

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXIX.

MAY.

[Vol. VIII.]

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Brief Account of the Rev. Henry Taylor, by the Rev. F. Stone.

30, Garden-row, Southwark,
Feb. 16, 1813.

DEAR SIR,

To fulfil my long-protracted intention to communicate to you particulars respecting my much-esteemed uncle-in-law, which came within my own knowledge, I cannot specify the place of his birth, but I have reason to think he was a native of Essex, as he was owner of a real estate in that county, which entitled him to a vote for the two knights of parliament. I believe that this estate of the Rev. Henry Taylor lay at South Weald, near Brentwood. His father, a gentleman, whose baptismal name might be Edward, I barely remember, having seen him but once, and when I was very young. He was a man of a very ready wit, and author of that well known humorous tale, in verse, "Numps, or the Apple-pye." Nor was his son inferior to him in witticism, devoid of the asperity of lashing satire and biting sarcasm. He was so pleasant a companion, that, at the temperately-convivial domestic table, he has been known, like Shakespeare's Yorick, to "set it in

a roar" of laughter. If the clergy of the Church of Rome, and those of your graver correspondents, whose features, however, may sometimes relax into a smile, will not be offended, you may publish his following epigrammatic *jeu d'esprit* on the crew of a ship in distress, all members of the Church of Rome.

"It blew a hard storm, and, in utmost confusion,
The sailors all hurried to get absolution.
This done, and the load of the sins they confessed
Were transferred, as they thought, from themselves to the priest,
To lighten the ship and conclude their devotion,
They tossed the poor parson sousc into the ocean."

He was also the author of an elegant copy of verses on the felicity of a married pair, entitled "Paradise Regained," for which I refer you to a volume of "Doddley's Collection of Poems." Mr. Taylor was educated at Dr. Newcome's school, Hackney, where he formed connections among his schoolfellows, which were of essential benefit to him through life. On leaving school, he was admitted a member of Queen's College, Cambridge, and, I think, became a fellow of it. But he soon preferred the social fellowship of ma-

trimony to the monotonous, monastic, collegiate life. He fixed his affections on my aunt, Christian Fox, the fourth and youngest daughter of my maternal grandfather, the Rev. Francis Fox, who died, prebendary of Salisbury and vicar of Saint Mary's, Reading, who did not reject his addresses. In consequence, they were soon united in wedlock; and I verily believe a happier couple never existed, till the prior death of my aunt separated her from her husband. At the time of his marriage, Mr. Taylor held the living of Whitfield, near Tetsworth, Oxon, for a minor; but was afterwards presented to a living, which he exchanged for the vicarage of Portsmouth. After some years, he succeeded to the rectory of Crawley, near Winchester, tenable with Portsmouth, through the interest of his schoolfellow, Chancellor Hoadly, son of the Bishop of Winchester. Mr. and Mrs. Taylor were blest with a numerous offspring, of which three children only are now living,—the Rev. Henry Taylor, who enjoys a benefice in Lincolnshire,—William Taylor, an eminent tin-manufacturer,—and Anna Taylor, who is domesticated with her sister-in-law, the relict of her brother, the Rev. Peter Taylor, at Tichfield, Hants, of which parish he was rector, under the patronage of Peter Delmé, Esq. his godfather, and another of his father's schoolfellows. Peter died without issue. Henry is in a state of celibacy; but William has a large family by his wife, who was a Miss Courthauld, a lady of a French Hugonot family. I could attempt to entertain you, Sir, with a narra-

tive, in full detail, of the very narrow and almost miraculous escape of her ancestors from the sanguinary sabres of those ferocious bloodhounds, the *gens d'armes* of that bigotted tyrant, the 14th Louis, which I received from a lady of the family, who, when a child, with her parents and brother, thus providentially escaped. But the length of the narrative will not admit being comprised in this communication. Mr. Taylor preached a visitation sermon, but on a different subject from that of his nephew. He published it in the form of an Essay, under the title of "The Beauty of the Divine Economy." His "Letters of Benjamin Ben Mordecai to Elisha Levi," in defence of the absurd hypothesis of the Arian Trinity, by him styled the Apollinarian, are well known. His last work, as far as I know, was entitled "Thoughts on the grand Apostacy," which well merits the serious attention of the reader. Having had the misfortune to lose a good father, before I had attained the third year of my age, I had the happiness to find a classical scholar and a theological friend in my uncle, whose arguments against that most senseless hypothesis, the Athanasian Trinity in Unity, were so convincing as to confirm me in my rejection of it;—to confirm me, I repeat, because my mother has informed me of a circumstance, which has not escaped my own memory, that at a very early age, on my return from church with her on a Sunday, when the Athanasian Creed had been read, I put to her, with puerile impatience, the following curious, perplexing interrogatory, which she confessed herself inca-

pable of answering in a satisfactory manner: "Pray, mamma, what has the clergyman been talking of to-day? He said, The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God. How can this be? I Francis, and my two brothers, Arthur and Daniel, are three boys. Can we three boys be jumbled together into one boy?" Exclusively of the advantages which, as a youth, I received from personal visits to, and occasional epistolary correspondence with, my uncle, on my election off from Charterhouse, as captain of that excellent public seminary, to University College, Oxford, I owed my knowledge of Hebrew to his kind recommendation of me to the notice of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Hunt, then Regius Professor of Hebrew in that University. The Professor, in his friendship for my uncle, with gratuitous generosity, instructed me in the language. When I was of age to take orders, my uncle gave me what is called a title, by appointing me his curate of Crawley, on which rectory he resided, and of Hunton, a chapel of ease, annexed to it. During my clerical connection with Mr. Taylor, I recollect that he lamented to me that a necessary church-reform was obstructed by *church-authority*; but that he thought it probable, I might live to be an instrument in removing that obstacle. It is worthy of remark, that not long before his death, I had addressed a letter to him, representing, that I flattered myself, that the good seed he had sown in my mind I had duly cultivated, so that it had sprung up into a plentiful harvest of fruit, to a de-

gree of luxuriancy, he might perhaps think, which might require amputation. I added, in short, that the disciple had outstripped his master in what is called heresy, being now more of a *heresiarch* than a heretic, having renounced the pseudo-miracle of the Virgin's conception, and re-instated Joseph in the honour of being the father of Jesus of Nazareth, our Lord and Master *Christ*, or God's *Messiah*, of the seed of David, promised to the Jews. In consequence of this letter, it was settled by him, that I should make him a visit in the ensuing summer. But alas! before the time arrived for my departure, my uncle was seized with the sickness which soon terminated in his death. And now, Sir, shedding a fresh tear to the memory of my uncle, and referring you for a more circumstantial biography of him to his two sons, and for a correction of any involuntary error I may have committed in my narrative, I have the honour to be,

Your obliged and
obedient Servant,
FRANCIS STONE.

Historical Account of the War- rington Academy.

[Continued from p. 231.]

During the interval between 1761 and 1767, the subscriptions originally promised being found to drop off gradually, partly, as Dr. Priestley states, (Life, p. 50,) in consequence of the unhappy differences between Dr. Taylor and the trustees, partly through the natural apathy of a great majority of the subscribers, who, having never had a regular account-current of the annual expenditure presented to them (such as is every year

furnished to each subscriber by the accurate and indefatigable treasurer for the York Institution) had no distinct idea of the object for which they were subscribing, and, therefore, becoming weary of their subscription, were willing to lay hold of any pretence for dropping it, various expedients were resorted to by the trustees. In 1762, Mr. Seddon was commissioned to visit London, Bristol, Birmingham, and other places, in order to ascertain, by a personal application, how far the annual subscriptions were to be depended upon, and to endeavour to obtain new ones. This produced a temporary revival; but the regular, annual mode of distinct information of particulars continuing to be still neglected, the revival was only temporary. Another expedient was, to devise a means of increasing the number of students, particularly of lay-students, by accommodating those parents who injudiciously wished their children to resort to a place of education extremely unfit for them at so very early an age. For this purpose they tried the experiment, for a few years, of taking boys, under the age of fourteen, to be placed under the care of Mr. Benjamin Stapp, a divinity student of extraordinary promise; who, under the title of sub-tutor, was to train them in the Latin and Greek languages, and prepare them for the higher classes. They were also to be attended by a teacher of writing and arithmetic (a person of reputation in this line had, indeed, from the first, been engaged to attend for the accommodation of those young gentlemen who were intended for business). But after the experience of two or three years it was found, that

the provision of a grammar-school for the elements of the learned languages had not been attended with the advantages expected. The discipline of a school and an academy,—that which must be exercised over mere boys, which, however founded upon the most ingenuous principles, must necessarily be, in a great degree, mechanical,—and that which is suited to the condition of more advanced youth, who, being arrived at a capacity of judging for themselves, are capable of understanding, and being regulated by, a system of rational and liberal restraint,—were found so incompatible, that this whole scheme was discontinued; and, in lieu of it, an attempt was made to provide further inducements to the parents of such young laymen as the institution originally contemplated, to send their sons to Warrington, by the appointment of a distinct professorship, to be held by a foreign gentleman, who should have the charge of teaching the principal modern languages.

In pursuance of this design, the trustees, on Dr. Priestley's leaving them, engaged Mr. John Reinhold Forster, a German scholar and naturalist of considerable eminence,*

* Of this eminent person a very full account is given in the 4th v. of Aikin's General Biography, from which it appears, that he was born at Dirschaw on the 22d Dec. 1729, that after surmounting various obstacles, he attained considerable eminence in literature, studied theology, became a minister; but, having a strong *penchant* for some more general literary engagement, accepted an invitation to Russia; was disappointed (perhaps disappointed those who sent for him), was tossed about, and at last came into England on speculation, in 1766: his first engagement was at Warrington, where his

recommended to them by Mr. Planta, Mr. Majendie and Mr. Woide, who undertook the charge of instructing the students in the modern languages, and also gave Lectures on Natural History. During his residence here, he published a Syllabus of Lectures on Mineralogy, which the present writer has heard well spoken of. But still the void occasioned by the loss of Dr. Priestley was by no means filled up, and a fourth professorship was out of the question. Dr. Aikin, therefore, was obliged to take the higher Greek and Latin classes, Mr. Forster, the junior ones, and Mr. Seddon, whose warm interest in the prosperity of the institution never deserted him, engaged to give Lectures on Grammar, Oratory, and History.

As this is the first occasion of his being connected with the Academy as a tutor, and as it pleased the Divine Providence that this connection should continue for little more than two years, the present seems the proper place for introducing any particulars which have been collected concerning him since the publication of the

total want of economy rendered it impossible for the Trustees to keep him long; after which he tried various projects till his appointment to accompany Capt. Cooke (on his second voyage; previous to which the University of Oxford made him LL. D). His quarrels with the other literary men engaged for that voyage, are detailed in his and his son George's controversy with Mr. Wales, &c.; he returned to Germany, was made Professor of Natural History at Halle; and, after losing his son, died of chagrin and disappointment, in 1798, aged 69. Several of his works, particularly his "Observations on Natural History made in his Voyage," are of very considerable value.

account of students educated by Dr. Rotheram, in your Repository, Vol. V. p. 428, 9.

Mr. Seddon was the son of the Rev. John Seddon (probably No. 182 in the list of students in Mr. Frankland's Academy, which he entered in 1691), who was first minister at Ormskirk, in Lancashire (where the subject of our memoir is supposed to have been born, and where he had some relations); he afterwards removed to the city of Hereford; where, probably, he continued till his death. The son, as we have seen, had his education for the ministry at Kendal and Glasgow; and, after he settled at Warrington, was unweariedly active in stirring up the opulent Dissenters at Manchester and Liverpool, to institute a plan of liberal education, till he was at length successful, as has been already related (p. 2). From its first establishment to his death he officiated as Secretary to the Trustees, and also as *Rector Academiæ*. In his former capacity he kept the minutes and accounts of the academy with great attention, carefully copying into them the several letters which he wrote to different gentlemen on the business of it (it would have thrown great light upon many of the transactions connected with it, if he had also inserted the letters which he received). In these and in the minutes, one sees his character very accurately drawn by himself; indefatigably active, warm-hearted, earnest, perfectly disinterested, not very patient of contradiction on subjects connected with this his favourite child, a little too fond of shew and parade, somewhat too meddling, and perhaps occasionally assuming, in

his intercourse with the Tutors. This, however, does not appear to have produced any ill effects, excepting in the first instance: to which his great partiality for the Hutchesonian metaphysics, which Dr. Taylor greatly disliked, and his own dislike of the doctrine of atonement, under any modification,—above all, the aid he lent to the composition of the Liverpool Liturgy,* might also contribute not a little. But he was not a Socinian any more than Dr. Taylor, though Messrs. Bogue and Bennett, with their accustomed accuracy, bring this *heavy* charge against them both,† evidently con-

* That he was *not* the author of the "Letter to a Dissenter," and that he had *no* wish to introduce a Liturgy generally, the present writer has obtained additional evidence. He never used any written notes in prayer. That in the new modelling of his chapel, his pulpit should be made with a reading desk, is no more a proof of the contrary, than that any secret intention of a similar kind should have been lurking in the minds of those who constructed the pulpits at Manchester, Chester, York, and most of our older places of worship.

† See Vol. III. p. 344. Mr. Seddon of Manchester, had no concern in the liturgy-controversy; and of Mr. Seddon of Warrington, who was the person to whom Mr. Orton wrote, as well as of his two colleagues, Dr. Priestley says, "We were all *Arians*: the only Socinian in the neighbourhood was Mr. Seddon of Manchester, and we all wondered at him." p. 48. In Vol. IV, p. 283. Dr. Taylor is represented as "abandoning the doctrine of Christ's deity and atonement for the cheerless system of Socinus." That he was no Socinian may be distinctly seen in what he says of the person of Christ in his Catechism.

Notwithstanding all its inaccuracies, however, and gross misrepresentations, the present author is disposed on the whole to thank Messrs. Bogue and Bennett for their "History of Dissenters."

founding, in the former case, the two Seddons together.

Mr. Seddon was remarkably gentlemanlike and affable in his manners; and took great notice of the students, particularly those in the more advanced classes, by whom he was greatly beloved.—He had a very fine voice, and an animated, popular manner in the pulpit; which, in conjunction with the judicious instructions of Dr. Aikin, no doubt contributed greatly to the character for propriety and force of elocution by which the students educated at Warrington during that period were generally distinguished.

He married a lady, whose father had been Equerry to Frederick Prince of Wales, and who possessed a considerable fortune. But a great part of this having been lost in some unsuccessful speculations in cotton-printing works, established near Stockport by some relations of her's, he consented, after having given his services for many years to the institution, in his capacity of rector and secretary, to accept a small salary (£50) on becoming also a tutor. His Lectures on Oratory, and on Grammar, were prepared with great care, and heard with great attention and pleasure. A copy of both, in three 4to volumes, fairly written out by himself, was placed in the library after his death, and continues to form a part of the library at York.

The Institution had now the

And he cannot but wish that every "wide," (p. 284) as well as narrow, Dissenter, would give it an attentive perusal. They might learn from it many salutary lessons. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

prospect of possessing, for a considerable time, four persons well qualified, some of them eminently so, for discharging the duties of their respective departments. For the further accommodation of the students, who might naturally be expected to flow in from all quarters, the trustees determined to build a range of apartments, connecting the tutors' houses with the Common Hall, and forming altogether a quadrangle, having a handsome collegiate appearance. But what are the expectations and schemes of man! Scarcely had they accomplished one half of their plan, and thereby incurred a very considerable debt, than they found it prudent, and even necessary, to get rid of Mr. Forster; and a few months after, Jan. 22, 1770, a violent fever deprived his friends and the public at large of a man, whose robust constitution, uniform health, and great activity, promised a long continuance of useful services. His intimate friend and constant coadjutor as a trustee of the Warrington Academy, the Rev. Philip Holland, of Bolton, preached his funeral sermon, in which his whole character is drawn with such simplicity of truth, while the colouring is kept down with such a delicacy of friendship, as renders it an admirable model for discourses of this kind. Having been found by his nephews among his papers after his decease, it was thought by them, while engaged in the task of preparing his Posthumous Sermons for the press, that this would be an interesting appendage to his *Sermon on the Importance of Learning, and his Character of the Christian Preacher*. It is found in the 2d volume

of that ill-fated publication, p. 197. The part which relates to Mr. Seddon's connection with the Academy will be no improper conclusion of this sketch; while the affectionate address to the students then at Warrington, may be read with advantage by other young persons, who may at any time or place be engaged in a course of academical instruction.

p. 209. "Every good man will feel a peculiar concern for the improvement and best interests of the rising generation. As a sincere friend to virtue and religion, it will naturally be his first and his last wish, that they may have the same influence over the minds of others, which they have over his own; and, in particular, that they may continue in the heart the great instruments of public and private happiness through all succeeding generations. For this reason he is extremely desirous that such methods of education should be encouraged and pursued, as may be likely to answer this purpose. This, one of the strongest presumptions of a good mind, was equally the character of our friend. He always discovered a particular regard for young persons, and had an uncommon facility in adapting his conversation to them in such a manner, as at the same time to conciliate their affections and promote their best improvement. You need not be told how great a share he had in the plan for the education of youth, which has been carried into execution in this place. The concern which he ever expressed for its support, honour, and success; the indefatigable pains which he took for that purpose, the influence which he shewed to same

or censure, to good or evil report, so that he might serve the general designs of the institution; and the satisfaction which he discovered in every degree of success, with which it was attended; are known by great numbers; but by none better than those who shared his greatest intimacy, and were acquainted with all his counsels.

“On the same principle on which he was ever active to promote the best success of this seminary, he was at length prevailed upon to enter into the office of a tutor. That in this office he acquitted himself with great usefulness and acceptance, will be easily believed by all who knew him. The testimonies of those who attended upon his lectures, might, if necessary, be brought in confirmation of this assertion. He was not only the able instructor of his pupils, but their affectionate friend; and heartily desirous that, whilst under his care, and throughout the whole of life, they might behave in such a manner, as to be the joy of their friends, the delight of mankind, and secure their own highest happiness. These he professed to be his sentiments and views, as often as he spoke on this subject; and I have been frequently told, that every part of his conduct in this relation, was agreeable to them. So that I may venture to make the appeal to all, who attended on his instructions, whether he has not ever approved himself a wise, affectionate tutor? Has he not consulted your best improvement? Has he not shewn a peculiar affection and tenderness towards you? Though he was ever desirous to preserve that good order and decency of manners, which are pe-

culiarly graceful in a young person, and which are so essential to the honour of such a seminary, yet he has ever wished and pleaded for such a discipline, as might leave room for the exercise of ingenious dispositions, and prevent irregularities and crimes, rather from the shame with which the commission of them might be attended, than from any other consideration. What has been the success of this generous plan, which speaks such confidence in those whom it is intended to govern, we all wish to know; and I shall greatly rejoice, if, upon enquiry, it shall appear to have succeeded so well as to justify the propriety of it, and to recommend it to the imitation of all succeeding teachers.

“These, the more public virtues of our friend, though more conspicuous, were not his principal, nor, perhaps his justest excellencies. In the domestic character, and in his behaviour to his nearest relations, there was so much prudence, affection and tenderness, as could not fail of attracting their highest regard.—To his particular friends, too, he was peculiarly dear and useful. How engaging was his conversation; how wise and faithful his counsels! With what readiness did he enter into their laudable views; with what zeal did he seek their interests, defend their characters, and cherish their memories! But I forbear; a private loss ought not to be much insisted on, where the public are sufferers.

“It was his peculiar felicity, that his virtues were adorned with that easy politeness and graceful address, which procured him a general acceptance, wherever he

appeared, and enabled him to engage great numbers, in different ranks of life, in those plans which he devised or encouraged for the benefit of mankind. In the conduct of those affairs, which he had to transact, he had a remarkable address in proposing what was to be done, with such clearness and accuracy, as conduced greatly to its dispatch and success. Hence, as well as on other accounts, he was uncommonly useful in the establishment and conduct of the academy in this place, and in other public designs in which he was engaged." p. 214.

P. 219. "It will not be unseasonable, I am persuaded, to add a short address to the students of this academy, with which our deceased friend was so nearly connected. Such is the experience which you have had, my young friends, of his tender affection, his wise advices, his faithful admonitions, that it may appear superfluous to call upon you to remember him. You will, I doubt not, recollect, with peculiar pleasure, his pleasing conversation, his engaging manners, and the unaffected concern which he ever expressed for your improvement and happiness. These are things which you will never forget, while any of the records of memory are preserved. As often, then, as you reflect upon them, you will, I trust, consider the use to which they should be applied by you, to form you to a worthy, honourable, conversation, to establish your virtuous purposes, and to train you up for that excellent course of life, which will insure your present and your everlasting happiness.

"It is with pleasure, but not without anxiety that the friends of virtue

and religion turn their eyes on such a society as yours. They flatter themselves with hopes, that the candid manners and generous sentiments which they discover in you, at this early period, will produce the fair fruits of wisdom and virtue, in your more advanced years; that the course of studies in which you are engaged will enrich your minds with sentiments of prudence, integrity and devotion; that you will prove the honour and grace of your friends, useful members of society, and, in your several stations, the guardians of its best interests, and the distinguished ornaments of the Christian religion as long as you live. But at the same time, they cannot dismiss their fears, (and let it not offend you, my young friends, that they have their fears,) lest bad principles should infect your minds, lest the contagion of evil examples should rob you of your innocence; lest you should be seduced by the love of pleasure; lest you should be spoiled by a constant dissipation; lest you should go in those ways in which you will offend the Author of your being, and incur the danger of his everlasting displeasure. As the present occasion will naturally make you serious and thoughtful, let me persuade you not too hastily to dismiss the sentiments which it may suggest to your attention, and the resolutions which it may lead you to form. Consider what your late tutor, what your present tutors, what all the friends of virtue and religion, wish to see you; and, as a matter of infinitely greater importance, what the great Governor of the world expects from you, and the account which you must hereafter give of all your advan-

stages, and of the purposes to which you have improved them. It was in part, at least, for your benefit, that the character of your late worthy tutor was so particularly laid open; and the means by which by which he was formed to that excellent character which was rendered conspicuous in so many instances during all the parts of his life, were mentioned, as a hint which you might possibly take, of the studies which you should pursue, and the purposes to which your knowledge and learning should be applied." P. 222.

V. F.

[To be continued.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham on the Controversy between Dr. Priestley and Bp. Horsley; in reply to the Structures of the Rev. H. Horsley, on the Calm Inquiry.—Letter II.

Essex House, May 1, 1813.

SIR,

The right reverend and learned prelate, whose success in controversy with Dr. Priestley is so highly rated by those who do not understand the question, and so very moderately by those who do, after having charged Origen in his seventh Letter in reply to Dr. Priestley with "the allegation of a notorious falsehood," when "he alleges of the Hebrew Christians in general that they had not renounced the Mosaic law," which assertion served Origen "as an answer to the invective which Celsus had put in the mouth of a Jew," adds these remarkable words, which I hope that, for the edification of your readers, you will be pleased to print in capital letters. "THE ANSWER WAS NOT THE WORSE FOR WANTING TRUTH, IF HIS HEATHEN ANTAGONIST WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY INFORMED TO DETECT THE

FALSEHOOD." This, Sir, is the logic of a Christian divine, of a right reverend father in God, of a master in Israel, of the famous, and, as some say, the invincible advocate of orthodox truth, the boasted conqueror of the heresiarch Priestley, and if the testimony of the reverend prebendary is to be admitted, "a greater master than most men both of the Aristotelian and the Baconian logic." And the Reviewer of the controversy is to be held up to shame because, forsooth, he is no logician. No Sir, thank God, he is not a logician of the Horsleyan school. The Gamaliels, at whose feet he boasts to have received his humble portion of science, laid it down as a first and sacred principle, which admits of no exception, that truth is inviolable: that no sacrifice is too costly to be offered at the shrine of truth: but that to sacrifice truth to victory is base, is despicable, is immoral in the extreme.

The reverend prebendary, upon whom the bishop's mantle, though not his mitre, has fallen, dutifully undertakes to vindicate his father's logic and his father's fame; and, occasionally, to illustrate the prelate's rules by his own instructive

example. Thus, presuming doubtless upon the ignorance of his readers, he ventures to allege, in p. 567 of his late publication, that "the object of Mr. Belsham seems to be to charge the bishop with taxing the veracity of Origen upon every question," whereas "the bishop's object was to tax the veracity of Origen in what he says *only* of the faith of the Hebrew Christians of his own time." To establish this allegation the reverend prebendary appeals to "no fewer than three sentences which all affect the question at issue of Origen's veracity," which Mr. B. has *prudently* omitted, and which the reverend prebendary has, with *equal prudence*, declined to produce. He charitably suggests the possibility of a culpable motive for Mr. B.'s conduct, but at the same time, with all Christian humility and in direct opposition to the blasphemous pretensions of the arrogant reviewer, he adds, "whether all this occurred to Mr. B.'s mind, and induced him to omit the sentences to which I allude, is unknown to me, *who possesses not the faculty of discerning the secrets of other men's hearts!*" Determined, however, that Mr. B. shall gain as little as possible by this concession, he subjoins immediately, that Mr. B. "could not have acted otherwise than he has done, if it had occurred to him and influenced his conduct."

What those important sentences "no fewer than three," are, which Mr. B. and his reverend opponent have both so prudently omitted, Mr. B. knows not, nor does he think it worth his while to inquire, not thinking it necessary to cite every sentence which an author has written of whom he professes

to give only an abridgment. All that he stated, and all that he intended to state, was, that the bishop had taxed Origen in his controversy with Celsus, with alleging a *notorious falsehood*. That a man who is guilty of wilful falsehood in one instance, will not hesitate in similar circumstances to renew the offence, and that, in such circumstances, his veracity is not to be depended upon, is a conclusion in which all are agreed. But that the most notorious liar should utter falsehoods upon "every question," and should speak nothing but untruths, is a supposition which no person in his senses will admit; even though they should not happen to be disciples of that philosophy which teaches that men are born with an instinct for speaking truth. It could not, therefore, be Mr. B.'s intention to insinuate that "the Bishop taxed the veracity of Origen on every question."

The reverend prebendary further states (p. 566) that "Dr. Horsley has actually *proved* that Origen's words will not admit of the sense in which Dr. Priestley has chosen to interpret them." It was therefore quite a work of supererogation to charge that eminent father with notorious falsehood, when in fact he had not made the assertion imputed to him. This the reverend prebendary admits, and expressly says, that the learned prelate "would probably not have made the concession, could he have foreseen the unfair advantage that was to be taken of it." That the bishop would not have been so ready to tax Origen with notorious falsehood, could he have foreseen that this charge would have terminated in his own dis-

comfiture and disgrace, is a position which may command a ready assent. But that, if he had been quite satisfied with his own interpretation of Origen's words, he would gratuitously, and without any motive whatever, have stepped out of his way for the sole purpose of calumniating the character of one of the most respectable of the Christian fathers, by charging him with notorious falsehood in saying what he himself proved that he never did say, may possibly be believed by a pious and dutiful son, laudably jealous for his father's reputation, but he must excuse others, who may not be so deeply interested in the bishop's vindication, if they indulge a little scepticism in so extraordinary a case. That the bishop was not satisfied that his own interpretation was correct and that of Dr. Priestley erroneous, is evident from his own reluctant confession, "I give him Origen." — Remarks on Dr. P. Part 2. c. 2.

"The object of the bishop was to tax the veracity of Origen in what he says *only* of the faith of the Hebrew Christians of his own time." So saith the son and advocate of the learned prelate. But this is not the language of the prelate himself. It was it seems from Mosheim that the venerable dignitary "first learned to rate the testimony of Origen at its true value," but unfortunately, Mosheim did not supply him with the facts upon which that estimation was founded. Having however adopted the charge, he was compelled to find evidence to support it. And after all his laborious researches for this pious and charitable purpose, the learned prelate can discover only two passages in

Origen's writings which are relevant to his object, and these are such as to a less willing or less perspicacious accuser would appear totally inadequate to establish so heavy a charge. I shall cite them in the bishop's own words, as they stand in the first chapter of the Second Part of the Remarks upon Dr. Priestley's Second Series of Letters.

Celsus, in his treatise against the Christians, introduces a Jew reproaching his countrymen for having deserted the law of their ancestors. "And how confusedly," says Origen in his reply, "does Celsus's Jew speak upon this subject, when he might have said more *plausibly*, some of you have have relinquished the old customs, upon pretence of expositions and allegories: *some* again, expounding as you call it spiritually, nevertheless observe the institutions of our ancestors: but *some*, not admitting these expositions, are willing to receive Jesus as the person foretold by the prophets, and to observe the law of Moses according to ancient customs." Here the bishop charges the learned father with falsehood and self-contradiction in acknowledging the existence of a sect of Jews professing Christianity, who had relinquished the ceremonies of the law. Common readers, however, can only discover, that Origen declares that his opponent would have expressed himself more *plausibly*, if he had charged only a part of the Jewish believers, and not the whole body, with having deserted the law. In this they see nothing approaching to falsehood or contradiction. And yet upon this frivolous pretence, the right reverend prelate adopts the harsh language of

Mosheim, which he prints in *large capitals*:—"EGO HUIC TESTI, ETIAMSI JURATO, QUI TAM MANIFESTO FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITURUM ESSE CONFIRMO."

The second passage, alleged by the bishop, in confirmation of the charge against Origen, is, if possible, still less to the purpose. Referring to the text, Isaiah vii. 14. "Behold a virgin shall conceive," &c. Origen remarks, "the word *Alma*, which the LXX have translated into the word *παρθενος* (a virgin), but others *νεανις* (a young woman), is put too *as they say*, in Deuteronomy for a virgin." "What," says the bishop, after having cited this innocent passage, "was it unknown to the compiler of the Hexapla, what the reading of the Hebrew text in his own time was? If he knew that it was what he would have it thought to be, why does he seem to assert upon hearsay only? If he knew not, why did he not inform himself?" And without further ceremony, he again fulminates the terrible sentence of Mosheim, "EGO, HUIC TESTI, ETIAMSI JURATO, QUI TAM MANIFESTO FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITURUM ESSE CONFIRMO."

The reader is now qualified to judge, not only concerning the justice, but also the extent of the bishop's charge against Origen for his want of veracity. The good father, it seems, was a man whose testimony the venerable prelate would not trust, even upon oath. Nor does he confine himself to the simple question concerning "the faith of Hebrew believers, in Origen's own times."

But what says Mr. Prebendary Horsley to all this? I will cite his words, as they stand in p. 576

of his late publication. Videlicet:—

"The character of Origen stands so high in the learned world, that he who should charge him with disregard to truth in general would *excite against himself the indignation of every man of letters.*"

This the reverend Prebendary calls vindicating his father's injured reputation. Surely, if the venerable prelate were permitted to utter a voice from the tomb, he would earnestly exclaim, "from such defenders, good Lord deliver us." And let all the friends and admirers of the pious prebendary say "Amen."

I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

Mr. Sturch on the Dialogue on the Study of the Scriptures.

SIR, March 1st, 1813.

The anonymous author of a sort of dialogue between A. and B. inserted in your valuable miscellany, (p. 103.) published this day, in recommending so earnestly the study of the scriptures, is, no doubt, actuated by a very commendable desire to promote the best interests of your readers. I cannot help wishing, however, that he had confined himself to calm and sober reasoning, without attempting to work on our passions, and overwhelm our minds, by such terrifying phrases as "eternal misery," "eternal punishment," and "the wrath of God for all eternity." Such language, it is admitted, may powerfully affect the imagination, but is not likely, I think, to produce that salutary and permanent influence on the conduct, which is the proper and genuine effect of patient enquiry and rational conviction.

I should, also, have been better pleased with this writer, if after speaking of the scriptures in the highest terms, and of the absolute necessity of acting from the motive "which they prescribe, as the only one that will be accepted," he had not endeavoured to coax us, as it were, into the study of them, by assuring us, that *if they do no good they can do no harm.* Really, Sir, if I were not afraid of giving a ludicrous turn to a grave subject, I should say, that this little artifice is not unlike that of the quack doctor, who assures us that his pills, besides being the only specific for all disorders, have the remarkable quality of being so *perfectly innocent*, that they may be taken without danger by an infant. One cannot help observing by the way, how widely this opinion differs from that of the opposers of the Bible Society, many of whom seem to regard the scriptures as one of those powerful medicines which may either *kill or cure*, and which, therefore, cannot be safely exhibited, except under the immediate direction of those regular professors of the art of saving souls, the divinely appointed clergy of the Established Church.

For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying, that if I had the honour of being acquainted with B. I would advise him not to be unreasonably alarmed by the denunciations of A. but honestly and manfully to make that use of his understanding for which it was bestowed on him by his benevolent Creator; namely, to exert it in the diligent acquisition of knowledge, with a view to practice; to make it the guide of his life, in his religious and moral conduct, as well as in his merely temporal con-

cerns; and in so doing, to avail himself of all the assistance which he could derive from the wisdom and experience of others, both by conversation and by reading. Should he consult me on his choice of books, I would not fail to recommend the collection called the scriptures to his particular attention, as containing, (with other matter of inferior value,) a most valuable treasure of theological, moral and political science; but I would not advise him wholly to submit his understanding to any book whatever; because all books, without exception, having been written by men, women or children, are liable both to original error and subsequent corruption; whereas the human mind, being the immediate offspring of God, is and must be superior in dignity and authority to any human production.

My principal object, however, in this letter, is to take some notice of the important assertions of this writer, which are contained in the following quotation.—"Conscience did not teach the ancients that revenge was a crime; it would not have taught you so, unless your reason be stronger and more perfect than theirs, which you will scarcely affirm it to be. It is true you *do* know and acknowledge that revenge is a crime; but *how* do you know it? Through those very scriptures which you yet think not of the first moment. By *no other means*, through *no other channel*, could the discovery be made; there is no other moral or religious code which holds the same doctrine."

I was on the point of calling these assertions *extraordinary*; but I correct myself; they are, in reality, too common. It is a prevailing opinion, that the poor

heathen, whatever might be their ingenuity in other matters, knew nothing at all of religion or morals. This opinion has been confidently taught by some of the clergy, (happily not by all,) and seems to have been believed by the bulk of the laity, without enquiry. Dr. Watts has thought proper to versify this opinion, that it may be in the mouths of good Christians of all ranks;—

“ Let all the heathen writers join

“ To form one perfect book,

“ Great God, when once compared
with thine,

“ How mean their writings look!” &c.

and the lowest maid-servant, having the doctor's authority, thinks herself entitled to sing these verses, to look with contempt on all that has been said or done by heathen moralists and to pronounce sentence of condemnation on their works, though she is so far from having the least acquaintance with any of their writings, that she is even perfectly ignorant of their very names.

But I have no difficulty in saying, because I am able to prove, that such assertions, as I have quoted from their anonymous author, are *the very reverse of the truth*. I affirm that the duty of forgiving injuries, or the unlawfulness of revenge, is agreeable to right reason, is a portion of the law of improved and cultivated nature, and was actually received and taught as such, before the Christian era, by those who had no other means of acquainting themselves with religious and moral truth than the exercise of their own faculties, assisted by the experience and observation of others.

I am happy, however to be relieved from the necessity of col-

lecting the proof of this myself, by presenting to your readers a short extract from a valuable work of my late excellent friend, the Rev. Charles Bulkley; of whom I take this opportunity of saying, that in learning and ability he had few equals, and in piety and virtue no superior. But, I wish it to be understood, that I say this merely as a just tribute to his memory, and not with a view to create any prejudice in favour of his *opinions*. I rely entirely on the *evidence* which he has produced, which I take to be complete and decisive. His words are the following:—

“ Within the compass of natural religion are to be included all moral obligations whatsoever, relative either to God or man. As this is in the general acknowledged, it can be no way necessary to enter into any distinct or ample detail, for the proof of it. I shall, therefore only make a few remarks with regard to one or two particular virtues, that have been thought scarcely to be known among those of the heathen world. Some, for instance, have seemed to think that forgiveness of injuries is a moral duty, peculiar to the gospel. But it is *impossible* that it should be so, since there are, in fact, a great variety of plain and express passages in several heathen authors, who wrote before the time of our Saviour's appearance, some at the distance of several hundred years preceding that period, in which this duty is explicitly inculcated, and such a temper highly applauded. How finely, for example, is it expressed by Plato, at the end of the apology of Socrates. “ I am by no means angry,” says the philosopher ‘ (ἄ πανυ χαλεπαίνω) with my enemies, unless it be for

thinking that they had it in their power to hurt me.' And in his *Crito*, it is in so many words insisted upon, in opposition to the too general sentiment, or at least perverse inclination of mankind, *ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ οἴονται—ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ φάσι* "that we are by no means to do an injury, no, not even in revenge, for having received one." With Aristotle it is an amiable and a manly character, to be no remembrer of injuries, *μη μνησικακος* but *εὐκαταλλάκως* easily reconcilable and forgiving.' It is mentioned by Nepos, to the honour of Epaminondas, "that he never remembered an injury or an affront." 'Nullam adhibuit memoriam contumeliæ.' His character of Atticus has the same eulogium:—'Neque si quam injuriam acceperat, non malebat oblivisci quam ulcisci.' "He never received an injury, but he strove rather to forget than to revenge it." And the very basis and fundamental sentiment in Cicero's celebrated oration *pro Ligario*, is the excellence of this virtue; as he himself observes at the beginning of it. 'Omnis oratio ad misericordiam tuam conferenda est.' "Bulkley's *Economy of the Gospel*, p. 8, 9, 10.

Although this extract appears to me to be abundantly sufficient to set the question at rest, and I trust will convince the anonymous writer of his error, yet I beg leave to add one more quotation from Cicero, on account of its transcendent excellence, and truly Christian spirit.—"Nec vero audiendi, qui graviter irascendum inimicis putabunt, idque magnanimi et fortis viri esse censebunt: nihil enim laudabilius, nihil magno et præclaro viro dignius, quam placabilitate atque clementia." "Nor are those to be listened to, who

think it right to be greatly offended even with our enemies; and who consider this as a proof of courage and magnanimity: for nothing is more laudable, nothing more worthy of a great and eminent character, than placability and clemency." De Offic. lib. i.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM STURCH.

Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Whitfield.

SIR, April 10, 1813.

Although Lord Bolingbroke is styled, with truth, "a mighty champion of infidelity,"* uninformed writers have sometimes quoted him by way of authority, for what are erroneously denominated "the doctrines of grace." He is said to have declared that the Calvinistic scheme is the only consistent system of Christianity, and to have thanked Mr. Whitfield, after hearing him preach, for "having done great justice to the divine attributes." What this nobleman thought of the divine attributes, your readers may collect from his *Posthumous Works*, (vol. iii. iv. v.) from Leland's *View of Deistical Writers*, (Letter xxiii) from some admirable reasoning of Gray's (the well known poet,)[†] and from Sykes on the Epistle to the Hebrews.[‡] It was his lordship's belief *that we have no adequate ideas of the goodness and equity of God, as we have of his natural attributes, his wisdom and power.* In short, he judged fit to attack the moral excellencies of the Deity.

What fact can be a stronger

* See Monthly Repository, vol. viii. 203.

† *Memoirs by Mason, Letter 31.*

‡ Introduction, § v.

condemnation of Calvinism than *this*, which has been appealed to with so much triumph! The coincidence of reputed orthodoxy with the sentiments of a philosopher who was nearly atheistical!

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

N.

Methodist Excommunication at Falmouth.

SIR,

I now send you a brief narrative of the proceedings of Messrs. Sec-kerson and Co. at Falmouth, which I hope will be inserted in the Monthly Repository, for the inspection of the friends of religious liberty.

I informed you in my last (vol. vii. p. 650,) that Mr. S. said he was determined to act at Falmouth in the same way he had done at Flushing; accordingly, six weeks after the methodistical expulsion at Flushing, he, with Mr. Riles, chairman of this district, came to Falmouth to excommunicate the heretics. After Mr. Riles had preached, the Stewards, Leaders and Trustees were requested to stop:—Mr. R. then proposed the following questions, ‘Do you believe in the true and proper Deity of Christ?’—‘Do you believe in the doctrine of original Sin?’ &c. If I were to record the different replies which were made, this letter would swell to a pamphlet: by your permission, Mr. Editor, I will mention a remark of friend Johns’, which I think ought to be inserted in the History of Cornwall, and handed down to generations yet unborn.—“I am a free-born son of England, and a free-born son of God also; I shall

VOL. VIII.

2 R

think as freely as I breath, and shall not be shackled by you, Sir, nor any man under heaven.”—This bold spirited reply was deemed so insulting to Mr. R. that he would not suffer him to speak any more for the evening, and he was actually disowned for this only, for he was told the next day, if he would apologize for his conduct to Mr. R. he might still continue a leader in their society; but he chose rather to suffer affliction with his despised persecuted brethren, than to enjoy the pleasure of reputed orthodoxy for a season.

Mr. Philp, who has been a member of the society for near thirty years, and a Steward, Leader Trustee and local preacher for a great part of that time, in a very judicious manner, proved to a demonstration, that the proceedings of Messrs. R. and S. were inconsistent with the rules of the society, the writings of the great founders of Methodism, and perfectly anti-scriptural and unreasonable.—It seemed as if they felt the force of Mr. P.’s reasoning, for they could not tell how to decide.

Near the conclusion of this affair, Mr. S., addressing Mr. —, said “I think you had better go to prayer and finish:” “Really, Sir, said Mr. R. I don’t know what to pray for, I have not been in a meeting of this kind before, and I hope I never shall again:” however, some time after, the good man recovered from his dilemma, and prayed that *truth* might universally prevail. As soon as prayer was ended, and the people were retiring, Mr. S. arose and said, “he should not consider Messrs. Philps, Mitchell, Johns, &c. as *officers* in the church,” and

consequently, Mr. Editor, they were degraded to the *ranks*.

It is with unspeakable satisfaction, I inform you, that we can now muster about thirty sticklers for the divine Unity, in this corner of the kingdom. We have opened two large rooms; one at Flushing, the other at Falmouth; the latter will hold about five hundred people, and is often crowded, for the purpose of worshipping Jehovah, the God of the universe, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the *only* proper object of religious adoration.

Messrs. Philp and Treleaven preach alternately; the latter, a popular local preacher among the Methodists, was expelled by Mr. S. merely because he expressed his disapprobation of Mr. S's conduct at Flushing and Falmouth; and furthermore, is actually expelled from his home, by his own mother. He has been a Sabellian (i. e. a Unitarian in a fog,) for some time, and appears now to be sincerely examining the evidences of what *we* call the doctrine of the gospel.

I am Yours, &c.
An Enemy to Popery,
THOMAS PROUT.

Musical Taste.

SIR, Nov. 22, 1812.

You recollect, I dare say, what evil propensities one of our dramatic poets has attributed to The man who has not music in his soul; yet I never supposed, till lately, that a taste for the charms of music had been ranked among the signs of *grace*. Such, however, appears to have been the fact, if we may depend on the historical ac-

curacy of *Sir W. Temple*, whose *Essay Upon Poetry* I have just read. At the close of the Essay he has the following passage:

“I know very well that many who pretend to be wise, by the forms of being grave, are apt to despise both poetry and music, as toys and trifles, too light for the use and entertainment of serious men. But whoever find themselves wholly insensible to these charms, would, I think, do well to keep their own counsel, for fear of reproaching their own temper, and bringing the goodness of their natures, if not of their understandings into question. It may be thought, at least, an ill sign, if not an ill constitution, since *some of the fathers went so far as to esteem the love of music a sign of predestination, as a thing divine and reserved for the felicities of heaven itself.*”

I wish any of your readers, conversant with the writings of the fathers, would give the *authority* to which Sir W. Temple here refers. Watts seems to have indulged the same speculation, when he composed the following stanza;

My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this,
And sit and sing herself away
To everlasting bliss.

The professors of *the Sister Arts of Paint and Verse* have been equally fond of this idea. I have often seen a picture of *the Flight into Egypt*, in which the notion is carried very far. Several angels are represented as paying their vocal homage to the fugitives, each with a music-book in his hands.

OTIOSUS.

On Death-bed Repentance.

SIR,

I shall thank you for an opportunity of calling the attention of your readers to what appears to me one of the great evils of the present day, one principal source of its vices and crimes; and this is, the notion which appears so generally to prevail in all ranks, and almost universally in the lower, that a few days or hours of prayer and contrition, before death, may put the most atrocious sinner upon a complete level, with regard to future hopes and expectations, with the man, who, from his youth up, has sincerely endeavoured to conform his will and ways to the written word of God. I do not pretend to be a deep casuist in theology, but am fully persuaded that this cannot be a scriptural doctrine, when I witness its baneful effects upon my fellow creatures. Judging it by the sure criterion which Christ himself hath given us, "By their *fruits* ye shall know them," it surely falls to the ground; nor can it be reconciled to the frequent and unequivocal declarations contained in the sacred writings, that every one will be finally rewarded or punished "according to his works."

The belief that an infinitely powerful and good God will condemn any creature to exist in never-ending torments, is too horrible, too irrational, and too contrary to and subversive of the most glorious of his attributes, to be, in these times, generally held by thinking men, though it is countenanced by many, as a useful check upon the evil propensities of the vulgar. Falsehood, however, never was, nor ever can be, useful to a good

cause; and whatever benefit the supporters of what may well be termed a system of terror, may hope to arise from it, is most effectually done away by the easy mode, which is now so generally looked forward to, of escaping any punishment at all. That the infinite mercy of the Creator will be extended to every thing that he hath made, is a prime article in my creed; but to suppose that by a sort of theological legerdemain, of which those who call themselves evangelical ministers are universally possessed, men of the worst description, the open profligate, the artful hypocrite, the base deceiver, the midnight robber, the cruel murderer;—to suppose that a man, who for years has been plunged deep in the pit of vice, may, by the help of the chaplain of the jail, or the person who is called upon to attend his sick bed, in the course of a few days or hours, be brought into a state which will entitle him to the blissful welcome promised to the "good and faithful servant," is what I think no rational Christian can believe.

I would be far from discouraging all possible efforts to bring sinners to repentance, even at their latest hour; and the more guilty they have been, the more strenuous these efforts ought to be: for every good idea that can be implanted, and every evil one which can be rooted out, is a step towards light and blessedness, from darkness and condemnation; but let us be careful that our desire to ease the mind of the sick or condemned man, and to magnify what we call the mercy of God, does not lead us to flatter him with false hopes. The apostle pronounces "indigna-

tion and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man who doeth evil ;” but modern divines have discovered, that by means of a panacea, administered within a few days or hours before death, the most depraved of men may throw aside all fears of a future judgment, and leave the world in perfect confidence of a blessed change ; to the great *comfort* and *edification* of all who witness his happy end, as it assures them that the work of repentance requires little time or labour, and consequently that they need not be in haste to give up their darling sins, in order to set about it.

The commonly received notion, that there are two places appointed for the final destination of the whole human race, one of exquisite and never-ending felicity, and the other of eternally-enduring torments, is still encouraged by many who cannot be supposed themselves literally to believe a doctrine so contrary to all our ideas of retributive justice. Which of us, on leaving this world, can hope, without a miracle, to be immediately fitted for the first, and what finite offender can deserve the last ; indeed, to suppose either of these extremes, would be to deny that *any man* will be dealt with *according* to his works. The animating assurances which we have of the infinite love and goodness of our heavenly Father, may lead us to indulge the most sublime and glorious hopes of what may be attained by his true worshippers, in the course of that eternity which the resurrection will open to their view : but no man can look to his Maker, even as a *just* being, who believes him capable of consigning a part of his creatures, his erring

children, to exquisite and never-ending torments. If we for a moment suppose this to be the mind and intention of God, how different, how *opposite* is it to that of his beloved Son, who, in his last agonies, besought forgiveness for his cruel murderers ; and knowing “ what was in man,” urged their ignorance in extenuation of their crimes. Supposing this, how different, how *opposite* are they, whom the scriptures pronounce to be *one* ! But though it appears to me little less than blasphemy thus to deny that God is just and merciful, I am fully persuaded that he will give to every one “ *according* to his works,” and “ by no means let the wicked go unpunished.”

Recent circumstances have forcibly led me into these considerations. On visiting a poor neighbour, who had two daughters living in a discreditable manner in her house, and urging the necessity of a change in their conduct, if they hoped for salvation, I was seriously answered by the mother, that “ God loved sinners, and could save the greatest as easily as the least, and perhaps would save them sooner than those who thought themselves righteous.” I was both shocked and astonished, and asked her, if God was thus favourable to the wicked, why the rich man in the parable was described to be, after death, in a place of torment ? She instantly replied, “ Because he did not *call upon the Lord* to save him.” How, according to the present style of teaching and preaching, are such sentiments and opinions to be eradicated ? And while they prevail, how is the religion of Christ to “ take away the sins of the world ?”

Another instance, proving the same thing, occurred soon after, when calling upon a poor man who was ill, a recent bad action of a very profligate person in the village happened to be mentioned, and I said, "What will he do, when he comes to your condition?" "O, when it comes to that, he will repent," was the answer that he made me: and thus, I believe, it will pretty generally be found, that few are deterred from evil by any strong apprehensions of future punishment.

What contributes greatly to spread this fatal delusion, is the frequent accounts we see in the public papers of the happy and even triumphant deaths of men with hands yet red with the blood of their fellow creatures. A most *atrocious* murderer was, some months ago, executed within a few miles of my place of abode, who, on ascending the scaffold, declared it to be the happiest day of his life; that he was going to be ever with the Lord; and called upon the crowd below to join him in a hymn of thanksgiving!! A short time before, I am shocked to say, *five* men were hanged upon the same spot for a burglary; and it was commonly reported, and I believe with truth, that the chaplain boasted of the pleasure he had experienced in attending upon them; as "though they had led the *wickedest of lives*, they died the *best of Christians*." I heard this repeated in a pretty large company, and no one expressed the least degree of disapprobation. This is certainly giving all possible encouragement to crimes; I had almost said, it is holding out the kingdom of heaven as a premium for their commission, and pointing

to the gallows as the open gate through which we may pass to immediate possession.

By thus grossly perverting the heart-cheering doctrine of mercy and forgiveness to the truly penitent, we lose the two great restraints upon the violent passions of men, the two principal incitements to a holy and virtuous life, *hope* and *fear*. Notwithstanding the numerous and plain declarations of scripture to the contrary, we are taught that happiness may be attained and misery avoided, without the least regard being had to purity of heart or life. This fatal perversion of the truth counteracts, in a great degree, that powerful influence which the awful doctrine of a future just and merciful retribution must have upon the minds of believers, and accounts for the lukewarm insensibility of many, and the varied vices which infect, in different measures, so large a part of this enlightened and Christian nation. The terror of never-ending torments, and no lesser degrees of punishment are held out to the vulgar, like the written penalties of our own criminal code, is too severe and heavy for a just and merciful judge to execute; and men are encouraged to transgress by the hope, and even expectation, of complete impunity.

This idea, too, operates upon the minds of those who attend upon the vicious in their last hours: they cannot believe it possible that God, who is infinitely good, will condemn the poor creature before them to a destiny more inconceivably dreadful than can enter into the heart of man to imagine; therefore they not only soothe him with the hopes of pardon, but however detestable the habits of his

past life have been, throw open the gates of heaven to his view, and bid him confidently look to entering in! The effect which a scene like this has upon the survivors who witness it, may readily be supposed. I have myself been present when the relatives of a man of the worst description, have immediately, on his death, felicitated themselves on his being gone to a state of everlasting blessedness.

I have said so much, Mr. Editor, hoping that some one of your correspondents will take up this important subject who is more able to do it justice, and remain, Sir, your obliged, humble servant,

M. H.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

West of England, 9th of
5 Mo. 1813.

ESTEEMED FRIEND,

I am induced to send thee a few remarks on a letter in thy last number, signed A. B. under the head of "The Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity." Thy insertion of that letter is a fresh proof of thy candid attention to all thy correspondents, who may think they have any claim to be heard in explanation. But when an individual writes on behalf of a whole society, who are mostly unacquainted with his name, his undertaking, and his knowledge, he had need to be careful as to what he advances. I give my unknown brother, A. B. some credit for good-will towards our Society, in supposing that he is clearing it from an unjust imputation, and vindicating its consistency.

He refers to a paper in a former number, wherein it is stated that "a member of our Society has been expelled for questioning the

doctrine of the Trinity;" a charge which he would indirectly repel by shewing that we *disown* that doctrine. The instance of *expulsion* is too notorious to be mistaken, and (as many of us think) too arbitrary and unchristian to be justified. It doubtless alludes to that very respectable member of our Society, Thomas Foster; a man whose moral and religious claims to social regard stand in no need of encomium, and whose case, as stated by his own able pen, on the principles of Christian liberty, will probably be printed before these remarks can appear. To that important publication, therefore, I would wish to refer thy inquiring readers.

My present motive for writing is briefly to animadvert on what A. B. has said, respecting our Society, in allusion to the doctrine of the Trinity. He has rightly stated, that *we do not admit even the term, as being no where to be found in the scriptures,—that we have no Quaker creed—and that the Society, as a body, never pretended to interpret the scriptures.* The *first* of these assertions is undoubtedly conformable to the testimony of our best writers, ever since we became a people. We have been, till of late years, particularly careful to preclude, by this very argument, and by more copious reasoning, the idea of a *trinity of persons* in the Deity. We have deemed it a spurious innovation, of human invention, in the Christian religion. But though our modern Friends reject the *name*, they appear to countenance the *thing*. This was too evident to escape our friend Thomas Foster's notice: and under a sincere concern at the growing innovation, he laboured to convince his

brethren of the inconsistency of it, and to guard the Society against its consequences. For this laudable conduct he has been most strangely *disowned* by the district meeting of which he was a member; not indeed on any specific charge, but on vague and ambiguous charges of *holding opinions inconsistent with those of his friends*; and *having become a member of another Society, &c.* When, in fact, he only became a common subscriber to the Christian Association for the distribution of religious books!

That the aforesaid symptom of our Society's declension from the principles of our forefathers, was apparent to others as well as to him, was but too true. I have to lament the fact. Within the last month, I have witnessed an instance of the public avowal of *Trinitarian* doctrine, by one of our most approved ministers, in these express words, at the conclusion of a prayer,—“Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons and one God!” Neither was this language *new* to me, though renewedly painful. Now, I would ask, What is this, but to proclaim the *Son* an object of worship, in common with our Father and his Father, and the *personality* of the *Holy Ghost*? What is it less than to proclaim explicitly, the doctrine of a *trinity of persons in the Godhead*? If this phraseology be allowable among Friends, what right have we to disclaim any longer the term *Trinity*, because not to be found in the scriptures? And if we have no *creed*, and have never pretended, as a body, to explain the scriptures, upon what warrantable ground can honest Thomas Foster stand *expelled*? If it could be any real or

imaginary good to him, *not* to be separated from such a society, I should contend that his brethren can have no Christian right to hold him expelled. For it is a fact, that his only offence has, in substance, been his pleading the sound scriptural doctrine of the *worship of one God*, in opposition to a *Trinity*,—in agreement with his ancient Friends, “with the testimony of prophets and apostles,—and of Jesus Christ himself, the chief corner-stone of *the church of God*.”

I am, with all due respect,
Thy obliged Friend,
C. D.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

To the Editor.

Thy correspondent N. C. has furnished thy readers with a paper, said to contain the “Quaker doctrine of the Trinity,” which is not, I believe, to be found in any of their accredited authors.

I send the following passages for the perusal of N. C. and such of thy readers as are desirous of gaining correct information of the belief of the Friends on this important article of Christian faith. They are extracted from Sewel's *History of the Quakers*, vol. ii. pages 497 and 499. The edition was printed in London, by William Phillips, in 1811.

The confession of faith from which these paragraphs are taken was published in London, on behalf of the Society, in 1693.

“We sincerely profess faith in God by his only begotten Son Jesus Christ, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and also our only mediator and advocate with the Father.

“That God created all things,

he made the worlds by his Son Jesus Christ, as being that powerful and living Word of God by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one, in Divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God, blessed for ever.

“Yet that this Word, or Son of God, in the fulness of time, took flesh, became perfect man, according to the flesh, descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. And also farther, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead.

“That the gospel of grace should be preached in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being one in power, wisdom, and goodness, and indivisible (or not to be divided) in the great work of man’s salvation.

“We sincerely confess (and believe in) Jesus Christ, both as he is true God and perfect man, and that he is the author of our living faith in the power and goodness of God, as manifested in his Son Jesus Christ, and by his own blessed Spirit (or Divine unction) revealed in us, whereby we inwardly feel and taste of his goodness, life and virtue; so as our souls live and prosper by and in him. And the inward sense of this divine power of Christ, and faith in the same, and the inward experience is absolutely necessary to make a true, sincere, and perfect Christian in spirit and life.

“That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ called upon (as

the primitive Christians did) because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and Son; and that we cannot acceptably offer up prayers and praises to God, nor receive a gracious answer or blessing from God, but in and through his dear Son Christ.”

A. B.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.

LETTER VII.

SIR, *March 11, 1813.*

In a former letter I mentioned the difficulty of separating the influence of sincere, though mistaken religion from statecraft and priestcraft, in a farther inquiry after English Protestant Persecution. I am, however, disposed to make the attempt, resuming the subject at the death of Mary, who, in 1558, closed a short reign, religiously cruel and politically inglorious. With Queen Mary fell the Papal ascendancy in England. The Protestant policy which then prevailed has continued to our time, employing the faith, the forms and the officers of an established church to the various purposes of the state. These purposes have been by no means confined to the diffusion of moral and religious instruction. The clergy, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, will be found, with exceptions eminent as they are uncommon, to have employed their influence to promote the changing and often discordant systems of civil policy, adopted by the rulers or administrations of their time. While their religious creed was settled for ages, without the toil of examination, and required only a subscription *ex animo*, their political creeds have been composed of *doctrines suited*

to the varying hour. Of those doctrines, that of the civil magistrate's power of the sword in spirituals, they have always been among the first to assert and the latest to abandon. Nor, whatever pretensions may have been made, in this comparatively liberal age, can it be shewn, from any satisfactory evidence, that a Protestant, any more than a Papal, established church was ever tolerant till toleration had become the policy of the state.

The moral purity of Elizabeth's character, a favourite theme of her panegyrists, has been by historians justly disputed, nor has her religion been esteemed less problematical. The character of her sister is better ascertained. Mary appears in morals unexceptionable, but in religion a priest-led, persecuting Papist, who killed and thought she did God service. Elizabeth can scarcely be esteemed more than a *political* Protestant. During the reign of Mary she had temporized, according to her learned Annalist Camden, who says, "The lady Elizabeth now governing herself as it were a ship in stormy weather, both heard divine service after the Romish manner, and was often confessed; yea, at the rigorous instances and menaces of Cardinal Pole, professed herself, for fear of death, a Romish Catholic." (P. 9.) Osborn, who wrote his "Traditional Memoirs of the Reign of Elizabeth," by the help of information derived from personal intercourse with her courtiers, mentions her dislike of Luther, to whose memory the queen had an unappeasable feud, ever since he upbraided her father with the repudiation of Charles the Fifth's sister." He proceeds to

describe the queen as "rather thrown, than of herself fallen, from the obedience of *Rome*." This opinion he deduces "from the ceremonies used at her inauguration, all purely Catholic, and the retention of the ring, cross, and surplice, contrary to the grain of her strongest assertors. From whence her aim may be guessed as not pointing at a greater dissent from the doctrine of *Rome* than her father's proceeding had chalked her out; commanding the *Common Prayer Book* (which contains most of the *Mass* in English) to be publicly read, and its opposers the *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, *Family of Love*, with a number of other crawling errors, the unnatural heat of *Luther's* disputes had produced over all *Germany*, to be restrained under no slighter penalty than death or imprisonment." (Works, 1673, pp. 411, 12.)

It is certain that Elizabeth discovered no eagerness to abolish the ceremonies of Popery. Dr. Warner (Ecc. Hist. ii. 427) as quoted by Dr. Toulmin (Neale i. 158) says, "When the Dean of St. Paul's, in a sermon at court, spoke with some dislike of the sign of the cross, her Majesty called aloud to him from her closet, commanding him to desist from that ungodly digression, and to return to his text. At another time, when one of her chaplains preached a sermon on Good Friday, in defence of the real presence, which, without guessing at her sentiments, he would scarcely have ventured on, she openly gave him thanks for his pains and piety." Burnet says, "The queen had been bred up from her infancy with a hatred of the Papacy and a love to the Reformation. But yet, as her first

impressions, in her father's reign, were in favour of such old rites as he had still retained; so, in her own nature, she loved state and some magnificence in religion as well as in every thing else. She thought, that in her brother's reign they had stript it too much of external ornaments, and had made their doctrine too narrow in some points; therefore she intended to have some things explained in more general terms, that so all parties might be comprehended by them. She inclined to keep up images in churches; and to have the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament left in some general words; that those who believed the corporal presence might not be driven away from the church by too nice an explanation of it." Burnet adds, with what justice I cannot perceive, "Nor did she like the title of *Supreme Head*; she thought it imported too great a power, and came too near that authority which Christ only had over the church." (Reform. ii. 348.) Dr. Warner remarks, with more probability, that "Elizabeth was not to be won with either threats or entreaties to part with her supremacy; of which she was as fond as the king her father." Dr. Toulmin well observes, that "to a woman of Queen Elizabeth's spirit, it was, independently of every religious consideration, a powerful inducement to support the Reformation." —(Neale, i. 124, 154.)

In your 7th Volume, p. 22, is quoted, from *Strype*, a curious Dialogue between Queen Elizabeth and Dean Nowell, on occasion of a pictured prayer-book presented by the dean to his royal mistress, as a new-year's gift. It is remarkable that such a present

should have been contrived by the Dean of St. Paul's, who headed that part of the clergy, which, from their desire to carry further the reformation of Edward, were called Puritans. The Protestant indignation, expressed by the queen on that occasion, it is difficult to regard as any thing better than mere affectation, one example of the queen-craft in which she was no mean proficient. *Strype* dates this dialogue in 1561. Yet he mentions, under the year 1564, "an English Papist at Louvaine," who dedicated a work to the queen, declaring, "that her good affection to the Cross moved him to adventure to recommend this treatise to her highness." *Strype* refers this to the crucifix in the queen's chapel, which he evidently supposes, till that time at least, to be retained. Burnet, in his *Collections* (iii. 292—294) has preserved some curious particulars on this subject, in several Latin letters from Bishops Jewell and Sands to Peter Martyr, in 1559 and 1560. From these it appears, that the queen had in her chapel a crucifix, and proposed to retain such in churches, with images of Mary and John, conveniently placed so as to be seen by all the people. Sands expostulated, and was threatened with the queen's indignation. She however appears, at length, to have conceded some point, perhaps the public exposure of the crucifix, and she might discard Mary and John. Yet Sands complains that Popish vestments were retained. Burnet has also preserved (Rec. ii. 316) the following submissive language, used by "bishops and divines" on this occasion—"Not in any respect of self-will, stoutness, or

striving against your Majesty, (God we take to witness) for with David we confess that we are but *canes mortui aut pulices*, [dead dogs or fleas] in comparison."

"Princes and statesmen, we know from numerous examples, will stand forth the champions of religion, when it neither warms their hearts nor is in any degree the impelling motive, even when the *form* they contend for looks most friendly to their interest." I borrow this remark from Dr. Brett, a Protestant divine of the Establishment in Ireland, and an early assertor of Catholic claims against the *Considerations* of Archdeacon Blackburne. Whatever were Elizabeth's real opinions in religion, if indeed she seriously entertained the subject, she soon determined that the Church of England should again become Protestant. The missal was once more exploded and the liturgy restored, to which it was enjoined on a whole people, immediately, at their peril, to return. Thus ignorant of the nature of religion, as a personal concern, or inattentive to its obligations, have been the Protestant, equally with the Papal maintainers of established churches. To expedite this return, a parliament was called, which, through courtly influence, consisted of members sufficiently obsequious to the wishes of the queen.

The first acts of this parliament put into the hands of Elizabeth two eminent *instruments of cruelty*, the statute "to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual," from which originated the court of High Commission, and the "Act for the uniformity of common prayer and service in the church,

and administration of the sacraments."

In the preamble to the former of these statutes the parliament indulge a recollection most appropriate on such an occasion; for they remind the queen of her "most dear father, of *worthy memory*, King Henry the 8th." She is empowered to "assign commissioners to execute ecclesiastical jurisdiction,—to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities whatsoever, which, by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority or jurisdiction, can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue, and the conservation of the peace and unity of this realm." Heresy is described to be whatever is so adjudged "by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or such as shall hereafter be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation." This court of high commission, after having been the source of grievous oppressions, was suppressed, in the 16th year of Charles I. 1641.

The *Act of Uniformity* still remains, the disgrace of the Common Prayer Book, to which it is generally annexed. However solemn its phraseology, it is nothing better than a cruel mockery of the Christian liberty affected by Protestants, when they discarded the Pope. The clergy are forbidden to make the slightest alteration in the "*Book of Common Prayer and*

Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, under the penalty, for a second offence, of suffering imprisonment during life." It may be said, that no one is compelled to be a clergyman, and whoever undertakes the office, should previously

Weigh well the wages with the work assigned.

The act however proceeds to ordain, "that if *any person or persons whatsoever* shall, in any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or *by other open words*, declare or speak any thing in the derogation, depraving or despising of the same book, or of any thing therein contained, or any part thereof,—being thereof lawfully convicted, he shall forfeit to the queen for the first offence 100 marks, or be imprisoned six months; for the second 400 marks, or be imprisoned twelve months; and if convicted a third time, he shall forfeit to the queen all his goods and chattels, and shall suffer imprisonment during his life." It is further ordained, that "all and every person or persons, inhabiting within this realm or any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions, shall diligently and faithfully, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, endeavour themselves to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed, or upon reasonable *let* thereof, to some usual place, where common prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of *let* upon every Sunday and holyday,—upon pain of punishment by the censures of the church, and also upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit, for every such offence, twelve pence, to be levied by the

churchwardens of the parish, where such offence shall be done, for the use of the poor of the same parish."

To enforce this system of robbery for a burnt offering, "the archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries" are required "to endeavour themselves, to the utmost of their knowledge,—as they will answer before God for such evils and plagues, with which Almighty God may justly punish his people, for neglecting this good and wholesome law."

In conformity to these statutes among Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559, are the following, (Wilkin Con. Mag. Brit. IV. 187.)

"31. That no man shall wilfully and obstinately defend, or maintain any errors, heresies, or false doctrines, contrary to the faith of Christ and his Holy Spirit.

"33. That no person shall, neglecting their own parish church, resort to any other church, in time of common prayer, or preaching, except it be by the occasion of some extraordinary sermon, in some parish of the same town."

Persecution, *unto death*, does not appear openly denounced in the acts and ordinances which I have quoted. Yet what has been observed of deposed princes, has been too often verified in the experience of those, whom priests and princes have agreed to persecute, that there is but a short distance between the prison and the grave. Besides, that the claims of royal ecclesiastical supremacy, and the authoritative definitions of heresy, became a fruitful source of capital delinquency. So false and even shameless was the compliment paid by Hollinshead to the government of Elizabeth, that

"the furious firebrands of cruel persecution, which had consumed so many poor men's bodies, were now extinct and quenched." (Holl. III. 1181.)

Whether, as this *chronicler* adds, "All persecution now ceased," under "a governor that promoted liberty of conscience," I shall soon proceed to enquire.

R. G. S.

Catholic Bill.

(From the *Belfast Monthly Magazine*, April 30, 1813.)

From the great pressure of *other* public business which would not admit of postponement, the friends of the Catholic bill have determined not to introduce it into the House of Commons, until after the Easter recess. Ireland must give precedence to India. We shall not enter into the comparative importance of the two subjects. The interests of five millions at our doors are, perhaps, politically speaking, equiponderant to those of fifty millions on the other side of the globe; but there is an ignorant and intermeddling philanthropy much in vogue at present, which holds in paramount consideration the "inhuman" and "degrading" superstitions prevalent in the immense population of India, and anxious for nothing so much as to Christianize that whole population, contemplates with a calm indifference those "inhuman" and "degrading" distinctions which take place among our own people, and which may well be called *political superstitions*, even more detrimental than the religious, to the best interests of the British empire.

Patriotism is, in our minds, the

only true, genuine, practical philanthropy; and one ounce of the former is of more sterling worth for all the uses and purposes of human life, than all that benevolent but abstract philosophy beaten into gold leaf, which shines on the surface of so many speeches and writings occupied with the propagation of Christianity among the heathen, deploring so bitterly the moral degradation of India, and at the same time careless about all moral melioration, either in law or policy, at home, or resisting it merely because it is an innovation. Thus, the burning of a Gentoo wife, or the exposure of infants, excites a paroxysm of horror among these philanthropists; but the sentence for treason, which orders the bowels to be taken out before the face of the criminal, or the law, which, by corruption of blood, punishes the innocent directly and voluntarily, and the guilty only from sympathy and attachment to those connected with them, these and similar *legislative* degradations which defile the statute book, and disgrace the moral character of the country, are cherished, with superstitious awe and irrational respect.

Infanticide! certainly a terrible crime in Ireland, as well as in India; but not seldom occasioned by the conflict of contending passions, shame, the fear of disgrace, the loss of character, abandonment, despair, the panic of the moment, the rashness of sudden terror, all motives tearing the heart, and blinding the intellect of the miserable mother, and generating that temporary madness which forgets the nearest and dearest feelings of human nature.

Infanticide! most certainly a terrible crime in India; yet it were to be wished that these philanthropists would cast their eyes over the history of the Foundling Hospital in Ireland, supported by such liberal grants of the public money. From the year 1785 to 1798, inclusive, in the course of thirteen years, 27,274 children were received, out of which number 13,120, or nearly one half, perished, and from the table shewing the number admitted from July 1797 to 1798, and the number of deaths, no less than 1,457 deaths out of 1,922 admitted, a result at which humanity must shudder. Since the new regulations, the mortality has been less, and an improvement has been effected in the management of the Institution, but the deaths among *the infants only*, from the year ending July 1799 to 1808, have been 5,043, out of 19,638.

O, let these philanthropists who are exporting their cargoes of fine feelings to India, condescend to look upon and examine thoroughly the whole *detail*, not only of the aforesaid infanticide establishment, but of many of our domestic state institutions, meant, no doubt, to alleviate, but which in reality have greatly aggravated the miseries of civilized mankind. Let them think less of reform abroad, and be more active about it at home, where it is not less wanted than in India. It will not be an easy matter to alter manners and customs of a thousand or two thousand years, by a missionary society; nor is it all likely that the sprinkling of a little water will make the Hindoo prefer the Jordan to the Ganges. The code of Menu, in addition to the

general and indisputable equity of its civil ordinances, contains a sublime and amiable philosophy, founded on immemorial usage and patriarchal tradition. We have always considered the proselyting spirit as closely bordering upon the spirit of persecution. If any resistance be made to the self-sufficiency that says, you *must* take *my* way to heaven, it is not improbable that in the spleen of disappointment, it may deem you better fitted for *hell*, a word once more become the fashion, and sanctioned by the highest authorities, as the very bathos of *sublime* recrimination.

Well — “*Inter ardua regni,*” India takes the lead of Ireland, and Ireland willingly yields the precedence. There is no hurry. After waiting for more than a century, it would be unreasonable not to protract patience for a fortnight. It is, we allow it, a most grave affair of state, marching, we trust, with slow but assured step, to its triumphant accomplishment. And we pray God, that, in this *sabbath of the year*, this recess, ordained by the religion of the state (as we suppose,) to awe or to allure the minds of men from selfish passions, and thus to give a salutary interruption and break to the continuity of worldly occupations, so apt to engross the whole human existence, we pray God, that those statesmen may employ this holy interval well in purging their minds from prejudice and suspicion, who are responsible to the whole empire for a final decision upon a subject so interesting to its present and ultimate welfare.

It has been reported that a disagreement prevails in the commit-

tee, between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Canning, with respect to several high offices, from which the latter would exclude the Catholics; loading, as it may be truly said, the bill with these exceptions, few in number, but material in effect. Conceiving, as we do, that Mr. Canning is prompt to set himself forward as successor to Mr. Pitt, in representing the Toryism of England, or the high-party of church or state, we judge the report to be extremely probable. We are not to estimate his abilities from his epitaph on Mr. Pitt, which certainly the stone-cutter might have performed as well as Mr. Canning has done; but his talents, like all bred in the same school, although of that ambiguous cast, and ambidextrous power which leaves you satisfied, or rather satiated with the orator, but most uncertain with respect to the *man*, are yet accounted such as qualify him to become the leader of the high church party, deserted as that party has been, in the present occasion, by the conciliating Lord Castlereagh. The Whig party, in both houses, seems to be dissolved into its original particles, indifferent to, and unsupported by the people. But, as we have before said, the people of England are in great proportion a *Tory* community; and those who, like Mr. Pitt and his pupils, have studied the dispositions of that people best, whether religious or political, without at the same time clearly manifesting their internal sentiments on a shining, ostentatious surface, (“*nimum lubricus aspicì*,”) those are the men, (not such men as Charles Fox,) who will, in longer or shorter time, manage to become

prime ministers of Great Britain. In the mean while, they are willing to make use of the Catholic question as a stepping stone to political power, and to a sort of new-found popularity, awkwardly worn and ungraciously exercised.

Yet let no aid from any quarter be declined, for it is by such contributions, varying in degree and quantity, according to that measure of liberality which is bestowed upon each individual by nature, by reflection, by circumstance, or situation, by his hopes or his fears, his interest or his ambition, that the Catholic cause has been so far pushed forward. And in this *civil concordat*, in this novel treaty of amity and alliance between two portions of the same people; the one, with power on their side, and the other, only with justice; it well becomes the Protestant portion, who are to draw up the treaty, and to digest its articles, to have before their eyes and their memories, the inflections of the treaty of Limerick, which were made so soon after that most solemn agreement, when the letter of the national compact was gradually and yet not slowly destroyed and nullified, solely by *political power not having its due balance and equiponderance among all portions of the same people*. The consequence of this unjust distribution, beginning from the same hour, was the penal code; proscription; persecution; political distinction, generating every other distinction; and above all, and through all, a *MORAL* degradation, weakening and withering the national character, abroad and at home, and keeping *all ranks* of society in a state of semi-barbarism, while ferocious insou-

lence and abject servility were diffused throughout the country, and often combined in the same individual: as in Egypt, none could aspire to become a *bey*, who had not formerly been a *slave*. We would then say, notwithstanding the great pressure of other business which does not admit of postponement, let the legislature of the empire make haste, as much as is reconcileable to the important business; make haste, we say, to atone to this much and long injured land, by large liberality and magnanimous policy, not in a compromising spirit, higgling and bargaining, as it were, in the market, but with a candid and confidential interchange of reciprocal rights and duties before the altar of the Most High.

The truth is, that the legislature must, in a great measure, instruct and lesson, and, as it were, *convert* the mass of the people in Great Britain, upon this question of vital policy, as well as vital Christianity, by the authority of reason, as well as by the enactment of law. We wish to think, that what is called the executive government, or at least, the influential portion of it, have preserved somewhat of an amicable neutrality upon the subject, in most parts of Britain, although with many exceptions. A singular exception of this kind has occurred, to illustrate the Isle of Wight, where a petition, sent for signature from *authority*, found only five or six, out of thirty-six clergymen, who could be induced to subscribe it; and even of those few, the greater part acted under confounding influence. We do the administration the credit to

believe, that they are much more enlightened upon the expediency, and even pressing necessity of this great healing measure, than the borough aristocracy of the land, who are neither able nor willing to consider it in any other light than as an *innovation*. That is enough. It forms a precedent for reform. There is the rub. *That* it is, and chiefly, if not altogether, *that*, which agitates their secret souls, not from religious regards, however much they may *affect them*, to give the best colour to their resistance, but, really and truly, from fears, purely and personally selfish, respecting the sad consequences of new experiments, in the existing order of things, which they account excellent, and which, with the help of their good friends, the clergy, they would wish to be accounted too sacred for mortal touch.

But, like the court of East India Directors, they should consider how to yield up with the best grace *some part* of their monopoly, for yield they must; and if they could with any degree of decency, as borough proprietors, or corporators, apply for a *compensation* from government, for the injuries they are like to suffer through Catholic emancipation, these speculators of public weal, would no doubt present such a petition of claims to parliament, and remunerate themselves for the enfranchisement of a part, by a tax upon the whole of the people. By bills of *compensation* the resistance ready to start against the union, was kept down and muffled; and, perhaps, by other bills of *compensation*, this second edition of the union, improved and amended, is to be imposed upon the public.

The monosyllable *job* has been of late changed into the polysyllable *compensation*, and as the name is changed, so many are contented to believe, is also the nature of things expressed by them, although identically the same. And on the whole, we conclude, that the *borough estate*, whether it be *Whig* or *Tory*, and it is composed of *both*, is (considered as a party) adverse to reform, and scarcely reconciled to Catholic emancipation, as eventually inducing that general and radical reform, which both parties equally hate, however individual partizans may now and then squander a popular sentiment or two upon the subject. Mr. Pensonby has done so; Mr. Plunket will do so; but a great people should be slow in their confidence, and cautiously discriminate in their effusions of gratitude, which often, meeting with future disappointment, brings the existence of such a thing as patriotism into doubt, when the sole fault lay in their own premature anticipations.

The man aloof from both parties, however inclined by personal affections to one of them; above the acceptance of transitory office; untainted by the habits and modes of thinking and acting incident to an ambitious and ambiguous profession, (the members of which are so often paid for making "the worse appear the better reason," that they lose by degrees the fine tact of morality, and substitute in its place a callous palm, a capacious pocket, and a distensible conscience,) enjoying a complete independence of fortune, always referable to the gratitude of his country: having lived so long as to lay up a rich accumulation, and bank of character; and now too old ever to

have the inclination, or (such is the influence of virtuous habit) to have the power of deviating from the glorious consistency and unity of that character: this is the man in whom we place our unbounded confidence, and on whose honoured head we presume reverently to cast our leaf of laurel. This man is—HENRY GRAT-TAN.

Dr. Priestley's Works.

March 24, 1813.

MR. EDITOR,

The propriety of printing an uniform edition of the invaluable works of the late Dr. Priestley, having been suggested in the 6th volume of your Repository, and as most of them are out of print, or else become exceedingly scarce, I and several of my acquaintance have long anxiously anticipated the appearance of an advertisement to that effect. The rapid increase of Unitarianism, of late years, and the spirit of inquiry into the principles of rational Christianity, which begins every where to prevail, call aloud for such a publication. It would prove a great acquisition to the congregational libraries, established in different parts of the country; and hundreds of persons who are eager to read what the doctor has given to the world, but who are now prevented, some on account of a scarcity of copies, and others by the great expence of purchasing whole sets at one time, would then be easily accommodated. If a new edition were determined on, and a volume published every two months, or two volumes in a quarter of a year, and so on till the whole be completed, they

would then come within the reach of all classes of persons, who might feel inclined to become subscribers. As there are many persons partial to the doctor's theological works, and those on collateral topics, who do not feel an equal interest in such as are on *scientific* subjects, perhaps it would be the better way to form an arrangement, so that the scientific ones should come last, and in such a manner that the subscribers might be at liberty either to take or omit them.

I wish very much to call the attention of Unitarians to the execution of this important publication, as it will not only tend materially to promote the extension of knowledge and virtue, but also to raise a durable monument of their affection and regard to the memory of the indefatigable, learned and pious author.

Humbly praying that the wise and benevolent Ruler of the Universe may send forth an ample supply of such faithful and disinterested labourers into his harvest, as was Dr. Priestley, I remain, Sir, with my best wishes for the progressive popularity of your excellent Repository,

Yours, &c.

GAIUS.

Extracts of Letters from the late Rev. B. Davies.

SIR,

As the duty of Unitarian Ministers boldly to state and defend their sentiments, has been often discussed, it may not be unacceptable to many of your readers to have the following thoughts on the subject, which I extract from a letter received from the late Rev.

B. Davies, of Evesham, upon his opinion and advice being asked about the propriety of a young Unitarian minister dwelling often on his peculiar tenets.

"I am extremely glad to find that * * * * * is sound in the faith, and I cannot be displeased at his zeal for the propagation of his apostolic creed. He is not ignorant, I am confident, of the efficacy of good principles thoroughly understood, deeply imbibed, and carefully cherished, to promote the melioration of the heart, and the direction of the conduct,—in warm, but rational devotion, in an exemplarity of life, free on the one hand from any degree of laxity, and on the other, from any *unnecessary* stiffness, or its frequent concomitant, a proud ostentation of sanctity, which is the odious badge of many enthusiastic sects in our day. But the point I had immediately in view, was to express my thoughts respecting the propriety of his expressing his zeal warmly and frequently in defence of his doctrines. His conduct in this respect must be modified by many complex considerations, as his talents, his audience, and connections, and the probability of making favourable impressions: he must follow his own well-informed conviction as to the mode of uniting the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove. The latter, I am glad to infer from your account, he is in no great danger to sacrifice to the former. In some cases, silence is criminal, but a sincere declaration can at the worst be deemed only imprudent. But a seasonable declaration, *Oh! how good a thing it is!* when coming from a respectable quarter, and verified by powerful arguments. Will it throw any light upon this subject, if I mention two modern divines *only*, of of the same *orthodox* sentiments, but widely different in their manner of divulging them, and at the same time men of equal integrity: the one Dr. Lardner, who seemed to have been forced by his conviction of duty, notwithstanding his aversion to controversy, to deliver the truth. He has been honoured by all parties of divines, the highest dignitaries of the church, and deists too, with the appellation of the learned and *candid* Dr. Lardner. There the matter rested: He was so oily and smooth, that nobody thought himself hurt by his ho-

retical principles, as they would call them,—and what converts did he make among churchmen, who universally extolled him, except among a few thinking persons, who were generally as cautious as himself? The other is Dr. Priestley, who was perhaps equally the mild, and I will add, in the essential sense of the word, the *candid* Christian. But when he appeared with the zeal and intrepidity of an apostle, people cried out, they that turn the world upside down, are come amongst us; the corrupt church trembled for its foundation, and thousands took the alarm; and a glorious list is upon record, and continually increasing, of many noble Brethren, who deserted their sanctuary, which they saw was polluted with Popish idols. Truth claims the field of discussion only,—in this field alone has she obtained her never-fading laurels,—this she courts and no other among rational beings. Let * * * * * and * * * * * fight under her banners with their affectionate, &c.

March 1st, 1809.

B. D.

Not altogether unconnected with the above subject is the following extract from a letter received from the same, upon sending him an account of the Unitarian Fund dinner, 1809; and you may perhaps not deem it unworthy a place in your valuable miscellany.

“ I partook of the feast in some measure with you. No cause will ever flourish without zeal and union, which I rejoice to see adopted for the spread of Unitarianism. What wonderful effects have these means produced in promoting Methodism! It threatens to overthrow all other *isms* in the nation, from its adaptation to the prepossessions, ignorance and passions of the lower class, which forms the largest portion of all people. It is remarkable, that Unitarianism takes root principally among the great, the liberal, the learned and the inquisitive; and Methodism among the uninformed. Besides, the methodistic cause is favoured not a little among some of the higher classes, by the jesuitical pretence of an adherence to the established church, which throws off the odium of dissent, and leaves the door open to their admission to all places under government. We may

however augur upon good grounds the final triumph of the truth of Unitarian Christianity. Growing information has hitherto ameliorated society, and been gradually, though slowly, effectual in expelling civil barbarism from the earth, and who can doubt but it will be progressive in its march. It is to a few select champions, that we are indebted for emancipation from the slavery of the dark ages, whose spirit was caught by others, and posterity will be equally indebted to the two great theological champions whom you commemorated, (Priestley and Lindsey) and other kindred souls, for emancipation from superstitious ignorance.”

Your's,

A CONSTANT READER.

Objections to the Unitarian Fund.

March 1, 1813.

SIR,

After a deliberate inquiry, in which I can truly say, that I was actuated solely by a desire to discover the truth, at the age of twenty-five I became a decided Unitarian; and in consequence, considered it as an imperative duty to secede from the Church of England, in which I had been educated, openly to profess the principles I had adopted, and to defend and promulgate them on all proper occasions. But as I always thought a liturgy, with which the congregation was previously acquainted, and in which they could occasionally join, highly expedient, if not essential to the due performance of public worship, and admired the affecting simplicity, piety and sublimity of much of the church service, I separated from its communion with regret: a regret, which was not diminished by the circumstance, that my nearest friends and connections were much hurt and displeased at the step I had taken.

With the sentiments of that apostolic man, the truly reverend The-

ophilus Lindsey, I entirely accorded. I had the happiness for many years to profit by his ministry, and to enjoy his friendship, which I shall ever consider as a great privilege and honour. Wishing to promote the cause of genuine Christianity, I joined the Unitarian Book Society, and believe it has done much good. So far, therefore, I have withdrawn from the Church established. I find, however, that I shall not therefore be acknowledged as a genuine Dissenter by any class of Dissenters now existing. And if, as has been asserted by persons of high authority among them, the proper characteristic of a Dissenter is an aversion to, and condemnation of, not only the present establishment, but all national establishments of religion, whatever they may be, I freely declare, that I am no Dissenter in this sense of the word. With the government of the church, I do not think myself, in my private station, called upon or warranted to interfere, nor indeed to have any personal concern with it. My objections lie to the Trinitarian and Calvinistic tenets introduced into her forms and liturgy: were they removed, I could conscientiously return to her communion. For I cannot but regard the objections alleged by the old Puritans as very insufficient to warrant their separation; and that, while they laid a great and undue stress upon matters of little moment, they were themselves deeply involved in error and fanaticism, united with a want of charity, and the same disposition to persecute, when in power, which they so loudly complained of in their opponents.

It appeared to me necessary to

say thus much by way of introduction. I now proceed to the purpose of my letter, which is, to explain the reasons that deter me, though a zealous Unitarian, from uniting myself to the Unitarian Fund Society, of which you are so warm and active a promoter: and I trust the candour and impartiality you profess will be evinced by admitting my letter into the *Monthly Repository*.

It seems to me that two sorts of ministers are requisite in the Christian church, whose provinces are different; and that excellence in both is seldom found in the same person. The first, men of study, well versed in the languages in which the scriptures are written, and in every thing that may tend to elucidate them. Upon their report the unlearned in those languages must depend. In cases where the learned are divided in their opinions, the unlearned must be doubtful; when the former generally concur in any interpretation the latter may be more confident. Another class of ministers is best adapted to convey religious instruction to the multitude; and may, as English scholars only, be very well-informed; be acquainted with the best commentators, and furnished with every other requisite for their office. Now I cannot conceive that the plan adopted by the Unitarian Fund Society, of teaching a few persons something of Hebrew and Greek for a short time, can tend to any thing but to make them smatterers and pedants; full of a conceit of that sort of knowledge, without the reality; which, should it induce them to enter into contests with able adversaries, such contests may end in their confusion, and perhaps

defection. No Sir, if the object of the Society be popular preaching, and the diffusion of genuine, rational Christianity among the people; let them employ discreet, virtuous and well-informed men, who have a true zeal; though their studies are confined to the English language, a very extensive field, and abounding in all useful knowledge.

The Society, as far as it has for its object the encouraging and supporting Unitarian congregations already formed, by presents of books, pecuniary assistance, and occasional visiting and preaching among them, thereby opening a communication and intercourse with them, and connecting them with the Society in London, has my approbation, and in this I earnestly wish them success. But I am not prepared to say the same of their sending missionaries to preach in market-places and carpenters' shops; and sending bellmen with hand-bills about a town to collect together people to hear them. This appears to have a tendency to stir up dissension, and even to endanger the public peace, which it is the magistrate's province to preserve. If it be said in answer, that our Lord and his apostles publicly taught in highways and market-places, I answer that they carried with them their credentials in the power of working miracles, which modern apostles, do not, I suppose, pretend to. I now proceed to consider, as connected with this sort of preaching, that declared hostility to the Church of England and all national establishments, so apparent in all the proceedings of the Society; which I must condemn, as both dangerous and unwarrant-

ed by reason or scripture. Into this error Dr. Priestley unhappily fell, which was the principal cause of his sufferings. I revere the memory of Dr. Priestley, and have a high esteem for the greater part of his various, ingenious, and valuable writings: but I blame him, inasmuch as I conceive, that had he steered clear of this point, he might, notwithstanding the freedom of his sentiments on other subjects, have remained in his country and among his friends to the day of his death unmolested. I hope his example will be an admonition to Unitarians to avoid any direct attack upon the national establishment, any further than is necessary in defending their own tenets, which are not connected with any form of public worship or church government: and still more, to avoid declarations against establishments in general, from which it may be inferred, that they do not desire the reformation, but the destruction of the church established. This must, in the opinion of a large portion of the community, rank them among the enemies of the state. The destruction of the establishment would probably make way for the predominance of a domineering, fanatical sect, whose principles incline them to persecution, of which Unitarians would be the first victims. And let me ask, while every congregation of Dissenters is left at liberty to choose their own faith and mode of worship, has not the legislature of the country an equal right to adopt that form of worship that appears to their combined wisdom to be the best adapted to the religious and moral instruction of the people committed to their charge?

If it be alleged, that it is hard the Dissenters should be compelled to pay for the established worship, while they support their own ministers, it may be answered, that it is no more than a reasonable tribute, since they differ from the majority of their countrymen: but in fact they do not pay for the established worship; the church is endowed with ample estates, which if they were properly and equitably applied, would be sufficient for its support. And the oppression of tythes might be removed by selling them, as the land-tax has been sold, and laying out the produce in land; or by converting them into corn-rents. For my part, I hold an established church, provided for by the state, without any distinction between Churchmen and Dissenters as to their admissibility to civil offices, which, in fact, amounts to nothing more than a public leading in religion, and a provision for the instruction of the great mass of the people, who, without it, would be in danger of losing all religious impressions,—to be very expedient and necessary: and that those who maintain the contrary opinion have a tendency, without perhaps knowing it, to fanaticism. I cannot but remark, and I do it with concern, that the Society, like most of the Dissenters, is very fond of extempore or, as they call it, free prayer. Now I conceive this to be a sort of Popery, compelling the congregation, if they will pray at all, to adopt the sentiments, and pray in the words of the minister, and that without examination; for if they stop to consider, they criticise instead of praying, and lose all devotion. To make

this worse, the prayers are usually very long, and weary the attention, even when good. If they be written beforehand, which is better, they come nearer to a liturgy, but a liturgy that no one but the minister has read. A liturgy combines and unites a congregation, which otherwise has really no bond of union. If well-composed and approved by the congregation, they may all join in it with understanding and devotion, and individuals may apply it to their own particular cases.

Another objection to the conduct of the Society is a very important one. This is the uniting with their teaching of gospel truths, such as the Divine Unity and placability, several dogmas on dark, mysterious subjects, beyond the ken of mortals; to which, however, they seem to require assent, to round their system. Such, I mean, as the materiality of the human soul, and that it, together with the body, totally perishes and is dissolved at death. To decide such a point as this, concerning which we are wholly ignorant, seems very presumptuous, especially considering how many among the learned and the wise, philosophers and Christians, have thought and still think otherwise. It appears like a contradiction and impossibility, that when a being, like man, has been totally destroyed and mouldered into dust, he should, after many years, be revived, and be the same man, with the same thoughts and dispositions. A new man may be created; but how this new man can be the same as the old one seems to be incomprehensible. We firmly believe that we shall live in a future state, and be re-

warded and punished according to our deeds done in the body; but of the manner in which this will be accomplished we are wholly ignorant; and it does not become any of us to dogmatise on the subject. We should

“Wait the great teacher death, and God adore.”

The doctrine of the necessity of human actions is another accessory, of a nature to alarm and perplex men even of sound understanding, and therefore very improper to be urged. To reconcile the divine prescience with the liberty of human actions is difficult; but the doctrine of necessity takes away all difference between right and wrong, vice and virtue. We all feel and believe, whatever the advocates for necessity may say to the contrary, that our actions are under our own guidance; that there is both vice and virtue; that they are most opposite to each other; and that all morality and religion are founded on this distinction. I must *act* upon this belief. Why, then, puzzle the understandings of men with attempts to explain what cannot be understood, and of which they who attempt to inform others are as ignorant as any among their hearers. The origin of the evil that abounds in the world, some also pretend to account for; but they leave us as much in the dark, on this difficult subject, as we were before.

Is the discussion of such dark and profound questions, which have foiled the sagacity of the greatest philosophers and the most learned and acute divines, before a mixed congregation, likely to be attended with any benefit to the hearers? Will it conduce to make

men more just and honest, more sincerely pious and benevolent? Is it not rather likely to confound their understandings, or to produce general scepticism? Above all, does it become any men in their present state of ignorance, to be positive on such points, and to make them articles of faith?

Such, Sir, are the particulars in the conduct of the Unitarian Fund Society, which must, while they exist, keep me at a distance from it. Nevertheless, with sincere good-will, wishing them success in all that part of the design of which I have before expressed my approbation, I subscribe myself,

Yours,

X. X. A SECEDER.

JOHN MILTON.

Unus patronus bonæ causæ satis est.

EPISCOPIUS.

No. XXV.

Popular Preaching and Pulpit Training.

But here it will be readily objected, What if they who are to be instructed, be not able to maintain a minister, as in many villages? I answer, That the scripture shews in many places what ought to be done herein. First, I offer it to the reason of any man whether he think the knowledge of Christian religion harder than any other art or science to attain. I suppose he will grant, that it is far easier, both of itself, and in regard of God's assisting Spirit, not particularly promised us to the attainment of other knowledge, but of this only; since it was preached as well to the shepherds of Bethlehem by angels

as to the Eastern wise men by that star; and our Saviour declares himself anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, Luke iv. 18. Then surely to their capacity. They who after him first taught it, were otherwise unlearned men; they who before Huss and Luther first reformed it, were for the meanness of their condition called, *The Poor Men of Lyons*; and in Flanders, at this day, *Les Gueus*, which is to say, *Beggars*. Therefore are the scriptures translated into every vulgar tongue, as being held in main matters of belief and salvation, plain and easy to the poorest; and such no less than their teachers, have the Spirit to guide them in all truth. *John* xiv. 26, and xvi. 13. Hence we may conclude, if men be not all their life-time under a teacher to learn logic, natural philosophy, ethics or mathematics, which are more difficult, that certainly it is not necessary to the attainment of Christian knowledge, that men should sit all their life long at the feet of a pulpited divine: while he, a lollard indeed over his elbow cushion, in almost the 7th part of 40 or 50 years, teaches them scarce half the principles of religion: and his sheep oftentimes sit the while to as little purpose of benefiting as the sheep in their pews at Smithfield; and for the most part, by some simony or other bought and sold like them; or, if this comparison be too low, like those women, 1 Tim. iii. 7. *ever learning and never attaining*: yet not so much through their own fault as through the unskilful and immethodical teaching of their pastor, teaching here and there at random, out of this or that text, as his ease or fancy, and oftentimes

as his stealth guides him. Seeing then that Christian religion may be so easily attained, and by meanest capacities, it cannot be much difficult to find ways, both how the poor, yea all men, may be soon taught what is to be known of Christianity, and they who teach them recompensed. First, if ministers of their own accord, who pretend that they are called and sent to preach the gospel, those especially who have no particular flock, would imitate our Saviour and his disciples, who went preaching through the villages, not only through the cities, Matth. ix. 35. Mark vi. 6. Luke xiii. 22. Acts xiii. 25, and there preached to the poor as well as to the rich, looking for no recompence but in heaven; John iv. 35, 36. *Look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest; and he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal.* This was their wages. But they will soon reply, we ourselves have not wherewithal; who shall bear the charges of our journey? To whom it may as soon be answered, that, in likelihood, they are not poorer than they who did thus: and if they have not the same faith which those disciples had to trust in God and the promise of Christ for their maintenance as they did, and yet intrude into the ministry without any livelihood of their own, they cast themselves into a miserable hazard or temptation, and oftentimes into a more miserable necessity, either to starve or to please their paymasters rather than God: and give men just cause to suspect, that they came neither called nor sent from above to preach the word, but from below, by the instinct of their own hunger,

to feed upon the church. Yet grant it needful to allow them both the charges of their journey and the hire of their labour, it will belong next to the charity of richer congregations, where most commonly they abound with teachers, to send some of their number to the villages round, as the apostles from Jerusalem sent Peter and John to the city and villages of Samaria, *Acts* viii. 14—25; or as the church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch, *ch.* xi. 22, and other churches joining, sent Luke to travel with Paul, *2 Cor.* viii. 19, though whether they had their charges borne by the church or no, it be not recorded. If it be objected that this itinerant preaching will not serve to plant the gospel in those places, unless they who are sent abide there some competent time; I answer, that if they stay there a year or two, which was the longest time usually stayed by the apostles in one place, it may suffice to teach them who will attend and learn, all the points of religion necessary to salvation: then sorting them into several congregations of a moderate number, out of the ablest and zealeusest among them to create elders, who, exercising and requiring from themselves what they have learned, [for no learning is retained without constant exercise and methodical repetition,] may teach and govern the rest; and so exhorted to continue faithful and steadfast, they may securely be committed to the providence of God and the guidance of his Holy Spirit, till God may offer some opportunity to visit them again, and to confirm them; which when they have done, they have done as much as the apostles were wont to do in propagating

the gospel, *Acts* xiv. 23. *And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.* And in the same *ch.* vs. 21, 22. *When they had preached the gospel to the city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra and to Iconium and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples and exhorting them to continue in the faith.* And *ch.* xv. 36. *Let us go again and visit our brethren.* And *v.* 41. *He went thorow Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.* To these I might add other helps, which we enjoy now, to make more easy the attainment of Christian religion by the meanest,—the entire scripture translated into English, with plenty of notes; and somewhere or other, I trust, may be found some wholesome body of divinity, as they call it, without school-terms and metaphysical notions, which have obscured, rather than explained, our religion, and made it seem difficult without cause. Thus taught once for all, and thus now and then visited and confirmed, in the most destitute and poorest places of the land, under the government of their own elders, performing all ministerial offices among them, they may be trusted to meet and edify one another, whether in church or chapel, or, to save them the trudging of many miles thither, nearer home, though in a house or barn. For notwithstanding the gaudy superstition of some devoted still ignorantly to temples, we may be well assured that he who disdained not to be laid in a manger, disdains not to be preached in a barn; and that by such meetings as these, being indeed most apostolical and

primitive, they will, in a short time, advance more in Christian knowledge and reformation of life, than by the many years preaching of such an incumbent, I may say, of such an incubus oft-times, as will be meanly hired to abide long in those places. They have this left perhaps to object further, that to send thus and to maintain, though but for a year or two, ministers and teachers in several places, would prove chargeable to the churches, though in towns and cities round about. To whom again I answer, that it was not thought so by them who first thus propagated the gospel, though but few in number to us, and much less able to sustain the expence. Yet this expence would be much less than to hire incumbents, or rather incumbrances, for life-time; and a great means (which is the subject of this discourse) to diminish hirelings.

But be the expence less or more, if it be found burdensome to the churches, they have in this land an easy remedy in their recourse to the civil magistrate, who hath in his hands the disposal of no small revenues, left, perhaps, anciently to superstitious, but meant undoubtedly to good and best uses; and therefore, once made public, applicable by the magistrate to such uses as the church, or solid reason from whomsoever, shall convince him to think best. And those uses may be, no doubt, much rather than as glebes and augmentations are now bestowed, to grant such requests as these of the churches; or to erect, in greater number all over the land, schools, and competent libraries to those schools, where languages and arts may be taught free toge-

ther, without the needless, unprofitable and inconvenient removing to another place. So all the land would be soon better civilized, and they who are taught freely at the public cost, might have their education given them on this condition, that therewith content, they should not gad for preferment out of their own country, but continue there thankful for what they received freely, bestowing it as freely on their country, without soaring above the meanness wherein they were born.

But how they shall live when they are thus bred and dismissed, will be still the sluggish objection. To which is answered, That those public foundations may be so instituted as the youth therein may be at once brought up to a competence of learning and to an honest trade; and the hours of teaching so ordered, as their study may be no hindrance to their labour or their calling. This was the breeding of St. Paul, though born of no mean parents, a free citizen of the Roman empire: so little did his trade debase him, that it rather enabled him to use that magnanimity of preaching the gospel through *Asia* and *Europe* at his own charges: thus those preachers among the poor *Waldenses*, the ancient stock of our reformation, without these helps which I speak of, bred up themselves in trades, and especially in physic and surgery, as well as in the study of scripture (which is the only true theology), that they might be no burden to the church; and by the examples of Christ might cure both soul and body, through industry joining that to their ministry which he joined to his by gift of the Spirit. Thus relates *Peter Gilles*, in his

History of the *Waldenses* in *Piedmont*.

But our ministers think scorn to use a trade, and count it the reproach of this age that tradesmen preach the gospel. It were to be wished they were all tradesmen; they would not then, so many of them, for want of another trade, make a trade of their preaching: and yet they clamour that tradesmen preach; and yet they preach, while they themselves are the worst tradesmen of all.

(Works. Folio. Vol. ii. 769—771.)

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

No. CXVIII.

Prince of Wales spiritualized.

In "The New Spiritual Magazine" for November, 1783, is the following article of News, with the *Improvement*.

"Nov. 20. The Prince of Wales has declared his intention to attend parliament whenever any important questions are brought on the carpet, in order to make himself acquainted with the internal and external politics of the country.—*The Prince of the Kings of the Earth, even Jesus, has declared his intention to execute the counsels of the Eternal Three in behalf of his people, to supply all their wants out of his infinite fullness, to overrule every event for their good, to be their indulgent Saviour to the end of the world, and at length admit them to partake of his glory in heaven. Even so. Amen.*"

The same Magazine has reflections,

"1. For one that hath a full barn, but no Christ. 2. For one that Christ but no barn. 3. For one that hath a full barn and Christ too. 4. For one that hath neither a barn nor Christ."

On the back of the title-page is advertised a new edition of the 4 first numbers, "in which are expunged all those particulars relating to Mr. Wills, Mr. Sellon, Mr. Clayton, &c. which gave so much offence to some particular persons."

No. CXIX.

A Fore-runner of Professor Marsh.

On Wicliff's putting out his translation of the Bible, an universal clamour was immediately raised. *Knighton*, a canon of Leicester, and nearly a contemporary with the Reformer, has left us upon record the language of the times: "Christ entrusted his gospel," (says that ecclesiastic,) "to the clergy and doctors of the church, to minister it to the laity and weaker sort, according to their exigencies and several occasions. But this master John Wicliff, by translating it has made it vulgar; and has laid it more open to the laity, and even to women, who can read, than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy, and those of the best understanding; and thus the gospel jewel, the evangelical pearl, is thrown about and trodden under foot of swine."

No. CXX.

Athanasian Musician.

The Athanasian Creed is ap-

pointed to be said or sung in the English Church, and in the older editions of the Book of Common Prayer there is a versification of it by Sternhold and Hopkins. This formulary would seem little accordant with any principles of harmony; yet Dr. Watts says, (*Improv. of Mind.* ch. xiv. § 9,) that he knew "a man of peculiar skill in music, who found out a great resemblance of the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity in every single note, and he thought *it carried something of argument in it to prove that doctrine.*"

No. CXXI.

Popular Preaching.

The qualities in a preacher which attract popularity do not always ensure fame. Some of the most eminent writers that the Dissenters have produced were disregarded in the pulpit, or disesteemed in comparison with some of their cotemporaries whose names have scarcely survived them. Let our popular preachers read the history of Dr. Lardner, and learn to estimate aright the honours in which they plume themselves. That great scholar thus wrote in the year 1721, when he was more than 37 years of age. "I am yet at a loss how to dispose of myself. I can say I am desirous of being useful in the world. Without this, no external advantages relating to myself will make me happy; and yet I have no prospect of being serviceable in the work of the ministry; *having preached many years without being favoured with the approbation and choice of one congregation.*"—He was forty-five

years of age before he obtained a settlement among the Dissenters. The rich Dissenting laity were remiss even in purchasing his works. A bank note of twenty pounds, sent to him by that excellent and munificent citizen, Thomas Hollis, was the greatest sum he ever received as a benefaction. He complained (how shameful that he should have had occasion to complain!) that *he had never received any mark of favour from the Dissenters; not, said he, so much as a trust:* alluding to Dr. Williams's charities and Library, the trustees of which consist of thirteen ministers and ten lay gentlemen. That body might have had the honour of making the first scholar in the world one of their number, and by electing him might have added to the satisfaction and pleasure of his life! But Dr. Lardner was deaf, and was moreover a Socinian.

No. CXXII.

Ruin of Monarchs:

Speed, the Chroniclist, says, "When princes are wilful and slothful, and their favourites flatterers, there needs no other enchantment to infatuate, yea, to ruin the greatest monarchs."

No. CXXIII.

No Time in the Grave.

Of the Elector of Saxony, who died of an apoplexy in hunting, *Luther* observed, that when his highness waked in the morning of the resurrection, he would think he had just returned from hunting.

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *A Second Letter to the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D.D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, concerning the Opinion that the vital Principle of the Reformation has been lately conceded by him to the Church of Rome. By the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, Priest of the Catholic Church.* London, printed and published for the Author, by Keating, Brown and Keating, &c. &c. 1813. 8vo. pp. 101.

When a controversy is at once voluminous and important, a retrospect of its successive stages—of the questions at issue and of the nature of the arguments severally employed,—may answer useful ends. The discussions, of which the Bible Society has been the occasion and the subject, are perhaps approaching their termination. However, they are too interesting and remarkable to share the fate of the mass of the polemical effusions of the day: and men who are not indifferent to the main principles of Protestantism, will anxiously watch the progress of a dispute in which the cause of the Reformation is concerned.

Dr. Wordsworth, the respectable editor of “*Ecclesiastical Biography*,” was, if we mistake not, the earliest of the Antibiblists: he laid before the public his apprehensions that the British and Foreign Bible Society would have an unfavourable influence on the state of certain long-established asso-

ciations for the diffusion of religious knowledge at home and abroad. It was replied, that the world furnished ample scope for the efforts of *all* these societies, that their several exertions would animate each other's zeal, and that it seemed impossible for the interests of a *Protestant* church to be endangered, or for the duty of its ministers to be compromised, by measures of which the *sole* view is the circulation of the Scriptures. Indeed, it has been fully ascertained that the associations thus referred to, were insufficient for supplying even our poorer countrymen with the sacred volume.

After some minor combatants, whose names and feats do not deserve to be recorded, had shewn themselves on the stage, the “*Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge*,” at length, appeared. His strength was greater and his weapons were brighter than those of his predecessor in this conflict. To drop the figure, he was superior to Dr. Wordsworth in point of perspicuity and skill. He boldly aimed at proving that those members of the establishment act a hazardous and inconsistent part who join Dissenters in the distribution of the Bible, *unaccompanied by the Prayer-book*. For *them* to bestow the volume of heavenly truth *without this explanation of it*, was, he argued, to countenance a sort of *generalized Protestantism*, neither contained in creeds nor defined by articles: it was an improper concession to

nonconformists—it was in fact giving them an ascendancy—it was to surrender the badge of a churchman, while no corresponding surrender was made by the dissidents. This declaration, nevertheless, could not be substantiated. The advocates of the Society assured him that the sacrifice was reciprocal; that if the churchman waves, *so far as he is a member* of this association, the circulation of the Liturgy, the nonconformist waves, for the same reason, and in the same connexion, the circulation of his favourite catechisms; that men are not precluded from distributing the prayer-book in other channels; and that since the establishment of the Bible Society, the distribution of it has considerably increased. To the force of these reasonings Dr. Marsh has been insensible: nor has even Mr. Vansittart, whose plainness and energy of argument in this discussion are happily combined with an engaging mildness of temper, succeeded in the attempt to convince him that his attack on the Bible Institution, is little consistent with the principles of Protestants.

The learned Professor has taken exception to some of its statements, or rather perhaps the statements of certain of its friends: “Its utility,” says he, “has not been so conspicuous as you represent it in procuring translations of the Scriptures to be executed into foreign languages.” Now, we believe the truth to be, that a few persons have advanced inadvertent and exaggerated assertions on this part of the subject. Still, the labours of this society *abroad*, as well as in our own country, have been widely beneficial: and

we are of opinion that the Review of Dr. Marsh's *Inquiry, &c.* in one of the recent numbers of *the Christian Observer*, will, on the whole, satisfy the reader that this objection is less formidable in reality than in appearance.

We shall next refer to an Anti-biblist, for whom, however we now differ from him, we feel great respect. In Dr. Maltby's judgment, to circulate *the whole* of the Bible, is unnecessary and useless—to circulate any part of it *without explanatory notes* is inexpedient. These propositions he has illustrated in a manner which exhibits his own acquaintance with scriptural criticism, and which deserves the regard of *all* ministers of religion; yet we think, and have endeavoured to shew, that his observations, valuable as many of them are in themselves, have no strict relation to the point at issue, and that the text of the Bible must be put into the hands of the people, before they can possess any curiosity to know on what principles they should interpret its contents.*

“The Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge,” is, after all, the grand champion of the anti-biblists: nor has he yet retired from the field, nor is he likely to retire from it, while one opponent remains with whom he is not ashamed of combating. His eminent learning and abilities, (for eminent they are, notwithstanding they have been exerted with less advantage in this controversy than on some other occasions) have been long known to our readers. The name of Mr. Gandolphy, too, does not now appear for the first

* Vol. VII: 704—711.

time in the pages of the Monthly Repository.* As a writer and a theologian, he has no claims on our esteem. His style bespeaks a pen unpracticed even in the correctness of English composition: and a divine, be he of what church he may, who in the nineteenth century, and in civilized Europe, appeals to the famous clause in 1 John v. 7, as authentic scripture, and who confounds biblical criticism with tradition,† must be pronounced either ignorant or bigoted in the extreme. Mr. Gandolphy seems to be a sincere and zealous Catholic who shrinks not from the avowal of his principles, nor fears to follow them to their proper consequences.

"Nothing," he remarks to Dr. Marsh, "was ever more foreign from my thoughts, than to compliment you, for appealing to an authority, whilst arguing with the Dissenter, which the Dissenter does not admit. I should first endeavour to convince him of the necessity of admitting that authority; which was my real motive for inscribing to you THE SERMON ON THE INADEQUACY OF THE BIBLE TO BE AN EXCLUSIVE RULE OF FAITH. For admit but the principle of *authority*, and you must either be a Catholic, or what you have defined a *generalized Protestant*." 5, 6.

The author's meaning, no doubt, is, that the principle of *church authority* being admitted, consistency requires the person embracing it to be a Catholic; and that, for such an one there is no safe resting-place between submission to the Romish sec and "generalized Protestantism."

This language is, nevertheless, inaccurate; the *generalized Protestantism* which he reprobates, and which consists in a firm

avowal of the belief that Jesus is the Messiah, and that the scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice, being perfectly irreconcilable to the ecclesiastical authority of which he is the advocate.

He afterwards observes,

"You must, either admit that *the poor of the establishment* do not require the Common Prayer Book to keep them in the religion of their fathers, and secure them against "the delusions of *false interpretation*," whilst they have the Bible, or acknowledge that *another* evidence, another authority or *clue*, is necessary, and that is, what is styled in the Catholic church **TRADITION**, the word unwritten in the scriptures. Else, whence do you make a distinction of orders in the hierarchy of your church? Else how do you justify the practice of baptizing infants who have no actual faith? Else how do you dispense with the obligation of *washing one another's feet*? Else why do you keep holy the first day of the week instead of the sabbath day? Else why do you ever venture to eat blood or strangled meats? Else how do you justify in a minister of Christ the possession of *gold and silver* and rich livings? Else how do you justify the tendering and taking of oaths?" 7, 8.

These questions certainly merit the attention of the Margaret Professor. To some of them, we suspect, he will be rather perplexed in giving an answer which shall be wholly independent on the authority of a church that either *cannot* or *does not* err.

"You affirm," adds Mr. Gandolphy, "that the religion of the church of England is the most correct system—the correct system of religion, (Inquiry, p. 11. Sermon, p. 33,) the true system of religion, (p. 4,) but that those who have the Bible *alone* cannot find it, (Inquiry, pages 4, 8, 11, 27,) therefore this *most correct*, this *correct*, this *true* system cannot be found by the Bible *alone*." 9, 10.

In the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth pages, the letter-writer reminds Dr. Marsh, that although

* Vol. VII. 182—184, and VIII. 204, 205.

† Pp. 31—37.

Protestantism is the established religion of Ireland, the great body of the Irish people are, however, Catholics: in a postscript he avers that "the scriptures lie about in Catholic families, like any other books, for any one to open," the reading of them not being prohibited; and he further says,

"I neither owe the Pontiff, nor will I pay him, the homage of any *external* allegiance; and though I acknowledge in him the spiritual character of chief bishop and supreme pastor of Christ's church, surely that is easily distinguished from the character of a sovereign, of a prince or of a civil legislator."

For ourselves, we see no reason to distrust these declarations; and we should hope that Dr. Marsh will not lightly doubt what Mr. Gandolphy terms (97) "the word of a clergyman."

We have heard of two disputants (we think they were brothers)—the one a Catholic, the latter a Protestant—who converted each other to their respective systems. This will hardly be the effect of the present correspondence. Not only are the gentlemen before us *unequally* opposed, in point of knowledge and ability, but the Margaret Professor must be *experimentally* and *practically* well persuaded that as the religion of the church of Rome is not *true*, neither is it by law *established*.

ART. II. *Sermons*, by Samuel Horsley, LL. D. F. R. S. F. A. S. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. Vol. III. Dundee, printed: London, sold by Longman and Co. Rivingtons, &c. 1812. 8vo. pp. 334.

Our sentiments of the late Bishop Horsley as a writer and a preacher, have already been ex-

pressed*. There was something in his tone and manner and general character which forced us to consider him as

More like a soldier than a man o' the church; and ingenious and elaborate as are many of the Sermons in the present volume, we discover few marks in them of sobriety, and still fewer of humility of mind. But we will not detain our readers from the discourses themselves.

The first four (numbered 30, 31, 32, 33,) are from Malachi iii. 1, 2, the subject of them being *The Advent of the Messiah*. We agree with the prelate in regarding this text as a prediction of the Mediator of the new covenant; but we protest against two conclusions which he is eager to deduce from it;—the one, that the deliverer whose coming is here announced, was "the Jehovah of the Old Testament,"—the other, that the phrasology of the former of these verses, affords a proof of the deity of Jesus Christ. Among the theological fancies of ancient or modern times, none is grosser than the notion that he was the *angel* of the Jewish dispensation. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever he was, could not but be more accurately informed on this subject than the divines of succeeding ages. He, in the beginning of his eloquent composition, has stated an unanswered and unanswerable argument against the hypothesis of God's having spoken "to the fathers" by "his Son:" and it is remarkable enough that, according to Morini and Hottinger, it is characteristic of the Samaritan translation of the

* Mon. Rep. Vol. VI. 234—236.

Pentateuch to express the name *Jehovah* by *the angel of God*.*

As to the clause "the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple," it describes the office, and not the nature of the Messiah: being, under God,† the head of the Christian church, he is styled the *Lord* of it;—"to us there is one Lord, Jesus Christ,"—"he is Lord of *all*," of *believing Jews and Gentiles*. The temple was *his*, because in that sacred edifice he was to communicate some of his instructions, to perform some of his miracles, and to exercise one of his most memorable acts of authority and power. For much the same reason, the Jewish nation are called, in John i. 11, *his own people*:—"he came unto *his own*, and *his own* received him not." Now they were the people, undoubtedly, of God: such they are often termed, and therefore, according to Bishop Horsley's ratiocination, Jesus must be God!

We learn from this preacher (37), assuredly not from the evangelists, that Christ, going up to Jerusalem to celebrate the passover, "found in the temple a market of live cattle, and bankers' shops, where strangers who came at this season from distant countries to Jerusalem *were accommodated with cash for their bills of credit*." Lightfoot has given a different and juster account of the matter.‡ The mind or the imagination of the deceased bishop, seems to have been familiar with the idea of "accommodation with cash for bills of credit:" yet,

really, he should not have applied modern usages to an exposition of ancient writings. Be the advantages of "paper credit" what they may, still there is no evidence that Palestine was favoured in our Saviour's days with this "last and best supply."

The next discourse (the 34th), printed originally as a single sermon, is on *the Incarnation of Christ*, from Luke i. 28. It professes to represent the importance of our Lord's miraculous birth as a tenet of Christian faith, and assumes, rather than proves, the fact. The pomp, loftiness and arrogance of the preacher's language, ill conceal the extreme feebleness of his reasoning.

In the Sermon which follows (the 35th), from Deut. xv. 11, and which was before published, he undertakes to shew, "first, that poverty is a real evil, which, without any impeachment of the goodness or wisdom of Providence, the constitution of the world actually admits; secondly, that the providential appointment of this evil, in subservience to the general good, brings a particular obligation upon men in civilized society to concur for the immediate extinction of the evil wherever it appears." These propositions are illustrated with some novelty, and for the most part strength of argument; and a pertinent application is then made of them to the occasion* of the discourse.

Mr. Horsley, the editor of this volume, ingenuously avows in the advertisement prefixed to it, that in his desire to withhold nothing of his revered father's from the public that could be given to them, he "may have suffered one

* Eichhorn's *Kritische Schriften*, Erster Band, 581. † Acts ii. 36.

‡ *Horæ Hebraicæ*, &c. on Matt. xx. 12.

* The Anniversary Meeting of the Sons of the Clergy.

or two sermons to appear which he himself, had he conducted the work, would have suppressed." The 36th discourse, which treats of the resurrection of Lazarus, from John xi. 25, 26, answers, we think, to this description. A few sentences in it however are not unworthy of seeing the light: and with these we are so much pleased, that we transcribe them:—

"Nothing is so much a genuine mark of barbarism as an obstinate incredulity. The evil minded and the illiterate, from very different causes, agree however in this, that they are always the last to believe upon any evidence less than the testimony of their own senses. Ingenuous minds are unwilling to suspect those frauds in other men to which they feel an aversion themselves: they always therefore give testimony its fair weight.—The man of science and speculation, as his knowledge enlarges, loses his attachment to a principle to which the barbarian steadily adheres—that of measuring the probability of strange facts by his own experience. He will be at least as slow to reject as to receive testimony; and he will avoid that obstinacy of unbelief which is satisfied with nothing but ocular demonstration, as of all erroneous principles the most dangerous and the greatest obstacle to the mind's improvement. The illiterate man, unimproved by study and by conversation, thinks that nothing can be of which he hath not seen the like: from a diffidence perhaps of his own ability to examine evidence, he is always jealous that you have an intention to impose upon him, and mean to sport with his credulity: hence his own senses are the only witnesses to which he will give credit." 120, 121, 122.

There is an air of originality in the two succeeding sermons (the 37th and the 38th,) of both which the text is Mark vii. 26, and the topic, *Our Lord's conduct and language to a woman of Syrophœnicia*. The preacher observes, that "the mercy shewn to this deserving woman, by the edification which is conveyed in the manner in which

the favour was conferred, was rendered a blessing to the whole church; inasmuch as it was the seal of the merit of the righteousness of faith,—not of *faith separable from good works*, consisting in a mere assent to facts; but of that faith which is the root of every good work—of that faith which consists in a trust in God, and a reliance on his mercy, founded on a just sense of his perfections." 173.

In the 39th discourse, preached before the Humane Society in 1789, and soon afterwards printed singly, there is much to be admired. The prelate takes Ecclesiastes xii. 7. as his text, and considers "human life as undeniably a compound of the three principles of intelligence, perception and vegetation,—death as consisting in nothing less than the dissolution of that union of soul and body, which Moses makes the principle of vitality, and this disunion as a thing subsequent, in the natural and common course of things, to the cessation of the mechanical life of the body." How far these views are theologically or physiologically correct, we do not now enquire. We are much gratified however by the eloquence with which the Bishop recommends the institution whose cause he was requested to plead, and especially by his address to some of the persons who had experienced its salutary aid. Having observed that it had been instrumental to the religious welfare of no small number, he proceeds thus:

"They stand here before you, whose recovered and reformed lives are the proof of my assertions. Let them plead, if my persuasion fail, let them plead the cause of their benefactors. Stand forth and tell, my brethren, to whom you owe

it under God that you stand here this day alive! Tell what in those dreadful moments were your feelings, when on a sudden you found yourselves surrounded with the snares of death, when the gates of destruction seemed opening to receive you, and the overflowings of your own ungodliness made you horribly afraid! Tell what were your feelings when the bright scene of life opened afresh upon the wondering eye, and all you had suffered and all you had feared seemed vanished like a dream! Tell what were the mutual feelings when first you revisited your families and friends!—of the child returning to the fond parent's care—of the father receiving back from the grave the joy, the solace of his age—of the husband restored to the wife of his bosom—of the wife, not yet a widow, again embracing her yet living lord! Tell what are now your happy feelings of inward peace and satisfaction, sinners rescued from the power of darkness, awakened to repentance, and reconciled to God! Your interesting tale will touch each charitable heart, and be the means of procuring deliverance for many from the like dangers which threatened your bodies and your souls." 199, 200.

In No. 40 we again find Dr. H. the advocate of a public charity. This discourse, from Matt. xxiv. 12, was preached for the Philanthropic Society in March 1792, and was printed, if we mistake not, within the same year. It is an animated, and we believe, a faithful contrast of the manners of the ancient Heathens with those of the Christian world and of modern times. With the exception of the Slave Trade (an exception in which this country no longer shares,) a decided preference is given to the morals of the present day. Still, as our author remarks, ages must elapse before the means of reforming the hearts and lives of men can produce their full effect: and hence he ably enlarges on the excellencies of the institution to the service of which this sermon was devoted.

Of the 41st and the 42d, from John xx. 29, *the incredulity of Thomas* is the subject. The Bishop first considers what ground there might be for this apostle to believe the fact of our Lord's resurrection upon the report of the other ten apostles, before he had himself seen him; and from what motives it may be supposed that he withheld his assent. In the second place he professes to shew that the belief of any thing upon such evidence as Thomas at last had of Christ's resurrection, is a natural act of the human mind, to which nothing of moral or religious merit can reasonably be ascribed. And, lastly, he inquires what is the merit and at the same time what is the certainty of that faith which believes what it hath not seen: its value he, accordingly, resolves into the devotional and moral principles on which it is founded.

There are parts of his argument from which we dissent: and his method of discoursing on this memorable declaration of our Lord's to Thomas, we regard as not a little circuitous and complex. The passage simply teaches that *testimony* is a legitimate branch of the evidences of revelation, and that he who admits it as such, gives proof of greater strength of mind, juster knowledge of the limits of the human faculties, more patience of inquiry, and more fairness and humility of disposition than the man who receives nothing as a fact but on the report of his senses.

We now come to a very curious sermon, (the 43d) preached at the anniversary of the institution of the Magdalen Hospital, April 22, 1795, and subsequently pre-

sented to the public in a separate form. Addressing his audience from 1 John iii. 3. the Right Reverend preacher lays down the proposition that “certain exquisite sensations of delight produced by external objects acting upon corporeal organs, will constitute some part of the future happiness of the just.” This doctrine he endeavours to establish by the aid of considerations derived from the frame of man, and by what he presumes to be the explicit assertions of the Holy Scriptures. He then expatiates on the nature and qualifications of heavenly bliss, and after speaking of the purity which it supposes and requires, makes a transition to the claims of the charity which has just been mentioned. We cannot so far compliment his memory as to say that he has unfolded his reasoning with all the delicacy of thought and language which was demanded by the magnitude of his subject and the situation of his hearers.

He insists on 2 Cor. v. 10, which passage, he contends, has lost “somewhat in our public translation of the precision of the original text,” and which he would render, “We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in the body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad.” But the alteration is both unwarrantable and unnecessary.* The single, though usually respectable authority of the Syriac version, (for it has really no countenance from the Vulgate,) cannot support it: and whoever will look into Schleusner's *Lexicon*, &c.

* Compare with the above text Ephes. vi. 8.

under the word *δια*, No. 13, will find that this preposition has exactly the same force in other texts of the New Testament. Τα [scil. πεπραγμένα] *δια* τῆς ζωῆς, are ‘the deeds done *throughout the whole course* of mortal life.’

The doctrine of the 44th and last sermon from Rom. xiii. 1. when divested of the pomp of style, the parade of argument, the fierceness of invective, and the bitterness of execration with which it is delivered, amounts to little more than this—that in ordinary times obedience to the civil magistrate, is a religious duty. This lesson we had long since welcomed, more clearly illustrated as it is, and more soberly and cautiously qualified, by Paley. Our Bishop, preaching before the House of Lords on Jan. 30th, 1793, deems it seasonable to censure, with a lofty air, “the freedom of dispute in which for several years past it hath been the folly in this country to indulge, upon matters of such high importance as the origin of government and the authority of sovereigns.” Such a discourse, *at such a period*, was sure of being soon printed, at the request of the noble and right reverend audience: and as the prelate, at the conclusion of it, had pronounced upon certain reputed levellers and republicans this episcopal curse—“they have no claim upon our brotherly affection: upon our charity they have indeed a claim: Miserable men! *they are in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.*” Mr. Hall, then of Cambridge, thus noticed, in the preface to his *Apology for the Freedom of the Press*, &c. both parts of the Anathema:

“With respect to the first, we must

have plenty of that article, since he has distilled his own; and if the bonds of iniquity are not added, it is only because they are not within the reach of his mighty malice."

In an Appendix to this sermon, Dr. H. employs needless pains to obviate the suspicion that Calvin's political tenets were virtually *Jacobinical*!

The attention bestowed by us on these discourses may shew that we are desirous of doing justice to the literary merits of the late Bishop of St. Asaph. Excellencies of this kind he certainly possessed. His style, though sometimes careless or vulgar, and sometimes ludicrously stately and magisterial, claims, on the whole, our admiration: it is generally energetic, in many passages, truly elegant, in many, dignified and impressive. It is easy to perceive that his mind was in no common degree cultivated and active; and, whatever be our opinion of his theology, we gladly acknowledge that he at least aimed at being a scriptural and Christian preacher.

What shall we say, however, to the manner in which he quotes and explains some of the texts that he brings forward to his aid. Here he is seldom judicious and accurate: he either falls into paradoxes or adopts trite and refuted criticisms. For example, he cites Jerem. xxiii. 6. in behalf of what he terms "the true doctrine," viz. the essential deity of Christ; notwithstanding Dr. Blayney has evinced* that it requires a different rendering and, by consequence, bears no testimony in favour of the popular belief. In the same manner, the phrase "made, [or born] of a woman," is adduced in de-

monstration of the supernatural birth of Jesus (Gal. iv. 4.); though from this interpretation it would follow, according to what we read in Job xiv. 1. [the former clause] that *all* mankind are *miraculously* born! 8, 9, 82.

But the worst of the Bishop's feats of criticism,* are creditable in comparison of his forgetfulness of the rules of courtesy and decorum, when he speaks of persons from whom it is his fortune to differ on points of metaphysics, theology or ecclesiastical or civil discipline. The hypothesis, for instance, of those who maintain the materiality of the sentient principle, or rather the *homogeneity* of of Man and his unconscious state between death and the resurrection, is stigmatized (129) as having "less coherence than the drunkard's dram." Mede, Sykes, Farmer, &c. are sneered at (153), not indeed by name but by direct implication, as "philosophizing believers, weak in faith and not strong in reason." Even Locke† is in fact arraigned for speculating with freedom on "the origin of government and the authority of sovereigns" (286, 287). Hoadly is designated as "the republican Bishop" (299). And Milton is rashly charged with the utterance of a gross falsehood for party purposes (332).

The editors of posthumous works are far more likely to injure the reputation of authors by the "desire of withholding nothing" which

* See a notable specimen of them in p. 154.

† It appears that the learned Selden was one of the writers who "presumed to treat these curious questions" much as Locke did afterwards. *Lives of Selden and Usher*, by Dr. Aikin, pp. 179, 180.

* Translation and Notes in loco.

can be given to the world than by the fear of giving it too much. Mr. Horsley had amply satisfied the demands of filial duty and the interests, if not the wishes, of the public, by two volumes of his father's sermons. Nevertheless, in his capacity of editor, he deserves the praise of having carefully superintended the printing of all three; and the typographical execution of them does eminent credit to the state of the Dundee press.

Art. III. *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. including a Brief Analysis of his Works, together with Anecdotes and Letters of eminent Persons, his Friends and Correspondents: also a General View of the Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in England and America. By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street. 8vo. pp. 568. Johnson and Co. 1812.*

[Continued from p. 201].

On resigning the living of Catterick, Mr. Lindsey wrote and circulated an "Address to his Parishioners," alluded to in his letter to Mr. Turner (p. 200); and soon after, he published his "Apology," one of the most interesting pictures of an honest and enlightened mind which was ever laid before the world. This work passed, in less than ten years, through four editions.

It has appeared (p. 201) that Mr. Lindsey's design was to "gather a church of Unitarian Christians out of the Established Church:" with this view he came up to London in the beginning of the year 1774. Here he had to

encounter the inconveniences of narrow circumstances and the difficulties of a new and hazardous undertaking. But Providence raised up friends for him, chiefly from amongst the Dissenters: of these Mr. Belsham has particularised Dr. Price, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Shore. "And by the exertions of the late Mr. Joseph Johnson, of St. Paul's Church-yard, a room was soon found and taken, in Essex-house, Essex-street, which having been before used as an auction room, might, at a moderate expense, be fitted up as a temporary chapel." (p. 101.) The Westminster justices hesitated, however, in granting a licence to open it.

The following is an extract of a letter from Mr. Lindsey to Dr. Jebb:

"I have the pleasure of assuring you that our difficulties are over, and we certainly begin, (may it be with the divine blessing upon us!) on Sunday next. But we have not succeeded without striking with the great hammer, if I may so speak. For this morning Mr. Johnson the bookseller went, according as he was appointed, to Hicks's Hall, and was there at the opening of the court. He got the clerk to move for him, that he was waiting to have our entry recorded, as the court had given him reason to expect. But Lord Ward, who was that day in the chair, said it was a matter of some deliberation, and must be set over till the next meeting, i. e. Saturday. It appeared from hence that they would put us off civilly, and leave us in the lurch at last. I met Johnson coming out of the court, and took him with me to Mr. Lee, who was engaged at Guildhall, where I found him pleading before Chief Justice De Grey. I got to him, however, and told him our situation. He said it did not look well; but that the Chief Justice's

Court would soon be up, and he would go immediately to Hicks's Hall and see what was to be done. He came like a lion soon; 'desired to see the entry that had been given into the court, to license a place of worship for a society of Dissenters; was sorry such unusual obstructions had been put to so legal a demand; that he understood it was said by some, that the Justices had a discretionary power in such cases; that they were mistaken; that, on the contrary, they were merely official; and if they refused, a mandamus from the King's Bench would compel them; that he hoped the great Magna Charta of the religious liberty of Englishmen was not now going to be attacked.' Upon this, one or two of the Justices said it was their opinion, and always had been, as Mr. Lee's, that they had no discretionary powers. On something being said concerning the doctrine to be preached, and the officiating minister, that some enquiry was to be made about them, he told them that 'those were subsequent facts and matters of enquiry; that the house of worship was the object before them, and they were bound to make record of it as desired.' After this, on a pause being made, he desired to know 'whether the court would give him the trouble to come again the next day and move the matter and argue it before them, or would now grant it.' The latter was conceded, and our certificate it was said should be ready next court day. We begin, however, without it on the authority of our counsel."* pp. 108---110.

Essex Chapel was opened on Sunday, April 17, 1774; an era

"* The fact however was, that the certificate was never granted, nor was the chapel registered or licensed as a place of worship till after the defect had been noticed by Dr. Horsley, in his Letters to Dr. Priestley; after which the neglect was immediately and without any difficulty rectified."

in the history of Unitarianism in this country; for though there had been long before this period Dissenting congregations, of the Presbyterian denomination chiefly, which might be called Unitarian,* there had been no public instance of a place of worship being opened for the avowed purpose of worshipping God the Father only. At the present day, such an event excites comparatively little notice; we fearlessly emblazon our Unitarianism on our portals, and take our rank amidst the well-known and legally-recognized sects of the nation; but very different was the case forty years ago, and we think Mr. Belsham has judiciously set before the reader, at full length, the proceedings relative to the procurement and opening of the chapel, which his unwearied labours still entitle to Bishop Horsley's sarcastic appellation — *the oracle of Unitarianism*.

The following account of the opening, was sent the next day by Mr. Lee, in a letter to his friend Mr. Cappe:—

"After a little difficulty in getting his chapel registered at the Quarter Sessions, which I had the good luck to remove, he entered upon his ministry yesterday. His chapel is a large upper room in Essex House, Essex-street, in a very central part of London, and in my neighbourhood. The place is convenient for the purpose of containing about 300 persons; a greater number would

* Of these deserves to be singled out Dr. C. Fleming's congregation at Pinner's Hall, which had also enjoyed the eminent and rational services of Dr. James Foster. Dr. Fleming was an able, determined and plain-spoken Unitarian advocate. He died in 1779 when several members of his congregation united themselves, we believe, with Mr. Lindsey's flock.

crowd it. He was well attended, considering that no public notice was given of the intended service. There were about ten coaches at the door; which I was glad of, because it gave a degree of respectableness to the congregation, in the eyes of the people living thereabouts. Of those that I knew and remember were Lord Despenser, Dr. Franklin, Dr. Priestley, Dr. Calder, Mr. Shore, jun. Mrs. Shore, Mrs. Robert Milnes, Miss Milnes, and Miss Shore; Dr. Hinckley, Dr. Chambers, Dr. Primatt, and two or three other clergymen, with a few barristers whom you do not know. All the rest were to all appearance persons of condition, and in the whole were, I think, near two hundred, and mostly of the Establishment. We were all pleased with the service and with his manner of performing it. His sermon, which I thought very good, will be printed, and you will of course see it. I begin to conceive hopes that his scheme will be patronized, so far at least as to produce him a comfortable subsistence. Indeed, I hope it will teach those who ought not to have needed such teachings, that reformation is both a safe and an easy work." (p. 111.)

Consistently with his design of gathering an Unitarian society out of the dissatisfied members of the Established Church, Mr. Lindsey departed no further from the mode of the national worship than was required by the great principle on which he separated from it. He therefore published *A Reformed Liturgy*, on the plan of Dr. Clarke's, which he used from the beginning, and which, with alterations and improvements, is still in use at Essex-street Chapel. He also retained the clerical dress, with the exception of the *surplice*, concerning which he says in a letter to Dr. Jebb, "*I should have blushed to have appeared in a white garment;*" although we do

not clearly see why he should have been less ashamed of a black gown than of a white one: both appear to us to be at least unnecessary, and not quite consistent with the manly simplicity which is the proper distinction and the true ornament of seceders upon principle from the national establishment. But we are aware that there may be prejudices against, as well as in favour of priestly vestments, and at this time of day these are not just objects of controversy. On the one side it will be admitted that habiliments do not dignify the preacher, as it will on the other that the preacher may dignify his habiliments.—On the recommendation of his attentive and judicious friend, Mr. Turner, of Wakefield, a prayer was introduced by Mr. Lindsey, both before and after sermon; the latter bearing a reference to the subject of discourse. We allude to this custom of Mr. Lindsey, in order to express our opinion of the Prayers appended to his Sermons, lately published, which have the pertinence and solemnity and simplicity, together with the vein of pious feeling running through them, which so eminently characterize the latter portions of the national liturgy. The sermon at the opening was published, with an Appendix, containing an account of the Reformed Liturgy: of the Sermon, five hundred copies were disposed of in four days, and of the Liturgy seven hundred copies were sold in six weeks.

In the Sermon, the preacher entered of necessity into a vindication of the Unitarian faith, but he somewhat strangely promised that he would do so in the pulpit no more: on this subject, however,

let us hear Mr. Belsham, whose reflections are entitled to the serious consideration of such ministers as sacrifice to prudence more than to truth :—

“ Upon this occasion Mr. Lindsey, by the advice of Dr. Jebb and his Cambridge friends, but as he soon discovered without due consideration of the subject, pledged himself in pretty strong language, not to introduce disputed points into his public discourses. “ Far will it be from my purpose,” says he, “ ever to treat of controversial matters from this place.” But if popular and pernicious errors are not to be combated, and if the plain, simple doctrine of Christianity is not to be taught from the pulpit, it is difficult to say how public attention is to be excited : how the mass of hearers are to be instructed, and how truth is to make its way. In fact it appears, that where public teachers have confined themselves to mere moral instruction and have either not touched at all upon Christian doctrine, or have veiled their real opinions under ambiguous language, the consequence has often been, that the teacher, by reading and reflection has become enlightened, while the hearer has been left in darkness ; the preacher has reformed his speculative creed, while the hearers have retained all the erroneous and unscriptural notions which their pastor has long ago renounced. And as a natural consequence, when a vacancy has occurred, a successor has not unfrequently been appointed whose system has been directly opposite to that of the person who immediately preceded him. Those who hold sentiments to which they give the pompous name of orthodox or evangelical, never decline to avow their systems in the most manly and explicit manner. And they do right, while they believe those sentiments to be true and important. How unbecoming then is it, for those who hold a better and a purer faith, to shrink from the public pro-

fession and defence of it, and to leave the adversary master of the field. It is a silly objection which is urged by some weak, or timid, or indolent, I will not say interested, persons, that speculative preaching, as they call it, tends to diminish a serious and pious disposition, and to promote a sectarian spirit. As to the latter part of the objection, let them read Sir George Savile's remark upon the subject of sectaries : and with respect to the former, I confess I could never see how the increase of knowledge had a tendency to produce deterioration of practice ; and he would be a very injudicious teacher who did not combine practical exhortation with doctrinal instruction.

“ Yesterday,” says Mr. Lindsey, in a letter to Dr. Jebb, dated May 23, “ I ventured to deviate from the idea which you and my friends with you seemed to entertain as right, of preaching merely practical discourses, and enlarged with much earnestness on John xvii. 3. I find it was acceptable to many, and that it was even looked for that I should sometimes treat upon the great object and principle on which our new church is formed, in order to confirm some that are already come out, and awaken others to come out of Babylon. But I expect the greatest effects, by and by, through the nation, from the thunder of your's, of Mr. —'s, and Mr. —'s apologies, for you can never go out in mute silence and without bearing your testimonies against her witchcraft and idolatries.” pp. 115---119.

Amongst Mr. Lindsey's earliest hearers, are found several distinguished names ; Sir George Savile, Mr. Serjeant Adair, Mr. Dodson, Sir Barnard Turner, Mr. Leake, and Mrs. Rayner. Of this lady, a near relation of the Duchess of Northumberland and of Lord Gwydir, Mr. Belsham has given an interesting sketch, which we cannot pass over :—

"She was married to a gentleman of large fortune and was attracted by curiosity and the invitation of a friend to hear the new doctrine at Essex Street, on the day when the chapel was first opened. Through the whole service her eyes were fixed, and her attention riveted upon the preacher, and when it was over, she and Mr. Rayner introduced themselves to Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, and from that time to the end of life she became a constant hearer at the chapel, and a firm and generous friend to Mr. Lindsey, and to the cause which he supported, and for which he suffered. Mrs. Rayner was a lady of open and unaffected manners, of superior intellect, and of a well-informed mind. She possessed unbounded generosity of spirit, and especially after the death of Mr. Rayner, denied herself almost what was necessary to support her rank and station in life, that she might spend her money in acts of great but not indiscriminate munificence. She became a liberal and powerful patroness of the cause of truth. And to this lady the Christian world is indebted for the publication of one of the most learned and most useful theological works which the age has produced: Dr. Priestley's *History of Early Opinions concerning Christ*. A work which demonstrates, in a manner which never has been and never can be confuted, that from the earliest age of the Christian religion, down to the fourth century, and to the time of Athanasius himself, the great body of unlearned Christians were strictly Unitarians, and consequently that this was the original doctrine concerning the person of Christ. This most valuable treatise was a work of great labour and expense, the demand for which would by no means have defrayed the charge of the publication. But Mrs. Rayner, with exemplary generosity, supplied the money, and to her the work is with great propriety dedicated. Many other acts of this lady's princely munificence might be men-

tioned, which almost exceed belief in a selfish and irreligious age. But she sought not worldly applause; and she is now gone where her works and virtues will follow her, to receive their appropriate and everlasting reward." pp. 119---121.

To be continued.

ART. IV. *A Letter to a Friend in the Country, &c. &c. on the Dissenting Ministers' Petition, and the Rev. J. Ivimey's Correspondence with J. Butterworth, Esq. M. P. By John Evans, A. M. 2d ed. pp. 32. Sherwood and Co. 1813.*

Mr. Ivimey is a Baptist minister, who has written a *History of his own Denomination*, whom he lauds for being the first to understand Christian liberty and the most zealous in opposing all persecution for the sake of conscience; and the same Mr. Ivimey has distinguished himself, along with Dr. Duigenan and other eminent persons, on the side of No Popery, or in other words, of the oppression of the Catholics. But Mr. Ivimey had a right to sustain the two different characters of an eulogist of religious liberty and an assertor of the necessity of penal laws against Romish heretics; though he had no right, we humbly presume, to misrepresent the proceedings of his brethren and to betray a member of parliament into a seeming breach of verity.

The case is briefly this:—the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of London and Westminster, met in February last, and voted, as they thought *unanimously*, Resolutions and a Petition to the legislature, in favour of universal religious liberty. Mr. W. Smith, on presenting their petition to the House of Commons, called it *unanimous*,

but was corrected by Mr. Butterworth, the member for Coventry, who stated that he had good authority for denying its being unanimous, or being even the sense of the majority of the ministers. In March, the ministers met again, and resolved that their petition had passed *unanimously*; and a copy of their resolution was forwarded to Mr. Butterworth; upon which he gave up his authority for his statement in the House, to wit, the aforesaid Mr. Ivimey, one of the body of ministers, who had been present at both the meetings above specified. Hereupon, Mr. Ivimey was put upon his justification; and his defence, as far as we understand it, is—that in 1812 the ministers actually divided upon a similar petition to that resolved on in 1813, upon which they did not indeed divide, but upon which they might have divided—that he and several others, though they did not lift up their hands against the petition, wish they had done so, and for himself, he would have done so, if his fortitude had not forsaken him—and that as the *minds* of all the ministers were known to be not favourably disposed to universal liberty (including the case of the Catholics), the proceedings should have been marked by the words *nemine contradicente*, and not by the word *unanimously*.

In addition to this notable self-defence, Mr. Ivimey turns *accuser of the brethren*, and shews the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library, the Presbyterians and the General Baptists, that though he had not the courage to raise his arm against their petition, he is bold enough to asperse their characters.

Mr. Evans, in his Letter, corrects the misrepresentations and

chastises the disingenuousness and bigotry of this No Popery railer, and “takes leave of him with a piece of salutary and evangelical advice—*Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.*”

ART. V. *The Salvation of Man by the Free Grace of God asserted and vindicated.* A Sermon preached at the Octagon Chapel, Norwich. By Thomas Madge. 8vo. pp. 66. Johnson. 1812.

Three propositions are laid down and argued in this discourse: I. That all our blessings come from God; II. That the pardon of sin proceeds entirely from his free grace; and III. That the only conditions of the Divine mercy are repentance, amendment and holiness of life. The preacher opposes the Unitarian view of God as a Father to the Calvinistic scheme of imputation, vindictive justice and proscription. His discourse is entitled to the praise equally of sound reasoning and good writing.

Several *notes* are added to the Sermon, in one of which the Calvinistic doctrine of atonement is stated in the words of Calvinistic writers, and some pertinent remarks are made upon Dr. Magee's Discourses: we notice this in order to express our wish that Mr. Madge would fulfil his design (pp. 57, 58) of animadverting upon Dr. Magee in a separate pamphlet. It would be easy to answer all the real arguments of this desultory and shewy polemic, and we commit him into the hands of Mr. Madge, who will not, we hope, be unmindful of a pledge which the talents displayed in his sermon will induce his readers generally to call upon him to redeem.

OBITUARY.

The Rev. W. Mann, on the Letters concerning Mr. J. Coventry.

[In a Letter to the Editor.]

Sic fatus senior, telumq; imbelles sine ictu Conjecit.

SIR,

In your Obituary for the last month, (p. 278) there is an article, relative to the death of *Mr. John Coventry*, of Saint Savior's, Southwark, which not only highly reflects on my ministerial conduct; but charges me with direct falsehood; a charge, which, if it could be substantiated, would stamp my character, and my name, with obloquy and infamy.

This article, it is more than probable, I should never have seen, nor perhaps heard of, had it not been left with me a few days ago, for the purpose, by a person unknown; and, if the writer had confined himself in it to the supposed truth of his own system, or to the error of mine, he would not have drawn from me a single remark: he might have plumed himself with the honours of a fancied victory; and all, on my part, should have been a profound, uninterrupted taciturnity.

There is one point, Mr. Editor, and only one, on which I have any feeling; it relates to a fact which your correspondent has stated; and I have only one request to make of you, and which you cannot in justice deny me; that you will give the same publicity to *my* statement of that fact, which you have already given to *his*. I shall make no enquiry into the source of his information; that is his affair, not mine: on its credit, whatever that may be, he has thought proper to rest his cause: it puts words into my mouth, which I never used, and imputes to them a meaning, which I never expressed—but the premises, the argument, and the conclusion, are of the same hue,—the whole a tissue of cunning misrepresentation, and, worse, than indirect, equivocating falsehood.

It is true, that I attended the dying bed of my father in law. I saw him at least once, generally twice, every day,

during his illness, and to the latest moments of his existence in this world. He opened to me all his heart; and I knew all the "*circumstances*" which occasioned his distress of mind. This is of consequence, only as it may serve to shew, how far I was qualified to form a true judgment, *had I been disposed to tell the truth*; and whether I was authorised to give an opinion, in what is called a funeral sermon.

I did not, Sir, attribute the darkness, which beclouded the last moments of our dear father, to the influence of the "*Winchesterian system*" as "*the principal cause*;" but only as *one* among many other causes, which I then enumerated: *that* did not occupy a larger portion of time than other particulars; nor did it obtain any other prominence, or pre-eminence, than was naturally given to it by the novelty of the subject. Now, Sir, the difference between assigning a reason as *the principal cause*, and mentioning it only as *one* in common with many other causes, which were all named and applied in the same manner, and allowed their equal weight in the scale of just consideration; the different colouring which is given to the same fact, by such a representation;—the shade into which it throws all other points of the same subject;—and the disingenuousness of the relater and the writer, are so manifest, that argument would here be quite superfluous.

But, in one of those conversations, which I had with the deceased, in some of his last hours, and as I saw his end approaching, I felt it my duty to deal faithfully with him—whether the impression of my mind, at this time, was a true ministerial affection, or only the impulse of fanaticism, does not at all enter into the present question, Mr. Editor; such was my feeling; and I did express my fear, that his mind had received serious injury from a former connexion; that his principles had been relaxed, and their tone lowered; that he had been put off his guard; that he had neglected his privilege, and lost that peace and comfort which once he enjoyed. He replied—"That he had long since abandoned that connexion

to which I alluded; that he had been so dissatisfied," I think he said "disgusted, with what he had heard, that he had not attended their worship, nor associated with them, for many years: that he had sent for an old friend (the writer of the article to which I am now replying) on purpose that he might tell him his mind on the subject, &c."

This, Sir, is the relation which I made in the pulpit; and it is either true or false. I say this, because it is more than intimated, it is pretty roundly asserted, by your correspondent, in the general tenor of his paper, and with a modesty peculiarly his own, that the story was of my own fabrication! that I told a lie in the pulpit!!! Not that my reputation is likely to suffer by the slander: I anticipate no danger in placing my single credit against that of your correspondent: I am not indeed aware that it was ever before called into question: what I said in the pulpit, Mr. Editor, will be believed, and would have been believed, though I had remained silent. It so happens, however, that the truth of the relation does not depend solely on my testimony. There were three or four other persons, standing round the bed of the deceased at the time he made the declaration. They have voluntarily offered their names as below; and we are all ready, if it were necessary, to give the same testimony upon oath; which will afford your correspondent an opportunity of convicting us of a conspiracy, or of indicting us for perjury. He says, "he never once intimated to me the least change in his mind respecting his view of the restoration of mankind:" nor did I, sir, on the occasion above alluded to, name the word restoration of mankind, but *verbum sapienti sat est*; he well understood my meaning, for we had often before conversed on the same subject. But I can refresh the memory of your correspondent, by another part of the same conversation, which I *did not* relate in the pulpit; and perhaps the hint, if considered in all its bearings, may assist his conception, as to what I mean by "mere quibblers." I asked the deceased whether he *had* conversed with his friend, and what answer he gave? It was this, "I read the scriptures impartially for myself, and I will form my own opinion;" or words to this effect; by which I understood Mr. C. to mean, that by this answer he was prevented from say-

ing what otherwise it was his intention to have said.

And now, Mr. Editor, that your correspondent has told you what he *believes*, I will tell you what I *know*. I *know* that Mr. Coventry had entirely withdrawn from a certain connexion long before I "married his daughter," or had any intimacy with the family. I *know* that his principles, even with respect to the "restoration of mankind," whether true or false, were shaken many years ago; and that whatever wish he might feel to retain them, he could neither support them in argument, nor was his mind at rest under the impression of them. I also *know*, which is of still more importance, and which I declare in the most solemn manner, that he died in the full conviction of the truth of that system which "Mr. Mann would call the evangelical plan of salvation;" that he expressed that conviction in the strongest terms which language could utter, and, I had almost said, by a thousand reiterations of that expression.

I have conscientiously, and equally, refrained from any remarks favorable to my own system, or unfriendly to that of your correspondent. His attack on my personal truth, in the relation of a matter of fact, is, I repeat, the only consideration which could have thus extorted from me a single word in reply: an attack, feeble indeed in its effect, like that of the old man to whom I refer in my motto; but made with far less honorable motives: its notorious indecency, even in this age when there are no wonders, really astonishes me. Had the writer been some *young* champion, desirous of provoking, or rather of creating, an adversary, for the purpose of throwing a lance with him in the polemical field, it would have excited no surprise: but, that an old man, like him, on the very verge of the grave, and whom hoary hairs ought to have better instructed in the rules of decorum and prudence, should, from partiality to a system, from prejudice, or any other infirmity of his nature, have taken it for granted, that an authorized minister of the establishment could so far forget the responsibility of his character, as to relate in the pulpit what was not strictly true, and that, too, on an occasion the most solemn, and in the very presence of those who were acquainted with the circumstances, and could easily have contradicted him, if

he had spoken falsely!—that he should not only have believed all this, without any evidence, but also have asserted it in the most public and offensive manner!—is such a mixture of weakness, folly and temerity, that I can give to it no adequate name.

I am, Sir,
Very respectfully, your's &c.
W. MANN.

St. Savior's, 19th May, 1813.

We whose names are under-written, were present when Mr. Coventry made the declaration as stated above; and we testify that the words convey the direct sense which he gave, and are, as far as we recollect, the very words which he used on that occasion.

J. C. PEACHE.
A. MANN.
A. PEACHE.

Mrs. Naish.

On May 3rd, died at Poole, MRS. NAISH, the wife of Mr. Naish, to whom she had been married eleven months. Mrs. N. was the youngest daughter of the late Joseph Olive, Esq. a respectable merchant of this place. The family from which she descended has afforded many worthy members to the old Unitarian Meeting in Hill Street. Liberty of conscience, and the right of private judgment, so peculiarly asserted by the congregation assembling in that place of worship, for the last 60 years, were ably defended by an ancestor of Mrs. N. in a series of Letters addressed to Mr. Philips, the seceding minister. She was in every respect a deserving representative. The following account is taken from her funeral sermon, which was preached to a very large audience.

“Her amiable disposition and prudent conduct were evidenced by a constant regard to the relative and social duties of life. Obedient, attentive and affectionate towards her surviving parent, rendered more dear and venerable by age, she guided her feeble steps with care, and watched her declining strength with all tender sensibility of heart, with all that foreboding anxiety of mind peculiar to one who had derived so many superior advantages from her counsel and instruction. Towards every branch of her family she acted with an uniform regard to the virtuous admonitions which had been received from her

youth. Kind, obliging, and assiduous as a sister, anticipating by her thoughtfulness, the wants, increasing by her lively turn of mind, the pleasures, or as occasion required, alleviating by her soothing accents of compassion, the sorrows of those around her. In her conjugal connexion, short as it was,—alas! very short, the same tender and affectionate feelings influenced her heart, and directed her conduct. The propriety of these remarks is best appreciated by that unfeigned sorrow and deep regret which her decease has occasioned. Her deportment as a Christian was no less conspicuous and eminent. It was regulated by principles, founded on very consistent conceptions of the Deity, and of his divine administration in the government of the universe. She embraced from conviction, and strictly adhered to the general doctrines of Unitarianism. The grand and leading truth of revelation, the unity of God, she maintained with firmness and integrity. The perfect and simple humanity of Christ was a consequence which followed of course. She considered the dispensations of Providence as tending ultimately to promote the universal happiness of the rational creation. The sentiments entertained by a mind naturally endowed with very strong powers, and considerably enlarged by reading, observation, and reflection, must necessarily have produced the exalted effects which we have seen in her conduct. In these sentiments she lived, in these sentiments she died, and died happy. Those who witnessed her last moments, witnessed a soul governed and actuated by the dictates of that system of religion which is the glory and boast of the Unitarian community. Her hopes of future happiness did not arise from an imaginary dependance on another's righteousness, but on the placability and goodness of that God who had been gracious to her during life. Sensible of approaching dissolution, with a mind equally calm and serene as in the full enjoyment of health, she sang the praises of the Most High, and frequently repeated this beautiful stanza:—

‘I'll praise my Maker with my breath,
And when my voice is lost in death,
Praise shall employ my nobler
powers:

My days of praise shall ne'er be past,
While life and thought and being last,
Or immortality endures.”

Thus lived and died a virtuous, respectable, and useful member of society.

R. S.

Poole, May 16, 1813.

Mr. C. C. Rotheram.

Died, at Liverpool, on the 11th instant, in the 18th year of his age, **Caleb Charles**, the youngest son of the late **Rev. Caleb Rotheram**, of Kendal. His artless simplicity and innocent gaiety, ingenuous manners and amiable disposition, tempered by honour, virtue, and integrity, which qualities were adorned by a sedulous improvement of his natural endowments, gave high promise, (had his life been spared,) of future distinguished usefulness and moral excellence.

His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere.

Rev. William Lord.

Died, April 23d, 1813, aged 61, **The Rev. William Lord**, rector of Northiam, in Sussex, who was unhappy in being ever at variance with the inhabitants of the parish where he resided, respecting tithes, &c. yet of whom every Dissenter must confess, he was the gentleman and the Christian to them that differed from him in religious sentiments: in this respect he was an example to all around him; he abhorred a persecuting spirit on religious differences; never did he misrepresent any denomination of Christians, or hold them up to contempt. His discourses were rational; he was not a preacher of the universal restoration, though many years a believer in it. His further sentiments may be elucidated from the following anecdotes. Some years ago, questioning the young people before confirmation, he asked a girl how many Gods there were? To which she answered, One. He said there was God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and then asked her again, How many Gods there were? To which she replied, Three. No, he said, there was but one God; he thought the matter wanted a little alteration, for he did not understand it himself. Being once at his house, when a child was brought to be named, he asked the servant who brought it, Why she wanted it done?

The answer was, The child is very ill, and my mistress is afraid it will die before it is named. He then said to the servant, You have made a mistake; it was the doctor you was to have given it to, for I can do the child no good. His servant once told him, a Mr. ——— had been seen since his death; the rector said he was very happy to hear of it, for he owed him considerable for tythe, and was in hopes he was now coming to pay it. When Mr. B—— a dissenter, died, his friends ordered the bell at church to go for him; the rector hearing of it, sent and stopt the bell; in a few minutes after I met him and thanked him for so doing; he said it was not out of disrespect to the deceased or his friends, or any that were dissenters, but those that dissented from the establishment he loved to see act consistently with themselves. Mr. H. petitioned him to go to prayer with Mrs. H. who was on her death-bed, saying she had lived a good moral life: he further requested him to question her, How she stood in faith with Jesus Christ? This he refused, saying, He might make a bad job of that; so begged to be excused in this part, but would willingly go to prayer with her. I wish there were more who could see as the rector did on these subjects, and view a persecuting spirit as an untimely frost on the fair bloom of spring, or as the mighty tempest destroying every thing before it.

JOHN PLOMLEY.

Northiam, May 1st, 1813.

Mrs. Elizabeth Worthington.

March 27, died at Altringham, in Cheshire, aged 72 years, **ELIZABETH**, wife of **JOHN WORTHINGTON**, Esq. and daughter of the late **Rev. James Hancox**, of Dudley.

Elegance and amenity of manner, were in her united with an excellent understanding and fervent piety: and on all occasions, even the most trying, she evinced elevated and correct principles of conduct. As trifling circumstances best elucidate the character, a little anecdote of her shall be recorded.

During the American war, the affairs of her first husband, **Mr. William Laugher**, brother of the late **Rev. Timothy Laugher** of Hackney, becoming em-

barrassed, she thought it right to discontinue the charities and little pensions she allowed to many distressed objects, particularly to one poor family. Having still, however, a good garden, she made up nosegays of flowers, which being evanescent, she considered as not entrenching on the property of her husband's creditors, and gave them to the poor children to sell; by which means the accustomed relief was continued to the families for whom she was interested.

A pleasing instance of active and ingenious benevolence, and of scrupulous integrity!

Her manners to young people were peculiarly engaging and attractive. Many a boy, unconnected by relationship, has felt happy in being permitted to address her by the affectionate name of aunt. She "laughing would instruct," and exhibiting virtue and religion in cheerful and amiable colours,

"allured" the youthful mind "to brighter worlds and led the way."

Her memory had been defective for some years, but her acuteness in reasoning on topics immediately present to her view, her apt, and sometimes witty, quotations from Pope and other authors familiar to her in her youth, and the naiveté of her manner, will long be remembered by her friends with admiration and regret.

She spent a long and chequered life with honour and utility,—regarded death with cheerful and resigned serenity; her last words were expressive of the delight she felt in the prospect of re-union with her friends in a better state, and her last looks indicative of gratitude and affection to them for their unwearied attentions during a protracted illness.

A mourning relative sketches this brief but faithful memorial of his benefactress and his friend.

H.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Fund.

The Annual Meeting of the Subscribers and friends to the **UNITARIAN FUND** will be held on Wednesday, the 9th of June, when a Sermon will be preached in behalf of the Fund at the Rev. W. Vidler's chapel, in Parliament Court, Artillery Lane, Bishopsgate Street, by the Rev. Edmund Butcher, of Sidmouth. Service to begin at eleven o'clock. After the service the Report of the committee will be read, and the usual business of the society transacted, in the chapel.

N. B. The subscribers and friends will afterwards dine together. [For particulars of the dinner, see Wrapper, p. 5.]

On Whitsun Tuesday, the **GENERAL ASSEMBLY** of **GENERAL BAPTISTS** will be held as usual at Worship Street, when the Rev. Mr. Coupland, of Headcorn, or in case of failure the Rev. Joseph Dobell, of Cranbrook, will preach on the occasion.

The next **KENT** and **SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION**, will be held at the Unitarian Chapel, Tenterden, Kent, on Wednesday, June 16th, 1813. Service to begin at half-

past ten o'clock. T. Blackmore, Jun. Secretary.

The Anniversary Meeting of the **SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY** will take place at Brighton, on Wednesday, June 30th. The Rev. W. J. Fox, of Chichester, will preach the sermon in the morning: and there will be service in the evening. J. Fallagar, Secretary.

Manchester College, York.

The Annual Examinations of the Students of the College, will take place in the library at York, at the close of the present session, on Wednesday, June 30, and Thursday, July 1, and the York Annual Meeting of Trustees will be held in the evening of Wednesday, the 30th of June. The Trustees and friends of the Institution will dine together as usual each day, at Etridge's Hotel, York. W.

Penal Laws against the Unitarians.

[Our readers are probably aware of Mr. W. Smith's motion for the repeal of so much of the 9th and 10th William III. as relates to Anti-trinitarians. We here record the proceedings in the House

of Commons on the motion, Wednesday, May the 5th.]

Mr. W. Smith said, he believed *no opposition* would be made to the motion he was about to submit to the House, and he therefore would not take up two minutes of their attention. The Act of King William, known by the name of the Toleration Act, denied to persons who disbelieved in the Trinity the benefit of toleration. An Act of the 19th of his present majesty, required only the general belief in *the doctrines of Christianity and the scriptures*; but it so happened, that though by the Act of the 19th it was not necessary to subscribe the Articles of the Church of England, professing the belief in the Trinity, the Acts of the 9th and 10th of King William were not repealed. By these Acts, persons who in writing or conversation deny the existence of any of the persons of the Trinity, are disabled in law from holding any office, civil, ecclesiastical, or military, on conviction; and if a second time convicted, they are disabled to sue or prosecute in any action or information, or to be the guardian of any child, and *liable to be imprisoned for three years*. The only object of his bill was to do away these penalties. He said the liberal Act which was passed last year was highly creditable to the liberality of the ministers of this country, and the times in which we live. The only question now for consideration was, whether those persons dissenting from the Church of England, should be still liable to the penalties of the Acts of King William. He therefore moved for leave to bring in a bill for granting farther relief to the different persuasions of Christians in this country, *who disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity*. The Speaker observed, that the regular course was to move first, that the motion should be submitted to a committee of the whole house; which was accordingly done. Lord Castlereagh said, he certainly *did not see any reason to object to the principle of the bill*. When the bill was before the House, he would then be enabled to see if there was any thing in the mode of granting the relief liable to objection. The House went into a committee, *when leave was moved for and obtained, to bring in the bill in question*.

Description of the newly erected Unitarian Church at Phila-
VOL. VIII. 22

delphia, with an Account of its opening. Feb. 14, 1813.

Of the design of a new Unitarian Church at Philadelphia, we have before given our readers information. The building was begun May, 1812, under the superintendence and direction of a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Taylor, Vaughan and Astley. From letters lately received, we extract the following particulars, which will not be thought trifling when it is considered that this is the first church erected avowedly in the New World for the worship of One God, the Father.

"The church is very handsome, without being gaudy. The form is octagonal. The pulpit and galleries are rather higher than was intended, but that cannot be of much consequence. The pulpit is circular, with a crimson velvet cushion, and crimson Persian curtains inside. Over the pulpit on a groundwork painted in imitation of marble, is this inscription from John xvii. 3.—*This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent*. The organ is 10 feet high, and 6 wide, with gilt pillars and pipes; the organ-loft with curtains the same as the pulpit. There are 72 pews on the floor, but none in the galleries, as there were so many benches belonging to the old place. The velvet and Persian was given by Mr. Vaughan, and Mr. Astley presented a very handsome clock. Mr. Lowe, the organ-builder, engaged several persons to sing, and most of the ladies went the evening before the opening to hear them rehearse. Mr. Rayner Taylor had the honour of opening the organ, which was excellently performed.

"On Sunday, Feb. 14th. the bell began at 10 o'clock and tolled 20 minutes, and then rang until half past 10, when Mr. Taylor struck up a voluntary on the organ. The Introductory Address was then delivered by Mr. Eddowes, after which Mr. Vaughan read the 96th. psalm, and a hymn was sung to the old 100th. Mr. Taylor then prayed, and another hymn was sung to London. Mr. Eddowes then commenced his sermon, from Joshua xxii. 22, 23:—he preached an hour, when, being fatigued, Mr. Taylor gave out a hymn, which was sung to Guildford. Mr. E. then resumed his discourse, and finished in 25 minutes, when a voluntary was played, during which a col-

lection was made for the building fund. The last hymn was sung to Cambridge, and Mr. E. concluded the service with the prayer and benediction.

"Mr. Vaughan performed the whole of the afternoon service: the tunes, Derby, 104th. and New Court.

"In the evening the place was excessively crowded; there were about 800 persons within, and 100 or 200 who could not get in. Mr. E. performed the first part of the service, and Mr. Taylor preached from Matt. xxi. 13. *My house shall be called the house of prayer*; the tunes, Bedford, St. Anns, Falmouth."

Mr. Eddowes's was a high-toned Unitarian Sermon and is to be published.

"The three collections amounted to 205 dollars, and 46 Cts. which was far more than was expected."

The friends write in high spirits. The building cost (it is estimated) about 12,000 dollars, exclusive of the ground, for which, in the year 1818, are to be

paid 7500 dollars. The Society subscribed among themselves, in the first instance, nearly 6000 dollars; a large sum, however, remains, as a debt on the new place. Our American brethren venture therefore to make an appeal to the liberality of their fellow Christians in Great Britain; and Mr. Joseph Priestley requests us to name the following gentlemen, as, amongst others, receivers of benefactions, how small soever, on behalf of the American Unitarian Church, the erection of which (to use the language of Mr. Priestley) cannot fail to have an important effect in a country, where the errors of the understanding are alone to be overcome, and where all sects are, in the eye of the law, on an equal footing:—

The Rev. J. Yates, Liverpool

— — W. Hawkes, Manchester

— — T. Jervis, Leeds

— — J. Kentish, Birmingham

— — J. P. Estlin, D. D. Bristol

— — T. Belsham, London

— — R. Aspland, Hackney

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The Bible Society now occupies so much of the public attention, that every thing relative to it becomes of importance, and particularly to the members of the religious world. This Society, it is well known, is formed on the idea of uniting Christians in one body, for the promotion of religious truth, and this by means of circulating the Bible without note or comment. We have frequently observed, that it does not follow its own rule, inasmuch as it circulates King James's, or the vulgar English Bible, in which are many annotations; and, as the funds of the Society are large, and it contains many learned persons, there is scarcely an excuse for its not acting up to its avowed design, and publishing a correct translation without annotation, so

that it may be a standard book for all parties of Christians to refer to, without offence to any. We had no doubt, when we first made this remark, that the reasonableness of it would be forced on its members by subsequent proceedings. But we have a singular circumstance to mention before we resume this point. To the parent society are attached several auxiliary societies, and at a meeting of one of them, a clergyman was called to the chair of the committee, which was met to arrange the business of the day, and previously to entering upon it he read a letter stating that one of the vice-presidents was accustomed to distribute *Unitarian* tracts with his Bibles, who being called upon in this manner, allowed the fact, and also that he was a Unitarian. Upon this the clergyman repre-

vented his feelings to be such, that either the Unitarian or he must quit the office of vice-president, and the company having declared very generally their opinion that their Society was formed for all denominations of Christians, the clergyman allowed the basis to be good, but denied that a Unitarian could be considered as a Christian. This point, however, he could not get established, and he left the room, thus abandoning his post as chairman, and his station as vice-president.

The charge of not being a Christian must seem a very absurd one to the body of Unitarians in this kingdom, who worship the Supreme Being under the peculiar title of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the very circumstance of distributing the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, unless there was an evident design in the distributor to counteract their authenticity by his tracts, is a sufficient proof of his design to promote Christianity. The term Unitarian does not in itself imply Christianity, since Jews are Unitarians; and there are many philosophical Unitarians; so that our title is, properly speaking, that of Christian Unitarians, and we are sorry to say, that we have seen reason, though there was none in this peculiar instance, for our brother Christians of other denominations, finding it difficult to separate the Christian from the philosophical Unitarian: the one, who looks up to Christ as the mediator between God and man, as the Saviour and Redeemer, and the other who considers Christ as merely a great moral teacher, to be ranked with other moral teachers, that have appeared in different ages in

the world. Indeed if a minister, calling himself a Unitarian, should studiously avoid to speak of Christ as his Saviour, his Lord, his Mediator, and employ his time in such philosophical or moral discussions, as would be more appropriate to a college lecture room, than an assembly of Christian worshippers, there cannot be a doubt, that a pious hearer would find a difficulty in reconciling such a conduct with that of a man, who looks up to Jesus as the author and finisher of his faith, and hence may be imbibed the idea that Unitarianism is unfavourable to Christianity. Such an idea we know to have been imbibed; and we felt no small grief, that any occasion should have been given for the charge. A Unitarian will be zealous for the honour of his God, but this will not diminish his attachment to his Lord; and as a suspicion is propagated against us, it becomes us to be on our guard, that as far as respects us, who acknowledge one Lord, Jesus Christ, our brethren of other denominations shall know that we do not fall short of them in attachment to our common Saviour.

The Bible Society has given rise to another, under the name of the Meeting of Protestant Friends, for the circulation of the Scriptures among Roman Catholics, and the latter have formed a Society among themselves for the distribution of Bibles among their own members. The former society allows, that it expected the latter to distribute its own Rhemish version; for assuredly there could be no reason for their taking the vulgar version, made under the authority of King James, and his laws of translation. But here

came the difficulty ; both versions have their respective annotations, and some in the Rhemish version are offensive to the Protestant Society, which has expressed its opinion of them in the following resolution, namely, " that many of the notes attached to the Roman Catholic version are not only hostile to Protestant principles, but subversive of all Protestant churches." Hence co-operation between the two boards becomes impossible: but besides it could never have taken place, as the Roman Catholics do not allow of an indiscriminate circulation of the Bible. The Protestant Society has, however formed a Committee to consider the expediency of carrying into effect the original proposal to reprint the Rhemish version of the scripture, without notes, and to enquire particularly into the circulation of the Rhemish version in its present state, among the poor. The proposition of printing the Rhemish version, without note or comment, shews the necessity of printing the Protestant version in the same manner : and the proceedings of this new Society promise ample matter for reflection. It has corresponded with several eminent gentlemen of the Romish persuasion ; and as it is not likely to be successful there, its efforts might, with advantage be directed to the Unitarians, to whom the Bible, with whatever notes and comments they please to add to it, will be very acceptable.

The above was collected from the Protestant account of this business, but the Board of Roman Catholics, in a meeting summoned to take into consideration the charges laid against their denomination, assure the public, that the representation, made by the

Protestant Society, is founded on total misconception, for it never was intended to print the Bible with these notes, described to be so offensive to Protestants. They repeat their resolution of the general board, of the 9th of last February, which " decidedly disapproves of every publication, either illiberal in language or uncharitable in substance, injurious to the character, or offensive to the just feelings of any of our Christian brethren, with all whom the Roman Catholics of England sincerely wish to preserve harmony and mutual good will, in the spirit of Christian charity." Such a resolution as this ought to have satisfied the Protestant Society, at least unless they had proof, of which there is no appearance, that the Catholics had acted in a different manner from this resolution. Let each denomination maintain its cause with all the zeal it pleases ; but of late years, in point of good manners, the Catholics seem to have had the advantage over the Protestants.

In the view of this agitation of the Christian world, we must not overlook a circumstance in which we may be supposed to be peculiarly concerned. This is the repeal of the Act which inflicts penalties on persons who disbelieve the Trinity. A Bill to this purpose is in Parliament, and met with no opposition on its introduction into the House; and surely the believers of the Trinity, if there are any really so in this kingdom, cannot, after the experience of the last hundred years, desire the continuance of an act, which we believe has not in any one instance inflicted any pain or penalty: two attempts, or rather one attempt and one threat, have been

made, the first in the case of the celebrated Elwall, against whom an indictment was framed under this act: but when it came to trial both judge and jury united in scouting it, and casting some severe reflections upon the persecutors. This attempt was made by members of the established church; the threat of enforcing the Act was held out by some Dissenters, having at their head a Dissenting minister, who indicted, two or three years ago, a minister at the Cambridge assizes, exposing themselves to a jury of members of the Church of England, who were struck with astonishment at their persecuting spirit, and threw out their bill. Such being the case, it may be doubted whether the Act deserved any notice. An old maxim, *Malum bene positum ne moveto*, might be applied to this case. The Act itself as long as it stood in the Statute Book, was a monument of the fears of the Trinitarians for the validity of their cause, rather than an object of any dread to the Unitarians. But a popular writer has taken up the argument, and he resists the repeal of the Act, and lays down as a basis, that he who does not believe Christ to be God is not a Christian. The strain of his writing is, however, to throw the utmost contempt on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Trinitarians will not be much pleased with their supporter. He is for no partial repeals. "I am," says he, "for a general Act, permitting every man to say or write what he pleases upon the subject of religion, or I wish the whole thing to remain what it now is." Every Unitarian would willingly accede to his general act; for we cannot desire for ourselves, what we would not grant to others;

and we the more willingly would do it, as we are not in fear, like the Trinitarians, that our cause should be injured by investigation. Whatever may be the laws of any country, he is not guided by the spirit of the gospel, but by the spirit of this world, who takes advantage of them to deprive his neighbour of any civil right, or to subject him to any pain or penalty on account of his religion.

The bill relative to excommunication is now in its progress through the house, on whose part there does not seem to be any disposition to inquire into the nature of the spiritual courts by whom it is exercised, nor the cases to which it is applied. There was an intention, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, to set these courts aside altogether; but it is singular, that they have maintained their ground from their being, in a manner, out of sight, and the causes tried in them seldom becoming matter of public notoriety. A bill brought in by a judge cannot be expected to enter into the general merits or demerits of the case. Little more is done than to change the penalty of excommunication into that of contumacy; for the writ is to run *de contumace capiendo*, instead of *de excommunicato capiendo*. It is not impossible, however, that this act may lead to farther investigation.

A singular and very well-deserved mark of respect has been paid by the town of Leicester to its late teacher Mr. Robinson, testifying the high sense entertained by the town, of his merits as a citizen, a subject, and a Christian minister. A resolution was passed at a public meeting, in which the Mayor presided, for the erection of a monument, by

subscription, to his memory, the surplus to be applied to the benefit of his family, and a committee was appointed for carrying this resolution into execution. In the address of the committee, Mr. Robinson is represented to have been the instrument of diffusing the true spirit of Christianity through the large mass of the population of the town and neighbourhood, his home, his town, his country, having been especially enlightened, fructified and cheered by the beams of this spiritual sun. He was the father and founder of many new and excellent institutions. There is scarcely a charity school, a benevolent society, or an hospital within his sphere of action, which does not owe its debt of gratitude to his alms or to his eloquence, to his immediate or to his more remote influence. We were not acquainted with this excellent person but by report, and all that we have heard bore the same testimony to his zeal and his philanthropy, and his Christian spirit. Our views of religion evidently forbid us to subscribe to several parts of his creed, which corresponded with that of the great bulk of professing Christians: but he added to it the zeal, which now in common parlance denominates a person to be evangelical, than which, indeed, a better title cannot be devised for, nor desired by a Christian teacher. The good tidings of the Redeemer's kingdom have long been proclaimed to man, and to diffuse its spirit is one of the noblest tasks in which we can be engaged. This spirit Mr. Robinson seems to have imbibed in a very high degree, and we hope and trust that his lessons, as far as they were agreeable to the truths of the gospel, will not be lost in the

neighbourhood, in which he finished an earthly career marked out by so many excellencies.

An occurrence of a very different nature will give rise to different comments. It took place in Shropshire, where a clergyman of the name of Rakeshaw applied to Sir R. Corbett to disperse, what is called a conventicle, and to arrest the preacher, Mr. Wood, a carpenter, and any others who should manifest a disposition to riot. In consequence, a warrant was issued, and the constable, without shewing it, went up directly to Mr. Wood, then on his knees, in the act of prayer, seized him and dragged him some paces. For this the constable was tried at Chester, found guilty and damages of two hundred pounds were awarded against him. Application was made to the court of King's Bench, for a new trial, which was not granted; and Lord Ellenborough expatiated with great propriety on the unjustifiable conduct of the constable towards a person in the performance of his devotions, whether erroneously or not; and it is to be hoped that this example will deter that officiousness, which would molest a quiet, peaceable, worshiping society, and at the same time view with perfect indifference the mobbing and rioting of a multitude, collected for mere amusement.

The catholic bill made great progress in the House of Commons, and such an oath was formed, and such rules laid down, as denote the times of popery to be gone by; for the present race of Roman Catholics may be considered now as members of the Romish church, but entirely separated from the politics of the court of Rome. They are semi-protestants

at least, and the late discussions will still more remove their prejudices. As to their doctrines, it must be continually enforced, that it differs very little from that of the Church of England, the offensive part of which, the damnation of all who are not within the pale of their creed, being maintained equally by both churches, and as the Roman Catholics can scarcely now be called Papists, no more can the majority of persons who go to church be called members of the Church of England. A transaction in Spain has been supposed to bear hard against the Catholics; but it strikes us in a very different light, it may shew the nature of the court of Rome and of priestcraft, but it does not involve in it the faith of a Catholic; a man may be a good Catholic and yet detest the acts of a popish nuncio. A nuncio in Spain was, it seems at the bottom of the opposition to the abolition of the inquisition, and endeavoured to create delays by his suggestions to the clergy. In these acts he was discovered, and the government issued a truly Protestant proclamation against him, in which it maintained the supremacy of the temporal sovereign, in every thing that is not spiritual. This is the more remarkable, as the head of the Spanish government is a Cardinal, and it shews that however bigoted a nation may be, its subjection to the Pope in spiritual concerns, does not alter their opinion of their civil rights, and it may be thence inferred, that an Englishman would certainly be as jealous of the interference of the Pope, in the concerns of this country, as a Spaniard in those of Spain. The House of Commons is very much divided upon this

question, for after much battling, the Bill has received its death-blow, by a division on the question, whether Catholics should be admitted into Parliament, when there appeared, for the admission two hundred and forty-seven, against it two hundred and fifty-one: so small a difference shews that, if vulgar prejudices are not entirely overcome yet religious liberty has made considerable progress.

The affairs on the continent wear a present at dubious, but most afflicting aspect. It has pleased Providence to permit the passions of men to continue to bring desolation on those regions, where civilization and Christianity were supposed to have fixed their seat. Germany has seen another of those dreadful battles, of which so many have disgraced Europe within the last twenty years, where hail-stones of a talent weight have fallen upon the earth, yet men have not repented of their sins, nor has the spirit of the Prince of Peace entered into the hearts of those who profess his religion, so that they should convert their spears into pruning-hooks, and their weapons of war into instruments of agriculture. The mighty hero, whose army was so wonderfully destroyed in the winter, has brought another into the field, and is now with it in the heart of Germany. The extent of its numbers cannot be ascertained, as it is his interest to swell the account at present to intimidate his adversaries. Scarcely had he joined his army, when every thing was prepared for an attack; nor were the confederate sovereigns behind-hand in their efforts to oppose him. Multitudes like the sand on the sea-shore were assembled on the

plains of Lutzen, and a dreadful day was fought, in which fell to the ground between thirty and forty thousand of our fellow creatures dead or wounded. Both sides claimed the victory, and this might the more easily be done, as the battle ended only in the night: but the next days witnessed the retreat of the confederates, and the advance of the French. Another dreadful battle of the same kind is to be expected. The fate of Prussia is in suspense, but it cannot remain long undecided. A general spirit of revolt is said to have taken hold of the minds of the Germans, but as yet it seems to have been confined to the northern part; and Hamburgh, threatened by the French, has not yet admitted them into its gates, and remains under the protection of the Danes, fearful that if Buonaparte should succeed, it must be exposed to the utmost severity of his vengeance. The Christian mind turns with horror from these sights, looking up to Providence with resignation and patience, hoping for a speedy end to these calamities, but confident in the Almighty arm, which curbs the passions of men, and finally will convert them to be instruments of his glorious purpose, the establishment of a kingdom of peace and righteousness.

Russia has presented to us the detail of the number of carcasses, that have been consigned to the flames or to the earth in the vast regions which were covered by them. Where is the man whose heart is not appalled by such a recital! Friends or enemies, they are our fellow creatures. May humanity be spared the recurrence of similar events, by more heroic designs entering the hearts

of princes, and leading them to the true glory of rendering the earth a better habitation for reasonable beings. Sweden presents to us a strange picture of human politics. It is said, in this mutation of kingdoms, to be preparing to annex Norway to its dominions: and Denmark to have failed in a negotiation with this country. Spain is still unsettled, but the French have been foiled under their best general, in an attack against the English army, and Lord Wellington is entering upon his campaign. The war there is of an inferior nature, as the real contention is in Germany, and on the approaching event seems to depend the fate not only of Spain, but of Europe.

The United States are beginning to feel the effects of war in the blockading of their ports; but are still not dismayed, and are preparing new schemes for a maritime warfare, and endeavouring to adapt the Congreve rocket to naval engagements. In the South, the army of Buenos Ayres has gained a victory over their Peruvian brethren, and thus strengthening their new republic. The mother country cannot assist its colonies, and the subversion of its interest in the south seems to be inevitable. The times are big with great events: but in the midst of these distresses from wars and tumults, the increased efforts to diffuse the everlasting gospel over the world hold out the encouraging hopes, that, when these storms are blown over, better days will spring up, and the seed now sowing and sown will hereafter ripen to good fruit. May thy kingdom come, must be still the fervent prayer, to the Father of mercies, of every true Christian

Erratum.—In the account of the division at Exeter, in the Catholic petition, p. 276, col. 2, (middle) for "two to one" read—twenty to one.