

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XCVIII.

FEBRUARY.

[Vol. IX.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Brief Memoir of the late Rev. Samuel Palmer.

[From his Funeral Sermon by the
Rev. Thomas N. Toller, of Kettering.]

The Rev. SAMUEL PALMER was born at Bedford in the year 1741. He received the rudiments of his education at the free grammar school in that town, and was brought up under the ministry of Mr. Sanderson, an eminently pious and able dissenting minister there. Discovering a thoughtful and serious disposition betimes, he was greatly noticed by that gentleman, whose affection for him and care of him were truly paternal; and I have heard him speak with tears of gratitude and veneration of Mr. Sanderson, as one of the most amiable and excellent of men. Mr. Palmer became a member of the church at Bedford at an early age, and having completed his grammar education, he removed to the dissenting academy at Daventry at the age of fifteen years, and passed through the usual course of study, under the tuition of the truly learned and respectable Dr. Ashworth. At the close of his studies he removed hither [Hackney], in the year 1762, and became as-

VOL. IX.

sistant to Mr. Hunt, the successor of a Barker, a Henry, and a Bates, whose praise is in all the churches. While Mr. Hunt was able to preach, Mr. Palmer undertook the morning service at the Weigh-House in London, in connection with Dr. Langford; but on Mr. Hunt's being laid aside, our friend became pastor of this society; and here, through the good providence of God, he has been enabled, with unremitting diligence, and with little interruption from ill-health, to exercise his ministry during the protracted period of more than fifty years. Soon after his settlement in 1766, he entered into the conjugal union, the consequence of which has been a numerous progeny, a large majority of which have had the painful, though in some sense honourable opportunity of dropping the filial tear into their father's grave.

As to the manner in which your minister has conducted himself, and discharged the various duties of his office, ye are witnesses and God also, how holily, justly, and in an essential sense, unblameably, he has behaved himself among you, exhorting, comforting, and charging every one of you, as a

L

father does his children. In respect to his general qualifications for his office, it would ill become me to give a public and decided opinion; but surely thus far I may go, that it was manifest to his acquaintance, his hearers, and the public, that those qualifications were highly respectable, and fully adequate to the general calls of his office. He was distinguished by a remarkably clear and lucid understanding, a solid judgment, and a sound discriminating talent on all subjects within his sphere. He possessed a very reputable share of information on the topics of general literature. It was evident that he had attained to eminence in biblical knowledge, and that he had more than a common acquaintance with the most approved and useful writers, both ancient and modern, especially on sacred subjects. He was particularly attached to, and conversant with, the writings of the most eminent of the puritan divines of the two former centuries. He was likewise well versed in the controversies which compose what is called polemical divinity. He had an intimate insight into the human heart, and was exceedingly well informed as to the knowledge of the world, of men and things; at least in the important and useful sense of that expression.

As a *preacher*, his manner was grave and dignified, calm and serious; his pronunciation easy and natural; his prayers simple and devotional, interspersed copiously with apt quotations from scripture, and partaking of a reasonable and desirable degree of compass and variety. He never seemed to lose the possession of himself, or the command of his

voice, or to lose sight of his subject, or for a moment to forget the great business in which he was engaged. If his delivery wanted any thing, it was what nature seemed constitutionally to have denied him, viz. *animation*; and yet on certain subjects, and certain occasions, it appeared that he could feel, and make others feel too. I have seen a considerable proportion of a congregation in tears, under the tenderness and pathos of his representations.

His public discourses were not much distinguished by magnificence of style, elegance of diction, eloquence of description, commanding appeals to the passions or the conscience, or abstruse profundity of thought; but they always appeared to me to be characterized by a vein of instructive, serious, scriptural good sense: they were the addresses of a wise and pious man, seriously conversing with his surrounding flock, and "reasoning with them out of the scriptures;" calculated not so much to strike the careless, as to inform and improve the well-disposed, listening hearer. His treatment of sacred subjects was remarkably perspicuous; his ideas were well arranged; and few ministers knew better what thoughts belonged to a subject, or succeeded better in putting them in their proper place.

His *theological* sentiments, I have no doubt, were prevailingly evangelical, in the usual acceptance of that word, though at the same time distant from all extremes: I suppose much in the line with the excellent Doddridge, whose character and memory I know he most highly revered.

Though I am not sufficiently acquainted with the subordinate articles of his creed, to produce a regular enumeration of them (were that proper,) yet I am persuaded that the supreme object of his ministry was to secure and establish the grand, fundamental interests of *grace* and *holiness* in the constitution of the gospel, in their mutual necessity, harmony, and consistency; laying the foundation of human hope in the sovereignty of divine mercy, through the mediation of the great Redeemer, in inseparable connection with that "holiness without which no man can see the Lord;" "testifying to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ," in conjunction with "doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God." Here I am confident he rested his own soul, and hither he wished to lead his hearers; while, with respect to the various topics of theological discussion, he had a mind as open to conviction as most men, and as little under the undue bias of education and prejudice as most. He freely thought for himself, and was disposed to pursue truth wherever it should lead him. His "Sermons on Truth" convey, perhaps, as fair a specimen of the state of his own mind, in this respect, as could be given. Though he could hardly be said to have enlisted himself under the banner of any particular religious party, yet I am sure I go not a step too far in saying, that he was a cordial lover of good men, of all parties: he could see and appreciate true worth wherever it appeared, under any external name, and through all the shades of varying opinion.

With respect to the substantial exercises of Christian beneficence, he discovered less of littleness of partiality to those of his own views than most men I ever knew. He had indeed, formed a very extensive acquaintance amongst different classes and denominations of Christians, and had acquired, by his liberal and friendly spirit, a large share of general respect amongst them all.

It is well known, that though descended from a member of the established church, he was not only a decided but a strenuous nonconformist—a dissenter, properly speaking, from principle. Indeed, the most popular works he ever published, which had the greatest spread, and perhaps produced the greatest effect, were on the subject of dissent from the established church. Yet, though he treated the subject with the firmness of a man, and the faithfulness of a conscientious Christian; nevertheless, bitterness and wrath, and illiberality, cannot justly be attributed to him towards the established church of his country, its ministers or members; as an evidence of which, it appears that he was upon as intimate terms of friendship with, and as highly respected by, many most respectable clergymen, and private members of the establishment, as any dissenting minister in the kingdom.

As an author, his works have been numerous, though not very voluminous; and a considerable proportion of them not altogether original compositions, but compilations, and abridgments of the writings of others. None of them can be classed amongst profound treatises on metaphysical subjects,

or discussions of nice points in theology, or popular representations of favourite subjects in the religious world; or indeed in any way calculated to fascinate the public attention, and obtain an extensive spread: yet all his publications have one grand character, viz. a manifest tendency to usefulness, and for the most part religious improvement; and it may be said, that he has never sent a single pamphlet into the world, but what was adapted to make men wiser and better, and would make any man so, if read with attention and candour, and, to a certain amount, has produced that effect.

While his mind was studious and active, he did not confine his exertions to his study, his pen, or his pulpit: he was a man formed for various species of public utility; hence, from a knowledge of his worth and ability, he was chosen, in several instances, as a supporter or trustee to institutions of general importance; for the discharge of the duties of which his judgment, caution, and benevolent activity, admirably qualified him. He was the father of the Sunday schools established in this place, and the zealous friend of others of similar tendency. Indeed he was never backward to lend a helping hand to any good work; at the same time, I have often thought, that in the capacity of a *private friend* was exhibited his most shining character. He was a *visiting* friend among his hearers, especially when such visits are most likely to be useful, viz. in seasons of affliction. He entered into, and sympathized with, the sorrows of the distressed: he had a tear to drop at the tale of woe, and

a cordial to send to the chamber of sickness. As the distributor of public charities, the almoner of the bounties of others, and in the beneficent communication of his own property, he felt the truth of the maxim, and acted upon its reality, viz. that it is "more blessed to give than to receive." Since the day of his departure from the academy, he has been the affectionate adviser and patron of students and young ministers, who looked up to him as a father, and a most kind and attentive friend and helper to his poorer brethren in the ministry.

It is now about forty-two years since I first saw him: the condescending frankness and familiarity of his behaviour attracted my heart; from that day, I believe, a mutual attachment took place, which has continued, without a moment's interruption, to this time. He was one of the oldest, most judicious, steady, faithful, and affectionate friends, I ever had. Though there was a "freedom of speech," which he sometimes used in his intercourse with his friends, which, to a stranger, had the appearance of harshness, yet they who knew him best were the least affected by those seeming severities, knowing the honesty and goodness of his heart. For myself, I have lost the friend of my right hand; and my inclination would almost lead me, on this occasion, to leave this pulpit, and take my station in yonder pew, mingling my tears with the fatherless and the widow in that bereaved family.

Though he had lived beyond the age of man, yet his death might be said, in a sense, to be premature, sudden and unexpected.

ed. Blessed with a sound constitution, unimpaired by intemperance, he seemed built for several future years: his mental powers retained their vigour, and his natural strength was little abated; but infinite wisdom fixed the bounds of his habitation, and appointed his lot on earth. Many merciful circumstances have attended his removal. In point of extent of duration, he had lived quite as long as a wise man would choose to live, if he dared to choose at all; and yet he had not lived long enough to become a burden or trial to his friends, or a cumber-ground in society. He had not lived so as to outlive his usefulness; preaching, without difficulty, on one Lord's day, and taking his flight into eternity early on the morning of the next. And when he did die, he died in the faith and hope and peace of a Christian; in the bosom of his family, amidst the tears and benedictions of his friends, the regret of a large proportion of Christian churches, and the unfeigned respect of a very extensive neighbourhood. His qualities and virtues not being of a showy, dazzling description, but intrinsic and substantial, will probably secure permanence of recollection and respect, by their solidity; and therefore I venture to predict, that his fame will last longer than that of many of more noisy and popular name; nay, that he will be more honoured after his death, than during his life. "The memory of the just is blessed." "The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance."

As to the peaceful state of mind in which he died, I have but little

evidence to produce, arising from what fell from his lips; but what I have to produce amounts to the contents of volumes, because from thence it appears probable, that, strictly and literally speaking, the last day of his life was, in point of mental and spiritual happiness, the most blessed of any in his whole earthly existence. After taking some refreshment, he repeated the language of the apostle, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," &c. Observing towards evening that the whole had been a very comfortable day to him, both in body and mind, he said that he could subscribe to Mr. Henry's remark (of whom he talked much), that "a life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the happiest life of any in the world," and which, said he, no one ever repented. Upon its being observed to him, that his mind appeared perfectly serene, he replied, "Religion, religion is all in all; nothing without it." He often said, "It is finished;—my work is done—our only mediator;" and it is a remarkable fact, that realizing views of the mediatorial character of Christ seemed to fill his soul with sacred joy, particularly in the repetition of that passage, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." The text also of his last sermon was frequently repeated, and seemed to be deeply enjoyed—"His commandments are not grievous." He often appeared engaged in prayer, uttered sentences only imperfectly heard, and at length, in

the most perfect composure, departed without a struggle. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

*Supplementary Hints to the late
Mr. Palmer's Memoir of
Dr. Ashworth.*

(Continued from p. 12.)

The improvement of his pupils was an object not only proposed, but as far as fidelity and pains might hope for divine blessing, was little less than secured. He was not satisfied with pressing forward to this mark, but he grasped the prize. A lecture was a serious business: what the tutor had assiduously prepared, and what his charge could not without notice neglect. The subject of delivery on one day, was the subject of examination on another. Such questions were proposed and such replies expected, as would presently decide on the attention first bestowed on his statement and the attention which it afterwards received. Occasional as well as frequent inadvertence was marked. His omission of a lecture would surprise and almost startle his own and all the other classes. Sharp attacks of the gout did not long suspend his labours. Often have his pupils been under the painful necessity of going through (perhaps rather going over) long demonstrations amid his extorted moans, which sadly disturbed and confused mathematical harmonies. When crowded by the demands of his correspondents, he has attempted to write letters while conducting a Hebrew lecture, which would admit of absence of regular thought better than the discussion

of abstruse science: but the doctor did not appear to possess the capacity of dictating to three amanuenses on distinct subjects, at the same instant. He frequently tore and burned what he then wrote. Though sufficiently authoritative, and sometimes imperious, he did not impose his peculiar sentiments on his pupils. On most subjects it was easy to conjecture to what side he inclined, but in positively ascertaining it there might be some difficulty. Freedom of inquiry was left unrestrained. Truth was considered as having the sole right to control. Study is often curtailed by implicitly embracing the opinion of a superior, and imposition successfully practised on a superficial lecturer by the compliment he has flattered himself he receives by such acquiescence. Some young men will labour more to conceal their defects than to make proficiency. In consequence of thus mildly and fully bringing out the whole of a controversy, there was never, or scarcely ever, a bigotted student, or a dogmatical, censorious preacher. Possibly owing to such candour in the tutors, for all pursued the same judicious course, habits of friendship and kindness prevailed through the house, and were fondly cherished by all the members after their departure. "Ye are all brethren," it was unnecessary to inculcate, and even the pupils who had other objects in view (literary, professional, or commercial) but who generally were as circumspect and exemplary as those designed for the Christian ministry, were equally sympathetic and affectionate.

He did not excel in the happy art of giving a charm to a subject.

Truth, as it is, was sufficient for himself; and he seemed to think that no more should be required by others. In the same vessel with which he drew out of the well, he distributed; as if what was so precious and refreshing, needed not the recommendation of the glittering urn. Taste, as a distinct faculty and habit, he did not much cultivate. The rhetoric of Mr. Burke did not meet his fancy. For him, there was too little thought, too much flourish: and had he been a senator, Lord North rather than Mr. Fox would have been his model. He was more the discriminating judge than the voluble pleader, and of our late judges he would more have resembled Lord Kenyon than his highly polished predecessor. Paul and Demosthenes were his favourite orators. In no men did energy of sentiment and diction better correspond and more closely adhere. Of Cicero he did not speak with warm admiration, though so much distinguished for refinement of thought and language, for perspicuity, precision, ardour, occasional vehemence, and for all that a philosopher, a poet, an orator whether civil or sacred, the consul, the tribune, the judge, the advocate can depict as calculated for instruction or pleasure, for warning, for soothing, for controuling every passion and arresting every thought. Cicero's art and address preponderated against these immortal accomplishments: at least, excited a prejudice in his mind, which, if it did not disqualify him for criticising such an author, probably indisposed him to peruse his pages with sufficient attention. But

though not always alive to beauties, no genius ever more quickly discerned defects. A mixed metaphor quite distressed him. Synonymous terms had the same effect, such as "valuable and important," "much wanted and very seasonable," "solemn and weighty," "distressed and sorrowful." He read with great propriety, yet his acumen in regard to pause and emphasis and cadence were only by a few observed. He could shew others what to avoid, not always exemplifying what was graceful. He rather checked than animated; and his pupils were in common diffident, fearful, backward, where they could decline, yielding to others rather than obtruding themselves. The character of the academy in this respect varied under Dr. Doddridge and his successor; the one spurring on, the other reining in; the one prompting, the other cautioning. Under Dr. Doddridge, there was a more popular exterior; under Dr. Ashworth, a more disciplined interior. It is difficult for a young man to restrain his ardour without being depressed, and a tutor should proceed under this impression. The rule is easy, but the practice is not general. As a tutor should not say, Like a rock defy the waves,—neither should he represent him as a vessel to be always "tossed with tempests." The most skilful pilot may notice with alarm some clouds and some seas, and may dread to leave the port. Though experience will not warrant this encouragement, The skies will never again frown, the night never again be long, the elements are

now hushed and all obstructions vanish. Neither will experience justify a tutor in this address,—“Son, go work to-day in the vineyard. In the sweat of thy brow” cut thy way through these hedges of briars and thorns, and the spot will not then be cleared; every step will require the same toil, and the green pastures and still waters will recede from thy view the more thou seemest to advance. To this extreme Dr. Ashworth rather veered, through jealousy of that conceit and presumption which expose the young to so many snares.

To decorum of conduct he was minutely attentive. Paul’s maxim was his motto—“Abstain from the appearance of evil.” A newspaper was never seen in the family on the sabbath: once, indeed, it was produced by his order, when a bill was in parliament relating to the Dissenters, and there was much anxiety about the division. But as soon as the desired satisfaction was obtained, the servant was again called to place it, for the day, on its usual shelf. His discretion was manifest in the affairs of the town, being not meddling nor tardy, not officious but public-spirited. The town is what is called *high*, but the principal gentlemen could not refrain from attending his successor’s sermon on his decease; not sitting, however, within the walls of the meeting-house, though they walked through the aisles to select their station. Somewhat questionable was his discretion in submitting to the mandate of a curate, by retiring from the front to the rear of the funeral train of a poor old woman.

But the professor of Hebrew, (honoured as such by a bishop who had himself occupied a Hebrew chair) the professor of theology and mathematics did not choose to hazard a violation of the solemnities of a grave by entering on a contest, in which surely he could not dread disparity. In little things, as they are commonly esteemed, he was not negligent. The apparently trivial circumstance of dress escaped not his eye, justly reasoning that where the habit of carelessness appeared, its influence might affect the mind as well as the person. His pecuniary transactions in the family, the academy, the meeting, in point of receipt and disbursement, economy and charity, were on the same scale by which his other concerns and pursuits were regulated. All could be seen through in a moment.

His piety partook of his characteristic qualities. It was solid, not assuming; it was steady, not dazzling. His surviving friends (so fast following him, now, to the valley of the shadow of death) do not boast, “I ne’er shall look on like again,” but the recollection of his life and labours is always accompanied with this honourable and useful reflection, “Being dead, he yet speaketh.”

*Brief Memoir of the late Rev. John Simpson.**

The Rev. JOHN SIMPSON was the youngest son of Nathaniel and

* Taken from the following funeral sermons, viz.

1. “*A Tribute to the Memory of the Rev. John Simpson*,” contained in a Sermon delivered at the Unitarian Chapel

Elizabeth Simpson, respectable inhabitants of the town of Leicester, where he was born, March, 1745—6.† He was descended from ancestors distinguished by their love of civil and religious liberty, one of whom, the Rev. John Woodhouse [Noncon. Memor. 8vo. 2nd. ed. iii. 107, &c.] surrendered his prospects in the religious establishment of his country, at the call of conscience, being one of the memorable band of confessors who were ejected from the Church of England (1662), by the Bartholomew Act.

His parents devoting him early to the work of the ministry, young Simpson was placed, 1754, under the care of Mr. John Aikin, [afterwards D. D.] who kept a flourishing school at Kibworth, in Leicestershire; and on his removal to take charge of the Academy at Warrington, 1758, was sent to Market Harborough. In 1760, the pupil followed his tutor, to Warrington, and there entered upon a course of education for the ministry amongst the Protestant Dissenters, under this most respectable divine, aided by Dr. Priestley, Mr. Seddon, and Mr. Holt. Of the great advantages of this academical institution, the

reader may form an accurate judgment by consulting the *Historical Account* of it by an able, discriminating pen, in our last Volume.‡ No one knew better how to avail himself of these advantages than our student; and his attachment to his tutors was in proportion to the benefits he received from them; of Dr. Aikin he always spoke in the warmest terms of admiration,|| and his regard for Dr. Priestley continued to the last.

From Warrington, Mr. Simpson went in 1765, to the University of Glasgow, where he spent two years: in this ancient seat of learning he attended the lectures of the able, pious, and candid Dr. Leechman,§ principal of the

† May we presume to remind our valuable correspondent V. F. that his promised continuation of this subject is anxiously looked for by many of our readers?

‡ The plan of Dr. Aikin's tuition, as described by Mr. Simpson, is given by V. F. Vol. VIII. p. 166, 7.

§ The following character of Dr. Leechman, by Dr. Wodrow, in the Life of him prefixed to his posthumous Sermons, in two Vols. 8vo. 1789, will gratify such as take an interest in theological history:—

“Dr. Leechman was qualified, beyond most men, to be a successful teacher and defender of truth. His love of it was pure and warm; yet this generous warmth was strictly guarded by the modesty of his own mind, and never betrayed him into any harsh or indecent language towards those whose opinions he could not but consider as hostile to truth and to the best interests of mankind. He was as free as any man I ever knew, from bigotry, or an improper attachment to any systems of Theology or Philosophy, that of Hutcheson his beloved friend not excepted. He was, to all appearance, equally candid with the justly admired Lardner: and though his reading or learning was considerably inferior to that prodigy of knowledge, yet it was still very exten-

in Bath, on Sunday, August 29, 1813. By Joseph Hunter. Crutwell, Bath; Johnson, London. 1s. 6d.” 8vo

2. “*The Instructive Remembrance of Departed Worth.* A Sermon preached at Mill-Hill Chapel, in Leeds, on Sunday, Sept. 5, 1813, on occasion of the death of the Rev. John Simpson. Also, an Address, delivered at the end of the Funeral Service, on Tuesday, Aug 31; and a Memoir of his Life, &c. &c. By the Rev. Thomas Jervis. Johnson.” 8vo. 2s.

† Mr. Hunter says, “on the 19th of March;” Mr. Jervis, “on the 30th.”

College, a rank which includes the office of divinity professor. Here, as before at Warrington,

size, especially in the historical, moral and theological branches. He had perhaps more original genius, and force of mind than Lardner. He had a most remarkable talent of selecting what was most important or most striking on every subject he handled; so that his arguments were never specious, but solid; not founded on speculations, but facts; urged, at the same time, with a degree of warmth which carried the hearers along with him; for they were addressed equally to the judgment and to the heart. In fine, the exertion of these distinguished talents was stimulated and heightened by a spirit of manly devotion, which he never concealed, but gave way to, on all proper occasions: and though the effects of this were transient on many, yet it left such impressions on some minds as will never be entirely effaced.

Dr. Leechman's fame and success as a teacher, was such as might be expected from such talents and virtues. The Divinity Hall at Glasgow was crowded in his time with a greater number of scholars than any other in Scotland. His labours there contributed to encrease the rising reputation of that University, and did eminent service to the church; especially by inspiring young minds with an ardour for truth, cherishing a spirit of enquiry after it, and diffusing rational and liberal sentiments of religion in that corner of the country. Even the young men designed for the ministry among the seceders, who are considered as the most rigid sect in Scotland, attended Dr. Leechman's lectures in considerable numbers; and thus manifested a thirst for knowledge, and a liberality of mind, which did them much honour. Many ingenious young men from England and Ireland attended his lectures, and improved under his tuition, several of whom have since distinguished themselves both among the Dissenters and in the Church. His numerous scholars, however they might differ in their sentiments of speculative theology and church government, were all cordially united in their affection and veneration for their old master, imbibed early and retained to the last."

Life, &c. pp. 68-71.

his studies were various; but theology was his favourite pursuit, and "no less from inclination, than from a sense of professional duty, he made every thing subserve to his advancement in that science, the most important of all the sciences."† Under the eminent tutors, before named, at both places, he laid the foundation of that eminence to which he afterwards attained in theological knowledge.

To the latest period of his life, he rejoiced that he had been so early led to those studies which belong peculiarly to the ministerial character; and especially that he had been in circumstances to pursue theological truth, not only unbiassed by professional interest but also unfettered by subscription to articles of faith. His regard to this last point was strongly manifested in his solicitude to ascertain what was the truth, when a few years ago it was intimated to him by a friend, that when he was admitted a student in the University of Glasgow, he had subscribed to certain articles of religion, incorporated with the statutes of that learned society. It turned out, much to his satisfaction, that his friend had been misinformed.‡

From the period of his leaving Glasgow (1767) Mr. Simpson

Dr. Wodrow states (p. 71.), that in 1744, Dr. (then Mr.) Leechman visited London, and was introduced to Lardner, Benson, and other eminent men among the dissenters: he adds, that he afterwards commenced an acquaintance and correspondence with Dr. Price, and that between these two excellent men, a sincere friendship continued through life.

† Mr. Hunter's Sermon, pp. 11, 12.

‡ Id. Note, p. 19.

passed his time chiefly amongst his family connections at Leicester, still prosecuting his private studies with diligence, till April, 1772, when he first settled at Nottingham, as joint minister with the learned and eloquent Mr. George Walker, of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters, assembling in the chapel at the High Pavement in that town. From hence in 1777, he removed to Walthamstow, where he became pastor of the congregation of Dissenters in that place which had enjoyed the joint services of Mr. Farmer and Mr. Radcliffe. With this congregation, however, his connection lasted only two years; and he never afterwards entered into the pastoral relation, though he continued to preach occasionally, to the end of life.

In the year 1780 Mr. Simpson married Mrs. Frances Watson, relict of ——— Watson, Esq. of Cottingham, near Hull, and only daughter and heiress of Mr. Thomas Woodhouse, of Gainsborough, to whom he was previously related. By this lady he obtained a respectable fortune. They lived most happily together, first at Cottingham, then at Little Woodhouse, near Leeds, and lastly, at Leeds, till the latter end of the year 1789, when she was taken from him by death.

The tie which bound him to his former residence being broken, Mr. Simpson removed in 1791, to Bath, where he resided, useful, happy, and respected, till the day of his death, Wednesday, August 18, 1812. On the 31st of that month, he was interred, at his own desire, in the same vault which he had prepared upwards of three and twenty years before

for Mrs. Simpson, Mr. Jervis performing the funeral rites, a last and melancholy office of friendship.

Mr. Simpson has left one son, Mr. John Woodhouse Simpson, of Rearsby, in Leicestershire.

The talents of Mr. Simpson as a preacher, if not of the highest class, appear to have been truly respectable; but as an author he has obtained no mean rank amongst those that have illustrated and defended the Christian religion. His first work, which appeared soon after his retirement from ministerial engagements, was, "An Essay to shew that Christianity is best conveyed in the Historic Form," displaying both ingenuity and ability. A still more important publication was "The View of the Internal and Presumptive Evidences of Christianity," of which an anonymous correspondent in the Bath Chronicle, said to be a liberal and enlightened clergyman, pronounces "that it is a most useful, masterly and excellent performance; and may be ranked, in merit and value, with the moral demonstrations of the verity of our holy faith, elaborated by the deep erudition and rare sagacity of Jeremy Taylor and John Locke, Dr. Lardner, Samuel Clarke, and Archdeacon Paley."* Of the "Essays on the Language of Scripture," the ample Review in our last Volume (pp. 600, 677, 792), will have enabled the reader to judge for himself: some of the positions may be unsound, some of the criticisms not sufficiently authorized, some of the conclusions too general, but

* *Mr. Hunter's Sermon. Note, pp. 17, 18.*

the mode and temper of investigation, the solid learning, the ingenuity, and even the originality, the genuine reverence for scripture, which the Essayist has displayed, will secure a permanent place for his volumes in every theological library, and keep his name familiar to the biblical student.

It is pleasing to consider this venerable Christian employing his closing days upon the sacred volume, for the Essays were his last, as, in our judgment, they are his best work; and it is peculiarly edifying to find both his biographers attesting that his veneration of the Bible increased with his examination of it.* The legitimate office of scriptural criticism is to discover truth, and its proper, if not its invariable, effect is devotion.

Mr. Simpson engaged in several controversies on subjects connected with his studies and profession, as will appear from the catalogue of his writings subjoined to this memoir. "They were all conducted with that temper and moderation which became the gentleman and the Christian. Even Mr. Wakefield, who boasted that in controversy "he knew no man after the flesh" laid down his "strong and sharp incision pen" when encountering Mr Simpson. After wishing, in the apostolic language, peace and mercy to all who walk according to such a rule as Mr. Simpson had followed, he declares, "without the malignity of fictitious praise and with the truest cordiality, I recommend this sermon to the perusal of all

interested in our controversy, as a very temperate, sensible and elegant performance; such as might be expected from an author, who had before ascertained his competency for the discussion of these subjects by an excellent work, if I rightly recollect, on the *Historical Conveyance of the Gospels.*"†

"In his theological creed," Mr. Simpson "was an Unitarian in the largest sense of the word. And, agreeably to the enlightened, conscientious and general consistency of his character, his speculative belief inspired him with the most genuine sentiments of a rational piety and an elevated devotion; for he was a most constant, humble and sincere worshipper of the One God and Father, in the name of Jesus Christ, his holy and beloved servant.‡"

Mr. Simpson rejoiced exceedingly in the publication of the Improved Version,¶ a measure so conformable to the course of his own studies. Both Mr. Hunter§ and Mr. Jervis|| bear testimony to his zeal for truth; the former asserts that "he sought its success by every means," though the latter declares that there were some methods of promoting it which did not accord with his judgment, and these he seems to explain to be controversial and missionary preaching.†† It is na-

† "See Mr. Wakefield's General Reply to the Arguments against the Enquiry into Public Worship, p. 29." —Mr. Hunter's Ser. Note, p. 31.

‡ Mr. Jervis's Ser. p. 18.

¶ Mr. Hunter's Ser. pp. 19, 20.

§ P. 30. || P. 20.

†† The language of Mr. Jervis on these topics requires notice. He says,

* Mr. Hunter's Ser. pp. 25, 27, Mr. Jervis's Ser. pp. 17, 18.

tural that every man should lay most stress upon his own means of usefulness: Mr. Simpson's was the press: but we cannot see why the different means may not be

of his deceased friend, "No man was ever more zealous for the spread and propagation of truth, although he differed from many *worthy* persons in his view of the methods most proper and efficient for this important purpose. He was not impelled by the sanguine temper of a restless activity, a fanatical impatience to compass sea and land in order to make proselytes." (p. 20.)

—This would seem to be the temper of the worthy persons from whom Mr. Simpson differed! Yet we beg leave to remind Mr. Jervis that he himself would not have explained the difference, or justified his standing aloof from certain plans of religious activity, *in such terms*. We write, in the distinct recollection of a conversation with the deceased on this very point, when we venture to assert, that he would not have rebuked uncandidly what he thought immoderate zeal, or have violently enforced moderation and quietness.—Mr. Jervis adds, "Nor was it his practice to preach polemical sermons. Controversial subjects he considered as the proper province of the press rather than the pulpit. The time commonly occupied in this place, he thought might be more profitably applied to the purposes of general instruction, of consoling and animating the hearers, of inculcating upon their minds just and rational notions of God, and of their duty, and imparting to them the true spirit of the gospel." (*ib.*) Upon this we might ask, how "instruction" can be "general" but by being particular? and how "just and rational notions of God" can be successfully taught without removing such notions of God (and in Mr. Simpson's judgment, in Mr. Jervis's, and in our's, the popular notions are such) as are unreasonable and unscriptural? But it will be sufficient to remark, in order to shew that Mr. Simpson's authority is not adverse to controversial sermons, that the only sermon which he published was controversial! (See No. 3, of his Writings.)

consistently adopted by the same person, and why he may not avail himself equally of the press and of the pulpit, and not merely of the regular, canonical pulpit, but also of that which convenience consecrates for the occasion.

We have it not in our power to enumerate Mr. Simpson's more particular friends, which as it would be a most pleasant, so also is it a most useful office of biography; but we have the authority of Mr. Jervis† for saying that he was in habits of occasional and friendly intercourse with Dr. Stock, Bishop of Waterford, who translated from the Hebrew originals the book of Job and the book of Isaiah: these two venerable persons closed their lives, which had been directed to nearly the same objects, about the same time, Dr. Stock|| dying on Sunday, the 15th of August, and Mr. Simpson on the Wednesday following.

Mr. Simpson appears to have attained to a very rare degree of moral and Christian excellence. He was held in general esteem; the rich reward of his various virtues. He was firm in his principles, steady in his conduct, and courteous in his manners; modest, humble, affectionate, disinterested and generous. "His life was innocence—his end was peace. When he approached the close of his mortal career, his disease, in its first attack, was unexpected, sudden and alarming; in its progress to its fatal termination, rapid and awfully affecting. Providentially, his suf-

† Ser. Note. p. 50.

|| We should be extremely obliged to any of our correspondents who would favour us with a Memoir of this learned and amiable prelate.

fering was light; nor did his native composure desert him in his utmost need.—His mind was firm, his faculties sound, his reason clear, his temper serene, without any overshadowing cloud of despondency or grief. All was calm and collected and patient and resigned and consistent to the last. He left this world without a murmur, a groan or a sigh, and entered into peace."†

Mr. Simpson wrote

I. (1782) An Essay to shew that Christianity is best conveyed in the Historic Form. 12mo. Leeds.

II. (1786) An Abstract of the Gospel History in Scriptural Language. 12mo. Leeds. N.B. This was reprinted for the use of Sunday schools.

III. (1792) Christian Arguments for Social Worship, a Sermon before Dissenting Ministers at Bristol, April 13, 1792; published by request. 8vo. Bath.

IV. (1793) Civil Mandates for Days of Public Worship no Argument for not joining in it. 8vo. Bath.

V. (1793) A Form of Public Prayer for the Lord's Day. 8vo. Private.

VI. (1794) A Reply to the Rev. Mr. Williams's Answer to an Essay, shewing that Civil Mandates, &c. 8vo.

VII. (1795) Essay on Religious Fasting and Humiliation. 8vo. Bath.

VIII. (1798) Thoughts on the Novelty, the Excellence, and the Evidence of the Christian Religion. 8vo. Bath.

IX. (1801) Internal and Presumptive Evidences of Christianity, Considered Separately and as Uniting to form One Argument. 8vo. Bath.

X. (1803) Arguments for the Use of a Printed Congregational Liturgy for Public Worship. 12mo. London. Private.

XI. (1803) An Essay on the Impropriety of the Usual Mode of Teaching Theology. 12mo. London. Private.

XII. (1812) Essays on the Language of Scripture, with Additions and Corrections. 2 Vols. 8vo. Bath. Published by Egerton, London. N.B. Several of these Essays were published separately and successively.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Suggestions concerning Moral Capability.

(Read before the Literary and Philosophical Society of Liverpool, March 5, 1813.)

The question of moral capability may be considered as an extension of the question of actual

capability, or the free agency of man. Much similar reasoning may be used, with respect to both questions; but there is one detached argument, against the supposition of free agency, which it will be very necessary, in the first place, to dispose of. This argument is drawn from the fore-

† Mr. Jervis's Ser. p. 26.

knowledge of God. "If, (says the Fatalist) God knows that a certain event will take place, that a certain action will be performed, such action *must* be performed, therefore, is not performed by the free will of man. In reply to this—Although we look upon things, as occurring, in successive periods of *time*, this may not be the case with Deity; with respect to whom, time is swallowed up in eternity, and relative terms of limited duration may be words without application or meaning. Eternity for ever present, is an idea which includes and absorbs all ideas of particular duration. Our faculties may not be capable of comprehending the nature of eternity—we can readily believe that a thousand years, with Deity, may be as one day with us; or even as one hour: and it may be only our ignorance in these matters (and not any impossibility in the nature of the thing), which prevents us from conceiving how a thousand of our years may stand actually present to the intelligence of God. Now, if this were admitted, what we call the prescience of God will be no argument against the doctrine of the free agency of man; for it will not be denied that a being may forbear to interfere in the promotion or distribution of events, actually *passing and present*.

Reasoning, however, under our own notions of time and succession, I do not know that we have any authority to suppose any universal prescience of God. That the Deity is all powerful is admitted—that He can control the events of this world, is allowed: but the power which is possessed is not always exerted.

God, after having bestowed upon his creatures a nature suitable to his purpose, may, for the good of these his creatures, decline to influence the general tenor of their actions—or, to *know* of such actions, before they are performed (possessing, at all times, the power to arrest their proceedings, at any individual moment). This might be the case; it would afford an instance of condescension, and of grace; it would be a positive act of volition; consequently an act of power. It may indeed, be argued that the fulfilment of prophecies is a proof of the foreknowledge of God—but, prophecies are occurrences, out of the common order of things; and the fulfilment of them cannot prove any thing, beyond the display of divine interference, with respect to the accomplishment of some particular event: but even this interference does not, *necessarily* control, perhaps never has controlled the free purpose of man. The finishing of a prophecy may be accomplished, as well by the interposition of circumstances, as by supernatural influence on the mind of the agent; and, hence, arises the question, how far the accomplisher of a prophecy is answerable for his conduct, admitting the necessity of the prophecy being fulfilled. The answer will be, that he is responsible, in as much as he has acted from his own free will; or, has not resisted inducements to actions, which ought to have been resisted, and which, with the powers he possessed, he might have resisted. Let us suppose a divine prophecy the accomplishment of which will require ostensible cri-

minality, on the part of the accomplisher. Let us estimate the moral powers of man at one hundred. Let us suppose the gradual interposition of a chain of circumstances (comprehending if necessary, internal influences), in opposition to these moral powers; which succession of circumstances shall terminate in the fulfilment of the prophecy above mentioned; let us estimate the force of these opposing circumstances at one hundred and fifty. From a comparison of these powers, it is evident that the prophecy must, eventually be fulfilled—nevertheless, if the human agent exert his powers to their full extent, he is morally exculpated, though physically instrumental: but, if he have not so exerted himself—if the prophecy be accomplished by his instrumentality, whilst the gradual interposition of circumstances, tending to such accomplishment, amounted, only, to the power of fifty (which we may suppose the extent, ordinary, in the course of Providence), his own moral power being, at the same time, one hundred, then, is he answerable for such accomplishment, in as much as it was brought about by means, over which he had control, and which he might have overcome.

It is possible that divine interference, by the interposition of circumstances, whether external or internal, may exist, in the common occurrences of life: or, to speak more correctly, that such interference is ready to be displayed, if the free will of man does not accomplish what the divine mind has declared shall be accomplished. But it is also possible, and it is reasonable,

that what is called the ordinary course of nature is so well adapted to the moral and physical constitution of man, that those events which the divine Being may have decreed shall take place, will take place (as, in the instance of prophecies, we have shewn they may take place), by the free agency of man.

It is evident that any consideration of this question does not influence the ordinary occurrences of this life; our reasoning therefore has a reference to another world. And with this limitation, those who argue for free agency have a manifest advantage over their opponents, for admitting the reasoning of men in favour of free will to be false, they can plead and are justified by necessity, it were impossible they could help reasoning as they have reasoned; they of course cannot be censured, therefore should not be punished for such reasoning or its consequences. The situation of the fatalist is very different; if his argument be sound, for him it may be well; but if it should prove to be false, he must answer at his peril for the perversion of that understanding which nature has given him. Moreover they who support the doctrine of mechanism possess no title to our praise or admiration, for what they may imagine their freedom from prejudice, or their superior penetration; for, it should be remembered, that reasoning and acting, as they allow, from mere necessity, the credit of their arguments and their actions devolves entirely upon some power ulterior to themselves.

But having disposed of this argument against the actual capa-

bility of man, there seems to be yet a kind of impenetrability in the nature of the causes of the degrees of perfection which different men attain.

Looking at the question something superficially, it seems reasonable to admit that according to the opportunities of moral improvement which a man possesses, considering the circumstances in which he is placed, his bodily constitution and spirits,—so must we judge of the degree of moral rectitude, to which he has attained. Thus two men may have advanced to the same elevation in the scale of moral excellence, although one may have committed more misdeeds than the other; owing to his temptations having been greater, or his means of resisting them less. A man's absolute state of moral habitude is to be judged by the degree in which he has approached a capability of enjoying moral happiness; of comprehending the nature and excellence of virtue. A man may have passed through life without having evinced any great dereliction of principle, without having committed any enormous faults; and yet be very little able to comprehend the dignity of virtue: whilst another man with deeper reflection, and compelled frequently to act upon stimulating and perplexing occasions; resisting some temptations and yielding to others, may possess truer notions of the nature of moral obligation, higher conceptions of the essence of virtue, and consequently be better fitted for the enjoyment of pure and rational happiness.

But the comparative merit of such a man is not determined by his ostensible virtue: a third man

whom circumstances may have driven into retirement, may possess the same merit, though he have not displayed the same virtue; the contingents of his life not having been such as to call for great exertions. The merit of the one has been proved—the merit of the other may exist. The warrior who mounts a breach in the face of the enemy, and the soldier who would eagerly have performed the same exploit if the task had been allotted him, are equally meritorious. One receives a laurel crown; both deserve it.

In like manner a man, A, may have committed more misdeeds than another man, B, and yet be the more virtuous character in the estimation of his fellow men, whilst at the same time his absolute merit may not be greater than the same qualification in B. The personal privations and hardships which A may have undergone in the manifestation of his virtue are a distinct consideration: for these he deserves a recompence in proportion to their extent, in the same manner as the endurance of unavoidable misfortune in ordinary life is, in the eye of justice, a title of recompence to the sufferer. But the chief subject of applause is the inward complexion of the mind, that energy of soul, that exertion of virtuous principle which prompted to the endurance of suffering, and was the chief support under its pressure—and with these qualities it is possible that the character B might equally be endued, though he possessed not the opportunity to display them. This might be the case. The merit of A is manifest; the merit of B remains to be proved.

It seems then necessary for the exact estimation of character to suppose two men, whose situation, constitution, and circumstances are precisely similar. But even here we are perplexed with considerable difficulty. Of two men, placed as far we can judge in similar circumstances, with equal advantages, with the same motives to action, the same advice, and the same example, one shall prove a noble, and the other a despicable character. How shall we account for this variety, for this opposition between the two, and how shall we estimate the actual virtue of each? Will it be said that one has taken more pains with himself, and is therefore more worthy? That he has pondered more upon the nature of moral excellence, and altogether applied himself more to the improvement of his mind than the other?—That corresponding effects will result from such conduct must be admitted—that is, this pains-taking with himself is the efficient cause of his future nobleness of character. But why did one of two persons, placed under similar circumstances, take more pains than the other; what induced him to think more upon his moral nature; what was the cause of that deep thought and persevering study? He had no motive to action but what the other man possessed; and if the same motive made a greater impression on the one than on the other, what was the cause of this inequality of impression? In fine, were their minds passive substances, and one more capable of being acted upon than the other? This is the conclusion, according with the usual acceptance of the doctrine of necessity; that is, under the notion of the impossibility of a man's acting otherwise than in compliance with the motives which impress themselves involuntarily on his mind. But on the other hand, if we adopt the notion of free agency, we are without any distinct solution of the difficulty. It is not satisfactory to say that one man chose to think, and that the other did not; for the fatalist allows this. Why did he chuse to think? if he had no good motive he had no merit; and whatever motive he possessed the other man possessed also: and this brings us to the former question, why was one man induced to set about obeying a certain motive rather than the other man? Moreover, can these doubts be resolved by reference to the bodily and mental original constitution of the men? It may be urged that if two men could be found, whose circumstances in these respects were precisely similar, their characters would be similar; and that in proportion as the circumstances of either varied, in so much his character would change. But is this the fact? And do persons vary in character, in exact proportion as they vary in circumstances? If they do, then are all men alike virtuous; and into this predicament the fatalist must fall. If they do not—that is, if persons' characters are not the same, taking into account the balance of circumstances, then different men whose circumstances are precisely the same, will nevertheless exhibit different characters; and it is this variety of character, under the same circumstances, which it is the question to explain. The doctrine of necessity would

afford a very compendious explanation, but this explanation would not prove the doctrine of necessity. An universal system of mechanism would equally explain any fact in natural history, or any result in chemistry which had not been accounted for; but the existence of these facts and results would not prove a system of mechanism. If this doctrine be first proved, we will admit the explanation; but ignorance of a true cause is no ground for the substitution of a false one; and the usual mode of arguing upon this subject about involuntary impressions and motives is not at all conclusive; as it pre-supposes every motive to be irresistible which is not resisted; and might with equal propriety be urged with respect to Deity himself, or with respect to any other power ulterior to man. God may admit the motives of benevolence, liberality and compassion, in his providence for the human race: but will it be said, that there is no moral excellence in acts arising from such motives? And will it be argued (as it might *a priori*, with Deity, as well as with man,) that these motives present themselves involuntarily, that they are the strongest which appear at the time—that, therefore, they are irresistible; consequently that corresponding conduct is the result; but, that in such conduct there is no moral beauty or grace, because the motives being irresistible, it is not possible that God should act differently from the manner in which he does act.

I observed that this kind of reasoning might be used *a priori* in respect to God, as well as in respect to man: now is there any thing in the consciousness of man,

or in the reasonableness of the thing, which renders a distinction in argument necessary? On the contrary, is there not an universal feeling in the breasts of men which almost impels them to believe that they have a power to act, or to refrain from acting according with their own pleasure? And do not reason and revelation, in broad and general terms, dictate the same conclusion?

It seems to me that it is our ignorance of the first principles and modes of operation in the human mind, which has given occasion to that negative sort of reasoning on which the system of the fatalist depends, and which gathers strength only from our inability to afford explanations on subjects with respect to which we have no means of information. But is it reasonable because of our ignorance (and this ignorance I shall admit) of the mode of operation and extent of our moral power to deny the existence of the power itself? and to protrude into its place, a doctrine against which, in general, the unsophisticated mind revolts, and which we have no reason to believe true, but because we cannot prove it to be false. No one, I imagine, will assert that free agency is a thing in itself impossible. For the sake of the argument then, let us suppose that man is a free moral agent—now, have we any proof or reason to suppose that his conduct would, in such case, be different from what it actually is—that he would exert his moral powers differently from the manner in which he does exert them at present? Or, can we imagine that his consciousness of such a power vested within himself, would

be in any ways different from that consciousness which every man now feels of such a prerogative; and which is never disputed, until he attempt to explain what may not admit of explanation; and to search into modes and operation of causes, which may in their nature be inscrutable. If we cannot perceive that our consciousness of possessing this power would be different from that consciousness which we do experience, it seems reasonable to conclude that we have this power, until it shall be shewn that we have it not.

The degree in which moral capability is possessed is not material, nor is it essential that man should know the extent of it, or comprehend the mode in which he derives it; for these considerations do not affect the reasonableness of the supposition. We admit the influence of constitution and circumstances upon ostensible character: we allow that the ambitious man cannot always help being ambitious, nor the effeminate man, effeminate. Diversity of character may be beneficial to mankind. Some men may be formed to honour, and some to dishonour; the economy of the world may require it: but each may have a power within himself to improve the capacities which nature has given him. This may be the case; there is no proof that it is not—it is reasonable that it should be. The comparative degree of virtue, or of criminality which attaches to different men, it may, in many cases, be impossible for human ingenuity to determine. The martyr who suffers death in defence of the truth, exhibits strong positive virtue, his merit is obvious. Amongst

the number who lament his fate, there may be some who would not have hesitated, had they been called to the same trial—these have the same merit; their reward will be less, inasmuch as their sufferings have been lighter. The criminal who pays with his life the forfeit due to his country may have exerted his moral powers as strenuously as thousands who witness his execution. It is possible that his criminality shall prove only the absence of strong positive virtue—of virtue strong enough to countervail the influence of opposing circumstances. This might be the case. It is clear that the culprit was destitute of a certain degree of virtue. That a similar degree of virtue is possessed by those who have witnessed his sufferings is not manifest; it is not necessary it should be. Man is not the judge between them. It is sufficient that he attend to his own state, and exert the moral powers which he may possess: the result will be influenced by circumstances; but the result is not the criterion of merit. A man's constitution and circumstances are with respect to himself (i. e. his moral capacity) what a block of marble is to a sculptor—which may or may not admit of very high polish and beauty, but upon which his power and skill may, nevertheless, be exerted, while the result of his labours will obviously correspond with the nature and quality of the substance, on which his talents have been employed. The prevailing dispositions of a man's mind, and the unavoidable contingents of his life will give a tone to his character; for we do not know that his moral powers are

sufficient to prevent such an influence; but he may improve what he cannot render perfect, and modify what he cannot subdue. A vessel in a strong current cannot be prevented going down with the stream; but a skillful pilot may frequently chuse the line of his course, and avoid the rocks which he cannot remove.

H. B.

Sunday Schools of Catholic Origin.

SIR,

Among the institutions by which this country is distinguished, every considerate Christian will set a high value on the late establishment of Sunday schools, which does so much honour to the memory of Mr. Raikes. In contemplating, however, the advantages to be derived from them, it may strike some of your readers with surprise, that the Protestants should not only have been so long a time without them, but that the Catholics may with justice claim the honour of setting us the example two hundred years ago. I have, in proof of this, made an extract from the *Classical Tour through Italy*, just published, whose amiable and enlightened author gives us the following account of the formation of them by St. Charles Borromeo, one of those great characters who shews that virtue and patriotism are to be found in that church, many of whose tenets are deservedly held by us in abhorrence.

“Many of the excellent institutions of Cardinal Borromeo still remain, and among others that of Sunday schools, and it is both novel and affecting to behold on that day the vast area of the

cathedral of Milan filled with children, forming two grand divisions of boys and girls, ranged opposite each other, and these again subdivided into classes, according to their age and capacities, drawn up between the pillars, while two or more instructors attend each class, and direct their questions and explanations to every little individual without distinction. A clergyman attends each class, accompanied by one or more laymen for the boys, and for the girls as many matrons. The lay persons are said to be oftentimes of the first distinction. Tables are placed in different recesses for writing. This admirable practice, so beneficial and so edifying, is not confined to the cathedral, or even to Milan. The pious archbishop extended it to every part of his immense diocese, and it is observed in all the parochial churches of the Milanese, and of the neighbouring dioceses, of such at least as are suffragans of Milan.”

It is not necessary to recommend this practice to Unitarians, as I believe very few places of worship are among us without a Sunday school, but I must take this opportunity of adding my testimony to the zeal of the Catholic clergy in other parts of Europe, as I have been a spectator, in the Alps, and in the Low Countries, of their attention to young children, an attention in which the Moravians also are very praise-worthy. At Neuwied, on the Rhine, I was detained very pleasantly in their chapel by the very agreeable manner in which instruction, suitable to the capacities of the learners, was communicated. Our Unitarian brethren,

who are in the neighbourhood of Moravian chapels, may not find their time ill-bestowed in observing their mode of addressing the younger part of their audience.

I remain, Sir,

Yours, &c.

VIATOR.

Juvenile Christian Library.

SIR,

It has often been a serious question with me, as a parent, what books I should put into the hands of my children, to furnish them with moral and Christian principles. There is no difficulty in finding good books for adults: my anxiety is to discover such as are proper for young-children, that is, such as are instructive on important points of morality and religion, intelligible and attractive and interesting. Would some of your readers who are parents, and who are conversant with books, communicate their opinions and plans, they would, I conceive, essentially serve many an anxious father or mother.

R. BROOK.

Mr. E. Taylor, on an old Copy of the N. T.

Norwich, Aug. 4, 1813.

SIR,

A very old copy of the New Testament (which unfortunately wants a leaf or two both at the beginning and the end) having lately fallen into my possession, I am induced to request your insertion of a short account of it for two reasons. 1st. That by a description of it I may learn from some of your correspondents what is its date, and 2ndly, to point

out a few differences in the translation of some celebrated texts, from the present authorized Version.

1st. It is a thick small octavo, printed in black letter, with a "prologue" prefixed to the gospel of John and to the Epistles. It is divided into chapters, but not into verses. The different paragraphs in each chapter are marked A, B, C, and so on. The epistle to the Hebrews is given in the running title to Paul, and the "prologue" contains the translator's reasons for attributing it to him.

2dly. The Gospel of John begins thus: "In the beginnyng was the worde, and the worde was with God, and the worde was God. The same was in the beginnyng with God. All thynges were made by it, and without it was made nothyng that was made. In it was lyfe, and the lyfe was the lyght of men, and the lyght shyneth in the darknes, but the darknes comprehendeth it not."

Hebrews i. 8. "But unto the Sonne he sayd, God thy seate shal be for ever and ever. The cepter of thy kyngdome is a ryght cepter. Thou hast loved rightewesness and hated iniquitye. Wherefore God which is thy God, hath anoynted the with the oyle of gladnes above thy felowes."

Romans iii. 23. "Ther is no difference: for all have synned, and lacke the prayse that is of valoure before God; but are justified frely by his grace, throught the redempcion that is in Christ Jesu, whom God hath made a seate of mercy thorow fayth in his bloud," &c.

Colossians i. 15. "Which is the ymage of the invisible God,

fyrste begotten of all creatures. For by hym were all thinges created, thinges that are in heaven, and thinges that are in earth: thinges visible, and thinges invisible, whether they be majeste or lordshyppe, either rule or power."

2 Timothy, iii. 16. "For all scripture geven by inspiracion of God, is proffitable to teache, to improve, to amende, &c."

Phillipians ii. 9. "Wherefore God hath exalted hym and geven hym a name above all names: that in the name of Jesus shulde every knee bowe, &c."

1 John, v. 7. This celebrated text is inclosed in brackets.†

The above quotations will, I think, be sufficient to free the editors of the Improved Version from that wicked and stupid charge which has been brought against them, (and which has lately been retailed by a clergyman in a visitation sermon in this city) of "gross and wilful mistranslation," and of altering the scriptures to make them suit their own particular views. It is clear who were the alterers and the innovators, since we see that the Improved Version merely restores the reading which modern translators had altered, in most of the passages above quoted. We all know what weight some persons attach to antiquity merely as such, and to these it may be satisfactory, to find that the rendering of the above texts in the Received Version of the New Testament is a mere modern corruption, and that the

only verse in the book which at all implies the doctrine of a Trinity, is now impudently retained in the text, without any mark whatever to denote that it has less authority than the rest to support it, contrary to the opinion of our ancestors. I am,

Your obedient Servant,

EDWARD TAYLOR.

Catholics in England and Wales.

It appears by the statement of a Dublin paper, that the total number of Catholics in England and Wales considerably exceeds three hundred thousand. The principal Catholic counties are Lancashire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Northumberland. These with Durham, Cheshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Kent, and Worcestershire, contain about 200,000; London and its suburbs, with Surry and Middlesex, 50,000. The remaining 50,000 are thinly scattered throughout the other counties and cities; but chiefly in Bristol, Bath, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Southampton, Exeter, Gloucester, and a few watering places. In every county in England, there are Catholic chapels and congregations. Altogether, there are about 200 chapels, and generally clean, commodious and well-built. Lancashire alone counts upwards of 100 Catholic chapels, and, in the Catholic counties, gentlemen maintain chaplains in their own houses.

On the Title Reverend.

SIR,

There has been always some doubt amongst Dissenters whether they should confer on their ministers the clerical title—*Reverend*—

† Query: Why were the brackets omitted in subsequent translations? It is pretty certain that no fresh evidence of the genuineness of this verse has come out since this translation was made.

amongst true Churchmen there has been no doubt on this subject; they have very correctly decided that Reverend is the style of one in holy orders, and cannot be allowed, without an egregious abuse of etiquette, to any person pretending to holy orders.

Dissenters plead that according to common forms of courtesy the title may be bestowed on their teachers as a short way of specifying their office: in this there may be reason: but I would ask whether it be consistent with modesty or Christian simplicity that Dissenting ministers should assume it, as their due, and place it ostentatiously upon door-plates and title-pages? Is not this a humble mimicry of a church, which scorns such as ape her dignities; and a voluntary descent to the level of that low tribe of *soi-disant* priests, who wanting education, talents and connections, lay claim to *reverence* by a name, a gown and the imitable *et cetera* of priesthood?

PHILO-GOGMAGOG.

On Future Punishment.

SIR, Nov. 7, 1813.

I have read the Letter (Vol. VIII. p. 640) On Future Punishment, with some portion, I trust, of that attention which the subject and the serious manner in which it is treated, justly demand. Rejecting, like your correspondent, the doctrine of "endless torments" as impeaching "the infinite benevolence of the Deity," I yet cannot perceive, like him, as the plain language of scripture, that "the wicked will be utterly destroyed." I shall not, however, enter at large into a question which

has been so often and so well argued that nothing new could easily be advanced, but rather confine myself to some points which appear to deserve your correspondent's attentive review, leaving to that able and excellent Christian, Mr. Wright, to answer for himself, if he should demur to the inferences drawn from his admissions, as quoted p. 641.

Your correspondent represents the Universalists (p. 642,) as "taking a most unwarrantable licence with the sacred writings." Yet he must hear every day, "the words perish, perdition, destruction, death, which are applied to future punishment," employed in popular language (and such is certainly the language of the Bible), when nothing less is designed than to describe a state absolutely unchangeable, and therefore properly endless. J. S. goes on to dispute the opinion, that "between the best of the wicked, and the worst of the good the shades are imperceptible." Yet how does he controvert that opinion? After proposing the just delineation of Christian perfection, "living in habitual devotion—seeing God in every thing and every thing in God," can he, on reflection, satisfy himself, that all who do not reach that eminence "have not God in all their thoughts?" Are there then "no nice shades of difference" but such "a broad distinction," that "a confirmed sinner who dieth a hundred years old," or the hypocrite who "devours widows' houses, and for a pretence makes long prayers," is to be confounded in present character and future destiny with "the young man void of understanding," who, while he

is enslaved by "the sin which easily besets him, has yet "some good thing in him," and is "not far from the kingdom of God." Has J. S. indeed offered any thing more than an opinion on this subject. To employ his own language, is not this broad distinction a "structure without a foundation."

Your correspondent (p. 642) appears closely to follow Dr. Price on Providence, p. 142, where he acknowledges himself a follower of Butler (Analogy, p. 1. c. 5). Yet those eminent Christian moralists only indulge a gloomy philosophical speculation. They no more than J. S. profess to prove from scripture that a large proportion of the human race may be expected to incur a proper destruction, because an immense proportion of plants and brute animals never reach maturity. Butler indeed, probably believed, or at least professed to believe, the doctrine of endless torments.

Your correspondent, like destructionists in general, seems to resolve the whole punishment of the wicked into loss of being. Yet he has not explained, whether the wicked are to perish at the end of this life, or to exist in a separate state, or the whole man to be restored with renewed consciousness at the close of the present dispensation, merely for the purpose of their annihilation. But most extraordinary appears the close of your correspondent's letter, in which he considers his opinion as laying a peculiar restraint upon vicious inclination. Can we have forgotten what has passed in our eventful times. Have we never heard of men who steeled their hearts and strengthened their hands

to commit the foulest deeds, not under that persuasion, to which J. S. attributes "a practical tendency to lessen the restraints to vice," a belief "that the punishment of the wicked will be long and severe, but remedial and corrective." No, they rather indulged that belief maintained by J. S. with a far different spirit and design that "death is eternal sleep."

BEREUS.

Mr. Wright on Future Punishment. To J. S.

Wisbeach, Dec. 9, 1813.

DEAR SIR,

In your communication on Future Punishment (Vol. VIII. p. 640), you have done me the honour to mention my name, and make some quotations from my Essay on the subject. I take the liberty, in return, of animadverting on some of your observations.

I agree, that no opinion respecting future punishment ought to be admitted unless it can be supported by the authority of the New Testament. On this ground precisely, I reject the doctrine of endless destruction. The proofs produced by its advocates appear to me insufficient. Forms of expression equally strong are applied in the Old Testament, to the punishment of men in this world, as any you can find applied in the New Testament, to the future punishment of sinners. When you read of the utter destruction of persons in the Old Testament, you do not suppose endless loss of being to be meant, though nothing is said there of the restoration of those so destroyed, and where will you find the destruc-

tion of the wicked in the *New* more strongly expressed? You inform the reader that, "when- ever the words everlasting, and eternal, are used in this [your] letter, they are intended to mean endless;" but your saying this alters not their true meaning. You ought to have proved that endless is necessarily their meaning, at least when connected with punishment. If it be necessarily their meaning it must be either, because the words themselves can admit of no other; this you will not assert, you must know they are often used in a limited sense; or because the nature of the punishment absolutely requires the words should have an unlimited meaning: but how can you shew that punishment will be of such a nature as to require endless duration? You say that future punishment is a doctrine "contained in the Christian scriptures alone." Yet the shame and everlasting contempt of the wicked is spoken of in the Jewish scriptures, Dan. xii. 2. We read of Amalek and Eber perishing for ever, Num. xxiv. 20, 24; and of the everlasting confusion of the persecutors of Israel, Jer. xx. 11. Of course you must acknowledge that the words "everlasting" and for "ever" are connected with punishment, and even destruction, which will not be endless, in the Jewish scripture: what is there to forbid their being so used in the Christian scriptures? Why should it be thought wrong to compare the New Testament with the Old on this any more than on any other subject?

Your second preliminary observation I allow to be just; but cannot see that there was any

need for you to state it on the occasion. We are not conscious of explaining as figurative texts which are not so; and your observation will not authorize your applying as plain and literal passages which can be shewn to be figurative. If you think we turn plain declarations of scripture into figurative language, point out the instances, shew us our mistake. You have totally mistaken the design of one passage quoted from my Essay; when I said, "it is of no consequence to our leading arguments in how literal a sense the words perish, perdition, destruction, death, are applied to future punishment," I simply meant, that in however literal a sense such terms be understood unless it can be proved that the perdition, destruction, or death, will be absolutely endless, a restoration may ultimately take place; and it is contended you cannot prove from the New Testament, that they will be endless: it follows, that if what the scriptures teach concerning God, authorize the conclusion that such a restoration will take place, what they express concerning the future destruction, &c. of the wicked, is not opposed to it. You, Sir, took for granted, that I meant, let the words of scripture be ever so plain and literal, I was resolved to turn them into figure and metaphor; than which nothing was farther from my thoughts. As the advocates for the destruction scheme, rely so much on the literal interpretation of the terms in question, I meant to shew that it answers not their purpose. Whatever happiness may be the reward of the righteous, I am not convinced that immortality will be

their reward, though you think in this "all seem willing to agree;" for as the righteous will be rewarded according to their works, they must be rewarded in different degrees, unless it can be proved they are all equal in piety, virtue and goodness; but what degrees can there be in immortality? No one who is raised to immortality can be more or less than immortal. I know not that you are authorized to say eternal life will be properly a reward, though the just will inherit it; for it is communicated as a free gift. You contend that eternal death, a form of expression no where to be found in the scriptures, by which you mean endless loss of being, will be the punishment of the wicked hereafter; yet as they will be punished according to their evil works, and all are not guilty alike, you must admit there will be degrees in future punishment; but there can be no degrees in endless loss of being; on this hypothesis all crimes and criminals will be punished exactly alike; which is contrary to both scripture and reason. If you say they will be punished in different degrees before they are destroyed, this is changing the ground, and giving up the notion for which you contend, that eternal death will be the punishment, and making it only that in which the punishment will issue.

Though the future existence and happiness of the righteous are plainly revealed, you will not contend that none of the language applied in scripture to their future state is figurative; you believe that "it does not yet appear what we shall be." This subject then is not free from obscurity. We

believe that the future punishment of the wicked is plainly revealed: and can you explain in what way, how long, or how much, they will suffer? Is there no figurative language used in the descriptions given of their punishment? Will you then still say that it is supposition only, that their punishment is involved in awful obscurity? The reasoning by which you attempt to reconcile your hypothesis with the character of God, comes not to the point. Though it is fully granted that God has an unquestionable right to make what differences he please in the constitution of his creatures, and the period of their duration: yet it should ever be remembered that he is a righteous judge, and a merciful Father. You have not shewn how it comports with his character as a righteous governor and impartial judge, to hurl one of his subjects to endless destruction, and raise another to endless life and happiness, when the shades of difference in their character and conduct are comparatively slight: nor how it agrees with his character as a gracious Father to consign to endless destruction a part of his rational offspring; to raise from the silent tomb those to whom he stands in the endearing relation of a father that they may only suffer and be eternally lost. Reconcile your doctrine, if you can, with what the scriptures teach of the paternal love and infinite goodness of God. You compare human beings to oaks and acorns, and reason as if their destruction or preservation was of no more estimation with the Almighty than the destruction or preservation of an acorn: remember, Sir, the words

of Jesus, "Ye are of more value than many sparrows." God esteemed the preservation of the Ninevites of much more consequence than the preservation of Jonah's gourd.

In what part of scripture is future punishment so contrasted with immortality, as to make the former an endless negation of the latter? That it is so contrasted you seem to take for granted; but to establish this point by scriptural proof you will find a very different thing. You have said "the wages of sin is DEATH, ETERNAL DEATH!" the apostle satisfied himself with saying simply death, the phrase you have used is unscriptural, of course the phrases, eternal life, and eternal death, are no where placed in contrast by the sacred writers. The burden of proving lies with you; if your proofs be insufficient, the doctrine of limited punishment follows of course. I remain, with much Christian respect,

Yours, &c.

R. WRIGHT.

Mr. Marsom's Strictures on Dr. Estlin's Discourses on Universal Restitution.

High Holborn, Feb. 2, 1814.

SIR,

Some observations on Dr. Estlin's Discourses on Universal Restitution having been introduced into your Repository (Vol. IX, p. 21), in a correspondence between Doctors Toulmin and Estlin, in which my name occurs with some allusion to the manner in which my arguments, in a work entitled, "The Universal Restoration of Mankind Examined, &c." are treated by Doctor Est-

lin in the above mentioned work. I beg to submit to you, for insertion in your valuable Miscellany, the following remarks on those Discourses.

After an attentive perusal of the Discourses I cannot help considering the arguments therein urged in support of the Doctor's views as very inconclusive; at least they have not produced any conviction in my mind. The Doctor, no doubt, will attribute this to invincible prejudice; for in p. 166, he says, "To a mind sealed by prejudice arguments can gain no admission. To a mind which is accessible to arguments, those which have already been adduced are more than sufficient." The Doctor, it seems, is so fully persuaded of the clearness and irresistible energy of his reasoning, that where it is ineffectual, the reason must necessarily be, that the mind is so sealed up by prejudice as to render it inaccessible to those arguments, which would otherwise have been more than sufficient for that purpose. This, surely, is assuming a great deal too much, and very far from being consistent with that respect and candour which are due to the judgment and understanding of those who after the most serious and impartial examination are under the necessity of differing from us.

In page 135, the doctor cites the following observation from my work, p. 5, 6. "Mr. Marsom says, It may be proper to observe, 1st, That the doctrine of Universal Salvation is no where expressly taught in the holy scriptures. If God then has no where promised a universal restoration of mankind, there can be no absolute, substantial ground to affirm

or expect it." The Doctor objects first, to the propriety of the term salvation in this connection. Was not the Doctor aware that that term forms a part of the title of the work against which I was writing? If therefore there is any impropriety in the term, as here used, that impropriety is not mine, but Dr. Chauncey's.

On the assertion, that, "The Doctrine of Universal Salvation is no where expressly taught in the Holy Scriptures," the Doctor observes, "That with respect to the manner in which the doctrine is taught, the teacher is a better judge than ourselves;" and after citing a passage of scripture which he supposes includes the doctrine, although I can perceive no relation it has to it, he adds, "It is taught by necessary inference from innumerable texts, and from all the moral attributes of the Divine Being." The Doctor here fully admits the truth of the assertion, that the doctrine is no where expressly taught in the scriptures; but at the same time he entirely evades the question in dispute between us, which is not the manner in which the doctrine is taught, but whether the scriptures teach it at all.

Here then we are come to a point, the truth of the doctrine is admitted to depend entirely on inferences drawn from passages of scripture and from the attributes of God. But let us ask, Had Jesus Christ and his apostles believed the doctrine of Universal Restitution, had they attached that importance to it which the Doctor does, and had they felt as he feels respecting it, would they not have been explicit upon the subject? Would it not have en-

tered into their public discourses and formed a prominent feature in the epistles to the churches? Would they not have stated it clearly, illustrated and expatiated upon it with rapture, and not have left it to be discovered by uncertain deductions, or by mere inferential reasoning? Most undoubtedly they would, had they believed it, and considered it as essentially connected with the honour of God and the happiness of mankind; but as we find nothing like this in any part of the New Testament we must necessarily conclude that it made no part of the counsel of God revealed to them, nor did it form any article of their creed.

The doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked, especially with respect to its nature and duration, forms the principal part of the Doctor's work (consisting of 211 pages), and although it is repeatedly adverted to in the course of it, yet till he comes to page 167 he does not attempt to explain the nature of that punishment, or in what it will consist, notwithstanding his whole system, in a great measure, depends upon the decision of this question. "The question (he there tells us) still remains, In what, according to the scriptures, will the punishment of the wicked consist?" The decision of scripture on this subject is certainly of great importance. Let us then attend to it, as stated by the Doctor. "The scriptures," he adds, "inform us that it will consist in an exclusion from the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, and in great and inconceivable mental anguish." Can any man acquainted with the New Testament admit

this statement? Where has that given us any such information? There is not any thing there that bears the least resemblance to it, nor is there a single passage from which it can be fairly inferred.

Mediatorial kingdom is a phrase not to be found in the scriptures, they know nothing of such a kingdom, and consequently cannot inform us that any will be excluded from it. What does mediatorial kingdom mean? Scripture, for the above reason cannot inform us. Shall we then appeal to analogy?—This will not assist us, because it has no analogy with any thing we are acquainted with. Shall we appeal then to Doctor Estlin? He will be able perhaps to explain the terms; especially as they form so essential a part of the system he is defending. Let us hear him. “The kingdom of Christ (he tells us, p. 141) as far as it is preparatory or mediatorial—that is the kingdom of means, will have an end: it will have an end, and be delivered up to God, when the final kingdom, which has been explained to be the kingdom of truth, righteousness and happiness shall be established.” How unmeaning is this! equally remote from reason and common sense as it is from the scripture. Mediatorial kingdom, preparatory kingdom, a kingdom of means, final kingdom, are all of them phrases, invented to serve an hypothesis which has no other support.

This quotation affirms, respecting the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, that, “It will have an end.” This sentence, not only as unscriptural as all the rest, but directly opposed to the very language of scripture, was too im-

portant not to be repeated. Prophecy, speaking of the kingdom of Christ, says, Isa. ix. 7, “Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end.” And in the New Testament the angel tells Mary that, “He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” See also Dan. ch. vii. 14, and ch. ii. 44. Yet in the face of these prophecies, and without the least authority from other scriptures, Doctor Estlin makes the unqualified assertion, above quoted.

From hence we learn why the terms mediatorial, &c. are applied to the kingdom of Christ, i. e. in order to get rid of the idea of its endless duration, and to support the opposite one, i. e. that it will have a termination; because if the duration of his kingdom will be endless, as the scriptures affirm, and if the punishment of the wicked will consist in an exclusion from it, as the Doctor affirms, then that punishment also will be endless.

The Doctor considers the above citation from p. 141, as a sufficient answer to 400 pages of my work; he says, “I apprehend that the following brief observation will lead to an answer to the rest of these two volumes.” What this “brief observation” is, we have seen. The Doctor has cited two or three short paragraphs from that work, making together about one page of his, and these he cites not to controvert but to approve; for he says, p. 137, respecting the propositions they contain, “Pitiable would be the state of intellect of that person who should deny either of these propositions.” “The rest of the vo-

lumes," it seems is to be answered by a single dash of his pen, by "a brief observation," without citing a single sentence, or referring to any one argument contained in them. Could the Doctor possibly imagine that he should be able to gain the confidence of his readers, or establish the truth of the sentiment he is advocating by treating a work, which professes to be an examination of its truth, in this manner?

The Doctor tells us that he has read those two volumes which he professes to answer; he must consequently know that in the second volume, p. 28 to 49. I have collected together all the passages in Dr. Chauncey and Mr. Winchester, where, in various ways and for different purposes, they assert that the kingdom of Christ will have an end, and have attempted to refute all their arguments in support of that assertion; yet, notwithstanding this, the Doctor re-asserts the same thing without taking the least notice of the refutation which, he must know, it has received.

I should now, Sir, proceed to examine the proof which the Doctor offers in support of his third proposition, that is, that, "The end of punishment in the divine government is to reform," and then go on to inquire whether the inferences which he draws from texts of scripture, and from the attributes of the Divine Being in support of the doctrine of Universal Restitution are either just or necessary. But I must leave the consideration of these subjects, with your permission, to another paper, and am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

JOHN MARSON.

Answer to Mr. Belsham's "Calm Inquiry."

Bath, Jan. 25, 1814.

SIR,

It is now upwards of a year and a half (M. Repos. vii. 568,) since your correspondent X. Y. expressed his "surprise and disappointment," that no Reply to Mr. Belsham's "Calm Inquiry into the Person of Christ" had been, or was intended to be, published, it appearing to him to be "capable of being fairly and satisfactorily refuted:" he therefore pledged himself to attempt such a refutation, should no notice be given, through the Repository, or by private letter to your printer, within two months, from the date of his communication, that such a work was already in hand. Now, Sir, as no such notice has appeared in your pages, or in any of the daily prints, I conclude that X. Y. will make good his pledge of "sifting every part" of Mr. B's "reasoning," and thereby "detect the latent, but primary and extensive sources of fallacy."

Being an admirer of Mr. B's very able and interesting work, but a still greater admirer of Truth wherever she may be found, I am not a little curious to see this promised refutation. And yet after so long a lapse of time, I cannot help feeling a sort of pre-sentiment that X. Y. on carefully analysing the principles of Mr. B's "Inquiry" finds that he has a little too hastily declared it "capable of a satisfactory refutation." Should it however be still X. Y's intention to favour the public with his remarks, by intimating as much in a future number of the Repository, he will oblige many of your readers, besides Yours, &c.

O.

*South's Sermons.**St. Ardleon, Jan. 1, 1814.*

SIR,

I lately added to my small library the volumes of your Repository, which has found its way into this corner of the island, where, expecting the close of life's various day,

I hear the tumult of the distant throng
As that of seas remote or dying storms,
And meditate on scenes more silent still.

You must know, Mr. Editor, that the engagements of active life never allowed me a methodical application to any department of literature or science. My reading, at intervals of leisure short, and seized, as it were, by stealth, has thus been unconnected, to a degree, of which you, whom I guess to be a regular student, can have, happily for yourself, no conception. Now that grey hairs are more than here and there upon me, it is too late to form a new habit. I must, therefore, be satisfied with literary pursuits, miscellaneous and desultory, to the end of the chapter.

Remarking your encouragement of correspondents, by impartially executing your editorial office, I am inclined to send you some account of such discoveries as may be made in an elbow chair. That an old man should prefer old books will not surprise, and I confess that my eyes are more accustomed to the sober tints of antiquity than to the mellow hues of modern hot-press.

I have lately proposed to improve my occasional acquaintance with South into intimacy, by a regular perusal of his sermons. The first of them, entitled, "The

ways of Wisdom, ways of Pleasantness," was recommended to our forefathers a century ago in the *Tatlers*, (205 and 211) and can scarcely fail to be interesting in centuries to come, for the wit and wisdom of South, as Johnson says of Butler's *name*, can only perish with his language. Yet I must demur to "the use of reason not shewing itself till about the seventh year," (ed. 1737, i. 9.), as an opinion unsupported by experience or observation. Nor do I know of any scriptural authority for expecting the resurrection to consist of the "reparation of the same numerical body, by a re-union of all the scattered parts." (p. 20.) Young, a juvenile poet in the age of South, so far imbibed this notion as to give the following description in his "Last Day," first published in 1713, without any design to burlesque a serious subject:

Now charnels rattle; scattered limbs
and all
The various bones, obsequious to the
call,
Self-mov'd advance; the neck perhaps
to meet
The distant head, the distant legs, the
feet.
Dreadful to view! see through the
dusky sky,
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly
To distant regions journeying, there
to claim
Deserted members, and complete the
frame.

Having then introduced the death of Pompey, the poet adds:

This sever'd head and trunk shall
join once more,
Tho' realms now rise between, and
oceans roar.
The trumpet's sound each vagrant
mote shall hear,
Or fixt in earth, or if afloat in air,
Obey the signal, wafted in the wind,
And not one sleeping atom lag behind.

Nor can he quit this notion in another part of his poem. Introducing a compliment to Queen Anne, (for Young was through life an ill-rewarded flatterer of greatness) he finds her grandfather Charles, standing "midst the radiant bands of spotless saints and laurelled martyrs," while

His lifted hands his lofty neck surround
To hide the scarlet of a circling wound,

adding, somewhat profanely, though as sanctioned by the service of his church—

"Th' Almighty Judge bends forward from his throne,
These scars to mark, and then regards his own."

The notion of the same numerical body was also entertained by a very different class of theologians, the Calvinistic Nonconformists. Thus, at first, it formed a part of the Confession of Faith, still imposed on their students by the King's Head Society, though, I understand, that doctrine has been for some years omitted, in the form now offered for subscription.

On the design of this "reparation of the same numerical body," respecting an unhappy portion of mankind, my author is horribly eloquent. It is, that divine Justice may "prey upon the sinner, for ever, satisfying itself by a perpetual miracle, rendering the creature immortal in the midst of the flames; always consuming, but never consumed." Yet, after thus describing the Christian's God as an omnipotent Jaggernaut, my author immediately calls "his mercy, his beloved, his triumphant attribute; an at-

tribute, if it were possible, something more than infinite; for even his justice is so, and his mercy transcends that." Must not the writer of this last passage have deceived himself when he supposed that he really believed the doctrine advanced in the first?

I shall refer once more to this sermon for the following curious conjecture on the Athenians to whom Paul preached. "How would it have employed their searching faculties, had the mystery of the Trinity, and the incarnation of the Son of God, and the whole economy of man's redemption been explained to them?" I cannot help asking, how my author could fail to suspect that these topics formed no part of Paul's religion, from his acknowledged neglect to explain them while he professed to teach theism and the Christian faith? But I must intrude no further till I observe, whether, by an early insertion of this letter, you encourage a farther communication from

R. B.

Progress of the Doctrine of the Trinity amongst the Quakers.

Bromley, Oct. 9, 1813.

SIR,

Many of your readers are, I have no doubt, well acquainted with the instructive history of the successive and gradual steps by which that master-piece of absurdity and priestcraft, the doctrine of the Trinity, was at length imposed on the Christian world. It did not assume the form in which it is now recognised in the creeds and liturgies of the Churches of Rome and England, till very many years after the death of Athanasius, its reputed

author. At the period of the Reformation, this grand corruption of the primitive Christian faith was left untouched, and is still held up as the standard of orthodoxy by the great body of Roman Catholics and Protestants. Such was almost universally the case in this country, when the Society of Quakers rose in the 17th century. Its founders and their converts were all educated in Trinitarian churches; and although the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity did not form the leading feature and principal ground of their separation from the various religious societies to which they belonged, yet so far were they from expressly adopting it as a fundamental tenet of the new association, that the doctrine is very seldom noticed by their writers, and is not so much as mentioned in Barclay's celebrated *Apology* for their principles, and for "the true Christian divinity." Yet he himself tells us, he wrote in this work, published in 1675, "as expressly and distinctly of that [doctrine] as is expressed in scripture." Had the reformers from Popery, the founders of the Protestant reformation, been equally cautious, how much more consistently and wisely would they have acted.

In the famous controversy between the Society of Quakers and George Keith, which commenced in America in 1692, the former alleged, that they "never thought it necessary to be curiously inquisitive about such fanciful notions as he appeared to have imbibed," "not believing subjects, above the investigation of human reason and knowledge, to be necessary to salvation, farther than they are

clearly revealed in the scripture. And looking upon other things which are clearly revealed, to belong to us, and to be sufficient to salvation, have avoided to pry into the secret things which belong to divine omniscience." Gough's *History*. vol. iii. p. 321.

Such was, it seems, the rational foundation, and the primitive simplicity of their faith. According to this testimony concerning them, their sole concern, as to articles of faith, was with such as were clearly revealed in the scriptures, and not with unintelligible mysteries and incomprehensible doctrines, but with such as human reason and knowledge was capable of comprehending, as they believed no others to be necessary to salvation.

On this occasion it appears, that the Friends in London wrote an epistle to their brethren in Pennsylvania, reminding them, amongst other things, "that obedience to the precepts of the gospel was a better proof of our honouring Christ, as a teacher come from God, than airy speculations and controversies, leading to contention about his glorified body in heaven,"—that the spiritual dispensation committed to them was "in no wise to oppose, reject, or invalidate Jesus Christ's outward coming, suffering, death, resurrection, ascension, and glorified estate in the heavens.—Let us keep" say they, "to the plainness and simplicity of scripture language in all discourses about matters of faith, divinity, and doctrine." *Ibid.* p. 327—329.

The Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia appear to have acted

on these wise and liberal principles towards George Keith, but "he hath often quarrelled with us," say they, "about confessions [of faith], declaring he knew none given forth by the body of friends to his satisfaction, and often charged most of us with being unsound in the faith." How did the Meeting act towards this "unruly member," who, not satisfied with the tolerance of the Church towards himself, and his fanciful unscriptural notions, would have imposed them upon his brethren?

"We have offered in several meetings," say they, "for his satisfaction, and to prevent strife amongst us, and for preserving the peace of the church, to deliver a confession of our Christian faith, in the words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the author of the Christian faith, and in the words of the apostles, and disciples, his faithful followers." This is to build upon the true foundation which our great Master hath laid, and not only to respect the rights of private judgment, but to encourage their exercise, and to be amiably indulgent to the weaknesses of an individual member. But they even went farther than this in the vain hope of effecting conciliation, and promoting the peace of the church, by such devices as have never, to any good purpose, proved successful. For they added: "Or we would declare our belief in testimonies of our ancient friends and faithful brethren, who were generally received by us; or we would concur and agree upon a confession, and have it transmitted for the approbation of the Yearly Meeting here, or the Yearly Meet-

ing at London; yea, it was offered unto him at the same time, that a confession concerning the main matters in controversy, should be given out of a book of his own; but all was slighted as insufficient." Ibid. p. 335.

In the spring of 1694, George Keith returned to England, and attended the ensuing Yearly Meeting in London, which used earnest endeavours, during no less than ten days, to reconcile the difference, and prevail upon George Keith, with his party, to return into unity and amity with their friends; but Keith, seeming pre-determined for carrying every thing his own way, or for a separation, eluded all endeavours for reconciliation and peace." Ibid. p. 383.

A few years afterwards this zealous advocate for unscriptural confessions of faith, was ordained, or took priest's orders in the Established Church, and, consequently, subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles. At this time he accused the Quakers of being more heretical than any other society of Protestants, and it is probable the Yearly Meeting of 1694 was induced to issue the following Minute; as a means of repelling the aspersions he had cast on the Society, respecting matters of faith, and of asserting the scriptural soundness of their belief concerning Christ, viz.

"If there be any such gross errors, false doctrines, or mistakes, held by any professing truth, as are either against the validity of Christ's sufferings, blood, resurrection, ascension, or glory in the heavens, according as they are set forth in the scriptures; or any ways tending to the denial of the

heavenly man Christ; such persons ought to be diligently instructed, and admonished by faithful friends, and not to be exposed by any to public reproach; and where the error proceeds from ignorance and darkness of their understanding, they ought the more meekly and gently to be informed: but if any shall wilfully persist in error in point of faith, after being duly informed, then such to be further dealt with according to gospel order; that the truth, church, or body of Christ, may not suffer by any particular pretended member that is so corrupt." *Book of Extracts*, p. 50.

The next Minute which appears to notice similar articles of faith, was made in 1732. It exhorts parents to instruct their children and families in the doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion, contained in the holy scriptures: — which" they say, "plainly set forth the miraculous conception, birth, holy life, wonderful works, ascension, and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

In 1736 the Yearly Meeting issued another Minute respecting points of faith, in which they exhort their brethren to "hold fast the profession of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ without wavering — in respect to his outward coming in the flesh, his sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, mediation and intercession at the right hand of the Father." *Ibid.* p. 82.

The above are the most express and definite Minutes, of the Yearly Meeting, if not the only Minutes to be found in the *Book of Extracts*, relative to matters of faith and doctrine. The first is

the most copious and scriptural. It is also guarded by the special condition — "according as they are set forth in the scriptures." The Minute of 1732 annexes an additional article, expressed in unscriptural terms, and then declares that the whole "are plainly set forth in the holy scriptures." This article is, however, omitted in the Minute of 1736, and was never afterwards noticed, so far as I know, in any Minute of the Meeting till the year 1801, when it was adverted to in the case of Hannah Barnard, on an accusation that "she was not one with Friends in her belief respecting the miraculous conception of Christ," inasmuch as she declined to acknowledge her belief of some parts of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke.

In the year 1760, the National Yearly Meeting for Ireland was excused from attending appeals against them to the Yearly Meeting in London, "until some manifest inconvenience shall be found to arise from such exemption except in matters of faith and principle," whereon the Minute made on this occasion, says, "they desire not to be excused." But the last Yearly Meeting held in Dublin in the present year (1813) appears, nevertheless, to have thought itself competent to draw up and give forth another formula of faith and doctrine, containing fresh articles, not recognised in either of the foregoing Minutes, or any other Minute of the Yearly Meeting in London, whose authority "in matters of faith and principle" they still acknowledge. This curious document professes to explain the occasion on which,

and informs us by whom the measure was suggested. It is verbatim as follows :

“ A communication from the Meeting of ministers and elders has been made, informing that an exercise arose amongst them, on a retrospective view of the distressing circumstance that took place a few years back, when so many had separated themselves from, or who had been separated by the society in consequence of dissent from the body : some of whom may be now looking to a return or re-union with us. And this meeting having been brought under considerable exercise in retrospective view of those days, when many who had filled conspicuous stations, as well as others in our society, separated themselves, or were separated from us, principally on the grounds of dissent from, or disunity with the body. And looking at the prospect that some of these may seek to be re-united to our society, we feel concerned, notwithstanding, that the return of such by the right door, would be cause of rejoicing to us, that friends in the several quarters where such cases may occur, should deeply feel for the counsel and guidance of truth in their proceedings respecting them, and in an especial manner attend to the apostolic injunction, “ lay hands suddenly on no man.” And that monthly meetings should be careful to wait for full proof that those individuals who may be desirous of being restored to the unity and fellowship of the society, have had their eyes opened clearly to see their great error in going out from the body. And also, that they are sound in the faith of the miraculous conception, birth, holy life, wonderful works, blessed example, meritorious death, and glorious resurrection, ascension and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of his eternal divinity and unity with the Father.

“ We are also desirous that monthly meetings may be encouraged to look to their quarterly meetings for assistance in judging and determining on such cases. And that quarterly meetings should be careful to render to monthly meetings, particularly in this respect, such assistance as their place in the body, and the state of the monthly meetings may require.”

Supposing the above minute to speak the present sentiments of the Society of Friends, by comparing it with that of 1694, your readers may judge what progress the Society has made since that time towards adopting the doctrine of the Trinity. The one holds up a belief in “ the heavenly man, Christ,” as a primary article of Christian faith, and yet as one respecting which an involuntary error required indulgence and toleration. The other inculcates no such article of faith. Nor does it recommend any such Christian forbearance towards those who have the misfortune to be involved in error. But it enjoins Monthly Meetings to wait for “ full proof,” that the objects of its concern “ are sound in the faith of the miraculous conception.” A tenet, whether of Christian origin or not, which the framers of the former minute, like two of the Evangelists, and the writers of all the apostolic epistles, pass over in total silence : their great Master taught no such doctrine, and they knew

better than to require of converts to his religion any such proofs of being sound in the faith. Nor is the birth of Christ represented anywhere in the New Testament as supernatural, or properly miraculous. As to his holy life, wonderful works, blessed example, meritorious death, glorious resurrection, ascension and mediation, as set forth in the scriptures, I know not that there is any controversy among professing Christians, nor was there any between the seceders alluded to in this minute, and the society.

For what purpose then are these things introduced? What end are they calculated to answer? No difference of opinion respecting them, or any of the other articles of faith, mentioned in this Minute, was alleged at the time as forming any part of "the grounds of dissent or disunity with the body," which led to the separation of which it speaks. Can such an enumeration, then I would ask, answer any other purpose, than unjustly to asperse the separatists, and to misrepresent the causes of their dissatisfaction with the body? It was not, as the meeting must have known, any such causes as these, which led to the separation of so many persons who filled conspicuous stations in the church. The grounds of their disunity were widely different, and such as the meeting did not chuse to explain. They are, however, upon record, and therefore all attempts to conceal or misrepresent them, are as weak as they are disingenuous. See Wm. Rathbone's instructive "Narrative of Events, that have lately taken place in Ireland among the Quakers, with corresponding documents, and occa-

sional Observations." Johnson, London. 1804.

Nor was there any dispute between the seceders and the society, relative to the "eternal divinity" of Christ, or his "unity with the Father." Neither of these propositions was asserted on the one hand, nor denied on the other. But after a lapse of ten years these novel tenets are directed to be proposed to such of them as may be desirous of being restored to the unity and fellowship of the Society. If any of the seceders were so inclined, which is, I understand, doubtful, they may think better of it in consequence of these preliminary conditions, which, if their eyes have been opened, so as to see clearly, they may well hesitate to accept. For what is it they are required to do, to give "full proof" that they are "sound in the faith?" To ascribe to the same Being mortality and "eternal divinity!" What is there in transubstantiation or any other doctrine of the Church of Rome, more unscriptural, more irrational, or more self contradictory than this?

As to the "unity" of the man Christ Jesus, "with the Father," in doing and suffering his will, and in accomplishing his glorious design by the gospel dispensation, all Christians are agreed. But the unity asserted in this modern Quaker Creed, is that of one Being supposed to possess "eternal divinity," with another who is therein represented as "the Father." This is surely to imply the existence of two co-equal and co-eternal Beings, but as a third is not also acknowledged it falls short of the Oorthodox doctrine of the Trinity. What fresh efforts

may be made towards establishing this doctrine at the next Yearly Meeting, to be held in London, I cannot say. But as I have had opportunities of knowing that there are a large number of intelligent and respectable members of that society, who are well grounded in the Unitarian faith as a doctrine of primitive Christianity and of the New Testament, I trust they will acquit themselves as men and as Christians, should any fresh attempts be made, tending to obstruct the diffusion of pure gospel truth, and to bring them and their brethren in religious profession into bondage, by imposing on them, for scriptural doctrines, the commandments of men.

I have already exceeded due bounds, and must therefore conclude for the present, although I have in connexion with the above modern creed, and the pretences for setting it up, some farther information to communicate if you should think it fit for insertion.

I am,
Your's respectfully,
THOMAS FOSTER.

Rational Christians.

We copy the following articles from the *Reading Mercury*. No. I. is the advertisement which the Unitarians of Reading published of the opening of their Chapel; Nos. II. and III. which appeared in successive papers will explain themselves.

No. I.
Unitarian Chapel, Redding.

The friends of rational Christianity, are respectfully informed, that a Chapel will be opened for Unitarian worship, on Wednesday

the 24th instant. (November, 1813,*)

On the previous Tuesday Evening a preliminary discourse will be delivered by the Rev. T. Rees, of London.

The Rev. Wm. Vidler, of London, will preach on the Wednesday Morning. The Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney, will preach on the Wednesday Evening, and on the following Thursday Evening also.

The services to begin at half-past ten in the morning, and at half-past six on the several evenings.

No. II.

To the Editor of the Reading Mercury.

SIR,

As the term, Rational Christianity, has (unhappily) been introduced into Reading, and even advertised in your paper, I beg you to admit the following explanation of the term, which I have extracted from an old Sermon. "Rational Christianity if it were called human Christianity, would not be so seductive in the sound; and yet would be equivalent, for rational refers of course to human reason only. But rational, so used, has a deception in it; for, being commonly opposed to irrational, a conclusion is tacitly drawn, that the Christianity, to which that epithet is not applied, has in it something contrary to reason or inconsistent with it; and between rational and irrational belief no man of sense would hesitate a moment. But the real opposition marked by such a term, in this case, should be that between rational and super-rational, i. e. between human and divine. And, in

* See Vol. VIII. p. 744.

this opposition of terms, it would be equally the part, not only of common sense, but even of the highest understanding, to give the preference to that which must be best; and human Christianity however speciously adorned, can be but ill regarded, when compared with that which is divine."

Thus, Sir, rational Christianity is human Christianity, that of the Church is divine,—the one invented by man, the other revealed by God.

Your obedient Servant,
FIDELIS.

No. III.

To the Editor of the Reading Mercury.

SIR,

To dissipate the unhappy feelings of Fidelis, and others, who, like him, lament the introduction of terms not found in their theological vocabulary, permit me to make the following statement in justification of the phrase Rational Christianity. God first made man a rational creature, and then revealed himself to him, consequently all revelation must be rational, not paradoxical, not a "revealed mystery," but possessing a commensurate suitability,—a fitness and adaptation to our common intelligence and understanding; that is, must be capable of being understood, and easy of comprehension, otherwise the design of it, which is to give to man the proper knowledge of his Maker, would be frustrated. This view of revelation abounds in the sacred pages themselves, in which sinful men are invited to "come and reason together with God," and

an humble submission to his mercy, with practical obedience to the gospel, is called, "our reasonable service."

In the dark ages of popish ignorance, this rational view of revelation was obscured, and doctrines were taught, by the assumed infallibility of the Church, at which "reason was confounded, and faith herself stood aghast." To shelter such doctrines from inquiry, the maxim ("unhappily") was introduced, that reason and revelation are opposed to each other. The Reformation discarded some of these doctrines, but having retained others of them, it is still found necessary to retain the old popish maxim above stated, for their defence: that by the cry of the "presumption and profanity of reason," men might be deterred from examining such doctrines by the light of revelation. These circumstances, Sir, have given rise to the phrase "Rational Christianity," so "unhappily" (for Fidelis) now "introduced into Reading and advertised in your paper;" meaning Christianity understood in the light of its own evidence. This is opposed to irrational Christianity, or that which is believed by habit on Church authority, without being understood.

The great patrons of Rational Christianity have been Archbishop Tillotson, Newton, Locke, Bishop Hoadly, Dr. Clarke, Dr. Paley, &c. If it be criminal to understand what they believed, and (under Christ our Lord and Master) to be pupils of such men, then the Rational Christians of Reading freely confess their guilt.

Hoping that Fidelis will cordially receive this living statement of Rational Christianity, in preference to his dead authority in his "old sermon,"

I am, Sir,
Your humble servant,
SENEX.

*"Hanging not Punishment
enough."*

Jan. 29, 1814.

SIR,
I lately observed that a benevolent professor of the law, Mr. Basil Montagu, republished in 1812, a small pamphlet, first "printed in 1701,"—entitled, "Hanging not punishment enough for murderers, highwaymen, and housebreakers, offered to the consideration of the two Houses of Parliament."

From the title of this pamphlet it must, I apprehend, be designed to oppose capital punishments rather on the ground of policy than of religion or humanity. Sir W. Temple, in his *Miscellanea*, 3d part, published in 1701, soon after the author's death, expresses the same opinion, as to robbers. In the *Essay on Popular Discontents*, the first in that volume, p. 62, he says, "I have often thought that some more effectual way might be found out, for preventing or suppressing of common thefts or robberies, than those which are of common use among us. The sanguinary laws upon these occasions, as they are not of ancient date, so they seem not to agree with the mildness and clemency of our government in the rest of its composition. Besides, they deprive us of so many subjects whose lives are

VOL. IX.

every year cut off in great numbers, and which might otherwise be of use to the kingdom.—But the worst part of this custom or institution is, that they have hitherto proved without effect, and have neither extinguished the humour and practice of such crimes, nor lessened the number of such criminals amongst us. Nor is it indeed to be hoped or expected they ever should, in a nation whose known character is, to be more fearless of death and dangers than any other, and more impatient of labour or of hardships."

His improved mode of treating criminals, which Sir W. Temple presently suggests, discovers an utter inattention, even in this accomplished scholar and statesman, to the subject of mental discipline. He relies entirely on corporal sufferings and perpetual infamy to deter from crimes or to reform criminals. Such is his proposal, p. 64.

"A liberty might at least be left to the judges and the bench, according to the difference of persons, crimes, and circumstances, to inflict either death, or some notorious mark, by slitting the nose, or such brands upon the cheeks, which can never be effaced by time or art. And such persons to be condemned either to slavery in our plantations abroad, or labour in workhouses at home; and this either for their lives, or a certain number of years, according to the degrees of their crimes."

For the consideration of "some such laws," Sir W. Temple looked forward to "some Parliament cool and undisturbed from heats of faction and animosity of parties" whose "regards and debates" should turn upon "public and

lasting institutions," instead of "temporary provisions or expedients." You will probably agree with me that the reformation of our criminal code is here postponed *ad græcas calendas*, or as the phrase has been freely rendered, to latter lammas, or never. Yet, I trust our Montagus and Romillys will not cease to deliver their own souls.

N. L. T.

*Mistake in the Obituary of
Mrs Parkes.*

Essex-Street, Feb. 7, 1814.

SIR,

If the excellent lady, of whom so interesting a memoir is given in this month's Repository, believed that I was the minister who baptized her in her infancy, she must certainly have been mistaken. I was indeed very intimate in her father's family, and often visited there during the few years that I resided at Worcester. But she must have been born about the year 1768, at which time I was a junior student at Daventry. The congregation at Bromsgrove was at that time without a minister: it is probable therefore that my worthy predecessor at Worcester, Mr. Urwick, performed the ceremony. He likewise was better entitled than I ever was to the appellation of Arian. For till I became a proper Unitarian I never descended lower than Dr. Clarke's scheme, nor did I ever give credit to that frightful doctrine *ὅτι ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, that there was a time when the Logos did not exist, which, as the pious Bishop of Alexandria affirmed, made the new heresy of Arius more odious and damnable than

all the heresies which had ever been heard of in the world before,
I am, Sir, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

Book-Worm. No. XII.

Feb. 7, 1814.

SIR,

In referring once more to Thomas Beard's "Theater of God's Judgments," I cannot venture to follow with any minuteness this author whose generally horrible, though sometimes ludicrous, instances of Divine Judgments prove not that Thomas Beard was singularly weak and credulous, but rather that he had not the rare merit of detecting and despising the weakness and credulity of his age.

The Chapter of Heretikes, p. 96, could not fail to be largely productive of Divine Judgments. Cerinthus is not forgotten who "denying, and going about to darken the doctrine of Christ's everlasting kingdom, was overwhelmed by the sudden fall of an hot house, [hot bath] which fell upon him and his associates as soon as St. John was departed from it." Manes is declared to have "had his skin pulled over his ears alive," and the vulgar tale of Arius is told without any variation. "As for Nestorius, the very worms did know in pieces his blasphemous tongue, and at length the earth opened her mouth and swallowed him up." Olympus, the Arian Bishop of Carthage "uttered blasphemous words against the holy Trinity, but a threefold thunderbolt came from above, and struck him dead in the same place." "Concerning the Anabaptists," my author discovers his zeal for

uniformity of faith and worship. He remarks, "how divers ways God scourged and plagued many of them—miserably put to death in divers places, as well for their monstrous and damnable heresies, as for many mischiefs and outrages which they committed." Soon follows a marvellous tale which Bishop "Cyril hath recorded to us, of his own knowledge," concerning "one Sabinianus, a perverse and blasphemous fellow, that denied the distinction of persons in the Trinity, and affirmed the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be but one indistinct person." This shrewd heretic, it seems, "wrote a book and fathered it upon Saint Jerome, now dead." To confute him, "Silvanus, the Bishop of Nazaren, made this bargain with Sabinianus, that if St. Jerome, the next day, did not by some miracle testify the falseness of his cause, he would offer his throat to the hangman, and abide death: but if he did, that then he should die. Now the day was passed, and no miracle appeared, so that Silvanus was commanded to yield his neck to that punishment which himself was author of." The orthodox Bishop was, however, soon released from his perilous situation, for "behold an image, like unto St. Jerome in shew, appeared, and stayed the hangman's hand—and vanishing forthwith, another miracle succeeded, Sabinianus's head fell from his shoulders, no man striking at it." With such wonderful testimonies against the Unitarian Doctrine how could the Christian world fail to become Trinitarian, especially under the powerful patronage of the magistrate. Yet he

sometimes overacted his part. Thus we learn that "Anastasius, Emperor of Constantinople, being corrupted with the heresy of Eutiches, published an edict, wherein all men were commanded to worship God not under three persons, as a Trinity, but as a quaternity, containing in it four persons." For this anecdote there is no marginal authority, nor do we learn the name or quality of the fourth person. The unassuming "Mary the mother of Jesus," raised by the schools to the rank of "mother of God," has been, I think, by some theologians admitted to that partnership in Deity which they have substituted for the "One God and Father of all," the object of apostolic reverence.

I shall conclude the extracts from this Chapter of Heretikes with a passage which inculcates a doctrine of most pernicious tendency, though I dare say not so understood by Thomas Beard. He describes "Justinus the II^d" as "a man of exceeding pride and cruelty, in avarice insatiate, contemning poverty, and murdering the nobility for the most part: notwithstanding all this, he prospered well enough until he fell into the heresy of Pelagius, soon after which the Lord bereft him of his wits, and shortly after of his life." How different was the judgment of Tillotson, "that the greatest heresy in the world is a wicked life."—S. 34. V. 1.

In Chapter 21. "Of conjuring and enchanters" (p. 114) we are told, as might be expected, from the then low condition of scriptural inquiry, that "a witch caused a devil to appear and speak unto Saul in the shape of Samuel." The following account of a more

modern diabolical appearance, Thomas Beard, no doubt, sincerely credited. He says, "it was a very lamentable spectacle that chanced to the Governor of Mascon, a magician, whom the devil snatched up in dinner-time, and hoisted aloft, carrying him three times about the town of Mascon in the presence of many beholders, to whom he cryed on this manner, help, help, my friends; so that the whole town stood amazed thereat; yea, and the remembrance of this strange accident sticketh at this day fast in the minds of all the inhabitants of this country." Mascon or Macon is a small city of the province of Burgundy. The authority for this story is Hugo de Cluny, Monk, and probably chief legend-maker to that famous Benedictine Abbey, in the vicinity of Macon. This place was the scene of another supposed diabolical visitation, nearer our time, and it may excuse the credulity of Thomas Beard to associate him upon this occasion with the great Robert Boyle, who gave his sanction to the following publication: "The Devil of Mascon: or a true relation of the chief things which an unclean spirit did and said at Mascon, in Burgundy, in the house of one Mr. Francis Perceaud, Minister of the Reformed Church in the same town. Published in French lately by himself, and now made English by one, that hath a particular knowledge of the truth of the story."

This translation was first printed at Oxford in 1669. To the fourth edition in 1672, is prefixed a letter from Mr. Boyle to the translator Dr. Peter Du Moulin.

Dr. Birch adds, "it was afterwards indeed reported that Mr. Boyle had disowned the story of that dæmon, as a clear imposture, but he declares that he never did this, in a letter to Mr. Glanvill, dated 1678." A passage from that letter Dr. B. proceeds to quote, in which, though Mr. Boyle declares his continued faith "as to the main story," he acknowledges an "indisposition to believe such things." (Birch Life of R. Boyle, p. 203.)

No such indisposition will be attributed to Thomas Beard by the readers of the following marvellous tale, for which he is indebted to some work on "Contempt of Sacraments." (Lib. 1. cap. 34.) "In 1457, a certain curate of a village near Soissons, to revenge himself of a farmer that retained from him the tithes which were appointed to the Knights of Rhodes, went to a witch, of whom he received in gift a fat toad, which she commanded him to baptise, as he also did, and called it by the name of John. This good holy curate, after he had consecrated the holy host, gave it also to the toad to eat, and afterward restored it to the witch, who, killing the toad and cutting it in pieces, with other, such like, sorceries, caused a young wench to carry it secretly into the farmer's house, and to put it under the table, as they were at dinner, whereupon immediately the farmer and his children that were at the table fell suddenly sick and three days after died."

To this horrible narration is attached, on the authority of Froissard, an anecdote comparatively pleasant "of another cu-

rate, that had a familiar spirit, whose help he used, to the disturbance of a lord, who had withheld his titles, causing a terrible noise to be heard every night in his castle."

Such a willing believer in the marvellous, as my author could easily receive from Jovius, that the celebrated "Cornelius Agrippa went always accompanied with an evil spirit, in the similitude of a black dog," and that when the time of his death drew near, "he took off the enchanted collar from the dog's neck, and sent him away with these terms, 'get thee hence thou cursed beast which hast utterly destroyed me,' neither was the dog ever seen after." Jortin, in his life of Erasmus, with whom Agrippa corresponded, (Anno 1520,) observes, that "Paul Jovius was either foolish enough to entertain, or disingenuous enough to pretend, a belief that Agrippa was a necromancer, and that his black dog, whom he used to call Monsieur, was a devil in masquerade, walking upon all fours." This scholar, of eminent mental accomplishments, or in the words of Erasmus, "*ardentis ingenii, variæ lectionis et multæ memoriæ*," has been remarkably ill-used by his biographers. They have dwelt on his early magical pretensions, but, so far as I have observed, have never recorded his later solemn recantation. It is now before me, at the end of the 48th chapter (*De Præstigiis*) of his last work, "*De incertitudine et vanitate Scientiarum*." He regrets the vain occupations of his youth in his Three Books of "*Occult Philosophy*," and warns others by his example from such injurious pursuits. "*Verum de*

magicis scripsi ego, juvenis adhuc, libros tres, amplo satis volumine, quos de occulta philosophia nuncupavi, in quibus quicquid tunc per curiosam adolescentiam erratum est, nunc cautior hac palinodiam recantatum volo; permultum enim temporis et rerum in his vanitatibus olim contrivi. Tandem hoc profeci, quod sciam, quem iis rationibus oporteat alios ab hac pernicië dehortari." He then goes on to threaten with eternal fire, in the company of Jannes, Jambres, and Simon Magus, those who pretend to divine and prophecy, not according to the truth of God, but by the operation of evil spirits.

I shall close these extracts from the "*Theater of God's Judgments*," with the following account of a contemporary, or rather immediate predecessor, of Shakespeare, one so eminent in the same profession, that his works are just now reprinted among select specimens of the ancient English drama. The account in ch. xxiii. "*On Epicures and Atheists*," is as follows:

"One of our own nation, of fresh and late memory, called Marlow, by profession a scholar, brought up from his youth in the University of Cambridge, but by practice a play-maker and a poet of scurrility—fell to that outrage and extremity, that he denied God and his Son Christ, and not only in word blasphemed the Trinity, but also (as it is credibly reported) wrote books against it, affirming our Saviour to be but a deceiver, and Moses but a conjurer and seducer of the people, and the Holy Bible to be but vain and idle stories, and

all religion but a device of policy. But see what a hook the Lord put in the nostrils of this barking dog. It so fell out that as he purposed to stab one whom he owed a grudge unto, with his dagger, the other party, perceiving, so avoided the stroke, that withal catching hold of his wrist, he stabbed his own dagger into his own head, in such sort that, notwithstanding all the means of surgery, he shortly after died thereof: the manner of his death being so terrible, (for he even cursed and blasphemed to his last gasp, and together with his breath an oath flew out of his mouth) that it was not only a manifest sign of God's judgment, but also a horrible and fearful terror to all who beheld him."

This passage is quoted by Wood (A. O. i. 338) who fixes the death of Marlow before 1593. Thomas Beard is the only authority to whom he refers, but he adds, as the circumstance of Marlow's death, that he was cut off in a disgraceful fray, with a rival in his attachment to a licentious woman, and that his "end was noted by all, especially the precisians." The late Mr. Warton, in his "History of English Poetry," (iii. 420, 37) could not fail to notice the dramatic celebrity of Marlow. He says, also, that he "translated the elegies of Ovid, which were printed at Middleburgh, and burnt at Stationer's Hall in 1599, by command of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of London," and that "his scepticism, whatever it might be, was construed by the prejudiced and peevish Puritans into absolute Atheism." Mr. Warton refers on this subject

to "Meres Wits, Tr. fol. 287," and "Account of the blasphemous and damnable opinions of Christ. Marley, and three others, who came to a sudden and fearful end of this life. M. SS. Harl. 6853. 80. fol. 320."

Wood's authority, for the disgraceful circumstances of Marlow's death, does not appear, and Wood has been accused of no small propensity to detraction. The assertion of Beard that Marlow "denied God," is quite inconsistent with his having "blasphemed the Trinity," which generally means nothing worse than an assertion of the divine Unity: and if Marlow "wrote books" on the subject, I confess I would gladly recover them. His opinion of Moses might be only that of the late Dr. Geddes, which he held, however unaccountably, in strict connection with a Christian faith and practice. Marlow's supposed invectives against Christ and his dying horrors, are too much in the style of polemic rant to be easily credited. I cannot better conclude this, than with the following passage, from Cibber's Lives of the Poets, vol. i. under the article Marloe:

"What credit may be due to Mr. Wood's severe representation of this poet's character, the reader must judge for himself. For my part, I am willing to suspend my judgment till I meet with some other testimony of his having thus heinously offended against his God, and against the best and most amiable system of religion, that ever was or ever can be. Marloe might possibly be inclined to Free-thinking, without running the unhappy lengths that Mr. Wood tells us it was reported he

had done. We have many instances of characters being too lightly taken up on report, and mistakenly represented through a too easy credulity, especially against a man who may happen to differ from us, in some speculative points, wherein each party, however, may think himself orthodox. The good Dr. Clarke himself has been as ill spoken of as Wood speaks of Marloe."

These Lives of the Poets, of which the M. S. was in Dr. Johnson's possession, he testifies, in his Life of Hammond, to have been written, not by Cibber, but by "Robert Shiels, a native of Scotland, a man of very acute understanding, though with little scholastic education, who, not long after the publication of his work, [1753] died in London of a consumption." Dr. Johnson adds, "his life was virtuous, and his end was pious."

VERMICULUS.

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

No. CL.

A Nation.

For a while (says the judicious Rapin,) five or six hundred persons, who compose a parliament, and as many magistrates of towns and counties, may seem to an imprudent prince the body of a nation; but a time will come, when every single person must be taken into the account.

No. CLI.

Empire of Christ.

The poets have done so much to disfigure and corrupt Christianity, that we are pleased when they make some amends by correct and striking pictures of Chris-

tian truth. One of this fraternity, who has contributed more than enough towards paganizing our religion, (see Gleanings, No. CXLII, VIII. 658*), has thus not unaptly described the true, spiritual reign of the Messiah:

He'll only o'er the mind his pow'r assert,

His grace his scepter, and his throne the heart.

Kings undisturb'd may bear imperial sway,

And peaceful nations may their lords obey,

While the blest Saviour keeps his court unseen,

And rules in light and heav'nly love within.

Prince Arthur, B. II.

No. CLII.

Burning Tobacco-Pipes.

Mr. Dyer relates in his life of Robert Robinson (p. 287) that when Winchester, the teacher of the restoration doctrine, was introduced to that playful divine, he thus accosted him, "What! are you the man, who think that God Almighty will burn the old tobacco-pipes, till they become white again?"

There is the same burlesque figure in a Latin poem of Dean Aldrich's, published by Mrs. Tollet. (Journ. Britan. xvii. 53, 54.) The poem is thus headed,—*Aldricius de Pæto, memoriter*,—and the following is the concluding stanza:

Ut tamen sordes renovata flammis
Exuit nigras, animus vel olim,
Igne purgatis vitiis, nitebit
Aetheris hospes.

Dean Aldrich was eminent as a divine, a scholar, a musical composer, and a smoker. He composed a smoking catch to be sung by four men smoking their pipes.

* By an error, which runs on also to the next page, 668.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Mr. John Jones on the Controversy on Acts xx. 28.

I respect the name of Griesbach, and feel grateful for his learned labours. But I am free to assert, and ready to prove, that implicit confidence is to be reposed neither in his judgment as a critic, nor in his fidelity as an assertor of facts. I will from time to time produce some of those passages which justify me in this opinion.

The following verse which he has grossly corrupted, shews that he was scarcely acquainted with the elements of the Greek language. "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness: God appeared in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen of angels, was preached among the Gentiles, believed upon in the world, and raised in glory." 1 Tim. iii. 16.

In this place the apostle opposes those false teachers, who, under the pretext of superior wisdom, introduced into the Christian church the most monstrous mysteries; and his object is to set aside all mystery as foreign to the gospel. As though he had said, "Though we, the apostles of Christ, reject as false and impious the mysteries taught by our false brethren, yet we preach a doctrine which, figuratively speaking, is a great mystery. This is the doctrine of godliness, the simple doctrine of piety and benevolence, which so far from being in the strictest sense mysterious, sets aside all mystery." To

comprehend the justness of this interpretation, it is necessary to observe, that our apostle, instead of directly opposing his adversaries, often endeavours to set aside their errors by applying some of their words in a different but analogous sense. Thus he sets aside the circumcision of the body, by insisting on the circumcision of the heart; he corrects the zealots for ritual observances, by calling upon them to be zealous of good works; he humbles the pride of the reputed wise, by admonishing them to be wise unto salvation; he softens the ignominy attached to the believers who were slaves, or soldiers, in a literal sense, by holding them forth as slaves or soldiers of Christ; and, finally, he seeks to supersede the sacrifices of the law by calling on all good men to offer themselves as a living and rational sacrifice to God. In the same ardent and elevated spirit he exterminates all mystery from the gospel, by designating it as the mystery of godliness.

Mystery in the N. T. means only a figure of speech, a fact or a moral concealed under the veil of metaphors. In this sense all parables, allegories, and even fables, are mysteries: and they are mysteries only so long as the figure is not explained, or the moral is not developed. Thus our Lord calls the parable of the sower a mystery, which ceased to be such when explained. Thus too the apostle Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, calls the conversion of the Gentiles, when described under the

figure of olive branches, a mystery; and at the end of the same epistle, he gives the same name to the gospel while yet metaphorically described by the prophets, or presignified by types of the law. While the apostle calls godliness a mystery, he illustrates its nature by describing the facts on which the gospel is founded in a mysterious or figurative language. He opposes θεός, God, to σαρξ, flesh, as meaning immortal and incorruptible, in contradistinction to corruption and death. His object was to assert, in opposition to the false teachers, that Christ possessed a real body; and that though he submitted to death, he proved himself divine and immortal by his restoration to life. This use of θεός is common in Greek authors. Heraclitus, in allusion to the supposed immortality of the human soul, calls men θεοὶ θνητοί, mortal gods: and Clement of Alexandria, writes, (Cohort. ad Græcos, p. 8) "The Logos became man, in order that man might become a god." Λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένος ἀνθρώπος. . . . ἵνα ἀνθρώπος γένηται θεός.

Each clause in the language of the apostle has great propriety, as contrasted with each other, or with facts which necessarily force themselves on the attention of the reader. Thus, "Though Christ is divine and immortal, he was really invested with flesh and blood; though he was condemned by the rulers, he was justified by the Spirit of God, which raised him from the grave; though he did not shew himself to his enemies after his resurrection, he was seen by angels—by the men commissioned to preach his gospel in the world; though rejected

by the Jews, he was preached to, and received by, the Gentiles; and, finally, though he submitted to the ignominy of the cross, he ascended to heaven in glory."

The wisdom, goodness, and power of God were personified by the apostles under the name of Logos, which having descended upon, and united with, the man Jesus, led them to speak of his divine authority, as if they intended to speak of his person. To this Logos Paul principally alludes when he here seems to ascribe to Christ, the principle of divinity. In my Sequel I have thus paraphrased his words: "The Logos of God, the great entity, the all-perfect model of material things, existing in the mind of God, became a man.—This principle of incorruption shewed itself in the most corruptible of all things, namely, in human flesh. Jesus, being thus constituted the Son of God, having received his Logos, the first-born of God, from above, was justified, or proved to be so, by the Spirit of God which raised him from the dead. His angels, messengers, or heralds, saw and conversed with him after his restoration to life, as the first fruits of the resurrection of all mankind. Agreeably to the commission given them, they went and preached to the Jews and to the Gentiles, the glad tidings of immortality, which, though rejected by the former, was received in the world at large." p. 379.

Now for θεός, the Vulgate reading, Griesbach has introduced ὅς; and endeavours to support the change by one of the most elaborate notes in his volumes. Yet I will engage to shew, that he has proved

nothing but his own incompetence as a critic, and his want of fidelity as a collator of the ancient copies.

First. The new reading is erroneous, because it is neither good sense nor good Greek. The antecedent indeed in Greek and in Latin is often understood. In such instances, the antecedent is so defined by the verb connected with it, as to become, without ambiguity, the subject of another verb. But then, it should be remembered, it means a whole class, and never an individual. *Ὅς εἰαν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων ἐλαχίστος κληθήσεται*, Mat. v. 19. Here *ὅς* is for *ἄνθρωπος* *ὅς*; the antecedent *ἄνθρωπος* being a general term, is limited by the clause *ὅς εἰαν λύσῃ*, and under this limitation it is the subject to *κληθήσεται*.—"The man *that shall break* one of these least commandments, shall be called *least*." In English, as in the original, the words in italics form the restricting clause, and the antecedent *man*, with that restriction, is the nominative case to *shall be called*. If we try the new fangled reading by this criterion, we shall find, that though grammatical in form, it is yet absurd in meaning. "He who hath appeared in the flesh, is justified in the spirit, is seen by angels," &c. But every man appears in the flesh: every man, therefore, is justified in the spirit and seen by angels, &c.

Secondly, the reformed reading perverts the language of the apostle. He says, that "God appeared in the flesh." This is the great mystery which he had just mentioned; and if *θεός* be taken away, or changed for *ὅς*, the mys-

tery vanishes. This, however, he says himself to be a mystery or figure of speech; and reduced to simple terms, means that he, who was a real human being, and simply so, and therefore subject to corruption and death, proved himself divine, incorruptible, and immortal.

Thirdly, The note of Griesbach in support of his emendation is, for the most part, a tissue of false reasonings and misrepresentations. He says, that the ancient Greek fathers read *ὅς* and not *θεός*; whereas it is a demonstrable fact that Justin, Origen, and Clement of Alexandria, &c. had in their copies the common reading. These fathers understood by the words—"God appeared in the flesh," the Logos of God united with the man Jesus, or Jesus Christ endued with the Logos. In this they understood him rightly, and were mistaken only in supposing that Logos a real being, which was considered by Paul and his brethren as a personified or metaphorical being. The question, then, is, did they, when referring to this verse of the apostle, mention the Logos as having appeared in the flesh? If so, they read *θεός* and not *ὅς* in their copies. Thus Justin—*ἀπεστείλε λόγον ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ, ὅς δια ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεὶς ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστευθῇ*. Origen also says, as Rufinus translates him,—"*Is qui VERBUM caro factus—manifestatus est in carne.*" These fathers considered the Logos as synonymous with *χρῖστος*; and thus Clement of Alexandria calls the Logos, when alluding to this verse—*μυστήριον μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον ὅτι ἀγγελοι, τὸν χρῖστον*.—Cyril writes, *τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, τούτες*

Χριστος ὃς ἐφανερωθη. The same writer also adds—Οὐχ ἕτερον τοῦ της εὐσεβείας μυστηρίου, ἡ αὐτος ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ὃς ἐφανερωθη. These ancient authors then, with absolute certainty, read θεος; and the variety and high antiquity of their copies, set at nought all subsequent copies that may read otherwise.—I have taken the above passages from Griesbach's own note.

I shall next take a final review of the arguments which justify the common text in Acts xx. 28.

It is usual in all ancient authors to omit the principal subject of discourse, or the nominative case, when the action expressed by the verb, or the frequent recurrence of the agent, sufficiently explains who that agent is. Of this I shall insert two instances: "Ye know that *he* appeared that he might take away our sins." 1 John iii. 5. In the original the nominative case expressed by the English *he* is omitted, nor does it occur in any of the preceding verses, and yet no one can be for a moment at a loss that Jesus Christ is meant. Thus again iii. 16; "In this we have known his love, that *he* laid down his life for us." Here, again, *he* is without a reference, and yet the subject of the discourse is most evident. In the same manner we are to understand the language of Paul: "Feed the church of God, which *he* secured with his blood."

A reader of Greek, unacquainted with modern languages, would, if there were no nominative case immediately, or at a distance, look to the drift of the writer, and more particularly to the meaning and termination of the

verb. He would know that a noun obliquely and accidentally introduced to define the object of a verb in a preceding, has no necessary connection with a verb in the subsequent clause. But a reader of English or any other modern language is betrayed to think otherwise. For *he* is always a substitute for some person preceding it, and consequently his attention is withdrawn from the meaning of the verb as the means of suggesting the agent, and directed backwards to a noun going before. Thus *he* in the above verse is taken to refer to God; whereas in the original, τοῦ θεοῦ has no more relation to περιποιήσατο, than if it recurred only in the beginning of Genesis. If such relation in any passage of any author can be pointed out, it is only accidental, and by no means rendered necessary by the rules of grammar. This is one striking instance, in which the genius of modern languages is a latent source of error in criticising Greek authors. The two following passages shew that modern associations in this respect are to be entirely disregarded: and they are cases exactly in point with the disputed verse, 1 John ii. 5, "Whosoever shall keep his word, in him truly the love of God is made perfect. By this we know that we are in him. He who says that he continues in him ought to walk as *he* also walked." Here according to strict construction *he* refers to *God*. But it is certain that it relates to *Christ*, who is not mentioned by name excepting in the beginning of the chapter. Again, iii. 2. "Beloved now we are sons of God, it hath not yet appeared what we shall be;

but we know that when *he* appears we shall be like unto him. "Let my reader look at the context, and he will be convinced that *he* means the Son of God, whose second appearance was denied by the false teachers, and is therefore several times asserted by John in the course of this epistle. These, and similar instances, clearly prove that it is not the pronoun or the termination of the verb that always determines the implied agent, but the meaning of that verb; and as *he* does not necessarily refer to God in the above places, so does it not in the controverted verse of Paul.

It is asserted that *την εκκλησιαν του κυριου* is better supported than *εκκλησιαν του θεου*. In a few words the contrary of this may be proved. Griesbach asserts that the Æthiopic Version has rendered the place by a word which means either Lord or God, and therefore proves nothing as to the original of that Version. But Ludolph and Walton, the two best judges in Europe, assert positively that the Æthiopic word is used only of Jehovah alone. The assertion of Griesbach therefore is a gross misrepresentation. — Forty-seven manuscripts, it is allowed, read *κυριου και θεου*. But these terms assuredly mean God the Father, and not the Lord Jesus. These copies then support the reading of *θεου*, and militate against the sole reading of *κυριου*, as applied to Christ. It is in vain to say that these words are limited to our Lord by the subsequent verb; because no such limitation exists in truth, and is founded only in the erroneous associations of modern critics. — Griesbach moreover asserts, that the more ancient

fathers had not in their copies the reading of *του θεου*, because, for sooth, they would then have quoted it against the heretics as an express declaration of the divinity of Christ: and here we see another proof of the surprising confusion which darkened the understanding of this critic — he supposes *του θεου*, accidentally used to define *την εκκλησιαν*, to be the same as if the apostle had written in direct terms, *ὁ θεος*, a nominative case to *περιποιησατο*. But it is sufficient to say that the early fathers were better judges of Greek than Griesbach; they were free from that prejudice which, arising from the genius of modern languages, has betrayed him and others into an error. They also knew that the connection of *του θεου*, if insisted upon, with the subsequent verb, supposes that Paul was in the habit of calling Jesus a God, and of ascribing to God flesh and blood: a supposition altogether false and contradicted by the whole of his writings. I have said that if *θεου* be the genuine reading, it is more easy to account for the introduction of *κυριου* into the text, than if the reverse were the case. For the authors of the copies containing it, would then be actuated only by a pre-conceived opinion, an influence to which all good men are liable; whereas the introduction of *θεου* would be a direct fraud. And I think it by no means probable that the authors of so many copies, jealous of, and in other respects at variance with, each other, should concur in corrupting the language of the apostle. Besides, if they agreed to corrupt the text at all, they would have done it so as effectually to answer

their end, by making ὁ Θεός, as Griesbach has done, a nominative case to περιεποιήσατο; whereas the forgery, as it now stands, would not suggest to an ancient reader, much less establish, the divinity of Christ. They could not but be aware that the interpretation of their forgery in the way they wished, would be resisted by the implication that the apostle had in other places called Jesus a God; and that he supposed God not only to possess flesh and blood, but to be subject to death. The implication is contradicted by an obvious fact: and this fact therefore sets aside the probability of forgery.

Lastly. I have insisted that the reading of κυρίου, for which Griesbach contends, is not probable, because no such phrase as εκκλησια του κυρίου occurs in other parts of the N. T.; that on the other hand the terms εκκλησια του θεου form the usual designation of the Christian Church; that the frequency and uniformity of this designation approximate the fixedness of a proper name; and that it has a force and pertinence as describing a body of people devoted to God in opposition to the Gnostics, of which the phrase εκκλησια του κυρίου is destitute.

These are the reasons which

induce me to maintain the genuineness of the common text. I sincerely wish the more competent readers of the Repository to consider them and decide on their merit.

Dr. Lloyd's reply is in every respect beneath my notice. He imputes to me an instance of the most unparalleled fraud, and intimates, in a Latin quotation, though he affects to have the politeness not to say so, that I am not to be believed on oath. I have no occasion to disavow the intention of misleading my reader. My words are clear, unequivocal, and strictly within the limits of truth, and the charge could have originated only in the virulent temper and disordered imagination of my accuser. The consciousness of my innocence has disarmed my resentment; and after the first glow of indignation I have no feelings but those of compassion. I am glad indeed that an opportunity was given me of exposing the misrepresentations of Griesbach, and of vindicating the loved name of Gilbert Wakefield; but I am truly sorry that I have been the unwilling means of inducing Dr. Lloyd to place himself before the public in a light so inconsistent * * * * *

J. JONES.

[* For this *hiatus* the Editor alone is responsible.]

POETRY.

MAN UNMADE BY BIGOTRY; RENEWED BY DIVINE CHARITY.

“Let all the creatures of this earth,
Or hail thy smile, or dread thy frown,”
Nature exclaimed, when Man had birth,
And on his cradle placed her crown.

“ This globe be subject to thy tread,
 Yon stars to thy command ;
 Thine, be the all-contriving head,
 And all-performing hand.”

So Nature spoke with voice benign,
 When, from her blackest cave,
 Bigotry yell'd—“ a share is mine,
 From cradle to his grave.”

The sun of reason then began
 To sink, eclips'd in blood ;
 And He alone can rescue man
 Who first pronounced him “ good.”

“ Let there be light.” 'Twas spoke, and light
 Shot radiant from above ;
 O for that word, through mental night
 To speak the light of love !

X.

LINES TO A SLEEPING INFANT.

Art thou a thing of mortal birth,
 Whose happy home is on the earth ?
 Does human blood with life imbue
 Those wandering veins of heavenly blue,
 That stray along thy forehead fair,
 Lost 'mid a gleam of golden hair ?
 O ! can that light and airy breath
 Steal from a being doom'd to death ;
 Those features to the grave be sent,
 In sleep thus mutely eloquent ?
 Or, art thou, what thy form would seem,
 The phantom of a blessed dream ?

Oh ! that my spirit's eye could see
 Whence burst those gleams of ecstasy !
 That light of dreaming soul appears
 To play from thoughts above thy years.
 Thou smil'st, as if thy soul were soaring
 To Heaven, and Heaven's God adoring !
 And who can tell what visions high
 May bless an Infant's sleeping eye !
 What brighter throne can brightness find
 To reign on, than an Infant's mind,
 Ere sin destroy'd, or error dim,
 The glory of the Seraphim !

INTELLIGENCE.

Eligibility of Unitarians to the Common Council of Dublin.

DUBLIN, DEC. 23.—The Common Council was specially summoned for yesterday, to take into consideration the Petition of James Shaw, a freeman of the corporation, against the election of Samuel Stephens, one of the sitting members for that Guild.

The Petition was read. After the usual preamble, the Petition proceeded as follows:—"That said Samuel Stephens, in the year 1802, caused to be printed and published in the city an Address to the people called Quakers, wherein he has, amongst other things, *asserted* that our Saviour Jesus Christ was not the power of God unto salvation, and has used several other disrespectful terms in allusion to our Saviour; and said Samuel Stephens has distributed same very extensively in this city, and upon being several times charged publicly in the Common Council as the author of the said Address, he did not disavow the same:—and your Petitioner is prepared with evidence to shew, that said Samuel Stephens is really the author and publisher of said Address.—That your Petitioner humbly trusts your Lordship and Honours, who are deeply interested in the support of the Christian religion, upon which the maintenance of our glorious constitution and the welfare of society so materially depends, will consider the said work of the said Samuel Stephens to be blasphemous and highly derogatory to the power and divine character of our blessed Saviour, and that the person who was capable of writing and publishing said dangerous doctrine is totally unfit to have a seat amongst your Lordship and Honours," &c. &c.

Mr. SEMPLE thought that the matters contained in the Petition were purely of an ecclesiastical nature, and as such did not come under the cognizance of laymen. He himself had been educated in the doctrines of Athanasius, and continued still to profess and admire them; but he did not the less think it right that others should adopt different opinions, or

that every one should have liberty to profess that which he believed to be the truth; nor was he ignorant that many persons of very great distinction in the country were tinged with the doctrines at present in question. He besought the Assembly to recollect in what a situation they would place themselves, should they accede to a Petition founded on such grounds as this: every liberal mind would be shocked, and the enemies of the corporation would seize the opportunity to expose it to the scorn and contempt of the whole world. He should therefore move that the Petition be returned by the proper officer to James Shaw, from whom it had been presented.

Mr. GIFFARD begged to remind gentlemen of what was really the matter before them; it was not whether men were to be allowed to have peculiar opinions in religion,—whether they were to enjoy the right of thinking for themselves—but it was "whether they were to dare to give these thoughts utterance";—whether, in short, a person who had been guilty of open blasphemy should be permitted to sit in that Assembly. The question, in his opinion, resolved itself into the bare matter of fact, "Did the member whose election is objected to, or did he not, publish a book denying the Divinity of our Saviour?" If any man, in the vanity of his heart, should send forth into the world a book affronting the faith of Christendom, wresting from us our dearest hopes and outraging all the feelings of piety, all the doctrines of revelation; is that man to remain unnoticed? is he to hold the same honourable rank in society which is due to the followers of pure religion? Several gentlemen seem to believe that the whole is an affair of very trivial importance; I would beg of them to reflect on the miseries which have desolated Europe, for the last twenty years, and then to call to their mind, that from a source like this—small as it may appear—the whole of that series of calamities drew their origin: they began by attacks on religion—they

ended in the overthrow of social order, in anarchy and blood. Let the Petition be investigated; let the Assembly be satisfied whether this book was published by its member; and whether these be the doctrines he professes; if they are, he ought no longer to remain among us: or let him renounce them—But no man, with my consent, shall sit down with me, who continues to hold such opinions.

Mr. E. STEVENS thought it altogether beyond the competency of the Assembly to go at all into the question. But if any person should choose to bring forward such a Petition as the present, it was at all events proper that he himself should be free from stain; was this the case? the petitioner was present and could answer—but had not he been seen to behave with the grossest indecorum? had he not appeared even in that Assembly in a state of intoxication? (*Order, Order.*)

Mr. GIFFARD must remind the Hon. Member, that this was not the place for recrimination: nor did the question regard the moral character of any one: he should be very sorry if it did—for he was sure there was not one there whose character would bear probing to the bottom.

COUNSELLOR CAMPBELL rose for Mr. Stephens.—He contended that the Assembly had no right to entertain the questions arising on this petition: it did not complain of a deficiency in any of the qualifications usually required in a member, and for investigating which there was a proper legal authority; but it went into an inquiry concerning the truth or falsehood of a certain member's opinions on theology, and called him to the bar of the corporation to answer for his creed. If the Assembly should allow a discussion so entirely ecclesiastical, the Bench of Bishops might, on the same ground, proceed to discuss the qualifications of a Common Councillor. (*Hear.*) Should the Assembly entertain it, there was no saying to what extent they might go; for having once assumed a power beyond their proper jurisdiction, the next step might be to institute inquiries into the private characters of members, and to expel them because their morals might happen not to suit the taste of certain of their fastidious colleagues. He was sure that the

gentleman (Mr. Giffard) who took so much interest in this question, would as little choose to sit with a bad father, or a bad husband, (*hear,*) as with one whose religious opinions he disapproved—and, therefore, the next step were the present to succeed, might be to expel these; but, in truth, the Assembly had nothing to do with either.

Mr. GIFFARD was not surprised at the eagerness of certain gentlemen to get quit of this matter: they were afraid to meet it; they knew the weakness of their cause. It was said the Assembly could not entertain it; but did not gentlemen recollect that a member had been once expelled because addicted to the use of wicked and profane words, and for no other reason whatever?—(*Some person, we believe, whispered that the member so expelled was an Atheist.*)—Mr. Giffard did not understand the difference between Atheist and Deist and Unbeliever, or any other title which the enemies of Christianity might assume—they were practically the same thing. He entreated gentlemen to recollect in what circumstances this book appeared: not in private—or obscurely—it was circulated with triumph, and exhibited at feasts and entertainments. Let them recollect, that the book went forth to tell the world that the Saviour of mankind was an impostor.

Mr. HUTTON requested the gentleman not to quote falsely; the book contained no such thing as that the Saviour of the world was an impostor*. But it were much to be wished that those who brought forward such

* As our readers may be curious to know something of the book in question, we subjoin that passage in it which has at the same time given the most offence to certain individuals, and is the clearest exposition of Mr. Stephens's general opinions.—“I believe it necessary for me to preface by some observations what I may have to communicate, in order to put to silence a vain and delusive spirit that has gone forth into the world, saying, that I, and some others, deny Jesus Christ and his coming, and that we rank him as an impostor—a thing which is utterly false: for I know not one within the circle of my acquaint-

Thanksgiving Day at Paisley for the passing of the Trinity Bill. 1899

accusations against any one, should themselves appear with clean hands, and a pure heart; that they should come down to that house devoid of malice, and influenced only by the wish to be just. Who could attempt to deny that this unfortunate petitioner was but an instrument in the hands of others, who had urged him on merely to gratify their private resentment? Was it a matter of the smallest doubt that the Member who had taken so active a part in the discussion, was the father of the Petition? (hear.) And had that Member any reason to boast of the peculiar sanctity of his private life? Or had the colleague, who with him had continued to goad on this Petitioner,

ance that looks on him in any such light: on the contrary, I believe him to have been the most perfect character that ever yet made his appearance amongst the children of men. But all this is not sufficient to satisfy them, because I cannot swallow down the absurd doctrine that he was God—a doctrine that they themselves acknowledge they cannot comprehend or understand—a doctrine they are as it were obliged to believe, because their church, sect, or party, requires them to do so; and on what ground? A few vague scripture expressions, backed by the writings of men as ignorant as themselves. For we must acknowledge that the world has been under such a cloud of gross darkness, so much so, that the very people who claimed to be the most enlightened of all, took and laid wicked hands on him, and put him to death, because they could not bear the purity of his doctrine, which went to sap the foundation of their superstitious building. And so it has fared more or less with all those before or since his day, that have endeavoured to tread the same path; witness the Prophets, Apostles, and others at different ages of the world, who declared against the established religion of the land, whether Jewish, Heathenish, or what is called Christian; be it which it may, the ruling party were always ready to rise up against them, and put them to death, for daring to call in question their mode of faith as prescribed by law."

any ground of superior exultation in the blamelessness of his character? Were such the persons who were to pry into the words and actions of others?

Mr. GIFFARD gave the most unqualified denial to the insinuations concerning him: and repeated that the book contained all he had asserted of it.

After some conversation, the original question was then put and carried with only the dissenting voice of Mr. Giffard.—*Sunderland's News Letter.*

Thanksgiving Day at Paisley for the passing of the Trinity Bill.

(In a Letter from Mr. Wright to the Editor.)

SIR.

Reading, Feb. 7, 1899.

To show how sensible our Northern Unitarian brethren are of the value of their religious rights and liberties, and how grateful they are to God for them, I send you a short account of a thanksgiving day, appointed by the Unitarian Church at Paisley, in consequence of the passing of Mr. Smith's Bill in favour of Antitrinitarians.

The second Sunday in September was fixed on for the above purpose; an earlier day would have been chosen, had it not been thought proper to wait till a copy of the Act had reached Paisley in the Monthly Repository.

The morning service, on the day appointed, commenced with the reading of the Act; this was followed by a suitable address from one of the Elders, in which he enumerated the motives for thankfulness suggested by the passing of the Bill which gave occasion for the present meeting. After the introduction to the business of the day; the congregation united in singing and prayer, then four of the brethren, in succession, addressed the assembly. They contrasted the former state of the world with the present, congratulated the meeting on the important change, and described it as a proper ground of rejoicing and thankfulness, as affording a prospect of the gradual removal of long established errors by the diffusion of knowledge and charity. The service concluded with prayer and praise; having continued about two hours and a half.

In the afternoon, after the usual devotional exercises, one of the brethren

130 *Thanksgiving day at Paisley for the passing of the Trinity Bill.*

delivered a discourse from Acts ix. 31. "Then had the churches rest," &c. In the introduction he noticed the circumstances under which Christianity was introduced into the world, and thence argued its divine origin. He next considered the opposition it had to encounter, the persecutions which ensued. He then glanced at the principal persecutions suffered by different sects of Christians down to the present times. He more particularly stated the sufferings of Unitarians since the period of the Reformation; he next exposed the pretexts for persecution and shewed their injustice. He observed that zeal for truth and the honour of God has been made a pretext for persecution, that errors in faith have been deemed more pernicious than errors in practice, hence it has been concluded that the former ought to be utterly extirpated. "But" he said, "the most pernicious of all errors is the supposition that God will accept a murderer, or any one who indulges dispositions directly at variance with those fundamental maxims of Christianity, whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.—If thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink." He insisted that as neither God nor Christ ever required belief without furnishing sufficient evidence to induce it, for men to enforce it by any thing but rational evidence is impious; and described the baneful influence of intolerance and persecution on the manners, morals, intellectual improvement, and prosperity of society in those countries, where uniformity of opinion has been enforced by penal laws and persecution: hence he concluded, that facts prove the connexion which God himself hath established between the rights and liberties of the subject, and the prosperity of the state. He traced the increasing liberality of the present age to the writings and principles of such men as Newton, Locke, Lardner, Priestley, &c. and mentioned Mr. Smith's Bill having passed triumphantly through both houses of Parliament in 1813, though a similar one, supported by all the eloquence of Mr. Fox, was rejected in 1792, as a pledge of the ultimate triumph of truth and liberality over superstition and intolerance: and concluded by exciting his hearers to thankfulness to that

great Being to whose adorable providence we owe every blessing, and encouraged them to look forward to the time when truth shall universally prevail, when JEHOVAH shall be King over all the earth, when there shall be one JEHOVAH, and his name One. The meeting was well attended; some brethren from Glasgow, and Kilburchan, and a number of strangers were present; had it not been for the wetness of the day it is probable there would have been more. The whole assembly seemed highly gratified with the services of the day.

In the evening a social meeting was held in the meeting-house. The venerable senior Elder was called to the chair, and after giving thanks the company partook of a moderate repast, prepared for the occasion; at the close of which the chairman observed that "the early Christians are said to have eaten their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." He then gave out the 279th hymn of the Exeter collection, which was sung by the company. Several of the brethren addressed the meeting, congratulating them on their different appearance at the time, to what they made about ten years before when they first began to hold meetings.

The following resolutions were moved and agreed to unanimously.

"RESOLVED: That the thanks of the Unitarian Church at Paisley be transmitted, through the medium of the Monthly Repository, to The Hon. William Smith, Esq. M. P. to the Committee of the Unitarian Fund, London, and to the Rev. Thomas Belsham, for their able and successful exertions, in obtaining a repeal of all the penal laws affecting Unitarians in the United Kingdom, and for their uniform and strenuous exertions in the cause of religious liberty in general.

"RESOLVED. That another such day of thanksgiving shall be observed by the church here on the anniversary of the Sunday next after the passing of the [Trinity] Act."

The thanks of the meeting were then voted to the worthy Elder for his conduct in the chair, and for his steady and exemplary exertions in the cause of truth; and to all those who assisted in conducting the services of the day.

The evening was spent in much

harmony and friendship, and afforded a pleasing picture of that brotherly love and Christian fellowship which the pure gospel produces. The company seemed to have but one heart and one soul, and that heart and soul filled with gratitude to God and benevolence to men.

I am, dear Sir,
your's respectfully,
R. WRIGHT.

A List of the Committee of Deputies, appointed to protect the Civil Rights of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenters, for the year 1814.

William Smith, Esq. M. P. Chairman, Park-street Westminster, John Gurney, Esq. Deputy Chairman, Serjeants Inn, Joseph Gutteridge, Esq. Treasurer, Camberwell, James Collins, Esq. Deputy Treasurer, Spital-square, Ebenezer Maitland, Esq. Clapham-common, Joseph Stonard, Esq. Stamford hill, Samuel Favell, Esq. Grove-hill, Camberwell, B. B. Beddome, Esq. Fenchurch-street, William Freme, Esq. Catharine-court, Tower-hill, George Hammond, Esq. Whitechapel, William Hale, Esq. Homerton, Thomas Stiff, Esq. New-street, Covent garden, William Burls, Esq. Lothbury, John Towill Rutt, Esq. Bromley, Middlesex, Henry Waymouth, Esq. Wandsworth-common, Edward Busk, Esq. John street, Bedford-row, William Savill, Esq. Clapham-common, Joseph Luck, Esq. Clapton, John Addington, Esq. Spital-square, James Esdaile, Esq. Bunhill-row, William Esdaile, Esq. Clapham, Thomas Wilson Esq. Tyndale-place, Islington, Joseph Benwell, Esq. Battersea, William Dudds Clark, Esq. High-street Borough, John Bentley, Esq. Highbury.

Unitarian Tract Society, Newcastle upon Tyne.

[We have great pleasure in announcing the establishment of a new Unitarian Tract Society at Newcastle upon Tyne: the following Address, is subjoined to the Rules. Ed.]

The eminent Apostle Peter, in his first Epistle, chap. iii. ver. 15, gives this excellent advice to the converts of Lesser Asia, "Be ready always to give an answer to every one that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you,

with meekness and fear." An exhortation suited to give encouragement and salutary instruction to Christians in all ages; particularly to those, who, like the persons whom Peter addressed, are "scattered abroad" among the various divisions of the Christian world; and in all have hitherto been subjected to much ill-founded censure, in some to great personal inconvenience, to forfeiture of goods, imprisonment, exile, and even death; and in no part, at least of European Christendom, have, till the present year, enjoyed the benefit of that common toleration, which had been extended, in this country particularly, to every other sect.

Thanks to the more enlarged and liberal policy which now appears to actuate the public mind, this boon, which had been indignantly refused but nineteen years ago, has been lately granted, not only without difficulty, but without opposition.—We now can claim, with the rest of our Dissenting brethren, a legal existence; and are authorized to appear before the civil magistrate, and our country at large, under the professed denomination of Unitarian Christians.

It may naturally be supposed that we should avail ourselves of the privilege, which we now can safely exercise, of modestly, but firmly, submitting our views of Christianity to the world.

For this purpose the present association has been formed; a purpose, we trust, not unbecoming our profession as children of One Father, worshippers of One God, and disciples of One Lord Jesus Christ. Our sole purpose is, the distribution of such books and tracts, as appear to us best calculated to promote Christian knowledge, and the practice of piety and virtue; as being founded upon the great fundamental principles of the "Unity, Supremacy and Essential Goodness, of One God, the Father, and of the divine, but subordinate, commission and authority, of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the constituted Instrument of the free grace and mercy of the Father to his undeserving, guilty creatures." Such societies had already existed in the metropolis, and in several provincial districts: and some of our neighbours and friends had, from the first, been members of them. It is now deemed expedient to attempt a similar society in these northern parts. And we trust,

that it may be done without offence; at least, without affording any just ground of offence.

For we wish to conduct ourselves, at all times in the spirit of the apostle's advice already referred to; or, in the words of another apostle, "in meekness to instruct those who oppose themselves;" since by this, if by any means, "God may give them a change of mind, to the acknowledgement of the truth." 2 Tim. ii 25.

These passages may serve as a directory for the plan of our association, as well regarding the principles on which it should be conducted, as the motives which should animate its members.

First, we must be "ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us:" in other words, to defend the evidences, explain the doctrines, and point out the sanctions, of the gospel.

I Plain and short treatises on the existence and perfections of God, on the necessity and advantages of Revelation, on the Evidences of the Jewish, and especially of the Christian, Revelation, should be provided for distribution by the society. Many valuable treatises are found in our libraries on these important subjects; but they are,

many of them, works of great research and learning, which the bulk of Christians have neither the requisite previous information, nor time, to read with advantage. Other works there are of a more popular nature; but most of these are written in answer to the objections of particular writers, whose bold assertions and delusive witticisms it is not worth while to save, by the circulation of replies, however solid, from the oblivion to which they are hastening. The labours of the rational friends to the interests of religion in the rising generation may here have a fair and almost open field.

II. The reasons of our hope being thus provided for, we may proceed to the hope itself; or, to the contents of that scheme of revelation which the Lord Jesus Christ has been commissioned to publish in the gospel; comprehending, the doctrines which he taught concerning God, concerning man as the creature and child of God, what God requires of man, and what man has to expect from God. For all this is included in "the hope that is in him," of which every one is required "to give a reason."

(To be concluded in our next.)

OBITUARY.

Richard Reynolds, Esq.

On the 10th of January, died, RICHARD REYNOLDS, Esq. of Little Paxton, in the county of Huntingdon, in the 87th year of his age; a gentleman revered by the neighbourhood for his truly Christian character, and by the readers of this work his memory will be cherished from the long and intimate friendship that subsisted between him and Mr. Lindsey. His grandfather was bishop of Lincoln, and his father a dignitary in that cathedral, and from the latter he received a sufficient fortune for a country gentleman. He was admitted early at St. John's College, Cambridge; and from the peculiar solicitude of his father and grandfather that he might be associated with a respectable young man, he became the chum of Mr. Lindsey, and in those early years was laid the foundation of that mutual friendship which continued

uninterrupted during their joint lives. On quitting College he lived a short time with his father, and was taken by Lord Sandwich, our minister plenipotentiary, as his private secretary to Aix la Chapelle, and he probably is the last survivor of the diplomatic characters that entered the great room in that city, to confer on the celebrated treaty on certain days of ceremony. His taste was not, however, for public life, and as he had sufficient fortune to live independent, he preferred the situation of a country gentleman, in which he performed the duties of a magistrate of the county, and was at all times the advocate for its liberty and independence. His political principles were similar to those of Dr. Jebb and Mr. Wyvill, with whom he acted in concert in all their measures for Parliamentary Reform, an object of great solicitude to him from his firm conviction of the

great importance of a House of Commons, to the happiness of the country and the necessity of striving to make it, as its name imports, a true representation of the people. In religion he agreed with Mr. Lindsey, and in family prayers he used the liturgy of the Church of England with the corrections made by the celebrated Dr. Clarke. Every undertaking that had in view the improvement of the country in real knowledge he zealously patronised. His door was constantly open to the poor whose wants he relieved, and whose complaints he heard with the greatest attention. Under a severe family affliction, with which it pleased Providence to try him, he conducted himself in such a manner as to shew the strength of conjugal affection in the highest degree, and he acted towards the unhappy source of his sorrows, whose mind, once of the finest mould, was lost to all feeling, with unparalleled benevolence and attention. To his domestics he was the kindest of masters, and at his death their services were liberally remembered. In short, as a neighbour, a friend, a master, a magistrate, in public or in private, he proved himself to be ever actuated by the truly Christian principle of loving his neighbour as himself; and, if he thus endeavoured to do his duty to his fellow creatures, he was no less influenced by the deepest impressions of piety and gratitude towards his Creator. The government of God he acknowledged with the deepest reverence, and the gift of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord he embraced with the truest humility, and with heartfelt sentiments of gratitude to the giver as well as to him through whom that blessing is imparted. Full of faith, hope and charity, he resigned his breath into the hands of his Maker, not doubting that his passage from this life was the entrance into a happy immortality.

Rev. Francis Stone.

1813. Nov. 1. At his house in Garden Row, St. George's Fields, the Rev. FRANCIS STONE, formerly rector of Cold Norton, Essex, but ejected from his living on account of an heretical Visitation Sermon. The circumstances are too well known to our readers to need recital. Mr. Stone was one of the clerical petitioners in 1775. About twenty years ago, he published an Address to the Jews on their Restora-

tion, which he considered as at hand. Since his ejection from his living, he has subsisted in a retired and humble manner, chiefly upon the fund raised on his behalf, at the time of his deprivation, by voluntary subscription. The trustees thought it not right at Mr. Stone's age to sink the sum total of the subscription in the purchase of an annuity; keeping it in their own hands, they allowed him one hundred pounds per annum, and have the satisfaction of holding about £400 for the benefit of his widow and children.

Mrs. M. M. Bowring.

1813. June 7. At Elizabeth City, in the State of Virginia, North America, MARY MATILDA, the wife of Mr. Charles BOWRING, late of Hackney. Her protracted illness induced their voyage to America, the result of which appeared at first answerable to their wishes in the restoration of her health; she was, however, afterwards attacked by a nervous fever, which, from the weakness of her constitution proved fatal. Sickness and consequent retirement confined her virtues chiefly to those of a passive and quiescent nature, but in these she was exemplary; from which it may be presumed, that had Providence favoured her with a wider sphere of activity, they would have been more extensively conspicuous. Though great had been her allotment of pain, at last her departure was so easy that a sweet serenity remained on her countenance at the time of her being placed in her coffin; consolatory to the feelings of those who most deeply lament her loss, but who look through the gloom of her past sufferings to the happy and glorious state to which she will hereafter awake. Her remains were conveyed to the grave by the principal persons of the town, and such had been her amiable deportment to the inhabitants of the place, that a stranger to have seen them, would have supposed that each individual had lost a dear friend. Her faithful attendant, whose constant assiduities, and whose sorrow more resembled that of a tender relative, than servant, was among the mourners. Thus was consigned to the earth, one whose gentle, uniform, but ardent affection in the conjugal relation, and whose general serenity of disposition qualified her to dispense and enjoy much comfort:

her loss must be proportionably felt ; to her affectionate, and beloved partner, it is indeed a deep and permanent affliction.—But, in closing such a grave we must say, *Blessed are the dead*

that die in the Lord, for, though in the cold and silent tomb they must rest from their labours of love and kindness,—yet, their works do follow them.

S. A.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

“When the enemy invaded our territories, his crimes occasioned to us much misery ; but the wrath of God has visited him. Do not let us imitate his example : but let us forget the sufferings we have endured from his crimes, and extend towards him the hand of friendship and the olive of peace. The religion, that we cherish in our hearts, commands us to forgive our enemies, and to do good to them that persecute us.” Thus spake the Emperor Alexander to his Russians, on entering France, and it is with the greatest pleasure that we record his words. Whatever may be the conduct of his army, here is a public testimony from a throne to those principles, which it is the great object of this Survey to inculcate, namely, to press upon the mind of every reader, that he has not a right to the title of Christian unless he obeys the Saviour's command, to forgive our enemies, and to do good to all who calumniate or persecute us. What a striking contrast there is between this language of the Emperor, and that of some of our newspapers, which are endeavouring as much as possible to prevent the return of peaceful sentiments in the minds of Englishmen, by aggravating the crimes of the French, and endeavouring to persuade us, that, sinful beings as we are, no vengeance is too great to be taken on those of our fellow-creatures, whose superior shades of guilt they can so pointedly discriminate! Far be it from us to entertain such sentiments ; and we would call on every one in the contending nations to prostrate himself before the throne of grace, with deep humility and contrition for his own sins and those of his nation ; and to confess, that great as have been the calamities of Europe, they have been brought upon us by the want of subjection, in every nation, to the plans and easy dictates of the Christian religion.

Since the issuing of this proclamation, the confederates have advanced into the heart of France, and at this moment of writing, the advanced guards are reported to be within twenty miles of Paris, and this unhappy capital is expected to share the fate of Moscow. Here let us pause for one moment, and let those who have seen a fire in a town, when all have been anxious to extinguish the flames, conceive what must be the misery and anguish of thousands of families, when whole streets are on fire, and parties are running about not to extinguish, but to increase the horrors of so dreadful a day. Is there a mind so callous to humanity as to rejoice in the distresses of his fellow creatures, and to exult in the destruction of one of the first cities in Europe? Be it so. There are such beings in the world : but do not let them disgrace the name of Christians, by pretending to profess a religion, which, a Russian emperor proclaims it, teaches us to forgive our enemies, and to do good to all who calumniate and persecute us.

The advance of the confederates was made with scarcely any resistance, till they came within a hundred miles of Paris ; when Buonaparte left his capital, trusting his faithful citizens with the guard of the place and the protection of his wife and child, and not without an intimation that their fidelity and courage might be put to a severe test, as the enemy might be expected to appear before their walls. The two great armies of the confederates had advanced by different routes into Champagne, the one consisting chiefly of Prussians under Blücher, who had passed the Rhine between Cologne and Mentz ; the other under prince Schwartzberg, who made their entry from the borders of Switzerland and the southern part of Alsace. The latter army was accompanied by the two confederate emperors. Buonaparte went out against this

formidable array with an evident intention to fight the former, before a junction was made with the latter.

Several engagements took place before the decisive battle, which was fought at Brienne, when after a very severe contest Buonaparte was compelled to retreat, which he did to Troyes, and then to Nogent, for at the battle of Brienne not only Blucher, but part of Schwartzberg's army was engaged. The confederates then seem to have taken the determination of marching to Paris, the one on the right the other on the left bank of the Seine. And now Buonaparte, mustering all his force, made another attack on Blucher's army near Chateau Thierry, defeating them, according to his own account, with immense slaughter, and loss of men, baggage and artillery, driving them before him towards Soissons, and compelling them to retreat to Rheims. This we have from the French papers, which however give no account of Schwartzberg's army, which in the mean time might have been expected to march directly to Paris, and this expectation gave rise to numerous reports of Paris being taken, and Buonaparte being destroyed, and various frauds being practised by the jobbers in the funds on the credulity of the public.

In the mean time negotiations were carrying on between the confederate powers and the French emperor, their ministers meeting for this purpose at Chatillon upon the Seine. At first an expectation was raised, that they might produce some effect, and particularly as the messengers from the English minister were permitted to come directly to England through Paris. But these hopes were kept up for only a short time, and various surmises were started on their supposed failure. The terms were at one time stated to be such as Buonaparte could not assent to, and England was accused, but probably without reason, of throwing every obstacle in the way of negotiating with the French emperor. At another time it was said, that nothing could satisfy the confederates but the re-establishment of the Bourbons, and that this would be effected to the general satisfaction of the French, as soon as the power of Buonaparte was destroyed, and the advocates for that family could shew themselves with any prospect of suc-

cess. In this respect it was constantly maintained, that the confederates would not interfere with the internal government of the country, nor force a sovereign upon it against the consent of the nation. Most probably the negotiations were carried on, and are still carrying on, as such things generally are, the terms rising or falling with the prospects of each party.

The conflict, however, does not appear so near its termination as at first was expected. When we wrote our last report the probabilities were strong that the confederates would dictate the terms of peace at Paris, and the check given to them by Buonaparte does not by any means remove that expectation. The losses experienced by Blucher will be easily made up by the troops under the Crown Prince of Sweden, who was advanced as far as Cologne in his way to Paris; and the Netherlands having renounced their incorporation with France, the way is made easy for another immense force to march through that country towards the capital. Thus Buonaparte has army after army to repulse, and his supplies are every day growing weaker: but at the same time, when we reflect on the energies of the French people, it cannot be imagined, that, if they persevere in their allegiance to their emperor, the conquest of France will be effected without torrents of blood, and many dubious battles.

The English army in the South of France has been kept in check by the forces under the command of Soult, which, however, have undergone a very material change: for his veterans have been transported by rapid marches to the aid of the emperor, and their places have been supplied by the new levies made in the South of France. As the confederate army took the direction of Paris from Switzerland, Lyons and the South of France have hitherto escaped. But the main point is now Paris, and to that city the eyes of all Europe are turned. It is left under the guardianship of the Empress Regent, and every precaution is taken to preserve it from a sudden attack. On the real state of its inhabitants little can be known with certainty. The bank, as might naturally be expected in such circumstances, has stopped payment, but only to a cer-

tain degree, and in their great distress they have not had recourse to so strong a measure, as was taken by the government of this country with respect to its bank, under an alarm of much less terrific nature. They continue their cash payments to a certain amount each day, but probably the time will soon come, when these must be altogether suspended. Their funds of course experienced a depression. On the whole, however, it may excite great admiration, that there has not been a defection of a much higher nature from their sovereign, and this may yet end in the destruction of one of the chief capitals of Europe.

Ferdinand is said to be on his progress towards his capital, but the Cortez, not having sanctioned his treaty with the French, may enforce such terms, that the reins of government can hardly be held by him with a very steady hand. The French are not driven out of Catalonia, but their stay cannot be much longer in that country. The limited monarchy of Spain will present in no short time a new feature in the affairs of Europe.

The North is also likely to call forth attention. Denmark, unable to resist, was under the necessity at last of acceding to the terms of the confederacy, and the cession of Norway to Sweden has been made absolute by the sovereign who held the former country. But if a sovereign may give up his own rights, can he also command the inhabitants of the ceded country to accept the new sovereign? Have not the inhabitants any concern in the exchange? The Genoese gave up Corsica to the French, and the title was good as far as Genoa and France were concerned: but the Corsicans refused compliance with a treaty, to which their consent had never been asked, and no where was the bravery of their resistance so much applauded as in this country. Norway, it is said, will not ratify the transfer, and, given up by its former

sovereign, prefers independence to submission to Sweden. Whether they will be able to support their determination, time must shew: but if the Crown Prince should meet with ill success in his present enterprise, the subjection of Norway may be attended with great difficulty. It was formerly a powerful country, and its sailors kept the coasts of Europe in awe. When the spirit of a people is roused, the conquest of them is not an easy matter, and the independence of Norway may do no injury to the balance of Europe.

America bears evident marks of rising in the scale of glory. It will be prepared to present to us similar scenes with those of civilized Europe. The President of the United States has opened the Congress with the usual message, in which their successes are of course more dwelt upon than their reverses; the blame of the war is laid upon us, and a desire of peace, consistent with honour, is expressed. To accelerate this object, it appears that ministers will be employed on both sides at Gottingen, England having refused the proposals of America to negotiate under the mediation of Russia. Here the difficult question will be agitated, what are the rights of a sovereign over a person born in his dominions, but who is out of them and become subject to another power. Our law condemns to death every subject taken with arms in his hands against his country, yet would the execution of this law be considered as worthy of the age we live in, if a man so taken had passed only a few years of infancy or childhood here, and had lived for sixty years in another country, where by marriages and intermarriages he had been previously to his birth much more connected with that country than with England? The settling of this question will prevent the unnecessary harsh treatment of prisoners.

Feb. 24.

CORRIGENDA.

- Page 38, col. 2, line 12 and 13, for *refrain* read *restrain*.
 P. 40, col. 1, line 10, for *use* read *us*.
 P. 40, col. 1, line 31, for *θεου*, of God, read *κυριου*, of the Lord.
 P. 41, col. 2, line 2, for *κυριου*, read *θεου*.
 P. 41, col. 2, line 3, for *θεου*, read *κυριου*.
 P. 41, col. 2, line 15, for *copies*, read *copiers*.
 P. 42, col. 2, line 8, for *cannot, I believe*, read *cannot I believe, or I cannot believe*.