





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,

AND

THE RIGHT REV. W. J. TROWER,

BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY.

GLASGOW:

MAURICE OGLE AND SON;

R. GRANT & SON, EDINBURGH; F. & J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1849.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T .

It will be obvious that the following Letters were not intended for publication. As, however, an inaccurate account of the Correspondence has got abroad, it has been thought advisable by the parties concerned in it, that the Letters themselves should be published.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WISTON RECTORY, *December 12, 1848.*

MY LORD DUKE,

It is with much reluctance and regret that I address your Grace on the matter which will form the subject of this letter: viz., the fact that your Grace received the holy communion last year at Paisley, (in the diocese of Glasgow,) and the possibility that your Grace may present yourself, either at Paisley or at some other church in my diocese, for the same purpose at the ensuing festival. I think it due to your Grace, and in every way the most prudent as well as manly course, to inform you, that having been consulted on this subject by the clergyman who administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to you last Christmas, I have informed him that I cannot sanction, under existing circumstances, a similar admission of your Grace to that holy communion.

It is possible, indeed, that the occasion which he has contemplated as not improbable, may not present itself; but I had rather run the risk of over-caution in a matter of this kind, than that of either having the question raised at the very time of so solemn an act of devotion, or else of admitting to communion one, whose recent publication breathes throughout so bitter and contemptuous a spirit towards the church at whose hands he had so recently received the sacrament of our blessed Saviour's body and blood.

Your Grace will, I trust, believe that it is most painful to me thus to bring myself before your notice; nothing would induce me to do so but a sense of duty, and a resolution not to avoid any responsibility which fairly devolves upon me; and I the more regret the occasion,

as I understand that the course which your Grace has taken in your exalted station, is such as, in many respects, to entitle you to the sincere respect of your fellow-countrymen.

I have the honour to be,

Your Grace's faithful Servant,

W. J. TROWER,

Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

ROSENEATH, 18th December, 1848.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 12th, intimating that I labour under sentence of excommunication within the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. I have to thank you for the expressions of regret with which you have accompanied the performance of what you describe to be a very painful duty.

Did I imagine that the body to which you belong is the only one in Scotland entitled to administer the ordinances of the Christian Church, this might be a serious penalty. But I generally communicate with another body, which to others I am apt to call the "Church of Scotland," but which, I fear, you consider better described as the "Form of Schism" established here. It is only on accidental occasions that I have sometimes communicated with the Episcopal Church in Scotland. I do not anticipate, therefore, any serious inconvenience from your spiritual censures.

I am not accurately informed as to the extent of power granted to the ministers of your church in excluding from the communion those who may seek admission. I do not know whether it is practically arbitrary from being undefined; or whether any line has been drawn up to which the exercise of such a power is legitimate, and beyond which it would be unlawful, or, at least, irregular. Practically, however, this question is of little importance. No man can desire to receive the communion from a reluctant, or an angry minister; whilst few men, probably, are so weak as to believe that the disapprobation

of any minister is a bar to his partaking of it from more willing hands.

I have had occasion to know, however, that the mere fact of being a Presbyterian by baptism or education, is not of itself considered in the Episcopal Church of England a disqualification for receiving the communion at her hands. Although your branch of the same church seems ambitious of distinguishing characteristics, I question whether any of her ministers would think themselves justified in refusing the communion on this ground alone. Indeed they must be too well aware of the semi-Presbyterianism of many of her members. Accordingly, I observe, that you make no allusion to the general fact of my being a Presbyterian, but have thought it necessary to assign a farther and a special reason for your communication.⁴

This reason seems to me to call for some remark.

You say that I have displayed throughout my recent work, a "bitter and contemptuous spirit" against the Episcopal Church in Scotland: and you allude, as an aggravation of this charge, to the fact, that I had, nevertheless, received the communion at her hands.

I presume, that before forming your judgment on my "spirit" so decidedly as to entitle you to make this communication, you have felt it to be your duty to read my "Essay" carefully. I conclude, therefore, that you have seen the expression of my feeling that "considered as a branch of the Church of England which gradually, and by legitimate means has successfully struck root in Scotland," your church is "thoroughly entitled to sincere respect." (p. 231.)

I must farther conclude, then, that the strong reprobation I have expressed, and shall ever express when occasion requires, of the crimes of the old "Prelacy" of Scotland before the Revolution, is what you condemn as a "bitter and contemptuous spirit;" and farther,—that you so sympathise with the course of that former party, and so identify your own existing church with it, that you look upon reprobation of the one to be reprobation of the other also, and thus consider my "bitter and contemptuous spirit" as directed against yourselves.

I deeply deplore this conclusion on your part, but I do not deplore it on my own account. It is one which does not tell creditably. May I beg of you, therefore, to be more explicit? May I ask you to specify what particular condemnation passed by me against the old Prelacy of Scotland do you appropriate as passed against the present Episcopal Church in Scotland? Is it that against the corruption of the "Tulehans," or that against the double dealing of Adamson

Spottiswoode, and Sharpe; or that against the tyranny of Laud; or that against the course of the same party under Charles II. and his brother?

There is only one other part of my Essay to which you can possibly refer. I have also expressed strong reprobation of the spirit in which certain writers of a literary society (happily defunct, I understand) speak of the church and worship of the majority of their countrymen. That spirit, you will not deny, is both "bitter and contemptuous." If, therefore, it is my exposure of this spirit which has moved your censure, it follows that your dislike of "bitter and contemptuous" speaking on such subjects, depends, like that of many other men, on whether it is employed for, or against the opinions of your own party.

I am quite aware that I have no special right to push these questions, because I have no special interest in your answer. I am not a member of your church, and am personally indifferent whether the chapels of your Diocese are open to me, or shut. But though, consequently, your act is of no importance in its effects, it is of great importance in its principle. I trust, and I know that there are very many members of your church, including almost all its laity, who would be ashamed of claiming sympathy with the course of the old "Prelacy" of Scotland, and who would condemn as strongly as I have done, all the crimes committed in its cause. I am really curious to know whether the free expression of their opinion on such matters would subject them in the nineteenth century, to the penalty of excommunication.

I do not know, Right Reverend Sir, what may be your idea of the impressions under which Christians must approach the communion in the Episcopal Church in Scotland. You must be aware that your members include every variety of opinion on such questions of ecclesiastical history. Yet I would suppose from your strange communication to me, that no one is, in your opinion, fit to enjoy the Christian festival in your church, who does not revere the Tulchans, cherish a pious memory of Laud, and, above all, refrain from designating Presbytery as a "Church," or under any other phrase than a "Form of Schism."

For my own part, I can assure you, that strong as my opinions are on the sins which have been committed in the name of Prelacy in Scotland, and strongly as I condemn any cherishing of its evil spirit in our own day, I should be ashamed of feeling under the slightest temptation to bring any thought on such subjects to the Rails of the Altar. I am never disposed to allow these questions to interfere with the intercourse of private life: still less would I suffer them to intrude

in moments of devotion. I should deeply regret to be the occasion of such a sin in others. Therefore, I would not wish to communicate again with the clergyman at Paisley. It would be painful to me to feel, (as since your letter I should have too good ground to do,) that when administering the holy communion he might be remembering with a grudge my "Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," or thinking, as of an insult to his own church, over my character of the "Tulchans."

What I have said by argument and implication, I will now say directly, following your example of straight-forward dealing. I have very little doubt that you and this Paisley clergyman think you are only acting under a strict sense of duty. But I have quite as little doubt that you mistake the impulse under which you have come to this conclusion. I believe that impulse to be personal irritation, arising out of wounded party-spirit. I assure you, I do not say this from any angry feeling. If I had the honour of your personal friendship, your communication would not have impaired it on my side. I draw my inference from the clearest evidence. There is nothing in my Essay which many members of your church might not have written; there is nothing of which many have not already heartily approved. It is possible to be member of a church, and yet have no sympathy with the passions associated with its former course, or the crimes committed in its name. I believe, accordingly, that the party with which I fear you are connected,—that party which in the grasp after a national history, cherishes kindness for the Tulchans, and warm sympathy with the prelates whom *Middleton* and *Lauderdale* could support, but with whom *Leightoun* could find no fellowship,—I believe this party to be a small one in your church, your laity do not belong to it. You do that church wrong when you identify that party with it. It is in virtue of membership with this party that alone you could have felt my Essay so keenly. It is against the spirit and opinions of this party that I have expressed the strong disapprobation which you interpret into a "bitter and contemptuous spirit" against your church. I deny and disclaim any such spirit in the Essay. I view the Episcopal Church in Scotland as a branch of the Church of England, and as such "entitled to sincere respect." But even if every one of its ministers were of the spirit which I most condemn, this would make no difference to me. I never think what may be the opinions, or the prejudices, or the passions of a minister from whom I receive the communion. The people ought not to think of such

controversies when they receive: the clergy ought not to think of them when they administer.

When I published the Essay I was not unprepared for symptoms of irritation from more than one quarter. I confess, however, that I hardly expected them to appear in such a form. I knew indeed that as clergymen deal in holy things they are very apt to vent their irritation in performing the duties of their office. This is the peculiar temptation of your order. I beg of you to reflect whether, in this instance, you have not yielded to it; and I trust that on consideration you will yourself dismiss, and instruct your clergy to dismiss, feelings of pique and irritation from such holy ground. I am sure that you must be acting very wrongly when you select the communion table of a Christmas festival as the place and the occasion for testifying your opinion of my "Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland."

I beg to apologize for any thing in this letter which may seem to you unnecessarily personal or offensive. I have not wished to go beyond the open and straight-forward statement of the view I take of your excommunication.

I am,

Right Reverend Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ARGYLL.

WISTON RECTORY, *December 20, 1848.*

MY LORD DUKE,

If I had the honour of being personally known to your Grace, I think you would acquit me of having acted under an impulse of "personal irritation, arising out of wounded party-spirit." I could not, indeed, have accepted the office to which I have most unexpectedly been called, unless I had the deepest conviction of the Divine institution of Episcopacy; but "party-spirit," I most unfeignedly abhor; and I should be altogether unfit for that office, (unworthy of it I own myself to be,) if I were capable of acting in such a matter under "personal irritation." My feelings towards your Grace are

those of a minister of Christ towards one whom a mistaken sense of duty is leading to devote his high gifts and excellent moral and intellectual qualities against the truth, rather than for it. They are feelings, in which (may I say, though personally a stranger, and in so different a sphere of life,) real personal regard is mixed with deep regret at the course which you have thought proper to take.

Allow me to observe, that your Grace misconceives the effect of my letter, when you say that you labour under a sentence of excommunication within my diocese.

I have pronounced no such sentence. Having been consulted by one of my clergy, I have informed him that I could not give my sanction to the admission of your Grace to communion in his church; and I thought it due to him and also to your Grace, to inform you of this reply. But I have taken no step to inform my clergy generally of what I have done; nor at the present moment do I think of doing so. It is one thing to pass an official sentence, or even to volunteer and circulate the expression of a strong opinion; and another, when consulted by those who have a right to ask my advice, to give it plainly.

In the unhappy conflict of religious opinion which is the inheritance of the present generation, especially in Scotland, I think much tenderness is due to those who have been trained under influences which lead them to a view of Divine truth far different from what approves itself as truth to my own mind, and what I believe to have been the doctrine of the church of God from the beginning. On this account, I am not one to recommend violent acts or sweeping denunciations; but I own that I cannot understand how conscientious persons can, in England, present themselves at the altars of the church, and in Scotland call themselves Presbyterians; nor could I consciously and formally sanction the admission to communion in the church of those who are in the habit of communicating with other denominations of Christians.

With regard to your Grace's book, I do not wish to enter into a controversy which would naturally result from an examination of particular passages. The passage to which your Grace refers, p. 231, had not escaped my attention. It is, however, my deliberate opinion that the writer of that book should neither seek, nor be admitted, to the holy communion in a church, the characteristic difference of which from the principles of Scottish Presbytery, is its acknowledgment as Divine truth of a doctrine which the writer of this book (p. 236) believes to be "the emptiest superstition." The church does not, indeed,

exact, as terms of communion, a formal acknowledgment of what she holds as the truth in this matter; but it is one thing to abstain from exacting such a formal acknowledgment as terms of communion, and another, to admit to communion any one who openly—I must say, I think in a bitter and contemptuous spirit—repudiates it in a deliberate and elaborate publication.

Let me just add, that of course I am not concerned to defend the various means which were taken to introduce and establish what I believe to be the truth, in Scotland. Your Grace, indeed, is, as I understand, a young man; and I think you will see reason hereafter to acknowledge that your able historical statement is (as often happens) one-sided: but certainly I do not wish to defend the means taken to establish Episcopacy in Scotland. Neither am I concerned, as your Grace seems to suppose must be the case, to maintain its historical claims to nationality. My part is simply to bear witness to it as the truth; and this I conceive that I should have failed in doing, had I (especially after your Grace's publication,) given any other reply than that which I gave to the clergyman who consulted me as his bishop.

With sincere prayer that your Grace may be led by the guidance of God's Holy Spirit so to employ your talents as, through the merits of our blessed Saviour, to attain a joyful resurrection,

I am,

Your faithful Servant in Christ,

W. J. TROWER,

Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

ROSENEATH, *December 22, 1848.*

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

I am much obliged to you for your letter of the 20th, since in defending what I must think a wrong course, its spirit is such as demands respect.

I am aware that the communion has long been unfortunately regarded by many as the peculiar token of what I may call *sect-*

membership, to distinguish this idea from *church-membership*, in a larger and truer sense. Your position, therefore, is perfectly intelligible, when you say you cannot conceive how any Presbyterian can conscientiously partake of the communion in the Episcopal Church. But I take a wholly different view of the communion. I conceive that it is a "Remembering of Christ,"—not a remembering of any thing else, of Episcopacy, of Presbyterianism, of Tulchanism, or any other "ism" whatever. One thing only I regard as in all ordinary circumstances necessary, viz.: that we be convinced that the Body and its ministers, along with whom we may communicate, are in all essentials true branches of the Christian society, and as such, entitled to celebrate its ordinances. I conceive the Episcopal Church to be such a Body. Therefore, I can as conscientiously communicate with it as with any other Body of which I entertain the same general opinion.

I do not hope to content you with such lax adhesion. I am aware that the clergy of almost all churches claim much more exclusive homage. But, except on the naked principle that no man ought ever to partake of the communion with any Body of which he is not actually a member, I cannot see that your course in this instance is defensible. Let me beg your attention, for a moment, to the more special grounds suggested by the wording of your letter.

You say that the characteristic difference between the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church is the acknowledgment, by the former, as a "divine truth" of a "doctrine" which I condemn as the "emptiest superstition;" and you conclude that therefore I ought neither to seek, nor be admitted to communion in the Episcopal Church.

Now what is the "doctrine" condemned by me as the "vainest superstition?" this—that Episcopacy is the corner stone of the christian temple, and that no Body organized without it is entitled to the name or privileges of the Christian Church.

This is the "doctrine" I condemn as the "vainest superstition:" and you now inform me that the acknowledgment of this as a "divine truth" is the "characteristic" of the Episcopal Church.

May I beg to be referred to your authority for this statement? Do you really, on reflection, believe yourself to be entitled to lay down this definition of the "characteristic" of the Episcopal Church? You must be quite aware that many of the greatest men in the history of that church, including, I think, almost the whole of the early English Reformers, held no such "doctrine," and would have condemned it, as

I do, as the vainest superstition. You must also be aware that a very large portion of the members of that church, both in England and Scotland, have no belief in this "doctrine." It may be prevalent among a greater or less number; but you have no warrant whatever for asserting that it is an essential characteristic of the church. To state this is to prove it. It is a notorious fact. It is therefore quite impossible that you can consistently maintain this as a ground for excluding from the communion.

You seem to be aware of this; and accordingly you draw a strange distinction between those who merely think, and those who also *write*. Thousands who, like me, disbelieve the "doctrine," and think of it, as I do, an "empty superstition," may be winked at, and tacitly admitted to communion: but those who venture to express their unbelief (especially in "elaborate publications") are unfit to "remember" Christ at a communion table in the Episcopal Church.

Need I represent to you farther the invalidity of both the above reasons, or need I suggest that two bad reasons do not help to make one good one?

But there is one other reason, suggested by the wording of your sentences. It may not be my unbelief in the doctrine—not my elaborately expressing it—but the "bitter and contemptuous" spirit in which I do so. This is at least a better reason than the other two. If it were true it might be valid; but I will content myself with asking yourself is it the true reason? If it be, I make no objection: only I shall hope to see your censures impartially applied. When any of the fanaticisms of the Presbyterian History are alluded to in "bitter and contemptuous terms," I will hope that your disapprobation will be shown as readily; and if the example is followed, there will be a marked improvement in the tone of the writings emanating from the adherents of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

But I think it due to the spirit in which your last letter is written, to assure you that I have no bitter or contemptuous feeling towards those who hold the doctrine, pronounced by you to be a characteristic of the Episcopal Church. I do indeed think that doctrine to be an "empty superstition"—"empty" in itself of all good influence on the character and functions of the Christian Church; and "superstitious" in its origin and nature. But many good and excellent men hold it. Many good men also hold other doctrines which you would describe as empty superstitions,—such as the bishop of Rome's supremacy.

I hardly know what value you would have me to put on the distinc-

tion you draw between "excommunication" over your whole diocese, and exclusion from the Paisley chapel. But whatever that value may be, I beg to remind you that your first letter distinctly referred, not alone to that chapel, but specially to all "other chapels in your diocese."

I sincerely believe that in the answer to this clergyman you have not consciously been acting under any feeling but that of a sense of duty. And so far as he is concerned, I think the answer was right in one respect. He would not have been in a fitting state of mind to administer the communion to me if he had remembered my Essay with such irritation. But you must excuse me when I say, that so far as any thing in that Essay is concerned, the disqualification was on his side, not on mine. Except on the principle of the communion being the token of sect-membership, there is no ground there for objecting to my admission which will stand a moment's reasoning. I accept your "deliberate opinion" as to the impropriety of one who condemns the "doctrine" you refer to, ever communicating with the Episcopal Church, with all the respect which is due to any "deliberate opinion" of a minister of the Christian Church. But I receive it also with the judgment which must be passed upon a "deliberate opinion," which would equally exclude from the communion much wiser and better men belonging to that church itself. I receive it with the judgment which must be passed upon a "deliberate opinion" which would have excluded Dr. Arnold. He not only thought against this "doctrine," but wrote against it too, and that in terms stronger, and much more forcible than mine. He is, in this respect, but one of many. You are therefore clearly wrong when you lay down as an essential characteristic of the Episcopal Church, a doctrine which is that of a party, not of a church, of a party, large indeed and respectable, but of a party still, and a party only.

I thank you very sincerely for your good wishes, and willingly accept them in the spirit in which I believe them to be given.

I remain,

Right reverend Sir,

Yours faithfully,

ARGYLL.

WISTON RECTORY, *December 26, 1848.*

MY LORD DUKE,

In writing to your Grace, it was, no doubt, my hope that you would abstain, in consequence of my letter, from presenting yourself at the holy communion in my diocese. It is not, however, my intention at present to issue any notice on the subject to my clergy in general. If any of them should consult me, I shall feel it my duty (and it is very truly a painful one,) to give the same reply which I have given to the clergyman at Paisley.

I need not remind your Grace, that in the early, and, as I believe, the purest ages of the church, the sin of schism (as the sin of heresy,) was regarded as among the greatest of which a Christian could be guilty. In the existing state of things,—especially in the case of those who inherit from their parents a system consecrated, in their view, by many sacred and affecting associations,—I quite admit (as I admitted in my last,) that much tenderness should be exercised in laying down terms of communion. I should be slow to exclude any, of whom it was possible to assume that they “drew nigh” in faith and penitence, and with due reverence to the church, at the hands of whose ministers they were seeking so great a benefit. It is plain, therefore, that I would in this way tacitly admit many, of whose opinions and practice, in respect of church-membership, I could not formally approve; and cases might occur, in which, were I formally consulted, I should feel myself bound to give an opinion, which I should not have thought it necessary to volunteer. In any instance, however, in which the person seeking communion had made himself notorious by publicly opposing any of the doctrines of the church, I should consider that in his case, the difficulty of assenting to his admission was much enhanced; and this the more, in proportion as the spirit in which such opposition had been manifested was violent, contemptuous, or irreverent.

Your Grace disclaims any bitter and contemptuous feeling towards the church of which I am a chief minister. Your disclaimer, as far as it goes, is creditable to your sense of what is due to that branch of the Universal Church. But your publication is an overt act, which you have (I fear) no thought of recalling or qualifying; and the expression which I quoted, as virtually applied to a belief in the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and in its being essential to the completeness and authority of a church,—viz., that this belief is “the emptiest superstition,”—this expression is, in my honest judgment, both bitter and contemptuous; and this use of it must have a most material bearing on

the question, whether the avowed Presbyterian who uses it, (and who is in open communion with the Presbyterian body,) shall be admitted to communion in a church, distinguished from his own by the very belief that Episcopal ordination is essential to a due administration of the sacraments.

It is not for me, on such an occasion as this, to write a treatise on the Divine institution of Episcopacy; nor on the church's doctrine on the subject. It is sufficient for me to observe, that a belief in its necessity, wherever it can be had, pervades her whole system, and all her Prayer Book. Declaring that the due administration of sacraments is essential to the very being of a church, (Article XIX. ;) and that sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, (Catechism;) and that they must not be administered by any but lawful ministers, (Article XXIII. ;) and that it is Christ's commission and authority that gives them their validity, (Article XXVI. ;) and that *none shall be admitted to holy communion, until they are confirmed, or are ready or desirous to be confirmed*, (Rubric;) by her whole practice and her whole ordinal from beginning to end, she declares her mind as to what is to be taken for "lawfulness" in those who claim to administer the sacraments of Christ. There may be too many who hold a doctrine on such subjects far short of what is the doctrine of their church. Your Grace, however, must, I think, see that a Bishop of the church, when called upon for a formal opinion, must give it, not according to the lax interpretation put upon the formularies of his church by individual members, but by his own conscientious judgment of what is their plain and natural meaning.

In conclusion, I would wish to remind your Grace, with all possible gentleness, that a man is not the best judge in his own case. You disclaim a bitter and contemptuous spirit; but it is for you to reflect that in the deliberate judgment of one whom your Grace acknowledges as a minister of Christ, you have written what may be justly characterised by those terms. Of course I may be mistaken in my judgment, and in the course which I have taken. I have only to say, that I give it under a distinct sense of the responsibility which I incur here and hereafter. If your Grace should ever hear of any expressions of mine which seem to you bitter and contemptuous, I will thank you if you will trouble yourself so far as to remind me of my fault. I would wish to avoid such expressions myself, and to discountenance them in others. The rule which I have at least proposed to myself, and by which, in this correspondence, I have endeavoured to be guided, is to

speaking the truth; *i.e.* what I honestly believe to be the truth, and what I think myself responsible for bearing witness to as truth,—to speak the truth in love.

Thanking your Grace for any expressions by which you have intended to soften the apparent harshness of the wording of some of your sentences,

I am,

Your faithful Servant,

W. J. TROWER,

Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

WISTON HURSTPERPOINT, *January 23, 1849.*

MY LORD DUKE,

I regret to find that the recent correspondence between your Grace and myself has become very generally the subject of conversation in Scotland and elsewhere; and as the part which I have taken seems to be, in many respects, inaccurately stated, I write to inquire whether your Grace would object to the printing of your letters, together with my own, merely for private circulation.

Probably in writing the letters, your Grace did not contemplate such a step as I am venturing to propose:—certainly my own wish and endeavour was, to avoid the necessity for any greater degree of publicity in this transaction than was inevitable. But I know no reason why your Grace should be unwilling that your letters should be printed: and my wish is, that if this transaction be spoken of at all, the part which I have taken should be known accurately.

Your Grace will not for a moment suppose that I attribute to any inaccuracy on the part of your Grace, the misconceptions which seem to exist as to what has taken place: we all know how common report soon distorts or mis-states, what was at first accurately detailed.

I have the honour to be,

Your Grace's faithful Servant,

W. J. TROWER,

Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

ARDENCAPLE, 25th January, 1849.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

I have this evening received your letter of the 23d, and am by no means surprised that you should wish to correct various misrepresentations which have arisen from common report respecting our late correspondence. I have not the least objection to the printing, or even to the publication of that correspondence, should you wish it to be published; indeed various persons to whom I have shown it had recommended that such a course should be taken. I should not, however, have thought it worth while; but as erroneous versions have been published, (one in the *Church and State Gazette*,) I think it very natural that you should wish to give a correct impression.

I have showed the correspondence to several private friends—both your letters and my own; but of course I am not responsible for the mistakes which have been circulated.

I see nothing which should induce either party to wish to avoid publicity. The letters were not indeed written with that view; but they concern a question of some general interest on which, I presume, neither you nor I am inclined to recede from the opinions expressed in those letters.

I am,

Right Reverend Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ARGYLL.

