

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LI.

MARCH.

[Vol. V.]

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, &c.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF SERVETUS, IN LETTERS TO THE REV.
JEDEDIAH MORSE, D. D.—LETTER I.

[The following Letters were addressed by a learned Unitarian, in America, to Dr. Morse, of the same country.—The English language is not the native tongue of the writer, which will account for some peculiarities in the construction of his sentences, and for his use of words and idioms which on this side of the Atlantic, at least, will be esteemed illegitimate and uncouth.—The candid spirit which pervades the “Sketch,” will, we trust, no less than the information which it contains, be a recommendation of it to the Reader. *Edit.*]

Dec. 1, 1807.

Dear and respected Sir,

Sennebier’s account of the fate of Michael Servetus at Geneva, has been always considered by me as erroneous in many essential parts; so that, whatever claim he may have as a faithful and impartial historian, in other regards, he does not deserve, in my opinion, any credit in this point. Though you are prepossessed (pardon the expression) in his favour, your candour will not allow you to give a final judgment, before you have weighed the arguments by which I shall try to impeach his veracity.

As your kindness favoured me in your acceptance of my sketch of Calvin’s life, I shall avoid to enter deeper into the discussion of

particular facts, than is necessary to explain the part which that great reformer took in the sufferings of Servetus.

I undertake this task with more ardour, Sir, as you imposed it upon me; and I flatter myself to have it in my power to produce evidences and facts, with which you could not be so well acquainted;—facts and evidences, Sir, which, if known to Sennebier, he has artfully glossed over, or industriously passed by.

It would, indeed, rather be a matter of surprise, if literary men, here in America, even of the first class, were thoroughly acquainted, I do not say with any principal historical fact of Europe’s continent, but with every material discussion upon such points by

the learned in Germany, Holland, &c. as a similar deficiency is beyond question in England, and *vice versa*.

The English language, however, is yet more known here and there on the Continent to a few learned and eminent divines, and more particularly to the connoisseurs in modern literature, than the authors of the Continent to the inhabitants of the British Isles. Voltaire, Rousseau, and La Fontaine; Montesquieu, Mably, and Raynal; Lavoisier, Chaptal, and Fourcroy; Winckelman, Klopstock, Rabener, Gellert, Haller, Gesner, and Schiller, are known to many in England, who never heard or scarce are acquainted with the names of Werdenhagen, Thomasius, Boëhmer, Semler, Bock, with a host of other writers. The latter wrote almost either in Latin or German; were, pretty generally, voluminous writers, who often did not, often could not, embellish their productions, and recommend them to foreigners, by a superior elegance of style.

Sennebier may sustain a respectable character as an historian, in what regards the general concerns of his darling city; but his being an elegant writer, or his being a Genevois, does, certainly, not give him a claim to infallibility—is no presumption for his impartiality. It is true, the sprightliness, vivacity, acuteness, and ingenuity of the inhabitants of this elegant seat of arts and sciences, (the beloved temporary residence of wealthy Britons, before it was polluted by the French Revolution,) are acknowledged by all foreigners; and the malignant pun, *Genevois! je ne vois rien de*

bon, quand je te vois, though from the mouth of a native of Geneva, must be considered rather the ebullition of disappointed morosity than truth. However, “that Sennebier was there on the spot, and *could* obtain access to the best materials for his history,” as you observed, proves nothing indeed, if he did not condescend to use them. There was no danger for Sennebier, that any errors or misrepresentations, if artfully executed, would be detected; or, if detected, discovered by his fellow-citizens, who rather would have crowned him with oak, and honoured him with a statue, if it had been in his power, no matter through what means, to have obliterated an event, mourned by every Genevois of our days.

This consideration applies with greater strength to the period in which Sennebier wrote, than if he had written fifty or a hundred years before. I need not to inform you, Sir, that the citizens of Geneva could not bear patiently the insinuations, that religious persecution had fixed her seat for a long while in their city; that the elegant writers among them left nothing untried to colour this foul blot; that, long since, the rigour of Calvin’s tenets had been there mollified, according to some well-intentioned, well-informed, and liberal-minded, *even to excess*; that the encyclopaidistic apostles of infidelity, with their usual unfairness and malice, when revelation can be attacked, obliquely branded Geneva’s reformed divines as Arminians, Socinians, &c. with such success, that the candidates of the French Reformed churches, in the *ci-devant* United Provinces, were sent in

later times to Lausanne, or kept at home, that they might not be infected by the doctrines of modern Geneva.

I am confident of making it appear to you, upon discriminating the materials which I shall bring forward, that all the historians, apologists, as well as antagonists of the great reformer, do pretty well agree in *all* the principal facts; so that the only remaining difference between them seems, in how far the main fact may be extenuated with fairness, or aggravated with truth.

I shall endeavour to write nothing but naked truth, without anxiously examining if the undorned facts shall acquit Calvin or bring a verdict against him; and in this discussion truth will compel me to bring forward a proof, not only that Servetus *was* deeply tinctured with the same virulent spirit, but that he actually defended the lawfulness of persecution: so that had the situation of Calvin and Servetus been reversed, the first would, perhaps, not have found more indulgence from the latter, than he was inclined to bestow upon this unfortunate sufferer. Both were not averse to the opinion adopted by Austin,* and patronized by Francis Turretin,† that the church *only* persecuted heretics, but with moderation, as nuisances to society. All the reformers, nearly, were tainted with

this leaven of Popery: moderation towards errors was criminal in their sight.

To conclude this letter, I shall communicate the principal authors, from which I borrowed the ingredients of the sketches: to copy with faithfulness and exactness is my only pretension.

Th. Beza vita Jo. Calvini.

Ad. Selhajius —————

And. Rivet. de Grotii libro pro pace Ecclesiæ.

Drelincourt apos. de Calvin.

Hottinger Hist. Eccles. Helvet. Tom. iii. page 544.

Jo. Angl. Werdenhagen apos. Serveti in Synopsi libr. Jo. Bodini de Republica. Amst. apud Janssonium, 1650.

M. de la Roche, who perused all the authentic acts of this unhappy event. Bibl. Angl. T. ii. Art. vii. p. 76.

Jac. G. Chauffepie Dict. Hist. et Crit, Tom. iv p. 219—245 compared with *T. Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Tom. i. p. 421. Tom. ii. p. iii. 517. 564. Tom. iv. p. 640.

Mosheim, Chancellor of the University of Gottingen, who made use of all the subsidies of *La Roche*, besides several MS documents, in his *History of Servetus*, published 1727, who had been opposed by

Armand de la Chapelle, in Calvin's defence, *Bibl. raison.* p. ii. and iii. in which apology, Armand has been deemed by many

* Porro illud Hieronymi quo Ecclesia negatur aliquem persequi, non ita est intelligendum, ut generaliter Ecclesia nullum persequatur, sed quod nullum INJUSTE persequatur. "Non enim omnis persecutio culpabilis est, sed rationabiliter hereticos persequitur, sicut Christus persecutus est eos, quos de templo expulit."

Lib. ii. adv. Manich

† Concludimus, Magistratum Christianum posse PœNA CAPITALI in similes pestes et hominum monstra animadvertere, sed ita ut extremis tantum malis extrema remedia adhibeantur—et in his moderatio, &c. Quæst xxxiv. § i.

of Calvin's admirers, to overshoot his mark, through various deviations from truth.

Mosheim's more elaborate and correct performance was republished Helmstad, 1748, 4to, in which edition he used a number of MSS of the Senate of Geneva, which he partly joined to it. To this excellent performance, *Mosheim* published a Supplement, 1750, Helmstad, to remove some new objections. See *Nova Acta Erud.* 1751, p. 297—311.

L'Abbé *D'Artigny's* *Nouv. Mem. d'Hist. de Crit. et de Literat.* tom. ii. 1749.

Fr. Turretin *Inst. Theol. El-*

ench. part ii. loci xvii. quæst. 24. page 373.

H. Venema, *Instit. Hist. Eccles. Vet. et N. T.* vol. vii. in 4to. page 461—483. Leyd. 1783. who, with his usual acuteness and impartiality weighed, as in a golden balance, all that was brought forward upon this subject; and lastly,

Fred. Sam. Bockius, *Hist. Antitrinitariorum, Regiomonti and Lipsiæ*, vol. iii. p. ii. p. 323—395. 1784.

Permit me to remain with high consideration and esteem,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
CANDIDUS.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE PROGRESS OF JOSEPH LANCASTER'S PLAN FOR THE EDUCATION OF POOR CHILDREN, AND THE TRAINING OF MASTERS FOR COUNTRY SCHOOLS.

In the year 1798, Joseph Lancaster opened a school in St. George's Fields, for the education of the children of the poor, at a very reduced charge. In the prosecution of this work he was obliged to devise plans of economy, in order to diminish the expense of books, paper, &c. and also a particular kind of discipline, that he might be able to manage a large number of children, without the necessity of employing ushers or assistants with salaries. The present state of perfection exhibited by his schools, is the result of numerous experiments and indefatigable attention, during a number of years; and it is with gratitude and pleasure that he acknowledges the encouragement he has received from enlightened and benevolent individuals, which has, from time to time, operated as a powerful stimulus to persevering exertion. In an early stage of

his labours, he obtained the patronage and liberal support of the Duke of Bedford and Lord Somerville, who commenced a subscription for buildings necessary to form a large school-room, in order that his experiments in tuition might be exhibited on a great number of children. This object was soon accomplished: the school was opened as a free school, and children received to the number of seven hundred. The same benevolent personages, looking forward to the more general diffusion of these benefits, were desirous that a plan should be established for training young men and lads as school-masters, that, by a practical knowledge of the improved modes of tuition, they might be qualified to superintend schools, to be formed in various parts of the kingdom upon the same plan. The institution in the Borough Road, therefore,

consists of free schools for boys and girls, and an establishment for boarding, clothing, and training up young men and women for school-masters and school-mistresses, so as to qualify them to undertake the charge of new schools. To this school and establishment, the king and queen, the prince of Wales, the princesses, and the royal dukes, have extended their patronage and annual bounty.

For a detail of the precise nature of this plan, Joseph Lancaster must refer to his printed book, intitled, "*Improvements in Education*;" but its distinguishing features are these:—

1. That by his system of order and rewards, together with the division of the school into classes, and the assistance of monitors, one master is able to conduct a school of one thousand children.

2. That by printing a spelling-book, or any other lessons for reading, in a large type, upon one side of the paper, and pasting the sheets thus printed on a paste-board, they may, when suspended to a nail, against the wall, be read by any number of children;—a method whereby one book will serve for a whole school, instead of a book for each child.

3. That by the introduction of writing upon slates, and one boy spelling to his whole class any certain word, the boys in the class will instantly write it, going on in this manner for an hour or more, so that boys may write and spell one hundred words in the course of a morning:—a method whereby five hundred boys may spell and write the same word at the same instant of time.

4. An entire new method of

instruction in arithmetic, wholly superseding the former method of setting sums in cyphering books, or using books, as *Walkinghame's* or *Dilworth's Assistant* for the four first rules:—a plan whereby any child who can read, may teach arithmetic with the utmost certainty.

5. The expense of education is reduced to a very trifling sum. Schools for three hundred children may be supported at the rate of seven shillings per annum for each child; and for a greater number of children, it may be reduced to four shillings per annum for each child.

And, lastly, while Joseph Lancaster is anxious to lay the foundation of religious and moral principles in the youthful mind, he studiously avoids introducing controverted theological points, and in short, every thing which is peculiar to any sect or party. The Holy Scriptures is the only religious book taught in the school,—for here, as *Sir. W. Jones* expresses it, we have "purer morality than can be collected from any other book in any language;" or, as *Locke* has well observed, a volume which has "God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its subject." By proceeding upon this broad and general basis, there is nothing repulsive to the feelings of any particular sect, but the doors of his schools are thrown open to receive the whole community.

The good which must arise from the extension of these elementary schools, cannot be calculated: their influence upon the morals and conduct of the lower orders of society has already been expe-

rienced ; and we may entertain more than a hope, that they will not fail to diminish the number of crimes, cherish and promote virtuous dispositions among the great mass of the people, and thus most materially contribute to the happiness and security of the state. In some places where J. Lancaster has established schools, by the committees dividing the children into different bodies, and conducting them to the several places for worship, hundreds of children are taken in an orderly manner to attend divine service, who formerly profaned the Lord's day by idle and riotous conduct in the streets.

In the Borough school alone, 4000 children have been educated, whose parents were of the poorest description ; and hitherto no instance has been noticed of any one of these being charged with a criminal offence in any court of justice. In this school the progress of the children in learning is rapid. It is no uncommon thing for one or two hundred boys to obtain tickets of commendation daily, and more than one hundred to have rewards for merit in the course of a single week. The improvement in morals, and the habits of order among the children who are educated on this system, in town or country, is of the most gratifying nature.

At Bristol, a school for 300 children has been opened, and the order is so complete, that a boy of thirteen can keep school as well as the master. At its commencement, profaneness was so common among the children, that it was not unusual for 70 or 80 to be found swearing in the

school-room in the course of a single week ; such instances now rarely occur. A lad, who only eight months ago could neither write nor cypher, is now head monitor of the school, having obtained his learning in the act of teaching others. The general improvement of the children is obvious and striking ; and many of the parents have voluntarily expressed their satisfaction. This school was organised by a young man, not nineteen years of age, an apprentice to Joseph Lancaster.

In the town of Swansea is a school, in which 270 children are now educating. It is conducted by an excellent young man, who had his education in the school at the Borough Road, and acted as one of J. Lancaster's earliest monitors. This school is in high order, and the accounts of the improvements of the scholars very satisfactory.

At the request of a number of gentlemen, belonging to the university of Cambridge, and by permission of the vice-chancellor, Joseph Lancaster explained the principles of his plan of education in a public lecture in the town-hall of that place, and a school was formed with the particular sanction and support of gentlemen of the first respectability in the university, who constituted themselves a committee for its management. The school consists of about 230 boys, and although it has not been opened above six months, the improvement of the children is very considerable.

At Canterbury, a royal free school has also been established, with the sanction of the mayor, the members in parliament for the

city, several aldermen, the deputy-lieutenant of the county, and a number of respectable citizens. Among the subscribers are Gen. Cartwright, aid-du-camp to the king, and several military officers. The number of children is above 400; who, only 12 months ago, were destitute of any instruction. The following extract from the half-yearly report of the committee in July last presents a most striking example of the utility of these schools.

“The committee of the Canterbury royal free school, have the pleasure to report to the subscribers, that, since the opening of the school, on the 1st of January, 321 boys have been admitted, many of whom are above ten years of age. Of these children, above 100 who did not know the alphabet, have learned to read, and there are more than 250 now being taught to write; likewise, that when the school was opened, very few had received any instruction in arithmetic, but that now 120 have commenced, and several of them have made considerable progress.”

The school at Dover, established by John Jackson, Esq. M. P. for that place, has been already productive of much good. The children mostly belong to sea-faring people, and it was said, “if you can bring these boys into order, you can do any thing.” This, however, was accomplished with small exertion, by one of J. Lancaster's lads, only seventeen years of age. This school consists of near 200 boys, many of whom have learnt to read and write in the course of the present year.

The city of Rochester has followed these noble examples. J.

Lancaster having explained his plans in a public lecture at the town-hall, the proposition for a school was seconded by the mayor, and met with general approbation. A school for 200 boys has since been established, and great credit is due to the committee for their philanthropic zeal in promoting the education of the poor. Their monthly returns, which are kept with great exactness, exhibit the great progress which the children make.

A school upon the same plan has been established at Lynn, under the sanction of the clergy, and most of the respectable inhabitants. The expense is defrayed by a subscription, to which the members of parliament for this place most liberally contribute. This school consists of 230 boys, and is in an excellent state of organization; and it is stated in the school-master's report, that in November last he had 20 boys in the Rule of Three, who did not know figures in the preceding May.

The Duke of Bedford, deeply impressed with the importance of extending these schools throughout the nation, has established one at Woburn, for a large number of boys. The duke and duchess occasionally visit the school, and take great interest in the improvement of the children.

To these may be added the following schools now formed and forming on J. Lancaster's plan, but which can only be briefly enumerated.

Maiden Bradley, Deptford, Leicester, several in Cheshire, Maidstone, Cheadle, Liverpool, Hull, Carlisle, Portsmouth, Oswestry, Manchester, Exeter,

Ramsgate, Seaford, Brighton, Edinburgh, Clewer, near Windsor, Birmingham, Downham, Watchet, &c. &c. &c. and several in Ireland.

In short, the public appear to feel so warm an interest in the cause of education, that J. L. is constantly receiving applications from fresh places for assistance in the formation of schools. These facts are a gratifying proof that the advantages of his system are not confined to his own institution, but are capable of becoming a national, instead of a mere local benefit. The plan is even now spreading upon the Continent of America. In New York, a school has been established for 180 children, which has given such universal satisfaction, that they now propose to enlarge their premises, so as to accommodate from 5 to 700 children. The example of New York is about to be followed in other parts of the United States.

As education can be afforded on terms so easy, nothing more is required for the establishment of a school in any district, than the union of a number of benevo-

lent persons in the neighbourhood, who might easily raise a trifling annual subscription among their friends, sufficient for the purpose. The next point is the formation of a small, but active committee; after which, a large airy room should be provided and fitted up in the manner described in J. Lancaster's *Improvements in Education*; and if any farther information should be thought necessary, J. L. will readily give it.

* The Free School is situated near Belvidere Place, Borough Road, not far from the Obelisk; and the public are respectfully informed, that the school is open for inspection every afternoon, (except Saturday,) at three o'clock.

For the guidance of those benevolent persons who may wish to establish schools, a tract is published, intitled, "Instructions for the Formation and Conducting of a Society, for the Education of the Children of the Labouring Classes of the People, according to the General Principles of the Lancasterian or British Plan;" which may be had at the Free School, and of Darton and Harvey, 55, Gracechurch-Street, and of all booksellers in town and country, price one shilling.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE QUESTION OF A LITURGY DISCUSSED.—LETTER I.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Norwich, Nov. 26, 1809.

SIR,

Your correspondent, "Primitivus," has again brought into discussion the long-contested question, of the propriety and ex-

pediency of the adoption of an Unitarian Liturgy. [Vol. iv. 358.]

Two letters have been written in reply to him; but, if you think with me, that the question is not exhausted, you will perhaps find

a page in the Repository, for a few additional remarks on the question.

Primitivus says, "Unitarians are either agreed on this subject, or are indifferent about its decision." Both these propositions I should deny. That Unitarians are not agreed on the subject, is plain from the fact, that a few congregations do use a liturgy, while the greater number do not; that they are indifferent about its decision, I am sure very few indeed would be disposed to admit. But, in order to bring the question to a point, let us first see on what authority the use of a liturgy is founded; secondly, how far the experiment has succeeded; and, thirdly, examine the policy of attempting to supersede free prayer, and substitute a written form. I am aware, that in the discussion of these points, on which it appears to me the question must hinge, not much of novelty is to be expected; but it is likely, that many of your younger readers may not have seen what has been written on this important subject, as, of late years, it has not been much publicly discussed. I trust, therefore, you will not think the worse of what will be offered for their attention, on that account.

1. On what authority is the use of a liturgy founded? I presume it will be admitted, that Christian societies and Christian teachers are bound to copy both the spirit and the practice of Jesus and his apostles, in conducting the devotional part of public worship. Do we find, then, that they ever used a written form? Is there any instance on record of their having drawn one up for the use of their

converts? I believe not. On the contrary, there is a complete silence on this point, throughout the whole of the Christian Scriptures; and, farther than this, prayer is recommended by Paul in such a way, with such an adaptation to particular times, circumstances and occasions, as is quite irreconcilable with the necessary limitation of a written form. Surely, if ever there was a time in which a form would have been useful and necessary, it was in the infancy of the Christian churches; yet, it is certain, that the apostles thought one unnecessary, to say the least of it. If a liturgy had been drawn up, either by Christ or the apostles, the probability is, that it would have been preserved. Indeed, there is very little chance of its having been lost. If any advantages were attendant upon the use of a liturgy, they must have been known to our Saviour and his immediate followers; and had it been essential towards the promotion of real godliness in the minds of the early Christians, they doubtless would have adopted it. But, as we have no trace of the use of a liturgy, during the life of any of the apostles, it follows, either that they never thought of, or else that they wholly disapproved it.

Whence, then, and how was a liturgy first introduced into the Christian church? Why, plainly on account of the ignorance and the laziness of its ministers. When priests began to neglect their duty to their hearers and to God; when they thought more of the emoluments of their profession, than of the improvement and spiritual welfare of their hearers; then,

Q

and not till then, began the use of written forms. It was not till the spirit of prayer was driven from their hearts, that they had recourse to any artificial helps. The introduction of liturgies was one of the corruptions of the fourth century; and it is very certain, that it was not till then that a written form was ever used. The sole reasons for this innovation, as we learn from the testimony of the Christian writers of that time, were those which I have stated above. It was not because those who used a written form were convinced of its necessity or utility: no;—ignorance and laziness were

the parents of a liturgy. This, no doubt, was altered and increased by the orders of successive popes and councils, till, at last, it ended in that precious heap of absurdity, the mass-book. Now, then, I would ask any serious and rational Christian, is this authority (and I know of no better) sufficient to warrant the adoption of a liturgy?

I shall, with your permission, resume this subject in another letter; and in the mean time, subscribe myself,

Your sincere well-wisher,
AN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN.

OBJECTION TO A LITURGY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Ipswich, Nov. 1809.

SIR,

Without rehearsing the arguments, adduced for and against the use of a liturgy, I wish to submit to the consideration of your readers, whether any dissenters, Unitarian, or of any other denomination, can consistently urge the general adoption of a form of words, which, however unexceptionable it may appear in the present day, might produce evils of a similar description to those, under which the Unitarians amongst the clergy of the establishment at present labour. Had there been any great advantage in the weekly repetition of the same words, a more obvious effect would have been produced. Dr. Clarke's Reformed Liturgy was altered by the Rev. Mr. Lindsay, again varied by Dr. Disney, and has received another emendation from the Rev. Mr. Belsham.

Let each minister and each society remain at perfect liberty to choose for themselves, and to vary their mode and their expressions as they think fit. Uniformity was the rock on which Constantine's best intentions were wrecked; and the desire of ensuring uniformity has been the bane of religious liberty in every age wherein it has been attempted.

I acknowledge, that whilst I commend the zeal, and wish not to detract from the praise due to the labours of the Unitarian associations, in different parts of the British empire, I look to them with a jealous eye, lest the spirit of priestcraft should possess the ministers of the districts, and undermine the pile of religious freedom, erected by our truly illustrious ancestors. As Unitarianism has never, by what I account the special grace or favour of God, been permitted to become the

established religion in any em- ration, and in concert with the
pire or state; so it is to be hoped, most perfect liberty.
that it will never triumph but un- Your's,
der the banner of universal tole- A NONCONFORMIST.

ESTIMATE OF STRICTURES ON THE IMPROVED VERSION OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.—LETTER I.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Feb. 7, 1810.

SIR,

I have derived considerable pleasure from observing the degree of attention which has been excited by the appearance of the Improved Version of the New Testament, and especially from the examination to which the work has been submitted in your instructive pages. It plainly appears, that a taste for scriptural knowledge is more widely diffused than some persons conceive; and that, at least, one denomination of Christians is unwilling to take things upon trust, and to acquiesce in the justness of a translation, merely because it is made by men whom they highly regard. The fact is much otherwise among a body of people by whom they are opposed. Preachers, who are in reputation with that sect, possess an influence over them little short of what is acquired and exercised by Romish priests over their credulous disciples. From such an authority there is no appeal. Every publication, be its merits what they may, of a minister of this description, is sure of obtaining their approbation: the volumes which he recommends, they eagerly purchase; and those of which he expresses his dislike, they as carefully forbear to read.

The class of Christians with

whom the undertaking of an Improved Version originated, and by whom it has chiefly been encouraged, are not in the habit of calling any one master, except him whose name they bear, and whose will they are sincerely desirous of knowing and obeying. They have, therefore, not hesitated to form and to declare their opinion of this volume, as their respective tastes and judgments dictate. And they rejoice, that, while the publication has been subjected to the ordeal of *eclectic* and *quarterly* reviewers, and is to be honoured with the animadversions of a zealous divine of the establishment, it is remarked upon by friends as well as foes; and that even they who think favourably of its general design and execution, are not backward to expose what they consider as its errors and defects.

Some of the strictures bestowed upon it, I will endeavour to estimate as fairly as I am able.

A correspondent of your's, under the signature of W. H.* has represented what he deems glaring improprieties in this version. The vagueness and injustice of his style of criticism, have been strongly exposed by *one of the editors*: and, in a short paper, which you honoured with insertion in your first number for the last

* Mon. Rep. Vol. iii. pp. 675, &c.

year,* I pointed out two remarkable instances in which the objector had seen fit to rebuke without previously understanding. I shall now only add, that, had the case required it, the illustration might have been made in many similar examples.

Theologus† I am content to leave in the hands of one of the editors, and in those of *Primitivus*, whose observations on the force of $\delta\varsigma$, (the reading in Griesbach's text of 1 Tim. iii. 16.) are confirmed by Michaelis.‡ It is remarkable enough, that while your reviewer blames the editors for their occasional departures from Griesbach, *Theologus* accuses them of implicitly following this guide, who, "though not blind, was often in the dark." It is still more curious to perceive, that, in one place, *Theologus* expresses great regret, that the editors did not use the confidence which their abilities most justly claimed in producing an entirely new translation;§ while, in another, he intimates, that they are deficient in sound critical talents!||

One of your correspondents, who signs himself a *country schoolmaster*, (vol. iv. 260,) complains, that terms and phrases are retained in the Improved Version, which the bulk of readers may consider as unfavourable to Unitarianism. But his complaint is really an eulogium on the fidelity of the editors, who are desirous that their readers judge of Scripture from its sense, rather than its sound. Whether it was advisable, that the work should con-

tain any *doctrinal* notes, is a question which I shall not now discuss. However, I will remind the *country schoolmaster* that it is one thing to translate the Scriptures, and another to paraphrase and expound them.

Your reviewer of the Improved Version has executed his office with very commendable diligence, faithfulness and candour: and, whenever a new edition is called for, I trust that advantage will be taken of some of his friendly hints. Of the critiques which have hitherto appeared upon the work, I regard this as best entitled to attention. Hence, I shall beg leave to accompany the writer in his remarks; principally, with the view of shewing where, and on what grounds, my conclusions differ from his.

He wishes that the common translation had been adopted as the basis of the Improved Version, and Newcome's as the general guide in correcting it. Now, it may be sufficient to answer that of the English translations of the New Testament, which have been published from 1611 down to 1801, none is equal to Newcome's for an union of simplicity and fidelity. With more correctness and precision than the authorised version, and with the advantage of a more accurate text, it has the merit of retaining more of the style and manner of this translation than any former publication of the kind. An important point was therefore gained by the selection of such a work as the basis of an improved version; especially

* Mon. Rep. vol. iv. p. 35.

† Mon. Rep. vol. iii. pp. 671, &c.

‡ Introd. &c. (Marsh's Trans.) vol. ii. p. 519.

§ Vol. iii. 671.

|| Vol. iv. 95.

as the eminence of the late primate of Ireland, as a biblical scholar, is almost universally admitted. Nor can I be of opinion, that the editors would have acted wisely or honestly in choosing for the ground-plot of their labours, a translation which was made of necessity from a corrupt and defective text. That the *Improved Version* is not more like that published by authority, no man can rationally lament, who looks upon the deviations as justified by a regard to precision, faithfulness and purity.

The general excellence of Newcome's translation is a fact of which those persons do not seem to be aware, who complain that an entirely new version was not attempted, instead of an improved one. I suspect, indeed, that these objectors are very imperfectly acquainted with the difficulties of such an undertaking.

Your reviewer properly begins with some observations on the text employed by the editors. And, for the most part, I cannot question the justness of his strictures under this head. I certainly wish, that we had been distinctly informed what text is used, and that ample and satisfactory reasons had been given for every departure from that of Griesbach. It is the subject, however, of grateful reflection, that the editors have availed themselves so largely of the diligence and sagacity of this learned man. For an additional proof that the preference avowed, on almost every occasion, by Unitarian critics for Griesbach's text, does not arise from their theolo-

gical prepossessions, I will refer to Matt. xix. 17. as it stands in the Improved Version and in Griesbach.

I further subscribe to most of the reviewer's sentiments on the subject of critical conjecture, and the impropriety of admitting it into the formation of the text of the New Testament. At the same time, it ought to be recollected, that we are to judge of the preponderating evidence of MSS. not so much by the number of them, as by their age and character.

In some instances, (as Matt. x. 8. xxiii. 14,) the editors appear to have contented themselves with the text in Griesbach's former edition, and with sufficient closeness to have followed Newcome, who translated from that edition.

Vol. iv. p. 156. The words in Mar. ii. 26. "in the days of Abiathar the high priest," they are not, I think, justified in omitting. Michaelis has suggested what I take to be a very probable explanation of the meaning of this clause, on which, he says, "many useless disputes have been wasted."*

P. 158. In Ephes. iv. 29. both editions of Griesbach have the reading *χρησας*.

P. 216. I fully concur with the reviewer as to the impropriety of printing 2 Peter ii. in Italics.

Ib. 217. He states the number of alterations actually made in Newcome as amounting to about 750, but adds, that many of them are in cases of frequent occurrence. Consequently, the whole number must be much re-

* Introd. &c. (Marsh) Vol. i. pp. 133, 134.

duced; a circumstance which may serve to lessen the surprise of his readers and his own.

Ib. 276. I pass over many texts, concerning which I either agree with the reviewer, or do not differ materially from him. As to Heb. i. 2. the instances are so few in which *διὰ*, with the force of *for*, precedes a genitive, as to create a strong presumption against this rendering in the Improved Version.

— 279, 280. His remarks on the translation of nouns which are without the article, and on the importance of uniformity in the mode of rendering the same phraseology in the original, are both just in themselves, and well illustrated and applied. The late Principal Campbell, is distinguished above most translators of the N. T. by his observance of the latter of them.

— 281. Gal. v. 21. (I. V.) *murthers*. The reviewer has no ground for stating and regretting, that Newcome's *murtherer* and *murther* have been *uniformly* changed. Nor, perhaps, is this the only example of the contrary.

By the way, on vi. 11. of this Epistle, the editors of the I. V. refer us to Whitby, in my copy of whose *paraphrase*, however, nothing occurs upon the verse. The reference should have been less general.

The notes, whatever they are, in the I. V. must stand upon their own merits. It was perfectly competent to the reviewer to examine into the propriety of inserting any which are simply *theological*. But, as such have actually found admission, it might now be useless to prolong the discussion.

In my next letter I propose to notice the animadversions of the Eclectic reviewers on the I. V.

I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

N.

P. S. I take this opportunity of reminding the editors of the I. V. that in their introduction to it, they represent Ephrem, the Syrian, as living in the sixth, instead of the fourth century.

MRS. CAPPE, ON THE LATE REV. N. CAPPE'S PRINCIPLES OF
SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

York, Feb. 5, 1810.

SIR,

Allow me to express, through the medium of your impartial Miscellany, the unfeigned pleasure I receive in seeing from time to time, that the principles of scriptural interpretation, adopted by my late honoured husband, begin slowly to make their way, and to justify the pleasing anticipation, although I may not live

to see it, that his Critical Dissertations, of which it devolved upon me to be the editor, will one day be more generally appreciated according to their real value. This, it is true, is of no importance to him; but if, as I firmly believe, they are founded in truth, it is of the greatest importance in an age of philosophical investigation like the present, to the interests of that gospel, to its receiving (ac-

according to the apostle's phrase) "free course and being glorified;" on which, in respect to the futurities of another life, all our hopes are ultimately founded. Two instances of this sort occur in your last number, which I have just received. Mr. M'Intyre gives a similar solution of the import of the phrases, "coming into the world," "being sent down from heaven," &c. with Mr. Cappe; and as it does not appear that he has seen the Dissertations, it supplies the independent testimony of another able and ingenious critic, to the soundness of the general principles on which it is founded. The express meaning indeed of these phrases, is not particularly examined in the Dissertations; but they are quoted as referring, not to the birth of Christ, but to the commencement of his public ministry, in illustration of the interpretation there given of somewhat similar phraseology in the proem of John's gospel; particularly in notes (c) and (p) vol. i. pp. 22, 37, 50. It happens, however, that I have among Mr. Cappe's papers, a particular examination of these very phrases, leading to the same result as that deduced by Mr. M'Intyre, which I will endeavour to arrange and transcribe, if you will have the goodness to insert it, in a future number, for his satisfaction, and for that, as I also hope, of many others of your readers.

The learned and ingenious paper signed "Geron," is the second instance to which I refer, of objections formed by other minds to

that hypothesis of the Temptation, which has probably hitherto, as he justly observes, been considered as the least objectionable. I am not competent to say, what were the grounds on which Mr. Cappe was led to differ so entirely from Mr. Farmer, but I know he was a writer so highly esteemed by him, that he would not have done it lightly. It was his usual method in scriptural research, not only to state the final result of his unwearied, patient and diligent investigation, but to state the reasons which led to it, not so much, however, with reference to any pre-established opinions, as to the simple developement of that interpretation which appeared to harmonize most completely with the manners, customs, and phraseology of the times; with the actual circumstances of the Jewish people, their erroneous expectations and unfounded prejudices; together with the character, views and objects of the several speakers or writers; but except in its agreement with Jewish phraseology, and with the particular views of the narrator, much light could not be thrown from these sources on the subject in question.—The notes affixed to the Life of Christ, which I have lately published, are deduced from the same principles; and, if they should not contribute to its present popularity, they will, I hope, eventually ensure its future more extensive usefulness.

I am, Sir, with great esteem,

Your much obliged servant,
CATH. CAPPE.

A LETTER, REFUSED BY THE EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Sheffield, Feb. 17, 1810.

SIR,

In December last, I addressed the following letter to the Editor of the Evangelical Magazine. As its principal object was to correct some erroneous statements which had appeared in that publication, I did think, Sir, that the persons who conduct the work, would gladly have embraced an opportunity of removing any false impressions, which, through their means, might have been made upon the public mind. I am deceived. In their number for January, they merely notice the receipt of the letter, without the least intimation of their intention respecting it; and in the number for the present month they give, in the following laconic note to correspondents, a proof at once of their impartiality and their good manners.

"Our custom is merely to make acknowledgments, without assigning, except in extraordinary cases, the reason for the non-insertion of pieces, which *do not suit our purpose.*"

All errors certainly ought to be corrected through the medium of the publications in which they were originally given to the world; but when an opportunity to do this is evaded or refused, no resource is left for counteracting their effects, but in the pages of those liberal and independent periodical works, which are open to Christians of every denomination. I shall, therefore, make no apology for requesting an early

place in your Repository; and as the letter itself will sufficiently explain the nature and character of those circumstances, which have been so injudiciously obtruded upon the public attention, I am spared the necessity of making them the subject of any prefatory remarks.

I cannot conclude, however, without expressing my strong disapprobation of the conduct of these evangelical authors and editors—men, whose settarian zeal overpowers their love of truth; who are not ashamed to delude the lower classes of the people by cant and sophistry; and who are content to bolster up their own peculiar creeds by the grossest misrepresentations. B.

To the Editor of the Evangelical Magazine.

SIR,

In your Magazine for November, I have just read an account of the death of A—— G——, Esq. of S——. In offering to your acceptance some brief remarks upon this article, it is my intention, not to make your publication a vehicle for my own theological tenets, but merely to correct a few errors and misrepresentations into which I think the author has fallen. In the fourth column is the following passage.

"He (his friend) was highly gratified to find such a disposition as now appeared in him to renounce atheistical, deistical, Socinian, and other errors and delusions, which he has formerly embraced and maintained."

The writer of this article knew Mr. G—— for the last eighteen years of his life, and has had many opportunities of becoming well acquainted with his sentiments upon religious subjects. He can, therefore, confidently assure you, Sir, that this gentleman, at no period of

his life, embraced those tenets which are usually termed Socinian. On the contrary, previously to his conviction of the truth of Christianity, he ridiculed them as idle tales; and after that conviction, he uniformly opposed them as false doctrines, with all that ardour and enthusiasm which belonged to his character. In short, Mr. G—— was a rigid Trinitarian, a zealous supporter and defender of the articles of the Church of England, and, of consequence, his religious tenets were really and properly those which are now generally known by the name of Calvinistic. I do not charge Figlinus with a falsehood in this instance, but it is evident, that he has been misinformed; and, I trust, that he will be cautious in any future statements of this nature, not to present the public with any circumstances, for the truth of which he has not indisputable authority.

I cannot, however, so readily acquit him of that wilful misrepresentation, and that studied perversion of the truth, which are but too conspicuous in some parts of his account. He frequently connects the words infidelity, Deism and Socinianism, as if they were synonymous terms. Now, Sir, he cannot be ignorant of the very great difference which exists between the sentiments of a Deist and those of a Socinian. He must know, that the latter believes in the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures; the mission, the miracles, the death and resurrection of Christ; his triumph over death and sin, and his promises of eternal life to all who obey him. These glorious facts are the foundation of the Socinian's creed, and from them, connected with the sublime doctrines of the gospel, he deduces the obligations to a pure and holy life. Is this Deism? But, to enlarge on such a subject would waste the time and insult the understanding of your readers. The motives of the writer are sufficiently evident. Thousands of the common people in this country, who well know that a Deist does not believe the Bible, are very imperfectly acquainted with the tenets of a Socinian: what, then, could be intended by the indiscriminate use of these terms, but to inculcate the belief, that infidels, Deists and Socinians are persons of similar views, sentiments and characters. Figlinus cannot forbear indulging in the vulgar cant about death-bed scenes. He says, that "many

Socinians have renounced their opinions with horror at the approach of death." And further, that "the shores of death exhibit not a single instance of failure in evangelical hope." What he means by this last passage is not very clear, for the uncouthness of the metaphor has obscured the sense; but if he intends to say, that no Calvinist ever experienced despair, terror, or depression of mind, in his last hours, I have one objection to the assertion, viz. that it is not true. Individuals of all religious persuasions have, in those awful moments, languished under very distressing debility of mind, and been harassed by dreadful terrors of the imagination. But these effects are often produced by the irresistible influence of physical causes; and I think a wise man would hesitate to defend a favourite theory by conclusions drawn from such precarious phenomena. In answer to the former part of the quotation, I would refer Figlinus to the venerable names of Lardner, Priestley and Lindsey, and then ask him, whether Socinian views of Christianity possess sufficient energy to enforce a life of piety and virtue, and to support the mind in the hour of death.

Your correspondent observes, that "the religion of Deists is only calculated for worldly ease, and cannot be the system of salvation revealed in the gospel." Pray, what does he mean by the "religion of Deists?" And what necessity was there to inform the world, that Deism cannot be the Christian revelation? Surely nothing, but the desire of coupling Socinianism with Deism could have led to this palpable absurdity.

In the third column, where Mr. G—— is charged with profaneness, I find another proof of inaccuracy. It is well known in this place, that he was not a profane character; and, during the many years in which I have enjoyed the pleasure of his society, I can truly affirm, that, in my presence, he never gave utterance to a single profane sentiment or expression. And here permit me to indulge a short tribute of affection to the memory of a man, whose incorruptible integrity commanded respect, whose gentleness of manners conciliated esteem, and whose active benevolence will be long and gratefully remembered by the very numerous objects of his bounty.

From some of the above observations,

R

122 *Mr. Woodham's Remarks upon Mr. Parkes's Opinion of Mind.*

it will follow, that the tedious verbiage with which Figlinus has thought proper to introduce his account of Mr. G——'s death, founded upon the notion of his being a Socinian, is entirely misplaced and inappropriate; and should he favour the public with any farther remarks upon such subjects, I would advise him to procure more correct information, particularly respecting the Socinian doctrines, with which he appears to be very superficially acquainted.

I cannot but regret, that any professor of Christianity should think it necessary to prop up his system of faith by such means as these. Pure religion disdains

the aid of sophistry, however splendid, and misrepresentation, however ingenious. Her temple admits none but the graceful decorations of Christian charity, and can only be supported by the pillars of truth.

“ No meretricious graces to beguile,
No clust'ring ornaments to clog the
pile;
From ostentation as from weakness
free,
It stands, like the cerulean arch you
see,
Majestic in its own simplicity.”

Sheffield, Dec. 16, 1809.

B.

MR. WOODHAM'S REMARKS UPON MR. PARKES'S OPINION OF MIND.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

London, Feb. 14, 1810.

SIR,

In perusing the letters of Mr. Parkes, on the Indestructibility of Matter, in the last volume of your Repository, I was forcibly struck with the singularity of his opinion, respecting the nature of the mind; and if you will do me the favour of their insertion in your next number, I will hazard on it a few remarks. Allow me, however, previously to observe, that I am not actuated by any hostile spirit, but solely by a desire to arrive at truth, by means of free discussion.

Most materialists, I believe, agree with Dr. Priestley, in regarding mind as the effect of the organized structure of the brain, and likewise acknowledge, that when that structure is destroyed by death, mind no longer exists. Mr. Parkes, however, if I rightly understand him, supposes mind to be a distinct substance, a particle of very subtile matter, encased or enveloped in the grosser matter of the body; and that the Deity prevents this particle, after the death of the body, from com-

bining with other material substances, by isolating it, and thus preserves its identity.

Now, Sir, I do not conceive, that we have the smallest grounds, *a posteriori*, for such an hypothesis. All that observation and experience inform us, is, that, in whatever animal such an organized mass as the brain is found, mind is present; but that when that mass is destroyed or decomposed, mind has no longer an existence. Sound philosophy, however mortifying it be to our vanity, teaches, I believe, no more. The experiment of the egg, supposed by Mr. Parkes to favour his opinion, does not appear to me to afford it the least support. The stimulus of the calorick, acting upon its vitality or susceptibility of impression, produces a development of the rudiments of the chick; and when the organization of its brain is complete, mind or perception follows. But I do not see any thing in this, that at all favours his hypothesis of a material atomic mind.

Mr. Parkes, too, is not aware, perhaps, that his idea so exactly

coincides with that of the immaterialists, that if the term be but changed, their definition of mind will be the same. He defines it, a *material* atom, "indivisible, unchangeable and immortal;" they, an *immaterial* atom, indivisible, unchangeable and immortal.

Beside, this atom must, I conceive, be elementary, and consequently, either oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen or carbon; but unless the Deity remove it after the death of the body out of our present system, it will require an almost perpetual miracle to prevent its forming new combinations.

Again, Mr. Parkes seems to infer, (vide supplemental number, p. 715,) that it can think and act independently of organs; but if so, of what use will be those glorified bodies, which we are told we are to have at the resurrection?

From these considerations, I

cannot but think, that Mr. Parkes's material atom, like the immaterial one of the hylorists, is purely a creature of the imagination, suggested probably to remove the obstacles of identity and the resurrection.

I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

JAMES WOODHAM.

P.S. I am disposed to think, that Mr. Parkes labours under an error respecting the historian of the "Decline and Fall." If Mr. Parkes will take the trouble to turn again to his immortal work, and peruse what precedes his quotation, he will find, that Mr. Gibbon is expressing the sentiments of others, not his own, on the probability of a future state of rewards and punishments; and those sentiments drawn, not from the unscriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body, but from the Platonic notion of the immortality of the soul.

ON THE DECLINE OF PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATIONS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

March 9, 1810.

SIR,

After several papers, which have appeared in your Repository, to account for the decline of Presbyterian congregations, the writers of which have ascribed it to various different causes, I observe one in your last number signed W. W. which attributes it to the deviation of the Presbyterian ministers from the Calvinistic doctrines, which have obtained the name of orthodox and evangelical. Whatever degree of influence this may have had in particular places, I cannot believe that this is the grand and general

cause of the evil, for two reasons. The first is, that in various instances congregations have continued in a very flourishing state, and even increased, where nothing of Calvinism has been preached. No body will suppose, that Dr. Foster was a Calvinist, and yet he was one of the most popular preachers in his day. His lecture at the Old Jewry was crowded to the last. And where was there a larger audience to be seen than that at the same place, in the time of the late Mr. Fawcett? Dr. Fordyce had very little of Calvinism about him, and yet he raised the congregation at Monkwell Street

to such a degree, that numbers more attended than could be accommodated with seats. There is still one Presbyterian meeting-house in the city, where nothing like Calvinism is heard, but where, nevertheless, the hearers are as numerous as ever in the afternoon, and by far more so than they are at the same place in the morning, where Calvinistic preachers have lately been introduced. It is also matter of notoriety, that even in some places where Unitarianism has prevailed, (though this is not a general case,) congregations have not only been kept up, but have considerably increased. Dr. Priestley himself, notwithstanding the disadvantage of his delivery, was a witness to this; and some of his successors, in more places than one, are still witnesses to the same.

My second reason for not acquiescing in the cause to which W. W. ascribes the decline of so many Presbyterian congregations, is, that there is a similar declension in many Independent societies in several parts of the country, and particularly in the metropolis. It is true, there are a few in and about the city that are still large

and flourishing, but some of the largest are far from being equal to what they were a few years ago, in the days of their late ministers, though their successors are equally Calvinistical. And there are others which are greatly reduced. Half a dozen, at least, might be at once mentioned, which are as low as most among the Presbyterians. No one will doubt of the Calvinism of the late Mr. Towle, or of his zeal for that system, or his ability in the defence of it; and yet what Presbyterian minister had, for many years before his decease, fewer hearers or communicants? From this statement, then, I wish your correspondents to alter the form of the inquiry, which has of late engaged so many of them, and let it henceforward be,

“What is the reason, why so many of the congregations of the regular dissenters, under an educated ministry, both Presbyterians and Independents, have of late years so visibly declined?”

To see this point calmly discussed by your correspondents, would afford satisfaction to the writer of this, who is, respectfully,

Your's,

X. X.

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE INDESTRUCTIBILITY OF MATTER;
IN REPLY TO MR. PARKES.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

London, March 2.

SIR,

Whether Mr. Parkes be correct in his conjectures of the author of the remarks on his essay, or not, he may be assured, it was neither my intention nor desire to misrepresent any of the arguments there adduced; least of all, would I insinuate, that the object of such a writer was to show the in-

utility of the Christian revelation; for I am well acquainted with the liberal and enlightened zeal which animates Mr. Parkes in the cause of genuine Christianity; nor, indeed, will the expressions with which I closed my remarks, admit of such construction.

I have again read his essay that appeared in the thirty-seventh number of the M. R. where he

declares his object is to produce a "strong and satisfactory analogical argument in favour of human resuscitation, from the indestructibility of matter;" but in his reply to my remarks, he reduces his object to a "*possibility* of identity being protected through a series of years, that may intervene between death and resuscitation, and hence the *probability* of a general resurrection." I can admit possible to be more probable than impossible, and yet to many events in their nature possible, I attach no degree of probability. To such as reject the important truth of a future life, from a supposed impossibility of continuing identity, his detail of occurrences in the natural world may produce conviction; but not being aware that a greater exertion of power is requisite to reproduce a being, than to give him existence at first, I am not one of these objectors: my design is only directed against the *probability* of such an event, from the instances he has adduced. Had it not been for the candid admission he has made in his reply, that his arguments were not intended as proofs of the justness of his hypothesis, many other of your readers, as well as myself, might have misunderstood the tendency of the strong and satisfactory analogical argument, he undertook to furnish us with. The instance of a vegetable nourished to maturity, by the various provisions supplied by the author of nature, and when his purpose has been effected, these supplies being returned in an unmixed state to the general store, ready to effect similar benefit to succeeding vegetables, I consider as a fit one of

the analogy Mr. Parkes endeavours to trace. But our experience has never furnished us with a single instance where the whole plant, root, or seed has been destroyed by the putrefactive process or otherwise, that hydrogen or oxygen has reproduced it: their vivifying powers, if exerted with success, have uniformly acted upon such roots or seeds as contain the fit and complete organization of the future plant. When we examine the case of a deceased human being, all whose intellectual faculties are probably but the result of organization, can any one discover the germ that remains undestroyed, ready to shoot up into the future mass, when exposed to the proper influence of those powers capable of such effect? It has been conjectured by some writers, that the human frame contains certain stamina incapable of discription, which, through the lapse of ages, will continue to preserve their identity; but till some evidence is brought forward in support of this hypothesis, I must consider it to be more supported by the imagination than the judgment.

It appears to me, therefore, Sir, particularly necessary, that Mr. Parkes, and those who adopt his opinions, should furnish us with evidence upon this point, where alone the whole controversy hinges; and if they undertake to argue the probability of a future life to human beings, by the revival of those subjects of the vegetable or mineral kingdoms, whose succession is provided for by the combination of properties that have been released from their former associates, with a remnant of the parent plant, to continue

their analogical investigations till they have more satisfactorily discovered those indiscerptible parts of the human frame, from which man is to arise, and by which identity is to be continued.

Upon reviewing my own remarks, I find they convey an opinion I do not adopt, and I am obliged to Mr. Parkes for pointing it out. I have said, *all the particles* of the human frame may be proved indestructible, and this, I observe, he applies to the whole body; and inquires, why I undertake to confute an opinion, the resurrection of the whole body, which he never maintained. I did intend my remark to be confined to the intellectual part of man, which constitutes his proper identity, which being the result of organization, and being destroyed at death, must depend upon the re-arrangement of the particles to induce the same consciousness.

In reply to the objection, that no individual of the human species is endowed with faculties capable of indefinite improvements, but are as regularly subject to decline and death as to birth and improvement, I must beg leave

to remind him, he supposes what from uniform experience is inadmissible, "that infirmities and death never assail him." For every being introduced into existence, necessarily proceeds to second childhood, should his life be sufficiently prolonged: and to refer to the vegetable kingdom, we might as reasonably expect the stately oak, in its progress to maturity, would advance till it eclipsed the Egyptian pyramid, as that the vigorous faculties of a Newton, at the age of forty or fifty years, would be equalled by those which had been exhausted by a career of eighty or ninety.

As to the arguments founded on the goodness of the Deity, in support of the expectation of a future life, I do not deem them more conclusive than those from the indestructibility of matter; but I am not desirous of enlarging this discussion, which, from the hint at brevity you lately gave to your correspondents, has, I fear, in the present instance, transgressed your bounds.

I am, Sir,
Your's, &c.
G.

INFORMATION CONCERNING MR. EVANSON'S NEW TESTAMENT.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Mansfield, Feb. 6. 1810.

SIR,

Should this arrive in time agreeably to my hopes, to receive a place in the next number of your widely-circulated Repository, the insertion of its contents there will be esteemed a favour granted to myself; and prove, I trust, rather a welcome piece of kindness shown to the gentleman, whose expressed apprehensions of dan-

ger, from the Dissonance of the Four Gospels, (introduced with a severe critique on that work and its author, in the article announced in the title-page of your last number, "A Review of a New Testament on Mr. Evanson's Plan,") to the Christian religion, I am very desirous to take an early opportunity of using my best endeavours to remove, by an assurance, which it is happily in

my power to give him, that so far from giving encouragement to infidelity, that work, on unprejudiced minds and attentive readers, has, in several instances, been the means of restoring declining and wavering faith to a firm confidence in that holy and comfortable religion; and to some persons who,—having rejected the doctrines, &c. of revelation, offered them, as being unworthy of divine authority, whilst attended with such difficulties to a common understanding; and which, for so many hundred years, the constant disputatious endeavours of the most learned of its teachers, have been unable to remove,—had commenced mere deists, from a supposition, that in that character they showed more reverence, and did greater honour to their Maker, than the generality of professing Christians. To such as those, Mr. E. had the great satisfaction and comfort of knowing, that the volume, by many so much dreaded, had given thorough conviction of the truth of that pure religion as it was simply preached and taught by its divinely-commissioned messenger, and his true apostles. Several most welcome letters on this head were received by Mr. E. from different quarters, especially during his last illness; containing grateful acknowledgments for the comfortable benefits derived from his labours; and to some of his near relatives, a communication of a similar kind has more than once been sent. In a very recently received letter for that purpose, the writer expresses himself fully “convinced of the truth of Mr. E.’s proofs, and the force of his strong arguments;” and concludes thus, “I can now read the Scriptures with pleasure, which before used to be troublesome and perplexing.” If the reviewer has patience to read this account of real facts, I trust he will see the Dissonance in a more favourable light, and be able to change, in some degree, the ideal character he has conceived and reported of Mr. E. who really merited one quite the reverse of that given by the reviewer; which, I am pretty sure, would be readily affirmed by every one personally acquainted with him, or by any unprejudiced reader of his writings; many of the former, being eminent scholars themselves, must be allowed competent judges; and by such he was always respected and esteemed, as endowed with every talent and requisite ability for an author, in patient investigation of truth, and with every other due qualification denied him by the reviewer, in a large list of particulars. Mr. E. too, amongst other useful gifts, had that of being a good “discerner of the signs of the times,” and therefore prepared his surviving relatives for many and frequent severe attacks on his memory and writings, which could not, at present, be expected to meet with that general approbation and usefulness hoped for, at a future period. They, therefore, will not be surprised, if the writer of this should be disappointed of success in its design. But it is surely rather extraordinary, that during Mr. E.’s life, no fair opponent appeared to accept his invitation, for refuting any of the arguments on which a publication was grounded, which, since his death, has been so violently, and

often illiberally, censured; though, at that time, one edition had been sold off, and the second just ready for publication. I must now beg leave to inform the reviewer of the Testament in question, (published full three years ago,) that there certainly was no direction given to, or preparation made by Mr. Evanson, or any of his relatives, for the editor of that volume, or the worthy gentleman, who, though a personal stranger to Mr. E. generously undertook the expense of printing it, &c. with a kind desire and wish to testify his respect to the memory of Mr. E. and make public avowal of his sincere approbation of those religious sentiments he had published. Two near relatives of Mr. E. received the first intimation of this very friendly design from that gentleman himself, when in London, with agreeable surprise; but they were all much disappointed in their hopes and expectations, on seeing the selection accompanied with notes, (besides three more Epistles than were, “in Mr. E.’s estimation,” authentic,)

very inconsiderately inserted by the editor; which, with the reviewer, they agree, must be as pleasing to the enemies of Mr. E. as they were the contrary to all his friends. In regard to the letter alluded to, (an extract of which appeared in the prefixed advertisement,) Mr. E.’s brother was not the author of it, and it was addressed by the writer to the above-mentioned gentleman, with no other view or motive than the professed one, of pointing out an apparently very unworthy passage of Scripture; which, it was supposed, would not have been admitted by Mr. E. himself into any similar publication, without a due remark upon it.

Depending on your clemency, for the intrusion of what, perhaps, may prove less acceptable for insertion in your generally-approved Repository, than I could wish; and relying on your profession of impartiality for its admission,

I am, Sir,
Your obedient humble servant,
E. M.

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A
COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. LVII.

*A Negro in Rubens’ Picture of
“The Last Judgment.”*

There seems now to be a laudable curiosity to discover all the eminent men, who, in former periods, declared themselves against negro-slavery. Among them may be certainly placed the painter *Rubens*, who, in his eminent picture of “The Last Judgment,” formerly in the gallery of Dusseldorf, has given a negro a

rank among the *elect*. This symbolical avowal of a sentiment of humanity and true philosophy, is the more noble, considering the age in which the painter lived, and that he was born at Cologne, the most bigotted city in the world!

It is singular, that in the same picture, Rubens has placed his second wife and himself in such a manner, that one cannot distinguish to what side they apper-

tain; whether to the elect or the non-elect. Was this pure modesty? or, was it a sarcastic, allegorical representation of the state of matrimony?

No. LVIII.

A Hint to Reviewers.

The brave Tartars used formerly to put their names to their arrows, that the person attacked might know his adversary.

No. LIX.

Figurative Praying.

Mr. John Hales concludes his sermon on "Peace, the Legacy of Christ," with a prayer addressed to the "Lord Christ;" in which he invokes Christ as God, and prays that he would hasten the coming of *his Son, our Saviour*, and, in conclusion, asks all favours "for his Son's sake, Jesus Christ, our Lord."

It is yet to be explained, who is *the Son of the Lord Christ*. Mr. Hales himself would, we believe, have been the last to have ventured upon the expounding of such a mystery, but the first to applaud us for refusing our assent to him, when he has not our understanding.

In the same prayer, this excellent writer's wish for moderation and charity, is ingeniously expressed in the accommodated language of one of Christ's parables. Tropes and similitudes are not fit ornaments of prayer; otherwise, we should be pleased, in no low degree, with the prettiness of the accommodation.

"Be with those, we beseech thee, to whom the prosecution of church controversies is committed, and, *like a good Lazarus*, drop

one cooling drop into their tongues and pens, too, too much exasperated against each other."

No. LX.

Ambition.

A person never mounts so high, said Cromwell, as when he does not know himself how far he desires to go.

No. LXI.

Reformation of Worship.

An English country parson, says Dr. Campbell, [Lect. on Eccles. Hist. ii. 201.] was bragging, in a large company, of the success he had had in reforming his parishioners, on whom his labours, he said, had produced a wonderful change to the better. Being asked in what respect, he replied, that when he first came among them, they were a set of unmannerly clowns, who paid him no more deference than they did to one another, did not so much as pull off their hat when they spoke to him, but bawled out as roughly and familiarly as though he were their equal; whereas now, they never presumed to address him but cap in hand, and, in a submissive voice, made him their best bow, when they were at ten yards distance, and stiled him, *your reverence*, at every word. A Quaker, who had heard the whole patiently, made answer, "And so, friend, the upshot of this reformation, of which thou hast so much carnal glorying, is, that thou hast taught thy people to worship thyself."

No. LXII.

A Nursery Clock.

In the year 1760, Lady Arabella Denny presented a clock to

the Dublin Workhouse, to be put up at her expense, in the nursery for foundling children, with the following inscription, viz.

“For the benefit of infants protected by this hospital, Lady Arabella Denny presents this clock, to mark, that as children reared by the spoon must have but a small quantity of food at a time, it must be offered frequently; for which purpose, this clock strikes every twenty minutes, at which notice, all the infants that are not asleep, must be discreetly fed.”

No. LXIII.

Unitarian Missionaries.

Origen in his reply to Celsus, as quoted by Dr. Lardner, (Works, vol. ii. p. 497,) states the true argument in defence of the *Unitarian Fund*, for promoting *popular preaching*. Celsus had reproached the Christians with gathering weak and silly people together, to hear their tales, comparing them to jugglers and mountebanks; as Unitarian missionaries are now censured for assembling around them the mean and illiterate. “But,” says the father, “how unjust is this reproach! wherein do we resemble those persons? we, who by readings, and by discourses upon them, excite men to piety toward *the God of the universe*, and to other virtues of a like excellence; and dissuade men from a contempt of the Deity, and from all things *contrary to RIGHT REASON*.

The philosophers would have been glad if they could have gathered together such mean people, to hear discourses recommending the practice of virtue.”

No. LXIV.

A Heretic.

A heretic is an undefined creature in the the theological world. Nobody can tell what he is, except that he is a *monster*. The vulgar have sometimes considered him as a monster in body as well as in mind. The unhappy creatures who formerly suffered under the savage cruelty of the Inquisition, were disguised and disfigured before they were burnt.

A less hateful elucidation of the remark is furnished by the life of Junius, the famous professor of divinity, at Leyden. Junius passed for a heretic. He once held a public theological dispute with a Franciscan, which a great number of people assembled to hear. An old man, bustling in the crowd, expressed a prodigious desire of seeing the heretic, which, when Junius was informed of, he desired might be granted. The crowd made way, the old man marched forward, and diligently surveying him from head to foot, cried, “Now I know the falsehood of what I have been told!” “What have you been told?” said Junius. “*I was told*, replied he, *that you had cloven feet!*”

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

ON ACTS ix. 31.

For the Monthly Repository.

Feb. 17, 1810.

Acts ix. 31. "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied." The cause of the rest here mentioned, has in vain been investigated by learned men. Dr. Lardner, vol. i. p. 97, supposes that suspension of persecution was occasioned by the imminent ruin which threatened the Jews by the mad attempt of Caligula to set up his statue at Jerusalem. But such a cause as this, if the true one, implies the severest reflection on the followers of Jesus. It supposes that they were so unfeeling, so destitute of all sympathy with their brethren the Jews, as to enjoy rest, to be comforted, and to be edified, at a time when the whole country was involved in one scene of horror and consternation; and that, too, on account of an event in which the Jewish converts were as deeply interested as the rest of their countrymen. Were they capable of *rest* and *comfort*, when the whole nation lay, as Josephus relates, prostrate on the ground, they might more fitly be deemed monsters, than the followers of the benevolent Jesus.

The real cause of the rest above noticed, was an edict which Tiberius, a little before his death, caused to be sent to the præfects,

and to be published in all the provinces in favour of the Jews, i. e. of the peaceable and well-disposed converts to Christianity among the Jews, whose faith as yet lay sheltered under the common name of Judaism. This fact is asserted by Tertullian, Eusebius, Orosius, &c. See Lardner, vol. vii, p. 232. The authority of these men is, indeed, questioned; but the fact stands on the indisputable testimony of Philo, whose words have escaped the notice of Lardner. The passage is to this effect, vol. ii. p. 569. "All nations, though prejudiced against the Jews, have been careful not to abolish the Jewish rites; and the same caution was preserved in the reign of Tiberius; though, indeed, the Jews in Italy have been distressed by the machinations of Sejanus. For after his death, the emperor became immediately sensible, that the accusations against the Jews were lying calumnies, the mere inventions of Sejanus, who was eager to devour a nation, that alone or chiefly would, he knew, be likely to oppose his impious designs. And to the constituted authorities in every place, he (Tiberius) sent orders not to molest in their several cities the men of that nation, excepting the guilty only, (who were very few,) and not to suppress any of their institutions, but, on the contrary, to regard as a trust committed to

their care, both the people themselves, as possessing peaceable dispositions, and their laws, which, like oil, brace them with order and resolution."

This wise measure, (with others mentioned by Tacitus, Suetonius and Josephus, all calculated to produce universal peace,) as soon as executed in the provinces, must have put an immediate stop to open and direct persecution. This now raged in Judea; but it was necessarily suspended, as soon as the imperial decree had reached

that country: and it was natural that the churches, as Luke relates, should then have rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria.

In my next paper, I shall point out and explain some passages in the N. T. in which this decree of Tiberius is recognised. The happy effects of it were felt long after the days of that emperor; and it will appear to have been reinforced by Claudius.

THEOLOGUS.

SIGN OF THE PROPHET JONAH.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Ealand, Sep. 16, 1809,

SIR,

In reply to A. B. (vol. iv. p. 474,) who wishes to see our Lord's explanation of the sign of the prophet Jonah, (Matth. xii. 40.) "that the son of man would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," reconciled with the known fact of his having lain in the sepulchre only two nights and one day; I beg leave to observe, that the only way of doing this appears to be, to admit that the meaning of Jesus was, "The son of man shall be *part of* (not *the whole of*) three days and nights in the heart of the earth." For admitting this interpretation of his words, the following reasons may be offered.

1. In almost every other passage in which Jesus speaks of his resurrection, he expressly says, that this event was to take place *on the third day*. See Matth. xvi. 21. xvii. 23. xx. 19. In Mark viii. 31. indeed, the words given us are *after three days*; but, in the parallel passage in

Matthew, (xvi. 21.) they are, *the third day*. In the obscure declaration, John ii. 19. 21. (which, we are told, he spake concerning the temple of his body,) he says, "Destroy ye this temple, and *in three days* I will raise it up;" which may surely mean *within three days*, as well as *when three days shall be completely expired*. Of his words spoken to his disciples in Galilee, the angels remind Joanna and her companions, Luke xxiv. 6, 7. where the same form of expression is used, "The son of man must be crucified, and *the third day* rise again." And he himself, after his resurrection, said to his apostles, "It was necessary that the Christ should suffer, and that he should rise from the dead *on the third day*, (v. 46.) And, accordingly, the apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, (1 Cor. xv. 4.) mentions it as an article of the faith he had delivered to them, that Christ rose again *the third day*. Now, as there are so many passages in which his resurrection is spoken

of as what was to take place or had taken place on *the third day*, and but one in which the time that he was to remain in the sepulchre is stated as *three days and three nights*; is it not reasonable to allow, that, by the latter expression, we are to understand only *part of three days and nights*? But, to confirm this interpretation, let it be observed, that, when the chief priests and Pharisees came to Pilate, desiring that a guard might be placed at the sepulchre, (because Jesus had declared, while he was yet alive, that *after three days* he should rise again,) their request is only, "Command that the sepulchre be made sure *until the third day*," (Matth. xxvii. 63. 64.) plainly intimating, that they considered the phrases *after three days*, (and consequently, *three days and three nights*;) and *on the third day*, as meaning the same thing. It may be added,

2. The scripture historians very frequently speak of parts of years or days, as if they were whole ones. When two of John's disciples followed Jesus, and were invited by him to his lodgings, it is said, that they went, and abode with him *that day*, (John i. 39.) Now it is plain, that here the word *day* can mean only *part of a day*; for we are immediately told that it was then about the tenth hour; so that, according to the Jewish method of reckoning, there were but two hours of it remaining. In the Old Testament, the reigns of the kings of Israel and of Judah cannot possibly be adjusted to one another, without very often allowing that by a *year* is meant only *part of a year*. Two remarkable instances to this

purpose are to be met with in 1 Kings xv. 25, 26. and xvi. 8, 10. And there is another passage, which particularly and most decisively proves, that *after three days* and *on the third day*, were considered as expressions bearing the very same meaning. When Jeroboam, attended by the congregation of Israel, waited upon king Rehoboam to solicit a redress of grievances, the king said unto them, "Depart yet *for three days*, and then come again to me." And then it follows, that Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam *the third day*, as the king had appointed, saying, "Come to me again *the third day*." 1 Kings xii. 3, 4, 5, 12.

It is hoped that these considerations will convince A. B. that there is sufficient reason for understanding the *three days and three nights* in Matth. xii. 40. as meaning only *part of three days and nights*; in which case, he will find no difficulty in reconciling the declaration of Jesus to what is a well-known fact. Indeed, if it must necessarily be granted, that the time during which our Saviour was to remain in the sepulchre, and the time that Jonah continued in the belly of the fish, were exactly of the same length; it will, perhaps, be more reasonable to allow, that the prophet was no more than part of three days and nights in the fish's belly, than to maintain that Jesus intended to say, that he should continue three whole days and nights in the sepulchre, when he so repeatedly declared, that he should rise on the third day, and the gospel-history proves that he actually did so.

Permit me just to remind A. B.

that what he seems to think a very great difficulty, has been fully considered by persons who have written most ably on the subject of the Resurrection of Jesus ; (particularly by the author of "The Trial of the Witnesses," and by the late Dr. Chandler, in his piece entitled, "The Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ re-

examined, and their Testimony proved entirely consistent ;") and that such full and satisfactory answers have been given to it as may justly occasion some surprise that any serious stress should now be laid upon it.

I am, Sir,

Your's sincerely,

J. T. E.

THE SIGN OF THE PROPHET JONAH.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

MR. EDITOR,

In your Repository, vol. iv. p. 474. "a request is made by A. B. in a letter dated Chatham, Aug. 19, 1809, that some correspondent would be so good as to reconcile our Lord's explanation of the sign of the prophet Jonah, that the Son of Man would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, with the known fact of his having lain in the grave only two nights and one day."

A correspondent informs A. B. that he will find the matter admirably reconciled in a pamphlet published in 1802, entitled, "An Essay on the Sign of the Prophet Jonah, intended to remove a Deistical Objection concerning the Time of our Saviour's Burial, &c. By Isaac James, tutor in the Baptist academy, Bristol."—I believe it may be had of Button, in Paternoster Row.

B. C.

MR. MARSOM ON THE RENDERING OF "HADES," IN THE IMPROVED VERSION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Jan. 29, 1810.

SIR,

A considerable degree of perplexity in understanding the New Testament, is occasioned by our translators frequently rendering the same Greek word by English words of very different signification. The word *hades* is by them rendered sometimes *hell* and sometimes the *grave*. The authors of the Improved Version have rejected the former of these renderings; yet, nevertheless, instead

of lessening the difficulty occasioned by such a mode of translation, they have increased it twofold. In Mat. xvi. 18. they have rendered it *death*, which it certainly never means. In Luke xvi. 23. the *unseen state*, which does not convey any determinate idea. In Rev. vi. 8. and xx. 13, 14. they retain the word *hades*, which, to an English reader, is perfectly unintelligible. In Mat. xi. 23. Luke x. 15. Acts ii. 27, 31. 1 Cor. xv. 55. and Rev. i. 18.*

* The above are all the passages in which the word occurs in the New Testament.

they render it the *grave*. Who would suppose that it is the same Greek word which is so variously rendered? and what confusion and difficulty does such rendering occasion? Let us now see what sense the two first of these renderings will make, as applied to other passages. 1 Cor. xv. 55. O death, where is thy sting? O *death*, where is thy victory? or, O *unseen state*, where is thy victory? Rev. vi. 8. Behold, a pale horse; and his name who sat thereon was death, and *death* followed him; or, the *unseen state* followed him. In two of the passages where they retain the word *hades*, they say in the notes, "*the unseen world, the unseen state*," thus explaining that which is obscure, by that which is no less so. The word *hades* is the name of a place, called in the Old Testament, "*the house appointed for all living*;" the name of which place in English is *the grave*, by which the term *hades* ought always to have been rendered, and not by the meaning of the word, or the reason why the grave is so denominated. The rich man died, and was *buried*, and in *the grave*, (where he was, and not in some *unseen state* where he was not,) he lift up his eyes being in torments. Nor is there any difficulty in this rendering, when we consider, that, in figurative and parabolical language, the Scriptures attribute speech and action, not only to the dead, but even to those things which never were the subjects of animated existence. See Isaiah xiv. 8—20. and Job. xxviii. 14, 22.

When it is said, "Lazarus died, and was carried by angels

into Abraham's bosom," the allusion is not (says Capellus*) to the custom of one person reclining on the bosom of another, as John on the bosom of Jesus at supper, (as the authors of the Improved Version make it,) but to that of children *resting or sleeping* in the lap or bosom of their parents. And where should the pious Jew rest, when he dies, but in the bosom of Abraham, the father of the faithful? This is agreeable to the language of the Old Testament, which represents the kings of Israel as *sleeping with their fathers*, which expression, Dr. Priestley observes, is used only of their good, and not of their wicked kings: and it is also agreeable to the language of the New Testament, which represents departed saints as *sleeping in Jesus*, and *resting* from their labours.

Proper names ought not to be rendered according to their etymology, excepting where there is a direct allusion to their meaning, as in the words of our Lord to *Peter*, Mat. xvi. 18. and I say unto thee, thou art *a rock*, (as thy name imports,) and upon this *rock* I will build my church; but who would be so absurd, (because the word *Peter* means a rock,) as to render Acts iii. 1. "Now *a rock* and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer?" Nor is it less absurd, as I conceive, to render *hades* the *unseen state or world*, instead of *the grave*, of which in the original it is the proper name, because the word means *unseen*.

I am, Sir,

Your constant reader,

J. MARSOM.

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEASED TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

POPE.

ART. I. *The Arabick Alphabet ; or, An Easy Introduction to the Reading of Arabick, for the Use of Hebrew Students.* Newcastle, printed and sold : sold also by Lunn, London. 1809. 12mo. pp. 20.

Every man who applies himself to the study of a language or a science, cannot but feel the importance of having its elements presented to him in as simple a form as possible : and he particularly welcomes this kind of assistance, if the undertaking on which he has entered is attended with more than usual difficulty, in consequence of the number, novelty or apparent complexity of the objects which it embraces. The knowledge and the skill of those who have gone before him in the same road, may smooth his path and abridge his toil : by means of *analysis* and methodical arrangement, his memory may be rendered quicker and more tenacious, his judgment clearer and more discriminating.

It is precisely this service which the learned editor of *Dawe's Miscellanea Critica** has here performed for those Hebrew students, who are desirous of gaining an acquaintance with Arabick.

Speaking from personal and recent experience, he says,

"The first difficulty which a learner has to encounter, is the having, apparently, four alpha-

bets to learn, instead of one." By four alphabets, he means, the initial letters, the middle letters, the final letters with ligature, and the final letters without ligature.

To remove this difficulty, he separates the alphabet into its component parts, gives the learner for his first lesson the seventeen primary figures, which contain the substance of the whole alphabet, and then shows him the origin of the middle and final letters from the initial.

Another difficulty, the difference between the order of the letters in the Arabick alphabet and that of the Hebrew, he tries to reduce by pointing out the dependence of the similar letters on the primary.

The worthy prelate has executed his design with much care and success : nor do we hesitate to affirm, that his tables and remarks are admirably calculated to introduce the student to the rudiments of Arabick, and to prepare him for reading with advantage the grammar by Erpenius.

It would be unjust to conclude this article without paying our tribute of gratitude to the right

* Dr. Burgess, bishop of St. David's.

reverend author for his efforts to extend and facilitate the knowledge of Hebrew and its kindred languages. We heartily join him in the wish, which his quotation from *Franzias* intimates, that candidates for the ministry were initiated in these tongues at an earlier age than they are usually taught. Ignorant of them, no

man can attain to any great proficiency in sacred criticism, or be able fully to avail himself of the theological labours of many of his predecessors and contemporaries. The typography of this little manual does credit to the well-known provincial press (Mrs. Hodgson's, of Newcastle upon Tyne,) from which it issues.

ART. II. *The Substance of a Sermon, preached at the Blessing of the Catholic Chapel of St. Chad, in the Town of Birmingham, on Sunday, December 17, 1809. By the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, Bishop of Castabala, in Cilicia, V. A. F. S. A., &c. Birmingham, printed and sold. Sold also by Wilkie and Co. London. 8vo. pp. 49.*

(Continued from page 88.)

"The second preliminary remark which" Dr. M. is "desirous of making, is, that if, after all, we cannot agree in faith and religion, we are, by the confession of all parties, bound to unite in the affection and services of Christian charity." In this sentiment we most heartily concur: others of a similar cast present themselves in his discourse; and he has thus given an example, which it will be the honour and happiness of Protestants to imitate. (P. 16.)

He now examines "the first of the above-mentioned rules, that of a special revelation."—"At the first breaking out," says he, "of those unhappy dissensions in religion, which have convulsed the Christian world during almost three centuries, a considerable portion of the reformers, so called, professed to be immediately guided by the spirit of God in their religious opinions and conduct." (P. 16, 17.) The statement is not quite so accurate as we could have wished. No very large

number of the reformers ever pretended to be under the direction of a special revelation, but avowed, on the contrary, that the Scriptures were the rule of their faith and practice. He informs us, moreover, that "the same rule has been followed by different denominations of Protestants down to the present day." (Ib.) By some it, no doubt, has: yet never by a majority; never by any great proportion; and, unquestionably, not by those from whom the body of Protestants has taken its complexion. There is no more propriety, no more justice, in his availing himself of the extravagancies of certain religionists, to insinuate a charge against the Protestant cause, than there would be in our charging upon the Romish communion all the freaks and follies of some of the monastic orders. His favourite axiom, namely, *That cannot be the rule of truth which is found to conduct to error*, is really an identical proposition. As a practical maxim, nevertheless, it re-

quires to be framed in more precise terms; for we know, that even the light of reason and of day may be misapplied.

On the reformation from popery, the minds of men acquired an elasticity proportioned to the heavy pressure which had long lain upon them. 'This was still more the case in Germany* than in our own island. No wonder if, in such circumstances, some persons made an ill use of their lately recovered liberty. Their excesses furnish a strong argument against spiritual ignorance and usurpation, but none at all against the characteristic principle of Protestants. Nor, as we conceive, is Dr. M. correct in every part of his historical statement under this division of his discourse. He speaks, for example, of one David George having been "emulated," in his blasphemies, "by our enthusiastic countrymen, Hacket, Thacker, Copping, and several others, who suffered death for the same." The case of Hacket, we acknowledge, is appropriately brought forward:† Thacker and Copping were men of very different character from his; nor did they suffer at the same time, or on the same account, but were condemned for a political offence, and were believers in the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and persons of unblemished lives.‡

In answer to Dr. M.'s accusations against the early Quakers, we content ourselves with refer-

ring to some of the notes of the editor of Neal's History of the Puritans.§ A service has there been performed, which enlightened and candid minds always feel satisfaction in rendering; and that justice, in which Neal and our author have, inadvertently, been defective, is at length exercised to a respectable society.

Concerning the numerous body of Christians who pass under the name of Methodists, and of whom this writer intimates, that they profess to be guided by a special revelation, it is notorious that they avow a supreme attachment to the Scriptures, and disclaim the imputation of embracing and teaching antinomian doctrines. It is with no pertinency that he adduces them in illustration of the evils of the rule against which he is contending. The followers of Zinzendorf, of Swedenborg, and of Joanna Southcott, he has a right to consider as pretending to a private revelation; but, after all, how small is the space which these occupy in the religious world! (19—25.)

The reverend prelate next addresses himself "to those who profess to be guided, in matters of religion, by the written word of God, the Bible alone, as interpreted by each person for himself." (25, 26.) And here, although he observes, "far be it from me to say a word in derogation of the bible," he appears to consider the Holy Scriptures as of subordinate importance.

* Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iv. 313, 314. and Robertson's Hist. of Charles V. vol. iii. 53, &c. (ed. Glasg.)

† Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. 462, 463. (Toulmin's ed.)

‡ Ibid, 341, 342. Dr. M. perhaps, confounds Thacker and Copping with Arthington and Copping. (Neal, vol. i. 462.)

§ Neal, iv. 151, 152. (Notes.)

His first argument stands thus: (26, 27.) "I know," says he, "that the Bible was written by the prophets, apostles and evangelists; but I will add, that you do not know this: I mean, you assume the fact, without having the necessary grounds for your opinion. Again, I know that these writers, who, however holy, were still men, and subject to human infirmities and passions, wrote their books under the immediate inspiration of God's spirit; but you have no sufficient reason for asserting this. Lastly, I know that the books themselves have not, in the lapse of ages, suffered any material alteration; but you cannot consistently assert this. Do you ask me my grounds for these positions? I answer you, I have the testimony of the universal church, who alone is competent to vouch for the facts in question, namely, for the authenticity, the inspiration and the integrity of the several books of Scripture; which testimony you reject as false and spurious. For observe, dear brethren, that the same uniform tradition of the great catholic church, which tells you that the four gospels were written by the evangelists, whose name they bear, under the influence of inspiration, and that they have not been corrupted since they were written, tells you, with equal positiveness and unanimity, that there is a living, speaking tribunal in this church for interpreting them; in other words, that she herself has authority to decide in all doubtful

matters on the sense of the divine oracles."

Our answer to this reasoning is short and plain. We admit these several points, not simply on the authority or testimony of any man or body of men, (though it is observable, that reputed heretics and even early enemies, as well as the mass of believers, have given their suffrages in favour of the authenticity of the Scriptures,) but, further, because in the books themselves we discern marks of authenticity, inspiration and integrity. We know that certain writings, purporting to be Matthew's, Mark's, Luke's, John's, Paul's, &c. are their's, on the same principles that we receive the histories of Xenophon and Livy, as the productions of those authors.* Does this admission imply, that the Romish communion is *the universal church, the great catholic church*? Or, even if it involved this concession, would it thence follow, that she has a sovereign and exclusive right to interpret the Scriptures? Can Dr. M. imagine us to be ignorant of the distinction between a man's testimony to a fact, and his assumption of a prerogative? Do we judge on the same grounds of the validity of both? What, although we believe that the books which the catholic church delivers to us are the genuine records of revelation, must we, of course, believe her when she tells us, that she has authority to explain them? In each of these instances we are determined by evidence: in the former it is sa-

* We almost doubt, whether Dr. M. has read the invaluable chapter on the authenticity of the N. T. in the first volume of Michaelis' Introduction. (Marsh.)

tisfactory, while, in the latter, it amounts to nothing; in the former, her testimony is corroborated by that of others, without which it might be suspicious: in the latter, what is it but bare assertion? So far as concerns her verdict in behalf of the Scriptures, we do not accuse the church of Rome of being a lying witness; but, looking into those Scriptures, we affirm, that she is an unauthorized and fallible interpreter.

Our author would, indeed, persuade us, that it was more easy for her to corrupt the Scriptures, than the doctrine of the Scriptures; since these writings were, “for a long time, in the hands of comparatively a few persons, and those chiefly priests and monks.” (Ib.) But the priests and monks, although they transcribed them, were ignorant of the language in which they were written;* and, by the admirable and kind appointment of Divine Providence, their very ignorance was rendered one mean of securing the integrity of the Bible; as, hence, they were unable to make material omissions, interpolations or alterations. Thus, as well as by the jealousies of rival sects, the purity of the sacred text has been wonderfully preserved.†

Dr. M. next remarks, concerning the Scriptures, that Jesus Christ did not, “during his mortal life, set about writing them;” that it was not “his first injunction to the apostles to write them;” and that he has not “provided” for “the generality

of mankind in all ages and nations being able to read and understand them, and this in the original languages.” (28.)

True: Jesus Christ wrote no books. His short ministry was too much occupied to admit of that employment: and it would not be difficult to show, that the fact adds considerable weight to the evidences of Christianity. What, however, is the soundness of the reasoning, which, from this circumstance, deduces the conclusion, that he did not intend that we should learn our religion from such books? Whether he expressly commanded his disciples to compose any, we know not; nor might the injunction be necessary; as he could not but foresee, that the apostles would leave behind them some such memorials of his ministry and doctrine. And the evangelist John informs us, that his history was drawn up for the conversion of unbelievers and the edification of Christians.‡ Similar to which is the import of Luke’s preface to his gospel.§ With regard to Christ’s not having provided for the generality of mankind in all ages and nations, being able to read and understand the books of the New Testament, it is sufficient to reply, that they are actually handed down to us in a way strictly corresponding with the nature of the divine government of rational and moral beings, and that there is no person who may not so read the Bible as to become wise unto salvation.

The preacher is right in stating,

* Gibbon’s Hist. of the Decl. &c. vol. xii. 119. and Mosheim’s Eccles. Hist. from the sixth down to the fifteenth century.

† R. Simon does justice, in this respect, to the ancient heretics. Hist. Crit. du N. T. Preface.

‡ John xx. 31.

§ Luke i. 1—5.

that "the canon of the New Testament was not absolutely settled throughout the church" till a late period.* Yet even this delay is a proof of the care employed to distinguish between genuine and spurious books; or, in other words, of the veneration with which the Scriptures were regarded; and it has been not a little favourable, in many views, to the cause of truth and knowledge. (29.)

His concluding observation on this subject merits the attention of those Protestants who forget upon what principles the Bible should be examined and interpreted :

"A great part of our mistaken brethren argue, as if they had received the modern Bible, in the English language, from the hand of God himself, in the same manner as Moses received the tables of the law on the top of mount Sinai." (Ib.)

He then urges the following argument against the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the Protestant principle :

"Finally, I will ask you, my brethren, whether you ever heard of a state or legislator, and whether you think such a one ever existed, that, having composed a rule or code of laws, left every subject at liberty to explain it according to his own private opinion?" (Ib.)

Now, our reply to this reasoning will be in a narrow compass. Religion is, in fact, described in the Scriptures as a subject of per-

sonal interest: *every man must give an account of himself to God: let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind:* and the Bereans are commended for examining for themselves whether Paul's statements corresponded with the prophecies. Not only so: if religion be considered as a law of moral conduct, there is no dispute about its precepts, sanctions and prohibitions, among any set of Christians, who, moreover, all agree in admitting the Messiahship of Jesus, on the evidence of his resurrection.† Then, as to other points of faith and discipline, even in these the agreement is more general in proportion as the Scriptures are attentively read; and, for the rest, the diversities of opinion that we perceive, are no more valid against revealed, than diversities of another class are against natural religion. (30.)

But, repeats Dr. M. "that same universal tradition which has handed down to us the Scriptures themselves, as likewise some of the clearest passages in these very Scriptures, testify, that there is a living interpreter, a speaking tribunal, viz. the concurring voice of the chief pastors of the church throughout the whole of her extent." (Ib.)

Of his argument to this effect from tradition, the nature and the value have been, in some degree, already estimated. "As for tradition," says Principal Campbell,‡ "what it is, how

* Lardner's Works, vi. 31.

† Rom. x. 9.

‡ Transl. of the Four Gospels, vol. i. (4to.) p. 63. Speaking of *scripture* and *tradition*, he adds, "We are already in possession of the former, if we can but expound it. We cannot say so much of the latter, which, like Nebuchadnezzar's dream, we have first to find, and then to interpret."

it is to be sought, and where it is to be found, it has never yet been in the power of any man to explain to the satisfaction of a reasonable inquirer." We are happy, we confess, in observing, that our author appeals likewise to the Scriptures, and to some of the clearest passages in them.

The first of these is 2 Pet. i. 20. "No prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation." At best, this text could prove no more, than that the church has authority to interpret scriptural prophecies: but, really, it will not warrant even this admission, (for it is silent as to *the interpreter*,) and much less Dr. Milner's inference.

Eph. iv. 12. is then produced. "He gave some for the perfecting of the saints," &c. This is an important and consolatory assurance. But he must have "the lynx's beam," who discovers in this verse an acknowledgement of the claims of the church of Rome: and he must be strangely at a loss for scriptural authority who refers us to it.

We are now directed to 1 John iv. 6. "He that knoweth God heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth not us; hereby, know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Such was the beloved disciple's language concerning himself and his fellow-apostles, who proved their inspiration by their miracles. By what title it can be used by the Romish, or any other church, Dr. M. has not thought proper to inform us.

Lastly, an appeal is made to

the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, which contains an account of the proceedings of the council of apostles at Jerusalem; a council (so our author calls it) which consisted of men who were undoubtedly inspired; a council—how unlike in its members, deliberations, resolutions and spirit, to that of Trent,* and of every other ecclesiastical assembly to which the name has been applied! (Ib. note.)

Surely, Dr. M. loses sight of history, when he says, that "the ancient church has been preserved, in truth and unity, during 1800 years;† while all later communions, by abandoning it, have split into endless divisions, and have died, or are dying away." On this topic, too, he surely loses sight of the reports of observation and experience. (31.)

He advances to lay down that short, easy and safe rule, which he promised to point out to his audience at the beginning of his discourse. *Short* it certainly is, for it is nothing more than this, "admit and practise whatever the church of Rome teaches and enjoins." *Easy*, likewise, it would seem to be; for, in its application at least, it asks no care, no discrimination. But, whether it be *safe* for those who can read in the New Testament such precepts as, *search the Scriptures, prove all things, hold fast that which is good*, may not be quite so clear. In one thing we perfectly agree with this writer: in following the rule which he prescribes, we shall not have to study and turn over the

* Hist. Con. Tr. by Fra. Paolo Sarpi.

† Chron. Table, at the end of Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.

pages of the Bible. Assuredly, we mean, of reading the he recommends an effectual specific against a disease which infects some Protestants; a fond-terpreter. (31.)

(To be concluded in our next.)

ART. III. *Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel. Letters to the Rev. Daniel Veysie, B. D.; occasioned by his Preservative against Unitarianism; containing a View of the Scriptural Grounds of Unitarianism, and an Examination of all the Expressions in the New Testament, which are generally considered as supporting opposite Doctrines. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D. 12mo. pp. 383. Longman and Co. 1809.*

Unitarianism is now in the condition of Protestantism two centuries and a half back. It can only make its way by controversy. Every inch of ground is disputed to it; and before it can make a convert, it must subdue an enemy. Its advocates have been aptly compared to the Jews, engaged, under Nehemiah, in building up the wall of Jerusalem; of whom, "every one, with one of his hands, wrought in the work, and, with the other hand, held a weapon."

This state of things is not a little beneficial to Unitarians, by constraining them to examine and define their principles, and by teaching them to abandon untenable positions, and to take their stand on those which are impregnable.

The Unitarian controversy affords an encouraging example of the progressive reformation of the Christian faith, by means of a succession of able publications. From the time of Firmin and Bidle, the Unitarians have not wanted, for any long time, apologists and defenders: their system has been gradually working a path for itself in various directions: and, at the present mo-

ment, they form a sect, considerable enough to be watched by rival sects with keen jealousy; to be pursued through periodical publications, pamphlets and volumes, as the most formidable enemies to the orthodox faith; and to be denounced weekly, in innumerable pulpits, as the abettors of a fatal, prevailing heresy. Notoriety only was needed to give wings to their doctrine. The "angel" of controversy has been "flying, in the midst of heaven," as a prelude to the fall of mystical Babylon, "having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people; saying, with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him, and worship Him that made heaven and earth."

In saying this much, we mean not to be boastful. But, why should we conceal our views and feelings? We measure our strength by the alarms and exertions of our opponents; and consider every effort to overturn Unitarianism, as an involuntary homage to its truth, and a presage of its success.

For this reason, although we pronounced Mr. Veysie's "at-

tempt feeble," (See vol. iv. p. 290.) we rejoiced to witness it; especially when we found that it had occasioned the elaborate work now before us. To the "candour" of this new controversialist, we bore willing testimony; this quality of his letter, it appears, was one reason, among others, for Dr. Carpenter's reply; and we are happy to state, that the rejoinder yields not in this respect to the *Preservative*, but is marked as much by urbanity and politeness, as by forcible reasoning and solid learning.

Dr. Carpenter is the advocate of Unitarianism, and not of Socinianism. He states the just distinction between the two systems, pp. 213, 214, and declares his astonishment that the early Socinians, who believed in the proper humanity of Jesus, should have thought the religious worship of him justifiable. In point of fact, the Unitarian of the present day differs as widely from the Socinian, as from the Arian; and it is both ridiculous and unjust to name him after Socinus, whose creed he deems unscriptural, and whose worship he considers idolatrous. The appellation is continued, either from ignorance, or from a spirit of blind hostility; and it may be instantly seen, whether a writer means to argue with Unitarians, or to cast reproach upon them, by the denomination under which he holds them up to view.

Besides the impropriety of Unitarians bearing the name of a reformer, from whom they differ in one of his fundamental doctrines, it deserves to be considered, that they now universally protest against ranging themselves under

the banner of any leader, but that of the Captain of their salvation. They own no master, no head, but Jesus; and would esteem themselves equally wronged by being called after Dr. Priestley, whose theological principles they for the most part adopt, as after the Polish anti-trinitarian, whose favourite notion they reject. But, were they to own any human founder, it certainly would not be one who was stained, like Socinus, with the guilt of persecution—persecution, too, against an Unitarian in the same sense with themselves.

The case is different as to Calvinists: they object not to this appellation; they profess to believe, in the main, as Calvin believed; they consider Calvinism and Christianity synonymous. Whether it be right that they should characterize themselves by the name of a fallible teacher, it is for them, not us, to determine; but we may be permitted to suggest, whether they might not select a purer name, than that of the defamer of Castalio and the murderer of Servetus!

It is, indeed, urged, that the term Unitarian is improperly appropriated by such as disclaim the title of Socinian; to which, the only reply necessary is, that the appellation is positive, not negative; that it refers to a doctrine, and not to a teacher; and that it does fitly describe the belief and worship of One God in One Person. The opposite of Unitarian is Trinitarian; and if those that hold the notion of three equal divine persons, be fairly designated by the latter name, those that hold the no-

tion of "but One God, the Father," cannot be unfairly designated by the former. Let there be no contention, however, about a word; let as many Christians, and as many sects of Christians, as please, be adorned with the honourable appellation which they envy, and wish to deny us; let the term Trinity, according to Calvin, "barbarous and popish," be buried in everlasting oblivion. Names are the feelers with which truth searches out its road; and if the Christian world were once to agree in receiving the denomination of Unitarians, it would not be long before they would return to the ancient and simple faith of the Divine Unity.

Amongst the ignorant, it has been at once an objection and a reproach to Unitarianism, that it rests upon a critical interpretation of the Scriptures. The charge is disproved, as far as it is material, by numberless instances, in which unlearned persons have been led into the Unitarian faith, by a study of the authorised English version. But it is only with the ignorant, that the study of biblical criticism can be held cheap; every man of good information, not to say of learning, knows its immense value to the right understanding of the sacred books. And if Unitarianism have increased rapidly of late years, may it not be, because the means of biblical learning have been abundantly multiplied, and a sensible approach made towards a perfect text of Scripture, and especially of the N. T.?

The publication of Griesbach's

N. T. forms an epoch in the history of sacred literature. His text is, we believe, a standard one with all that can read it for themselves. Trinitarians, as well as Unitarians, agree in its praise. But it is a singular, and to us a pleasing fact, that, though no Unitarian himself, faithfulness, as an editor, has constrained him to exclude from his text several of the passages which have been always accounted the firmest supports of the Trinitarian hypothesis! This, to an Unitarian, appears to be in the natural course of things; and he argues from it, surely not enthusiastically, that the more light there is thrown upon the Scriptures, the clearer will the great truth of the Unity of God be revealed to mankind.

Of Griesbach's labours, Dr. Carpenter frequently avails himself; showing that he is a great, though not indiscriminate admirer of this learned man; of whose merits and services [not intended, and, therefore, the more effectual] to Unitarianism, we were never so fully convinced as in perusing these Letters.

Mr. Veysie's Preservative consisted chiefly of "a long list of unexplained texts," [vol. iv. p. 290.] which, with all the others bearing in any shape upon the Unitarian question, Dr. Carpenter has particularly investigated. His work reminded us frequently of the invaluable volume by Emdinus* on the same plan, and suggested to us as often the remark before made, of the advantages derived to modern Unitarians from the reformation of

* "Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma stabiliri solet."

the Greek text of the Christian Scriptures. The exposition of every passage cannot be expected to be equally luminous or satisfactory; but the inquirer will be pleased to see the view taken by a judicious and learned critic of the words and phrases which have so long puzzled and divided the Christian world. There is no text which the author has feared to meet; and there are not a few of those that have been usually regarded as hostile to Unitarianism, which he has shewn to be in alliance with it. He has not concealed the difficulties in his way, but has rather, we think, in some instances, overrated them; a fault, if such it may be called, which is not usually chargeable on controversial writers. His criticisms are generally intelligible to the English reader; the few cases in which, perhaps, they are not so, occur in the notes, where we meet with many just strictures upon the force of the Greek particles, chiefly in opposition to the fanciful hypothesis of Mr. Sharp and Dr. Middleton, so completely refuted by the learned and witty Gregory Blunt. The mass of the book is, however, plain to a common understanding, and cannot fail to please and instruct, if it do not fully convince, such as make the Scriptures their study.

Although the work grew out of Mr. Veysie's Letter, we do not think that the author has adopted the best form of an answer, that of Letters addressed to him. The person addressed is frequently, of necessity, lost sight of, and the return to him is, in some instances, [as in p. 215,] abrupt and awkward.

The volume is bulky, but will scarcely be pronounced by any lovers of truth to be heavy; at least, we ourselves have observed few passages in it which could be spared; and, certainly, every reader will agree with the writer (p. 14.) that "it is better to be diffuse than to be misunderstood."

(To be continued.)

ART. IV. *A Sermon delivered at the Old Meeting House, Walthamstow, Oct. 29, 1809, on occasion of the death of Ebenezer Radcliffe, Esq. By E. Cogan. 8vo. pp. 35. Johnson.*

Mr. Radcliffe came not, as Mr. Cogan truly remarks, within the description of ordinary men. His departure from the world could not fail to make a deep impression upon the minds of survivors. The preacher, affected by the death of his venerable friend, poured out his feelings in this discourse, which is published verbatim as it was preached. Though the subject be common, the sermon is highly interesting: it is argumentative, pathetic and eloquent.

POETRY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

The following verses were taken, nearly thirty years ago, from an old Magazine. They were there ascribed to the Rev. Mr. Stogden; but I know not whether the same with him of whom you have given us so interesting and instructive an account, or not.* If you think them worthy of insertion, they are at your service, from

Your's truly,

T.

THE UNKNOWN WORLD:

Verses occasioned by hearing a passing-bell. By the Rev. Mr. Stogden.

"But what is beyond death? Who shall draw the veil?"

Hark, my gay friend! that solemn toll
Speaks the departure of a soul!

'Tis gone! that's all we know—not
where,

Nor how th' unbodied mind does fare.

In that mysterious world, none knows,
But God alone, to whom it goes;
To whom departed souls return
To take their doom, to smile or mourn.

O! by what glimm'ring light we view
The unknown world we're hastening
to!

God has lock'd up the mystic page,
And curtain'd darkness round the stage.

Wise heav'n, to render search perplex,
Has drawn, between this world and th'
next,

A dark, impenetrable screen;
And all beyond is yet unseen.

We talk of heav'n, we talk of hell:
But, what they mean, no tongue can
tell.

Heav'n is the realm where angels are;
And hell, the chaos of despair.

But, what these awful words imply,
None of us know before we die:
Whether we will or no, we must
Take the succeeding worlds on trust.

This hour, perhaps, our friend is well;
Death strikes the next; he cries, "Fare-
well,

I die;" and then, for ought we see,
Ceases at once to breathe and be.

Thus, launch'd from life's ambiguous
shore,

Ingulph'd in death, appears no more;
Then, undirected, to repair
To distant worlds, we know not where.

Swift flies the soul; perhaps 'tis gone
A thousand leagues beyond the sun,
Or twice ten thousand more thrice told
Ere the forsaken clay be cold.

And yet who knows if friends we lov'd,
Though dead, may be so far remov'd?
Only this veil of flesh between,
Perhaps they watch us, though unseen.

Whilst we, their loss lamenting, say,
"They're out of hearing, far away;"
Guardians to us, perhaps, they're near,
Conceal'd in vehicles of air.

And yet, no notices they give,
Nor tell us where, or how they live;
Though conscious, whilst with us be-
low,

How much themselves desir'd to know.

As if bound up by solemn fate
To keep this secret of their state,
To tell their joys or pains to none,
That man might live by faith alone.

Well, let my sovereign, if he please,
Lock up his marvellous decrees;
Why should I wish him to reveal
What he thinks proper to conceal?

It is enough that I believe,
Heav'n's brighter than I can conceive;
And he, who makes it all his care
To serve God here, shall see him there.

But O! what worlds shall I survey,
The moment that I leave this clay!
How sudden the surprise! how new
Let it, my God, be happy too!

* Vol. iv. p. 57. The name of the subject of the Memoir is Stogden. Ed.

OBITUARY.

Addition to the Obituary of MR. THOMAS HAWKES, p 93.

The following is a list of his CHARITY LEGACIES:

To the Missionary Society, 2000l. 4 per cents.

Missionary Society to Africa and the East, 1000l. 3 per cents. reduced.

Poor pious Clergy in the country, 1000l. do.

Decayed Ministers in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion, 500l. 3 per cent. cons.

Society for promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor, 100l. sterling.

A Society in the west of England, 1500l. 3 per cent. reduced.

Ditto in the north, 1500l. 3 per cent. reduced.

Cheshunt College, 1000l. 4 per cent.

Hoxton Academy, 500l. 3 per cent. reduced.

British and Foreign Bible Society, 1000l. 4 per cent.

Naval and Military Ditto, 500l. 3 per cent. consols.

Sunday-School Society, 200l. sterling.

Sick Man's Friend Society, 200l. ster.

Stranger's Friend Society, 200l. ster.

London Penitentiary, 1000l. 3 per cent. consols.

Plymouth Penitentiary, 200l. ster.

Lock Hospital, 500l. ster.

Lock Asylum, 500l. ster.

New Rupture Society, 500l. 3 per cent. reduced.

Poor of Bromsgrove, in Worcester-shire, 1000l. 4 per cent.

New Chapels at Stourbridge and Wordsley, 850l. ster. *Ev. Mag.*

1809, October 9. At Bridport, after a lingering indisposition, ABIGAIL, the wife of Mr. George FOWLER. The uniform patience with which this excellent young woman submitted to, and even acquiesced in, the will of her heavenly Father, affords another proof of the efficacy of religious principles, where they are truly felt, in reconciling the mind to the most painful dispensations. "Death forgot in youth," says Young, "is folly; in age, madness.—Happy they! whom death, when he comes, shall find at home: his visit will have less of terror in it. In peace

many have died; and, therefore, it is certain all may. The whole secret for obtaining that peace, is an absolute resignation to the Most High; which, (as hard a task as it seems to some,) at the bottom, is no more than owning him to be God."

"Death gives us more than was in Eden lost:

This king of terrors is the prince of peace."

1809, Dec. 24. Died, at Birmingham, in his fifty-second year, JAMES BELCHER, bookseller and printer.

He won attachment, not merely by his knowledge and good sense, and his superior diligence and skill in his profession, but still more by the kindness of his temper, the modesty and gentleness of his manners, the purity of his mind, and his correct and exemplary discharge of the duties of every relation which he filled. And his friends had numerous opportunities of remarking, with what ease he could forego his own ease and benefit, to render service to others; and with what success he had learnt a lesson, which, judging from facts, should seem to be particularly difficult:—*the union of candour and forbearance, with firmness and decision in the avowal of important truths.*

The closing moments of such a life were suitable to the virtues that had adorned it. The mind had peace and joy in believing. All was thankfulness, resignation and hope, tenderness to survivors, gratitude to friends, the counsels of wisdom and piety, mingling with the consolations which affection and faith alike suggested. It was a scene truly honourable to religion: never may the remembrance of it be lost by the writer and his fellow-mourners!

1809, Dec. 29. At Whitstable, near Canterbury, the Rev. JOHN BAKER. He had received some instruction for the ministry, under the Rev. J. Evans, at Islington; and was placed there by the General Baptist Education Society. At the close of his studies, he settled in Leicestershire, where his labours were very acceptable. This sphere of usefulness he left for Chatham; but quitting that situation, about Midsummer last, he

was now about to settle at Berkhamsted, where there was every prospect of his being useful and happy. But his course was run:—his work was drawing to a termination. The Sunday evening preceding his death, he preached a farewell sermon at Chatham, from this remarkable passage, Acts xx. 25. *And now, behold! I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.* The next day being Christmas day, he preached the lecture at Whitstable, with his usual earnestness and animation, from Luke i. 79. *To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.* This, alas! proved the conclusion of his labours; for the next day he was seized with a violent fever, and on Friday he died, sincerely regretted by his relations and numerous friends. He was interred at Whitstable, where Mr. Flavius Kingsford preached his funeral sermon, to a crowded and weeping auditory.—*Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come!*

Islington.

1810, Jan. 10. At Brompton, in Kent, Mrs. ELIZABETH FLAXMORE. This poor, but pious woman, had been, for some years, a professor of the religion of Jesus Christ, among the people called Methodists; and though she evidenced a decided preference for that connexion, it was not at the expense of a prejudice against any other denomination of Christians. On the contrary, she was remarkable for a spirit of candour which reflected no small credit on her character. To those who knew her, and were capable of appreciating moral worth, she could not but be (as was the case) highly esteemed. For some considerable length of time, the writer of this had been closely acquainted with her, and occasionally visited her in the period of an illness of some few months duration. Then it was that her patience shone conspicuous; while a comfortable belief in the promise of immortality caused her to anticipate the approaching moment of dissolution without dread.

January 18. At seven o'clock, on Thursday evening, an inquest was held in Upper Thames Street, before the coroner for the city of London, on the body of Mr. LYON LEVY, who was found dead about noon that day, in Monument Yard. It appeared in evidence, that the deceased had paid for admission

into the monument, observing to the keeper, that some ladies were shortly to join him: upon which the man said, "Sir, had not you better wait until the ladies come?" The deceased, however, proceeded onwards directly; he reached the gallery, precipitated himself over the railings, and falling on his head, expired without a groan. His fall appeared at first to be in such a strait, perpendicular direction, that it was thought he would have fallen inside of the railing; his feet, however, striking against one of the griffins by the way, threw him some distance from the monument, and he fell into the yard surrounding it. He was one of the most extensive dealers in diamonds, pearls, rubies, topazes, emeralds, and other precious stones, in England. He was of the Jewish persuasion; and, besides several very extensive connexions abroad, he had nearly 20 Jews about the streets of London, who acted as hawkers or runners to his house, and each of whom had power to give credit to the jewellers to a great extent. Within the course of the last month, he called on a person of responsibility in the trade, residing in Craven Buildings, and offered him diamonds and other precious stones to the amount of between 2 and 3000l. on credit; but the other prudently refused the offer, on account of the very great risk he ran of disposing of such a quantity of valuable gems in time sufficient for the re-payment. The deceased was a man of such correctness in all his dealings, that up to the very day of his death, he could have got credit amongst the other merchants in his line of business to almost any amount. He had been, however, unfortunate in several very extensive speculations to Gibraltar and other places abroad; he could not brook the idea of sustaining his credit for some time longer by the assistance of friends, whom, perhaps, he might not have it in his power to pay. And, after having passed many years in the most honourable affluence, his altered circumstances made a deep impression on his mind; he was observed to be frequently of a gloomy habit, was totally absorbed in thought, and absent from every thing that was the topic of conversation around him. He has left a wife and eight children to bewail his loss, and it is supposed that his wife is pregnant of a ninth child. Under all these circumstances, the jury returned a verdict of insanity.

January 26. At Myniddbach, in the county of Carmarthen, Mr. JOHN SYMON, in the 34th year of his life, Unitarian Baptist minister of Zoar, leaving behind him an aged afflicted mother, and a destitute congregation, as chief mourners for his loss. He was a modest, serious young man, of pure and blameless conversation. His inquiries after truth, led him to embrace the simple doctrine of the divine Unity, as it is clearly taught in the Bible, consequently wholly to renounce all the modifications of a Trinity, whether *Athanasian, Arian, or Sabellian*. The influence of a religious friend for some time embarrassed his mind, and this, I believe, has often been the case in similar circumstances, where an opinion of character has been high; but afterward, he saw the weakness of his conduct in that part of it, and lamented over it, that he should be tempted for a moment to hesitate between the voice of *God*, and that of *man*! His health had been declining for some time prior to his dissolution; but he continued his labours to the end of his life. For on the Lord's day before his dissolution he delivered an excellent discourse to young people! His last views of the Christian religion, were highly *satisfactory* and *consoling* to his own mind, and the recollection of his sincere endeavours to rescue the character of the *one God and Father of all*, from the imputation of partiality and cruelty, in which, as it

appeared to him, the general mode of preaching involved it, was soothing. The common doctrine of *satisfaction*, or the purchasing the *favour* of God, by satisfying the claims of his *justice* in a *limited* or *extensive* sense, by the death of Jesus Christ, before God *would* or *could* forgive any sinner, he considered as one of the *corruptions* of Christianity, as having no foundation in scripture, as changing the object of worship, and destroying the doctrine of salvation by the *free favour* and *mercy* of God to penitent sinners, which is uniformly taught in the scriptures! These were his views of religion, and they were full of consolation to him in death. His funeral was attended by *nine ministers*, and a concourse of people, and his funeral sermon was preached by his friend Mr. Thomas, of Llangyndeyrn.

February 14. The Rev. JOSEPH BARBER, pastor of the Independent Church, London Wall, for some time co-pastor with the late Mr. Towle, aged 84 years. He had been 60 years in the ministry. He published a volume of sermons on Regeneration, which have lately come to a second edition.

Mar. 14. The Rev. DANIEL JONES, pastor of the General Baptist Church, Trowbridge, Wilts.

Also, lately, the Rev. Dr. LAW, bishop of Elphin.

[More enlarged obituaries hereafter.]

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS; OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

When the old beast gave up his seat and great authority to the new beast, the world was struck with astonishment, that it should have been done with such ease, and the event passed with little notice from either the divines or the politicians of Europe. No less wonderful has been in our times the recovery of the beast, which received a deadly wound from the sword, and it now appears with greater lustre, than when it aimed above a century ago, at universal dominion. But it was little thought a few months since, when the house of Austria seemed to be at the lowest pitch of depression, when its fu-

ture existence was doubtful, and it depended upon the nod of the great conqueror, that its dissolution should not only be stopped, but that an alliance of an intimate nature should be formed with the new raised family, and that a daughter of the depressed house should be elevated to the honour of sharing the bed of the great representative house of Ajaccio.

These are extraordinary events, that must fix the attention of all, who consider the history of mankind as connected together in a higher degree than it appears to the fluctuating counsels of short-lived cabinets: but in the history

of courts the false prophet will continue to occupy a share of our regards. We have for some time looked upon the papal authority, as having received a blow, from which it could never revive: yet it still exists, and it is by no means certain, that its influence in the affairs of the world may not hereafter be very considerable. That part of Italy, which was formerly known under the title of the patrimony of the Church, is now part of the French empire, and, if Rome ceases to be the chief city of an independent state, its splendour will attract the stranger, when he visits the palaces of the viceroy and of the head of the Church. The decree, which annexed the patrimony to the French empire, made Rome the second city, gave palaces to the Pope in both Paris and his ancient metropolis, fixed on him a very large revenue, and confined within determined limits his future powers.

To understand his new state we must look back to the ancient struggles, which subsisted between the see of Rome and the Gallican church. The kings of France were, by no means, pleased with the depression, in which it was the ambition of the court of Rome to place them. The Gallican church claimed certain privileges, and the court, according as it was in good or ill humour with the see of Rome, brought forward, or kept in the back ground, their claims. In the reign of Louis the fourteenth, they were reduced to the following four propositions.

1st, St. Peter and his successors have not received from God, any power to interfere directly, or indirectly, in what concerns the temporal interests of princes and sovereign states: kings and princes cannot be deposed by ecclesiastical authority, nor their subjects be freed from the sacred obligation of fidelity and allegiance, by the power of the church, or the bulls of the Roman pontiff.

2d. The decrees of the council of Constance, which maintained the authority of general councils, as superior to that of the Pope's in spiritual matters, are approved and adopted by the Gallican church.

3d. The rules, customs, institutions, and observances, which have been received in the Gallican church, are to be preserved inviolable.

4th. The decisions of the Pope, in points of faith, are not infallible; unless

they are attended with the consent of the church.

These four propositions were, as might naturally be expected, a sad bone of contention at Rome. Whilst the supremacy of the Pope in the hierarchy is allowed, the denial of temporal authority and infallibility to him, could never be allowed. The doctrine was, however, partly orthodox in France; and it is now established, and it is not only established, but the Pope himself must, in future, become a party to them. They are to form part of his coronation oath, and we may easily imagine, with what grace he will swear, that he has no right from God, to turn thrones upside down, and that he is not infallible. He is, however, now a subject of France, and this oath he must take, before he is put into possession of his palaces at Rome and Paris, and raised to be the head of the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, and of the French empire, and of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

A similar revolution to this took place formerly, in a distant part of the world. Japan was anciently under the dominion of a spiritual and a temporal sovereign, and the spiritual gentlemen played exactly the same tricks in that island, that their spiritual brethren have done in Europe. The same spirit guided them both, that of deception and fraud. The temporal sovereign, at last, got the better of the spiritual, who, however, is allowed to have his palace, a large income, and great respect; but he is confined entirely to his spiritual tricks. Whether this Pope will, by any art regain his former pre-eminence, time must determine. His claims as the successor of St. Peter, remain the same; the bigotted catholic will still retain his allegiance, and this may, in future times, be turned to an advantage, which at present is by no means suspected. The true christian will not however be dismayed. Fraud may prevail for a time, but an end must arrive when mankind shall see the deception in its true light; they will then, in scripture language, hate the whore and tear off her meretricious ornaments.

The Catholics of Ireland seem determined to preserve their attachment to the pretended holy see. A meeting of Bishops has published their resolutions, in which they declare the necessity of their adhering to their present consti-

tution, and of their disregard of any provision but what arises from the voluntary contributions of their flocks: and in the same resolutions they expressly declare the impropriety of lay interference in their spiritual concerns. These resolutions have received the applauses of many lay associations, and several petitions have been presented to parliament to reinstate them in the rights which belong to all subjects who are willing to pay civil allegiance, and to perform civil duties. It is curious to see how truth and error are continually blended. The Catholic bishops are right in their opinion, that a christian community is, as far as its spiritual concerns extend, independent of the state, and the election of any of their bishops no more belongs to the crown than the election of a minister of a dissenting congregation in England. But we think that neither the episcopal nor the lay Catholic meetings, have duly considered the nature of a christian society. They divide it into two classes laity and clergy, a distinction, which is a mere fiction of men, and completely without foundation in the scriptures. The bishops and elders, whose offices are described by St. Paul, are as much laymen as the rest of the society: they were no more separated from the rest than the chairman and members of a committee of the House of Commons are from the rest of the House. The committees are formed for peculiar purposes, and the committee of bishop and elders in a christian community, when it arrogates to itself any pretended spiritual claims, not derivable from the particular meeting to which it belongs, and not dissoluble by that meeting, advances claims, which may tend very much to their worldly interest but which receive no countenance from the christian dispensation.

The Pope in the mean time, who is thus the subject of so much civil discussion in the two countries now at war with each other, whose power is completely curtailed and defined in the one, and is not allowed at all in the other, is living the life of a prisoner in some fortress in the Alps. It is said, that he was brought into Dauphiny, but so great a concourse came after him that it was thought advisable to remove him. A delegation of Irish Catholics would find it now difficult to lay before him the names of three can-

didates for a vacant bishopric and their sees may remain some time without this supposed requisite part of their body. Perhaps a requisition has been made to the holy father to bless the approaching nuptials, and he may have refused; but at any rate, as his place is now fixed in the empire, he cannot be kept long in a state of obscurity. We should not be surprised at his appearance in the French metropolis to grace the altar, at which the emperor and empress are to exchange reciprocal vows.

Great preparations are making for this solemnity. A temporary altar is to be erected in the Louvre, and the extent of that superb gallery is to be lined by four thousand gentlemen and ladies dressed in the grandest stile; and between them in the open space the emperor, followed by his kings and princes, the empress, followed by her queens and princesses, are to walk in solemn procession. Fire works, illuminations, balls, plays, every thing that a worldly fancy can desire are to mark this memorable day. France and Austria have been united already by a similar marriage. What this will produce time must shew; one thing is certain, that it cuts off England completely from any alliances with the continent, and in this respect even it may be viewed with a great degree of indifference.

In the midst of these preparations Buonaparte has issued an edict, which condemns to years of misery a great number of our fellow-creatures. We should have hoped, that so much appearance at least of joy would have turned his heart, and that he would have made it an occasion of a general amnesty. But so far from this being the case he has revived the old system of the French Bastilles, and various prisons are fixed upon, where are to be immured various descriptions of state prisoners whom he does not think proper to bring before the tribunal of the laws. This is a subject, which has excited severe remarks in our public papers, and doubtless we cannot contemplate the vengeance, inflicted by man upon his fellow-creatures, without extreme sorrow. Yet what country is free from similar imputations. In our own country a few years ago a number of our fellow-subjects were immured in the same manner by the minister of the

day, in different prisons of England for several years, and at last were discharged with the imputation of crime, and without the opportunity of freeing themselves from the charge by an open trial. The arguments, used by Mr. Pitt and his advocates, will be employed by Buonaparte and his supporters: and assuredly nothing but extreme necessity can justify a sovereign in using this species of terror. Wherever it is employed, the people are in danger of the greatest degradation: for how can nobility of sentiment exist, where life and liberty depend on the nod of an individual.

It is a curious thing, that the power exercised by Buonaparte and so justly complained of, is allowed, or at least is practised, in our own country, upon certain occasions, which do not by any means appear to call for such an appearance of tyranny. The House of Commons thinks itself to be invested with this power, and in consequence of it, an individual is now in prison, sent there by a speaker's warrant, to be kept there during the pleasure of the House of Commons, which in this case takes upon itself the offices of prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner. The case has called forth a most acute examination into the power claimed by the House, and Sir Francis Burdett, one of its members, protests against it; and, in a most valuable enquiry into the nature of the privileges of the House, shews that the imprisonment of a person on a charge of libel, is totally foreign to their institution. We do not wish that our House of Commons should bear a resemblance, in this most important relation to the subject, to a foreign despot. But what does Buonaparte claim for himself? the right of imprisoning without trial, the man who displeases him. What has the House of Commons done? it has imprisoned the man who displeased them. But the House of Commons may say, the man has infringed on our privileges; and so will Buonaparte say, the man has infringed on my privilege. But common sense tells us, that it is dangerous, to trust frail beings, like ourselves, with the power of being judges in our own causes. True liberty cannot exist, where the executive, deliberative, and judicial powers are placed in the same hands. The argument of Sir Francis Burdett is de-

cisive upon this subject, and deserves the attention of every one who has a regard for the true dignity of man. A completer analysis has perhaps never been exhibited, and we are not without hopes, that the House of Commons will perceive, that it consults its own dignity more by the rejection than the exercise of such a power.

We do not hear that the French, who exulted so much on the fall of their Bastille, have made any expostulations on the subject of this new decree. They are immersed in the splendor of his reign, and he employs their minds continually on new objects. Holland and Hanover excited many conjectures. The former country was to be absorbed in the French empire, and the latter was said to be reserved in its unsettled state, as a bribe for peace, to its former sovereign. Holland, however, remains a kingdom, though its sovereign has destroyed those edicts, by which he established a species of nobility in that country. Its destiny is not yet known. It may still remain an independent country, if that can be called independence, when the sovereign is in fact, only a viceroy of an emperor. Severe orders are issued on the subject of trade, yet, we do not know how it is, but cargoes are transferred from one country to the other, and the prohibitions serve only to make the commodities dearer to the consumer. But Hanover is completely severed from this country. It now forms part of the kingdom of Westphalia, and a Buonaparte is its sovereign. Cassel, that metropolis formerly of the Landgrave of Hesse, is the residence of the new king where he may occasionally visit his palace at Herrenhausen, and live among his Hanoverian subjects. His territories will thus be of considerable extent; and Westphalia freed from the pride of its ancient barons, may rise to a higher degree of comfort and civilization.

The southern part of Germany is occupied with the passage of the various parties belonging to the bride. But the Tyrol is full of lamentation. It is reduced to a state of quiet, and must submit to its new yoke. We hear little of the Russians and Turks, the latter cannot but be under some apprehensions from the rise of Austria after its sudden depression. What changes are destined to take place in

the Ottoman empire, must soon be discovered; and that seems to be the quarter, in which the fury of the French will spend itself. Russia does not seem to oppose any obstacle to present engagements; and as to the idea of war with France, it does not seem to rest upon any foundation.

The fate of Spain is not completely settled. The junta is sovereign of a small district about Cadiz, but the rest of Andalusia is in possession of the French. They have even advanced so far as to occupy the lines, lately held by the Spaniards, before Gibraltar. No rational hopes can now be entertained of effectual resistance. The Spaniards equally tired of their Bourbons, their inquisition, their monks, will resign themselves to the dominion of a Buonaparte, and in a few years will find the advantage of the exchange. The junta and the English never offered any terms, which could rouse a people to the exertions which the nature of the combat required. Great Britain obtains Ceuta, a small compensation for the lives and treasures expended, upon so fruitless an object; and Portugal cannot be expected to resist long after Spain has submitted to its new master. But the English remain in Portugal, and a body of thirty thousand men are taken into our pay.—Vain efforts!

As we have taken Ceuta, and thus have the complete command of the entrance into the Mediterranean, we may, notwithstanding the French are in possession of Spain, prevent them for some time, from making all the advantage, that such an acquisition is calculated to give them. We have also, by another conquest in the West Indies, taken from them the last of their sugar islands. Guadaloupe has surrendered to our arms, and this may be of consequence in our negociation with the Americans, who are not yet reconciled to us. Warm debates have taken place in their Congress. The French and English have their respective parties; but in the difficulties of their situation, it is probable that they will steer their course, as well as circumstances permit, without coming to an open rupture with either. Of the Brasil government we hear little, and the state of the Spanish colonies will necessarily call in a short time for a declaration on their part of independence. This becomes a

measure that cannot suffer a long delay. If the Colonies should not prepare themselves for a fixed government, they may at the return of peace be easily reduced to the Gallo-Spanish yoke, and then the power of France will be increased by extensive dominion in both worlds.

The inquiry into the Walcheren expedition has occupied the chief attention of the House of Commons, and the reports of witnesses and extracts of papers make a very voluminous publication. The debates upon it already, have terminated in the defeat of the ministers, and a severe censure on one of them. This arose out of the memorial on the expedition presented by Earl Chatham to the king, which gave occasion to Mr. Whitbread to make a motion upon the subject; namely, that the earl had acted unconstitutionally. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in opposing the motion confessed, that had he foreseen all that has happened, he should have objected to the appointment of a cabinet minister to the post of commander of the expedition. Many members spoke upon the occasion, but the delivery of the paper in question seemed to be considered, even by the favourer of the earl, as an injudicious measure. Mr. Canning modified Mr. Whitbread's motion by an amendment, that conveyed the regrets of the House, that such a paper should have been delivered, which was of pernicious consequences in itself and of evil example to future commanders. The Chancellor moved the previous question, in which he was beat by a considerable majority. Mr. Canning's censure then passed without a division; and on Mr. Whitbread's motion it was directed to be presented to the king. In the House of Lords the ministers were more successful as to number of votes, but equally unsuccessful in debate. The question was the king's answer to the city of London, in which the ministers confessed, that all agreed except the Earl of Chatham; but the first Lord of the Admiralty declared, that when he concurred with the rest, he knew nothing of the circumstances in Lord Chatham's paper, nor had he heard of any differences between the two commanders, as their letters contained mutual panegyrics. Thus, the ill-advised step, taken by Lord Chatham, has involved him in

great disgrace, and obliged his retreat from the ministry.

Sir Francis Burdett, after a most able speech on Gale Jones's imprisonment, obtained only fourteen votes in his favour. In a letter to his constituents, the argument is detailed at full length. It is unanswerable; and if the members of the House of Commons would take equal pains in the several subjects coming before them, some applying to one and some to the other, our Acts of Parliament would be better drawn up, and our expenditure would be well regulated. Lord Wellington has obtained his pension, in spite of the petition of the city of London; but the petition is unanswerable. A debate also took place on the merits of a gallant officer, who did not receive the thanks of the House of Commons. This is Sir Robert Wilson, to whom Lord Wellington is indebted for the escape of himself and army after the battle of Talavera. Sir Robert, by very skilful manœuvres, drawing off the attention of the French to his small body, which he contrived to make them believe to be twelve thousand strong, and thus preventing them from pouring down on Lord Wellington, who, by the speed of his flight, thus got out of their clutches. Both sides of the House concurred in their encomiums on the gallantry of Sir R. Wilson, but the motion was withdrawn from some informality. The reversion bill has occasioned debating; and the gallery of the House of Commons was shut by Mr. Windham, on Mr. Sheridan's motion respecting reporters, whom the benchers of Lincoln's Inn had declared to be unworthy to be called to the bar. Upon this occasion, Mr. Ste-

phens did himself very great honour, bearing testimony to the merits of many gentlemen, who were reporters at the same time with himself, and calling to the recollection of the House the names of Johnson, Burke, Mackintosh, and others, who began life in this honourable and useful course. All sides of the House censured the illiberality of Lincoln's Inn, and we have no doubt that their ill-advised measure will be rescinded. This measure has been attributed, but without foundation, to Lord Erskine; that noble lord is, indeed, incapable of harbouring a sentiment against rising talents.

Mr. Yorke has met with a merited repulse from Cambridgeshire. His services having been rewarded with a trowsership of the exchequer, his seat became vacant, and he met with that reception from his constituents, which his conduct deserved. The country in general applauded the spirit of the county in not choosing to return a placeman to the House. A great argument has been held before commissioners for the purpose, on the subject of a new theatre, to be erected in London; and much was said on the increase of the play-going part of the population of this country. The important point to be settled, in our apprehension, is, that if theatres are to be allowed, they should be under proper regulations; and as the present are notoriously deficient in this respect, the establishment of one, in which husbands and parents may sit with their wives and daughters, free from rudeness and insult, may be a good example to the rest, and correct the profligacy of their manners.

INTELLIGENCE.

LONDON SOCIETY FOR CONVERTING THE JEWS.

The society, bearing the above appellation, is amongst the curious births of the year 1809. It was instituted for the sake of supporting *Mr. Frey*, a convert from the Jews, who had been educated for the ministry by the missionary society, but who had deserted his earliest patrons, on account of some difference

of opinion as to the best plan of operations. Mr. Frey has lately published a Narrative of his history: his suspicions, it seems, of the errors of Judaism, were first awakened by his being ill-treated by a brother Israelite; the conversation of a Christian stranger helped forward his inquiries; he was carried still fur-

ther by uneasiness of conscience, at having broken the Jewish sabbath; and a dream or two conducted him into the bosom of the British missionary society. It is somewhat curious, that throughout his Narrative, Mr. Frey does not once advert to the doctrine of the Trinity, as an obstacle to his conversion, nor give any intimation of the reasons which prevailed on him to embrace a tenet, which has been always hitherto accounted a stumbling-block in the road from Judaism to Christianity. We do not think it impossible for a conscientious and well-informed Jew to become a Trinitarian Christian; but we do regard it as highly improbable, that such an one should think so lightly of the difference between the Jews and nominal Christians on this point, as to esteem it unnecessary to mention the subject in a professed account of his conversion. One half of the volume is taken up with a detail of the author's quarrel with the directors of the missionary society; of which we shall make no other use than to refer it to the author of "The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems compared, as to their Moral Tendency," to be introduced, if he think fit, as an illustration of the principle of the work, in the next edition; Mr. Frey, as will presently be seen, has as orthodox an antipathy to Socinians as the missionary society, or Mr. Andrew Fuller himself.

To the institution of a society for converting the Jews, there can be no objection; nay, we can applaud the benevolent intention and zeal of attempting to bring over the worshippers of One God to the unscriptural and absurd worship of a Triune Godhead, involving in it a crucified man. Though we might, perhaps, think that the descendants of Abraham would not come much nearer the truth, by embracing Mr. Frey's system of Christianity, we cannot feel much concern on the subject, because we firmly believe, that no preaching on the part of Christians will change their mind and temper, which sets the New Testament in opposition to the Old, and represents Christ as teaching a different God from that of Moses.

But, we confess, we felt a little surprise, on reading in one of the public prints, [M. Chron. of Jan. 20.] that the directors of the society had recently made application to the ARCHBISHOP

OF CANTERBURY for the PATRONAGE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT to their proceedings! This, we have no doubt, was a paid paragraph, designed to feel the pulse of the public. Patronage! Patronage of supposed truth! Is argument, then, found insufficient? *Patronage of the Establishment!* The directors and subscribers are, it would appear, good churchmen. We had the curiosity to look over the names of the supporters of the society, and we found amongst the most prominent some well-known Dissenters. What, then, can be the meaning of the aforesaid, advertised application? We cannot conjecture, except it be for some such compulsory power, as has, in past times, converted a nation in a day! Yet we rejoice that these zealous *Dissenters* are mistaken as to the influence of the archbishop, the empire of the church, and the temper of the times, if they calculate upon the accession of strength to their body, from the rescripts of spiritual lords, or the decrees of spiritual courts!

We may be thought by some readers to overrate the importance of a newspaper paragraph; but how came the paragraph to be published? Every one acquainted with the London daily press, knows the difficulty of obtaining an introduction for a single sentence in the principal papers, on any subject, however important, without a fee; and who would fee the newspapers for making known the proceedings of the London society for converting the Jews, but the society itself?

And a mere application to the archbishop for his subscription as an individual cannot be intended; the words convey an idea of much more. Nor are there any unappropriated funds in the establishment from which it was meant to request pecuniary aid; the children's meat is not, in the Church of England, given to dogs. The application, if real, could not have intended more or less than that the *spiritual power* of the church should be enlisted on the side of the directors, to compel Jews, and perhaps heretics, to come into the Calvinistic fold.

The interpretation put on the newspaper paragraph, is borne out by the language of the society in their "First Report," to which our attention has been called by several correspondents.

and to which we now call the attention of our readers. We shall first give an extract from the paper in question, as furnished by a gentleman, on whose accuracy we can rely, and next make some remarks upon the avowed design of the society, with regard to Unitarians, whether Jewish or Christian.

Extract from the First Report of the Committee of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews.

After detailing the general plan and objects, and the pleasing prospects of the society, and "throwing out *one or two ideas* for the particular consideration of the descendants of Abraham," (the latter of which subjects of reflection is not the most happily adapted to the purpose of conciliation, viz. an Act of Parliament of Queen Anne's reign, enabling the lord-chancellor to make a discretionary and compulsory provision for the young convert to Christianity, out of his Jewish parents' effects,) the Report proceeds as follows :

"Your Committee have also to remark a most indecent attempt, by some persons, at one of the late lectures, to defeat the effects of Mr. Frey's preaching, by inculcating in the minds of some of the Jews present, Arian or Socinian doctrines; *such persons are desired to remember, that the Toleration Act affords no protection to those who detract from the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and though nothing is further from the disposition of the Committee than an intolerant spirit, they cannot but feel indignant at the gross indecency of the conduct above alluded to; and they are determined NOT TO PASS BY any future recurrence of the same nature.*"

1. Here is a great predilection manifested for *Acts of Parliament*; and, truly, though they be but miserable instruments of religious conviction, they may very well serve to endow orthodox believing, and punish heretical pravity.—But, seriously, what can the society intend by suspending the sword over the heads of the whole body of the Jewish people? Do they degrade and irritate them as preliminary steps to their conversion?—The notable *idea* which they have "thrown out for the particular consideration of the descendants of Abraham," borrowed from that great authority, "Queen Anne," is tantamount to an intimation, that, if a Jewish

youth, having opulent parents, be, from his supposed incapacity and notorious vices, kept in a state of dependence, he has only to profess himself a Christian, (which a weak or wicked Jew would be the most likely to do, on a sudden,) and here is a society, courting the *patronage of the Establishment*, prepared to appeal to the law, to enforce the prudent parent's apportioning the imbecile or profligate child! Profligate, *then*, it may be said, no longer; but will the society, in its zeal for proselytes, wait till the reformation be fully ascertained, before it commences law-proceedings? Will it take all prudent care not to patronize any that may *turn Christians out of spite, or with a mercenary design*? But, shame on the times! that it should be necessary now to plead for the civil rights of Jews!—necessary to contend, that a Jew ought to have the free disposal of any property that the law of the land allows him to possess!—necessary to assert, that a Jewish parent has the feelings of human nature, and that it is cruel to hold out a bribe to his children to rebel against him!

2. The matter of complaint, contained in the paragraph within inverted commas, requires to be ascertained:—"*a most indecent attempt, by some persons, at one of the late lectures, to defeat the efforts of Mr. Frey's preaching, by inculcating in the minds of some of the Jews present Arian or Socinian doctrines.*" The words presented to our minds, on the first perusal, the idea (a novel one, we confess) of an *Arian or Socinian mob*; of the disturbance of the preacher; of the dispersion of the congregation; in short, of a riot, instigated and effected by *Arians or Socinians*. We instantly saw, however, a flaw in the indictment, through which the persons implicated might escape. They are not identified on the part of their accusers. The charge is concerning doctrines, and to introduce an *alias*, to indict generally *Arians or Socinians*, is as reasonable as to indict conspirators at the Old Bailey as *men or women*.

A closer examination of the paragraph, however, satisfied us, that there was no mob, no riot, no disturbance of the congregation, no injury or insult to the preacher. The *Jews Chapel*, the scene, we suppose, of the *indecent* complained of, is, we take for granted, registered according to law; it is, there-

fore, as much under the protection of the civil power as a parish church; and, on a complaint before any magistrate of any persons creating an uproar, a penalty of 20l. or, on the non-payment of that sum, imprisonment, would have been promptly executed upon the offenders. There would have been no inquiry on the part of the magistrate, whether the disturbance was an Arian or Socinian, an Athanasian or Sabellian one. The fact of the riot would have been every thing; if that were substantiated, conviction must follow. And we have too little reason to confide in the clemency of the society, to imagine that, if such had been the circumstances of the case, the directors would have contented themselves with waiting till they printed a Report, and then expressing their anger in a paragraph, and threatening vengeance for the future.

No, no; the sentiments, and not the conduct of the persons in question, excite the "indignation" of the society. The language we have quoted plainly implies, that those persons supposed that they were doing nothing illegal, and that in the opinion of the writer or writers, the doing the same thing, under other circumstances, would not have put them out of the "protection of the Toleration Act." It is their "detracting from the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," not their disturbing public worship, which calls forth the significant memento, the fearful threat of the directors.

We have only conjecture to guide us, but we take the real fact which has chafed the managers of the society, to have been, that some persons, after hearing Mr. Frey, were curious to learn the effect of his preaching upon some of his Jewish auditors, and took an opportunity, at the close of the service, to satisfy their curiosity by conversation with the objects of it; and that the doctrine of the Trinity was canvassed, and pronounced, probably on both sides, to be subversive of the law of Moses. Whether the conversation were pertinent or impertinent, sober or extravagant, temperate or intemperate, we have no means of ascertaining; but, however this may have been, we confidently assert, that the language of the *Report* is "indecent, intolerant and unchristian."

What! is this converted Jew infalli-

ble! Is the *Jews' Chapel* to be erected into an Inquisition? Is it for this that the patronage of the Establishment is sought? Are the liberties of Englishmen to be abrogated by a foreigner coming into this country to lisp Calvinism? Do his supporters really claim for him the privilege, never assumed by the highest dignitaries of the church, of passing off his notions as inspirations, his sentences as oracles? Are the public invited to hear, but forbidden to examine? Is a lure thrown out to decoy the Jew into the chapel; and is a constable provided to carry him to the watchhouse, if, as he is leaving the place, he tells an inquirer that he can acknowledge no God but Jehovah?

The society is on the watch, let the weavers of Spitalfields beware. They may hear Mr. Frey, but woe unto them if they vent even in whispers their dissent from him, or utter a syllable calculated to "defeat the effects of his preaching." They may be unsafe, not merely in the chapel, but also in the precincts of it!—Hopeful instruments for converting Jews!—a German, who teaches, in broken English, that Jehovah was Jesus Christ;—a committee of dissenters;—the patronage of the archbishop of Canterbury;—two Acts of Parliament, enacting the deprivation of property and liberty; and an indefinite number of spies and constables!

3. The directors seem willing to remind Unitarians, that they are out of the protection of the Toleration Act. For this, that class of English dissenters ought to be thankful to them. The pains and penalties hanging over Unitarians, are, we believe, of no disservice to the denomination; as far as they are recollected, they unite the members of the body, otherwise unconnected; and the sense of them will, we trust, in some auspicious moment, prompt the whole of them to approach Parliament, in the respectful, but firm language, of freemen, to solicit to be placed upon the footing of citizenship. We do not mean it as irony, when we say, that we are really glad when zealots reproach us with what we consider reproachful only to our country, and what we know some of our warmest theological opponents lament, amongst other reasons, because it places us on the vantage-ground of being possible sufferers for our principles.

We had a thought of inserting here the names of Mr. Frey's committee; who would not be deemed *intolerant*, but who, at the same time, intimate how easily certain believers, or disbelievers, may, unless they behave well, be deprived of *Toleration*: but, as committees are often changing, we might possibly, by taking any one list, fix the imputation of persecution upon some who would disclaim it. Perhaps, the threat contained in the Report may be acted upon; we sincerely wish, for the benefit of Unitarians, and for the cause of religious liberty, that it may; and in that case, we shall be ready to apprise our readers to whom they are indebted for the agitation of a question, which can never be discussed without benefit to truth and freedom.

One word of advice, however, to Mr. Frey's committee: they are many of them connected with institutions for the education of dissenting ministers,

and for the support of English missionaries; but do they know that it is seriously doubted by the best legal authorities, whether the Toleration Act afford any protection to teachers, not pastors of particular congregations! We do not mean to retaliate, but let them take care, that by instituting too rigorous an inquiry into the limits of the Toleration Act, with a view to shut out of the pale of religious freedom, *Arians* or *Socinians*, they do not prompt others to adopt the same means to exclude some of themselves from privileges which they are so greedy to confine within their own circle.

In what we have said, we wish to awake no resentments in Unitarians; nor, if we do not mistake their character, shall we; for we know, that their first and most ardent prayer is for universal religious liberty,—for liberty to themselves, only as a part of the great body of English Dissenters.

MISCELLANEOUS.

We learn, from a letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, [Jan. 2, 1810.] that the Rev. SIDNEY SMITH, in a visitation sermon, preached at Malton, and since published, has asserted most strongly his orthodoxy. He not only protests against the charge of *Socinianism*, which he says, has been groundlessly preferred against him, but solemnly professes his entire belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, and “in every iota of every one of the 39 articles.” Nay, he goes further; and with a view we suppose, to prove his biblical cru-

dition, as well as his faith, expresses his regret that the passage 1 John v. 7. is abandoned, and affirms that the establishment is endangered by the hasty concessions of Bishop Prettyman and others, upon this point!—This is not in our humble opinion the way to the episcopal bench, though we believe that neither the witty *ci-devant* lecturer at the Royal Institution, nor the learned Dr. who lately edified the university of Cambridge, by theological lectures, intended that a profession of *entire faith*, should be a bar to preferment.

NOTICES.

THE NEW UNITARIAN MEETING-HOUSE, AT SOHAM, Cambridgeshire, will be opened on Tuesday and Wednesday, April 3 and 4. The religious services will be on Tuesday evening and on the morning and evening of Wednesday. Mr. Aspland and Mr. Wright are expected to preach; and Mr. Grundy, (of Nottingham,) and Mr. Madge, (of Bury,) to take a part in the other services.

The Anniversary Dinner of the LONDON UNITARIAN BOOK SOCIETY will be held on Thursday, April 12, 1810,

at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street.

STEWARDS.

Gideon Ackland, Esq.
Samuel Dunsford, Esq.
Rev. J. Joyce,
Rev. T. Rees,
Hollis Solly, Esq.
James Stodart, Esq.

The Chair for conducting business will be taken at half past three o'clock precisely, and for dinner at half past four o'clock precisely.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following subscriptions have been received for the "five destitute orphans" of the late MRS. STANDEVENS: (See p. 90—92).

[illegible]

We have received various letters of advice from numerous correspondents, for which we wish to make a general acknowledgement. If one do not follow the suggestions of the respectable writers, it is not because we disregard them, but because they are contradictory. For instance, one letter expresses great dissatisfaction with the "Say Papers;" another pronounces them the most valuable fund from which the Editor has yet drawn his materials: one complains of the dullness and tediousness of the controversy on the "Decline of Presbyterian Congregations;" another congratulates us on having luckily fallen upon a topic, which must powerfully interest the whole body of Dissenters: one regrets that we so often indulge in "sermonizing;" another that we are so seldom moral and practical: one declares that the writer never reads the "Gleanings;" another that the writer turns to them first, and devours them with avidity. Now in this multiplicity and opposition of counsel, there is but one plan for the Editor to adopt; and that is, to consult his own judgment. In doing this, however, he wishes to lean occasionally, and as much as he consistently can, to the different opinions of his correspondents, and to study variety, and, above all, impartiality.

The following communications are intended for publication, though the bare list of them will sufficiently explain why we cannot pledge ourselves for the speedy insertion of all of them: viz:

Anecdote of Mr. Samuel Jones and Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Secker.—Dr. Wallis's curious explanation of the mystery of the Athanasian Trinity.—Sketch of the Succession of Ministers in the Chapel, Nicholas-street, Ipswich, by Mr. Drummond.—Hazael not the Murderer of his master.—On Dissenting Ministers wearing gowns.—A Question concerning the Letters to the Prelates.—Luke's account of Malta verified, from Captain Yule, by Mr. Butcher.—Extract from Voyages, 1780.—A Friend to Truth, on Rev. xxii. 16.—Primitivus, on the Present Participle in the Greek.—Mr. Marsom, on the "Reasons for baptizing Infants."—"A Rational Dissenter of the Old School," in explanation.—Address to the Distributors of Bibles and Testaments.—Authors of "Forms of Devotion."—Inquiry concerning Nicholas and Thomas Warren.—Particulars concerning S. and J. Crellius, Lælius Socinus and Hartley.—Philo, on a Passage in Virgil.—One of the Academic Sect, on the Jewish Sabbatic Year.—Mr. Hampson, on the Decline of Presbyterian Congregations.—Extracts from Herder.—And numerous Gleanings.

The Letter of the Reviewer of the Improved Version has been received, but too late for insertion this month.

In the next number will, be given an *Original Letter of Dr. Lardner's, on the Jewish Jubilee and Sabbath Year*, and a Review of Mrs. Cappe's *Life of Christ*; and, in the following number V. F's Account of Dr. Rotherham.

We are too much in arrears with our correspondents to be able to commence a controversy on the subject, of *Social Worship*. From the same cause, we are obliged to put aside E. H. H's Remarks on Mr. Allchin's arguments on Necessity.

It is with reluctance that we inform "A Churchman," that we must abide by our determination, expressed, we allow, firmly, but we hope, not uncandidly.

ERRATA.

The following errors crept into a half sheet of the last No. which the reader is requested to correct.

- P. 81. col. 2. for "PACIFICATUS" (a signature) read PACIFICUS.
 — 84. col. 1. l. 7 from the bottom, for "*basty*" read *happy*.
 — 85. col. 1. l. 20 for "*far*" read *for*.
 — — — — — l. 33 for "*negro-slaving*" read *negro-slavery*.
 — 86. col. 2. l. 15. for "*amity*" read *unity*.