THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXX. AUGUST. [Vol. VII.

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

Gosswell Street, July 10, 1812.

SIR,

The enclosed, which I found lately, in examining some old letters, came into my possession, I believe, among Mr. Wakefield's papers, when his Memoirs were preparing for publication. It was not then printed with his correspondence, for an obvious reason, which no longer exists. This letter is too interesting from the character and story of the writer, and too honourable to Mr. Wakefield's memory, to be suppressed; and I know not where it would be read with more gratification than in your pages.

I remain, Sir, Yours,
J. T. RUTT.

Original Letter from the late Joseph Gerrald, to Mr. Gilbert Wakefield.

On board the Sovereign, lying off St. Helen's, May 17th, 1795.

I should wantonly repress the warmest emotions of my heart, and feel myself guilty of a breach of moral duty, did I depart the country without bidding adieu to my respected friend Gilbert Wakefield. The tender attention which, during my persecution he, a stranger to every thing but my principles, maliciously paid to me, can never be erased from my mind. The recollection of it will be a

trying events of life; and, after the approbation of my own mind, will stand among the firmest supports of an inflexible fortitude.

I did not think, my friend, to have quitted you so abruptly.—I received assurances, through an indirect channel, *from ministerial authority*, that it was not their intention to send me *immediately*. But they knew that I was incapable of making any submission, and therefore were determined to insult and deceive a man, whom even the iron austerity of their persecution was not able to subdue. But the circle of their conduct was well rounded. That no fund of human depravity might remain untouched by them, the rankness of their duplicity was made to keep pace with the rigour of their oppression; they attempted to infuse hope, only that they might enjoy the demon-like satisfaction of blasting it; and I was hurried away, like the vilest of malefactors, fettered and without the slightest notice, to the remote shores of the Southern Ocean, without those tender consolations of friendship, which all good men willingly afford to those who want, and those who deserve them. The zealous alacrity of my friendly devotement has [illegible] which ministerial malignity had aimed at my heart, and [illegible]

to a man enfeebled by long sickness, and macerated by a close imprisonment of fourteen months, were essentially necessary to the preservation of life. Without their friendly aid I must have wanted these comforts, and wanting them must have perished. Among these friends, the revered name of Samuel Parr must ever be remembered. Upon my past conduct, and particularly upon that part of it, which marked me out as the victim of persecution, I look back with triumph and exultation. Having nothing in view but the *good of mankind*, my spirit feels its purity, and, therefore, must be happy. It may indeed be extinguished, but can never be subdued.

This system of terror, (which however will counteract its own purposes,) and which government have adopted, is the base offspring of their cruelty, their cowardice and their conscious guilt. They scatter false alarms and act upon them as if they were real. They infuse the panic which they feel, and inflict the *punishment* which they *fear*.

For myself, my friend, whatever destiny awaits me, I am content. The cause which I have embraced has taken deep root, and must, I feel, ultimately triumph. I have my reward. I see through the cheering vista of future events, the overthrow of tyranny, and the permanent establishment of *benevolence* and *peace*. It is silent as the lapse of time, but as certain and inevitable; for though justice treads along with woollen feet, she strikes at last with iron hands.

During my exile, I hope to be supported by the consolation of your correspondence; though even without it I should never cease to cherish Gilbert Wakefield. May every happiness attend him.

JOSEPH GERRALD.

P. S. My friend Mr. Maitland, who has assiduously attended me at Portsmouth, is the bearer of this letter. If you think that the publication of it will do good, you are welcome to publish it.

Remember me kindly to George Dyer.

Letter from Dr. Watts to Mr. Clement Sharp, of Romsey.

Stoke Newington,
January 21, 1735—6.

Sir,

Your letter, dated about the middle of Oct. should have been answered long ago had I not been withheld from my study by long illness, nor am I yet fully recovered. I take pleasure, Sir, to find your honest enquiries after truth, and that you are not willing either to put off your children or to be contented yourself with a mere set of words, instead of clear and intelligible doctrines.

I will therefore write you my thoughts in a few lines of that impotency and inability of man to believe and repent, and return to God, which arises from the fall, and which is, I think, the best and only way to secure our thoughts from running into the extremes of Antinomian opinions on the one side, or Arminian on the other. This impotency, though it may be called natural or rather *native*, as it comes to us by nature in its present corrupted state, yet it is not a want of natural powers, either understanding or will, to know or

to chuse that which is good: for if there were not natural powers sufficient for this purpose, I do not see how men could be charged as criminals in not receiving the gracious offers of the gospel: this impotence, therefore, is what our divines usually call a *moral impotance*, i. e. their mind will not learn divine things, because they shut their eyes; their wills refuse to receive the proposals of grace, they shut it out of their hearts; they have a delight in sin, and a dislike of Christ and his salvation; they have a rooted obstinacy of will against the methods of divine mercy, and against that holiness which is connected with happiness. And yet this moral impotency is described by such metaphors in scripture, as represent us blind or dead in sin, and that we can no more change our natures than the Ethiopian can change his skin, or the leopard his spots: and the reason of these strong expressions is, because God knows this native aversion to grace and holiness is so strong and so rooted in their hearts, that they will never renounce sin and receive the salvation of Christ, without the powerful influences of the spirit of God, even that same spirit which can cure those who are naturally blind, or can raise the dead. Now that this weakness of man to do that which is good is a moral impotence, and not properly natural, appears by the moral remedies that are applied to cure it; viz. commands, promises, threatnings, &c. which sorts of methods would be useless and ridiculous to apply to natural impotence. But to make the blind see, or the dead arise, it must be concluded, therefore, that man has a natural ability, i. e. natural powers, to do what God requires; but, at the same time, such a native aversion of will, that he never will do it without divine grace; thus there is a fair way laid for the necessity of divine grace, and yet, at the same time, a just foundation for the condemnation of impenitent sinners. I have spoken something more largely to this subject in the 11th sermon amongst the *Berry Street Sermons*, which were published last year, in two volumes, in octavo.

May the wisdom and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ direct you to walk in a safe way to eternal life; and to lead your children therein; at the same time assuring you that the happening to take a little different turn of thought in some of these difficult enquiries is not of so vast importance as some persons would make it to be, with respect to our salvation, provided we do but maintain a constant dependence upon the grace of the Spirit of God, in all our duties, to assist us; and on the perfect righteousness or obedience and sufferings of Christ as our atonement for sin, and the only effectual ground of our acceptance with God. I am, Sir, under frequent returning weaknesses, rendered unable to write much, and therefore subscribe myself

Your friend & humble servant
unknown,
I. WATTS.

P. S. If you would apply the general doctrine I have proposed, of natural and moral impotency, to the particular question in your letter about praying for the Spirit of God, it may be done thus:—every man has such natural powers of understanding and will, that if he will exert them so far as the powers of nature go in seeking the

assistance of the spirit, he has abundant reason to expect that promise which is made to them that ask, shall be fulfilled, without any consideration whether this man be elected or no, for this is the usual way of grace, in working upon the elect, to set them upon exerting their natural powers to seek salvation, under a rational sense and conviction of their own guilt and misery, by reason of sin; and there is so much encouragement given to the diligence of man, in this case, that I am well satisfied, there shall no soul ever arise at the day of judgment and plead that he has sought salvation as far as the powers of nature would go, and yet God refused to bestow it upon him. The great condemnation is, that men love darkness rather than light, and they will not come unto Christ that they may have life.

I. W.

Letter from a Tutor in a Dissenting Academy, to a Candidate for the Ministry.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I cannot but feel myself peculiarly interested in your welfare, and heartily wish that the plan you are now pursuing may promote it, in connection with your being an instrument of advancing the best interests of others.

You are, I conceive, strongly impressed with a sense of the worth of souls, having been divinely taught, I sincerely hope, the value of your own. Endeavour, my friend, always to maintain a lively sense of this: it will give vigour to your studies, and contribute abundantly to your usefulness. An habitual conviction that your object is the salvation of the souls of men, will make the labour and difficulties attending exercises preparatory to the ministry more easy; and reconcile you (should that be your lot, which has been the lot of some of the most upright and best of men,) to the suspicions of those prejudiced against you, and shield you from the tongue of slander.

A hint of this sort cannot be amiss, when it is considered that Jesus himself met with such treatment, and has suggested to his followers, that the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord.

You are convinced with me, my dear friend, I doubt not, that all error has a pernicious tendency, and your concern is to preach the truth as it is in Jesus. But where do you expect to find it? Where—but in those very writings which he has given to all his followers. I cannot but think, that many mistake on this head; that while they join to cry out—"The Bible, the Bible is the religion of Protestants,"—they do not, in fact, pay that deference to the sacred scriptures which they deserve. Our grand concern ought to be, that we may know and preach just what they contain, not substituting any human interpretation of scripture in the place of scripture itself. This, I fear, is often done: and phrases, entirely human and arbitrary, become very important; ill-will is generated among children of the same family, or servants of the same master, whose great concern is mutually to know and do his will;—hence parties of Christians, supposing each other mistaken, look as shy on each other, as they would on those who reject the common salvation, or did not call Christ Lord, or labour to understand and obey his will.

Search the scriptures diligently and impartially, with daily prayer to the Father of Lights, for divine illumination: and allow me to add the following hints:—Consider carefully in reading the different parts of scripture, *who* is the speaker,—to *whom* he addresses himself, i. e. under what *particular circumstances* his auditors are to be regarded; and how they, of course, would most naturally understand his language. Distinguish between those passages where any particular point is evidently *laboured* by the inspired writer, I mean, formally stated and enlarged upon, and where, at most, it is only *occasionally alluded* to. Weigh as carefully as you can, the *exact amount* of *different scriptural expressions* on different subjects, when you have compared them together:—collections of texts of scripture, on the leading doctrines of Christianity, may, in this view, be very useful. Remember, *truth* is *consistent* throughout, and divine truth all practical.—But I have not room or time to enlarge. Let me hear how you go on; and be assured of the best wishes and prayers of

Your sincere Friend,

Letter to a Noble Lord, with Mr. Wyvill's Petition.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I have transcribed the following letter for insertion in your valuable Repository, if you think it in the least degree calculated to promote liberal sentiments respecting the unalienable rights of conscience. It was sent, a few months ago, to a nobleman, in the name of some Christians of different denominations, in a country town, with the Petition drawn up by the Rev. C. Wyvill, in favour of liberty of conscience, and with a request that his lordship would have the goodness to present it to the House of Lords. This he did, at the time that the Right Honourable Earl Grey, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and Lord Holland presented similar petitions, viz, April 20th, 1812. I shall only add an observation of his lordship in answer to this letter, which in my opinion does him more real honour than his high title. "I observe with pleasure that your petition embraces the claims of Christians of every denomination, a liberality and justice which I am sorry to say has not *always* marked the language and conduct of Protestants, but which I now hope to see universal, and which must sooner or later (and I think at no very distant period) be successful."

With fervent wishes and ardent hopes that no intolerant law on account of religion, will much longer remain to disgrace our Statute Book, I am, Sir, respectfully Yours,

A FRIEND TO UNIVERSAL LIBERTY.

To the Right Honourable Lord

MY LORD,

I have done myself the honour of sending your lordship, by this day's mail-coach, a Petition on the unalienable rights of conscience, drawn up by that well-known liberal clergyman of the Established Church, the Rev. C. Wyvill. It was sent to me by a Dissenting minister in this place, with a request that I would lay it before my friends, and if they with my-

self approved its contents, that we would affix our signatures to it, and apply to other persons in the town and neighbourhood who may be supposed favourable to the object of it, for the same purpose. This has been done, and upwards of ninety professing Christians of different denominations, have put their names to it.

Considering you, my Lord, as the zealous friend and eloquent advocate of the civil and religious rights of all classes of the community, the subscribers take the liberty of requesting your lordship to present their petition to the House of Lords. We are by no means sanguine in our expectations of *immediate* success, but it will, we apprehend, produce discussion, and discussion your lordship knows is eventually fatal to groundless prejudices and errors, and favourable to the cause of truth. We are persuaded that the more freely the civil and religious rights of men are examined, the more clearly they will appear to be founded in reason and justice, and that it would be as much a point of policy as equity, to abolish those penal laws which interfere with them, and which disgrace the Statute Book, the present enlightened age, and this land, in various respects, of justly boasted liberty.

The object of this petition, as your lordship will perceive, embraces the Roman Catholics as well as Protestant Dissenters; *their* cause, however, we should not advocate, were we not convinced by what appears to us satisfactory evidence, that the pernicious tenets attributed to them, such as that "no faith is to be kept with heretics," and the power of the Pope to dispense the subjects of other states from their allegiance," &c. are not entertained by them as a body of Christians, whatever may be the sentiments on these points of a few obscure, ignorant and bigotted individuals among them. With respect to their avowed religious principles, such as the "doctrine of transubstantiation," "the worship of the virgin Mary and of the saints," and other articles of their faith, however irrational and absurd they appear to us, we think these ought to be considered as no more a ground of their exclusion from the freest toleration, than the peculiar sentiments of the various discordant sects of *Protestant* Christians, some of which must, necessarily, be false and unscriptural. We also apprehend that the extending to the Catholics as well as to all classes of Protestant Dissenters, the free toleration or rather the just rights, civil and religious, for which the Petition pleads, would instead of being attended with any danger either to church or state, add to the security of both, and be the best safeguard to the British empire, in the present awful and critical situation of our public affairs.

Should you, my Lord, think proper to present this petition to the House of Lords, your Lordship will have the goodness to state it as the petition of individual Christians of different denominations in the town and neighbourhood of ———

Your Lordship's compliance with the request contained in this letter, will oblige the petitioners, and more particularly

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most respectful and humble servant,

———

*** Since transcribing the above letter, I have seen it announced in the Newspapers, that Lord Castlereagh means to introduce a Bill into Parliament, explanatory of the Toleration Act, in favour of the Dissenters. This I trust, should it pass into a law, will be received by them with all due gratitude to the legislature, but not induce them to compromise for it their just rights, or be content with any thing less than the repeal of all the penal statutes on account of religion.

July 10, 1812.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Penal Laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland,

[From *A Statement, &c.* — Continued from the last No. p. 424.]

CHAP. II.

Of the Laws which deny to the Catholics the Right of Sitting and Voting in the Houses of Legislature: and herein, of the elective Franchise, as enjoyed in Ireland.

Until the year 1692, the Catholics were admissible by law into both the houses of legislature, in Ireland. Their exclusion was effected by an English statute of this year.—The English Parliament, exercising in those days the jurisdiction of binding the people of Ireland by laws expressly naming Ireland, passed an Act declaring that the provisions of a former English Act, (namely the 30, Chs. ii. stat. 2. ch. 1.) should extend to Ireland.

In 1782, upon the restoration of legislative independence to Ireland, the friends of the Protestant Ascendancy became alarmed, lest in the national enthusiasm for freedom, the chains of the suffering Catholic might be loosened. It was apprehended that the Irish Parliament might, by a retrospective operation, defeat the policy of the English statute of 1692, amongst many others, and that the Catholic might thus chance to re-enter the sanctuary of the legislature. As a barrier against Catholic hope it was therefore enacted, "That all clauses in English statutes, relating to the taking of oaths, or making or subscribing any declaration or affirmation in Ireland, or to penalties or disabilities in cases of omission, shall be in force in Ireland, *according to their present tenor.*"

The Irish Parliament having thus, in the express terms of this statute of 1782, confirmed this exclusion of Catholics, thought proper to renew their vigilance in 1793.

The statute of 1793, professing to be an Act for the further Relief of the Catholics of Ireland, has expressly reserved and re-enacted a great number of the most grievous privations, disabilities and incapacities, which, however obsolete, heretofore existed in the Statute Book. This dormant prohibition against the admission of Catholics into either House of Parliament, was found amongst others and was renewed.

Having stated this article of exclusion, according to the *letter* of the law, we shall next advert to its *extent* and *operation* in Ireland.

1. As to the House of Peers.

2. As to the House of Commons.

1. The honors of the Peerage, the profitable rank and effective power attached to it, the personal benefits derived from that rank and power, not only to the individual peer, but also to the wide circle of his family and connections, are objects deservedly high in the estimation of all, who are gifted with superior minds, or capable of noble exertions. They are valuable in the eyes of any person, who looks around him, and observes, even cursorily, the present state of society.

Let us take a short view of the extent to which these honors and privileges are now enjoyed.

The lords temporal, who sit and vote in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, exceed 340 in number. Taking a view of the creations to peerages, which have occurred only within his present Majesty's reign, comprizing about fifty years, we find about 250 in England, and nearly an equal number in Ireland, forming a total, not far short of 500 peerages. Of these, however, several are extinct.

The books of peerage will satisfy any reader, how very large a proportion of these five hundred personages have raised themselves from the rank of commoners, perhaps from a mere equality with their Catholic neighbours, even within these last thirty years. Some few may have been indebted to accidental causes for their elevation: many to the display of eminent virtues, talents, or other splendid qualifications: all, however, may have had cause to feel, that the law afforded exclusive encouragement to their services and claims, and amply rewarded their comparative merits. Nor do we presume to insinuate any diminution of those merits, when we offer the observation, naturally growing out of this subject—that these 500 personages have been thus selected and distinguished, not from amongst the people of these realms at large, but from amongst the members of a favoured religious community, who, in Ireland, do not amount to one tenth part of the population.

If, therefore, these honours be great, the competition for them must be recollected to have been necessarily very limited, and especially in Ireland.

Now it will scarcely be denied, that some portion of talent, virtue, or other claims to honorary distinction must naturally have been dispensed by Providence to the Catholics of Ireland, during the period we have taken. So large a number of Christians as four millions, dwelling in the immediate vicinity of enlightened nations, cannot in the ordinary course of affairs have been so utterly abandoned by nature, so long uncultivated and sunk in stupid torpor, as to have remained altogether destitute of individuals, whose merits might have laid claim to a participation of those rewards. Perhaps many brave captains, many upright statesmen, many useful legislators, might have arisen amongst the Catholics of Ireland, if the laws had not frowned upon their early hopes, and paralysed their exertions. Who will affirm, that there might not have appeared amongst them a Rodney or a Nelson, a Hutchinson, a Moira, or a Moore, to swell the triumphs, and spread the renown of this country, if the grand incentives, public applause,

and rank, had been permitted to dawn upon his youthful prospects? How many, at this moment, bereft of hope and of emulation, are the withering votaries of inglorious indolence! How many desponding Catholics now stagnate in obscurity, or pine in wasting chagrin, who could reflect ample honour upon their country, if they might hope for honour in return! But, without chance of reward, without an object worthy of exertion, they now languish unnoticed and useless.

——Virtutem quis amplectitur ipsam,
Præmia si tollas?——

The exclusion of the Catholics from the honors and benefits of the peerage operates, therefore, like their exclusion from all other rewards, equally to the detriment of the public, and to the depression of the individual.

For it is really but a puerile and confined view of this interesting subject, to argue, as some have recently argued, that "there are not more than about ten Catholic individuals actually aggrieved by this exclusion." The number of Catholic peers, say they, does not exceed 7 in England, 8 in Ireland, and 2 in Scotland; not more than two or three of the Irish and Scotch would probably be elected as representative peers: the united number therefore would not exceed *ten*, and these are the only persons entitled to complain.

Now, this argument is fallacious. According to the *letter* of the constitution, every situation of honour, trust and power, ought to be accessible to every citizen. In daily practice the Protestants enjoy the full benefit of this principle, in which a nobleman is privileged from the [illegible] Catholics. It appears, that all access to the honors and powers of the peerage is closed against every Catholic. He remains without even the hope of ever attaining any participation in them. This exclusion operates as a bar against every Catholic, who might otherwise reasonably expect to count the ennobling of his name amongst the possible events of his future life, and whose actions might accordingly be influenced by this incentive. No such bar stands in the way of the Protestant. Therefore, this exclusion, by the partiality of its principle and the general mischief of its spirit, inflicts injury, not merely upon a few Catholic peers, but upon the Catholic community at large.

That the ancient Catholic peers are peculiarly aggrieved by this exclusion, will readily be admitted. Survivors of the stormy persecutions of centuries, they present at this day a disheartening spectacle of shattered greatness. Blameless in private life, circumspect in the narrow sphere of their public conduct, they are, nevertheless, treated with ignominious distrust. A Catholic peer is, indeed, in a singularly distressing predicament. He is subject to all the responsibility and charges of ostensible rank, yet bereft of its incidental patronage and power; nay, debarred, by honour and etiquette, from many pursuits, many means which are free to a commoner, from all enterprizes of trade, from all gainful occupations of a pecuniary nature. The professions of arms, diplomacy and literature [illegible] which a nobleman is privileged to seek for [illegible]

ment. From these pursuits the Catholic peer is deterred by the letter of the laws, or by their necessary operation. Still more galling to a well-constituted mind, must be the state of systematic insult and contempt, to which the Catholic peer is exposed. His conspicuous rank points him out to continual notice, and as a *mark* for hostility; whilst his powerless and unprotected condition invites repeated aggression, and prostrates him before the slights and spurns of official insolence. Poverty, obscurity, personal privations—these might be tolerable, but, alas! to be made

A fixed figure for the hand of scorn
To point his slow unmoving finger at—
Oh! *this is too much!*

A late Catholic peer (Lord Petre) universally revered for his valuable endowments of head and heart, has feelingly complained of this exclusion, as amounting to little short of a *personal* imputation. In pathetic language he thus vents his indignation:

"Is it not *an insult* to me, *to be debarred from exercising my hereditary right* of legislating in the Peers' House of Parliament, merely because I will not take oaths, and subscribe declarations, of which my conscience disapproves—and to be cruelly told, in the same breath, that any oath I may take cannot be depended upon? *Is it not disgraceful to any man of honour to stand as an object of suspicion, and the victim of, at least, an implied stigma, in his native land,* for no other reason but because he prays to God in his own way, and professes the religion of, not only his forefathers, but the forefathers also of those very persons, who impose restraints upon him, and are at the same time *ready to express the highest veneration for their ancestors in other respects?*"

We shall conclude our view of the disabilities, which peculiarly affect the Catholic peers, by observing that as the law now stands in Ireland, the Catholic peer is precisely the only man in the community, who is *wholly disqualified, not only from sitting or voting in either House of Legislature, but also from voting at the election of a member for either.*

By the express words of the Act of Union, he is disabled from voting at any election of a representative peer to serve in the Parliament of the United Kingdom; and, by the standing order of the House of Commons against the interference of peers, he is forbidden to interfere or vote at the election of any member of the lower House of Legislature.

2. As to the House of Commons.—This exclusion is still more important in its extent and operation. It comprizes a greater number of situations of trust and power, amounting at present to 658. These 658 members and their connections are in continual contact with the people of all descriptions; they transact a great quantity of public business, controul the public purse, correct public abuses, criminate public delinquents. They have frequent opportunities of manifesting personal favour or ill-will: of benefiting or enriching their private friends: of injuring or despoiling the obnoxious or defenceless. Moreover, the frequent changes of its numerous members, the variety and fluctuation of its proceedings, render this House

far more instrumental than the upper House can be, in widely diffusing the effective influence of legislative power.

Let us keep in mind, that it is not so much to the purpose to inquire, what may be the precise number of Catholics *actually excluded* from the legislature, as to consider how many are excluded from all chance of *participation* in it; and what must be the general effect of such exclusion upon the interests and feelings of the Catholic body.

The number of Catholics qualified for seats in the Legislature, (if learning, talent, landed estates, or commercial wealth be admitted as a qualification,) probably exceeds thirty thousand persons. These men stand personally proscribed by the existing exclusion, whilst their Protestant neighbours find every facility for ready admission.

Now, the advantages flowing from a seat in the Legislature, it is well known, are not confined to the *individual representative*. They extend to all his family, friends and connections; or, in other words, to every Protestant in Ireland. Within his reach are all honors, offices, emoluments: every sort of gratification to avarice or vanity: the means of spreading a great personal interest by innumerable petty services to individuals. "He can do an infinite number of acts of kindness and generosity, and even of public spirit. He can procure advantages in trade, indemnity from public burdens, preferences in local competitions, pardons for offences. He can obtain a thousand favours, and avert a thousand evils. He may, whilst he betrays every valuable public interest, be, at the same time, a benefactor, a patron, a father, a guardian angel to his political adherents." On the other hand, how stands the Catholic gentleman or trader? For his own person, no office, no power, no emolument: for his children, brothers, kindred, or friends, no promotion, ecclesiastical or civil, military or naval. Except from his private fortune, he has no means of advancing a child, of making a single friend, or of shewing any one good quality. He has nothing to offer but harsh refusal, pitiful excuse, or despondent representation.

Further, we may observe the powerful effect of *opinion* upon this subject. The personal importance, the conscious independence, the sense of security and protection which belong to the legislative character, are participated with hundreds of persons without doors, whom the representative may be desirous to court, or whose interests or sympathies may accord with his own. In Ireland, these persons are, almost universally of the Protestant profession; connected with the member by the ties of family or of friendship, of early acquaintance, education, or reciprocal services. Besides, they already enjoy exclusive power and privileges, and therefore can command the respect, and pre-occupy the exertions of the member. Perhaps, they are not without the prospect of seats for themselves. Hence, every Protestant feels himself, and really is, more firm and secure in the favour of the laws, more powerful in society, more free in his energies, more elevated in life than his Catholic neighbour of equal

merit, property, talents, and education. He alone feels and possesses the right and the legal capacity to be a legislator, and *this consciousness is actual power.*

In 1727, the Catholics of Ireland were deprived of the elective franchise, or right of voting at the election of members of Parliament, by act of Parliament. And thus they remained during 66 years. In 1793, it was enacted, in substance, "That every Catholic should be qualified to vote at such elections, upon his producing to the returning officer a certificate of his having taken and subscribed certain oaths and declarations required by that Act."—But, by a subsequent statute of 1797, commonly termed the Election Act, it was declared, that Catholics, who qualify *previous to the teste of the writ of election*, shall be deemed to have qualified within the meaning of those statutes of 1793 and 1797, in order to entitle them to vote at such elections. Upon these two statutes a question has arisen, which imposes new difficulties upon the Catholic franchise.

[Since this Statement went to press, a valuable statute has been passed in 1811, 51 Geo. iii. ch. 77, which removes the difficulty stated in p. 84, and facilitates the Catholic qualification for exercising the elective franchise. This statute, obviating the contradictions between the statutes of 1793 and 1797, enables the Catholics to qualify *during the election.* In other particulars, it so clearly and wisely establishes the general exercise of the elective franchise against frivolous verbal objections, that it may perhaps be termed the most salutary statute for the Irish public, that has been enacted during the last twenty years.]

The Catholics are liable to peculiar restraints as to the elective franchise, in cities and towns corporate. Such Catholics as are entitled to their freedom of the corporation, by birth or service, are rarely admitted to it. They are scarcely ever made free by grant; and thus they are denied equal means of acquiring the elective franchise with those which the Protestants enjoy.

In cities and corporate towns, the elective franchise, as appertaining to freemen, is almost solely confined to Protestants, who are, in the ratio of at least *fifty to one* of the Catholic freemen, owing to the watchful jealousy with which the freedom is withheld from Catholics. This monopoly, therefore, occasions a decided though unnatural, preponderance of Protestant voters, at elections of members for such places; contrary to the professed principle of granting equal qualification for voting to persons of all religions.

Moreover, in *all* elections of members, whether for counties, cities or towns, every Catholic freeholder is liable to rejection, for some alledged error in his certificate of Catholic qualification, whether as to the date or wording of the certificate, place or time of qualification, or other ground of technical objection to the peculiar form of his qualification.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Information concerning Lord Rochester and others.

SIR, *April* 26, 1812.

I have a copy of Burnet's Account of Lord Rochester, published in 1680. On a blank page at the end of the book have been written the following verses, on the death of that nobleman, by Mr. Flatman.—

As on his death-bed, gasping Strephon lay,
Strephon, the wonder of the plains,
The noblest of the Arcadian swains,
Strephon, the bold, the witty and the gay;
With many a sigh, and many a tear, he said,
Remember me, ye shepherds, when I'm dead:
Ye trifling glories of this world adieu,
And vain applauses of the age;
For when we quit this earthly stage,
Believe me, shepherds, for I tell you true,
Those pleasures which from virtuous deeds we have
Procure the sweetest slumbers in the grave.
Then, since your fatal hour must surely come,
Surely your heads lie low as mine,
Your bright meridian sun decline,
Beseech *the mighty Pan* to guard you home:
If to Elysium you would happy flie,
Live not like Strephon, but like Strephon die.

In Jacob's Poetical Register, 1723, (ii. 56.) Mr. Flatman is described as "a Barrister of the Middle Temple, equally ingenious in the arts of painting and poetry." His Poems were published in 1682. He died in 1688, aged 55. Mr. Wakefield, in his *Observations on Pope*, has occasionally quoted Flatman among the versifiers to whom the poet had been indebted.

That expression, *the mighty Pan* is, I apprehend, not merely a *poetic licence*, but an allusion to a story in Plutarch's Dialogue on the cessation of oracles, to which a Christian application has been given, but which Lardner examines, (H. T. Works, vii. 246.) and declares to be "all over heathenish." To his instances of those who have *Christianized* the story, may be added George Sandys, the learned translator of Ovid. In his *Travels*, 1610, passing by *Delos*, which he describes "as utterly forsaken, when oracles ceased, which," he says, "doubtless was upon the passion of our Saviour," he adds:—"For *Plutarch* reports from the mouth of one *Epitherses*, who had been his schoolmaster, that he embarking for *Italy* and one evening becalmed before the *Paxi*, (two little islands that lie between *Corcyra* and *Leucadia*,) they suddenly heard a voice from the shore, (most of the passengers being yet awake,) calling to one *Thamus*, a pilot, by birth an *Egyptian*, who till the third call would not answer. *Then* (quoth the voice) *when thou art come to the Palodes, proclaim it aloud that the great Pan is dead.* All in the ship that heard this, were amazed. When, drawing near to the aforesaid place, *Thamus*, standing on the poop of the ship, did utter what formerly commanded, forthwith there was heard a great lamentation, accompanied with groans and screeches. This coming to the knowledge of *Tiberius Cæsar*, he sent for *Thamus*, who avouched the truth thereof. Which declared the death of

Christ, (the great Shepherd) and subjection of Satan, who now had no longer power to abuse the illuminated world with his impostures."—Sandys' Travels, 7th ed. p. 9.

Fontenelle well proposes the question, *cui bono?* to such an application of the story. He asks, whether in the age of Plutarch it was ever conjectured that Pan was Jesus Christ. *Mais qu'en arriva-til? Quelqu'un entendit-il ce mot de Pan dans son vrai sens? Plutarque vivoit dans le second siecle de l'eglise, et cependant personne ne s'etoit encore avisé que Pan fût Jesus Christ mort en Judée.* Hist. des Orac. 1728. P. 20.

I have thought that Watts might have the verses of Flatman in his recollection, when he wrote, in 1708, in Lyric Poems, Pt. 2d. the following lines on Lord Rochester:—

Strephon, of noble blood and mind,
For ever shine his name!
As death approach'd, his soul refined,
And gave his looser sonnets to the flame.

'Burn, burn,' he cry'd, with sacred rage,
'Hell is the due of ev'ry page,'
Hell be the fate, but, O indulgent heav'n!
So vile the muse, and yet the man forgiv'n!'

Does the poet here refer to any circumstance then known respecting the last hours of Lord Rochester, or only expressing that desire which he must have felt, to destroy the remembrance of those too numerous "lines which dying he might wish to blot?"

There is an interesting anecdote respecting this nobleman, in the preface to White's *Restoration of all Things*, 1712. The anonymous editor of that posthumous work, having observed, respecting unbelievers, that "those who would convince them upon the common hypothesis, the schemes and systems of these latter ages, have wanted their greatest arguments to prevail upon them," he adds:—

"One instance I shall give, which I have been well informed of, and that is in the late *Earl of Rochester:* in the midst of all his extravagancies, both of opinion and practice, he was once in company with the author of this treatise, who, discoursing with him about religion and the being of a God, took the opportunity to display the goodness of God in its full latitude, according to the scheme laid down in this his present work. Upon which the Earl returned him answer, *that he could approve of and like such a God as he had represented.* So far was he from drawing any encouragement for his loose principles from hence, that, on this supposition, he gave up the cause.

Burnet affords but scanty information on this point. He says, (p. 54.) that Lord R. "doubted much of rewards and punishments: the one he thought too high for us to attain by our slight services; and the other was *too extreme to be inflicted for sin.*" We are not informed whether the objector were silenced or satisfied by Burnet's reply, (p. 58.) that "good or ill dispositions accompanying the departed souls, they must either rise up to higher perfection, or sink to a more depraved and miserable state," and that "in a state wherein the soul shall be separated from sensible things, and employed in a more quick and sublime way of operation, this must

very much exalt the joys and improvements of the good, and as much heighten the horror and rage of the wicked."

Another reputed unbeliever, in conduct happily distinguished from Lord Rochester, is said to have entertained the same objection to Revelation, on the ground of its alledged doctrine of endless punishment. The passage is in Biog. Britt. (iv.) and introduced in the following manner.

"Mr. now Dr. Huntingford, the learned Bishop of Gloucester, communicated to Dr. Kippis, in 1789, for his Life of Lord Shaftesbury, some "anecdotes and observations." In these, the Preface to Whichcot's Sermons is declared to be undoubtedly the production of of that nobleman, and a fair presumption of "what Bishop Butler used to assert, that had Lord Shaftesbury lived in the present century, when Christianity is more perfectly understood, he would have been a good Christian." Mention is made of some unavailing, and now lost, "letters, in which Mr. Locke recommended Christianity to his lordship." These had been a few years before "read by two gentlemen, who were so affected by the strong and pressing terms in which Mr. L. expressed his sentiments that they could not abstain from tears." To this communication Dr. Kippis subjoins the following passage:—

"There is a tradition, that, amidst other difficulties which occurred to the Earl of Shaftesbury, with regard to the truth of the Christian revelation, he was startled at the idea of its containing the doctrine of the eternity of hell torments; that he consulted some eminent churchmen, whether the New Testament positively asserted that doctrine; and that upon being assured that it did, he declared himself incapable of assenting to a system of religion which maintained a tenet so repugnant to all his views of the benignity of the great Governor of the Universe." I cannot forbear to add the accompanying remark, which may justly rank the biographer among the *merciful Doctors*.

"If," says Dr. Kippis, "his lordship had lived in the present day, he would have found a number of divines who would have given him quite a different answer. They would have informed him, that, in their opinion, Christianity holds out no doctrine of so dreadful a nature; and that at the very utmost, it only denounces the final extinction of the impenitently wicked; so that such, *if there be any such*, who after all, shall remain incorrigibly corrupt and abandoned, will, at length, no longer exist in the creation of God."

One of Dr. Kippis's predecessors in the service of the congregation at Princes Street, appears to have occupied his mind with painful anxiety, on the subject of the divine dispensations as they respect the final condition of man. I refer to a letter written by Mr. Say, of whose papers you have given a large account. [Vols. iv. & v.] This letter is in the collection generally called Hughes's Correspondence. (ii. 150.) It is dated March, 1743. Mr. S. "endeavoured to persuade himself, that there never was a sensible or conscious being, who, upon the whole of his existence, should not possess an overbalance of good to his evil, notwithstanding the two different states of good and

bad men, which we believe hereafter." Yet he was immediately perplexed with the case of *Judas*. This letter to an anonymous correspondent, is followed in the collection (p. 156.) by remarks dated May 27, 1743, a very few weeks after the writer's death, from the pen of his friend, Mr. W. Duncombe, a man of letters, the correspondent of Lord Corke and Archbishop Herring, and author of a tragedy entitled *Lucius Junius Brutus*. Mr. D. has taken a liberal and comprehensive view of this most interesting subject, in the following passages, which, I think, you will deem worthy of being transcribed:—

"Perhaps all those natural evils, or moral obliquities, of which we so grievously complain, may be no stronger an objection to the rectitude of the whole system, than hills and mountains are to the rotundity of the globe; and may answer various excellent purposes, though we are too short-sighted to discover them. *Vindictive justice* in the Deity, is, I own, no article in my creed. All punishment in the hands of an infinitely wise and good Being, I think, must be medicinal, and what we call chastisement."

Mr. D. then quotes "a passage in Milton's Mask of Comus," *Virtue may be assailed*, &c. as seeming "to comprise the marrow of theology," and adds:—

"What St. Paul speaks more directly of the reconciliation both of Jews and Gentiles to God, by Jesus Christ, Romans xi. 32. *For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all*, I am willing to understand in a more extensive sense, of the general redemption of mankind, at the consummation of all things. With what raptures of devotion must every one, who cherishes this generous doctrine, join with the apostle in the following pathetic exclamation, *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.*"

Mr. D. next sustains his opinion by quoting the well-known passage from a Sermon by Tillotson, and thus concludes a view of divine Providence towards man.—"They, indeed, who obstinately refuse to be converted, shall suffer punishment proportionable to their offences, and such as the rules of justice and equity dictate. And this the order of God's government, the reverence due to his laws, *the benefit and final conversion of the offenders themselves*, and the improvement of other moral agents, manifestly require." (P. 162.)

I have quoted this writer so largely, not merely on account of his literary reputation, but because, unfortunately, not a hint on the subject is given by Dr. Kippis in his life of Mr. Duncombe, (B. B. v. 504.) compiled chiefly from the communications of his son, the late Rev. John Duncombe, the editor of Hughes's Correspondence. There is a passage in that life (507, Note M.) from a MS. letter to Archbishop Herring, which, if not already given, you may wish to add to your notices of Mr. Say.

"I never conversed," says Mr. Duncombe, "with a person of more learning or modesty. He was an excellent critic, and had a fine talent for poetry. But it was his misfortune to have so penetrating a judgment, that he

could never be satisfied with his own performances, nor think them correct enough."

DISCURSOR.

Chalmers's General Biographical Dictionary.

SIR,

I am one of those who watch the periodical and popular literary productions of the day, with a particular view to the spirit and character of the authors who are likely to influence the times. With some eagerness, I lately procured the 1st volume of the New *General Biographical Dictionary*, editing by *Alexander Chalmers*, and a cursory examination of it has, I confess, afforded me pleasure. It seems to be more extensive in its plan than any similar work in the English language; and it is a great recommendation of it, that the works of authors are specified with the titles at length, in their proper form and language, and with their respective dates. The omission of scripture biography is, also, an improvement.

There is, however, one considerable blemish in the work: when the lives of several persons of the same name are given, they are huddled together without chronological arrangement. I perceive, indeed, that they are in the alphabetical order of their Christian or first names; but this is the poorest and meanest of all modes of classification.

Some inaccuracies are retained from the old edition. Bishop *Aldrich* is said (p. 381.) to have "died March 25, 1555, at *Horncastle*, in Lincolnshire, *which was a house belonging to the Bishops of Carlisle*." The folio editions of *Ainsworth's Annotations* are represented as containing only the *Pentateuch* (p. 261.); whereas they contain all his Annotations, viz. on the *Pentateuch*, the *Psalms* and *Canticles*.

Upon the whole, the work is free from a party spirit. From this praise, however, must be excepted the whole of the article *Alembert*, or, as it is more commonly and properly given, *D'Alembert*. How could Mr. Chalmers revile the authors of the French Encyclopædia upon such authority as the Abbé *Barruel*? A persuasion of the dangerousness of discussion is no good qualification for a general literary biographer.

We may notice also two minor exceptions. *Richard Adams*, one of the ejected ministers, is called (p. 141.) "an *Anabaptist* teacher." This term *Anabaptist* is not descriptive, but reproachful. They who practice adult baptism by immersion, hold every other mode of administering the ceremony to invalidate it as a scriptural rite, and to make it nothing at all. The epithet is abandoned to the small remnant of theological bigots.—In the account of *John Alexander*, a dissenting teacher, mention is made of his posthumous work on the xv. chap. of Corinth. I. published by *John Palmer*, and it is added (p. 415.) "Mr. Palmer has bestowed high praise on the critical sagacity and learning displayed in this work. *It is some detraction from its merit, however, that in the preliminary dissertation, he favours the opinion of there being no state of consciousness between death and the resurrection.* Of his talents, in another respect, a

much more favourable opinion may be formed from the papers he wrote in "The Library." This passage is bad enough for the obscurity of the last sentence, but worse for the dogmatism and illiberality which run through it.

I point out these faults in Mr. Chalmers's work, not with a view of disparaging it, but in the hope that if this letter should reach his eye, or that of any of the booksellers concerned in the publication, there may be more care bestowed upon the suceeeding volumes. EPISCOPUS.

Mr. Fordham on Natural and Revealed Religion.

Sandon, July 8th, 1812.

SIR,

Much has been written upon the subject of natural and revealed religion, as if there were two particular distinct religions, independent of each other. For my part, I am of opinion, that there is but one simple, indivisible, eternal religion, which is founded in the immutable order of things, of which God is the sublime author. Natural and revealed religion mean one and the same thing. God, who is the God of all things, and ever consistent with himself, can never be the author of two distinct religions, because, this would be to make him at variance with himself. The God of nature, is the God of Christianity. Christianity is the religion of Nature, or the religion of Nature is the religion of Jesus Christ. I do not intend here to include miraculous operations, but to confine the interpretation of the word religion or Christianity, to the *Moral Code*, which is religion, properly so called. Miracles form no essential part of religion, properly so called, they are appendages designed to answer the purpose of extrinsic evidences. Miracles have ceased, but the moral law is as immutable as God himself, and will continue the same "yesterday, to-day and for ever."

I commence then, at once, with the broad plain position, that natural and revealed religion are identical. God is one; and the religion which emanates from God is one. In all its features and qualities it resembles its Divine Parent. Like him, it is benevolent, immortal and universal. Like him, it is just, tolerant, sublime and beneficent. Christianity is adapted to the *nature* of man; that which is suited to the *nature* of man must form a part of the system of nature. This is the point at which I aimed. Can any thing be more evident? The *written* law of God forbids gluttony and drunkenness, so does the *unwritten* law of Nature. The drunkard and the glutton do not act in compliance with the simple dictates of Nature, which renders it absolutely impossible for either of them, even to enjoy the physical and moral beauty of a healthy organization. It is as impossible that they should experience the sweet and noble tranquillity of pure and perfect health, the divinest blessing that can emanate from the mercy of God, as that water should flow from a lower to a higher situation, or that we should swallow poison and not destroy ourselves. The *written* law of God inculcates chastity, so does the *unwritten* law of Nature. It teaches us that it is necessary to our health and strength, that it

contributes to our vigor of mind and body;—that libertinism undermines our moral energy, and our ardour for the great and beautiful, and surrenders the voluptuary, in the prime of life, to all the infirmities and miseries of a premature old age. The *written* law of God teaches gratitude, justice, mercy, humility; so does the *unwritten* law of Nature. All these virtues are modifications of interior felicity.—Is it not agreeable to our nature, to be happy? are we not organized for this grand purpose?

I know, Sir, that this interesting subject admits of considerable expansion, but enough, I presume, has already been produced to prove my point, which, at the same time, is, I conceive, to support the honour of God, the unity of his design, the harmony of his attributes, and to show that the scope of his operation, is not narrow and confined, but grand, expansive, universal and sublime. I conclude, with repeating, what I commenced with, that as God is one, so religion is one, and that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and the exalted interpreter of the laws of Nature.

G. G. FORDHAM.

Case of Mr. Stone.

SIR, *August 2*, 1812.

The benevolent person (p. 447.) who has chosen to advocate, in a mode so unusual, the opinion ably maintained by the late Rector of Cold Norton, has not, very accurately, stated that opinion. He seems to have been thinking on another question, long agitated, and still undecided, in the Papal Church, respecting the *immaculate conception of the Virgin*, or that she was born without the taint of original sin.

Mr. Stone, as is well known, controverted the *supernatural*, or as it is generally named, the *miraculous* conception of Jesus Christ. By thus publickly avowing his *heresy*, according to the judgment of his own church, he certainly "has fallen a victim to his honesty," but I cannot so readily ascertain "the ignorance and want of charity of his opponents." I am not able to forget that the preacher and his opponents alike held their ecclesiastical benefits on the faith of their adherence to the creeds and articles of the Church of England. One of those creeds asserts that Jesus Christ was *conceived by the Holy Ghost* and *born of the Virgin Mary*.

VERBUM SAT.

Letter of the Rev. Theophilus Browne to the Hereford Journal.

Congleton, July 22d, 1812.

SIR,

The inclosed address having been refused admittance into the Hereford Journal, I have to request that you will give it a place in your Repository.

I am, Sir,

Your's respectfully,

T. B.

To the Editor of the Hereford Journal.

SIR,

Whenever the public mind is in danger of being misled, whether designedly or by accident, it is the duty of every man to endeavour to prevent it as far as lies in his power. Error, though in many

cases it may be innocent, in a moral point of view, may yet in its actual results be greatly injurious, and where we have no cause to censure, we may see much to commiserate. Guilt, no doubt, is the most tremendous evil in the whole circle of things, but misfortune, though devoid of guilt, may yet be extremely pitiable. And he who will not assist in preserving the traveller in his right path, or in restoring him to it, when he has once deviated, merely because he did not lose his way from any criminal cause, will be justly esteemed to possess the feeblest sense of benevolence and humanity. Under this conviction, I have considered myself as bound in duty to request your insertion of a few observations explanatory of a paragraph which I noticed in your paper of the 17th of June. I will first transcribe the passage and then subjoin the comment.

"The sermon yesterday was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Watts, Vicar of Ledbury, from Acts xx. v. 20, 21. From this passage the preacher ably enforced the great duties of faith and repentance, noticed that a partial or spurious edition of the scriptures was circulating by the Deists and those who deny the Divinity of our Saviour, and urged his brethren to increased vigilance in the discharge of their duties, at a period when a laxity of morals too generally prevailed in all classes of society." Now, Sir, it is at first sight exceedingly improbable that Deists should take the trouble of circulating any edition whatever of the scriptures. They say there neither are nor ever were any scriptures, i. e. records containing communications to mankind by inspiration or a divine afflatus. They deny all revelation from heaven, and believe that God is to be known only by the marks and signs of his existence exhibited in the works of the creation. Hence they are called Deists, or simply believers in God, not in his Word. And the circulation of an edition of the scriptures, by them antecedently so improbable in itself, the public may be assured has never taken place. But it seems to be insinuated that those Christians who deny the Divinity of our Saviour, are of the same stamp as Deists, and that they are not worthy of being placed in a higher class. The Unitarians, however, who freely and unreservedly deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ, if by Divinity is meant the Divine nature or Godhead of Jesus Christ, most solemnly protest against being classed with Deists. So far from disbelieving the revealed writings, it is their most anxious study and desire, to clear them from all foreign additions and admixtures, and to present them to their brethren in their fairest and purest form. *They* have, it is most true, circulated an edition of the Christian scriptures and they rejoice in their labours, but they with one voice assert that so far from being either a partial or a spurious edition, it is not only an impartial and genuine, but an improved edition, and so far improved that however imperfect (for they have never laid claim to perfection) it is yet the most improved and the most correct and just to the original of any edition that has ever been published. As the discussion of this point would far exceed the limits of your Journal, the Unitarians can only say, that

they are ready at any time to meet their orthodox brethren, even the most exalted and learned of them, in the open field of controversy, and there discuss their pretensions, upon the common and allowed principles of legitimate criticism. If the orthodox imagine that the Unitarians circulated their edition of the Christian scriptures, with any, the most distant intention to aid the cause of Deism, they are involved in the grossest error that ever men were. The greatest enemies of the religion of Jesus never accused the primitive Christians with less reason of being promoters of Atheism. That the clergy should use increased vigilance in the discharge of their duties, Mr. Watts cannot wish more heartily and ardently than the Unitarians do, and, of course, they feel themselves jealous, lest an impression should be made on the public mind of its being intimated that they are accessary to that laxity of morals which too generally prevails in all classes of society. If any man of fair character and good understanding, after deliberately and dispassionately reading the edition of the Christian scriptures which they have published, will venture to affirm that it has any tendency to promote a laxity of morals, they will acknowledge that verdict just, which condemns them to eternal shame and infamy. The Unitarians have the cause of truth and good morals most deeply at heart, and they are fully sensible of the awful responsibility under which they act. The clergy, therefore, should not hastily condemn them, lest, as Gamaliel told the Jewish Sanhedrim, they should lay themselves open to the merited but most severe censure even of contending against God.

T. B.

On the Correspondence between Lord Stanhope and Mr. W. Smith.

SIR, *August* 2, 1812.

You have, very properly, copied the late correspondence, in the public prints, between two senators, well-known to the friends of civil and religious liberty. One cannot help regretting that such a correspondence should exist. Yet, when once in the world, justice to the parties requires that it be preserved *entire*, so that neither may be injured by an opinion formed from accidentally meeting with detached passages. On the merits of the dispute I am little disposed, and as ill prepared to decide. In the ardour of earlier years, I have frequently accompanied both the disputants, through *evil report and good report*, in pursuit of *reform*, and now, reclining in my elbow-chair, I exclaim with the *umpire*, among Virgil's shepherds,

Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites,

or, as faithful *Trapp* translates,

'Tis not in me this contest to decide.

The difference between these correspondents appears to have arisen chiefly from their different manner of proportioning, for their own use, the two ingredients which compose an invaluable mental *viaticum* for public men, exerting themselves in pursuit of public good. These ingredients you will guess to be *courage* and *conduct*, or *fortiter in*

re—suaviter in modo. Give me leave here to quote an old book, on *Reformers*, in other times, which this correspondence, and the *Bill*, with the speech introducing it, brought to my recollection. I refer to the *Divine Dialogues*, first published in 1668, and long since attributed to Dr. Henry More. One of the speakers in Dial. vi. No 25, thus characterizes *Luther*.

"Though he might not be allowed to be the *Elias, the conductor and chariot of Israel*, as some have styled him; yet I think, at least, he might be accounted a faithful postilion in that chariot, who was well accoutred with his wax boots, oiled coat and hood, and who turned the horses', noses into a direct way from *Babylon* toward the city of God, and held on in a good round trot through thick and thin, not caring to bespatter others, in this high jogg, as he himself was finely bespattered from others.—The word of God then it was, hid like a precious cabinet, and sunk in that *Augeæ stabulum*, the overflowing corruptions and down-bearing tyrannies of the Church of *Rome*, which that noble hero *Luther*, like another *Hercules*, by removing the filth, was to bring into the sight of the world again. And would you then have had him and his fellow-labourers not such as they were, but such pure, spruce gentlemen, in white *Spanish* leather pumps, in clean linen stockings and holland doublets, with all other correspondent elegancy and unexceptionable neatness? And in this pure and splendid plight to have taken into hand their shovels, wheel-barrows and muck-forks to rid away this stinking dunghill."—Divine Dial. 2d. ed. 1713, pp. 483, 4.

You and your readers, Mr. Editor, will not fail to make the application of these passages designed by

PLEBEIUS.

Mr. Grundy's Defence of his Statement of Unitarianism in America.

To the Rev. Francis Parkman, of Boston, Massachusetts.

Manchester, July 29th, 1812.

REV. SIR,

Immediately on the appearance of the latter part of your letter, [See Monthly Repository, present (viith) Vol. pp. 198 and 264.] I wrote to our friend, Mr. T. of Liverpool, who had communicated to me the information of Mr. L. and his own remarks. Mr. T. was then in London, where he was detained ten weeks, in attendance upon the Houses of Lords and Commons, on the inquiry into the orders in council. On his return he wrote, dated July 8th, 1812. I make the following extract from his letter and one enclosed from Mr. H.

"Being desirous, when I had first the pleasure to hear from you, to procure for you more full and complete information than I possessed myself, I waited upon my friend Mr. N. L. who had resided a longer time in Boston, and I procured from him the statement which I enclosed to you. I regret that *his return to America* has prevented me from shewing him your later communications."

"The account," says Mr. H. "which Mr. T. transmitted to you, and which has occasioned F. F's remarks, was drawn up by

a gentleman who had *recently* been in Boston, and thought himself *fully qualified* to give an account of Unitarianism in that place. *I* have reason to believe that, in the opinion of *several gentlemen* who have resided in Boston, *Anti-trinitarianism* is more prevalent there than Mr. P. seems to be aware of."

In consequence, therefore, of the absence of Mr. L. I can only make a few general remaks on the statement in your letter.

One observation, Sir, naturally occurs as applicable to the whole; that you have taken up the question on a totally different ground from that laid down in the statement. Allow me to lay before you the passage to which the note you have criticised is appended. "Since we must have some discriminating appellation, would that we could unite in the use of one term, so defined as to include us all, the term *Unitarian*: *Unitarian* in contra-distinction from *Trinitarian*, and referring *solely* to the *object* of religious adoration. A Trinitarian worships one God with *three* Persons. An Unitarian worships One *Undivided* God. The term, thus defined, would include us all, whether believing the *pre-existence* or the simple *humanity* of Jesus Christ."

After this definition, Sir, judge of my surprise at reading in your letter, the following passage. "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." To the readers of these two passages, Sir, it must be evident that we have no common ground. *One* thing is asserted by my friend, *another* is denied by you. I am inclined to think, that, after a little explanation, you will be found much nearer to each other than, at first sight, you appear to be.

There is another ground which you have taken, my good Sir, of which, in behalf of my absent friend, I must complain. His statement is the following;—that "a gentleman of much talent and very high celebrity in America, in speaking on this subject to the writer of this article, (Mr. L.) said that he did not think there were two persons in Boston who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. This assertion," continues Mr. L. "though it *cannot be intended to be literally understood*, may serve to shew the great *prevalence* of Unitarianism."

The most determined opponents in argument, contending only for victory, allow their adversary the right of giving his own definition. Was it then candid, in an advocate for Christian truth, to build an argument upon the literal interpretation of a hyperbolical expression, [not used by my friend, but by another gentleman,] when he explains at the same time, the

* The term used in the note quoted is *Humanitarians*.

sense in which he wished it to be understood?

Now, Sir, keeping in mind the extensive meaning of the term Unitarian, before assigned; keeping in mind my own friend's explanation of the language used by another, which we are, in candour, bound to do; allow me to take a brief survey of your statement, and see how far it is really contradictory to that in the note.

You say, there "are twenty-one places of public-worship" in Boston. In summing up, you remark "you see that of our twenty-one churches there are seven, at least, that are Calvinistic or Trinitarian." Now if there be only seven Trinitarian, it must follow that the *remaining* fourteen are, in the sense before explained, Unitarian. What should we think, if such were the case in any town in Great Britain of 35,000 inhabitants? Should we be much inclined to quarrel with, or very minutely to criticise, an expression similar to that in the note, so used and *so explained?*

You proceed to give a detailed account of the ten congregational churches; of the ministers of which, you say, *two* are very decided Calvinists." And really, Sir, from your own statement, I must infer that the other eight are, *in the sense before assigned*, (for to this we must still revert,) Unitarians. Now what is my friend's statement in the note? "Out of *nine* congregational ministers in this town, *eight* are either Arians or Humanitarians!?

In justice to myself and my friend, I ought not to omit a remark or two, upon some passages in your letter, which, I think you yourself will wish, had been different. Your substitution of the term "Unitarian" for "Humanitarian" has already been noticed. Speaking of Dr. Kirkland, the term "a professed Unitarian," is changed by you into "an *acknowledged* defender of Unitarianism." The statement, that "it *appeared* at an annual meeting, that 100 ministers *declared* themselves converts," is first changed by you into their *becoming* converts in *one day*, and then made "a miracle," and "a new day of Penticost." After quoting my *friend's* words, (though with the omission of "it appeared,") you assert that "*I* candidly acknowledge the doctrine to be *new*." When such alterations as these are *designedly* made, a disputant appears more like a quibbling lawyer, straining to gain a point, than like a Christian minister, advocating the cause of truth. I really do not mean to impute to you this wilful perversion, believing that you were carried away by the warmth of your feelings, but the effect upon others is the same.

The following passage in your letter, conveys to the reader an idea, that you wish to represent Dr. Freeman, as *not* being an Unitarian, yet closes with an acknowledgment, that he is. "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."

To your triumphant conclusion

I allude only to remind you that such expressions contain no argument, and are calculated to excite unchristian feelings, both in the writer and in the reader.

The result of the comparison, between your statement and that of the gentleman whom I have had the pleasure of meeting in Liverpool, is, in my own mind, a strong confirmation of the opinion which forms the substance of the note you have criticised: that if "the minds of men were left unfettered, unawed by threats, unallured by temptations," the worship of the One God the Father would be greatly increased. That it has greatly increased in Boston, though there may be various opinions, as to the *extent* of the increase.

I cannot conclude without taking the liberty of asking you one or two questions. Am I mistaken in the opinion I have formed, that you, in the sense so often referred to, are *yourself* an Unitarian? I ask this question, because it appears to me so astonishing that, if you are a Trinitarian you should not have preached Trinitarianism any of the times you officiated in the chapel, where the sermon, which has caused your animadversions, was delivered. When a division of the Deity, into different persons, is *never* taught in the sermon; when One Supreme Undivided Being is the *sole* object of prayer, that I call Unitarian preaching, this I call Unitarian worship.

Does your letter profess to give an account of the *present* state of Unitarianism in Boston? Or was it written after an absence of *two* years, spent principally in travels on the continent?

And does your letter merely contain your view of the subject, as a *student* at College? or is it the result of your observations, since you became a stated minister of the gospel?

As I am sure my wish is to obtain an accurate statement, if, now, on your return to Boston you will have the goodness to favour us with an account of the present state of Unitarianism, in its enlarged sense, I think you will gratify many readers of the Repository, and you will confer an obligation on

Your respectful
and obedient Servant,
J. GRUNDY.

Burning a Sinner.

Hampton, July 1, 1812.

SIR,

Travelling lately in Lincolnshire, I heard, upon unquestionable authority, a story which I think ought to be known to the public.

In that county a sect prevails, known by the name of *Baptists of the New Connection*: on enquiry, I found that they were Arminians, and differed from the Wesleyan Methodists only in the article of Baptism, in the independence of their churches, and in a more zealous concern for the doctrine of everlasting torments.

A teacher of this sect, who is also a farmer, had taken a poor lad, a relative, into his house, as a servant. The lad committed some fault, for which probably he deserved chastisement. He was brought before his master and mistress, and lectured upon the wrath of God and endless burnings. Not seeming to enter into the sub-

ject readily, the following plan of making him feel was adopted: a lighted candle was procured, and one of this religious couple held down one of the boy's hands, whilst the other applied the flame to it! The experiment was continued, I suppose, till it appeared to have answered the purpose. The boy was afterwards seen by his neighbours with his hand tied up; this led to inquiry; the fact came out; it even reached the neighbouring magistrates; no legal steps were taken; but a general indignation was excited in the neighbourhood.

This indignation is the best security against such atrocities; and therefore I venture to communicate the story to you and your readers. Unless the depraved perpetrators of such a deed were taught their error, by the expressed abhorrence of society, who could tell how high the gloomy spirit of fanaticism might arise, and whether it might not become a popular practice to *burn the body for the good of the soul.*

I am not disposed to charge upon a sect the misdemeanour of one of its teachers; but surely the leaders of the denomination should make some disavowal of such a method of conversion. My informant (whose name I can give up if required,) told me that this sect boast of a recent *revival*, (as their phrase is); I replied that I hoped, whatever might be the case in another world, no proselytists would be allowed in this world *to save men so as by fire.*

Your's

ROBERT BROOKE.

Lord Sidmouth and the Dissenters.

SIR,

I congratulate you and your readers upon the passing of the New Toleration Act, which I regard as the most important legislative measure, next to the Act for abolishing the traffic in slaves, that has been carried in the present century. For this Act we are indebted to Lord Sidmouth; he first united the Dissenters, and next alarmed the magistrates, and hurried them into constructions of the Acts of Toleration that could not be maintained, consistently with the Dissenters' security, and this again led them to united efforts which have been crowned by a most wise and beneficent law.

It is now useless to discuss Lord Sidmouth's merits as a legislator in religion, in any other light than as a question of history, but in this view it is not unimportant to have the matter rightly understood.

The Dissenters have been complained of and reproached for mistaking and misrepresenting Lord Sidmouth's Bill; he meant, it is said, to improve their condition. Unfortunately for his advocates, his Lordship did not remain silent in the discussions on the new Act, but revealed what his apologists have denied, that his original and still prevailing desire was to curb the Dissenters and to break down the constitution of their churches. I find him in the Newspaper reports of the proceedings in the House of Lords, July 23*d*, objecting to the repeal of the Conventicle Act; and foretelling lamentable abuses from the proposed extension of civil immunities. "He lamented, particularly,

that by this Bill no qualification was required from preachers or teachers, but that all persons, whatever might be their ignorance or their moral character, might, on their taking the oaths, be preachers and teachers. He thought that some qualification ought to be required before they were allowed to preach or teach, instead of their being self-elected and self-appointed, as they would be under this Bill."—His Lordship, then, would have established by law, (to use his own words,) "some test of qualification," as to the *learning* and the *character* of Dissenting teachers. Such a test would necessarily have thrown great powers into the hands of the magistrates, that is, of the clergy, who swarm upon the bench and influence all its decisions; and under such a new power, what would have been the condition of Dissenters? But suppose the Test not to have had this effect; it must have been exercised by some individuals or some body of individuals: and these, whoever they might have been, would have had the real nomination of Dissenting ministers, in violation of the independence of the nonconformist churches. If a church should have chosen a minister for whom the certificate of qualification could not have been obtained, they must have foregone their election or must have had a teacher subject to direct legal penalties. The certificate might, indeed, have been required only of the congregation choosing and appointing a teacher, but this would not have answered the professed purpose of securing his competent learning and good character; for with regard to settled teachers no alteration would have been effected by this enactment; they who are now content to hear or support a minister, would in that case have signed his test; the only good of the regulation would have been its troubling and puzzling the poorer Dissenting congregations.

The test for students, supernumerary preachers, &c. must have been obtained (if obtained at all) from ministers in the same connection as the applicants; and it would have depended upon a synod appointed by law, not by the Christian people, whether young men aspiring to the pulpit should be kept down or brought forward.

On this plan, a teacher of a doctrine not already professed amongst the Dissenters could not have risen up; and if a country gentleman, led by his studies into a different faith from that of all his neighbours and acquaintance, should have established worship in his house, and invited more than five persons besides his family (the regulation of Lord Sidmouth's favourite Conventicle Act,) to join his devotions, he might have been indicted for a misdemeanour: he would have had neither congregation nor connection to give him a passport to the pulpit and to save him from prosecution.

Whether dissenting ministers might not be improved in point of learning and character, is a question which Lord Sidmouth may fairly discuss, if he pleases; but it is the height of absurdity to think that an act of Parliament would have made them either learned or moral. In point of virtue, it is a fact notorious as the

sun at noon-day, that ministers among the Dissenters yield to no clergy whatever; and as to the rest, it is the vital principle of the Dissenters to choose their teachers, of whose fitness they are the sole judges. To take this liberty out of their hands is to unmake them.

If Lord Sidmouth had prevailed, what would have been the event with respect to uncertificated teachers, with whom the land would, judging from all history, have still abounded? The goals would have been filled with them! And yet we have been rebuked for asserting that the Toleration was in danger, and charged with calumny in representing Lord Sidmouth's as a persecuting measure.

The first lesson of a good education is to teach us to call things by their right names; and I must ever reckon it a strange and mischievous blunder to rank in the same class the Sidmouths (if more than one of the species can be found) and the Erskines, Stanhopes and Hollands of the age.

VINDEX.

Lord Sidmouth and the Dissenters.

SIR, *July* 25, 1812.

I perceive by the report of the proceedings in the House of Lords yesterday, that a Noble Lord, whose lucubrations on the Toleration Act, attracted no small notice during the last year, is again generously anxious for the reputation of non-conformist teachers; perhaps grateful for the compliments he has received from eminent individuals of that body. His lordship still contends that a preacher should be obliged to procure testimonials. These are not to satisfy his hearers, but the state, which bestows upon him the boon of religious toleration, for religious *liberty* has not yet a chapter among the laws of England.

This Noble Lord was once Speaker of the House of Commons. In that capacity he had few opportunities of discussing legislative measures. He has, however, recorded the true character of his professed liberality and regard for public morals, on a great occasion. I have now before me "The Debate on a Motion for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, in the House of Commons, 2d April 1792, reported in detail by Woodfall." In that debate the late Lord Melville proposed his scheme of *gradual* abolition. He was powerfully supported by Mr. Addington, who, like Mr. Dundas, professed abhorrence "of the Slave *Trade*, as it was called, though," he added, "*it certainly did not deserve that name.*" Mr. A. then suggested that this trade might be "permitted to exist for a few years longer, possibly eight, ten, or twelve," and in the mean time recommended *a greater encouragement to the importation of females than males, by means of a bounty on the former, or by subjecting the latter to a heavier duty.* (P. 113.)

Thus *humanely* this curator of public morals would have legislated for the most helpless portion of a race more powerless than even the *pig-drivers* and *chimney-sweepers* whom Lord Sidmouth would have consigned to silence.

This proposal by Mr. Addington was thus well appreciated by Mr. Fox in the same debate.

"I will suppose, if you please, that the West India Islands are likely to want slaves, on account of the disproportion of the sexes. How is this to be cured? A right honourable gentleman proposes a bounty on an importation of females, or, in other words, he proposes to make up this deficiency by offering a premium to any crew of unprincipled and savage ruffians, who will attack and carry off any of the females of Africa! *A bounty from the Parliament of Britain* that shall make the fortune of any man or set of men, who shall kidnap or steal any unfortunate females from that continent! Who shall bring them over as slaves, in order that they may be used for breeding slaves! Who shall kill their husbands, fathers, or relations, or shall instigate any others to kill them, in order that these females may be procured! I should like to see the right honourable gentleman *bring up* such a clause. I should like to see how his clause would be worded. I could like to know who would be the man who would dare to pen such a clause." (P. 116.)

Our *moral* legislator, unabashed by so forcible an appeal to his justice and humanity, appears to have adhered to his proposal, like Shakespeare's Jew to his *pound of flesh*, for thus says Mr. Addington to explain, *I mentioned certainly, that I thought a duty might be laid on imported negroes, which should be lighter on the females than on the males. I admit this must operate in effect as a bounty on the women imported.* (P. 136.)

We are reminded, on the highest authority among Christians, that *of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramblebush gather they grapes.* No more can they fairly expect a legislative measure of unqualified justice or liberality from such a senator as my quotations of his own language have described. *Ex uno disce omnia.* The noble lord, I scarcely know why, has been sometimes named *the Doctor.* Depend upon it, Mr. Editor, as we have observed in the composition of Mr. Addington's *specific* for that desolating *plague* the slave trade, so in his lordship's *panacea* for religious ills, there will always be found some deleterious ingredient to corrupt its *savour*, like *dead flies in the ointment of the apothecary*,

GOGMAGOG JUNIOR.

Letters to a Student.

LETTER V.

DEAR EUGENIUS,

You have, probably, expected that before this I should have offered some remarks on a study to which you are professedly devoted, I mean theology. But I have purposely waved to mention it with the other parts of learning, not only because it is an object of peculiar importance and dignity, and is to engage your chief attention, but because the first years of an academical life will be most properly and advantageously occupied in other branches of learning. Theological questions have been so obscured by polemics, that it is expedient to postpone the investigation of them, till the faculties have been opened and enlarged, a habit of close attention has been formed, and materials and principles, by which to

draw a just conclusion, have been laid up in the mind by preparatory sciences.

There is, however, a species of reading connected with the study of theology, which will, pertinently and beneficially, accompany your scientific pursuits. This is the perusal of the scriptures in their original languages; and it is highly desirable that you should devote some portion of every day to this; for it will improve your acquaintance with those languages, furnish the mind with a rich variety of scriptural ideas and sentiments, familiarize to you the idiom and phraseology of the sacred writers, and qualify you to judge with more accuracy and readiness of the verdict which they give on the questions in divinity, concerning which they will, hereafter, be appealed to as decided witnesses. This reading is also, in a practical view, useful, as it is in a critical one, very serviceable. There are also other books in divinity, which may be occasionally mingled with literary and scientific attainments: and which will enlarge your stock of ideas, expand your mind, and leave on your heart the best impressions. Of this class are such as treat of the history of religion, the evidences of revelation, and the morality of the gospel.

But the theology which I wish to have kept out of sight, till you have gone at least through half your academical course, is the discussion of those points on which the Christian world has been so much divided: on which, however, every Christian, as far as he has ability and time, and certainly every minister ought to have an opinion of his own. The honour, nay, the efficacy, of revelation is materially concerned in our acquiring just and liberal notions on these points. It can admit of no dispute, that they whose province it is to teach religion ought to understand it with accuracy and in its full extent. It may not be necessary for them at once to make up their minds on every question which has been altercated among divines. But they ought to seek the truth with fairness and diligence; and whatever points come before them, they should gain clear ideas and come to a rational conclusion on them: a conclusion, not the offspring of prejudice, but the effect of conviction.

I congratulate you, my friend, that you are in a situation most favourable to this end. In the first place, your mind is not shackled and tied down by subscription to a prescribed system; you are not called upon to express a decision before you have formed a judgment upon questions; you are not obliged to take a side before you have heard the merits of a cause. I pity the youth in some celebrated seminaries, who are by previous subscriptions made slaves to a creed; who, instead of being conducted free and unbiassed into the temple of truth, are only initiated into the mysteries of a particular church. You feel yourself at liberty: placed in a seminary where you will be invited and encouraged to inquire; the managers and tutors of which will neglect no means of making you and your fellow-students not only good scholars and enlightened philosophers, but honest and candid believers. "The best way," to

adopt the words of an excellent man and writer, "of attaching men to true principles is to enable them to examine impartially all principles. Every truth that is necessary to be believed and really *sacred* must be attended with the clearest evidence. Free inquiry can be hostile to nothing but absurdity and bigotry. It is only falsehood and delusion which fly from discussion and skulk in darkness."*

Inquire then freely; inquire impartially. Let truth be your only object; search after it with diligence and constancy. In the search after truth, do justice to every sentiment, by calmly hearing, though it militate against your preconceived opinions, the evidence advanced in its support. Let not prejudices against particular parties and denominations of Christians be a bar, as opportunity offers, against the investigation of their tenets and practices. Good sense, learning, and moral worth, are not peculiar to any party, and these will entitle a man to a candid hearing, though his ideas (on some points, and at the first mention) should appear to be fanciful and absurd. It is not to be expected indeed, that in your academical course, you should be able to command time for the examination of every system, much less for the discussion of every question which has been controverted among Christians. The course of lectures on which you will attend, will guide the method of your inquiries; and it may be sufficient, without anticipating subjects, to wait for them as they arise, and to consider them as they come before you; remembering, that the conclusion to which you may at present come upon particular points, is not to be regarded as your last judgment; from which you will never depart. New evidence on one side or the other may hereafter offer to demand your attention; and, probably, overbalance that which at first search determined you one way. The mind should ever be kept open to conviction.

With this reserve, it is exceedingly proper, that you should endeavour to make up your mind on some subjects, before you appear in a public character. Should you ask, what are these subjects? I reply, such as relate to the object of worship, and the principles that will most frequently recur in your discourses, and form the grounds of your practical addresses; and to these may be added the positive institutions of Christianity; because they will be continually coming into exercise.

The field of controversy is wide and thickly set with thorns and briars; but the liberality of later times has, to a great degree, removed the obstructions to our traversing it with ease and pleasure. Questions in theology are simplified, stripped of the scholastic forms under which they formerly appeared, and treated with more fair discussion, moderation, and candour. Much has been done towards bringing every point into full view, and referring it to a decisive tribunal, by a critical investigation of the sense of scripture; and by such treatises as have professedly brought together and closely examined the sense of the

* Price's Sermon for a new Academical Institution, p. 46.

texts, which have been supposed to hold forth a particular doctrine.*

This method is a good one, and has its advantages. But there is still a better method to obtain satisfaction concerning the doctrines of Christianity, and that is, to have recourse to the Scriptures themselves in the first place, and to study them according to the order in which the writers composed them. The great and good Dr. Jebb has furnished an excellent plan of this mode of study, as it concerns, particularly, the four Gospels. Should it not enter into the course of the divinity lectures which you will receive, you will do well to pursue it in your private studies.

The reflections of this admirable man merit your close regard: I will give them to you. "The inquirer into the credenda contained in the Gospels, resembles the inquirer into the fundamental laws of nature, before a better philosophy had taught us the vanity of systems, and inclined us to adopt the humble process of experiment.

"We begin our researches in theology with the assumption of a certain set of religious tenets, and frequently employ the most valuable of those hours which we destine to sacred study, in collecting arguments in their favour, and in vain endeavours to explain them; while every text of scripture is, in its turn, perverted from its obvious meaning, in order to support them.

"How much more reasonable, previously to investigate, with patience and critical attention, the sense of each particular text or passage, in the natural order of the writer, and to defer the formation of opinion, until, like a principle of sound philosophy, suggested by a numerous train of experiments, it forces itself with accumulated evidence on the yielding mind!

"It is solely owing to the preposterous method of enquiry above described, that the holy records of our faith have, very injuriously, been supposed to be so loosely worded, as in effect to countenance opposite opinions and to justify the most fantastic doctrines.

"But let us for a moment reflect, and let the reflection teach us wisdom, that the same phenomena of nature which were brought in evidence of the figments of remote antiquity were also applied to support the equally vain hypotheses of more modern times. The laws of the material world, in consequence of the introduction of a better method of investigation, are, however, now demonstrated to be consistent, simple, and invariable, affording a just and easy explication of every natural appearance. If a similar process be observed, success may reasonably be expected to be our reward, when we ex-

* Such are Dr. Clarke's "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity:" Dr. John Taylor's "Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin:" "Bishop Law's Examination of all the Texts where the words, "Soul or "Spirit," occur in the "Appendix to the Considerations on the Theory of Religion:" "Edwards' Doctrine of Irresistible Grace:" Dr. Sykes' "Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ:" Foot's "Letters on Baptism:" "Dr. Carpenter's "Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel," and Mr. Belsham's "Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ."

plore the sacred sources of religious truth."

These hints are, certainly, suggested with peculiar force and propriety to you, Eugenius, as you are destined to the character of a Christian minister; but were you designed for any other profession, I should still be inclined to urge them upon you, for religious truth is the concern of every man. It is reported concerning Sir John Pringle, that "he was too great a lover of truth not to make religion the object of his serious enquiry." It must be felt to be a just object of great attention, on the least calm reflection, by every one who believes the truth of the Gospel. If God have revealed his will to mankind, it must be our duty to study it and to conform to it; and the examination of controverted questions, on account of the long and wide prevalence of particular systems, becomes necessary for the establishment of scriptural truth. Though it be admitted, that "nothing is very important except an honest mind; nothing fundamental except righteous practice, and a sincere desire to know and do the will of God;"* yet the profession of religion must be considered as subject to the laws of integrity, as are the intercourses of civil and social life: and the knowledge of God comprehends an acquaintance with the principles which he has revealed for our instruction, and the ceremonial which he has required, as well as with the precepts of relative and personal virtue, that have the sanction of revelation. That desire to know and do the will of God, which is partial and limited, cannot be sincere; and, though just and correct ideas on all speculative points may not be necessary to individual salvation, yet they are essentially necessary, that Christianity may display its excellence with purity, and act on mankind with full energy. They are essential to the improving illumination of the world, and to its advancement to that perfection of knowledge and practice, to which prophecy instructs us to look forward with expectation and hope. It is, on these principles, the duty of all, it is the duty of each person for himself and according to his ability and opportunities, to enquire into the will of God, as revealed in the scriptures.

It is a material consideration here, that such enquiry can scarcely be pursued with the temper now recommended, without improving the moral character: without forming and strengthening habits of candour, liberality and love of truth, which being exercised, at first, in the investigations of religious principles will extend and spread their influence through the whole life, and characterize the man as well as the controversalist. Especially will this be the effect, when all enquiries after divine truth are accompanied as they ought to be, and as every good undertaking ought to be, with humble, daily and fervent prayers to the great Source of illumination and truth; to "the only wise God, who giveth wisdom liberally and upbraideth not."

I am, &c.

* Dr. Price.

Dr. Priestley's Dying Sentiments.

SIR, *Aug.* 3, 1812.

Having seen an advertisement on the covers of your Repository, of "*Scrutator's Letter* on the consoling Influence of Unitarianism in a Dying Hour," I have been led to peruse that tract, but find myself disappointed by it. Though the author has given Messrs. Bogue and Bennet a deserved chastisement for their bigotry, I cannot think it is done in a manner adapted to answer any good end, either to them or their admirers; nor do I apprehend that the friends of Dr. Priestley will be much gratified with the writer's zealous defence of that distinguished character. I have always thought it a strange and unfortunate mode of expression, which the Dr. used in his last hours, with respect to Simpson's piece on the duration of future punishment, and am inclined to question whether it be correctly or fully reported: viz. that the belief of its temporary nature "had been a great support to him: that we shall meet finally, only we require different degrees of discipline," &c. The use which Bogue and Bennet have made of these expressions, (though natural enough to persous of their cast,) is highly unwarrantable and infamous, having inferred from hence, that the Dr. was sensible that he was going to hell, and all the comfort he had was, that his suffering there would not be eternal.

But how does Scrutator answer this injurious interpretation of the Dr.'s language? Strange to tell! by admitting the fact, that the Dr. thought himself going, (yea, that he is actually gone) into a state of punishment, but that his punishment will not be so severe or so lasting as that of greater sinners! See the writer's own words, page 11. "Is there no difference in the DEGREE of punishment which *in all probability will await the Doctor*, and that which shall be inflicted on the veriest wretch that died unpardoned?" What is this, but representing Dr. P. as holding the popish doctine of purgatory?

Though it is true he believed that those who live and die wicked will be purified and reformed by the sufferings of a future state, and that even the most abandoned of mankind will all be happy at last, (which I deem an error, though I do not think they will live in eternal torments,) I ask whether there is a passage in all the Dr.'s works, which countenances the idea, that the virtuous and pious will need *any* punishment in a future world to fit them for the heavenly felicity? I never met with any thing like it in his, or indeed any other Unitarian writings. Nor can I see any thing in the above expressions of the Dr. on his death bed, which any candid writer could interpret as implying his apprehension that he was going into a state of suffering. The utmost that I think can fairly be made of the unhappy expression respecting the comfort he had in believing a final restoration was, as it affected those who live and die in sin.

As to himself, though I materially differ from him in some points of doctrine, I have a better opinion of him than to think that he needed the "discipline" of a future world, and that what he suffered in this was abundantly

ly sufficient to fit him for the rest which remains for the people of God. That, I doubt not, was his own idea. His dying words appear to me to express a cheerful expectation of awakening from the sleep of death to an everlasting life. If any can doubt of this, I would refer them to the habitual state of his mind, expressed in several of his letters, written in the closing scenes of his life, which Mr. Belsham has annexed to his Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey. Some quotations from these would be edifying to your readers, and might convince Scrutator of his mistake: and I could almost hope they would cure Messrs. Bogue and Bennet of their bigotry; or, at least, make them ashamed of their gross reflections.

I remain
Respectfully yours,
H. P.

Mr. Harrison's Letter to the Quakers, on Mr. Wyvill's Petition.

SIR, *August* 10, 1812.

The following letter, from a most respectable member of the Society of Friends, appears to me well deserving a place in your Journal, and as I imagine most of your readers are unacquainted with the constitution of the body to whom it was addressed at so seasonable a time, and in so impressive a manner, however the ill-success of such an appeal is to be accounted for, I will give a brief account of its origin, &c.

In the year 1675, a time of very severe persecution, the Yearly Meeting in London appointed a Meeting to be held in that city, in order "to advise and assist in cases of suffering for conscience sake." It is composed of Friends under the name of correspondents residing in or near the city, who are chosen by the Quarterly Meetings in the several counties, out of a list of names selected by the *elders and overseers* of the several Monthly Meetings in London. These "elders and overseers are to meet together annually and make a list of such Friends' names, *as shall be by them approved for this service*, and leave the said list with the clerk of the Meeting for Sufferings, *for the information of the Friends in the country.*

The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to attend as occasions shall require. The names of all these correspondents previously to their being recorded as such, are submitted to the approbation of the Yearly Meeting. Such men as are approved ministers, wherever they may reside, are also members of the Meeting for Sufferings, which as a standing Committee of the Yearly Meeting is intrusted with "a general care of whatever may arise during the intervals of that meeting affecting the Society, and requiring immediate attention: particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to government."

Such is the constitution of the meeting which declined to take any part in opposing Lord Sidmouth's Bill, on the selfish plea that it did not contain any thing *which particularly affected Friends*, and on whom as a collective body Mr. Harrison's letter appears to have made no impression. How is such an apparent relinquishment of the generous feelings and

noble principles of their predecessors to be explained? Does this meeting, in so perseveringly forbearing to emulate their example, truly exhibit the general sense of the society they represent? I believe not, and may at some future time offer you my reasons for thinking so, provided no person better qualified should take up the subject. It ought to be understood whether such marked supineness is the real character of the Society, or only of those who are at present its representatives, chosen out of a list prepared as above mentioned by the elders and overseers of London, in secret conclave assembled.

AMICUS.

To the Meeting for Sufferings, to be held the 1st of 5th Month, 1812.

DEAR FRIENDS,

I do not wish to obtrude upon your attention a matter of slight moment, but there is a subject now before the Commons House of Parliament, and likely soon to come before the Upper House, by way of petition, which attaches most closely to the principles of the society, as they were zealously professed and acted upon by our ancient Friends. I mean the subject of universal toleration, or perfect liberty of conscience in matters of religion, for which our ancestors, almost exclusively among the people of these realms, and under the heaviest temporal discouragements, contended.

No Friend, acquainted with the statute books, will say, that there are not many acts trenching upon the rights of conscience, and formed in the times of darkness and bigotry, which ought not to exist in the code of a Christian country, and the force of which is only repressed by the leniency of the times; but whilst they do exist the monster of persecution may be rather said to be dormant than to be defunct.

Many Friends, doubtless, may be disposed to make their minds easy on the subject, if no new enactments affecting the society, and of an offensive nature take place; but such Friends must have read the history of the society with very little attention, if they have not perceived that our predecessors were zealously affected, not only for the interests of the society particularly, but also for the interests of Christianity generally, by being the undaunted advocates of religious liberty; and it is for such Friends to consider how far they are discharging their duty by confining their views to present ease and accommodation, at a juncture when the exertions of all those who are on the side of virtue and truth are peculiarly called for.

The worthy and respectable character who has taken the most active part in bringing this subject before the view of Parliament, I mean Christopher Wyvill, is anxious to obtain the co-operation of sincere-hearted Christians of every denomination, and from the known principles of the society, is willing to reckon upon that of Friends. In one of the communications lately received from him, he expresses himself thus: "Your predecessors in past times, were long the only avowed advocates for liberty of conscience in these countries. At least the honourable exceptions in other classes of

Christians were few indeed. Their doctrine, in this respect, is now avowed and pressed upon Parliament by Christians of every other denomination. It is not the time, I think, when your benevolent sect will perseveringly refuse their concurrence. Other considerations will give way to the sense of duty; and the example of our virtuous supporter of the rights of conscience, after a few equally virtuous, equally consistent friends, have joined him, will be followed by the rest of his Christian community."

What an honourable testimony is this, in these more enlightened times, to the principles and conduct of our ancient Friends. Such is the solicitude of this good man, that our society should not give away their crown, or desert the standard which our early Friends so consistently set up, and a corresponding solicitude attends my mind that his expectation may not be disappointed.

Having now relieved my mind, by discharging what I have conceived to be my duty on the subject in this department, a subject which I deem of higher moment to the civil and religious well-being of the inhabitants of this country, and of human society in general, than any thing that has engaged the public attention in modern times, I refer it to your serious and deliberate consideration, and in so doing I have no motive, I can have no motive but what respects universal good, to promote which is the sincere wish of your respectful friend,

GEORGE HARRISON.

West Hill, Wandsworth,

27th, 4th Month, 1812.

POETRY.

VERSES ON SEEING (p. 333.) THE "CONSOLATIONS OF UNIVERSAL RESTORATION," WRITTEN AT READING.

Midst scenes where zeal, by Calvin's lore inspir'd,
The Christian's God, in wrath, had long attir'd,
Wrath, ever-glowing o'er man's hapless race,
Save the predestin'd, favourite, sons of grace,
There wakes a lyre, nor meanly skilled to move
The gladsome strain celestial, *God is love.*

Distinguish'd Bard! to whom so early giv'n
To vindicate the high behests of Heav'n,
See love o'er guilt and woe triumphant rise,
And judgment just, but mercy in disguise;
Each path be thine to trace He whilom trod,
Prophet of Nazareth—approv'd of God;

His faith explore that *he who ran might read,*
Ere whelm'd in mystery's pedantic creed.
For lo! *the night far spent,* with influence bland,
Behold the promis'd *latter-day at hand,*
Again to illustrate Heav'n's eternal plan
To shew the Father, not the foe of man.

And, as thou roy'st by *Cam's* time-honour'd stream,
A *Newton's* haunt, a *Milton's* classic theme,
Of Learning, Science, the choice gifts be thine;
Yet humble offerings at Religion's shrine.
Clad in her panoply, nor fear to assail
The sceptic foe, or rend the mystic veil
By fraud and folly wrought, of various dies
That shrouds her form divine from vulgar eyes.
Thus shall thy manhood, grateful as thy youth,
Pay votive homage in the fane of truth,
Where erst they worshipp'd, *Cam's* enlighten'd sons
Nor envied mitred favourites of thrones:
With *Jebb,* with *Wakefield,* thus to enrol thy name,
A meed beyond *all Greek, all Roman fame.*

J. T. R.

STANZAS ON WAR. FROM LORD BYRON'S CHILDE HAROLD; A ROMAUNT.

By Heaven! it is a pleasant sight to see
(For one who hath no friend, no brother there,)
Their rival scarfs of mix'd embroidery,
Their various arms that glitter in the air!
What gallant war-hounds rouse them from their lair,
And gnash their fangs, loud yelling for their prey!
All join the chase, but few the triumph share;
The grave shall bear the chiefest prize away,
And havoc scarce for joy can number their array.

Three hosts combine to offer sacrifice;
Three tongues prefer strange orisons on high;
Three gaudy standards flout the pale blue skies,
The shouts are France, Spain, Albion, Victory!
The foe, the victim, and the fond ally
That fights for all, but ever fights in vain,
Are met—as if at home they could not die,—
To feed the crow on Talavera's plain,
And fertilize the field that each pretends to gain.

There shall they rot—Ambition's honour'd fools!
Yes, Honour decks the turf that wraps their clay!
Vain Sophistry! in these behold the tools,
The broken tools that tyrants cast away
By myriads, when they dare to pave their way
With human hearts—to what?—a dream alone.
Can despots compass aught that hails their sway?
Or call with truth one span of earth their own,
Save that wherein at last they crumble, bone by bone?

Oh Albuera! glorious field of grief!
As o'er thy plain the pilgrim prick'd his steed,
Who could foresee thee, in a space so brief
A scene where mingling foes should boast and bleed!
Peace to the perish'd! may the warrior's meed
And tears of triumph their reward prolong!
Till others fall where other chieftains lead
Thy name shall circle round the gaping throng;
And shine in worthless lays, the theme of transient song!

Enough of Battle's minions! let them play
Their game of lives, and barter breath for fame:
Fame that will scarce re-animate their clay,
Though thousands fall to deck some single name.
In sooth 'twere sad to thwart their noble aim
Who strike, blest hirelings! for their country's good,
And die, that living might have prov'd her shame;
Perish'd, perchance, in some domestic feud,
Or in a narrower sphere wild Rapine's path pursu'd.

ON SEEING A CHAPEL, FOR TRINITARIAN WORSHIP, ERECTED ON THE SITE OF A JEW'S MANSION.

Where Christians hymn, devout, *the Sacred Three*,
The Jew to *One Jehovah* bent the knee,
Yet stripp'd his honours from Messiah's brow;
These Deify the man, and, erring, bow.
Blest age, predicted, come! when all shall own
That Christ is *Lord*, and God, our Father, *One*.

IGNOTUS.

REVIEW.

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

POPE.

ART. I. *An Examination of Dr. Marsh's Inquiry relative to the British and Foreign Bible Society: In a Series of Letters to the Rev. E. D. Clarke, Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Cambridge, By the Rev. W. Dealtry, A. M. F. R. S. Fellow of Trinity College, and examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bristol.* London: printed for Hatchard and Co. 8vo. pp. 127. 1812.

ART. II. *The Speech of Thomas Lister, Esq. delivered in the County-hall in Stafford, April 8, 1812, as Chairman of a Meeting assembled for the Formation of an Auxiliary British and Foreign Bible Society, for the County of Stafford.* Stafford: printed for Longman and Co. London. 8vo. pp. 23. 1812.

We have great satisfaction in witnessing the controversy between Biblists and Antibiblists. Of the issue no doubt can be entertained: while the infinite importance of the Scriptures to the happiness of man, both here and hereafter, is placed in a stronger light, the most seasonable and essential service will be rendered, at the same time, to the cause of Protestantism. Protestants have long been inattentive to their grand and common principle: they have been much more zealous for their respective systems of discipline and doctrine, than in maintaining the consistency of their opposition to the Romish see. We do not mean to intimate that religious opinions are of trivial moment; but our wish is to furnish contending parties with a reason for reciprocal justice and forbearance. They who agree in acknowledging the sufficiency, the supreme authority and value, of the word of God, bring themselves under a solemn obligation to protect and esteem each other in their application, severally, of their characteristic tenet. None of them being infallible, none are to speak or act as though they urged the claim. Their duty is to abstain from injurious suspicions, from calumnious language, and to use no weapons, in their contests, except those of argument and love. Such is the tendency, such will, probably, be the effect, of the union of different denominations of Christians in the British and Foreign Bible Society. We hail, in this view, its progress and its triumphs: we rejoice in the discussion which it excites; and we are thankful that men of eminent ability employ their pens in attacking it, and that others of the same character are active in its defence. If its expediency is more than questioned by a *Marsh*, its plan and object are vindicated by a *Dealtry* and a *Lister*.

Those of our readers who are acquainted with the labours of the former of these two gentlemen in this noble cause, will find that his present publication is not, on

the whole, unworthy of his fame. They will here meet with considerable acuteness of reasoning, liveliness of style and felicity of illustration. Sometimes, indeed, they will wish that the author had been less caustic in animadverting on his opponent: and, assuredly, they will condemn his communication to the world of a circular letter of Dr. Marsh's, which has no relation to the topics in dispute. Perhaps, too, they will conjecture that the following delectable sentence is the composition not of Mr. Dealtry but of Bishop Horsley:

"Any one may hold all the theological opinions of Calvin, harsh and extravagant as some of them may seem, and yet be a sound member of the Church of England and Ireland; certainly a much sounder member than one who, loudly declaiming against those opinions, which, if they be erroneous, are not errors that affect the essence of our common faith, runs into all the nonsense, the impiety, the abominations, of the Arian, the Unitarian and the Pelagian heresies, denying in effect the Lord who bought them."

This decision is so much in the manner of the departed prelate that we suspect it to be *his*, and conclude that the usual marks of quotation have been inadvertently omitted. We have even a faint recollection of having seen the passage in one of his Charges: but as we have not his works before us, we are unable to verify the citation.

With the honest declaration of Mr. Dealtry concerning the Madras and the Lancasterian (or, as we would still call them, did fashion permit us, the *Lancastrian*) schools, we are extremely pleased. Being a minister of the Church of England, he is decidedly a friend to the instruction of the children of the poor in her catechism and liturgy: but he speaks with high approbation of the mechanism of Mr. Lancaster's system: he represents the facility with which churchmen may apply it to their own wants and views, nor aims at depriving the very meretorious framer of it of that public praise, to which he is unequivocally entitled.

Mr. Lister's speech is the address of a gentleman, a scholar and a Christian, and does the greatest credit to its author by the liberality of its spirit and the general soundness of its reasonings. If we differ from him as to the usefulness and expediency of civil establishments of religion, if we cannot deem his arguments on this point pertinent and valid, we heartily concur in his sentiments and advice with reference to the English hierarchy:

"It ill becomes that church which first set the noble example of asserting its freedom, to come loaded with chains and fetters to destroy the liberty of others. There is something in religious opinion, that spurns at all human controul, and perhaps for this reason, because, when sincere, it rises superior to all worldly considerations. It may be won, it may be converted by kindness and conciliation; but is never to be overcome, either by the language of resentment, or the frown of disdain. I will moreover add that no man, or body of men, ever so much evince their real superiority, they never so completely triumph, as when they make the first advances to friendship and cordiality; on a subject too where Christianity is so deeply concerned, this maxim becomes so imperative upon us, that I feel surprised that one angry or jealous feeling should ever have existed on the occasion.—The question then resolves itself to this; shall the established church, clothing itself in Pharisaical pride, standing upon points of speculative doctrine, shut the door of Christian peace for ever against all who dissent

from her opinions—or shall she, nobly and e altedly disregarding all petty distinctions viewing all the Christian wo ld with a feeling of maternal protection, unite with all the followers of Ch ist in the promotion of his holy word? Will the church venture to forego this only op, o tunity that may ever present itself of establishing between Christian and Christian the bond of perpetual peace?" (17, 18).*

Without introducing the name of Dr Marsh, Mr. Lister has replied satisfactorily to the chief of his objections. Two capital errors pervade the writings of the learned Professor on this subject: the one, that the churchman alone, and not the dissenter, makes a sacrifice in becoming a member of the Bible Society; the other, that Protestantism is a set of articles and doctrines, instead of being *the principle of separation from churches assuming to themselves infallibility and temporal authority*. It is owing to the former of these mistakes that within the United Kingdoms Dr. Marsh will not act with non-conformists as Fellow-Protestants; though he is not averse from co-operating with them in the distribution of the scriptures beyond our own shores! In consequence of the latter of his false impressions, he brands *generalized Protestantism* as something absurd and dangerous, notwithstanding that *Protestantism is always and every where the same principle*.

The Professor's exclamations against *generalized Protestantism*, have reminded us very forcibly of a pleasant and not uninstructive passage in a publication of Mr. Aspland's:

"Being at Soham (says the writer) one evening, I was accosted by one of the persons who (as will appear in the sequel) made a distinguished figure as one of Mr. Gisburne's opposers. He inquired if I could not get a congregation for Mr. Gisburne *some where London side*. Upon my asking, why he wished to get rid of a minister whom he had once highly extolled, he said, *Why, would you believe it? When one asks him, what are his sentiments? He says that he is not a Calvinist, nor an Arminian, nor a Socinian, but a Bible-Christian. A Bible-Christian! There's a fool for you!*"*

Could we believe, as Cardinal Ximenes is said to have believed, that men may become Christians without reading the scriptures, our zeal for the success of the Bible Society would at least be abated. Such, nevertheless, is not the fact; and such will not be the consequence. Of the themes which agitate the public mind none is nearly so interesting to us as the merits of this society. *These* will ultimately be established even by the hostile efforts of Dr. Marsh. "The triumphant flood shall roll with more ample wave and swifter current for the temporary delay occasioned by opposition."

N.

---

* To the same effect are some observations found in Six Brief (and we can add excellent) Letters, occasioned by the institution of an Auxiliary Bible Society at Chelmsford, March 23, 1812. See particularly pp. 6 and 25 of the second edition. Rev.

* Bigotry and Intolerance defeated, &c. By Robert Aspland, (The 1st Ed. p. 6, note). Rev.

ART. III. *A Serious Inquiry into the Nature and Effects of Modern Socinianism; being an*

Answer to the Question, Why are you not a Socinian? By J. Freeston. 8vo. pp. 56. Longman & Co. 1s. 6d. 1812.

There is a ludicrous solemnity in this farrago of ignorance, folly and uncharitableness. Mr. Freeston, who is we understand a minister in a small and obscure sect, sometimes known under the denomination of *Free-Grace-General Baptists*, assumes an air of infallibility; and, with a confidence that would become the papal chair, determines what is truth and what is error, who are holy and who are unholy. Knowing nothing, apparently, of Unitarians, but through the medium of the works of their adversaries, he does not hesitate to accuse them of every thing anti-christian; retailing the calumnies of such historians as Messrs. Bogue and Bennett, as if he really knew not that those writers have by their intemperateness and misrepresentations forfeited all claim to credit even with their own party.

With a vulgar illiberality, Mr. Freeston uses the term *Socinian*, though he acknowledges (*Note to Preface*) that it is not perfectly descriptive of the denomination of Christians to whom it is applied. It is however a reproachful term, and therefore suits the purpose of that class of writers, who, incapable of reasoning, have no alternative but silence or calumny.

Mr. Freeston has numbered his reasons for not being a *Socinian*; we shall give them in their numeral order.

"1. Because the Socinians depreciate the Bible;" i. e. they point out *mistranslations and interpolations* in the commonly received English text. Does this Christian teacher, then, believe in the inspiration of King James's translators? Has it not yet reached Hinckley that 1 John v. 7, 8, is a forgery? Does Mr. Freeston receive the *Apocrypha* as part of his Bible? If he does not, it would be amusing to the *Socinians* to learn his reasons for its rejection.

"2. Because the Socinians appear to idolize human reason:"—the precise reason a Roman Catholic gives for not being a Protestant. On what ground does Mr. Freeston, against the letter of scripture, deny transubstantiation?

"3. Because they degrade the person and character of Jesus Christ." This word *degrade* is convenient to the unfair adversaries of the Unitarians: it signifies to put a person in a lower rank than he has occupied or been supposed to occupy, and in this sense may undoubtedly be applied to those who protest against the opinion that Christ is God; but it generally signifies also an unfriendly, a hostile disposition on the part of those who reduce a person's rank, and in this sense is a foul calumny against the misnamed *Socinians*. They intend to honour Christ by representing him to be what he declared himself to be; and if their scriptural arguments be good, their opponents must acknowledge that they do honour to Christ.—Did it never occur to Mr. Freeston, that there is a possibility of degrading and dishonouring the *Holy One of Israel*, who is a jealous God, and whose glory he will not give to another?—Before our author assumed the office of accuser and judge, he should have been careful to study the matter in

question; but had he done so, he would have found that all Unitarians do not deny the 'miraculous conception,' much less 'declare Christ to have been fallible and peccable!'

"4. Because they reject his expiatory sacrifice, intercession, &c." i. e. they reject Mr. Freeston's interpretation of the word sacrifice, but they presume to think that they understand as well as he the meaning of the word, as applied to Christ in the New Testament, and in the true scriptural meaning, they gladly acknowledge the sacrifice of Christ. Mr. Freeston betrays a strange ignorance of their sentiments and writings in the assertion that 'they deny that there was any merit in the shedding of his blood.' His *et cetera* they do in all probability deny.

"5. Because the important doctrines of regeneration, justification, divine influence, &c. are rejected by them as enthusiastic." Here is another *&c.* which it is highly probable the Unitarians do not believe; but as to the important doctrines specified, they do hold them in the sense in which they believe they are taught in scripture, though they deny Mr. Freeston's sense of them as unscriptural, absurd and pernicious.

"6. Because I cannot see in what respects Jesus Christ is a saviour, upon their scheme, any more than the apostles were." But though invisible to Mr. Freeston, it may yet be made clear that the Unitarians distinguish Christ as honourably as they find him distinguished in the scriptures. The apostles have set Unitarians the example of considering death as the great enemy of mankind, and of ascribing the *victory* over this enemy *to God by Jesus Christ. He, the only begotten from the dead, by the power of his resurrection, hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light.* This was the great salvation effected by Christ, of which the apostles were witnesses and reporters. To them the Unitarian feels his gratitude and reverence to be due, but he does higher honour to their and his Lord, *to the glory of God the Father.*

"7. Because Jesus Christ is so little the subject of their public preaching, in which they so essentially differ from the practice of the apostles." Whence does Mr. Freeston derive his knowledge of the "public preaching" of the Unitarians? Assuredly, they do not preach Christ in his way, if he preach as unscripturally as he writes; but let him know that they do preach *Christ crucified*, which Trinitarians do not and cannot, and further that they make it their just boast that their mode of preaching Christ is as congenial, as that of the self-named orthodox is repulsive, to the plan of apostolic preaching.—Hard fate of 'Socinians!' If they keep back their doctrine, they do not preach Christ; if they bring it forward, they degrade him.

"8. Because they appear to lay another foundation for pardon and eternal life than what the scriptures recommend." Where does this appear? Unitarians lay no other basis of salvation than the love and mercy of God, revealed and confirmed by Christ. They plead guilty indeed to the charge of holding "repentance

and a good life" to be the indispensable conditions of salvation; but if this offend Mr. Freeston, he must bring his complaints against the apostles, from whom the Unitarians have learned to make the divine benevolence the procuring cause, and well-doing the necessary means of eternal life.

"9. Because I find the church on earth and the church in heaven, ascribe their salvation to the blood of the Redeemer." What does Mr. Freeston mean 'by the blood of the Redeemer,' more than his voluntary death, his offering up his life for the good of mankind! If more be meant, let it be explained:—if no more be meant, then it will appear a curious reason for not being a "Socinian," that the scriptures teach the favourite doctrine of the "Socinians," that salvation is by the death of Christ, connected, as it was in fact, and is in scripture, with his resurrection.

"10. Because, as far as I am able to judge, the Socinians, in general, are more curious, critical and speculative, than devotional, spiritual and practical." This is an odd charge, and the man had need to be well satisfied of his own Christian excellence who should presume to prefer it. *Curious*, indeed, the 'Socinians' are in matters of religion, for they are careful about truth; *critical* too they are, for they make it their practice to *search the scriptures*; and *speculative* they may be, for they look well to the tendencies and consequences of opinions before they embrace them; but that they are less *devotional* or *spiritual* or *practical* (as far as these words of Mr. Freeston's denote love to God, hope of heaven and the practice of virtue) than other Christians,—who shall dare to pronounce, unless he can read the heart and be authorized to mount the seat of judgment? Our author arrogates to himself this prerogative of heaven, and insinuates that "Socinians" are deficient in "spiritual-mindedness" and "morals," and asserts that they are "frequently fond of carnal pleasure." Such slander, which must proceed either from malignity or wilful ignorance, can call forth no other answer from Unitarians than their pity and their prayers. Let them however take care and not regard this mode of calumny as necessary to the reputed orthodox system; for we know many of its advocates who would abhor the use of such poisoned weapons, and who look on such auxiliaries as Mr. Freeston as the greatest foes to the cause which they are officious to serve.

"11. Because the Divine Being appears to withhold the sanction of his blessing from them, in that their ministry is not succeeded to the conversion of the ungodly." Let us here only express our admiration that a minister of the "New Connection of General Baptists" should set up numbers as a test of truth!

"12. Because the wisest and best, the most prayerful and holy men, as well as the most learned in all ages of the church, have held very different views of Christian doctrines, and rejected their's as dangerous errors." This reason we might suspect to be copied from a Roman Catholic Preservative against Protestantism, if we did not know that ignorance and presumption speak the same

language in all sects. How would Mr. Freeston reply to this argument in the mouth of a Catholic? He may "commit the guidance of his conscience to a Doddridge, a Hall;" but the Catholic has a *wiser* and *better*, a more *prayerful*, a *holier*, and more *learned* guide, — 'the holy Catholic church.'

"13. Because they who hold evangelical opinions are men after mine own heart, whose devotional views, tastes and habits are congenial to my own:" *q. d. I am not a Socinian, because I am not a Socinian.*

Mr. Freeston's reasons now run low, and the next is almost verbally the same as the 8th.

"14. Because, I dare not risk my salvation on the foundation on which they hope for eternal life."

"15. Because, I fear, I should find no rest for the soles of my feet, till I sunk into absolute Deism, and be finally lost." We shall astonish Mr. Freeston, probably, by informing him that the great champion of Christianity, whom even the reputed orthodox profess to revere, Dr. Lardner, was a "Socinian!"

Under this head, we find more bold calumny. The 'Socinians' are charged with 'considering the epistles of the apostles, as the writings of other men,' and 'their college at Hackney' is said to have been 'given up, because most of their students were infidels.'

"In fine," says Mr. Freeston, "the direct tendency of the Socinian scheme seems the very reverse of that of the holy scriptures:" and, in fine, we say that the spirit of such men as Mr. Freeston is diametrically opposite to the spirit of the gospel, which is the spirit of truth, of meekness, of diffidence, of candour, of love and of a sound mind.

ART. IV. *Imposition the Support of Religious Imposture and Heresy; and the Enemy of Revealed Truth.— A Sermon preached before the Congregation of Protestant Dissenters, at Harlow, Essex, By Benjamin Penn Severn.* 8vo. pp. 32. Jones, Newgate Street. 1s.

Harlow is memorable in the history of Dissent, for having been the seat of the *Synod*, (as Mr. Burke denominated it,) or, in plain language, of the Baptist Association, which approved and recommended the late Mr. Robinson's popular tract, *A Plan of Lectures on the Principles of Nonconformity.* It appears from this sermon that the village still retains the savour of Dissenting principles. At the request of his congregation, Mr. Severn has published one of the boldest defences of religious liberty that we ever remember to have read. We cordially recommend it to the notice of our readers, as a sample, we would fain believe, of the reasoning and language of a numerous, respectable and growing sect, the Particular Baptists, on the subject of the rights of conscience. There is a peculiarity in the preacher's manner, which is as entertaining as his arguments are convincing.

ART. V. *A Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism; By William Penn. With a Modern Sketch of Required Orthodoxy, and*

Real Intolerance, by Ratcliff Monthly Meeting. 8vo. pp. 60. Cradock and Joy. 1812.

By some unaccountable association of ideas we have been thinking, all the time we have employed upon this pamphlet, of the title of one of good Archbishop Tillotson's Sermons; viz. *The folly and wickedness of honouring dead saints and persecuting living ones.*

How dangerous a possession is spiritual power! In the hands of the magisterial Pharisee, the lordly, papistical prelate, and the 'plain Friend,' it is a certain, though not equal, instrument of oppression.

Here is an interesting record of 'the Ratcliff Monthly Meeting,' disowning Mr. Thomas Foster for simply 'aiding in propagating' the favourite principles of William Penn. The 'Minutes' of the meeting are given by the editor, and from these it appears that the charges brought and proceeded on by this Quaker Inquisition, were that T. F. *distributed* some remarks on the Quakers' Yearly Epistle, which appeared in the number of our work for October 1810; that he did not deny being the author of certain publications under the name of Verax, intended to prove that the early Friends were not Trinitarians; and that his name stands as a member of the Unitarian Book Society. The Editor has appended to the pamphlet the preamble to the Rules of the Unitarian Society, and the Remarks as they were published in this Magazine. Thus the reader is in possession of the case between Mr. Foster and the Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, and may judge for himself how far the excommunicating power exercised by that body is consistent with truth and freedom, with the principles of William Penn, and above all, with the doctrine and spirit of the New Testament.

But the greater part of the publication consists of a tract of William Penn's, less known by Quakers and others than its merits deserve. We shall give the whole title of it, with an extract or two, relating to its history, from the Editor's preface. Our end will be answered, if we excite our readers to procure, and to put into the hands of their neighbours, this excellent manual of Quaker-Unitarianism, in other words, of evangelical truth.

"The Sandy Foundation Shaken; or, those so generally believed and applauded Doctrines, of One God, subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons, the Impossibility of God's pardoning Sinners, without a plenary Satisfaction, the Justification of impure Persons by an imputative Righteousness, refuted, from the authority of Scripture Testimonies and right Reason. By William Penn, a Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved. But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity? He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy. Micah vii. 18. For I will not justify the wicked. Exod. xxiii. 7."

"The following justly celebrated Tract was first published by William Penn, in the year 1668, in London, and soon excited as much attention, that the author was committed to the Tower, by a warrant signed by Lord Arlington, the principal Secretary of State, on account of the offence it had given to some then at the helm of the church.'

"During Penn's imprisonment,

it appears he was kept 'under close confinement, and even denied the visits of his friends.' His biographer adds, 'But yet his enemies attained not their purpose; for when after some time his servant brought him word, that the Bishop of London (Dr. Henchman) was resolved he should either publicly recant, or die a prisoner, he made this reply: All is well; I wish they had told me so before, since the expecting of a release put a stop to some business. Thou mayest tell my father, who I know will ask thee, these words; that my prison shall be my grave, before I will budge a jot; for I owe my conscience to no mortal man; I have no need to fear. God will make amends for all. They are mistaken in me; I value not their threats nor resolutions; for they shall know I can weary out their malice and peevishness; and in me shall they alb behold a resolution above fear; conscience above cruelty; and a baffle put to all their designs, by the spirit of patience, the companion of all the tribulated flock of the blessed Jesus, who is the author and finisher of the faith that overcomes the world, yea, death and hell too. Neither great nor good things were ever attained without loss and hardships. He that would reap and not labour, must faint with the wind, and perish in disappointments; but an hair of my head shall not fall, without the Providence of my Father, that is over all.'

"During this close imprisonment, the loud and general clamours against him reached Penn's ears, or eyes, and induced him to write a small tract which he called an Apology for the former, not with an intention of recanting any of those doctrines, which he had so recently professed to lay down, on the immoveable foundations of scripture and right reason, but to clear himself from the aspersions cast upon him, for writing the Sandy Foundation Shaken.

"'In this Apology,' says his biographer, 'he so successfully vindicated himself, that soon after the publication of it, he was discharged from his imprisonment, which had been of about seven months continuance.' However quickly Penn's release followed the publication of this Apology, it seems, by his own account, to have had nothing to do with the cause of his liberation. His persecutors, although professed Protestants, were not to be so easily appeased. Nor was that work, favourable as it may be thought, to the Sabellian hypothesis, likely to produce such an effect. The high eulogium it contains on Socinus, not only on account of his 'parts, wisdom, gravity, and just behaviour,' but as having had, 'in many things, a clearer prospect' of religious truth, 'than most of his contemporaries,' would rather serve to inflame, than allay, the intolerant spirit of such men.

"That it was not to their indulgence Penn was indebted for his release, but to the laudable interposition of the Duke of York, afterwards James the Second, appears by a letter of Penn's, dated Oct. 24, 1688, to W. Popple, Esq. in reply to a most friendly epistle from him, in which Penn says, 'To this let me add the relation my father (that is, Admiral Penn, who died Sept. 16, 1670,) had to this king's service, his particular favour, in getting me released out of the Tower of London, in 1669, my father's humble request to him, upon his death-bed, to protect me from the inconvepiences and troubles my persuasion might expose me to, and his friendly promise to do it, and exact performance of it, from the moment I addressed myself to him.' See his Works, vol. i. p. 131 to 139, in which these interesting letters are inserted.

INTELLIGENCE.

Northern Unitarian Society.

The Annual Meeting of the NORTHERN and MIDLAND UNITARIAN MINISTERS was held at Chesterfield, on Wednesday the 1st of July, at the chapel of the Rev. T. Astley. The service commenced at eleven o'clock, when the Rev. E. Higginson, of Derby, conducted the devotional part; and the Rev. D. P. Davies, of Makeney, delivered a sermon on the subject of Toleration. After the service was concluded, the Secretary of the Northern and Midland Unitarian Book Society presented his accounts for the last year, which were audited by two gentlemen present; and it appeared that the Society's finances were in an improving and flourishing state. Mr. Davies was desired to continue in his office of secretary; several new works were voted into the catalogue; some new members admitted; and a few resolutions passed for the better conducting the society's affairs. It was resolved, that the next annual meeting of the ministers be held at Mansfield; when the Rev. E. Higginson is appointed to preach, and the Rev. T. O. Warwick, M. D. to conduct the devotional part of the service.

S.

Unitarian Chapel, Brighton.

On the 22d. July, 1812, was opened a Meeting-house for Unitarian Worship and public instruction, situate in Cumberland Street, Brighton, Sussex. Two Sermons were preached on the occasion by the Rev. R. Aspland: that in the morning from 1 Tim. iv. 3. on the Existence and Unity of God, and that in the evening, from Rom. xiv. 5, on Christian Liberty. The house was well filled both parts of the day. It had long been lamented by the friends of rational religion, that in so populous a town as Brighton, no eligible house for Unitarian worship had been procured. By the advice and assistance of several friends this desirable object is at last obtained. The above house is small, yet neat and commodious, will hold from 150 to 200 people, and present circumstances seem to promise considerable success.

It is thought proper to state, that the purchase money and other expences will amount to nearly 200 pounds. About two thirds of this sum is raised by the voluntary subscriptions of friends in the neighbourhood of Brighton, Lewes, and Ditchling; and if other friends to rational Christianity think this case worthy their notice, their aid is hereby solicited. Any donation for the purpose of defraying the above expence, transmitted to Mr. Bennett, Ditchling, Sussex, or to Mr. Thomas Vine, Sen. Brighton, will be thankfully received and duly appropriated.

B.

Annual Meeting of the General Baptists in South Wales.

The Annual Meeting of the GENERAL BAPTISTS in SOUTH WALES, was held this year, at Panteg, in the county of Cærmarthen, on Tuesday and Wednesday in Whitsun week. It commenced on Tuesday, at 3 o'clock, by Mr. William Morris reading a portion of scripture; then Mr. John Griffiths preached from John xvii. 20; and on Wednesday it began at 11 o'clock, by reading and prayer, by Mr. J. Griffiths; then Mr. W. Morris preached from 1 Peter iv. 8. and after him Mr. Evan Lloyd from Matt. xxiv. 14. They afterwards

took some refreshment. At six in the evening, Mr. William Thomas preached from 1 Tim. vi. 16. Thus the Association closed, having been well attended, and it was conducted with its usual peace and harmony.

OBITUARY.

Died, July 1, 1812, at his house, Elliot Place, Blackheath, JOHN BRENT, Esq. in the 83d year of his age. He was born in the year 1729, at Portsea, in the county of Hants, of pious and excellent parents, who, knowing the value of religion, brought up their children *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*. He served his apprenticeship to a shipwright in his Majesty's Yard at Portsmouth, and in the year 1762, removed to his Majesty's Yard at Sheerness, where he filled the situation of foreman of the new works, along with the late Sir John Williams. About the year 1768, he was appointed assistant surveyor to the East India Company, under the late Gabriel Snodgrass, Esq. In the year 1770, he entered into partnership with John Randall and John Gray, Esqs. in the ship-building line, at Rotherhithe. Here he continued for many years, maintaining a high and deserved reputation in his profession. His mind was active and his body strong, whilst his skill in *naval architecture* exceeded that of most men, and few did more for its extension and improvement. The comprehensiveness of his views and the promptness of his conceptions have been the subject of general admiration. The blessing of Providence descended on his superior knowledge and honest industry, by which means he was enabled to retire about *twenty* years ago to the enjoyment of ease and comfort for the remainder of life. He had erected a small but neat mansion at Elliot Place, Blackheath, where he lived beloved and revered by all who knew him. His venerable appearance, his cheerful looks and his kind address will not be forgotten by those who had the happiness of his acquaintance. His was a *patriarchal* dignity—the contemplation of which excited the mingled sensations of love and esteem.

He had been married TWICE; by his *first* wife who died January 23d, 1793, and who was distinguished for the mildness of her disposition and the softness of her manners, he had *eleven* children, two only of whom, Mr. *Samuel Brent* and Mr. *Daniel Brent*, live to cherish the virtues of a parent whom they loved and revered. At the time of his death he had nine grand children and eleven great grand children. *Lo! Children are* (Psalm 128) *an heritage of the Lord. As arrows in the hand of the mighty, so are children of the youth. Yea, thou shalt see thy children's children and peace upon Israel.* By his *second* marriage he united himself to the eldest daughter of the late truly respectable and reverend *John Sturch*, of Newport, Isle of Wight, who not only proved a suitable companion in his declining years, but by her constant kindness and attention smoothed his descent towards the tomb.

Of his religious character much might be said. He was only 18 years of age when he joined the General Baptist church in St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth. Upon his removal to London in 1768, he became member of the General Baptist church which, in the year 1688, met for religious worship in Fair Street, Horsleydown, but has now, for some years, assembled in the Old Meeting House, Church Street, Deptford, under the pastoral care of the Rev. William Moon, by whom he was interred in the adjoining cemetery, and who afterwards improved the mournful event by a discourse suited to the occasion. Of the deceased it may be remarked with truth, that *he* adorned the doctrine he professed. His views of religion were enlarged and liberal. The goodness of the Deity in nature, providence and grace had made a deep impression upon his mind. I have heard him more than once expatiate on this his favourite topic with tears of joy. Indeed *universal redemption* and its legitimate concomitant, *universal restoration*, were themes on which he dwelt with rapture, and the benevolent disposition which he cher-

lished in consequence of this belief (so remote did he deem it from any kind of licentiousness) rendered him happy in himself, useful to his fellow creatures, and a blessing to the world.* His *faith* and *practice* went hand in hand, he never even in thought separated them; for in him they formed a delightful and edifying union throughout life. Of the scriptures he might justly exclaim, *Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage!* As to public worship, nothing but indisposition could prevent his attendance, for his language was—*How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts—I love the habitation of thy house and the place where thine honour dwelleth.* Nor was it the regularity of his attendance only that deserves to be mentioned, but the serious and devout manner in which he conducted himself during the whole of the service. He listened to the accents of religious instruction with delight, and his features glowed with a heart-felt satisfaction. Indeed he often reminded me of the picturesque description which Dr. Watts gives of the true worshipper:

> 'Not like a stranger go and come,
> But like a child *at home!*'

And with respect to prayer, it was an exercise in which he delighted, as an appropriate homage to the Supreme Being and a principal medium of moral improvement. Indeed, with as few imperfections as any man I ever knew, he was anxious to do the will of God in his day and generation. As to his benevolence and zeal, his contributions to charitable objects and to charitable institutions were cheerful and prompt, agreeable to the ability which Providence had bountifully given him. His ready support of *the General Baptist Education Society* from its commencement in 1794, is deserving of particular mention. He knew that by means of this institution, several churches had been supplied with young men of ability and learning, who are assiduous in promoting the cause of truth and righteousness. The interests of religion lay near his heart. He had nothing of that constitutional apathy or of that criminal indifference which is to be found even in some professors of Christianity. A bigot is the dupe of his prejudices and the enthusiast is a slave to the reveries of his own undisciplined imagination. But THE CHRISTIAN, rational, serious and cheerful, rejoices in the progress of *true religion*, as a permanent source of individual happiness, as the firmest cement of society and as the best preparation for eternity! In the journeys that my aged friend took annually during the summer season (and this was his practice for many years) he would often tell me, upon his return, how gratified he had been to observe large and flourishing congregations. This feeling was in unison with the experience of the Psalmist, when he says—*Walk about Zion and go round about her; tell the towers thereof; mark well her bulwarks; consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following: for this God is our God for ever and ever, he will be our guide even unto death.*

Throughout the whole of his long life he was blest with an uncommon share of health and strength. It was only within two years of his decease, his constitution began to be shaken by the slow but certain approach of old age. But he was still cheerful in the social circle and active to the last period of his existence. He had been on a visit to his younger son in Essex, but returning home was immediately taken ill, and after a few days indisposition, expired without a groan! *All the days of Methuselah were nine hundred and sixty-nine years and* HE DIED! But *the hoary head is a crown of glory* when thus eminently *found in the way of righteousness.*

I beg leave to conclude with the mention of a circumstance which may not be unworthy of preservation. It was my honour and happiness, not only to be introduced to my excellent *deceased friend*, upon my first settlement in the metropolis, but to share largely in his kindness and esteem. In return for many acts of friendship and early patronage, I inscribed to him my *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*. The Dedication of the last and *twelfth* edition, which was published only six months ago, had this additional and closing paragraph.

"And now, my dear Sir, at your advanced age of upwards of *fourscore years*, this is probably the last time I shall have the opportunity of addressing you. I have therefore done it at some length

---

* Though he enjoyed not the advantages of a liberal education, yet he was anxious to have his mind well informed, especially on religious subjects. He employed his leisure hours in reading, and took the *Monthly Review* almost from its commencement.

and with freedom. I congratulate you that Providence has spared your life to witness the success of a work, in the diffusion of which, from your known characteristic love of candour and charity, you were pleased deeply to interest yourself. May your NUMEROUS DESCENDANTS adhere stedfastly to that religion which you have professed and adorned for more than half a century! And may you continue to experience its abundant consolations, raising you by *the good hope through grace* above the fear of death and rendering your last end—*Peace*. Farewell, my venerable Sir, till we meet in that luminous sphere of being where neither error nor infirmity will remain to exercise our mutual forbearance and where the *universality* of Divine Love in the redemption of the human race by JESUS CHRIST shall be the theme of eternal triumph expressed in the glorious and long-suspended hallelujahs of the heavenly world."

The above account is an *Extract* from a SERMON, preached by the Rev. J. Evans, at Worship Street, from Luke xxiii. 50, HE WAS A GOOD MAN, and which, by particular request is now in the press, as a *tribute of respect* to A GOOD MAN's memory. The General Baptists have, within the short period of these last two years, lost three of their best friends in the decease of *Stephen Lowdell, William Kingsford*, and *John Brent*, Esqs. Their joint ages amounted to 239 years, and their character was such, that they would have proved an ornament to any denomination of the Christian world.

Died, 15th July, 1812, Miss SARAH MARTEN, of Kingston, near Lewes, Sussex. Her illness and death were occasioned by that common scourge of youth, a pulmonary consumption, which she bore for many months with great and exemplary patience. About two years ago she attended the funeral of her youngest brother, who died of the same disorder, and last November, she followed her honoured and highly beloved father to the grave; and, alas, in the 20th year of her age, she ceased to breathe, and is now sleeping in the regions of the dead. As far as her character was formed, it may be denominated virtuous, which gives her distressed and affectionate parent a well grounded and cheering hope of seeing her beloved daughter rise to glory, honour and immortality in the world to come. In this hope the deceased was interred in the General Baptist Burying ground, Southover. Mr. Bennett, of Ditchling, preached a sermon on the mournful solemnity, from Job xvii. 11, 'My days are past, my purposes are broken off;' and Mr. Morris pronounced the address at the grave. May we all stand ready, for in such an hour as we think not, the Son of Man may come.

Lately died, at Clifton Hot Wells, of a rapid decline, PHILIP MALLETT, Esq. Barrister at Law, and formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge. Mr. Mallett was respected by all who knew him, as a man of distinguished abilities and of the most upright, independent principles. He was the editor of a philosophical work of Mr. Hobbes, just published, to which he has prefixed a very valuable life of the author, which he just lived to finish. Mr. Mallett also edited Lord Bacon's Advancement of of Learning, together with a Life of that great Man, and an Abridgment of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The Dissenters are no longer subject to the bigotry of petty magistrates, who finding fault with the increase of religion among the people, wished to restrain it by their interpretation of the late Act of Toleration. A new one has passed with the unanimous consent of the members of the legislature. Neither in the Lords or Commons was any opposition made to the principle of the bill, and all parties seemed to be drawing nearer to the Christian precept of allowing to their neighbour what they would wish for themselves. Several

ridiculous penalties remain still on our statute book which affect the members of the established as well as those of the other sects; but the good sense of the times has got rid of the folly by which they were enacted; and it may perhaps be as well that they should be retained, if it were only to shew to what excesses the pride and the intolerance of priestcraft will run.

The Conventicle and the Five Mile Acts are repealed; but the votaries of dissipation and riot have the advantage over the sons of religion. No more than twenty persons are to meet under this act for the sake of prayer or religious exercises, in any house, without a license. The Lady Bettys and Lady Marys of the age would have created no small tumult in the legislature, if an attempt had been made to restrain their assemblies for cards or dancing or music to the same number. We cannot see the propriety of this distinction. Wherever there is a public meeting it may seem to be liable to the cognizance of the public, though even here we do not see why religion should be put under peculiar restraints; and in such meetings, as decorum is most likely to be preserved, it is sufficient to guard them only from the intrusion of evil-minded persons, who love to disturb the peace of society. Let us be thankful, however, for what is granted and trust to time for future improvement. The established sect is so much on the decline, that it may stand in need itself, in no long time, for that toleration which it has so long denied to others.

The body of Methodists in the Wesleyan connection has, at a meeting of their general committee, thanked Lord Stanhope for his "unwearied exertions in behalf of religious liberty;" to which his lordship returned an admirable answer. In this it is observed, that "the already tottering tower of intolerance could not any longer stand in opposition to the power of argument, aided by the force of ridicule. That rotten and despicable system has at last given way, and it is only necessary to attack it properly and with united efforts, directed by the light of principle, to cause it totally to disappear like an empty dream." The principle of the Methodists respecting the rights of conscience is seen in their circular letter, dated July 31, 1812. "It is the unalienable right of every man to worship God agreeably to the dictates of his own conscience: he has a right to hear and to teach those Christian truths which he conscientiously believes, without any restraints or judicial interference from the civil magistrate, provided he does not hereby disturb the peace of the community." This is firm ground to stand upon, and we congratulate our country, that so large a body as that of the Wesleyan Methodists has come forward in the maintenance of this great and essential right in every Christian society. There is, however an unnecessary preamble to the resolution, of which we must take notice; namely, "All well regulated societies and denominations of Christians will exercise their own rules for the admission of public or private teachers among themselves." Societies, professing to be Christians, have, it is to be lamented, exercised their own rules in the admission of teachers, and every nation almost exhibits the fatal consequences of the injudicious exercise of this right, and the impudent assumption of power on one side and the base acquiescence of mind on the other to rules not founded on the scriptures, but on the vain and idle traditions of men. A society may be independent of others, yet in itself may be far from that liberty with which Christ has made us free. Its burden may be heavy, its proceedings intolerant. Having laid down a set of rules, it may be so rigidly attached to them as not to permit any inquiry into the reasonableness or truth of them. The members may become slaves to the tenets of a former age, to which they bend the scriptures, instead of examining the scriptures themselves and bringing every opinion to the test of divine truth. The difference between a Christian and a worldly society is this; that the former cannot lay down any rule in opposition to the scriptures and is ever ready to give an answer in meekness to the doubts of any inquirer. It will not turn away from examination. It will not say, such was the faith we received from our fathers; but, on the contrary, our forefathers have been in error, they were once heathens, then papists, afterwards Church of England men, many of them extremely bigoted to the fallacious opinions they held. Let us, convinced by the example before us, beware of placing implicit confidence in any men or any set of men or any set of rules, which have not the seal of divine truth, and above all, let us be upon our

guard against unscriptural terms, such as the Trinity, Transubstantiation, &c. A worldly society, on the contrary, lays down rules, to which it requires implicit obedience, and its leaders are in a passion if any one dares to call them in question. An instance of this kind may be seen in the late dealings of a Quaker society with a member, whose faith was in unison with that of its original founder and who defended it by scripture.

The passing of the Dissenters' bill has also given occasion for a meeting of the Deputies of the three Denominations, in which several appropriate resolutions were passed; but one peculiar mark of distinction between them and the Methodists is, that in the latter the merits of Lord Stanhope are peculiarly recognized, whilst they are entirely overlooked by the Deputies, who speak of the distinguished services of Mr. Smith, their chairman. The correspondence between the Peer and the Commoner was given in the last month's number; and so far from depreciating the merits of either, we wish that the number of such champions was increased in both houses. The exertions of Lord Stanhope will not be relaxed from the neglect of the Deputies to notice them; for if he was to be biassed merely by popular favour, he has surely the greater encouragement in the approbation of the Methodists. To the Methodists we are chiefly indebted for the new bill, as without them not a tittle, we believe, would have been granted to the chairman or the Deputies of the three Denominations. The latter is, indeed a small body in comparison with the former, and having existed a long time and meeting under old forms, it was less likely to be animated with that zeal, which upon the present occasion has done so much honour to the Methodists.

The religious world has witnessed another phenomenon, which, like the toleration bill, is a marked feature of the present times. A bill, which, a hundred years ago, would have set the whole nation in a ferment, has passed almost without notice: the Pope, who could not have moved fifty years ago without occasioning discussions in the cabinets of princes and a concourse of people, in every town through which he passed, to prostrate themselves before the grand impostor, is now settled at Fontainbleau: his passage to this place being scarcely known, and his arrival at it being distinguished only by the presence of a few ecclesiastics, the kingdom of France not knowing or caring more about the matter than they do in this kingdom on the visitation of a bishop, or the arrival of the archbishop at a watering place.

The cause of the removal of his pretended holiness from a prison to a palace is not known. It is connected, we may presume, with the council at Paris, and we may now expect to see its decrees come forth with the sanction of the head of the Romish sect. A stronger proof could not be given to the world of the decline of power in this pretended holy see. A few centuries ago the Pope would have divided with the sovereign the homage at least of the country. Every where he could have created confusion. Buonaparte has so clipped his wings, and is so secure of his obedience, that he is not afraid of any convulsion, though he is nearly a thousand miles from his capital. In fact, the trick is completely discovered, the impostor is detected. He will be used only as far as suits the purpose of the sovereign of the country, and the day is over of the pretended spiritual giving laws to the temporal power of a country. This is a great point gained by the convulsions of the present times, and we wish it to be duly considered by our Catholic brethren in Ireland. Their pretended spiritual head is now the subject of the enemy of this country. Can it be supposed that Christianity, which is intended for all countries, should have sanctioned such an absurdity, as that the subject of one country should give laws or appoint officers in another country. The great error, however, has been in supposing that Christianity gave its sanction to the existence of such a body of men, as that from which the Pope is elected, and of which he is the head. Christianity knows no such order. All Christians are members of a royal priesthood and are a peculiar people. All are laity.

The Bible Society continues its triumphs, and we rejoice in them. The more auxiliaries it receives, and the greater the attachment expressed for the pure and unmixed word of God, the more attentive, we hope, the members of this Society will be to the precepts of religion. If they are desirous that every poor man should have the sacred volume in his cottage,

surely they will not neglect the perusal of it in their own houses, and we will venture to say, that if the Bible is read without note or comment for half a dozen years, by so large a community as the Bible Society, it will have a material influence on the whole kingdom. What will then become of the words Trinity, Transubstantiation and the like, and the doctrines under them, which have occasioned so much dispute in the world? What will become of the creeds and catechisms, which the established and other sects of this kingdom have made the rules of their faith? If the unsophisticated precepts of our Saviour are meditated upon, no more will intolerance prevail, nor will priestcraft be known. Such are the effects to be expected from the extension of the Bible Society, and we hail the day, that witnessed the meeting in the Egyptian Hall, where a Lord Mayor presided, and where a Chancellor of the Exchequer expatiated on the Divine treasures, and the union of all parties in diffusing them over the whole world. The city of London, under its chief magistrate, forms an Auxiliary Society, and several inferior, though similar societies, have been formed in various parts of the kingdom. Thus the Bible Society will be enabled to exert itself with every prospect of success, and we shall be glad to see it really giving to the world a Bible without note or comment; that is, a Bible fairly translated from the original scriptures, and without those notes and comments, which are to be seen in King James's Bible, the Bible which they now circulate, and which is far from being the Bible that agrees with the principle laid down by their Society.

The politics of this world have much in them of a mixed nature. War has given its successes to different sides, at different parts of Europe, but we look with more anxiety to the other side of the Atlantic. We had flattered ourselves that the United States would have continued to preserve themselves free from those calamities and those horrors which war, however just or necessary, brings in its train. We will allow them causes of complaint, but what do they all amount to, compared with the mischiefs of a single campaign. The congress has, however, thought otherwise, and not being able to adjust their differences in a reasonable manner, they now appeal to the mouth of the cannon to decide them. They cannot, it is evident meet us on the seas; they have no ships of the line to cope with ours. Their war can be only of a prædatory nature. We are vulnerable in our commerce, and against that its privateers are to be directed. Here temporary success will, it is to be feared, attend their first efforts; but such a contest cannot last long. Their privateers will be cut off one after another, by the superiority of our maritime force. They are to try their strength upon land, and direct their efforts against the Canadas. Here they may produce the usual devastation and distress, and the disposition of our colonies will be tried. Our ambassadour has quitted the country and left only a *Charge des Affaires* to conduct the business that may still be transacted between the two powers, but the difficulties of adjustment are increased, and the loss to us in mercly cutting off our trade with so large a tract of country will be very considerable.

The war is not popular over the whole country, and one circumstance may soothe us in this melancholy posture of affairs, that one province seems to have viewed war in its true light, and considered it as a sufficient cause for fasting and humiliation before God. If this, indeed, were really the case with all parties, if they were sufficiently humbled in their own minds, and viewed their fellow-creatures through the proper medium, the relationship to one common Saviour, how could a war exist? True Christians would find a way to soften down existing animosities. War degrades man to the state of children, who are crying and quarrelling with each other for trifles, but it ill becomes the manhood of reason.

We are not to be surprised at the war between the two emperors of Europe: nor is it necessary to enquire closely into the cause of their differences. Buonaparte has by his skill placed himself advantageously on the frontiers of Russia. He has seized that part of Poland which Russia, in so barbarous a manner, tore away from its ancient rulers. He proclaims liberty and independence to the inhabitants; freedom indeed of some consequence to the lower classes, for he has broken the shackles of vassalage, and the

higher classes are flattered with being, again the heads of their own people. They have made a confederacy of which he is the patron, but he confines his services to a part of them only, for in allowing them to legislate he does not admit their deliberations to extend to the part belonging to Austria. That he tells them very gravely, is guaranteed, and the arguments which the diet uses so forcibly are to have no weight beyond a certain line. What else indeed could be expected from the conqueror, whose chief object is to distress his enemy, not to give live liberty to the world?

The conquest of Buonaparte was made in a very short time, and gives him the command of a population of upwards of five millions of persons and a very fertile soil. His army is posted along the Dwina, and the country between it and the Boristhenes. His ulterior movements are not known, and there is reason to believe that the resistance of the Russians is greater than he expected, and may prevent his progress to any great distance into the interior of the country. It is now supposed to be his object to march to Moscow, and the liberty granted to the peasants of Lithuania will be extended to the boors of Russia. They are to be allured to his standard by a greater boon, for they are slaves of the soil, and by the number of slaves, not of acres, is wealth computed. Such a state cannot have been intended for human beings, but whether the time is come to destroy such a system time will shew. The Russian is ignorant, barbarous, uncivilized, incapable perhaps of appreciating the value of the gift offered to him, and France may be foiled in her attempt.

The emperor of Russia is at the head of an immense army. The depots of ammunition and provisions destroyed by him are immense, and by means of our ships, great quantities have been preserved, that were laid up in the maritime towns on the Baltic. The English and Russians now act amicably together, and Sweden is joined in a firm alliance with them. From the latter a great diversion is expected, by the landing of a large body of troops in what was called Swedish Pomerania, and if any thing efficacious is done by the French against the Russians, such a measure may be expected. It is singular that, in the last French Bulletin, there is a talk of the troops being led into quarters for refreshment, and if so, they may have to dread the attacks of Russians, in which case the assistance of the Swedes will be of no small importance.

But the most material intelligence received since our last, is from our army in Spain, where victory, in the completest manner, has crowned the efforts of Lord Wellington and the allied army under his command. English valour was here seen in its noblest attitude, and the French have no longer reason to boast of their superior tactics. Lord Wellington made but a short stay at Salamanca, and to the east of that city he gave the enemy battle, after they had exhausted all their manoeuvres. A whole day was spent on both sides in displaying their forces in various positions to each other, but in the evening Lord Wellington made a movement which decided at once the fate of the day. He marched his columns direct against the enemy, which broke through every thing before them, dispersed the opponents in every direction, and it was a complete rout, till the darkness of the night prevented the assailants from following up farther their victory. The French general was severely wounded. In this and the following days upwards of fifteen thousand men were killed, wounded or taken prisoners. They could not rally. The English pursued as far as Valadolid, and the king, Joseph, who had advanced near to the scene of action, was obliged to make a precipitate retreat from it. Marmont's army discomfited, cannot again for a long time make head, and Soult's is at too great a distance for affording any assistance. The interval between the armies is now open for the exertions of the Spaniards, and if they are really in the cause of Ferdinand, they have now the opportunity of making it triumphant. A very short time will discover their dispositions, and shew how far they merit the valour and skill which have been exhibited in their behalf.