

that of a learned and accurate divine; nor do we think it likely to be shaken by the efforts of party spleen, though they should be assisted (as we confess they are) by his own want of care in the management of the present controversy.

Of Lord Teignmouth, his principal opponent, it is equally impossible to speak without the sincerest commendation. We know and love his many virtues. The integrity of his life, and the genuineness of his piety tend, still more than his rank, to place him in the very first class of respectability. To advance the cause of christianity is the habitual motive of his conduct; nor will any thing less pure and dignified be charged against him, but by ignorance or malice.

Here we should wish to stop. But these, like other primary bodies, are attended by smaller and more obscure satellites. We will mention only two of them. With a narrow view of his question, and in a tone of argument faint and unimpressive, Mr. Spry adopts the cause of Dr. Wordsworth. He adds no force to the statements of others, and brings no novelty of his own.—With this humble character, Mr. Dealtry is not content; and espousing the cause of his Lordship, makes sundry efforts to be both witty and wise. In spite of all his attempts, however, the reader cannot but discover the poverty of his resources, and the unfitness of his judgment to decide such a dispute. There is a flippancy and incompetence in his manner of writing, which makes it far more insupportable than the decent heaviness of Mr. Spry. He seeks to disguise the sentiments which he adopts from his principal in the affected dress of his own phraseology: *sequiturque fugitque*—he follows the track of others, while he appears to soar away as an original genius. ‘Do my Bibles,’ procured from the Bible Society, ‘by some process of chemical combination, neutralize my Tracts and Bibles derived from the other Institution? Or, what is still worse, are they converted by the process into a baneful commodity; a mere *caput mortuum*; a pestilential mass of sulphur and charcoal?’ If this ‘examining chaplain’ were himself to be asked, from what treatise on a serious subject might be produced a passage which should combine the meanest reasoning with the most affected levity, he might safely quote his own pamphlet, page 13. If he were required to point out the most injurious, as well as the most tasteless, of all attempts at the illustration of the matter in dispute, he must fix on his own ‘two scolds in a parish,’ or the vapid and pert invention of his ‘two streams.’ p. 27. But we gladly leave him, and turn the attention of our readers to the subject itself, and to the principles, by which, as appears to us, so important a question may be determined.

It is to be observed then, that there has long existed in this