after lash fell upon him, not a word was heard. He had fainted ! At the expiration of the second dozen, the Captain instantly commanded another boatswain's mate to come forward, and 'Give that man one dozen lashes'. During the time this man was flogging, the poor fellow revived a little, and, turning to his flogger, he requested him to '*flog fair*'. The fourth dozen having been inflicted, he was released from the grating, with a *back literally mutilated and his ribs quite blackened*. After having had a little oil applied to his scars, he was taken down to the fore-cockpit (where complete darkness and foul air prevail) and put under the charge of the sentinel. Allow me here to mention that the poor fellow has yet *two years of imprisonment, with hard labor*, for the same trifling crime.

I would, in conclusion, ask, Can the readers of this letter ever think of advocating, or even countenancing, such a *horrible and inhuman act* ? Rather hang a man at once and have done with him, than punish after such a manner ; for, I venture to assert, that *he never will or can be* the same man again. I hope that some of our noble and humane Representatives will catch a glance at this, and boldly advocate the *total abolition of Flogging*. *Liverpool Mercury*, 30 April, 1863.

As to *Witchcraft*, our Country Newspapers continue giving recitals of the existence of *Mosaic barbarity*, enough to make every *really-civilized* Englishman hang down his head—for Shame ! *Editor*.

* "*Law*, in its present state, like *orthodoxy* in religion, is A MYSTERY—where reason ends and faith begins. None of the uninitiated can enter even the vestibule of the temple. *Law* ought not to be a branch merely, but, the chief branch of Social ethics. Society knows nothing about it, but by means of the Lawyer. A digested Code of plain, undeniable legal principles, founded on the morality of commonsense, applied to everyday's transactions, might render the whole community wiser, better, more prudent, more cautious, and less litigious. Men would be better able to judge when they ought, and when they ought not, to go to Law. They would be better jurors, better arbitrators, wiser and better citizens. COOPER.

Bonaparte, the Butcher of millions of his race, is

"Damned to everlasting fame" ;

but, the Emperor Napoleon I. is

"Immortalized, for ages yet to come",

by his having given to his Country a Code of Laws—CODE DE NAPOLEON ! *Editor*.

† The neighbouring nations cry aloud against the Legislators of Great Britain, for erecting Prisons like palaces, instead of establishing Schools and Libraries throughout the land ; and when our neighbours read of the wise men in Westminster talking about "this enlightened nation", they cannot but reproach our Members of Parliament, with England's having five millions of Adults who cannot *read*, and eight millions who cannot *write*, their own names ! *Editor*.

"It is asserted, on good authority, that there are in the Metropolis 18,000 children trained to crime ; 15,000 men living by low gambling ; 50,000 by constant thieving ; 5000 receivers of stolen goods ; and 150,000 men and women subsisting by other disgraceful means. There are not fewer than 25,000 beggars. So that there are more than 250,000 persons in the London district, of all ages and sexes, who prey upon the honest and industrious part of the community. *Another Blow for Life*.

‡ Perfit, in his Discourse on the Death of Theodore Parker, has the following paragraph—

Woman and her Rights, were subjects to which he [Parker] frequently alluded, and always as *Woman's friend*. In his sermon upon 'The public function of Woman', he deals with the

ities, our claims to CIVILISATION are not by any means so great, neither so flattering, as some gentlemen present would wish us to believe.* [Hear, hear, hear!]

This, however, is verily an Age of Progress. The hearts of the philanthropists of by-gone days would dance for joy, could they behold the present dawning of that blissful future on which this Age is entering. The most sanguine Expectant of intellectual, scientific, political, social, moral, and religious improvement, as well as the boldest Experimentalist of the last century, would stand aghast at the unprecedented and truly wonderful Progress of the present! Yet, Mr. Chairman, glorious as the Age we live in is, the Golden-age is still to come! [Bursts of applause.]

J. WARTON, Esq. Mr. Chairman, you have, of course, read the Rev. James H. Wilson's letter to *The Times*, wherein he expresses his fear, that notwithstanding the religious accommodation for the inhabitants of the metropolis has greatly increased, the percentage of attendance has not sensibly improved. After commenting on the Bishop of London's remarks, the other day, to an assembly of more than 700 ministers of the Gospel, who met at his residence, for the express purpose of considering how they might best deal with the sin and wickedness by which they were surrounded, Mr. Wilson contends, that the picture drawn of the spiritual destitution of London was too sombre. He writes—

We all remember the appeal of bishop Blomfield and the erection of ten New churches in Bethnal-green and the eastern districts, as the result of that appeal. The churches were built and equipped; but, has Bethnal-green been reclaimed? It has been my lot to have had a good deal to do with the spiritual destitution of that part of London, and to conduct, or assist in conducting, a careful inquiry into its moral and spiritual condition. Now, will it be believed, that in one small district, we found 400 houses inhabited by 935 families, comprising 4150 souls, where 867 people were found scarcely able to Read, 186 knew not the Letters of the alphabet, and 739 children between the ages of 3 and 8 had never been to a school? And yet, within a radius of 700 yards [*seven hundred yards*] from this point, there were *four churches, two chapels, and three schools*. But, what *the churches failed to do*, more simple and direct means accomplished; for, in two years, an intelligent Home Mission agent, assisted by a few voluntary helpers, succeeded in bringing about 300 under instruction, in reclaiming from 40 to 50 of the poorest and most sunken members of that community, and establishing a Temperance society and Penny-bank, by means of which many drunkards have been saved, and about 1000 depositors have been taught how to economize their little and precarious earnings. To complete the good work thus begun, the Sanitary reformer has come to the aid of the Christian missionary, and new cottages are rising up on every hand. It is thus that we may reclaim the moral wastes of London.

Mr. Wilson shows that a new order of means [*men not churches*] is re-

question, Whether she should enter the learned professions—should she practise Medicine? the Law? or, teach Theology? and he answered plainly, YES! Those Men who will not permit their consciences to take part in the discussion are, *we believe*, able to answer, No! but, it is difficult to extract from them any reason which *justifies* their unfavorable reply. This man [Parker] felt, that Man cannot accomplish fairly all his work, cannot develop his powers to their full stretch, and cannot bring his moral nature into full play, *until Woman is treated with perfect justice*; first, in regard to her Education, and then, in relation to her *freedom* to achieve victories *side by side* with him. Woman was moulded by God, not to be a *slave*, but, a *helpmate and companion*; and, were Society wise enough, to act upon the generous and just principles laid down in that sermon, there is every reason to believe the stock of *human happiness* would be quadrupled within the coming century". *Reporter*.

* "He that looks back to the history of mankind, will often see that in politics, jurisprudence, religion, and all the great concerns of society, Reform has usually been the *work of reason* slowly awakening from the lethargy of ignorance, gradually acquiring confidence in her own strength, and ultimately triumphing over the dominion of Prejudice and Custom. *PARR'S Character of Fox*."

quired, to evangelize London. Men with downcast spirits, gloomy countenances, and cheerless tones of voice, are not the men to reach *the hearts* of the outcasts and self-degraded thousands of the metropolis. Religion must be introduced with all the cheerfulness and kindness possible, breathing good-will and hope and confidence. But, Mr. Chairman, I must read yet another paragraph, from Mr. Wilson's letter, bearing testimony to that progress spoken of by Mr. Spencer—

To those who live in London, and know what is doing to reclaim the lost, there is no great risk of misunderstanding the real state of the case; but, in the eyes of foreigners, especially where your columns [*The Times*] are read, what can they infer from the Report, but that London is going headlong to destruction—whereas, there never was *more* doing—nay, *never so much doing*, to promote the moral and spiritual well-being of the community, than there *is doing now*. During the past 20 years, the standard of Education among the poor, has been raised 50 per cent; the Ragged-school has become a power for good which cannot be over-estimated. The Bible-woman's Mission has become a 'great fact'; Evangelical Dissenters have multiplied their agencies in some cases fourfold; the Social habits of the people were *never better* than at present; millions of pounds are invested in lands and houses by the Working-man, and the character of our popular Literature has greatly improved. That we have a million of inhabitants [in London alone] who neither attend Church nor Chapel, is an appalling fact, and we must do more than we have yet done to face it; but, these people *are not lost to us*—for they were never *won*. We must begird ourselves for the work of evangelizing London—but, do not let our Church dignitaries *ignore all other workers*, nor give us all the dark side without a ray of light*.

I know not how it is, Mr. Chairman, but the fact has forced itself upon my unwilling acknowledgement, that we Episcopalians, seem incapable of effecting more than a tithe of the good effected by Dissenters among the graceless, the wretched, and the vile; and yet, Sir, we have not the common honesty to give the Dissenters credit for their superior operations. [Hear, hear! and applause. Long pause.

REV. J. GAY. Mr. Chairman! Though I will not say, that Professor Somerville has not given any *proofs* of the Inspired writers having made us acquainted with their own acknowledgements of their not always having written under the immediate influence of *divine* Inspiration; yet, I must say, He has not satisfied me on the matter.

T. RANDOLPH, Esq. Then, Mr. Gay, You are not satisfied with abundance. But, just pass me a Bible from the table. [On its being handed] Listen now, if you please, Sir, to what you have repeatedly read; but, like you Pulpit gentry in general, have read without observance—

"Forasmuch as *many* have taken in hand to set forth in order a Declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee, in order, most excelent Theophilus, that thou mightest know *the certainty of those things*, wherein thou hast been instructed".

These four verses constitute the preamble to Luke's historical and biographical Treatise (as He himself calls it) the Treatise itself beginning at the *fifth* verse of our "authorized version".

Hence it appears, that "many had taken in hand" before Luke, to write an account of "those things" which had taken place, and which were believed on the authority, *not* of Inspiration, but of "Eyewitnesses and ministers of the word"—from which we learn, that Luke compiled his account from "many" others (most of which are for ever lost*) just as You or I should

* The 318 Bishops who met at Nice, at the call of that bloody Christian tyrant, Constantine,

do, were we to sit down to write an historical and biographical account of any remarkable man of our own time, consulting prior accounts, and collecting materials wherever we could gather them. Now, Mr. Gay, does not this go rather hard against your favorite doctrine of *plenary inspiration*? [Hear, hear!] But, let us hear how John managed his compositions—

“That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*, which we have *seen* with our eyes, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have *handled*—that which we have *seen* and heard, Declare we unto you”; &c. “this then, is the message which *we have heard* of him, and Declare unto you”, &c.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this frank confession of John, given at the very opening of his Epistles, does *not* imply any supernatural guidance—but, I shall not multiply words; I leave everyone to draw his own inference. [Applause. Calls for Professor Johnson.]

DR. S. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman! Ladies and Gentlemen! It is a very easy thing for you to call upon anyone to speak, but, which of you will tell me, what to say?

“Words are like leaves, and where they most abound,
Much fruit of sense beneath, is rarely found”.

It cannot, Mr. Chairman, be too strongly stated, that nearly all the difficulties which have stood in the way of the cordial reception of the pure religion introduced and propagated by the Founder of Christianity, whether by foreign heathens or by native sceptics, have been gratuitous, artificial, and, I firmly believe, *the creation* of avowed Christian ministers and divines. [Hear, hear!] Thousands, and hundreds of thousands, would joyfully have accepted the rich essentials of the New covenant, had it not been for the legends, and dogmas, and speculative propositions, which were affirmed to form part and parcel of Christianity itself—affirmed by ministers, to be inextricably bound up in its nature, and to be inferentially involved in its reception—fatal and deplorable affirmations on the part of theological teachers. [Hear, hear!]

It is *not* the noble poetry, the sublime devotion, the unfailing trust of Job, and David, and Isaiah; it is *not* the fascinating character, solemn grandeur, elevating, enriching, guiding, glorious career of the Founder of Christianity; it is *not* the satisfying, comforting, strengthening, convincing views of our relation to our Father who is in heaven, revealed to us by his godlike Son; it is *not* those grand and far-reaching hopes, nor those grave and sad warnings, nor those ineffable and inspiring consolations, which we gather from the Old covenant as well as from the New: no, Mr. Chairman,

in 325, made havoc among the Writings penned by the early followers of Jesus, as well as among Writings more ancient. From the mention made of Narratives of the Life of Jesus, in the works of the Fathers of the Church (wherein are many extracts) we know of about 50 Gospels, though we have but 4; and from the Scriptures themselves, we know of several books, both Jewish and Christian, which have not come down to us. Several may have been accidentally lost; but, the numerous Writings *destroyed* by the 318 Bishops, at the instigation of Constantine, should render his name for ever execrable to the lovers of Jewish and Christian Scriptures, and the admirers of ancient literature: and it certainly would have been better for the religious world, had the 318 Bishops been roasted to cinders, than that they should have burned so many invaluable Writings in the flames of ignorance, superstition, bigotry, or priestcraft. *Reporter.*

On p. xv. of the Introduction to that strange book, “A Voice from the Ganges”, Ed. 1861, may be found the following paragraph—

It appears, that at the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 363) there were 200 varied versions of the adopted Evangelists, and 64 several Gospels, all differing essentially from each other, and all purporting to be a true account of this person Jesus; and from these our 4 Gospels were selected. But, be it remembered, that the present Gospels are *not originals*, but, taken from copies of the 6th century, from some other unknown copies; for, there are no copies in *existence* nearer the time of Jesus, than 500 years!”

no ; it is none of these things that have deterred the thoughtful and the good, or even the careless and the critical, from accepting Christianity with joy, thankfulness, and submission, as the greatest boon ever offered to struggling and aspiring Humanity ; for, these things would have been attractive, not repellant ; and these things are the essence of the faith which Jesus taught, and for which he lived and died—but, the Angel, Mr. Chairman, the Angel who has for ages stood with flaming sword at the gate, the Angel that has driven men away from what they regard as that Eden of *truth* and *hope*, wherein they might have found rest for their troubled souls, that Angel is none other than the unbiblical, irrational, mischievous doctrine of *literal* and *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration, against which evil Angel Colenso has struck a blow, which is still vibrating from sea to sea and shore to shore !* [Applause.]

It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman, to go into long details ; a few instances may suffice.

Be it remembered then, that it is on the authority of *plenary* Inspiration, and on *this alone*, that You and I, that all educated persons are required, as the very condition of our *Admission into the Garden*, to accept as true, as indisputable, as altogether unquestionable—*what ?* Why, among other things, Mr. Chairman, the Six 24-hour days of Creation, with all their rude errors and their singular misconceptions—Eve made out of one of Adam's ribs—of their marriage before they were a week old—the Tree of knowledge, the Serpent, the Apple, and the Fall—two statements as to the Creation, and two statements as to the Ark, and the creatures that entered it, contradictory and incredible—the ingenious legend about the Tower of Babel—the literal version of the plagues of Egypt, and the numerous miracles of the Exodus, the passage of the Red sea, the sojourn in the Desert, and the establishment in Canaan—the “passing strange” stories about the Patriarchs and their Wives—and, to crown the whole, the directly *divine* origin of the horrible Levitical instructions ! [Hear, hear !] Of course, Mr. Chairman, no man in his “right mind” would dream of accepting these *incredibles* as History, if not constrained to it by the doctrine of *verbal* Inspiration ; nor would all the *incredibles* in the Old covenant prevent men of understanding from studying therein the ways of God to Man, were it not for the imposition of the repulsive doctrine of *literal* and *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration ! [Hear, hear ! mixed with murmurings.]

So much for Narratives, Mr. Chairman. In the matter of Creed and Doctrine, there are *three* notable articles of Faith, so-called, which have prominently stood in the way of the cordial and grateful reception of ecclesiastical Christianity by the purest, most elevated, and sincerest minds—those whose instincts of justice were truest and strongest—those whose conceptions of the Deity were the most lofty and consistent :

* “That M. Rénan should, in France, follow up the good work to which such an impetus has been given in England by bishop Colenso, of endeavouring to lead us out of the paths of *Idolatry* to the worship of the Almighty alone, is, in my humble opinion, a most hopeful sign of Progress ; and, in former superstitious times, would have been looked upon as little short of miraculous. EAGLE EYE. Islington, Sep. 28, 1863.

† The famous Origen himself (whom the great Jerome pronounced to be, after the Apostles, “the master of the Churches”) treated all these accounts as nothing more than emblems ; he writes—

What man of sense can persuade himself that there was a first, a second, and a third day, and that each of those days had a night, when there was yet neither sun, moon, nor stars !” And St. Augustine (in his “City of God”) informs us, that in his time, the whole story about Adam and Eve, and the Serpent, and the Garden of Eden, with its forbidden fruit, was considered *allegorical*—nothing more. Reporter.

such are *Vicarious Punishment, Salvation by Belief, and Endless Damnation!* [Hear, hear, hear!] Of these three doctrines, I venture to make three assertions—they never entered the mind of Jesus; they must ever be inadmissible and revolting to all whose intuitive moral sense has not been warped by ecclesiastical sophistry; and no Christian, no sensible religious teacher, would ever think of preaching such doctrines, were they not *supposed* to be inculcated by a few isolated texts—not one of which is in accordance with the tenor of Scripture—and were it not, Mr. Chairman, that *every text, every word*, is by too many teachers, still held as being authentic, authoritative, indubitably true, and, in some wonderfully inexplicable manner, thought to be *inspired* and *divine*! [Prolonged cheerings.]

But, Mr. Chairman, when once we give up, as untenable and unreasonable, the *verbal* and *plenary* Inspiration of the sacred writings, and begin to search the Scriptures for *the Truth that is in them*; the Bible instantly becomes a repository of a multitude of Good things, and an arsenal whence we may collect adequate weapons to contend against all the Evils of life: we then read the Scriptures with a new and intense interest, and feel, as we never before felt, their intrinsic value, their never-dying verities; while the discrepancies and errors with which they are crowded, cease to cause us any uneasiness—the Bible *then* becomes in reality, a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path. [Cheers] He who has *not* ceased to read his Bible as a mass of faultless and supernatural records and communications, knows not, cannot know, how great, how inestimable a volume the Bible is—immeasurably dearer to him who reads it, and studies it, as *containing* the Records of Revelation, than to him who believes the whole of its contents to be the Revelations themselves. [Hear, hear!] Speaking personally, Mr. Chairman, ever since I have read my Bible as being the depository of Inspirations vouchsafed to fallible men, as natural, and not as supernatural, records of God's dealings with a small portion of his intelligent creatures, all hard thoughts of God, all disquieting doubts of His infinite goodness, have vanished from my mind, and its fallacies and errors trouble me no more: it is, to me, indeed and of a truth, the Book of Books, wherein I read the *Absolute Goodness of God, the Certainty of Universal Restoration, the Divine authority of Conscience, and the Comfortable assurance that I am an Object of his Care!* [Silent tokens of approbation.]

REV. E. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman! I pronounce the *three* doctrines so inveighed against by Professor Johnson, as three of the most sacred and momentous doctrines inculcated by our Church on the authority of God's word! And, Sir, I denounce as pestilential, abominable, and superlatively wicked, the Innovation of doctrines such as Mr. Johnson, and others of his demoralizing caste, have advocated in the course of this Discussion! [Hear, hear!] Sir, I hate, from the very bottom of my soul, everything that savors of *innovation*! [Hear, hear!] Innovations, Sir, are the curse of the country, the curse of the age, the curse of Christendom, and should be resisted to the very utmost, by all who have the welfare of the Church at heart, by all who love the long-established and worthy-to-be-admired institutions of their land! [Prodigious cheering—but, much of it ironical.]

MR. R. NOYES. What a tempest in a Teapot! What an outpouring of bodily-strength! What an exhibition of mental-weakness! [Cheers] *Young* in name, *young* in experience, *young* in discretion! as unlike St. Paul, as I am unlike Hercules; forming a striking contrast to the young man Proteus, of whom Valentine says—

His years are young, but, his experience old ;
 His head unmellowed, but, his judgement ripe ;
 And in a word (for far behind his worth
 Come all the praises that I now bestow)
 He is complete, in feature and in mind,
 With all good grace to grace a gentleman".

Had Mr. Young remained silent, we should not have known from his outward appearance (so decorous and so grave) that he had such a dearth of manliness within ; and this Meeting might have escaped being annoyed by any speech of mine. [Hear, hear !] But, Mr. Chairman, the unwise and uncalled-for attack upon *Innovations*, has roused me out of quietude, and I cannot resist the temptation to stand up and have a rap at him. [Hear, hear !] What a tirade on *Innovations* ! Yet, a little consideration might have taught Mr. Young, *young* though he be, that every *improvement*, is an *Innovation* ; that every *medicine*, is an *Innovation* ; that every *spark* of mental light struck into the mind of man, is an *Innovation* ; that every *new* good, every *fresh* benefit we receive, every cup of *additional* happiness we enjoy, is an *Innovation* ; and, as Bacon has remarked—

Time is the greatest *Innovator* ; and if Time alter things to the worse,
 and Wisdom and Counsel shall not alter them to the better, *what* shall
 be the End ?"

Why, Mr. Chairman, had it not been for *Innovations*, *what* should we have been at the present day ? *what* would this England of ours have been, but for the blessings of successive *Innovations* ? *what* would have been the state of mechanics, mathematics, geography, astronomy, chymistry, geology, and all the useful arts and sciences, tending to the instruction and happiness of mankind, but for consecutive *Innovations* ? *what* should we have known of political, social, and religious freedom, but for the success of elevating *Innovations* ? The signing of Magna Charta, the introduction of the Mariner's Compass, the erection of that modern marvel the Printing Press, was each a glorious *Innovation* ! The abolition of Slavery throughout the British colonies, the emancipation of our Roman catholic countrymen, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the establishment of the French Treaty, the ridance of the Paper duty, were, all of them, blessed *Innovations* ! [Cheers] Every step in advance towards Civilisation, every impetus given to political right, every accession of religious freedom, is a triumphant *Innovation* ! [Cheers] I rejoice, Mr. Chairman, I exult exceedingly, that I live in this cheering, exhilarating, and progressive age of joyous, buoyant, rapturous *Innovations* ! [Enthusiastic cheerings.

Let those who choose, *stand still* ; and, if they prefer it, let them aim at becoming a species of petrifications ; human stocks and stones, fossilized in body, soul, and spirit : but, let us, Mr. Chairman, be up and doing—hewing down the barriers to Advancement, smoothing the rugged road to Improvement, and, with all our heart and soul and strength, pushing forward the Progress of the age we live in, that Posterity may say, we have not lived in vain ! [Long-continued applause.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, it must be admitted, there may be *Innovations* such as Mr. Young describes as being "the curse of the country"; [Hear, hear !] but, of what species are they ? Certainly not the *Innovations* of which I have spoken, for, they are meritorious and ennobling—but, Sir, those *Innovations* which are degrading, pernicious, and unmanly ; such as the introduction of the doctrines of Men into the primitive Churches, contaminating the pure religion revealed and taught by Jesus and expounded

by his earliest followers; such Innovations as the introduction of a Duality of gods, about the middle of the second, and an increase to a Trinity of gods, before the close of the fourth century; such Innovations as have corrupted the simplicity and purity of genuine Christianity, into priestly money-making precepts and clerical doctrines, productive of wealth, luxury, and power! [Hear, hear!] Such are the Innovations which have been, and still are, "the curse of the country"! and not untill men return to the simple, pure, genuine Christianity as founded by Jesus, and trample underfoot the counterfeit and spurious Christianity of the Churches, can men rationally entertain any well-grounded hope of doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God. [Hear, hear, hear!]

YOUNG. I have heard all you have said, Mr. Noyes; but, you are so rhapsodical, unintelligible, and vague, that I scarcely know what you have been talking about. Were you to declaim in that style for a month, it would not have the least effect on me, as I do not see the drift of your Speech. I shall go on in my own way, paying no more regard to what Unitarians say, than to the babblings of Urchins just let loose out of school. [Hear, hear!]

REV. JOHN HOME. "From such Apostles, O ye mitred heads,
Preserve the Church! and lay not careless hands
On skulls that *cannot* teach, and *will not* learn!" [Applause.]

REV. GEO. CRABBE. There is something very shocking, Mr. Chairman, in the manner—let me say *profane manner*, in which many Speakers have expressed themselves at this Meeting. It is with dreadful irreverence that some of them speak of holy things; and it makes my blood run cold to hear them quoting and commenting on the Bible, as if it were any ordinary book. [Hear, hear!] Like the audacious Essayists, and the still more reckless Davidson, Stanley, and Colenso—

"They presume to take *reason* for their guide, and scruple not to examine and criticize the Bible, as if it were a collection of the writings of Eschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, or, those of Luther, Calvin, and Zwingle".

E. WALLER, Esq. And why not, Mr. Crabbe? Is not *reason* our safest guide? Dr. Arnold maintains, that "the gift of Reason is God's original revelation of Himself to man", and that "Faith, without Reason, is not properly *faith*, but mere power-worship, which *may be* devil-worship; for, it is Reason which entertains the idea of God". Our greatest Divines have unhesitatingly propagated the opinion, that we ought to judge of the Contents of the Bible by the exercise of our *reason*, and our *reason only*.

CRABBE. No such thing, Sir; I know better. It is not for You, to tell me of the sentiments of our Divines on such matters. You forget yourself, Mr. Waller, in presuming to teach me what is the view our Dignitaries have taken of this subject—I need not your dictation. [Hear, hear!]

WALLER. Pardon me, Vicar, I am not presuming to *teach*, nor *dictate* to You; yet, you probably do not know what bishop Butler, no mean authority, has written upon this very point: his words are—

Reason can, and it ought to judge, not only of the *meaning*, but, also of the *morality* and *evidence* of Revelation. It is the province of Reason to judge of the *morality* of the Scriptures".* [Hear, hear!]

* In Butler's *Analogy of Religion*, I read—

Reason is the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything—even Revelation itself; for, if it contain clear *immoralities*, or, *contradictions*, either of these would prove it *FALSE*". *Editor*.

CRABBE. Sir, I repeat, you forget yourself, in presuming to dictate to me; and I must not hear any more of it!

Chairman. Whatever your authority may be elsewhere, Mr. Crabbe, it is not in force here. As Chairman of this Meeting, I may not, and will not, allow You, or any other gentleman, to assume a privilege to which you are not entitled by "the Regulations of this Discussion"—nor yet, by the laws of Good-breeding. [Cheers.]

WALLER. 'Pon my word, Mr. Chairman, I little thought our Vicar was so touchy; nor did I think him half so arrogant—and as He sometimes treats me to a text, I'll give him one: "Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit, there is more hope of a fool than of him". [Hear, hear!]

REV. A. MARVELL. I am sorry, Mr. Waller, that you have resumed your seat; as I should have listened with pleasure to one so capable of instructing us: to your admirable quotation from bishop Butler, I beg leave to add one from bishop Conybeare—

Let us endeavour heartily to discover the Will of God, whether by the light of human Reason, or, from divine Revelation. Whatever shall appear to be the divine Will, from *either* consideration, we must adhere to it inviolably: whatever cannot be proved on this foot, is no part of Religion. This is the general rule, to which we must add nothing, and from which we must diminish nothing. To do the one, is superstition; to do the other, is impiety. *Defense of Revealed Religion.*

MR. J. FLETCHER. In bishop Hoadly's sermons, I read—

Man, as a reasonable creature, has a principle in him, interwoven with his very nature, which is plainly designed to direct and advise his practice *before* action, and to judge him *after* it; which calls him back when he is going astray, and reproves and reproaches him when he has acted unreasonably. And this is what we call *reason*, or, which is the same thing, *conscience*".

J. MARSTEN, ESQ. Permit me to read a passage from the learned Dean Prideaux—

Let what is written in all the books of the New testament be tried by *that* which is the touchstone of all religions—I mean that religion of *nature and reason* which God hath written *in the heart* of every one of us from the first creation".

DEAN HARRINGTON. Archbishop Tillotson maintains—

It is a thing of very considerable use, rightly to understand the natural obligation of moral duties, and how necessarily they flow from the consideration of God and ourselves. For, it is a *great mistake* to think that the obligations of them doth solely depend upon the Revelation of God's Will made to us in the Holy Scriptures. It is plain that mankind was always under a Law, even *before* God had made any external and extraordinary Revelation; else, *How shall God judge the World?* How shall they to whom the Word of God never came, be acquitted or condemned at the Great Day? For, where there is no *law*, there can neither be *obedience* nor *transgression*. It is very useful for us to consider the primary and natural obligation to piety and virtue, which we commonly call *the Law of Nature*; this being every whit as much *the Law of God*, as the Revelation of his Will in his Word".

MR. HENRYSTONE. My late friend, archbishop Whately,* informs us—

There are two volumes, as it were, both by the same divine author, spread out

* "The courageous Reformer and enterprising Innovator, who had breasted the full tide of Oxford Church feeling, and who was ready to encounter anybody, and to do and dare anything in an intirely new position at Dublin, has sunk to his grave [8 Oct.] venerated and loved by his Clergy, as a witness to Protestant principles, to the authority of Scripture, and the claims of the Established Church in Ireland; nay more, He has latterly allowed his Name to be associated with a system of Proselytism to which it would be hard to object, since Richard Whately has not objected to it. *The Times*. 10 Oct. 1863.

The following is copied from *The Christian Reformer* of November, 1863—forming a part only of the article from which the selections are made—

before us, for our instruction and benefit; from each of which we may learn something of his dealings, so as to apply what we learn to our own practical advantage. One of these may be called the *Book of Nature*—the system of the created universe; the other, the *Record of Inspiration*".

MR. LEE, Student. Bishop Marsh, in his "Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible" (a work of acknowledged authority by the Clergy of our church) gives his opinion in the following very intelligible words—

No apology can be required for applying to the Bible the principles of *reason and learning*; for, if the Bible could not stand *the test* of reason and learning, it could not be *what it is*—a work of divine wisdom. The Bible, therefore, *must be examined BY THE SAME LAWS OF CRITICISM which are applied to other writings of antiquity*". [Hear, hear!]

Chairman. Permit me to suggest, Gentlemen, the possibility of adducing more authorities than necessary; 100 highly respectable writers belonging to our Episcopal church, may be quoted as 'maintaining that we ought to test Scripture by reason; but, I really think those already quoted are amply sufficient. [Hear, hear!]

MR. BROWNE, Student. Mr. Chairman! Two minutes only—I hold in my hand bishop Gleig's "Study of Theology", from which I wish to read but a couple of lines—

It is indisputable, that no doctrines which clearly contradict any Truth which has been demonstrated by *the light of Nature*, can have been revealed by *the Father of lights*".

a tremendous blow, Mr. Chairman, to *literal, verbal, plenary* Inspiration. **REV. A. HUME.** This, Mr. Chairman, is called an *enlightened age*, an age of *philosophy* ("falsely so called") an age of *reason*; but, Sir, be it known to all the Idolisers of *reason* now present, their God is corrupted, depraved, lost! and Christian ministers, if faithful, must appeal to the *consciences* of men! [Hear, hear! Hear, hear!]

MR. COOPER. That I most positively contradict, Mr. Chairman! [Hear,

Three years and a few months have seen all the four Archbishoprics of England and Ireland vacant through Death; and that of York a second time through Translation. Of the four departed prelates, Whately is *the only one* who has left a strong intellectual or administrative mark upon his time. It may be no blame to the quiet Musgrave and the gentle-hearted Sumner, that they did the mere work for which they were evidently appointed, in keeping English Church politics and doctrines *quiet*; and the Irish Church Establishment was proud of her princely Beresford's munificence, alike in her tithe struggles and the national struggle against famine; but, Whately had a more distinctive work, as he had a more distinctive personal ability; and his Episcopal life has amply justified the wisdom of the appointment which, in 1831, startled the English Church and alarmed the Irish. It was a bold step on the part of Earl Grey, to appoint as Successor to a Churchman so conspicuously orthodox and intolerant as archbishop Magee, one *not yet consecrated*, nor even in high preferment, whose life had been almost exclusively spent as Fellow of a College and Principal of a Hall at Oxford, and who was notorious and singular there, for his *liberalism* in theology, politics, and literature, and for the boldness, bordering upon aggressiveness, and not a little tinged with eccentricity, with which he spoke his thoughts, in all companies and on all occasions. Earl Grey knew his *man*, as he knew *the work* awaiting him.

His appointment to the Archbishopric, called forth all kinds of accusations against his supposed *latitudinarianism, indifferentism, socinianism*, etc. and his friend Arnold wrote thus in his defense:

In point of essential holiness, there does not live a truer Christian than Whately. It grieves me that He is spoken of as *dangerous* and *latitudinarian*, because his intellectual nature keeps pace with his spiritual, instead of being left as Low Churchmen leave it—a *fallow field* for all unsightly Creeds to flourish in. He is a truly *great man*, in the truest sense of the word; and if the safety and welfare of the Protestant Church in Ireland depend on *human* instruments, none could be found in the whole empire so likely to maintain it".

If Whately, like Arnold himself, had to *fallow it* a little at last, according to approved Church rotation, we must divide the blame, the pity, and the sorrow, between *the man and the system*".

hear!] for Reason, that godlike faculty, the peculiar gift of Heaven to Man alone, is not, cannot be *lost*—except where aberration of the mental powers has place. Reason, Sir, may be obscured, but, *not lost*; it may be borne down, and its free operations resisted, by the weight and force of the appetites and passions, but, it is *not destroyed*; it may lie dormant, but, it is *not annihilated*—it is ever susceptible to the awakening influences of mental light and life, to spiritual communication: and I give it as my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that to the injudicious and unwarrantable depreciations of Reason, by our religious teachers, is to be attributed, in no small degree, the spread of Infidelity and Atheism throughout Christendom. [Hear, hear!] I have often witnessed the baneful consequences of Ministers inveighing against Reason—I have seen it lead designing and bad men to *hypocrisy*; I have seen it push thinking but not investigating men headlong into *infidelity*; and, Sir, I have seen it drive good but weakminded men into *atheism*, and sometimes into *madness*! then, in the name of Reason and Religion, let our Platforms tell our Pulpits, that the man who will not reason, is a Blockhead; that he who dares not reason, is a Coward; and that he who does not reason, is not a Rational being! [Hear, hear!]

Reason is the highest and noblest faculty of Man; and both Jewish and Christian scriptures teach us, that Reason *not* Conscience, is Man's prescribed guide for his conduct in life. [Proof, proof!]

Call to mind that striking appeal in the Old testament—Come now let us *reason* together, saith the Lord": and remember that "Paul, as his manner was, *reasoned* with the people, out of the scriptures". [Hear, hear!] And that Reason is superior to Conscience, a less erring guide, we have many examples in both sacred and profane History. [Proof, proof!]

Does not Paul inform us, in his admirable defense before Agrippa, that in following the dictates of Conscience, he committed heinous wrongs while persecuting the followers of Jesus, which his Reason afterwards condemned? [Hear, hear!]

I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that Mary, in burning Protestants at the stake; and that Elizabeth, in putting Romanists to death; as also some of the spiritual Advisers of those bigoted and persecuting Queens, followed the dictates of Conscience; and, like Saul of Tarsus, our English fanatics fancied they were doing God service. [Hear, hear!] Yet, Sir, we cannot think that these royal and clerical Persecutors acted rightly—No; our reason tells us, that their Conscientious deeds were morally, religiously, radically wrong; diametrically opposed to the plainest precepts of genuine Christianity, which never yet brought God's image to the rack, the stake, or the halter—never devastated countries, burned cities, or extirpated tribes and nations—never levied distresses for Easter-offerings, sold the poor man's bed for Church-rates,* or put Gospel-ministers into the Arches-court!

* On Thursday and Friday last [10 and 11 March, 1864] a crusade against Church-rate defaulters was commenced. On Thursday the goods of James Clarke were seized. In reference to this case, the Broseley Anti-Church-rate Society has issued a placard, of which the following is a *verbatim* copy—

Cruel distraint for Church-rates by the Broseley churchwardens, William Nicholas, Esq. and Humphrey Charlton, Esq. On Thursday last, a distraint was made on the goods of James Clarke, a poor laboring man, with a wife and seven children, a bed-ridden mother, 83 years of age! and an imbecile sister 43 years of age! the last two receiving parish relief. The amount of Church-rate was 1s. 3½d. for which, and costs, the above-named churchwardens have caused to be taken the following articles: *clock, oak-chest, oak-cupboard, two tables, seven chairs, tea-tray, looking-glass, smoothing-iron, and straw mattress*; thereby emptying the poor man's house, and causing some of the children to lie on the floor the following night".

The *Birmingham Daily Post* has the following remarks on this scandalous work—In the

[Tremendous applause] No ; none of these atrocious deeds, none of these persecuting propensities, can be charged upon the mild, benevolent, humane precepts and principles of uncorrupted Christianity! [Hear, hear!

P. WHITEHEAD, Esq. So far, so good, Mr. Cooper ; yet, though Reason is a safer guide than Conscience, our worthy Chairman will bear me out, that even Reason itself is not an *unerring* guide ; for,

“ How shall men reason, but from what they know ? ”

What induced Medea to kill her children ? or, Cato to kill himself ? Why did Epicurus deny a providence ? How is it, that some are Sceptics and others Enthusiasts in religion ? Whence is it, that some believe in the Perpetuity of future punishments, while others believe in Universal restoration ? What has caused the profession of Bhuddism, of Christianity, of Mahometanism, of Brahminism, of Judaism ? Nay, what has split Christianity into hundreds of different and contending Sects ? Why, Reason, to be sure ! Reason, and Reason only !* [Hear, hear !

However, as the Christian scriptures not only appeal to our intellectual faculties, but solicit the decision of our judgement, it would be heterogeneous to suppose, that Christianity demands, or in anywise countenances, either the *annihilation* or *degradation* of our Reason ; on the contrary, if we but follow its dictates—no matter how egregiously we may err in so doing—we shall assuredly stand acquitted at the bar of unerring Justice ; for, as Mr. Addison has already observed—the Judge of all the earth never will, never can consistently with the rectitude of his own nature and divine perfections, condemn anyone for *not* doing what He never gave understanding and power to do”. [Cheers.

MR. JONSON. Mr. Chairman ! England, though favored with the introduction of Christianity within the century of its introduction into the world, continued ages after ages without beholding more than the dawn of light, the break of day. Wiclif's translation of the Bible into his vernacular tongue (in the 14th century) was the morning-star of England's mental emancipation, the harbinger of intellectual day, the precursor of a national literature ; thence, the Circle of knowledge was gradually extended ; and though it has, in recent times, swelled more and more, it continues in our day expanding with a celerity beyond anything ever witnessed since the moment of its first enlargement ; and, Sir, it shall go on and on, widening

unobtrusive form of a short paragraph of district news, there was published in this journal, yesterday, a piece of intelligence which ought to make every Englishman whose Christianity is that of the Established Church, blush with *shame*. The facts of the case are so monstrous that it seems difficult to believe them to have been correctly reported ; but, on that head we are afraid there is no room whatever to doubt. It is, we are assured, unquestionably true, that on Thursday, the 10th instant, the Churchwardens of Broseley levied a *distrain* on the goods of James Clarke, a poor laboring man, for the non-payment of the sum of *one shilling and threepence halfpenny*, which the said James Clarke was called upon to contribute towards certain expences which are annually incurred by the congregation that worships in Broseley parish church ; that the articles seized in satisfaction of this claim consisted of a clock, an oak-chest, an oak-cup-board, two tables, seven chairs, a tea-tray, a looking-glass, a smoothing-iron, and a straw mat-rass ; and that Clarke has a family of seven children, who together with his wife, his bed-ridden mother, aged 83, and his idiotic sister, aged 43, constitute the household which has thus been deprived, at an inclement season of the year, of so many humble, but, to them valuable necessaries, in order that the *Church of the State* may profit to the munificent amount of *fifteenpence halfpenny*. Such being the facts, what need be said in the way of comment ? Surely nothing more than a simple narrative of the case is necessary, in order to excite from all the community (except perhaps some little clique at Broseley) an indignant cry of *SHAME !* Will any Church Defense Association have the face to defend this unexampled instance of ecclesiastical free-booting ? ”

* “ Wise men, are instructed by Reason ; men of less understanding, by Experience ; the most ignorant, by Necessity ; and beasts, by Nature. CICERO.

and increasing, untill Knowledge shall cover the face of the earth, as the waters cover the bottom of the great deep! [Cheers] Now and then, the tide of our national advancement, like the tide of the ocean, may appear to recede; but soon, as if having gathered vigor during its momentary retreat, it is seen rolling gently, majestically, and irresistibly, onward and onward and onward—but, Mr. Chairman, unlike its type, it returns *not*, nor will it ever again return within its former demarcations! [Cheers] We live, Sir, in a glorious age; an age of progress and of promise! and, though no wizzard,

I see the *dawn* of that Golden-age
Which Bards have sung with deep regret;
It stands as *past*, on History's page,
But, I perceive it is *coming* yet:
The Iron-age, I allow, is *done*,
But, the Golden-age is *yet to come*! [Cheers.]

To me, Mr. Chairman, it is evident, that Christianity *has been, is, and shall continue to be*, expounded by every age for itself. We know, from the New covenant, that it was much better understood after Christ's crucifixion, than during the days of his ministry; we also know, that it is still more clearly apprehended now, than in any former age; and, without the gift of prophecy, I venture to predict, that the humane and spiritual doctrines of Christianity, shall go on and on, diffusing more and more light, untill all darkness shall be expelled the human mind! [Cheers] Neither the sneers of audacious Scepticism, nor the ridicule of witty Atheism, nor yet the groans of a gloomy Theology, can shake my faith in the godlike powers and tendencies of Humannature. Moral and Intellectual and Religious elevation of mind, is the very soul of freedom; Christianity itself, without freedom would be a byword, and Religion only a mockery! [Hear, hear!] Everything around us, Mr. Chairman, seems converging towards mental emancipation and religious liberty. The Essayists and Reviewers throw in their firebrands among the dry stubble of parched-up theologies, and Canons and Deans and Bishops are incessantly adding fuel to the flames! [Hear, hear!] Physically and morally, politically and religiously, England is now in a transitive state. The grand characteristic of the present day, Mr. Chairman, is, as Mr. Hill has described it, "a tendency, in all its chief movements, to participation, diffusion, expansion, universality—a state diametrically opposed to that spirit of exclusiveness, restriction, narrowness, monopoly, which has characterized all former ages"—and we are now undergoing a religious change, as well as a social revolution, and a radical reform! Incredible as it may appear, even our Historians are beginning to speak out manfully, on the musty doctrine of *literal, verbal, and plenary* Inspiration—for, in No. 1 of the "History of the World; by P. Smith, B.Á." published on 1 December, 1863, I read as follows—

We accept the Bible as a Record of the highest credibility, as truly the *inspired* Word of God, without encumbering our faith with the theories of Inspiration. We test and interpret its statements by *the same rules of commonsense which we apply to other historic Records*. In relating external events, we do not expect the Historian to be *precise* about their hidden and intrinsic nature; just as we do not expect even the Astronomer, in using the language of common life, to carry back the heavenly bodies beyond the visible sky. In a word, the language of historic description is, in the vast majority of cases, *phenomenal, not absolute*. It is a true account, if it truly describes *the appearances* of things to a spectator. But, for a man to insist on understanding those appearances as absolute realities, and that according to

the narrowest *literal* sense of the words used, *is to impose fetters upon the sacred text*, beneath which no secular historian could move a single step. The attempt thus *to compel our faith* is most unwise; but, when the like method is insisted on to drive us to unbelief, we can scarcely speak of it with moderation". p. 23.

REV. W. SCOTT. A thought strikes me, Mr. Chairman, to which I beg leave to give utterance.

All Commentators and Elucidators of the Scriptures, with their tens of thousands of Readers, are necessarily **DISBELIEVERS** in the *literal, verbal, and plenary* Inspiration of the Bible; as no reader of commentaries, much less Commentators themselves, *can be ignorant* of the numerous words and sentences that have been corrected by our biblical scholars and critics: and yet, Mr. Chairman, so fearful are some religious persons of admitting that the Scriptures contain any *errors*, that, despite their own knowledge to the contrary, they stick up for the *Infallibility of the Bible!* [Hear, hear!] Nay, even Ministers of the Word, whose professed object in life is to propagate Truth and root out Error, are averse from our having a Revision of the "authorized version" of 1611, lest the exhibition of the thousands of inaccuracies "should *shake the confidence* of weak minds in the oracles of truth!" [Hear, hear!] Our own archdeacon Denison* openly avows—though there may be errors in the Prayerbook and Bible, yet, He prefers *any amount of error* to the unsettling men's minds by admitting them! [Hear, hear!] Such timidity I look upon, as superlative weakness, and pregnant with evil; indeed, to me, there is something shocking, something repulsive to moral feeling, in anyone's preferring *known error* to Truth, under any circumstances whatever.† If men are quietly reposing in Error, the sooner they are disturbed in their repose, the better for themselves, lest they slumber their lives away without coming to a knowledge of the Truth. [Cheers.]

DR. GRAINGER. We have just such another pitiable specimen of moral cowardice in our Connection, Mr. Chairman; a man of as much note and notoriety among the Wesleyans, as Denison is in the Church—no less a man than our fascinating and very effective speaker Mr. Punshon. [Hear, hear!] As I have an extract by me, which I made from his bepraised Lecture on John Bunyan, delivered in Exeter Hall, to the "Young Men's Christian Association", I beg, Mr. Chairman, to let Mr. Punshon speak for himself—

There is yet one matter on which I would fain be one among the 'cloud of witnesses', who have testified against the clamor for a New version of the Bible. 'No man having tasted the old wine, straightway desireth new, for, he saith, the old is better'. Doubtless, certain words in the authorized version might be *more felicitously* rendered; certain philological *emendations* might be made; certain passages might be made *less amenable* to criticism; but, no improved translation could set the essential doctrines of Christianity in a clearer light, nor give to the articles of our precious faith a more triumphant vindication, nor point the weeping sinner more directly to the cross of Jesus, nor give to the inquiring after truth a speedier answer, or, a safer rest. And what are the petty advantages we should gain, compared with the invaluable benefits which we should inevitably lose? 'If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?' What could compensate for

* Archdeacon Denison was Chairman of the Committee appointed by Convocation to *Examine and Report* upon "the Essays and Reviews"—How admirably fitted for the Office! What the Convocation may think and say of bishop Thirlwall's masterly *condemnation* of its treatment of Colenso's critical examination of the Pentateuch, etc. who can prognosticate! *Editor.*

† In Channing's "Remarks on the formation of Associations", he brings a heavy charge against Bible Societies, for continuing to propagate *known errors.* *Editor.*

the dismay which would be struck to the hearts of thousands, and the *incertitude* which would be instilled into the minds of thousands more—for the upheaval of old associations and memories—for the severance of that which is the closest bond of international union wherever Anglo-Saxons wander—for the abolition of any recognized standard of arbitration and appeal—and for the resolution of all religious opinion into an elemental chaos, ‘a mighty maze, and all without a plan’. Sirs, this cry for a New translation of the Bible has come from the wrong quarter. Doubtless, there are some earnest and godly students of the Divine Word who look for such an advance *in some far time to come*, but, who candidly confess, that ‘now, all is most unfit for it’.

Probably, Mr. Chairman, the Meeting has had enough of this bombastic rigmarole, this misappropriation of texts of scripture, this illogical, narrow-minded, deplorable fanaticism—alike discreditable to the Teacher, the Christian, and the Man—at all events, I have not patience to read any more of Mr. Punshon’s unprofitable and mischievous communications to “Christian Young Men”! [Hear, hear, hear!]

PARNELL Blessed be God, England is not yet quite given over to Scepticism, Infidelity, Atheism, and the Devil! the Lord still has his witnesses among us! But, Sir, were it not for such men as Dr. Pusey, the judgements of the Almighty would speedily overtake us! [Hear, hear!] Dr. Pusey and his Supporters, are the very Salt of the earth; the preservation, the salvation, of this rapidly-deteriorating country! [Hear, hear!] Thank heaven, He and upwards of 8000 of his friends, have entered their Protest against “the Soul-destroying judgement” of the Privy Council; and if England be saved, she will be saved by the skin of her teeth; for, wickedness is rampant in high places, and the rulers are confederated together against the Most High! [Hear, hear!] They establish iniquity by a Law, and mock God to his face! [Hear, hear!] But, Sir, these are the words of our champion, Dr. Pusey—

Take away *Hell and the Inspiration of the Bible*, and you take away all the safeguards of Morality”!

BUTLER. As the gentleman seems to have exhausted himself, allow me, Mr. Chairman, while he is recovering his powers of oratory, to read an extract or two from the eminent ecclesiastical lawyers Stephens and Trail—

If a body of the Clergy combine together to impeach a Judgement given by the Queen in an ecclesiastical cause, and publish a Declaration, substantially stating that they do not *submit* to such Judgement, they are, constructively, seeking to relieve themselves from submission to the Royal supremacy”!

They then compare the recent Judgement with Dr. Pusey’s presumptuous and ill-advised Declaration, and add—

From the view of the case thus presented, it is evident that the Declarants *impeach* the Judgement of the Judicial Committee, by affirming the converse of the propositions established by the Judgement: and *that fact*, taken in connection with the language and tenor of the Declaration and its Title, is open to no other reasonable construction than that of AN INTENTION on the part of the Declarants NOT TO SUBMIT to the Judgement pronounced by the Queen.

If, as the Declarants state, ‘the United church of England, and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic church, maintains, *without reserve or qualification*, the Inspiration and Divine authority of THE WHOLE Canonical scriptures, as not only *containing* but *BEING* the Word of God’—their Declaration will not make such open and unqualified maintenance of that doctrine the more manifest; and, consequently, it is difficult to assign a legitimate justification for the Publication of a document that is *uncalled-for* as an expression of an Opinion, and tends to *IMPEACH* the Queen’s supremacy”.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, if Dr. Pusey and his infatuated adherents, are not

prosecuted for their consummate impudence and priestly arrogance, we shall have to attribute their escape, either to contempt for their ignorance, or, the desire of manifesting the amiableness of mercy. [Cheers] Where little is given, but little should be required! [Deafening applause.]

MR. HEMINGE, *Student*. Mr. Chairman, here is an English Bible on the table, published by Longman & Co. in 1841, WITH 20,000 EMENDATIONS—Denison and Punshon must surely know of its existence; if not, perhaps, some of their friends now present, may kindly inform them of it.

LOVELACE. Buy a couple, and send one to Each, as a present.

SANDYS. Well done, Lovelace! that is the best thing you have said to-day—so don't spoil it by opening your lips again!

REV. MR. GOWER. It must be confessed, Mr. Chairman, that many of my fellow-clergy, have, unhappily and unwisely, set their faces against a REVISION OF OUR BIBLE, notwithstanding they must be privy to the multitude of inaccuracies with which it is crowded, from Genesis to Revelation. [Hear, hear!] Like Denison and Punshon, they seem to entertain childish fears, lest the erasure of Errors should militate against the reception of Truths; not giving the Laity credit for possessing as much penetration, discrimination, and devotion, as themselves—as if wisdom dwelt with them alone! [Hear, hear!] They ought to remember, how common it is for the enemies of Revelation to triumph in objections plausibly raised against the Scriptures, upon the basis of *unsound* texts and *wrong* translations; and, instead of thwarting attempts to free the Scriptures of the thousands of known and acknowledged blemishes, they ought, zealously and religiously, to exert all their influence to render them a less obscure lamp unto our feet and a more brilliant light unto our path. [Applause.]

On 21 July, 1836, Mr. Brotherton presented to the House of Commons, a Petition from Mr. John Bellamy, of Well Street, Gray's Inn Road, representing that the Petitioner having seen the direful effects of certain Deistical writings, and having directed his attention for a series of years to the Hebrew language, he, with the approbation of some learned Bishops and eminent Divines, undertook to translate the Scriptures from the original Hebrew—the present authorized Version *not* having been translated from the Hebrew, but from Translations—that is, we English have been duped for 250 years by our so-called *Religious Instructors*, who have palmed upon us a mere *translation* of a Translation, and which we are compelled to read, by Act of Parliament! The Petitioner had been constantly engaged in the work for upwards of 48 years, and the result of his labor was, that he had translated the whole of the Old testament, from Genesis to Malachi.

“The translation would prove, that the objections of the Deist only applied to the *mistranslations* in the authorized Version and the *wrong interpretations* of men, and *not* to the Bible in the original language”.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it is just such a Translation as this, we need in 1864, that Unbelievers may be deprived of our *mistranslations* which lead them into Error. The petition also contained a number of passages of Scripture, in which Mr. Bellamy's translations were contrasted to our authorized Version: and, what is particularly worthy of notice—

“According to this new Translation, the laws of Scripture and the laws of Nature were in harmony. The *word* of God, rightly understood, never contradicted the *works* of God; that God is *not* inconsistent, sanctioning at one time what He forbids at another; that polygamy, incest, adultery, murder, and robbery, are *not* sanctioned in the Original, *in any age*; that the characters of Abraham, Lot, Moses, Joshua, and other servants of God, may be completely vindicated from the imputations which have been cast upon them! *The Times*. 22 July, 1836.

If such be the excellences of Mr. Bellamy's translations, it is a burning shame that the People of England should still be deprived of them; and if our professedly *religious teachers* stand *between us* and God's truths—may God, in his goodness, sweep them out of our way! [Applause.]

DEAN JOHNSTON. Mr. Chairman! Were it necessary, I might appeal to you for the truth of what I am about to say—It is well known to biblical scholars, that Dr. Mill long since enumerated more than 30,000 variations in the MSS. and Versions of the New testament alone—that, according to Professor Max Müller, one *fifteenth* of the words employed in the version of 1611, had no longer *the same meaning* in 1861 which they had 250 years previously—how then, Mr. Chairman, can mere English readers get at the Truths contained in the Bible, through a version so faulty and unintelligible? No one pretends that it was *improper* in our predecessors to revise the Bible in the reign of James I.—then, wherein consists the alledged *impropriety* of its being revised in the reign of a much more Christian-like monarch in our day? What are the veritable Scriptures? Are they not penned in Hebrew and Greek? And will anyone pretend, that by *amending* the English translation, the excellences contained in the Originals will be impaired? Can the Truths suffer damage, by the removal of Errors? or, is anyone so infatuated as to suppose, that our confessedly faulty Translation is preferable to a Translation less faulty? Had our Legislators but a tithe of that *wisdom* for which they are proverbially credited, and but a fraction of that *christianity* which they occasionally profess in Parliament, we should soon have a translation or revision (“appointed to be read in churches”) conveying to the understandings of the masses of the people, the *true meaning* of the Original scriptures! [Cheers] And, in my opinion, it is *the duty* of the People of England, not merely to petition and pray, but, to demand and compel their upper Servants to furnish them with a REVISOR OF THE BIBLE, suited to the advanced intelligence and investigating spirit of the times we live in. [Hearty applause.]

A. POPE, Esq. It is a treat, Mr. Chairman, to hear our Clergy thus giving free scope to their sentiments, while so many of their fellows have not the moral courage to call their Souls their own—“for fear of the Jews”. [Hear, hear!] It would not be a difficult matter, Mr. Chairman, to quote from printed works, 100 testimonies of our Clergy and men of erudition, in favor of a *New translation*—or, what might be preferable, a *Revision* of our Bible—but, it is not so easy to get 100 such living testimonies as we have this day heard with our own ears, bearing witness against the apathy and dilatoriness and timidity of “men in high places”. [Hear, hear!]

Dr. Kennicott, the celebrated biblical scholar and critic, assures us, in his “Remarks”, 1787—

Great improvements might now be made, because the Hebrew and Greek languages have been much cultivated, and are far better understood, since the year 1600”. [Hear, hear!]

J. S. KNOWLES, Esq. I read here, Mr. Chairman, in Dr. Lowth’s Translation of Isaiah—*Prel. Diss.*

Whenever it shall be thought proper, to set forth the Holy Scriptures for the public use of the Church, to better advantage than as they appear in the present English translation—the expediency of which grows every day more and more evident—a *revision* or *correction* of that translation may, perhaps, be more advisable than to attempt an *intirely new one*. For, as to the style and language, it admits of but little improvement; but, in respect of *the sense* and *the accuracy* of Interpretation, the improvements of which it is capable are GREAT and NUMBERLESS”. [Hear, hear, hear!]

SANDYS. Call Denison and Punshon into Court!

F. BEAUMONT, Esq. When writing of our “authorized version”, Dr. Mac-knight observes—

It is by no means such a just representation of the inspired Original, as merits to be implicitly relied on". [Hear, hear!

MR. DEKKER, *Student*. Among other telling remarks of our accredited Teacher, bishop Marsh, he exclaims—

We cannot possibly pretend, that our authorized version does *not* require amendment"! [Hear, hear!

SIR G. ELLIOT. One of my favorite authors, Dr. Pye Smith, treating on our English translation, takes it for granted—

No person will contend, that it is incapable of *important* amendment". [Hear, hear!

P. MASSINGER, ESQ. In his "Observations on the expediency of revising the present Version", Professor Symonds writes thus—

Whoever examines our Version in present use, will find that it is *ambiguous* and *incorrect*, even in matters of *the highest importance*". [Hear, hear!

And Blackwell, in his Preface to *Sacred Classics*, observes—

Innumerable instances might be given of *faulty translations* of the divine Original. An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavilers". [Hear, hear, hear!

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, our Ecclesiastics do not see that Christianity is a religion of Progress; that there is such a thing as a *principle of progressive revelation*; yet, Dean Milman has not overlooked it, for, he writes—

The progressive development of Christianity, seems the inevitable consequence of man's progress in knowledge and in the more general dissemination of that knowledge. Human thought is almost *compelled* to assert, and cannot help asserting *its own Freedom*. And as that progress is manifestly a *law* of human nature, proceeding from the Divine Author of our being, this self-adaptation of the one true religion to that progress, must have the Divine sanction, and may be supposed, without presumption, to have been contemplated in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom".

Chairman. Gentlemen! As it is so perfectly familiar with all who have ever turned their attention to the subject, that biblical scholars and critics, of various denominations, have long been insisting on the expediency and necessity of our having either a *New translation*, or a *Revision* of our "authorized version", I beg that the Meeting may be relieved from the production of further testimonies. [Applause] I have not, however, any expectation that our Bench of Bishops, or that our Legislators, will, *unsolicited*, grant the Nation so great a national blessing as a REVISED ENGLISH BIBLE—I expect no such boon for the People, at their hands! [Hear, hear, hear!

HOME. You remind me, Mr. Chairman, of what a god-fearing Clergyman wrote at the close of the last century—

The prejudices of some, the interests of others, the supineness of not a few, and the fears of disturbing the long-established order of things in most, form an insuperable barrier against every Reform; insomuch that nothing, it is to be feared, can accomplish any considerable change for the better, but a CONVULSION. If, indeed, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the whole Bench of Bishops, had *discernment*, and *humility*, and *public spirit*, and *self-denial* enough, to come forward of their own accord, and *with one consent* desire an ameliorated state of things, there might be some hope. But, that Six-and-twenty interested men should be brought to concur in a business of this sort, seems next to an impossibility. The sacrifice is too great! Humannature is too frail to make it! [Hear, hear!] SIMPSON'S *Plea for Religion and the Sacred Writings*.

JOHN OLDHAM. Mr. Chairman! Ladies and Gentlemen! I belong to a Class, which, of late years, has been allowed to have a voice in Public Meetings; and that I may not be censured for abusing the privilege awarded us, I shall be brief in the expression of my opinion on a subject in which the Working-classes are so deeply interested. [Cordially greeted on all sides.

As I am not capable of reading the Scriptures in the original languages, I have—speaking as the Representative of the most useful Class in the kingdom—[Cheers] I have, Mr. Chairman, a moral claim on those Scholars who live at the Public expense, to provide me with such an English translation as shall convey to my mind *the spirit* of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. [Hear, hear!] I hear, on all hands, that our “authorized version” is teeming with inaccuracies and swarming with errors, to the tune of considerably over 100,000 in number—and as I have no grounds to question the truth of this crying reproach against those who drain millions yearly from the hard earnings of the Working-classes, [Hear, hear!] I demand, in the name and on behalf of the People of England, a faithful and intelligible Copy of those ancient and invaluable Writings, containing the Record of God’s dealings with mankind during an unknown period of time! [Loud and long applause.

When, Mr. Chairman, when I go to Church or Chapel, the Parson or Preacher reads his text; and, not unfrequently, opens his discourse by telling me, that some word, or words, in his text, must *not* be accepted in the usual English meaning, but, in a meaning I can make neither head nor tail of—at any rate, I am told the word does *not* mean *what it means*, but something else. Now, Mr. Chairman, though we wear fustian jackets and corduroy unmentionables, we have neither wooden heads nor stoney hearts; and, thanks to Brougham, Chambers, and Knight, we have been raised from ignorance and crime to constitute a moral and influential and legitimate portion of the State. [Hearty cheers] I am told (though I can’t believe half of what I hear) that some *one* Hebrew or Greek word, requires to be translated into English by *half-a-dozen* different words, according to the context; therefore, what we Working-men require, is simply to have the right word put in the right place: we ask of our well-paid Bishops, and Clergymen generally, to call a spade *a spade*, a lie *a lie*; to call good *good*, and evil *evil*; that we may know what is meant by what stands printed before our eyes: do not tell us, that the word *saviour* has THREE different, and the word *parable* has TEN different, and the word *father* has TWENTY different and distinct meanings—but, in every case, give us, the *unlettered* but *paying* Class of the community, give us that particular English word which conveys to an Englishman’s mind, the meaning of the word in the Original language.* [Vociferous applause.

REV. M. PRIOR. Mr. Chairman! the last Speaker has “hit the nail on the head”; for, if the English *words* do not convey to an unlettered Englishman’s apprehension *the meaning* of the original text, then, his Bible is not a faithful representation of the Scriptures, and he reads “words, words, words”, without the possibility of imbibing the spirit of Holy Writ. [Hear, hear!] For, as bishop Hare writes—

It is not *the words* of Scripture, but, *the sense*, which is the rule; and so far as

* During the Discussion on the desirableness of a Revision of the Bible, it struck me as “passing strange”, that not a single Speaker ever mentioned the contemplated “Authorized Commentary on the Bible”, suggested by the Speaker of the House of Commons, at whose instance the Archbishop of York undertook to organize a plan for carrying it out. *Reporter*.

that is not understood, so far the Scriptures are not our rule, whatever we pretend, but, *the sense that men have put on them*—men fallible as ourselves, and who were by no means so well furnished as *the learned at present are*, with the proper helps to find out *the true meaning* of Scripture.

If, then, we are concerned for the Study of the Scriptures farther than in words; if we in earnest think them the only rule of faith, *let us act as if we thought so*. Let us heartily encourage a free and impartial study of them; let us lay aside that malignant, arbitrary, persecuting, popish spirit; [Hear, hear!] let us put no fetters on men's understandings, nor any other bounds to their inquiries, but what God and Truth have set. Let us, if we would not give up *the Protestant principle*, that the Scriptures are plain and clear in the necessary articles, declare nothing to be necessary but what is *clearly revealed* in them". [Hear, hear!]

It behooves us of the Established church to agitate the question of a *Revision of the Bible*, until the Working-classes possess a Bible they can readily understand in whatever pertains to their conduct in life. [Hear, hear!] The English language has undergone considerable mutation since 1600, and Biblical scholars have considerably advanced in critical knowledge since that comparatively remote period; therefore, it is our Duty to the nation at large, to furnish, or cause to be furnished, a *Revision* suited to the exigences of the age we live in.* [Applause. Calls for Mr. Skelton. REV. MR. SKELTON. This volume, Mr. Chairman, has repeatedly been called *the Book of Books*; and in my appreciation, Sir, it is the Book of Books, however slighted by the thoughtless, however ridiculed by scorners, however contemned by the unbelieving! yet, Sir, with all due reverence, I hesitate not to affirm, that, like all other books, it partakes of human error! [Hear, hear!]

Dr. Miller, Canon of Worcester, in his "Bible Inspiration Vindicated", stoutly affirms that *the Bible is the Revelation of God*; but, the Rev. S. Bache, in his Examination of the Canon's Essay, affirms *it is not*—though he admits that the Revelation may be found *in the Bible* by those who will Search the Scriptures; and this he emphatically repeats in the following words—

* We need no other evidence of the imperfection and inexactness of our Bible, than the numerous translations and corrections it has undergone; each Translator taking upon himself the onerous task of *altering and improving* the so-called *Infallible Word of God*. From the earliest ages of the primitive church, translation has succeeded translation down to the present day. We learn from writers cotemporary with Adelm, that there was then extant a partial translation of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue; and Adelm, who was the first Bishop of Sherborne, translated the Psalter into the Saxon tongue, about 706. The whole Bible was rendered into Anglo-Saxon by order of King Alfred, who is reported to have undertaken a version of the Psalms himself, but died before his task was accomplished. Wicklif made a complete translation of the whole Bible (including, of course, the Apocryphal books) from the Latin, which appeared between 1360 and 1380. In 1535 Cranmer prevailed upon Henry the first "Defender of the Faith", to order another translation, which Cranmer himself undertook (commencing with the New testament) called *Cranmer's Bible*. But, even that great effort to render the Scriptures perfect, was a failure; and other *improved* translations followed in succession. The so-called *Bishops' Bible* was published in 1583, when it was expected that a really *infallible* translation had been effected, as 8 of the 15 learned translators were Bishops; yet, despite the pains that had been bestowed upon it, it was not considered infallible, and was soon superseded; for, the Puritans complained to James, shortly after his accession, of the numerous errors contained in the *Bishops' Bible*; errors too glaring to be longer tolerated. A conference was then convened, which took place at Hampton Court, in 1603, on the application of Dr. Reynolds, the spokesman of the Puritan party, for the purpose of effecting a New translation, free from *all* the errors and defects which had damaged *all* preceding versions. Fifty-four "learned and eminent men" were then appointed to render the Scriptures truly infallible; yet, even that translation, our present "authorized version appointed to be read in Churches", contains thousands upon thousands of inaccuracies, awaiting Correction! Hence, the absurdity of talking about an *Infallible Bible* is patent to all who think for themselves. *Reporter*.

Of the so-called 64 "learned and eminent men", 47 only took an active part; and Bellamy maintains (in Preface to New translation) that out of the whole 47 translators, *not One of them was a critical Hebrew scholar*; and that they, in fact, translated chiefly from the Septuagint. *Editor*.

The Bible is, as I have shown you, *the Record* of divine Revelation—not *the divine Revelation itself*”.

A judicious, philosophical, and scriptural distinction, apprehensible and admissible by every unprejudiced mind; yet, stoutly contradicted by the contracted Oxonians—Pusey and his creed-bound associates. [Hear, hear!

Though I should have remained silent, had I not been called upon by Name, I scruple not to declare on every fitting occasion, my conviction of the crying evil so prevalent among my fellow-clergymen, of holding up the Bible as an *Infallible Book*—[Hear, hear!] God’s Words are, indubitably, *infallible*; but, Man’s Records of them necessarily partake of *the fallibility of man’s nature*; and our insisting on the *literal, verbal, plenary* Inspiration of all that is printed in the Bible, is fraught with evils of immense magnitude. [Hear, hear!

I am looked upon, by several of my Collegiates, as *a man of doubts*; and some actually call me *the Doubter*: and really, Mr. Chairman, I meet with so many things in my Bible that are surrounded with difficulties, and imbedded in uncertainties, that I am often unable to decide at a first reading, upon their import and bearings—therefore, I am constrained to *doubt*! [Hear, hear!

MR. TALFOURD. Sir David Brewster maintains—

There can be no firm convictions, where there have been no perplexities and doubts; and that faith which comes in the train of early scepticism, will finally rest upon an immovable foundation. Credulity, on the contrary, is *the disease* of feeble intellect and ill-regulated minds. Believing everything, and investigating nothing, the mind accumulates errors, till its overgrown faith overmasters its untutored reason”.

SKELTON. Thanks, Mr. Talfourd. I cannot tell what magic light my cleverer Collegiates cast upon many of the passages which are inscrutable to my obtuser apprehension, to keep their minds free of *doubt*; but, when I meet with propositions and doctrines, which seem to be both supported and opposed, by various degrees of evidence, *I pause to examine*; and until I have arrived at something like certainty in my decision, my mind hangs equipoizing between different conclusions. [Hear, hear!] In all such cases, it appears to me, that hasty conclusions would be injudicious and irrational; and either believing or disbelieving without examination, would be a proof of my understanding being improperly affected. I state this, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of my juniors, on whom I would impress this doctrine, strange as it may sound—*Doubt* is often the fittest state in which the mind of man can be!* [Hear, hear!

It must be known to several present, that Coleridge has been severely censured by some of our Church dignitaries, on account of his published opinions regarding doctrinal points—*Inspiration* among the number; and the following paragraph has given umbrage to many—

He never truly *believed*, who was not made first sensible and convinced of *unbelief*. Never be afraid *to doubt*, if only you have the disposition *to believe*—and doubt in order that you may end in believing the Truth. For, he who begins by loving Christianity better than the Truth, will proceed by loving his own Sect better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all”† [Hear, hear!

* It was Mede’s custom to have his Scholars at his chambers in the evenings; and his first question on entering, usually was—*Quid dubitas?*” or, “What doubts have you met with in your Studies today?” for, the Professor looked upon *doubting nothing and understanding nothing*, to be about the same thing. *Editor*.

† “There lives more faith in *honest doubt*,
Believe me, than in half the Creeds. ТЕННТОН.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, some of the heads and ornaments of our Church, not only think highly of Coleridge as a biblical critic, but strongly recommend his teachings to the study and adoption of others. No less a man than that credit to our church, Dr. Arnold, wrote to Mr. Justice Coleridge, in 1835—

Have you seen your Uncle's letters on *Inspiration*? They are well fitted to break ground in the *approaches* to that momentous question, which involves in it *so great a shock to existing notions*—the greatest, probably, that has ever been since the discovery of the *falsehood* of the doctrine of the *Pope's infallibility*. Yet, it *MUST COME*; and will end, in spite of the fears and clamors of the weak and bigoted, in the *higher exalting*, and *more sure establishing*, of christian Truth". [A simultaneous burst of applause throughout the Meeting.

REV. T. BLACKLOCK. Dr. Watson, late Bishop of Llandaff, tells us,

Many doctrines have been *imposed* on the Christian world, as doctrines of the Gospel, which have *no foundation whatever in Scripture*. Instead of defending these doctrines, it is *the duty* of a real disciple of Jesus Christ, to reprobate them, as *gangrenous excrescences*, corrupting the fair form of genuine Christianity". [Hear, hear!

MR. DODSLEY, *Student*. And, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Marsh writes, in the same work which serves our Bishops as a *text-book* to Candidates for Holy Orders—

If in the progress of Inquiry, excrescences should be discovered, which violate the symmetry of the original fabric—which betray a *mixture* of the Human with the Divine—of *interpolations* which the authority or artifice of Man has engrafted on the oracles of God, it is *the duty* of sacred criticism to detect the *spurious* and REMOVE IT from the *genuine*". [Hear, hear!

REV. C. SACKVILLE. Mr. Chairman! Such quotations as we have just heard, as also many others during 'the Discussion, from distinguished members and teachers of our own Church, ought, at least, to convince this respectable auditory, that *not all* the Clergy of the Church of England are to be ranked among bigots, sycophants, and hypocrites; that we both have had, and still have, men among us, as much entitled to be called CHAMPIONS OF TRUTH, as *Champions of the Church*! Men who are neither afraid nor ashamed to declare their belief in the Truths recorded in the Bible, though they deny its *literal, verbal, plenary* Inspiration, and admit of its containing thousands of inaccuracies, blemishes, and errors! [Hear, hear!

Dr. Hampden, the present Bishop of Hereford, when he confederated with his Right Reverend Fellow-sinners, to prosecute the Essayists, had forgotten what He himself had previously written and published—

Before we admit any proposed Revelation, we must *explore its nature* from an actual survey of it in all its parts. We must analyze it into the materials of which it consists, and thus, either detect the *base infusions of human fraud*, if there be any latent within it, or, trace out, as far as we may be able, the indications of a design and workmanship beyond the scale and perfection of Man; and which may, without derogation from the divine attributes, be ascribed to the Father of Light and Author of all Goodness. Now, there are two ways in which a judgement may be formed respecting the character of any Revelation. Either we may judge of it by itself, referring those views of the Divine Being which it unfolds to us, to the principles of our *moral* nature, which is *the direct test* of its worthiness to be received; or, we may judge of it *indirectly* by comparisons with *that previous Revelation of God* which we possess in the *natural world*".

Well may the Essayists, Colenso, and other persecuted individuals, turn round upon this mitred delinquent, this Bishop of Hereford, and exclaim—*Physician, heal thyself!* [Cheers.

MR. ROCHESTER. Dean Alford maintains, that in matters relating to phenomena in natural history, etc.—

The Evangelists and Apostles were *not* supernaturally informed, but left, in common with others, to the guidance of their natural faculties. The same may be said of citations and dates from history. In the last apology of Stephen, we have at least *two demonstrable historical mistakes**. [Hear, hear!

MR. THURLOE, *Student*. Dr. Wild, Vicar of Dodderhill, in his manly and christian "Brief Defense of the Essays and Reviews", exclaims—

How anyone, who has ever read the Notes of any ordinary Greek testament, could take offense at the statement, that occasional 'interpolations and forgeries' may occur in the Scriptures, is indeed surprising! I suppose that now, there is not a Scholar in Europe who does *not* allow 1 John v. 7, to be *both* the one and the other. Even Blomfield, whom most would consider a sufficiently cautious guide, allows it to be *spurious*. But, we may briefly ask on this matter, *To what end* are all the labors of Theologians in the discovery and collection of MSS. excepting for this very purpose of detecting *interpolations and forgeries*?" [Hear, hear, hear!

Though an Aspirant to Holy Orders, I would say, with all becoming modesty, I reprobate every species of *persecution*, and condemn every Persecuter, whoever he may be, as a contravener of the forbearing, conciliating, forgiving principles of the Gospel of Jesus. [Hear, hear!] All Clergymen are not poreblind, Mr. Chairman; many among them can clearly discern the difference between "a Hawk and a Handsaw"; can see a Jowett, a Williams, a Colenso, and an ordained Iconoclast, in many a Church of England Dignitary; for, as the *Athenæum* has declared—

There is not a point on which Dr. Colenso is blamed, but what is held by some Clergyman of *high position*. There is a Colenso ready-made to hand in Stanley,† Milman, Alford, Browne, and others".

But, Mr. Chairman, I forego enlargement; time is precious. [Cheers.]
SACKVILLE. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that by the Laws of the Land, every BAPTIZED individual is an acknowledged *Christian*, and is entitled, by

* Canon Wordsworth, in his recent discreditable outpouring of uncharitableness, writes—

Dr. Stanley apologises for the Old testament, and tells us that we ought to extend the same charitable indulgence to it, as 'to other histories, especially Oriental histories'; and that 'the very errors and defects' of the Bible, 'are guides to the true appreciation of its meaning'. In the same place he [Stanley] suggests, that there are errors 'in St. Stephen's speech in the Acts' (ch. 7) a statement which I challenge him to prove".

Poor Wordsworth, what a pigmy of intellectuality, when contrasted to the gigantic-minded Stanley! *Editor*.

† "The appointment of Dr. Stanley to the Deanery of Westminster, is one of those things, which, if they happen *only once* in the life of a Church, happen once too often for its well-being and repute. There is a school in England, of which, in one degree or another, Dr. Temple, Mr. Jowett, Dr. Stanley, bishop Colenso, are the principal exponents; and which, in France and Germany, culminate, with some varieties of aspect, in Rénan and in Strauss: Dr. Stanley is more than half-way to bishop Colenso; bishop Colenso is four-fifths of the way to Strauss and Rénan. *Church and State Review. Reporter*.

The Record goes beyond the preceding quotation, in its onslaught against Professor Owen's *heterodoxy*, contained in his Lecture to "the Young Men's Christian Association", in Exeter Hall; for, *The Record*, piously indignant at the promulgation of knowledge and scientific truth, most piously exclaims—

It would almost seem as if our atmosphere had become impregnated and poisoned with the Smoke issuing from THE BOTTOMLESS PIT, that many by whom it is inhaled, who would spurn at the thought of disseminating Scepticism and Infidelity, have lost the power of discerning its actual presence or malignant influence".

On the question, as to the propriety of publishing Professor Owen's instructive Lecture ("On the Power of God in his Animal creation") in the annual volume of Lectures to the "Young Men's Christian Association", the righteous (over-righteous) *Record* most devoutly declares—

We should as soon think of inserting in it, one of the *Essays and Reviews*, or, a Chapter from Dr. Colenso's attack on Moses and the Pentateuch!"

The British Standard, another of our mild, gentle, and conciliating Ornaments to the *Religious Press* (so-called) undertook, on 25 Dec. 1863, to establish—that the Lecture of Professor

Law, to all the ordinances of the Church of England, untill EXCOMMUNICATED—a process long obsolete—such is the Law: yet, on the first of June last, the Archbishop of Canterbury declared in his place in Parliament, that He himself would *brave any penalties* of the Law, rather than Read the appointed Burial Service over anyone who had died in cherished Sin! [Hear, hear!] which startling Declaration seemed to shock the Lord Chancellor, watchful and jealous for the honor of the Law. That most injudicious avowal by the Most Reverend Prelate, has been deliberately seconded by the usually wary Bishop of Oxford! but, Mr. Chairman, had I been so indiscreet as recklessly to *dare the rigor of the Law*, our Clerical Jackall would speedily have popped me into the Arches Court—and so it has ever been:

“That in the Captain’s but a *choleric word*,
Which in the Soldier is *flat blasphemy*”. [Applause.]

No matter how obnoxious a Statute may be, so long as it remains Law, so long are Doctors Longley and Wilberforce bound, in duty and by oath, to observe and keep it; as a Bishop has no more power, or moral right, to subvert an established Law, than a parish Clerk, or a Sexton. [Applause] If a Law be unjust, or, impolitic, *remove* it, by all means; but, DO NOT BREAK IT: exhibit its incongruousness, or, evil, and get it *repealed*; but, DO NOT SET IT AT DEFIANCE. What may not Wilson and Williams and Colenso, think and say and write, on such public avowals of INSUBORDINATION TO THE CHURCH? They have suffered vexatious persecutions and prosecutions, and have endured them like men and christians; [Cheers]

Owen is a covert thrust at Revelation”—and most manfully does the indomitable Doctor wield his Sledge-hammer! Yet, neither his Hammer nor his Anvil are hard enough to pound Truth into nonentity; nor can his learning nullify the Professor’s knowledge. However, as I have a sneaking kindness for the good and well-meaning positive old Doctor, I shall not insert anything here to disquiet him, but, spare him, in consideration of his well-intentioned advocacy of what to him appears Truth.

The following is a specimen of *The Record’s* penetration, judgement, and amiability—

If Professor Owen has not virtually scoffed at the Mosaic narrative of the Fall of Man; if he has not, by the most puerile sophistry, tried to discredit the story of the Serpent; if he has not done his best to sap the confidence of his youthful audience in all Authority, and especially in the *preachers and teachers* of the Gospel; if he has not positively sneered at all systematic theology, and called on the Young to ‘*amancipate themselves*’ from the lessons of their boyhood, and to put away the blinding ‘film’ of the pious instructions ‘screwed’, as he contemptuously says, ‘upon their mind’s eye by their early teachers’; then, we may admire the devoutness of *the sentimental tone* in which he repels ‘the hard names flung by a brother Christian’; but, such honeyed words, unaccompanied by any denial, explanation, or withdrawal of the Charges of *The British Standard*, seem to us only to add insult to injury”.

Though a long Note, I feel constrained to make it longer; that I may adduce the deliberate opinion of England’s greatest living Benefactor, on what is called *the Religious Press*; of which the *Church and State Review*, the *Record*, and the *British Standard*, constitute (as they think) the most important adjuncts.

Lord Brougham, in his Address, delivered at the Meeting of the *National Association for the promotion of Social Science*, at Liverpool, on 12 October, 1858, when treating on Popular Literature, expressed himself as follows—

It would be wrong if we did not advert to the great Improvement in one material particular of the Newspaper press in our time. The Papers which made a *traffic of slander*, have ceased from among us. For a while, they acted *like a drain* to carry off the impurities which had been diffused over other Journals; the good sense both of the public and of literary men, *has now filled up a sewer no longer wanted*; and, to all appearance, that portion of the Press no longer exists. But, it is truly grievous to think, that for some portions of the Press—though not those now under consideration [not the *Popular* portion] certain religious Newspapers—we should, perhaps, rather say, *Papers calling themselves RELIGIOUS*—there is still a want of the Drain; because, impurities there abound, extremely offensive! We there find, *through the virulence of a factious spirit*, outrages upon Decorum and Truth—to say nothing of Christian charity—which have made pious men refuse to read them; declaring they had much rather see such things served up *in the naked simplicity of common slander*, than smothered in *Religious thoughts!*”

Of these abominations I need not give any examples. *Editor.*

and, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, for considerably less provocation than what the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Oxford have given, in their declarations of readiness to act *Contrary to the Prayerbook* and IN DEFIANCE OF THE LAW. [Repeated applause.]

The Express, of June 2, has the following paragraph—

We are not about to incur the risk of presumptuousness, by urging any particular recommendation on a subject the difficulties of which have been acknowledged by so many grave Divines; we simply express what we are sure is the universal sentiment, in saying, that the Burial Service must be *substantially preserved* in all its marvellous comfort and tenderness. We cannot commit our Dead to the earth *without hope!* It is impossible; it is not necessary. We say, with the Archbishop of York, better no Service than a service from which *words of hope* are excluded! But, we submit that the difficulty which now weighs upon the Clergy might be removed, without weakening the Service as an instrument of Consolation". [Hear, hear!]

In *Public Opinion*, June 6, the subject is mentioned as follows—

In the House of Lords, on Monday night, Lord Ebury moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission, to inquire what steps could be taken to obviate the evils arising out of the *indiscriminate* use of the Burial Service over all classes of people—even notorious infidels and profligate livers. The Archbishop of Canterbury objected to the question being mooted at the present moment, but, added, *That rather than consent to read the Burial Service over a man who had died in the open profession of Infidelity, there was no penalty the Law could enforce, He would not submit to!*

The Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and others, advised that the Motion should be withdrawn, as it was likely to engage the attention of Convocation; and Lord Ebury withdrew the Motion accordingly".

I think, Mr. Chairman, when Law-makers publicly announce that they are prepared to become Law-breakers, the obnoxious Laws themselves should be annulled without one day's unnecessary delay. [Cheers.]

J. DRYDEN, Esq. I shall not presume to occupy the time of the Meeting, by any observations of my own; but, having collected a variety of Pamphlets, Letters, Speeches, etc. both for and against Dr. Colenso's views, I solicit the attention of the Meeting to a single extract only, from an able Letter to Colenso, by a gentleman well known in the literary and scientific world, the Rector of Preston, dated Salop, 20 May, 1863; wherein the courageous Houghton shows, that Dr. M'Caul's charge against Colenso's so-called "*heretical*" opinion—an opinion said to "rob Christ of his Deity, by denying his Omniscience"—is an opinion, however *heretical*, that is fully borne out by three of the highest of all authorities:

- I. That it is expressly taught by our Lord himself;
- II. That it has the sanction of very many eminent Biblical writers, both ancient and modern;
- III. That it is implied in the language of the Formularies of our Church":

and, after Mr. Houghton has *proved* these three points, He closes his letter in the following words—

Thus, my Lord, you have been judged a *Heretic* for promulgating a doctrine, which is expressly taught by our Lord himself and by the Evangelist St. Luke, which is implied in the Formularies of the Church of England, and is sanctioned by many of the most learned and devout writers, both ancient and modern. It is a pity that those, who have so severely condemned you for publishing this and suchlike 'puerilities which an intelligent Youth can answer', have not taken more trouble to inquire whether 'these things are so,' or not.

And now, my Lord, with respect to the general character of your recent publications on the Pentateuch [Parts I. and II. only] I feel it *my positive duty*, at whatever

cost, to say a few plain and honest words. I have diligently, conscientiously, and prayerfully, studied the whole question at issue, for the last six months, and am compelled to admit *the general truth of your arguments*, though differing in some particulars. You are aware that I published a pamphlet in Reply to your Part I. I HAVE WITHDRAWN THAT REPLY FROM CIRCULATION. Before the appearance of your book, however, I was quite certain that the *Bible* and *Science* were opposed to each other. Four years examination of almost every word in the Bible relating to its Natural history has convinced me, that, in many essential points, the Biblical and Natural records, are, to use the words of the learned and candid Kalisch, 'utterly and irreconcilably at variance'. The more I examine the whole question for myself, the more certain I become, that, in the Bible, 'legend is mixed up with history, poetic imaginings with prosaic narrative, that no miraculous power has been exerted to preserve it from omissions, interpolations, and corruptions of the text', and that the Bible 'is, therefore, *not infallible*, in the sense in which the popular creed assumes it to be'.

We acknowledge, my Lord, notwithstanding a large admixture of the human, and therefore *fallible* element in the Bible, that in that Book there is a *jewel* of heavenly lustre and precious value. Why are we to suppose that this *jewel* shines less brilliantly, or loses one iota of its value, because the gold of its *setting* has a considerable percentage of alloy? Why will men refuse to drink of 'the water of life', because it is offered to them in an earthen vessel?

Your Lordship is at liberty to make any use you please of this Letter". [Hear, hear! and Cheers.

This, Mr. Chairman, is but One testimony out of hundreds of Clerical testimonies, published and continuously publishing, that the most able, the most scientific, the most learned of the Ministers of the Church of England no longer believe in the doctrine of *plenary* Inspiration, but have given up as altogether untenable, *the Infallibility of the Bible*. [Cheers.

REV. T. OVERBURY. Sir, as a Clergyman, I protest against Mr. Dryden's representation! It is, Sir, a most indefensible representation of the opinion of the great body of the Clergy of the Church of England! [Hear, hear!] What we say, Sir, is this—

"The Bible is none other than *the Voice of Him that sitteth* upon the Throne! Every book of it—every *chapter* of it—every *verse* of it—every *word* of it—every *syllable* of it (where are we to stop) every *letter* of it—is THE DIRECT UTTERANCE of the Most High! The Bible is *none other* than the Word of God—not some part of it more, some part of it less, but, all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne—ABSOLUTE—FAULTLESS—UNERRING—SUPREME"!* [Hear, hear, hear!

SANDYS. I say, Overbury, does your Mother know you are out?

DRYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I call you to witness, that I spoke of "the most able, the most scientific, the most learned of the Ministers of the Church of England"—not of such Clergymen as Mr. Overbury. [Hear, hear!

REV. R. POLLOCK. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to inform Mr. Dryden, that no less an authority than archdeacon Pratt, makes use of the following words—

By *the Inspiration of Holy scripture* I understand, that the Scriptures were written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who communicated to the Writers *facts before unknown*, directed them in the selection of other facts already known, and PRESERVED THEM FROM ERROR OF EVERY KIND IN THE RECORDS THEY MADE". *Science and Scripture not at Variance*. p. 102.

DRYDEN. And, in return for Mr. Pollock's information, I wish him to understand, that I by no means include Messieurs Overbury, Pratt, and

* See Rev. J. W. Burgon's *Inspiration and Interpretation*, p. 89, for this admirable Creed of the truly orthodox Believers, in which "the heretics" Colenso, Stanley, Tait, Davidson, Thirlwall, Maurice, Browne, Wild, and other suchlike sinners, were educated, but which, *after examination*, they have repudiated as Untrue. *Reporter*.

Pollock, among "the most able, the most scientific, the most learned, of the Ministers of the Church of England". [Hear, hear !

In Principal Tayler's Address at Manchester New College, on 12 Oct. 1863, he takes a more rational view of the Sacred writings, when he says—

Looked at with the cold eye of a worldly criticism, the Bible stands before us as a simple piece of History interwrought with its cotemporaneous Literature—often curious, romantic, and beautiful, not seldom also repulsive and terrible; but, when we detect that great idea of a *Kingdom of God* which animates it throughout, of Man's direct subjection and responsibility to *the invisible Lord of conscience*—that dim foreboding of a final communion between God and Man, towards which the yearnings and endeavours of its saints and its heroes were constantly directed, we begin to feel—once caught by the spirit in which its deeds were acted and its words spoken—that it is something *more* than mere History and mere Literature—a revelation of God in our Humanity—in the struggles of successive generations to come nearer to God *as their Father*, and to live in filial harmony with him".

MR. T. BROWN. In *The Scotsman* of January 12th, 1864, is a very interesting Report of the annual meeting of the *National Bible Society of Scotland* on the 11th—the President, His Grace the Duke of Argyll, in the Chair—and, if it would not be trespassing too much on the time of the Meeting, I should be happy to read his Grace's very sensible comments on Dr. Candlish's views regarding *the Inspiration of the Scriptures*—

CAPTAIN DORSET. Pardon my interrupting you, Mr. Brown, but, you seem not to be aware, that Dr. Candlish has repudiated the liberal sentiments for which the Duke gave him credit; and has, very confusedly and clumsily, attempted, as you may see in *The Daily Review* of Jan. 29th, 1864, to prove that He still belongs to the Old school, delighting himself in "the wisdom of our ancestors" !

Judging from the various Reports and Communications in the Papers of the day, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Candlish must have admitted more than was congenial to the bigotry of his Friends; who, taking "alarm" at his advances towards the enlightened views of the Duke of Argyll, set upon the Doctor and tarred him on to contradict himself; and, in the confusion of his intellects, to pen and publish a sort of *recantation*; for, the Doctor closes his "hide and seek" specimen of confused notions, confused sentences, and confused words, with the following period—

I claim the justice of being believed, when I avow it as my sole aim, to advocate, as best I may, *the great truth* on which the religion of Christ and the hopes of Christians depend—that, not only is the Word of God *in the Bible*, but, that the Bible is itself, in the strictest and fullest sense, *in every particular* of its contents, and *in every expression* which it uses, THE INFALLIBLE WORD of the *One only living and true God*.* [Hear, hear !

BROWN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall not occupy the time of the Meeting, by reading the Duke's comments on the sentiments of a man who knows not what he writes. [Hear, hear !

MR. HOGG. Mr. Chairman ! In archbishop Whately's very last Charge to his Clergy, on 16 June, 1863, I met with the following passage—

One of the instances of a dangerous reaction, produced by an error, which some

* "The confirmed Prejudices of a *thoughtful life*, are as hard to change as the confirmed Habits of an *indolent life*; and as some must trifle away Age, because, they trifled away Youth, others must labor on in a *mass of Error*, because, they have wandered there too long to find their way out. БОЛИВБРОКЪ.

might consider, in itself, trifling, is that which has resulted from the theory of what is called 'plenary inspiration'; meaning by this, an Inspiration extending to matters quite unconnected with Religion, and extending also to *the very words* employed, so as to imply that those whom we call *Sacred Writers*, were literally no more than *mere Writers*, putting down *the exact words* which had been dictated to them, instead of being Men who recorded, in *their own* language, the information which had been supernaturally communicated to them; and that only *so far as Religion is concerned*". [Hear, hear! Calls for Mr. Chaucer—Pause.

MR. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman! I have just had a Newspaper put into my hand, from which I would read a few sentences to the Meeting. Canon Wordsworth writes, in his Protest against Dr. Stanley—

In those Lectures which were addressed chiefly to Candidates for Holy Orders, He [Stanley] asserts, that 'the history of Israel is *not* the history of an *inspired book*, but, of an *inspired people*'. Surely, such an allegation is injurious to the Bible, as implying that it is *less inspired* than a Nation which God punished as rebellious, and excluded from Canaan for its sins. It is also irreconcilable with the declaration of St. Paul, speaking specially of the Old testament, '*All Scripture*'—or, as it literally signifies, '*every Scripture is given by Inspiration of God*' and with the language of our own Church, in the Collect of this season [Advent] ascribing *all Scripture* to God—'Blessed Lord, who has caused *all Holy Scripture* to be written for our learning'.

It is said by Dr. Stanley, that the acceptance of every part of the Old testament 'as of equal accuracy, is rendered impossible by every advance made in Biblical science, and by every increase of our acquaintance with Eastern customs and primeval history'.

Ought Dr. Stanley to be installed in the Seat once filled by bishop Andrews?"

W. WYCHERLEY, ESQ. Who and What is that Canon Wordsworth?

TAYLOR. Dr. Wordsworth was, at the time he wrote his bigoted Protest against Dr. Stanley, the Senior residentiary Canon of Westminster; and had he continued in that office a little longer, it would have devolved upon him to induct Dr. Stanley into his Office as Dean of Westminster—but, Wordsworth was removed to St. Paul's. Wordsworth is "the man whom the English people will scarcely ever forget, for writing that miserable, bald, and jejune life of William Wordsworth, which has attained the eminence of *the worst biography in the English language*".

In December last, he presented himself before the Ecclesiastical public, in his "Remarks on the proposed Admission of the Rev. Dr. Stanley to the Place of Dean in the Collegiate Church of St Peter, Westminster"; whereby poor Wordsworth rendered himself as notorious to the *religious*, as his wretched biographical composition had rendered him notorious to the *literary* world. The *Daily Telegraph* gives a volume of information in a few lines only—

Canon Wordsworth is—a Canon; and a Westminster Canon besides—the Senior member of that Body which grants Leases of its Property for any IMMORAL purpose, but, refuses them to any *religious* purpose other than that sanctioned by the canons of the Church".

WYCHERLEY. "Ye Gods, it doth amaze me!" Why, Mr. Chairman, that is taking the mote out of another's eye, with a witness, while the splinter is in his own!

"Twenty times I rather would be
An Atheist clean,
Than under Gospel-colors hid be
Just for a screen"! [Cheers.

And Who and What is Dean Stanley?

TAYLOR. Stanley is a man in a million—"a Workman, that needeth not to

be ashamed"—one of the Leaders of the pioneers of Progress, and as much respected, as highly honored, as any choice spirit of this stirring age. [Bursts of applause.

Stanley is the son of a recent Bishop of Norwich, who has himself (as fame reports) already refused a Bishopric; known as the biographer of Arnold, the eloquent Canon of Christ church, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, Chaplain to the Queen and to the Prince of Wales, Author of attractive professorial Lectures, the Advocate of Professor Jowett, the Defender of "Essays and Reviews" in the *Edinburgh*, the Star of Oxford, the man whom Royalty delights to honor, and beloved by all who know him—

"A most incomparable Man! breathed, as it were,
To an untirable and continue goodness". [Cheers. Pause.

MR. SOTHEY. Mr. Chairman! In the course of this interesting Discussion, I have more than once heard, that the very discrepancies and errors in the text of the Bible, tended to strengthen the belief of the Speakers in the authenticity and verity of the Scriptures; if the gentlemen who uttered such expressions and intimations are still present, the Meeting, I should think, would gladly receive a few words of elucidation. [Pause.

REV. J. CLARE. Mr. Chairman! Who the Speakers were, I know not; probably, they have left; but, as I entertain similar views, I shall endeavour to reply in their stead. [Cheers.

Chairman. Perhaps, Mr. Clare, you may excuse my suggesting, that it may be expedient, at this advanced hour, to limit your elucidations to a couple of examples.

CLARE. Your will be done, Mr. Chairman! I shall restrict myself to One passage in the Old and One in the New covenant. [Hear, hear!

Detractors of the Bible fancy, that the story of the Deluge furnishes them with an unanswerable argument against the Bible's claim to being *trust-worthy*; as they can prove, scientifically and irrefragably, the *fallacy* of the historian's narrative—the utter impossibility of this Globe's ever having been completely covered with water—and though I shall not follow those unphilosophical expounders of Scripture who attempt, by gratuitous assumptions, to reconcile Scripture and Science (perplexing even perplexity itself) I am prepared to maintain *the general truth* of the historian's account of the Deluge, though at the cost of giving up, as untenable, the Infallibility of the Bible—or rather, the *plenary* Inspiration of the Scriptures. [Hear, hear!] No man within these walls, Mr. Chairman, holds the Scriptures in greater veneration and higher esteem, than I do; nor will I admit that God contradicts in his Word what he declares in his Works. [Hear, hear!] It is not the brazenfaced Detractor, but, the shortsighted Apologist, that has sunk the Bible in the estimation of the present generation. [Hear, hear!] Bible idolaters have done more, by worshipping the Bible, ay immeasurably more, towards bringing the Scriptures into general contempt, than all the Sceptics, Infidels, and Atheists, put together! The Bible, Mr. Chairman, is not that medley of sense and nonsense, that nest of absurdities, impurities, and monstrosities, that collection of fables, myths, and lies, so repeatedly represented in the speeches and writings of the self-styled *Iconoclasts* of our day—nor could it ever have fallen so low in the appreciation of the Working-classes of Great Britain, but for its injudicious and irrational Advocates, who have sadly damaged their cause by sophistry, fanaticism, and ignorance! The Bible, Mr. Chairman, must be defended

from the attacks of its Detractors, by the cogency of Reason and the exercise of Commonsense—or, we must yield it up a prey to ribaldry, impiety, and blasphemy! [Hear, hear!]

I have here taken up from the table, a Number of *The Christian Reformer*, a publication I see now for the first time, in which I find the following passage—

In the face of conclusions established beyond the reach of all rational controversy, by such men as Bunsen, Jowett, Stanley, Davidson, and Colenso (to mention only names familiar to an English audience) no one will now venture to assert, that because a thing is said in so many words in any part of Scripture, *therefore* it must be accepted as a declaration of positive fact, or, an utterance of absolute truth. Scripture has acquired a new aspect in the light cast on it by the rapid development of historical and philological science. It has ceased to be One book with a uniform character throughout, and taken the form of a multifarious literature, radiating hues of thought, all fundamentally religious in their tone, but, as various as the media through which they are refracted, and none of them to be identified with *the pure white light of Truth* which is behind them and shines through them. This revolution of opinion respecting the Bible, is *an accomplished fact*. It is impossible for any well-informed mind, to go back again to the scriptural position *maintained by our ancestors*. The knowledge of the age forbids it. Scripture, must, henceforth, hold a different, though, as I hope to show, a not less important place in our plan of theological study; and it becomes, therefore, one of the gravest questions of the day—especially for those who fill the office of Teachers in an Academy like this—*how* the Scriptures, which have been, still are, and will ever be, the main source of spiritual strength and comfort to our human world, are to be viewed and handled and enforced in *the altered state* of enlightened belief respecting them—to keep them in harmony with a progressive Science, and secure to them not only an unenfeebled, but a more exalted influence over the popular mind. REV. J. J. TAYLER'S *Address*. 12 Oct. 1863.

Our Clergy, Mr. Chairman, must no longer skulk behind the hedges of decayed formularies and musty creeds, blurring their popguns of powerless tracts at the assailants of the Bible; but, they must issue boldly forth into the open field, armed with the volume of Revelation in one hand, and the volume of Nature in the other—two weapons, against which, not even the redoubtable artillery of the Iconoclasts can prevail! Our Clergy must no longer hesitate to shake hands with Science, but feel assured that God's *works* are as truthful, as convincing, and as ennobling as his *words* can possibly be. Let us at once introduce the volumes of Nature and Revelation to each other, and to every congregation in the land, uniting them in perpetual wedlock at the altar of Truth, to do battle against the combined powers of Ignorance and Vice! [Hear, hear!] Untill we enlist Reason and Science and Truth on our side, we shall never subdue the adversaries of the Bible! [Hear, hear!]

When the historian recorded the Deluge, he recorded it *truthfully*, inasmuch as he recorded it *faithfully*—that is, in conformity to the best of his knowledge. [Hear, hear!] How could he possibly know that the Earth was a round ball? or, how could he know the extent of that apparently immeasurable flat surface on which he and his race dwelt? To him and to them (as to all unscientific minds in 1864) the Earth was a broad plain, in a state of perfect quiescence; this small Planet alone, constituting the Universe; while the myriads of worlds, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, were nothing else than a few menial luminaries, placed in the heavens for no other purpose, than to give light and warmth to the Human race—and were I to read of a Deluge, reported to have taken place during the infancy of mankind, and said to have been described by one of the historians of

antiquity, and that description should be given in accordance with the Scientific acquirements of a much more advanced state of the world, I should in that Scientific account possess a convincing proof of its *spuriousness*, of the impossibility of its being *genuine*, as *forgery* would be stamped on the very face of it, by the introduction into a document so ancient, such species of knowledge as were first acquired in long after-ages—therefore, Mr. Chairman, the disagreements between the Biblical narrations and the well-known Scientific facts of our day, are, to me, a pledge of the GENUINENESS of what we call *the Mosaic narration*—whoever may have been the writer of it. [Hear, hear!]

What confidence could you have, Mr. Chairman, in a history of the Elizabethan age, which should represent *iron-clad Vessels steaming* out to meet the Spanish Armada? Of her Majesty rolling along, in her Pavillion, at the rate of 60 miles an hour? And of her receiving Telegraph messages every hour of the day, from the uttermost parts of her dominions?

Even so, had those ancient sacred writings been penned in conformity with our present astronomical and geological knowledge, I should at once condemn them as *forges*—their *not* being in accordance with the acquired knowledge of after-ages, is, to me, a guarantee of their originality. [Applause.]

In all probability, Sir, we have in our Bible *two* accounts of the Deluge, as we have *two* accounts of the Creation, *two* accounts of the Garden of Eden, *two* accounts of the first progenitors of mankind, and *two* accounts of other historical narratives; but, I shall not now pause to descant on their irreconcilableness, much less attempt disentangling the mixed records—that I leave to those who have more leisure than we have at this Meeting.

Were it necessary, the Truth of the Biblical account of the Deluge, might be corroborated by a reference to the Hindoo theology, by the Mexican tradition, by the Chaldean historian, and other valid authorities; but, such corroborations might seem to savor more of *learning* than *utility*; therefore, I refrain.

As an example from the New covenant, I shall instance Rom. v. 12—which shows that Paul had imbibed the false doctrine inferred from Genesis, that the Human race became *mortal* by Adam's transgression; [Hear, hear!] for, Paul says distinctly, *By one man Sin entered into the world, and Death by Sin*—and he also says [1 Cor. xv. 21] *By man came Death*—which must be *false*, if the science of Geology be true. [Hear, hear, hear! mixed with Hisses]

I cannot for a moment suppose, Mr. Chairman, that individuals bearing the semblance of *gentlemen*, could so far forget themselves as to vent their Hisses at me, nor yet at St. Paul, much less can the Hisses have been vented at you, Mr. Chairman; therefore, I infer the Hissers have been hissing at TRUTH. [Hear, hear!] Truth, Sir, has often been hissed at, spit upon, persecuted; but, never by the earnest Inquirers after Truth: and whoever, Mr. Chairman, loves his own opinion, his own favorite dogma, his own sect or party, his own self, better than he loves Truth, in the name of Justice, let that imbecile be *anathema maran-atha*, and Hiss on to his heart's content! [Dead stillness.]

Mr. Lubbock, in his Lecture delivered but the other day, claimed for Man a still greater geological age than that allowed by Sir C. Lyell, who carries the existence of Humanity backwards to a period beyond 100,000 years. [Hear, hear!] Some, who may shrink from the avowed *low origin* of Man, as indicated by scientific researches, may find some consolation in the au-

tiquity of the Human race, gathering hopes for the future from the history of the past.

“ Compare, for instance, a flint hatchet, as a work of art, with one of the masterpieces of Thorwaldsen, or, as an implement, with any of the recent products of mechanical ingenuity; or, contrast *the minds* of the men to whom it never occurred that they might *polish* their flint axes, with the intellect of an Aristotle, a Linnæus, or a Newton. Yet, there is no reason to suppose that Man has reached the limits of his intellectual development; and, it is certain, that he has not exhausted the infinite *capabilities* of nature. Indeed, our progress seems to be continually more and more rapid. Even in our own times, we may hope to see a great improvement; but, the unselfish mind will find its highest reward in the confident hope that our Descendants, even in this life, may avoid many of those dangers against which we have but imperfectly striven, escape much of that sin and suffering to which we are subject, enjoy many blessings of which we are not yet worthy, and penetrate, perhaps, into some of those secrets of Nature which we can, as yet, no more understand than the poor Savages who made these flint implements, could have appreciated the wonderful discoveries of modern science.”

It is not generally known, yet, I am persuaded it will be generally admitted by this Assembly, as soon as I declare it—that the dogmas of the Theology of 1864, have not been so much disseminated by the Bible, as through the instrumentality of what we call our *Sacred Poets*—Quarles, Milton, Young, Wesley, Watts, Cowper, Montgomery, and others. [Hear, hear, hear! frequently repeated.

Time does not admit of my supporting this opinion by examples; yet, just listen to the opening of *Paradise Lost*—

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought Death into the world, and all our wo,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, heavenly Muse!”

Here, Mr. Chairman, in the very first five lines of our great Epic, we have dogmas sufficient for a five-hours comment.

I cannot, I will not, Mr. Chairman, insult this respectable assemblage, by descanting on the Science of Geology, as being an established fact; I could not think of so grossly offending such an auditory as the present, by supposing Ladies and Gentlemen of 1864, *not* ready to admit that *Geology is a fact*—I should as soon think of Hissing at them! [Hear, hear!] I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that all above the illiterate masses, accept the Science of Geology as a Truth—as true, Sir, as the Science of Astronomy, Geometry, or Mathematics—therefore, I make no hesitation in saying, that Paul, who knew nothing of Geology (a Science even yet in its infancy) committed an Error in propagating the dogma, that *Death came by Sin*: [Hear, hear!] for, the ravages of Death had prevailed hundreds and thousands and millions of years, prior to the first appearance of Man on the earth;* [Hear, hear!] yet, Mr. Chairman, had our Bible, containing the record of Paul's writings, come to us with the mistake corrected, unaccompanied with the blunder committed by the earlier Old covenant writers, I should have de-

* “It is supposed that the plants of the *coal period* required a temperature of 22° Reaumur; the mean now is 8°, or 14° less. By experiments on the rate of cooling lavas and melted basalt, it is calculated that 9,000,000 of years are required in the earth to lose 14° Reaumur. Hibbert puts the period at 5,000,000. But, supposing the whole to have been in a molten state, the time that must have elapsed in passing from a *liquid* to a *solid* state, is fixed at 360,000,000 years. BOUEN.

tected modern meddlesomeness, and should not have scrupled to denounce the passage as *false*—the blunder being a warranty of its *genuineness*. [Cheers.]

As to the *literal*, the *verbal*, the *plenary* Inspiration of the Scriptures, Mr. Chairman, that, Sir, you I am sure must allow, is a dogma for ever cast to the moles and the bats, by all but the most pitiaibly ignorant, or, the most deplorably fanatical—a dogma, as ludicrously absurd as it is absurdly ludicrous.* [Long-continued cheering, with Murmurings.]
N. CORRON, Esq. Thank heaven, the Bible still is ours, Mr. Chairman! or, as Greg† expresses it—

The Bible still remains; though no longer as *an inspired and infallible* record. Though *not* the Word of God, it contains the words of the wisest, the most excellent, the most devout men, who have ever held communion with Him. The poor, the ignorant, the busy, need not, and will not, read it *critically*. To each of them, it will still, through all time, present the Gospels and the Psalms—the glorious purity of Jesus, the sublime piety of David and of Job. Those who read it for *its spirit*, not for its dogmas (as the poor, the ignorant, the busy, *if unperverted*, will do) will still find in it *all that is necessary* for their guidance in life and their consolation in sorrow, for their rule of duty and their trust in God. *Creed of Christendom*. p. 222.

This paper, Mr. Chairman, [*The Maidstone Telegraph*] contains an interesting Report of a Lecture delivered on 21 Feb. last, by Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, on "*Genesis and Geology*"; who gave the evidence of the computation of Dr. Phillips, to prove that the Earth was 40,000,000 years old, and not 6,000 merely, as stated by Ecclesiastical authority. [Hear, hear!] I shall not detain the Meeting long, as the conclusion of the Lecture is all I purpose reading, and I give it in Mr. Maclellan's own words—

As you turn over the Bible's numerous pages, you will find many mistakes in science; many mistakes in numbers; many mistakes in dates; many mistakes in

* No less an authority than the erudite Dr. Thirlwall (the present Bishop of St. David's) discountenanced the untenable doctrine of verbal, literal, plenary Inspiration, several years ago, when he wrote—

All the hypotheses we have mentioned, are equally and decidedly *irreconcilable* with that doctrine of Inspiration *once* universally prevalent in the Christian church, according to which, the Sacred Writers were *merely passive organs*, or instruments, of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine, however, *has been so long abandoned*, that it would be a waste of time to attack it. Among theologians, this doctrine of *literal inspiration* has been long softened into a milder and more flexible theory". *Reporter*.

"The word *inspiration* is but of yesterday; not found in the earlier Confessions of the reformed faith—the difficulties that have arisen about it, are only two or three centuries old."

Thanks to the increasing knowledge of the age, *inspiration* is a stumblingblock which Ministers of all denominations are now kicking out of their way; for, as Professor Jowett has observed—

Any true doctrine of Inspiration *must* conform to all well-ascertained facts of History or of Science. The same fact cannot be *true* and *untrue*, any more than the same words can have *two opposite* meanings. The same fact cannot be *true* in Religion when seen by the light of faith, and *untrue* in Science when looked at through the medium of evidence or experiment. It is ridiculous to suppose, that the sun goes round the earth *in the same sense* in which the earth goes round the sun; or, that the world appears *to have existed*, but has *not* existed, during the vast epochs of which Geology speaks to us. But if so, there is no need of elaborate *reconcilements* of Revelation and Science; they reconcile themselves the moment any scientific truth is distinctly ascertained. As the idea of Nature enlarges, the idea of Revelation also enlarges: it was a temporary misunderstanding which severed them. And as the knowledge of Nature which is possessed by *the few* is communicated, in its leading features at least, to *the many*, they will receive with it a higher conception of the ways of God to Man. It may hereafter appear as natural to the majority of mankind to see the providence of God *in the order of the World*, as it once was to appeal to *interruptions* of it". *Editor*.

† "The Creed of Christendom; its Foundations and Superstructure: by William Rathbone Greg. Second edition. Trübner and Co. London. 1863."

This is an exceedingly clever work, and well deserving an attentive perusal by everyone capable of discriminating between the *true* and the *false* which it contains—it is highly and deeply interesting. *Editor*.

history; many irreconcilable modes of relating the same events; many imperfect representations even in matters of morals, and in things relating to the attributes and dispositions of the Most High. You are now reading chiefly with the *intellect*, and it is right that you should do so; but, read on, and strive to read this time with the *affections*, with the *conscience*, with the *soul*, with a fervent desire after *spiritual* good. When you thus read, you will find in the very same Bible, ten thousand things in prophecy, or psalm, or epistle, or parable, which speak rightly, and warmly, and penetratingly, of God, of duty, of Christ, of immortality, of repentance, of forgiveness, of love to all in heaven, of love to all on earth, of personal holiness as the chief, the only real good; ten thousand things which fit for redemption, and lead to redemption, and bestow redemption". [Long-continued applause.]

MR. FARQUHAR. If any gentleman present, Trinitarian or Unitarian, could but succeed in vindicating the Scriptures generally, against the charges of Historical discrepancy, but half as well as Mr. Clare has succeeded in his attempt; we Secularists, whom most gentlemen present look upon as sheer *detractors*, might possibly be induced to class the Scriptures among the Historical writings of remote ages, and we might also be induced to consult them as Records meriting closer examination than we have hitherto given them: but, I fear, Sir, that the Books constituting the Bible, will never be able to take their stand in the Schools of Freethinkers, among the writings of what is called *profane history*. [Murmurs.]

S. T. COLERIDGE, Esq. I only wish, Mr. Chairman, that such readers as Mr. Farquhar, would be as lenient towards the discrepancies of the Bible as they are towards other ancient writings—or, even modern historical writings; we should not then hear petty and perfectly insignificant inaccuracies and errors, swelled into monstrous charges and ponderous accusations; for, *all* historical records, WITHOUT A SINGLE EXCEPTION, are demonstrably erroneous; one book contradicting another, just as glaringly and irreconcilably as the books constituting the still more ancient Scriptures. [Hear, hear!]

GEO. G. BYRON, Esq. Nonsense, Mr. Coleridge, nonsense! Why, Mr. Chairman, we should lose all confidence in those writers who have been the study of our school days, and the admiration of our riper years, could such discrepancies be pointed out in their pages, as have been pointed out in the Bible, at this Meeting. Such an accusation, as you, Mr. Coleridge, have insinuated, against Historical records, pretending that they are inaccurate and contradictory, is as false as it is contemptible; and I challenge you, or anyone present, to support your charge by Examples. [Pause.]

ADDISON. [Rapturously cheered] As Mr. Coleridge does not seem disposed to reply (though no one present is more capable than Himself) *for the credit of the Bible*, when placed alongside other Histories, even Histories comparatively modern, I accept the Secularist's challenge; and, with your leave, Mr. Chairman, I shall encounter it at once. [Tremendous cheerings.]

Bucke, in one of the volumes of his "Book of Human Character", has sagely observed—

So little veracity is there in most of them, that *truth*, *biographers*, *historians*, and *epitaph writers*, appear to have taken oaths *never to agree*".

H. KNOWLES. Nonsense, Sir; ridiculous nonsense! [Silenced by the Meeting.]
ADDISON. Nepos (in Vit. Conon.) and Plutarch (in Vit. Cimon.) and Justin (Lib. ii.) and Valerius Maximus (Lib. v.) and Seneca (Controv. 29) all assert that Miltiades *died in prison*; yet, it is evident, from a passage in Herodotus (Lib. vi. c. 136) that such was *not* the case. [Hear, hear!]

Perhaps Mr. Byron, aided by Mr. Farquhar, may some day undertake, for the guidance of future generations, to reconcile a variety of the accounts

given by Plutarch, with the contradictory accounts given by other Historians—with me, the task is utterly hopeless. [Hear, hear!]

Nepos confounds Darius with Xerxes; also Miltiades the son of Conon, with Miltiades the son of Cypselus. And pray, Mr. Byron, what do you think of the lives of Conon and Agesilaus by Nepos, contrasted to those in Xenophon and Justin? [Hear, hear!]

Rome, Mr. Chairman, as you know, riess from a band of criminals, slaves, and debtors, in the account given by Livy; but, in the amplifying page of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Rome sprang from a colony, with Romulus at its head, peacefully issuing from the gates of Alba. Perhaps, Mr. Byron does not know, that the contrarieties regarding Rome in its earlier ages are so numerous, that Niebuhr treats the existence of Romulus, and also Numa, equally unreal with those of Hercules, Theseus, and Menu. [Hear, hear!]

The account of the torture of Regulus, by the Carthaginians, is said to have been drawn up between the time of Polybius and Cicero—now, Cicero writes (*De Officiis*, Lib. iii.) that they cut off his eyelids, threw him into a dungeon, and kept him awake in a machine untill he died—Florus says (*Lib. viii.*) he was tortured and crucified—Appian records (*De Bell. Punico*) that he was put into a barrel stuck through with sharp nails—Diodorus Siculus (*Lib. xxiv.*) ascribes his death to neglect—while Polybius, who ought to have been better informed than any of them, is intirely silent on the subject! Yet, had Polybius suppressed such a remarkable atrocity, what value would or could the Romans have placed on his history? [Hear, hear!]

I suspect that Messieurs Farquhar and Byron, in all their readings and with all their qualifications for detecting discrepancies, have not yet discovered, that some writers *invented* the principal parts of their materials; while others, such as Varillas (*Anecdotes de Florence*; ou, *L'Histoire Secrète de la Maison de Medicis*, 1685) quote authors who never had any other existence than in their own imaginings! and as to Eusebius, he candidly confesses, that in treating of a certain persecution, he carefully suppressed all that was likely to throw ignominy on the professors of Christianity, and as carefully related in glowing colors whatever might in any way redound to their glory. [Hear, hear!]

Does Mr. Byron prefer Arrian's History to that of Quintus Curtius? They differ very considerably. The accounts by Curtius seem much more probable; his geography is more accurate; and he quotes his authorities—Ptolemy, Aristobulus, etc. [Hear, hear!]

And really, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know, which of the Histories of the Jews, is Mr. Byron's favorite—that of Tacitus, or Justin, or Josephus? as they scarcely agree in anything: perhaps, Mr. Byron esteems them all alike, and thinks them all equally accurate. [Hear, hear!]

Will Mr. Byron undertake to decide between the two opposed Histories relating to the Medici family? by Nerli (*Commentari*) and Nardi (*L'Istoria della Città di Firenze*) or, is he unable to do so? [Hear, hear!]

Guicciardini and Rucellai insist, that Pope Alexander VI. excited Charles VIII. of France to the invasion of Naples; yet, Comines, who was more likely to be accurately informed, attributes the invasion intirely to the entreaties of Sforza, Duke of Milan. And as regards the fact, whether this Pope died of a fever, or, of the poison he and his son had prepared for others, perhaps, Mr. Byron can determine between those who assert the latter, and Burchardo, Muratori, and others, who insist upon the former. [Hear, hear!]

Some gentleman has, in the course of this Discussion, instanced the Biblical discrepancies about the blind man and two blind men, about one angel and two, about four dissimilar inscriptions, and such-like differences ; but, what are they, Mr. Chairman, when contrasted to other historical accounts ? why, as nothing ! for, in the relation of a Battle fought near Bologna (in which Federigo, Count of Urbino, was general of the Florentines, and Alessandro Sforza, of the Venetians) one account states, that 300 men were killed ; a second increases the number to 800 ; and a third to 1000 ; while Machiavel declares that both parties kept the field at the close of the day, and that not a single soldier lost his life ! [Hear, hear !

Even modern German histories, Mr. Chairman, are not to be relied on, however highly our Secular friends may appreciate them ; they far surpass any discrepancies either Mr. Farquhar or Mr. Byron can adduce against the ancient records in the Bible—but, Sir, I must not rest in “mere assertions” ; therefore, I instance the historical records relating to the dispute between Huss and the Clergy of Prague, quite a modern affair, in consequence of which dispute, a considerable number of Germans retired to Leipsic—but, as to the real number, we shall have to ascertain that from our Secular friends, who are so very, very particular, and so very, very rigidly exact ; for, Trithemius states the number as having been 2000—Eneas Sylvius insists upon 5000—Dubravius swells it to 24,000—Lauda puts it down as 36,000—while Lupatius makes it 44,000 ! Now, can Mr. Byron inform this Meeting which of these *five* historical records is correct ? or, would he have us believe them all accurate ? and that there exists no discrepancy at all ?* [Hear, hear !

But, Mr. Chairman, without giving Examples of incongruities and contradictions and irreconcilables from the Historians of Spain, Portugal, Holland, and other countries—all of which abound in Errors—I have probably instanced discrepancies sufficient to convince our Secular friends, that the still older Historians of the Bible, are, at least, as worthy of general confidence, as Historians of much later times, and that inaccuracies and errors belong to every History ever penned by Man—all of them, without exception, partaking of the imperfections of Humannature. [Hear, hear !

Apologizing for having so repeatedly addressed the Meeting, I——[Rounds of applause ; during which, Mr. Addison resumed his seat.

BYRON. Most sincerely do I acknowledge my individual obligations to Mr. Addison, for his never-to-be-forgotten Lesson ; and I think, Mr. Chairman, the Meeting at large owes me a vote of thanks, for having provoked Mr. Addison to turn me so cleverly to the right about. [Cheers. Calls for Mr. Chaucer. Pause.

KNOX. I was as much surprised as pained, Mr. Chairman, to hear Dr. Johnson speak respectfully, and even favorably, of such a man as Colenso ; a man whose name has become a name of reproach among all wellwishers to our Establishment, and who richly deserves to be EXCOMMUNICATED, as a sower

* These discrepancies call to mind the notorious Suwarrow, who having ordered his secretary to draw up a report of the battle at Persan, the scribe wrote—“The Russians lost 2000, the Turks 300”. Very well, said the general, a plain story enough, and not far from the truth : but, you do not seem to have reflected on the *nature* of your subject ; the Russians, remember, are friends ; we must spare them—write down 250 killed. As to the Turks, they, you know, are infidels ; and we must, as soon as we can, utterly exterminate them—write 22,000’.

And with this dispatch in the Moscow and St. Petersburg Gazettes, the good people of Russia, as also those of all Europe, were, for many years, deluded—and for anything I know to the contrary, are so still. Thus, is History manufactured ! and were this a fitting place, I could here insert other specimens of *history-making*, both in Holland and England, which would surprise every reader—the truth of which is indisputable. *Reporter.*

of tares, and a disseminator of heresies. [Hear, hear!] Without quoting Lord Shaftesbury's splendidly contemptuous and richly-deserved censure of Colenso's "*very silly*" and "*singularly childish*" book,* assailing the Pentateuch, as the Bishop of Manchester happily expressed it, "by misrepresentation the most unpardonable, by distortions of the truth the most monstrous, and with a savage glee and exultation which would rather become a *fiend* in an attempt on what was good, than a minister of a Christian congregation";† I declare, with vicar Watkins, that the Bishop of Natal struts before the world with "blasphemy on his mitre, apostasy on his shepherd's crook, and his lawn sleeves engraved with the subscription of infidelity"‡ [Hear, hear! with Cheers and Moans.

SANDYS. Mild, gentle, affable Sir, I kiss your hands!

SOMERVILLE. Sandys, Sandys—Oblige me!

SANDYS. Professor, "'Tis yours to speak, and mine to hear"!

SOMERVILLE. I am extremely sorry, Mr. Chairman, that my friend Johnson should have left the hall; as it would have gratified him to have had this eligible opportunity of giving Mr. Knox a thorough dressing.

As you, Mr. Knox, have imparted quite sufficient to enamor us all with due reverence for bishop Lee, and an ardent love for vicar Watkins; it would be adding to the obligation, were you to favor us with certain communications, of which you are perfect master, in connection with your two intimate friends, Waldegrave and Close, both of whom have expressed themselves warmly regarding Colenso.

KNOX. I prefer not carrying on a discourse with you, Professor; I had rather let the subject drop.

* The following extract from the Earl's speech, is copied from the *City Mission Magazine*, being the paragraph to which Mr. Knox alluded—

It is a very singular thing, that this *very silly* and pestilential work (Dr. Colenso's) should have made its appearance simultaneously with the sudden development of the *small-pox*, equally pestilential, and equally remedial; for, as inquiry universally shows that those only have taken the small-pox who either were never vaccinated at all, or, very imperfectly vaccinated; so you will see, that no one has been misled by this *singularly childish* book, this miserable imitation of 'Cocker's Arithmetic', but those who had never read the Bible at all, or, had read it most imperfectly, or, with aversion".

† See Report of bishop Lee's speech at the annual meeting of the Manchester Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in 1863.

‡ The Rev. C. F. Watkins, Vicar of Brixworth, has issued a publication on the subject of *Subscription*, wherein he vents his brotherly-love for Colenso; and assails the *Essayists* and *Reviewers*, as a "fraternity of scavengers". He then indulges his christian charity in a downright savage critique on the well-known volume, *Meditations on Death and Eternity*, published by Her Majesty's desire; which volume, in the superior judgement of the better-informed and more strictly pious vicar Watkins, renders it an incumbent duty on the Bishop of London to point out to his Royal Mistress the rampant mischief which such works have introduced into this godly Kingdom, and the "*leprosy*" and "*plague*" with which such pernicious books have affected the Church. And, more offensive still, this brute of a Vicar has the indelicacy, the indecency, the inhumanity to add—

It is said, that the late Prince Consort was enamored of *this* and similar works of the German school. Then, we have *the key* to that mysterious Providence which called *Him away* in the midst of his days—FROM FURTHER EVIL!"

And, incredible as it may seem, on this unfeeling and audacious *sentence of judgement*, passed by this Pope of a Vicar, on the life and conduct of such a Model of a Prince, the *Clerical Journal* had the consummate impudence and impious daring to remark—

Few true Churchmen felt other than that the *INFLUENCE* of the Prince Consort was *injurious*, if not *DISASTEROUS*, to the Church!"

"Shame burn their cheeks to Cinder!"

If such be Clerical commiseration for the Living, and respect for the Dead, may heaven preserve me from every species of Clerical notice, alike in Life and in Death!

A more heartless insult could scarcely be offered to the Queen, who, happily, possesses majesty sufficient to pardon it—nor could a more reckless censure be cast upon the Prince

"Enough to rouse a dead man into rage,
And warm with red resentment the wan cheek!" *Editor.*

SOMERVILLE. Then, I must tell you, Mr. Knox,

“The man that dares traduce, because he can
With safety to himself, *is not a man*!” [Cheers.]

SANDYS. If the cap fits, Knox, put it on.

SOMERVILLE. If bishop Waldegrave and his righthand man, Francis Close, Dean of Carlisle, instead of describing Colenso as a mouthpiece of the Devil, had cleverly controverted the Bishop of Natal, by *disproving* the points insisted upon by his so-called *Satanic majesty's plenipotentiary*, the public might have been much more benefited, than by the outpouring of ungentlemanly abuse and the commission of scandal, which the two Dignitaries ought to have known stands classed in the Book of Common Prayer among deeds which are neither pious nor sinless—such as neither Dean nor Bishop can commit with impunity. [Hear, hear!]

Paul insists upon a Bishop being “*blameless*” and having “*a good report*”—What says the world of your friend bishop Waldegrave? and what sort of a Character do you think Colenso could conscientiously give him? But, let me spare him—

“That Mercy I to Others show,
That Mercy show to Me”!

As to the Bishop's righthand man, the *Examiner* tells us—

Like his prototype Mawworm, Dean Close “loves to be despised”. To be talked of is his great ambition, and *how* he is talked of, is quite a secondary consideration. He would of course much prefer *praise*, for which he has an excellent appetite; but, if he cannot get that, he will gladly accept ridicule, or contempt, rather than pass unnoticed. Notoriety is his passion, *quocunque modo*. Happily for him, he has a Bishop over him, who requires a vast deal of defense, and who gives plenty of opportunities for the Dean to come forward in the character of an ecclesiastical SWASH-BUCKLER. The word is rather obsolete, but, there is no other that so well represents the character defined by Johnson as one who makes a great clatter pugnaously”.

If our bishops, archdeacons, deans, and canons, instead of railing against Colenso, were to put their wise heads together, and try to *refute* him, they would merit a Nation's thanks, even though they failed in the attempt. Surely, if Colenso be so very, very egregiously wrong, the Dignitaries of our Church should be everyway qualified to set him right—or, Wo betide mother Church!” [Applause.]

REV. R. FANSHAWE. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat ashamed on standing up to address this Meeting—ashamed, Sir, of my not having stood up earlier—for, though the Wesleyans have taken a conspicuous part in this Discussion, not one of our Society [Primitive Methodists] has raised his voice against many of what I call *the damnable doctrines* which have been advocated here today. [Hear, hear! Hear, hear!]

Notwithstanding the hereditary depravity and innate sinfulness of man, several Speakers would wish to persuade us, that Man is an exalted creature; forgetting, Mr. Chairman, his inborn corruption, which makes him subject to the wrath of God; and that, being by nature unholy, unless saved through the merits of Jesus Christ, he must perish eternally.* [Hear, hear!]

I have, at this Meeting, heard original sin spoken of as if it were a fantasy, and not a Scripture doctrine; but, Sir, I maintain it is; and that all men

* That illiterate Primitive Methodists should hold forth such damnable doctrines as *eternal punishment*, is not surprising; as they only spout out, what they have heard, and what they have been taught to believe from infancy: but, it is surprising that well-educated men, scholars, and biblical critics, should be capable of propagating a doctrine which they must know, has not any foundation in Holy Writ. They must know, that the horrible doctrine of

are born guilty, and deserve everlasting damnation. [Hear, hear!] Mr. Chairman, I defy all the Unitarians in the world to gainsay what I have

endless misery, is contrary to the tenor of Scripture; and that it is principally indebted to *mis-translations* for the common belief in its absurdity and unqualified blasphemy against the beneficent Creator of all men. *Everlasting damnation* is effectively used by Revivalists, to frighten weak-minded persons half out of their wits; but, it is almost incredible, that Dr. Pusey should have said, in Committee, on 25 Feb. 1864—

I have come across some interesting passages in the Fathers, which decidedly maintain *endless punishment*; and the impression on the minds of the Uneducated is, that the doctrine is to be believed: most of those who love God, have been brought to do so, by their *fear of Hell!*"

If the Bible is to be our guide, *Universal Restoration* is as certain, as that God's name is I AM THAT I AM! Reporter.

But, what will the intelligent world say of our present Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the so-reported "liberal and enlightened Dignitaries of our Established Church"? That unadvised Letter of his, published with his consent, and which has already gone the round of the Newspapers, will sink Him in the appreciation of Public Opinion; as it countenances one of the most revolting of pagan doctrines, equally abhorrent to christianity and to humanity—*eternal punishment!* It is as follows—

To Mr. W. H. Trendall, of Tany Bwlch, Carnarvon.

Dear Sir—

Lambeth Palace, S. March 4.

I wish it to be generally understood, that in assenting to the Reversal of the Judgement of Dr. Lushington, on the subject of *eternal punishment* in the case of Mr. Wilson, I did so solely on Technical grounds; inasmuch as the charge against him, on this point, was so worded, that I did not think it could be borne out by the facts.

The eternity of punishment rests, *according to my mind*, exactly on the same ground as the eternity of blessedness; they must both stand or fall together; and the Church of England, *as I maintain*, holds both doctrines clearly and decidedly.

Believe me, yours faithfully, C. T. CANTUAR'.

That such should be the opinion of a man holding the highest office in our Established Church in 1864, is lamentable indeed! and that He should for an instant fancy the eternity of punishment and the eternity of blessedness, rest "exactly on the same ground", and that "they must both stand or fall together", is truly deplorable! Happily, our Archbishop is not the highest of all authorities—

"Thus saith the High and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy—I will not contend for ever, neither will I be *always* wroth: for, the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made!"

Now, as Jehovah not only assures me, He will *not* contend for ever, but assigns a reason *why he will not*; the least our Archbishop can do, is, to give me as good a reason *why God will*, as the High and lofty One has given me, *why He will not*.

Archbishop of Canterbury though he be, Dr. Longley is hereby informed, that future *punishment* and *blessedness* do *not* stand on "exactly the same ground"; that his Bible, if read thoughtfully, will prove to him, undeniably, that the future felicity of the righteous is expressed in much stronger language, than the sufferings of the wicked. Perhaps, Dr. Longley is not aware, that there is not any word in the Hebrew language which absolutely signifies *ENDLESS DURATION*; yet, his brother Dr. Colenso, as well as the Jewish Rabbies, can assure him of the fact. It would be ungracious towards an Archbishop to suppose it possible that He should *not* know, as well as I do, that *every expression of duration* connected with the threatened punishment of the wicked, is *LIMITED*—that the expressions *for ever, for ever and ever, eternal, everlasting*, are all of *LIMITED DURATION*—I take it for granted, that our Archbishop knows so much of his Bible, as to enable him to *prove*, from both the Old and the New covenants, that *not one of these expressions* means, or can be made to mean, *ENDLESS DURATION*—I should not think of offering such an insult to the Primate of all England, as presenting Texts to authenticate what I am now advancing; I give him credit for his being capable of proving, by Scripture, that all these expressions in connection with future punishment, mean *durations which must END—periods which must necessarily CLOSE—terms that must inevitably FINISH—endure NO LONGER—exist NO MORE—be not of the present, but, for ever of the past!* But, from his Letter, I am afraid the Most Reverend Father in God, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, is not so well read in his Bible as he ought to be; for, He seems *not to know* all things that are written therein; he does not even know that the Salvation of Man is declared to be "*WORLD WITHOUT END*"—neither does he know anything about an "*ENDLESS LIFE*"! He has *not yet* learned, that "the eternity of blessedness" as he expresses it, will be "*ENDLESS, WITHOUT END*"—limitless expressions never once attached to "the eternity of punishment"! the one *ceaseless bliss*, the other *temporary suffering*—or, I have read my Bible to very little purpose. Besides, an Archbishop ought to know, without being told after He has assumed the Highest office in the Church, that Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture, and that *every expression* in the Bible denoting the *perpetuity* of future punishment, is, in the Bible itself, restricted in its *meaning* to *LIMITED DURATION*—never so much as once, from Genesis to Revelation, employed in the English sense of *ENDLESS, or, WORLD WITHOUT END!* such expressions being restricted to denote *ETERNAL LIFE* only! Editor.

asserted, or, to show that we are not by nature unholy, and children of the Devil—every one of us guilty through Adam's transgression. [Hear, hear, hear! and Bravo, bravo!]

REV. G. DOUGLAS. Sir! on seeing Mr. Fanshawe rise to address the Meeting, I spontaneously took out paper and pencil to note down a few of the *cant phrases* with which I was aware he usually decorates his public speeches; and even as you, Sir, in the former part of this Discussion, censured certain pulpit expressions, which are not to be found in the Scriptures, so I have noted certain expressions employed by Mr. Fanshawe, which, though common in pulpits, he cannot find in his Bible. [Hear, hear!]

Mr. Fanshawe, with all the air of a pedagogue, has been talking to this Bible-read assembly, about *hereditary depravity, innate sinfulness, inborn corruption, original sin, born guilty, by nature unholy*—all of which expressions are perpetually on the lips of our Itinerant spouters of froth; but, not One of which is to be found in this best of Books, whence, fanatics wish us to believe, they cull these superstitious and fanatical expressions. [Hear, hear!] Sir, it is *blasphemy*—I mean derogatory to our Maker, for any Teacher of religion to utter such inexcusable and shameful language! and I think it writ down in my duty to break my resolution of remaining silent, lest anyone in this mixed assembly should leave this place under the impression that the Scriptures expressed the wretched doctrines, the fanaticisms, and cant of Mr. Fanshawe. [Hear, hear!]

Without wishing to deduct from the momentary celebrity of Mr. Fanshawe, as a *stirring* preacher and an *industrious* revivalist, laboring, in season and out of season, to propagate what he imagines to be the doctrines of Christianity, I must tell him and his drunken associates—*drunk*, though not drunken with wine—"Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures". [Hear, hear!]

Of all the cant phrases uttered in the fervent Speech of our probably well-meaning Revivalist, there is not One of them to be found in his Bible. When the Scriptures tell me plainly, that "the Son shall *not* bear the iniquity of the Father", but that "Everyone shall bear *his own* burden", and "the soul that *sinneth*, shall die", I cannot, Mr. Chairman, give credence to Mr. Fanshawe's unreasonable and blasphemous nonsense about "original sin" and "innate depravity", for, "God hath made us, and not we ourselves"; and what is more, He made us "in his own image", as is affirmed and re-affirmed, over and over again, even after the alledged Fall of our first progenitors—and it is therefore blasphemy against my Maker, for Mr. Fanshawe to say, that I am "by nature unholy" and a *Child of the Devil!* [Hear, hear!] It is a damnable doctrine, Sir, for anyone to promulgate, that babes and sucklings, who have never transgressed against any law, divine or human, are condemned for Adam's sin*—but, Sir, such is not the teaching of Jesus, who on many occasions declared concerning Infancy, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"! Sir, if God hates Sin, it is unqualified blasphemy for any man to say, that we are "by nature unholy", that we are "born guilty", and that we are laboring under "inborn corruption"—for, God made Man—God is our Father, and no one is a Child of the Devil! [Cheers. Calls for Mr. Chaucer.]

* "There is a never ending Hell,
And never dying pains,
Where Children must with Demons dwell,
In darkness, fire, and chains:
For, Hell is crammed with Infants damned,
Without a day of grace!"

REV. G. CHAUCER. [Warmly greeted] Mr. Chairman and Christian friends! Despite my determination to remain silent, I now feel myself bound to speak; persuaded, that an obstinate persistence in my pre-determination would be punished with the upbraidings of conscience, for not having done my duty: [Hear, hear!] and, Sir, I the more willingly answer the Call of the Meeting, from beholding such an unexpected array of Ministers of various denominations, many of whom have taken an active part in the Discussion, to several of whom I have listened with no little gratification, and, I hope, to some profit. [Cheers] Were I addressing an ordinary assemblage, I might be at a loss how to express my sentiments plainly and truthfully and inoffensively; but, Sir, before such an auditory as this, I waive restraint, premising, in the phraseology of Jerome—

If an offense come out of the Truth, better is it that the Offense come, than that the truth should be concealed". [Hear, hear!]

That our "authorized version" is *not* what it should be, is known to us all; [No, no!] well then, as all *might* know it, if they would, it *ought* to be known to us all: and those who have had the opportunity of knowing it, are not entitled to exculpation on the score of ignorance. Who in this assembly can say, without a blush, that this inestimable volume [the Bible] is faultless? is the infallible Word of God? that he has *not yet* discovered any of its defects? that he has *not* observed its contradictions? that he has *not* detected any fraudulent interpolations? that he is *not* now aware of its manifold errors? [Hear, hear!]

MR. H. CONSTABLE, *Student*. I stand up to protest—[Down, down! Silence! Order, order!]

CHAUCER. If I am to be interrupted, I certainly shall sit down; yet, as I am obeying the Call of the Meeting, I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Meeting may secure me a Hearing—

"I speak as to men of understanding, judge Ye what I say". [Cheers.]

The so-called *Canon of the Old testament*, is supposed, by biblical critics, to have been compiled about the time of Ezra, if not much of it by Ezra himself, who is held by several of the Learned, in different countries, to have been the man who made "a genuine Collection"—as far as circumstances permitted. The Jews have computed that Canon to have contained 22 Books, analogous to the number of Letters constituting the Hebrew alphabet—our Old testament contains 39 Books, without the Apocrypha. The compilation of Ezra took place in consequence of the Burning of the Originals by Antiochus Epiphanes, during his war against the Jews; [about a century and a half B.C.] and many persons attach no little importance to those very remarkable words in the xiv. ch. of 2 Esdras, which I beg leave to read to this Meeting—premissing, that Esdras of the Apocrypha and Ezra of the Canon, is the same person. Esdras exclaims,

Behold, Lord, I will go, as thou hast commanded me, and reprove the people *which are present*; but, they that shall be born *afterward*, who shall admonish *them*? The world is set in darkness, and they that dwell therein are without light; for, **THY LAW IS BURNED**; therefore, *no man knoweth the things that are done of Thee*. But, if I have found grace before Thee, send the Holy Spirit into me, and *I shall write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning*, which **WERE WRITTEN IN THY LAW**, that men may find Thy path. And He answered me, saying, Go, etc. and prepare me many Box-trees [Tablets for writing] and take with thee Five which are ready to write swiftly; and I shall light a candle of understanding in thy heart, which shall not be put out till the things be performed which thou shalt begin to write. And my mouth was opened, and shut no more. The Highest gave under-

standing to the Five men, and they wrote the wonderful visions of the night that were told", etc.

These notable words, Mr. Chairman, strongly corroborate the opinion of several learned men, that the World does not possess any Records whatever that can, properly and legitimately, be called *Originals*—that our least disputable documents are, at the best, *but Copies of Copies from Copies*—the Originals of the ancient Jewish Canon having perished several ages before the existence of the oldest Copies of Scripture now extant.* [Proof, proof!]

Mr. Chairman, those who cry *Proof, proof!* tacitly acknowledge before this imposing Assemblage, their own *unobservant* mode of reading the Scriptures; and it is not to the credit of any man, much less of an expounder of the Bible, if he does *not* know, without my proving to him, that in the New testament, quotations are made from writings which have *not* descended to us, from Books mentioned by name, unknown to us. [Hear, hear!] But, Sir, I have not been called upon to instruct the ignorant; and as every reader of the New testament *ought* to know, that certain Scripture writings, lost to us, are both *named* and *quoted* by the Evangelists and Apostles, I do not choose to adduce a single passage, nor give the title of a single book, merely to gratify the curiosity of careless readers. [Hear, hear!] Unlettered men, Mr. Chairman, may be excused asking for information on subjects they have not had the opportunity of examining for themselves; but, Sir, when I hear religious Teachers crying *Proof, proof!* on matters with which they ought to be well acquainted, I cannot wholly repress my indignation at their culpable negligence in *not* Searching the Scriptures! in *not* knowing for themselves, without any *proof* from others, that an Infallible Bible is as *impossible* as it is *unnecessary!* [Hear, hear!] Notwithstanding the tens of thousands of inaccuracies and errors which disfigure and distort our "authorized version", the morality and spirituality of the tenor of the Scriptures remain unimpeachable, and are, indeed and of a truth, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness". [Applause] What though professed Infidels and avowed Atheists attack the Bible, and demonstrate its inconsistencies and blemishes and errors, they cannot overthrow its fixed and imperishable Truths; nor can their scoffs and jeers have the least

* The *Athenæum* gives the following account of some remarkable Biblical manuscripts—

The Russian government has purchased, for the sum of 100,000 silver roubles, the celebrated collection of Caraitic manuscripts of the learned collector Abraham Firkowitch. After the collection had been duely examined by different *savans*, and pronounced to be highly important for the criticism of the text of the Holy Scriptures, for palæography and chronology in general, and for the history of Southern Russia in particular, it was delivered as property to the public Imperial Library. The Caraitic scholar, Abraham Firkowitch, has devoted, we hear, thirty years of his life to the acquisition of these rare Manuscripts. As early as 1830, during his stay in Constantinople, he succeeded in finding some valuable Hebrew codices. This seems to have given him the impulse for his untiring exertions in this field. He sacrificed his fortune in the search for rare and old manuscripts; bore without murmuring long separations from his family; subjected himself to all sorts of privations, and often endangered his life. Mr. Firkowitch has traveled through and explored the Crimea and the Caucasus in all directions; he has lived for months in churchyards and burial-places, to study and copy old inscriptions; he has penetrated into synagogues and other likely places, where the Jews used to hide books on sudden attacks or invasions from the enemy; he never wearied of the struggle with fanaticism and barbarity. Thus he succeeded in collecting 124 Hebrew original copies of the Old testament, which are older than all other Hebrew codices in any of the libraries of Europe. Twenty-five of the manuscripts of Mr. Firkowitch's collection were written *before the ninth*, and twenty *before the tenth* century. Five of the manuscripts on leather are maintained to be the oldest of all documents on the Scriptures hitherto discovered. The whole collection consists of 47 rolls of the Pentateuch, on leather and parchment; 77 codices of the Holy Scriptures; 33 translations in different languages; 272 works of Caraitic authors; 523 works of Rabbinit authors; 250 miscellaneous letters and articles; 722 inscriptions; 300 documents regarding the history of the Caraim in Western Russia, and 300 old plans of different Russian towns'. *Editor.*

baneful influence on my conduct in life, or, shake my faith in the spiritual portion of the Scriptures, which with all their physical and historical imperfections and obscurities, still remain "a lamp unto my feet, and a light to my path". [Cheers.

I cannot, Mr. Chairman, forego the inclination I feel to quote a few lines from a Unitarian minister, [Hear, hear!] Principal Tayler, which I find here in his admirable Address at Manchester New College, on 12 Oct. last—

We know not what great and unsuspected Truths may *yet break forth* from God's word, when once it is handled honestly. There is a History and a Literature shut up in the Bible, the true worth of which has *never yet* been appreciated; the surpassing beauty of which has *never yet* been relished; because, *never yet* has it been brought into fair and open contact with Humanity; because, the full warmth and glow of the mind, needful to ripen its latent seeds of truth and beauty, has *never yet* been allowed to fall on it—pure taste, natural sympathies, an unperverted moral sense, and an unstrained application of the critical test of the false and the true". [Hear, hear, hear!

When, Mr. Chairman, when public Instructors generally—Instructors not of our own Church merely, but of all denominations of Christians, shall have acquired sufficient moral courage to teach and preach such Truths as meet their apprehensions, without paying any regard to the stereotyped dogmas of Churches, Convocations, Synods, or Councils; when the great body of religious Teachers shall become possessed of sufficient manliness to communicate their *own* conscientious sentiments, regardless of "the wisdom of our ancestors", and without "fear of the Jews"; then, Mr. Chairman, then shall Truth speedily root out Error, and the multifarious degrees of superstition, bigotry, and fanaticism, quickly fleet away, like the gleams of transient meteors before the rising light of the sun. [Cheers] But, Sir, it is the curse of the age, that we, the Occupiers, if not the Usurpers of the sacred offices in the Ministry, standing between an irretrievable past and an inscrutable future, as Ambassadors from God to Man, are not *faithful* to our trust; [Hear, hear!] many of us, both in and out of the Establishment, believing what we *do not*, DARE NOT, preach and teach; propagating the now fossilizing doctrines and the already petrified idiosyncrasies of our forefathers, as they stand crystalized in Articles, Creeds, and Catechisms! [Applause] All *unfaithful* men, Mr. Chairman, are *culpable* men; more especially we of the Church of England, who boast of our "Apostolic Succession", and haughtily look down on what we contemptuously call "*Dissenters* worshipping in their *Conventicles*". [Loud applause] Our model of a Bishop, the worthy Watson of Llandaff, declared, that

A reformer of Luther's temper and talents, would, in five years, persuade the People to *compel* Parliament to abolish Tithes—to extinguish Pluralities—to enforce Residence—to confine Episcopacy to the overseeing of Dioceses—to expunge the Athanasian Creed from our Liturgy—to free Dissenters from test acts*—and the Ministers of the Establishment from Subscription to human Articles of Faith!† These, and other matters respecting the Church, ought to be done"! [Tremendous applause.

Had we, Mr. Chairman, but a dozen such men as bishop Watson on our Episcopal bench in 1864, there would soon be a stop put to the never-

* "The repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, is a most encouraging event; as it indicates the slow but certain triumph of reason and justice over the dull resistance of intolerance and superstition, the offspring of ignorance and timidity, which, though wanting a name, is an extensive agent in obstructing the Advancement of society. *Examiner*.

† Ere long, our Clergy will get freed from Subscription to human Articles of faith; for, the

ceasing cry—*the Church is in Danger!* for, they would prudently remove the danger, by removing the shakey pillars and rotten stones out of the building. Great as the Reformation was a few centuries back, a Reformation equally great is required in our day, to meet the increased intelligence of the People, millions of whom are now in a more advanced state of Civilisation, than the Nobility and Gentry of that former period; for, thanks to Brougham and—

DR. W. DUNBAR. All Bosh, Sir; Bosh! the People—[Put down, by the general voice of the Meeting.

CHAUCER. Such interruptions disconcert me, and break the thread of continuity of thought.

The mental Progress of the People of England, during the present century, is marvelous in my eyes! Within the present century, that is, Mr. Chairman, perfectly within my recollection and under my own observance, Mechanics, Literary, and Scientific Institutions—Benefit, Friendly, Mutual, Bible, Tract, Peace, and Temperance Societies—Circulating Libraries, News-rooms, Reading-rooms, Infant and Ragged Schools—Dormitories and similarly humane, philanthropic, and educational Establishments, have all risen to eminence, and most of them been called into existence! [Hear, hear!] Thanks to the leaders of the People—England's greatest Benefactors—thanks to our Broughams and our Birkbecks, thanks to our Chambers Brothers and Charles Knight, literary and scientific and social knowledge is carried by Lecturers to all parts of the kingdom, while the Cheap literature of the present day is rendering the Poor-man's fireside, a school of instruction! [Much cheering.

The safety of our Established church, Mr. Chairman, now depends solely on the removal of *Obstacles to Progress*, imposed on the great body of the Clergy at a time when they were not considered capable of thinking, examining, and judging for themselves. The Clergy, Sir, must be liberated from the shackles of barbarous oaths and anti-christian ceremonies; they must be free to investigate, and free to communicate the results of their investigations—or, the Church, Sir, must fall—and great would be the fall thereof! [Hear, hear!] Our danger as an Establishment, is not from without, but, from within; and I am bold to affirm, in the presence of so many of my Collegiates and so many Ministers of other denominations, that the very injudicious and unchristian prosecutions recently instituted against our enlightened and truth-seeking Clergy have done, and are still doing more towards pulling the Church down about our ears, than the combined efforts

names of the parties constituting the Commission of Investigation on Clerical Subscription, have already been published—

The Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin; Earls Stanhope and Harrowby; the Bishops of London, Winchester, St. David's, and Oxford; Lords Lyttelton, Cranworth, and Ebury; the Right Hon. E. P. Bouverie, the Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, D.C.L. the Right Hon. Spencer H. Walpole, the Right Hon. Joseph Napier; Sir J. T. Coleridge, Sir W. Heathcote, Mr. C. Buxton, the Very Rev. Henry Hart Milman, D.D. Dean of her Majesty's Cathedral Church of St. Paul, in London; the Very Rev. Harvey Goodwin, D.D. Dean of her Majesty's Cathedral of Ely; the Ven. John Sandford, B.D. Archdeacon of Coventry; the Rev. William Jacobson, D.D. Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford; the Rev. James Amiraux Jeremie, D.D. Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; the Rev. Henry Venn, B.D. and the Rev. William Wilson Humphry, B.D.

These are the men who have received orders to *consider* and *revise* the various *forms* of Subscription and Declaration required to be made by the Clergy of the Established Church, on *ordination* or on *appointment*, *admission*, or *induction*, to any ecclesiastical dignity, benefice, curacy, lectureship, or office; and to Report their opinion how far they may be altered and simplified consistently with due security for the declared agreement of the Clergy, with the doctrines of the Church, and their conformity to its Ritual. *Reporter.*

of all who are without the pale of our Establishment! and, it may be, that our bench of Bishops and members of Convocation will not learn, untill for ever too late, that—

“Every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation; and every city, or house, divided against itself, shall not stand”! [Bursts of applause.]

I cannot refrain from expressing a hope, Mr. Chairman, that the admirable, impressive, and needful Lesson, just taught our persecuting Dignitaries, by the Privy Council's *reversal of the judgement* of the Court of Arches *in re Williams and Wilson*, [8 Feb. 1864] may prevent all further obloquy being cast on the Established Church; and that no man or men may ever again be so unwise and unchristian, as to prosecute any man or men for difference of Opinion! [Cheers] Let now our dignitaries in Africa beware, let Convocation at Home beware, let every individual persecuting Spirit beware, of the Privy Council—which, in 1864, has not a particle of sympathy with Invaders of the right of private judgement!* [Deafening acclamations.]

REV. W. BLAKE. Mr. Chairman! I wish to read a short paragraph from Dr. Pusey's letter to the Editor of *The Times*, published in this morning's [11 March] issue—

Mr. Wilson, in reinforcing his own opinions by an extract from a Rotterdam pastor [Reville] *who denies eternity of punishment*, as inconsistent with the attributes of God, shows the depth and breadth of the question at issue. *We do not believe in the same God.* God, whom we adore in His awful and inscrutable justice and holiness, these writers [Maurice and Wilson and Reville] affirm to be *cruel*. The God whom they acknowledge, *we believe to be the Creature of their own minds*, not the God who has revealed himself to Man. E. B. PUSEY.

It is indeed sad, very sad, Mr. Chairman, to read such *self-condemnations* in the Newspapers, as the Dignitaries of our Established church are foolishly publishing from day to day; and I am grieved at heart, that archbishop Longley should have been so unwise as to lower himself to a level with such ill-read men as Pusey, Denison, and the like—men, who trumpet to the world their ignorance of the *meaning* of such passages of Scripture as a little thoughtfulness and observation would have taught them to apprehend rightly—had they read their Bibles with only common attention, without first putting on their theological spectacles. [Hear, hear, hear!]

If, Mr. Chairman, if our Dignitaries had but sense enough to *think more and write less*, the world would give them credit for knowing a great deal which they really do *not* know. Had our Archbishop *not* published his mistake of the real grounds on which the endless bliss of the righteous is based in Scripture, we might have given him credit for knowing, what poor Pusey, Denison, & Co. have long proclaimed is quite unknown to them—that the life of the righteous is hid with Christ in God; and that the foundation of a good man's hope in immortality and endless bliss, rests on the assurance given by the Son of God himself—

BECAUSE I LIVE, *Ye shall live also*”! [Hear, hear!]

Even if our Primate had never given the subject an hour's consideration,

* Righteous indignation has arisen in many minds, in and out of the Established church, against the pious imbecility, narrowmindedness, and petty tyranny, of the contemptible clique, headed by Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, that, despite the Judgement of the Privy Council, intends still to kick against the pricks!

The Committee appointed at the Meeting held in Oxford, on 25 Feb. 1864, has drawn up the following Declaration (bearing testimony to its own obstinacy and mental darkness) which has been widely circulated among the Clergy—

We, the undersigned presbyters and deacons in holy orders of the Church of England and

but, like thousands of our Clergy, accepted the doctrine of the Church without investigation, still, common prudence ought to have withheld him from unnecessarily giving his crude notions publicly to an intelligent Nation, on a subject that He had never *examined* for himself, and on which his individual lack of investigation prohibited Him from forming an opinion—*opinion* He has none; but, a mere *notion* at most. [Hear, hear!] No man, Mr. Chairman, whether Bishop or Archbishop, whether Cardinal or Pope, is entitled to give his individual opinion on a subject he has not been at the pains of *examining*: and, Sir, that fatal Letter of this day week's Date [4 March] signed C. T. CANTUAR, is, to me, an irrefragable proof, that our highly-respected Primate has *adopted*, but never thoroughly *investigated*, the question of either future bliss or future punishment—that, Sir, is utterly

Ireland, hold it to be our bounden duty to the Church of England and Ireland, and to the Souls of men, to declare our firm belief that the Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole catholic church, maintains, *without reserve or qualification*—the inspiration and Divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing but being the Word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the 'punishment' of the 'cursed' equally with the 'life' of the 'righteous' is everlasting".

And the names of the *Seven Wise Men*, constituting the Oxford Committee, which has so reverently adhered to "the Wisdom of our Ancestors", are unblushingly published in the following notation—

C. C. Clerke, D.D. Archdeacon of Oxford;
 R. L. Cotton, D.D. Provost of Worcester College;
 G. A. Denison, M.A. Archdeacon of Taunton;
 W. R. Freemantle, M.A. Rector of Claydon;
 F. K. Leighton, D.D. Warden of All Souls College;
 J. C. Miller, D.D. St. Martin's, Birmingham; and
 E. B. Pusey, D.D. Regius Professor of Hebrew.

Query—Do not these men hereby declare themselves *Nonconformists*? and what will the Public opinion of these *Seven Wise Men* be, a dozen years hence? *Reporter*.

The following *epitaph*, suggested by the Reversal of Dr. Lushington's *Judgement*, has been circulated freely through the Inns of Court, and copied into many Newspapers—

Richard Baron Westbury,
 Lord High Chancellor of England;
 He was an eminent Christian,
 An energetic and successful Statesman,
 And a still more eminent and successful Judge.
 During his three years tenure of Office,
 He abolished
 The time-honored institution of the Insolvents Court,
 The ancient mode of conveying Land,
 And
 The Eternity of Punishment.
 Towards the close of his earthly Career,
 In the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council,
 He dismissed Hell with Costs;
 And took away from Orthodox members of the Church of England,
 Their last Hope of Everlasting Damnation".

Our daily and weekly Newspapers, from one end of the Island to the other, are now dabbling in "Religious squabbles". Strange subjects indeed, exclaims *The Globe*, for Newspaper discussion! adding—Who has made them so? Who has forced them into the field of public controversy? *The Bishops have done it all*; and mainly the Prelates of Oxford and Salisbury. But for the last, there would have been no Prosecution of Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, no Judgement of Dr. Lushington, no Reversal by the Privy Council, and no Archbishop's epistle to Tany Bwlch!"

The pungent *Saturday Review* observes, 5th March, 1864, that Archdeacon Denison and his supporters, carry their conflicts before Courts of Law, but, it is not with the intention of submitting to their *decision*. If the Courts decide against them, they prefer to run the risk of bringing down the whole ecclesiastical edifice on their heads, rather than acquiesce. The Archdeacon and his friends are attempting to impose, by *social pressure*, restrictions which the Courts of Law have declared they cannot obtain by *legal means*. They are attempting to reverse a legal defect, by extra legal means. They are resolved to press their own views to the uttermost, with the Law or in spite of it. But, it is as well that He, and those who aid him, should bear in mind, that this is not the plan by which the marvelous permanence of English institutions has been secured". *Editor*.

impossible, as He is now laboring under the delusion that they are of *equal endurance*, the one as *ceaseless*, as *perpetual*, as *endless* as the other—contrary to the tenor of both the Old and New covenants. [Cheers] It surely is high time, that a Church professing *Christianity*, should repudiate the *Pagan* notion of the perpetuity of future punishments, and adopt the *Christian* doctrine of Universal Restoration! No such fallacy existed in the early Christian church, as may be proved from the writings of the Fathers. It is one of the many "*gangrenous excrescences*, corrupting the fair form of genuine Christianity"—one of the many "*counterfeits*" respecting which archbishop Tillotson writes—

If an Apostle, or, Angel from heaven, teach any doctrine which plainly overthrows the *goodness* and *justice* of God—LET HIM BE ACCURSED!" [Hear, hear, hear!]

OVERBURY. But, don't you know, Mr. Blake, that there are Texts so plain and irrefutable, proving the *never-ending punishments* of the wicked, that neither You nor any other man can set them aside?

BLAKE. No, really, I don't; I never met with any Text that seemed to countenance the horrible doctrine, which could not be set aside by Scripture.

OVERBURY. Then, Sir, I have here a whole collection in my hand, which will compel you to confess, before this Meeting, that the Oxford Declaration against the Reversal of Dr. Lushington's Judgement, already signed by thousands of the Clergy, is in strictest accordance with divine Truth; and that your doctrine of Universal Restoration, is of its Father, the Devil! [Hear, hear! Hear, hear!]

I commence with the word *everlasting*, which I suppose, Mr. Blake, you know to be hundreds of times connected with future punishments in the Old and New testaments.

BLAKE. I fear You are but wasting the time of the Meeting, Mr. Overbury, as I already perceive you are not acquainted with your subject—but, go on, if you choose.

OVERBURY. In Isaiah xxxiii. 14, it is written—

The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the *devouring* fire? Who among us shall dwell with *everlasting* burnings?"

Here we are told, that the Sinners shall dwell with *devouring* fire, and that the Hypocrites shall dwell with *everlasting* burnings; if then that fire is to be *everlasting*, how can—

BLAKE. Mr. Chairman, it is as I suspected; Mr. Overbury is but wasting the time of the Meeting, as he knows not what he is talking about: he has quoted the expressions of the wicked Jews, under their alarm for the desolation of their country, by Sennacherib; fancying the words had reference to the punishment of the damned in a future life—to which they do not bear the slightest reference. [Proof, proof!] Consult bishop Lowth, who has rendered the passage thus—

The sinners in Zion are struck with dread;
Terror hath seized the hypocrites:
Who among us can abide this consuming fire?
Who among us can abide these continued burnings?"

and the Bishop, like others of the learned, is of opinion, that the terror was occasioned by the fear which had seized upon the Jews, that Sennacherib would desolate and burn their possessions. [Hear, hear!] Besides, Mr. Chairman, our English word *everlasting* has nothing whatever to do with the passage, be its meaning what it may; for, the Hebrew word [*g'olam*]

means *hidden, unknown*, not *eternal, everlasting*: so that, when connected with time, it means an *unknown* duration; when connected with eternity, it means a *hidden* duration—certainly not an *eternal* or *everlasting* duration. [Hear, hear! and Applause.

That this Meeting may not think me too hard on Mr. Overbury, by declaring "He knows not what he is talking about"; the *hundreds of times* he says the word *everlasting* is used in connection with future punishment, I declare, unequivocally, as not amounting to *scores*, nor *dozens*, nor yet *half a dozen*, but to *five* only—one, in the Old and *four* in the New covenant—and, Mr. Chairman, *not one of the five* means ENDLESS! [Hear, hear, hear! frequently repeated] It may be found in Daniel xii. 2—

Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake: some, to *everlasting* life; and some, to shame and *everlasting* contempt".

There are several other *everlastings* in the Hebrew scriptures, all of which are necessarily *limited* in their duration; such as the *everlasting* covenant of circumcision, long since declared by the Holy Spirit, to be null and void—such as the *everlasting* possession of the land of Canaan, which must be dissolved, or burned up in the conflagration of the Earth—such as the *everlasting* hills, the *everlasting* priesthood, the *everlasting* statute, the *everlasting* mountains—every one of which means a TEMPORARY, not an ENDLESS duration.

Our Translators have VERY IMPROPERLY thrice given *everlasting* as the English equivalent for *aionion* in Matthew; [xviii. 8 and in xxv. 41, 46] in Mark they have given *eternal*; [iii. 29] in Luke and in John they have avoided both words; in the Acts, containing so many sermons and parts of sermons, neither *everlasting* nor *eternal damnation* is once to be met with, though such a staple article in modern orthodox sermons; notwithstanding Paul's writings constitute such a large portion of the New testament, *everlasting destruction* is but once mentioned; [2 Thess. i. 9] in the epistle of Apollos to the Hebrews, in the epistle of James, in the 2 epistles of Peter, and the 3 epistles of John, our Translators have omitted both words; in Jude they have *everlasting chains* [6 v.] and *eternal fire*; [7 v.] but, have escaped both words in the book of Revelation: and I am prepared, "on the instant", if Mr. Overbury disputes me, to negative these 2 *eternals* and 5 *everlastings* by the production of other Texts wherein the words cannot possibly be received in any other than a *limited* meaning. [Considerable applause.

OVERBURY. But, Mr. Blake, though you may be able to negative the employment of the two words *eternal* and *everlasting*, still, the *never-ending punishment* of the wicked is shown in a multiplicity of other Texts, differently expressed; such as—

The smoke of their torment ascendeth up *for ever and ever!*

The Devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the Beast and the false Prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night *for ever and ever!*" [Hear, hear!]

BLAKE. O dear, O dear! and so you are under the necessity of quoting a Book which so many biblical scholars and accredited critics have denounced as *spurious*; and of which our Dr. South has written—"If the Apocalypse does not find a man *mad*, it leaves him so"—Witness poor Dr. Cumming. [Hear, hear!] Have you, Mr. Overbury, nothing better to urge in support of *endless damnation*, than these two texts? You might as well have added the third, [Rev. xix. 3] and then you would have had *all* that stand in the Bible—and all equally unavailable; for, they are all of *limited* duration—even admitting them to be genuine.

OVERBURY. How do you make that out?

BLAKE. It can be proved in many ways; it can be proved from the Apocalypse itself, which tells us, that *after the expiration* of your *for ever and ever*, there is to be "a new heaven and a new earth", when "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for, the former things are [*then* shall be] passed away".

But, let me not lose myself, like poor Dr. Cumming, in the inextricable meshes of the fascinating intricacies of the embarrassing and perplexing Apocalypse. [Hear, hear!]

I prefer negating the texts given by Mr. Overbury, with texts that are intelligible to all men; such as—

Go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come *for ever and ever*: Isaiah xxx. 8.

I will cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers, *for ever and ever*. Jer. vii. 7.

Turn ye again now, every one from his evil way, and from the evil of your doings, and dwell in the land Jehovah hath given unto you and to your fathers *for ever and ever*. xxv. 5.

It must be evident to all present, that in these 3 passages, *for ever and ever* (which ought to have been *ages of ages*) cannot mean *endless*; and that Mr. Overbury must try again.*

OVERBURY. Well, here I have a text you *cannot* negative—

He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit, and with fire: whose fan [winnowing

* If *for ever and ever* be of longer duration than *for ever*, which must upon investigation be granted, then, there is some *proportion* between the two durations; and if any proportion whatever exists between the two, both must necessarily have an *end*—otherwise, *proportion* cannot have existence. The fact is, our English translation is at fault; the numerous texts embodying the words *for ever*, and *for ever and ever*, ought to have been rendered by the English words *age, ages, ages of ages*, which would have made those passages intelligible, that are now sheer nonsense: such, for instance, as—

Ps. lxxviii. 69— He built his sanctuary like high palaces; like the Earth, which he hath established *for ever*.

Ps. civ. 5— Who laid the foundations of the Earth, that it should not be removed *for ever*.

Eccle. i. 4— One generation passeth away, and another cometh, but, the Earth abideth *for ever*.

Similar mistranslations run throughout our "authorized version"; for, if understood in the meaning of *endless*, the passages would be preposterous—

Gen. xliii. 8, 9—Judah said unto Israel his father, Send the lad [Joseph] with me: if I bring him not unto thee, then, let me bear the blame *for ever*.

Exo. xxi. 6— His master shall bore his ear through, with an awl; and he shall serve him *for ever*.

Lev. xxv. 46— They shall be your bondmen *for ever*.

Similar mistranslations have place in the Christian as well as in the Hebrew Scriptures; for instance—

Heb. i. 8, 9— Unto the Son he saith—Thy throne, O God, is *for ever and ever*: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore O God, THY GOD hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness *above thy fellows*.

Here, the throne of the Son is contradistinguished from the throne of the Father; yet, our translators, instead of making the Son's throne to abide *for ages of ages*, have made its endurance *for ever and ever*—notwithstanding it must have an *end*, when the Son shall "have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when he [the Son] shall have put down all rule and all authority and all power—then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him [the Father] that put all things under him, [the Son] that God may be ALL IN ALL".

As bishop Hare has remarked—It is *not the words* of Scripture, but, *the sense*, which is the Rule". And what should be our rule in translating and understanding the words of Scripture but this—

What MUST BE the meaning of the words in *many places*, and MAY BE the meaning in *all*, is THE TRUE SENSE. Reporter.

Were it worth while, I could add a list of Texts which would carry in themselves the proofs, that no argument for *endless punishment* can be maintained from the association of such words as *for ever, for ever and ever, eternal, everlasting*; all of which are associated in Scripture with things that are neither PERPETUAL nor ENDLESS. Editor.

shovel] is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor; [cleanse his grain] he will gather his wheat into the garner; but, *he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire!* Mat. iii. 12. and Luke iii. 17.

Whether we take Matthew's expression, *unquenchable fire*, or, Mark's *fire that never shall be quenched*, or, the *fire unquenchable* of Luke, is immaterial; such is Hell fire: and if that be not ENDLESS, I give up the point. [Hear, hear!]

BLAKE. Then, give it up, and do not occupy the time of the Meeting unprofitably; for, as I told you before, You are not master of your subject. I read of several fires in the Scriptures much stronger and far more durable than yours—yet, NOT ENDLESS. [Hear, hear!]

The fire shall *ever be burning* upon the altar: it shall NEVER GO OUT. Lev. vi. 13.

Now, though a fire should be *unquenchable*, it may go out of itself; though never *quenched*, it may burn itself out: but, here we have a fire *ever burning*, one that shall NEVER GO OUT—yet, it *no longer burns*—it WENT OUT AGES AND AGES AGO! [Cheers.]

But, Mr. Chairman, you must perceive that Mr. Overbury, like most of our Clergy, has yet to *examine* the subject for himself, as He knows no more about it than the uninitiated writers who, week after week, occupy the columns of *Public Opinion*, without taking that comprehensive view which it positively demands—they do not see that Universal Restoration is INEVITABLE, if it be true, that where Sin has abounded Grace shall much more abound; and when *the last enemy* shall be destroyed, [Death] it is preposterous to say, that millions will still remain to all eternity. [Hear, hear!] If all things were indeed delivered to the Son, by the Father, and if of all that was given him, the Son shall not have lost anything, when he gives up the kingdom again into the hands of the Father, that God may be ALL IN ALL—then, is Universal Restoration an essential, an inevitable, an absolutely indispensable requisite, in the economy of the Kingdom of God! [Applause.]

CHAUCER. Unless we give the People who frequent our churches, something more substantial than “the beggarly elements” of rites, liturgies, and creeds; unless we can meet the demands of an intelligent and intellectual people, we shall, ere long, have nothing else left to preach to, than whited-walls and painted-sepulchres. We must either give up our dogmatic way of teaching and preaching, or, see our Pews and Free-seats given up by those who are forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God, in Christ Jesus. [Hear, hear!] In short, Sir, we, the Clergy of the National church, must be set at Liberty, and no longer be Bondmen to withered Creeds and worn-out Stipulations, we must not only exercise our faculties of thought and judgement, but, we must be awarded the right to give free scope to Inquiry, and unrestricted utterance to our Opinions—be they what they may! [Loud and repeated cheerings.]

REV. J. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman! I hold in my hand *The Unitarian Herald* of this day's date, [11 March, 1864] wherein I learn that Dr. Rowland Williams has addressed a letter to the *Salisbury Journal*, commenting on the Appeal for Subscriptions towards the expenses incurred by the Bishop in the recent notorious prosecution; a part of which letter I beg to read to this Meeting—

My only wish is to offer his Lordship's numerous friends some suggestions which may have escaped their notice. Their first anxiety, as I conceive, should be directed

to the preservation of this diocese from *the danger of losing* his Lordship's *paternal activity*. There seems some ground for alarm, lest our *good* Bishop and his friends, on comparing all that they have declared untenable in the Church of England with all which our judicial tribunals have sanctioned, may *resign in a body their offices*, and leave us all to our miserable fate. Supposing this *calamity* to be averted, there remain some serious moral questions, to which our *good Bishop's friends* should be prepared with answers of a more ratiocinative kind than have yet been given them. There is a book called *the Old testament*, in Hebrew, in which the prophet Daniel comes after the prophet Malachi. By what right does any Bishop first *misrepresent* the order of the books, secondly accuse the Jews of having disarranged them, and finally prosecute, *with groundless imputations*, any Clergyman who finds no evidence for the assertion that the Jews altered the Hebrew arrangement? There is a book, in Greek, called *the New testament*, which contains an epistle to the Hebrews, the author of which is not mentioned by name in the Bible, and was confessedly *unknown* to the ancient fathers and to the English reformers. By what right does a Bishop bid a Clergyman say the author *must* have been Paul rather than Apollos, if he happens to think the second more likely? There is an English book, called *the Book of Homilies*, which teaches that all sacraments without faith are worthless. By what right does a Bishop, bound to those homilies, prosecute a Clergyman for saying that all wholesome instrumentality of sacraments comes, *not of physical contact* with the elements, but of *faith* signifying itself by proper symbols? There is another English book, called *the Prayer Book*, from which St. Augustine's *pleasant* doctrine of God's burning unbaptized Infants for ever, was excluded by archbishop Cranmer, because, he said, he 'judged the case to be far otherwise'. Granting poor Cranmer to have been burned for this and other such instances of neology, I still ask, by what right a protestant Bishop can prosecute a Clergyman for denying so barbarous a superstition? There is one more book, older than any Bible or Prayer Book, and written by God's finger *on the conscience of man*. This book of universal morality, or primary righteousness, forbids all attempts to darken truth by violence, or, to thrust gross imputations of heresy into the fair domain of literature. Is it, I ask, no outrage to *this book*; that a Bishop should load a Clergyman, no less anxious than himself for the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, with imputations so groundless, that a first hearing, even in an Ecclesiastical court, causes most of them to be *rejected*, and further investigation leads to their total *collapse*, while yet their sound is invidious enough to give partisanship a handle, and ignorance a ground of alarm?"

Mr. Chairman, I have done.

Chairman. Gentlemen, I have already lost one Train, and if you do not shortly bring this discursive Discussion to a close, I shall lose another—or, I must vacate the Chair. [Hear, hear!

REV. G. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman! A slip of paper has just been passed, from an unknown quarter, into my hands, urging upon me the performance of what is styled "a bounden duty"; namely, to bear my testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity—[Hear, hear!] to this I have not any valid objection, and shall give it to this Meeting in the precise words of the well-known trinitarian, Dr. Hey—

My understanding is involved in perplexity; my conceptions bewildered in the thickest darkness. I profess and proclaim my confusion in the most unequivocal manner!" [A burst of applause.

MR. C. SHAW. We, on this side of the table, Mr. Chairman, have openly maintained, at this Meeting, the following 5 points—

I. There is One only true wise God;

II. There is a God the Father;

III. There is a God the Son;

IV. There is a God the Holy Ghost;

V. There is a holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, of which God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, form *three* constituent

Parts, or Persons ; yet, there are not *three* Gods but *one* God only : God the Father, is Himself and God the Son and God the Holy Ghost ; God the Son, is Himself and God the Father and God the Holy Ghost ; God the Holy Ghost, is Himself and God the Father and God the Son : for, "in this Trinity none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another, but, the whole *three* Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal" ; God the Son, the only begotten of his Father some 1864 years ago, is as old as his Father ; and the Holy Ghost, who first proceeded forth from the Father some 1830 years ago, is as old as the Father and the Son : for, "the whole *three* Persons are co-eternal together"—Mary, a Virgin, having given birth to all three, of whom "none is afore or after other"—

and this, Mr. Chairman, is the Catholic Faith, "which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly !" but, Sir, as my Maker has not given me intellects to apprehend the "three incomprehensibles", how the Son is his own Father, his own Self, his own Son, and the Holy Ghost besides, though I should never be saved, I now publicly renounce Trinitarianism for ever ! [Cheers.

W. WHITEHEAD, Esq. And I, Mr. Chairman, having discovered in the course of this Discussion, that, according to Trinitarianism, the Virgin was the Mother of her own Creator—for, without the Child* to which she gave birth, "was not anything made that was made"—I also, now cast the pagan and popish Trinity to the moles and the bats, henceforth worshiping the One only true wise God ! [Cheers.

REV. J. HALL. And I shall at once erase your name from the Plan, Mr. Whitehead ; you shall no longer occupy a pulpit over which, thank Conference, I have full controll ; never again shall you have an opportunity of disseminating your infidel principles among the flock under my care.

WHITEHEAD. Mr. Hall, I know you ; and I know, that Jesus never said to Wolves, *Feed ye my Sheep* ! [Hear, hear !

Chairman. But, Peter has said, *Be courteous*". [Pause.

MR. OLDYS. As you, Mr. Whitehead, have announced to this Meeting your resolution of "henceforth worshiping the One only true wise God", I am desirous of knowing, from your own lips and in the presence of so many witnesses, If you acknowledge and intend worshiping that God I read of in the Bible, who conversed familiarly with Adam in the Garden of

* Some kind-hearted soul (but who, I have not discovered) has been at the trouble and expense of sending me, by Post, during some years, the trashy issues of "The English Monthly Tract Society", in the expectation, perhaps, of converting me from the error of my ways, by such offensive rubbish as the following—

Let us look at that little Babe, lying, in all the weakness of helpless infancy, in the arms of its Virgin mother. *That Babe it was*, who formed this fair world, so beautiful ; yea, 'drowned in beauty', as one has sung. What must it have been before Sin entered to mar it ! *He it was*, who created those glorious orbs of heaven, and who guides them in their courses. '*Without Him was not anything made that was made*' ; from the cherubim and seraphim who hymn *His praises* around the throne, to the tiniest insect which floats upon the summer breeze, or, the little fern that finds a home in the clefts of the rugged rock". No. 268, p. 12.

They must be Baby-minds, indeed, who can deliberately peruse, or, patiently peruse, such puerile, childish, silly Tracts as these—they turn the cream on my stomach. *Reporter*.

Yet even Kingsley transfers the Creatorship from the Father to the Son, in his *Sermons on The Gospel in the Pentateuch*—

You must believe"—what ? why, that "the Babe who is born at Bethlehem, who grows up, as other human beings grow, into the man Christ Jesus, is none other than the Lord God who created the universe".

Let us cease talking pitiably of the Superstition of the Heathens until we get rid of our own still more pitiable and reprehensible Superstition. *Editor*.

Eden? and afterwards, with the Patriarchs, with Moses, and with the Prophets?

WHITEHEAD. I acknowledge a Superintending-power, who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

OLDYS. But, Sir, I read of a God who visited Abram, and dined on veal, cakes, butter, and milk, sitting under a tree; a God who wrestled bodily with Jacob; a God who showed certain parts of Himself to Moses: do you acknowledge and worship *that* God?

WHITEHEAD. I worship no such Being; but, One whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain; whom no man hath seen, nor can see; neither hath any man heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.

OLDYS. Do you then abjure *that* Jehovah who was the national God of the Hebrews of old? who gave them a Code of laws, and especially Ten commandments on two tables of stone, written on both their sides by God himself, in mount Sinai? for, I read—the Tables were the work of God, and the Writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables’.

WHITEHEAD. I adore a paternal God, our Father who is in heaven, dwelling in light ineffable and full of glory—the Father of the spirits of all flesh; the God of Moses, of David, of Isaiah, of Jesus, of Paul, of every man who worships Him in spirit and in truth—the Creator and Preserver and Saviour of all his intelligent creatures.

OLDYS. You mean, of course, that jealous and angry and relentless God, who could only be appeased by sacrifices and whole burnt-offerings—He who repented of what he had done, and of what he had threatened—is it not so?

WHITEHEAD. I mean the God apprehensible to refined conceptions, to whom burnt-offerings and sacrifices were a weariness and an abomination; with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning—longsuffering and plenteous in mercy, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, delighting in multiplying pardon.

OLDYS. Ay, but not for your sake; only for Christ’s sake.

WHITEHEAD. No; *not* for Christ’s sake, but, for His own great name and mercy’s sake.

OLDYS. Your New testament says distinctly, “for Christ’s sake”.

WHITEHEAD. I admit there is such an expression, and but One in the Scriptures; that, however, is a well-known blunder in our “authorized version”—not to be found in the text of the original.

LAMB. I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that you allow Mr. Oldys to engross our attention; for, he surely has some sinister motive for so doing; perhaps, He also begins to find out, that *Infidelity does not Pay*, and therefore wishes to join the Christian ranks, like his former associates, Cooper, and Gordon, and Barker, and Bebbington, etc. [Hear, hear!]

REV. H. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman! I rise to Order. [Hear, hear!] The dialogue, Sir, between the Secularist and the Dissenter, is such a digression from the avowed object of this Meeting, that I must Protest against its continuance. [Hear, hear!] We Clergy of the Established church, do not attend here for the purpose of listening to the irreverent interrogatories of a professed Infidel, and the replications of a Wesleyan preacher, but, for the purpose of controverting the foolish doctrine of the mischievous Unitarians, and bearing our testimony to the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity—*three Persons in one God!* [Hear, hear! and Cheers.]

Chairman. You are certainly right, Vicar, in calling the Dialogue between Messieurs Oldys and Whitehead a *digression*; yet, to confess a truth, I

would myself have sacrificed *propriety* to *enlightenment*, and should gladly have heard the gradually approaching intellectual contest between two such clever and well-matched antagonists; but, your having risen to Order, and Protested against its continuance, I am bound, as Chairman, however reluctantly, to request the Champions for Secularism and Christianity, at once to desist. [Hear, hear! and Applause.]

OLDYS. I hope to meet with a more favorable opportunity of encountering so courteous an Opponent.

WHITEHEAD. And I trust you, Sir, may find me "ready, always to give an answer, to every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is in me, with meekness and fear, having a good conscience". [Hear, hear!]

PEELE. 'Tis with our judgements, as our watches—none
Go just alike; yet, each believes his own".

SIR J. HARRINGTON. Though several Speakers have touched upon the difference between the *Gospel of Jesus* and the *Christism of Paul*, no one, Mr. Chairman, has called the particular attention of the Meeting to what Stearns designates "The Mistake of Christendom"; and there certainly is a vast difference between the two Gospels: for, in the historical biographies given by the Evangelists, we have the simple, pure, unsophisticated doctrines of Jesus; but, in Paul's epistles we have several *new* doctrines, such as Jesus never taught, and about which the Churches of our day are incessantly quarreling. [Hear, hear!] Stearns, not unaptly, calls Paul "*the Inventor of Christism*"; and on the titlepage of his book, he mentions "Jesus and his Gospel" as having existed *before* "Paul and Christianity". Stearns also maintains that Jesus was not known as *the Christ*, never called *Christ* during his lifetime; that Christendom is indebted to Paul, not the Evangelists, for the appellation *christianity*; and that the Disciples of our Lord had, every one of them, to be converted to Christianity, *after* the Crucifixion—*then first* adopting the new doctrines unknown to Jesus.

REV. T. K. HERVEY. But, how can that be? for, we read of *Christ* in the gospels, just as familiarly and as frequently as we read of *Christ* in the epistles.

HARRINGTON. Nothing of the kind! In the gospel by John, for instance, the name *Jesus* occurs 233 times; while the name *Christ*, taken under its various applications, occurs but 21 times in all; yet, Jesus is called *Christ* 46 times in the first epistle to the Corinthians, and only *twice* by his proper name. [Hear, hear!]

HERVEY. *His proper Name!* Do you mean to say that *Christ* was *not* his proper name?

HARRINGTON. I mean to say, that the Compilers of the evangelic history have represented Matthew and John as having *twice each* put the title *Christ* for the cognomen of Jesus—Mark but *once*—Luke *not at all*—while Paul repeats the misnomer about 180 times, though he never once met with it in the Hebrew scriptures.

HERVEY. Well, but Paul had read of *Christ* in the Evangelists.

HARRINGTON. You forget, Mr. Hervey, that when Paul wrote, the New testament was not in existence—the Evangelists had not penned their biographical accounts.

HERVEY. At any rate, when our Lord asked his disciples, *Who say ye that I am?* Peter answered, *the Christ of God*.

HARRINGTON. Why do you not add the remainder of that text? why mutilate the passage? The words which immediately follow Peter's answer, in

the same verse, are—and *Jesus straightly charged them, and COMMANDED them, to tell no man that thing*": and why not? why because, He was known as *Jesus only, the sent of God*, and not known as *the Christ*. [Hear, hear!] Besides, had Jesus been named *Christ*, the prophecy concerning his birth would not have been fulfilled. The angel announced the maternity of Mary in connection with the words—"She shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name *Jesus*"; and Joseph "called his name *Jesus*". Luke also informs us, that another angel predicted the same things to Mary; and adds—When 8 days were accomplished for the circumcizing of the child, his name was called *Jesus*, which was *so named* of the angel BEFORE he was conceived in the womb". It is not anywhere expressed in the scriptures, that Jesus was named, or even generally called *Christ*, during his life. It certainly is stated in the genealogy prefacing the book Matthew, that "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, *who is called Christ*"; [Hear, hear!] but, this is a tacit proof that *Jesus was not Christ*, not called *Christ* during his lifetime; for, that genealogy was penned many years *after* the death of Jesus, whose proper name is inserted of set purpose, and plainly distinguished from the name *Christ* afterwards given to him—in plain English, Mr. Chairman, the text says—the Son of Joseph and Mary, whose name was *Jesus*, is now, at this day, called *Christ*. And this is what we in 1864 can say, even in a wider sense. The believers in the *divinity* of Jesus, were then but very few. The expression was as appropriate when employed by the Evangelist in reference to certain admiring survivors of Jesus, as in the mouth of Pilate, when calling to the mob of accusers—What shall I do, then, with Jesus, which is *called Christ*?" Pilate knew him as *Jesus*, and wrote the superscription of his accusation over the cross—*Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews*". But, Mr. Chairman, not to pursue the mere Name farther, Stearns insists, upon Scripture grounds, that the Gospel of Jesus is immeasurably superior to the Christism of Paul; and that the adoption of Paul's Christism to the setting aside of the Gospel of Jesus, constitutes the grand "Mistake of Christendom". [Hear, hear!] DR. CROWNE. Paul, Mr. Chairman, was an exceedingly self-sufficient man, and took more upon himself than he ought to have done. [Hear, hear!] He is the only biblical writer that inculcates the extended Creed which our National church propagates as *the Gospel of Jesus*; whereas it is *Paul's gospel*—and such, indeed, he calls it. [Never!] In writing his very first epistle, that to the Thessalonians, and also when writing to the Corinthians, he makes use of the expression "*our gospel*"; and to the Romans, as well as to Timothy, he emphatically writes, "*according to My gospel*": and anyone capable of examining the doctrines of Jesus and the doctrines of Paul, must be constrained to admit they are very far from being the same—very far from being even similar—

"The Epistles of Paul, and others, are only deserving of notice, as containing the principal doctrines of *modern* Christianity; and in these are to be found the origin of all the strange and anti-christian doctrines that have mystified and disturbed the world for nearly the last two thousand years, under the names of the innumerable and conflicting Sects that have sprung up amongst us—all professing to be followers of Jesus, and *all* differing widely, both from his doctrines and from each other.*

To Paul the world is indebted for the doctrines of the Divinity of Jesus, the Trinity, Original Sin, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, Predestination,

* "The Trinitarian denounces the Unitarian, and the Unitarian the Trinitarian; and both unite in condemning the Roman Catholic.

The Arminians denounce the Calvinist's views, 'as a system consisting of human creatures

Reprobation, Free Will, and Election—all of which, with perhaps the exception of the last, were *unknown* in the time of Jesus.

A Voice from the Ganges. p. 200. Ed. 1861.

Paul's Christism was the foundation of our so-called *christianity*, which, as Man progresses towards perfection, will gradually wear out, and make way for the Gospel of Jesus, whose Sermon on mount Olivet is an ever-during monument of his moral and spiritual genius! [Hear, hear!

J. NEWTON, Esq. The Rev. John James Tayler, B.A. has remarked, in his Address on 12 Oct. 1863—

Even Rénan, the most recent, and certainly not the least daring of modern expositors of the Life of Jesus, has eloquently maintained the *finality* of his religion, and urged the world to seek its spiritual renovation, not in any new theories, but *in going back to his simple faith*, and drawing out of it, with new conviction and nobler consistency, the principles of unsuspected power and blessing which it still contains".

I would also direct the consideration of the Meeting to a remarkable saying in the writings of Lessing—

The *Christian religion* has been tried for 18 centuries; the *religion of Christ* remains yet to be tried".

The Gospel of Jesus teaches, that He was the *Son of Man*, the *Son of God*; and those who contradict him, saying, He was *God the Son*, destroy, to all intents and purposes His being a *human Exemplar*—as He could not, in that case, be tempted in all points as we are. [Hear, hear!

HARRINGTON. In his defense before Agrippa, Paul makes known *the source* of his Faith, in these words—

Having obtained God's help, I have continued until this day witnessing both to small and great, SAYING NOTHING BEYOND what the Prophets and Moses said would

without liberty, doctrine without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy'. *Arch-deacon JORTIN*.

The Calvinists on the other hand, represent Arminianism as 'delusive, dangerous, and ruinous to immortal souls'; (CLOSER'S *Sermons*) and the Unitarians declare them both 'to be a mischievous compound of impiety and idolatry'. *Disc. on Priestley*.'

Again—Archbishop Magee denounces the Unitarian system, as "embracing the most daring impieties that ever disgraced the name of Christianity"; and declares, that "if Unitarianism be well-founded, Christianity must be an imposition".

All Sects join in denouncing the Methodists, "as misled fanatics, alienated from all knowledge of the true God. *Divine Truth*."

The Church of England denounces the whole body of Dissenters, "as accursed, devoted to the Devil, and separated from Christ"; (*Canon v. vii.*) and the Bishop of London (*Letters on Dissent*) denounced the Dissenters "to be actuated by the Devil, with the curse of God resting heavily on them all".

The Dissenters are not slow in retaliating on the Church of England, declaring it to be "an obstacle to the progress of truth and holiness in the land, that it destroys more souls than it saves, and that its end is most devoutly to be wished for, by every lover of God and Man! *Christian Observer*."

The Roman Catholics declare their Church to be "the only true one", and all the other Sects join in denouncing Her to be "the scarlet whore of Babylon", and a combination of idolatry, blasphemy, and devilism: (*Census Apostasy*) whilst the Roman Catholics retort on the whole body of Protestants, of every sect and description; consign them to eternal damnation, as heretics and schismatics, and their Clergy desecrated "as thieves and ministers of the devil. *Rheims Test*."

It would be endless to enumerate the names and tenets of the various Sects which constitute that "chaos of confusion" denominated "*the Christian Church*", all derived from this *one* book, the Bible, which is declared to be an emanation from the Almighty, and a revelation of His will to Man. *Voice from the Ganges*. pp. 216, 217. Ed. 1861.

One Sect denouncing another, testifies to the lack of genuine Christianity—or, as Jesus would say to all these contending Sectarists—Ye know not what spirit ye are of!" *Editor*.

come—that the Christ should suffer, that He first from the resurrection of the dead should show a light to the people and to the Gentiles”.*

Consequently, Paul's own testimony, as to the *source* whence he derived the matter of his Faith, may be summed up thus—

I. Paul believed “*all things* which are written in the Law and in the Prophets”.

• II. The Christism which Paul preached, was “*according to the Scriptures*”—the Old testament of course.

III. Paul believed and preached “*nothing beyond* what the Prophets and Moses said would come”.

Whence it may rationally be inferred, Mr. Chairman, that Paul's notion about his having received any portion of Christian faith from the departed Spirit of Jesus, was wholly without foundation. [Hear, hear!]

DR. M. GOOD. At any rate, the prosecuting Dignitaries of our Established church ought to feel very much obliged to Paul, for having introduced into his Christism such doctrines as *Inspiration, Atonement*, etc. which have furnished their propensity for persecution with a sort of biblical excuse—though a very lame one. Had it not been for Paul's gospel, the Essayists and Reviewers, Colenso and all the rest of the so-called *heretical writers*, would have escaped Prosecutions.† [Hear, hear!]

MR. LOWTH. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the most deplorable of all the sad chapters in the history of Christianity, is that wherein Christ has been made to *supersede* Jehovah; and it is lamentable beyond all expression, that with thousands of thousands in our day, THE SON IS MORE HONORED THAN THE FATHER—Jesus, in fact, being their “*all in all*”: He who sent his special Messenger, to reveal the *paternal* character of the Father of all intelligent creation, is virtually set aside in the minds of men, to make room for their adoration of Christ. [Hear, hear!] What though the “Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth”, takes precedence of the Son, in Church *formularies*, yet, everyone of our day who has received a Protestant education, knows very well, that, in *practice*, the Son is a much more prominent and exalted personage than the Father—just as the Virgin Mary runs away with all the adoration, gratitude, and love of the Romanist—the one

* When Scripture is quoted by any Speaker, I give the words used by the Speaker, without any regard to the Translation; one Speaker reading or quoting from one copy, and another from a different copy. Mr. Harrington having followed Sharpe's clever translation of Griesbach's accredited Text, I am bound to give Sharpe's words, however much or little they may differ from our “authorized version”—and so I have done throughout. *Reporter*.

† Young Coquerel, who with his highly-talented Father (personally known to me upwards of 40 years) now manfully enduring Persecution for Conscience-sake (in France) writes in the periodical *Le Lien*—

In every form of Persecution, there is, at the bottom, an implicit confession of *conscious weakness*. It is ignorance that persecutes science, routine that persecutes progress, tradition which persecutes young truth. The ill-humor and exclusiveness of the thin orthodoxy of today, are explained only by its *inability* to defend itself by Discussion. *Don't do Man the injustice to think him a persecutor by Nature*—He is made so by NECESSITY. Where is the Church, that would not rather close the mouths of its adversaries by *reason*, than by *faggot*? Orthodoxy has then only recourse to *carnal* weapons, when it finds itself lacking *spiritual* ones. Calvin himself, that great gladiator in theological discussions, when he prevented Castallo from being a minister because of the views he held of the “Song of Solomon”; when he drove Bolsec into exile for having contradicted him while preaching in favor of predestination; when he burned Servetus on account of his Unitarian publications: Calvin, in each case, distrusted the power of his logic to convince those heretics, and to counterbalance by solid argument the influence of their writings. They were to Him, dangerous men, and their *banishment*, or their *death*, was with him AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY”. *Reporter*.

Dr. Samuel Parker (nominated Bishop of Oxford, by James II.) maintains, in his “*Ecclesiastical Polity*”, [1670] that “Princes may, with less hazard, give liberty to men's *vices*, than to their *consciences*”. *Editor*.

offering up prayers and thanksgivings to the "Mother of God" the other to the "Son of God", popishly converted into "God the Son"; both Protestant and Romanist slighting the "ONE ONLY TRUE WISE GOD", in their idolatrous worship of his Creatures. [Hear, hear!] This is sad, this is blasphemous, this is sinful; inasmuch as the worshiping of any Idol, whether it be the Bible, the Virgin, or Jesus, is a sin against God, who has declared in the plainest terms—I am Jehovah: that is my name; and my Glory will I *not* give to another"! Yet, in the face of this Declaration, Trinitarians are now declaring, that "the Jehovah of the Old testament, is the Christ of the New". [Hear, hear!]

REV. S. SAY. [After long-continued Calls, rapturously cheered on rising] Mr. Chairman! Though it is with some degree of reluctance, that I stand up to address the Meeting, I yet feel that I ought not perversely to resist the repeated Calls; as I am individually under great obligations for the lessons I have received from several Speakers: and as I shall leave this Hall a wiser, if not a better man, than I entered it, I obey the Call more from a sense of gratitude, than from a feeling of gratification at being so generally and so strongly urged to express my sentiments. [Hear, hear!]

When his Grace, the Primate of all England declared, that the Objections published by Colenso,

"are for the most part puerile and trite—so puerile, that an intelligent Youth, who read his Bible with care, could draw the fitting answers from the Bible itself—so trite, that they have been again and again refuted—200 years ago by archbishop Usher, one of the most learned analysts of this or any country, more recently by bishop Watson and others"—

I felt, that as bishop Colenso had *re-produced* the Objections, they required to be *again refuted*; and will continue to require refutation as often as they may yet be produced, in after-times. [Hear, hear!]

When the Bishop of Oxford, who stands at the head of those Bishops that ignore the existence of such a Science as *Biblical criticism*, asserted that Colenso's "speculations, so rash and feeble in themselves", are,

"in all essential points, but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils against the Word of God"—

I felt, that something more was required of bishop Wilberforce, than merely condemning them—that He ought at once to have performed the task, to Him so easy and simple, of exposing the rash and feeble speculations of Colenso, and *once more* have answered the cavils. [Hear, hear!]

When the Bishop of Chichester represented Colenso's critiques as being "unfounded, false, and childish",* I felt that Dr. Gilbert had shirked his duty to the Church and the Nation, by *not* manfully stating their falsities and fairly overturning them. [Hear, hear!]

Then, the thought struck me—If Colenso's writings were so *puerile and trite*, as the Archbishop of Canterbury declared them to be; so *often-*

* In Colenso's Preface to Part III. p. xv. stands the Note I now copy—

In the single short Letter of one of my Episcopal Brethren, *forbidding* me to Minister in his Diocese, the following expressions appear, applied either to myself or my work:

Unfounded—false—childish—heretical—blasphemous—abominable—unhappy—blind—daring—ignorant self-sufficiency—instrument of Satan—poor bishop Colenso".

However poor bishop Colenso may be, with his moderate stipend, when contrasted to his rich Brethren, with their princely revenues, He is too noble-minded to answer railing with railing. *Reporter.*

Neither Dr. Gilbert nor Dr. Wilberforce, nor yet Dr. Longley himself can say, with their so-called *prototypes* Peter—SILVER AND GOLD HAVE I NONE"—neither can any one of these boasted Successors of Peter, say *curatively* to a man lame from his mother's womb—RISE UP, AND WALK!" *Editor.*

answered, as the Bishop of Oxford represented; and so *unfounded*, as the Bishop of Chichester pronounced them; it would not be a difficult matter for Me to undertake their refutation to the intire satisfaction of the tens of thousands who had been "unhinged, shaken, staggered, and deceived"; by "the mischievous and pestilential writings of the erring Bishop of Natal": and, with that intent, I sat down to *read* and *refute* his "heretical and abominable production"; but lo! I found the contemned Bishop of Natal quite an overmatch for me; and I rose from the perusal of his "silly" writings under the impression, that Colenso was *right*, and his clerical adversaries egregiously *wrong*. [Hear, hear!

The notorious persecuting Bishop of Exeter, who was expected to have rushed forth "like a roaring lion", has astonished the Bench of Bishops, the Convocation, and the Public generally, by his prudent, calm, and christian bearing, towards his brother Colenso—and what may be noted as still more astonishing, Dr. Phillpotts has administered a most severe rebuke to the Clerical assailants of the Bishop of Natal, not sparing even the Primate, by the publication of his deliberate opinion on Colenso's case—

I deem it the duty of the Bishops of the province of Canterbury—whatever may be the duty of others—to abstain from making any declaration which shall *pre-judge* matters which must be the subject of judicial consideration before our Archbishop. His Grace, as an appellate judge, will, I apprehend, have to preside on the trial of the Bishop of Natal. It is manifestly much better that we should be charged with want of sympathy with those whom we most highly esteem, than that we should do anything which may endanger the *impartiality* and *purity* of the tribunal of Justice".

Such a reproof, from such a quarter, must have stung the Assailants of the *yet untried* Colenso to the quick!*

Hence, Mr. Chairman, I repudiate as untenable, the *literal, verbal, plenary* Inspiration of the Scriptures—yet, still believing that they are every way able to make us wise unto Salvation. [Cheers.

"The word *inspiration* has received more numerous gradations and distinctions of meaning, than perhaps any other in the whole of Theology. There is an Inspiration of Superintendence, and an Inspiration of Suggestion—an Inspiration which would have been consistent with Apostle or Evangelist falling into Error, and an Inspiration which would have prevented him from Erring—verbal organic Inspiration, by which the inspired person is the *passive* utterer of a divine Word—and an Inspiration which acts through the character of the sacred writer. There is an Inspiration which absolutely communicates the fact to be revealed, or statement to be made; and an Inspiration which does not supersede the ordinary knowledge of human events. There is an Inspiration which demands infallibility in matters of doctrine, but allows mistakes in fact. Lastly, there is a view of Inspiration which recognizes only its supernatural and prophetic character; and a view of Inspiration which regards the Apostles and Evangelists as equally inspired in their writings and in their lives, and in both receiving the guidance of the Spirit of Truth in a manner *not different in kind, BUT ONLY IN DEGREE*, from ordinary Christians. Many of these explanations lose sight of the *original meaning* and *derivation* of the word; some of them are framed with the view of meeting difficulties; all, perhaps, err in attempting to *define* what, though real, is incapable of being defined in an exact manner. Nor for any of the higher and supernatural views of Inspiration is there *any foundation* in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings, that the Evangelists and Apostles had *any inward gift*, or, were subject to any power *external* to them, different from that of preaching or teaching which they daily exercised; nor

* Colenso states, in his Preface to Part iii. p. xiv—

Up to the present time, none of my Episcopal Brethren who have condemned me, EXCEPT BISHOP OLLIVANT, have taken any notice of these criticisms—except that some have pronounced them, generally, as *rash and feeble; unfounded, false, and childish*".

do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were *free from error or infirmity*. St. Paul writes like a Christian teacher, exhibiting all the emotions and vicissitudes of human feeling, speaking indeed with authority, but, hesitating in difficult cases, and more than once *correcting* himself, *corrected* too by the course of events in his expectation of the coming of Christ. The Evangelist "who *saw it*, bare record, and his record is true". (John xix. 35) Another Evangelist does not profess to be an *original* narrator, but only "to set forth in order, a declaration of what eye-witnesses had delivered", like many others whose writings have not been preserved to us. (Luke i. 1, 2) And the result is in accordance with the simple profession and style in which they describe themselves; there is no appearance, that is to say, of insincerity or want of faith; but, neither is there perfect accuracy or agreement. JOWETT. *Essays and Reviews*. 1861.

In that interesting and clever little volume "*Broken Lights*", but just published,* I read—

Inspiration was said, by the old Rabbins, to be of 7 degrees. Between their time and ours, a gradual *narrowing* and *hardening* of the idea conveyed by the term has been going on—and especially in the last two centuries, under the peculiarly matter-of-fact spirit of English *divinity*—till it has now assumed the sharpest form, as the doctrine of "*Infallible Inspiration*". The Archbishops and Bishops of the National Church, in addressing their Protest to bishop Colenso, in 1863, do not hesitate to say—

All our hopes for eternity, the very foundation of our faith, our nearest and dearest consolations, are taken from us, if, *one line* of that sacred Book be declared unfaithful, or, untrustworthy'.

Slight shades of difference exist—the Low Church go to the extreme point, and declare belief in *verbal* Inspiration: "every word, every letter, every grammatical construction", in the Bible, they maintain to be *absolutely perfect*. The High Church generally content themselves with the theory of *plenary* Inspiration, and leave a little room for possible flaws in numbers, or, other wholly unimportant matters. The *first* Broad Church go farther yet, and recognize the *necessity* for the aid of Criticism to determine the proper exegesis of the Inspired book. On the main point, however, all 3 parties are in harmony. They all alike maintain the principle, that the Inspiration granted to the writers of the Bible, was *unlike* the Inspiration granted to any other men, and that the narratives in the Books of Chronicles, or Esther, or the worldly-wise maxims in Proverbs, or Ecclesiastes, were *delivered by God in a different manner*, and bear with them a more sacred character, than the sublimest thoughts of Plato, or, the enraptured hymns of Milton".

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that several of my Collegiates entertain views very different from mine, and that they have given their opinions publicity; for instance, Rev. E. Garbett, "Select Preacher and Boyle Lecturer", in his Sermon of 16 Nov. 1862, preached before the University of Oxford, tells us—

If the belief in the infallibility of the Scripture be a *falsehood*, the Church founded upon it, must be a *living fraud*—in all consistent reason, we must ACCEPT THE WHOLE of the Inspired autographs, or, REJECT THE WHOLE, as from *end to end* unauthoritative and worthless". p. 10.

So, because the Reason with which my Maker has endowed me, will not suffer me to accept the most glaring contradictions and self-evident errors, I am neither to Search the Scriptures, nor embrace the Truths they contain!

"A *mistake* is not the less so, and will never grow into a *truth*, because we have believed it a long time; though, perhaps, it be the harder to part with: and an *error* is not the less dangerous, nor the less contrary to *truth*, because it is cried up and had in veneration by any party. LOCKE.

In "*Baylee's Verbal Inspiration*", a Manual, which according to the

* Broken Lights: an Inquiry into the present condition and future prospects of Religious Faith—by Frances Power Cobbe. Published by Trübner & Co. 60, Paternoster Row. 1864.

Preface, is "Part of an intended Course of Lectures on Scripture, Philosophy, and Exegesis, chiefly for the use of the Students of St. Aidan's College", I read, on p. 48—

The Bible cannot be less than Verbally inspired. Every *word*, every *syllable*, every *letter*, is just what it would be, had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention"!

And this outrage on commonsense, is what Theological Students are taught, in the face of the manifold discrepancies and errors and "pious frauds", known to every thoughtful reader of his Bible!

Those of my clerical Brethren, who have so hastily and unadvisedly condemned Colenso, as not believing that the Bible is the *Word of God*, are, every one of them, guilty of bearing *false* witness against their Brother! [Hear, hear!] Turn, Mr. Chairman, to xxviii. p. of the Preface to Part III. and you may there read with me the Bishop of Natal's own words—

They have expressed themselves, indeed, in the strongest terms, as resting *their hopes* of eternity upon the 'Word of God'. But *that*, I trust, *I do*, as truly and intirely as they. There is a sense also in which I am quite ready to speak of the Bible as *The word of God*—just as we call a Church a *House of God*, without meaning, therefore, to say that the plan or material of the building is *divine*, or, that God meets with us there exclusively. But, I prefer the language of the first Homily—*In it* (Holy Scripture) *is contained the true Word of God*; and I agree fully with the language of Dean Milman, who says, *Hist. of the Jews*, Pref. p. xi—

The moral and religious truth, *and this alone*, I apprehend, *is the Word of God* contained in the Sacred writings. I know no passage in which this emphatic term is applied to any sentence or saying, which does not convey or enforce such Truth".

My opinion, Mr. Chairman, is—that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit"; and though it is generally thought, that Inspiration has *ceased*, I know not of any authority for such a conclusion. God is as intimately associated with his intelligent creatures in 1864, as He ever was in the days of the Apostles and Prophets; and Why should He not commune with us as directly and distinctly, as with men of old? [Hear, hear!] "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness"; but, such Inspired writings are imbedded in a mass of extraneous matters wholly unconnected with the *spiritual* concerns of mankind; and unless we "Search the Scriptures", and discriminate between what is of Man and what is of God, we shall never be able to accept them as an *unerring* Lamp unto our feet and a Light unto our path. [Hear, hear!] Even if we accept the Bible as an *infallible* book, before we can rely implicitly on its contents, we shall require an *infallible* interpreter; and where amidst the host of contending and contradictory Expositors, shall we pitch upon the *infallible* individual? Ten thousand different fallible minds, will necessarily deduce 10,000 different inferences, 9999 of which, *must be erroneous*—Truth, like God, being but One. [Hear, hear!] Hence, Mr. Chairman, every one must be left at perfect liberty to read and interpret the Scriptures for himself, inasmuch as "Every one of us shall give an account of Himself, to God"—neither Preacher nor Priest, neither Bishop nor Archbishop, neither Cardinal nor Pope, neither Saint nor Angel, being allowed to intervene between Man and his Maker! [Hear, hear! repeatedly pronounced] As to the Revision of our "¹⁸⁸¹ authorized version" of the Scriptures, that, Mr. Chairman, will, ere long, be ¹⁸⁸¹ forced upon our Legislature. [Hear, hear!] Both the national Churches of France are now busy revising their Translation; and even our Scotch ¹⁸⁸¹ neighbours

on 1 June last, agreed in Committee, to a Revision of the 1826 Version of the Gaelic Scriptures,—and our wise men in Westminster Palace will be *driven* to do their duty, from very shame! [Hear, hear!]

Imputed Sin, and imputed Righteousness, are things much talked of, but little understood; nor shall I descant upon either of them: I am not a whit the worse, for any church, or any man's imputing to me the sin and pollution of Adam; nor can I be an iota the better for the imputation of Christ's righteousness—a Donkey might just as reasonably be held to be a Newtonian philosopher, by having Sir Isaac's system outwardly imputed to it. [Hear, hear! and Murmurs.]

Vicarious salvation and Vicarious punishment, are merely the inventions of Men; dogmas of the Churches, "gangrenous excrescences, corrupting the fair form of genuine Christianity"—not in accordance with the leading doctrines of the Bible—

"Behold, all Souls are mine; as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is mine: *the soul that sinneth it shall die*; but, if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God. Yet say ye, Why doth not the Son bear the iniquity of the Father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, *he shall surely live*—the soul that sinneth, it shall die; the son shall *not* bear the iniquity of the father, *neither* shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him—but, if the Wicked will *turn from all his sins* that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall surely live, HE SHALL NOT DIE!*

Hence, Mr. Chairman, as we are assured by the great Apostle—

Every man shall bear his own burden; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap: for, he that soweth to his Flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but, he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting!"

The Resurrection is clearly a scripture doctrine; yet, how vague and irrational are the notions of men respecting it! The multiplicity of strange conjectures, as well as fanatical surmises, in the minds of the superstitiously religious, afford as much amusement to the disbelievers in immortality, as pious regret to reflective and intelligent christians; for, the chimerical vagaries propagated concerning both soul and body, by "pulpit teachers" and "godly books", surpass all human understanding! So infatuated is Man with a love of *materiality*, that he contemplates having a Body of flesh, blood, and bones, beyond the grave, as surely as his God was made flesh and dwelt among men, eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, and working at the carpenter's bench! Yes, Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do, the degrading views of men in general—Good people are to inhabit the New Jerusalem, the very streets of which are paved with gold; while Naughty people are to be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, there to be tormented by the Devil and his angels. Such is the lack of *spirituality* in the thoughts of many men! A material God, a material Heaven, and a material Hell—without any Lazarus to dip the tip of his material finger in material water, to cool the material tongue that is tormented in the material flame!

But, Mr. Chairman, enough of this human weakness! much of which has been promulgated by our so-called *Sacred Poets*.* [Hear, hear!]

According to Paul, who fully expected Christ revisiting this earth, to

* "Sweet are the charms of sweet Beliefs!" An acquaintance of mine, who lost a Leg and a Thumb at Waterloo, part of his left Ear in Canada, and a Tooth while crossing the great

judge the quick and the dead, and that He and his fellow-christians should never taste of Death, but be miraculously transformed into Angels of light—according to this same Paul, if Christ did *not* rise from the Dead, if Christ's body of flesh was *not* raised, did *not* ascend into heaven; then, was his [Paul's] preaching vain, and the faith of the believers in Christ vain—"then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ *perished!*" But, this I

Herring-pond from Australia to Liverpool, thoroughly believes in his *future* enjoyment of these scattered parts of his Body, when the time shall arrive that Old things will be made New, either in that new heaven, or that new earth, of which he entertains strange but harmless notions. As one example, from among many, in which our Poets indulge wild fancies, and disseminate odd doctrines, Blair's "*Grave*" affords the following—

The glad Soul
Has not a wish uncrowned. E'en the lag Flesh
Rests, too, in hope of meeting once again
Its better Half, never to sunder more.
Nor shall it hope in vain: the time draws on
When not a single spot of burial earth,
Whether on Land, or in the spacious Sea,
But must *give back* its long-committed dust
Inviolatè; and faithfully shall these
Make up the full account; *not the least atom*
Embezzled or mislaid of the whole tale.
Each Soul shall have a Body ready furnished;
And each shall have *his own*. Hence, Ye profane!
Ask not *How this can be!* Sure the same Power
That reared the piece at first, and took it down,
Can *re-assemble* the loose scattered parts,
And put them as they were. Almighty God
Hath done much more: nor is His arm impaired
Through length of days; and what He *can* he *will*;
His faithfulness stands bound to see it done!
When the dread trumpet sounds, the slumbering Dust,
Not unattentive to the call, shall wake;
And *every joint* possess its proper place,
With a new elegance of form, unknown
To its first state!" Etc.

Weeleyns promulgate the same strange and irrational notion, when they sing—

May not a creating God,
Who built this house of clay,
Re-inspire the breathless clod,
In his appointed day?
From the *dust* He formed us man,
And shall we circumscribe his power?
Doubtless the Almighty can
Our *mouldered dust* restore!" p. 649.

Query—Is man made of the same sort of *dust* as that *dust* to which his flesh and bones are reduced? What a mixture of *figurative* and *literal* language!

To reconcile the preceding with the following (inserted on p. 557 of *Public Opinion*, from an *American Paper*) may be a very easy matter for Dr. Cumming, perhaps, though beyond the skill of either Dr. Pusey or Dr. Wordsworth—

"WE DIE DAILY—The Bodies of animals are continually undergoing a series of invisible Changes of substance, of which they are intirely unconscious. We look at our Hand today, as we write, and we fancy it is *the same* substance as it was yesterday, or, last year, as it was ten years ago. The form of each finger, of each nail, is the same. Scars made in our infancy are still there. Nothing is altered or obliterated; and yet, it is *not the same* Hand. It has been renewed, over and over again, since the days of our Youth. The skin, and flesh, and bone, have been frequently removed, and replaced. And so it is, more or less, with our whole Body. The arms and limbs that sustained us in our Schoolboy struggles, are long since consigned to the Dust—have, perhaps, lived over again more than once in plant, or flower, or animal. In from *Three to Five* years, the intire Body is *taken out*, and *built in again* with new materials. A continued activity prevails among the living agencies to which this hidden work is committed. Every day a small part is carried away—just as if a single brick were every day taken out of an old Wall, or, a single wheel out of a Watch, and its place supplied by another. The Body, therefore, requires constant supplies, at every period of its life, of all those things of which its several Parts are built up". *Reporter*.

I read (about a couple of years back) an interesting Article in the *British and Foreign Bran-*

cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, not even on the authority of Paul; [Hear, hear!] nor could I believe it, though an Angel from heaven were to tell me so! I have, Sir, *a consciousness within me* that is superior to Paul's teachings, superior to the Bible, [Hear, hear!] being a more direct communication from the Spirit of Truth—I believe,

gical Review, No. xl. April, 1862, on "*The Resurrection-Body*", and I then made a few Extracts, which may be acceptable to the Curious—

In the teaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, this doctrine occupies so prominent a place, that it has constituted *an article of faith* in every Christian church from that day to the present. Most of the Churches have contented themselves with using the language of the Apostles creed, 'I believe in the Resurrection of the Dead'. Others, however, go farther. The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1683, says, '*My body* [or, my flesh] also being raised by the power of Christ, shall be united with my soul, and be like the glorious body of Christ'. The Synod of Dort, in 1618, representing the Churches of the United Provinces, and of England, Scotland, Switzerland, and other countries, expressed themselves thus: 'For, all the Dead shall be raised out of the Earth, and their souls joined and united with *their proper bodies*, in which they formerly lived'. But, by no Church has the doctrine been enunciated with greater fullness and precision than our own, both in the Confession of Faith and in the large Catechism. In the first of these (chap. 32, art. 2) it is said, 'At the last day, such as are alive, shall not Die; but, be Changed; and all the Dead shall be raised up *with the self-same bodies*, AND NONE OTHER, *although with different qualities*, which shall be united again with their souls for ever'. p. 345.

A few generations back, no one conceived the possibility of a person's having more than One body during his earthly life. But, the fact is now universally familiar, through modern discoveries, that we *change our bodies*, as we do our garments, only not so suddenly, or, so perceptibly; and that in the course of threescore and ten years allotted to Man, the change may occur as many as *ten times*. The question, therefore, has arisen, *Which of these TEN complete bodies, is to be THE body raised up at the last day?* p. 346.

If it is replied, *the Last one worn*, then, there arises other difficulties. This 'last body' is known, in some instances, to enter into the *composition* of other 'last bodies'. A ship's crew, for instance, are driven to the horrid necessity of Cannibalism. In the course of a few days, one of the men, whose body is composed, in part, of the 'last body' of his comrade, falls a second victim. The process is continued; and, finally, the remainder of the Crew, whose bodies are *composed of the composed*, and *recompounded* bodies of those devoured, are engulfed in the ocean. Who, by any conceivable mode of reasoning, can *dismantle* from this hopeless intricacy, the 'my body' of the Heidelberg Catechism? the 'proper body' of the Synod of Dort? or, 'the self-same body, and *some other*', of our Confession? It is manifest, that if by these terms, we are to understand *the intire Last body of each*, the propositions involve an absurdity. Nor is this all—it were easy to show, on sound chymical principles, that the dissolved elements of our material structure *escape* from the grave; are borne by winds and waters in boundless diffusion over the earth's surface, and become incorporated into thousands of plants, the food of men and beasts, or, are received by the lungs into the blood, and thence into the solid structure of other human beings; so that there is, probably, not an individual on earth, whose Body is not, in part, composed of elements that belonged in turn to *the Last bodies* of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of the race. The thought bewilders!" p. 347.

None but a Dr. Cumming (reported by his poreblind admirers, *to know all things*, past, present, and future) can be expected to disentangle the intricacies involved in this bewildering view of *the Last body* of a multitude of bodies! John says, Beloved, we know not *what* we shall be—yet, still Dr. Cumming *may* know; and the very first time I "come across him", I shall certainly endeavour "to worm the secret out of him". Paul says, Flesh and Blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption"; but then, Paul was not fit to hold a candle to Dr. Cumming!

The human frame, besides its organized (or, more correctly, its *organising*) vitality—"the psychical body", or, "essential vitality", of Prof. Bush—is composed of certain substances well known to chymistry, the principal of which are carbon, lime, potash, iron, sulphur, phosphorus, oxygen, hydrogen, etc. but, can Lime *think*? can Potash be *conscious*? can any aggregation or combination of these Inert substances be made to *know* anything of Identity? Of course not.

"It will no doubt be painful to many, to learn that the celebrated passage in Job [xix.26,28,27] beginning with—I *know* that my Redeemer liveth, and constituting a part of the impressive Burial-service of the Church of England, cannot be relied upon as a *proof text* on this subject, since it is given up by the great body of learned men (including Calvin, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Eichhorn, Jahn, and many others) as not touching the doctrine of the Resurrection at all". p. 344.

Scientific truth, associated with reason, justice, and charity, is elbowing Infallibility, Dogmatism, and Superstition into a corner; and, ere long, none but those who have selfish ends to serve, will venture to oppose, or even retard, the Progress of Humanity towards the goal of consummate Civilisation. *Editor.*

"The Soul, of origin divine,
 God's glorious Image, freed from clay,
 In heaven's eternal sphere, shall shine

A Star of Day!

The Sun is but a spark of fire,
 A transient meteor in the sky;
 The Soul, *immortal as its Sire,*

SHALL NEVER DIE!" [Cheers.]

Paul, however, insists upon it, over and over again, that *God raised Christ from the Dead*—yet, strange to relate, the Archbishop of York but recently (in his primary Visitation) told his Clergy, that CHRIST RAISED HIMSELF FROM THE DEAD! but, neither can I believe that, Mr. Chairman! [Hear, hear!]

It may be allowable, perhaps, for an Archbishop to talk such nonsense to his acquiescent and indulgent Clergy, who possibly belong to Cunningham's "World without Souls"; but, Sir, as long as I live, no power, no influence on earth, shall induce me to forego my prerogative as *Man!* [Cheers] God has given me *reason*, and to Him I am accountable for its use and abuse. [Hear, hear!] I revere the Scriptures; no one within these walls can possibly hold them in greater veneration, in higher estimation, than I do; but, Mr. Chairman, the days of my *idolatry* are for ever past! [Hear, hear!]

I read, Mr. Chairman, in the countenances of several of my Collegiates, that I am uttering sentiments which are either novel or disapproved—immaterial to me which; as a sense of *duty*, with me, outweighs all other considerations. [Hear, hear!] I am not One of the thousands, Mr. Chairman, who have signed the so-called *Pusey Protest* against the unwarrantably designated "*soul-destroying*" Reversal of Dr. Lushington's Judgement; I could not be moved, Sir, neither by persuasion nor threat, to append my Name to that unadvised and censurable Document! [Hear, hear!] Neither am I in the least surprised that so many Signatures have been obtained; for, as Baptist Noel has assured us (I quote, Sir, from memory) Of the 13,000 *working* Clergy of the Church of England, there are upwards of 10,000 who neither *know* nor *preach* the Gospel!" [Murmurs.]

Yet, Mr. Chairman, bad as things are, they are not so bad as formerly; for, I read in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, April, 1862, page 299—

Among the 15 or 18 thousand Clergymen of the English establishment, Mr. Romaine, of London (a cotemporary of the Wesleys) declared, that at the beginning of his ministry He could not count 20 [twenty] faithful Preachers of the Gospel!" [Hear, hear!]

Thank heaven, Mr. Chairman, we have now many twenties of God-fearing men in the Church, faithful men, who both know and preach the Gospel! [Cheers.]

The doctrine of Rewards and Punishments in an *after-life*, prevails in all religions and in all climes; but, strange, and passing strange is the paradox, that Christianity should be *the only* traditional religion known, the professed Teachers of which, promulgate the unscriptural and blasphemous doctrine of the never-ending existence of THE WRATH of God!* [Hear, hear, hear!] SANDYS. "O, horrible, horrible! most horrible!" SAY. But, Mr. Chairman, the greatest variety with the least definite notions,

* "The Parsees believe, that the sufferings of the wicked will end after three days of purifying fire, after the general Resurrection, when all created beings, even Ahrimanes himself, shall be

among religious Disputants, may be found in the doctrine of MIRACLES; a doctrine exciting considerable attention at the present time.

REV. MR. HAMPSON. Pardon my interrupting you, Mr. Say, but surely you may pass the doctrine of Miracles over, as *a thing of the past*, or rapidly passing away from the minds of the intelligent and philosophical of the present day.

RAMSAY. Far from it, Mr. Hampson; Mr. Say is perfectly right in stating that Miracles are occupying much of the religious world's attention just now—it was but last night, I heard one of the most stirring and eloquent Sermons I ever heard in my life, on Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness, which is a splendid tissue of Miracles; the Preacher holding his hearers in fixed admiration for upwards of an hour and a half.*

HAMPSON. Too long by half, even had the subject been worth listening to; which, treated as a Miracle, or as you say, a "tissue of Miracles", it certainly was not. John, the intimate of his beloved master, does not even mention the wonderful story; and if he had ever heard it, he judiciously cast it aside, as not fit to be recorded. [Hear, hear!] John, if ever he shared in the common weakness of his fellows, in their superstitions regarding Ghosts and Demons, and suchlike pagan myths, had outlived the delusion before he penned his biographical and historical account of his Master, as they have no place in his record. He does not even honor his Satanic majesty with the least notice, though a special favorite with many writers of the age in which John lived. [Hear, hear!]

Though Matthew tells a strange story about *two* men possessed with Devils, while Mark and Luke mention but *one* man, and that the legion of Devils on being cast out of the man, or men, "entered into about 2000 Swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the Sea, and

restored. (*Zend-Avesta*, Boundchesch, b. ii. p. 413) Sabœaniam (the religion of Baptism, as Rénan tells us it means) taught that the wicked would be pardoned after a purgation of 4000 years. That of the old Egyptians, for whose termination they embalmed their dead, lasted 3000 years. Ages of weary labor expiated the sins of the Peruvians. 'He who has gone to the place of misery (say the Buddhist authorities) after he has suffered enough for his miserable sins, it appears that he can become free'. COBBE'S *Broken Lights*. 1864.

* Stories of Ghosts and Hobgoblins, of Sprites and Demons and Devils, are not in such high repute and general favor now, as when I was a boy, scampering about in the last century. Chambers, Knight, and other publishers of cheap literature, have put many of the Gods of Ignorance to flight; and, ere long, that modern marvel the Printing-press, will banish his Satanic majesty himself out of the kingdom. That venerable gentleman, Old Nick, has had his day; but, his sun is fast setting; and as "*There is no Darkness but Ignorance*", we may reasonably expect that the Light of daily-increasing Knowledge, will shortly drive many of the superstitious fancies of the religious world into utter oblivion. I remember several strange and exciting stories about Ghosts and Haunted houses, which none but the most ignorant, or fanatical, would listen to in 1864—though a belief in the *ubiquity of the Devil*, still retains a tenacious hold of some thoroughly *orthodox* minds and pulpits. Reporter.

In 1857, a neatly-printed volume of upwards of 300 pages, was published at the Wesleyan Bookroom, City Road, entitled—*Christ in the Wilderness; or, Practical Views of our Lord's Temptation: by Luke H. Wiseman*"—containing a pack of rubbish suited to the Dark Ages.

In Paul's time, the grand problem was—to separate Christianity from *the forms* of the Mosaic ritual; in the time of Luther, to separate *vital* religion from *the forms* of the Church; but now, in our time, to separate *the spirit* from *the letter*, the *meaning* from the *words* of Scripture.

After having stated that some persons accepted the narration of the Temptation in a *figurative* sense, this same silly Wiseman tells us—

If such exposition be admitted, *all certainty of Interpretation is at an end*. Not one of the three Evangelists who speak of the Temptation, hints that his account is to be taken in *any other* than the *Literal historical sense*". p. 117.

Can the credulity and fanaticism of the much-pitied Heathens surpass the darkness and Ignorance of this Wesleyan minister, who aspires to be ranked among the Leaders of the Body? Here is another unmistakable passage—

Let it be sufficient then, for our Faith, that the TEMPTER, ACTUALLY AND IN PERSON, came to Jesus, *spoke* to him, and *took* him hither and thither"; etc. p. 125.

After abortive attempts to *prove* that Old Harry *literally took up Jesus* in the Wilderness,

were choked"—yet, John has not recorded this incredibly marvelous circumstance; nor has he handed down any one of the other Devilish stories. The natural inference is, John (or whoever wrote the Evangel bearing his name) had either never heard of such tales, or, having heard them, did not believe them.

SAY. On 29 November last, the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon told his congregation, that Paul had "*the gift of Miracles*"; that—

"Paul also had power to have CREATED A CLOAK, if he had liked. Why could he not? His very shadow healed the sick"——

J. HUGHES, Esq. Time, time, Mr. Say; Time!

SAY. Mr. Chairman, as I would rather hear anyone else speak than myself, I readily give place to Mr. Hughes. [After resuming his seat, Mr. Say could not be moved to finish his observations on Miracles.

REV. W. L. BOWLES. Whatever may be said of Miracles, nothing can be clearer, Mr. Chairman, than this—If there be ONE GOD ONLY, and if CHRIST BE GOD, then Christ, who was of Woman born, was CREATOR OF HIMSELF, the maker of all things visible and invisible, THE CREATOR OF HIS OWN FATHER AND HIS OWN MOTHER—the Great First Cause.

REV. J. DAVIES. Mr. Bowles, I am shocked at your turning such serious matters into ridicule; I could not have believed it of you.

BOWLES. Not so fast, Mr. Davies, if you please. Ridicule is not my forte; and were it, I should not employ it on matters of such grave import. If you discover anything ridiculous in my inferences, you must attribute it to the premisses whence my inferences are drawn. Do you, Mr. Davies, believe in *One only true wise God*?

DAVIES. Unquestionably.

BOWLES. And do you as firmly believe that *Christ is God*?

DAVIES. Certainly! "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was

and flew off with him to Jerusalem, setting him on the pinnacle of the temple; Wiseman, in the plenitude of his wisdom, foolishly asks, what He calls, *a natural question*—

In what way did Jesus reach the pinnacle, or wing, of the Temple? What means of transit had he from the Wilderness thither? *That He really did stand in Person upon the temple at Jerusalem*, has already been shown; but, the inquiry now arises, *How did he get there?*" p. 187.

And I, in my turn, very naturally may ask, *How the devil did he get back again?*

It is not the shafts of ridicule, slander, and malice, shot from the bows of the declared enemies to Christianity, which imperil belief in the Scriptures! for, they are harmless, when contrasted to the superstitious and irrational publications of such fanatics as this inebriated Wiseman; and Dr. Chalmers hit the mark when he wrote—

What Christianity has most to fear, is from the encroachments of an insidious and undermining fanaticism—from its false friends—from those men who disgrace the cause by their bigotry, or, their enthusiasm—from those who have brought Religion into contempt, by throwing over it the deformity of an illiberal and contracted Superstition".

Such men as Punshon and Wiseman, among the Wesleyans; as Pusey and Wordsworth, among the Episcopalians, do immeasurably more harm to the cause of Religion, than its avowed enemies, whether Infidels or Atheists: these are the doctrinal men who stab Christianity to the heart; and in reference to whom the Bishop of Llandaff said—

It will require as much application of genius, industry, and learning, to free the Christian world from the dominion of *corrupted doctrine*, as it did to free the Philosophical world from the dominion of Aristotle".

If Wiseman's supercilious notions, that the *literal* meaning of the words in the strange narrative concerning the Temptation of Jesus in the Wilderness be countenanced by the Wesleyans generally, and Conference continue to countenance his absurdities by publishing them at the City Road Bookroom, we may expect 300 pages on the Lord God's dining off Abram's *oat, cakes, butter*, and *milk*, snugly sitting under a tree; or, 300 pages of Wiseman's nonsense on the *literal* meaning of the close of the xxxiii. chapter of Exodus.

John repudiated the story of the Temptation altogether, as well as the other strange tales about Demons. John was not so well acquainted with his Pagan majesty, the Devil, as Wiseman pretends to be. The first mention made of the Hairy Old Gentleman in Scripture, takes place in the Translation into Hebrew of that magnificent Gentile poem called *Job*, one of the most erudite books in our Bible—though not of Hebrew origin. *Editor.*

with God, and the Word was God ; the same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him ; and without Him was not anything made that was made”.

BOWLES. Without entering into a critical examination of the *meaning* of the words quoted, I suppose, Mr. Davies, I am to infer that you hold Christ to have been the Creator of the universe ?

DAVIES. Is it not so written in the Bible ? and is it not plain enough—“Without him was not anything made, that was made” ?

BOWLES. And *when* do you think the Universe was made ?

DAVIES. I abide by what I was taught—and taught at the same school with yourself—this world was made about 6000 years ago.

BOWLES. I remember it well ; we were taught, *as a fact*, that the Creation of the World took place 4004 years *before* the Christian era ; and that the Norman conquest took place 1066 years *after* it—these two points we learned together, Mr. Davies ; yet, I can assure you, if there be any truth in the science of Geology, this Earth has been *millions of years* in existence ; and that the statement of 4004 years, though it stands printed on the margin of the first verse of every “Reference Bible” issued under Ecclesiastical authority, is nothing short of a ridiculous absurdity—an Untruth !

PEELE. “Old Opinions—rags and tatters—
Get you gone ! Get you gone !”

DAVIES. What do you mean, Mr. Bowles ?

BOWLES. Well, you must know, I have had to *unlearn* a great many things I learned at School ; and, among others, I have had to *unlearn* all the nonsense our esteemed Master taught us about the age of this world of ours ; for, according to Boué, it must have required about 350 millions of years to have rolled away, before this globe passed from a *liquid* to a *solid* state ; and though many millions of years have transpired since the first appearance of Vegetation on the Earth’s surface, we are informed, by competent instructors, that this Ball, on which we live, is still in a state of *fusion*, but 50 miles below its surface. [Hear, hear !

DAVIES. If you are serious, you must not only have *unlearned*, but *learned* a precious deal more than I have, since we left School together.

BOWLES. Why, as you know, my old friend, I have had advantages which did not fall to your lot ; and it would be unkind in me, not to communicate something of what I have learned since last we met—upwards of half a century ago. [Hear, hear ! and Cheers.

DAVIES. And so, You really think, Bowles, that the world is older than 6000 years, do you ?

BOWLES. 6000 years, 6000 fiddlesticks ! I tell you the Earth is many *millions* of years old. 6000 years ! why the Human race is upwards of 100,000 years old, and God’s Universe millions and billions and trillions of years.*

DAVIES. Now, how can You pretend to know that ?

BOWLES. From reading and studying God’s works. The volume of Nature

* Captain Spratt, R.N. has discovered that the western extremity of the island of Crete, has been raised about 25 feet since the construction of the ancient ports in that part, which are now high and dry above the sea. Supposing the movement to have been uniform, this would lead us to assign an antiquity of more than 20,000 years to the emergence of the Mussel-beds of Cagliari from the sea.

Dr. Dowler estimates the deposit which covered the Skeleton found 18 feet beneath four successive layers of buried trees, to have occupied 50,000 years in forming.

Professer Agassiz estimates that the southern half of the peninsula of Florida, which is built up of Coral reefs, the whole of which appears to be post-tertiary, took 135,000 years to form ;

is one of God's grand revelations to Man ; and whoever refuses to consult his Maker in the book of Nature, is not very likely to become intimately acquainted with Him in the Bible—though confessedly, of all human compositions, the best of Books.

DAVIES. Well now, just tell us something worth hearing. You have raised my curiosity.

BOWLES. The tenth edition of that wonderful work, "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation" (a work harshly and unjustly treated by several *religious* writers, who had not the requisite knowledge and penetration to apprehend it) opens thus—

It is familiar knowledge, that the Earth we inhabit is a globe of somewhat less than 8000 miles in diameter, being one of a series which revolve at different distances around the sun, and some of which have satellites, in like manner revolving around them. The sun, planets, and satellites, with the less intelligible orbs, termed comets, are comprehensively called *the Solar system* ; and if we take as the uttermost bounds of this system, the orbit of Uranus (though the comets actually have a wider range) we shall find that it occupies a portion of space not less than *three thousand six hundred millions of miles in diameter*. The mind fails to form an exact notion of a portion of space so immense ; but, some faint idea of it may be obtained from the fact, that, if the swiftest race-horse ever known, had begun to traverse it, at full speed, at the time of the birth of Moses, he would as yet have accomplished only half his journey. [Hear, hear !]

It has long been concluded amongst astronomers, that the Stars, though they appear to our eyes only as brilliant points, are *all* to be considered as Suns, *representing so many Solar systems*, each bearing a general resemblance to our own. [Hear, hear !]

CRABBE. Really, Mr. Chairman, it is very absurd in anyone's talking such balderdash ; [Hear, hear !] for, if there were so many Suns, as Mr. Bowles would have us believe, by quoting that mad book, *The Vestiges*, we might expect to enjoy something of the influence of that heat, which, as Suns, they would necessarily impart.

WALLER. Why, Vicar, you seem to know as little of the *influence* of the Stars, as you know about the *province* of Reason ! [Hear, hear !] But, since you are *not* the well-read man your position in life led me to suppose, I shall quote what Dr. Lardner communicates on this matter—

It is a *fact*, that if the Earth were dependent *alone* upon the Sun for *heat*, it would not get enough to keep existence in animal and vegetable life upon its surface. [Hear, hear !] It results from the researches of Pouillet that the Stars furnish heat enough, in the course of the year, to melt a crust of ice 75 feet thick—almost as

and hence he would estimate the age of the Human jaws and teeth, and bones of the feet, found in one of the Coral banks, by Count Pourtalès, to be 10,000 years old.

In that unexampled "Journal of Philosophical Research and Criticism, *The Future*, Edited by Luke Burke", a writer of transcendent abilities, yet, hitherto almost unknown to his Cotemporaries, Italy is clearly shown to have been inhabited by Man far beyond 10,000 years.

The time which elapsed between the growth of the Cromer fossil forest and the commencement of the "second continental" condition of the British Islands, has been estimated at about 180,000 years.

Mr. E. B. Hunt, arguing on the growth and chronology of the great Florida reef, after having stated its dimensions, proceeds—Taking the rate at 24 years to the foot, we shall have for the total time $24 \times 250 \times 900$, on the data as stated ; or, we find the total period of 5,400,000 years as that required for the growth of the entire Coral limestone formation of Florida".

Boué fixes the time which must have elapsed during the Earth's passing from a *liquid* to a *solid* state, at 350,000,000 years !

During the last quarter of a century, tens of thousands in the religious world have beheld "men as trees walking"; in another 25 years, thousands of thousands will exclaim, "Once I was blind, now I see" ! It is, however, amusingly provoking to read the redoubtable onslaughts made by the Editors of *the religious press*, on such men as Agassiz, Darwin, Huxley, Lyell, Murchison, Owen, and others, who have had the consummate impudence to forsake the "Wisdom of our Ancestors," and heretically as well as heroically to pursue Science and embrace Truth. *Editor.*

much as is supplied by the Sun. [Hear, hear!] This may appear strange, when we consider how immeasurably small must be the amount of heat received from any One of these distant bodies. But, the surprise vanishes, when we remember that the whole firmament is so thickly sown with Stars, that in some places thousands are crowded together within a space no greater than that occupied by the full moon. The eye cannot see more than a thousand at the same time in the clearest heaven, yet, the number is probably infinite. From the first to the sixth magnitude inclusive, the total number of visible Stars is 3128".

BOWLES. Our Solar system, Mr. Davies, is but One amongst the countless systems of the Universe, infinitely more magnificent than ours, all of them under the governance of the Godhead. [Hear, hear!]

The human eye cannot see, neither can the astronomer's most powerful telescope discover, *the extent* of the Universe of which our earth constitutes but a particle, a grain, a point—so indescribably insignificant, that the Rev. John Bovee Dods tells us—

The fall of a single leaf, is a catastrophe as dreadful to the thousands of inhabitants of its surface, as the destruction of this Globe would be to us! And the blotting out of our Globe from the catalogue of worlds, would no more be missed amid the immensity of Creation, than the fall of a Leaf compared to the sublime magnificence of the countless Forests on this globe. *Electrical Psychology.*

DAVIES. But, is not what you are now so gravely delivering, purely fabulous? mere flights of fancy, ey?

BOWLES. I am dealing with *realities*, Mr. Davies. Persons in general not only talk, but think (if *thinking* it may be termed) of this petty Globe of ours, as if it were the Universe; not having the least idea of Immensity, nor of the myriads of worlds moving with velocities which stagger the belief of the uninitiated. Many cannot even credit that the Earth we inhabit is moving in its orbit at the rate of 70,000 miles an hour;* [Hear, hear!] much less can they form any adequate conception of a Comet's traversing still more rapidly an orbit which requires 1000 years before it again becomes visible to the inhabitants of the Earth. Where, Mr. Davies, where can the Comet be traveling, at such a rapid rate, during its absence of 1000 years? Why, it is simply performing its round in the immensity of Space, under the guidance and controul and to the glory of its Maker! and, like the millions, billions, and trillions† of other celestial orbs, it is fulfilling its allotted part in the harmony of Nature! [Hear, hear!] Tell uneducated persons, Mr. Chairman, that astronomers have given the rate which Solar light travels, as being 192,500 miles a *second* — or, about

* Professor Ansted tells us, on p. 161 of *The Intellectual Observer*, Oct. 1863—Herschel assigns velocities varying from 18 to 36 miles per *second* for ordinary Meteors; and states that some appear to travel at the rate of 90 miles per *second*. The Earth's motion, in its orbit, is between 9 and 10 miles per *second*". *Reporter.*

† Such words as *million*, *billion*, *trillion*, merely represent a *great many*, and nothing more than a *great many*, to the generality of readers, who do not, cannot form any adequate conception of what the words *really* mean.

A banker's clerk who should count, on an average, 60 sovereigns a minute, without a second's cessation, from 10 to 4 daily, could not count a *MILLION* in 48 days!

All the pin-manufactories that are and ever have been in the world, have not yet, *unitedly*, made a *BILLION* of Pins!

A *TRILLION* of Seconds has *not yet* elapsed since the orthodox computation of the creation of Adam! nor will a *TRILLION* of Seconds have elapsed until the first of February in the year 25,825—for, in a *TRILLION* of Seconds there are 31,687 years, 32 days, 1 hour, 48 minutes, and 40 seconds!

A *MILLION* may be Counted; but, no human being could possibly count a *BILLION*. If instead of 60 sovereigns a minute, we allow 200 a minute; and if instead of 6 hours a day, we take 24 hours (counting day and night, without a moment's interruption) then, an hour would reach 12,000; a day 288,000; and a year, or 365 days (allowing one day's rest every leap-year) 106,120,000. Now, supposing Adam, at the commencement of his existence, had begun to count

700,000,000 of miles an *hour*; and then tell them, that astronomers inform us that there are Stars at such remote distances, that though this Globe of ours has been many millions of years in existence, there has not yet been time enough for the light of those Stars to have reached us—and they will shake their incredulous heads in disbelief, fancying it, at best, but an extravagant joke. [Hear, hear!]

DAVIES. I feel a willingness to credit what you say, Mr. Bowles, but really, my mind does not seem susceptible of imbibing what you impart; you tell us things, the vastness of which, transports me fairly beyond myself!

S. ROGERS, Esq. Without breaking the thread of your communications, permit me, Mr. Bowles, to familiarize your astounding facts to Mr. Davies's apprehension—I shall not suspend your lesson beyond a few minutes.

BOWLES. Go on, Sir, if you please.

ROGERS. The distances of the remoter fixed Stars, Mr. Davies, baffle all human computation, as we have neither words nor numbers to express them; for, the whole length of the Earth's orbit, though 190 millions of miles, is but *as a point* when placed in contrast to some of those incalculable distances—therefore, we shall leave the remoter Stars out of the question altogether, and simply glance at the distance of *the nearest* fixed Star, which astronomers tell us, cannot be less than 100,000 times the length of the Earth's orbit—that is, a hundred thousand times 190 millions of miles! Let us now, Mr. Davies, reduce the overwhelming immensity of this distance, by forming a comparison with things of which we have some adequate knowledge, that our minds may in some degree grasp it.

The swiftest motion with which we are accurately acquainted, is that of Light, which moves at the rate of about 700,000,000 of miles an hour; and some faint notion may be formed of the distance of *the nearest* fixed Star, when I tell you, that it would require *about three years* for the Light from that *nearest* fixed Star to reach our Earth! [Hear, hear!]

DAVIES. That must be fabulous—but, go on.

ROGERS. Let us suppose a Cannonball moving at the regular rate of 20 miles a

sovereigns at the rate of 200 a minute, and that he had counted on and on and on to the present day, he could not yet have counted a *BILLION*! as that would require 9512 years, 34 days, 5 hours, and 20 minutes.

After these, any elucidations of the constituent parts of still higher numerals would be superfluous; as a *million* is, ten hundred thousand; a *billion* is, a million of millions; while a *trillion* is, a million of millions of millions!

Yet, it is with such words, representing such uncountable, ungraspable numbers, that we have to speak and write and think, when treating on the Worlds constituting the Universe—created, preserved, governed, by the *ONE ONLY TRUE WISE* God, whose infinite Goodness is manifested *in, throughout, by, over,* all his works! *Reporter.*

The enlightened man may have a clear understanding of thousands, and even millions, but much beyond that, he can form no distinct idea. A simple example, and one easily solved, may illustrate the observation. If all the vast bodies of water that cover nearly three-fourths of the whole surface of the globe were emptied, drop by drop, into one grand reservoir, the whole number of drops could be written by the two words *eighteen septillions*, and expressed in figures by annexing twenty-four ciphers to the number 18—18,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. Man might as well attempt to explore the bounds of *eternity*, as to form any rational idea of the units embodied in the expression above; for, although the aggregate of drops is indicated by words in the space of only *three quarters of an inch* of this print, yet, if each particular drop were noted by a separate stroke like the figure 1, it would form a line of marks sufficiently long to wind *round the sun* six thousand billions of times! Now, observe the marvelous power, or value, which the ciphers or “naughts”—insignificant by themselves—give to the significant figures 18. The young reader will be surprised to learn, that the use of the cipher to determine the value of any particular figure, which is now practised by every schoolboy, was *unknown to the ancients*. Therefore, among the Greeks and Romans, and other nations of antiquity, arithmetical operations were exceedingly tedious and difficult. They had to reckon with little pebbles, shells, or beads, used as counters, to transact the ordinary business of life. Even the great Cicero, in his oration for Roscius, the actor, in order to express 300,000, had to make use of the very awkward and cumbersome notation cccccc cccccc cccccc, which may admit of the very liberal translation: Three c's, one i, three inverted c's; three c's, one i, three c's inverted; three c's, one i, three c's upside down. How very odd this looks in the year of our Lord MDCCCLXIV—1864! *Editor.*

minute; it would require 1800 thousand years to traverse the distance to that *nearest* fixed Star! [Hear, hear!]

Again—Sound, the velocity of which is 13 miles a minute, would be more than two millions seven hundred thousand years in traveling the immense distance! [Hear, hear!]

Let us again suppose, that it were possible for the inhabitants of the Earth, to *see* the flash, to *hear* the sound, and to *receive the ball*, discharged from a Cannon mounted at the *nearest* fixed Star; they could not *perceive* the Light of its explosion till three years after it had been fired, nor *receive* the Ball till 1800 thousand years had rolled away, neither *hear* the Report until two millions and 700 thousand years afterwards! [Hear, hear, hear!]

Mr. Bowles, my parenthetical attempt at familiarisation is ended. [Cheers.]

BOWLES. Thanks, Mr. Rogers; your elucidations have been simple and clear, and I hope may be useful.

There are tens of thousands, Mr. Chairman, that boast of having had a liberal education, who know not, that though the relative distances have been measured between the Sun and the Planets that revolve round it, and which borrow their light from it, yet, to express the relative distances of the greater number of *Stellar systems*, words and ciphers are utterly inadequate. [Hear, hear!] Many, Mr. Chairman, are not aware, that the Earth, the Sun, the myriad Stars, floating in Space, revolve round a greater Sun, which is itself revolving in the glorious centre, perfectly hidden from the inhabitants of the Earth, whose most powerful telescopes cannot descry it. [Hear, hear!]

When, Mr. Chairman, when we learn from the observations of distinguished astronomers and natural philosophers, that the size of the Sun is more than *a million and a half* times larger than our Earth, and, in all probability is inhabited by Beings far superior to Man, we cannot, Sir, any longer believe that Omniscent Omnipotence created the superior Sun and the still more superior Stars, for no other purpose than to give Light to this very inferior planet Earth. [Hear, hear!] Yet, Sir, let no one rashly condemn the Mosaic account of the Creation, the most magnificent symbolic representation ever penned by man! penned in accordance with the knowledge existing in the early ages of the Human race. [Hear, hear!] The *moral* and *spiritual truths* contained in the Bible, are not in anywise affected by the now known errors of its Writers, in connection with either Astronomy or Geology; for, as Galileo Galilei wrote, about 250 years ago, in his repudiation of any attack upon Religion—

The object of the Scriptures was, to teach mankind the way of Salvation, *not* to instruct them in Astronomy, for the acquiring of which they needed not a Revelation, as God had endowed them with competent *natural faculties*". [Hear, hear!]

I read here, Mr. Chairman, that

Bessel assigned a parallax of *thirty-one hundredths of a second* to the double Star 61 Cygni, placing it at a distance of nearly 670,000 times that of the Earth from the Sun".*

—that is, Mr. Davies, 670,000 times 95,000,000, or, 63,650,000,000,000 miles! [Hear, hear!] and such, Mr. Chairman, are, as you know, *but the first steps* we take among the hosts of orbs by which we are surrounded. Now, if we suppose that similar intervals exist between all the Stars, amounting to myriads, we shall be constrained to admit, that the Space occupied by even the comparatively small number visible to the naked eye, must be vast beyond all powers of human conception. [Hear, hear!]

* Herschel's Address to Astron. Soc. of London, 1841.

The number of Stars visible to the naked eye, is about 3000; but, when a telescope of but small power only, is directed to the heavens, a great number more come into view; and the number is *ever increased* in proportion to the increased power of the instrument. In one place, where they are more thickly sown than elsewhere, Sir Wm. Herschel reckoned that 50,000 passed over a field of view, two degrees only in breadth, in a single hour. [Hear, hear!] It was first surmised by the ancient philosopher, Democritus, that the faintly white zone which spans the sky, under the name of the *Milky-way*, might be only a dense collection of Stars, too remote to be distinguishable. This conjecture has been verified by the instruments of modern astronomers, and some speculations of a most remarkable kind have been formed in connection with it. By the joint labors of the two Herschels, the sky has been "gauged" in all directions, by the telescope, so as to ascertain the conditions of different parts with respect to the frequency of Stars. The result has been a conviction, that as the planets are *parts of Solar systems*, so are Solar systems parts of what may be called *Astral systems*—that is, systems composed of a multitude of Stars, bearing a certain relation to each other. [Hear, hear!]

The elder Herschel (who raised himself from a Drummer in a regiment, to an astronomical Philosopher) directing his revealing tube towards the *sides* of our system, where Stars are planted most *rarely*, and raising the powers of the instrument to the required pitch, was enabled (with awe-struck mind) to see suspended in the vast empyrean, *Astral systems*—or, as he called them *firmaments*, resembling our own. What appeared like mere *light cloudlets* to a certain power of the telescope, resolved themselves, under a stronger power, into Stars, though these, generally, seemed no larger than *the finest particles of diamond dust*!* [Hear, hear!]

The general forms of these systems are various. So also are the distances, as proved by the different degrees of telescopic power necessary to bring them into view. The farthest observed by the astronomer, were estimated, by him, as 35,000 times more remote than Sirius, reckoning its distance at about *twenty millions of millions of miles*! [Hear, hear!]

REV. DR. GLYNN. As you know, Mr. Chairman, more recently, the Earl of Rosse brought a superb instrument to bear upon these distant objects, and revealed them in more wonderful forms than ever known before. Many of the heavenly objects which Herschel saw *only as filmy matter*, spread in patches over the sky, are now found to be *vast aggregations of Stars*! every Star a world! and, probably, every world inhabited by God's intelligent creatures! [Hear, hear!]

MR. OGILVIE. Nichol, when describing the wonderful telescope of Rosse, tells us that Lord Rosse has looked into Space a distance so inconceivable, that Light, which travels at the rate of about 200,000 miles a *second*, would require a period of 250,000,000 of Solar years, each year containing about 33,000,000 of seconds, to pass the intervening gulf between this Earth and the remotest Point to which this telescope has penetrated!†

N. TATE, Esq. The mind of Man is utterly unable to grasp even a fraction

* See the *Intellectual Observer* (February) for an interesting article on, *We never See the Stars*—an assertion to be laughed at, by the thoughtless, though no statement can be more accurate. Neptune, the remotest known member of our System, although 2,864,000,000 of miles from the Sun, is *near him*, and *near us*, when compared with *the nearest* of the Stars.

† "Professor Phillips has succeeded in obtaining drawings of the Moon, seen through a New telescope with a 6-inch object-glass. They exhibit many new and striking features; showing a volcanic action of which we of this world have no conception. What should we think, if the whole continent of Europe were a collection of *craters*, with hills rising out of their midst and divided by radiating ravines of awful depth? The only approach to any such scenery in our world is to be found in the Cordilleras of the American gold regions. CASSELL'S *Illustrated Family Paper*. 12 Dec. 1863.

Microscopists will be delighted to learn that Powell and Lealand have succeeded in making a $\frac{1}{8}$ -inch microscope object-glass, which magnifies 7500 diameters; thus, magnifying a given area 56,000,000 of times! *Editor.*

of such immensities! To conceive the passing events of a hundred thousand years only, is, to my limited powers of apprehension, simply an *impossibility*! what am I then to think, how am I then to conceive, of millions and billions and trillions of years, miles, and worlds! The most expanded Genius of the human race, when brought into association with celestial objects, with their ages, distances, and dimensions, is indeed, to all intents and purposes,

“A worm, a leaf, a blast, a shade”!

BOWLES. Such, Mr. Chairman, is the Universe, as developed to the perceptions of the modern Philosopher and not wilfully blind Christian—very different indeed, from the notions of our Ancestors, who did not so much as know the bounds of this little world of ours; who beheld in the Sun, Moon, and Stars, nothing more than so many menial lights, ordained to attend upon this tiny Earth—a mere peppercorn, nay, a particle of diamond dust, when contrasted to the Universe created, and preserved, and governed, by that omnipresent and indivisible Spirit whose ways are emphatically said to be “past finding out”; who holds immensity in the hollow of his hand, and whose beneficence is scattered over all his works! [Hear, hear!] To such exalted contemplations are we raised, by modern Science! contemplations unknown to Moses and the Prophets, and to which the Evangelists and Apostles were alike strangers! [Hear, hear, hear!]

If, Mr. Chairman, if we inquire, *how* it has come to pass, that the Orby myriads have taken the places in which we discover them? and to *what* authorship we are to ascribe the stupendous whole? we shall find, Sir, that our pursuit of Science leads us, step by step, to a deeper and wider acquaintance with the infinite and adorable Creator, the invisible, unapproachable, inconceivable Godhead!

HUGHES. Mr. Chairman! allow me to ask you, Sir, *what* can be the object of Mr. Bowles, in occupying the time of the Meeting, with his interminable talk about the Stars, and things we know nothing at all about? I object, Sir, to all this vague sort of thing; and as it cannot have any connection with the Unity or Trinity of the Godhead, the sooner it is dropped the better, as nobody will be a whit the wiser for it.

Chairman. I am not of your opinion, Mr. Hughes; and I only wish that Mr. Bowles may be allowed to proceed without interruption.

HUNT. But, Mr. Chairman, as you interfered with me, and prevented the expression of my sentiments, I see no reason why I should listen to a rank Unitarian's utterance of remarks which have nothing at all to do with the business of this Meeting. [Hear, hear! and Applause] I protest, Sir, against Mr. Bowles's continuance, unless he instantly turns his discourse to the subject before us—the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity. [Cheers.]

Chairman. If I am not under a grand mistake, Mr. Bowles is perfectly in Order; as he is approaching, skilfully and forcibly, the very mark which so many Speakers have been aiming at in vain. The gentleman is a perfect Stranger to me, though evidently no stranger to his subject; and I must again express my wish, my ardent desire, that He be permitted to proceed. [Cheers and Dissatisfaction.]

T. YALDEN, Esq. With all due respect for the Chair, I must say, that the gentleman ought *not* to be suffered to proceed, without his first promising that he will confine himself rigidly to the object of the Meeting. [Hear, hear! and Cheers.]

BOWLES. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you, though others may *not* perceive

it, I know perfectly well *what* I am talking about; and, Sir, I also know that I am strictly in Order, inasmuch as I am aiming *direct* at the object for which this Meeting was convened. [Hear, hear! and Applause.

YALDEN. I cannot see it; nor do I think it fitting, that such an insignificant Body as the Unitarians, chiefly composed of the ignorant Working-classes, [Hear, hear!] with scarcely a respectable member of Society among them, should usurp so much of our valuable time. [Hear, hear, hear! and Cheers.

LANGHORNE. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, in justice to the Clergy of the Church of England, to observe, that there is more liberality of sentiment, more generosity of feeling, more christian charity, towards those who are not Communicants with us, than certain Clergymen present have evinced in the course of this Discussion; [Hear, hear!] and, as a set-off against some of the uncharitable expressions I have heard—heard, Sir, with pain and regret, I beg to read a short extract from the Visitation address delivered to us last August, at Coventry, by our venerable archdeacon Sandford, on the question of Subscription, etc.—

There is something in the idea of *exclusion*, which is abhorrent to the spirit of the Christian dispensation. The heart's desire and prayer of the Church for Separatists, is, that they may be won back to the fold. It is said, by men of great authority, that there can be no revision of the Church's *formularies*, and ought to be no relaxation in her *subscription*. Are the words of a minister of Christ's church in the *first* century, inapplicable to the *nineteenth*? namely—

Now, I beseech you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be *no division* among you, but, that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement'.

Because I might not altogether approve the conduct of Nonconformists, would that exculpate the passing, in hot haste, an Act which enforced their immediate *conformity*, under a penalty of expulsion from their benefices? Because Nonconformists complained that their burden was heavy, did this justify the rendering it still more oppressive? Because they had been already scourged with whips, was this a reason why they should be scourged with scorpions? Is there anyone before me, who does not *lament* the Act? who does not think of it *with shame*? who does not wish, from the bottom of his heart, that it may be *expunged* from the annals of the Church? and from the page of history? The removal or modification of the Act, is one of the leading questions of the day. It was passed in the most profligate reign of English history, at a moment when both Church and State were in a chronic fever, with a view not so much to *secure the doctrines of the Church*, as to *engross its TEMPORALITIES*. It was an Act *baneful* in its spirit and application, and its consequences have been most *disasterous*. It emasculated and secularized the English Church for more than 100 years. It drove Baxter, Calamy, Flavel, Howe, Owen, Poole, Alleyne, and Philip Henry, *out of the Church*, and made Sheldon an archbishop! Its undisguised intention was not to *comprehend*, but, to *exclude*; in the words of its prime movers—"to make Dissenters *knaves* if they conformed". It was meant to coerce Nonconformists in the seventeenth century, and it has fettered and fretted the Church, more or less, ever since". [Repeated cheers.

Allow me to add, but one sentence, Mr. Chairman, from the Rev: Christopher Nevile's Letter to Lord Ebury (in 1861) on the present state of the Church—

The result of compelling the Clergy to bind themselves to the confused mass of theology, put forth 300 years ago, by the very few persons, whose business it was to form a *religious belief* for the people at large, has been, that the Clergy have, *officially* at all events, *stood still*, whilst the rest of the nation has been *progressing* in religious knowledge—and this is the true solution of all the difficulties we are now in".

Hence, Mr. Chairman, we are not *all* equally intolerant, not *all* blind to the mischievous system of "fixed doctrinal truth"; and the light, Sir, which has burst in upon us, within the last few years, is already too exten-

sively spread, ever again to be extinguished by Priestcraft or by Act of Parliament! [Tremendous applause.]

A. A. WATTS, Esq. I hope to goodness, Mr. Chairman, the Meeting may not be deprived of the remainder of Mr. Bowles's observations, through any misunderstanding, or any misconception of the tendency of his remarks; as I am persuaded, if but allowed to finish his discourse, every individual present will be gratified as well as informed. [Hear, hear!]

KNOX. I have no notion, Mr. Chairman, of giving way to such "a Sett of men as the Unitarians", whose notions and views are as mean and vulgar, as the low-lived creatures constituting their perfectly paltry community. [Hear, hear!]

REV. B. BOOTH. Pioneers, Mr. Knox, are necessarily few; and majorities have usually originated in minorities. Unitarians cannot vie in numbers with Church of England members, any more than Protestants can vie with Romanists, or Christians with the rest of mankind. You probably are not aware, Mr. Knox, that the greatest Teacher the world ever saw, deputed but 12 Disciples to propagate those doctrines which have been spread from sea to sea and shore to shore—which are still spreading over the face of the whole habitable globe—and which shall continue to spread, until mankind shall *not* teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying—*Know the Lord*—for, all shall know Him, from the least even unto the greatest! [Applause.]

PERLE. "He is a Slave, who dares *not* be
In the right with two or three!"

D. DE FOX, Esq. Though Mr. Booth does not choose to notice either Mr. Yalden's or Mr. Knox's ungentlemanly and unchristian allusion to the *Illiterate* and *Unaristocratic* character of the Body of Unitarians; it is not, perhaps, altogether out of place in me, Mr. Chairman, to inform those defamers, that the Community they so much despise, *has had* and *still has* men of both talent and genius, both learning and wisdom, both virtue and godliness, both rank and humility, not to be outdone either by Mr. Yalden or Mr. Knox, nor yet by their circles of high-bred associates. [Deafening cheers.]

That incomparable triumvirate of talent, learning, and piety—Milton, Locke, and Newton—has already been referred to by some previous Speaker; 3 Unitarians, Mr. Chairman, who renounced their *trinitarianism* after the most diligent investigation; 3 giants in science, literature, and theology, not to be matched by any 3 of our most able Bishops now upon the Bench. [Hear, hear!] And what names can Messieurs Yalden and Knox adduce from among Trinitarians, to eclipse in literature and theology the honored names of Belsham, Jeremy Bentham, and Dr. Carpenter? Channing, Davies of Castle Howell, and Dr. Dewey? Everitt, Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, and Lindsey? Theodore Parker, Peabody brothers, and Dr. Priestley? Dr. Ware and Sons, Dr. David Williams, and Noah Webster? with a host of others not now within my remembrance. [Hear, hear!] Or, who, Sir, are the living Trinitarians, likely to cast into the shade such men as Sir John Bowring, Emerson, the Heywoods, Longfellow, Professor Martineau, Sharpe the translator of Griesbach, Principal Tayler, and others? [Hear, hear!] Among men in high position, even if we pass over such nobles as the Duke of Grafton, Viscount Falkland, Earl Lovelace, Earl Zetland, etc. still, such Unitarians as Sir William à Beckett, late Chief Justice of Victoria, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, Lord Macaulay the historian, Sir Samuel Romilly, Judge Story, the eminent writer on Jurisprudence, the uncrowned Wash-

ington, and others known to fame, are not very likely to be outdone by the associates of either Mr. Yalden or Mr. Knox. [Vociferous cheers.]

And who is the man, Mr. Chairman, that at this day and this hour occupies the first place in this first Metropolis of the world? Who, Sir, but the publicly-avowed Unitarian Lawrence, the Right Honorable the Lord Mayor of London. [Deafening cheers.]

I dare not venture on instancing names of our various living "Limbs of the Law", for they are Legion, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Byles and the Hon. Mr. Justice Crompton downwards; [Hear, hear!] and as to Members of Parliament, it is well known, that our "insignificant Body" sends more Representatives to the House of Commons, than any other Sect in the Kingdom; [Hear, hear!] while Scientific men, throughout the length and breadth of the land, whether they avow it or not, are necessarily *Unitarians*! [Long-continued cheerings.]

BOWLES. In philosophizing, it has often been found, Mr. Chairman, that the prime difficulty lay in bringing down the mind to sufficiently *simple* conceptions. Too many, soar into irrational regions, or, plunge into mystifications, and so fail of attaining any good result. To a few only, is it given to find Truth where it is usually to be found—among things most familiar. The notions which the ancients formed of the movements of the heavenly bodies, were, some of them at least, lofty and pleasing, though most of them very erroneous. It was reserved for the Geometricians and Philosophers of the last two centuries, by pursuing Truth on more solid basis, to establish the *simplicity* which is now known to extend through the physical constitution of the Universe. It has been fully and clearly ascertained, that the planets have obtained their forms, keep their places with regard to the Sun and to each other, and pursue all their various motions, in obedience to certain Laws which are daily to be seen acting on the humblest scale before our eyes. Thus, the Earth is a *globe* for the same reason that a Dewdrop is a *globe*. [Cheers.]

PEELE. "The very law that moulds a tear,
And bids it trickle from its source;
That law maintains the earth a *sphere*,
And guides the planets in their course".

BOWLES. I need scarcely remark, Mr. Chairman, to an assemblage like the present, that the marvels I have mentioned, rest on mathematical calculations of the nicest exactness.

DAVIES. That, Mr. Bowles, is what I do not comprehend.

BOWLES. And I, Mr. Davies, cannot now pause to instruct you; yet, you may rely upon it, the Astronomers computed, *ten years beforehand*, the time at which the planet Jupiter would pass our meridian; and, Sir, the predicted time was correct *within Half a second*! [Applause.]

T. ROSCOE, Esq. The next transit of Venus will take place ten years hence—in 1874, and the next following in 1882; already, however, arrangements have been made for taking Observations in all parts of the world; for, it is expected that the Sun will be found to be four millions of miles nearer to the Earth, than has been supposed—that is, Astronomers expect to prove, by the Observations yet to be made, that instead of 95,000,000, we are 91 millions of miles distant from the Sun. [Hear, hear!]

H. NELLE, Esq. Just allow me to remark, Mr. Chairman, without breaking in upon Mr. Bowles's interesting communications; that, Scientific instruments have been brought to such a surprising degree of perfection, as to render an accurate description of them almost incredible to any but the

Scientific themselves. Rosse's telescope, of which Mr. Bowles has spoken, reminds me of an instrument of a very different kind.

Messieurs Ludwig and Krommeyer have recently invented an Instrument, called *Bathoréomètre*, which one of the Members of the French Academy of Sciences undertook to describe and explain. It is an *electric novelty* of wonderful precision, and promises to be useful in a variety of ways, in ascertaining the thinnesses of different substances. Instead of *thinness* our Scientific friends speak of *thickness*; for instance, I read—A single thread of the silkworm was found to have a thickness of 0·014 of a millimètre; that of a spider (such as is used to divide the field of the telescope) 0·037 mm. Hair from an infant's head, is 0·009 mm. that of an adult averages 0·047 mm. in thickness. French gold-leaf has a thickness of 0·009 mm. A film of mica was obtained so wonderfully thin as 0·003 of a millimètre—that is, about TWELVE MILLIONTHS of an Inch! [Hear, hear!]

BOWLES. Since the days of Newton, there have been some important additions made to his philosophy. It has been shown, that certain perturbations in the planetary movements, which to him appeared to denote a necessary *end* to the system, observe periods, and are in reality proofs of the *stability* of the whole arrangement—sweet consolation to poor Dr. Cumming! It has also been discovered that the *laws of motion* extend beyond the Solar system. Amongst the Orbs, which seem so still to our ordinary perceptions, *we now know*, there is no such thing as *rest*.

MR. BAXTER. It has also been discovered since Sir Isaac's time, that *all* the Planets move nearly in *One plane*, corresponding with the centre of the Sun's body. And it is not less worthy of attention, that the motion of the Sun on its axis, those of the Planets around the Sun, and the Satellites around their Primaries, and the motions of *all* on their axes, are in *One direction*—namely, from West to East.

BOWLES. Now, Mr. Davies, had all these matters been left to *accident*, to the Atheist's god *Chance*, the chances against the uniformity would have been immensely great! But, "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork!"

DR. HAWKESWORTH. Of the motions of the 23 bodies known in the early part of this century, it was calculated by Laplace, that the adverse chances were as upwards of *four millions of millions* to *one*. [Hear, hear!] Must not then the *uniformity* of the motions, as also their general adjustment to *one plane*, be attributed to a *Single cause* acting throughout the whole system? And would any sane mind tell us, that such *Single cause* could possibly be *Chance*?* [Hear, hear!]

BOWLES. The tendency, Mr. Chairman, of all these discoveries, has been to deepen the conviction, that the physical affairs of the Universe, are all of them under the regulation of *Laws*; the *forms*, the *distances*, the *movements*, the *interdependencies*, are determined.

DAVIES. What do you mean by "the regulation of *Laws*"?

BOWLES. A *law*, in the Science of Nature, is merely the *term* applicable where any series of phenomena is seen *invariably* to occur in certain given circumstances, or, in certain given conditions. Such phenomena are said to *Obey a Law*, because they appear to be under a rule or ordinance of constant operation. In the case of these physical *Laws*, we can bring the idea to mathematical elements, and see that *numbers* in the expression of Space

* "That *chance* should imply *direction*, is the most monstrous of absurdities; and to suppose the Universe to be governed by *Chance*, is to deny the Being of a God. HAMPSON.

or of Time, form as it were its basis. We thus trace in *law*, Intelligence—often we can see that it has a beneficial object, still more strongly speaking of *mind* as concerned in it. There cannot, however, be an *inherent intelligence* in these Laws. [Hear, hear!] The intelligence appears *external* to the Laws; something of which the Laws are but as the expressions of the Will and Power. If this be admitted, Mr. Chairman, the Laws cannot be regarded as *primary* or *independent* Causes of the phenomena of the Physical world. We come, in short, Sir, to a *Being beyond Nature*—its AUTHOR, its GOD—infinite—inconceivable—and yet, One whom these very Laws present to us with attributes showing that *our nature* is, in some way, a faint and far-cast shadow of His, while all the gentlest and most amiable of our emotions lead us towards believing, and feeling, that we are as Children in his care, and as Vessels in his hand. [Hear, hear!] *Natural Law*, then, must be understood as being *the mode only* in which the divine Power is exercised and manifested—it is, Mr. Chairman, but another phrase for *the action* of the EVER-PRESENT and SUSTAINING God. [Hear, hear!]

REV. W. LILLO. It seems difficult to say, which is most to be pitied—the man, who having but a smattering of Science, treats Religion with contempt, or, the religious fanatic, who *not* seeing God in Nature, looks down upon Science as beneath his notice! [Hear, hear!] Men of good understanding, Mr. Chairman, see nothing in the Universe, but *littleness* and *greatness*; the littleness of the Creature and the greatness of God; and I may venture to say, that in a feeling *sense* of this, lies the essence of all Philosophy and of all Religion. [Cheers.]

BOWLES. Be it clearly and unmistakably understood, by every individual in this assembly—the PURSUIT OF SCIENCE, is, a *Searching after a more intimate acquaintance with the Infinite*—THE GREAT FIRST CAUSE! [Applause, often repeated.]

DAVIES. I am lost in wonder, reverence, and adoration! Never until this happy hour, had I any exalted views either of Nature or of God. I now begin to form some faint conception of the *immensity* of Creation, and the utter *inconceivableness* of the Creator, whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain! and whose ways are past finding out! [Hear, hear!]

BOWLES. Tell me, Mr. Davies, can you *now*, after having had a glimpse of the Universe, with its myriads of worlds floating in Space; can you *now* believe, that the Creator and Preserver and Ruler of all things animate and inanimate, all worlds visible and invisible, all systems finite and infinite, ever vacated his boundless empire of Immensity, to occupy a Manger in the obscure village of Bethlehem, on this less than peppercorn of a globe? ever became a helpless Infant of a span long, “mewling and puking in the Nurse’s arms”? a whining Schoolboy? a Man among men, toiling at the Carpenter’s bench in Nazareth? a Creature created by Himself, at most about 5 feet high? a Resident on this speck of Earth, for 33 years? suffering Himself to be spit upon, to be scourged, to be crucified, by such ephemeral atomies as we are! Can you *now*, Mr. Davies, believe that the invisible Spirit, the Omnipresent Solipotent Omniscient God, ever——

[Suddenly interrupted, by the violent ringing of a sonorous Bell]

BUTLER. Mr. Chairman! Ladies and Gentlemen! The Committee has but 5 minutes more legal possession of this Hall—in 5 minutes time, the Doors will be thrown open to the assembled Crowd without!

I, therefore, Move—that, this Discussion be adjourned—that, the

same Committee of Management be appointed to arrange farther proceedings—that, at the next Meeting, the Trinitarians shall Open the Discussion—and that, No one shall be allowed to take *an active part*, who is not in the Hall at the instant the Chair shall be taken.

M. GREEN. I second the various Motions, embodied in One!

[Carried with Acclamations]

Nothing farther was heard by the Reporter, of whatever was said, by several Speakers—so great was the Commotion and Noise, in hurrying out of the Hall. *Editor.*

N.B. The following Quotations have been Omitted, *somewhere*; but, the Editor has not, now, the means of ascertaining by which Speaker they were adduced—

For ever—In the exhaustless variety of nature and of art, in the equally infinite variety of the analogies and relations of objects, the human intellect may expatiate FOR EVER, and never find lack of argument, wit, and fancy; but, how small a portion can be preserved or retained. *Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1849.

If one half of the Bar be the shields of innocence, the other half is FOR EVER sharpening and driving home the two-edged sword of craft and oppression.

Social Condition and Character of the Bar.

For ever and a day—

I have no more to say,

But bid Bianca farewell FOR EVER AND A DAY.

Taming of the Shrew. Act iv. Sc. 4.

For ever and for ever—Juno, we are told, when she had killed Argus, took the poor fellow's eyes and fixed them FOR EVER AND FOR EVER on her peacock's tail.

History of St. Giles and St. James.

The king shall have my service; but, my prayers

FOR EVER AND FOR EVER, shall be yours!

Cromwell to Wolsey. *Henry VIII.* Act iii. Sc. 2.

Eternal—I could not have slept this night on my bed, nor even reposed my head upon my pillow, without giving vent to my ETERNAL abhorrence of such enormous and preposterous principles!

Chatham's Speech, on War with America.

Warwick. From this hour, expect
From injured France an enmity ETERNAL.
Edward. ETERNAL be it, then! for, etc.

Franklin's Earl of Warwick.

Eternally—When a man is ETERNALLY anxious about the next hour's food, he has neither time nor inclination to think or care for anything else.

Shadows of Coming events. 1845.

Fair lovers, you are fortunately met:
Of this discourse we will hear more anon.
Egeus, I will overbear your will;
For, in the temple, by-and-bye, with us,
These couples shall ETERNALLY be knit.

A Midsummer-night's Dream. Act v. Sc. 1.

Everlasting—Rhymes are EVERLASTING recreations for the poor and the rich.

Bowring's Language and Literature of Holland.

Melun.

Thus hath he sworn,
And I with him, and many more with me,
Upon the altar of Saint Edmund's-Bury;
Even on that altar where we swore to you
Dear amity and EVERLASTING love.

King John. Act v. Sc. 4.

Everlastingly—What New fact can be elicited by those, who copy EVERLASTINGLY from the Old?

Rev. C. H. Townshend's Facts in Mesmerism.

King Rd. Say, I will love her EVERLASTINGLY.

Queen Eliz. But, how long shall that title, *ever*, last?

King Rd. Sweetly in force unto her fair life's end.

King Richard III. Act iv. Sc. 4.

Some other individual instanced a variety of similar examples, showing that, in daily life, we use *limitless words in limited meanings*, without any risk of misapprehension—half a dozen of which only, I add for the consideration of the Curious.

O Woman, lovely Woman! nature made thee
To temper Man—we had been brutes without you!
Angels are painted fair, to look like You;
There's in you all that we believe of Heaven—
Amazing brightness, purity, and truth,
ETERNAL joy, and EVERLASTING love!

Otway's Venice Preserved.

You must have lived in the country, I say, to conceive the EVERLASTINGNESS of such a topic as this.

Pine-Apple Shot. 1845.

What is our life but an ENDLESS flight of winged facts or events! *Emerson.*

The principle that gives the EVER-ENDURING popularity to the four great tragedies (for Richard III. is not acted as written) is the tremendous interest derived from the conflict of the passions and the feelings. *Jerrold's Review of an Essay on Macbeth.*

Much of the Literature produced by both [Greek and Roman Classics and the Bible] partakes, no doubt, of the fate which attends other kinds; the books they severally elicit, whether critical or theological, pass away; but, they themselves retain their hold on the human mind, become engrafted into the literature of every civilized nation, and continue to evoke a NEVER-ENDING series of volumes in their defense, illustration, or, explication. *Edinburgh Review. 1849.*

And, let me perish, but, in Cato's judgement,
A day, an hour, of virtuous Liberty,
Is worth a WHOLE ETERNITY in Bondage!

Addison's Cato.