

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXV.

MARCH.

[Vol. VII.]

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Correspondence between the Rev. J. Berington and the Rev. J. Evans, with Remarks by the latter.

[Extracted from the Appendix to a Sermon, by Mr. Evans, at King's Lynn, Norfolk, Jan. 5, 1812, just published.]

LETTER I.

To the Rev. J. Evans.

REV. SIR,

HAVING often heard your *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World* much spoken of, I lately purchased a copy of the last edition, and immediately—as was natural—turned to the article *Papist*. The word was repulsive; but I proceeded, and having read it through, I exclaimed—*Si sic omnia*;—one edition surely might have satisfied the public curiosity, for a more loose, unsatisfactory, and, in many points, a more unfair statement of our opinions was never given! And yet, can it be thought that the religion of Fenelon, and of so many great and good men, in all ages and all nations, did not claim a candid and correct exposition?

We object to the word *Papist*. You know it to be a term of reproach, not used in good society, and which you yourself, in ad-

ressing a Catholic, would not use. Then why—as you profess moderation—write it? The legislature, in its late acts, has relinquished the term, adopting that of Roman Catholic. This last is our family name, come down from the earliest ages.—We do not object to the adjunct *Roman*, because it shews the connection we hold with our ecclesiastical head; otherwise the single word *Catholic* ever has fully distinguished us from all other Christian societies. *Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen*, was said by a Spanish bishop, arguing against the Novatians, as far back as the fourth century.

“You strangely confound *infallibility* and *supremacy*, calling them a ‘leading tenet.’ The first, as applied to the Pope, never was a *tenet* of our church. Some divines have maintained it, as their opinion; but do opinions, or divides, mark you, form the church? This church alone, the assembly of all the faithful, we believe, from the promises of Christ, to be secured from error, on all essential points of doctrine. To the Roman bishop, the first pastor, or head, of this church, we ascribe *supremacy*;

or, perhaps more properly, *primacy*; his government being limited by, and controuled by, the canons of established discipline. To represent this primacy, as extending to princes—because such has been its abuse—argues utter ignorance. Some divines have said it: the church never. Your third division of Catholics on this head, is a mere fancy. Every Catholic admits the primacy of the Roman bishop. Our opinions are various; our belief, or faith, one. Show me from the council of Trent, or the creed of Pope Pius, or any public acknowledged rule of Catholic belief, that we speak your language, and you will have done something. And this you should do, would you *sketch* a true portrait, and not a caricature. Gilray would beat none of you in this art.—We do not pay divine worship to the host or consecrated wafer. The worship we pay is to Jesus Christ whom we believe to be really present, under the mystic signs or forms of bread and wine.—As to your works of *supererogation*, I know little about them, only that they serve your purpose. Some schoolmen may have talked about it; and I believe, if a man sells what he has, and gives it to the poor, he does more than is required from him, as a disciple of Christ; but if in this, or in any other good work, there be any merit, which can be applied to himself or others, all its value must arise from the superabundant merits of Christ; by which alone the actions of man become good, and find acceptance with God.—You then proceed to confound points of discipline and belief; and speak of different schools as so many sects;

whereas, the plain fact is—the Jansenists, who were condemned, excepted—they maintained different opinions, as they might, adhering all to the same faith.—As you mention the council of Trent and the creed of Pius, let me request you to sketch your next Papist from those repositories of his doctrines. And thence you should have drawn your account of *indulgencies*, and not from Robertson, whose statement abounds with error. As to the form, you subjoin; if Tetzel, in the extravagance of his own fancy, proclaimed it—which I doubt—you may be assured it is not Catholic. There is no remission of sin, nor of the consequences of sin, without sincere repentance. The ‘present state’ of our religion, is to be collected—as it always was—from our catechisms and books of public instruction, and not from the opinions of any individual, such as Dr. Milner. We value his miracle as little as you do.

On the Greek church you are no more correct than on ours. What can you mean in saying, that the Greeks or Russians ‘reject images in the worship of the Deity,’ when you cannot be ignorant that on the subject of images, they are particularly censurable; and this yourself shew in the following page.—*Consubstantiation*, with the Lutherans, they do not admit; but a real change of the elements, as we do: and this your Greek pupil, if he knew any thing, could have taught you.—It always has been, and is notorious, to men that will see, that both churches, on all points of faith, have thought and do think alike; the primacy of Rome

and the procession of the third person from the Son excepted. In discipline we differ.

Both these articles are compiled in the most slovenly manner: indeed, I must say, without the smallest knowledge on the subject, as if, in your opinion, the Jumpers in Wales, and the Shakers in America, had a claim to more attention. The minds of you ALL overflow with prejudices; you copy from one another: deign not to look into Catholic writers, in whom truth might be found, and modestly insist, that we do not know what our own belief is. I can, therefore, with truth say, that from the time of your boasted Reformation to the present day, no writer, as far as I have read, has been, or is free from the charge of the grossest misrepresentation.

Having completed your *Sketch of opinions*, you say: 'To a thoughtful mind they exhibit a melancholy picture of the human understanding, misguided through passion, and warped by prejudice.' Indeed it is so; but what then must the same thoughtful mind think of that leading principle of your Reformation—from which all the evil has flowed—which invites the most ignorant man to interpret the scriptures as he pleases; thence to form his own religion; and to become the teacher of others? To this principle we oppose the commission of Christ to his apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15, 16; while reason and common sense tell us that no rule can be so safe and so philosophical as that of authority, resting on the promises of our master, and the uninterrupted tradition of ages. This principle of authority, however, is not meant

imperiously to controul, but to direct the conscience, in the choice of what may most conduce to eternal happiness.

That through the long progress of ages, there have been among us absurd opinions; and in our practices, superstition; and in our conduct, bigotry and intolerance, no Catholic will deny: but our faith, throughout, has been one and unchanged, such as the apostles taught, and their successors in the ministry have brought down with them. Again, we allow that in our discipline are many things—such as the use of the Latin tongue, the dress of the ministers, and many ritual ceremonies—not agreeable to modern taste and manners; but we received them from venerable antiquity; and, therefore, we preserve them. Had our religion been modern, modern would have been all its outward garb and expression.

I make no apology for these strictures on your *Sketch*, nor for their occasional asperity. It is hardly possible to reprobate too strongly the conduct of men, who, when truth lies open before them, turn aside to the sources of error, thereby to perpetuate their own prejudices, and the prejudices of their readers. And by what casuistry, let me ask, can such conduct be here justified, which, on other occasions, the plain dictates of honour and honesty must condemn? Had I undertaken to compile such a work as yours, I should have procured, from every society, that statement of opinions which was deemed by *them* most correct; and then have submitted each article to the inspection of the most intelligent man in each society I could have found, with

a determination to abide by his corrections. But had you done this, in regard to the two articles, at least before me, I can confidently tell you that not many lines would have remained uncanceled.

I am, Rev. Sir,
Your obedient
and humble servant,
JOSEPH BERINGTON.

Buckland, near Farringdon, Berks,
Dec. 11, 1811.

Let me add.—We ask you not to approve our doctrines. Reject them, refute them, as you can: state them only fairly. Do as you would be done by. I often suspect that you feel your Reformation cannot be supported, but by misrepresenting the tenets of the church from which you withdrew: otherwise, why will you thus persevere?—I will send you a summary of our principles.”

LETTER II.

To the Rev. J. Evans.

REV. SIR,

Inclosed is the *Summary* I mentioned, which I recommend to your perusal.

I have now gone through your *Sketch*, for which on one account, you have my sincere thanks. Surely no work was ever better calculated to strengthen *the Catholic* in his belief of the necessity of a guide in religion. In this view, I shall recommend it to their perusal. But how any Protestant, when he seriously contemplates this melancholy series of discordant opinions can approve the principle of private judgment, and not rather adopt universal scepticism, is to me, I own, incomprehensible. Were I not a Catholic, nothing short of this, or

even of Deism, could afford me any resting-place. Must the thoughtful man, left to himself, go on from Luther to Calvin, from Calvin to Muncer or Arminius, from these to George Fox, or Swedenborg, or Ann Lee, or Joanna Southcott, &c. &c.

‘And find no rest—in wandering mazes lost’—

and still be told that Christ came into the world to be to him *the way, the truth and the life*; and that he who follows him *walketh not in darkness*?

‘We deprive the laity,’ you say, p. 289, ‘of the scripture, by restraining its use.’ For use read *abuse*, and the word will be correct. On points *of faith*, we would have the scriptures to be explained, as *the church*, from the beginning, has explained them. Had this rule been followed, your *Sketch of Christian Denominations* would have been comprised within a few pages. On points, *not of faith*, each one is left to his liberty. This has given, and does give, rise to that variety of opinions, which you are anxious to confound with variation in essential belief. This latter variation, I admit, has at all times too much ‘disturbed the tranquillity of the Catholic church.’ But here lies the difference. With us, it has ever arisen from the violation of our principle of *authority*: with you, it is the direct and invited consequence of your principle of *private judgment*. But we ‘deny,’ you add, ‘the sufficiency of scripture.’ Let me ask you: What was the *rule* of belief followed by the early Christian churches, before the written word was sufficiently established and extended, to become a guide? Was it not the

authority of their teachers, the apostles and their successors, to aid and confirm which authority, the written word or scripture, in due time came forward? Such, we think was the order established by Christ; and the same ever has been, and is our rule of belief. Had *the scriptures* never been written, our faith would have been equally secure: where would yours have been? Did Christ leave any directions for the writing of his doctrines?

I am, Rev. Sir,
Yours, &c.

J. BERINGTON.

Dec. 12, 1811.

REPLY.

To the Rev. J. Berington.

REV. SIR,

I acknowledge the receipt of both your letters, and the little pamphlet, entitled *Roman Catholic Principles in Reference to God and the Country*—written in the reign of Charles the Second. Many observations occurred to me upon *the asperity* with which you address me; but I wish not to recriminate. However I must say, that the correspondence which you had, many years ago, with Dr. Priestley, respecting your preaching a charity sermon at his place of worship, in Birmingham, had impressed me with an idea of your good sense and liberality; you may judge, therefore, how I am disappointed on the present occasion. Notwithstanding your remarks, I am still of opinion that I have *in substance*, given a correct account of your sect, in my *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*; and your glosses do not affect it. With your writ-

ings, as well as with those of Dr. Milner, I am not unacquainted; and it is, indeed, wonderful to me that men of such talents and learning can profess, and even advocate a religion, whence *the exercise of reason* is excluded. As you have sent me *your creed* in the little pamphlet—I have transmitted you mine in the inclosed *address*; and as you recommend your creed to my perusal, so I hope you will read *mine* with equal attention.* For any controversy with you I have neither time nor inclination, occupied as I am in my professional labours of educating youth, and being naturally disposed to peace—but subscribe myself your well-wisher, and, as a friend to *Catholic emancipation*, a well-wisher to your whole body.

JOHN EVANS.

Islington, Dec. 19, 1811.

P. S. To shew you, however, that I am under no fear, as to the issue of your animadversions on my *SKETCH*, on the REFORMATION and on PROTESTANTISM at large, I mean to send your two letters and the above reply, for insertion, to the Monthly [Theological] Repository, sold by Sherwood and Co. Paternoster Row. This is a liberal publication, where the merits of the case may be discussed—and thus, indeed, the purchasers, both Catholics and Protestants, of the last edition of *the Sketch*, may benefit by your corrections—my account of your sect being (according to your representation) so erroneous and defective! My sole object in drawing up the *Sketch*

* My Twentieth Anniversary Sermon, preached at Worship Street, November 3, 1811.

was to extend the empire of Truth and diffuse the benign influence of Christian charity—*Tros Tyriusque MIHI nullo discrimine agetur.*

REMARKS.

As the writer of the *Letters* has given me “full permission to publish them in any form I please,” they are placed in this *Appendix* to a Sermon, in which a single extract is made the subject of animadversion. The Editor of the *Monthly Repository* is welcome to transfer them, with my *reply*, into his work—where no doubt, an ample vindication will be made of *Protestantism* and of the *Reformation* in general. The introductory remarks* are merely by way of *self-defence*—and I shall add a few words respecting the *Greek church*, which I am also accused of having grossly misrepresented. The following respectable authorities will shew that my account, in the *Sketch* of that Church, is pretty correct:—

Dr. Charles Coote, in his *History of the Eighteenth Century*—subjoined to the last edition of Mosheim—speaking of the Greek church, says—“*Transubstantiation* is not a decided doctrine in this church. It is apparently maintained in one of the public confessions of faith, but the words used in the service itself seem merely to imply, that the supposed change is an act of the mind, not a *physical* conversion of the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ. The gross absurdity of supposing it to be an *actual change of substance* does not appear to have formed a part of the early creed of the Greeks, but was in all probability borrowed

from the wild fancies, or artful inventions, of Romish priests, the notorious corrupters of primitive Christianity.”

The Rev. Mr. Coxe, in his *Russian Travels*, tells us that “the *Greek religion* prohibits the use of *carved images*; but the pillars of their church, the walls and ceilings, are painted with representations of our Saviour, the Virgin Mary, and different saints.” And Mr. Bruce, speaking of the Abyssinian churches, says—“Their walls were almost covered with pictures of saints or other representations; but *no figures, embossed or in relief*, were exhibited, for they considered the use of these as a species of idolatry!”

In a controversial pamphlet, written some years ago, Mr. Berington thus reluctantly acknowledges—that *Protestantism* allows a greater range of intellectual freedom than *Popery*—a striking proof of liberality struggling with the prejudice of education. “Many things, I confess, in the *Catholic belief*, weigh rather heavy on my mind, and I should be glad to have a *freer field* to range in! Can you wish for a reader with better dispositions than these? I read with a rapid but close attention, every moment expecting that some happy discovery will set me at liberty. Alas! sir, it has never yet happened. I meet with assertions, thrown out sometimes with an air of plausibility—texts of scripture alleged but proving nothing—fathers dragged forwards to contradict their own words—and reason decoyed from its proper pursuits, to discuss matters which belong not to it. With indignation I throw the book aside, for instead of gaining liberty I discover that

* Not inserted here, for want of room. Ed

I have been reading only to convince myself still more that I am *obliged* to believe what *my church* proposes to me!!” The giant *Prejudice* rules the human mind with a more than iron sway. Such cases are entitled to our pity and compassion*.

I shall conclude with reminding *the young reader* of the difference between the Romish church and the Reformed church, on the subjects of *scripture* and of *tradition*. The council of Trent says, concerning *tradition*, that “The truth and discipline of the *Catholic church* are comprehended both in the sacred books and in the *traditions*, which have been received from the mouth of Jesus Christ himself, or of his apostles, and which have been preserved and transmitted to us by an uninterrupted chain and succession!!” The doctrine of the *Reformed church* is — *That the Holy Scripture* containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever

* It is but justice however to declare that the above EXTRACT, as also the extract in the *Preface*, are taken from *Reflections addressed to the Rev. J. Hawkins*, published in the year 1785 and that the Rev J. Berington has since made the *amende honorable*, in a printed paper, dated Feb. 13, 1801, now in the hands of the Catholic clergy — from which it appears, to use its own words, that he has “submitted all his religious opinions and writings to the judgment of the apostolical See of Rome; revoking and condemning every sentence and passage in them contrary to, or derogatory from, the definitions and decisions of the general councils, Roman pontiffs and orthodox fathers professing himself sorry for the offence and scandal which *these* have caused, and promising to avoid the same in future!!” — See the Rev. Dr. Milner’s *Letters to a Prebendary*: Fourth edition, printed at Cork, “by the permission of the Author,” 1807, p. 448.

is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” This line of demarcation, drawn between the two churches, is too palpable for misrepresentation to disguise, or sophistry to annihilate. Let no Protestant lose sight of the distinction. And upon the rising generation, in the religious world, it ought to be deeply impressed, for it is of high importance that *their* tender minds should be imbued with a love of the *Holy Scriptures*, which make wise unto salvation. By the exercise of the understanding in the interpretation of the pure word of God — *the truth, as it is in Jesus*, must be attained — and *the truth as it is in Jesus*, will always be *the doctrine according to godliness*. Free inquiry is in strict alliance with genuine Christianity. “Some, I know, affect to believe (says the venerable Bishop of Llandaff) that as the restoration of letters was ruinous to the Romish religion, so the further cultivation of them will be subversive of Christianity itself — of this there is no danger. It may be subversive of the reliques of *the church of Rome*, by which other churches are still polluted, of persecutions, of anathemas, of ecclesiastical domination over God’s heritage, of all the silly outworks which the pride, the superstition, the knavery of mankind have erected around the citadel of our faith; but *the citadel itself* is founded on a rock — the gates of hell cannot prevail against it — its master-builder is GOD — its beauty will be found ineffable, and its strength impregnable, when it shall be freed

from the frippery of human ornaments, and cleared from the rubbish of human bulwarks. It is no small part of the province of a *teacher of Christianity* to distinguish between *the word of God* and *the additions* which men have made to it."

At this particular crisis I should deem myself wanting in duty, as *an advocate of Protestantism*, not to congratulate the religious public upon the recent multiplication of *Charity Schools* and of *Bible Societies* throughout the land. The truly Christian union of *Churchmen* and *Dissenters*, in this blessed work, is a cheerful and invigorating ray of light which shoots athwart the portentous darkness of the times. It shews that *Christianity*, with its divisions and subdivisions, hath still left energy enough to lift up its professors above the wretched narrowness of party-views; rendering them intent on advancing *the glory* of the SUPREME BEING, by cordially uniting to promote the present and everlasting interests of mankind—

———Ho'd fast the golden chain
Let down from Heav'n—'twill bear thee
upward:

"Twas WISDOM's noblest work—and
every link is love!

WATTS.

Islington, Feb, 8, 1812.

Present State of Education in Iceland

[From Sir G. S. Mackenzie's *Travels in Iceland*. 4to. pp. 280—290.]

At the present time, the school of *Bessestad* is actually the only establishment for education in Iceland. About the middle of the 16th century, when the reformation of religion took place in the island, two schools were founded;

one at *Skalholt*, the other at *Hoolum* in the northern province; and a landed property was attached to these institutions, sufficient for the support of between twenty and thirty scholars at each place. Towards the close of the last century, the two schools were united into one, and transferred to *Reikiavik*; while in lieu of the school-lands, which were appropriated by the crown, an annual sum from the public money was allotted to the support of the establishment. A few years ago, the school was again transferred to its present situation at *Bessestad*; the building being vacant which was formerly the abode of the governors of Iceland. This edifice, though by no means in good repair, is from its size better adapted than any other in the country for the purposes to which it is now applied; and, but for the intervention of the war between England and Denmark, would have been further improved by the completion of some additional buildings, which are yet in an unfinished state.

The establishment at *Bessestad* consists, at present, of three masters, and twenty-three or twenty-four scholars; the funds of the school not allowing the reception of a greater number. The head master, or *Lector Theologiæ*, has an annual salary of 600 rix-dollars. It is his office to superintend the general concerns of the school, and to conduct more especially the theological department, and the study of the Hebrew language. At the time of our arrival in Iceland, the person who held this situation, was Mr. *Steingrim Jonson*; a man apparently not more than thirty-five years of age, but

possessed of talents and learning which well fitted him for the discharge of its important duties. For several years, he was the pupil and secretary of the late Bishop *Finsson* at *Skalholt*, after whose death he studied some time at Copenhagen; where as a classical scholar, he acquired very great credit. His knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages is said to be accurate and extensive; and to theological studies he has given a very minute attention, being intimately acquainted with the writings of the most eminent of the German theologians. This gentleman, during our stay in Iceland, was removed from *Bessestad* to the church of *Oddè*, in *Rangarvallè Syssel*, one of the most valuable livings in the island. He was succeeded by another person, of the same name, who is likewise reputed to be a man of learning and acquirements.

The two inferior masters of the school have salaries of 300 rix-dollars each. The office of the second master comprehends the instruction of the scholars in Latin, history, geography, and arithmetic; while the third is occupied in teaching the Greek, Danish, and Icelandic languages. It is a singular circumstance in the regulations of the school, that each scholar, whether intended for the pastoral office or not, is obliged to study the elements of Hebrew, and to undergo some examination in this language. By far the greater number, however, of those who attend the school, are preparing themselves for this future situation in life; and in the admission of scholars, a preference is always given to the children of priests. A youth is not allowed

to enter until he has been confirmed; and a certificate of his talents and dispositions is required from the minister of the parish in which he has resided. The period of annual study extends from the beginning of October to the end of May; the summer being made the season of vacation to accommodate the rural occupations, in which all ranks among the Icelanders are obliged to partake. It is a part of the office of the Bishop to visit the school at the commencement and close of each session; and at the latter time to superintend the examinations of the scholars which then take place. These examinations continue during several days, with a prescribed form of proceeding, of which a sketch has already been given in the narrative.

After a certain degree of progress in the studies allotted to him, each scholar becomes what is termed a *demissus*; leaving the school and pursuing his future studies at home. No particular period is fixed for a *demission*. This is determined solely by the proficiency of the student, as ascertained by an examination; for which it is required that he should be able to read and write Latin with accuracy, that he should have some knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, and of the rules for interpreting the Old and New Testaments; and that he should be acquainted with the Danish language, with history, arithmetic and geography. The knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, though officially required, is, however, in the practice of these examinations, by no means very rigorously exacted. Where the students are preparing for the

priesthood, as is generally the case, they are farther questioned upon the Bible and ecclesiastical history, upon the doctrines of the Lutheran church, &c. If a youth has continued seven years without attaining the qualifications which entitle him to become a *demissus*, the Lector writes to his family, representing the matter to them, and he is not allowed to remain longer at the school.

A library is attached to the establishment at *Bessestad*, containing probably twelve or fourteen hundred volumes; among which are a few good editions of the classics. The greater part of the library consists of Icelandic and Danish works; beside which there are a considerable number of volumes in the German language, and a few in the English and French. The number of manuscripts is very inconsiderable, and they appear to be of little value. The private library of the *Lector Theologiæ*, though smaller, is more select, and contains the works of Mosheim, Hein-

zius, Reinhard, Lowth, Griesbach, Michaëlis, and numerous other authors of minor note, on ecclesiastical history and doctrine. It is the best theological collection in the island.

Among the young men educated at this school, there are some who afterwards go to Copenhagen, with the view of prosecuting their studies at the University there; this advantage being occasionally afforded to the children of those who hold civil offices, or possess landed property, and to the sons of some of the wealthier among the clergy of the country. The number of students, however, who enjoy such opportunities is very limited; and the remainder, oppressed by poverty and the necessities of their situation, are generally compelled to take up their abode for life in solitary spots, where their intercourse even with each other, is almost wholly suspended, and where any future progress in knowledge can only be effected by their independent and unaided exertions.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Comments on Paine's "Age of Reason," Part. iii.

London, Feb. 21, 1812.

SIR,

I had lately put into my hands, Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason," Pt. iii.—a wretched compilation of falsehood and calumny, the dregs of a genius always coarse. For the publication of it, a bookseller [Daniel Isaac Eaton, of Ave-Maria Lane; not I presume the D. Eaton, who is known on

your pages as the historian of the York Baptists:] is under prosecution by the Attorney-General; a miserable way of defending Christianity. The copy which I have is valuable, on account of some manuscript comments, by a pen, dipped as I conceive, in the very spirit of the New Testament; these I now send you for your use, if you shall judge them serviceable to your great object of promoting rational religion.

On a blank page opposite to the title, are the following remarks:—

"Whatever may be thought of the "Reason" of Mr. Paine, or of the prudence of his publisher, highly we cannot deem of the Christianity of the Attorney General, quasi Attorney General. Infidelity is not more anti-christian, than is the coercion of conscience by the civil power. It would be curious to see what sort of an indictment, Sir V. G. with all his acuteness and dexterity, would be able to draw from the New Testament, against D. I. Eaton!"

Paine concludes his work with the definition of infidelity, thus—
"He that believes in the story of Christ is an infidel to God:" upon which the annotator remarks,—

"He that comes to Mr. Paine's conclusion upon his premises, must be an infidel to common sense. He attacks the corruptions of Christianity, rather than Christianity itself. Unable to distinguish between spurious and authentic scripture, he confounds and opposes both: one might give him almost all his arguments, (his scurrilities are out of the question,) and leave Christianity, as really contained in the New Testament, untouched.

"Did Mr. Paine know that Christians do not all believe in the miraculous conception, or, in the infallibility of the Evangelists? This he must have known, [for he was formerly usher in the school of Mr. Noble, who was a Christian and a divine of the class of Dr. Foster;] as also that the doctrines of election, &c. are as much reprobated by some believers as by any unbelievers. Where

then the justness of representing these as undisputed Christian doctrines?"

In some blank leaves at the end of the work, the commentator has thus written:—

"What is the great gain of infidelity?—It relieves the mind from superstition! But Voltaire was eminently superstitious; and the Parisians, in the heat of the French Revolution, bowed down before a naked harlot, as the goddess of reason.—It explodes priestcraft! But priests may be infidels; there have been infidel bishops and infidel popes; of one of the latter it is told that he once remarked, 'What a profitable fable is this of Jesus Christ!'—and if men become infidels, there is no longer any reason in morals, why they should not be priests or bishops or popes, or impostors, usurpers and tyrants of any other description: to such, there is no rule of right but their own interests; and what a rule is that for human conduct! What citizen would wish his magistrate governed by it! what master his servant! what parent his child!—Infidelity was, for a time, accidentally associated with free principles in government; but nothing can be more fallacious than the association. Robespierre was an infidel, and a bold, zealous and consistent one; so, I dare say, was H.—D.— and possibly Thomas Paine and Bp. H. might, in secret, have understood each other, on the subject of religion. Hume (to whom every other infidel is a pigmy,) was the advocate of the despotic, wretched house of the Stuarts; and Bolingbroke (next in ability perhaps to Hume, in the ranks of infidelity,) was one

of the framers and promoters of the Schism Bill, (providentially smothered by the seasonable death of Queen Anne), by which no man was to have been allowed to educate his children, without subscribing the 39 articles. Gibbon, too, hated equally Christianity and civil and religious liberty. —Away, then, the plea that infidelity would abolish priestcraft, —it tends directly to favour it, by providing a license for deceit and wickedness, —and that it is not more prevalent, is owing, not to infidels but, to Christians, understanding Christianity. The New Testament is the Magna Charta of the Rights of Man: —in every age, it has inspired and emboldened our Hampdens and Hollises, our Russels and Sydneys, our Washingtons, our Palmers and our Priestleys, to expose and resist hypocritical churchmen and infidel ministers of state. The Christian has a reason, a motive for patriotism; *he is called to glory*.

“It is not meant to be insinuated by the foregoing remarks, that unbelievers are necessarily bad men; their habits are, happily, formed before their principles; and to that religion which they despise they owe it, perhaps, that they are not pilferers or ruffians, voluptuaries or sots. But the history of mankind warrants me in saying that, there is no instance on record, of heroic virtue achieved by an infidel. Men cannot become heroically virtuous by habit; or because their judgment coolly approves of heroism: they can attain this moral height only by the force of some great principle, some sense of duty,

some expectation of reward, acting constantly upon their minds:

“If a man has a vicious habit, what motive to correct it, will he find in infidelity? say that he is inclined to intemperance; and what will be his motto, but that of the Epicureans, rebuked by the Apostle Paul—‘Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die’—we perish. It is not contended that infidel principles impel a man at once into vice; but that if he fall into vice, they have no power to raise him from it. Who can say that Mr. Paine would not have been a temperate man, if he had lived under the influence of *the powers of the world to come*! and who but must lament that intemperate indulgence should have brought on, in his case, such well-known, premature dotage,—that dotage in which this book was written, and of which it exhibits so many melancholy tokens.

“What then is the great gain of infidelity?—This: that it takes off all moral excitements and restraints in life, and extinguishes all hope in death; in other words, that it enables a man to sin without fear, and rewards him with the assurance that he shall perish like a beast!

“The greatest prostitution of terms—next to the foul calumnies cast upon religion—is the calling of such a wretched, debasing, corrupting system, as infidelity, a fruit of REASON.”

So far, Sir, the annotator: some of his remarks may be deemed too strong, some of his allusions too particular; but it will be remembered that he wrote for the private reader of Paine's book and not for the public: I judged his

reflections too valuable to be confined to the shelf of a library, and I could not allow myself to prune or correct them.

EPISCOPUS.

Question relating to the Holy Spirit.

MR. EDITOR,

Will you favour me with a corner in your excellent miscellany for a question which I wish to propose to your trinitarian readers and correspondents, hoping that some one of them will esteem it worthy of serious consideration.

If the Holy Spirit is indeed an individual person distinct from the Father; if he is according to the orthodox creed, his *equal*; or in other words, if he is the One Jehovah! "in whom we live and move, and have our being!" "For whom, and to whom, and through whom, are all things!" If he is the "High and Lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity!" to whom all created beings owe their existence, and look for their future preservation!—and to be *equal* with the Father he must be all this; why did Jesus Christ, who spent whole night in prayers to the Father, and devoutly addressed *him*, on a variety of recorded occasions, never offer up a single petition, to this *equal* in *Omnipotence*, or give the slightest hint to his disciples to do so? Why, by his own uniform and most impressive example, and by that most striking and comprehensive form of words which he delivered to us, does he *exclusively* teach us to pray to the Father, if there are indeed three persons equally entitled to our worship and adoration?

An answer to this question is earnestly requested by, Sir,

Your constant reader,
M. H.

Want of Candour towards Unbelievers.

SIR,

The exercise of reason and liberality, are, I think amongst the more conspicuous excellencies, by which that sect of Christians, called Unitarians, would be thought to distinguish themselves; and there certainly can be no quality more calculated than these, to win the affections, and to make a proselyte of the honest and amiable enquirer, who may be led to doubt the correctness of the doctrines and principles, he has elsewhere acquired. Reason leads us to an acquaintance with the unlimited liberality and benevolence of the Deity towards all his creatures. This benevolence, or liberality, is not less a celestial quality, than is the infinite wisdom, or the boundless power of the Almighty, and being more attractive and lovely in the eyes of his creatures and dependents, it will ever be sought for by ingenuous minds, as the first feature in every system which claims the Father of all for its author.

I have witnessed and have felt the power of this supposed liberality, in a community which I have been induced to join, chiefly from a belief that it was more largely endowed with this heavenly attribute than others; I confess I think so still; or I would instantly abandon its meetings, for the one most congenial to my sentiments in this respect. Yet I have found limits to this virtue, not before observed by me, and it is on a

circumstance, which I conceive to be a lamentable departure from this most estimable quality, that I am now induced to address you. I regret the occasion for this: and I particularly regret that the want of liberality, which is but another name for charity, for justice! should have been evinced by one, who, in most respects, is an ornament to the church to which he belongs, and a conspicuous example of talent combined with unremitting zeal in the discharge of every apprehended duty.

The instance of which I have to complain, occurred in a sermon I am just returned from hearing, and, as I cannot suppose that the worthy minister, of whom, in this case, I am induced to disapprove, stands alone in the fault, I am desirous through your publication of submitting to the consideration of others, as well as to that of the person more immediately concerned, the propriety of avoiding the defect in future, and of revising and eradicating the erroneous opinions, from which it springs.

The discourse alluded to, was designed chiefly to shew the worthlessness of the applause and honour of men, inasmuch as such honour is not paid to piety and Christian holiness, but rather to the disquisitions of philosophy, the display of talents, and the successful artifices of the ambitious conqueror. In contemning the praises bestowed on the latter I freely participate, but I can by no means accord with the preacher in, what I understood to be, his sentiments with respect to the futility and even pernicious tendency of the former. Such praise is certainly futile, and of injurious consequences, when bestowed on vicious

arts, and in opposition to piety and virtue; and this must doubtless have been the meaning of this respectable minister. But while I am sensible that talents are too frequently thus misapplied, I think they seldom or never lead to Atheism, as he appeared to intimate; much less, is this unhappy state of mind to be ascribed to the enquiries of philosophy, the parent, rather, I conceive, of genuine and elevated piety.

This, however, which I regard as an unfair and injurious disparagement of philosophy and talents, is not the material object of my present appeal to you. I lament that I have to complain of imputations of the very worst kind, against MEN, who, though they may be "faithful friends, good citizens, lovers of truth and attached to what is good," yet without Christian principles, would not be found to stand in the moment of temptation. Give them but an opportunity of promoting their own advantage, "of supplanting a rival," or "of overcoming an enemy, and "they will not be scrupulous about the means;" whilst "he who is under the influence of Christian principles," will persevere in the discharge of his duty, even unto death. Now what ingenuous mind, I may be permitted to ask, what unsuspecting mind, would not infer from this, that the influence of Christian principles could, alone, enable a man to withstand the temptations and the sufferings of the world, and to brave the terrors of death? But is this true in fact? I believe not, and I think it would be difficult for this gentlemen to shew, *why that man is not to be trusted*, who does not believe and

acknowledge Jesus Christ, because he conscientiously deems himself in want of sufficient evidence; but who, notwithstanding, is immovably convinced of the superintendence of an omnipotent and all-wise Creator, who has everlastingly ordained, that virtue shall never fail to meet its appropriate reward—happiness; and that vice and disregard of principle shall as invariably be followed by misery.

I know the estimable author of the imputation I have complained of, I know him to be incapable of making such injurious reflections on any of his *Christian* brethren, to whatever sect they may belong. But is this sufficient? I would entreat of him. Has his Christian charity, his liberality no wider a range: or does he really conceive that the most absurd dogmatist of the Christian denomination, is more entitled to his affection and forbearance, than the man whose principles may be such as I have described? I am satisfied that it is unnecessary to point out the serious consequences of such imputations, were they implicitly received, and acted upon. Nor would any one be more averse, I hope, than the author of them, to the deliberate proscription of men from the confidence of their fellows, merely because they differed in an affair of moment, on which they had not learned to agree.

It requires, I conceive, no very extensive knowledge of mankind to convince any one, that, whatever superiority Christianity may possess in other respects, it is in no wise *peculiar* to its votaries to resist temptation, or to encounter martyrdom, in the maintenance of its

principles. Every vice, and every absurdity have had their zealous devotees, who have met death rather than abandon them. The honest and conscientious disciple of moral rectitude, may be as incorruptible as other men, and is faithful and true so long as he adheres to his principles, however inferior those principles may be deemed. No more can be justly said in favour of the Christian. Both are men subject to weaknesses and passions, and it is not the adoption of this principle, or of that, that will secure us against the danger of falling.

Had the reflections, on which I have taken the liberty thus to animadvert, been confined strictly to a display of the superiority of CHRISTIANITY over every other system of religion or morality, it would have been worthy and becoming of the minister; but when a distrust of MEN was inculcated, because they were impressed with other principles, he certainly incurred the reproof of the Apostle Paul:—"WHO ART THOU THAT JUDGEST ANOTHER MAN'S SERVANT; TO HIS OWN MASTER HE STANDETH OR FALLETH."

T. S.*

Early English Antipædobaptists.

SIR, Feb. 28, 1812.

The following paper I copy from a volume in 18mo. entitled *Mercurius Rusticus, or the Countries Complaint of the barbarous Outrages committed by the Sectaries of this late flourishing Kingdome.*

* Our Correspondent has favoured us with his name at length, and the place of his residence, which we suppress, from their not being necessary to the elucidation of his argument. Ed.

Printed in the yeere 1646. This was a weekly paper, published by the royalists. It contains horrible details, though large allowance must be made for a virulence of party spirit, apparent in every page. Having narrated the sufferings of some royalists in other parts of Essex, the journalist proceeds with an account of the demolition of a window of painted glass, in the church of Chelmsford, by the *Sec-taries* of that town, who, though *the churchwardens tooke downe the pictures of the blessed Virgin, and of Christ on the crosse, and supplied the places with white glasse, yet did rest very ill satisfied with this partiall imperfect Reformation.* P. 23. The story of this outrage is prefaced in the following manner:—

“*Chelmsford* is the Shire-towne, and hath in it two thousand communicants. All these are parishioners of one and the same church, for there is but one church in this great town, whereof at this time Doctor *Michelson* is parson, an able and godly man. Before this Parliament was called, of this numerous congregation there was not one to be named, man or woman, that boggled at the Common-Prayers, or refused to receive the sacrament kneeling, the posture to which the Church of England (walking in the footsteps of venerable Antiquity) hath by Act of Parliament enjoined all those which account it their happiness to be called her children. But since this magnified Reformation was set on foot, this town (as indeed most corporations, as we finde by experience, are nurseries of faction and rebellion,) is so filled with sectaries, especially

Brownists and *Anabaptists*, that a third part of the people refuse to communicate in the church-liturgie, and halfe refuse to receive the blessed sacrament, unless they may receive it in what posture they please to take it. They have amongst them two sorts of *Anabaptists*. The one they call the old men or *Aspersi*, because they were but sprinkled. The other the new men or the *Immersi*, because they were overwhelmed in their rebaptization.” P. 22.

The former part of this quotation, shews the rapid progress of the anti-episcopalian party, during six years, after the meeting of the Long-Parliament at the end of 1640. But my principal design in sending you the extract, was to enquire of your readers, acquainted with the history of the Anti-Pædobaptists, whether there were really, any description of them in those times, who practised *sprinkling* in opposition to *immersion*. I have read, though I cannot recollect where, of a scheme attributed to Dr. Watts, that the Pædobaptists should give up their *unconscious* subject and the Anti-pædobaptists sacrifice their mode, certainly a most unequal barter. If Dr. Watts proposed such a compromise, it is evident that he had found very little, if any, *scriptural* authority for infant baptism. I have heard, though I know not how to credit the story, that there are Protestant dissenting ministers, who have arrived at that conclusion, and yet practise infant-sprinkling. How such *rite-makers*, if such there be, can answer to their satisfaction, the question, “what mean you by this service?”

or, "who hath required this at your hands?" I am at a loss to discover.

BEREUS.

Questions to Mr. Wright, on Church Discipline.

SIR,

I observe in the extracts from Mr. Wright's journal of his tour in Scotland (p. 52) that in the Unitarian church at Glasgow, "the Lord's table was *declared free*:" again, in the afternoon, "the declaration of the freedom of the Lord's table was publicly made," and "about 150 united in observing it." Mr. W. describes this as "a great triumph of Christian liberality over bigotry, and narrow plans of discipline."

Now I am not sure that I quite understand this account; but I suppose it means, that every person who happens to be present when the Unitarians in Glasgow are going to eat the Lord's supper, is at liberty, if he chuses, to join with them; without any questions being asked, about what he believes, or what are his motives for so doing. If this be the case, I must say, that I do not consider such an arrangement as any triumph of Christianity. I should wish to ask Mr. W. a few plain questions, which, if he would answer through the medium of your Repository, he may perhaps produce some enlargement of my hitherto narrow ideas on this subject. Were there not some persons formerly called brethren, with whom, the apostle Paul would not allow the churches he planted to eat? Does not the general strain of the New Testament re-

present Christian churches something in the light of families, where mutual understanding and good will, and constant reciprocal duties, are maintained? Were not all who believed the apostle's doctrine in primitive times baptised, and then added to the society of those who had believed before them? Have we any evidence that any persons but those who were thus initiated, were invited or permitted to join the first churches in any of the ordinances? What reasons will the Unitarian church at Glasgow allege, for deviating from the plans pursued by the apostles and primitive Christians in regard to communion?

I highly esteem Mr. W. for much that he has written, and for his zealous labours as a missionary: but I am afraid he is not aware, that even our party may have a cant about liberality and bigotry, which is much calculated to keep us from a serious and candid examination of the question—did Jesus or his apostles, lay down a plan for the conduct of Christians in society as brethren, or did they not?

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

AN UNITARIAN.

P. S. I take this opportunity of saying, that consistency requires of Unitarians, now they are excited to a becoming zeal for the propagation of apostolic doctrine, that they should candidly examine the important questions proposed in your last number by your correspondent P. dated from *Maidstone*. Let me request the attention of Mr. Wright, and his coadjutors to this subject.

The Book-Worm. No. I.

SIR, Feb. 1, 1812.

As you have lately presented to your readers, "Extracts from New Publications," will you accept, occasionally, from a rambler among old books, some account of his discoveries? The contrast may be not unamusing, and by the licence allowed in your miscellaneous department I shall pass, without scruple,

From grave to gay, from sportive to severe.

The articles in these papers shall be strictly confined to works which preceded the *Æra* of Reviews, and of these to such only as I have an opportunity of consulting for myself. I begin with that work of generally acknowledged merit,

"*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ* or a Collection of Lives, Letters, Poems; with Characters of Sundry Personages, and other incomparable pieces of language and art. By the curious pencil of the ever-memorable Sir Henry Wotton, Knt. late Provost of *Eaton College*. 4th ed. 1685."

Sir H. Wotton is to be considered rather as a statesman and an accomplished scholar than a divine, though in his latter years he took deacon's orders, to comply with the statutes on becoming Provost of *Eton College*, where he had for an associate "the ever-memorable John Hales," whom he "used to call *Bibliotheca Ambulans*."

Wotton, like his friend and relation, Lord Bacon, ventured to explore the recesses of scholastic theology. The great philosopher, as you have shewn (*M. Repos.* ii. 535,) had a taste for *Trinitarian Paradoxes*. Wotton has "a meditation upon Christmas day: of the birth and pilgrimage of our Saviour Christ, on earth," to whom the whole is a direct address.

Speaking of our Lord's birth, of Mary, he adds "of all women the most blessed; and yet more blessed by being thy daughter and thy servant than thy mother." (p. 270.) In the same address, he thus describes the evidence on which he received the Deity of Christ.

"How should we have known, how should we have apprehended thy eternal generation, if thou hadst not been pleased to vouchsafe a silly fisherman to lean on thy breast, and to inspire him to tell us from his boat that *in the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God.*"

Wotton has the merit, whatever it be, of exhibiting that idea which Watts afterwards expanded so poetically into a throne of God burning with vengeance, only to be appeased by the rich drops of the blood of Jesus. I find the thought in a hymn which he communicated to his friend and biographer Isaac Walton. Being a short and no unfair specimen of the transitions which abound in orthodox poetry, it is here quoted from p. 362.

A Hymn to my God in a night of my late sickness.

Oh thou great Power! in whom I move,

For whom I live, to whom I die,
Behold me through thy beams of love
Whilst on this couch of tears I lie;
And cleanse my sordid soul within
By thy Christ's blood, the Bath of Sin.

No hallow'd oyls, no grains I need,
No rags of Saints, no purging fire;
One rosie drop from David's seed
Was worlds of seas to quench thine ire.
O precious ransom! which once paid,
That consummatum est was said.

And said by him that said no more
But seal'd it with his dying breath.
Thou then, that hast dispos'd my score,
And dying wast the death of Death,
Be to me now, on Thee I call,
My life, my strength, my joy, my all.

In this hymn, the worship of the *Father of Mercies, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* is presently discarded for the worship of another Being who could quench the ire of the former and *disponge* the sinner's score, and thus acquired the first claim to his grateful adoration. I may be gravely told by some *soi-disant* evangelical Christian that the worship of the *God-Man*, of the Assembly's Catechism, does not preclude the worship of the *One God, even the Father*, of the New Testament. Yet the scriptures direct me to one being alone on whom to depend as *my life, my strength, my joy, my all*.

I will now invite your readers, Mr. Editor, to quit the rough and thorny road of polemic theology and to accompany this author, who was no partial scholar, into one of the paths of science and even to wander into a delightful region of taste.

Sir H. Wotton has probably given the first description in our language of that entertaining, and now common, apparatus, the *Camera Obscura*, though I have not found this circumstance mentioned in any dictionary of science. The invention is ascribed to *Baptista Porta*, who died in 1519, but whose *Magia Naturalis*, where it is described, was not published till about 1590. Wotton is writing to Lord Bacon, probably from Venice, where he was ambassador. The letter has no date but is an answer to one from the Chancellor, dated Oct. 20, 1620, which appears to have accompanied a present of his *Novum Organum*. Of that work Wotton says, "I have learned thus much by it already, that we are extremely mistaken in the computation of antiquity, by

searching it backwards, because indeed the first times were the youngest, especially in points of natural discovery and experience." p. 299. He adds, "I owe your lordship even by promise (which you are pleased to remember, thereby doubly binding me,) the commerce of philosophical experiments, which surely of all others is the most ingenuous traffic. Therefore, for a beginning, let me tell your lordship of a pretty thing which I saw coming down the Danube, though more remarkable for the application than for the theory. I lay a night at Lintz, the metropolis of the higher Austria.—There I found *Kepler*, a man famous in the sciences, as your lordship knows, to whom I purpose to convey from hence one of your books.—In this man's study, I was much taken with the draught of a landskip on a piece of paper, methought masterly done. Whereof inquiring the author, he bewrayed, with a smile, it was himself, adding he had done it *non tanquam pictor, sed tanquam mathematicus*. This set me on fire. At last he told me how. He hath a little black tent (of what stuff is not much importing) which he can suddenly set up where he will, in a field, and it is convertible (like a windmill) to all quarters at pleasure, capable of not much more than one man, as I conceive, and perhaps at no great ease, exactly close and dark, save at one hole, about an inch and a half in the *diameter*, to which he applies a long perspective trunk, with a convex glass fitted to the said hole, and the concave taken out at the other end, which extendeth to about the middle of this erected tent, through which the visible radiations of all the objects without,

are intromitted, falling upon a paper, which is accomodated to receive them, and so he traceth them with his pen in their natural appearance, turning his little tent round by degrees, till he hath designed the whole aspect of the field. This I have described to your lordship, because I think there might be good use made of it for chorography: for otherwise to make landskips by them were illiberal; though surely no painter can do them so precisely." (p. 300.)

The other passage to which I referred is quite as distant from the road of theology as that just quoted, unless as it may be connected with the poetic theology of *Paradise Lost*. Lord Orford, in an essay "on modern gardening," (Works. ii. 527) celebrates "one man, one great man, on whom nor education nor custom could impose their prejudices. Who seems with the prophetic eye of taste to have conceived, to have foreseen, modern gardening, as Lord Bacon announced the discoveries since made by experimental philosophy." Lord O. proceeds to quote, as instances, the well-known descriptions, in Milton's fourth book, of the garden of Eden and the bounds of Paradise. Dr. Aikin, in his "Letters from a Father to his Son," has a criticism (v. ii. l. 6) on this passage of Lord Orford's essay, disputing Milton's claim to originality, by quoting *Claudian*, and Italian poems which preceded *Paradise Lost*. I am surprised that the following passage, written probably before Milton was born, published in 1624, and scarcely unseen by the poet, before the formation of his poem, has escaped the obser-

vation of both the essayist and his critic. It is in the "Elements of Architecture," where speaking of "Ornaments without, as gardens, fountains, groves, conservatories of rare beasts, birds and fishes," Sir H. W. thus proceeds:—

"I must note a certain contrariety between *building* and *garden- ing*. For as fabricks should be *regular*, so gardens should be *irregular*, or at least cast into a very wild *regularity*. To exemplifie my conceit, I have seen a garden, for the manner perchance incomparable, into which the first access was a high walk like a *terrace*, from whence might be taken a general view of the whole *plot* below, but rather in a delightful confusion, than with any plain distinction of the pieces. From this the beholder descending many steps, was afterwards conveyed again by several *mountings* and *valings*, to various entertainments of his *scent* and *sight*: which I shall not need to describe, for that were poetical. Let me only note this that every one of these diversities was as if he had been *magically* transported into a new garden." p. 64.

Nothing can shew the superiority of taste in Sir H. Wotton, or be a fairer illustration by contrast, than the *receipt* to make a *square* garden given by his friend and cotemporary, Lord Bacon, in his well-known Essays. No. 46.

And now, Mr. Editor, lest you should judge the topics in this paper to be rather glaringly unconnected, let me remind you of two examples which may excuse me. Dr. Young wrote his "Essay on Original Composition," to introduce the death-bed of Addison, and Bishop Berkeley defended the

Trinity against the Arians in his *Siris*, or a Treatise on Tar Water. The latter occasioned an epigram, the words of which I forget, but it turned on this conceit, that those *heretics* should be enjoined to take large potations of that salutary, if not pleasant, beverage.

Being fond, in search of mental provender, of making my way through *old* books, I beg leave to name my paper the *Book-Worm*, and am,

Yours,
VERMICULUS.

Calvin in England.

SIR, May 7, 1811.

In your 5th vol. p. 170, you have brought Lelius Socinus into England. I was surprised to find by a passage in one of *Bayle's* notes, that Calvin had also visited this country. The passage occurs in the life of *Louis De Dieu*. Of his grandfather, of the same name, a domestic of Charles 5th, and a secret favourer of the Reformation, the following account is given.

“ Il passoit en Angleterre avec d’autres jeunes gens: Calvin faisoit le trajet sur le meme bâtiment, et représenta à cette jeunesse qu’il ne falloit pas jurer en jouant aux cartes. Il n’y eut que Louis de Dieu qui aquiescat à cette censure: tous les autres s’en moquerent. Cela fit que Calvin le trouvant à part, sur le Vaisseau lui parla de Dieu, et le convertit de telle sorte, que ce jeune homme écrivit à ses parens que rien ne le sépareroit jamais de la foi de Jean Calvin.” *Bayle*, ed. 1740, ii. 289, Note A.

He was going over to England with some other young people; Calvin, taking his passage in the same vessel, expostulated with this young party for swearing, while playing

at cards. Only Louis de Dieu submitted to his reproof. The rest derided him. Calvin, finding De Dieu alone, was inclined to talk with him on religion, and so converted him, that the young man wrote to his relations, that nothing should ever separate him from the faith of John Calvin.

Bayle quotes this as a fact extraordinary and unknown to all those who had written the life of Calvin, no one having remarked that he had made a voyage to England. The authority which Bayle gives is *Leydecker*, professor of divinity at Utrecht in his Latin *preface* to the theological aphorisms of Louis de Dieu, who died at Leyden in 1642. *Leydecker* appears to have taken the account from a funeral sermon for Louis de Dieu (the elder) preached in Dutch, by Abraham Heidan. It must have been when Calvin was a young man, probably before his first settlement at Geneva in 1536, and towards the latter part of Henry the Eighth’s reign, that he visited England. It is surprising that this fact should have escaped Burnett in his researches for the history of the Reformation. If known to him, he could scarcely have omitted the circumstance.

J. O.

Epigram and Epitaph by Samuel Wesley.

SIR, Oct. 9, 1811.

Reading the “ Epitaph on King Theodore,” (p. 547,) it occurred to me that the hint of the last line might be taken from the following justly admired epigram written by Samuel Wesley, (mentioned in your v. iii. p. 374.) on occasion of Butler’s monument being erected in Westminster Abbey, in 1721, for-

ty years after the poet's death, in extreme penury, if not in absolute want. (See *Biog. Brit.* 2d ed. iii. 91.)

While Butler, needy wretch, was yet alive

No generous patron would a dinner give:
See him, when starv'd to death, and
turned to dust,

Presented with a monumental Bust.

The Poet's fate is here, in emblem,
shown,

He ask'd for bread, and he receiv'd a
stone.

I am tempted to add, from memory, an *Epitaph on an Infant*, by Samuel Wesley, in which the poet appears to have prevailed over the priest, and done violence to the article of his church, of *original or birth sin*.

Beneath, a sleeping infant lies,

To earth whose ashes lent

More glorious shall, hereafter, rise,

Though not more innocent.

When the archangel's trump shall
blow,

And souls and bodies join,

What crowds shall wish their lives be-
low

Had been as short as thine.

SELECTOR.

Parish Priests of Iceland.

SIR,

March 3, 1812.

I have lately perused with great pleasure the "Travels in Iceland," performed during the summer of 1810, by Sir G. Mackenzie, and his companions and coadjutors, Dr. Holland and Mr. Bright. With the dissertations of the former of these on the history and literature of the natives, and on their present state in respect of literature and religion, I have been particularly interested. They exhibit the singular phænomenon of a people, "whose habitations bespeak a condition little removed from

the savage state; who suffer an almost entire privation of every comfort or refinement of life; and who, amid the storms of the surrounding sea, seek, in their little boats, the provision on which alone their families can scarcely depend: among whom however, the traveller often finds an intimate knowledge of the classical writings of antiquity, a taste formed upon the purest models of Greece and Rome, and a susceptibility to all the beauties which those models disclose. While traversing the country, he is often attended by guides, who can communicate with him in Latin; and, arriving at his place of nightly rest, he not unfrequently draws forth, from the labours of his little smithy, a man who addresses him in that language with fluency and elegance."—

Among the causes of this general diffusion of literature, (next to the great name of their ancestors) Dr. H. assigns "the long period of leisure they enjoy, during the protracted winter of their northern region. This leisure, those who have acquired in their youth the habits of literary pursuit, will naturally devote to a continuance in occupations so well adapted to relieve the weariness of the passing time."—"Among the class of priests, another motive is, the desire of maintaining an influence, which cannot be derived from any difference of external circumstances. The pastor must undergo the same labours and hardships as the meanest of his flock; and, but for the superiority of his intellectual attainments, he would lose the station in society which it is so necessary he should retain. It forms, too, an important part of his duty to superin-

tend the business of domestic education, in the families placed under his pastoral care. This office is founded upon a sense of the necessity for such a superintendence, in a country where the means of education are so greatly limited by the poverty of the people, and the dispersion of their numbers." — An interesting instance of the attention with which this duty is exercised in Iceland, is given by Sir G. M. in the journal, p. 143, in the case of Mr. Hialtalin, pastor of the parish of Saurbar, adjoining to one of the Fiords, or Friths, near the western extremity of the island; and I wish to solicit for the whole account a place in your useful miscellany, not only that your pages may have the honour of recording the name and merits of a most exemplary character, but that I may have the opportunity of exhibiting to your readers a specimen of a more complete register of a minister's congregation, than I had an idea of, when I wrote the Letter to a young Minister, which you indulged with a place in your last volume, p. 472.

"At a short distance from the shore of Hval Fiord (Whale Frith) is the residence of the parish priest of Saurbar, Mr. Hialtalin. He has been settled at this place twenty-four years, with a stipend of *thirty dollars*, and as much land as maintains a small stock of cows and sheep. Upon this slender provision he has contrived to support a very numerous family. His habitation entirely resembles the common farm-houses of Iceland, except that it is somewhat cleaner and more comfortable in the inter-

rior. The sitting-room, which is small and ill-lighted, is furnished with a stove, an article not common in the houses of the Icelanders, and possesses a considerable collection of books.—In the course of the evening, we had much conversation with our worthy host, who spoke Latin exceedingly well. We obtained from him, some interesting particulars relative to his parish, and had much reason to admire his paternal care of the flock committed to his charge. In a population, varying, in different years, from two hundred to two hundred and ten, there are fifteen married couples. The average annual number of births is seven, and of deaths, six or seven; of marriages, below one. The extent of the parish is sixteen miles in length and ten in breadth, so that the population does not exceed $1\frac{1}{4}$ to a square mile.

"We were gratified with a sight of Mr. Hialtalin's parish register; a very interesting book, in which, for his own satisfaction, he makes an annual record of the state of each family within the district of which he has the pastoral charge. He permitted us to copy part of this book; and the following is a translation made by his assistance, of the first page of the register for 1805." (I have only copied one example.) "This example of the attention and pious care with which the duties of a country priest are performed, in so remote a corner of the Christian world, may excite a blush in many of his brethren of more fortunate countries and more opulent establishments.

Habitation.	Names of Persons.	Situation.	Age	Confirmed.	Communi- cant.	Able to read.	Conduct.	Abilities.
Thyrrill	Jorundr Girlasson	Elder or Constable	41	Yes	Yes	Yes	Well disposed and clean	Moderate
	Margaret Thorsten-dottir	His Wife	52	do.	do.	do.	Good character	Piously disposed
	Gudrun Eiriksdottir	Daughter by a former husband	19	do.	do.	do.	A hopeful girl	Well-informed
	Gudrun Grimson	Servant man	25	do.	do.	do.	A faithful labourer	Has neglected his improvement and is therefore admonished
	Thorsdys Sæmnsdottir	Maid servant	42	do.	do.	do.	Neat and faithful	Well-informed
	Jarfruder Stefansdottir	Her child	3	—	—	—		
	Hristin Jonsdottir	Female orphan	8	—	—	—	Tractable child	Finished her Catechism: to be confirmed
	Waldi Sterinderson	Male orphan	6	—	—	—	Tractable and obedient	Learning the Catechism.

The books in this house are, The Old Psalm Book and the New ; Vidalin's Sermons ; Vidalin's Doctrines of Religion ; Fast Sermons ; Seven Sermons ; Sturm's Meditations, translated into Icelandic ; Bible Extracts ; Bastholm's Religious Doctrine ; a Prayer Book ; and a New Testament belonging to the Church.

“ This table is extremely interesting in many points of view. Besides shewing the great attention of Mr. Hialtalin to the duties of his office, it exhibits also, in some degree, the character of the people, the importance they attach to moral dispositions, and the attention which is paid to education, even among the lower classes. p. 144.

“ By this superintendence of the priests (for the instance of Mr. H. is by no means singular,) and the long-established habits of the people, a regular system of domestic education is maintained. With the exception of these who inhabit the coast, in the vicinity of the great fishing stations, it is a rare thing to meet with an Icelander who is unable to read and write; and who does not possess considerable intelligence on all subjects to which his situation allows him access. The instruction of his children forms one of his stated occupations ; and, while the little earthen hut which he inhabits is almost buried by the snows of winter, and darkness and desolation are spread universally around,

the light of an oil-lamp illumines the page, from which he reads to his family the lessons of knowledge, religion and virtue.—The books in the possession of the lower classes are chiefly of a religious nature, a great number of these works having been printed in Iceland during the last two or three centuries, and very generally circulated through the country. In many parishes there is a small collection of books belonging to the church, from which, under the superintendence of the priest, each family in the district may derive some little addition to its means of instruction and improvement.”

By giving these extracts a place in your valuable miscellany, I persuade myself, you will gratify your numerous readers; you will at least oblige your friend and constant reader, V. F.

P. S. I have just seen the Extracts on the Present State of Religion in Iceland which you have inserted in your No. just published, p. 73.—But those, you will readily perceive, though highly interesting, will not interfere with that which is now transmitted: but will rather be confirmed and illustrated by it.

An Epitaph.

SIR, Feb. 9, 1812.

Among some old MSS. I have found, on a scrap of very dingy paper, and in an antique hand, the following stanzas, which appear to have been designed as an epitaph, in no panegyrical strain.

Here liv'd and died a useless thing,
The dry remains of stupid life,
A drone to country, church and king,
Without all judgment, wit, or wife.

A slave to forms from morn to bed,
Grown rich and proud, with college
pelf.

VOL. VII.

X

A monk, scarce worth his beer and bread,
And good for nothing, but himself.

With parts extinct presum'd to read,
Improv'd his head-piece not a jot,
Quite Orthodox in famous Creed,
Poring to know, he knew not what.

Soured by age, by sloth made dull,
Rusty in temper, as in gown,
With pride, and narrow notions full,
A pceevish, stiff, pedantic clown.

If these lines have been in print, perhaps one of your readers can oblige me with the name of their author or a reference to the publication. QUÆRENS.

A Collection of Facts relating to Criminal Law.

[Continued from p. 87.]

“It is a kind of quackery in government, and argues a want of solid skill, to apply the same universal remedy, the *ultimum supplicium*, to every case of difficulty. It is, it must be owned, much easier to extirpate than to amend mankind: yet that magistrate must be esteemed both a weak and a cruel surgeon, who cuts off every limb, which through ignorance or indolence he will not attempt to cure.”

Blackstone, Comm. B. iv. ch. i.

“The ruling principle of government in this kingdom is allowed to be liberty; but our criminal laws seem rather calculated to keep slaves in awe than to govern free men. They seem to contradict all notions of justice, and confound all distinctions of morality. By the ignominy they impose in many cases they bend the mind to the lowest state of servitude: by the rigour they indiscriminately inflict they adopt the principles of despotism and make fear the motive of obedience.”

Dagge's Consid. Crim. Law, I. ch. vii.

“If a reflecting and benevolent foreigner were to examine our Statute Book, where death is commissioned ‘to keep the fatal key’ of so many cells, and ‘to shake a dreadful dart’ in so many directions, his soul would be wrung with anguish: and, unless he were told that common sense wages a perpetual war with positive institutions, and that the

“Milton.”

malefactors annually executed fall very short of the number annually condemned, he would suspect that every accuser is a Lycurgus,* every judge, a Cassius,† and every legislator, a Draco.”

Philopat. Varvicens. Char. C. J. Fox, ii. 333.

Proposition VI.

The Punishment of Death, considered as the affair of a moment, is not so powerful a restraint from crimes, as other punishments of a visibly longer duration.

“A recent instance of this deplorable state of mind has fallen within my notice. A youth of 22 had deserted more than once—he betook himself to robbery. He anticipated death as the probable punishment of his thievery or his desertion. He neither cared, nor professed to care at what time or in what manner it might overtake him. He despaired. He plundered. He defied the wrath of man. He frowned at the mention of God. ‘He laughed at a violent death as the affair of a moment.’‡ And without shewing the smallest sign of shame, or compunction, or terror, he underwent the sentence of the law.”

Philopat. Varvicens. ii. 394.

Proposition VII.

If the other lawful ends of punishment may be answered along with the Reformation of the Criminal, then that mode of punishment ought to be adopted by which the criminal will be reformed: this mode embraces the greatest sum of ultimate good; and experience has shewn it to be practicable.

“The comparative tables, drawn up since the last alterations made

in the penal code [at Philadelphia], prove that crimes have diminished nearly half in number and that very few criminals have been condemned for a relapse.

“A criminal of the most hardened nature, who had infested the environs of Philadelphia several years before the change in the penal code took place, being dismissed, thus addressed one of the inspectors: ‘I thank you for the care you have taken of me ever since I have been here, and for having enabled me to fulfil a duty I owe to society. You know what my conduct has been, and whether it has atoned for my past offences: but I am now at liberty, and consequently all I could say, would be of little service to me. Pursue your plans and you will neither have thieves nor pick-pockets: with respect to myself, be assured you will never see me here again.’ The man kept his word.”

Dr. Louis Valentine’s Report to the Academy of Marseilles, and Mr. Turnbull; quoted in the Philanthropist. No. 4, p. 350.

Proposition VIII.

“When very severe punishments are denounced against numerous offences, they cannot be in all cases inflicted without cruelty; and yet if they may be remitted in some cases, it is necessary that much should be left to the Discretion of the Judges, which will be variously exercised in similar cases, thus having the appearance of caprice, of partiality, and of injustice.

“An unfortunate woman was tried for stealing above the value of five shillings, I was present at the trial. From many circumstances it was obvious that it was

* The Athenian Orator.

† The Roman Prætor.

‡ Beccaria, cap. xxviii.

a first offence, and every person in court wished her acquittal. The jury watched the testimony very narrowly, to see if any thing could be laid hold of in her favour. Lord Kenyon told the jury, that they were not to take any of the alleviating circumstances into consideration in their verdict, whatever palliation they might be; and the woman was found guilty. Lord Kenyon proceeded to pass the sentence of the law. When the woman heard the sentence of death, she shrieked and fell lifeless to the ground. Lord Kenyon, who was endowed with sensibility, instantly called out—*My good woman, I do not mean to hang you.—Will nobody persuade the poor woman that she is not to be hanged!*

“This case made a great impression upon myself, as well as on every one present. I have frequently heard the same noble Lord pass sentence, *not on the prisoner before him, but on the law.*”

Mr. Morris's Speech in the House of Commons on Sir Samuel Romilly's Bill. Reported in *Flower's Pol. Review*. v. ix. p. 76.

“Not many years ago, upon the Norfolk circuit, a larceny was committed by two men in a poultry yard, but only one of them was apprehended: the other having escaped into a distant part of the country, had eluded all pursuit. At the next assizes, the apprehended thief was tried and convicted, but Lord Loughborough, before whom he was tried, thinking the offence a very slight one, sentenced him only to a few months' imprisonment. The news of this sentence having reached the accomplice, in his retreat, he immediately returned, and sur-

rendered himself to take his trial at the next assizes. The next assizes came; but, unfortunately the prisoner, it was a different judge who presided; and still more unfortunately, Mr. Justice Gould, who happened to be the judge, though of a very mild and indulgent disposition, had observed, or thought he had observed, that men who set out with stealing fowls generally end by committing the most atrocious crimes; and building a sort of system upon this observation, had made it a rule to punish this offence with great severity, and he accordingly, to the great astonishment of this unhappy man, sentenced him to be transported. While one was taking his departure for Botany Bay, the term of the other's imprisonment had expired: and what must have been the notions which that little public who witnessed and compared these two examples, formed of our system of criminal jurisprudence?”

Sir Samuel Romilly's Speech in the House of Commons, Feb. 9, 1810.

On the Extract from the Eclectic Review.

SIR,

Your extract from the Eclectic Review (pp. 92—94) brought to my mind several circumstances, which made a deep impression on it some years back, when I was at the University of Cambridge, and when the proceedings against ‘a noted academic’ excited at that place a great deal of attention. I was then acquainted with the writer of the article, who from his mode of writing may easily be detected as not being a member of the University, though, if he

had been one, I will not answer for his giving a correct account of the proceedings of those times. His bitterness against the 'noted academic,' is easily accounted for by those who are acquainted with the two parties: and I am very sorry that a Dissenting minister should use so coarse and vulgar a stile, and after the lapse of so many years, should have retained so much of an unchristian spirit, as the extract and many other writings of his, too plainly exhibit. It would be wrong to dwell much upon the ravings of a dis-tempered mind: though I approve highly of your inserting the extract, both that the Unitarians may see what is said of them by their adversaries, and that the editors of the *Eclectic Review* may be ashamed of admitting such trash into their publication.

To the writer of the extract I have reason to believe the academic referred, and the question was not about the plurality of persons in the Godhead, but on a peculiar opinion of that writer's, who amongst other vagaries of his, had that of believing in two Gods. Whether he retains that faith at present or not, I cannot tell, as several years have elapsed, since I heard any thing of him, and it is probable that the academic referred to, is as little acquainted with him as myself.

On the appellation of Unitarian, I am not surprised that the *Eclectics* feel sore. It is a term which brings to their mind, a discriminating truth, and does not allow them to enter into those personalities, in which they would delight to indulge, if we had been so imprudent as to enlist under the banners of a party, or to desig-

nate ourselves by the name of any man. We acknowledge no other name, and have no leader but Christ. Lardner and Priestley, or the gentleman whom the writer designates by his asterisks *****, may have written well or ill: we are not bound by their tenets, nor will we be called by their names. We leave to others to say, 'I am of Paul,' 'I am of Apollos,' 'I am of Cephas,' 'I am of Calvin,' 'I am of Arminius.' Let us say, 'We are of Christ:' we look up to him as the author and finisher of our faith, and if we must take any other name besides that of Christian, let it be one which marks our opinion, without reference to any human authority. On this account, the term Unitarian is properly assumed by us, and very properly given to us by the best writers among the sectarians, whether established by law, or going under the name of Dissenters.

Give me leave, Sir, to present you with an extract from a publication which seems to me to confirm the propriety of the title in question. It is in p. 25, 2nd edition, of Mr. Friend's *Thoughts on Subscription to religious Tests*. In the text, he says,

"From my view of the scriptures, it appears to me, that there is one God, the Creator and Governor of the Universe, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; that the hypothesis of two natures in Christ, has no foundation in scripture, but arises solely from the endeavours of man to solve some apparent difficulties, which they could not do on any other supposition: that Jesus Christ was a man like ourselves, sin only excepted, through whom, by the free gift of God, they who

are obedient to his precepts shall obtain everlasting life."

To this is subjoined the following note:—

"As persons are frequently led away by names, to which they affix very opprobrious ideas, and this abuse prevails no where more than in the University, I shall for the sake of the junior students, just delineate the leading features of some sects now prevailing in the nation. By Unitarians I mean those, who believe God to be one person, and all other persons and things to be his creatures: in opposition to Trinitarians, who believe God to consist of three persons in one substance, and all creatures, persons and things to be their joint production. The different opinions concerning the nature of Christ, may be briefly stated in the following manner. Either Christ pre-existed, or he did not. If he pre-existed, it must have been either as God, or as a creature of God; the former is the Athanasian, the latter the Arian opinion. If he did not pre-exist, his existence must have commenced either naturally or supernaturally; that is, he must have been conceived by his mother in the ordinary manner, or in some extraordinary way, must have been the son of Joseph and Mary, or of Mary alone: the former as it was the opinion of some early Christians, so it is also of some sensible and learned persons of our times; the latter is the general opinion prevailing among the Socinians. The author professes himself to be a Unitarian, distinguished from the Arians, by denying the pre-existence of Christ; and from the Socinians, by denying the propriety of addressing prayers to any but the one true

God. The time, it is hoped, is not far distant, when men will cease to be called by the names of Athanasius, Arius or Socinus."

If this should fall in the way of the writer in the *Eclectic Review*, I should be glad, if he would in as clear a manner state his own opinions; I am sure you would give them a place in your *Repository*, which I trust will continue to present to your readers both sides of the question, for our cause delights in investigation, and neither requires nor will ever employ abuse in its support.

I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient

PHILO-XENOS.

Gogmagog on the 'curious' Extract from the 'Eclectic Review.'

SIR,

Impotent rage is always ridiculous: you have, indeed, amused your readers by bringing forward a redoubtable *Eclectic* to play his frantic part on the arena of your *Repository*. (pp. 92—94.) Whether he or his brethren have been equally satisfied with his being exhibited on such a stage, may perhaps be doubted. You have given him rope enough, according to the condition of the proverb, and he has exemplified the consequence of it (which I need not put down in words,) most notably.

Your 'curious' extract enables me to answer a question which I have sometimes heard concerning this company of *Eclectics*. The true *Eclectic* in religion, is one who picks up one grain of truth out of this party, and another out of that, and so fills up his measure of wheat without chaff; but this is evidently not the just defi-

nition of such Eclectics as he who has been figuring away upon your pages, who has no taste but for seed of the growth of Geneva, and who would empty his bushel, rather than suffer it to contain a single kernel of Polish corn. Your Eclectics are not necessarily philosophers; Shakespeare has sketched out in his wonderful manner a company of female Eclectics, who reviewed all nature, in order to choose and pick whatever is nauseous and venomous; I allude to the 'Weird Sisters' in Macbeth, who *elected* and *collected* the following 'ingredients' for their 'caldron':—

"Toad, that under coldest stone,
Days and nights hast thirty-one
Swelter'd venom sleeping got,
Boil thou first i'the charmed pot!
Fillet of a fenny snake,
In the caldron boil and bake:
Eye of newt and toe of frog,
Wool of bat and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork and blind-worm's sting,
For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth boil and bubble.
Scale of dragon, tooth of wolf,
Witches' mummy; maw and gulf
Of the ravin'd salt sea-shark;
Root of hemlock digg'd i'the dark,
Liver of blaspheming Jew;
Gall of goat, and slips of yew,
Sliver'd in the moon's eclipse.

Double, double toil and trouble;
Fire burn; and caldron, bubble."

By a like eclectic process, divines gather together all that is rank in prejudice, all that is bitter in calumny, all that is malignant in passion, and after proper distillation acquire the *odium theologicum*, the essence of bigotry, a spirit more intoxicating and brutifying, than

————— the insane root
That takes the reason prisoner.

The meaning therefore of the term *Eclectic* cannot be any longer doubtful. It was assumed, we

are told, by a certain set of physicians among the antients, who culled simples to cure disease; and from them it is borrowed, doubtless, by our modern reviewers, who collect and decompose new publications in order to get an *extract* that shall poison heresy.

Thus, Sir, you have an idea, in the language of the above-mentioned antient doctors, of the *medicina eclectica*.

But to follow our own Eclectic, instead of wandering after Eclectics, in general,—he complains that 'Socinians' have received from "the Christian world, a forbearance and complaisance to which they were ill-entitled," and he instances in those two 'Socinian' ring-leaders, Lardner and Priestley. The opposite of complaisance—is rudeness, of forbearance—intolerance; and certainly Lardner, though a 'Socinian,' was not insulted, much less imprisoned or expatriated, by his *orthodox* contemporaries; perhaps, they could not well spare his learning, or conveniently forget his services to the cause of Christianity, and hence agreed to cover his nakedness, to veil his abominable heresy*. In this our Eclectic thinks them wrong and laments their

* It is amusing to observe how eagerly *Lardner* is held up to praise as a Christian, by the very men, that think no abuse too much for him as a 'Socinian.' We have the same farce played off with the names of *Locke* and *Newton*, who, whenever Christianity is to be defended against unbelievers, are blazoned forth as illustrious ornaments of the faith, (as in this very article of the *Eclectic Review*, in the next paragraph but one, to those quoted in the *M. Repos.*) but who, there is every reason to believe, were 'Socinians,' that is, in the *Eclectic* version, 'Anti-scripturalists, Semi-deists.'

error. But, surely, he has little occasion to regret the lavish "complaisance and forbearance," indulged to Dr. Priestley! That heresiarch might not, indeed, deserve respect or kindness—but he certainly found little of either from our Eclectic's '*Christian world*.' He was, it is true, only driven from his peaceful home; his library and philosophical apparatus only were burnt; the copies of his works, dispersed throughout the country, were not committed to the flames by the hands of the hangman; his approvers were not every where threatened and harassed by an orthodox mob; and war was not made upon America for receiving into her bosom, a man with the 'viper' of heretical pravity 'fastened on his hand,' and 'vengeance' marked out on his person and family. Yet he suffered enough, one would think, to satisfy any ordinary malice; and his sufferings would, I verily believe, have satisfied our Eclectic himself, but for the recollection of certain eulogies passed upon the celebrated exile, by some writers, whose talents and eloquence might have been expected to be devoted wholly to the orthodox faith, but whose philanthropy triumphed, for a moment, over their creed. I am persuaded, Sir, that our Eclectic had in his eye, a beautiful wreath of praise, wound about the head of Dr. Priestley, by "Robert Hall, M.A." of Cambridge, in his pamphlet entitled "*Christianity consistent with a Love of Freedom: being an Answer to a Sermon, lately published, by the Rev. John Clayton*." Printed for Johnson, 1791. Permit me to place the passage I allude to in your work; it is in

that lofty stile of eloquence, to which a vigorous writer is sometimes lifted, unconsciously, by his subject.

"The reader can be at no loss to determine, whom the author intends by a *busy active man in regenerating the civil constitutions of nations*. The occasion of the Sermon, and the complexion of its sentiments, concur in directing us to Dr. Priestley; a person whom the author seems to regard with a more than *odium theologicum*, with a rancour exceeding the measure, even of his profession*. The religious tenets of Dr. Priestley appear to me erroneous in the extreme, but I should be sorry to suffer any difference of sentiment to diminish my sensibility to virtue, or my admiration of genius. From him the poisoned arrow will fall pointless. His enlightened and active mind, his unwearied assiduity, the extent of his researches, the light that he has poured into almost every department of science, will be the admiration of that period, when the greater part of those who have favoured, or those who have opposed him, will be alike forgotten. Distinguished merit will ever rise superior to oppression, and will draw lustre from reproach. The

* The Eclectic Review was not instituted, till many years after Mr. Hall wrote his pamphlet, or we might have interpreted him to insinuate here that 'the Rev. John Clayton' was an Eclectic. It is, however, the divine faculty of genius to see future events, when they are as yet in embryo; and Mr. Hall might from his great perspicacity, be able to foretel that bigotry, after 'sleeping' many 'days and nights,' would get so much 'sweltered venom,' of such potent malignity, as to require an Eclectic Review for its discharge.

vapours which gather round the rising sun, and follow it in its course, seldom fail at the close of it, to form a magnificent theatre for its reception, and to invest with variegated tints and with a softened effulgence the luminary which they cannot hide." (pp. 34. 35.)

This was worthy of the successor of Robert Robinson; this merits, too, the anger of our Eclectic, who can never, I dare say, forget the length to which Mr. Hall here carried "forbearance and complaisance" towards such an arch-heretic, or forgive the 'Socinians' the honour of having had such an eulogy pronounced upon their leader.

There is another reason why I feel a strong conviction that our Eclectic meant to smite Mr. Hall through the sides of the 'Socinians;' which is, that Mr. Hall, in the valuable pamphlet before quoted, gives a definition of an Unitarian totally different from that of our Reviewer, and one which allows the appellation of Unitarian to the 'Socinian' and conveys nothing reproachful. He says, (p. 56) "An Unitarian is a person who believes Jesus Christ had no existence till he appeared on our earth, whilst a Trinitarian maintains that he existed with the Father from all eternity." Now this is the very definition of an Unitarian for which Dr. Priestley himself contended against both the Arians and the Trinitarians; but with this our Eclectic quarrels, because it is a matter-of-fact statement of a theological opinion, and cannot like the bugbear term 'Socinian,' (appropriate to no English sect,) be pressed into the service of calumny; and, objecting to the loss of such a con-

venient instrument of reproach, he very naturally reflects (as appears to me,) upon Mr. Hall, who has, in various parts of his reply to "the Rev. John Clayton," magnanimously protested against the use of poisoned weapons in the controversy with the Unitarians.

My opinion that our Eclectic intended his article to be a disingenuous attack upon both Mr. Hall and the 'Socinians,' is further strengthened by the recollection of many passages glancing at and reprobating cowardly theological assaults, in the admirable pamphlet which seems to have made an equally deep impression upon the reviewer and me. Feeling himself condemned in the condemnation passed by Mr. Hall upon such as resort to base polemical artifices, how much in character was it that, whilst he was foaming with rage against 'Socinians,' he should have sprinkled a little of his venom upon that liberal writer! The following is one passage out of many at which our Eclectic must have maddened:

"He (Mr. Clayton,) gives us a pompous enumeration of the piety, learning and talents of a large body of his brethren who concur with him in a disapprobation of the theological and political tenets of the Unitarians. The weakness of mingling them together has been shown already; but if these great and eminent men, whom the world never heard of before, possess that zeal for their religion, they pretend, let them meet their opponents on the open field of controversy, where they may display their talents and prowess to somewhat more advantage than in *skulking* behind a consecrated altar." (p. 74.)

Our Eclectic has indeed benefited the public by the exercise and display of his peculiar talent; but he felt it more safe to cast abuse from behind a hedge than to take open ground, where the abuse and the abuser would have been seen together. He feared, perhaps, that if he grappled personally with the expiring Unitarians, some one of this once formidable tribe might summon up the last remains of strength and throttle him in a convulsive, dying struggle. However this may be, it is to the honour of Mr. Hall that he should be looked upon as an adversary, in virtue of his character as an author, by a disciple of the Old Man of the Mountain.*

One more reason may be assigned why I consider our Eclectic as having Mr. Hall in his mind; namely, a certain awkward imitation of that writer's style, which Dr. Parr, (Spital Sermon, p. 63, Note) pronounces 'most beautiful and animated.' Nor is it uncommon for good writers to be imitated by such as are least disposed to borrow their spirit or principles. Hume has copyists who are not stoics or sceptics; Johnson's ponderous sentences are repeated by many who are not Jacobites; Parr may be taken for a model by some that do not think it useful for the cause either of learning or truth to heap together a mass of names, great and little, good and bad, and to crown them all with superlative praises; and Hall, in point of eloquence, may have his humble admirers, who would yet gladly consign to oblivion his eulogy on Dr. Priestley, his philippics against

Dr. Horsley and Mr. Pitt, his sarcastic ridicule of 'the Rev. John Clayton,' his vindication of the liberty of the Press, his arguments for a Reform of Parliament, and his rapturous exultations on the French Revolution. Such an admirer of Mr. Hall, I conceive our Eclectic to be, who nevertheless caricatures all the features of his style; who exhibits his coarseness without his vigour, and his passion without his genius,—who gives us his painful periods which yet as to sense are perfectly abortive, and who designs his bold figures but is utterly unable to mould them into shape, to give them expression or to keep them from confusion; who attempts fine writing but violates grammar, who affects to be nervous upon nonsense, and who seeks to be brilliant by the aid of the printer, and with an inverted sacredness, an anti-apocalyptic sublimity, couches slander under 'the mystery of the seven stars.'

In answer to all these reasons for my supposition, it may be pleaded that so safe a polemic as our Eclectic would not have aimed a kick at a living lion: but he might reckon upon impunity from his conscious insignificance and contemptibleness; or he might, more probably, consider the once formidable champion of freedom, peace and charity, as a defunct author; as, at least, unharnessed for "liberty's defence," twenty years ago his "noble task;" in short, as an *emeritus* professor of the rights of man and the prerogatives of conscience.

I am Sir,

Yours, in all honest service,
GOGMAGOG.

* Prince of the Assassins, whose 'mountain' was in Syria, not in Switzerland.

Original Letter of Mrs. Lindsey's; communicated by Mr. B. Flower.

Harlow,

SIR, *Mar. 8, 1812.*

I cannot but deem it one of the principal advantages and felicities of my life that Providence has favoured me with the friendship of some of the worthy, the sincere, and the pious, "the excellent of the earth," amongst the different denominations of Christians: and as I have the honour and the pleasure of ranking amongst my most esteemed friends the late Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, there were few if any of your readers who felt more interest in the brief but admirable memoir written by a most worthy and intimate friend of both the departed saints. I cannot but express my ardent hope that the same pen will favour the world with an enlarged account of a life which afforded such a bright example to her sex. Persuaded that it will render this communication additionally acceptable to yourself and your readers, I enclose for your insertion, a copy of a letter which I received from Mrs. Lindsey, when under the immediate pressure of the most heavy affliction I ever endured, and which I think can never be exceeded, if equalled; for when reflecting on what I suffered on the death of one who so entirely possessed my heart, I at times in the contemplation of my own death exclaim—"Surely the bitterness of death is past."—Those who are acquainted with Mr. Lindsey's writings, will perceive how admirably his worthy partner in life, has epitomised his most favourite system in one paragraph. Short as is the letter, it proved to me a

cordial drop in the bitter cup which my heavenly father gave me to drink; and it is not improbable but it may produce effects somewhat similar on some of your readers under the various troubles of life.

Your constant reader,

B. F.

Essex Street, April 13,

DEAR SIR, *1810.*

Nothing but the afflicting event which has befallen you by the loss of a most excellent, amiable and good wife, could have induced me to set pen to paper. A severe debilitating disease, from which it seems to be the will of God I am not to recover, has disabled me from doing any thing. Your letter,* I felt grateful for, and this is my only return for it, to assure you how sincerely I condole with you, hoping and praying that you may be supported under so severe a trial, more and more sanctified by it, and spared to support your very dear children, and bring them up in the fear and love of God. All human consolations I know are useless: we must be left to our Maker for comfort; *believing, that as in his hands alone are the several ingredients of the cup of mortal life,* IT CAN NEVER BE MIXED MORE BITTER THAN TO MAKE IT, IN THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE DEGREE, SALUTARY! Adieu! I can only repeat my wishes and prayers for you and yours, being always

Your very sincere friend,

H. LINDSEY.

Mr. B. Flower,

Harlow.

* Written to Mrs. L. on the death of her husband.

*Mr. Simpson, on a Quotation
from him.*

Bath, March 7, 1812.

SIR,

In your number for February, page 99, your correspondent, whose signature is D. has accurately quoted, from page 537, note 2. of my Internal and Presumptive Evidences of Christianity, the following passage: "*εἰμι is used to express future time in John viii. 58. as Jesus also uses it, John xvii. 24.*" But in page 15, of *Emendanda et Addenda* to that book, which I printed some time ago, and which was given with it, he will find the following correction.

Page 537, note 2, lines 3, 4 and 5, dele the whole of the last sentence in this note. In this sen-

tence *εἰμι* is said to express future time in John viii. 58.

The subject of my Ninth Essay on the Language of Scripture, in the second volume, is also a particular examination of John viii. 58. in which I have endeavoured to shew that *εἰμι*, in this text, denotes a previous divine purpose and appointment of Jesus to be the Messiah.

Your Correspondent having ingenuously avowed his own change of sentiment respecting the signification of this text, I attribute his supposition, that I now retain the opinion concerning it which was first expressed in the note above-mentioned, to his not having seen my correction of it, or my Ninth Essay.

JOHN SIMPSON.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM,

AND

INQUIRIES AND DISQUISITIONS ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

*Jerom, on Psalm lxxxii. 8, with
Remarks.*

Ps. lxxxii. 8. Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations.

"Here Jerom, or whoever is the author of the Breviary upon the Psalter, in a style and manner, somewhat resembling Jerom's, extols the success of Peter and Paul in preaching the gospel. 'God sent Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah and other prophets. And in Judah was God known, his name was great in Israel, a small tract of land only. He sent Peter, no philosopher nor orator, but an illiterate fisherman, who went from Jerusalem to Rome, and converted Rome, which the

most eloquent men were not able to do. Again, he sent out the apostle Paul, and he preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum. [Rom. xv. 19.] Alexander the Great, King of the Macedonians, with a powerful army, did not conquer so many nations as they did. This Paul, who once was a persecutor, who says of himself, that he *was rude in speech, though not in knowledge*, who made solæcisms in his speech, subdued the whole world. Some one may say, all this was done for the sake of gain; so says Porphyry. Ignorant and indigent men, because they had nothing, performed some signs by magical art: which is no great matter; for the magi-

cians in Egypt, and many others, have wrought signs. Let it be granted: and as you say, the apostles wrought signs that they might enrich themselves with the treasures of rich women whom they perverted. But then, why did they die? Why were they crucified? Others have wrought signs by magical arts, but they did not die for a dead man; they were not crucified for a man that had been crucified. They knew him to be dead: and did they die without any reason? Our victory is completed in the blood of the apostles: our faith is ratified in their blood. Let us therefore praise God, to whom be glory for ever and ever."

This translation is by Lardner. (Works, viii. 223—5.) The passage is a pleasing specimen of rational theology in the 4th century. It might have come from the pen of Lardner himself, a decided Unitarian. Two or three remarks may be made upon it.

1. The two apostles mentioned in it are not designated by the superstitious appellation of "Saint," which is now the usual præfix to their names. *Peter* is denominated simply *a fisherman*; or as it is in the original, which is not literally translated by Lardner, *a rude fisherman, whose hand was hardened by labour*. "*Petrus piscatorem, qui dimiserat rete, qui ab opere callosam habebat manum: — hominem rusticum.*" Paul is styled merely *an apostle, once a persecutor*, "*Paulus Apostolus—quondam persecutor.*" And both Peter and Paul are called *poor men*, "*pauperes.*"

2. The master to whom Peter and Paul stood in the relations of disciples and messengers, that is

Jesus, is pointed out as *a a dead man—a man that had been crucified—a man whom they knew to have been dead*. "*Homine mortuo—homine crucifixo:—sciunt isti hominem esse mortuum.*" So steadily had the simple language of the first Christians fixed itself in the church; though their simple doctrines were beginning at this period to be exploded.

3. Here are some phrases which if found in the New Testament, applied to Christ, would be reckoned decisive proofs of his blood being shed to satisfy Divine Justice for the sins of mankind. Peter and Paul (martyrs) *died and were crucified for a dead, a crucified man*; "*pro homine, &c.*" How readily would an orthodox divine shew that to die for another, is to die as his *substitute* or *ransom*. He would refer us to Ainsworth, who says, "*Pro. (1) For, on account of, as a price, or recompense. (3) Instead of.*" To modern Christians, it would seem little less than impiety to say that Christ died for men in the same sense that Peter and Paul by their martyrdom died for Christ.—Again, great worth and efficacy is attributed to the blood of the martyred apostles. *Our victory* (says the Christian writer) *is completed in the blood of the apostles: our faith is ratified in their blood*. The original is much stronger: "*Felix ergo nostra victoria, quæ in sanguine apostolorum dicata est. Fides nostra non probatur, nisi per illorum sanguinem.*" *Happy then is our victory, consummated in the blood of the apostles. Our faith is not confirmed but through their blood*. Phrases of much less force in reference to Christ are believed to convey the

idea that his blood was of infinite pacificatory and atoning power; so suitably expressed in the following popular stanzas of Watts :

"Once 'twas a seat of dreadful wrath,
And shot devouring flame :
Our God appear'd consuming fire,
And vengeance was his name.

"Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calm'd his* frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
And turn'd the wrath to grace."

EPISCOPUS.

On John xii. 31.

[An Extract from a Letter to a Friend.]

I have this week been led to consider John xii. 31, with the context. Neither the common interpretation of that verse, nor that in the I. V. gives satisfaction to my mind as the true one, and no commentator at hand helps me out of the great difficulty, in which the passage involves me. Priestley mentions that Wakefield understands Jesus as intending himself by "the prince or ruler of this world," here and ch. xiv. 30, but how the latter can be understood of Jesus himself, I am yet to learn. I much wished I had had his Testament to consult. That not being the case, all I could do was to weigh the matter as well as I was able, and the result is a strong conviction that the circumstances of that part of the history of Jesus, and the connected import of his discourse (John xii. 23, &c.) require that v. 31. should be thus taken. "Now are the unbelieving Jews, (in concert with the Gentiles,) about to pass an unjust judgment upon me, and condemn me to death. Now shall I,

the prince of the world, be denied, rejected and cast out by them with scorn and contempt, as a wretch altogether too unworthy to live."

To avoid the plots of the Jews against his life, Jesus left Judea for a time. (John xi. 54.) On his return to attend the Passover, he informed the twelve of his approaching sufferings and death. (Luke xviii. 31—34.) On the 5th day before the Passover, he went from Bethany in humble triumph to Jerusalem, and into the very temple, and was greeted all along as he went, as "the king of Israel, a prince of the house of David." (John xii. 12, &c.) While there, certain Greeks (v. 20—22.) desired an interview with him, probably in hopes of being advanced in his kingdom, expecting it would be a temporal one. Their desire being communicated to Jesus, he said aloud, (v. 23.) "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified," by exaltation in heaven, and the extension of his kingdom, but he intimated, (v. 24—26.) that his death must first intervene, and that all who would obtain honor in his kingdom must be ready, after his example, to sacrifice their lives in support of his cause.

(V. 27.) Pausing to reflect on his near approaching sufferings, he was deeply affected, but in prayer expressed full resignation to his Father's disposing will, and wish to be subservient to his glory. (27, 28.) Upon this a voice from heaven testified his Father's approbation of him, which must have cheered his afflicted mind, though it was uttered chiefly for the conviction and encouragement of others. (28, 30.)

* God, the Father's.

Resigned to his lot, and favoured with a divine attestation, his noble soul soars far above all suffering and death—he even exults, looking to the glorious issue of them. (v. 31, 33.) “Soon is the unjust judgment of this world to be passed on me! Soon shall I, the prince of this world, and who have just been hailed by the public plaudit, under the character of a prince or king, be cast out with odium, denied, judged, condemned and put to an ignominious death, but although I be lifted from the earth, crucified, in consequence of the unjust judgment of the world against me, yet I shall come off victorious, and by my cross draw all men to me as my disciples.” This sense appears to me to receive confirmation from considering, 1. that Jesus was actually condemned and put to death, under the character and appellation of a prince or ruler, “The King of the Jews,” as John particularly relates, ch. xviii. 33. &c. and was in three languages declared such by the title on his cross, (ch. xix. 1. &c.) 2. Jesus said, (John xvi. 8—11.) “When the comforter is come (the promised spirit) he shall convince the world of judgment, because the Prince of this world is judged.” The two preceding articles evidently refer to Jesus, and I conclude this is to be understood, in relation to him. *q. d.* “The Spirit in my Apostles shall convict the Jews and Jewish rulers of partial and unjust judgment in condemning me, an innocent person, and ordained of God to be a Prince and Saviour, to a cruel death.” And 3. this the Apostles laboured at, in their preaching, from the very day they received the promised Spirit, (Acts ii. 22—36. iii.

13, &c. iv. 10, v. 28, &c.) and actually effected upon great numbers, to the thorough conversion of some to Christianity (Acts ii. 37 and 41.) and to the cutting mortification of others. (Acts v. 33.)

Through early and long continued association, many will doubtless find a great difficulty in admitting that Jesus meant himself by “the Prince of this world,” one so opposite having been usually so termed, but to me it seems to make the plainest and best sense, to be most agreeable to the drift of his discourse, both in John xii. xvi. chs. and the strict propriety of the appellation to him, will unquestionably be owned by all, “When the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.” Rev. xi. 15.

On Heb. xiii. 7.

[From the Introduction to “A Funeral Sermon, for the Rev. Mr. Seddon, of Warrington,” from “Sermons by the Rev. P. Holland, in two Volumes, 1792.” Vol. ii. pp. 197, 198.]

Heb. xiii. 7. Remember those who have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.

These words evidently refer to the pastors and teachers of the Christian church; but the sentiments conveyed by our translation, are not the same with those of the original. For in the first place, we should conclude from the former part of the verse, in the English, that the persons spoken of were still living, in opposition to the latter part, which supposes them to be dead. Besides, the words, “them which have the

rule over you," will give an English reader an idea of certain powers in the pastors, either to determine the faith and duty of others, or to inflict certain penalties on their disobedience; neither of these notions is consistent with that authority in the church, which our Saviour has reserved to himself, or with the obligation which lie [*lies*] upon every Christian to search the scriptures, and to make the best use in his power, of the understanding which God has given him, in order to determine what he is to believe and practise. But the words of the original convey no such sentiment. The primary sense of the word which we translate "rule," is to "lead;" and though it may sometimes be applied to governors, yet it refers to them only as persons chosen to lead or precede in any particular affair. And thus the words may be rendered: "Remember your pastors or guides, who have spoken the words of God unto you, and considering the end of their conversation, follow their faith."

Illustrations of Scripture,

[From an interleaved Bible.]

Job. xxxi. 26, 27.

"On the first appearance of the new moon, which they look upon to be newly created, the Pagan natives, as well as Mahomedans, say a short prayer; and this seems to be the only visible

adoration, which the Kafirs, [the infidels, Pagans,] offer up to the Supreme Being. This prayer is pronounced in a whisper: the party holding up his hands before his face: its purport, (as I have been assured by many different people,) is to return thanks to God for his kindness through the existence of the past moon, and to solicit a continuance of his favour, during that of the new one. At the conclusion, they spit upon their hands and rub them over their faces: this seems to be nearly the same ceremony, which prevailed among the heathens, in the days of Job."—*Mungo Park's Travels in Africa*, 8vo. 1810. p. 406.

Jeremiah xlix. 19, and l. 44.

"After having descended the outermost bank, you go about a furlong on a level strand, before you come to the immediate bank of the river. This second bank is so beset with bushes and trees, such as tamarisk, willows, oleanders, &c. that you can see no water till you have made your way through them. In this thicket, antiently, (and the same of it is reported at this day,) several sorts of wild-beasts were wont to harbour themselves; whose being washed out of the covert by the overflowings of the river, gave occasion to that allusion, Jer. xlix. 19, &c."—*Maunderell's Journey*, 8vo. p. 110. London ed. 1810.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."

POPE.

ART. I.—*A Plain Statement of some of the most important Principles of Religion, as a Preservative against Infidelity, Enthusiasm and Immorality. By the Rev. Thomas Watson. 8vo. pp. 176. Longman and Co. 1811.*

This treatise is the production of a Dissenting minister at Whitby in Yorkshire, who, before the commencement of our Repository, rendered essential service to the interests of rational religion and sound morals, by two very excellent publications. The first of these, which is entitled, *Intimations and Evidences of a Future State*, details the proofs of that important doctrine, derived from reason and natural religion, and from revelation, with that force, perspicuity and simplicity, which render it admirably calculated to produce impression on ingenuous and unprejudiced minds. The other publication, entitled, *Popular Evidences of Natural Religion and Christianity*, possesses similar recommendations in point of composition with the former, and merits the encomium which it has received in the most respectable of our monthly critical works, where it is observed that the author "has in this treatise so collected and displayed the various evidences in favour of religion, that it is impossible to weigh them without feeling the dignity of man, and the importance as well as truth of Christianity." In his Introduction the author, while apologizing

for bringing forwards such a work after the appearance of Dr. Paley's *Elements of Natural Theology*, and *View of the Evidences of Christianity*, justly observes, that though his performance and those of the Doctor are nearly allied in title, and accord altogether in design; the plans are totally different, the materials are no where the same, and there is no interference in the management of the argument. To this statement we cannot but add, that while we are duly sensible of the excellence of the Doctor's labours, we consider those of Mr. Watson better adapted to the use of readers in general, and particularly of the young and uninformed. The design of the author in the work which more immediately claims our notice, "is to give a plain statement of some of the most important principles of religion, and particularly those principles which may have the most powerful influence upon our conduct; and to shew that Christianity is a system founded upon the best evidence, that it is a rational system; that it is simple and plain, adapted to the capacity of all those who are endowed with common understandings; and that its great aim is to bring in and support universal righteousness." This design the author has executed in a manner very creditable to his abilities as a writer, intending to inculcate important and valuable truths, in language likely to produce effect,

from its being plain, familiar and intelligible. Throughout the whole work he also appears animated by a spirit of warm and genuine piety, and by an ardent zeal for vindicating religion from those corruptions, abuses and inconsistencies, which have too long been substituted for the plain principles and excellent morals taught by Jesus Christ. Thus much we can say, without subscribing to all the opinions advanced by the author, (though we have seldom found reason to differ from him;) and we recommend his work as deserving the perusal and encouragement of the well-wishers to the interests of truth and virtue; particularly, as an useful manual to be placed in the hands of young persons, before they have recourse to more extended treatises on the important subjects which it embraces.

The contents of this volume are distributed into seven chapters, which are subdivided into a variety of sections. The 1st chapter treats of the Existence and Attributes of God; the 2d, of the Doctrine of Providence; the 3d, of the Importance of forming worthy Conceptions of God, and of the Worship of God and Prayer. The 4th chapter discusses the subject of Revealed Religion; the 5th, that of Religious Duties, and particularly Christian Morality; the 6th, is on Internal Feelings; and the 7th, on the Sanctions of the Gospel. That our readers may be able to form for themselves some idea of the author's manner of writing, and of the sentiments which he enforces, we shall lay before them the whole of chap. vi, *on the Internal Feelings required by Religion*.

“ 1st. In the estimate of the religious life, great reliance is sometimes placed

on the inward feelings. Without the operation of these, it is asserted, there can be no vital religion: and therefore great pains are taken, and every means employed, to excite in the converts a proper degree of sensibility. It is certainly of the highest importance, that the heart should be right before God; and Christ's religion addresses itself to our hearts, and furnishes us, at the same time, with the best subjects for our serious thoughts and meditations. We have for the exercise of our thoughts, the perfections and providence of God, particularly his holiness, his goodness, his love and his mercy. We have a future state of rewards and punishments. We have the admirable life and character of Jesus Christ, his excellent doctrines, and his perfect example. No subjects can be more interesting than these; and nothing so well calculated to purify and improve our natures. It will be a proper and instructive subject of private meditation, also, to take a review, frequently, of our own life and conduct, how far we have performed our duties, and in what cases we have been negligent. And the practical use of reflections of this nature will be to correct wherever we have erred; and to supply where we have been defective. Here is a plain path traced out to us, but too plain, I am afraid, to be followed.

“ But this is not what is generally meant by inward feelings and vital religion; it implies something dark and mysterious, beyond the reach of common sense, and the general experience of mankind. Christ, according to them, must be formed within; and their labour must be to work themselves up to some fervour and holy enthusiasm.

“ 2ndly, Without attempting to give a formal definition of enthusiasm, I would observe, that it may be generally understood by referring to examples. There is an enthusiasm which discovers itself in a vast variety of things, and which we look upon with approbation. A man becomes an enthusiast, in particular pursuits, when he becomes passionately fond of them, and devotes the whole of his time and labour to their acquisition, and his enthusiasm is most remarkable, when there is a little eccentricity and extravagance of character accompanying the pursuit. The patriot is often an enthusiast, in the love of his country, when he is so inflamed with the object, as to sacrifice every thing for

its preservation; and this is seen more particularly, when he embarks in undertakings, sometimes wild and almost impracticable, for its honour and deliverance. There is a religious enthusiasm also, pure, sublime, and animating, which good men may frequently feel, sometimes in the acts of devotion, and sometimes in their meditation on the Supreme Being, and his infinite goodness and love; and on the disinterested love, and admirable character of Jesus Christ.

“But, then, there is another species of religious enthusiasm, of a baser origin, that runs counter to common sense; that is not authorised by scripture; to which men of weak minds are liable, which crafty men feign, and which interested men foment and encourage. It is this, which produces those wild feelings or expressions of feelings, which outrage all reason and experience. Men, under the influence of this spirit, pretend to feel, sometimes horrors most dreadful, and at other times joys unutterable. But they carry this still farther. They believe, or affect to believe, that they receive, also, communications from heaven and illuminations from above; and proceeding to the utmost height of extravagance, they feel assured, that their sins are pardoned, and that their eternal happiness is secure. Now these are not harmless delusions; they ought to be combated, on account of the mischief which they create, and the disgrace which they inflict on religion.

“3. There is no principle, which can be so little depended upon, as a man's inward feelings; and in nothing does he expose himself so much to every kind of delusion. The feelings are greatly influenced by the animal spirits, by the powers of the imagination, and by a state of health and of sickness. When we trust, then, to such uncertain guides, we lay ourselves open to the arts of every impostor. How difficult is it, with people of weak minds to distinguish between the suggestions of a heated imagination, worked up by the enthusiast to the highest pitch of ardour, and the suggestion of the spirit of God. Weak men are easily wrought upon and deluded, and they are soon misled by the bold and confident assertions of the hypocrite or impostor. Various means are employed to accomplish their purpose; sometimes they are to be agitated by terrors, and at other times seduced by hopes. With such things they are plied incessantly,

from the moment they are caught, till they be completely secured. The imagination, when once heated, by exercises of this nature, is never permitted to cool. Any suggestions, by such means and at such times, may be produced and supported, whilst all these inward feelings are nothing more than the delusions of an over-heated brain. It is melancholy to have to combat such principles, in an age, which boasts to be an age of reason; and in a country where we have the freest exercise of this blessing.

“From the general principles of Christ's religion, we can find no authority for such delusions; and in the general mass of those, who maintain such principles, we see no improvement in their morals, to justify such extravagant pretensions. The allowing also of such principles is opening a wide door for every thing that is wild and extravagant, and is exposing the religion of Christ to the scorn of the unbeliever, by divesting it of every thing that is rational.

“Upon this system, we can find no principle, either to judge of ourselves, or of others. The simplicity and plainness of the Christian system, are some of its distinguishing excellencies; by our fruits, according to the declaration of our Lord, are we to be known; whilst the extravagancies produced by such feelings, should be a sufficient warning to mankind, not to rely upon them. By these the enthusiast supports all his pretensions. Swedenborgh, a man of education and rank, under the influence of such feelings, relates with the greatest gravity, his journey to the highest heaven; and so infectious is such influence, that he has been followed, in his religious principles by some men of ingenuity and learning; and his writings, full of absurdities, have been translated, and have had a very extensive circulation. The ingenious and learned Mr. Wesley, in his Journals, gives many relations of his own feelings, and of the feelings of others, sometimes manifested in trifles, and sometimes in matters of some importance, but generally containing matter and circumstances so absurd, as should be sufficient to discountenance all confidence in principles so wild and extravagant.

“4. The following reflections must naturally suggest themselves to every man of reason, who seriously considers the whole of this process.

“In the first place, what must be the spiritual pride and presumption of those

who believe themselves to have obtained the highest hopes that can be obtained by mortals? And from the top of that pinnacle to which they have raised themselves, they look down with pity, mingled with contempt, on all those they have left below: but in this new character there is neither charity nor humility, the most certain marks of the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus.

"But, in the second place, what must be the condition of those, who after embracing this faith, and after the most serious application and diligence, have not been able to raise themselves to this high distinction: and are too honest to put in their pretensions? Is not this tempting many of them to feign feelings which they never felt, and to put on the appearance of joys, which they never experienced? And thus they surrender their integrity to preserve their consistency. But, if in the general tenor of their lives, we do not see more honesty, more disinterestedness, &c. than in other men, we may infer, that the gifts, which they have received, are not very powerful, and come from a source not very pure.

"It is certainly, not easy to believe, that some of the most abandoned of mankind (for the more abominable they are, the fitter subjects for this experiment) after passing, for a few days, through these operations, should come out perfectly transformed in heart and life, and become angels of light. We have nothing in nature that we can compare with this. It resembles most the transformation which the heathen poet has feigned; and it has more the appearance of magic, than an operation of rational religion. Protestants ridicule the pardons, sold and purchased in the Romish church, and the easy admission that they thus gain into the gates of heaven: but this new mode surpasses every thing which that church ever invented, for cheapness and expedition.

"Dr. Middleton, in his celebrated Letter from Rome, demonstrates the exact conformity between Popery and Paganism, establishing it, that modern Rome has borrowed a great number of its religious ceremonies from that ancient mistress of the world. But will it not surprise the Protestant world to learn, that these wonderful transformations are nearly a copy of the ancient Pagan mysteries, practised in Greece, and in other parts of the heathen world? I will not

say they are borrowed; the resemblance may be purely accidental; for the superstitions of all countries are nearly related. The historian in giving an account of the terrible ceremonies by which the initiated were received into their sacred mysteries, 'A mechanical operation,' says he, 'was played off at proper intervals, during the course of the celebration. Towards the end, the whole scene is terrible; all is trembling, shuddering, sweat and astonishment. Strange cries and howlings are uttered. Light succeeds darkness, various holy phantasies enchant the sight. Melodious notes are heard from afar, with all the sublime symphony of the sacred hymns. The pupil now becomes free, is admitted to bear a part in the sacred rites; and then declared a perfect man.'

"It requires a firm mind to pass through such scenes with the perfect use of the faculties. The mind is required to be in continual exertion, by night and by day, and upon subjects often the most horrible. The deluded converts are labouring to believe and adopt, what they are told they must feel. They are forbidden to enjoy any of the common innocent amusements of society, as a relief to the distressed soul. They are kept constantly on the rack, and fixed on such exercises only, as are too powerful for weak minds. It is not to be wondered, then, that the spirits, from this unnatural agitation, should sink down in confirmed melancholy, or burst out in outrageous madness. Those have the best chance of escaping, who are the least in earnest in these operations. An eminent physician, in a late Treatise upon Insanity, in enumerating the causes of this unhappy malady, founded upon principles taken from the register of Bedlam, from 1772 to 1787, assigns 90 cases, in that period, to the effects of false religion: and it is to be observed, that this is a larger number, than from any other cause, excepting to fever he gives 110, and 115 to hereditary tendency." (pp. 145—153.)

ART. II.—*Two Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge, on the Doctrine of a Particular Providence, and on Modern Unitarianism: with Notes, referring to some recent Opinions and Publications on*

these Subjects. Being the Christian Advocate's Publication for 1811. By George D'Oyly, B. D. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Christian Advocate in that University. Cambridge, Printed: Sold by Rivington, & Co. in London. 8vo. pp. 86.

“By the will of the late Rev. JOHN HULSE, the CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE is required to produce every year a publication; which may be an answer to cavils and objections brought against natural or revealed religion, or which may tend to confute ‘any new or dangerous error, either of superstition or enthusiasm:—’”

Hence we may fairly suppose that the Christian Advocate will often be among divines, what the Laureat usually is among poets, and will illustrate, in his own example, the disadvantages of a man constrained to produce a publication every year, and to write under prescribed restrictions. Either Mr. D'Oyly has been thus affected by a sense of his situation, or the University of Cambridge is singularly unhappy in his acceptance of the office, which has now “dipt him in ink.”

In the discourse on a particular providence, we meet sometimes with a confusion of ideas, and almost uniformly with a want of clearness and precision, which, from such a quarter, we should hardly have expected, and which on a subject so delicate and important, are greatly to be lamented. It would have been well if Mr. D'Oyly had defined what he means by a particular providence. Much of his argument is employed in vindicating the doctrine of providence in general: and though he

professes to throw out of consideration (p. 7.) “the cases in which a miraculous power is exerted,” he tells us, nevertheless, in the very same sentence, that, according to the plan of the divine government, which is unfolded in holy writ, “the Deity compasses his particular purposes by controuling the established laws of nature.” What then does the Christian Advocate understand by a miracle?

By the particular providence of the Supreme Being, we mean his application of his own general laws to his various purposes, be they what they may, in respect of individuals, to their several ages, conditions, tempers, distinctions, &c. and to the other unseen ends of his intelligence and goodness. This statement of the case, both explains and enforces the duty of acknowledging him in all our ways; and it shows that, in strict propriety of language, there is no such thing as chance* in the creation.

Mr. D'Oyly remarks with truth that

“—the effect on human feelings and practice, caused by pressing with extreme closeness the doctrine of a particular providence, is nearly allied to that which flows from the chilling principle of fatalism.” (22.)

In his first note he produces passages from the writings of Whitfield and Wesley, and of their respective followers, which indicate a sad abuse of the doctrine. This part of his undertaking, however, was equally needless with the sermon itself; more numerous and

* Paley's reasoning in his *Natural Theology*, (549—572) is to be examined, we conceive, in reference to these observations.

more pertinent citations having been made by former writers*.

Of *modern Unitarianism* Mr. D'Oyly is, in every view, deplorably ignorant. It is not true that the advocates of the belief which he so denominates, regard the controversy between their opponents and themselves as involving merely speculative tenets. It is not true that they employ unjustifiable weapons in the conflict: eager as our author is to bring the accusation, his own note is a proof of his inability to substantiate it. (c) Further, it is not true that the Unitarians invite any (46) to a "hasty, ill-grounded and premature exercise of their judgment;" though, on the other hand, they do not, like the *Christian Advocate*, recommend that men should, "for a time receive truth on the authority of others," and suspend the process of pursuing investigation for themselves. (47). Still we agree with him that the question between the Unitarian and the orthodox writers, is very far from being *new*: it has even subsisted much longer than this gentleman seems to be aware. (48, 49). Nor, again, do we object to the *principle* (52) that "it is by catching the spirit of the sacred writings, by viewing the texts in their several bearings, by discovering their general scope, that scriptural *truth* is to be placed on its *true* basis."

The *Christian Advocate*, after the example of authors of greater reputation than himself, has endeavoured to throw his strength of talents and learning into his notes, in the last and most tedious

of which, he bestows a few animadversions on the *Improved Version* and on Mr. Belsham's *Calm Inquiry, &c.* For a particular reply, however, to these publications, he sends his readers to *Leslie's Dialogues with a Socinian*, which, if they are indeed "a full, detailed and specific answer to every main and important argument on which the Unitarians are resting with so much confidence at the present day" (72), might reasonably have saved Mr. D'Oyly the trouble of this Discourse. Possibly, too, he might have been more sparing of his censures on Mr. Belsham and others, had he known that J. D. Michaëlis, a believer in the divinity of Jesus Christ, had strong doubts of the authenticity of the introductory chapters to Matthew's Gospel*, of the Epistle to the Hebrews† and of the book of the Apocalypse‡.

He observes (82, 83) that "while some texts of scripture announce that God will hereafter judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained, (Acts xvii. 31,) all Christians have hence derived a capital confirmation of the truth that Christ really possessed, in addition to his human nature, some nature of a very superior cast." And what conclusion, we ask, can be more unwarranted? What more notorious irreverence can you shew to scripture, than to draw from the very passage where Jesus is spoken of as a *man* ordained by God, a proof of his Deity,—and this in opposition to another (John v. 27), which declares that he has "authority to execute judgment because he is the son of man?"

* The Barrister, and Dr. Outram in his Extracts, &c.

* Introd. to N. T. (Marsh's Trans.) Vol. I. 210.

† Vol. IV. 268.

‡ Ib. 544.

While the greatest writers in the Christian Advocate's own communion, differ considerably among themselves in the explanation of disputed texts, it ill becomes him to accuse Unitarians of that mutual diversity of interpretation and opinion which not even an infallible church can entirely prevent. It is equally indecorous in him to hazard a sneer (69) at Mr. Belsham's "rate of intellect and acquirement," and to connect with the *Improved Version* the name of that gentleman, of whose concern in it he can know nothing but in common with the public. As to this translation itself, we challenge Mr. D'Oyly to disprove the assertion that it is an *Improved Version*: it has at least the praise of exhibiting a correcter text of the Christian Scriptures than previously existed in our language.

The deficiency of information, the weakness of reasoning and the absence of good manners which characterize this pamphlet, are not redeemed by any excellencies of style. On the contrary, improprieties and obscurities of expression occur in almost every page: and we discover examples of incongruous imagery which would hardly be tolerable in a *fresh man*.

What, for instance, shall we think of "two opposite extremes—both pregnant with mischievous results" (1), of "a pregnant source," being opened (3), of "that insight into the methods of the divine government which is unfolded in Holy Writ" (7), of *uncertain ignorance* (18), of *knowledge touching with the sweetest hope the bosom of affliction* (26), of *views striking us with admiration, winning us to gratitude and obliging us to obedience* (31), of

an engine of *assailment* (33), of that imposing *aim* of confidence which is well calculated to *entrap* the unwary (35), and more than all, of *sifting* the general *tone* of Scripture (51), and of a man's *sole* and *main* intention (68).

It were easy to enlarge this list of examples of Mr. D'Oyly's bad taste in composition. But we are called to more agreeable employments. Intelligent and impartial readers, whatever be their religious opinions, will be disgusted with his work. His own University, in particular, will blush and sigh when she contrasts "the Christian Advocate's publication for 1811" with the vigorous and durable productions of her Medes and her Lightfoots, her Cudworths and her Spencers, her Bentleys and her Clarkes, her Jortins and her Laws, her Jebbs, her Watsons and her Paleys!

ART. III. *A Defence of the Ancient Faith; or Five Sermons in Proof of the Christian Religion. By the Rev. Peter Gandolphy. 8vo. pp. 160. Keating and Co. Duke Street, Grosvenor Square. 1811.*

Mr. Gandolphy is a Roman Catholic Priest—and it was with us a matter of some curiosity on receiving this volume to see how a preacher of his persuasion would conduct the 'Defence of the Ancient Faith.' The perusal of the work has we confess much mortified us; it has forced upon us the unpleasant apprehension that the English Roman Catholics are yet on the lowest steps of the ladder of society; uninformed, credulous, bigoted. Wishing well to the Catholic body in their struggle for

religious liberty, we should be glad to be convinced that Mr. Gandolphy is below the level of the priests of his communion, or that the priests are less enlightened and liberal than the laity.

The 'Preface' is upon the whole modest, and more *Catholic* and less *Romish*, than the rest of the publication; excepting indeed the use of the word *conventicles*, in connection with an allusion to modern *fanaticism*, p. 7. In the evil sense of this word, a Roman Catholic Priest should know that it has never so much venom as when applied to a popish meeting-house. We suspect, however, that Mr. Gandolphy, whose name would seem to import that he is a foreigner, does not enter into the nicer shades of meaning of English words; and hence our surprise is somewhat abated at many inaccuracies in his style and many expressions which might otherwise be thought to indicate an intolerant spirit.

The sermons are on the following subjects,—‘The Necessity of Revelation:—The Evidence of a New Dispensation:—The Evidence of the Prophets:—The Evidence which Events offer for Christianity:—The Divinity of Jesus Christ.’

It is impossible to analyze these discourses; for Mr. Gandolphy does not argue, nor even declaim speciously: thread-bare maxims in vulgar language, quotations from a narrow set of writers, without felicity of selection or pertinence of application, appeals to the scriptures with an utter ignorance of their connection and import, the boldest figures of rhetoric with an obvious beggary of thought and language,—such are the materials

with which the volume is constructed. The preacher aspires to the honour of combating philosophers without understanding philosophy, and addresses the passions of the multitude without a single qualification for popularity.

The following is a *favourable* specimen of the discourses:

‘Malachias is the last of the prophets in the order of time; and with him, at the distance of about 400 years before Christ, closes that long train of inspired characters, who for nearly 3000 years successively enlightened Israel. From that period reigns an unbroken silence. No prophet rises in Judah’ (*Judah*) ‘to address the chosen people of God. An important moment is approaching—all is hushed into a mysterious calm, a calm which even for an interval pervades the universe. At length the angel mentioned by the prophet, the Baptist coming forth as the precursor of Christ, proclaims his arrival to the Jews, when he immediately appears, announcing himself the Son of God, the Messiah, and accomplishes in his own person all the predictions of the prophets. He is born amongst that people a king, he lives amongst them a prophet, and he dies amongst them a victim, a saviour and a God. *Agonizing*, he exclaims with a loud voice, *All is consummated, and gives up the ghost.** Like Sampson, he again bursts the bonds of death, issues forth a God from his tomb, and commands twelve poor friendless and dejected men to go and establish the Christian religion throughout the world. Go, he says, persecution shall be your bread, prisons your palaces, racks your thrones and martyrdoms your crowns. Scarcely are the commands received than the whole world resounds with the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified; their rapidity is like to the rapidity of the torrent, and their conquests like to the conquests of a mighty conqueror.’ Pp. 82—84.

Mr. Gandolphy loads unbelievers with a variety of epithets of vulgar reproach, and he warns his hearers against social intercourse with ‘these demons incarnate.’ (p. 95.) He is somewhat silly,

* ‘John xix. 30.’

deplorably ignorant, and not a little ridiculous in his selection of objects of abuse; he attributes, for instance, every folly, vice and crime to the following "heroes of former ages,"—*Solon—Nero—Plato—Stilpo—Vespasian—Zeno—Faustus—Cicero—Cato—Seneca—Lucien* (*Lucian*); and to the names 'for more modern times,' of *Shaftesbury, Hume, &c.* (pp. 91, 92.) Does this Catholic Priest really believe *Shaftesbury* and *Hume* to have been the most immoral of mankind? Does he credit the monkish fables about *Dr. Faustus*? Outdoing the monks of the dark ages in ignorance, does he consider *Faustus* as a Greek or Roman hero? Whom does he mean by 'the impious Boyle?' p. 13. Is it our English philosopher and Christian, of that name, or is it Mr. Gandolphy's way of writing the name of *Bayle*, the author of the *Historical Dictionary*?

We might fill a sheet with the blunders, we would hope not wilful and malignant, of this redoubtable Defender of the Faith; but we are tired with the disgusting employment, and shall only point out one more piece of ignorance or notable artifice which disgraces his volume. In his sermon on the Divinity of Christ, he confounds that tenet with the Divinity of the Christian Religion, and considers 'Socinians' and Infidels as identical; he confidently ascribes the disbelief of Christ's personal divinity to 'pride,' 'impiety' and 'unchastity' (pp. 123 and 135); and associating *Socinus* and *Voltaire*, *Bolingbroke* and *Hume*, he asks, 'Have they not been infamous in their lives, and the apologists for vice?' p. 123. Does

this hardy calumniator know any thing of the doctrine or history of the Polish Reformer? We acquit him of all such knowledge, and are disposed to believe that he threw out his slander in the dark, trusting to the kindred ignorance and credulity of his auditors and readers.

In England, happily, Mr. Gandolphy's sermons are out of their proper meridian: to produce the effect contemplated by the preacher, they should be backed by the Inquisition. The Catholics are, we think, peculiarly unfortunate in such a champion at such a moment; if indeed, we do not err in imagining that they will own him in that character. They ought to know that the bigotry of well-meaning Protestants is the obstacle in their way to liberty, and that by their own bigotry they will dispirit their friends and encourage their enemies, and fix this impediment, immoveably, which would soon melt away of itself.

ART. IV. *The Christian Character Exemplified, in a Discourse occasioned by the Death of Mrs. Hannah Lindsey, and delivered at Essex Street Chapel, Jan. 26, 1812. By Thomas Belsham. 8vo. pp. 35. Johnson and Co.*

After some spirited remarks upon the character of Dorcas, described in the text, Acts ix. 36, Mr. Belsham proceeds to delineate the varied excellencies of Mrs. Lindsey; which he does with the pencil of one who knew her intimately and respected her highly. Had we not already been favoured with a full account of this distinguished friend of truth from the pen of another confidential acquaint-

ance, we should take the liberty to make large use of this funeral eulogy.

It will not we trust, be attributed to captiousness, if we venture to remark that we cannot fully admit Mr. Belsham's apology for such Unitarians as conform to divine worship which *they deem idolatrous*. (pp. 16, 17.) With the preacher's well-known opinions and history, nothing, we are fully aware, but Christian candour, could have led him to exculpate such as act so differently from himself; but we are not convinced that it is expedient in the present times to censure those who maintain a high-toned morality in relation to a religious profession. Nay, it appears to us that in the same proportion that we justify such as bend their conscience to their interest, we disparage the high merits of our Evansons, Lindseys and Wakefields, who sacrificed every interest to conscience.

ART. V. *The Christian Minister's Retrospect. An Address delivered at Worship Street, Finsbury Square, Sunday Morning, Nov. 3, 1811, upon the Twentieth Anniversary of his Settlement at that Place. By John Evans, A. M.* 8vo. pp. 41. Sherwood and Co.

Mr. Evans converts Jacob's expostulation with Laban, [Gen. xxxi. 38.] into a memento to his congregation of their long-subsisting religious connection. The "Address" consists of a Review of the Preacher's pulpit instructions; the principal topics of which have been such as eminently become a "Christian minister," namely, the absolute Unity of God and Universal Redemption.

ART. VI. *The Fidelity of Paul as an Apostle and Minister of the Word, and the subjects of his preaching and Doctrine; A Sermon, delivered at North-Gate Chapel, Halifax, April 28, 1811. By John Williams.* 8vo. pp. 20. 1s. Crosby and Co.

This is a bold review of a course of faithful Christian preaching; in which Mr. Williams appears to have declared, according to his own belief, the whole counsel of God,—consisting of the doctrines of the Unity and placability of God, of the humanity of Jesus Christ, and of the availableness and necessity of a virtuous life to eternal salvation.

ART. VII. *Protestantism and Popery illustrated. Two Letters from a Catholic Priest, &c. &c. By John Evans, A. M.* 2nd edition. 8vo. 1s. Crosby and Co.

This is a republication, in a separate form, of the 'Correspondence between the Rev. J. Berington and the Rev. J. Evans,' appended to Mr. Evans's sermon preached at Lynn, and given in our present number. (pp. 137—144.) We notice the pamphlet only to state that the author has corrected and enlarged his own 'Remarks.'

ART. VIII. *A Dialogue between a Dutch Protestant and a Franciscan Friar of Dort, with Illustrations and Notes, and an Address to the Reader. By Joshua Toulmin, D. D.* 2nd ed. 24mo. pp. 34. Eaton.

We recommend this small pamphlet, for the sake of the monk's speeches, to our good brother, the Eclectic Reviewer. (pp. 92—94.)

OBITUARY.

SIR,

As you have in your last and former numbers, given an account of Dr. Percy, I have thought it not unlikely that your readers might be gratified with the following sketch of the character of his amiable but short-lived successor, drawn up by his intimate friend Dr. Stock, and communicated to me by a near relation of the deceased.

I am, Sir,

very respectfully,

V. F.

Some Account of the Life and Character of the Rev. George Hall, D. D. late Bishop of Dromore in Ireland.

To pay a just tribute of praise to departed virtue, is not only an amiable principle of our nature, but a duty which we owe to the living, in setting before them examples worthy of imitation, particularly when such examples may be considered as having a direct and immediate influence upon the liberal youth of the rising age, who are justly esteemed among the fairest hopes and most solid supports of a nation. Of this description was the late excellent Bishop of Dromore, whose character well deserves a more lasting memorial than the following short account can bestow, yet even here will be found some qualities and virtues that may excite an ingenuous mind to laudable exertion. He was born in Northumberland, of a respectable family, of whom some were men of learning and ability. His father was

many years rector of the parish of Earsden, one of his brothers was a fellow of Cambridge, and the celebrated Brown, who answered Shaftesbury, was nearly related to him. Having received the first rudiments of classical education under an able master, he gave so early a promise of capacity, that his friends directed his views to the University of Dublin, whose fellowships are an honourable and independent provision for life; accordingly, in the year 1770, he was admitted a student, with very flattering prospects of success. In the undergraduate course, he obtained the highest academic honours, to which was added a character of diligence, sobriety and good conduct so exemplary, that he was held in very general esteem; how much he was esteemed by the Board, consisting of the Provost and senior Fellows of the college, we have a striking instance, in their dispensing with a general regulation in his favour, and in conferring upon him emoluments intended exclusively for the natives of Ireland. And he proved himself worthy of this unusual grace; for some time after, he became a candidate for a fellowship, and succeeded, by excellent answering, on his first trial. This station he filled above twenty-three years, the greatest part of the time, as tutor, in which capacity there certainly never was one at any period, superior to him, for fidelity, care and judgment, in managing his pupils. He possessed a clearness and precision, in his manner of instructing, which always sa-

tified the rational student, and conveyed some knowledge to the most unthinking. As their friend and adviser he was vigilant and careful, yet his admonitions were tempered with the kindest concern for their welfare, and his sincere attachment to them gained him their confidence in difficulty or distress. The remaining years of this period were occupied by his duties as a senior fellow; these he discharged as an active, intelligent and upright member of the Board, uniformly studying the interest of the University, and the advancement of learning. It should be recorded to his honour, that he was always the confidential friend, and in many cases the adviser, of that most highly venerable and truly Christian character Doctor Murray, who was Provost at that time, and also of the present much esteemed Bishop of Ossory, Doctor John Kearney, and of the ingenuous and much beloved Doctor Young, late Bishop of Clonfert (then senior fellow). Such friendships are the best testimonies to his merit. We are next to attend him in a different situation—as an incumbent of a parish. In the year 1800 he resigned his fellowship and accepted the living of Ardstran, in the diocese of Derry. Of this extensive and populous parish, he soon acquired the love and respect, by an assiduous performance of his various duties, by the propriety of his religious and moral conduct, by the marked attention to the wants of his parishioners, by his general benevolence and judicious charities, and all this sweetened by affability and kindness to every rank and description of persons; so that it may be safely affirmed, that never was pastor in so short a time, so dear to his flock. Their regret on his removal when called to the Provostship, was deep and sincere, yet blended with joy for his promotion. But alas! a late event has left them no such consolation; they cannot, however, forget him, and though his connection with them had been dissolved for several years, and like most others of the kind, would have passed away unnoticed, had there not been in it something peculiarly endearing; they mean to record their veneration for his memory, by setting up a marble tablet in their church, with a suitable inscription. Upon his resignation of Ardstran, he was raised to the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin, an office for which he was eminently qualified by talent, learning, judgment, experience, temper, manners, and every other quality requisite for this arduous and important station. As a man both of science and classical erudition he ranked in the first order, neither did he suffer these gifts to lie idle; from the moment of his elevation he set himself with all diligence to look into the state of every department, within his government or influence, and he introduced such regulations as were thought necessary to supply some defects in the former system of academic education. He declined no task to promote the advantage and honour of the University. When a senior fellow, he for the most part examined mathematics or history for fellowships, and had he studied his own ease and satisfaction, he might, as Provost, have confined himself to the same branches, instead of which, he undertook different and more important courses, logic and ethics, and was in all so perfect,

that it is difficult to say in which he most excelled. No man in that college it is supposed ever examined so many difficult and weighty subjects as he did, and few even in their limited courses maintained an equal reputation; nor were his views exclusively occupied with these higher concerns, but extended to the minutest point of discipline. It was his custom to attend early prayers at six o'clock in winter and summer, that he might set an example of devotion, industry and self-denial to the students; sloth he considered as the bane of youth and nurse of idleness, and therefore he omitted nothing that could induce them to become active and diligent. He was equally in the maintenance of good order and good government, yet the strictness of his discipline he admirably tempered with the courteousness of his manners, and was popular even with those whom he was obliged to censure. Thus he proceeded in his government of the college to the universal satisfaction of the public, till his Grace the Duke of Richmond, lord lieutenant of Ireland, in his accustomed noble spirit of patronizing men of virtue and talents, thought fit to reward his services by conferring on him the bishopric of Dromore, vacant by the death of the late Dr. Percy, and had it pleased the Almighty to have spared him some years longer we cannot entertain a doubt, but that he would have adorned this high station with the graces becoming a Christian bishop. Even during the short time he lived after his appointment, he turned his mind to the care of his diocese, enquiring into the state of his clergy, providing for their constant residence, and forming designs for the faithful discharge of their several duties. But he was destined to view his earthly reward only at a distance and for a moment; the day of his consecration, we may say, closed the scene of his valuable life; on the next, a mortal complaint seized his throat, and, baffling all the efforts of medical skill, hurried him off in a few days; he expired in the bosom of the present Provost, Dr. Elrington, who had through his illness, watched with the anxious tenderness of a friend and brother.

The foregoing historical summary has accidentally exhibited some traits of his lordship's character; a few more may not be displeasing to the reader. He had early imbibed a principle of religion, the only sure and safe guide of life, and had made it the foundation of his moral conduct; hence, that sobriety and modesty so remarkable in his youth; hence, that regular attendance on divine offices and his devout humility in attending them. His piety was warm without enthusiasm, sedate without austerity; he worshipped in the beauty of holiness, in spirit and in truth; he was well versed in theology, to the study of which much of his time was devoted, not so much from curiosity as conscience, for he deemed it the duty of every minister of the gospel, to be ready always to give an answer as to the reason of his hope—such were his religious impressions. In his transactions with the world he was strictly just, candid and honourable, hospitable without parade, and charitable without ostentation, a generous relative, a constant and sincere friend, especially to those under the pressure of sickness or sorrow, when there ap-

peared in him a most amiable sympathy and concern joined to his best efforts to relieve and console. Under this part of his character we must not omit a feature which might seem to belong rather to his manners, but we give it a place here as expressive of fine feelings and a good heart,—he was one of the few that *prosperity and elevation* improved. His talents were various and excellent, a clear perception, nice discrimination, accurate judgment, quick in discovering, yet cautious in admitting proofs. He was seldom deceived in his conclusions; his habits of thinking were close, yet sufficiently enlarged for the purposes of method and arrangement, in which few excelled him. It is therefore to be lamented that he could never be prevailed on to undertake any literary work for the public; had he done so, it would have been a much better eulogium on him than the present inadequate attempt, but although those friends who were best acquainted with his talents and resources are convinced he would have satisfied his readers, yet he was either too modest or too fastidious ever to please himself. For his manners they were naturally polite and engaging; he was fond of society, and frequently enlivened conversation with delicate touches of pleasantry and wit. His company was courted by persons of the highest dignity and station, whose good opinion he never failed to conciliate, always paying a proper deference to their rank, yet without ever forgetting what became him as a gentleman, a clergyman and a scholar—in truth, his society was sought after by every class. There was a gentleness and playfulness

in his manner, which won on those who had not talents or taste for his higher acquirements, and without laying a restraint on his natural manners, he equally distinguished himself, entertaining his humble parishioners at Ardstran, or the Viceregal Court at the Provost's house. Among his intimate friends he used to unbend with the sweetest familiarity, forgetting all reserve and yielding to the overflowings of an affectionate heart. Whoever had the happiness of knowing him *well*, can never forget those delightful scenes while life and memory hold their seat. But let us console ourselves with the sublime hope that he is gone to join an infinitely happier society of just men made perfect, and to become partaker of the highest and most lasting pleasure.

1811, Dec. 15, at the Cape of Good Hope, after an illness of eight days, DR. VANDERKEMP, a distinguished missionary to the Hottentots, and other nations of South Africa, under the patronage of the Missionary Society of London. Dr. Vanderkemp was a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, had practised some years as a physician in Holland, and had attained considerable eminence in his profession. At that period of life, when the desire of repose induces most men to retire from scenes of activity and labour, this venerable man was impelled by feelings of the purest benevolence and most exalted philanthropy, to undertake a mission to some of the most ignorant, uncultivated and unpromising of mankind, and cheerfully to expose himself to all the fatigues and privations which such an at-

duous enterprize involved. His labours were unremitted—his prudence was not inferior to his zeal, and his success in promoting civilization and Christianity, in a place where he found both literally and morally a wretched wilderness, was such as to afford to his benevolent mind, no mean recompence for his disinterested and persevering exertions.

M. Chron.

1812, *Feb.* 17, at Trowbridge, Wilts, the REV. WILLIAM JONES, minister of the General Baptist church in that town. He was a native of Wales and educated for the ministry, under the Rev. J. Evans, of Islington. He was very recently settled at Trowbridge,—having commenced his labours at Chichester, where he continued only a few months—preferring the situation in which he died, as being nearer to his native Principality. He was ill for a considerable time, but bore his affliction with exemplary resignation. Cut off in the prime of life, he affords an additional proof of the precarious tenure on which we hold every earthly blessing. We are born,—we live a longer or shorter period, and are buried! Melancholy would be this history of the human race, were it not for the *hope* of a *blessed immortality*.

Islington.

1812, *March* 5, the day on which he compleated his 54th year, MR. JOHN BURTON, of Birmingham. Descended from highly respectable parents, he did not disgrace his lineage, for though deprived in youth of his father, (Mr. G. Burton, of Mancetter, War-

wickshire,) and early placed in the world, he never suffered temptation to lead him astray from the path of conscious rectitude. Though only in the middle walk of life, the public and private acts of charity and beneficence, in which he was either a principal or participator, would not have disgraced persons in a much more elevated situation. One leading feature of his character, was the pleasure he took in training up young men to habits of industry and virtue; but his concern for their welfare, ceased not when they quitted his house, for he continued as long as he lived, a kind and considerate adviser to them in all their troubles, and a true and wise friend to them in their prosperity. In a word, his life might be taken as a pattern for imitation by young tradesmen. The magnanimity which he displayed, and the danger to which his person was exposed in the disgraceful riots at Birmingham, of 1791, will long be remembered by many persons still living. Educated in the principles of religious dissent, he never deserted them, and at the time of his death, had been thirty-nine years a member of the Old Meeting congregation: his remains were interred in the burial ground adjoining, on the 14th instant, attended to the grave by his eight nephews, and several young men, who deeply felt their loss, considering him as possessing all the feelings of a wise and affectionate parent. He has also left five sisters and two nieces, who feel all that human nature can on so mournful an occasion; yet, blessed be God, they mourn not as those who have no hope, trusting in the revelation of their Lord and Savi-

our Jesus Christ, that at the last day he shall again stand on the earth and that the just and righteous man shall receive the recompence of the reward.

Birmingham,

March 12, 1812.

1812, *March 11*, at Norwich, Mr. JOHN WIGGETT ROE, aged 36. His death was occasioned by the bursting of a tumour, which had formed on one of the principal arteries. A man of more spotless character will scarcely be found. Benevolent, cheerful, unassuming in his manners, he was respected by all who knew him; and by his family and friends he was sincerely and tenderly beloved. His death has made a void in their circle, which must be long and deeply deplored, and which cannot easily be replaced. It is one of those dispensations of Providence, which teaches us the uncertain tenure by which we hold all our earthly blessings, and which a firm reliance on the infinite wisdom and goodness of our Creator can alone enable us to support. He was early educated in Calvinistic principles, but he afterwards embraced the great doctrines of the Unity and supremacy of God, and of his infinite goodness and placability. These important doctrines he adopted from sincere conviction, and he constantly defended them with firmness. He exemplified their effects in his life. The meekness, the unaffected piety, the zeal and the resignation of a true Christian, adorned and dignified his character; they were conspicuous in every action of his life, they formed the charm, which endeared

him to his friends, and to all who knew him. Nor will the graces of his mind alone be embalmed in their remembrance. Mr. Roe was gifted by nature with a voice of almost unexampled power, sweetness and extent. To this he had added an uncommon facility in reading music. It was his most favourite amusement. His taste was formed on the best models; his perception was remarkably nice, and his judgment accurate. He was a bigot to no school in music, but his two favourite composers were Handel and Webbe.

His remains were interred on the Sunday after his death, and he was followed to the grave by the tears of his relatives and friends, and by the blessings of the poor. If a stranger had witnessed his funeral, he would have supposed some great public character was deceased, so large was the number of persons present; but the tribute was paid, not to exalted rank, to title, to splendid talents, but to modest worth, to active benevolence—in a word, to the virtues which adorned and graced the life and character of a true Christian.

Norwich,

E. T.

March, 18, 1812.

1812. *March 18*, at his house at Wimbledon, JOHN HORNE TOOKE.—This extraordinary man has flourished so long, and acted a part in the world so remarkable and diversified, that it is not within our limits to attempt any outline of his life. Neither, indeed, is it necessary, to those who are at all acquainted with literature or our domestic history for the last forty years, to delineate a man, who has

been so conspicuous in both. We consider his literary character to be already immoveably fixed, and that there is no man of ingenuity, who does not lament to see the close of his philological labours. As a man of wit and general talents, he will be likewise allowed on all hands to stand in the highest rank; as a companion, well-bred, affable, cheerful, entertaining, instructive, and in raillery to have been perhaps without an equal.—But when we proceed to his politics, we find ourselves on contentious ground, and feel the embers hot under our feet. Gay and lively in his general habits, here only he was inflexible and severe. Whether it was the love of mankind or impatience of power, let men dispute according to their fancies. It is a sufficient motive for *our* praise that he was constantly on the side of freedom.—We, ourselves, who have always preferred, from love as well as principle, to tread in the footsteps of another leader, may have thought Mr. Tooke culpably fastidious and intractable. But, to say nothing of his just confidence in himself, he must be allowed to have had some ground for caution and distrust in forming connections with public men: for he had supported Wilkes, and was betrayed; and had united with Pitt, and was persecuted.—By those who are ready to approve every encroachment of power, his writings may still be termed libels, and his conduct turbulence. Yet the nation has long since come to agree with him respecting the American war, and the “murders of Lexington;” and if the judgment of a jury shall be confirmed by posterity, the infamy that was prepared for Tooke may fall on his prosecutors. At any rate, the supporters of future administrations will probably be satisfied with classing him among the Hampdens, the Miltons, and similar disturbers of quiet government and order.—In his public character, he may fairly be allowed the praise of being disinterested, for he exposed himself to sufferings and loss when he failed, without personal advantage from success. Nor let it be thought that his exertions in the cause of liberty were vain, because they were so generally repelled. The abuse of power has no greater restraint than the dread of some stubborn mind, which fines and prisons cannot subdue; and we are persuaded that ministers and even judges, have sometimes been awed into moderation, by a man who not only sacrificed to liberty, but was willing to yield himself up as the offering.—The marked and inveterate hostility which he so long indulged against the purest and most disinterested patriot of our times, took its rise in the memorable period of 1782, when on the demise of the Marquis of Rockingham, Mr. Fox felt himself compelled to resign, in consequence of the appointment of the Earl of Shelburne to be First Lord of the Treasury. Mr. Tooke closely allied himself with, and became the active partizan of that ministry; and though in the end he detected the inordinate lust of power, at the shrine of which Mr. Pitt sacrificed every principle of his youth, Mr. Tooke never seemed to forgive the keener penetration of Mr. Fox, in discovering at once the real character and views of that youthful statesman. Added to which, Mr. Tooke had in his nature a jealous and unrelenting enmity to

all intellectual endowments superior to his own. He would be the master of his circle. He did not envy Mr. Fox his political superiority more than he did Mr. Porson his literary attainments—and this humour was not of a character to be corrected by age. We fear it went with him to his death-bed.—Mr. Tooke was in the 77th year of his age. He had been for several weeks in a declining state, and had lost the use of his lower extremities. A few days ago, mortification appeared and rapidly advanced. Dr. Pearson, Mr. Cline, Mr. Tooke's two daughters, and Sir Francis Burdett, attended on him, and he was informed that his dissolution was approaching. He signified, with a placid look, that he was fully prepared, and had reason to be grateful for having passed so long and so happy a life, which he would willingly have had extended if it had been possible. He expressed much satisfaction that he should be surrounded in his last moments by those who were most dear to him. He professed his perfect confidence in the existence of a Supreme Being, whose final purpose was the happiness of his creatures. The eccentric facetiousness for which he was so remarkable, did not forsake him till he became speechless, and even then his looks were an aspect of cheerful resignation. A short time before his death, when he was supposed to be in a state of entire insensibility, Sir Francis Burdett mixed up a cordial for him, which his medical friends told the Baronet it would be to no purpose to administer, but Sir Francis persevered in offering it, and raised Mr. Tooke with that view.—The latter opened

his eyes, and seeing who offered the draught, took the glass and drank the contents with eagerness. He had previously observed, that he should not be like the man at Strasburgh, who, when doomed to death, requested time to pray, till the patience of the magistrates was exhausted, and then, as a last expedient, begged to be permitted to close his life with his favourite amusement of *nine-pins*, but who kept bowling on, with an evident determination never to finish the game.—He desired that no funeral ceremony should be said over his remains, and that six of the poorest men in the parish should have a guinea each for bearing him to the vault which had been prepared in his garden.

M. Chron. March 21.

1812. Jan. 16. At Upminster, Essex, JAMES ESDAILE, Esq.—a man, endeared to his neighbourhood by that active benevolence, which rendered him at once an example and a blessing; to his family, by the habitual exercise of all the gentler affections, which constitute the charm of domestic life; to his personal friends, by the cordial interest, which he took in all their concerns; and to the friends of rational Christianity, by the steadiness of his religious principles, and the corresponding fruits of a good life.—For the early impressions of that piety, which constituted a prominent feature in his character, he was indebted to the care of his excellent mother, Lady Esdaile; and the seed thus sown, with maternal solicitude, was cherished in its growth, under the ministry of Dr. Jas. Fordyce, than whom no preacher knew better the happy art of applying the

truths of religion with effect, to the conviction and improvement of youth. But "though Paul may plant, and Apollos water, it is God that giveth the increase;" and he gives it, not by any supernatural interference, but by blessing the diligent use of our own powers, when sincerely exerted in the search of truth. In religion, as well as in science, those who would be educated well, must educate themselves. Having received the elements of knowledge, they must combine, arrange, and improve them, till they are formed into consistent notions, and become leading principles in the mind, impelling and regulating its movements, and producing that harmony of action, which principle alone can ensure. This can be accomplished only by personal meditation and research; by taking our creed, not from the authority of man, but from the word of God. Such was the course pursued by Mr. Esdaile, who devoted a large portion of his leisure to the examination of the sacred volume, and has left ample proof, in his manuscript notes, of the diligence and impartiality, which he employed to discover and apply its genuine doctrines. The consequence was, that the devotional spirit, which he had so happily imbibed in his tender age, was enlightened and guided, as he advanced in years, by the most liberal views of the Christian dispensation, and settled into a habit of piety, uniformly cheerful; equally remote from the coldness of formality, and the intemperance of fanaticism; warm, but well regulated, and always connected in his mind with the formation of a virtuous character. This devotional spirit was accom-

panied in Mr. Esdaile, as it generally is in minds of much sensibility, by a congenial taste for those beauties of nature, which elevate the soul so pleasingly to the fountain of beauty, and of all that exalts and delights the rational man. Whilst his body and his mind were in health, he always expressed the highest satisfaction, in surveying that sublime and romantic scenery, which accords so well with pious feeling, and disposes so much to a cordial acquiescence in all the ways of divine wisdom. This acquiescence was severely tried on different occasions, by domestic losses, peculiarly distressing; and few men have ever discovered more than he did, of that genuine resignation, founded upon Christian principles, which, without outraging the feelings of nature, checks her murmurs, and enforces submission, even when she is deeply wounded in the tenderest part.—Mr. Esdaile was educated a dissenter; and the habit of thinking for himself confirmed him in dissenting principles. He was fully alive to the importance of fixing the right of private judgment upon a wide and solid base: and when the interests of truth and freedom were at stake, no man was better disposed to come to their aid, both with his substance and his personal exertions. In the support and management of our charitable institutions, his advice and his exertions were prompt and disinterested; and no support was ever less ostentatious, or less actuated by vain glory. For a simplicity, bordering upon diffidence, was the basis of his mental constitution; and, though he was active in encouraging and conducting public

trusts, as well as private charities, he was never heard either to boast of his own exertions, or to depreciate the labours of those who cooperated with him. Not only these trusts, but the dissenting interest at large, have sustained, by his death, an irreparable loss. In truth, the loss is not confined to dissenters, any more than were his expressions of kindness, and labours of love. He was not the furious advocate of a sect. Though firm to the principles, which he had deliberately embraced, he entertained the most perfect goodwill to men of every denomination, who conscientiously adopted opinions the most contrary to his own. His nature and his creed were equally remote from that bigotry, which converts speculative discussions into a ground of enmity, and dignifies bitterness of spirit, with the name of holy zeal. He readily allowed to others the same privilege of judging which he claimed for himself, and thought the Catholic equally entitled with the Presbyterian to those civil immunities, which are the right of all or

of none. His opinion was, that differences in religious belief, are no just cause either of private enmity or public exclusions, and that the most essential part of Christianity is to hold the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. To the liberality of Mr. Esdaile in this respect, all his friends can bear an ample testimony—and none more than the writer of this humble tribute to his memory.

Mrs. Lindsey.

We are informed by a respected friend, that there is a trifling error in Mrs. Cappe's Memoir of Mrs. Lindsey. "So far from becoming speechless, the day after she was taken ill, (see p. 117) she retained her speech and her faculties, till Friday afternoon. On Friday morning, she inquired particularly and by name after the sick and poor in her neighbourhood whom she was accustomed to relieve. About one in the afternoon, she was seized with a fit, and after that she spoke but little, and very inarticulately and rambling."

INTELLIGENCE.

Letter to the Rev. Dr. Marsh, Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; occasioned by his Address to the Senate of that University.

DEAR SIR,

I beg to return my best acknowledgments for the communication of your Address to the Senate of Cambridge; which I the more strongly feel as a mark of your kind attention, as I have not the honour of belonging to that University, and as it is a considerable time since I have been so for-

tunate as to have had an opportunity of meeting you. You were perhaps not aware that you were sending your Address to a member of the British and Foreign Bible Society; but I accept, as a proof of kindness, your candid and friendly admonition, which affords me an opportunity of justifying myself to you, as a Church of England man, for contributing my assistance to that institution.

I never indeed *before* thought it necessary to offer any apology for so doing; for though I was

aware, before I engaged in the Society, that it had been represented as dangerous to the Church, it appeared to me that this charge had been so completely refuted, that it is with no less surprise than regret that I now learn that *you* still think it well founded.

The sole and exclusive object of the Bible Society, so far as it respects the United Kingdom, is THE CIRCULATION OF THE AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES, WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT. I should as a member of the Church, be very sorry to think that the devout study of the SCRIPTURES could lead to the disregard of our LITURGY; on the contrary, I should hope that it would produce a more general acknowledgment of its excellence, as it originally, at the period of the Reformation, led, through the blessing of Divine Providence, to its establishment. *THE BIBLE, says Chillingworth, and THE BIBLE ONLY, IS THE RELIGION OF THE PROTESTANT; it is the sole basis of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and the only one on which you, I am sure, would wish to place it.* But you observe, that you can have no guarantee, that as the power of the Bible Society increases, *other* objects, inimical to the Church, will not in time be associated with the *main* object. To this I answer, that so long as the members of the Church take part in the Bible Society, its very constitution will afford such a guarantee as you desire. The PRESIDENT, and all the VICE-PRESIDENTS without exception, are Churchmen, and are constant members of the managing committee, in which they always preside; and of the other

members of this committee, the Churchmen are equal in number to all the Dissenters of different sects; so that in every question *the Church must have a constant majority*; and in the general meetings, in which alone all points affecting the constitution of the Society must be decided, the members of the Church must have a weight in proportion to their numbers and consequence. In proportion, therefore, as Churchmen of talents, rank, and influence join the society, this preponderance must increase. Among the VICE-PRESIDENTS are already numbered one of the ARCHBISHOPS OF IRELAND and FIVE ENGLISH AND TWO IRISH BISHOPS. I doubt whether the SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, which now, as you observe, enjoys the countenance of the whole episcopal bench, was, at so short a period from its formation, honoured with the support of so large a body of the prelates; and I should hope the time might not be far distant when the two societies may equally flourish under the general patronage of them all. This would appear to me the most effectual remedy for any supposed danger from the *dissenting influence in the BIBLE SOCIETY.* But what is the remedy you propose? —That all Churchmen should withdraw themselves from the Society, and leave it *wholly* in the hands of the DISSENTERS. If *any thing* can make the Society dangerous, this must do it; because there would then be no check to any sectarian spirit which might introduce itself, and which must be unavoidably irritated by so harsh, and I think so unjust an indication of jealousy. But even

if no sentiment of resentment should be excited, one of two consequences must inevitably follow: either the Society, being deprived of the hope of further support, and crippled by the loss of its pecuniary means, and of many of its most valuable members, would wholly expire, or sink into insignificance: or else the *dissenting interest*, making up for these losses by more extensive sacrifices, and an increase of zeal and activity, and availing itself of the assistance of the foreign societies already formed, would carry on the Institution in nearly the same manner as before.

In the first case you would have crushed an establishment which has done more for the diffusion of **CHRISTIANITY** than has been effected in the same space of time in any age since the **APOSTOLIC**; which has in **SEVEN YEARS** been the means of preaching the Gospel in **FIFTY-FOUR LANGUAGES**. This would *indeed be putting out one of the eyes of Britain*.

The other alternative would be to transfer to the body of **DISSENTERS** all the *honour and influence of whatever has been done, and whatever may be done*, by an Institution, of which the dawn has been so glorious, but which is visibly rising into brighter day. Shall it be said that the **DISSENTERS ALONE** have carried the **WORD OF GOD TO EVERY NATION UNDER HEAVEN**? or shall the **CHURCH OF ENGLAND** continue to claim the leading part in this important work? And can the Church of England stand so secure upon a narrow and exclusive policy, **AS BY DESERVING THE BLESSINGS, AND UNITING THE PRAYERS OF ALL PEOPLE, NATIONS, AND LANGUAGES?**

The evils of either alternative seem to me equally fatal and inevitable. I am far from undervaluing the efforts of the **SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE**. I am an *old member of that Society*, and am heartily disposed to lend any assistance in my power to its useful plans. But how little, either that, or any other society now existing, would be competent to supply the place of the Bible Society, the experience of above a century has shewn. Even supposing (what I think impossible) that it might be made, in some considerable degree, to answer the same purposes, I see superior advantages in the present constitution of the **BIBLE SOCIETY**. The *co-operation of CHURCHMEN and DISSENTERS in religious matters*, so far as they can *conscientiously co-operate*, seems to me one of the most efficacious means of *lessening both the political and religious evils of dissent*. It dispels prejudices, promotes candour and good will, and must prepare the mind for the reception of that truth which every one perceives to be no less the object of those who differ from him than his own. From such a communication, the Church of England has nothing to fear, and every thing to hope: as holding (*in our judgments at least*) that *middle line of truth* in which all opposite opinions have a natural tendency to coincide. And is that *truth* more likely to be *acknowledged and embraced* by minds embittered by mutual jealousy and aversion, or by such as have been previously softened by conciliation?

The existence of *dissent* will perhaps be inseparable from *religious freedom*, so long as the mind of man is liable to error; but it is

not unreasonable to hope that *hostility may cease where perfect agreement cannot be established.* If we cannot RECONCILE ALL OPINIONS, let us endeavour to UNITE ALL HEARTS.

I ought, perhaps, to apologize for troubling you with arguments, which must probably have been already brought before you, as I know your opinions are not taken up hastily and lightly. But I have thought it necessary to state such as have chiefly induced me to consider my taking a part in the concerns of the Bible Society not only as consistent with, but as a proof of the sincerity and warmth of my attachment to the Church of England; and which still, on reflection, seem to me to have so much weight, that, far from *repenting* of what I have done, I feel convinced I shall *least of all repent of it* as I approach THAT STATE IN WHICH THE DISTINCTION OF CHURCHMAN AND DISSENTER SHALL BE NO MORE.

I am, &c.

(Signed) N. VANSITTART.

*Great George Street,
4th Dec. 1811.*

Unitarianism in America.

In our article of intelligence, under this head, we alluded (p. 57,) to a note in Mr. Grundy's Sermon, at Liverpool, (reviewed in our last number, pp. 107, 108,) as corroborating the statement of our correspondent. We have since received from a friend, a letter addressed to Mr. Grundy, on the subject of the note referred to, by a respectable young clergyman,

lately on a visit from America to England. As this letter is on the subject of our own statement, as much as Mr. Grundy's, candour induces us to give it to our readers. We shall first insert as much of the note as is animadverted on by the letter-writer. It may be proper to premise that we are well-assured of our correspondent's correctness in describing his own impressions; and it is but justice to Mr. Grundy to state, that he received his information from "a friend who has been a considerable time resident in the United States" ED.

Extract from a Note in Mr. Grundy's Sermon.

"It may be interesting," [Mr. Grundy is here quoting from his friend's Letter] "to the friends of Unitarianism, to be informed, that the doctrines which they consider as consonant to the genuine principles of Christianity, have already made very considerable progress in the northern and eastern parts of the United States. For several years, these doctrines have been spreading rapidly in the town of Boston; and at present, an open profession of them is made by the most popular and influential among the clergy there.—Nor is this change by any means confined to the teachers of religion, inasmuch as a gentleman of much talent and very high celebrity in America, in speaking on this subject to the writer of this article, said that he did not think there were two persons in Boston who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. This assertion, though it certainly cannot be intended to be literally understood, may serve to shew the great prevalence of

Unitarianism ; in farther proof of which, it may be well to mention, that a very large and expensive place of worship, which has been recently erected to enforce Calvinistic doctrines, has completely failed, and it was expected would be sold to its opponents. An intelligent bookseller in Boston, has republished Griesbach's Greek Testament, (the first work in that character which has been printed in America,) and the Improved Version of the New Testament. One thousand copies of the former work were subscribed for by Harvard College—an academic institution, which is deservedly considered as the first in the United States. The office of President of that college having lately become vacant, Dr. Kirkland, a professed Unitarian, was elected by a great majority of votes.—Until very recently Unitarianism has been confined to the town of Boston, but at the last annual meeting of the congregational clergy of the states of Massachusetts and Connecticut, it appeared that upwards of 100 ministers, declared themselves converts to the new doctrines. The town of Boston contains (according to the last census) upwards of 33,000 inhabitants.

“ Out of nine congregational ministers in this town,” says another friend, “ eight are either Arians or Humanitarians. Nothing like Calvinism is to be heard.”—pp. 26, 27.

Letter to the Rev. Mr. Grundy, of Manchester.

London, Feb. 20, 1812.

REV. & DEAR SIR,

Mr. ——— was kind enough to lend me a sermon, which you delivered a short time since, at the

opening of a chapel in Liverpool. It contains, towards the close, a note, respecting the supposed progress of Unitarianism in the northern and eastern parts of the U. States, and particularly in Boston. As I am a native of that place, and, excepting a short visit in this country, have constantly resided there, and from my acquaintance as a student of divinity, with most of its ministers, and attendance upon their preaching, have had the best opportunity of knowing their sentiments, as well as the general state of religious opinions among us, I hope you will pardon, dear Sir, the liberty I am taking, of mentioning some misstatements in your note. The account it gives of the general progress of Unitarianism in America, is certainly incorrect. I will first mention a few facts, for which I can answer, with respect to Boston ; and I think you will see, that the gentleman, who gave you the information, on which you relied, in his zeal for Unitarianism, has imagined occasions for triumph, which do not exist.

We have, in Boston, twenty-one places for public worship. Of these, ten are Congregational or Independant. But there are also two *Episcopalian*, in which the service of the Church of England is read, with no other alterations, than those, which are adapted to the different state of the country. Of course, all the Trinitarian doxologies, the addresses of the Litany, &c. are used. One of the clergymen is an high churchman ; and I believe I am correct in saying, that both are decided Trinitarians. There are also three *Baptist* churches, the ministers of which, and their leading hearers are Calvinists, and Cal-

vinism is uniformly maintained. Besides these, there are two Methodist meetings. I will not undertake to say, whether they are Arminian or Calvinistic, for I scarcely ever attended them, and indeed, I believe, the distinction, so common in this country, between the Wesleyan and the Whitfieldian Methodists is very little known in ours. At least, in common with the Baptists they are decided Trinitarians, and both pray, and preach as if this were a doctrine absolutely essential to Christianity. This certainly is not consistent with your friend's very wide declaration, that "he did not think there were two persons in Boston, who believed in the Trinity." You see, that of our twenty-one churches, there are seven, at least, that are Calvinistic, or Trinitarian. Indeed, you would hardly look for Unitarianism among our Methodists or Baptists.

But it is, I presume, to the congregational churches, that your friend's account must chiefly refer. With the ministers of these I am well acquainted. I have always heard their preaching, and, as a student of divinity, I constantly attended for two or three years their monthly meetings, when they frequently converse upon their religious opinions. This "Association" is composed not only of the ministers of Boston, but of several of the neighbouring towns. Of these gentlemen, about twenty in number, there is only one, whom, from any thing I ever heard him offer either in private or in his pulpit, I, or any body else, would have a right to call an Unitarian. Even this gentleman, when

I was in Boston, did not preach Unitarianism systematically. I never heard him express such views of the person of Christ, and it was rather from inference, that I could say he held them. Many of his people are widely different from him; and, with the exception of two or three, or, at most, four or five heads of families, I may safely say, that there is scarcely a parishioner in Boston, who would not be shocked at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism.

There is one church in Boston, which may perhaps be said to be founded on Unitarian principles. Dr. Freeman, of King's Chapel with his church, about thirty years ago, adopted an amended Liturgy. But if you will admit, what Mr. Belsham himself very fairly stated, "that no man can justly be called by the name of a party, unless he willingly, and (if he be a minister) to a certain degree, openly, acknowledge himself of that party," Dr. Freeman can hardly be considered as an exception to the great majority of his brethren. For though on other subjects he is as explicit and unreserved, as he is able and intelligent, I never heard him express an Unitarian sentiment; and I believe, he carefully avoids it in the pulpit, because it might unnecessarily disturb some of his hearers.—There is now, one more gentleman in Boston, who with his intimate friends may, perhaps, be considered an Unitarian; but he maintains the same cautious reserve; and from neither his sermons, his prayers, nor his private conversation, could I infer, that he was an Unitarian.—Now even admitting, what I hardly think I

have a right to do, that these three gentlemen are Unitarians, to what can all this prudent reserve be ascribed, but to their conviction, that the preaching of Unitarian doctrines, would be offensive to their hearers, and injurious to their usefulness? In truth, the congregational societies of Boston, as are most of those in the country, are composed of hearers of various opinions. Some of them are Calvinists, some of them Arminians; perhaps the greater part, without having minutely investigated, or having any very distinct views of the shades of difference among them, entertain a general liberality of sentiment. But as I personally know, from instances too of those, who attend the three gentlemen, I have just mentioned, they regard the doctrines of Unitarianism as unscriptural, and inconsistent with the great object and spirit of Christianity.

Of our other seven congregational ministers, two are very decided Calvinists. One of these is the minister of the new church you mention. I know not how this church flourishes at present, but it was opposed, not because it was founded upon Calvinism, for this would be altogether inconsistent with our love of religious freedom, but on account of the intolerant spirit, some of its first patrons displayed. Our other five ministers, if I must use so many names, which I do not like, are very far from Unitarians. You say they are all Arians or Unitarians; as if these were very nearly the same. But I assure you, they would contend for a very great distinction, and *holding, as I believe they do, high and exalted*

views of the person and mediation of Jesus Christ, resting on the merits of his atonement his cross and passion, and zealous to pay the honour, which they believe due to his name, they would, I think, be very unwilling to be confounded with the followers of Dr. Priestley. Some of them, I know, are utterly opposed to the sentiments and spirit of Unitarianism.

You say, that Dr. Kirkland is a professed Unitarian, and mention him, as if his election to the presidency of Cambridge University, were a decisive proof of the prevalence of your sentiments among us. Dr. K. was formerly one of the ministers of Boston, and whatever his particular friends may think of his opinions, he never preached these sentiments. Nay, I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, he would not have been elected to that place. Unitarianism is too unpopular in the country, and his friends, who are at the same time, the friends and governors of the University, with all the respect they most justly entertain for his exalted talents and character, and particularly for his candid and liberal mind, would, I believe, have deemed it necessary to sacrifice their private wishes, and consulted the interests of the University in electing a President, whose sentiments were more agreeable to the great body of the Massachusetts's clergy, of which *ex-officio*, he is generally considered the head, and to the sentiments of the community at large. Had a decided Unitarian been elected, I really believe, that the number of the students would have been diminished.

[We find ourselves obliged to divide this letter the remainder in our next. Ed.]

POETRY.

SIR,

You must know I am a literary projector, and in common with most who have borne that character, have made many fruitless proposals to the public, and have sustained many bitter disappointments. There is one scheme, however, which I have yet to try; and on which I beg leave to take the sense of your readers: it is a *Poetical Review*, in which the sentences of criticism shall be set off with all the attractions of verse. As the project is novel, I have chosen to make my first attempt in a version, and have selected for translation the 'curious extract, which you have given (pp. 92—94) from the *Eclectic Review*; moved to this by my sympathy with the writer of that critique, (*facit indignatio versum*,) and also by the ease with which I thought I might versify periods, which though not poetry are certainly not prose. How far I have succeeded, I must leave to your readers:—should the judgment of any of them be favourable to my publication, they will oblige me by sending in their names as subscribers, to the office of the United Theologico-Eclectic Booksellers, at the sign of Calvin's Head, in Tabernacle Walk.

I am, Your Humble Servant,

POETICUS ECLECTICUS.

N. B. *Evangelical* preachers shall be supplied with the work gratis, on applying at the Office; but to prevent imposition, none need to apply who have not got the *Assembly's Catechism* so well by heart, as to bear dodging in it.

Specimen of a Poetic Eclectic Review.

This book of friend Gregory's every where shows
The spirit of Calvin towards Calvin's base foes.
'Abettors of simple humanity,' wretches!
He detects your 'chicane' and exposes your fetches.
Mathematics' Professor, Professor Eclectic,
In school cool as ice, in the 'Church' in a hectic,
His *calculi*, now, all deep problems determine,
Now, put in his sling, stone heretical vermin.
Hypocritical birds! he rifles your pinions,
And, stript of false feathers, you're naked 'Socinians.'
There's that Academic, too well known to Fame,
No friend to the Faithful, a *Friend* but in name,
Who lighted a fire might have dried up old Cam;
Who clamour'd for *Peace*, and rais'd a fierce war,
Who pleaded for *Union*, and got driven afar,—
That *Fellow* I mean, deem'd for *Jesus* unholy,
Who scar'd *Alma Mater* with's creed melancholy:
Now did not he *Dualist* call some believer?
A charge on the 'church' from which I'll relieve her,
For sure this bold Cantab, by logical rules,
When he says *I'm* not wise, calls all mankind fools,
When he says he knew one man *two* altars adore,
Taxes all men but him with just *one less than four*,

For what calculator that knows worship's profit,
 Would take but *one* slice, when he might have more of it?
 But as for myself, *Friend!* no *Duellist* I,
 Such bold savage fighting we Eclectics ne'er try,
 In the mists of our mystery-loving Review,
 Unseen, we hurl fire-brands at ***** and you,
 The mob we provoke all to orthodox passion,
 That 'forbearance' to doubters may cease to be fashion.
 It can't be denied that *Nat. Lardner* was learn'd,
 But it's high time to know he'd more praise than he earn'd,
 'The public he cheated with base 'moderation,'
 And the Eclectic Review shall soon lower his station;
 We'll neither be moderate, like him, nor unsound,
 For fury and faith none like us shall be found.
 If Priestley had 'science,' and thereupon 'fame,'
 His heresy foul will still stick to his name.
 But in *him*, pray, what now have 'Socinians' to boast?
 Of what use are books, when the author is *lost*?
 And here it quite grieves me, to think of the crime
 Of some orthodox men, too grave for light rhyme,
 Who alas! by the glare of false 'science' betray'd,
 To the heretic leader such compliments paid.
 Repentant, atonement Oh! swift let them make,
 And curse all 'Priestleians' for Priestley's own sake.
 The 'Socinians' are dead—altho' they don't know it,
 Guillotin'd by *A. Fuller*, and I think I can show it;
 For is not their creed the life's-blood of 'Socinians'?
 Which blood streams abroad, in the British dominions:
 And if it be true, as some country dames say,
 That a chicken beheaded will run a great way,
 Nay, faster will travel, unburdened of head,
 And with 'frightful convulsions' will plunge 'mong the dead;
 So sure the strong efforts of 'Socinians' vile,
 Which move all our churches, and e'en shake our isle,
 Denote nothing less than the death of their *ism*,
 Of soul-killing candour, carnal reason and schism.
 'The poets,' O shame! 'were once painted like dogs,'
 At trough of old Homer, all swilling as hogs;—
 But the simile further the Muse wo'n't pursue,
 (The obstinate jade, she's turn'd quite a shrew!)
 And scolding she says, with her fingers on nose,
 If I mean to be nasty, I must be so in prose.
 My meaning then, plainly and shortly, is this,
 In words which the squeamish wo'n't sure take amiss,
 That Priestley's opinions, like some matters gaseous,
 Have by agitation become much more 'nauseous.'
 Why should the 'Socinians' hate name of the *Pole*?
 Eclectics so shrink not from Calvin, meek soul!
 Do *they* truly differ from that noted *Frater*?
 Yes, yes, they say backwards the old *Noster Pater*,

And raise a worse devil than *Poland* e'er saw,
 With foot far more cloven and more rav'nous maw;
 They're farther from 'church,' and they're nearer to Hell;
 In rapid descent, to the place where they'll dwell.
 Then what if reproach mark the old Polish name!
 'Socinians' should take it, to hide their worse shame.
 'They differ from him!' yes, as Despard from Cobbett;
 He dirtied 'Church' holy—but they dare to rob it.
To be candid, these men are in *Priestley* believers,
 Then dub them 'Priestleians'; the hateful deceivers!
But, to put aside candour and give my opinion,
 You have a *Half-Deist* in every 'Socinian.'
 No more then let's Christians call *Newton* and *Locke*,
 And *Lardner* and *Lindsey*, and such sort of folk;
 Their places we'll instantly, properly fill
 With *Romaine* and *Whitfield*, *McGowan* and *Gill*.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS ;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The horrors of war are not likely to cease. The time does not appear to be approaching when the sword shall be turned into a ploughshare, and the spear into a pruning hook; when nations shall cease to learn war, that savage and debasing employment of man, and engage themselves in the noble occupation for which they were created, in subduing the earth to useful purposes, and making it a fit abode for reasonable and religious creatures.—So far from ceasing to learn war, this detested occupation is to become the primary object of a great and populous nation, which will thus compel its neighbours to attend to the same pursuit. The age of Cyrus, of Alexander, of Cæsar, of Charlemagne, is revived, and Buonaparte, no longer rivalled by them, seems determined to surpass all his predecessors.

Melancholy has been for some time the state of Europe. In every direction the bayonet and the cannon are seen, and fields of battle have been drenched with blood in every quarter. A respite from such calamities has been the prayer of every sincere Christian; for who can utter the daily ejaculation, 'May thy kingdom come!' without feeling for the disgrace thrown upon christianity by the bloodshed and strife among its professors. Yet all the evils of this state

seem likely to be increased rather than diminished. The number of men in arms is not sufficient for the designs of the great Hero of Fracce, and he has conceived a plan, which increases his power and means of aggression in a manner that strikes with awe and horror every one who contemplates it. France is to become really an armed nation, since no one, between the ages of twenty and sixty, is to be exempted from taking his share in the burden.

For some years past every young man in France has been subject to the conscription, and a certain portion of all between the ages of twenty and twenty-one was drafted off to supply the wants of the army. The remainder were free to pursue the ordinary occupations of life. But a new system is now laid down. All those young men of the last six years, or those from the age of twenty to that of twenty-six, are subject to a new call, and they are to form an army of a hundred thousand men, to be incamped in various parts of the empire, to be ready to march to any part of it, where their services are required. The remainder of the men between twenty and sixty are to be regularly disciplined in regiments at home, so as to take upon themselves the entire defence of the country. Thus France will be

defended by an armed and disciplined population, and the sovereign is at liberty to employ what was before called the regular army in any way he pleases: since not a part of it will be required for garrison service or for the interior of the country.

The sword may thus be sent through the earth. To what part it will be first directed, time must discover. Rumour says Russia will be the object or Sweden, and it is not likely that an ardent mind will be long idle, when he has such an instrument to wield at his discretion. He can now double his armies in Spain, and the only check upon his designs will be the difficulty of providing for his troops. Wherever there is money and provision, thither will they direct their steps: where the carcase is, the eagles will be gathered together.

The plan is grand in conception, and is highly extolled by the French orators. Future orators, poets, and historians will emblazon it, and the unthinking multitude will dignify with heroical titles him whose object is universal dominion, and whose means of attaining it are force and warlike skill. How different are the kingdoms of this world from that of the lamb! What a contrast between the outward splendour of a warlike sovereign at the head of immense armies, and the humble Jesus with his twelve associates, destined to proclaim good tidings to all nations and languages! He, who admires the one cannot love the other: and they who aim at the honours of the two different kingdoms, must pursue opposite lines of conduct, and expect different rewards.

France has seized upon Swedish Pomerania; and Sweden has been contented hitherto with simply protesting against the violence of the action. Nowhere has the sword been drawn to oppose the French. The pretext of France, is to support its measures with respect to commerce; the result might be thought to be the junction of Great Britain and Sweden, to prevent farther aggressions on the latter. By such a conduct, Sweden itself will be safe from attack, since the French will have no means of entering the country but by a tedious march round the Gulph of Bothnia, in which the reduction of Russia must be a previous object. This is said to be within the view of the enterprizing monarch, who seems to have no just complaint against the Autocrat; yet what

will not ambition do, and who is to set bounds to a conqueror?

The armistice between the Turks and Russians is at an end. More bloody battles may be expected on the Danube, and the two powers at war do not seem to be aware of the dangers that threaten them from their mighty neighbour. Constantinople is as easily to be attacked as Petersburg, and the march to the one is not more difficult than to the other place. The pride of Buonaparte may be flattered by erecting his eagles, where the crescent now predominates: and his sçavans will flatter him on the title of the Restorer of Greece. To speculate on such a man's conduct seems to be idle; it is sufficient only to say that wherever he orders his troops to march, devastation accompanies their career: but the Greeks cannot be worse under a French than the Turkish yoke. The time is approaching for the overthrow of the Mahometan superstition, and Buonaparte may be a great instrument in the hand of Providence to effect its destruction.

We hear nothing of his pretended Holiness the Pope, and the future state of his church remains to be developed. At any rate, he is not gone back to Rome, nor is he likely to see again that seat of fraud and delusion, which, cleared of its monks and priests, begins to wear the aspect of useful industry. In Sicily, the old superstition remains, and the revolution in its politics does not affect it: but we trust, that it will be attended with the free exercise of the Protestant religion in that country. One instance of our intercourse with that island has transpired in the conversion of the eldest son of an English peer to the popish religion; but whether the same spirit has infected our army, we do not know. We hope, that the Bible Society will not however lose the opportunity of conveying the treasures of sacred knowledge to that benighted country and, if some missionaries were also sent to it, we should think them much better employed than in the east. How far the government of the country is improved by our interference cannot yet be ascertained: but a sound policy might make the intercourse between Britain and Sicily very advantageous to both countries.

From Spain nothing encouraging to the views of the adherents to the old system has appeared. The French continue to consolidate and to increase their

power; the English confine themselves to the preservation of Portugal or a slight hovering over the frontiers of Spain: and the Regency at Cadiz regulates with its little senate the district of the Isla, and receives occasional dispatches from the distant colonies which are willing, or from governors who are able, to communicate with it. There is every reason to believe that Mexico is lost to the mother country. As to the Caraccas, their independence is not likely to be shaken, and Buenos Ayres is so far from coming back to its allegiance to the mother country, that we are more likely to hear of a war between this settlement and the Portuguese Brasilians. This latter power had the imprudence to interfere in the dispute between the Spaniards on the opposite banks of La Plata, which will end probably in a rooted hostility between the two governments; and future historians will talk of the inhabitants of Buenos Ayres and the Brasilians being formed by nature to cut each others throats, as in these days it is pretended by absurd writers, that such is the situation of the French and English.

At home, the great topic of conversation, and subject of some debates in Parliament, has arisen from the Letter of the Prince and the refusal of the opposition to come into power. Public writers have descended into personalities upon this occasion which cannot be too much reprobated. The character of the Sovereign is not to be brought into contempt, and the calamity that has befallen the nation, might have been a lesson of awe to those, who take such liberties with his representative. In both houses, however, the minister has been triumphant, and the strength of the parties will be seen in the approaching debate on the Catholic question. The number of votes will not however be an absolute criterion, as many who support the ministerial side in general, may on this occasion exercise their own judgment and discretion, and favour the cause of a more enlarged toleration. Ireland seems to be unanimous nearly in its petition, and, as the people of Great Britain do not express their disapprobation of it, we cannot conceive that any danger, considered merely in a politic and still less in a religious point of view, could arise from Catholic emancipation.

In the house have been several debates, and it is with pleasure we perceive that military floggings to the extent of a thousand lashes, grow less and less in

estimation, even with the favourers of that species of punishment. The views of the parties have been unfolded in speeches referring to the Prince's Letter, but the silence of the Marquis of Wellesley has disappointed the public. Ireland has, as usual, afforded a topic of debate, but great preparations are making for the grand question of Catholic emancipation, to come on the 17th. The favourers of it are supposed to amount to upwards of two hundred and fifty members, in the House of Commons, but how many will be brought into the field is uncertain: at the same time, it is imagined that the minister will find great reluctance in his troops, for many will vote against him, and many will stay away. The issue of the debate is thus made more interesting, and it is far from being absolutely certain on which side it will be carried.

A trial has taken place in the Courts of law on a subject, which cannot easily be made a matter of argument in such a place. We have the account of it from the public papers, and if it is properly reported we stand in the peculiar situation of differing from prosecutor, defendant, judge and jury upon this occasion. The Attorney General filed his information against the defendant for publishing a blasphemous and prophane libel on the holy scriptures, in other words, for denying the Christian religion—asserting that the holy scriptures were from beginning to end a fable and an imposture—the apostles liars and deceivers—placing the history of Christ on a level with the legends of the heathen mythology. The Attorney General is said to have observed, that the object of the book was to lay the axe to the very root of religion, and this mistake seems to have pervaded both his mind and that of the judge, for the author did not intend to root out religion, but a peculiar mode of it, which he apprehended to be false. In consequence of this mistake, his speech appealed to the passions and feelings, not to the reason of mankind. His quotation from Judge Hale, that Christianity is parcel of the laws of England, led also to mistake: for Christianity cannot make part of any worldly laws; it is founded upon love, and not one of its precepts can be sanctioned by temporal authority or temporal punishment. A civil magistrate may be member of a Christian community, but in that community his authority ceases: all are brethren, held together by the law of

love, and no one can exercise lordship over the other. The Attorney General however allowed, that the disputes of learned men on controversial points were not to be included in his list of punishable crimes, and the interpretations of the orthodox might be called in question, without danger of being an imputed libeller on scripture. The defendant read his defence, in which he treated the scriptures with such little reverence, that the judge gave him repeated admonitions, saying he did not sit there to hear the Christian religion reviled—that the defendant was not to defame religion—but at last, upon mature deliberation, gave up the point, and left the defendant to read what he pleased, who concluded his paper with a hope, that he had satisfied both judge and jury of the falsehood of the scripture. The judge stated the defence to be from beginning to end a tissue of opprobrium and defamatory reviling on the Holy Scriptures, and it could not be endured, that whatever might be the practice in America, religion should be calumniated and abused. The defendant was found guilty, and on the motion of the Attorney General, was committed to prison.

Differing in opinion, as we do, from the defendant, it cannot be imagined, that we would take his part as favourers of his argument. These we hold much cheaper than his prosecutor, or his judge, or his jury: and if the Christian religion could make its way against the efforts of power, and the skill of the most learned, we cannot see, that it was likely to suffer in the least from so trifling a publication. But we are sorry for the prosecution, because it gives occasion to the enemies of our faith to blaspheme. They will say, that we use the arm of flesh, which is positively excluded by Christ, because we cannot defend ourselves by argument. Let us put the case, that the question were reversed, and that an infidel Attorney General had brought an action against a Christian for writing in defence of the scriptures, before an infidel judge and an infidel jury. The defence of his opinions would be considered by them as an aggravation of the offence; and the attempt to convert them, as an insult upon their understandings. The arguments of the book, and of the defendant, require, if they are answered at all, the coolness, the patience, and the integrity of a true Christian: and nothing is gained by an appeal to the passions. The high priests

stirred up the multitude against Christ for blaspheming religion, and reviling the temple; and in what manner did he treat his opponents? Not by reviling again; but by patiently suffering whatever they chose to inflict. And if our Saviour could endure such contumely thrown upon him, his disciples must vindicate his religion by patience, by forbearance, by love, by the best arguments urged in the gentlest manner. If the infidel reviles us, let us not revile again. The judgment belongs to God, and the ark of the covenant cannot be sustained by the powers of this world.

Another circumstance ought to be taken into consideration. Missionaries are now sent from this country into heathen lands, to convert the natives from idolatry, their established religion, to Christianity. The conduct of the Societies, that subscribe for the support of these missionaries, and the patience and courage, and magnanimity, of the persons sent, are matter of general approbation. The imprisonment of these missionaries is deprecated; yet with what justice could it be complained of? The heathens may retort upon us: "You imprison those who revile the established religion of your country; how then can you expect, that we should treat with respect the men who revile the established religion of our own country? Either permit your religion to be freely canvassed at home, or do not attempt to send your people to disturb our faith. You assert that your religion is from heaven, we assert the same of ours. If yours is from heaven, surely it can not stand in need of chains and imprisonment to support it."

The Lancasterians have had another triumph in the metropolis. A meeting was held for the wards of Aldersgate, Bassishaw, Coleman Street, and Cripplegate, and for the parish of St. Luke's, in which it was agreed to establish a school, for a thousand children, on Mr. Lancaster's plan, without regard to the sect to which they may belong: the committee for conducting it to be selected in equal numbers from the members of the established sect, and the dissenters from it; and the clergymen and dissenting ministers in the district are to be honorary members of the institution. The children to attend that place of worship which their parents or guardians assign to them. This union of the sects cannot fail of promoting christian knowledge and christian charity, and

it is a great satisfaction to learn, from all quarters, that a liberal spirit is now pervading the community in general, that men begin to be more attached to the scriptures than to the factions raised upon them, and that the name of Christian begins to be more honourable than that of Calvinist, Lutheran, Methodist, Church of England, or any other denomination of party, which has too long torn in pieces the Christian Church.

The pseudo-national society for the education of the poor in the principles of the established sect, has published another Address to the public, framed at a meeting, at which were present two archbishops, eleven bishops, four lords, five esquires, and six clergymen. The chief object is to shew its friends that the scheme is coming into action, that several schools are forming, and schoolmasters are wanted, who are exhorted to become candidates, upon the following qualifications. "No one will be treated with, who does not bring full and satisfactory testimonials, from the minister, churchwardens, and principal inhabitants of their respective parishes, that they are members" of the sect established by law, "and profess its doctrines and principles; that they have been in the habit of attending their parish church, and are of irreproachable moral conduct."

The subscriptions, we have observed, are very numerous and great, but trifling, compared with the object aimed at, and the society seems to be of the same opinion with us. For the Address states,

that "the sums which have been so liberally subscribed by the original friends of the institution are not likely to do much more than to establish and maintain those schools, which the society itself has resolved to open in the metropolis." A more general and extended support is therefore called for, in which they say, "the best interests of the established religion and constitution of this country are so deeply involved," and they recommend to the parochial clergy in the metropolis and its neighbourhood to exert themselves. We are not surprised, that the established religion and constitution are hooked together in this address; but the cry will no longer do. It might serve very well, when the members of the established sect bore a greater proportion to the population of the united kingdom, or when, speaking of England and Wales, they very much outnumbered those of a different persuasion. But that time is gone by. The members of the established sect have more landed, but less monied and commercial, interest than those of the other sects: and, if we were to weigh its influence by the class to whom the gospel was first preached, this is very slight and rapidly diminishing. It is a matter of no consequence to the constitution whether a single man attends or not the meetings of the established sect. The only difference is that, if the secession should be general, and each sect provide for itself, the country would not be embarrassed by their rivalships.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Being frequently unable to bring into our pages even a very narrow list of books, we shall endeavour in future to supply the place of that article, by an early Review of all publications, which fall within the scope of our work. We request that books, of which a notice is desired, may be sent to us, on their first appearance.

Our *Coseley* and *Bridport* correspondents, will see that the subject of their valuable communications is taken up in the present No.; and perhaps they will agree with the Editor, that this is one of the very few cases, in which serious argument would be misapplied.

A respectable correspondent from *Chesterfield*, solicits 'some account of Le Clerc, the friend of Mr. Locke.' We are disposed to enforce his request: and should, indeed, be glad to receive well-written, concise Memoirs, not only of Le Clerc, but also of those eminent contributors to Biblical learning, Erasmus and Grotius. There are, likewise, some English divines and scholars of whom we wish to give an account; Dr. Conyers Middleton, Dr. Caleb Fleming, Dr. Richard Price, Dr. Harwood, Mr. Moore, author of a pamphlet on our Saviour's Agony in the Garden, &c. &c. Memoirs, or hints for Memoirs, will be peculiarly acceptable.

All Communications for this work are requested to be addressed [post paid] to the Editor at the Publishers', Messrs. Sherwood and Co. Paternoster Row; where also Advertisements, Bills for the Wrapper and Books for Review are received.