

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XCV.

NOVEMBER.

[Vol. VIII.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of Dr. Caleb Ashworth,
by Rev. S. Palmer.

Hackney, Oct. 4, 1813.

SIR,

As a department in your Repository is devoted to Biography, and admits brief anecdotes of respectable persons of whose history but little information can, from distance of time, be procured, I am encouraged to send you a few particulars concerning my worthy tutor Dr. Ashworth, in consequence of the notice which I find taken of him in the *Memoir of Mr. Worthington*, in your last Number, p. 526, where a reference is made to the Sermon which I preached on occasion of his death. That sermon, I confess is, as the writer of the *Memoir* observed to me, very defective in regard to the Doctor's history, of which something might have been introduced consistently with the restraint I was under with respect to his character. With your permission, therefore, I will now attempt to supply that deficiency, so far as I am able, and am sorry that I have so little to communicate worthy the notice of your readers.

DR. CALEB ASHWORTH was born at an obscure village in Lancashire, where his father was a lay-preacher, of the particular Baptist

denomination; of whom I can relate only this single anecdote which I had from the Dr., which shews him to have possessed some talent; the application of which is not very common, nor indeed very enviable. His congregation, carrying the matter of extemporaneous devotion to such a length as not to allow of singing pre-composed hymns, required him to deliver extempore ones, line by line, with which requisition he continued to comply for some years: in what manner, and with what success, I presume not to say, and leave your readers to judge.

He had three sons brought up to the ministry among the Dissenters, who all had academical education. Mr. Thomas Ashworth, the eldest, whom I well knew by his visits at Daventry, was a man of great piety and an amiable temper. He continued a Baptist, and was many years the pastor of a Calvinistical congregation, at Heckmondwick, in Yorkshire. Though he possessed no great share of learning, and was remarkably plain in his manner and appearance, he was a very useful preacher, and his prayers were peculiarly excellent. A younger brother, Mr. John Ashworth, also continued a Baptist, but joined with those of the Gene-

ral denomination, and was settled in London, where he was a colleague with the celebrated Dr. Foster, and consequently may be supposed a man of considerable talents. But he died young, and Dr. Foster preached and printed his funeral sermon.

Caleb, the subject of this memoir, was early placed for education, under Dr. Doddridge, at Northampton, where, it is presumed, he became a convert to Pædobaptism: and I have in my possession several letters of his relating to that controversy, which he wrote to me on my application to him, when, in the early part of my ministry, I had some difficulties on that subject; and they were of considerable use in determining my judgment and practice.

On finishing his studies at Northampton, he was fixed with the congregation at Daventry, where he spent the rest of his life, though he had an invitation to remove, from a congregation in London, which, if I mistake not, was that at Crosby-square. He was at first chosen as assistant to Mr. James Floyd, who not possessed of very acceptable talents as a preacher, (though very eminent in prayer) upon marrying a lady of considerable fortune, gave up the pastoral charge, to which Mr. Ashworth was then chosen, and he had a flourishing congregation, which after some years required a new gallery to be erected.

He married a lady of Northampton, to whom he was attached during his studies (I think of the name of Hemmings), with whom he had but a slender fortune; so that having a growing family, he soon found himself in those straits which many of his brethren have

experienced; a circumstance which occasioned him to give his pupils some prudential hints with respect to matrimonial connexions. One of the disadvantages which he, among many others, felt from a slender income, was his inability to purchase such books and commentaries, as a studious minister most needs and wishes to possess. In this difficulty, however, he had the happiness to find great relief, through the kindness of Dr. Watts, to whom he had been recommended by his tutor, Dr. Doddridge, who had always expressed the warmest friendship for him. Of the truth of this anecdote I have the pleasing proof in a manuscript letter, (among many in my possession, of that excellent man, to Dr. Doddridge) dated Oct. 18, 1746. In the P. S. the Dr. says, "I rejoice to hear so well of Mr. Ashworth. I hope my lady and I have set him up with commentaries, for which he has given us both thanks."

This circumstance leads me to mention a remarkable testimony of his respect to the memory of his kind benefactor, for whose writings both he and his people had a very high esteem. Happening, after the Lord's Day afternoon service, to see, in a newspaper, an account of the death of Dr. Watts, he determined that very evening to give his people a discourse for the improvement of the event, at a lecture which he had been accustomed to hold at an ancient building in the town, called the Abbey. Accordingly, short as the interval was, which admitted only of his writing some brief hints, he delivered a very interesting discourse, of which a friend of Dr. Watts in London who heard of

it, requested a copy, and, on the perusal, earnestly desired him to publish it. He accordingly yielded, though not without reluctance and a modest apology in the advertisement. It is entitled *Reflections on the fall of a great man*, on 2 Sam. iii. 38. It affords proof of wonderful facility in composition, and is at least equal to any other discourse published on the same occasion, although at that time he could be but about 28 years of age: it soon came to a second edition.

When, upon the death of Dr. Doddridge the academy was removed to Daventry, Mr. Ashworth erected a new house for the reception of the students, contiguous to the meeting-house, and a new parsonage-house was built by the congregation at the same time. Though the situation was by no means eligible, being in a narrow street, close to a very public road, and opposite to a large inn; both the erections, which were under his superintendence, were extremely well contrived, considering the narrow extent of the premises; and the institution retained its respectability. By the strict discipline which he maintained, and his unwearied application, together with his prudence and friendship, the house was usually filled with pupils. Besides those who had entered on academical studies, there were a few educated in grammar learning, who could not be accommodated in the house. These had lodgings in the town and were instructed by a clergyman, but were required to attend the domestic worship of the academy, and Mr. Ashworth devoted no small portion of his time to their improvement.

The academical building which he himself erected, with the assistance of friends and of the trustees, became his own property, and by means of great prudence and economy (which however were accompanied with great liberality) he was enabled to acquire some pecuniary remuneration for his labour, and in a course of years his circumstances were so much improved that he not only brought up his family with reputation, but left those who survived him a decent competency.

In the year 1759, Mr. Ashworth received a Doctor's diploma; a distinction unsought by him, but not undeserved, for not only the office he sustained as a teacher of theology, as well as other sciences, but his general respectability and influence in the station he was called to fill, gave him a much better claim to such a title than many who have obtained it. And had it not been for his great diffidence and his backwardness to appear as an author, he might have acquired much literary fame. He had a particular taste for Jewish antiquities, and he so much improved Dr. Doddridge's Lectures on that subject, that the publication of his manuscript would supersede any thing yet extant upon that branch of science.

He was once urged by some persons in London to publish a Course of Sermons on a Particular Subject, and he so far complied as to transcribe them for the press, but afterwards hearing nothing from those who made the request (probably because he refused the invitation to remove to the metropolis), he very willingly desisted from the publication; and these

M.SS. it is supposed he destroyed, as he did many others a little before his death.

There is great reason to believe that his intense application to study, and the want of exercise sufficient for a man of his corpulence, injured his constitution, naturally strong. He had for many months been afflicted with a dropsy in the chest, which the last time he was in London greatly affected his breath, and at length put a period to his life at a time when he might have been expected to enjoy many years of health and usefulness.

Instead of enlarging on his character and talents (which it would be pleasant for me to do, were it not through fear of trespassing too much on your pages) I will only refer your readers to your extract from Mr. Worthington's Memoir of Mr. Crabb, and to the highly honourable testimony of Mr. Belsham, in his farewell sermon at Hackney; a copy of which, with a few other particulars, are given in the notes subjoined to the *Letters from Mr. Job Orton to Dissenting Ministers, &c.* among which is one of some length to Dr. Ashworth, for whom in several others of those letters he expresses the highest respect.

Dr. Ashworth had three sons and three daughters, none of whom are now living. It is a very affecting circumstance that the whole family, though very robust, were cut off in the space of a few years. His eldest son, Mr. John Ashworth, at first designed for the ministry, preferred the business of a grazier, and was placed under the famous Mr. Bakewell, in Leicestershire. He afterwards became the landlord of the Wheat-Sheaf Inn, opposite to the academy, and married the daughter of his predecessor, by whom he had one child, a very accomplished young lady, who still survives.

If in any of the above particulars I have committed a mistake, I shall readily submit to the correction of any surviving pupil of the Dr., by whom also I shall be glad to see any material deficiency supplied. I am not insensible to his failings; but such were his excellencies, that to this day, after the lapse of above half a century, I often reflect with pleasure on the years I spent under his tuition as some of the happiest of my life.

I am, Sir,

Respectfully yours,
S. PALMER.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Account of the Pope and Court of Rome.

[From Eustace's Classical Tour through Italy, in 2 Vols. 4to. 1813.—Appendix to Vol. II.]

Though the Pope is both Bishop and Prince, yet his titles, dress,

equipage, and the whole ceremonial of his court, are adapted to the first of these characters. He is styled Holiness, the Holy Father, and sometimes in history the Sovereign Pontiff, but the former appellations, as more appro-

priate to his duties and functions, are exclusively used in his own court. His robes are the same as those of a bishop in pontificals (excepting the stole and the colour, which is white, not purple). His vestments, when he officiates in church, as well as his mitre, do not differ from those of other prelates. The *tiara* seems originally to have been an ordinary mitre, such as is still worn by the Greek Patriarchs. The three circlets, which have raised it into a triple crown, were added at different periods, and it is said, for different mystic reasons. The first or lowest seems to have been originally a mere border, gradually enriched with gold and diamonds. The second was the invention of Boniface VIII. about the year 1300; and to complete the mysterious decoration, the third was superadded about the middle of the fourteenth century. The use of the *tiara* is confined to certain extraordinary occasions, as in most great ceremonies the Pope uses the common episcopal mitre.

Whenever he appears in public, or is approached even in private, his person is encircled with reverence and with majesty. In public, a large silver cross raised on high is carried before him, as a sacred banner, the church bells ring as he passes, and all kneel in his sight. When he officiates at the patriarchal Basilicæ he is carried from his apartments in the adjoining palace to the church in a chair of state, though in the chancel his throne is merely an ancient episcopal chair, raised only a few steps above the seats of the cardinals or clergy. In private, as the pontifical palaces are vast and magnificent, there are perhaps

more apartments to be traversed, and greater appearances of splendour in the approach to his person, than in an introduction to any other sovereign. In his antichamber, a prelate in full robes is always in waiting, and when the bell rings, the door of the pontifical apartment opens, and the Pope is seen in a chair of state with a little table before him. The person presented kneels once at the threshold, again in the middle of the room, and lastly, at the feet of the Pontiff, who, according to circumstances, allows him to kiss the cross embroidered on his shoes, or presents his hand to raise him. The Pontiff then converses with him a short time, and dismisses him with some slight present of beads, or medals, as a memorial. The ceremony of genu-flection is again repeated, and the doors close.*

* Some Protestants have objected to this ceremony, which, after all, is only a mark of respect formerly paid to every bishop,† and still kept up in a court tenacious of its ancient observances. It is said, that Horace Walpole, when presented to Benedict XIV. stood for some time in a posture of hesitation, when the Pope, who was remarkable for cheerfulness and humour, exclaimed, “Kneel down, my son, receive the blessing of an old man; it will do you no harm!” Upon which the young traveller instantly fell on his knees, and was so much pleased with the conversation and liveliness of Benedict, that he took every occasion of waiting upon him, and testifying his respect during his stay at Rome. In truth, English gentlemen have always been received by the Popes with peculiar kindness and condescension, and every indulgence is shewn to their opinions, or, as the Romans must term them, their prejudices, and even to their caprices.

† Fleury, *Mœurs des Chrétiens*. xxxii. ad finem.

The pomp which environs the Pontiff in public, and attracts the attention so forcibly, may perhaps appear to many, a glorious and enviable distinction; but there are few, I believe, who would not, if accompanied by it in all the details of ordinary life, feel it an intolerable burden. Other sovereigns have their hours of relaxation; they act their part in public, and then throw off their robes, and mix in the domestic circle with their family or their confidants. The Pope has no hours of relaxation; always encumbered with the same robes, surrounded by the same attendants, and confined within the magic circle of etiquette, he labours for ever under the weight of his dignity, and may, if influenced by ordinary feelings, often sigh in vain, for the leisure and

The custom of being carried in a chair of state has also given offence, and is certainly not very conformable to the modern practice even of courts; however it is another remnant of ancient manners, a mode of conveyance, (less luxurious indeed) copied from the *lectica*, so much in use among the Romans. In the earlier ages, the custom of the Popes as of other Bishops was to pass from the sacristy through the church on foot,* leaning on two priests, and thus advance to the altar; a custom more conformable to Christian humility and to the simplicity not only of ancient but even of modern times. In fact, in all the ceremonial of the Roman Church and Court, the only parts liable to misrepresentation or censure, are certain additions of later times, when, in religious pomps and court pageants, in dress and in style, all was inflated and cumbersome. The rule of reform is easy and obvious; to prune off the excrescences of barbarous ages, and to restore the majestic forms of antiquity.

* Ordo Rom. Primus et Secund. *Murator.*

the insignificance of the college or the cloister. A morning of business and application closes with a solitary meal; a walk in the gardens of the *Quirinal* or the *Vatican*, a visit to a church or an hospital, are his only exercises. Devotion and business, the duties of the Pontiff and of the Prince, successively occupy his hours, and leave no vacant interval for the indulgence of the taste, or the arrangement of the affairs of the individual. What honours can compensate for a life of such restraint and confinement! (P. 620—623)

On the whole, the person and conduct of the Pope, whether in public or in private, are under perpetual restraint and constant inspection. The least deviation from strict propriety or even from customary forms, would be immediately noticed, published, and censured in pasquinades. Leo X. loved shooting, and by the change of dress necessary for that amusement, gave scandal. Clement XIV. (Ganganelli) was advised by his physicians to ride; he rode in the neighbourhood of his *Alban Villa*, and, it is said, offended the people of the country not a little by that supposed levity. Benedict XIV. wished to see the interior arrangement of a new theatre, and visited it before it was opened to the public; the next morning an inscription appeared over the door by which he had entered, *Porta santa; plenary indulgence to all who enter*. These anecdotes suffice to shew the joyless uniformity of the papal court, as well as the strict decorum that pervades every department immediately connected with the person of the Pontiff.

Some centuries ago the Popes considered themselves authorized, by their temporal sovereignty, to give the same exhibitions and tournaments, and to display the same scenes of festivity and magnificence in the Vatican, as were beheld at the courts and in the palaces of other princes; nor did such ill-placed pageants seem at that period to have excited surprise or censure. But the influence of the Council of Trent, though its direct interference was strongly repelled, reached the recesses of the pontifical palace, and the general rigour of discipline established by it, ascended from the members to the head, and at length pervaded the whole body. Hence the austere features of the papal court, and the monastic silence that reigns through the vast apartments of the *Vatican* and of the *Quirinal* palaces; and hence also the solitary repasts and the perpetual abstemiousness of the Pontiff's table. (P. 624—626.)

We proceed to the College of Cardinals, the real senate of modern Rome, and the council of the Pontiff. The title of Cardinal was originally given to the parochial clergy of Rome: it seems to have been taken from the imperial court, where, in the time of Theodosius, the principal officers of the state had that appellation added as a distinction to their respective dignities. The number of titles, or churches which give a title to this dignity, is seventy-two, including the six suburban bishoprics; their principal and most honourable privilege is that of electing the Pope, and it is easy to conceive that their dignity and importance increased with that of the Roman See itself, and

that they shared alike its temporal and its spiritual pre-eminence. As they are the counsellors, so they are the officers of the Pontiff, and are thus entrusted with the management of the church at large and of the Roman State in particular.

In the middle ages, when the Roman Bishop seemed to engross to himself the government, both spiritual and temporal, of Christendom, and acted at once with all the power and authority of Emperor and of Pontiff, the cardinalate became the next most conspicuous dignity, and rivalled, sometimes eclipsed, the splendor of royalty itself.

Even after the plenitude of papal power had been retrenched, and the Reformation had withdrawn so many provinces from its dominion, the purple retained its lustre, and a cardinal still continued to rank with princes of the blood royal. This honour they possess even in our times, and in spite of the Revolution itself, they enjoy it in such courts as are not immediately under French controul. Thus the College of Cardinals has made a conspicuous figure in Europe for the space of at least one thousand years. The Roman Senate itself can scarce be said to have supported its fame and grandeur for so long a period; in fact, in dignity, rank, talents, and majesty, the sacred College is worthy to succeed and to represent that august assembly. One of the advantages or rather the peculiar glory of this body is, that it admits men of eminence in virtue, talents, or rank, without any regard to country or nation, thus paying a tribute to merit in opposition to local prejudices, and

inviting genius from every quarter of the universe, to receive the honours, and at the same time to increase the lustre, of the Roman purple. The classic writers of the age of Leo, while they beheld so many distinguished characters collected in this assembly, and while they received so much encouragement from its learned members, looked up to it with reverence and affection, and joyfully applied to it the titles and appellations of the ancient senate. It was with them *amplissimus cætus, imperii et rationis arx—partus omnium gentium—Orbis terrarum concilium, &c.* Its members were the *purpurati patres—gentium patroni—Urbis principes, &c.* It cannot therefore be a matter of surprise that this dignity should at all times have been the object of ecclesiastical ambition, and been accepted with joy by the sons even of the first monarchs in Europe.

The cardinals are named by the Pope, though all the Catholic powers are allowed to recommend a certain number. Some hats are generally kept in reserve, in case of any emergency, so that the number is seldom full. The nomination is not often abused, and the honour so rarely misplaced, that the public has not been known to complain for a long lapse of years.

The grand assembly of the cardinals is called the consistory, where the Pontiff presides in person. Here they appear in all the splendour of the purple and form a most majestic senate, such as might almost justify the emphatical expression of the Greek orator. But this assembly is not precisely a council, as it seldom discusses, but witnesses the ratifica-

tion of measures previously weighed and adopted in the cabinet of the Pontiff. Here therefore public communications are announced, foreign ambassadors received, cardinals created, formal compliments made and answered, in short, the exterior splendour of sovereignty displayed to the public eye. But the principal prerogative of a cardinal is exercised in the Conclave, so called because the members of the sacred College are then confined within the precincts of the great halls of the Vatican palace, where they remain immured till they agree in the election of a Pontiff. The halls are divided into temporary apartments: each cardinal has four small rooms, and two attendants called conclavists. The Senator of Rome, the conservators, and the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, then in the city, guard the different entrances into the Conclave, and prevent all communication. These precautions to exclude all undue influence and intrigue, from such an assembly, on such an occasion, though not always effectual, deserve applause. However, the clashing interests of the different courts are so well-poised, that even intrigue can do but little mischief; for if the cardinals attached to any sovereign make particular efforts in favour of any individual of the same interest, they only awaken the jealousy and rouse the opposition of all the other courts and parties. In fact, the choice generally falls on a cardinal totally unconnected with party, and therefore exceptionable to none, exempt from glaring defects, and ordinarily remarkable for some virtue or ac-

ful accomplishment, such as learning, dignity, moderation, firmness.

It is not my intention to specify all the forms of *etiquette* observed, or the ceremonies practised during the process, or at the conclusion of the election; two or three, however, I must notice for reasons which will appear sufficiently obvious; one is the custom of putting the tickets containing the votes of the cardinals on the *patina* (or communion plate), and then into the chalice: now, however important these votes may be, and however intimate their connection with the welfare of the church, yet to apply to them the vases devoted in a peculiar manner to the most awful institutions of religion, seems to pass beyond disrespect, and almost to border on profanation. The next ceremony to which I have alluded, is that called the adoration of the Pope; it takes place almost immediately after his election, when he is placed in a chair on the altar of the Sixtine chapel, and there receives the homage of the cardinals: this ceremony is again repeated on the high altar of St. Peter's. Now in this piece of pageantry I object not to the word *adoration*; no one who knows Latin, or reflects upon the sense which it bears on this and on a thousand other occasions, will cavil at it, though he may wish it otherwise applied. Nor do I find fault with the throne, he who is at the same time both Pontiff and Prince, has, from time and custom, perhaps, a double title to such a distinction. But why should the altar be made his footstool? The altar, the beauty of

holiness, the throne of the *victim** lamb, the *mercy-seat* of the temple of Christianity; why should the altar be converted into the footstool of a mortal?

I mean not, however, while I condemn this ceremony, to extend the censure to those who practise or who tolerate it. Besides the difficulty of altering an ancient rite (if this piece of pageantry, however, deserve that epithet) the world is too well acquainted with the virtues of the late Pontiffs to suspect them of want of humility. To conform to an established custom, and refer the honour to him whom they represent, the *Prince of Pastors*, and the *Master of Apostles*, appears perhaps to them a greater act of humility than to excite surprise, and perhaps to give offence, by an untimely and unexpected resistance. Be the motives of toleration however what they may, the practice is not edifying to any, it is offensive to most, and of consequence, as producing some evil and no good, it ought to be suppressed.

The last ceremony which I shall notice is the following. As the new Pontiff advances towards the high altar of St. Peter's, the master of the ceremonies kneeling before him, sets fire to a small quantity of tow placed on the top of a gilt staff, and as it blazes and vanishes in smoke, thus addresses the Pope, *Sancte Pater! sic transit gloria mundi!* This ceremony is repeated thrice. Such allusions to the

* Hic suus pascit populos fideles
Carne, qui mundi scelus omne tollit
Agnus, et fusi pretium cruoris
Ipse propinat.

HYM. DEL.

nothingness of sublunary grandeur have, we all know, been introduced into the ceremonials of royal pageantry, both in ancient and modern times; nor is it mentioned here as a novelty, but as a proof of the transcendent glory which once encompassed the papal throne.—*Nemo est in mundo sine aliqua tribulatione vel angustia, quamvis Rex sit vel Papa.*—*De Imit. Christi.* I. 22. The pontifical dignity was then, it seems, supposed to be the complement and perfection of regal and even imperial power.

Yet there is no sovereign who seems to stand in so little need of this lesson as the Roman Pontiff. The robes which encumber his motions, the attendants that watch his steps, and the severe magnificence that surrounds him on all sides, are so many mementos of his duties and of his responsibility; while the churches which he daily frequents, lined with monuments, that announce the existence and the short reigns of his predecessors; nay, the very city which he inhabits, the sepulchre of ages and of empires, the sad monument of all that is great and glorious beneath the sun, remind him at every step of fallen grandeur and of human mortality. One lesson more the Pontiff is now destined to receive daily, and that is of all others the most impressive and most mortifying; power escaping from his grasp, and influence evaporating in the shadow of a name.—*Sic transit gloria mundi.*

Of the retinue and procession of the Pontiff at the inauguration, we shall say no more; but of the ceremonial of the Roman court in general give the opinion of the most intelligent of French travel-

lers, in his own words, after having observed, that to the eye of an Englishman, though as partial to pomp and stateliness as the native of a northern region can be, the effect would be increased if the quantum of ceremony were considerably diminished. *La pompe qui environne le Pape, et les ceremonies de l'Eglise Romaine sont les plus majestueuses, les plus augustes, et les plus imposantes qu'on puisse voir.**

From the state and the exterior of the Popes in general, we will now pass to the person and the character of the present Pontiff. Pius VII. is of a noble family, *Chiaramonte* by name, and became early in life a Benedictin monk of the Abbey of *S. Giorgio*, at *Venice*. His learning, virtue, and mildness, raised him shortly above the level of his brethren, attracted the attention of the Superiors first, and afterwards of the late Pope, Pius VI. who had an opportunity of noticing the Father *Chiaramonte*, on his way to *Vienna*, and who shortly after promoted him to the see of *Imola*, and afterwards raised him to the purple. His career in this splendid line, seems to have been marked rather by the mild and conciliating virtues than by the display of extraordinary abilities; we accordingly find him esteemed and beloved by all parties, and respected even by the French generals, and by *Buonaparte* in particular.

* *La Lande.*—The reader will perhaps be surprised to find no account of various observances, of which he has heard or read much, such as the open stool, the examination, &c. &c. but his surprise will cease, or perhaps increase, when he is assured that no such ceremonies exist.

When the late Pope was torn from his capital by the orders of the French Directory, and dragged prisoner into France, the cardinals were banished, or deported with circumstances of peculiar cruelty, and the cardinal *Chiaramonte* of course shared in common with his brethren, the hardships and the dangers of this persecution.

On the death of Pius VI. the cardinals assembled in conclave at *Venice*, and in a short time unanimously proclaimed cardinal *Chiaramonte* Pope. This election took place in the month of March 1800. The French were obliged to evacuate Rome about the same period, and the Pope embarked for *Ancona*, and made his public entry into Rome in the following April.

We may easily conceive the joy, both of the Pontiff and of the people on this happy occasion. The scene was unusually splendid, but it owed its splendor not to the opulence of the sovereign, but to the zeal of the subject. The guard that lined the streets and escorted the Pontiff, consisted of a numerous body of young patricians; the triumphal arches and decorations were supplied by the Roman people, and the equipage of the Pontiff himself was the voluntary homage of the generous *Colonna*, a prince truly worthy of the name of a Roman. In fact, the Pope was personally as poor as the Apostle whom he succeeds, and like him brought to his flock nothing but the piety of the pastor and the affection of the father. As the procession moved towards the *Vatican*, tears were observed more than once streaming down his cheeks, and the details which

he afterwards received of the distress occasioned by the rapacity of the late invaders, could only increase his anguish.

To relieve the sufferings of his people, and to restore the finances of the country, was his first object, and to attain it he began by establishing a system of the strictest economy in his own household and around his own person. He next suppressed all immunities or exemptions, and subjected the nobility and the clergy to the same or to greater burthens than the lower orders; this regulation, so simple in itself, and so just, is yet little practised on the continent, where in general the weight of taxation falls upon those who are least capable of bearing it. The French republic affects indeed to adopt it, but in fact uses it only as a convenient method of plundering the rich without relieving the poor. Such are the beneficial effects of this regulation, that though some oppressive and unpopular duties have, I believe, been removed, and the sum imposed on each individual diminished, yet the general amount of the taxes is considerably increased. Other salutary arrangements are, it is said, in contemplation, and the good intentions, the sense, and the virtuous feelings of Pius VII. encourage the hope that his reign, if he be not thwarted in his designs, will be the commencement of an era of reform and of prosperity.

The Pope is of a middle stature; his eyes are dark, and his hair is black and curly; his countenance is mild and benevolent, expressing rather the tranquil virtues of his first profession, than the sentiments congenial to his latter ele-

vation. However, it is whispered by those who are more intimately acquainted with his character, that he can on occasions display great firmness and decision; that he is influenced much more by his own judgment than by the opinions of his ministers, and that he adheres irrevocably to his determination. At the present crisis, when the temporal possessions of the Roman church are at the mercy of the strongest, a spirit of conciliation is perhaps the best calculat-

ed to preserve their integrity; and even in the spiritual concerns of the Apostolic See, the interests of religion may doubtless be best consulted by such concessions and changes in discipline, as the reason or even the prejudices of the age may seem to demand. In both these respects, and particularly in the latter, the lenient and judicious Pontiff is likely to employ his authority in a manner highly conducive to public utility. (p. 628—637.)

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

From the late Robert Robinson to the Rev. Mr. Gentleman of Kidderminster.

SIR,

In looking over some papers the other day, I met with the following letter, which you may perhaps think worthy of inserting in your Repository, as it must have been one of the last letters which Mr. Robinson ever wrote, and stands in need of no external proof of its authenticity.

The following week an advertisement appeared to this effect. On such a day a Sermon *will* be preached at Kidderminster, and by the Rev. R. Robinson, but before that period he was a lifeless corpse. From that time I determined never to make use of the word *will*, as applied to future events, especially to religious services; as being inconsistent both with the uncertainty of future events, and with an express apostolic injunction: "Go to now, ye that say, we *will* go into such a city, &c. whereas ye ought to say, if the Lord *will* we shall live and do this or that."

Yours, &c. B. C.

Chesterton,

Tuesday, May 25, 1790.

REV. SIR,

This morning your favour came to hand. It is, like yourself, a pleasing compound of piety and politeness. I own, it gives me a great deal of pain to feel my incompetence, and foresee my inequality to the good work which your complaisance hath assigned me. Indeed my cold hath lain harder upon me than any other of my life, and to go so far to bray like an ass sinks my courage. I have but one hope, and that is, that change of air will do me good, at least every body tells me so.

I feel myself extremely obliged to you for forming such an agreeable plan of journeying. I intend to have in this instance, but to resign myself wholly to the disposal of my friends, and I trust they will prescribe me no clashing rules. If they be happy, I shall be so, here, there, any where.

I intend to travel in a single horse-chaise, for the benefit of

accommodating the journey to my own feelings, to go, to stay, to stop, to eat, to fast, just as my feeble stomach will give me leave. It is also as cheap, if not cheaper, than the road machines. My youngest son, a sailor just returned from the Levant, and at present on a visit here, intends to pilot me out and home, and I indulge myself in indulging him, for he is neither a booby nor a knave, but he is deeply infected with heresy, of which to be sure Dr. Priestley is like to cure him.

Most certainly, unless all men be liars, the Leasowes, Hagley, Hales-Owen, Enville, &c. are fine scenes, and tend to enrapture the beholder; but set to music by Mr. Gentleman's wise conversation, I shall lay aside the stare, and dispose myself to listen and learn. You live in happy scenes, and I murmur because I am tethered to willows, priests, and bogs and fens.

I think the printed sheet is fine, because it is tender, and goes to sooth and supple the heart.

I mean to set out on Wednesday, June 2nd, to spend that day with a quondam clergyman about ten miles off, a Mr. Hammond, who fled for freedom from established creeds and rituals to our land of liberty, and now shines with peculiar lustre. Thence I proceed by easy stages to Birmingham by Saturday night. I shall be free from all engagements by Thursday, and intend to get home the Tuesday or Wednesday night following. Pray God I may not be interrupted by illness. I am, dear Sir, with truest esteem,

most affectionately yours,
R. ROBINSON, miserably hoarse.

Original Letter of the late W. Huntington.

Bristol, Nov. 16, —86.

Rev'd Father in the Lord,—grace, mercy & peace be with thee,

If God permit and you approve I will honour your pulpit next Thursday evening—honour it I say—with the person of the vilest sinner that ever liv'd—and in possession of a Hope that can never die. If you want to know my pedigree—I am by Birth a Beggar, by practice a devil, by trade a coal-hever, by profession—and possession a sinner saved, by principal a stiff decenter, and one of God's own making, for it was he alone that call'd, ordained me, & sent me out—and he has bin my bishop, my tuter, my provider and my defence ever since—else I had bin kill'd or starv'd long ago—If you or your people are fond of the original languages—of eloquence—oratory—or grammer, I am the man that can disapoint them all. But if apostolick ignorance will sute them—they will go nigh to glean a few scraps of that sort—but my degrees will promis nothing further than that. But to inform my Rev'd Father a little about my irregularities—I am in my prayers very short—in my sermons short also—unless the master attends the feast. If so and the cruse gets a spring of oyl in it—then I generally drop all thoughts of working by the day—nor can I give it up until I have emtied the whole content—tho' I know I shall get no more without much knocking and a deal of calling at mercies door. This I call liberality—and am vain enough to think that it is fervant charity—and *that* charity which if aplyed covers a multitude of sins—and no wonder when we

hold forth freely the blood and righteousness of him that cleanseth from all the guilt of sin—and the robe that covers all the remains of sin. Rev'd father, God bless you—abundant happiness, comfort and success attend both you

and your family and your flock, while I remain, tho unknown, affectionately yours,

WM. HUNTINGTON.

*The Rev'd Mr. Parsons,
Claverton Street, Bath.*

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

*Essay on the Relation between
Protestant Nonconformity and
nonconformity to the World.*

Sept. 30, 1813.

Εκ τῆς κερμυθ ἐκ εἰσι.

The attempt to produce unity of faith and worship by means of compulsion, would seem to be one of the wildest measures which ever originated in the mind of man. It is easy to perceive that such a scheme, even when most successful, can reach no further than the language and the conduct, and cannot fetter the thoughts. The result of it may be temporary concord in ignorance or hypocrisy; but its final influence cannot be auspicious even to the cause which it is designed to serve. It can only promote some present, some momentary benefit. In no age, except in one in which it would be needless, an age of total darkness and barbarism, could it answer its intended purpose.

We may well be astonished that any efforts of this kind should have been made since the revival of learning in Europe. But History records the fact. During the reign of perhaps the most profligate monarch who has filled the English throne, a pretended zeal for the honour and welfare of the ecclesiastical establishment, dic-

tated the famous Act of Uniformity, which took effect on August 24, 1662.

By the provisions of it the clergy were obliged, in the words of an historian who had no partiality for the seceders,* "either to relinquish their livings or to sign the articles required of them:" and this writer confesses that "the terms of subscription had been made strict and rigid, on purpose to disgust all the zealous and scrupulous among the Presbyterians," (so he incorrectly styles them) "and deprive them of their livings."

What was the issue? I will state it in my author's language, that there may be no suspicion of exaggeration. "About two thousand of the clergy, in one day, relinquished their cures, and, to the astonishment of the court, sacrificed their interest to their religious tenets." That day was what he calls *the fatal St. Bartholomew*, already signalized in the annals of persecution, already stained by the treacherous massacre of the Protestants at Paris ninety years before.

Fatal it might justly be denominated: it was so, in the opinion of Mr. Locke, to the church and

* Hume's Hist. &c. Vol. VII. (1793) 384.

to religion. The ejected ministers were not only the most popular, but the holiest and most useful of the clergy. For the body of the people to be deprived of their labours and examples, was a national affliction and disgrace. It is the prerogative, however, of the Supreme Ruler that he can, in the most effectual manner, bring good from events which human beings are inclined to regard as unmixed evils. By the Act of Uniformity the interests of religious freedom and virtue have been ultimately advanced: the excellent men to whom I have alluded were the fathers of Protestant dissent.

There is no quality by which these venerable confessors appear to have been so much distinguished as superiority to the world. In quitting their benefices they had shewn that they could resist its smiles, when conscience challenged their allegiance: after they had quitted them, they were called to encounter the frowns of men, and terrors and sufferings for the sake of truth. Very few out of this large number returned to the bosom of the Establishment: very few were content to remain long or altogether in silence and inactivity. They esteemed, and rightly esteemed, it their duty to preach, as they were able, even though fines and imprisonments, and bonds and cruel mockings awaited them in consequence. Their governing maxim was, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Accordingly, though their temporal situation was commonly mean, and often indigent; though, as may be supposed, they were frequently incapable of providing their families with bread for the

passing day, and still less for the morrow, though, in not a few cases, they were pursued, like criminal outcasts and fugitives, from town to town and village to village, and were compelled to leave their homes, not knowing whither they were to go, yet with the faith of the patriarch, whom in situation they resembled, they "endured as seeing him who is invisible." Thus, they kindled a refulgent light, which is far from having been obscured through successive years. Had they possessed those superior advantages for the study of the scriptures with which their descendants have been favoured, it is probable that they would have abandoned some of their sentiments on articles of discipline and doctrine. In respect, however, of moral, of devotional, of Christian excellence, they are among the foremost of those illustrious spirits of whom the world was not worthy.

The bond then which unites Protestant dissent and a dissent from the maxims and manners that characterize the generality of men, is *religious principle*. I am far from even intimating that this principle may not be found in numbers of the conformists to an established church. But I mean to say that it *must* influence the minds and the lives of *consistent* dissenters, because, as their profession of religion is at least unattended by temporal advantages, it were *difficult*, perhaps impossible, to discover any inferior reason for their separation. Now it is precisely on account of their devout and conscientious attachment to what they regarded as the suggestions of duty, that our

nonconformist forefathers are entitled to our veneration.

But although the relation between Protestant dissent and dissent from whatever is criminal, frivolous, and of hurtful tendency in the customs of the world, consists in religious principle, it ought to be shewn in what manner religious principle operates to produce and aid both.

Nonconformity to an ecclesiastical establishment is, or should be, a *religious* act. It is a case in which we render unto God the things that we owe to God. Nothing political, nothing civil, invites us to dissent. Such considerations cannot govern those who voluntarily support their own forms of worship, while they also contribute to the support of modes of faith and prayer which have the exclusive patronage of the state. Protestant dissenters separate themselves from the mass of the people, that they may offer what they look upon as a purer homage, that they may attend with greater effect to subjects which concern their everlasting peace: they separate themselves through a rational fear that religion will be corrupted and deeply injured by the interference of human authority with its solemn requisitions. If their nonconformity then do not engage them to be strictly religious, that is, if it do not render them in a just sense nonconformists to the world, they are chargeable with gross inconsistency; and the sincerity of their avowed principles will be suspected, even if the falsehood of them cannot be demonstrated.

Here it may be asked, Are there no instances of what we might call hereditary dissent? None

of families and individuals continuing to secede from a church established by law, because their fathers thus seceded before them? I shall not deny that there may be some examples of the kind: habit has always a mighty and often an unfelt dominion over men. But where every temporal motive is thrown into one scale, and where nothing but the force of custom weighs in the other, the former, as facts may teach us, will usually prevail.

Protestant dissent cannot be maintained where it is entirely or in a high degree unaccompanied by the spirit of vital, fervent, and active religion. If it be only nominal, it will quickly sink either in an indifference to all religious principles, or in an unreflecting, perhaps a bigoted conformity to established practices and tenets. Devotion, benevolence, and holy zeal must uphold the cause of nonconformity. The principles on which it rests, however true and important, must not be cherished as merely speculative propositions.

A life of strict religion, the happiest which a man can lead, was the life of our nonconformist forefathers; this, the acquisition which they sought and gained. If we follow their example, we shall not simply advance our dearest personal interests, but shall secure and extend the credit of the dissent which they testified, and of which their posterity, it may be presumed, are desirous of being considered as the enlightened patrons. Let those descendants rank among the honourable band of nonconformists to the world, by their punctuality in secret prayer, in family worship, in

attendance on Christian ordinances and on the duties of social piety.

I add a few words on the last instance of obedience to the claims at once of religion and of Protestant dissent. Punctuality on the part of congregations as well as of ministers in public worship, tends to cement their mutual relation, to render it useful and happy, and is indeed an act of justice on the side of each. To the character of the particular societies who exemplify it, and to that of the denomination under which they rank, it is not a little honourable; while the want of it lessens their respectability and, with this, their capacity of doing good. All men, moreover, need the dedication of no inconsiderable portion of their time to acts which are immediately religious; in order that, by these means, the cares and vanities of life may be prevented from engrossing our attention and ruining our peace. But I am the advocate of this regularity chiefly that our nonconformity from the established church, may serve the purpose of rendering us superior to the world, and that the enemies of dissent may not reproach us with relaxation of principle and a proneness to follow the thoughtless multitude, at the voice of ease or luxury or pleasure.

So far as nonconformity draws the eyes of men upon the separatists, it is favourable to the advancement of personal religion. It is a motive to the more exemplary discharge of religious duties and the zealous cultivation of the virtues of the Christian character. Though we are never to do any thing merely for the sake of our being seen of men, yet, when, for other reasons, their attention is directed

towards us, we shall, surely, make it our care that our deportment be such as to endure the test of even the most hostile and envious observation! *Sects* (as the several classes of Dissenters are often lightly and invidiously termed) are not surveyed with indifference by the persons in the midst of whom they live. In the present day many circumstances concur to render them objects of thought; and they will be considered and spoken of with increasing honour by reflecting men in proportion as it is found that their nonconformity to the establishment, is accompanied with an equally scrupulous nonconformity to the vanities of the age.

Nor has dissent any formidable enemy except in the smiles, the treacherous arts and the magic influences of the world. In vain has that world assailed it by argument or the appearance of argument: the principles of nonconformity are learnt in the school of Christ and from the lessons of his apostles. In vain have men attempted to crush Dissenters by persecution and by terrors: no external force can subdue conscience and religious principle. But prosperity is more to be dreaded by the separatist than the blackest frowns or severest buffetings of adversity.—Prosperity may lull him into those dangerous slumbers which precede death: it may inspire him with a sense of safety which portends the near approach of ruin.

Rational, Christian nonconformity to the world, will preserve us from this evil. No fear of singularity, no love of power, gain and pleasure, will draw aside the truly religious man from the strait

path of truth and duty. Over *him religion* will have more controul than *honour* has over men who are of the world.

N.

Improved Version.

SIR,

I find by a letter written lately by Mr. Madge, in defence of what Mr. Walpole calls the Unitarian, and what is generally known by the title of an Improved Version of the New Testament, that in consequence of the demand for this publication a new edition will soon go to the press. I do not know whether Mr. Madge was one of the editors of this work, though I am a subscriber to it and highly approved of the plan on which I understood it was to be executed. But previously to a new edition something seems due both to the subscribers and to the public. Of the persons who had the superintendence of the publication some may be dead, others removed to an inconvenient distance, or there may have been valuable additions to the original number. Now, Sir, I know no publication in which the information I am desiring can be so well communicated as in your's, and I should be much obliged to Mr. Madge, who seems by his letters to be well acquainted with the editors, or to any other gentleman who has the means of doing it, to inform the numerous individuals interested in this work as subscribers, and the public at large, what is the present state of the committee which undertook the Improved Version. A list of the original committee would be acceptable, as from the two lists we may see

what changes have been made by time or other causes in it.

I remain, Sir,

Your's respectfully,
A SUBSCRIBER.

Book-Worm. No. IX.

SIR, Oct. 23, 1813.

There was printed in 1793, among the tracts of the Unitarian Book Society, "A Designed End to the Socinian Controversy, or a rational and plain Discourse, to prove that no other person but the Father of Christ is God most High," first printed in 1695. In the preface to the edition of 1793 it is justly regretted that the "personal history of the writer" is unknown. It is added, indeed, on the authority of Dr. Hickes, in 1695, that among "many heretical and Socinian books seized and stop't" this was "taken with its author." I very lately gained some additional information on this subject by finding on a book-stall the following publication:—*A Divine Antidote against a Devilish Poyson, or a scriptural answer to an anti-scriptural and heretical pamphlet, entituled, A Designed End to the Socinian Controversie, written by John Smith. Answered by Francis Gregory, D. D. and Rector of Hambleden in the County of Bucks.* London. 8vo. pp. 359.—1696.

Of Dr. Gregory Woodd has given the following account. (Athen. Oxon. Fasti ii. 146.)

"Francis Gregory of St. Mary's Hall was created D. D. Sept. 12, 1661. This person was born at Woodstock, educated in grammar learning in the College School at Westminster, in academical at Cambridge, whence he returned to Westminster, and was an usher

under Mr. Richard Busby. Afterwards he became master of the free school in the town of his nativity, and at length the first master of the free school founded at Witney, after his majesty's restoration. At both which places, continuing several years, he did much good by his sedulous instruction. In 1672, or thereabouts, he became rector of Hambleton, near Great Wycomb in Bucks, and about that time one of his majesty's chaplains in ordinary. He hath written (1) *Etymologicum parvum, &c. in usum Schol. pub. Westmin.* Lond. 1654. 8vo. (2) Instructions concerning the Art of Oratory, 1659. (3) *Nomenclatura brevis Anglo-Latina-Græca.* (4) Examples of the Five Declensions of Nouns. (5) *Votivum Carolo*: or a welcome to his sacred majesty Charles II. 1660. This book consists of several copies of verses mostly made by Mr. Gregory, and some by his scholars at Woodstock. (6) The Tryal of Religions, with cautions to the members of the Reformed Church against defection to the Roman. 1674. (7) The Grand Presumption of the Roman Church in equalling their traditions to the written Word; and their jealousies of themselves in refusing to admit the Holy Scriptures as the rule for the tryal of their religion. 1675. (8) Discourse upon the Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles. 1678. He hath also extant [among other sermons] (2) The *Gregorian Account*, or the *Spiritual Watch*, preached to the society of the *Gregories*, dwelling in, and about the city of London, and assembled in the church of St. Michael's, Cornhill, 19th of June, 1673, on Mark xiii. 37.

(5) *The Religious Villain*, preached before Sir Robert Clayton, Lord Mayor of London, and the Court of Aldermen, 5th Nov. 1679, on 2 Samuel xix. 3. 1680. This Dr. Gregory is now (1695) living at Hambleton, free from the noise of a school."

In Lycons' *Magna Brittannia* (i. 569) there is noticed as "in the parish church of Hambleton a tablet for Dr. Francis Gregory, rector, who died in 1707."

As mottos to the title-page of the *Divine Antidote* are 2 Pet. ii. 1. Ephes. iv. 14, and a Latin sentence from Augustine, expressing that the faithful believe not heretics, but are curious to know what may be replied to them. Also a sentence in Greek, of Epiphanius, ascribing every heresy to an evil disposition and blindness, inflicted by the devil.

From these ornaments of his title-page and the profusion of Greek and Latin quotation from the fathers, in his preface and throughout the work, I am ready to suspect Dr. Gregory of a design to overwhelm John Smith with learned lore, since he had discovered him to be only an "illiterate mechanic." But let us hear the learned doctor himself, in his address

To the Christian Reader.

"To shake the faith, and stagger the minds of orthodox Christians, touching the doctrine of the glorious Trinity, there came out a little book, which by mere accident I met with. A book stuffed with blasphemous falsehoods, too much magnifying humane reason, abusing the sacred word of God, denying the divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost. What censure its author

deserves, let authority judge; but I will venture to say that the *book* itself doth both *deserve* and *need* the flames; for 'tis so abominably foul, that nothing can purge it, save only that which consumes it too. This book was first put into my hand by an eminent citizen of London, who informed me, 'that its author is by trade a clockmaker.' This being so, it may be thought a matter of no great credit for a divine of the Church of England to dispute a point of faith against an illiterate mechanic." The doctor reverts to the occupation of John Smith in the Introduction p. 5. After mentioning "Ebion, and besides him that villian Cerinthus, who held and endeavoured to propagate the same cursed opinion," he asks who is "this very assuming Socinian champion?" he calls himself, if his printer do not nickname him, John Smith, and truly, as the poet observes, *convenient rebus nomina saepe suis*, this person's name is apposite enough, and somewhat of kin to his occupation; for I am informed this great undertaker and reconciler is by trade a clockmaker, and therefore a man, in all probability, who never had any thing of a liberal and learned education; perhaps indeed some little skill in the *mathematicks* may be useful to him in framing a clock, but in his managing this great controverted point of divinity, as we do not expect any *mathematical*; so neither can we find any *logical* demonstration." Our learned doctor presently admires the "unparallell'd presumption of an illiterate mechanick, who should rather handle the smith's hammer than the scholar's pen." He adds, "since in this unhappy age

of ours, we have good store of lay-preachers—who without any steps and university degrees *per saltum* leap from the shopboard into the minister's pulpit—whether our clockmaker be a preacher or not, I cannot tell."

Dr. Gregory is a polemic of the school of South rather than of Tillotson. During more than a century, elapsed since his publication, he has scarcely been excelled if even equalled as a coiner of opprobrious epithets. Observing his talent for calling names, I have taken the trouble to collect them, and find that in the course of this volume, John Smith is invested with the following titles.

"Heretical clockmaker—great pretender—subtle sophist—illiterate mechanic—foolish Socinian author—Socinian scribbler—blind beetle—apron schoolman—mechanic divine—trifling scribbler—rank Socinian—bold mechanic—mighty sophister—mighty disputant—confident heretic—our clockmaker—doting scribbler—double heretic—bold author—Socinian babbler—Socinian pamphleteer—presuming mechanic."

Besides these comprehensive appellations John Smith is described as "unexpectedly started up, though not dropt down, from the clouds:—a sorry artist if the works of his *hand*, in his own craft, be not far better than this of his *head*, if he do not use his common *tools* much better than his *pen*; and if the motions of his springs, wheels and clocks, be not more regular and true than the arguments and assertions of his book." His book is called a blasphemous libel which does highly deserve the flames, what censure soever this *author* may

deserve as to his person." He is charged with "barefaced impudence." Of "learned men," whom Dr. Gregory has quoted against John Smith, the doctor says, "if we shall put them and him into an equal ballance, their judgment will as much outweigh his, as Bow bell, or Great Tom of Lincoln, or Christ church in Oxford, would outweigh the least bell in any of this man's clocks."

On this "sorry pamphlet" are charged "impertinent cavils—assertions false and impudent—such an high degree of blasphemy as no good man would be guilty of for all the world." This "Socinian author, proceeding without any method" is "a man who scarce brings one probable argument—an Antinomian as well as a Socinian"—a "worthy gentleman," and a "seraphical divine," yet, by unavoidable inference, a "saucy wretch," and one who "wants and deserves a room in Bethlehem, or in some other mad-house."

The learned Dr. Gregory, though he has so often referred to the reputed occupation of John Smith, cannot quit that favourite subject. He is indeed as fond of clocks as Charles V. in his monastery, though unhappily the Dr. does not appear, like the emperor, to have learned from them the folly of intolerance, for in his preface he quotes with approbation the "imperial laws" against heretics, and especially the following:—"If any Manichee be seen within the Roman empire let him lose his head." He however affects to part friendly with John Smith, after advising him "not to prefer the private opinions of a few particular men above the

general judgment of the Catholic church," he thus addresses him, at the close of his postscript.

"And now for a farewell, let me recommend to you that counsel of the Roman orator—*artem, quam quisque novit, eam exerceat*, and those vulgar proverbial speeches, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, and *tractent fabritia fabri*, since the wisdom of nations is said to lie much in their proverbs, it will be your prudence to govern yourself by these; the meaning whereof is this: that every man should exercise that art only which he well understands; that a shoemaker should not presume to go beyond his last; that a smith should deal with those materials and tools only, which are proper for his vocation. And since your name is Smith, and as I am credibly informed, your employment, being that of a clockmaker, is somewhat suitable thereunto; you may do well to lay aside the use of pen, ink, and paper, in order to the writing of books; and to take up the hammer, or use the anvil; to mind the springs, wheels and movements of your clocks; to leave the interpretation of scriptures, and the decision of controversies, to learned men who are able to manage them a great deal better."

Whether Dr. Gregory proved himself, on this occasion, one of those *learned men*, or whether John Smith does not appear in the comparison to have been a *scribe well instructed*, and if he really were a mechanic and illiterate, yet *scripturally learn'd without the schools*, I shall enquire in my next number.

VERMICULUS.

*Mr. Palmer on the Appellation
"Socinian."*

Hackney, Nov. 10, 1813.

SIR,

The reviewer of my pamphlet in your last number does not, in my apprehension, give a fair or correct view of my argument; and many of my readers, both orthodox and heterodox, differ from him in their opinion of the publication, thinking that I have fully proved my point, that "Dr. Watts was not a Socinian," nor, in your sense of the term, a *Unitarian*. I mean not, however, to occupy any of your pages with a controversy on the subject, but shall content myself with referring the matter to the impartial judgment of such of your readers as have seen or may yet see my performance. If any one of them should think fit to answer it, with his name, I may possibly attempt a defence, with the addition of something that I have in reserve, or confess myself mistaken.

All that I at present intend is, to offer a few words to vindicate the application of the term *Socinian* to your "sect." It is never used by me as "a term of reproach," nor do I think it often is by others. And why it should be "offensive" to any of you I cannot conceive. Though you differ in some particulars from *Socinus*, his character is still in high estimation among you. See his *Life* by Dr. Toulmin. What though he believed more than you do, it cannot for that reason be reproachful to you to be called by his name. Indeed your difference from him is only in some of the least considerable points: as to the capital articles in which he

differed from the generality of Christians in his day, you agree with him.

Upon the principle of your reviewer, and some of your correspondents, scarcely any denomination of professing Christians can with propriety be called after their leaders. Very few, for instance, of those called *Arians* (a term which your writers often use) will allow, I presume, that they entirely agree with *Arius*. Nor will the modern *Calvinists* subscribe to every thing maintained by *John Calvin*, though they are far from thinking his name "a reproach." Why then should your "sect" (I mean no offence by that term which you often adopt) be so much offended at being called *Socinians*? Be assured, there is no danger of its being misunderstood, to your disadvantage, since it is generally known that you do not "idolize Christ," as *Socinus* is said to have done. And the objection that the term is "ambiguous" is altogether groundless, since every one knows what is meant by it.

Your friends chuse rather to be called *Unitarians*. But this appellation cannot be yielded up to them, because this certainly is *ambiguous*. Accordingly Mr. Merrival noticed it in his correspondence with Dr. Lardner, who did not vouchsafe to satisfy him in what sense he used it with respect to Dr. Watts. (See the quotation at the close of your review of Mr. Lindsey's *Life*.) Though it is true all Socinians are Unitarians, the term cannot be appropriated to them exclusively, since there are other sects who claim it, and have an equal right to it. Yours' therefore

must be content to be called Socinians till they contrive some other name which shall be expressive of their distinguishing opinions, and then the former shall no longer be used by your respectful correspondent.

S. PALMER.

Strictures on a recent publication of Mr. Palmer's. No. I.

SIR, Nov. 2d, 1813.

I cannot be astonished that different religious societies are eager for the honour of enrolling under their several banners the name of Dr. Watts. "Such he was," said Johnson, "as every Christian church would rejoice to have adopted." Yet while I give full credit to Mr. Palmer* for the sincerity and zeal with which he enters on the task of vindicating the suspected orthodoxy of a favourite divine, I cannot compliment him on the success of his undertaking. He stumbles at the very threshold. His title-page is at once needlessly offensive and glaringly incorrect. Who has affirmed that Dr. Watts was a Socinian? Lardner attests that "the last sentiments" of this very excellent man, "were completely Unitarian:" and what Lardner meant by Unitarian—how carefully and precisely he discriminated between the opinions so denominated and those which characterized Socinus and the Polish brethren—is evident to every reader of his works.† Nor is Watts classed by Mr.

Belsham,‡ among Socinians. The catch-words therefore which stand at the head of Mr. Palmer's pamphlet, have no just relation to the matter in dispute. If this gentleman plead (27) that the term Socinian is less ambiguous than Unitarian, I must deny the fact. Mr. Palmer is accurately acquainted (few men more so) with the appellations by which the respective bodies of professing Christians are distinguished: he is aware (no man more perfectly) that the attempt to fix upon any one of those bodies a denomination which they disavow, which they maintain to be altogether inappropriate, and which in most instances has an invidious object and application, is a species of persecution. Granting that he has proved Dr. Watts to have been no Socinian, he has not, of course proved, in contradiction to Lardner, that he was no Unitarian. Undoubtedly, there is a description of persons who will take a livelier interest in this series of letters, when they glance on the sentence in the very front of it: upon this set of men, the slaves of ignorance and prejudice, wonders are wrought by the magic energy of names; hence the antipathies of some and the prepossessions of others are awakened in a moment. But these, I presume, are not the readers on whose favour Mr. Palmer calculates, and to whom he addresses his theological and literary labours.

On consulting a former publication of this gentleman's§ I learn

* See his recent pamphlet entitled "Dr. Watts no Socinian."

† See especially vol. x. 619, &c.

‡ Memoirs of Lindsey, 217.

§ Postscript, 44, 45.

§ Life of Watts by Dr. Johnson, with Notes, &c. 96, &c.

that a writer in the *Monthly Review*, Feb. 1782, had spoken of Dr. Watts's change of opinion, "with respect to some points of what is called *orthodoxy*, as undeniable," as "well known" to Lardner, and by him communicated to the late excellent Mr. Merivale of Exeter, from whose mouth "the reviewer immediately received it." This identical communication to Mr. M. it would seem, has recently been printed, for the first time, in Belsham's *Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey*. As it was extracted thence in a late number of the *Repository*, there is no necessity for my transcribing it: though the date of it does not appear, and though I am neither able nor concerned to say why Dr. Priestley (8) withheld from the world the letter of Mr. Merivale's in which it is contained, I nevertheless, without hesitation, admit its genuineness. My present inquiry will be, whether Mr. Palmer has invalidated the testimony of Lardner: and I shall hope to shew hereafter that it is confirmed by strong presumptive evidence arising from passages and documents in the worthy author's pamphlets on this subject.

He has presented "The Rev. Joseph Smith, of Manchester," and the public with five letters. The first is introductory. In the second and third an attempt is made to repel Dr. Lardner's testimony as insufficient: and positive evidence of the orthodoxy of Watts is professedly adduced in the fourth and fifth.

All the objections, Mr. Editor, which the Letter-writer urges against the testimony of Lardner, may be resolved into the following: that this witness had not

read *the whole* of Dr. Watts's manuscripts; that his communication to Mr. Merivale is destitute of accuracy and precision; that the substance of it is little more than positive assertion made and repeated; that it is far from being decisive of Watts having renounced the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence; that it leads to some conclusions which the character of this celebrated man refutes; that it is not consistent with two books which he printed within that number of years of his decease, with information sent by Dr. Jennings to Dr. Doddridge, and with other facts and dates; that the worthy family with whom Dr. Watts resided, did not understand that he was become an Unitarian; and that Mr. Neal (partial to his own opinion, as he was in the sentiments of his uncle Lardner) would naturally make the most of what dropped from the lips of Dr. Watts.

(1.) It is alleged (14) that Lardner "had not read **ALL** Dr. Watts's M.SS. for he says that his nephew only shewed him **SOME** of them, consequently he can scarcely be admitted as a thoroughly competent judge."

Now, Sir, the decision of the author of the *Credibility, &c.* on this matter, was formed not merely from those of the M.SS. which he had read, but, moreover, from his conversations with his near relation Mr. Neal, who was one of the executors, who had possession of the papers, who, doubtless, was well acquainted with their contents, and who, though he did not "chuse to meddle with them"* just upon the death of

* Palmer's *Appendix to Johnson's Life of Watts*.

Watts, afterwards submitted them to the inspection and disposal of the Drs. Jennings and Doddridge. Mr. Palmer himself has not seen ALL the M.SS. of this popular divine. Yet from some which have subsequently been laid before the world, he infers, in his Letters (31, 32) and in another work†, that the Doctor's unpublished papers afford much "the same explanations of the Deity of Christ and the Spirit" with those given in the pieces which he himself* last printed. "The sum of which is that Christ is a divine person in consequence of the in-dwelling of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is God, as being the power or active energy of the Deity."‡ But had not Lardner an equal right with his censor to deduce an inference concerning the tenor of *all* the M.SS. from his perusal of *some* of them, —such, for example, as the *Solemn Address, &c.*? Thus far at least, is *he* not as "thoroughly competent a judge?"

(2) "These letters of Dr. Lardner," adds Mr. P. (14) "are not written in a manner very creditable to him, but discover something like that *imbecility* which he reports of Dr. Watts. They are certainly destitute of that accuracy and precision by which his writings in general are distinguished, so that it is not easy to gather any clear consistent ideas from them."

The testimony of this respectable man, I admit, is concise; for it is a simple statement of what he believed to be a fact. Even Mr. Palmer acknowledges (p. 1,) that it is "accompanied with cir-

cumstantial evidence;" and where is the difficulty of gaining "clear, consistent ideas" from the declaration that "Dr. Watts's last thoughts were completely Unitarian?" Who can doubt that Lardner affixed an *accurate* and *precise* sense to the word, and never confounded it with the term *Socinian*?

(3) But we are told (*ib.*) that "the proof of what he asserts is very defective. Here is little more than positive assertion made and repeated that Dr. Watts was an Unitarian, without defining the sense, in which (as Mr. Merivale justly observed) there is some ambiguity."

"Mr. Merivale was very well aware in how strict a sense the Doctor* generally used it." Why then should he have suspected that his correspondent deviated from this strictness in the present instance? Or why should Mr. Palmer, who can be no stranger to Lardner's writings, consider the word Unitarian as ambiguous? At any rate, it is equivalent, in this connection, with Antitrinitarian; though the very valuable person upon whom the ambiguity is charged, was accustomed to employ the name in a less general signification.

(4) In the letter writer's judgment, Dr. Lardner's testimony is far from being decisive of Watts having given up the tenet of Christ's pre-existence (15). Surely, even the former of the two communications should have obviated all doubts upon this point. Mr. Merivale having mentioned, in his correspondence with Lardner, the difficulty of fixing his

† Appendix, &c.
VOL. VIII.

‡ *ib.*

* Lardner.

own sentiments with regard to the person of Christ, though he had before thought the doctrine of his pre-existence sufficiently proved by Dr. Clarke, Dr. Watts, and others, his venerable friend replies, “I think Dr. Watts never was an Arian, to his honour be it spoken.”

(9). This answer, Sir, taken in connection with the sentences preceding it, appears to me abundantly explicit and satisfactory. However, as Mr. M. was desirous of still further information, and a yet stronger assurance, Lardner opens to him the sources whence the intelligence had flowed, namely, Mr. Neal's conversation and his own perusal of some of the M.SS. Supported by this evidence, he hesitates not to affirm, **DR. WATTS'S LAST THOUGHTS WERE COMPLETELY UNITARIAN.**

It is not a little remarkable, Mr. Editor, that the *Solemn Address, &c.* maintains a profound silence concerning the pre-existence of Jesus Christ (12). This most interesting composition Mr. Palmer reprinted in his edition of Johnson's Life of Watts: and it may well afford occasion for several observations, and awaken many a tender sentiment in the feeling mind. At a future time, I shall assign reasons for believing that this paper and one or two of a similar complexion, which have not seen the light, were some of the manuscripts perused by Dr. Lardner, and that to these he principally referred. For the present, I content myself with quoting from the *Solemn Address, &c.* the following sentences on the person of our Lord.

“I believe thy only Son Jesus Christ to be all-sufficient for the glorious work of mediation between

God and man, to which thou hast appointed him. I believe he is a man, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. I believe he is one with God; he is God manifested in the flesh; and that the man *Jesus* is so closely and inseparately united with the true and eternal Godhead, as to become one person, even as the soul and body make one man.”†

I invite the readers of Mr. Palmer's pamphlet to compare this extract with Dr. Lardner's testimony. Although the language of Watts may not be technically correct, it is clear enough that he was in truth no Trinitarian. Nor is this theology *Arianism* in any of its modifications.

(5) Was Dr. Watts then an Unitarian (in Mr. Palmer's less accurate phraseology a *Socinian*) without his knowledge? “Can a severer reflection,” asks this author, “be cast upon his understanding?” (20) There would be some pertinency in the question, if the world had never heard of men of acknowledged talents, of freedom of inquiry, and of exemplary diligence, who, nevertheless, unconsciously embraced sentiments which they fondly endeavoured to reconcile to the prejudices and feelings of their earlier years, and to the popular names indicating which they expressed a great dislike “and even horror.” This is no uncommon case: and it has been well stated and applied by Mr. Belsham in a passage the greater part of which is cited in these Letters (19, 20).

But Watts had an “allowed aversion to Socinianism;” and “I should think it most natural,”

† Life of Watts, &c. (1785) 103.

reasons his vindicator (20), "to infer that he was far from embracing it." *Parcior esto*: the words Socinianism and Socinian, Mr. Palmer knows, have long been employed as theological scare-crows: and that man has no very intimate acquaintance with his own mind and with human nature, who is ignorant that our antipathies to names, are among the last which we overcome. To proper Socinianism—the thing no less than the denomination—Dr. Watts might, not improbably, be averse: nor have we evidence that he adopted the characteristic opinions of Socinus and his followers. Now, "the Unitarian system," Sir, does not comprehend those opinions; it was taught and received centuries before they had an existence. And, were it not illogical and invidious to compare with Deism (21) any system including a belief in revelation, I might add that the professor of Unitarianism has not more sentiments than the Calvinist* in common with a Deist.

If Dr. Watts, argues Mr. P. (16), "had become a complete Unitarian, and had he been very desirous to promote that opinion, he would have been very explicit in renouncing his former sentiments on these points, and very full in stating his objections against them; indeed, as an honest man, he should have given positive orders to his executors to publish what he had written on these his new sentiments, which it is plain from his will he did not."

We renounce error, Mr. Editor, when we state and defend truth. The contents of the So-

lemn Address, &c. are a sufficient proof of the honesty of Watts's mind. It is a "very explicit" and "very full" disclosure of those objections by which he was affected. But to oppose the direct testimony of Lardner by speculations upon what Dr. Watts might or should have done, is not to reason legitimately and conclusively.

(6) This testimony is further pronounced inconsistent with two books which Dr. W. printed within the same number of years of his decease (10, 21). And it is readily conceded, Sir, that, according to the analysis of these works which Mr. Palmer has given in his notes on Johnson's Life of Watts,* *the pre-existence of Christ's human soul* is there asserted. But the inquiry before us, we should always remember, is, what were the *last* thoughts of this celebrated nonconformist divine? Now I am as much at liberty to assume that the *Solemn Address*, &c. was drawn up *after* the publication of the *Important Questions*, &c. and the *Glory of Christ*, &c. as the author of the Letters is to take for granted that it had a *prior* date. The truth is that the *Address* was framed by Dr. Watts on a review of what he had written in the Controversy. In *this* therefore we are far more likely to discover his *last* thoughts than in any former piece, not to insist on the more than possibility of his changing his sentiments within even two years. If these three documents be carefully examined and mutually compared, the comparison will corroborate instead of impugning the testimony of Lardner.

(8) "But it so happens," subjoins Mr. P. (22) "that we have decisive proof that what Dr. Watts wrote and left in manuscript, on the points about which he had given up his early opinions, was written *some years before his decease*. For the proof of this I refer to a letter of Dr. Jennings to Dr. Doddridge, in which he says, "I believe we shall not have near so much trouble in publishing the Doctor's M.SS. as I expected, when he acquainted me with his design of committing them in part to my care, *which was three or four years ago*." He adds, "for since then he has published most of the M.SS. he designed for the press." These were doubtless the two volumes mentioned above, both of which are dated 1746" (23).

This argument is urged by the letter-writer with apparent triumph. To convert it into *decisive proof*, he should have shewn, first, that by *most* of the M.SS. Dr. Jennings meant **ALL OF THEM**; next, that "the two volumes mentioned above," included most of those M.SS. and lastly, that it was utterly improbable Watts should have written any thing on the subject of the Trinity at a yet more advanced period of his life. As long as the *Solemn Address*, &c. is in existence, the probability will be on the other side.

(8) Still Mr. Palmer cannot reconcile Lardner's testimony with other facts and dates: I will quote his own words (10):

"Dr. Lardner says that Dr. Watts was a Unitarian several years before his death. This does not agree with the most prevalent report, which is that he changed his sentiments but a few years be-

fore he died, and this, if he became a Unitarian at all, is by far the most probable."

On this step of the reasoning I shall only observe that the express testimony of such a man as Lardner, is, in my eyes, highly deserving of regard, even though it contradict "the most prevalent report." Are there not numerous cases in which Mr. Palmer declines giving to report the name of evidence?

He goes on (ib.)—"it is an undeniable fact that Dr. Watts himself published several things upon this very subject, viz. the Trinity and the person of Christ, within the two last years of his life, and it is incredible that in these his Unitarianism should not have appeared, especially if he was so very desirous, as is said, to promote that opinion."

For several years, as is admitted on both hands, Watts had thought and written and printed much on the Trinitarian controversy. It is further agreed that his opinions respecting this doctrine, had varied for some time from the popular ideas. Now, in perfect consistence with this representation and with a strict examination of the books which he composed and published, Lardner states that for several years Dr. Watts had been an Unitarian, but that his *last* thoughts were *completely Unitarian*.

But why, Mr. Palmer should ask (11) did Dr. Lardner approve the suppression of the posthumous papers? Why does he exculpate the executors, who did not think them "fit for publication?"

My answer is in Lardner's own language: "I was of opinion," he remarks to his nephew (13),

“that Dr. Watts was unable to recommend his new sentiments to the public, because he had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject. So it proved.”

The meaning of this last sentence Mr. Palmer does not comprehend. But I am astonished that he should feel any difficulty in understanding it. Mr. Merivale's correspondent declares that the fact was agreeable to his conjectures; he believed that Watts “had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject:” and the sight of the papers confirmed his judgment.

Very eminent as were the learning and assiduity, the genius and talents of Dr. Watts, it is certain that in closeness of scriptural research and reasoning on the person of Christ, he is extremely inferior to Lardner. A comparison of the celebrated *Letter on the Logos* with any one of Watts's publications in this controversy, will decide the point. Lardner, free from the fetters of human schemes and systems, interprets scripture by scripture; while the great and good man with whom I am contrasting him, is principally employed in an attempt to reconcile offensive sentiments to popular phraseology. The one writes with the rational confidence of a man who has discovered truth in all its beautiful simplicity; in the other I perceive a devout and virtuous, an inquisitive and candid mind struggling with the prejudices of early youth. Though I heartily wish that all his M.SS. had been printed, I cannot wonder at so accomplished a divine as Lardner affirming that Dr. Watts had never been used to a proper way

of reasoning on such a subject, and was therefore unable to recommend his sentiments to the world: his powers were various and superior; but it was not in controversial theology that he displayed his strength.

(9) That the worthy family with whom he resided did not suppose that he was become an Unitarian (25), may be allowed. They might not have read *all* or *most* of his M.SS. and even if they had, they were not “so thoroughly competent judges” of their contents as Lardner.

(10) Nor can I discover any good cause of arraigning Mr. Neal's judgment or impartiality in this affair (25, 26). Does a man's *partiality* to his own *opinion*, incapacitate him for being a *witness* to a *fact*? The common rules of evidence, Mr. Editor, must be set aside before this principle can be established. Neal's testimony to the Unitarianism of Watts and Hopton Haynes's to that of Sir Isaac Newton, are in vain attempted to be overthrown by the consideration of their own religious sentiments; for it will surely be granted, that notwithstanding they were Unitarians, they were honest men. The intellectual and moral qualities of Mr. Neal, appear indeed to have been of no vulgar order; and his letters to Dr. Doddridge, are perhaps the best in the Collection published by Mr. Stedman.

Mr. P. opposes to Lardner's testimony that of Mr. Joseph Parker, of the late Mrs. Abney, of Dr. Gibbons and of Dr. Stennett. He further places stress on the epitaph which Dr. Watts ordered to be inscribed upon his tombstone, on the funeral dis-

course for him delivered by Dr. Jennings, on the *Solemn Address* and on a tract of which a small edition, said to have been published during Watt's life, was soon suppressed, but which was reprinted in 1802 (27, &c.).

The testimony of Mr. Parker and of Mrs. Abney, both of them very excellent persons, is not yet distinctly before us: I conclude therefore that it was *negative*: (25) nor can it weigh against the *positive* and repeated declarations of a man so eminent as Lardner not only for the compass and accuracy of his theological knowledge, but for the strictness of his regard to truth. Dr. Gibbons's relation is partly original, partly hearsay evidence. So far as it contains his own observations, it is vague, general and unsatisfactory: and Mr. Palmer, who seems fully sensible of its insufficiency "to furnish a decisive argument in the present case" (28, note), endeavours to compensate for its imperfection by adding to it what he "received from the person himself alluded to" by Gibbons, "the late Dr. Stennet, who in conversing with the letter-writer on Dr. Watts's last sentiments, said they had been much misrepresented; for so far from having embraced the Socinian system, he expressed his firm belief of the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and lamented, even with tears that so many should have given it up; with more to the same purpose."

There are so many theories, Sir, of what Mr. Palmer styles the doctrine of Christ's *atonement*, that, in every instance where the word is undefined, we are left to conjecture what a firm belief in it comprehends. This author knows

that the phraseology itself is destitute of countenance from the Christian scriptures, and that the original term ought to have been translated *reconciliation*: nor is there any class of professors of the gospel who embrace with greater cordiality than Unitarians the assurance that *God is in Christ RECONCILING the world to himself.* 2 Cor. v. 19.

The epitaph that Dr. Watts ordered to be inscribed on his tomb, was, *In Uno Jesu omnia.*

These words appear to have been suggested by Rom. viii. 32: and an Unitarian could employ them with as much justness and interest as a Trinitarian; though not in exactly the same signification.

Zealous as was Dr. Jennings in his attachment to the orthodox faith, he could not however be insensible to the great and amiable qualities of Watts. Even on the supposition that his friend had departed totally, or in a high degree from the popular creed, what should prevent him from still being his warm and eloquent panegyrist? Unless it can be proved that it was impossible for Jennings to unite *orthodoxy* and *charity*, the strain of his funeral sermon for Dr. W. cannot counterbalance direct testimony.

It may be true, Sir, that no marks of the Socinianism of Watts are contained in the *Solemn Address*, &c. But then it is equally true that no persons, whose judgment is of any estimation, call him a *Socinian*. The evidence alleged to arise from his two publications, in 1746, I have already noticed.

The tract reprinted in 1802, was, on Mr. Palmer's own shewing (34), prior to these: there is

therefore no pretence for saying or insinuating that it records the *last* thoughts of Dr. Watts. But to this document, and to some other pieces analyzed or quoted by the letter-writer, I shall give particular attention in the following Number, and shall thus, I flatter myself, unquestionably prove, that his *glorying is not good*.

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

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev.
H. Horsley.

LETTER VII.

Essex-Street, Nov. 4, 1813.

SIR,

I flatter myself that enough has been advanced in the preceding Letters to evince the justice and impartiality of the Review of the celebrated controversy between Dr. Horsley and Dr. Priestley, which is annexed to the first part of the *Calm Inquiry* into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the person of Christ. And I am persuaded, that notwithstanding all the *ingentia verba* of the reverend prebendary it has been made evident to your attentive and impartial readers, that the learned prelate did upon the authority of Mosheim impeach the character of Origen, and that when called upon for his proofs he failed to substantiate his charge—that, notwithstanding the reverend prebendary's assertion to the contrary, the bishop did, by his own confession, borrow every circumstance which he has related concerning an orthodox church of Hebrew Christians at Ælia, from Mo-

sheim, excepting some necessary circumstances which he himself added to *help out the broken story*—that being urged to produce his authorities from antiquity, he found that those appealed to by Mosheim would by no means bear him out in his narrative, that the testimony of Sulpicius Severus proved nothing, that Orosius was a *feather in the scale*, and that the passage from Epiphanius was so truly absurd and irrelevant that he did not think proper even to translate it into English. It has been further made evident, beyond contradiction, that the bishop, discarding all these authorities, produces original evidence of his own to establish the existence of an orthodox church at Ælia, consisting of Hebrew Christians, who had abandoned the rites of the law to participate in the privileges of the Ælian colony—that this proof consists of six gratuitous propositions which, by the right reverend author's own confession, only prove the possibility of the supposed fact: that, to complete the proof therefore, he adds a seventh proposition, in which, from the mention which Jerome makes of "Hebrews believing in Christ," in his time, he argues that a body of orthodox Hebrew Christians existed at Ælia in the time of Adrian. (Tracts, p. 419.) And finally, that being duly sensible that this assumption was rather a large stride to so important a conclusion, the learned prelate frankly owns in his sixth disquisition, that "St. Jerome's evidence proves nothing more than that a body of orthodox Christians of the Hebrews actually existed in the world in his day, that it is brought for this position singly:

and that the existence of the church at Ælia in the reign of Adrian, depends upon the six first propositions." Those very propositions concerning which he had before expressly said, "they amount not to a proof that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia." p. 417.

The attentive reader will easily conceive, that to such an argument it was not very difficult for the bishop's active and learned opponent to make a triumphant reply, which he concludes by loudly challenging his right reverend antagonist to meet him again in the field of controversy. But the case was now altered: *Ille ibi quo vis qui zonam perdidit*. The bishop observed a discreet silence. And both the combatants retired from the hard fought action well, if not equally well, content with the result of the conflict: Dr. Priestley with his **VICTORY**, and Dr. Horsley with his **MITRE**.

Thus far the reverend prebendary attends the statement of the *Calm Inquirer* with something which he dignifies with the name of argument; with what success, the attentive reader may judge. Either from confidence or despair he now withdraws from the pursuit. And indeed he acknowledges with great frankness and naïveté, p. 591, "Of the remainder of Mr. B's. arguments against Mosheim and the bishop, I confess that I can make nothing." A confession to which the intelligent reader will give easy credit, considering how little the reverend gentleman has made of those arguments which he has already examined. But let not the good-

natured reader imagine that he gives up the cause though he abandons the argument. He has another weapon at hand in the management of which *his great strength lies*: and in which his adversary is no match for him: it is that of sarcasm, abuse and calumny. In which he resembles the great Napoleon, who, if he cannot beat the Crown Prince, can at least hire his scribblers to rail at him. It may not be amiss to conclude this correspondence, by exhibiting a few specimens of this mode of attack, by which the reader may judge of the gentle spirit with which this pious ecclesiastic conducts the controversy.

The worthy prebendary admits, p. 591, that the *Calm Inquirer*, "occasionally differs from Dr. Priestley." This is a testimony to the impartiality of the reviewer, the more to be valued as it is extorted from an enemy. It proves at least that the *Inquirer* is not the blind admirer of his acute and learned friend. The worthy gentleman gravely adds, that "these differences certainly add nothing to the force of the Doctor's original reasoning." Indeed, Sir, it was not expected that they would. The design of the Reviewer was not to act the part of an advocate, but of a candid and impartial judge.

"He contrives however," continues the reverend prebendary, "to weaken the bishop's reasoning by *making him occasionally say what he has not said*, and quoting partially what he has said." To the latter part of the charge, the Reviewer must plead guilty, as it was by no means his intention to transcribe the whole of the bishop's work. To the for-

mer he can only oppose an unqualified denial, challenging the reverend gentleman to produce his proof, or to submit to the disgrace of having advanced an accusation which he was unable to substantiate. But the venerable ecclesiastic is not backward to produce proof how shamefully the reviewer has misrepresented the sentiments of the learned prelate. In page 599 he mentions an ancient tract, *soi-disant* the epistle of Barnabas, which the bishop does not attribute to the apostle, but appeals to it as the production of some orthodox Hebrew Christian of the apostolic age. And the reverend prebendary grievously complains that though "Mr. B. does not *directly* charge the bishop with having attributed it to any undue authority, yet the manner in which he labours to set aside its evidence, must lead the unthinking multitude, who have never looked into the bishop's tracts, to *imagine that he considers it as the work of an inspired apostle.*"

Now, Sir, what is it that Mr. B. has said, which can possibly lead the *unthinking multitude* to conclude that the bishop considered that notable epistle as the work of an inspired apostle? The following are his very words, extracted, you will hardly believe it, from the prebendary's own book, p. 600, the page immediately following that in which the charge is brought. "The epistle of Barnabas," says Mr. B. which, though it is admitted *not to have been written by the companion of St. Paul*, the learned writer contends to have been a production of the apostolic age, and addressed by a Hebrew Christian to his Jewish brethren." These are Mr. B's

words. And yet he is charged with insinuating that the bishop attributed this epistle to an inspired apostle. Surely, this cannot be the allegation of a *sober critic*.

The reverend prebendary condescends to carp at words. The reviewer states that Dr. Priestley's reply sufficiently *impeaches* the testimony of the pseudo-Barnabas. The expression is inadvertent and inaccurate. It would have been better to have said, that the reply affords *sufficient ground for impeaching*, or that it sufficiently *invalidates* the testimony of Barnabas. A candid critic would have so understood it. But our literary champion triumphs mightily in the discovery of this verbal incorrectness. Nor is he indeed to be too severely censured. Since he finds that he can make nothing of arguments, who can blame him for making the most he can of words?

Our reverend prebendary is not however always equally successful in his verbal distinctions, and is himself occasionally chargeable with inaccurate phraseology. He accuses the calm inquirer of applying to Bishop Horsley such epithets as *ignorant* and *pitiful*. Tracts, p. 612. Most certainly had the reviewer of the controversy applied such epithets to the learned prelate *generally*, he would have richly deserved the rebuke which the reverend prebendary so justly applies to those who call Origen a liar, viz. that "he would excite against himself the indignation of every man of letters." But of this offence against the reputation of an able and a learned man, the reviewer's conscience entirely acquits him.

The first of the reverend prebendary's accusations is founded upon nothing more than the hope, which the reviewer expressed, that at the beginning of the controversy, when the bishop had not studied the subject, and relied wholly upon Mosheim, he had *ignorantly* adopted the calumny upon Origen's character from that learned, but partial writer. This the venerable prebendary works up into a charge against the bishop as an ignorant man. "Bishop Horsley ignorant, and Mr. B. learned!"

The second charge, viz. that the Reviewer applies the epithet *pitiful* to Bishop Horsley is totally destitute of foundation. It is indeed true, that the calm inquirer, in his review of the controversy, p. 436, represents his lordship as *piteously* complaining of the uncivil attempt of his merciless adversary to embarrass the question with chronological difficulties, notwithstanding the earnest caveat which he had prudently entered against it. But the reverend prebendary ought to have understood the difference between a *piteous* complaint and a *pitiful* writer. It is possible however, that between his professional engagements in the mountains of Wales, and his present residence in the Highlands of the North, the pious ecclesiastic may have become more familiar with the Welsh and the Gaelic, than with his native tongue, some of the nicer distinctions of which may have escaped his recollection. In the present case, as the reverend gentleman has an objection to *logical* definitions, a familiar example may perhaps suffice to refresh his memory. An Englishman, who speaks the language correctly, would say,

for instance, it is a *piteous* cause which requires misrepresentation to support it, and he is a *pitiful* advocate who can stoop to make use of such a mode of defence.

The reverend prebendary's holy indignation at the reviewer's blasphemous assumption of those divine attributes which he denies to his Saviour, has been noticed in a former letter. The delicacy of his religious feelings seems to have been almost equally hurt at the *profane* allusion which the reviewer makes to a text in John. For the last hypothesis, upon which the bishop builds his church, being that the holy brethren resident at Jerusalem, without taking the trouble of a journey to Pella, entered as colonists at *Ælia*, only abandoning the rites of Moses, that they might not be known as Jews, the reviewer asks how they could hope to escape detection, and particularly, whether the eyes of the Roman magistrates *were holden so as not to know them*. This allusion to the words of scripture, the reverend prebendary is pleased to stigmatize, p. 593, as "a profane artifice," and "a ludicrous application of one of the proofs of our Lord's resurrection." By the use of scripture language the writer intended no offence. But perhaps it is the first time that the circumstance of the disciples not knowing our Lord when they saw him has been alleged as a proof of his resurrection. This discovery was reserved for the ingenuity of the prebendary of St. Asaph.

The reverend gentleman having charged the reviewer of the controversy with representing the learned prelate as an ignorant and pitiful writer, with equal truth insinuates that the reviewer arrogates to himself the praise of supe-

rior learning. "Bishop Horsley ignorant, Mr. Belsham learned."

While, at the same time, he insinuates that the reviewer is so wretchedly ignorant that he cannot understand a Greek or Latin author without having recourse to an English or a French translation, which, says this polite writer, (p. 571.) is "the common practice of the most arrogant polemics of the Unitarian school." And who can doubt whether the accuracy of Mr. Prebendary Horsley's information keeps pace with the intrepidity of his assertions? Especially as throughout his vaunting Appendix, he takes frequent occasion to throw out sneers and sarcasms of similar tendency.

If, however, the learning of the reviewer of this famous controversy enables him to shew, beyond contradiction, that the right reverend prelate, who perfectly understood the question, retired from the field conscious of a total defeat, and if it is competent to prove that the well-meaning efforts of the pious prebendary, who undertook, with more zeal than prudence, to vindicate his father's theological fame, have only served to notify his own lamentable ignorance, and to render the learned prelate's failure still more conspicuous, the public can have no further concern in the literary attainments of so obscure an individual as the reviewer of this controversy. Nor can it be of the least moment to any one to ascertain the comparative learning of the contending parties. To depreciate classical literature is very far from the wish, or the intention, of the reviewer. Let it not however be forgotten, that a man may be a profound scholar but a shallow

theologian; and that the learning even of a Parr or a Porson can never convert nonsense into sense, nor prove a contradiction to be true.

Yet, after all, let it not be said, that the reverend prebendary accumulates charges without proof. He has caught his luckless adversary upon the horns of a terrible dilemma, from which it appears impossible for him to escape unwounded. Wilful falsehood or gross ignorance are the only alternatives, out of which he is left to make his choice, and the Christian tenderness which so eminently distinguishes the pious ecclesiastic is willing to screen even a *foeman* from the imputation of deliberate untruth. Let him speak for himself. See Tracts, p. 597.

"Though I am as far from suspecting him of a disregard to truth in general, as my father was of suspecting Origen of such disregard, it is impossible to doubt that in the heat of controversy he has, through inattention, no doubt, asserted at least one falsehood as notorious as that of which the bishop accused Origen. In his zeal to degrade the Son of God from the dignity of the Creator to that of a mere man in the creation, he finds the epithet *μονογενης*, which is applied to him by St. John, so much in his way, that to get rid of it, he supposes it to be employed by that apostle in no other sense than as equivalent to *αγαπης*, which he boldly affirms does not occur in St. John. As he is one of the authors of the Improved Version, [who told the reverend prebendary that?] we cannot suspect him of having never read the original, or of having read it with so little attention, as to have to-

tally overlooked any thing of importance which it contains. We can only suppose that his mind was so completely occupied by the object of the controversy in which he was engaged with the celebrated Dr. Clarke, [*what can the reverend prebendary mean?*] as to make him lose sight of at least six different sentences in which St. John employs the word *αγαπητος* in the sense in which it is commonly used by other Greek writers." And that the reverend gentleman's ingenuousness may be as conspicuous as his learning and his charity, he frankly confesses that this grand discovery of Mr. B.'s ignorance and falsehood was not his own, but that he retailed it from that oracle of truth and wisdom, the British Critic for January 1812, "to which," says he, "I am indebted for pointing out to me this blunder."

How unfortunate is it that so much learning, so much critical acumen, so much profound research, and what is more than all, so much Christian charity as that which is displayed in the above paragraph and which reflects so much credit upon the reverend prebendary and his worthy coadjutors, the British Critics, should be all lost, and wasted upon a mere shadow. It is grievous to say, but the truth must be told, that Mr. B. never made any such silly unqualified assertion as that which is here imputed to him. Nor any thing like it. And if the worthy gentleman wishes to know what Mr. B. really did say, what can he do better than follow his right reverend father's advice, "*if he be so pleased he may go and seek,*" taking this further admonition with him, that it is better

to trust to his own enquiries than to the lying reports of mercenary reviewers, and that when a person means to *rebuke* it is commonly advisable that he should *first understand*.

The learned prelate in discussing the testimony of Jeremiah Jones which had been appealed to by Dr. Priestley, has fallen into the common error of confounding him with his relation and tutor the respectable Samuel Jones of Tewkesbury, who kept an academy there, at which bishops Maddox and Butler, archbishop Secker and Dr. Chandler received their education in classics and theology. The reviewer, *en passant*, rectified this error of the bishop's: but though the error is not denied, yet the correction of it cannot escape the reprehension of the pious prebendary. "What this has to do," says he p. 603, "with the question at issue about the deference due to the testimony of St. Barnabas, or of the author assuming that name, I confess myself unable to imagine." What then are the errors of a bishop too sacred to be touched? But it seems that to notice this error was a digression from the subject. And to shew, no doubt, what it is to write connectedly, the reverend prebendary hooks in a long story of good Dr. Buchanan and the India missionaries. p. 596. A common reader would be puzzled to discover the connexion between this modern tale and the orthodox church of Ælia. But Mr. Prebendary Horsley is no common writer, nor does he write for common readers.

The reverend prebendary introduces in p. 595, a quotation from

Dr. Cave's Lives of the Fathers, in which that learned writer appears to think that in a case to which he alludes, Origen's zeal in controversy carried him beyond the strict limits of truth. Had this citation occurred to the bishop he would, no doubt, have made the most of it. As it now stands this article can have no place in a review of the controversy between Bishop Horsley and Dr. Priestley.

To eke out the remainder of his Appendix, for probably it was thought that a dissertation of less than fifty good octavo pages would not be of sufficient consequence to offer to the Prince Regent, the reverend prebendary introduces a long dissertation from Cotelerius and Jeremiah Jones, upon the date and authenticity of that miserable fragment of Christian antiquity which assumes the title of an Epistle of Barnabas. And the worthy ecclesiastic proves, from Jeremiah Jones's own shewing, that no less than eighteen writers give their verdict against him. Perhaps it might not occur to the reverend writer that one sound argument is better than twenty authorities. But after all, why does the reverend prebendary give himself all this trouble of copying from and refuting Mr. Jones? We have already said, "we give him this Barnabas," in return for the bishop's great liberality in giving Origen to Dr. Priestley.

But enough, and more than enough, of comments upon these miserable cavils. They shew, however, the spirit with which theological discussion is conducted by the reverend prebendary and by men like him. He trusts for-

sooth that all these illiberal sarcasms and gross misrepresentations "*are not unworthy of a gentleman or a Christian;*" but at any rate, they are utterly unworthy of a calm, a serious, and impartial inquirer after truth.

Of this distinction indeed the reverend prebendary is not ambitious. How is it possible that he should? Tied down, in an enlightened and inquisitive era, to a system of theology, the wretched relick of a dark and barbarous age, upon the profession and defence of which all his hopes are built, TRUTH must necessarily be the object of his terror and abhorrence. And next to the mighty effort of closing his own eyes against her beautiful ray, must be his eagerness to obstruct her progress, by raising a cloud of sophisms to bewilder the minds of others, and by attempting to bear down the advocates of truth by insolence and dogmatism. The father tried the experiment, but it did not answer his purpose: nor will it succeed better in the hands of the son. Truth is omnipotent and will maintain her course. When one instrument is laid aside another will supply its place. All will accomplish the purpose for which they were designed. Even the efforts of the adversaries of truth to oppose her progress shall eventually contribute to accelerate her march.

Aware of the difficult situation of the established clergy, the present writer, who in the pursuit of truth neither desires nor envies the honours and emoluments of an establishment, has endeavoured as far as possible to avoid coming into contact with it: and where he has had occasion to

mention the established religion of his country, he has treated it with all the respect which was consistent with a paramount regard to truth; and if he has differed from any of her eminent theological writers, he is not conscious that he has upon such occasions departed from the forms of civilized society. In the intercourses of life it has been his fortune to be occasionally connected with and even nearly related to some persons of no mean station in the church. And it has been his happiness to be acquainted with many whose morals have been an ornament to their profession. Nor do his sentiments, either concerning the expedience of an established religion, or the advantage of an episcopal hierarchy, or the propriety of public liturgies, differ so far from those of the best writers of the established church, as those of many of his nonconformist brethren. But upon the subject of Christian doctrine, and especially the fundamental truth of the Unity of God and the object of worship, he feels it his duty to be firm. He can make no compromise with antichristian error. But while he bears his public testimony to what he conceives, after long and patient inquiry, to be the pure doctrine of Christ, he is solicitous to abstain from all illiberal reflections upon the talents, learning and character of those who conscientiously hold opinions which were once his own.

With these views he has cautiously refrained from entering into controversy with the established clergy, and has remained silent under an enormous mass of obloquy, of misrepresentation and

contemptuous abuse. Nor would he have deviated from his general rule upon the present occasion had he not flattered himself that by the attention which this controversy may excite, the complete, indisputable victory of his honoured and departed friend over his learned and able antagonist might become more generally known; and that from henceforth no unhallowed arm might presume to tear from the brow of Dr. Priestley his well-earned laurels.

The reverend gentleman concludes his animadversions with expressing an assurance that if the public receive his work with candour, "the sentiments of Mr. Belsham will give him no concern." No doubt he speaks the truth. And with equal sincerity Mr. B. can return the compliment that if *his* works are approved by the lovers of truth, and the serious enquirers after it—the sentiments of the whole body of preferment-hunters will give him no molestation whatever.

The Appendix closes with a Greek sentence, perhaps intended for the Prince's eye; who, though he may be no theologian, is said to be an elegant scholar, and though he may be very indifferent to the fate of the church at Ælia, may feel interested in the fortunes of a clergyman whom he has graciously permitted to dedicate to him a defence of that crazy edifice. In these lines the reverend prebendary expresses his earnest wish, a wish in which the writer of this letter, and no doubt many others, heartily concur, that *he was completely out of debt*. Οφειλομι μηδενι μηδεν, κ. τ. λ. And if the Prince Regent should take the hint, and graciously relieve the

reverend prebendary from all his difficulties by rewarding his exertions with a golden prebend, or a richer deanery, it would occasion no surprise if, in that event, the worthy ecclesiastic should, like his father before him, leave the orthodox Hebrew church at Ælia, together with our *holy brethren the primitive saints of Jerusalem*, who so nobly bartered the rights of their ancestors for the privileges of the Roman colony, to shift for themselves, till some other champion, from motives either of generosity or prudence, shall again undertake the cause.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
T. BELSHAM.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.—Letter VIII.

SIR, Oct. 18, 1813.

My last letter was concluded (p. 313) with Hollingshead's description of Queen Elizabeth as "a governor that promoted liberty of conscience." I then expected much sooner to have inquired into the exactness of the old historian's character of the queen.

This phrase *liberty of conscience*, has had, at different times, various significations, not unlike the *liberty of the press*, which at some periods comprehended a right to censure, and at others was limited strictly to the expression of panegyric. Thus liberty of conscience too often designed only the liberty to worship according to the conscience, real or pretended, of the prince or power in possession. That such was the case in the reign of Elizabeth we know on the authority of her secretary

Walsingham, in his letter to Monsieur Crotoy, a Frenchman. He indeed describes it as a principle of the queen's government that "consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced, by the force of truth, with the aid of time, and use of all good means of instruction," and represents "her majesty" as "utterly disliking the tyranny of Rome, which had used by terror and rigour to settle commandments of men's faith and consciences." Yet he applauds the queen, because "as a princess of great wisdom and magnanimity she suffered but the exercise of one religion."

I quote these passages from Walsingham's letter, given at length by Burnet (ii. 388) as translated from the French. The bishop did not perceive or perhaps declined to expose the absurdity into which this "great and wise secretary" had fallen, by praising the queen's tenderness for the consciences of her subjects, which ended in permitting but *the exercise of one religion*.

Burnet was a free and manly historian of his own times, yet too often appeared as a *partizan* in his "History of the Reformation of the Church of England." Almost, if not altogether, silent respecting the severities by which that reformation was established under Elizabeth, he describes "the queen" as "of her own nature merciful," because Bonner was permitted to live, and the rest of the deprived bishops were only spoiled of their revenues, debarred the free exercise of their religion, "put in prison for a little while," and then subjected for the remainder of their lives to a more easy

restraint. Such was "the queen's gentleness," as Burnet expresses it (ii. 367). He adds, "all this might have been expected from such a queen, and such bishops" as "the reformed divines," who "had learned in the gospel not to render evil for evil."

Yet in this age of inquiry into those facts which historians have either blazoned or disguised, as suited the purpose or party for which they wrote, the character of even *such a queen* has been freely discussed. Nor are there wanting many who agree with a modern female historian, respecting Elizabeth, that "her good fortune is in nothing more conspicuous than in the unmerited fame it has to this day preserved to her," (Macaulay, i. 2). As to the subject in question, it will no longer be denied that many suffered under the government of Elizabeth, as the victims of religious intolerance. The degree and extent of such sufferings are still disputed, nor probably can their amount be now determined with any exactness.

Among those who were united by pains and penalties, inflicted under the joint authority of law and prerogative, there were great disagreements. The Papist revolted at the first step of that Reformation which the Puritan considered, as to rites and ceremonies, as resting far short of gospel simplicity. Yet both would have cordially assisted the Established Church to exterminate that small number of Christians who had discovered, or at least suspected, that the Creeds of both Papists and Protestants contained gross corruptions of *the faith once delivered to the saints*.

I proceed to the case of the Papists now persecuted for the profession of their religion. The history of this religious persecution, undoubtedly severe, is so blended with well-supported accusations of crimes against the state, committed by individuals of the Romish communion, that it is not easy to make the separation. Papal historians have too often ranked among martyrs to their religion those who suffered for attempts against the civil government, which, however excited by religious zeal, made them justly liable to the penal consequences of political delinquency. Protestant writers, on the other hand, with an obvious design, have enlarged on the papal persecution under Mary, while they have left their readers almost ignorant of any thing like a persecution of Papists by her Protestant successor. So just is the remark of Camden, that "persons whose minds differ in religion, do too much obscure the light of honesty and truth on both sides."

According to that annalist, An. 1559, (where he professes to follow Roman Catholic writers) the clergy, at the accession of Elizabeth, including the various dignitaries, were about 9400. Of these all, except 189, conformed to the new religion established by the queen and parliament. There must still have been great numbers among the people attached to the Romish ritual. Yet of these, according to Rapin, there were not wanting those who witnessed the accession of Elizabeth with goodwill, though they expected the *reformed church* to be immediately re-established. The historian having remarked that among the

Catholics, some regarded the decrease of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth as a death-blow to their religion, adds that others did not regret to see an end of those barbarous punishments by which it had been dishonoured, *n'étoient pas fâchez de voir cesser ces supplices barbares qui la deshonorient*.

It appears that during the twelve first years of Elizabeth's reign the Catholics enjoyed the private exercise of their religion, by connivance, while on the part of the queen there was an evident desire to assimilate the Church of England, in doctrine and ceremonial, as nearly as possible to the Church of Rome. During this period too his holiness the Pope held with Elizabeth a correspondence conciliating and even complimentary. It appears however, from Camden, An. 1568, that the patience of Pius Quintus being now exhausted, he employed a Florentine who had lived long as a factor in London, to excite the Papists in England secretly against the queen. Two years after having, as Fuller says, (C. H. 92) "long patiently expected the amendment of Elizabeth, and weary with waiting in vain," the pope "resolved at last (if not wisely, valiantly) that seeing desperate diseases must have desperate cures, he would thunder his excommunication against her." In this bull he absolved her subjects from their allegiance, and even commanded them to disobey her, under the penalty of being excommunicated themselves. Yet Dr. Milner, of Winchester, in his Letters to a Prebendary (4 Ed. 212 N.), would have it believed "that Pius V. did not require the English Catholics to receive or

observe his bull," because "in fact he never published it, or signified it to them." It will be more to my purpose to observe what sentiments and conduct Camden attributes to the Catholics on this occasion, and how far he agrees on that point with their just-mentioned acute and zealous advocate.

The learned Annalist of *Elizabeth* had recorded, An. 1569, during "the rebellion in the North," that the insurgents "sent letters to the Papists round about throughout the whole kingdom, exhorting them to join their forces with their's. But so far were they from associating themselves with them, that most of them sent the letters which they received, together with the bearers, to the Queen, and every one strived who should be forwardest, from all parts of the land, to offer his person and his purse against them." Having mentioned the daring act of *John Felton*, who hung the Pope's bull on the Bishop of London's palace gates. An. 1570, Camden adds, "The most part of the moderate sort of Papists secretly disliked this bull, because there had no admonition preceded according to law, and foreseeing also that hereby a great heap of mischief hung over their heads, who before had private exercise of their religion within their own houses quietly enough, or else refused not to go to the service of God received in the English church, without scruple of conscience. And from that time many of them continued firm in their obedience."

Camden thus appears to countenance the general representation of this subject made by Dr. Mil-

ner in his Letters. That zealous partizan of the Catholics goes indeed the length of asserting, respecting this *bull*, (p. 212) that "only one person in their whole number, John Felton, is known to have approved of it." This is marvellous considering the deference to the personal authority of the Pope then entertained, at least, among the vulgar. It is to be regretted that such a fair enquirer as Dr. Geddes had not examined this question in his *Modest Apology*.

The influence of this ill-advised measure on the condition of the Catholics, through the remainder of Elizabeth's reign, with a short view of the sufferings endured by Puritans and Unitarians, during the same period must be reserved to another letter.

R. G. S.

Difficulties in the Doctrine of a Resurrection.

Maidstone, Oct. 8, 1813.

Sir,

It is necessarily by a slow process that the human mind advances in the discovery of the one infinite Cause of the universe. Of this truth I cannot but think, that the extreme difficulty which is still felt by the student in Christian theology, concerning the possibility of a resurrection, by the sole energy of the Deity, affords a somewhat striking attestation. "If I die wholly," says your correspondent Cantabrigiensis, "a resurrection appears scarcely within the bounds of possibility.*"

Now if there be, properly speaking, one, and but one, absolute eternal Cause; if the creature be the simple entire result of the

infinite power and intelligence of the Creator; if every being which begins to exist, exists but as the pure effect of a particular mode of operation of the infinite Cause, as the stream proceeds wholly from its fountain; then surely it must be equally possible to restore any particular being, or modification of being, after it has been absolutely withdrawn, or suspended for any period, as it was absolutely to produce it in the first instance, and to continue its existence uniformly for any term. An absolutely dependant being, owes its preservation to the constant continuance of that particular operating energy by which it was produced; if its mode of operation be changed, the creature, which is the pure result of that operation, must sustain a correspondent change; if the operating cause be wholly suspended, the creature, which is the effect, must wholly cease; and if it be renewed in precisely the same manner, precisely the same created effect must result from the operation; and no reason appears why the same exact operation cannot be renewed, as well as originally excited, continued and suspended, by the infinite Operator.

This general reasoning is remarkably confirmed by the actual history of the human mind in this state. If by the immortality of the soul be meant the continued, uninterrupted existence of the mind, or of the operations of thought and its affections, in which sense alone any distinct ideas can be annexed to the phrase, nothing can be more contrary to our constant experience. The mind, or faculty of perception, is uniformly suspended, either to-

tally, or so far at least as it respects any practical purposes, during the night season. In profound sleep, all perception, or consciousness, which is but a reflex act of perception, ceases; mind hath no real existence. Yet so far is this suspension of the mental process from destroying its identity, or operating as any real obstacle to its existence, or successful operations, that there is reason to believe it is essential to these purposes. The same mind is restored, with the return of morning, in a state of renewed vigor and fitness for future action. Should, however, any doubts be entertained respecting the reality of this suspension in sleep, which is nevertheless a matter of plain experience, as far as a negation can be said to be so, they will surely not be extended to the state of dormancy, to which the human species have in some instances been subjected, and from which they have sometimes recovered the full possession of their minds and of their conscious identity, as in the case of the ordinary returns of vigilance. In this state it is often impossible by any natural means to impart sensation, which is the first principle of perception, to the patient; and it can scarcely be distinguished from death, in which it frequently terminates, by any other circumstance than the absence of putrefaction. . . . Now if in the usual course of nature the mind can be thus withdrawn and restored, not only without impediment, but with real advantage to its existence and conscious sameness; if the functions of the system can be absolutely suspended for a season, and afterwards recalled to the produc-

tion of precisely the same mental effect as before, why may not the like be effected, with correspondent advantages, by the more immediate intervention of the Deity? Why may he not for any term, which his infinite wisdom may dictate, suspend the *existence*, as well as the *operations* of that curious mechanism by which mind is produced, and again re-organize it, with such alterations in its structure and external circumstances as may be more immediately adapted to the future purposes of its existence? The organ though renewed will, if adapted to the production of the same mental effects as before, be essentially the same, and a renewed vigor and enlargement of capacity may surely be imparted to it, not only without endangering, but with the greatest advantages to its former and future attainments. "The power of uniting the past and future with the present" will be promoted both by the improved powers of the organ, and by its advantageous circumstance, on its entrance on the world now future; while the scenes with which we are now immediately conversant, being contemplated with a strong but distant and comprehensive view, will be seen more according to the true character and just relation to the general scheme of things. The same mind being thus restored, with vast advantages, with regard both to its former and future acquisitions, will obtain a more complete self-possession than it had ever before experienced, and may feel a peculiar degree of self-complacency, both in its conscious identity and the glorious changes which it has undergone.

With regard to the supposition of Cantabrigiensis, that upon the principle of an absolute restoration of being or as he denominates it, "a new creation, any number of beings might be himself" it is not only inconsistent with the idea of renovation, which can apply only to the same number, as well as to the same beings in every other respect, as those which had previously existed; but it involves the contradiction of supposing that many can be one; and he might with equal propriety suppose, that any number of beings in the present state might be constituted exactly alike; and that their minds and conscious identities might be so similar, or so blended together, that neither themselves nor others could distinguish between them, except from their numerical difference and that of their external circumstances; and might urge it as an argument against the present existence, that any number of persons being created precisely like himself, might actually be himself! But the fact is, that as we are all necessarily numerically different, and different with regard to our external circumstances, so are these circumstances uniformly and necessarily accompanied with correspondent differences, in the structure of our minds and their respective acquisitions. These differences, which commence in some degree from our birth, and are promoted by the several peculiarities which attend the experience and mental operation of each individual; and if a difference is discernable between us on our *first* entrance into being, there is reason to believe a much more marked difference will attend our

second entrance, with all our respective former acquisitions, accompanied with a renovated vigor adapted to review them with peculiar advantages. . . . Unity of person is a circumstance essentially connected with conscious identity. The mind is an image or representation of external things; and if the person to which it belongs, together with surrounding objects, preserve their sameness, with only such alterations, as might reasonably be expected, the mind, which is the transcript will likewise preserve its sameness and its reflex consciousness of it. But if so material an alteration is introduced as that of the multiplication of persons exactly similar, the utmost disorder must be introduced into its conceptions, and conscious diversity and confusion must take place of conscious uniformity and sameness.

Much of the difficulty that has been felt upon this subject, seems to have arisen from the idea that matter, and perhaps mind also, have a kind of independent existence, and consequently that certain particular portions of one or both are necessary to constitute the same being. But in fact the supposition of more than one infinite independent Being is a manifest absurdity; all existence either is the Deity himself, or the result of his operations. And that our future existence should depend rather on such an extraordinary act of his power, as is usually considered as the effect of his more immediate intervention, than on any of those ordinary operations to which the name of secondary causes is usually applied, may have a peculiar tendency to promote in our minds

a just sense of our absolute dependence; as well as be productive of peculiar advantages, with regard to the future constitution of our frame.

The analogy on which I have insisted between sleep and death, resurrection and returning vigilance, is frequently alluded to in the scriptures; and the phrase *sleeping with their fathers*, is a common expression to denote the state of dissolution. When Christ *awakened Lazarus out of sleep*, after he had been dead four days, and his body had become putrid, there can be no doubt that his former mind was restored, with there-nued vigor of his corporeal system, after a manner perfectly analagous to what is experienced on the ordinary returns of vigilance, or in recovery from a state of dormancy. It must however have been effected by what is denominated the immediate interposition of the Deity, that interposition which first formed man out of the dust of the ground, which fed five thousand men, besides women and children, from five loaves and a few small fishes, which rendered the widow's cruse of oil, an exhaustless source of sustenance, and which could surely have produced the same effects, although no dust, no fishes, and no oil had been present for their production.

Notwithstanding the objections of Cantabrigiensis to the resurrection of Christ, as being "scarcely the case in point, that Unitarian divines represent it," I cannot but think that it is admirably adapted to testify and illustrate the great doctrine of a resurrection from mortality to a state of immortality. Had not the body of Jesus, before it was dissolved, been removed

from its place of sepulchre, and exhibited alive precisely in the same state in which he was formerly known, the evidence to his disciples, and men in general, of the reality of his resurrection would not have been equally satisfactory. The existence of the dead body, or its remains, would have been regarded as a proof that he was not really risen. But although the same body was in this case occasionally exhibited, by the most indubitable proofs, yet proofs no less indubitable were presented, that its usual, and what may therefore be denominated its natural state, was not that of an animal or earthly, but of a spiritual, invisible and heavenly body. His usual state, subsequent to his resurrection, was that of invisibility, though, often at least, if not uniformly, previous to his ascension, of intimate mental presence. The same mind now inhabited a body of much more subtle composition, or rather both had undergone a glorious transformation, while yet the essential characteristics of identity were preserved; and having borne this image which appertained to their earthly estate, they now assumed that which belonged to their heavenly destination. His mode of manifesting himself to his disciples, from a state of invisibility, in his own original form, and with precisely his former habitudes, and his again vanishing out of their sight, afforded probably the most satisfactory evidence that could be given of a transformation from mortality to immortality, while yet the essentials of the same being were effectually preserved. The apostles could entertain no doubts, after these repeated exhibitions,

of his person eating, drinking, conversing, and even being handled and examined by them, and after repeatedly witnessing his transformations from and to a state of invisibility, terminating in his visible ascent into heaven, either of the reality of his resurrection in his own proper person, or of the glorious change which he had undergone. It would operate on their minds as a complete pledge and pattern of their own resurrection and glorious transformation. Nor was it necessary to this object that any part of the old body should be retained. The power who could thus preserve the same person under such different forms, rendering him alternately what, in modern language, may be denominated matter and spirit, or visibly existent, and again apparently unexistent, though mentally present, could surely have produced precisely the same effect, although the old body had been suffered to moulder in its sepulchre. It was most manifest in this case, that both body and spirit are but the pure effects of the creative, and transforming efficacy of God—And we have substantial grounds for relying on the assurance of Christ, that *all that are in their graves, or who have passed through this vale of mortality, shall hear his voice and come forth*, each appearing in his own proper person and character, and *receive the reward of the deeds done in this life*; they whose conduct has been generally upright and virtuous, and who have thus attained to a meetness for heavenly enjoyment, entering immediately on the fruition of immortality; while those whose conduct has

marked the prevalent influence of this world in their minds, will, even on their entrance on this renovated being, find the *sentence of sin and of death still reigning in their members*.

T. B.

Vindication of the Dialogue on the Scriptures in Reply to Mr. Sturch.

[Continued from p. 653.]

In the course of his animadversions, Mr. S. objects to the strength of my expressions, such as “eternal misery,” and so forth. If Mr. S. had been half as familiar with the scriptures, as I give him credit for being with the pages of philosophy, he would, perhaps, not have raised this objection. Bearing in mind such passages as the following—“*These shall go away into everlasting punishment:**”—“*Into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched:†*”—having in his recollection, I say, these, and similar passages, Mr. S. would at least have allowed, that I had not gone further than the gospel authorised me to go. He will not, I am aware, receive the sacred records as an authority from which there is no appeal; this his general language makes very evident; but I have yet to learn what *degree* of importance he is disposed to attach to them.

One of three things he must allow; either that they are altogether of divine origin; that they are partially so; or that they are

* Matt. xxv. 46,

† Mark ix. 43. 44.

merely a human composition. The first supposition is obviously not that of Mr. S., and if he have adopted the second, I have only to beg of him, that he will tell me what parts I may venture to believe, and what to reject, of a book, the whole of which (I am speaking more particularly of the New Testament) rests upon the same evidence. I imagine, however, that Mr. S. never thinks of the scriptures in any other light than as a book of mere human origin. Now if this be the case, I affirm that Mr. S. cannot honestly (though he says that he would do so) recommend them to any living being. For if that book which says, "all scriptures were written by inspiration of God," be not written by inspiration of God, then is it false? And carrying in the face of it one falsehood so egregious as that which I have just supposed, what credit can we possibly give to stories so improbable as the feeding of 5000 human beings with five loaves and two fishes; the raising of a dead man; the conversion of water into wine, and so on? Now though we might as good fathers take a world of pains to prevent our children from regarding these narrations in any other light than that of amusing fables, yet such silly prejudices have the bulk of people about us, that it will be next to impossible for our young ones not to hear the scriptures spoken of by the majority of those they mix with, as uniformly and minutely true. It is evident, therefore, how great danger they run of adopting a belief which must pervert their imaginations, and miserably impede them in their search after truth.

As a book of amusement Mr. S. would do much better to put the Arabian Nights into his children's hands, and for their moral instruction I would recommend to him in preference to "the collection called the Scriptures," the collection called Miss Edgeworth's Moral Tales, because this latter being received as a book confessedly of mere invention, "*if it did no good, could do no harm.*" I thank Mr. S. for making me aware how improperly I used those words before; I now perceive that in his estimation the scriptures must be capable of doing the *greatest* harm. So great being the probable danger of reading them, and so certain the possibility of obtaining all that is good in them through other channels, (for the same morality is now transfused into very many other books), I hope, for the credit of his understanding, consistency, and independence of character, that Mr. S. had for a moment forgotten himself, when he talked of recommending "the collection called the scriptures."

In the next place, Sir, I have to defend my assertion that a religious motive alone can sanctify any, our best actions. Either the scriptures do or they do not insist on a certain definite mode of conduct; and they do or do not prescribe to that conduct a certain definite motive. That they do so, is evident from the following texts. Paul says, [1 Cor. x. 31] "Whether therefore ye eat or drink," (as if he had said in the most unimportant things) "or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And again, he says, [Coloss. iii. 17] "And whatsoever ye do in word, or deed, do all in

the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.* The motive then, if the scriptures may be depended on, is full as necessary as the act, or rather it is for the motive's sake alone that the act can be accepted by God. *A priori*, all our actions must be equally indifferent to him, for they are all equally unable to affect either his happiness, greatness, glory, or power. To believe this is necessary to our notions of an all-perfect being. None of our actions therefore can be acceptable to God for their own sake; none of them can be acceptable to him, but as they are done, *because he wills* to have them done, and *as he wills* to have them done. Now we have no, even pretended, declaration of God's will but that which appears in the scriptures, unless it be that which it is affirmed may be gathered from the suggestions of reason or conscience, and I have shewn how entirely unable these are to enlighten us on this momentous subject. On the whole then, we can have no reasonable expectations that our actions shall be accepted by God, but as they agree with the injunctions of the scriptures, and the scriptures as I have shewn, insist on the motive no less than the act.

I must beg leave to intrude on your patience yet a little longer. Mr. S. says that I have misrepresented facts as it relates to the opinion of the ancients with respect to revenge. If what I said on this subject implied that there

* I trust, Sir, that these two quotations settle the question as effectually, as if I had adduced all the texts to the same purpose, which it is possible to bring forward.

never were amongst the ancients any individuals who thought revenge wrong, I willingly confess that I spoke too much at large. Mr. S. has made evident by his quotations, (what was readily allowed before) that in the long course of time a few such men, at least, have existed, men who thought that we ought not to be "*greatly* offended even with our enemies," and that "*placability*," and "*clemency*," were graceful. But so small has been their number, that they should rather be adduced as exceptions to prove this general rule, viz. that reason and conscience do not point out or discover revenge to be a crime, than for any other purpose.* I would no more say, that the ancients accounted revenge a crime, because a few individuals amongst them did so, than I would affirm that professing Christians make the Scriptures a lie, or a dead letter, or a mass of contradiction and absurdity, because a few individuals amongst them do so.

To conclude, Sir, I think it is pretty obvious, on the whole, that Mr. S. would willingly enough substitute books of philosophy for the col-

* I think it would be easy, but certainly not worth the trouble, to shew that there is an essential difference between Christian forgiveness and heathen *placability*, which is a sort of qualified, conditional forgiveness, presupposing something conceded on the part of the offender. Surely, *placabilis*, *misericordia*, and *clementia*, have meanings very different from that which we attach to the forgiveness inculcated by the gospel; *μὴ μνησθῆναι* comes nearest to the spirit of it, perhaps, but is far from fully expressing it. To have had a full apprehension of this most amiable Christian quality, the ancients must have first felt Christian humility.

tion called the Scriptures, for he seems to think it a matter of great indifference, whether people even read the latter or not; he is even somewhat angry with me for recommending them so very earnestly to my friend's perusal, whilst he himself advocates the cause of the Heathens with little less zeal. Now, if for a moment we allow Mr. S. to be one of those favoured mortals, whose superior penetration might have discovered these important truths in religion and morality, which revelation has made known to us, (and which, by the way, initiated as he has been into them from his infancy, he can never know that he should have discovered) yet what would the bulk of men, less intellectual or less inquiring, have done? If none but philosophers might discover, or receive these truths so necessary to be known, alas! how little may we hope that that immense body of men, who form at present the unchristianized part of the world, shall ever, continuing such, know the truth as it is in Jesus. How little may we hope,

that peace and good-will shall ever be universally established amongst men; that those blessed times foretold in the gospel shall ever arrive, when every man shall be safe under his own vine and under his own fig-tree! Christians, all men, the most unlettered, the most ignorant, may be; but when shall we see a world of philosophers? What inconceivable combination of circumstances shall produce this unheard of effect? And supposing even that all men should, at some future period, acquire, by dint of philosophy, a perfect knowledge of moral and religious good and evil, what, short of the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, could ensure the observance of one, and forbearance from the other? What engine powerful enough to effect these great ends, in any degree worth our consideration, when even scripture threats and promises are unable wholly to effect them?

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,
A. L. B.

OBITUARY.

Mrs. A. Smith.

Died, suddenly, on the 2nd of September last, in the 63rd year of her age, at Ringmer, near Lewes, in Sussex, (where she had been for a short time on a visit) MRS. ANN SMITH, relict of the late Mr. Richard Smith, for many years a resident of Brighton, in the same county.

Educated in conformity to the established church, she continued in union with that body till she was about nineteen, when, on hearing some of the discourses of the late Rev. Mr. De Courcy, she became a dissenter from principle. The religion of Protestant Dissenters in

those days, and especially in that part of the country (Sussex) was by no means a fashionable thing; to follow the path of duty was then a matter of serious and weighty importance, and those who did so, had daily to "take up their cross," to subdue the passions, and to sacrifice some of the most endearing ties of nature at the shrine of truth. This she found by experience; for in thus publicly declaring her change of sentiment, she had to combat the ridicule and contempt of her acquaintance, as well as the prejudices, the promises, and the bitter threats of her nearest relatives. But she had made her elec-

tion, and her resolution was not to be shaken; she freely gave up all, being assured "that whoso forsaketh not father or mother, for the great cause of Christ is unworthy of him." In order to shew the serious nature of her undertaking, it may be observed, that to worship God agreeably to the dictates of her conscience, was not only generally at the risk of personal assault, but more than once at the imminent hazard of her life.

In, or about the year 1780, she, together with her husband, was baptized at Battle, and joined the Calvinist Baptist church in that place, under the then pastoral care of Mr W. Vidler, (now of Parliament Court, London.) In this communion she lived for some years, in sentiment a Calvinist, and nothing particular arising to agitate the question of orthodoxy, a quiet acquiescence in the received dogmas of Calvinism precluded the deadly crime of heresy.

This calm was not always to continue. A circumstance in the course of Divine Providence occurred, which, while it roused in her breast, all the tender feelings of a fond mother, shewed her the fallacy of her religious sentiments, as a refuge in the hour of distress. This was the loss of a beloved and only daughter, snatched off in her childhood. Her affliction was deep: and while her habitual piety induced submission, it also naturally solicited her attention to the Divine character for support under this severe stroke of his hand. But here, instead of consolation, she found herself plunged in tenfold doubt and misery. She dared not look to heaven, lest her child should be missing from that seat of bliss. The grave was dark: futurity was dreadful. "Who," she would exclaim, "can assure me, in the small number of the elect, my child is included? Ah, me! miserable! can I bear the thought? There is a doubt! nay, a high probability she is not!—What! is this dear infant, for whom I have suffered all a mother's pains, for whose existence my willing knees have often bowed in grateful homage to the Father of Spirits, whose sick couch I have nightly watched, and from the overflowings of an aching heart bedewed with unavailing tears,—and whose untimely death I now so deeply mourn,—is she formed for no other purpose than endless damnation? Yes, yes, it may be so; my creed declares

it, and, oh, dreadful thought! I must hear and approve the sentence of the Judge! must laugh at her tribulation and anguish! the mother must exult in the unending torments of her child!"

Such reflections, (the natural conflict between her better feelings and the horrid doctrines of Calvinism) reduced her mind to a situation little short of distraction, and insanity or infidelity must have been the consequence, had not some friendly voice whispered in her ear,—“The all-bountiful God will some way find a means to exempt those from punishment who have not actually sinned.”

Although she had no clear conception, according to her preconceived ideas, how the Deity could be so bountiful, yet the sentiment afforded a buoyance to her mind; and in this state of doubt and hope (the family having removed to Brighton) she joined the Calvinist Baptist church there in 1790, under the then pastoral charge of Mr. Thomas Vine, (the present respected member and supporter of the Unitarian cause in that place.) It may be worthy of remark, that her husband was still *soundly orthodox*; so that she stood quite unsupported, till about the year 1792 or 3, the poison of heresy began to insinuate itself into this orthodox church; the symptoms were of no doubtful nature, and the disease spreading with rapidity, amputation was deemed absolutely necessary, and, shocking to relate, the pastor's name stands the first of eighteen who were dismembered incurable and, whom no threats or intreaties could prevail on to sign this favourite article in their creed, "That Christ died for the elect; and the elect only."

Among this number is to be found the name of the subject of this memoir. The doctrine of God's universal love was congenial to her mild and benevolent temper; her heart had long been in a state of preparation to receive it; and hope, and joy, and peace were the happy consequences.

The opposition of the orthodox party, as before observed, was very violent; their arguments indeed few, but conclusive; their zeal making ample amends for such trifling deficiencies; all with one voice declaring "the doctrine, (viz. universal restoration) to be a damnable error, sprung from hell," and one, to give the finishing stroke and set the question for ever at rest, asserted, "That if it should please God to send him to hell, he would not come out again."

It may not be a matter incurious to the reader to learn, that this circumstance, was the first cause of the subsequent introduction of the glorious doctrine of Unitarianism in Brighton. The deceased was one of the first who had the honour of professing and supporting in that place the more extended views of God's love to his creatures,—though it must at the same time be acknowledged, she never carried her sentiments farther on this subject than as taught by the late Mr. Winchester;—this may be accounted for,

1st. By the relief which her mind had so long and anxiously sought, being afforded in the doctrine of universal restoration.

2dly. This doctrine was founded on her already pre-conceived notions of divine vengeance and Christ as a vicarious sacrifice, &c. &c. and

3dly. Connected with this, her being then arrived at that time of life, when the mind seldom disengages itself from every early opinion. In the universal doctrine therefore from that period she both lived and rejoiced, and maintained it to her death.

To a temper of uncommon natural sweetness and benevolence, she united undeviating firmness of character in avowing and following the convictions of her mind,—exhibiting through the whole course of her life, an example of integrity, of Christian meekness, and unaffected piety.—Generous and faithful in her friendships—she was also mild and placable to her enemies; conducting herself through all the relations of life with such respect and attention to its duties,—that those who best knew her, esteemed and honoured her the most.

The writer who offers this imperfect tribute to the departed worth of the tenderest, the most affectionate of mothers, cannot conclude without expressing a hope, that her example may have its due effect; and her memory, and her virtues may be so cherished by those who survive, that it may be said of a truth, "being dead she yet speaketh."

W. T.

Rev. John Mills.

Died the Rev. JOHN MILLS, late Pastor of the General Baptist Church, meeting in St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth. The deceased was a native of

an obscure village in Northamptonshire, but from his eighth till his twentieth year appears to have resided with his father, who was many years pastor of the General Baptist Church at March, in Cambridgeshire, when he went to London, and acted as an assistant in a school of respectability, conducted by the Rev. Mr. Noble, predecessor of the Rev. J. Evans, qualifying himself at the same time for the ministry, till he accepted an invitation from the Church of Portsmouth to become their pastor, to which office he was ordained on the 30th July, 1771; his father, the Rev. Thomas Mills, the Revs.—Evershed, Sparshott, and J. Sturch officiating on the occasion. This situation he filled till the month of April, 1812, a period of upwards of forty years, when from the debility of age, and an increasing weight of infirmities he felt obliged to resign. The latter years of his life were much afflicted, but as might have been expected, they served only to perfect his patience, and display his resignation. His decease happened on the 9th Sept. last, being then in his 75th year, and his remains were interred a few days afterwards in the General Baptist Meeting-house, on which occasion an appropriate address was delivered by the Rev. Jos. Brent, of Godalmin; who further improved the event of his death, in an impressive discourse, to a respectable and numerous audience on the Sunday evening following, from the words of Paul to Titus, Chap. iv. verses 7 and 8.

As a man Mr. M. was exemplary in the discharge of every duty; affectionate as a husband, kind and benevolent as a relative, steady and firm as a friend; he was attached to the cause of liberty, civil and religious, an advocate for learning, and a promoter of free inquiry.—As a minister he did not stand high in the scale of popularity, though much close reasoning and sound argument were to be found in his discourses, which were ever addressed to the understanding of his hearers, and though sensible of the importance of just views of religion, his aim was generally to improve the morals and correct the heart. As a Baptist he was ever strenuous for that ordinance being administered by immersion, as he was thoroughly satisfied that such was the mode adopted by Jesus, followed by his apostles, and left for his example. As a

744 *Intelligence.—Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Reading.*

General Baptist he entertained enlarged views of the benignity of the Divine Being; and he taught, as he believed, that the operations of the divine government would result in the ultimate well-being of all God's rational creation. With respect to the Deity he held the scriptural doctrine of his unity in its strictest sense, and though he ascribed a pre-existent dignity to Jesus Christ, the One God was the sole object of his adoration and worship. That holding such sentiments, he should have experienced much of the contumely attendant on an open avowal of them will not be thought strange; but though he met with his full share of this trial, like his heaven-commissioned Master, when reviled he reviled not again, and if he met with curses his blessing was ever ready in return. Not long before his death, during an interval in which he

appeared to possess the full exercise of his faculties, a friend observed to him, that "he hoped they should meet in a better world," he replied, "I believe so;" another said to him, "I hope, Sir, that as through a long life you did not find Christianity to be a cunningly devised fable, you find it a comfort to you in your affliction?" "I do find it," he answered, "a comfort now, and more than that, I shall feel its support in the article of death." It was thus that rational Christianity could soothe the death bed of its votary, and faith forbids a doubt but that there is laid up for him that crown of righteousness, which the Lord the Righteous Judge shall give to all his faithful ministers, and all those who love his appearing.

S. P.

Newport, Isle of Wight.

INTELLIGENCE.

Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Reading.

It is now about two years since Mr. Vidler first went down from the Unitarian Fund to Reading. His preaching, as is well known to our readers, drew over a respectable number of persons to the Unitarian doctrine, and, of consequence, to Unitarian worship. These have not, even under unfavourable circumstances, forsaken the assembling of themselves together; they have been accustomed to meet, often without a preacher, in a commodious and spacious workshop. At length, they have obtained a proper place of worship: a small chapel, formerly occupied by a congregation of Calvinists, fell into the hands of one of the members of the Unitarian Society, a builder; and he has enlarged and improved, and, it may be truly said, beautified it, and it was occupied for the first time as a Unitarian Chapel, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the 23d, 24th, and 25th instant. Mr. Vidler had conducted the services in the temporary meeting-house, for the last time, the preceding Sunday.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Vidler opened the worship in the Chapel by prayer, and Mr. T. Rees preached,

from Acts iv. 18, 19, a Sermon on the Principles of Dissent from Established Churches; arguing against the interference of the magistrate in matters of religion, and urging the importance of Unitarians asserting their faith, and observing their worship in assemblies of their own.

The service on the Wednesday morning was introduced by Mr. Rees, with the reading of the scriptures and prayer. Mr. Vidler was to have preached, but was prevented by sudden indisposition; this duty therefore fell to Mr. Aspland, who delivered a discourse from Mark xii. 28—30, on the importance of the doctrine of the Divine Unity.

Between the morning and evening services of this day, the gentlemen of the Society and their friends dined together, Mr. Rutt in the Chair, and the pleasant and edifying conversation that took place, will long be remembered by all present. The company consisted of about fifty persons.

In the evening Mr. Rees again introduced the service, and Mr. Aspland again preached; the text, Gal. vi. 14,—the subject, the death of Christ. The preacher considered, first, the scriptural account of this event, and secondly, the account of it given in the prevailing sys-

tems of Christianity; and then compared the two accounts, and concluded with remarks and exhortations, bearing upon the Unitarian faith and the moral duties of Unitarians.

There was a collection at the doors after each service. Nearly twenty pounds were collected.

The last service was on Thursday evening, when Mr. Aspland preached once more by appointment: the subject, Paul before Felix, from Acts xxiv. 24, 25.

The pleasantness of the services was much enhanced by the very agreeable mode in which the congregation conducted their singing; the choir is assisted by several appropriate instruments, played with judgment and taste.

The number in the several congregations varied, but the place was more than once well filled.

Mr. Vidler's indisposition threw a damp upon the minds of the congregation and their friends; but before the services closed they had the satisfaction of witnessing an amendment in his health, and have the pleasing prospect of his ministerial labours (with the blessing of Divine Providence) the two following Sundays; after which they expect (with the same reliance upon the Disposer of our times) to be visited by Messrs. Bennett, Gilchrist, and others.

Nov. 27, 1813.

TRINITY BILL.

Unitarian Fund.

At a Special General Meeting of the Subscribers to the Unitarian Fund, holden at the King's Head Tavern, in the Poultry, on Friday, August 20, 1813,

Mr. Alderman GOODREHERE in the Chair.

Resolved unanimously,

I. That we conceive it to be the right of every man—a right derived immediately from the Almighty Creator—to form his own religious opinions, to profess them amongst his neighbours and fellow-creatures, and to act upon them in the exercises of divine worship;—that in religious opinion, profession, and worship, as held, avowed and observed in Great Britain, there is no interruption of the peace of civil society, and no call for the interference of the Magistrate, who cannot affect to Tolerate without assuming authority to Persecute; and that all penal statutes, whether they enact fine or imprisonment, or positive bodily suffering, or whether they declare civil disabilities, exclusion and privation, on the ground solely of such opinion, profession and worship, are manifest invasions of natural right, and equally repugnant to the Christian Religion, and to the spirit of the British Constitution.

Resolved unanimously,

II. That as Unitarian Christians, distinguished from our fellow Christians only by the faith and worship which we have learned from the Holy Scriptures,—that the God and Father of the Universe is one Being, Mind and Person, the sole object of Religious Worship, and that Jesus Christ is the chosen, honoured, and divinely-endowed Messenger of God,—we had long felt the injustice of being excluded by positive statute from even that share of religious liberty which was allowed to the mass of Protestant Dissenters;—for which exclusion we humbly conceive no reason was to be found in our character and conduct as subjects and citizens, wherein we have never yielded, and can never yield, the superiority to any denomination or class of our countrymen.

Resolved unanimously,

III. That we congratulate our Unitarian brethren on the Bill lately passed into a Law for the relief of those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity: the British Legislature having thus readily performed an act of justice denied by the House of Commons, twenty years ago, to the earnest and eloquent application of that able and enlightened and ever-memorable statesman, the late Mr. Fox.

Resolved,

IV. That in common with all the friends of religious liberty and just government, we rejoice that persecuting

laws, enacted at the era of the Revolution, in direct violation of the principles then asserted, and which, though too cruel and impolitic to be often enforced, have yet remained for a century the disgrace of the statute book, are at length expunged, amidst a general acquiescence in the justice and even necessity of their repeal.

Resolved unanimously,

V. That our best acknowledgments are due to William Smith, Esq. M. P. for his compliance with the request, originating in our Committee, to bring the subject of the legal insecurity of Unitarians before Parliament, and for his unremitted attention to the Parliamentary progress of the Bills, which he accordingly brought into the House of Commons, for the repeal of those penal statutes which had so long rendered Unitarians liable to be deprived of civil protection merely on the ground of their religious profession.

Resolved unanimously,

VI. That we trust the period is advancing, and would willingly hasten its arrival, when not only Christians of every description, but also our countrymen at large, shall be alike free to profess and defend their opinions, and all equally partake the civil rights of Britons.

Resolved unanimously,

VII. That as Unitarian Christians feared not to profess and inculcate what they esteem the doctrines of the Gospel, though liable to the infliction of severe penalties, it is their incumbent duty, now that they are placed within the protection of the law, not to relax their efforts, but rather to extend those exertions which well consist with the peace and order of civil society and the purest principles of Christian charity.

Resolved unanimously,

VIII. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Committee of the Unitarian Fund, for their zealous discharge of the trust committed to them, and for their watchfulness over the interests of the Unitarian body.

Resolved unanimously,

IX. That the above Resolutions be printed, and that a copy be sent to every member of the Society within the reach of the twopenny post.

Resolved unanimously,

X. That the Resolutions now passed be advertised in the MONTHLY REPOSITORY,—a publication which, for

the support it gives to the cause of free inquiry and religious liberty, is entitled to the countenance of the Unitarian Body, and particularly of this Society.

Resolved unanimously,

XI. That the above Resolutions be advertised also in the principal periodical publications and the newspapers, at the discretion of the Committee.

SAMUEL GOODBEHERE,

Chairman.

John Christie, Esq. having taken the Chair, it was Resolved unanimously,

That the thanks of the Meeting be given to Mr. Alderman Goodbehere for his conduct in the Chair, and for his general support of the rights and liberties of his fellow-citizens and fellow-countrymen of all denominations.

Unitarian Society.

At a Special General Meeting of the Unitarian Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue, by the Distribution of Books, convened for the purpose of taking into consideration the Act lately passed for the "Relief of Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity," holden at the Chapel in Essex Street, July 30, 1813.

The Rev. THOMAS BELSHAM, in the Chair.

The following Resolutions moved by Isaac Solly, Esq. and seconded by Sir Charles Colville, were adopted:

Resolved,

I. That the Members of this Society view with great satisfaction the recent success of a measure, which more than twenty years ago they solicited in vain, though supported by the transcendent abilities of the late Mr. Fox; and they congratulate each other and the friends of civil and religious liberty in general, that by the Bill which has lately passed for the "relief of those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity," persons who profess their dissent from that article of the Established Creed are no longer exposed to severe and ruinous penalties, but are placed under the protection of the law.

II. That the Members of this Society are truly grateful to the Legislature for the liberality and unanimity with which this important measure was received; and for the readiness and alacrity with which, when the original Bill was lost, through a technical informality, a new

and amended Bill was allowed to be introduced; was expedited through the necessary forms, and was passed by both Houses in time to receive the Royal Assent previously to the prorogation of Parliament.

III. That this Society hail the present measure as an auspicious prelude to that happy day, when all penal laws and political restrictions on religious grounds shall be for ever abolished; when an invidious and limited Toleration shall give way to **UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY**; and when all, without distinction, shall be entitled by law to the possession of those civil and political privileges which are the birthright of Britons.

IV. That the thanks of this Society be given to that able and enlightened Member of Parliament, William Smith, Esq. for the generous zeal with which he has stood forward, upon this and many other occasions, to vindicate the rights and liberties of his fellow-subjects, for the promptitude and cheerfulness with which he undertook to introduce this important measure into Parliament; and for the attention and perseverance with which he watched and supported the measure in every stage of its progress, till the Bill, which entitles its author to a conspicuous rank in the honourable records of civil and religious liberty, received the Royal Assent.

V. That the Chairman be desired to communicate these Resolutions of the Society to Mr. Smith.

THOMAS BELSHAM, Chairman.

The Chairman having left the Chair, it was moved by Sir Charles Colville, and seconded by Isaac Solty, Esq.

That the thanks of this Meeting be given to the Rev. T. Belsham for his conduct in the Chair, and for the great zeal which he has on this and every other occasion evinced, both by his exemplary conduct and his masterly writings for the interests of the Christian Religion.

It was then moved by James Young, Esq. and seconded by Sir Charles Colville,

That the thanks of this Society be given to the worthy Secretary, the Rev. J. Joyce, for the promptitude that he evinced in summoning the Meeting upon this important occasion, and for his sincere and zealous discharge of the duties of his situation.

J. JOYCE, Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS adopted at a Meeting of the **KENT and SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION**, held at Northiam, 20th Oct. 1813.

Resolved,

I. That we thus publicly express our gratitude to the great Parent of all good, congratulate each other, and rejoice with the liberal-minded of all denominations, that a bill has been brought into Parliament and passed, so essential to the right of private judgment in religion, and the open avowal of what may result from it; freeing those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity from pains and penalties, and putting them under the protection of the law.

II. That we are highly gratified by the unanimity with which the above Bill passed the two Houses, and received the Royal Assent, flattering ourselves that it will be a prelude to the abolition of all political restrictions and distinctions on the ground of religion.

III. That receiving this fresh act of justice from the Legislature, whilst we relax not our exertions in the defence of the Divine Unity, and of supreme Worship as directed to the *One only living and true God*, we will be, as ever, equally exemplary for a respect to the peace, the good order, the prosperity and happiness of our country.

IV. That the thanks of this Association are due to, and that they be transmitted by the Chairman, with these Resolutions, to W. Smith, Esq. M. P. for his activity, zeal, and perseverance in promoting the above great object.

V. That the thanks of this Meeting are due to the Chairman, for his kind assistance, and able, and impartial conduct in the Chair.

LAWRENCE HOLDEN.

Tenterden, Oct. 21, 1813.

N. B. Transmitted to the Editor of the Repository by the request of the Association.

At a Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society (for promoting the genuine knowledge of the Scriptures and the practice of virtue by the distribution of books), holden at the Unitarian Chapel, Newport, Isle of Wight, the 13th of October, 1813,

THOMAS COOKE, Esq. in the Chair, The following Resolutions, in reference to the Act passed in the last session of Parliament, for the "*Relief of Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity*," were carried unanimously:

RESOLVED,

1. That it is the right of every man to worship God agreeably to the dictates of his conscience, and by all peaceable means to publish and defend his religious opinions, without being subject to any pains, penalties, or privations whatever.

2. That the principles of Religious Liberty, by which this right is recognized, were asserted at the Revolution; and have long been the glory of Englishmen.

3. That nevertheless, in opposition to these principles, persons denying the doctrine of the Trinity were first excluded from the benefits of the Toleration Act, by a clause in that Act itself; and afterwards by the statute of the 6th and 10th of William the Third, it was enacted, "That if any person or persons, having been educated in, or at any time having made profession of the Christian religion within this realm, shall, by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of Divine authority; and shall, upon indictment or information in any of his Majesty's Courts of Westminster or at the assizes, be thereof lawfully convicted by the oath of two or more credible witnesses, such person or persons for the first offence shall be adjudged incapable and disabled in law to all intents and purposes whatsoever, to have or enjoy any office or offices, employment or employments, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, or any part in them, or any profit or advantage appertaining to them, or any of them. And if any person or persons so convicted as aforesaid, shall at the time of his or their conviction, enjoy or possess any office, place, or employment, such office, place, or employment, shall be void; and is hereby declared void. And if such person or persons shall be a second time lawfully convicted as aforesaid, of all or any of the aforesaid crime or crimes, that then he, or they shall from thenceforth be disabled to sue, prosecute, plead, or use any action or information in any court of law or equity, or to be guardian

of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or capable of any legacy or deed of gift, or to bear any office civil or military, or benefice ecclesiastical, for ever within this realm, and shall also suffer imprisonment for the space of three years, without bail or mainprize from the time of such conviction."

4. That we sincerely rejoice in the repeal of these acts as far as they thus affect ourselves, and of others still more severe, as affecting our Unitarian Brethren in Scotland; feeling that both they and we no longer owe our safety to a precarious connivance, but may publicly worship our Maker, and defend our opinions, under the full protection of the laws.

5. That our satisfaction in this legal recognition of our just rights is further increased, when we reflect on the sufferings of persons who in past ages professed sentiments similar to those which we feel it our duty to avow.

6. That we are anxious, in the first place, to express our gratitude to the Almighty Disposer of Events for this signal instance of his protection and favour.

7. That our thanks are likewise due to all those Members of Parliament who were instrumental in obtaining this Act of the legislature in our behalf; particularly to that able and enlightened senator, WILLIAM SMITH, Esq. for his zealous and persevering efforts not only on this occasion, but during a long political life devoted to the cause of civil and religious liberty.

8. That, as disciples of the same Master, we earnestly wish to hail the time when our Catholic brethren shall be exempted from religious restrictions and disabilities; and when all those penal laws, which tend to shackle the mind and enslave the conscience, shall be expunged from the statute book.

9. That these Resolutions be sent for insertion to the Monthly Repository, and advertised in the Times, the Courier and Salisbury Journal.

THOMAS COOKE, Chairman.

10. That the thanks of this meeting be given to Thomas Cooke, Esq. for his able conduct in the Chair.

JOHN FULLAGAR, Secretary.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;
OR*The Christian's Survey of the Political World.*

Events since our last have crowded on us in such a manner as strike with awe and astonishment both the worldly politician and the sincere Christian. The glory of the mighty conqueror is cast down to the ground. His armies have been defeated, and he is returned to his capital a second time to appal his oppressed subjects with the heart-rending intelligence, that the armies of the enemy are approaching their territories, and that they, in their turn, will have to fight for their country and their independence. All Europe bowed not long ago to the nod of this mighty sovereign. He himself at last proclaims from his throne—All Europe is now against us:—and the bold language is held that France and himself would rise superior to every attack. France is likely indeed to see again upon her own soil the troops of a great confederacy, and it has no longer to resist them the mighty energy of soul, which arose from the feelings of liberty and independence breathed into her by the revolution.

Buonaparte was fixed in Dresden, making this place the *point d'appui* of his armies. The main force of the confederates was in Bohemia, and in the North the Crown Prince was at the head of a large army protecting Prussia, and threatening the country on the banks of the Elbe from Leipsic to Hamburgh. Instructed by former disasters the confederates moved with a decided plan to bear down with all their force upon the French in such a manner, as to surround them, and to compel them to fight under every disadvantage. The French Emperor saw through their plan, and was conscious, at the same time, of his own incapacity to render it ineffectual. To remain at Dresden was impossible, and he had already staid too long to give him a chance of extricating himself without immense loss. If he moved forward into Bohemia, the Crown Prince would gain the command of the Elbe, and cut off his retreat. If he marched against the Crown Prince, the confederate emperors would press upon him. To

evacuate Dresden, and forsake the line of the Elbe, and march back into France without a battle, did not suit his lofty spirit, or the difficulties in executing such a plan might appear insuperable. On reviewing the whole there seems to have been vacillations in his mind, and to them probably he may now attribute the extent of his losses. He staid too long at Dresden, either to ensure victory or to make a safe retreat. If he could not fight the battle in Bohemia, it was in vain to expect success, when he was compelled to fight one in Germany against the united armies of his opponents.

On leaving Dresden, Buonaparte took the direction of Leipsic, carrying with him the King of Saxony and his family. The confederate emperors immediately marched their troops after him, and it was soon seen, that the neighbourhood of Leipsic would be signalised by a bloody field, to determine the fate of Europe in this mighty conflict. It is now said, that the arrangement of his troops was not such as might be expected from so experienced a commander: but this question must remain undecided even among military men, till a clearer account is given of the relative position of the armies before the horrible days of combat. Napoleon quitted Dresden on the 5th of October, and after various marches and counter-marches, the armies on both sides found themselves in the neighbourhood of Leipsic on the 16th, when the sanguinary battle began, which was completed on the 18th, with the total overthrow of Buonaparte's army, and the loss of an immense number of men, with nearly all his ammunition, guns and baggage. He is supposed to have lost sixty thousand men in these fatal days, and with the wreck of his army, between seventy and eighty thousand men, he made the best of his way back towards France.

So complete a defeat excited an expectation, that the retreating army might receive considerable molestation in its retreat, and hopes were entertained of the capture of the general.

But the victory was not obtained on the part of the confederates without great loss, and they required time for repose after their fatigues. Hence Buonaparte, by the rapidity of his movements, escaped from the main body of the confederates, and he palliated, in some degree, the disgrace of his defeat, by the victory he claimed over the Austro-Bavarian army, at Hanau. This army, by rapid marches, had followed the course of the Main on its right bank, with a view of intercepting Buonaparte in his flight, and had they been more numerous this battle would have put an end to the conflict. But Buonaparte was still powerful, and his cavalry far exceeded that of his opponents. They were driven from the plains of Hanau towards Aschaffembourg with great loss, and Buonaparte boasted of the trophies which he had gained on that day, and which were sent to Paris to be laid at the feet of the Empress. But the French Emperor did not place much reliance on this success: for he continued his hasty route to Mentz, into which fortress he marched his troops, leaving only on the right bank of the Rhine a sufficient number of troops to guard his camp and fortifications at Cassel.

On the day after the great victory near Leipsic, the confederate emperors with the Crown Prince entered that town. The king of Saxony was there left to make what terms he could with the conquerors, and what will be his fate time must determine. He is now a prisoner to them, and his dominions are under the government of the confederate powers. A striking contrast to his situation about twenty years ago, when he received the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia, and with them formed at Pillnitz the celebrated plan for controlling the power of France! What changes has he not experienced since that time! To France he owed his elevation to the rank of king—to France he owed a great accession of territory. With the humiliation of that country, which he was one of the first to attempt to depress, his own degradation is connected. Whether the confederates will permit him to reign or not, time must shew, yet probably he wanted opportunity only, not inclination, to desert his benefactor.

The triumph of the confederates was not owing entirely either to their bravery, numbers, or to the skill of their arrangements. The conflict might have terminated very differently, if treachery had not palsied the arm of their potent enemy. The German auxiliaries quitted him in the hottest of the conflict, and not only quitted him but turned the edge of their swords against him. It was impossible for him thus situated to pursue any effective plan, and all the skill he was master of, and the bravery of the troops of his own nation, were unable to extricate him on this trying occasion. The complaint of treachery served to diminish his failure in the eyes of his country, but the nations of Europe, wearied with the tyranny under which they have so long groaned, will not view with severity an action, to which they are so much indebted for the prospect of returning liberty.

The intentions of the conquerors with respect to Europe are not yet known. They must have complete possession of the countries, before they determine on their future government; and it remains to be seen, what efforts will be made by the French to regain their late unbounded influence on the continent. The military plans of the confederates are not as yet completely developed. The emperor of Austria has advanced as far as Hanau, and his advanced guard has had some affairs with the French at Cassel. An invasion of the French empire in that quarter may be expected, and as the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine are Germans, they may participate in the sentiments of their brethren on the right, and separate from the government, to which they have been for some time so intimately connected. Here then will be an opening into the territories of what was formerly called France, and the Prussians and Austrians may again try their fortunes on the plains of Champagne. The Crown Prince, who had so great a share in the glory of the battle of Leipsic, marches with his forces through Westphalia into Holland, where the inhabitants have anticipated his wishes, by taking upon themselves the recovery of their liberty and independence.

By being situated in an island we are dependent on the winds for our news from the continent, and at this

interesting period they were singularly unfavourable to us. In fact we received through France the account of Buonaparte's return to his capital, and the victory he had obtained at Hanau. After a long delay a delegation arrived in England from Holland, communicating the welcome news of a great change that had taken place in that country. Holland has been very unhappily circumstanced not only during the revolution, but for some time previous to it. England and Prussia took part in the domestic concerns of that country, by which the party, called the Patriots, were driven out, and the Orange party, gaining the ascendency, exercised in a very wanton manner the superiority it had obtained through foreign influence. The Patriots courted the interference of France, whose cabinet was too much occupied by its own concerns to grant them the relief they requested: but it gave them an asylum, and all the assistance that could be expected without coming to a rupture with the powers that had patronised the Stadtholder. When the French Revolution burst out, the Patriots availed themselves of it for a return into their own country; and then the Stadtholder himself, and a vast body of his adherents, shared a similar fate. They were in their turn driven out, and compelled to find an asylum in Great Britain and Prussia.

Since that time various changes have taken place among them. From a republic they have been converted into a kingdom, the kingdom has been removed, and they have become a province of France. Under French tyranny, the most adverse possible to all their former habits, and particularly to commercial industry, they have long groaned, and it is to be hoped that both Patriots and Orangemen have forgotten their ancient animosities and can unite cordially in support of their common country. The grounds of their variance are not generally known in this country, but they chiefly rest on this,—that one party was continually adding to the influence of the Orange family, whilst the other were for confining the head of it to the offices of Stadtholder and high admiral, within the limits of the law, and agreeably to the republican constitution of the government. At pre-

sent the great point is to get rid of French tyranny, and in this the people seem to be generally united. The chief towns have driven away the French garrisons, and selected from themselves committees for the administration of the government. A delegation has also arrived in this country to communicate with our government and with the Prince of Orange on the subject of the change, and measures were taken to render Holland all the assistance possible. A large force was to be sent thither with the Prince himself at their head, and as in the appointment of committees they looked to those, who were in the government in the year 1793, it is probable that the Prince will be invested in his office with all the powers belonging to it at that time. Already they begin to talk big, and think of the advantage of annexing the Netherlands to the United Provinces, to make a compact government: but they have much to do in forming a good government for themselves, and it is to be hoped that time has cooled their animosities, and that both parties, having smarted so long under a most oppressive tyranny, will learn to forget and forgive, and to unite in liberal concessions to each other for the good of the commonwealth.

The arrival of Buonaparte in his capital spread consternation over his kingdom, but nothing has openly appeared to indicate a decline in his authority. He has met his Conservative Senate, and has received addresses of a similar nature to those that are offered to crowned heads on the eve of their descent from the throne. He did not disguise the extent of the calamity that had befallen him, and his nation, in very plain language, pointed out the apprehensions they were under of an invasion of their country, and the necessity there was for every Frenchman arming in defence of its independence, and his own property. The example of Poland (that wicked act of original jacobinism) was held out to them, as a presage of what they might expect. The powers which partitioned Poland, were advancing into France, and without the utmost energy in defence of their common country, the horrors of Warsaw might, under another Suwarrow, be exhibited in its capital. A con-

scription of three hundred thousand men was enacted, and several financial edicts passed, which proved the distress to which the Emperor was brought, and it is evident, that whatever may be the success of the confederate powers, it will be impossible, for some time for him to rise from his abject situation, much less to attain to that height, from which it is to be hoped he is irrecoverably fallen. When on the banks of the Niemen he surveyed his gallant army, he proudly anticipated glorious triumphs, and additions to his coffers. All that he had accumulated has been lost in the last effort, and the countries whence he derived his resources, are falling from him. To proper France he must now look for support, and even in that country there may still be a feeling for liberty, which it will be impossible to keep under. There are forms sufficient by which the French may make known their sentiments, and this change may be as beneficial to them as to the rest of Europe. It is an awful time, and we shall see whether the late judgments have made the proper impression on the hearts of sovereigns and people. Both had much to learn, and the severe chastisement inflicted on them will, it is to be hoped, bring both to a proper sense of their duty, and teach them equally true loyalty, and a due sense of their situation in that dispensation of God, which authoritatively commands kings and people to become obedient to their common Saviour, the Prince of Peace.

The news of this wonderful change in the affairs of Europe was brought to England on the eve of the opening of the sessions of parliament, and afforded noble scope for the speech of the Prince Regent. The sentiments contained in it could not but be satisfactory to the whole nation: There was no presumptuous elevation, no degrading expressions on the fallen: "no disposition to require from France sacrifices of any description inconsistent with her honour or just pretensions as a nation;" and

this sentiment was equally ascribed to the allies. Peace was looked to as the great blessing to be derived, but that could not be attained without farther exertions, and great pecuniary supplies were necessary for the subsidies to the allies. The war with America was lamented, and a readiness expressed to enter into discussion with that government for a conciliatory adjustment of all the differences between the two powers, on principles of perfect reciprocity, not inconsistent with the established maxims of public law, and with the maritime rights of the British empire.

Addresses were voted in both houses with great cordiality, which were followed by the grant of a large loan, and by new regulations respecting the militia, to render them more efficient in the great contest. Party seemed to be quite asleep, and joyful as such an event must be, it rendered the sittings of the houses less interesting, less occupied by debates. One subject engaged their attention, which materially affects the clergy, who have lately been harassed by *qui tam* actions, brought against them by an informer, who, from his late situation of bishop's secretary, enjoyed particular opportunities for his purposes. The plan was to derive an immense sum in fines from the clergy, who had not complied strictly to the letter of an act of parliament respecting residence; but, the informer seems likely to be foiled; for a bill has been brought into parliament to stop all proceedings under that act, till the month of April, within which time, it is to be presumed, that some better regulations will be made to enforce the views of the legislature, without subjecting the clergy to the mercy of a common informer. It would seem strange, that the army and navy should be kept to their duty by *qui tam* actions, and it is equally absurd that the clergy should be exposed to them. They are all equally officers under the civil power, and may all be equally regulated by their superiors in their respective departments.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The length of some of the Miscellaneous Articles has quite excluded the Review.

The Memoir of Mr. Bealey in our next Number.

We have the melancholy task of announcing to our readers the death of the Rev. SAMUEL PALMER, of Hackney, whose Memoir of Dr. Ashworth, and whose name, in another communication, appears in the present number. He died Sunday morning, the 28th inst, after a very short illness.