

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Calcutta Christian Observer* can be found here:

[https://missiology.org.uk/journal\\_calcutta-christian-observer-01.php](https://missiology.org.uk/journal_calcutta-christian-observer-01.php)

THE  
*Missionaries*  
**CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.**

No. 16.—*September, 1833.*

\* \* The profits arising from the Sale of this Publication will be devoted to the  
CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY.

*Illustrated by a Drawing of the TEMPLE AT KALEE GHAUT, near Calcutta.*

**CONTENTS.**

ESSAYS, &c.	Page.		Page.
I.—Account of the Temple at Kalee-Ghaut, in the vicinity of Calcutta.	413	VII.—Sir Edward Ryan's remarks on the conduct of the Missionaries, in the hearing of the case of Brijonanth Ghose.	461
II.—Robert Hall's Views of Authors and Literary Characters.	419	VIII.—Remarks on the present State of the law of Marriage affecting British subjects in India.	461
III.—Strictures on "J.'s" Remarks on Prayer.	430	DOMESTIC OCCURRENCES.	
IV.—The Chinese Mission.	432	1. Marriages, Births, and Deaths.	465
V.—Translation of the Siva-Dhyana, or Popular Muntra of the Hindoos.	434	2. Arrivals and Departures.	466
VI.—Mr. Longueville Clarke and the Missionaries.	437	3. Meteorological Register.	468

Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.

\* \* *Communications, it is requested, may be addressed to "The Editors of the CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER," care of Messrs. THACKER AND CO. All orders, and remittances for the work, to be addressed to Messrs. Thacker and Co. direct.*

1833.

*Price to Subscribers, 10 Sa. Rs. per Annum—payable in advance.  
To Non-Subscribers, or Subscribers not paying in advance, 1-8 per No.*

## FUNDAMENTAL RULES.

I. That the CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER be established on those evangelical principles, in which the leading Reformers of the 16th century were agreed.

II. That no piece advocating the peculiarities of a particular denomination, shall in any case be inserted in the work.

III. That the Editors, who are of different religious denominations, shall be at liberty, without offence to the contributors, to modify or reject all communications which may appear contrary to the above Rules.

---

## NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

---

Our best acknowledgments are again demanded by the favours of numerous correspondents, received during the month. Our time is so limited however that our notices must be brief.

In compliance with the wish of numerous Subscribers we have inserted the enlarged account of the controversy between Mr. Clarke and the Missionaries, as well as the paper on Marriage by Dissenting Ministers; and in order to find room for them, have been obliged to postpone till next No. many communications already in type—among these are, "Memoir of the late Rev. R. Burn, H. C.'s Chaplain at Singapore;" "Delhi College and Delhi Gazette;" the second communication from "Amicus;" and "Jerusalem." Their respective writers may confidently anticipate the insertion of their communications in our next.

The kind friend, to whose exertions we owe the plate which illustrates the No. will accept our best thanks; while the author of the account which it is intended to illustrate will, we hope, without delay, send us his intended account of Dukyin Roy and other idols, which alas! for the credit of the human understanding, are the objects of reverence in the country.

If L. were now to hand us his intended piece on the "necessity on *preaching* the Word," it would be acceptable and useful.

"B." (if possible) in our next. We shall be happy to receive the other communication he promises.

We feel much obliged to our correspondent M. W. for his translation of "the Sivadhyana," which appears in this No.; and for the extracts from the "Hindoo Prayer Book," which shall find a place in our next.

"R.'s" poetical piece has been received.

After mature consideration, we would recommend "J" to revise the *language* of his continued article on Prayer. For this purpose we shall return it to him. The sentiments are good:—but some of the *expressions* are unguarded, and might possibly lead to a second letter from "Amicus," containing "strictures," &c.

The want of space in the præsent number prevents our insertion of "Alpha's" remarks on the merits of the controversy between Lieutenant Burnes and Mr. Wold. The article shall appear in our next.

The Madras Gazette, and Gutzlaff's Appeal on behalf of China, &c. have been duly received.

The oversight with regard to the despatch of our work, referred to in the Bombay Spectator, has been rectified.



Drawn on Stone by J.M. Voe

Temple at **KALEE GHAT**, near Calcutta.

From a drawing by M. W. Woodliston

THE  
CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

---

September, 1833.

---

I.—*Account of the Temple at Kalee-Ghaut, in the vicinity of Calcutta.*

[With an Engraving of the Temple.]

To the Editors of the Calcutta Christian Observer.

DEAR SIRS,

I beg herewith, agreeably to my promise, to forward to you an account of the temple at Kalee-Ghaut. It is probably known to most of your readers as the principal place of resort for Hindoo worshippers in Bengal. It is situated about three miles to the south of Calcutta, and at a short distance only from Tolly's Nullah. The road leading to it branches off from the Barripore road, immediately at the end of the suburb of Bhowanipore. The approach to the temple is very unlike to what a European visitor would naturally expect: it is mean and filthy in the extreme. The entrance is through a low, ruinous archway, which introduces the visitor into a miserable-looking court-yard, containing a few temples consecrated to Gonesh and Radha Krishno, and a lofty *Oshotto* tree (*Ficus religiosa*), under the shade of which are generally a number of Sunnyasees and Fakeers of different descriptions performing their devotions; though not quite with such a degree of abstraction as to prevent them from wishfully looking up to the passers by, in hope of a mite of their worldly goods.

A second archway, as ill looking as the former, leads to the precincts of the temple, which form a pretty large enclosure. The temple itself is on the north side. It is rather of larger dimensions, both as to height and spaciousness, than most buildings of the sort in Bengal, though not to be compared to even the smallest church or chapel used for Christian worship in Europe. It has two doors, one to the south and the other to the east. Immediately to the south of the temple is a roomy open hall, supported by pillars and of more modern architecture, called *Nath Mondir*. This hall serves to accommodate the worshippers, and especially the Brahmuns employed in reading the *Chundee*, a religious poem containing an account of the wars and triumphs of Kalee. Occasionally,

as I have myself witnessed, a cow or bull takes its place among these holy men, without apparently giving offence to any one present. To the south of the *Nath Mondir*, is the place where the animals are sacrificed. To the east of the temple, is the *Pâk-shala*, or kitchen where the food for the use of the goddess is prepared by the wives of the priests. Besides the above buildings, there are within the yard several small temples, chiefly dedicated to *Sheeb*, and belonging to private individuals. The aspect of the whole is any thing but splendid and noble: it is in fact rather mean, and in perfect unison with the system to which it owes its origin.

The idol is a huge black stone, with four arms attached to it, holding in each a weapon of some kind or other. The face is most hideous; the eyes, nose, and mouth, are painted red, and a golden tongue projects nearly half a cubit from the lips. The figure is not complete, and appears above ground only from the middle upwards, or indeed rather less. It is arrayed with every kind of female ornament, bracelets, nose-ring, necklace, &c. and the lower part of the body is covered with a cloth.

The reason, why this place is held so sacred, is because it is one of the *Peet-s'hans*, an account of which holy places, was inserted in your number for July last. The toes of the right foot of *Doorga* fell on this spot, after they had been cut off by Vishnoo at the festival of *Dokkyo*.—Some Hindoos maintain that these toes are buried in the earth under the goddess, whilst others pretend that they are lodged within her holy belly. I am not able to say which of these opinions is most to be credited: in fact this is a point not fully decided among the Brahmuns themselves!

The place where the temple stands, was formerly (as indeed the whole country south of Calcutta) a part of the Sunderbuns, and covered with jungle; but without being then known as the receptacle of such sacred relics. There are several accounts given by the Natives respecting the manner how the holy spot was discovered; I will mention one communicated by an intelligent young Hindoo, who has appeared in your pages under the name of a "Hindoo Spectator." I insert it in his own words.

"It is the prevailing notion of most Hindoos that a certain Brahmun of the name of *Holdar* had a cow which did not yield a single drop of milk, whenever she was allowed to enter the forest by which the place called *Kalee-Ghaut* was then surrounded. In order to discover the cause of this uncommon circumstance, one day he set his cow at liberty, and followed her wherever she went. At last he saw her enter into the deepest recess of the wood, and stand still on a spot which appeared to him to have been illumined with a beam of resplendent light. Amazed at a circumstance so wonderful, he threw himself on the ground, sat cross-legged, closed his eyes, and commenced entreating the gods to disclose this mystery to his benighted understanding. In mercy to his brahmunical lineage, the goddess appeared to him in a dream,

and declared to him the absolute propriety of dedicating a temple to herself on that very spot, where he would find her toes buried under ground. Pursuant to this direction he lost no time to erect the said temple, taking care to publish abroad that it was at the express command of the goddess that he had resorted to this step. In a short time that temple became one of the most famous in Bengal."

One is really at a loss which to admire most, the impudent assumption of Holdar, or the blind credulity of those who received his testimony. Be this as it may, the above event occurred about 200 years ago. The temple originally built by Holdar, was, not thirty years ago, much enlarged at the expense of the Shaborno Chowdries, the opulent zemindars of Bealah.

The descendants of Holdar, are the proprietors of the temple. They have now increased to 25 or 30 families, who share all the offerings presented to the goddess.—Some heads of families have 2 or 4 days in the month, during which they officiate and are entitled to all that is offered during that period. Others, being the posterity of more prolific progenitors, have had their turns so subdivided, as to be permitted to officiate only 3 or 4 hours a month; yet all are more or less wealthy, and several possess much landed property.

The poorest of these Holdars officiate themselves as priests, and the richest keep a Brahmun in their service at a small monthly salary to perform their duties in lieu of them; but reserving of course all the profits and emoluments of the worship to themselves. Surely it would be no great disparagement to some ecclesiastical establishments in Christendom, if they bore, with regard to this practice, less analogy to the Pagan establishment of Kalee-Ghaut.

Rich Natives take occasionally their own Poorohits (family priests) to present their offerings to Kalee. To this, the Holdars have no objection whatever, as they themselves get, even in this case, all the offerings;—an object, it is much to be feared, they have more at heart to obtain, than the honor of doing duty in the presence of the glorious Kalee.

There are constantly lounging about the temple a set of Brahmuns, who may be called *brokers* of the Holdars. These entice parties to present offerings to the goddess, and officiate for them. For their trouble they get from the Holdars a part of the things offered, and from the worshippers a trifling fee, which enables them to live pretty comfortably. These Brahmun brokers, however, it must be acknowledged, are not much respected by their countrymen. It is an understood thing, that when a native of property has once had his offerings presented to Kalee by any one of the Holdars, the latter becomes his regular priest at this shrine, and considers the offerer as his *Jojmaun* (i. e. customer), and expects he will always, at a future period, manage to come to worship when it is *his* turn to officiate.

Kalee, it is well known, is the guardian deity of many of the Bengalees, and almost all, rich and poor, are in the habit from time to time to present offerings to the goddess at this temple. Bloody sacrifices are offered daily. He-goats, rams, and buffaloes, are the only animals thus offered. Of the former two kinds, often 100 and seldom less than 50, are sacrificed daily, and from 4 to 8 of the latter. On Saturdays and Mondays, which are days particularly sacred to the goddess, as many as 2 or 300 goats and rams, and 10 to 15 buffaloes, are sacrificed; and at the Shyama festival, otherwise called *Kalee Poojah*, which usually takes place at the end of October, not less than 4 to 500 goats and 50 buffaloes are sacrificed. The place on such occasions is inundated with gore, and any one who entertains the notion that the "mild Hindoos" are so averse to the taking of life and the shedding of blood as nearly to faint at the very sight of the latter, needs only to visit Kalee-Ghaut to convince himself of the contrary.

The Holdars are entitled to all the animals offered in sacrifice; but when an equivalent in money is given to them, they permit the offerer to take them away. Those not disposed of in this manner, are either eaten by themselves or sold to any applicants, never mind to what caste or religion they may belong. The carcasses of buffaloes are sold by the priests to shoe-makers, who eat the flesh and use the skin for the purposes of their trade.

Bloody sacrifices are far from constituting the principal income of the Holdars. The other gifts presented to the goddess are far more lucrative: generally rice, curds, sweetmeats, fruits of all kinds, cloth, gold and silver ornaments, even golden eyes and tongues, &c. are offered by the worshippers, frequently to the amount of some hundreds and thousands of rupees; though usually to a much smaller amount. *Cash* is never given as an offering to the goddess, but only to the priests, in the shape of a *fee* for their trouble. Persons who have worshipped at Kalee-Ghaut, are decorated by the priests with a garland of flowers which is put round their necks. Such persons, especially sepoys, are often met with in Chowringhee-road, and other streets of the metropolis.

The infatuation of the thousands of worshippers who visit this shrine daily, is beyond all comprehension. It is truly amazing to see what a hold this place possesses on the poor deluded Hindoos. No sensible Christian who has witnessed the scenes exhibited there, and is aware of the turpitude and degradation produced on the people by this haunt of superstition and craftiness, can help experiencing the painful feelings which the Apostle Paul mentions to have affected him so much, when he beheld the entire population of Athens "wholly given to idolatry." And he will almost instinctively express the wish, that this temple, and the

whole debasing system of error with which it is connected, may soon crumble into dust, to make room for the blessed and truly ennobling religion of the Redeemer.

Kalee partakes of three meals a day. The first, which may be called her breakfast, is served out to her at about 9 A. M. and composed of *Kidjoree*, a dish prepared with rice and split pease, seasoned with ghee and spices of different kinds. This breakfast is sufficient to satisfy the cravings of 30 or 40 people, who are easily found willing to perform the coarse offices of masticating and digesting this holy food; the goddess being satisfied, as the Hindoos say, with the refined acts of beholding and smelling the repast prepared by her devoted worshippers. At 2 P. M., Kalee's dinner is served up. This consists of boiled rice, with all kinds of curries, curds, milk, sweetmeats, &c. &c. On common occasions, about 100 people are feasted with these provisions. After dinner, the goddess takes a nap for two hours, when the temple is closed, and no one is allowed to disturb her slumbers. Towards evening, the last meal, called *Shitolee*, is served up. It consists of fruits, sweetmeats, &c.; much incense is burned at this time, after which Kalee goes to sleep. The Brahmuns are not quite agreed among themselves whether she dreams occasionally, or whether her sleep is perfectly undisturbed.

Numbers of persons are in the habit of making vows at Kalee-Ghaut whenever they have any desiderata in view: these are usually riches, children, the destruction of enemies, recovery from illness, the gaining of a law-suit in the court, &c. Wealthy people, in order to propitiate the goddess, employ Brahmuns to read the *Chundee* a certain number of times. This act is considered very meritorious. Should, however, the desired object not have been obtained, the blame is laid at the door of the poor Brahmuns, who are accused of having neglected some of the many requisites described in the Shastras, as absolutely necessary to render the reading of the *Chundee* beneficial. The young Hindoo alluded to above, mentioned the case of one of his acquaintances, who having instituted an action in the Supreme Court, sent two Brahmuns to Kalee-Ghaut to read the *Chundee*; not doubting that this would secure him a favorable decision from the judges. It however turned out otherwise, and the man took his revenge by lavishing every kind of abuse on the two Brahmuns, whom he accused of not having read the sacred poem as many times as they had engaged to do, and of being thereby the cause of his disappointment.

There are near and about Kalee-Ghaut a great number of shopkeepers, whose business it is to supply the worshippers with the offerings they require. They sell their articles at an exorbitant price, on which account they are detested by all the Hindoos. As a proof of this I may mention, that the whole of that bazar having

been destroyed by fire twice in less than six months, about two years ago, the Natives unanimously forbore sympathy, and expressed themselves satisfied that these accidents were visible tokens of the goddess's displeasure, on account of the cupidity and extortions of these retailers.

The temple of *Nokool Eshwor*, the guardian of the *Peet-st'han* at Kalee-Ghaut, is to the north-east of the great temple. Worshipers at the latter, almost invariably present some trifling offering at this shrine, with a view to secure the full benefit of their worship of the goddess, who is not pleased unless her husband is remembered also.

The late excellent Mr. Ward, of Serampore, in his History of the Hindoos, has a passage on Kalee-Ghaut, which I feel induced to transcribe, as it is likely to catch the eye of some of your readers who may perhaps have the opportunity of discountenancing the evil practices to which it refers.

“The Hindoos, it seems, are not the only persons who worship this black stone. I have received accounts several times, of Europeans or their native mistresses, going to this temple and expending thousands of Rupees in offerings. The Brahmun with whom I wrote this account, declares that when he was a student at Burshya, near Kalee-Ghaut, he several times, saw the wives of Europeans come in palanqueens with offerings; though I suppose these ladies were born in India. But the proprietors of the temple, positively assured this Brahmun (as he says), that very frequently EUROPEAN MEN presented offerings, soliciting some favour at the hands of the goddess; and that very lately a gentleman in the Hon'ble Company's service!!! who had gained a cause at law, presented thank-offerings to Kalee which cost two or three thousand rupees. I confess that I very reluctantly insert these accounts, because I should hope they mostly originate in wilful misrepresentation on the part of the Brahmuns of the temple, or in mistake. I suppose some *Portuguese* (who also go by the name of Saheb) may present offerings and pray to this goddess, hence one source of misinformation: the mistresses of Europeans are supplied with money by their retainers, and hence the worship not unfrequently passes off, with many a triumph over degraded Christianity, as the worship of such a European.

“And many Europeans who go for curiosity to see the temple and the image, INCONSIDERATELY or WANTONLY give presents to the clamorous and greedy Brahmuns, who proclaim it as an offering to their goddess. Actions even the most innocent (even going to view the image), are construed by these ignorant idolaters into an approval of idolatry. A European who was lately there, to make a drawing of the image, when he departed, gave the officiating Brahmun a gold mohur, and this present was probably enrolled among the gifts to the temple.”

As to the foul practices alluded to in the former part of this extract, I would hope for the credit of the European and Christian name, that they do no more exist; and I would on the subject of the latter part, particularly caution visitors to Kalee-Ghaut or any other shrine, never to make presents to the Brahmuns of the temple, as I can from my own observation testify to the truth of Mr. Ward's remarks, and declare, that such presents are invari-

ably construed by the priests to be offerings to their god:—and where is the Christian who does not shudder at the idea that he should thus countenance idolatry, and bring a reproach on his own most holy religion?

I could have mentioned several other particulars respecting this celebrated place; but I perceive I have already lengthened my paper far beyond what I at first intended. I will therefore conclude, with a particular request to your Hindoo readers to consider well these words of the Scriptures of truth: “*Con-founded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols. Our God is in the heavens; he has done whatsoever he pleased. Their idols are silver and gold, the work of mens’ hands: they have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not: they have ears, but they hear not: noses have they, but they smell not. They that make them, are like unto them: so is every one that trusteth in them.*”

To your Christian readers, I would say: Be zealous for your God, and shew yourselves true Philanthropists by extending as much as your circumstances will permit the knowledge of Christianity—of that divine religion, which alone is able to enlighten men, to pacify their consciences, to change their hearts, to furnish them with strength to subdue their evil passions, to uphold them in affliction, to comfort them in death, and to give them a sure hope of eternal life beyond the grave. And let them not consider their work done until the knowledge of the Lord cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea; and until all, from the least even unto the greatest, shall be holy and happy under the peaceful reign of the King of Righteousness.

L.

---

## II.—*Robert Hall's Views of Authors and Literary Characters.*

To the Editors of the Calcutta Christian Observer.

GENTLEMEN,

I have recently read, with no common interest, the brief, but very beautiful Memoir of the Rev. ROBERT HALL, late of Bristol, by Dr. Gregory, and the masterly Essay on Mr. Hall's theological character by the celebrated Mr. John Foster. As it is a work which may not, in all probability, come into the hands of many of your readers, I have thought a few extracts from it might not be unacceptable to them. Perhaps you will favour me by giving them a place in some early number of the Calcutta Christian Observer. The present selection will refer chiefly to Mr. Hall's Views of Authors and Literary Characters; and should it meet your approbation and the approbation of your numerous readers, a subsequent paper may be occupied with quotations illustrative of Mr.

Hall's own character as a Christian, a preacher, and a writer ; in all which, as far as it can be said of human beings, he seems to have touched the boundary of perfection ; but especially in the two last, where, by all modern orators or writers, he stands unrivalled and alone. His compositions have the beauty of a flowing river, with its depth, force, copiousness, and majesty combined. Never, I should suppose, in the English language were elegance and energy ; perspicuity and profundity ; ease and harmony ; simplicity, sublimity, and variety more happily blended ; at least, it has never fallen to my lot to see them. There are writers whom we read almost entirely for their style ; there are others whose thoughts, however expressed, must command attention : in Mr. Hall the two were united ; the noblest sentiments were clothed in the most appropriate verbal attire ; they were to each other, as the elegant drapery of a classical statue. I have read of examples being so perfect as to produce despondency rather than emulation in the minds of pupils : there is scarcely a page in Mr. Hall's writings which has not this effect on me ; and after perusing a portion of his works previous to composition, for the purpose of tuning my ear to harmony and raising my thoughts in some humble degree to " the height of some great argument," I have laid down my pen in utter despair. But I must proceed to the selections, some of which I have taken from other parts of Mr. Hall's works, and some from *Reminiscences of Mr. Hall*, by Mr. Green.

Mr. Hall, observes Mr. Green, also directed my attention to books suitable for my perusal, in English. Among others which he lent me, were Lord Bacon's *Essays*. After reading the preface, he made comments :—" There, Sir, no man but Lord Bacon could say this :—'As to the Latin edition of these *Essays*, it will last as long as books last.' " Why, Sir, it would be the greatest vanity and presumption in any other man to say this of his own work." Then he read the following striking passage from the first *Essay on Truth* :—" It is a pleasure to stand on the shore, and to see ships tossed upon the sea : a pleasure to stand in the window of a castle, and to see a battle and the adventures thereof, below ; but no pleasure is comparable to the standing on the vantage ground of truth, (a hill not to be commanded, and where the air is always clear and serene,) and to see the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests, in the vale below, so always that this prospect be with pity, and not with swelling or pride. Certainly, it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of truth." He repeated the last sentence ;—" ' Turn upon the poles of truth ! ' How beautiful ! There, Sir, I will lend you that, but remember, you must not keep Lord Bacon more than a fortnight ; for there is scarcely a week in which I do not want to consult or refer to him."

Speaking of Barrow's *Sermons*, the style of which is extremely rugged, Mr. Hall observed, " I have read them, Sir, and am exceedingly pleased with them ; Barrow was a great man. His style is verbose, but the matter excellent." Blair's *Sermons* were then mentioned. " Blair is not to be compared with Barrow, Sir. It is true, that his periods are rounder, and, as compositions, his discourses are more elegant ; they resemble heaps of po-

lished pebbles, Sir. Barrow is however the closest thinker ; his ideas are profound ; they are diamonds stuck in mud, Sir."

B. "May I ask, Sir, what writer you would most recommend to a young minister." H. "Why Sir, I feel very incompetent to give directions on that head ; I can only say that I have learned far more from John Howe, than from any other author I ever read. There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions. He had not the same perception of the beautiful, as of the sublime ; and hence his endless subdivisions." B. "That was the fault of this age." H. "In part, Sir ; but he has more of it than many of the writers of that period,—than Barrow, for example, who was somewhat earlier. There was, I think, an innate inaptitude in Howe's mind for discerning minute graces and proprieties, and hence his sentences are often long and cumbersome. Still he was unquestionably the greatest of the Puritan divines."

After adverting to several of Howe's works, Mr. H. said, in reference to his 'Blessedness of the Righteous ;' "Perhaps, Baxter's *Saints' Rest* is fitted to make a deeper impression on the majority of readers. Baxter enforces a particular idea with extraordinary clearness, force, and earnestness. His 'Appeals to the Conscience' are irresistible ; Howe, again, is distinguished by calmness, self-possession, majesty, and comprehensiveness ; and for my own part, I decidedly prefer him to Baxter. I admire, exceedingly, his 'Living Temple,' his sermon on the 'Redeemer's Tears,' &c. ; but, in my opinion, the best thing he ever wrote is his 'Defence of the Sincerity of the Gospel Offer.' I refer to the treatise, called the 'Reconcilableness of God's Prescience of the Sins of Men, with his Counsels, Exhortations, and whatever other means he used to prevent them.' This I regard as the most profound, the most philosophical, and the most valuable of all Howe's writings."

Mr. H. for full sixty years, read Jonathan Edwards's writings with undiminished pleasure. And of 'Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants,' he has often been known to say, "It is just like reading a novel ;" which indeed, was his usual expression of commendation, with regard to such works, of a dry or abstract nature, as discovered subtilty, depth, or vigour of thought. In this class he placed the works of Jeremy Bentham, for whom he entertained the highest estimation, as an original, profound, and accurate thinker ; observing often, that in the particular province of his speculations, the science of legislation, he had advanced to the limits of reason ; and, that if he were compelled to legislate for the world upon uninspired principles, "he should take Bentham, and go from state to state with as firm a step as though he walked upon a pavement of adamant\*."

"Of Blackstone's Commentaries," he says in one of his Reviews, "it would be presumptuous in us to attempt an eulogium, after Sir William Jones has pronounced it to be the most beautiful outline that was ever given of any science. Nothing can exceed the luminous arrangement, the vast comprehension, and, we may venture to add from the best authorities, the legal accuracy of this wonderful performance, which, in style and composition, is distinguished by an unaffected grace, a majestic simplicity, which can only be eclipsed by the splendour of its higher qualities."

Lord Byron was mentioned—"I tried to read Childe Harold, but could not get on, and gave it up." "Have you read the fourth Canto, Sir, which is by far the best?" "Oh no Sir, I shall never think of trying." "But, Sir, independently of the mere poetry, it must be interesting to contemplate such a remarkable mind as Lord Byron's." "It is well enough, Sir, to have a general acquaintance with such a character ; but I know not why we should take pleasure in minutely investigating deformity."

\* He always recommended those who were likely to be offended with the strangeness of Bentham's style, to study his principles through the medium of his elegant French commentator, M. Dumont.

"He also read in his family the translation of the Four Gospels, by Campbell, whom he particularly admired, and often recommended, as an accurate translator, and a critic of great acuteness, taste, and judgment."

In a letter to a friend, written in 1823, Mr. Hall writes—

It is quite unnecessary to say that I perused the letters with great admiration and delight. I have always considered the letters of Mr. Cowper as the finest specimen of the epistolary style in our language, and these appear to me of a superior description to the former, possessing as much beauty with more piety and pathos. To an air of inimitable ease and carelessness, they unite a high degree of correctness, such as could result only from the clearest intellect, combined with the most finished taste. I have scarcely found a single word which is capable of being exchanged for a better.

Mr. Hall repeatedly referred to Dr. Chalmers, and always in high admiration of his general character. The following are some remarks respecting that extraordinary individual: "Pray Sir, did you ever know any man who had that singular faculty of repetition possessed by Dr. Chalmers? Why, Sir, he often reiterates the same thing ten or twelve times, in the course of a few pages. Even Burke himself had not so much of that peculiarity. His mind resembles that optical instrument lately invented; what do you call it?" B. "You mean, I presume, the Kaleidoscope." H. "Yes, Sir, it is just as if thrown into a Kaleidoscope. Every term presents the object in a new and beautiful form; but the object presented is still the same. Have you not been struck, Sir, with the degree in which Dr. Chalmers possesses this faculty?" "Do you not think, Sir," I replied, "that he has either far too much of this faculty, or that he indulges it to a faulty excess?" H. "Yes Sir, certainly; his mind seems to move on hinges, not on wheels. There is incessant motion, but no progress. When he was at Leicester, he preached a most admirable sermon, on the Necessity of Immediate Repentance; but there were only two ideas in it, and on these his mind revolved as on a pivot\*."

\* The first of the above similes is beautiful, and as a *general* representation of the Dr.'s *preaching* style, appropriate. But the others are too unlimited, and apt therefore to convey an erroneous idea of the mental habitude of the man. Sure we are that Hall himself would never have allowed the opinion to be published in a form so crude and unmodified. There is an amplitude about the mind of Dr. Chalmers that naturally impels him to overlook minutæ, and seize at once on the broad relations of things, and trace their grand outlines, and portray their most prominent features. And having grasped these with giant power, and set them forth with an amazing exuberance of language and illustration, it were mightily to subtract from the effect produced, did he attempt to descend to details, or topics merely collateral. Partly, therefore, from the original cast of his own splendid mind, and partly from a keen appreciation of the best mode of reaching the hearts and understandings of a popular audience, Dr. Chalmers, as a *preacher*, has certainly resorted to the plan of repeating the same grand idea as represented in the simile of the Kaleidoscope. But this, instead of being a blemish, is in him real beauty. By introducing many subjects into the body of his discourse, he would communicate *more information*: by adhering to the plan now described he never fails to produce a *deeper and more lasting impression*. And, if we greatly mistake not, the production of the latter, while it is confessedly the most difficult of accomplishment, ought to be the *main design* of every preacher. Dr. Chalmers' peculiar plan would no doubt be apt to degenerate into dull monotony in the hands of men whose minds have been cast in a less capacious mould than his. But with himself it is like "the club of Hercules," that never fails of execution. Of this, his unrivalled and undiminished popularity, as a preacher, is an incontestible proof—his popularity, not in a city, or in a province, or amongst a particular denomination, but his popularity throughout a whole kingdom, and amongst all ranks and classes of men, and all denominations of Christians. Princes, nobles, and statesmen have crowded to hear him, and left the house of God astonished and edified. On one occasion, Mr. Canning, no mean judge, unable to resist the flow of eloquence, at length rose up from his seat, and unconsciously uttered *aloud*, in quaint but emphatic language: "The Tartan beats us." Men of learning and of science have been delighted to do him homage. And we know that the poor and the illiterate of the land have hung upon his lips, with admiring ecstasy. Once the

Mr. Hall gives the following opinion of Foster's Essays :

On this account we are highly gratified when we meet with a writer who, to a vein of profound and original thought, together with just views of religion and of morals, joins the talent of recommending his ideas by the graces of imagination and the powers of eloquence. Such a writer we have the happiness of reviewing at present. Mr. Foster is probably new to most of our readers ; but if we may judge from the production before us, he cannot long be concealed from the notice and applause of the literary world. In an age of mediocrity, when the writing of books has become almost a mechanical art, and a familiar acquaintance with the best models has diffused taste and diminished genius, it is impossible to peruse an author who displays so great original powers without a degree of surprise. We are ready to inquire by what peculiar felicity he was enabled to desert the trammels of custom, to break the spell by which others feel themselves bound, and to maintain a career so perfectly uncontrolled and independant. A cast of thought, original and sublime, an unlimited command of imagery, a style varied, vigorous, and bold, are some of the distinguishing features of these very singular essays.

For the two last years, Mr. Hall read daily two chapters of Matthew Henry's Commentary ; as he proceeded, he felt increasing interest and plea-

writer of these remarks witnessed a scene which no words can describe :—a whole congregation of at least three thousand souls, in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye, by one wide and sympathetic movement *drop down their heads*, and *shed the tears* of subdued and melted spirits, when the orator reached the climax of his description of the vanities of human life.

But not to dwell any longer on this theme, we may here extract some observations by a correspondent of the *Inverness Courier*, recently received. Not because they are the best which we could furnish, but because they are the *latest* which we have seen. Several sketches have been published at different times, beyond all comparison superior to that which follows : but this one may have the advantage of novelty.

“The mental luxury enjoyed in hearing a Sermon from Dr. Chalmers, of which Peter in his letters to his Kinsfolk speaks so highly, is more than realized in the Divinity Hall. There is grandeur, and beauty, and perspicuity, about the theological lectures of this divine, which require to be felt in order to be understood. And yet, as if aware of the facility of his mind, and the redundancy of his ideas, there seems a struggle between the natural flow of his thoughts, and the strong desire felt in his own mind, that such may be chastened and simplified, before presented to those whose design in attending his lectures is, or should be, the attainment of knowledge, and the acquisition of the best means of communicating it to others. There is an inherent urbanity and courteousness associated almost invariably with true genius. This was finely exemplified in the manners of the late lamented Sir Walter Scott, to whose noted humility in carrying his honours the character of Dr. Chalmers bears a striking relation. But in nothing is the Doctor's dignified meekness so discoverable as in his conduct to his students. His advice, and sympathy, and table are generously open to them, and small indeed is the pecuniary remuneration he receives for his labours. We must judge of his academical income by the goodness of his heart, rather than the number of his pupils. From no needy student does he take money, and he has been known to return without upbraiding, the sum the student has paid for his class ticket when he subsequently understood that his circumstances could ill afford its application to that purpose. Such is the man on whom, in other churches, the highest offices would have been bestowed, or who might have retained, in union with his university charge, one of the best livings in the church, had he chosen to have become a pluralist. About five minutes after the lecture hour, the Doctor hurriedly enters the hall with his paper in his hand, and upon taking his seat, generally on a temporary form, affixed to the bottom of the theological chair, he rises up and pronounces a brief prayer ! but what a prayer ! how rich in devout feeling ! how full of pious eloquence ! how different from the last, but yet how apposite to the occasion. Praise to the Supreme Being comes first, for the Book of Revelation, the analogy betwixt natural and revealed religion, for the various classes of proof by which it is fortified ; distinct indeed, but uniting together into one glorious whole, and yet fitted for the lowly faculties of man. To this succeeds the earnest prayer that so many advantages may be well appropriated, and that the divine presence may countenance his present work. There is in the prayers of Dr. Chalmers an embodying of the feelings of his favorite Newton, the lofty science of the philosopher with the still loftier sentiments of the humble Christian. Few things in elocution can possibly be grander than when in the midst of a brilliant and masterly lecture, the Doctor pauses to explain something which requires particular elucidation. The change from the lofty style common to his compositions, to the familiar colloquial form of instruction, and the resumption, when that is past, of the animated and bold, is striking and delightful. Anxiety to be fully understood, by even the most obtuse intellect, is the great aim of Dr. Chalmers. He never rests satisfied till he conceives this laudable object accomplished. In the laborious work of examining his students, the affection, forbearance, and impartiality of this excellent man are finely exemplified : he is ever ready to encourage the timid, and soothe the embarrassed ; while the earnestness of his very intellectual countenance, and the deep attention he bestows on the whole minutæ of the case, inform all under his charge that what is necessary should be done, and what is done must be well executed.”—Ed.

sure, admiring the copiousness, variety, and pious ingenuity of the thoughts; the simplicity, strength, and pregnancy of the expressions. He earnestly recommended this commentary to his daughters; and on hearing the eldest reading, for successive mornings, to the second, he expressed the highest delight. The remainder of the morning until dinner, about three o'clock, was spent in reading some work of learning, or of severe thought. After dinner he generally retired to his study, and if not in so much pain as to prevent it, slept for some time.

Mr. Hall's plan of reading was different from that of Dr. Johnson and some other great men. He generally read regularly through a book, but with great rapidity. Speaking to him one day on the comparative merits of the Rambler and the Spectator, I expressed my preference for the Rambler. "Yes Sir, so do most young persons; but when you arrive at my age you will prefer the Spectator; there is a pomp and swell in the rounded periods of Johnson, but a beauty, simplicity, and true taste in Addison."

At supper-time, Mr. Hall inquired, whether I had heard Mr. Irving, who was then much followed in London? I replied in the affirmative. "Well Sir," said he, "and how did you like him?" I expressed great disappointment, and gave it as my opinion, that his statements were too bold, and his manner declamatory and theatrical. I then instanced the harsh and unfeeling manner in which that gentleman would repeat such solemn words of the Apostle, "*If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha.*" That is very bad taste, Sir," said Mr. Hall; "your account exactly corresponds, however, with the description I have received from several persons, whose judgments I respect. I can only form my opinion, Sir, from his publication, having never heard him; but as comparisons have been instituted, I am careful in stating an opinion, lest it should be attributed to jealousy. If his 'Orations' be really eloquent, we are all wrong, Sir—our standard of eloquence is *wrong*; all the great masters are *wrong*, Demosthenes, Cicero, Fox, Burke, Pitt, and Sheridan have all been mistaken," &c. &c.

Of Bishop Leighton, said he, whose sermons I wish you to read, Bishop Burnet declares, that, during a strict intimacy of many years, he never saw him, for one moment, in any other temper than that in which he should wish to live and die; and if any human composition could form such a character, it must be his own. Full of the richest imagery, and breathing a spirit of the most sublime and unaffected devotion, the reading him is a truce to all human cares and human passions; and I can compare it to nothing but the beautiful representation in the twenty-third Psalm—it is like "Lying down in green pastures and by the side of still waters."

Of the literary characters respecting whom we conversed, there was none whom he praised so highly as his friend Sir James Mackintosh, and the following fragments will convey some idea of Mr. Hall's estimate of that distinguished and lamented person—"I know no man," he said repeatedly and emphatically, "equal to Sir James in talents. The powers of his mind are admirably balanced. He is defective only in imagination." At this last statement, I expressed my surprise, remarking that I never could have suspected that the author of the eloquent oration for Pelletier was deficient in fancy. "Well Sir," said Mr. Hall, "I don't wonder at your remark. The truth is, he has imagination, too; but, with him, imagination is an acquisition rather than a faculty. He has, however, plenty of embellishment at command; for his memory retains every thing. His mind is a spacious repository, hung round with beautiful images, and when he wants one he has nothing to do but reach up his hand to a peg, and take it down. But his images were not manufactured in his mind; they are imported." B. "If he be so defective in imagination, he must be incompetent to describe scenes and delineate characters vividly and graphically;

and I should apprehend, therefore, he will not succeed in writing history." H. "Sir, I do not expect him to produce an eloquent or interesting history. He has, I fear, mistaken his province. His genius is best adapted for metaphysical speculation; but, had he chosen moral philosophy, he would probably have surpassed every living writer." B. "I admired exceedingly some of his philosophical papers in the *Edinburgh Review*; his articles, for instance, on *Madame de Staël's Germany*, and on *Dugald Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation*; but there seemed to me a heaviness about them, and I think that Mr. Jeffrey could expound a metaphysical theory with more vivacity and effect." H. "With more vivacity perhaps, but not with equal judgment or acuteness. He would not go so deep, Sir; I am persuaded that if Sir James Mackintosh had enjoyed leisure, and had exerted himself, he would have completely outdone Jeffrey and Stewart, and all the metaphysical writers of our times."

"Pray, Sir," I said, do you admire Macknight as a commentator?" "Yes Sir," he replied, "I do, very much; I think it would be exceeding difficult, indeed, to come after him, expounding the apostolic epistles. I admit, at the same time, that he has grievous deficiencies; there is a lamentable want of spirituality and elevation about him. He never sets his foot in the other world if he can get a hole to step into this; and he never gives a passage a meaning which would render it applicable and useful in all ages, if he can find in it any local or temporary allusion. He makes fearful havoc, Sir, of the text on which you preached to day. His exposition of it is inimitably absurd." The text referred to was *Ephesians i. 8*. "Wherein he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence;" and the "wisdom and prudence" are explained by Macknight, not of the wisdom of God, as displayed in the scheme of redemption, but of the wisdom and prudence granted to the apostles to enable them to discharge their office."

In a beautiful essay, written by Mr. Hall in his younger days, on *Poetry and Philosophy*, there is the following very striking comparison between *Homer and Milton*.

"Perhaps few authors have been distinguished by more similar features of character than *Homer and Milton*. That vastness of thought which fills the imagination, and that sensibility of spirit which renders every circumstance interesting, are the qualities of both: but *Milton* is the most sublime, and *Homer* the most picturesque. *Homer* lived in an early age, before knowledge was much advanced; he would derive little from any acquired abilities, and therefore may be styled the poet of nature. To this source, perhaps, we may trace the principal difference betwixt *Homer and Milton*. The Grecian poet was left to the movements of his own mind, and to the full influence of that variety of passions which are common to all: his conceptions are therefore distinguished by their simplicity and force. In *Milton*, who was skilled in almost every department of science, learning seems sometimes to have shaded the splendour of genius.

No epic poet excites emotions so fervid as *Homer*, or possesses so much fire; but in point of sublimity he cannot be compared to *Milton*. I rather think the Greek poet has been thought to excel in this quality more than he really does, for want of a proper conception of its effects. When the perusal of an author raises us above our usual tone of mind, we immediately ascribe those sensations to the sublime, without considering whether they light on the imagination or the feelings; whether they elevate the fancy, or only fire the passions.

"The sublime has for its object the imagination only, and its influence is not so much to occasion any fervour of feeling, as the calmness of fixed

astonishment. If we consider the sublime as thus distinguished from every other quality, Milton will appear to possess it in an unrivalled degree; and here indeed lies the secret of his power. The perusal of Homer inspires us with an ardent sensibility; Milton with the stillness of surprise. The one fills and delights the mind with the confluence of various emotions; the other amazes with the vastness of his ideas. The movements of Milton's mind are steady and progressive; he carries the fancy through successive stages of elevation, and gradually increases the heat by adding fuel to the fire.

"The flights of Homer are more sudden and transitory. Milton, whose mind was enlightened by science, appears the most comprehensive; he shews more acuteness in his reflections, and more sublimity of thought. Homer, who lived more with men, and had perhaps a deeper tincture of the human passions, is by far the most vehement and picturesque. To the view of Milton, the wide scenes of the universe seems to have been thrown open, which he regards with a cool and comprehensive survey, little agitated, and superior to those emotions which affect inferior mortals. Homer, when he rises the highest, goes not beyond the bounds of human nature; he still connects his descriptions with human passions, and, though his ideas have less sublimity, they have more fire. The appetite for greatness—that appetite which always grasps at more than it can contain, is never so fully satisfied as in the perusal of "Paradise Lost." In following Milton, we grow familiar with new worlds, we traverse the immensities of space, wandering in amazement, and finding no bounds. Homer confines the mind to a narrower circle, but that circle he brings nearer to the eye; he fills it with a quicker succession of objects, and makes it the scene of more interesting action."

---

On metaphysics and moral philosophy, we talked at great length; but I cannot now give a tolerable specimen of his acute and eloquent remarks. One of his observations, however, I do remember, which struck me at the time, as exceedingly just and happy. Much had been said respecting the utility or inutility of metaphysical studies, and respecting the fact that they as yet had led to no useful discoveries. I made some such remarks as this, that admitting such studies did not terminate in profitable discoveries, still they were advantageous as a field for cultivating and invigorating the mental powers. Mr. H. said, "An arena, not a field. Metaphysics yield no fruit. They are not a field, they are only an arena, to which a man, who has nothing to do, may go down sometimes, and try his skill in intellectual gladiatorship. This at present is their chief recommendation."

Of Dugald Stewart, Mr. H. spoke slightly; and it seemed to me that he is somewhat prejudiced against that amiable and accomplished philosopher, in consequence of unfavorable reports which had reached him respecting Mr. Stewart's religious sentiments. "He is," said Mr. H. "a pleasing but feeble writer. I would never compare him with any of our great metaphysicians, with Malebranche, or Locke, or Berkeley, or even with Tucker. Reid had a more vigorous and original mind than Stewart, and Campbell, I suspect, was superior to both. If Campbell had devoted his attention to mental philosophy, he could have done all that Reid or Stewart has accomplished; but neither of them could have written the preliminary dissertations to his work on the Gospels. There is also too much egotism and parade about Dugald Stewart. He is always polishing away at the corner of a subject, but he could not rear a system of his own."

This comparison Mr. Hall followed out at considerable length, and in language exceedingly beautiful and magnificent, which, however, I cannot now recal. With regard to Stewart's style, Mr. H. observed, "that it was

unquestionably one of the finest philosophical styles that ever was written, that Mr. S. had carried embellishment farther into the region of metaphysics than any author that had preceded, and that his embellishment was invariably consistent with perfect sobriety of taste." Of Dr. Thomas Brown, Mr. Hall observed, "that he was a man of more genius but less judgment than his predecessor; that his style, with all its beauties, was far inferior to Stewart's, as a vehicle for philosophical speculation; that it was deficient in clearness and precision; and so exceedingly diffuse, that all that was valuable in the four volumes of his lectures might be condensed into one." I remarked that Dr. Brown was often the victim of his own ingenuity; that in point of candor, he was immeasurably inferior to Stewart; that the former would never agree with any writer, if he could possibly differ from him, and that the latter would never differ from any one, if he could possibly agree with him. Mr. Hall acquiesced in substance in these remarks, and proceeded to comment on Dr. B.'s amazing boldness and originality. He characterised several of his lectures, stating that those which had most deeply interested him, and which he thought among the best, were the Lectures on the Immateriality and the Immutability of the Soul."

Mr. H. mentioned that he had read a considerable portion of Kant's works. On my remarking that I knew nothing of that philosopher, except from Dr. Thomas Brown's article upon him, in an early number of the Edinburgh Review, and from Madame de Staël's book on Germany; that I should suppose his writings to be utterly unintelligible and uninteresting; Mr. H. replied, "It is certainly no great loss to be ignorant of Kant's works. His philosophy is a system of scepticism." In answer to his question, whether I had read much of Madame de Staël's works, I informed him that I had read her 'Remarks on Rousseau,' one of her novels, and her book on Germany. H. "Did you read her book on Germany from beginning to end?" B. I did." H. "I admire your patience more and more, Sir." He added that he had looked into Madame de Staël's Germany; that on finding some philosopher, a well-known idealist, (I cannot at this time recollect who it was,) spoken of as an opponent of the ideal theory, he had thrown aside the book in disgust; supposing that very little could be learned from a writer so ill informed as to be capable of such a blunder. He seemed very reluctant to allow that many of her remarks were acute and ingenious; and when something was said about the flights of her fancy, he said, that, "for his part, he could not admire her flights, for to him she was generally invisible; not because she ascended to a great height above the earth, but because she invariably selected a foggy atmosphere."

It would be useless to record, even briefly, Mr. Hall's opinion of the numerous authors, ancient and modern, which he read at this period with such close attention, since they accord generally with those of all men of correct taste and sound judgment. Yet perhaps I may state, with regard to his chief uninspired favorite among the Greek writers, that to none of the ornaments of pagan antiquity did he refer in such terms of fervid eulogy as to Plato. Not Cudworth himself could appreciate him more highly. He often expressed his astonishment at the neglect into which he apprehended the writings of Plato were sinking; and said, that an entire disregard of them would be an irrefragable proof of a shallow age. Milton, he remarked, gave the noblest proofs, in his prose writings, of a knowledge and love of Plato; and he expressed a surprise, almost bordering upon contempt, in reference to those who classed this wonderful man with the schoolmen. It was his frequent remark, that even when Plato wrote upon the most abstract subjects, whether moral, metaphysical, or mathematical, his style was as clear as the purest stream, and that his diction was deeply imbued with

the poetic spirit. On occasions when he ran no risk of the charge of pedantry, he would, by appropriate quotations, confirm these views. He delighted to expatiate upon this philosopher's notions of vice and virtue, of idleness and industry; and often adduced the platonic definition of education, as "that which qualifies men to be good citizens, and renders them fit to govern or to obey." On one occasion he pointed to a passage, in the first Republic, I think, from which it appeared that Plato perceived the advantages resulting from the *subdivision of labour*, and suggested the natural progress of such subdivision in proportion to the advance of civilization.

In a letter Mr. H. says, "I have just finished the perusal of Mr. Scott's answer to Bishop Tomline. He has demolished the Bishop entirely. I find but little in Mr. Scott's views against which I can object; it is somewhat loosely written, but full of argument, instruction, and piety. There is a trait of egotism in the good man which had better been avoided. He quotes almost entirely from his own works. It is well for the Bishop, his rank excuses him from replying to it."

In the course of some remarks on various theological writers of our own times, he said, "Dr. Smith is the best biblical critic with whom I am personally acquainted; and I should think him one of the most learned theologians now alive." On my asking, if he did not consider Archbishop Magee superior in ability, and equal in learning, to Dr. Smith? he replied, with his usual decision, "Not nearly equal in learning, Sir. I do not suppose that Archbishop Magee knows any thing about the German critics, with whom Dr. Smith is intimately acquainted, and from whom, notwithstanding all their absurdity and impiety, much may unquestionably be learned. There is one thing," he added, "in Dr. Smith's work, much to be lamented, and that is, the tone of excessive lenity maintained towards his opponents. In consequence of this, his reasonings will not produce an effect proportioned to their intrinsic force; and his readers are tempted to regard the opinions which he refutes with far less horror than they deserve. The proper tone in the theological controversy is, I imagine, somewhere between Bishop Horsley's intolerable arrogance and asperity, and Dr. Smith's unwarrantable softness and urbanity.

"In one of my early interviews with Mr. Hall, I used the word felicity three or four times in rather quick succession. He asked—"Why do you say felicity, Sir? Happiness is a better word, more musical and genuine English, coming from the Saxon." "Not more musical, I think, Sir." "Yes, more musical, and so are words derived from Saxon generally. Listen, Sir. 'My heart is smitten, and withered like grass;'—there's plaintive music. Listen again, Sir. 'Under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice,'—there's cheerful music." "Yes, but *rejoice* is French!" "True, but all the rest is Saxon, and rejoice is almost out of tune with the other words. Listen again. 'Thou hast delivered my eyes from tears, my soul from death, and my feet from falling,'—all Saxon, Sir, except *delivered*. I could think of the word *tear*, Sir, till I wept. Then again, for another noble specimen, and almost all good old Saxon-English: 'Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.'

On this quotation, indulge me, Mr. Editors, in one or two remarks. In no country, and under no circumstances, where the English language is spoken or cultivated, do these observations deserve greater attention than in this. It cannot fail to have struck the mind of most persons in the least degree observant of style, that in the Eng-

lish compositions of young men brought up in this country, whether natives or others, there is a manifest defect on the point to which Mr. Hall alludes. They seem to conceive that what are vulgarly called hard words, that is, words of Latin or Norman origin, are the only good words which our language contains; the consequence is, their compositions are loaded with such terms, and have a pedantic stiffness, and a mock majesty, which to a person of taste is much more offensive than the homeliest style which can be adopted. Moreover, according to the opinion of some of the best judges of our language, its force and energy, and very much of its grace and harmony; but almost the whole of its true idiom, lies in its Saxon phrases. I will corroborate this sentiment by two or three testimonies.

“It is worthy of notice,” says Dr. Whately, in his *Treatise on Rhetoric*, “that a style composed chiefly of the words of French origin, while it is less intelligible to the lowest classes, is characteristic of those who in cultivation of taste are below the highest. As in dress, furniture, deportment, &c. so also in language, the dread of vulgarity, constantly besetting those who are half conscious that they are in danger of it, drives them into the extreme of affected finery. So that the precept which has been given with a view to perspicuity, may, to a certain degree, be observed with an advantage in point of elegance.”

Sir James Mackintosh, speaking of any attempt which might be made to form a new English version of the Scriptures, makes the following very striking remarks:—“Such a task, however, should only be entrusted to hands skilful and tender in the case of a translation, which, to say nothing of the connection of its phraseology with the religious sensibilities of a people, forms the richest storehouse of the native beauties of our ancient tongue; and by frequent yet reverential perusal has, more than any other causes, contributed to the permanency of our language, and thereby to the unity of our literature. In waving the higher considerations of various kinds which render caution, in such a case, indispensable, it is hard to overvalue the literary importance of daily infusions from the ‘well of English undefiled’ into our familiar converse. Nor should it be forgotten, if ever the revision be undertaken, that we derive an advantage, not to be hazarded for tasteless novelties, from a perfect model of a translation of works of the most remote antiquity, into that somewhat antique English, venerable without being obscure, which alone can faithfully represent their spirit and genius.”

To which I will add one other testimony: it is from the forcible pen of the present Lord Chancellor, and occurs in his inaugural discourse delivered in the University of Glasgow:—“But the English writers,” says his Lordship, “who really unlock the rich sources of the language, are those who flourished from the end of Elizabeth’s

to the end of Queen Anne's reign; who used a good Saxon dialect with ease, but correctness and perspicuity,—learned in the ancient classics, but only enriching their mother-tongue, where the Attic could supply its defects,—not overlaying it with a profuse pedantic coinage of foreign words,—well practised in the old rules of composition, or rather collocation, which unite natural ease and variety with absolute harmony, and give the author's ideas to develop themselves with the more truth and simplicity when clothed in the more ample folds of inversion, or run from the exuberant to the elliptical, without ever being either redundant or obscure. Those great wits had no foreknowledge of such times as succeeded their brilliant age, when styles should arise, and for a season prevail over both purity and nature, and antique recollections—now meretriciously ornamented, more than half French in the phrase, and to mere figures fantastically sacrificing the sense—now heavily and regularly fashioned as if by the plumb and rule, and by the eye rather than the ear, with a needless profusion of ancient words and flexions, to displace those of our own Saxon, instead of temperately supplying its defects. Least of all could those lights of English eloquence have imagined, that men should appear amongst us professing to teach composition, and ignorant of the whole of its rules, and incapable of relishing the beauties, or, indeed, apprehending the very genius of the language, should treat its peculiar terms of expression and flexion as so many inaccuracies, and practise their pupils in correcting the *faulty* English of Addison, and training down to the mechanical rhythm of Johnson, the lively and inimitable measures of Bolingbroke.”

---

### III.—*Strictures on “J.’s” Remarks on Prayer.*

To the Editors of the Calcutta Christian Observer.

GENTLEMEN,

On perusing the July number of your truly valuable Observer, I must assure you that I was surprised by a communication under the signature of “J,” upon the Nature and Effects of Prayer. Surely the communication of your correspondent, is the result of some thoughtless moments in which his more mature consideration had no part; for nothing could be more absurd, or in itself involving more contradiction, than the product of his pen. I would ask, could any thing be more subversive of the true nature of prayer, than the assertions of your correspondent? They amount to this, that we must change our dispositions and renovate our hearts by prayer, in order to obtain the blessings of Heaven. Thus the mercy of God is bestowed after we have prepared our hearts to receive it; when the fact must be obvious to every one who has experimentally felt

the evil of sin, that it is the sovereign mercy of Heaven, that alone can stimulate the heart to pray aright. The assertions of your correspondent seem to indicate the want of a proper knowledge of the ruined condition of man; and his total inability to do any thing pleasing in the sight of God, without the previous operations of the Holy Spirit upon his heart. Who that knows and feels the heinous, hideous, ignominious, and malignant nature of sin, can say that his prayers are to prepare him for the reception of heaven's mercy? There is so much darkness in your correspondent's notions upon the subject of prayer, that I should advise him to read the Scriptures, asking the direction and enlightening influences of that eternal Agent, the necessity of which he does not appear to feel. Not a page of that hallowed record, (the Bible,) but some way or other exhibits the total depravity of human nature, and consequently the inability of man either by prayers or sacrifices to gain the favor of God. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots. But in the "fountain filled with blood, drawn from Immanuel's veins," the sinner black as the Ethiopian can be made white; the soul spotted as the leopard can wash all its spots away. Who can take a walk by contemplation to the garden of Gethsemane, or visit on meditation's wings the hill of Calvary, and not see the aggravated nature of sin, from the sacrifice which was offered to cancel it?

Your correspondent's notions of prayer are at variance with the whole tenor of Scripture. Let him take example from the illustrious worthies of old, of whom the world was not worthy—let him behold them confessing, before the mercy seat of heaven, their guilt, and the unholy nature of their dispositions and wills—let him read the psalmist and the Saviour's history of the human heart, and I am sure that he will afterwards exclaim with the prophet, "Behold I am vile." By what means, I would ask, does "a change take place in the suppliant, by which he is rendered receptive of the heavenly graces and virtues, and opened in a certain measure to the influences of heaven?" By grace and the new-creating influences of the eternal Spirit, says the Scripture. By the operation of prayer upon the heart, says "J." These two are manifestly at variance; however, it appears evident which is to be believed. The conclusions of "J" involve a contradiction, which I think he may easily perceive. M.

[We think our worthy correspondent has greatly overstrained the words of "J." We are sure that the latter intended not that such a construction should be put on his language. We are commanded by our Saviour at once to "ask, seek, and knock." Now, who can tell how far the *first* inclination, effort, or attempt to pray may not be the *incipient* work of the Spirit? And if so, who can say how far the soul may not thus be rendered receptive of farther supplies of grace? This we presume to have been L.'s meaning.—ED.]

IV.—*The Chinese Mission.*

We have long been desirous of presenting our readers with an account of the existing state of the Chinese Mission: because we feel persuaded that its merits are less appreciated, and its claims less attended to by British Christians, than they ought. Were the importance of a Mission to be estimated by the magnitude of the field, that which embraces China and the neighbouring Archipelago, should occupy the *first* rank: that which is designed to encompass the whole of Hindoostan, the *second*. In either of these vast empires, which unitedly include the half of the globe's inhabitants, the light of the "Gospel, once enkindled, might radiate from nation to nation with reflected and multiplied brightness, instead of being hid in a bye-corner of the world, where the most triumphant success would have found but a speedier termination in the waves."

We are glad that it is now in our power to furnish a brief and authentic statement of the present condition of the Chinese Mission, lately drawn up and signed by Dr. Morrison and Mr. Bridgman, and forwarded to us from Canton, by the authors. Perspicuous and comprehensive, it will best speak for itself.

It is as follows:—

Twenty-five years have now elapsed, since the first Protestant Missionary arrived in China, alone, and in the midst of perfect strangers,—with but few friends, and with many foes. Divine Providence, however, prepared a quiet residence for him; and, by the help of God, he has continued to the present time, and can now rejoice in what God has wrought. The Chinese language was at first thought an almost insurmountable difficulty. That difficulty has been overcome. The language has been acquired, and various facilities provided for its further acquisition. Dictionaries, grammars, vocabularies, and translations have been penned and printed. Chinese scholars have increased, both at home and abroad, both for secular and religious purposes. It is not likely that Chinese will ever again be abandoned. The Holy Scriptures in Chinese, by Morrison and Milne, together with religious tracts, Prayer-books, &c., have been published; and now, thanks be to God, Missionaries from other nations have come to aid in their distribution and explanation. The London Missionary Society's Chinese press, at the Anglo-Chinese College, Malacca, and Mr. Medhurst's, in Java, have sent forth millions of pages, containing the truths of the everlasting Gospel; and that Institution has given a Christian education to scores of native youths. There are also native Chinese, who preach CHRIST'S Gospel, and teach, from house to house. Such is a general outline of the progress of the mission. We boast not of great doings; yet are devoutly thankful to God, that the work has not ceased, but, amidst many deaths and disasters, has still gathered strength from year to year.

The establishment of English presses in China, both for the diffusion of general knowledge, and for religious purposes, arose out of the Protestant mission. The Hon. East India Company's press, to print Dr. Morrison's Dictionary, was the first; and now, both English and Americans endeavour, by the press, to draw attention to China, and give information concerning it

and the surrounding nations. The Indo-Chinese Gleaner, at Malacca, the Canton newspapers, and the Chinese Repository, have all risen up since our Mission commenced. Missionary voyages have been performed, and the Chinese sought out, at various places, under European control, in the Archipelago; as well as in Siam, at the Loochoo Islands, at Corea, and along the coast of China itself, up to the very walls of Peking. Some tracts, written by Protestant Missionaries, have reached, and been read by the Emperor himself. Still this is but the day of small things. The harvest is indeed great, but the laborers are few. Preachers, and teachers, and writers, and printers, in much larger numbers, are wanted, to spread the knowledge of God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, among the Chinese-language nations. O Lord, send forth laborers whom Thou wilt own and bless; and let Thy hand work with them, till China shall be completely turned from dumb idols, vain superstitions, wicked works, and false hopes,—“from Satan to God!”

The persons at present connected with the Chinese mission are:—

- 1 Robert Morrison, D. D., of the London Missionary Society, in China.
- 2 William Henry Medhurst, of do. in Java.
- 3 Samuel Kidd, of do. sick, in England.
- 4 Jacob Tomlin, of do. at the Anglo-Chinese College, Malacca.
- 5 Samuel Dyer, of do. at Penang.
- 6 Charles Gutzlaff, of the Netherlands Missionary Society, on a voyage.
- 7 Elijah C. Bridgman, of the American Board, at Canton.
- 8 David Abeel, of do. in Siam.
- 9 Leang-Afa, native Teacher, of the London Miss. Soc., in China.
- 10 Keuh-Agang, assistant to do. and lithographic printer, do.
- 11 Le-Asin, assistant to Leang-Afa, do.

Only ten persons have been baptized, of whom the three above-named are part. The two first owed their religious impressions to the late Dr. Milne, at the Anglo-Chinese College, where they were printers. Another was a student, and is still retained in the College.

About ten years after the Protestant mission was established in China, a Chaplain for the British Factory was sent out from the Episcopal Church in England; and about twenty years from the commencement of the mission, a Seamen's Chaplain was sent out from the American Seamen's Friend Society. Dr. Morrison hoisted the first Bethel Flag on the Chinese waters, in 1822. Mr. Abeel officiated in 1830. And the present occupant of this cure is the Rev. Edwin Stevens, from New-York. Mr. Abeel is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. Messrs. Bridgman and Stevens are from Congregational Churches. Their patron in China, a merchant of great devotedness to the blessed Saviour, is of the Presbyterian Church, in America.

In 1831, the Scripture Lessons of the British and Foreign School Society were printed in China, and are found a very acceptable epitome of Sacred Writ. The Rev. E. C. Bridgman, with the assistance of his native Scholars, and Mr. John R. Morrison, made the extracts from Morrison and Milne's Chinese version of the Bible. Leang-Afa, with his first assistant, named above, carried them through the press. And Christian merchants in China subscribed the necessary funds.

During the current year, Leang-Afa has printed nine tracts, of about 50 pages each,—composed by himself, and interspersed with passages of Sacred Scripture. They were revised by Dr. Morrison, when in manuscript; and printed at the expense of the London Religious Tract Society. Keuh-Agang has printed Scripture sheet tracts, &c. with the lithographic press, and Mr. Gutzlaff has taken them to the north of China, for distribution. Mr. Bridgman has instructed several native lads in the English lan-

guage, and first principles of Christian truth. He has, also, performed Divine Service in English, once every Sabbath-day at Canton.

The servants of our Lord, engaged in this mission, although from different nations, and connected with different churches, have cherished reciprocal affection, and united in the most cordial co-operation. By this brief exposition, they wish to call the attention of the Churches, throughout the whole of Christendom, to the evangelization of, at least, *four hundred millions* of their fellow-creatures, and fellow sinners, in Eastern Asia, comprehending China and the surrounding nations. Ye Christian Churches, hear your Saviour's last command,—“Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”

Should any of our readers be aroused by the above to come forward to the help of those devoted labourers, who are struggling against almost insurmountable difficulties, to promote the spread of Christianity among the teeming myriads of Eastern Asia, we need not say how happy we shall feel in becoming the medium for transmitting their contributions.

---

V.—*Translation of the SIVA-DHYANA, or Popular Muntra of the Hindoos.*

To the Editor of the Calcutta Christian Observer.

DEAR SIR,

In a recent number of the Reformer, the Editor of that paper, commenting on the case of Brijonauth Ghose, took occasion to recommend to all persons engaged or interested in the education of native youth, to teach them first their own religion; then, when they were advanced in years and in knowledge, to let them consider the claims of other religions. Now for my part I should have no objection to this plan of proceeding, provided it were guaranteed that after a certain period devoted to one religion, an adequate portion of time be devoted to the study of other religions; but who is so little acquainted with the customs and habits of the Natives, as not to know, that if the native pupil be removed at 12 or 14 years of age from school, he has no time to devote to the study of the different systems of religion that demand his attention; for to suppose that young men after they have left school have time, or if time, the inclination, or if inclination, the *proper means*, of acquiring a knowledge of the Christian, or any other religion, would be to suppose what is totally inconsistent with experience. Admitting however, that it is proper that a Hindoo should be acquainted with his religion, I would ask the Reformer, where is he to learn it, in what books is it to be found, and who is it that will explain it to him? Have the Natives any means of learning it for themselves? have they access to books? can they diligently examine it? are they at liberty to ask whence its authority is derived, and to demand evidence for its truth, before they assent to its doc-

trines or comply with its requisitions? No, they must hear it from Gooroo, persons whom they are taught and commanded to honor; and they are to take upon trust all that they hear, without daring to ask a question as to the *truth* of what they hear. The Shastras, they assert, come from God, and on that account alone, *whatever is written* in those Shastras, that must *ipso facto* be true; there is no further appeal, no, not even to reason. But where is the Hindoo that knows any thing about his religion, except what he sees and hears at the Jatras and Poojahs? I never yet met with a person that could defend it or explain it. Hundreds I have heard acknowledge, that to them it is unintelligible, chaotic, and perfectly at variance with all their notions of what is pure, and holy. When asked, how they reconcile the conduct of Krishna, Bramha or Siva with their notions of morality and decency? their only reply is, and that accompanied with a *smile*, not a *blush*, "They cannot tell."

The subjoined tract is a specimen of the daily prayer or Muntra, which every Soiva is required to utter when he bathes in the Ganges. The very sight of it in my hands (I am sure I don't know why) excited a sensation of *apparent* horror in every native who saw it. It is astonishing, however, how little real regard they had for its *sanctity*; for not one of them would have hesitated to hear me read it *privately*, though in each other's presence, they affected to be struck dumb. Any person may witness a follower of Siva at his morning devotions at the river, but he can only learn, by reading the following translation, what the penitent is actually thinking about.

*Translation of the Muntra.*

(Written by a Gooroo for the instruction of his Pupil.)

(Say) Reverence to Horo, I take this lump of clay; again reverence Horo; then addressing the clay say, I make thy image—praise to Sulpani (the holder of the *Trisula* or trident). O God, enter into this image, take life within it. Constant reverence to Mohesa, whose form is radiant as a mountain of silver, lovely as the crescent of the moon, and resplendent with jewels, having four hands, two bearing weapons (the mace and *Trisula*), a third conferring blessings, and the fourth dispelling fear,—serene, lotus-seated, worshipped by surrounding deities, and seated on a tiger's skin. The first of all beings in the world, the seed of all worlds, dispeller of fears, five-faced, three-eyed. Reverence to the holder of the *Pinaca* (a part of the *Lingam*). Come, O come, vouchsafe thy presence, vouchsafe thy presence, approach, rest, tarry here, and receive my offering. Lave thy body in the Ganges, O Lord of animals. I offer thee water to wash thy feet. Praise to Siva, take water to wash thy hands, smell this sandal-wood, take these flowers and leaves (of the *Bel tree*), accept this incense and this flame, consume this offering of mine (consisting of plantains, cucumbers, oranges, plums, and other fruits, molasses, &c. ;) take one more draught of this stream, raise thy mouth, and now take (*Tamboolung*) or betel-nut, elachi, lobongo, kopoor, joyphul, dachinee, chuna, kudheera, jone dhunya, &c.

The pupil must now worship, commencing from the east; offer flowers all round the image, and say,

Reverence to Sorba (the figure of the earth).  
 Reverence to Bhoba (the figure of the water).  
 Reverence to the fierce Bayu (the figure of the air).  
 Reverence to Rudra (the figure of the fire).  
 Reverence to Bheema (the figure of the sky).  
 Reverence to Posopotee (the figure of sacrifices).  
 Reverence to Mahadeva (the figure of the moon-plant).  
 Reverence to Iswana (the figure of the sun).

Then say, Receive these offerings of flowers. I present these fragrant flowers to Doorga, thus I worship thee; then repeat these names as often as you can, counting on the fingers, (called *Jhop*,) worship and bow, and beating the cheeks, utter the words *bom bom*. Say—Reverence to Chundeswara, then throwing the flowers into the water, pray to Mahadeva to forgive your sins, twine your fingers one into the other, place the image once more before you, and then *fling it away*.

*The Muntra\**.

নমো হরায় নমঃ । ইতি স্তম্ভিকা হরণং । নমো মহেশ্বরায় নমঃ ইতি  
 সংগঠনং । নমঃ শূলপাণে ইহ স্প্রতিষ্ঠোভব । ইতি প্রাণ প্রতিষ্ঠা । নমো  
 ঞ্চায়ৈম্বিহ্নং মহেশং রজতগিরিনিভং চারু চন্দ্রাবতং সৎ রত্না কল্পোঙ্ক-  
 নাঙ্গং পরশু স্তগ বরাভীতি হস্তং প্রসন্নং পদ্মাসীনং সমস্তাৎ স্তত মম-  
 রগণৈ বর্গ্যত্রকৃষ্টিং বসানং বিশ্বাচ্যং বিশ্ববীজং নিখিল ভয়হরং পঞ্চবক্ত-  
 ত্বিনেত্রং ॥ নমঃ পিণ্ডাধিক ইহাগচ্ছ ইহ তিষ্ঠ ইহ তিষ্ঠ ইহসম্মিহিতোভব  
 ইহ সন্নিক্শোভব অত্রাধিষ্ঠানং কুরু মম পূজাং গৃহাণ ॥ এতৎ স্নানীয়ং  
 গন্ধোদকং নমঃ পশুপতয়ে নমঃ । এতৎ পাচ্যং নমঃ শিবায় নমঃ । এষোহ-  
 য়োনমঃ শিবায় নমঃ । ইদমাচমনীয়ং । ইদং স্নানীয়ং । এষগন্ধঃ । এতৎ  
 পুষ্পং । এতানি বিলপত্রাণি । এষ ধূপঃ । এষ দীপঃ । ইদং সোপকরণ  
 নৈবেদ্যং । পানার্থং গন্ধোদকং । পুনরাচমনীয়ং । এতৎ তাশ্বলং ॥ ততঃ  
 পূর্বাদি ক্রমেণ পূজয়েৎ । নমঃ সর্বায ক্ষিতি স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নমো ভবায়  
 জন স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নমো রুদ্রায় অগ্নি স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নম উগায় বায়ু  
 স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নমো ভীমায় আকাশ স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নমঃ পশুপতয়ে  
 যজমান স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নমো মহাদেবায় সোম স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । নম ইশা-  
 নায় সুর্য্য স্তম্ভয়ে নমঃ । এষ পুষ্পাঞ্জলি নমঃ শিবায় নমঃ । ইদং দবা  
 এতে গন্ধপুষ্পে নমো ছর্গায়ৈ নম ইতি পূজাং কৃৎবা নমঃ শিবায় নম  
 ইতি মন্ত্রং যথাশক্তি জপ্ত্বা স্তব্ধা প্রণম্য গানবাচ্যং কৃৎবা নমঃ শিবায় নম  
 নম ইত্যনেন নিস্পীচ্যং ক্ষিপ্ত্বা নমো মহাদেব ক্রমস্ব ইতি সংহার  
 মুদ্রয়া বিসর্জয়েৎ ॥

\* We have inserted the Muntra in the Bengalee character, as sent to us; but should our up-country readers request it, we will supply them with a version in the Deb Nagree in a future No.—Ed.

VI.—*Mr. Longueville Clarke and the Missionaries.*

Our readers will remember, that about a year ago, we inserted in the *Observer* some unfair and invidious remarks on the Missionaries. by H. H. Wilson, Esq. of Sanscrit celebrity; together with an able and triumphant vindication\*. It is now our lot to direct their attention to a still more unjust and ungenerous attack, by L. Clarke, Esq. of legal notoriety. The attack was recently made, in the presence of the Supreme Court, on the hearing of the case of Brijonauth Ghose, of the nature of which a succinct notice appeared in our last. Mr. Clarke's unreasonable and unfounded charge led to an immediate correspondence between himself and the Rev. A. Duff. Many of our readers must long ere now have become acquainted with the issue. No satisfactory explanation having been granted, the correspondence, with additional remarks, was published in the *John Bull*. It was soon afterwards extracted in another of the daily, and one of the weekly, *Journals of the Presidency*. On this account, we should not have felt ourselves called upon to insert *the whole* in our pages, had it not been that many of our subscribers have urgently requested us to furnish them with a copy of the whole, in a form more likely to prove permanent than that of an ephemeral newspaper. We have yielded to the earnest solicitations of so respectable a number of our supporters; and lengthened though the correspondence be, we have resolved to give it a place in our pages:—appending a few additional notes and observations by Mr. Duff†.

The Editor of the *Bull*, we understand, with a promptitude that did him infinite honour, received and published the correspondence; and with a readiness scarcely less commendable, the Editors of the *Calcutta Courier* and the *Philanthropist* extracted the whole in their pages. And now we cannot do better than introduce the subject to our readers in the editorial remarks of the *Bull*. They are as follows:—“ We offer no apology to our readers for surrendering a considerable portion of our space to a correspondence which has recently passed between Mr. Longueville Clarke, the Barrister, and the Rev. Mr. Duff, the Missionary, arising out of some expressions used by the former on the hearing of the case of Brijonauth Ghose. No class of men has at different times, and in different places, been more frequently the objects of unmerited vituperation than the Christian Missionaries, who are labouring in a right cause in India,—and yet no men, we will make bold to say, have exhibited more patient endurance under their wrongs, or less anxiety to thrust their grievances before the public eye. They

\* See *Calcutta Christian Observer*, Vol. i. Oct. 1832, p. 233.

† These are distinguished by being enclosed in brackets.

have almost uniformly suffered the scoffs of their enemies to pass by them as the idle wind, preferring to leave to the silent but certain operation of time, the triumphant vindication of their conduct and the just appreciation of their cause. Such a course, however, though deserving of commendation, is not at all times safe. Repeated calumnies, *exhibited* to an unthinking multitude, and not refuted through the same medium as that which was chosen for their utterance, are liable to be caught up and adopted to the infinite prejudice of the parties concerned. It hence becomes a matter of duty occasionally to meet the calumniator on his own ground, and put him to the necessity of establishing the truth of his allegations, or prove his slanders to be false and unmerited. This course has been taken by Mr. Duff in the present instance, and when the importance of his cause is considered, and the probable effect of the imputations cast upon his labours and those of his brethren duly weighed, he will not be thought to have acted wrong."

---

*To the Editor of the John Bull.*

SIR,—I beg leave to submit to you the following correspondence and remarks. As the subject is deeply interesting to a large body of the community, I trust that you will insert the whole in your columns.

Your's very truly,

ALEXANDER DUFF.

29th July, 1833.

---

SIR,—In a report of a case of Brijonauth Ghose, which appeared in the *John Bull* of this morning, you are represented, after making other remarks, to have added, "that this was a case of great importance, as the rights of Hindoo parents were too often invaded by the Missionaries in Calcutta."

Had this assertion occurred among the statements of an *anonymous* writer in a newspaper; or had it involved merely matters of *opinion*, in reference to which every one has an undoubted right to judge for himself; or had it been called forth in the course of private conversation;—it might well have been passed over in silence. But uttered, as it is reported to have been, by a gentleman of high legal reputation, and in the presence of the Supreme Court of this land, I think its tendency must be to create unfavourable impressions in the minds of the ignorant, or of those who are placed beyond the range of personal inquiry.

Now, being entirely unconscious myself of ever having invaded either the legal or the natural rights of Hindoo parents in this city, and being wholly unaware of any invasion of these rights on the part of other Missionaries, I am sure you will excuse me for respectfully soliciting an answer to the following queries:—1st, Were the above-mentioned or similar terms employed by you in presence of the Court? 2nd, If not, will there be any objection to a public correction of the mistake? 3rd, If so, are these terms intended to include indiscriminately the whole body of Missionaries? 4th, In what respect, or to what particular cases of illegality, was it designed that they should be understood as applicable?

I have the honor to remain, your's respectfully,

ALEXANDER DUFF.

4, Wellington Square, 17th July, 1833.

To L. CLARKE, Esq., Barrister, &c. &c.

Calcutta, 18th July, 1833.

SIR,—I was engaged in Court when your letter was delivered to me, and have only this moment left it; but for this detention, you should have had an immediate reply.

In answer to your first and second questions, I have only to say that, to the best of my recollection, I did utter (and at all events I intended to utter) the words which you quote, and therefore there is no mistake to correct.

In reply to your third question, permit me in explanation to state, that I employed the words "*in Calcutta*," to prevent any application of my censure to the Missionaries at Serampore, of whose conduct and utility I entertain the highest opinion.

Sincerely do I wish that it were in my power to bear similar testimony to the labors of the Missionaries in Calcutta, but their errors of judgment and imprudent zeal lead them to acts alike detrimental to the true interests of Christianity, and the extension of education.

This opinion has been formed after having resided in this city upwards of ten years, during which period I have often been consulted, sometimes as a counsel, sometimes as a friend, by numerous Hindoos, the peace of whose families they have represented to me as having been disturbed by the practices of the Missionaries.

As a professional man, I am precluded from mentioning the names of the parties by whom I have been consulted, or disclosing the circumstances of their cases; but I can assure you that I have had frequent complaints made to me of conduct full as flagitious and dangerous as that which it became my duty on Tuesday last to submit to the Supreme Court.

I have the honor to remain, Rev. Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LONGUEVILLE CLARKE.

TO THE REV. ALEXANDER DUFF, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,—While I cordially acknowledge the readiness and the frankness with which you replied to my former note, I must candidly confess that the reply has left involved, in as great obscurity as ever, the main points in which I feel most interested.

It is altogether needless to enter into any abstract discussion respecting "errors of judgment" and "imprudent zeal:" for in all probability what would be so characterized by you, and those who coincide with you in opinion, might be accounted "exercises of sound judgment," and "zeal according to knowledge," by me and the thousands who think as I do. But when you refer to the *outward* acts of particular agents—these must certainly be held as more obviously cognizable by other men. The Great Author of Christianity himself has given his sanction to the rule, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Now, I have no desire to act the part of an inquisitor, to search officiously for the *names* of parties, or to pry into the details of specific cases. But, surely, when you charge Missionaries with "acts alike detrimental to the true interests of Christianity, and the extension of education," and with conduct at once "flagitious and dangerous," you cannot regard me as exceeding the bounds of moderation, when I earnestly wish to know *something* of the *general nature* of such reprehensible conduct and acts. You cannot, I should suppose, have any hesitation in stating, in a *general way*, what *kind* of acts those have been which you so pointedly condemn, and what *sort* of conduct that has been which calls for the use of epithets of censure so unmeasured on your part. The charges are conveyed in terms sufficiently condemnatory, and yet in terms so vague and indefinite that it is impossible to conjecture what they are designed to represent and hold up to

public reprobation. All that I urge, then, is the reasonable request, that you be kindly pleased to lift up the veil, even partially, and *so far* remove the mystery as to let us distinctly understand towards what portion of the doings of Missionaries you intend to evoke the disapprobation of Europeans and Natives. You must allow that tamely to lie under grievous charges, that are either unknown or unproven, would indicate a destitution of moral feeling, and a degree of base cowardice not less dishonourable than unchristian. Should you kindly comply, and I see no reason why you should decline complying with my present moderate request, it will be in the power of those concerned, and of their friends, to judge how far the charges preferred are just or unjust. If the former, then must the Missionaries acknowledge their error, and confess their guilt; if otherwise, they must be honourably acquitted as guiltless.

Again, you exempt the Serampore Missionaries from blame and animadversion. Now, though no one can yield to myself in admiration of the general conduct of the Missionaries at Serampore, I cannot divine in what respect their proceedings towards the natives have essentially differed from those of their junior brethren in Calcutta. But letting that pass, permit me to ask—Does your censure extend to *all* the Missionaries of every denomination in Calcutta? If not, to what class or classes do you specially refer? Do you include *me* in the number of those who have been guilty of committing “acts alike detrimental to the true interests of Christianity, and the extension of education,” and whose “conduct has been at once flagitious and dangerous?”

I have the honour to remain, your's respectfully,

4, Wellington Square, 19th July, 1833.  
To L. CLARKE, Esq., Barrister, &c. &c.

ALEXANDER DUFF.

Calcutta, 19th July, 1833.

REV. SIR,—I believe that the following is the sentence in my letter, of which you desire that I should give you an explanation,—“But I can assure you that I have had frequent complaints made to me of conduct as flagitious and dangerous as that which it became my duty on Tuesday last to submit to the Supreme Court.”

What that conduct was in this particular case will appear from the affidavit made by the father of the boy, and the return to the Habeas Corpus by the School-master. What that conduct has been, in other instances, was described in my address to the court, namely, “an invasion of the rights of Hindoo parents.”

You have asked me if you are among the number to whom I allude? My reply is, that I spoke generally of a body of men, and that, as I have not pointed at any individual, the acknowledged usages of the world do not confer on you any right to call on me to be more specific.

To the other matter contained in your letter I decline giving any reply.

I have the honour to remain, Rev. Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LONGUEVILLE CLARKE.

To THE REV. ALEXANDER DUFF, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,—As the charge preferred by you against the Missionaries was brought forward in open court, and published in the public journals, I trust that you will have no objection to my giving a like publicity to your explanations, if I should deem it proper to do so.

Your's respectfully,

4, Wellington Square, 20th July, 1833.  
To L. CLARKE, Esq. Barrister, &c. &c.

ALEXANDER DUFF.

Calcutta, July 20, 1833.

REV. SIR,—You must be well aware that my answers to those letters which you have addressed to me were written on the spur of the moment, and without any notion that they were to be laid before the public. On this account, I am desirous of explaining one expression of which I have made use.

I have charged the Missionaries with an invasion of the rights of Hindoo fathers. Now the right to which I allude is, the right which every father possesses, of rearing up his child in the faith in which he himself conscientiously believes. The invasion of this right, with which I charge the Missionaries, consists in their instructing the child in a religion different from his father's, while he is yet of that early age that the right of instruction is in the father alone.

I have applied the words "*as flagitious*" to the conduct of the Missionaries, in allusion to cases similar to that which I brought before the Supreme Court, but the particulars of which cases I am not at liberty to detail; and I have also applied the word "*dangerous*" to their conduct, because I have known instances of the natives having withdrawn their children from certain places of public education, when they found that instruction was the pretext, but that apostacy was the object, of the teachers.

I have the honor to remain, Rev. Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LONGUEVILLE CLARKE.

P. S.—I need hardly suggest to you that, if you make any appeal to the public, that the whole of our correspondence, and not a portion of it, ought to be published.

TO THE REV. ALEXANDER DUFF, &c. &c. &c.

Having thus laid before you the correspondence, suffer me now to address a few remarks to Mr. Clarke.

SIR,—Aroused by the harshness and injustice of your indiscriminate censure, I hastened to write, on my own individual responsibility, for an explanation; and I did so *privately*, because I wished and hoped that such an answer might be returned as would prevent the matter from being dragged before the public in a form offensive to either party. But the very unsatisfactory nature of your replies soon convinced me that the wish was vain and the hope illusive, and that there was no alternative as to the course that ought to be pursued.

No one will suspect you of insincerity in your attack upon the Missionaries, though many may fairly call in question your honour. In vain will you take shelter under the much-abused pretext of hazarding doubtful statements merely in vindication of your client. The Court deprived you of this flimsy evasion by laying an arrest on your intended career of censure: the Court virtually rebuked you for beginning to wander on forbidden ground. And it did right. To attack a defenceless party, under any circumstances, were unmanly; to prefer an irrelevant accusation against a respectable party were disorderly; but virulently to assail an absent party was unbecoming and cowardly in the extreme.

Conscious of my own innocence, and anxious to correct the mis-statement, I earnestly entreated you to explain. How did you meet my entreaty? Partly by subterfuge, and partly by a reiteration of the censure in terms not less vague, but far more opprobrious than before. Was this the part of sterling integrity? Was this the part of openness and candour? Was this the part of a man of honour? You may have written on the spur of the moment: your expressions may have been unguarded and unadvised; and, in your haste, you may not have cared one jot for the feelings which vituperative language might lacerate. But how can all this furnish an excuse for your deliberate resolve to enter into no explanation whatever with me as a

private individual, and one of the party assailed? Has experience taught you to make so light of character that it may be trampled on remorselessly, whenever silence and impunity may be thought capable of being secured? You may allege that your inglorious resolve has been changed, and that in your *third* letter you deign to unfold your meaning. Thanks to the public press for this change, and not to your sense of justice. The instant you heard of "publicity," your tone became softened, and your language of an explanatory nature. But what are we to think of the conduct of the man who will refuse to be just and honourable, until the scourge of publicity is seen to hang threateningly before him?

You decline stating whether you included me in the number of the accused, on the ground that you "spoke generally of a body of men, and that the acknowledged usages of the world do not confer on me any right to call on you to be more specific." This shift may very well suit "a world lying in wickedness;" it may be very convenient for a man who either has not the candour to confess his error, or the moral fortitude to confront his antagonist: it may admirably suit the purpose of a legal casuist, and it may serve as a thin veil to intercept the response of conscience. But, Sir, let me tell you that "the usages of the world" may often be absurd in the eye of enlightened reason and unrighteous in the sight of God: they may be erroneous in principle and tyrannous in practice. And of this description must be the usages to which you refer, if they tend to shield the slanderer, by leaving at his mercy the characters of men, however unsullied may be their reputation. According to your view of the case, it would appear that any one, who claims a pre-eminence in malice, may fearlessly calumniate "a body of men." If I should, in a fit of wicked folly, declare that "L. Clarke, Esq. Barrister, is a liar and extortioner;" he might, I presume, justly prosecute me for libel. But if inured in "the usages of the world," I should cautiously assert, "that the Barristers of the Supreme Court in Calcutta are liars and extortioners;" Mr. Clarke, as one of these, might lie under the foul and calumnious imputation all the days of his life without redress. I should only have to reply to a troublesome interrogator—"My good Sir, I did not point to you individually; I spoke generally of a body of men, and the acknowledged usages of the world confer on you no right to call on me to be more specific." But I question much whether the world, in all its madness and folly, has ever sanctioned, in its fullest latitude, a usage under whose covert there is no outrage the most glaring that may not be perpetrated without risk or penalty. Should one of a numerous company exclaim, "The present assembly is composed of thieves and liars,"—would you not expect the man in whose breast there harboured no guile indignantly to cry out, "Do you really call me a thief and a liar?" And would you not expect the accuser to adduce decisive proofs of guilt, or immediately to apologize and retract the infamous charge? Parallel cases to that now mentioned have not been unknown in "worldly" society. But even if they had, I must leave to you the undivided glory of acting on an "usage," which, carried to its legitimate extent, might soon deluge the "world" with the slanders of the malignant.

Pernaps you may urge in your defence that you are not answerable for your censorious remarks—that you have only reported "the complaints of the natives." Good; listen by all means to the natives; hear patiently all their plaints; undertake to avenge all their wrongs; and, if you choose, show forth *practically* your zeal for "the interests of Christianity," and "taste not, touch not, handle not," any of their good things, their silver or gold. But did it not occur to you, notwithstanding your philanthropy, that the natives were not perfect men? Did it not occur to you that the influence of superstition and the horror of losing caste might lead to misapprehension and exaggeration? Did it not occur to you that in such a

case it would be well to remember the maxim—*audi alteram partem*? Did it not occur to you that, in your total ignorance of the plea on the opposite side, you might be led to entertain impressions not less unfounded than injurious? And did it not occur to you that it might be a breach of decorum and common honesty to cite such *ex parte* statements as undoubted verities? I admit that, agreeably to the loose tenor of conventional morality, you, as counsel, are not expected to make yourself acquainted with the real merits of the other side. But I appeal to you whether, as an honest man and professing Christian, you were not bound to institute an inquiry, ere you formed your own deliberate judgment, and adopted the complaints of natives as your own settled opinions? It may be that you are under peculiar obligations to natives—and that these may have, in various ways, contributed much more to your “worldly” comfort than humble Missionaries who preach the self-denying doctrines of the Cross: but I must be allowed to doubt whether, at “the bar of heaven’s jurisprudence,” a one-sided view of the subject, or a sense of interest or experience in “the usages of the world,” or skill in the quirks of law, can be made to “cover a multitude of sins.”

In your *last* letter, as I have already stated, you at length condescended to enter into some explanation of your meaning.

“Every father,” you say, “has the right of rearing up his child in the faith in which he himself conscientiously believes;”—and when the Missionaries “instruct the child in a religion different from his father,” they do, in your estimation, “invade the right of the parent.” This is plausible; it remains to be seen whether it is sound. Let us examine it in detail. *First* then, as to the *abstract* question of *right*. If the right exists at all, it must be either *natural* or *legal*. Now I deny that there is any *separate* legal right. I am fully aware that the father is the guardian of his child, as to all civil rights, till the latter be of age: but I question how far the law confers the right of religious instruction on the father *alone*. Rather I am prepared to deny that there is any such right conferred at all—else might the father prosecute the teacher of a religion, different from his own, for misdemeanour;—an absurdity from which British law, with all its anomalies, is honourably exempt. To take a nearer view of the subject, I may refer to the clause of the act of Parliament *anent* the permission given to teachers of religion to settle in India. It begins thus: “And whereas it is the *duty* of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India, and such measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge and of religious and moral improvement: and in furtherance of the above objects, sufficient facilities ought to be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India, for the purpose of accomplishing those benevolent designs, &c.” In this clause “religious and moral improvement” is as expressly contemplated and provided for as “the introduction of useful knowledge.” From this, it is clear, that our British legislators were prepared to anticipate any possible changes that might arise from the peaceable inculcation of “religion and morals,” and to regard these as “the accomplishment of benevolent designs.” And I think, that all your ingenuity cannot extract from this act any exemption in favour of minors—cannot detect even an insinuation that the teachers of “religion and morals” are to *confine* their efforts *exclusively* to persons above age, or that the attempt to teach persons under age in “religion and morals” is to be considered a violation of right, a breach of law. In other words, the law of the land evidently does not prohibit the instruction of persons under age in religion and morals—and consequently does not consider such instruction as illegal. For if there be no law to forbid, there can be no law to violate: if there be no

right legally conferred, there can be no right illegally infringed upon. I presume, therefore, that with all your skill in the intricacies of law, it would be impossible for you to show, that in communicating religious knowledge to the children of Hindoos, the Missionaries have "invaded *legal rights*."

So much for law. Let me now view the question as it relates to "natural right." And here *in limine*, I must candidly acknowledge that I despair of propounding an argument which can command an universal, or even a general, assent. And why? Because so long as the world is agitated amidst conflicting opinions on the subject of religion, so long must large classes of men differ as to the fundamental principles on which the solution of the question must hinge. Still, there must be a right and a wrong somewhere: there must be some mode of treating the subject in which most *reasonable* men may be ready to acquiesce. It appears to me that at the outset we must pass by that whole class of misguided men who consider *all* religions as *alike inexpedient* and *alike false*; since, for *them* to maintain that there are *natural rights* to teach and support what is pronounced by *themselves* to be *inexpedient* or *false*, were too ridiculous to be imagined. The question must then rest chiefly between those who loosely believe that *all* religions are *alike expedient* and *alike pleasing* in the sight of Heaven—and those who believe that *all* religions are *inexpedient*, and *displeasing* to God *save one*, i. e. Christianity. If the advocates of the former branch of the alternative *could* establish their position, there would be no great difficulty in admitting, that it *seemed* to be the ordination of Providence that the people of every country should inherit a *natural right* to the religious system prevalent amongst them, in the same way as they might be said to enjoy a *natural right* to the varied products of their respective soils. But this position has *never* been established to the satisfaction of any number of *rational and enlightened men*. And to proceed, without farther inquiry, to deduce inferences from it as to *natural rights*, were to build on a baseless assumption—were to resort to a plain "begging of the question." Widely different is the case with those who advocate the latter branch of the above alternative. They proceed on no assumption of the matter in dispute: they have recourse to no "begging of the question." The truth of Christianity having been demonstrated, times and ways without number, to the entire satisfaction of thousands and tens of thousands of the most rational and enlightened men that ever lived, its adherents have, as they think, an indisputable title to proceed on the admission of its truth. Believing, therefore, as they do, on grounds that have never been invalidated, that Christianity is *true*, they feel constrained to look

\* In a *loose way of speaking*, it may be said that the father has a *legal right*. But it is a misapplication of the strict meaning of the term. It is of a negative rather than a positive description. The father has a common liberty to teach what he pleases, not an *exclusive* monopoly that forbids the intrusion of others under pains and penalties. So far as law is concerned, it seems to be a perfect non-interference. An example may still more clearly shew what I mean. In ordinary speech the father may be said to have *legal right* to clothe his child in what raiment he thinks proper. Should another step in, and, without the knowledge or against the will of the father, strip the youth of his clothes, he might be legally prosecuted by the father. And the case would not be materially altered, even if he had substituted some garments of his own in place of what was taken away. If in like manner, it be said that the father and *none other* has a *legal right* to teach his child religion:—in common parlance the expression might be admitted, but, in strict propriety of language, it would not. And why? Because I find that, should another step in, and without the knowledge or against the will of the father, deprive the child of the faith which the father had inculcated, or even substitute another in its place, he could not be *legally* prosecuted by the father. Now, had there been a special exclusive right conferred on the father by law, the father could undoubtedly sue the violator of it in a court of justice. And his not being able to do so, proves the non-existence of such a *legal right*.

upon every other religious system as erroneous, dishonorable to God, and destructive of the happiness of man. To be more specific—they would belie their reason and their conscience, did they not regard Hindooism as a system of error, and, as such, a system which does all that the impotency

[Since the appearance of the above correspondence in the John Bull, I have through the kindness of some legal friends, been put in possession of certain facts that seem to bear on the present question. I have stated that there is no legal statute by which a *special exclusive right* is conferred on parents to teach what religious sentiments they please to their children. In a general way it may be said that the law is *neutral*, neither conferring a legal right, nor controlling a supposed natural one. But if at any time it interfered at all, it seems to have done so, *not to force the child to submit to the tyranny or caprice of the parent, but to compel the parent to abstain from coercing the conscience of the child.*

I should have expected that Mr. Clarke, as a lawyer, would have voluntarily made mention of some exceptions to the general power and control which the father is *permitted* to exercise over the minds and education of his children. If he take the trouble of looking into the 10th volume of Mr. Vesey's Reports, he will find that the Lord Chancellor Eldon, no mean authority on the subject, said, in the case there reported of *De Manneville v. De Manneville* that, "with reference to religion, this court (the court of Chancery) had interfered to prevent parents from preaching irreligious doctrines in the presence of their families." And can he possibly forget the late case in which Mr. Wellesly was *deprived of the custody of his children*, upon the ground of his immorality, and the danger which existed that his fatherly authority might be exerted to vitiate and demoralize the minds of his children. That a power, therefore, does really exist under the sanction of the British Legislature, to control and put effectual restrictions on the *general* rights of parents, with the view of promoting the moral and religious well-being of the child, cannot well be doubted.

Still farther, I would present to Mr. Clarke's notice the fact, recorded in the constitutional history of England, that two statutes were passed by the legislature at different times, to *protect* the children of Jews and Papists from the bigotry of their respective parents, upon their renouncing the Catholic or Jewish faith, in order to embrace the truths of the Protestant system. The first of these was the *statute of 11th and 12th Wm. III. c. 4*, which declares its object to be, that the Protestant children of Popish parents "may not for want of fitting maintenance be necessitated in compliance with their parents to embrace the Popish religion, *contrary to their own inclinations.*" The other statute is the *1st Anne, c. 30*, which professes a similar object; viz. "that sufficient maintenance be provided and allowed for the children of Jewish parents, *who shall be Protestants.*"

With respect to the first of these acts of Parliament it is worthy of remark, that the *British Legislature seriously thought that a child might have an inclination of its own, wholly independent of its parents, towards one religion, in preference to another, though that might be his ancestral faith,—and that this inclination should on no account be forcibly interfered with by the bigoted parents.*

Of course, both these statutes clearly recognize the general principle that *it is not unlawful to communicate religious instruction to the mind of a child, even though that instruction should be entirely opposed to the religious system in which the parents conscientiously believed.* For how, or by what means is the child to become a Protestant? Not, surely, through the instrumentality of the Popish or Jewish parents, or any other Papists or Jews. How then, could the child be converted to Protestantism? By no means which I can imagine, except through the zealous exertions of Protestant teachers.

The fair logical conclusion therefore, to be drawn from all these premises, is, *that the law of England permits a child to exercise the mental powers which God hath bestowed upon it, in forming its own judgment on the subject of its eternal interests—*to renounce freely what it discovered to be false, and as freely and fearlessly embrace what it considered to be the true religion,—and consequently that the law sanctioned the efforts of those teachers who were employed in instructing the children, even if the consequence of such instruction should be non-compliance, in matters of religion, with the wishes and commands of earthly parents.

The same conclusion may be formed negatively thus. Had the legislature for a moment conceived the idea that it was a violation of existing legal rights, *i. e. a crime* to instruct a child in a religious system different from that in which the parents conscientiously believed, what ought to have been its regular procedure? Would it not have been necessary, in passing the above-mentioned statutes, to repeal the pre-existing law—to withdraw the pre-existing rights? Most undoubtedly. And its passing the said statutes

of human contrivance can achieve to undefy the Deity, and all that the malice of the "powers of darkness" can devise to infatuate and ruin man. Accordingly, they must deny, absolutely and without reserve, the existence of any *natural right* to teach and perpetuate a system of falsehood and delusion so loathsome and deadly. For who has the power of conferring a *natural right*? The very expression imports that this is the sole and inalienable prerogative of the Great Author of Nature. One step more leads to the unanswerable query: Is it possible—is it for a moment to be conceived, that the God of Truth, the pure and the holy God, who cannot look upon sin but with abhorrence, could have conferred on any of his creatures a *natural right* to inculcate Hindooism, i. e. to impart the knowledge of a system of hideous error,—that, by so doing, he could have enforced, by the sanction of omniscience and the thunders of omnipotence, the exercise of a privilege to insult the Majesty of Heaven, to violate his laws, and cover his subjects with confusion, shame, and everlasting dismay? In the solemnity of Apostolic language, I exclaim, "God forbid." Pause, then, Sir, I beseech you, if you are a sincere Christian, ere, in your ignorant and misdirected zeal for the pretended rights of man, you seriously entertain a sentiment, which, in its principle, is so derogatory to the God of heaven,

without the slightest reference to pre-existing laws and rights, proves incontrovertibly the non-existence of both. Again, had the legislature supposed that it was a *crime* to teach a child a religion different from that of its parents, what might we expect its procedure to have been, more especially towards Papists? At a time when the utmost anxiety was manifested by it to swell the ranks of the Protestant party and to diminish those of the Popish,—at a time too, when acts were crowded upon acts to regulate and control the natural and civil rights of all who adhered to the Popish interests,—at such a time, might we not have reasonably expected that a special statute should be enacted investing Protestant teachers with an express legal authority to instruct the children of Papists? And the non-hestowment of such authority proves incontestibly that the legislature did not think it requisite, i. e. *did not once entertain the idea, that there were any legal rights that could be violated by efforts to instruct children in a religious system different from that of their parents.*

And it cannot for a moment be supposed that those who *prospectively* provided for "the maintenance of the children who should turn Protestants," would have forgotten to protect, if protection had been necessary, the instruments through whom the change of religion was to be effected. But no legal enactment was thought necessary for this purpose. In a civilized and Christian country, a doctrine so inimical to the spirit of our laws and of our religion as this, viz. that we are not to inculcate, in the minds of children, pure notions of moral and religious obligation, because their parents happen to be blinded by ignorance and superstition, could not well have been anticipated. Such a doctrine, however, strange though it may appear, has actually been broached in a more enlightened era, though certainly not in a more enlightened country, in the 19th century.

It is not possible that any question can arise as to the meaning of the expression "children," used in the preamble of the statutes already referred to. In the enacting part of the first of them, it is ordered, that "the maintenance shall be suitable to the degree and ability of such parent, and to the age and education of such child," clearly shewing that the term *child* was used as descriptive of the *age* of the son or daughter of the Papist, and not merely as descriptive of his own issue. The maintenance also was intended to provide for the *education of the child*, which would have been an unnecessary provision in the case of an adult.

Before dismissing the subject of law, it may not be unseasonable to mention that by the British law, a male at 12 years of age may take the oath of allegiance to the king. But we are now told that a boy *above 14 years* of age has not sufficient discretion to be allowed to choose whether he will serve the great God, or idols of wood and stone, or to declare whether he shall yield obedience to that which is pronounced to be "nothing" in the world, or be faithful and bear *true* allegiance to the "King of kings!" And to make the case still more strange, it is expressly declared by Mr. Justice Blackstone that a boy "at 14 is *at years of discretion*, and therefore may consent or disagree to marriage\*."]

\* Black. Com. 463.

and in its consequences so disastrous to the temporal and eternal well-being of man\*.

But apart altogether from the question of natural right, the two classes above-named must differ widely in their estimate of the good to be lost or gained by a change of religion, and must differ proportionately in their estimate of the nature of the attempt to effect a change. The one class, with their *equalizing* views on the subject of religion, may easily conclude that it is a piece of useless toil, if not of wanton mischief, "to disturb the peace of families," by any efforts to substitute one form of faith for another that is not allowed to possess higher claims. The other class, with their views of the immeasurable superiority of Christianity, must reject this latitudinarian conclusion with the disinterested zeal of genuine philanthropy. Led to believe that the Christian faith is the only true religion—originally announced

\* Lest any misunderstanding should arise, I may here remark that, in a *general way*, it may be said, that the father has a natural right to teach his child religion. In the same way it may be said, that the father has a natural right to command the bodily services of his child. But in neither case is the right unlimited. Far otherwise. It is subject to a high and solemn responsibility. It is necessarily confined to things indifferent, to things agreeable, or, at least, to things not contrary to the will of God—the Supreme Lawgiver. Thus, should the father command his child to lend him the aid of his bodily services in *stealing, robbing, &c.*, it is plain that he has overstepped his jurisdiction, and even the law of the land would not dismiss the boy as guiltless in such a case, on the ground of his acting under the father's authority. A father has no natural right to issue such a command. And if in his ignorance or folly he has done so, it is clear that the command is nugatory; it is superseded by the contrary command of a higher power. If it were not so, God would be conferring a natural right to violate his own laws—which is nothing short of blasphemy. In like manner, suppose the father to have a natural right to teach religion to his child; it is plain that so far as the supposed natural right is concerned, it must be expressly confined to the inculcation of what is agreeable, or not contrary to the will of God. Should the father, for instance, teach his child that an idol is God, and that the idol ought to be worshipped as God, it is palpable that he has, in the sight of Heaven, overstepped his jurisdiction. He can claim no *natural right* to teach that which the Great Creator hath denounced and prohibited. Otherwise, God would be conferring a *natural right* to teach what he himself has pronounced false, and therefore, subversive of his own authority, and injurious to man. Hence, as I have stated above, if Hindooism be confessedly a system of error, we cannot even imagine such a thing as a natural right to teach it.

This, I may remark, in passing, clearly exposes the fallacy of that sort of *argumentum ad hominem* which has lately been urged with an air of triumph. It ought rather, I think, to have been introduced and reiterated with a tolerable degree of shame. Its fallacy, and no trifling one it is, consists in *assuming* the very points that ought to be debated. It *assumes*, first, that the Hindoo parent has precisely the *same* right to teach Hindooism that the Christian parent has to teach Christianity. It *assumes*, secondly, as the foundation of this proposition, that Hindooism has the *same* claims to be received as a true revelation from God, that Christianity has. The argument is thus doubly fallacious. And it must remain so until the same overwhelming evidence can be brought forward to prove the truth of Hindooism, that can be adduced to demonstrate the truth of Christianity, i. e. it must *ever* remain so. Christianity being true, the Christian parent has the sanction and command of the Almighty to teach it: Hindooism being false, the Hindoo parent cannot, without blaspheming, plead the sanction and command of the Almighty to teach it.

[From this and similar passages some have absurdly imagined that I plead for the right of Christians *forcibly* to inculcate the true religion. Nothing could be more contrary to my intention; and I think that by no fair interpretation can any such notion be extracted from my words. All that I insist on is, that, as the Hindoo parent can appeal to no natural rights to teach what is acknowledged by *all* enlightened men to be *false*, it is impossible to charge a Christian, who communicates a knowledge of his own religion to those children to whom he finds access, with a violation of rights which have no existence. The Christian is *not to compel* the children of heathen parents to come to him for instruction: but if they do *voluntarily* come to him, he cannot be justly accused of violating either legal or natural rights, should he, by information and argument, lay open to their minds the evidences and doctrines of his own holy faith.]

at the dawn of creation—gradually developed in a magnificent chain of prophecy—and gloriously consummated in the life, sufferings, and death of the Son of God ;—that it is the only religion which can sublimate and refine human nature ; which can exalt it from earth unto the heaven of heavens, there to behold, as it were, unveiled, the glories of the Great Jehovah ; which can cause it to soar aloft without bounds or limits to check its swift and resistless movements, and so advance from one glory to another that rises higher and higher in infinite progression ;—Led, I say, to believe all this, on the ground of overpowering evidence, must they not infer, that to impart a knowledge of this religion is to impart a blessing which no finite mind can fully comprehend,—is to bestow a treasure richer far than all the wealth of “ Ormus or of Ind ?” Must they not be convinced that, to convey it in obedience to a divine command, is an act of duty to God, paramount to the natural wishes of corrupt nature, and to rights which are the veriest figments of a depraved imagination ? Must they not be persuaded that the bestowing of this sublime enriching knowledge is an act of purest, holiest, most godlike benevolence ? And must they not, of necessity, conclude that those who actively oppose the communication of it, really and truly oppose the highest good of their fellow-creatures—that all those who have set on foot the unholy crusade, and joined in the insane shout against religious instruction, are, in the sight of heaven, the bitterest, cruelest enemies of the race of man ?

Leaving, however, the abstract question, and coming to the practical one, I DENY that, in any sense of the expression, the rights of Hindoo parents have been invaded by the Missionaries. Granting, what it is impossible to do—still, for the sake of argument,—granting that Hindoo parents have a *legal* and a *natural right* to teach their children in the religion in which they themselves believe, I demand of you, Sir, distinctly to explain in what way such supposed rights have *actually been* invaded. If you could adduce one instance, in which a pledge was given to natives that no religious knowledge would be communicated, and one wherein it appeared that the pledge was afterwards violated, then indeed would you prove not so much that rights were invaded, as that there was a gross breach of faith, a base and dishonorable treachery. But you cannot establish a single instance of this sort. On the contrary, all the natives know, or ought to know, that Christian principles are instilled in Missionary schools, as well as they know that Hindooism is taught in Sanscrit seminaries conducted by learned Brahmuns. They know it from universal report ; they know it from perusing newspapers ; they know it from inspecting the class-books employed ; they know it from interrogating the pupils or masters ; they know\* it from visiting the schools and hearing the classes examined. Still, notwithstanding all this, do parents and guardians *spontaneously* bring their children and protégés to the superintendents of Missionary schools : they are often importunate in their petitions for the admission of boys : they entreat, they beseech, they implore : and, after all, it not unfrequently happens that *numbers* of applications are rejected for want of accommodation and other causes. Deny this representation, Sir, if you can or dare ; and if you cannot and dare not, I must hold it to be a piece of foul and wanton insult on your part to throw that blame, if blame it really be, on the unoffending Missionaries, which ought to be charged home directly on the parents and guardians themselves†.

\* I have been informed, on the best authority, that the very father of Brijnauth Ghose was present at the last annual examination of the Mirzapore School, on which occasion the Lord Bishop expressly announced that the inculcation of Christian principles was the grand object of the conductors of the school !

† The force of this reasoning has not been discerned by some, and yet, it seems wonderfully plain. It depends on the simple principle that if men are allowed to possess

You seem to reckon it a grievous offence that "the peace of Hindoo families has often been disturbed by the Missionaries." What a testimony this, if you only knew it, to the successful exertions of these labourers, and that, too, from one who will not be suspected of over-much religious enthusiasm! What a triumphant reply to those blinded men, who slanderously report that *nothing has been done* in the Missionary field! And the triumph would then only be complete, could you announce that\* the peace of every family in

certain rights, it is in their power to relinquish these, or delegate them to others. And if there be a voluntary abandonment, a formal or tacit delegation of supposed rights on one side, there can be no illegality in an implied or actual assumption of these on the other.]

[\* This passage has been thought by some to be liable to mis-interpretation: it may be, but this is nothing more than can be said of the language of the Redeemer himself. It has actually been misrepresented by others: but this is only what has been done to the words of the Saviour of the world. Viewed fairly and candidly as it *ought* to be, in *connection* with the *whole context*, it is impossible to misunderstand it. Mr. Clarke referred to "the disturbance of the peace of certain Hindoo families" in such a way as to lead one to suppose that he reckoned the circumstance disreputable to the Missionaries. In reply it necessarily devolved on me to shew that such "disturbance of the peace of families" proceeded from no evil *design* on the part of Missionaries—that it *resulted directly from the opposition made by depraved men themselves to the sin-condemning doctrines of the Gospel*. These doctrines are neither designed nor fitted to produce such results. To the evil passions of mankind, that war against the salutary restraints of holiness and truth, are these lamentable effects to be attributed. So far then as the spirit of the Gospel itself is concerned, these effects may be truly characterized as "collateral and incidental." But our Saviour emphatically foretold, and all past experience has verified the prophecy, that from the stubborn and prevailing degeneracy of mankind, effects like those already described might in the first instance be exhibited in a greater or less degree, wherever the Gospel was proclaimed. In a country therefore, like Hindoostan, where the opposition to the spread of the Gospel is so *inveterate* and so *universal*, its successful issue in the conversion of any member or members of a family might well be expected to be accompanied almost inevitably with the wrath, hatred, and revenge of those bigoted relations and friends *from whose opinions and practices they are obliged conscientiously to differ*. If there should be no successful issue, the "peace of families" would not certainly be much disturbed. In this view of the subject, "the disturbance of the peace of families" occasioned by efforts to propagate the Gospel, and success attending these efforts, might reasonably be considered, so far as the proclamation of the Gospel and the establishment of it in every family are concerned, as a certain *indication*, however undesirable, *not a direct necessary result*, of the completeness, or universality of Missionary triumph. Must the prime agents in the movement be, on that account, supposed to *rejoice because* of the universal disturbance of the peace of families? Malevolence or ignorance may make the supposition, but the principal actors themselves will ever be found bewailing the blindness and depravity that can convert the noblest product of heaven's boundless love into a source of wretchedness to man, and of outrage against Heaven's Lord.

Many may wonder that I have deemed it necessary to enter into so lengthened an explanation of a passage which no unbiassed reader can possibly misunderstand. But I have done so, *because it has been* either misunderstood or misrepresented by those who must have known better. And while it is pleasing to think that no private individual, who had not some sinister purpose to serve, has ever ventured to distort the plain meaning of my words—it is, if possible, still more gratifying to find that so highly respectable a journal as the *John Bull*, has gratuitously come forward to vindicate my language from the wilful misrepresentations of *a few unhappy men*. "Mr. Duff," remarks the *Bull* of the 24th August, "quoted a passage of Scripture—gave a full, fair, and perfectly lucid explanation of its spirit and meaning. There is no evidence but he did this with a view to show, not only the truth of the passage itself, but also that it might be *reasonably expected*, that the Gospel, coming into collision with other systems of religion—with the prejudices, passions, and evil propensities of mankind—would be the *occasion* of 'setting a son at variance against his father and a daughter against her mother, &c.' And what religion, whose commands require the strictest and most unremitting moral discipline over one's self, which requires perfection, and claims to be exclusive, might not be expected to be the occasion of much 'variance' in countries, communities, and families? And are we to declaim against Missionaries, because they

Hindoostan had, for like reasons, been disturbed ! What ! Sir, do you know any thing of human nature—have you ever read your Bible—and have you failed to learn that it is impossible for the sin-condemning doctrines of the Gospel to be promulgated without “disturbing the peace of families,” and, it may be, the internal peace of whole kingdoms ? What mean these emphatic words—“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth ; I am not come to send peace, but a sword ; to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother ?”—Not what some perverse interpreters would have us to believe, that he who uttered them was an incendiary, whose direct design was to put the world in a flame of discord and rebellion ;—the whole strain of prophecies forbids the impious thought : the annunciation of angels at the birth of the Messiah forbids it : the whole life, precepts, and doctrines of the blessed Jesus forbid it ; the parting words to his sorrowing disciples forbid it : his very title, and a distinguishing one it is, as “Prince of Peace,” forbids it. What then is the meaning of these significant words ? They have been, and may be, paraphrased thus : “Do not expect that I shall be quietly owned and submitted to, or that my religion will be readily and peaceably embraced ; for if you do, the event will defeat and disappoint your expectations. Though I was sent to refine and civilize mankind, and root out of their nature all *sour, unsocial, and mischievous* passions, and to make men *gentle, affable, and condescending* in their behaviour, yet, through the prevailing *degeneracy and corruption* of the world, I shall prove the occasion of *strife and discord, of unnatural heats and animosities, of violent hatreds and bloody massacres* ; and men will, on the account of my religion, break through the bonds of nature, and the strongest ties of humanity, as if indeed the very end of my coming was, not to give peace, but rather division ; to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother.” And how fearfully has this solemn forewarning been verified ? How often has that very Gospel, which was “Heaven’s best gift,” and sent expressly “to bring peace on earth and good-will to the children of men,” been fiercely opposed by the corruption of sinful creatures, who constantly mistake its spirit, misrepresent its nature, and abuse its blessings ? Aye, and how often has it been made the *innocent occasion* of the shedding of rivers of

propagate such a religion by the only possible means in their power ? Or because *Christianity* has been, and still is, the occasion of ‘variance,’ are its friends to cease to propagate it, by fair and honourable means, *through fear of giving offence* ; or does it follow, that it is a religion really pernicious to society and detrimental to the best interests of mankind ? We do not see this consequence. We see what injunctions it lays on its followers and advocates, and no one can deny that *the true Christian is the man of peace, benevolence and love.*”

The Johu Bull contains many more remarks equally appropriate and excellent. Space will not allow me to copy all, but the following passage is so truly pointed and unanswerable that I cannot refrain from quoting it : “It is a curious fact, that many who pretend and sometimes profess, to admire *the zeal and devotion* of Jesus, are found amongst the first to vilify his disciples for their exhibition of the same virtues. *He* taught in the Synagogues. *He* offended the prejudices of the Jews. *He* openly attacked the first orders in the Jewish community. *He* publicly denounced them as ‘a generation of vipers.’ *He* warned them of approaching condemnation. If *He* had acted as some of our fastidious contemporaries would have Missionaries conduct themselves : if *He* had trimmed his religious deportment according to the opinions of the times, as the censors of Missionaries would have them carry themselves in the midst of the Hindoo community, we should have heard nothing of the indignation of the rulers of the Synagogues, or of the priests, or of any other hypocritical pretenders to adherence to the law and the prophets : and if Missionaries at the present day were trimmers, and would balance themselves *equally between all parties*, that is to say, if they would cease to use the only available means in their power to propagate Christianity,—if they would be at the trouble and expense of establishing schools *and not teach Christianity*,—then would they escape the denunciations of their present enemies.”]

human\* blood? After this, need you, Sir, affect surprise or evince displeasure when you hear of "the peace of certain families being disturbed" by the promulgation of the Gospel? If you do, it will prove to all reasonable men that you must know more of Heathenism than you do of Christianity, and are more sincerely attached to the practices of the former than to the sacred institutions of the latter. But this alternative I should hope, for the credit of the British name, you will be prepared to repudiate with the indignation of at least "a man of honour."

You state that "the conduct" of the Missionaries is "dangerous," because you "have known instances of natives having withdrawn their children from certain places of education when they found that instruction was the pretext, but that apostacy was the object, of the teachers." From this implied detestation of hypocrisy and double-dealing; as also an expression of something like sorrow in your first letter, on account of the injury supposed to be done to the Christian faith, by the imprudent zeal of the Missionaries, one would naturally suppose that you too are zealous for the "true interests of Christianity" and "the extension of education." Well; it is not for me to dispute your claim. You may be the best of Christians. You may be the most indefatigable friend of native education that ever reached these shores. But with the allowance of these *possibilities*, I fear that, as regards the present subject, you have been asleep or dreaming during the greater part of your ten years' residence in India. Do you know, Sir, what Hindooism is? Are you aware that as sure as the sun cannot rise in the firmament of heaven without dispelling the darkness of night, so surely must the dissemination of European literature and science banish the thick darkness of Hindooism? If not, you too must, in these matters, labour under "errors of judgment," which may go far to account for any future hallucinations. But the fact is even as I have stated it. And I must then turn round, and thus retort on one and another of those gentlemen who advocate "education apart from religion:" "Sirs, you accuse us of 'making instruction the pretext, but apostacy the object.' Never was there a more miserable mistake. We come forward openly, boldly, honestly. We scruple not to declare in the hearing of the natives that we wish to communicate the elements of *all* valuable knowledge, literary, scientific, and religious, if they choose to receive it at our hands—that after they imbibe our instruction, they must think, judge, and act for themselves—and that as rational creatures they must be prepared to follow the dictates of reason and conscience, though many a sacrifice should thereby be demanded. What, on the other hand, is the general nature of your address? Approaching the natives with a courteous winning smile, you in substance say, 'While others plot your ruin, we are your best friends—we only desire to impart unto you the treasures of wisdom. We have no wish, far from it, to do any thing that can in the least interfere with your religion,—that is too sacred a subject for us to meddle with. In us therefore you may repose implicit confidence.' And what follows this specious pleading? You take advantage of the confidence reposed in you by the "unsuspecting" natives; and forthwith you proceed to supply that fatal knowledge to their children which you *know* must necessarily subvert the very

\* It must ever be remembered, that unbelievers, and Christians falsely so called, *alone* are answerable for such proceedings. All those who have understood the principles, and imbibed the spirit of Christianity, have *never* resorted to any other weapons of propagation, save teaching, preaching, persuasion, and argument. They are its adversaries and false friends who, in the absence of patience and argument, have excited private clamours, have appealed to force and violence, and have aroused human governments to public persecution and bloodshed. Such measures Christianity itself wholly reprobates.

foundations of their religion\*." And such is the spotless consistency of those gentlemen who madly vociferate against the innocent for pretended breaches of faith!—Well might I exclaim, in my turn, *risum teneatis?*—This forcibly reminds me of the case of a rich man who thus addresses his poorer neighbours: "Friends, some I know have been trying experiments on your lives, which are dear unto you: far from me be such a thought. My only wish is to promote your health and happiness; and as the best proof I can afford of my good wishes, here is a rich repast spread out before you. Come, partake, and make yourselves merry." The poor deluded men joyfully obey the invitation: they do partake, and soon find to their ruin that the artful entertainer had mingled ingredients in the fare that seriously affect the health of some, and endanger the lives of others. Pray, Sir, would you style this the perfection of fair-dealing? And yet to one and another of those, who, with one hand, pretend to uphold the Hindoo religion, and with the other supply that which they *know* must destroy it, I might aptly apply the language of the Roman poet, *Nomine mutato, de te fabula narratur*. Not that I intend to insinuate that Hindooism is spiritual life, but the Hindoos think so; and the advocates of "education without religion" tolerate the idea in *words*†, while in *acts* they do all they can to efface it. Well said the Divine Author of Christianity: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Again, you limit the term "dangerous" to the "conduct" of Missionaries, in so far as it has led some Hindoo parents "to withdraw their children from certain places of public education." This may be true; but is it the whole truth? I trow not. Have you been ten years in Calcutta, and have you never heard of children being removed from "certain places of public education," on account of causes totally unconnected with Missionary conduct? Have you never heard of the panic struck into the minds of the native community by the liberal, but certainly not religious, proceedings of the late Mr. Derozio? Have you never heard of the numbers of with-

\* I might here go farther and state, that you not only *know* what effects must be produced by the instruction you are the means of communicating, but even make these effects a matter for *glorying*. Look at your own Reports, and say, whether you do not frequently *boast* of the influence of your measures in dispelling the darkness of Hindoo superstition, &c. And what you denominate superstition is, with the Hindoos, Religion. Yea, can you deny, that some of your number sometimes boastingly declare that they are the pioneers of Missionaries?—that they are employed in sweeping away the accumulated rubbish of ages, and so clearing a ground on which Missionaries may successfully rear the beauteous structure of Christianity?

† I cannot here refrain from quoting the words of one, whose personal experience of the School Society and Hindoo College system entitles his testimony to a weight, that is superior to a thousand speculations. In the *Inquirer* of the 26th instant, Baboo Krishna Mohun Bannerjea thus writes: "The object of the College is one in reality, and another in profession. For while it is told *abroad* that it leaves Hindooism untouched, the pupils are perhaps telling their astronomical lessons *within*, and learning to consider their great *Soorjo Deb*,—whom their priests, and such of themselves as are Brahmun boys, daily pray to in the morning,—as nothing but a round bright inanimate body, called, in English, "the Sun," lying at rest and supported by what *Juvans* and *Melechas* (contemptuous appellations of Europeans) term *laws of motion*. What a treachery this must be, to delude Hindoo parents with the idea that their children shall not be taught principles contrary to their religion, while in reality it is intended to sap its foundations, and directly inculcate lessons which inflict deathblows upon it."

"But how dreadfully miserable the issue! Young men dragged from the gloomy wastes of Hindooism, only to be plunged into the dark abyss of general infidelity! And for the accomplishment of this object lakhs of rupees are lavished by persons bearing the name of Christian! The Missionaries are at least exempt from this foul blot on the Christian name. If they succeed in destroying Hindooism, it is only in order that they may substitute the divine system of Christianity, with its refreshing streams of grace."

drawals from the Hindoo College in consequence of these proceedings? But this, though a satisfactory instance, is not the only one. Causes of a more general and permanent nature are actively at work. A liberal education and pure Hindooism, as it is called, cannot possibly co-exist. This, the principal advocates of "education without religion" must have all along known: the Hindoos, as a body, certainly did not. Accordingly, whenever the latter begin to make the important discovery, many of the more bigoted of them immediately withdraw their children from the Hindoo College and the School Society's Schools:—and the severest censures have been poured on the heads of those who deluded them by the ensnaring profession: "We do not wish to interfere in any degree with your religion." Instances of this description are numerous. But not to go farther; have you not read the statement inserted in the *Chundrica*, and translated in the *Durpun*, by your late client, the father of the persecuted boy, Brijonauth Ghose? If not, for your edification, I shall here insert it. It is as follows: "I sent my son to the Hindoo College to study English, and when he had risen to the fourth class, I thought he had made some progress in English knowledge. I therefore forbade his going to the College; for I have heard that the students in the higher classes of the College become *Nastiks*\* (i. e. infidels, or unbelievers in Hindooism)." Now I ask, who are responsible for this system of instruction, which leading, as it does, to the renunciation of Hindooism, induces parents to act like your client, and remove their children from the Hindoo College and School Society's Schools? Plainly, not the Missionaries, but the advocates of "education apart from religion." Now, as the gentlemen of the bar are often celebrated for their subtilty and acuteness, I cannot do better than apply your reasoning against the conduct of the Missionaries to a case exactly parallel. Put into the simple form of a syllogism, it runs thus:

That "conduct" on the part of individuals which leads natives to withdraw their children from certain places of public education must be denounced as "dangerous."

The "conduct" of the advocates of "education apart from religion," in encouraging and supporting a system of liberal European instruction, has, in many instances, led to the withdrawal of boys from certain places of public education.

Therefore, the "conduct" of the advocates of "education apart from religion" must be denounced as "dangerous."

This application of legal logic is mine: to you, Sir, belongs the sole credit of its conclusiveness.

I come now to your last and most aggravated charge. You dare, with unblushing effrontery, to stigmatize the conduct of the Missionaries as "flagitious." It is well, Sir, for you, that you have limited the application of this term as to the offence, and generalized it as to the offenders, else might you in your turn be summoned to the bar of the Supreme Court for libel. And even now I know not how far an individual is at liberty to employ a libellous expression, and, when called to task for the use of it, to mince and explain it away to such a degree that it is made to convey a meaning

\* It matters little whether this was the *true* cause of the boy's removal from the College. The point of real importance is that the father here states the prevalent opinion among the Hindoo community—an opinion on which many parents and friends are *known* to have acted.

† I am aware that that is not unusually reckoned libellous which may be written in a *private* note. But the case is very much different when the expression is written in *explanation* of words *publicly* uttered: and still more, when permission is granted to make the explanation public.

totally different from what it bears in standard works and common discourse. But, not to dwell on this, I think I can perceive vacillation in your own mind as to the proper bearing of the infamous term. In letter *second*, you appear to confine it simply to what you designate "an invasion of the rights of Hindoo parents." In letter *third*, you seem to have thought that what even you represent as "an invasion of rights was not sufficiently "wicked, atrocious, and vile\*," to merit the application of the epithet "flagitious;" you therefore purposely restrict it to "cases similar to that which you brought before the Supreme Court." Does not this vacillation seem to indicate something of the confusion of guilt? Besides, I might maintain, without fear of contradiction, that the very case to which you have appealed, and it is the worst which you could adduce, is not of such a nature as to deserve the appellation "flagitious." Neither reason, nor law, nor "the usages of the world," entitled you to apply to it so villainous a term. But not to insist any farther on this point, I now come forward, and, in my own name, and that of the Calcutta Missionaries generally, DENY, DENY UTTERLY, that there are any other cases in existence similar to that which you brought before the Supreme Court. And I call upon you, as in the presence of the Omniscient God, to come forward and substantiate your charge, or be accounted for ever the utterer and the writer of the basest untruth. There is no other alternative, unless indeed you retract your words, and apologize;—in which case, we are ready, with all our heart and soul, to forgive you.

Think not that you will escape the indignant censure of an impartial public by taking refuge under the cloak of *professional duty*—as if the word *profession* were of the nature of a magical charm, sufficiently potent to charm into silence the voice of the injured and the oppressed,—or, as if it conferred a sort of royal privilege to slander and abuse with impunity. If, as a *professional man*, you cannot adduce "the names of parties," or enter

\* This is the common definition of the word "flagitious"

[† It would appear that, from some expression in my second letter the *terms* of which must have been overlooked, Mr. Clarke has strangely concluded that I wanted no information at all respecting the complainants and their complaints. To undeceive him and others in this matter I crave the attention of readers to the following representation:

Having made special inquiry respecting the intercourse between Barristers and Hindoos, the result has been that *not a single Barrister of Calcutta, except Mr. Clarke himself, appears to have ever been consulted by a Hindoo parent relative to the conduct of Missionaries.* Now this, to say the least, is a singular fact, if we bear in mind that Mr. Clarke's professional business among the natives of India, is not so extensive as that of some other members of the Calcutta Bar, that might easily be named. But, waiving this view of the matter, it would be some extenuation of Mr. Clarke's conduct, if he could have adduced some *proof* of the statement which he has publicly made, viz. that *he has been often consulted on the subject.* The proof that *he was often consulted* would of course, have established nothing to *substantiate* the charges preferred: because it would still remain to be proven whether the complaints of Natives as to "flagitious" cases, were well or ill-founded. But such proof would have exculpated Mr. Clarke, so far as the *fact* of grievous complaints having *often* been made to him, was concerned. He did, however, object to give any information on the subject; and he screened himself behind the plea of "professional confidence." Well, giving him due credit for the purity of the motive that suggested the plea, I shall now endeavour to point out how he might have cleared himself of *part* of the imputation under which he now lies, without any breach of "professional confidence." And as he refused to remove even that part of the stigma that now attaches to him, which it was perfectly consistent with his honour to have done, the alternative as to his conduct must be inevitable.

Supposing Mr. Clarke to have kept copies of his "opinions" on the various cases laid before him, he might have shewn them with their dates and the facts upon which they were formed, either to myself, or to some other individual mutually approved of,—the names of Mr. Clarke's clients having been previously erased. If he had not kept copies of these opinions, he could surely have had no objection to give the names of the solicitors through whom he was consulted. If no solicitors were present, which I ought scarcely to anticipate, as I understand that strict professional etiquette requires a solicitor to be the

into "details of circumstances," I must hold your informants answerable for the calumny, and they ought to be called upon to make good their accusation. And if you knew that neither yourself nor your informants would or could publicly substantiate charges so heinous, I must ever maintain, Sir, that, by the laws of honour and of charity, by the laws of God and of man, you were forbidden to bring them forward publicly at all.

For the present I have done. If I am wrong, I pray God to forgive me, If you are wrong, as I cannot but believe you are, I pray God to forgive you. Let us remember that "it is a small matter to be judged of man's judgment." There is a God in heaven that "searcheth the heart and trieth the reins of the children of men." We may deceive ourselves, we may deceive others, but we cannot elude the glance of his all-seeing eye. And you and I must one day stand before his dread tribunal. Little, oh little will it avail us there, what may have been our subtilty, our reputation, or our triumphs on earth. Now life is very short and very uncertain; and surely it is a solemn thing to die, as after death cometh the judgment. Let us prepare then to meet our God. These things you may call *dreams*. I call them sober *realities*. And my best wish for you is, that you may understand them in time, and so become a genuine child of God; that you may be privileged to sit and reign with him for ever in the realms of glory.

ALEXANDER DUFF.

—  
TO THE REV. ALEXANDER DUFF.

MY DEAR PADREE,—So long a time had elapsed since you obtained my permission to give publicity to our correspondence, that I was beginning to believe that some wiser man than the Rev. Alexander Duff had induced him to consign our letters to oblivion. I had supposed, that some prudent Missionary might have suggested to his Christian brother, that it would be better not to point the public attention to the fact, that one whom Mr. Duff in his complimentary moments described to be "a gentleman of high legal reputation, had, in the presence of the Supreme Court of this land, announced, that the rights of Hindoo parents were too often invaded by the Missionaries of Calcutta." But it appears, my good Sir, that I was mistaken, and although it be true, that delay is one of the indications of prudence, I was wrong in supposing that even reflection could make you wise.

Your letter is now before me, and from that I can learn the cause of your procrastination,—for how strongly does that letter pourtray the struggle between bad passions and Christian habits, and announce that it required ten days before the nature of the man could break through the meekness which Christianity had taught her pastor.

medium of communication with the Barrister, it might have been in Mr. Clarke's power, on the supposition of the cases, or any one of them having been brought before the Supreme Court, without any breach of "professional confidence" to give us the *clue* to find them, as well as the decisions of the judges thereupon. Should it have turned out that none of the cases were brought before that tribunal for judgment, might we not very naturally ask *why* were they *not* brought before the court? The language of Mr. Clarke in the Supreme Court, and throughout his correspondence, has been too plain and unequivocal for any one to mistake the "opinion" which *he* would have given *if* a similar case to that of Brjjonanth Ghose had been laid before him. That the "Hindoo parents" were anxious to avail themselves of any legal remedy within their reach cannot for a moment be doubted, as they are said to have applied expressly to Mr. Clarke for his opinion, as a lawyer, on the subject of their grievances. I need scarcely add, therefore, that, as Mr. Clarke declined giving even the sort of information which has now been suggested, and which he must have known would not trespass on the limits of "professional confidence," his conduct cannot fail to give rise to fresh suspicions, and the untoward nature of his attack on the Missionaries, become shrouded in thicker darkness than ever.]

You have occupied nearly six columns of a newspaper in discussing a question which might have been disposed of in twice as many lines; my charge was this, "that the rights of Hindoo parents were too often invaded by the Missionaries of Calcutta." This induced you to call for an explanation, which I have given, and this explanation you now term a subterfuge, and not satisfied with that term, you proceed to employ other expressions, which will lead the friends of your cause to deplore the imprudence of their champion.

But let me examine how far you are correct in accusing me of subterfuge. I have described the *nature* of the right which I say has been invaded, namely, "the right which every father possesses of rearing up his child in the faith in which he himself conscientiously believes." This surely is intelligible enough; there is no subterfuge here, no concealment of my meaning. There may be no such parental right in existence, but that is a matter of argument, an argument in which I fear I should fail to convince you, at least until some Moollah circumcises your son, or marries your daughter as his fourth wife, and thus brings the case home to yourself by infringing on your own parental rights.

I have then told you *in what* the *invasion* of the right consists, namely, "in the Missionaries' instructing the child in a religion different from his father's, while he is yet of that early age that the right of instruction is in the father." Is there any subterfuge here? I call it a concise and clear statement, and I believe that "the most thinking people" (as Cobbett termed the public) will be very nearly of the same opinion.

If there be no subterfuge in these explanations, then where is it to be found? It can be found alone in my withholding the names of the persons who have complained, and the particulars of their complaint; yet this you do not require, and have implicitly admitted that I ought not to give them. I quote your own words, Mr. Duff, "Now I have no desire to act the part of an inquisitor to search officiously for the *names* of parties, or to pry into the details of specific cases." If you do not want the names of the parties, or the details of the specific cases, what is it, Mr. Duff, that you do want? Surely on every other matter but these, (which you yourself have excepted,) I have been as candid and specific as any man can be, who has no opinion to conceal, nor any anger to vent. But, Mr. Duff, you did want something else, and that, my good Sir, was to vent your anger.

Mr. Duff, you accuse me of unblushing effrontery, and vacillation, and the instance which you give is vastly amusing. You tell me that in my *second* letter I confine the term "flagitious" simply to what I designate an invasion of the rights of Hindoo parents, but then in my *third* letter, I restrict the term to cases *similar* to what I had brought before the Supreme Court. Now, Mr. Duff, had you quoted my letters fairly and fully, it would have appeared that I had not been guilty of any vacillation, nor introduced any *new* restriction in my third letter, inasmuch as that very restriction was in my *first* letter; the words of my first letter are these, "Complaints of conduct *as* flagitious and dangerous *as that* which it became my duty to submit to the Supreme Court." You will tell me that the words "*as that*" do not mean "*similar*"—critically they may not, in common parlance they do—in that species of common parlance at least, which is employed by men who write as I told you I did,—on the spur of the moment.

To whom now, Mr. Duff, ought the term "unblushing effrontery" be applied? Perhaps not to you, for you may be in the habits of blushing sometimes; but if you are not, let me secure for our Calcutta Drury the benefits which will accrue from your first performance in this line. Consent, dear Sir, to front the audience, and read this letter before them, and I will answer for your blushing, and my friend Philip shall perform as an overture,

“Young I am and sore afraid.”

But Mr. Duff, though I have laughed at you, (as I always do at every angry man,) I must have one serious word with “the most thinking people” before I close this letter. True it is, MY PUBLIC, that I have charged the Missionaries of Calcutta with invading the rights of Hindoo parents, and true it is, that the Reverend Alexander Duff has come forward to do battle in their behalf; but in the bottom of the fourth column of the Reverend vindicator’s letter you will find these words written. “What mean these emphatic words? Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I am not come to send peace but a sword, to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother.” Having given us this text, Mr. Duff comments at length upon it, and winds up with this appeal to me. “After this, Sir, need you affect surprise, or evince displeasure, when you hear ‘of the peace of certain families being disturbed by the promulgation of the Gospel?’” Mr. Duff, I have neither affected, nor felt any surprize; and as for displeasure, it is you who have been displeased, not at the peace of certain families being disturbed, but at my saying that such was the case, albeit that you tell me that I need not be surprised at it.

Mr. Duff, I thank you, I will not say, whether it is to your candor or your folly I am indebted for furnishing me with this coup de grace, but nevertheless accept my thanks for it; and,

Believe me, your grateful friend,

LONGUEVILLE CLARKE.

Calcutta, 31st July, 1833.

Respecting the preceding correspondence and remarks, we may here quote one or two recorded opinions. The Philanthropist of the 1st August writes:

“Mr. Clarke, our readers may remember in the case of Brijonauth Ghose, thought proper to assert, that “the rights of Hindoo parents were too often invaded by the Missionaries,” and when very properly called on by Mr. Duff for an explanation, aggravated his charge by accusing them of conduct “flagitious and dangerous.” Mr. Duff again called on him for proof; but this he very dexterously evaded under the ungenerous plea, that what he knew was committed to him professionally! and that therefore, (though forsooth, on such *ex parte* evidence, he was at liberty to accuse a body of honourable and deserving men,) he was not at liberty to give them an opportunity of rebutting his accusation.

“In the remarks appended, Mr. Duff, on the behalf of his brethren of all denominations in Calcutta, has most triumphantly refuted the charge thus gratuitously preferred; and we envy not the feelings of Mr. Clarke, while undergoing the searching scrutiny of his honourable, but keen opponent. Surely the least that Mr. Clarke can do, will be to prove his charges, or to acknowledge his fault in preferring charges without being able to substantiate them.”

Again, the Philanthropist of the 8th August remarks:

“They (our readers) will perceive that though Mr. Clarke thought proper in public court to accuse the Missionaries of Calcutta of too often invading the rights of Hindoo parents, and to decry them in his subsequent correspondence as guilty of conduct “flagitious and dangerous,” yet when called upon for proof of his assertions, he laughs at his own calumnies, and leaves the Missionary body without any charge but what may be equally applied to their Great Master. Happy they whose conduct, when scrutinized, forces from their adversary such a testimony to its propriety and dignity!”

The Indian Register of the same date proceeds thus :

“When first the controversy appeared between the Rev. Mr. Duff and Mr. L. Clarke, we suspended our opinions on the subject, in the hope that it might lead to some explanation on the part of the learned advocate, as to the grounds upon which he cast such ungenerous reflections upon the whole body of the Missionaries, (and even if he had adduced instances where interference with the religious rights and usages of the people might, in worldly points of view, be considered impolitic, we were prepared to argue that the feelings and principles by which the Missionaries were actuated, might be more than a sufficient apology for the interference :) but we were disappointed; the respectful solicitations of the Missionary, embodied in language at once indicative of the scholar and the gentleman, anxious for the removal of an implied stigma on a body to which he belonged, were met by irony and sarcasm, unworthy the talents of the learned advocate, and most assuredly out of place. We are therefore constrained to consider Mr. Clarke’s assertion one of those “mere inferences,” which the customs of society have permitted the bar to resort to occasionally, on the behalf of a client.”

These sentiments, so far as they go, are just, and coincide with public opinion : but we would go farther and say, that Mr. Clarke’s conduct throughout the whole business called forth one burst of indignation, and his reply excited one common feeling of disgust, in the minds of all upright and honourable men. The correspondence affords a lucid commentary on the principles of the man ; and the reply is the severest, bitterest satire that could have been composed on L. Clarke, Esq. Barrister. Of the latter we might truly say with Young in his epistle to Pope :

He rams his quill with scandal and with scoff ;  
But ’tis so very foul, it won’t go off.

The points in which Mr. Clarke *imagines* that he has caught his antagonist *tripping*, are so *very few* and so *very unimportant*, that even if we allowed *his* representation of the case, it would not cause the balance to preponderate one jot in his favour. But we cannot in *justice* allow him the advantage even of the few brittle reeds to which in his last struggle he would gaspingly cling.

With the ready ingenuity of a lawyer, Mr. Clarke *feigns* a reason for Mr. Duff’s delay in publishing the correspondence. But as often happens, he is quite mistaken. The real causes were—*1st*, that Mr. Duff could not allow the letters to appear before the public, without subjoining a series of remarks ; and *2nd*, that *several parts* of the remarks *could not be written till all* the Calcutta Missionaries had been *individually* consulted. As to the insinuation about “passion” and “anger,” it is just *as true* as Mr. Clarke’s other charges. No such cause, we feel assured, actuated Mr. Duff ; neither is there any *semblance* of it to be found in his remarks. He wrote with the *boldness* and the *strength* of conscientious integrity, and with the natural warmth of virtuous indignation. We have reason to know that if his heart was more susceptible of one feeling than another towards Mr. Clarke—that feeling was

unfeigned compassion. It is surely a pitiable evasion for one who is beset with arguments which he cannot answer, to turn round and content himself with the foolish saying, that his opponent is angry and he must laugh; instead of honourably confessing that his opponent is triumphant, and he must acknowledge his error.

Mr. Duff charged Mr. Clarke with "subterfuge" in these words:—"Conscious of my own innocence, and anxious to correct the misstatement, I earnestly entreated you to explain. How did you meet my entreaty? partly by subterfuge, and partly by a reiteration of the charge, &c." Here, Mr. Duff manifestly refers to Mr. Clarke's *two first* letters; for he afterwards proceeds thus:—"You may allege that your inglorious resolve has been changed, and that in your *third* letter you deign to unfold your meaning. Thanks to the public press for this change, and not to your sense of justice, &c." Now, how does Mr. Clarke rid himself of the charge?—By explicitly admitting it! He *only* quotes some explanatory words in his *third* letter, the *absence* of which in the *first two* led in part to the adoption of the term "subterfuge."

In Mr. Duff's *second* letter is contained this passage:—"Now I have no desire to act the part of an inquisitor, to search officiously for the *names* of parties, or to pry into the details of specific cases." From these words Mr. Clarke most strangely infers that Mr. Duff wanted to know *nothing at all* about parties or details; and then, very wisely puts the question, "What is it that you do want?" Never was interpretation more at variance with the very *letter* of a sentence. Mark the words, "inquisitor," "search officiously," "pry into." What do these words denote? They at least imply *undue* and *unreasonable curiosity, importunate forwardness, &c.* And why were these words used by Mr. Duff? Undoubtedly to indicate, that he was disposed and determined to act the part of an honourable man—and *inquire with no greater minuteness into the painful subject than was absolutely necessary for the vindication of himself and his brethren.* The peculiar phraseology employed by Mr. Duff evidently contemplated *the possibility* of his being afterwards obliged to resort to more particular inquiries: but in order to escape the imputation of being *inquisitorial, prying, or officious,* he would forbear descending from *generals to particulars,* until necessity left no alternative. Mr. Clarke's unsatisfactory replies created this necessity: and Mr. Duff then called upon Mr. Clarke *publicly* to substantiate his charges, i. e. he did make known to Mr. Clarke *what* he wanted. Since however the latter does not appear to have understood this part of the subject perfectly, he will find it explained more at large in an additional note supplied by his opponent.

The instance of vacillation adduced by Mr. Duff seems to have afforded some amusement to Mr. Clarke. And we must confess

that Mr. Clarke's defence of it, has in turn afforded no little amusement to us. Mr. Duff's statement was that, in letter *second*, Mr. Clarke appeared to confine the term "flagitious" simply to what he designated "an invasion of the rights of Hindoo parents;"—and that in letter *third*, he restricted it to "cases similar to that which he brought before the Supreme Court." Now, whether vacillation be the proper term to express this difference between letter *second* and letter *third*, can only be an idle question about words: the important point is, that whatever be the cause, *the difference really exists*. How does Mr. Clarke remove the discrepancy?—By allowing that it does exist. How is this?—He merely tells us that, in the circumstance referred to, letter *first* resembles letter *third*—leaving without dispute the original statement unimpaired, viz. that in this particular, letter *second* does *actually differ* from letter *third*.

But this is truly childish stuff; the patience of many must be wearied by it;—and yet it is *the very best* which Mr. Clarke's reply presents. The rest is a tissue of vulgar jokes and rude familiarities—far beneath the dignity of a noble-minded man to put in writing—far beneath the dignity of an honourable man to notice. There is an attempt to laugh in spite of the biting sting of guilt within: but it is like the awkward attempt of a wayward child, who tries, by a forced unnatural effort, to laugh away the disgrace of a merited castigation.

The reply, if it was ever seriously intended to be viewed as such, is worse than a *lusus naturæ*. It is a compound of affected mirth, real bathos, and mangled burlesque: for what does it contain that is at all appropriate? It leaves unaffected every statement of fact in Mr. Duff's remarks; and the inference must be, that there is no statement that can be affected. It leaves unanswered every argument; and the inference must be that the arguments are unanswerable. It leaves unremoved and even unmodified the fearful alternative which involves something worse than *slander*; and the inference must be that there is some invincible necessity imposed for lying under the disreputable imputation.

It were ungenerous in us to pursue any farther a humbled foe: it were cruel to prolong the shout of triumph over him when laid prostrate in the dust. *We* need institute no memorial in commemoration of the signal victory. The correspondence will long survive to testify the wanton and unprovoked nature of the aggression: the remarks will ever prove with what success the aggression has been repelled: and the last impotent reply will do more than sculptured monument to perpetuate the shamelessness of the aggressor, and his irremediable discomfiture.

To conclude, we bear no personal hostility towards Mr. Clarke. We have condemned his acts, but sincerely compassionate the man. Would, that he saw the error of his ways, and repented in

dust and ashes, before God, of his misdoings! Then would the Lord have mercy on his soul; and out of the treasures of his grace would He supply those blessings that might sweeten earth with foretastes of heaven. And then too would the present enemy of God's people be converted into a friend, whose greatest delight might be in doing them honour!

---

VII.—*Sir Edward Ryan's remarks on the conduct of the Missionaries, in the hearing of the case of Brijonauth Ghose.*

From the imperfect reports of this case which appeared in some of the Calcutta journals, the public in general were led to infer, that the learned judge animadverted with unjust asperity on the conduct of the Missionaries generally; and at the time we wrote the remarks on the case which appeared in our last No. we were not possessed of sufficient data to controvert the propriety of the inference. Those who are intimately acquainted with the character of Sir Edward, were somewhat surprised; and others seemed to doubt the accuracy of the reports. If there was misrepresentation, our readers may remark, a single sentence from the Judge, inserted in the public journals, would have obviated all injurious impressions. But this was scarcely to be expected, even if the misrepresentation had implicated character to a much greater degree:—since, if men filling high situations, and having their words and actions constantly exposed to public gaze, were to correct every misconception entertained of their motives, opinions, and conduct; such perpetual correction of errors might eventually absorb the greater part of their time. We are, however, glad to learn from sources on which we can implicitly rely, that nothing was farther from Sir Edward's intention, on the occasion alluded to, than to use expressions tending to throw a slur upon the character and conduct of the Missionaries; whom he has cheerfully acknowledged to be a most respectable body of men, and for whom he has ever entertained sentiments of esteem.

It is but due to Sir Edward Ryan that we should thus correct a mistake that is widely prevalent; record sentiments to him so honourable; and make the only reparation in our power for having given currency to language, that was justly warranted only on the assumption of the accuracy of public reports.

---

VIII.—*Remarks on the present State of the Law of Marriage affecting British Subjects in India.*

A marriage, which has lately been solemnized in the Union Chapel, has given rise to much discussion in the public papers. Its validity, it has been hinted, is doubtful, and the departure from the common, we cannot call it the prescribed, mode of celebration, until we know by what authority, has been characterized as indecent. The question is one in which a large portion of this community is deeply interested, and we think that if we can succeed, by a dispassionate discussion of the subject, in removing the

doubts which have been attempted to be raised, and in shewing that in India a marriage in a Dissenting Chapel is, by the civil and criminal courts, considered as *legal*, as if celebrated, according to the usual forms, in the Cathedral, we shall perform a service acceptable to many of our readers. We might perhaps with justice complain of some observations upon the subject, which would not have been less forcible had they been advanced with more courtesy, and which have not derived any additional weight from the authoritative manner in which they have been urged. But our object simply is to arrive at a correct conclusion, and in endeavouring to do so we shall therefore avoid whatever might be calculated to give offence.

It were indeed strange, if, after our countrymen have been settled for above two hundred years in this country, the way in which they may legally contract the most important engagement in life were a question still open to dispute. Custom has hitherto sanctioned particular forms within the Presidency, which have been likewise observed at those stations in the interior where the Company have provided a Chaplain. At those stations where there has been no clergyman of the established church, the parties have generally thought it necessary to obtain a licence either from the Supreme Court or from the Bishop's Registrar, and the ceremony has been performed by the magistrate of the district, or by the commanding officer of the station. Few persons have given themselves the trouble of inquiring by what authority the particular forms were prescribed. They acquiesced in those which they found established. At length, however, a Dissenter took the trouble of inquiring, whether the ceremony might not be as legally performed by his own minister in his own place of worship, as by the Company's Chaplain in the Cathedral. He satisfied himself that it might, and he was married accordingly. We are now told that the ceremony was irregular, and perhaps invalid. We suspect that the parties starting the objection have no duly considered the consequences resulting from it, and that they would have hesitated to raise doubts as to the legality of the late marriage in the Union Chapel, had they been aware, that, if there be any foundation for them, the children of many of the marriages in the interior are illegitimate. This is a startling position, but we maintain, it is strictly true. The statute of the 4 Geo. IV. c. 91, has been referred to as an act passed *for India*, and as proving that doubts were entertained by the legislature. Where it was discovered that the enactment was made with the particular view of legalizing marriages in this country, we know not. It certainly was not from the act itself, which refers to marriages in Ambassador's Chapels, in foreign countries, and within the lines of a British Army serving abroad. Now, with the *exception* of those in the Indian cantonments, it is easy to point out doubts which might reasonably have been entertained respecting the validity of such marriages, which before the act, to render them legal, ought to have been celebrated either according to the law of the country where the parties were, or of England as it then existed, i. e. according to the provisions of the Marriage Act. These doubts, as we hope to shew, in no way apply to India since the English law was introduced here in 1726. We do not, however, wish to dispute about this question. We are willing to admit that the act referred to, would have made legal the marriages in the cantonments here, had they not been so before. But where, if that statute were necessary, is the act to declare valid the marriages before magistrates at the civil stations? The forms observed in the Cathedral are those directed by the Marriage Act, the 26 of Geo. II. c. 33; if they cannot be dispensed with in a dissenting chapel, by what authority, we ask, are they neglected at a civil station in the interior? Who in India has the power of authorizing the civil ma-

gistrate to perform the marriage service in a private house in the mofussil, if the ceremony cannot be legally celebrated by a dissenting minister in a chapel in Calcutta? The necessity of the case affords no answer to this question.

But the English Marriage Act does not extend to this country. To be satisfied of this, it is not necessary that a lawyer be consulted. Those who will take the trouble of looking at the act will find, that the last words in it are, "provided always, that nothing in this act contained shall extend—to any marriages solemnized beyond the seas." These words are too clear to admit of doubt; the only question is, has the statute, by any subsequent act of the legislature, been extended to India. That this has not been done, we assert, without fear of contradiction. By the charter of Geo. I. in the year 1726, the common and statute law, at that time extant in England, was introduced into the Indian Presidencies, and it has since been generally held by the judges of the *King's* Courts that no subsequent enactments, unless expressly extended to this country, are here binding. The Marriage Act was not passed until many years after the granting of this Charter. A case which occurred at another Presidency, within the recollection of some who are still in this country, is decisive of this question. In the year 1808, C. Teesdale obtained, from the then Governor of Madras, a licence authorizing his marriage with Barbara Ann Latour, who was at the time under age. The licence was afterwards revoked upon the application of the young lady's brother; and the parties, who were both Protestants, were subsequently married by a Roman Catholic priest, according to the form of the Romish Church. The priest, before he performed the ceremony, informed them, that, unless they were both Roman Catholics, the ceremony was invalid. The parties soon after went to England, where the validity of the Indian marriage being disputed, it was decided, in the year 1816, by Sir Vicary Gibbs, in the court of common pleas, to be a legal marriage; "since it was a marriage between British subjects, celebrated in a British settlement, according to the laws of England, as they existed before the Marriage Act; and which, if it had been celebrated there before that statute, would have been valid."

The law of marriage as it now prevails in India, with the single exception of the Scotch Marriage Act, to which we shall afterwards advert, is the law of England as it stood before the year 1726. The state of the matrimonial law of England at the period we have mentioned, is most fully and clearly laid down by Sir William Scott, in his elaborate judgment in the case of Dalrymple against Dalrymple, which has always since been referred to as a conclusive authority upon this subject. From this it appears that in England before the act of Geo. II. marriages were always governed by the canon law, and that, by that law, a contract of marriage entered into *per verba de præsenti*, or in words of the present tense, between persons able to contract, was an actual marriage. The law of England, says Blackstone, considered it in no other light than as a civil contract; the holiness of the matrimonial state was left entirely to the Ecclesiastical Courts. No particular ceremony and form of words were prescribed for its celebration; all that was necessary, as in other cases of contract, was, that the parties contracting should distinctly express their intention. The children of such a marriage were legitimate, and the husband and wife were entitled, in the civil courts, to all the rights arising out of the married state, or to be punished for bigamy by the criminal, if they transgressed the law. If however the husband were obliged to have recourse to the Ecclesiastical Court to establish any right, and the validity of the marriage were there questioned, it was necessary to shew that it had been

solemnized by a person in holy orders. The only authority, we believe, for this is a decree of Pope Innocent III.\*, before whose time the presence of a priest was not required by the Canon Law. In the reign of Queen Ann, an unfortunate Sabbatarian, named Haydon, happened to transgress this decree by having himself married by a minister of his own persuasion, forgetting that that minister was, in the eye of the law, a mere layman. He was told by the court of delegates, in which he sued after his wife's death, that he could not obtain the right which he demanded, *because* he could not prove himself to have been married *per presbyterum sacris ordinibus constitutum*, which had been the constant form of pleading a marriage. We hope it will never be necessary, in order to defeat a husband's rights, to translate this plea, which has not, we believe, yet been used for the purpose, since the pleadings have been in the English language. Should however any of our readers who are husbands, wish to resort to the Ecclesiastical Courts, but be prevented by the Pope's Bull, we can tell them for their consolation, that, while their wives are living, they may at any time, by having the marriage ceremony again performed by a clergyman of the establishment, entitle themselves to all the *privileges* of suing before those tribunals.

The act of the 58 Geo. III. c. 84, declaring certain marriages solemnized in India by ministers of the church of Scotland to be valid, has in no respect altered the law applicable to this country, except in the particular instances to which it relates. The Ecclesiastical Courts would now be obliged, either to acknowledge the Scotch chaplain as a person in holy orders, or the marriage by him to be as valid as if the ceremony had been performed by a priest. With the exception of this change, it merely declares that to be law which was so before. It is, we think, a most inconsiderate piece of legislation, passed without due inquiry as to its necessity; or, supposing it, which we do not admit, to have been necessary, leaving those cases of marriages by officers and magistrates in the interior totally unprovided for: the act referred to as legalizing the former, not having then been passed.

We believe that the above will upon enquiry be found to be a correct statement of the law upon this subject as it now exists in India.

Much has been said about the mischiefs and irregularities likely to arise from this state of the law; and we have heard them urged as a reason for upholding the present system. We freely admit that much mischief may happen: but we deny the expediency of endeavouring to obviate it by an attempt to continue and enforce restrictions, which are not binding. Instead of this a legislative enactment should be obtained, establishing some legal form for the registration of the marriages of Christians and British subjects in India. This too is the more necessary, because there is at present no law to regulate the marriages of East Indians and Native Christians residing beyond the Mahratta ditch. There can be no difficulty in providing effectual checks against secret and irregular marriages, and for preventing marriages, without the consent of parents or guardians, when either of the parties happens to be a minor. Further the legislature ought not to interfere, but to leave the religious part of the ceremony to the feelings and belief of the individuals. We trust we shall never have the English Marriage Act extended to this country. The objections to many of its provisions have been often pointed out; they only require to be

\* The authority of the canons of 1603 cannot be relied upon, since it was decided by Lord Hardwicke, in the year 1736, that as they have not been confirmed by Parliament, they do not bind the laity even when suing in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is, we believe, under the authority of the 103rd of these canons that the marriage licences are here granted.

stated, in order to be admitted by every unprejudiced mind. For who at the present day will not join in condemning a law, by which the Roman Catholics are compelled, at the altar of a church which they deem heretical, to join in a religious ceremony, performed by a minister, who believes their worship to be idolatrous; and the Unitarian is obliged to be married by the form of joining in a service, the prayer of which, according to his creed, is blasphemous. The sincerest friends of the Established Church are the most anxious to see this blot removed from the statute book.

We are glad to find that this subject is now exciting attention at home. On the 28th of last March, Mr. Patten gave notice in the House of Commons that he should move to bring in a bill to legalize the marriage of Roman Catholics by their own clergymen. On the same evening also a select committee was appointed to consider the general state of the laws relating to the registries of births, baptisms, marriages, deaths and burials in England and Wales. Mr. Wilks, by whom the subject was introduced, stated that his plan would render it imperative for the established clergy to keep the registries: but that he was for rendering them, in this respect, rather civil than religious officers.

### DOMESTIC OCCURRENCES.

[Where the place is not mentioned, *Calcutta* to be understood.]

#### MARRIAGES.

##### JULY.

25. At Cawnpore, Mr. J. T. Bony, junior, to Miss Margaret Goldrick.
  27. At Ghazee pore, Captain R. Wilcox, 59th Regt. N. I., to Susan, eldest daughter of George Wilson, Esq.
  30. Mr. T. Clarke, Branch Pilot, H. C. Marine, to Miss Catherine Harris.  
— At the Union Chapel, by the Rev. G. Gogerly, the Rev. J. W. Buyers, of Benares, London Missionary Society, to Miss E. A. Walker, of Aberdeen.
- ##### AUG.
10. Lieut. W. Tritton, 41st N. I., to Mary Anne, only daughter of the late Captain James of the Bengal Army.
  12. George Alexander, Esq. of the Civil Service, to Rebecca, third daughter of W. Molloy, Esq. of Rock Valley in the county of Tipperary.
  14. H. R. Alexander, Esq. H. C. China Civil Service, to Elizabeth Charlotte, second daughter of James Young, Esq. of Calcutta.
  15. At Cuttack, George Becher, Esq. to Miss Eliza Sturrock.

#### BIRTHS.

##### JULY.

25. At Chauleah, Jessore, the lady of V. Jacob, Esq. of a son.
28. Mrs. Henry Cook, of a daughter.
30. At Kamptee, the lady of Captain J. C. Coffin, of a son.  
— At Sultanpore, Oude, the lady of Captain Orr, 58th Regt. N. I., of a son.

##### AUG.

4. Mrs. R. Z. Shircore, of a son.
5. The lady of Captain Sewell, of a daughter.  
— The wife of Mr. Charles Waller, of a daughter.
6. Mrs. N. Alexander, of a daughter.
8. Mrs. V. Rees, of a son.
9. Mrs. W. B. Carbery, of a daughter.
10. Mrs. R. B. Richardson, of a daughter.  
— The lady of the Hon'ble C. R. Lindsay, Esq. of the Civil Service, of a daughter.
12. At Mynpooree, the lady of Lieut. Alston, of a daughter.
15. The lady of P. Durand, Esq. of Nissendypore Factory, Jessore, of a daughter.
16. The wife of Mr. A. Vallente, of a daughter.  
— The lady of Capt. Thomas Rees, of the Lady Amherst, of a daughter.
17. At Mynpooree, the wife of Mr. G. J. Scott, of a daughter.
19. At Chinsurah, the lady of Capt. W. Bell, Executive officer, of a daughter.

## JULY.

## DEATHS.

12. At Neemuch, the infant daughter of G. C. Ponsonby, Esq. 2nd Light Cavalry.
  17. At Nagpore, Henry, the third son of Captain W. Warde, 5th Regt. Beugal Light Cavalry, aged 3 years, 8 months, and 15 days.
  23. At Delhi, Mrs. M. Bruce, lady of Captain D. Bruce, Commanding Palace Guards.
  - At Cuttack, J. Browne, Esq. 3rd Member of Medical Board, aged 68 years.
  25. At Futtyghur, W. T. Garrett, Bengal Artillery, aged 27 years.
  26. At Doorgaporean, Kishnagur, A. McDonald, Esq. aged 42 years.
  28. Mrs. Ann Frances Breen, the wife of Mr. W. C. Breen, aged 25 years.
  30. At Bulliah Indigo Factory, Shahabad, Mr. H. Innis, aged 28 years.
  31. R. W. Bruce, Esq. Deputy Post Master, and Assistant Salt Agent, Diamond Harbour, aged 53 years.
- AUG.
2. At Kamptee, G. H. S. Coffin, son of Captain and Mrs. J. C. Coffin, aged 3 years.
  3. At Futtyghur, Charlotte, youngest daughter of Mr. J. Brierly, aged 2 years.
  - At the Conductor's Quarters, Baloo Ghaut, Thos. Edward Spencer, eldest son of Mr. Conductor T. Spencer, of the Expense Magazine, Dum-Dum, aged 13 years.
  4. Captain André Francois Ballot, Commander of the French Barque Elise, aged 24 years.
  - Of a brain fever, Mr. T. Champion, Chief Officer of the late H. C. Ship Lord Amherst.
  5. Ann Martha, daughter of Mr. R. Wall, H. C. Marine, aged 7 years.
  6. At Bowannypore, the wife of Magazine Serjeant H. W. Spier, of Dum-Dum.
  - Mr. Wm. Mandy, Carver and Gilder, aged 46 years.
  8. Hannah Maria, the beloved wife of W. Braddon, Esq. C. S. in her 43rd year.
  - At Garden Reach, Caroline Mary, the wife of Henry Paulin, Esq. Solicitor to the Hon'ble Company, in her 37th year.
  9. At Madras, T. A. Penman, Esq. late Surgeon, at Calcutta.
  10. F. H. Spencer, Esq. Assistant to the Salt Agent, Barripore, aged 34 years.
  - Anne, infant daughter of the Hon'ble C. R. Lindsay, Esq. of the Civil Service.
  - At Saugor, the daughter of Lieut. John de Fountain, 56th N. I.
  13. Vardon Gasper, Esq. late of Madras, aged 85 years.
  - At Allahabad, Serjt. Alex. McMillan, aged 32 years.
  - At Kamptee, the infant son of Captain Coffin, aged 14 days.
  18. Eliza, youngest daughter of R. Stewart, Esq. aged 11 months and a half.
  - Madame Maria Laplace, aged 36 years.

## Shipping Intelligence.

## JULY.

## ARRIVALS.

30. Ship Emma, from London 29th March.
  31. Bark Fanny, H. Sherwood, from London (date not mentioned), Sydney 24th March, and Singapore 2nd July.
- Passengers from Sydney* :—Captain G. Young, H. M. 38th Regt.; Monsr. Luna-grasse.—*From Singapor* :—C. Rennet, Esq.
- French Ship Lasiene, L'Marie, from Havre de Grace 6th March, and Pondicherry 24th July.
  - French Bark Victoire and Lise, J. T. Carteir, from Bourbon 11th June, and Pondicherry 24th July.
- Passengers* :—Mrs. Filliard; Mrs. Majeste; Dr. Majeste; Miss Filliard; E. Fresquet; G. Kock, and—Bonaffe, Esquires, Merchants;—Filliard, Esq. Advocate General of Chandernagore; Mr. Detour, Attorney at Law.
- Bark Thetis, W. Boothby, from Mauritius 17th June, and Madras 26th July.
- Passengers from Mauritius* :—J. H. Oliver, Esq. Mariner; H. Geoffroy, Esq.
- From Madras* :—J. B. Green, Mariner.
- Schooner Elizabeth, J. Norris, from Moulmein 15th July.
- AUG.
2. The Bark Penelope, P. Hutchinson, from Mauritius 13th June.
  - The Bark Merope, A. Pollock, from Hobart Town, 10th March, Swan River, Lomback, Mauritius, and Madras 28th July.
- Passenger from Hobart Town* :—C. Whitmore, Esq. C. S. *From Mauritius* :—Mr. E. W. Page.
5. The American Ship Mount Vernon, Wm. Whitney, from Boston 18th April.
  - The Bark Prince George, W. McCrea, from London 20th February.
- Passenger* :—Miss Gilbert.

5. The English Bark Jean Graham, J. Dunscombe, from London 22nd March.  
 — The Brig Thomas Dougall, R. Brown, from Mauritius 7th July.  
 — The Bark Skinner, J. R. Gillon, Akyab 4th June, and Basin 18th July.  
 — The Dutch Barque Deidericka, from Batavia (date not mentioned).  
*Passenger*:—Mrs. Bell.
7. The Bark Clarinda, J. Antram, from London.  
 9. The Bark Memnon, R. H. Aikin, from Liverpool 22nd March.  
 — Ship Princess Victoria, J. Hart, from Liverpool 23rd March.
12. Ship Hall, J. Hughes, from Liverpool 23rd Feb. and Bombay 22nd July.  
 — Ship Elizabeth, R. W. Blenkinsop, from Bombay 21st July.
13. F. Ship Cinq Freres,—Ytier, from Marseilles 24th Jan. and Bourbon 4th May.  
*Passengers from Bourbon*.—E. Rossolin, and C. J. Luvecat, Esqs. Merchants.  
 — Ship Margaret, W. Johns, returned from sea leaky.  
*Passengers*:—Mrs. Bolton and children; Mrs. Dundas; Miss Broughton, and Lieut. Dundas.
16. Ship Lady Kennaway, L. W. Moncrief, from London 22nd April, and Madras 8th August.  
*Passengers*.—Mrs. Chambers and child; Miss Orton, Rev. Mr. R. Chambers, Mr. N. C. McLeod, Cadet, and Mr. Dixon.
17. Ship Loujee Family, J. H. Johnston, from Bombay 31st July.
19. French Ship L'Courier de St. Pierre, F. Besque, from Nantz and Pondicherry (date not mentioned).  
 — Bark Capricorn, R. Smith, from Liverpool 23rd January, Cape of Good Hope and Colombo (date not mentioned), and St. Pedro 8th August.
21. Brig Joanna, R. Paterson, from Greenock 22nd April.  
 — Bark Egyptian, W. Lilburn, from Bombay 31st July.  
 — Schooner Mary, Thos. Daniel, from Rangoon 6th August.
23. American Ship Lion, J. Rick, from Boston 15th May.  
 — Bark Swallow, W. Adam, from Rangoon 13th August.  
*Passengers*:—Captain G. Burney, 38th N. I., W. Spiers, and W. Roy, Esquires, Merchants. 1 Havildar, 1 Naik, and 8 Seapoys, 38th Regt. N. I.

## Acc.

## DEPARTURES.

4. Ship Cavendish Bentiuck, R. A. J. Roe, for Bombay.  
 — Ship Indian Oak, E. Worthington, for Mauritius.  
 — Brig Onyx, Wm. Chamber, for Mauritius.  
 — The Brig Ripley, R. Lloyd, for Liverpool.  
 — The Bark Bahamian, J. Pearce, for Mauritius and Liverpool.  
 — The Bark Renown, G. McLeod, for Mauritius.
7. Bark Fifeshire, R. Allport, for China.  
*Passengers for China*:—Mrs. Allport and children. *For Singapore*:—McKay, Esq. Captain Welland. *For Penang*:—Mrs. Bristow; Major Bristow.  
 — Ship Robert, H. Blyth, for Liverpool.  
*Passengers for London*.—J. Wilkinson, Esq.; W. J. Dry, Esq. and J. Somerville, Esq.
8. Bark Judith, W. Ager, for Mauritius.  
 — Brig Industry, A. Combes, for Mauritius.  
*Passenger per Industry, for Isle of France*.—Mr. Underwood, Civil Service.
9. Brig Galatea, W. Tayte, for Mauritius.  
 — Ship Hydross, P. D. Trezevant, for Bombay.
10. General Gascoyne, J. Fisher, for Madras.
11. Bark Will Watch, William Barrington, for Penang and Singapore.
16. Ship William Wilson, J. H. Miller, for Port Louis and Mauritius.  
 — Bark Falcon, D. Ovenstone, for China.  
 — Bark Research, A. Ogilvie, for Madras.
17. Bark Sylph, R. Wallace, for China.
20. French Ship Laseine La Marie, for Havre de Grace.  
 — Bark Clarinda, J. Antram, for Mauritius.
21. Ship Arab, T. S. Sparkes, for London.  
*Passengers*:—Captain Hicks, late of the Lord Amherst, and W. H. Tincler, Esq.  
 — Ship Imogen, J. Richardson, for Mauritius.  
 — French Ship Velocifere, A. Rouden, for Bourbon.  
 — Schooner Dalla Merchant, W. Allen, for Rangoon.
22. Brig Thetis, W. Boothby, for Madras.
23. Brig Nelson Wood, S. Ball, for Mauritius.

Meteorological Register, kept at the Surveyor General's Office, Calcutta, for the Month of July, 1833.

Day of the Month.	Minimum Temperature observed at Sunrise.				Maximum Pressure observed at 9h. 50m.				Observations made at Apparent Noon.				Max. Temp. and Dryness observed at 2h. 40m.				Minimum Pressure observed at 4h. 0m.				Observations made at Sunset.				Rain, Old Gauge.	Rain, New Gauge.							
	Observed Height of the Barom.	Temper. of the Mercury.	Of the Air.	Of an Evap. Surface.	Wind.	Direction.	Obsd. Ht. of Barom.	Temper. of the Mercury.	Of the Air.	Of an Evap. Surface.	Wind.	Direction.	Obsd. Ht. of Barom.	Temper. of the Mercury.	Of the Air.	Of an Evap. Surface.	Wind.	Direction.	Obsd. Ht. of Barom.	Temper. of the Mercury.	Of the Air.	Of an Evap. Surface.	Wind.	Direction.			Obsd. Ht. of Barom.	Temper. of the Mercury.	Of the Air.	Of an Evap. Surface.	Wind.	Direction.	
1	29.706	81.6	80.2	80.	S. E.		.742	85.	85.8	84.4	S. W.	.748	84.4	83.1	81.6	.670	85.	89.2	85.2	S.	.650	86.8	91.2	87.	S. W.	.646	85.8	87.3	85.	S. E.	.074	.065	
2	.648	83.	82.4	80.7	S. E.		.676	85.6	87.6	84.3	S.	.674	86.9	91.8	86.7	S. W.	.620	87.7	92.	87.5	S.	.600	88.4	90.5	86.7	S.	.618	86.	86.5	84.3	S. E.		
3	.702	81.9	80.8	80.1	S. E.		.734	84.7	84.8	82.6	S.	.716	85.8	88.	85.	S.	.676	86.2	88.2	86.6	S. E.	.650	86.3	87.7	85.7	S. E.	.656	84.1	84.6	83.8	S.	.025	.020
4	.694	80.8	80.3	80.4	S. E.		.728	82.5	82.	81.7	E.	.718	82.8	81.4	80.5	S.	.676	82.9	81.3	80.3	S. E.	.650	83.8	83.5	81.8	S. E.	.784	79.	75.	76.3	at sw	.092	.085
5	.682	78.3	78.5	77.9	E.		.710	82.	83.5	81.	E.	.702	83.3	83.7	83.	S. E.	.656	85.5	85.6	84.3	S. E.	.618	85.	86.8	85.6	S. E.	.634	82.9	83.1	83.3	S. E.	.056	.047
6	.674	82.1	81.6	80.8	E.		.724	85.	86.4	86.	N. E.	.692	85.0	88.3	86.4	N. E.	.670	85.	85.2	84.	E.	.654	84.1	83.9	83.1	E.	.682	82.	81.5	81.2	E.		
7	.682	82.3	80.7	80.6	E.		.796	84.5	85.9	84.2	N. E.	.754	85.1	87.8	85.5	N. E.	.732	85.	85.9	84.8	N. E.	.714	84.	84.5	84.7	N. E.	.732	82.1	81.	80.6	E.		
8							.786	84.	85.3	84.2	S. E.	.752	85.5	88.3	86.	S. E.	.706	86.5	89.9	87.5	S. E.	.684	86.8	90.	87.3	S. E.	.692	86.	86.1	85.4	S. E.	.015	.013
9	.714	81.5	81.3	81.	S. E.		.674	85.5	87.	85.	S. E.	.694	86.3	89.	87.	S. E.	.630	87.4	92.1	89.	E.	.608	87.1	90.2	88.6	N. E.	.602	86.6	87.2	87.	S. E.		
10	.722	81.7	81.6	81.2	S. E.		.682	86.3	87.4	85.8	E.	.666	87.2	88.9	87.4	E.	.630	88.3	92.4	88.8	S. E.	.614	89.1	92.2	89.5	N. E.	.624	85.6	83.7	82.9	E.		
11	.710	83.4	81.9	81.5	S. E.		.694	86.6	90.2	87.3	E.	.680	87.3	91.7	88.4	E.	.638	87.	88.1	86.2	S. E.	.620	86.9	87.	86.	N. E.	.638	86.7	85.8	84.7	N. E.	.052	.048
12	.698	83.9	82.5	81.9	N. E.		.704	86.	86.	84.2	N. E.	.670	85.6	85.	84.	N. E.	.626	85.2	84.2	83.3	N. E.	.604	85.5	84.9	84.1	S.	.620	84.1	82.5	81.8	E.	.052	.045
13	.626	83.3	81.9	81.6	E.		.654	84.8	84.9	83.5	N. E.	.638	85.	85.4	83.5	N. E.	.606	84.7	83.8	82.8	N. E.	.588	85.1	85.	84.	S. E.	.602	84.	82.6	81.9	S. E.	.018	.018
14	.652	82.9	80.6	80.4	S. E.		.690	83.5	82.5	82.2	E.	.644	84.7	85.	83.5	S. E.	.612	84.7	85.	84.	S. E.	.628	84.	84.6	83.8	S. E.	.652	84.1	83.	82.3	S. E.	1.34	1.16
15	.664	83.3	80.7	81.	S. E.		.700	84.	82.9	82.7	S. E.	.680	85.	85.3	84.8	S. E.	.634	85.5	86.8	85.2	S. E.	.650	85.	85.2	83.9	S. E.	.658	84.2	82.6	82.1	S. E.	.038	.030
16	.676	83.5	82.	80.7	S. E.		.718	84.1	83.3	82.2	S. E.	.694	85.5	87.6	84.5	S. E.	.670	83.4	81.2	81.	E.	.642	83.7	82.7	80.6	E.	.646	84.3	83.4	81.4	E.		
17	.692	82.9	80.6	80.	S.		.734	84.	85.9	82.	S. E.	.720	85.4	87.6	84.3	S. E.	.676	85.7	88.1	85.	S. E.	.658	85.5	87.5	84.6	S. E.	.678	85.	83.8	82.8	S.	2.10	1.93
18	.708	83.2	82.5	82.	S.		.746	84.3	83.1	82.2	S.	.700	84.5	83.5	82.5	S.	.662	84.3	83.	82.3	S. E.	.646	84.6	83.6	82.8	S.	.668	83.4	82.8	82.3	S.		
19	.696	81.9	79.8	79.9	S.		.732	83.	81.2	80.6	S. W.	.716	82.2	80.3	80.1	S. W.	.684	82.7	81.6	80.3	S. W.	.652	83.3	81.7	80.8	S. W.	.676	82.6	81.	80.6	S. E.	1.54	1.30
20	.704	82.9	82.	81.7	S. W.		.748	84.2	85.2	83.9	S. W.	.730	84.	82.5	82.	S. W.	.678	84.	83.3	81.7	S. W.	.676	84.3	84.5	82.5	S. W.	.694	83.8	83.7	82.4	S.		
21	.686	81.5	79.5	79.	S.		.710	82.	81.6	81.2	S.	.692	82.8	82.3	81.7	S.	.654	84.3	85.	84.2	S.	.652	84.7	85.2	84.	S.	.680	83.9	83.8	82.8	S. E.	2.14	1.97
22	.678	81.9	79.	79.	S. E.		.726	83.2	84.8	82.	E.	.710	84.	86.2	83.9	N. E.	.666	85.2	88.2	86.3	E.	.638	85.3	88.	85.2	E.	.650	83.8	83.	82.5	E.	.010	.010
23	.736	81.5	80.	80.	N. E.		.722	84.	85.5	83.1	E.	.720	84.	85.	82.6	N. E.	.668	86.2	90.5	85.9	N. E.	.656	86.6	89.1	84.7	E.	.672	84.2	84.	83.1	S. E.		
24	.698	81.6	80.1	80.1	E.		.740	84.8	86.2	84.8	E.	.692	85.1	86.5	84.5	E.	.670	85.2	83.7	83.8	E.	.652	86.	89.	86.3	S. E.	.674	84.8	84.4	83.5	S. E.	.008	.006
25	.694	81.7	80.6	80.3	S. E.		.740	84.1	85.	83.7	E.	.718	85.2	89.	85.6	E.	.664	86.	86.4	86.2	E.	.654	85.2	85.	83.8	S. E.	.660	84.6	83.4	83.2	S. E.	.060	.050
26	.698	81.9	80.9	79.5	N. E.		.728	84.7	86.	84.2	S. E.	.692	85.8	87.5	86.	S.	.642	85.7	86.4	85.3	S. E.	.618	85.7	86.2	86.	S. E.	.652	85.5	85.8	84.7	S. E.	.006	.006
27	.656	81.5	80.	79.4	S. E.		.710	85.4	87.2	86.2	S. E.	.676	86.3	89.2	86.9	S. E.	.640	87.	90.	86.5	S. E.	.620	87.	89.4	86.3	S. E.	.626	85.8	86.3	83.2	S. E.	.086	.070
28	.668	82.1	81.3	79.7	S.		.706	86.	87.5	85.8	S.	.688	87.	91.	87.3	S.	.652	86.7	88.3	86.	S. E.	.620	86.4	87.5	85.2	S. E.	.628	84.1	83.	82.6	S.		
29	.604	82.4	81.6	81.	W.		.652	86.	89.3	87.	S. W.	.622	87.4	92.	88.2	S.	.600	87.4	88.	87.2	S. E.	.548	84.	81.8	81.6	N. E.	.550	84.3	82.5	82.	S. E.		
30	.632	83.5	82.3	81.9	N. E.		.646	86.	88.1	84.8	N. E.	.618	87.2	90.8	86.2	N. E.	.568	84.3	82.3	81.5	N. E.	.556	84.2	82.7	81.6	E.	.576	84.	82.8	81.2	E.		
31	.578	80.9	79.7	79.7	S. E.		.620	83.3	81.2	80.6	S. E.	.620	83.7	82.7	81.1	S. E.	.572	83.9	84.1	81.8	S. E.	.594	84.	82.5	82.	E.	.610	81.3	79.2	79.7	VAR.		

## NEW BOOKS,

*Just received from England by the Graham and other arrivals,  
and for Sale on Commission at the Exchange Sale Rooms, at ex-  
tremely low rates, as will be seen by refering to the London Prices  
inserted below. Applications to be made to Mr. A. MAITLAND.*

Valpy's Divines of the Church of England, comprising in 22 vols. 8vo. neatly half bound in cloth, Sherlock's Works in 5 vols.—Dr. Barrow's Works, with some hitherto unpublished Sermons of the Doctor, in 7 vols.—Jeremy Taylor's Works in 5 vols.—Hall's Contemplations in 3 vols.—Fawcett and Powell's Sermons in 1 vol. and Ogden's Discourses in 1 vol. with a <i>Life of each author—</i> a <i>Summary of each Sermon or Discourse</i> , and <i>Notes</i> , &c. by the Rev. T. S. Hughes, B. D. of Em. Col. (London Price £7 5s.)	70 0
Alexander's Costumes of England—Russia—Austria—Turkey—and China, Illustrated with Two Hundred and Seventy-four Coloured Engravings, with letter-press descriptions, 5 vols. imperial 8vo. half bound in morocco, . . . . .	(£15. 15s.) 100 0
Ayscough's Complete and Comprehensive Index to Shakspeare, new edition, 8vo. half cloth, . . . . .	(£1 4s.) 7 0
Ambrose Looking unto Jesus, with all the other Works of this Author, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(10s. 6d.) 5 0
Analysis of the Calendar of the Church of England and perpetual Guide to the Almanac, illustrated with a variety of Anecdotes and descriptive Sketches of the year, and authenticated by references to Scriptural and other Authorities, by the Rev. Hugh Martynedale, A. M. neatly bound, . . . . .	(4s.) 2 0
Ainsworth's Latin and English Dictionary, improved by Dr. Dymock, in one thick 18mo. vol. Seventh Edition, with Index of Proper Names. . . . .	(7s.) 5 0
Arabian Nights' Entertainments, complete in one vol. 12mo. fancy boards, . . . . .	(8s.) 5 0
Baker's Sermons, from Porteus's Lectures, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(9s.) 4 0
Barclay's Apology for the True Christian Divinity, being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the people called Quakers, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(9s.) 4 0
Baxter's Saints' Rest, New Edition, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s.) 2 8
Baxter's Poor Man's Family Book, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(2s.) 1 0
Beauties of Washington Irving, with Illustrations, 18mo. boards. (4s.)	2 8
Belcher's Poetical Sketches of Biblical Subjects, partly Original partly Selected from the most esteemed Poets, illustrative of the Sacred Volume, 12mo. cloth, . . . . .	(3s.) 2 0
Belcher's Interesting Narratives from the Sacred Volume, illustrated and improved, shewing the excellence of Divine Revelation, and the practical nature of True Religion, 2 vols. 12mo. half calf, (13s.)	8 0
Berkeley's (Bishop) Works, containing the Principles of Human Knowledge; New Theory of Vision; Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher; the Analyst; a Defence of Free Thinking, &c. &c. with an Account of his Life, 3 vols. 8vo. boards, (£1. 11s. 6d.)	15 0
Berthold's Comparative Dictionary of the German and English Language, square 12mo. sheep . . . . .	(5s.) 2 8

Beveridge's (Bishop) <i>Private Thoughts on Religion and on a Christian Life</i> . A new edition, edited by the Rev. C. Bradley, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, and a list of his Works, 12mo. boards, .. .. .	(5s.)	3	0
Beltrami's <i>Pilgrimage in Europe and America</i> , 2 vols. 8vo. Plates, boards, .. .. .	(£1 11s. 6d.)	10	0
Bingley's <i>Economy of a Christian Life</i> , foolscap 8vo. boards, (5s. 6d.)		3	0
Boarding School; or, <i>Familiar Conversations between a Governess and her Pupils</i> , 12mo. boards, .. .. .	(4s.)	2	0
Booth's (Abraham) <i>Reign of Grace</i> , 12mo. boards, .. .. .	(4s.)	2	0
Bouilly's <i>Tales for Mothers</i> , 12mo. boards, .. .. .	(6s.)	3	0
Blair's <i>Sermons</i> , complete in 1 vol. 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(12s.)	6	0
Buchan's <i>Domestic Medicine; or, Treatise on the Prevention and Cure of Diseases</i> , 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(9s.)	4	0
Burnet's <i>Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England</i> , new edition, 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(9s.)	6	0
Burnet's <i>History of the Reformation of the Church of England</i> , 6 vols. 18mo. plates, boards, .. .. .	(£1. 10s.)	15	0
Bradford's (Rev. John) <i>Select Works</i> , containing <i>Sermons and Godly Meditations</i> , 12mo. boards, .. .. .	(4s.)	2	8
British Poets—Cabinet Edition—comprising in 4 vols. 12mo. nearly 60 vols. of "Johnson's Poets," and including many recent Authors, in lieu of those of inferior merit, with Portraits, neatly bound in Silk, lettered, and the edges gilt, .. .. .	(£2 10s.)	24	0
Brown's <i>Union Dictionary</i> , 12mo. sheep, .. .. .	(10s. 6d.)	6	0
Brown's <i>Dictionary of the Holy Bible</i> , an Historical and Descriptive Account of the Persons and Places recorded in the Scriptures, 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(14s.)	7	0
Brown's <i>Diamond Concordance of the Scriptures</i> , 24mo. bds. .. .. .	(4s.)	2	0
Butler's <i>Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed</i> , 12mo. (4s. 6d.)		3	0
Cameron's <i>Token for Children</i> , 2 vol. 18mo. half bound, .. .. .	(5s.)	3	8
Carpenter's <i>Lectures on Biblical Criticism and Interpretation</i> , 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(12s.)	5	0
Carpenter's <i>Examination of Scripture Difficulties</i> , elucidating nearly 700 Passages in the Old and New Testament, second edition, 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(12s.)	5	0
Child's <i>Own Book</i> , (the) illustrated with nearly 300 Engravings. New Edition, with considerable Additions, extra boards, (7s. 6d.)		5	0
Citizen's <i>Pocket Chronicle</i> , including the Customs, Charters, Rights, and Privileges of the Citizens of London, royal 12mo. bds. (7s. 6d.)		4	0
Clark's <i>Demonstration on the Being and Attributes of God</i> , 8vo. boards, .. .. .	(9s.)	5	0
Complete <i>Governess</i> , or a course of <i>Mental Instruction for Ladies</i> , with a Notice of the <i>Principal Female Accomplishments</i> . By an Experienced Teacher, post 8vo. calf, .. .. .	(9s.)	4	0
Crabbe's <i>Dictionary of General Knowledge</i> , or <i>Explanation of Words and things connected with all the Arts and Sciences</i> , illustrated with several hundred beautiful cuts, second edition, corrected and enlarged, 12mo. bound in neat Turkey morocco, and the edges gilt, .. .. .		10	0
Crabbe's <i>Poetical Works</i> , including the <i>Borough</i> , <i>Tales</i> , and <i>Tales of the Hall</i> , 5 vols. 8vo. half cloth, .. .. .	(£2 12s.)	15	0

Crawford's (Rev. W.) <i>Dying Thoughts</i> , recommended by the Rev. Alex. Waugh, D. D. 12mo. boards, . . . . . (3s.)	1 0
<i>Death-bed Scenes and Pastoral Conversation</i> , by the late John Warton, D. D. 3 vols. boards. fine edition, . . . . . (12s.)	8 0
Dewhurst's <i>Human and Comparative Phrenology</i> , plates, 18mo. boards, . . . . . (3s. 6d.)	2 0
Dwight's <i>System of Theology</i> , in 1 vol. imperial 8vo. boards, (£1. 4s.)	14 0
Edwards's <i>History of Redemption</i> , on a plan entirely original, with the life and Experience of the Author, new and corrected large type edition, 8vo. cloth, . . . . . (6s.)	4 0
Enfield's <i>Scientific Recreations in Philosophy and Mathematics</i> , with amusing Secrets in various Branches of Science, fourth edition, 12mo. boards, . . . . . (3s.)	2 0
Evans's <i>Sketch of the different Denominations of the Christian Religion</i> , a new edition, 12mo. boards . . . . . (5s.)	3 8
Evans' <i>Golden Centenary, or One hundred Testimonies in behalf of Candour, Peace, and Unanimity: by Divines of the Church of England, of the Kirk of Scotland, and among the Protestant Dissenters, with their Biographies concentrated</i> , 5th edition, with Portraits, 12mo. cloth. . . . . (5s.)	3 8
<i>Family Magazine</i> , by Mr. Shoberl, editor of <i>Ackenman's Forget Me Not</i> , 2 large vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . . (10s. 6d.)	5 0
Fergusson's <i>Lectures on Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Hydraulics, Pneumatics, Optics, Geography, Astronomy, and Dialling</i> , a new edition, by C. F. Parington, with Plates, 8vo. boards . . . . . (10s.)	5 0
Fisher's <i>Young Man's Best Companion</i> , in boards, . . . . . (3s. 6d.)	2 0
Forster's <i>Encyclopædia of Natural Phenomena</i> , 12mo, bds. (10s. 6d.)	4 0
Flavel on <i>Divine Providence</i> , 12mo. boards, . . . . . (3s. 6d.)	2 0
Flavel's Works, containing in 2 vols. 8vo. a Treatise on the Divine Conduct, or the Mystery of Providence—Saint Indeed, or the great work of a Christian opened and pressed—Husbandry Spiritualized, or a New Compass for Seamen, and a Pathetic and Serious Disuasive from the horrid and detestable Sins of Drunkenness, Swearing, Uncleanness, &c. &c. printed on a large type, cloth, (16s.)	6 0
Flavel's <i>Husbandry Spiritualized</i> , or the heavenly use of earthly things, 8vo. cloth, . . . . . (5s.)	2 0
Fletcher's (Rev. John) Works, with a Life by the Rev. Abraham Scott, complete in 2 vols. 8vo. printed verbatim from the original edition bound in cloth, . . . . . (£1.)	10 0
<i>Frugal Housewife</i> , (the) dedicated to those who are not ashamed of Economy, to which are added Hints to Persons of Moderate Fortune. 12mo. boards, . . . . . (2s.)	1 8
Gay's <i>Fables</i> , with numerous Embellishments, 18mo. sheep, . . . . . (2s.)	1 0
<i>Gesta Romanorum</i> , or entertaining Moral Stories, invented by the Monks, as fire-side recreations, and commonly applied in their Discourses from the Pulpit: whence the most celebrated of our own Poets and others have extracted their plots. Translated from the Latin, with Preliminary Observations and Copious Notes, by the Rev. Charles Swan, late of Catherine Hall, Cambridge, 2 thick vols. 12mo. boards, . . . . . (16s.)	6 0

"They (the Monks) might be disposed occasionally to recreate their minds with subjects of a light and amusing nature; and what could be more innocent or delightful than the "Stories of the *Gesta Romanorum*."—*Douce's Illustrations of Shakspeare.*

Gordon's (Rev. Sir Adam) fifty-two Lectures on the Catechism of the Church of England, 3 vols. 8vo. bds. . . . .	(£1. 11s.)	7	0
Graham's (Dr.) Account of Persons remarkable for Health and Longevity. with Maxims for the Gouty, Paralytic, and Asthmatic, 2d Edition, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(8s. 6d.)	3	0
Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, with Engravings, 3 vols. 8vo. half calf. . . . .	(£2 15s.)	20	0
Grattan's (Right Hon. Henry) Miscellaneous Works, now first collected. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(12s.)	4	0
Gray's Works, containing his Poems and Correspondence, with Memoirs of his Life and Writings, 2 vols. post 8vo. bds. . . . .	(15s.)	4	0
Gurney's (Rev. W.) Diamond Pocket Dictionary of the Holy Bible, consisting of an Historical and Geographical Account of the Persons and Places, and an Explanation of the Terms, Doctrines, Ordinances, Institutions, Precepts, and Figures of the Sacred Oracles, 24mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	8
Hampton's translation of the General History of Polybius, 5th edition. 2 vols. 8vo. bds. . . . .	(£1. 1s.)	8	0
Harding's (Mr. Justice) Miscellaneous Works, by Nicols, 3 vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£2 2s.)	15	0
Harris's Hermes; or, Philosophical Inquiry concerning Universal Grammar. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(7s.)	4	0
Harris's Philological Inquiries, 2 vols. 8vo. in one, boards, . . . . .	(12s.)	6	0
Hayward on the Science of Agriculture: comprising the Investigations of Mr. Kirwan and Sir Humphrey Davy's Agricultural Chemistry, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(12s.)	5	0
Hervey's Meditations and Contemplations, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	0
Hill's (Rev. Rowland) Village Dialogues, the twenty-sixth edition, enlarged by several additional Dialogues, 3 vols. 12mo. bds. . . . .	(13s. 6d.)	9	0
Howett's British Sportsman, 70 Plates 4to. boards, . . . . .	(£3 13s. 6d.)	20	0
Hunter's Sacred Biography, or the History of the Patriarchs being a course of Lectures delivered at the Scots Church, London Wall, 2 vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£1. 1s.)	10	0
Hufeland's Art of prolonging Life, by Dr. Graham, . . . . .	(9s.)	3	0
Hutton's Book of Nature Laid Open, in a Popular Survey of the Phenomena and Constitution of the Universe and the Appearances of Nature during each month in the year. By the Rev. W. Hutton, A. M., 6th edition, 12mo. extra boards, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	0
"If this interesting volume could but get into the hands of our youth of both sexes, whose minds are vitiated, or are in danger of being vitiated, by Novels or Romances, what important effects might it not, in process of time, operate upon them. Every page of it supplies topics of rational conversation."			
Hawker's (Dr.) Commentary on the New Testament, with the Sacred Text at large, 3 vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£2. 2s.)	12	0
Johnson's Dictionary in Miniature; with an alphabetical account of the Heathen Deities; Table of Remarkable Events, Discoveries, and Inventions; Men of Learning and Genius, &c. &c. 20th improved edit. 18mo. sheep, (per doz. 17 Rs.) . . . . .	(3s.)	1	8
Johnson's Rasselas, beautiful pocket edition, neatly half bound, . . . . .	(2s.)	1	8
Jonas' Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Gauging as now practised in London, &c. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(12s.)	6	0

NEW BOOKS FOR SALE.

Jones' History of the Christian Church, from the Birth of Christ to the 18th Century, including the very interesting account of the Waldenses and Albigenses, 5th edition, revised and corrected, with an Additional Preface, containing Strictures on a recent Publication by W. S. Gilly, M. A. 2 vols. 8vo. boards. . . . .	(£1. 4s.)	13	0
Jortin's (late Rev. Dr.) Sermons, edited by Rev. G. Whitaker, 3 vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£1. 4s.)	10	0
Kennedy's Instructions to Mothers and Nurses on the Management of Children in Health and Disease; comprehending directions for regulating their Diet, Dress, Exercise and Medicine, with a variety of Prescriptions adapted for the use of the Nursery and an Index of Medical Terms, by Jas. Kennedy, M. D. 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(7s.)	4	0
Law's Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, nineteenth edition, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s. 6d.)	3	0
Lawson's Farmer's Practical Instructor, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(14s.)	7	0
Lobb's Contemplative Philosopher, or Short Essays on various Objects of Nature, as noticed throughout the Year, 2 vols. 12mo. bds. (16s.)		6	0
Lee's Dictionary of Practice in the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, second edition, 2 vols. royal 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£3 3s.)	20	0
Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, 3 vols. 8vo. new edit. boards, . . . . .	(£1. 4s.)	9	0
Lloyd's Inquiry into the most important Question—What it is to Preach Christ, and what is the best mode of Preaching him? 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(9s.)	4	0
M'Lean's Works, new edit., containing Christ's Commission, Discourses, Paraphrase on the Hebrews, Sermons, &c. with an Original Memoir, 7 vols. 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(£3. 10s.)	20	0
Manual for Invalids, by a Physician, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(5s.)	2	0
Mason's Sabbath Companion, suited for the Family or Closet, consisting of Meditations: Doctrinal, Experimental, and Practical, for each Lord's Day throughout the year, 8vo. half cloth. . . . .	(9s.)	4	0
Mason's Spiritual Treasury, for the Children of God, consisting of a Meditation for every Morning and Evening in the Year, founded upon select Texts of Scripture. With a recommendation by the Rev. W. Romaine, complete in one vol. cloth boards, . . . . .	(18s.)	8	0
Mason's Student and Pastor, or Directions how to attain to Eminence and Usefulness in those respective characters, to which are added a Letter on Elocution and Pronunciation, by John Mason, M. A., author of a Treatise on Self-Knowledge, new edition, with additions, and an Essay on Catechising, by Joshua Toulmin, D. D. 12mo. cloth, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	0
Miller's Inquiry into the Present State of the Statute and Criminal Law of England, 8vo. boards, . . . . .	(9s.)	4	0
Mitchell's Portable Encyclopædia; or, Dictionary of Arts and Sciences on the Basis of Dr. Gregory's, comprehending the latest Improvements in every Branch of Knowledge, 8vo. boards, 50 engravings, . . . . .	(£1. 1s.)	14	0
Modern Pulpit Eloquence, Selections from the Popular Discourses of Eminent Divines, 24mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	8
Montesquieu's Reflections on the Causes of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire, 12mo. boards, . . . . .	(4s.)	2	0

- Trial of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, &c. for a conspiracy, and abduction of Miss E. Turner, post 8vo. boards, . . . (6s. 6d.) 3 0
- Turner's Fashionable Letter Writer, or Art of Polite Correspondence, consisting of Original Letters on every occurrence in life, written in a Concise and Familiar Style, and adapted to both sexes, to which are added Complimentary Cards, Petitions, Wills, Bonds, &c. by R. Turner, B. A. A new edition, revised throughout, and improved by the insertion of many new Letters, by W. Limming, of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 18mo. extra boards, . . . (3s.) 2 0
- WALKER'S PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY, new edition of 1832, beautifully stereotyped, with a Portrait, 8vo. half cloth, (9s.) 4 8
- The same work elegantly bound in strong calf, . . . (13s.) 6 8
- The Mother's Method of Instructing her Children at Home, on the Mutual System. By Walter Bromley, Esq. late Travelling Agent to the British and Foreign School Society, with Lithographed Engravings, sq. 12mo. cloth, . . . (2s.) 1 0
- Watts's Divine Songs, Cuts, 18mo. half bound, (per doz. 4 Rs.) (6d.) 0 6
- Watts's Scripture History, 12mo. boards, . . . (4s. 6d.) 3 0
- Watts's World to Come; or Discourses on the Joys and Sorrows of Departed Souls, 12mo. bds. . . . (4s. 6d.) 3 0
- Watts's Remarkable Events in the History of Man, post 8vo. boards, . . . (12s.) 5 0
- Wesley's (Rev. John), Sermons, the whole, with Life, by the Rev. S. Drew, in 2 large vols. 8vo. bds. . . . (£1. 1s.) 10 0
- Willison's Sacramental Directory, 12mo. boards, . . . (3s.) 1 0
- Wine Drinker's Manual, 12mo. boards, . . . (6s. 6d.) 3 0
- Whiston's Josephus, to which are added three Dissertations concerning Jesus Christ, John the Baptist, James the Just, God's command to Abraham, &c. 4 vols. 8vo. bound in 2, neat calf, (£1 12s.) 14 0
- Wright's Advice on the Study and Practice of the Law, with Directions for the Choice of Books. Addressed to Attorney's Clerks, post 8vo. boards, . . . (8s.) 4 0
- "We are happy in finding a volume which may safely be recommended to every Clerk at an Attorney's desk, as a clear, concise, and useful guide to those studies and pursuits which will make him the better Attorney and the better Man. It will open to his mind various sources of information, from which during the period of his Clerkship, he may derive the most important advantages, and it will teach him the most apt and judicious mode of pursuing them."—*British Critic.*
- Young Woman's Companion, or Youth's Instructor, thick 8vo. vol. calf, lettered, . . . (15s.) 8 0
- Zelucca, or Educated and Uneducated Women, 3 vols. 12mo. boards, . . . (£1 1s.) 4 0
- Zimmerman on Solitude, or the effects of occasional retirement on the Mind, the Heart, &c. a beautiful 8vo. edition, embellished with several fine Engravings, boards, . . . (12s.) 4 0
- The Book of Common Prayer*, new edition of 1832, in beautiful embossed binding, edges gilt, at 4 Rs. per copy.
- Children's Drawing and Writing Boxes*, with 12 cakes of Color, Brushes, Pencils, Ink Glass, Steel and Patent Pens, and Wafer, at 4 Rs. each.
- Children's Work Boxes*, with Scissors, Thimble, Needle Case, Bodkin, &c. and a Looking Glass, at 4 Rs. each.

# CALCUTTA DEPOSITORY.

## NEW BOOKS

RECEIVED PER "HOOGHLY" AND "MARGARET."

(Continued from last month's Observer.)

### ORTHODOX AND ESTEEMED WORKS IN DIVINITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, &c.

*The whole in half-calf (12mo.), unless otherwise described.*

Leland (Dr. J.) on the advantage and necessity of the Xtian Revelation, 2 vols. 8vo.	20
Leslie's (Rev. A. of Monghyr) Vision; and Memoir of Mrs. E. Leslie.....	3½
— (Rev. C.) Short and Easy Method with Deists, Essay, &c. by Russell, 18mo.	3
Locke's (J.) Reasonableness of Christianity, 8vo.....	10
Luther's Commentary on Galatians, 8vo.....	12
— Treatise on Justification; Epistle to Leo X, &c.....	24
Lucas's (Dr. R.) Enquiry after Happiness, 2 vols. 8vo.....	16
Lawson's (Dr. G.) Discourses on Esther, 1809.....	5
— Lectures on the History of Joseph, 1812, 2 vols.....	10
Lyson's (Rev. D.) 15 Sermons, taken from Jeremy Taylor, 1818, 8vo.....	9
Mason's (W.) Spiritual Treasury, revised by H. C. Mason, 2 vols. 8vo.....	18
— — — — —, 1 vol. 8vo.....	12
— Christian's Sabbath Companion, 1817, 8vo.....	9
— Crumbs from the Master's Table, 32mo. half roan 1 Rupee, 64mo. calf,...	1½
— Prayers for every Morning and Evening in the Week, 32mo. stitched,...	½
— Believer's Pocket Companion, 32mo.....	1½
— (J.) Treatise on Self-Knowledge, 24mo.....	3
M'Ewen's Grace and Truth, Explanatory of the Old Testament Types, &c.....	4
Macgowan's (Rev. J.) Works, 2 vols. 8vo. boards Rs. 12, half calf,.....	16
— Death, a Vision, 18mo.....	14
— Looking Glass, 18mo.....	2½
— Dialogues of Devils, 2 vols. 18mo.....	5
— Socinianism brought to the Test, 18mo. boards 2, half calf,.....	2½
Macknight's Harmony of the Gospels, Maps, &c. 2 vols. 8vo.....	20
— Translation of the Epistles, Notes, &c. 4 vols. 8vo.....	40
— — — — —, 1 vol. royal 8vo.....	20
— Truth of the Gospel History evinced, 1763, 4to.....	20
Maclaurin's (Rev. J.) Works, with Rev. J. Brown's Essay,.....	7
Marshall's Gospel Mystery of Sanctification.....	4
Meade's Almost Christian Discovered, 32mo. half roan,.....	1½
Milner's History of the Church of Christ, continued to the death of Melancthon, 6 vols.	25
Meikle's Solitude Sweetened, 12mo. Rs 6, 8vo.....	9
— Traveller, and Converse with the World Unseen, 12mo. Rs. 6, 8vo.....	9
Milman's History of the Jews, 3 vols. 18mo.....	18
Mann's Theological Essays, cloth,.....	3½
Moore's (Rev. Charles) Sermons, 3 vols. 8vo.....	30
More's (Mrs Hannah) Works, 11 vols. sm. 8vo. portrait.....	100
— Practical Piety, 8vo.....	12
— Christian Morals, 8vo.....	12
— Essay on the Character, &c. of St. Paul, sm. 8vo.....	12
— Spirit of Prayer, 18mo.....	6
— Bible Rhymes, wood cuts, 32mo. half roan,.....	2
— Moral Sketches, foreign and domestic, 8vo.....	10
— Essays on the Manners of the Great, &c. 8vo.....	8
— Hints on the Character of a Princess, 2 vols. 8vo.....	14
— Strictures on Female Education, 2 vols. 8vo.....	14
— Stories and Tales, 2 vols. 8vo.....	16
— Poems, complete, 8vo.....	10
— Search after Happiness, and other Poems, 32mo.....	3
Morgan's (H. D.) Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce, 2 vols. 8vo.	30
Mortimer's (T.) Lectures on the Influences of the Holy Spirit, 8vo.....	11
Morison's Lectures on the Reciprocal Obligations of Life,.....	7
— Councils to a married Pair, 32mo.....	1½
Muir's Sermons on the Seven Churches of Asia,.....	6
Mourner's Companion (The), Essay by Dr. Gordon,.....	5
Mark's (R.) Devotional Testament, 4to.....	16
Morris's Remains of A. Fuller, Notes, &c. 8vo.....	6
Modern Pulpit Eloquence, 24mo.....	4

## TWINING'S CLINICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

A few copies still remain for sale by Messrs. THACKER and Co., at St. Andrew's Library, Calcutta. Price 16 Rs. From the following remark, which concludes the announcement of this publication in JOHNSON'S Journal and Review, it appears to have been as favorably received in England as in India. Dr. JOHNSON says, "This work should be in the hand of every medical man who sails for our Eastern possessions."

Mr. TWINING'S work on CHOLERA, published in London, may also be had at St. Andrew's Library. Price 5 Rs.

---

### BAPTIST MISSION PRESS,

*Circular Road, Calcutta.*

Authors and Publishers are respectfully informed, that at the BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, 11, Circular Road, Books and Pamphlets in the various languages of Europe and Asia continue to be printed on moderate terms, and with the greatest attention to correctness and elegance.

Specimens of different publications printed at the Baptist Mission Press, in Bengalee, Mahrattee, Sanscrit, Hindoostanee, Hindoowee, Persian, Siamese, &c. &c. may be inspected on application to the Superintendent.

Roman and Oriental Types of different characters and sizes, with Europe Printing Paper and Ink, constantly on sale.

N. B. No Binding executed at the Baptist Mission Press, except of works printed there—No business transacted on the Lord's Day.—The Conductors do not hold themselves responsible for the sentiments of any Work issued from their Press, unless they are themselves the Editors.

September 1, 1833.

---

*Lately published, in one volume 4to., neatly bound and lettered, and to be procured of Messrs. Thacker & Co. Price 36 Rs.*

## CONSTRUCTIONS

BY THE

OCURTS OF SUDDER DEWANNY AND NIZAMUT ADAWLUT

OF THE

REGULATIONS AND LAWS,

*For the Civil Government of the whole of the Territories under the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal. Complete from 1798 to Dec. 1831.*

---

Also the following useful works :—

REPORTS of CASES determined in the Court of NIZAMUT ADAWLUT, for 1830.....	Rs.	5 0 0
Regulations of Government, for 1831, Chronological Series.....		4 8 0
—————, Molony's Series.....		5 0 0
————— for 1832, Chronological Series.....		3 8 0
—————, Molony's Series.....		4 0 0

---

*This day is published, Price five Rupees, 8vo. bound, in cloth,*

A COLLECTION OF PROVERBS, BENGALI AND SANSKRIT,

With their Translation and Application in English.—By the Rev. W. MONTON, Senior Missionary of the Incorporated Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.