

THE
Monthly Repository,
&c.

No. CXVI.]

AUGUST, 1815.

[Vol. X.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Professor Mylne's Account of the Proceedings against him, on the Charge of Sedition.

(Concluded from p. 410.)

THE extract referred to in the concluding sentence of the above letter, has been already inserted in your paper of the 28th April, and in many others. It is unnecessary, therefore, to occupy your columns by again giving it in full. It is right, however, to mention, that the meeting of the 19th was called at my request, to deliberate on the means by which we might in some degree prevent that injury to the reputation of the University which might be dreaded from the notoriety of the precognition carried on in the College; and especially from the profound secrecy which was maintained by the Lord Advocate and the inferior Law-Officers, as to the charges thus investigated with so much solemnity; a circumstance which might be expected to produce in the public the inclination, as it would afford them the opportunity, of exaggerating, beyond bounds, the degree both of their enormity and of the credit due to them. On my suggestion, the meeting agreed to put some questions to all those gentlemen, members of the Faculty or closely connected with it, who had been examined by the Sheriff, or who had been in the chapel on the morning of the 26th March, that from their answers it might be known both what really was the crime alleged against me, and what proof there was of my guilt. Professors Young, Jardine, and Muirhead, and Mr. Alexander (who during the session had filled with so much respectability the vacant chair of Humanity) were accordingly examined in the meeting, and, upon their solemn declarations, the Faculty una-

VOL. X.

nimously resolved, 1st, That the offence of which I had been accused appeared to be, that while conducting Divine Service, and particularly in the Psalms and the concluding prayer, I had expressed satisfaction and exultation in the recent successes of Buonaparte and his arrival in Paris: 2dly, That this odious accusation was completely disproved by the concurrent testimony of the four gentlemen, who had been all of them present during the service, and who declared not only that no unusual impression was made on their minds by any part of it (which certainly there would have been, had the accusation been true), but that, on the contrary, the whole of it was proper and decorous, and the prayer particularly suitable to the alarming intelligence of the day: 3dly, That it should be recorded in the minutes, that the Faculty entertained the fullest conviction of the utter groundlessness of the charge apparently made against me.

On the 29th of April, I received from the Lord Advocate the following letter.

SIR,

London, April 26, 1815.

I yesterday received, inclosed in a letter from you, an extract of minutes of the Faculty of Glasgow College, dated the 19th of April, referring to declarations or statements then made *viva voce*, by some members of the University. Since that time the Faculty would, on the 21st of that month, receive the copy of the opinion which I transmitted to that body, bearing testimony plainly and decidedly to the rectitude of your conduct on the 26th March.

In answer to your application, requesting me to give orders to the Procurator Fiscal of Lanarkshire, to communicate to you the information on which he proceeded in presenting a petition for a precognition, and to direct the precognition and whole proceedings taken by and carried on before the Sheriff (or copies of them) to be

transmitted to you, I beg leave to say, that I would, in the existing circumstances, have entertained great doubt of the legality and expediency of such an extraordinary interference on my part, but in any view, you have placed an insurmountable bar to the adoption of that measure. It appears from your statements to me, that you have in contemplation judicial proceedings against some individual or individuals, as being in your opinion guilty of malignantly defaming your character; and I should not think myself justified in prejudicating in any manner any question that might affect the rights of third parties, which may come under the cognizance of a court of law. If judicial proceedings shall be instituted, it will be the province of the Court before which they shall be carried on, to give such orders as they may consider necessary to the ends of justice.

I have the honour to be, &c.

AR. COLQUHOUN.

To Professor Mylne,

The above letter is the last of those documents which I regard as essential to the history of the late extraordinary proceedings here: I hope to be indulged by you with an opportunity of stating, in a future paper, some other circumstances connected with them, of minor importance perhaps, but still meriting attention; and a few observations intended to place the whole business in a distinct point of view before that public to whose impartial judgment I shall then leave it.

JAMES MYLNE.

Glasgow College, 6th May, 1815.

Glasgow College, April 26, 1815.

Whereas, impressions unfavourable to the reputation and interests of the UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW, and of PROFESSOR MYLNE, may be produced by the precognition into the conduct of that Gentleman lately made by the Sheriff of Lanarkshire, the attention of the public is requested to the following Minute, extracted from the Records of the College.

Glasgow College, April 14, 1815.

The Faculty being duly summoned and convened, present, the Principal, Professors M^cGill, Cumin, Young, Jardine, Millar, Mylne, Meikleham, Davidson, Couper and M^cTurk,

Mr. Mylne stated as the reasons that induced him to request this meeting to be called, That the late extraordinary precognition carried on here by the Law-Officers of the country, has now become matter of notoriety; that the fact of his

having been subjected to such a precognition encourages a belief, that the criminal charges against him, which had given rise to such proceedings, could have been of no ordinary or light nature: and that such a persuasion generally entertained, as it would probably be if no effectual means were taken to prevent it, might prove very injurious not only to his own reputation and interest, but to those also of the University; especially since the Public, not being permitted to know the actual nature of these charges, or the grounds on which they are rested, might magnify to any amount the degree both of their enormity and of the credit that is due to them.

Mr. Mylne therefore requested that the undermentioned Gentlemen who had already been examined by the Sheriff, or who had been present when the offences that gave rise to the precognition were supposed to have been committed, might now be called upon to reply to some questions to be put to them in presence of the meeting, in order that from their answers it might be known, both what are the charges that have been made against Mr. Mylne, and on what evidence they are founded. The persons whom the Faculty were thus requested to examine, were Professors Young, Jardine and Muirhead, together with Mr. Alexander, teacher of the Humanity Class.

The Faculty having agreed to Mr. Mylne's request, and having heard the declarations of the above-named Gentlemen, in answer to the questions put to them in the meeting, unanimously agreed to the following Resolutions:—

First, From the declarations now made by Professors Young and Jardine, and by Mr. Alexander, all of whom had been examined by the Sheriff, it appears to the Faculty that the offence of which Mr. Mylne had been accused or suspected, was, that on Sunday, the 26th March, while conducting public worship in the College Chapel, he had manifested exultation in the recent successes of Buonaparte, and in his arrival at Paris. That in his concluding prayer particularly, he had expressed that sentiment; and that the passages which he appointed to be sung by the congregation, had been chosen by him as alluding to those events and as indicating his high satisfaction in them.

Secondly, That from Mr. Mylne's general character and conduct, it would have required evidence of the very strongest kind to have induced the Faculty to entertain the belief that he could have been guilty of such a gross violation of his public duty, as that with which he seems to have been charged; and from the declarations now made by Professors Young, Jardine and Muirhead, and by Mr. Alex-

ander, all of whom attended divine worship in the Chapel on that occasion, it appears evident not only that no unusual impression had been made on the mind of any of these Gentlemen by any part of the service, but that, on the contrary, the whole of it was conducted with the greatest propriety and decorum; and that in particular the prayer was highly suitable to the alarming intelligence that had been received that morning.

The Faculty, therefore, in justice to their colleague and themselves, think it right that it should appear on their Minutes, that they entertain the fullest conviction of the perfect propriety of Mr. Mylne's conduct on that occasion, and of the utter groundlessness of the charge that seems to have been made against him.

(Signed) W. TAYLOR, Principal.

Extracted from the Records of the Faculty of Glasgow College, by
JAMES MILLAR, Clk. p. t.

To the Editor of the Glasgow Herald.

SIR,

To complete the history of those proceedings which you have had the goodness to permit me to state so fully in your paper of Monday last, very little remains to be added; nothing, I think, except an account of what took place at a meeting of the Faculty of the College on the 2nd inst. That meeting was held for a variety of purposes; and, among others, for taking under consideration the letters which had been received from the Lord Advocate on the subject of the precognition, and particularly his *opinion* on it, which, in his letter of the 7th April, he had offered to transmit to the College, and which accordingly he had received on the 21st; and for determining whether any farther measures should be adopted by the College, in relation to that transaction, and what these measures should be.

It is believed that no one who attentively considers that *opinion*, and the other communications from his lordship, all of which have been fully and accurately exhibited in your paper, will be greatly surprised to learn, that there were many members of the Faculty who were far from being satisfied either with the general spirit expressed in his correspondence, or with the manner in which he had been pleased to treat their earnest requests. Consequently, it will be expected that some explanation should

be given of those considerations which induced the Faculty not only to acquiesce in his determined refusal to comply with these requests, but also to abandon all application to other quarters for that redress which they conceived themselves entitled to, and which his lordship had shewn himself so unwilling or unable to give. To attempt such an explanation of the motives that weighed with the Faculty in forming this resolution, is the principal object of this letter.

Various quarters were mentioned from which such powerful interference might be hoped for, as would procure every thing that was necessary for the successful prosecution of redress.

1. *From Government.*—An application, it was suggested, might be made, by a respectful petition, either to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, or to his Majesty's Privy Council, praying that the power of government might be interposed, to authorize, perhaps to command, the Lord Advocate to make those disclosures which we had in vain demanded from him. By some it might be thought that his resistance to our urgent applications on this point was the result of his high sense of the duty imposed upon him by his official character. Believing the most important functions of his Majesty's Advocate for Scotland to consist in the exercise of a constant vigilance over State delinquencies, he might imagine it to be incumbent on him to afford informers that security which they would derive from a strict concealment of their persons and their communications; he might conceive that even the base motives from which they often acted, or the utter falsehood of the information which in some cases, as in the present instance, they gave, would not be sufficient to justify him in exposing them, by such disclosures as the Faculty demanded, to the odium of the public, or to the natural and just resentment of those whom they had calumniated; but that, as the high officer of the crown, it was his paramount concern to take care that the State should sustain no harm; and that from the prosecution of this great object, he was not to be diverted by the complaints of individuals, nor even by his own feelings for their wrongs. Some expressions in his

lordship's letters, particularly in his first letter, seem to indicate that such were the notions he entertained of the obligations laid on him by his office. In that letter he replies to a representation unanimously addressed to him by the Faculty of Glasgow College, stating a serious injury which they had sustained from the baseness and falsehood of an informer, and requesting that the informer and his information might be made known to them, as necessary to their obtaining due redress: and though in this reply he acknowledges his connexion with the University, and expresses in handsome terms his affectionate and respectful regards for her as his *Alma Mater*, yet he warns the Faculty to expect no kindness from him in consequence of these sentiments: he tells them, that when the precognition shall be laid before him as his Majesty's Advocate for Scotland, it shall be considered with the greatest attention and deliberation, but that nothing more from him was to be looked for—he must sternly adhere to the rigid line of official duty—"he cannot in this instance deviate from the established rules, or from the usual practice."

That, in these circumstances, some of the Faculty should think of seeking relief against his lordship's scruples, by a direct application to government, was natural. But a very little attention was sufficient to discover strong reasons for abstaining from such a measure. To some it might appear a measure so improper in itself, so opposite to, and inconsistent with the general spirit and character of the British Constitution, that it ought not to be resorted to, whatever advantage it might promise: and all were impressed with a conviction that it would be vain, and therefore inexpedient, to adopt it. The same measures of policy which are acted upon by the inferior servants of the crown, are no doubt followed by those also from whom they derive their powers. If the circumstances in our case, which we represented as very peculiar, were not regarded by the Lord Advocate as a sufficient reason for breaking through the ordinary rule to comply with our requests, it was certainly very improbable that they would be otherwise thought of by his Majesty's

immediate ministers, whose situation and occupations remove them so far from any opportunity of forming an accurate judgment. Such an application therefore to government, it was predicted, would produce nothing more than a reference for our answer to the Lord Advocate himself, as possessing the best means of knowing what answer was most proper to be given; accompanied, perhaps, with a repetition of what his lordship had already communicated to us, namely, "that if we felt ourselves wronged by his answer, the law is open to all who are injured by any magistrate."

2. *From Parliament.*—Parliament naturally occurs as the proper and effectual resource in all cases in which redress is not to be obtained by ordinary means. To this resource the University had easy access. In both Houses of Parliament were members connected with it by various ties; of known zeal for its interests; willing to give their talents and exertions to support any claim that essential justice entitled us to make. Why not take the benefit of their influence or friendship, in carrying through a motion for the production of the information, petition, warrant, and all other papers connected with the precognition? Why not in this way bring into light all the mysteries of that outrage that had been committed upon us: and drive the original author of it, the odious informer, from that screen of established rules, and usual practices, behind which he lurked, and which saved him from the disgrace, and other punishment he so well deserved.

But to this proposal also, objections of great weight obviously presented themselves. If it were probable that ministers would impatiently listen to a respectful petition on the subject, presented immediately to themselves, it seemed certain that their decided resistance would be given to such an application, coming upon them in the unceremonious dress of a motion in Parliament; necessarily setting out with the ungracious air of complaint and remonstrance against some of the servants of the Crown; and aiming at the most exalted of them, the compulsory force of parliamentary authority. Who of those that usually act with ministry would choose to be

seen supporting a measure of which such were the features? and what would be the fate of it, if brought forward under other auspices?—That circumstance alone would be sufficient to make many regard the wrongs of the college as imaginary, and their complaints as the clamours of faction: that circumstance would abundantly supply the place of that evidence of political guilt, which the precognition had so totally failed to bring forward. Many would find it easy to believe, that those might well rejoice in the successes of Buonaparte, who thus, at such a time, could endeavour to weaken the hands, or even to occupy the attention, of his most ardent and energetic adversaries.

3. *From the Courts of Law.*—This mode of seeking redress, though the last I have mentioned, is that which would first occur to every one's mind. Application to government, applications to parliament, would certainly never be thought of by those who imagined that suitable redress could be obtained by regular process before the ordinary Courts of Justice.—But to many, at least, in the Faculty, this mode of seeking redress appeared not more promising of success than the others. Though it was not known with certainty whether the information, on which the petition and warrant for the precognition were founded had been originally communicated to the Lord Advocate, yet the Faculty had been informed by himself, that the precognition and the proceedings connected with it had been placed in his hands by the local magistrate, and were now in his custody. It was evident, therefore, that a process for compelling the exhibition of these documents, and the open disclosure of the information and the informer, must necessarily be a process against his lordship for an undue exercise of power, in withholding information which, for the ends of justice, the College were entitled to demand and to obtain; and of the success of such a process, few entertained any hopes—its utter failure was, by many, confidently, perhaps too confidently, anticipated, from the undefined nature and extent of the Advocate's powers in all cases, and the disposition generally shewn to indulge the unrestrained exercise of them in cases similar to the present. It was foreseen that he

would resist our demands by a variety of arguments, which have been seldom overruled—certainly never, in those cases where offences, alleged to be of a political nature, were concerned:—he would plead the dangerous nature of such crimes; crimes exposing to hazard the public tranquillity, the public safety; indicating and promoting a spirit of sedition and disloyalty, of disobedience to lawful authority, of disrespect for the established government:—he would plead, that one of the most important of his functions, was to watch and to check the first tendencies to such offences; and that for its successful discharge, it was absolutely necessary that he should be permitted to protect, from resentment and enmity, those individuals through whose information these offences were brought to his knowledge. On these *general* grounds, he would defend his right to withhold disclosures such as those which the Faculty demanded—he would at the same time maintain, that in this particular case, there was nothing that called for the interference of the law with the use he had already made, or was now making, of the powers with which this office invested him—at first, in acting upon the information communicated; and now, in maintaining determined silence as to the informer: for that (as perhaps he might assert) the informer in this case was one whose situation in society seemed to entitle him to credit; and whose communications, therefore, called for the immediate attention of the Law Officers, and warranted the investigation that had been made. His information, indeed, had been found to be groundless; but there was no reason to believe that, in giving it, he had acted from malice, or from any motives but those that were of a public and honourable kind: he had only been deceived; or if guilty of any faults, guilty only of rashness and indiscretion; of too hasty a confidence in the truth of reports which he should have more carefully examined; but these were faults of too venial a nature to permit him on account of them to be subjected to all the hatred and contempt which, with little discrimination, are generally poured on all who bear the name of informer. Besides it would be asked by him, where was the evil which he was required

to remedy by such an unusual violation of an established rule and practice? From the precognition, so much complained of, no harm had resulted to the individual immediately concerned, or to the College of Glasgow. From the evidence which it had furnished, the former had been cleared from all crime or criminal intention; and the University consequently could suffer no stain on its reputation, no loss of its interests, from an inquiry which had terminated so honourably; but, on the contrary, both that individual and the University had been thus saved from the mischievous consequences of insinuations and surmises to their prejudice, secretly circulating among the public, and never met by any accurate and regular investigation.

By these arguments, it was conceived, that the demands of the Faculty in a Court of Law would be opposed on the part of the Lord Advocate; and though to many of their number, and no doubt to many others also, it may appear that these arguments admit of easy answer, and that they furnish no just or equitable bar to their claim, yet it was generally believed by the members that they would be found effectual against them; and that therefore, they presented strong and sufficient reasons for declining to engage in legal proceedings. It is hoped, that in entertaining this persuasion, and in thus acting upon it, the Faculty of the College of Glasgow will not be regarded as chargeable with throwing upon the Courts and the Judges of their country any libellous or unbecoming imputations. This persuasion they were led to entertain from the usual and well-known practice of these Courts; from the total absence of all cases relating to *political* offences, that could warrant a different belief; and particularly from the entire confidence which the Lord Advocate seemed to entertain of his absolute security against all compulsion by legal authority—a confidence which is not ambiguously indicated in the conclusion of his letter of the 26th April, addressed to me, and inserted in your former paper.

I consider it, however, as incumbent on me to add on this subject, that to a *majority* of the meeting on the 2nd, (the meeting whose proceedings I am endeavouring to explain), it ap-

peared, that though it would be highly rash and inexpedient to enter immediately into a process against the Law Officers, yet it would be proper that the College should take the opinion of able Counsel, whether such a measure would be attended with any chance of success. But as many, even of those who were of this opinion, had very weak expectation of receiving from such consultation any satisfactory encouragement as to the final result; and as the minority, on the other hand, strongly expressed their apprehensions that even this step might have the effect of involving the College in a tedious, expensive and fruitless litigation, it was, with my entire concurrence, abandoned even by those gentlemen by whom it was proposed or supported.

I have now, Sir, finished all that seems to me essential in the statement which you have permitted me to communicate, through your paper, to the public. The facts of the case have been given in your former paper, on the authority of documents which cannot be questioned; and, on this occasion, I have stated those considerations which weighed with the Faculty, and with myself, in the purpose which has been adopted; and which, perhaps, some will consider as not fully vindicated, even by the considerations and reasons which I have stated; I mean the purpose of the College to relinquish all attempts of obtaining redress, by application either to government, to parliament, or to the courts of law, to leave the amount of their wrongs to be estimated by the judgment of a liberal and intelligent public; and to look for that recompense only, which consists in continuing to be regarded with general approbation and confidence, and in finding the enemies of their reputation and tranquillity, known or unknown, branded with universal hatred and contempt.

Perhaps the wisest and fairest plan I could follow, would be to leave the public to form their judgment from the statements I have already made, unaccompanied with any remarks or comments from me. It is not my intention to trespass upon your indulgence, by any such additions at present; what has been contained in this and in your former paper, I intend to print immediately in the form of a

pamphlet, which will conclude with a few circumstances and observations, which I scarcely considered myself as entitled to introduce, so long as I felt myself as in some measure stating the case of the Faculty, but which it will not only be allowable in me, but

incumbent upon me to bring forward, when speaking solely in my own name.—I am, &c.

JAMES MYLNE.

College, 13th May, 1815.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Charles James Fox.

(Continued from p. 412.)

7. *No durability in Peace.* (Dec. 5. 1782.)

THE honourable gentleman may talk of the durability of peace, said Mr. Fox, but I can never think it wise to pay much regard to that prospect. The inconsistency, the weakness and the passions of human governments will in all time continue to tear asunder the bands of civil concord; and no gratification, no accession, no dismemberment of empire, no good fortune, no calamity, will induce kings to sit down contented with what they have acquired or patient under their loss, but after a little breathing time they will again rise into outrage, offence and war.

8. *His Coalition with Lord North.* (Feb. 17, 1783.)

I now come, said Mr. Fox, to take notice of the most heinous charge of all. I am accused of having formed a junction with a noble person, whose principles I have been in the habit of opposing for the last seven years of my life. I do not think it at all incumbent on me to make any answer to this charge: first, because I do not think that the persons who have asked the question, have any right to make the inquiry; and secondly, because if any such junction was formed, I see no ground for arraignment in the matter. That any such alliance has taken place, I can by no means aver. That I shall have the honour of concurring with the noble lord in the blue ribbon on the present question is very certain; and if men of honour can meet on points of general national concern, I see no reason for calling such a meeting an unnatural junction. It is neither wise nor noble to keep up animosities for ever. It is neither just nor candid to keep up animosity when

the cause of it is no more. It is not in my nature to bear malice or to live in ill-will. My friendships are perpetual, my enmities are not so. *Amicitiae sempiternae, inimicitiae placabiles.* I disdain to keep alive in my bosom the enmities which I may bear to men, when the cause of those enmities is no more. When a man ceases to be what he was, when the opinions which made him obnoxious are changed, he then is no more my enemy but my friend. The American war was the cause of the enmity between the noble lord and myself. The American war and the American question is at an end. The noble lord has profited from fatal experience. While that system was maintained, nothing could be more asunder than the noble lord and myself. But it is now no more; and it is therefore wise and candid to put an end also to the ill-will, the animosity, the rancour and the feuds which it occasioned. I am free to acknowledge, that when I was the friend of the noble lord in the blue ribbon, I found him open and sincere; when the enemy, honourable and manly. I never had reason to say of the noble lord in the blue ribbon, that he practised any of those little subterfuges, tricks and stratagems which I found in others; any of those behind-hand and paltry manœuvres which destroy confidence between human beings and degrade the character of the statesman and the man.

9. *Mr. Pitt's Motion for a Reform in Parliament.* (May 7, 1783.)

Mr. Secretary Fox rose, and remarked to the House, that he made no doubt there were some persons present who would attribute what he said to lukewarmness and not to zeal; however, regardless of their censure, he would freely deliver his sentiments, and assure the House that he most heartily

concurred with the right honourable gentleman who made the motion, that the constitution required some reform, and so far from its being absurd to make any innovation on it, he was certain that the nature of our constitution required innovation and renovation; for the beauty of the constitution did not consist, as some people imagined in theory, but in practice. He knew it was the common and the popular opinion, that our constitution was beautiful in theory, but all corrupt in practice. Singular as his sentiment might be upon the subject, he made no scruple to avow that he looked to the reverse as the true description of our constitution, and thought it admirable in practice but imperfect and very faulty in theory. *The theory was in its nature found by experience to be absurd in several parts; for, as it was composed of three estates, King, Lords and Commons, it was absurd to think that one man should have an equal power to the whole multitude; therefore, in the practical part, that power was wisely curtailed, and not left in the breast of one man, but in a government consisting of several ministers. He regarded it as one of its chief excellencies, that it involved a renovating principle in itself, and by being capable of repeated improvement, admitted the possibility of its being from time to time carried to a degree of perfection beyond which no human idea could go.*

10. *Votes and Wishes. (Westminster Scrutiny, May 25, 1784.)*

He took notice that a learned friend of his, speaking of the partiality of the electors towards him, had carried the paradox rather too far, and declared that the votes for him had been almost universal; he would not venture to say this; but though he had not a majority of votes, yet it might fairly be said that when a candidate like him, a known object of the enmity and persecution of government, ventured to stand for Westminster, to obtain an equality of votes, he must have a majority of wishes. He observed that the Latin word *votum* admitted of two translations, both of which applied to his case; for he might be said to have enjoyed the majority of the voices of his constituents, or he could not have been honoured with an equality of their votes.

11. *Long Speeches. (May 30, 1785.)*

Before I touch upon the charges to which I allude, I cannot help observing, with what special grace the right honourable gentleman (Mr. Pitt) ridicules long speeches—with what a singular propriety he, of all the members in this House, attempts to correct others for occupying much of the time of the House. I do not intend to deny the right honourable gentlemen the merit of great abilities, great eloquence and great powers of pleasing his hearers; but of all the crimes to be urged against any person within these walls, the last, undoubtedly, for the right honourable gentleman to venture upon is, to charge the long duration of his speech as a fault against any member. The right honourable gentleman, like myself, is under the necessity of troubling this House much oftener and for a much longer time than is perhaps agreeable; and it ill becomes either of us to reprobate others for a practice we ourselves so frequently fall into. Grateful for the indulgence we are favoured with, we should certainly be the last to condemn that in which we ourselves are the greatest transgressors. And I shall drop this part of the subject, with only remarking, that if an almost uniform deviation from the immediate subject in discussion,—if abandoning liberal argument for illiberal declamation,—if frequently quitting sound sense for indecent sarcasms, and preferring to rouse the passions and inflame the prejudices of his auditory to the convincing their understandings and informing their judgments, tended to diminish the title of any member of this House to a more than common portion of its temper and endurance—I do not know one gentleman who would have so ill-founded a claim upon it for such favours, as the right honourable gentleman himself.

12. *English and Irish Patriot. (Irish Commercial Propositions. May 30, 1785.)*

Although the right honourable gentleman charges upon me (concluded Mr. Fox) that I have not not heretofore opposed this proposition, he might surely have recollected that a noble lord near him (Lord Mahon) had attempted to ridicule me when this question was before under discussion, as being now an English, now an Irish patriot; and to that ridicule, impotent

and awkward though it felt, I beg leave to plead guilty. I wish to appear what I really feel, both an English and an Irish patriot; only let it be recollected that I am not so now, merely for the exigency of the moment. Let it be recollected, that if, in defending the liberties of Ireland and discovering a jealousy for her constitution, I deserve the name of an Irish patriot, to that honour I am entitled ever since the first day of the session, when I could not foresee the events of the present day, and long before I knew that any commercial treaty with Ireland had been talked of. I embraced the first opportunity afforded by the meeting of the House, to declare my execration of the conduct of the King's ministry in their proceedings in Ireland, where I saw the fundamental and most sacred principles of the constitution daringly overturned, and doctrines advanced and measures adopted, in my judgment, utterly subversive of every trace of civil liberty; and all this in the zeal of the right honourable gentleman to suppress the reform of Parliament in Ireland.

Upon the opening of the proposed arrangements in this House, I repeated the same arguments, and was convinced that Ireland never called for this system, nor ever thought of it, but was seriously occupied with other objects. I added, that I considered the whole plan as a lure to divert the Irish from constitutional points, by throwing the trade of Ireland at their feet; and to reconcile them to the violation of the laws of the land and of the constitution, by the enchanting prospect of the commercial benefits held out by this system. In this opinion I am

strengthened every day, and the eager part acted by those who surround the right honourable gentleman, would confirm to me my fears for the constitution of Ireland. If this conduct, Sir, constitute an Irish patriot, then am I one; and if to struggle to save the trade of England from annihilation, gives any claim to the appellation of an English patriot, I possess that claim. I did not invite the merchants and manufacturers to an opposition to this scheme. If I were capable of making them instruments in this business, they were incapable of becoming my instruments: they did not follow me; I followed them. To the right honourable gentleman's (Mr. Pitt's) government they were exceedingly partial; and not quite recovered from the insanity of the times, they were absolutely prejudiced against me and my friends. They are as discerning and respectable a body of men as any in Europe, and merited, I think, better treatment than they experienced from the right honourable gentleman. No man was ever more indebted to the protection of the people than that right honourable gentleman; and no people I believe ever so soon began to repent of their predilection. Every act of his government has tended to open their eyes; they are, I believe, completely cured of the popular infection, but I fear their conviction comes a little too late.

I shall now relinquish this subject, perhaps for ever, with repeating a sentiment that I have before thrown out during the discussions upon this business: I will not barter English commerce for Irish slavery; that is not the price I would pay, nor is this the thing I would purchase.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Essay on the Apocryphal Book styled the Wisdom of Solomon.

June 24th, 1815.

THE genuineness and authenticity of writings purporting to be ancient, must, in the first instance, be ascertained, if possible, by *external* evidence. On this evidence we receive the books which compose the Jewish Scriptures: and it is principally owing to the want of it that we reject other productions which find a place in the

larger copies of our Bibles, and are there distinguished as *apocryphal*. The word denotes uncertainty and doubt; and it implies not only that we have no exact acquaintance with the authors and the dates of the works so denominated, but that for these, and perhaps additional reasons, we do not admit them to the same important rank with the books deemed canonical. A literary performance may possess great intrinsic merit—if a poem,

it may be sublime and elegant, if a moral treatise, it may be correct, perspicuous and impressive—although it cannot with truth be ascribed to the writer whose name it bears, or even although it should be anonymous.

In judging, however, from whose pen it proceeded, *internal* testimony deserves our attention. There are cases in which this kind of testimony will soon determine the question affirmatively: there are many in which it will for ever set it at rest negatively. Authors who do not mean to deceive us, and who, with this view, do not adopt the style and manner and sentiments of a remote age and country, will usually exhibit marks of the time, the spot and the circumstances in which they arise. In proportion, too, as sound criticism is cultivated, an attempt to impose on the world, by *personating*, as it were, some illustrious poet, historian or moralist, will become more impracticable. It is evident, therefore, that a serious composition may contain signs of truth and nature which will direct us—if not to the framer of it, yet—to the period and the scene of its origin.

Let us apply these general observations to the book entitled the Wisdom of Solomon.

That it makes no part of the Jewish canon, is an uncontradicted and indisputable fact. Now if it were the production of Solomon, can we believe that his countrymen would not have classed it together with the *Proverbs* and the *Ecclesiastes*, that they would not have placed considerable value on a work of their wise and favourite monarch? Will it be pretended that they were not better judges of the question than modern critics? This were too much to concede. Yet, even could the concession be fairly demanded and made, criticism, whether ancient or modern, must pronounce, on internal evidence, that the book of wisdom was written in an age long subsequent to Solomon's.*

If we may argue (as we, assuredly, may) from the composition itself, we must conclude that its author lived *after* the captivity in Babylon. During their exile there, the Jews seem

to have borrowed some parts of what I am entitled to call the *mythology* of their conquerors: manifest traces of it present themselves in the book of wisdom† and hence there can be no difficulty in overthrowing the hypothesis of its early date.

By some commentators it has been assigned to Philo of Alexandria. If this opinion be correct, the book was written subsequently to the birth of Christ; an inference which certain modern adventurers in literature and theology are eager to admit. Where, nevertheless, shall we find any proof, either direct or presumptive, of the celebrated Philo being the author of *the Wisdom*? Eichhorn, in his valuable remarks on it, has brought together not a few instances of dissimilarity between passages in that writer's acknowledged works, and others in the composition which is the subject of the present inquiry.‡

The *conjecture* (for it is nothing more) that this composition was framed by some Christian, with whose name we are unacquainted, takes its origin from an erroneous reference of two or three parts of *the Wisdom* to the founder and the doctrines of the Gospel. It is assumed that the author has purposely drawn a portrait of Jesus Christ in his representation of a righteous character; that he adverts to the Christian doctrine of a life to come; and that the moral spirit of his book proclaims his knowledge of Christianity.§ Now his picture of a good man is, in truth, much too general to have been copied from any individual, or to be thus confined in its application: nor does it exhibit features specifically resembling those of our Saviour. Although a future existence, moreover, be brought to light by the Christian dispensation, yet the Jews of a former period were not ignorant of the tenet: obvious traces of it may be seen in their canonical writings; and the grand distinction of the religion of Jesus is the establishment of the assurance of the *resurrection* of the dead upon the *fact* of his own. In this treatise nothing occurs which is inconsistent with the creed of a Jew; nothing which necessarily implies that it is the production

* Gray's Key to the Old Testament and Apocrypha, (Ed. vi) 576. Eichhorn's Einleit. in die apokryph. Schriften des A. T. 163, 164.

† Ch. ii. 24. xix. 18.

‡ Einleitung in die apok. Schrift, des A. T. 172—177.

§ Chap. ii. iii. iv. v.

of a Christian. Indeed, if we suppose it to have been framed by a believer in Jesus Christ, we must ask ourselves, Why its allusions to the evangelical history and doctrines are not at once more numerous and more direct? Nor will it be easy to return a satisfactory answer to the question. There will also be equal difficulty in assigning a solid reason for the person of a Jewish writer being borrowed by a member of the new dispensation.

We can scarcely err if we place the date of the Book of Wisdom somewhere in the interval between the Babylonian captivity and the birth of Christ—not long perhaps before the latter of those events. It would seem, however, that we have no means of ascertaining the author.

A highly valuable critic* has remarked, that the book divides itself into two parts; one comprehending ch. i.—xi. 2, the other, the remaining chapters. And these appear to be distinct fragments, in which the careful reader will perceive some considerable variations, both of style and thought.

The Wisdom, it is most probable, was written originally in Greek. Three ancient translations of this treatise are extant—the Syriac, the Arabic and the Latin. The last will be found in the *Vulgate*, and is older than the age of Jerom, by whom however it was not revised and improved: so that it is disgraced by numerous obscurities and barbarisms of expression. Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius and Jerom speak of this book as apocryphal. Many ecclesiastical councils have stamped it with canonical authority. N.

Mr. J. Yates on the Term Unitarian.

SIR, Glasgow, July 6, 1815.

ALTHOUGH I hold in high estimation the intellectual and moral attainments of Mr. Belsham, and consider him as a great ornament to the cause of evangelical truth, yet I am decidedly adverse to his confined application of the term UNITARIAN. Thinking the subject of much importance towards the promotion of those objects which he, in common with all zealous Unitarians, is pursuing, I beg leave to offer to him and to the readers of your Repository the

following reasons for uniformly extending the name in question to all Christians who, in opposition to the prevailing doctrine of three co-equal and co-eternal persons in the Godhead, maintain that the Father is the Only True God, and consequently that our Lord Jesus Christ is a created, subordinate and dependant being.

I. In the first place, the term was so understood by those to whom it was originally applied.

In my Sermon on the Grounds of Unitarian Dissent, (p. 13, note,) I referred in proof of this fact to Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, cent. 16, sec. 3, part 2. Since publishing that Sermon, I have paid some attention to the use of the title among the theological writers who preceded Lardner. I have found that its *original and proper* acceptance is exactly what I had stated. All these writers, so far as I have observed, employ the name UNITARIAN as a *generic* term, including under it all Christians, whether Arians or Socinians, who believe that there is only *one* person in the Godhead. The term was intended to distinguish them from *Trinitarians*, who assert that there are *three* persons in the Godhead. It was consequently viewed as synonymous with *Anti-trinitarian*. It was not conceived to denote a disbelief of the pre-existence of Christ, or of his agency, as a subordinate instrument, in creating the material world.

Nevertheless we find the names Unitarian and Socinian sometimes used as synonymous. Many of your readers will recollect an example in the title-page of the "*Brief History of the UNITARIANS, CALLED ALSO SOCINIANS.*" The occurrence of such expressions probably arose from the following cause. The greater part of the Unitarians being Socinians, the common people, who are not accurate etymologists, used the title Socinian, which properly belonged to *most* Unitarians, in so great latitude as to apply it to *all*. A circumstance which supports this conjecture, is, that the specific term *Arian* was also used with a similar freedom. Thus we find in Sandius's *Bibliotheca Anti-trinitariorum* (p. 178) the title of a book which may be contrasted with that above quoted: "*A Brief History of the UNITARIANS, COMMONLY CALLED ARIANS.*" Other examples might be produced of the extensive application of the name *Arian*

* Eichhorn, 90—162.

as equivalent to *Unitarian*. The confusion of terms may be accounted for on the same principle in this case as in the former. It arose from the want of correct discrimination, by which all persons, denying the Trinitarian faith, were called either Unitarians, Arians or Socinians, merely because it was known that there was a general similarity of sentiment among them.

Although the people at large, and perhaps some of the orthodox writers, confounded together the *generic* and the *specific* names, using them all with an equal latitude, yet the Unitarian authors, whether Arians or Socinians, appear to have preserved the distinction with perfect accuracy. I extract from their writings the following passages as examples to prove that the term Unitarian was then universally applied and understood in its *extensive* sense.

1. Sandius (Bibl. p. 52) gives the following account of one of the leaders of the Arians.

“STANISLAUS FARNOVIUS, or FARNESIUS, a Pole. About the year 1568 he separated from *the other Unitarians*.” “He held the same opinion with Gonesius concerning the person of Christ, whose pre-existence he warmly defended agreeably to the doctrine of Arius, and on this account made the above-mentioned separation.” “Farnesius practised the baptism of adults by immersion in the same manner as *the other Unitarians*.” “After his death his followers joined *those other Unitarians*, who held the opinions of Socinus.”

2. Wissowatius (Brief History of the Separation of the Unitarian Christians in Poland from the Reformed Trinitarians, p. 209) relates, that John Sigismund, “having held a conference during ten days at Alba Julia, in his principality of Transylvania, upon the principles of religion, and especially the doctrine of a Tri-une God, approved of the opinion of those, who confess that God is in *person* as well as *essence* ONE, that the Father alone is God, and that his only Son was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary; who on this account are there called UNITARIANS; and rejoice in their religious liberty, confirmed by that prince.”

3. The anonymous author of the “Epistle, giving an account of Wissowatius and of the Unitarian churches

in his time” (p. 225), after stating that the members of those churches were commonly, though improperly called Arians and Anabaptists, and that they themselves wished to be called simply Christians, relates, that, “for the sake of distinction from those who chose to be named after the Trinity, *they have assumed the appellation of UNITARIANS*: because, abiding by the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, of the Apostles’ Creed, and of the Primitive Church, and abhorring the idea of any sort of division or multitude in the Deity, they acknowledge simply ONE SUPREME BEING, who is one in person as well as in essence, the Only True God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and who alone is the Father.”

4. The author of “the Acts of the great Athanasius” (Unit. Tracts, vol. i. p. 6) applies the name *Unitarian* to Eusebius of Cesarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Constantine the Great, and Constantius; by which the writer could only mean, that they were believers in the simple unity of God as one person.

5. The author of the “Brief History of the Unitarians” (Unit. Tracts, vol. i. p. 11, 12) uses these words:

“D. Petavius, the most learned of the Jesuits, has granted, that the Fathers (generally,) who lived before the Nicene Council, and whose writings are preserved, agreed in their doctrine concerning God with the UNITARIANS, that is, the Nazarenes or Photinians, (now called Socinians,) and the Arians. *and concerning the Son our Lord Christ and the Holy Spirit* with the Arians. For 'tis to be noted that the Arians and Socinians agree in their doctrine concerning God; they both say, that he is only one person, even the God and Father of our Lord Christ; but they differ concerning the Son and Holy Spirit.” After describing this difference, the author adds, that because they agree in the principal article, that there is but one Person who is God, “both parties, Socinians and Arians, are called Unitarians, and esteem of one another as Christians and true believers.”

6. Mr. Emlyn, who to his death maintained the pre-existence of Christ and his subordinate agency in creating the world, always speaks of himself as a Unitarian. In almost every page of his writings we find the appellation employed in its *extensive* sense, and in

one place (Tracts, vol i. p. 286) he expressly says, "The Unitarians are some of them Arians, and some Socinians, in their judgment concerning Jesus Christ."

7. Lastly, Mr. Cardale, though he maintains the simple humanity of Christ, includes under the appellation in question even those who doubted or denied that our Saviour was a creature, if only they admitted the supremacy of the Father. Arguing (True Doctrine, p. 110) that, if Christ was uncreated, he must have been self-existent. "It appears," says he, "very strange to me, that so many learned men among the Unitarians should give into an opinion so inconsistent with their own avowed principles, and which does in effect entirely subvert the doctrine of the unity. But this indeed is the best and only resource they have, or can have, so long as they hold with the notion of pre-existence."

The first author who used the term Unitarian in its *restricted* sense, was, I believe, Dr. Lardner. In a few instances we find him employing it in contradistinction not only to the Trinitarian, but also to the Arian faith; a misapplication which we should not have expected from a man of his caution and accuracy. In this innovation he was followed by Dr. Priestley and other eminent writers, who have called their system *the proper Unitarian doctrine*, and who have given currency to the *limited* application of the name, but, so far as I can judge, with considerable detriment to the progress of truth. The word has however happily returned to its original acceptance; for,

II. As a second reason, it may be stated, that the designation we are considering is now *generally* understood to apply to all Christians who, in opposition to the commonly received doctrine of the Trinity, assert that the Father is the Only True God.

All the present Arians lay claim to the appellation of Unitarians. I wish I could add, that all the present Socinians admit their claim. I conceive, however, the exceptions are but few. The great majority of those Christians, who believe the simple humanity of Christ to be the doctrine of the Scriptures, wish to include their Arian brethren under the same denomination with themselves. So far as I can learn from private conversation with the

Unitarians of my acquaintance, either in England or Scotland, they generally agree in understanding the term under consideration as equally applicable to all who worship the Father as the Only True God, and bear their testimony against the established doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead.

The same definition of the term is given by nearly all those who have lately been called upon in the course of Providence to appear before the public as the advocates of the Divine Unity. It is given by Dr. Carpenter, in his controversy with the Devonshire clergy; by Mr. Aspland, in his Plea for Unitarianism in answer to Norris; by Mr. Grundy, in his Sermon at the Opening of a Unitarian Chapel in Liverpool; and by the venerable Dr. Toulmin, in his Sermon before the Western Unitarian Society.

Perhaps a still more decisive indication of the sense in which the term is understood by the great body of Unitarians now living, is the constitution of the various Societies established by them for the propagation of their principles. One of the fundamental objects of the *Scotch Unitarian Association*, as expressed in the Rules, is "to promote and keep up an intercourse and correspondence between the different societies, which are united upon the common principles of *the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures.*" Although the *London Unitarian Society* is avowedly opposed not only to the Athanasian, but also to the Arian doctrine, the other institutions in this kingdom of a similar nature are, I believe, framed upon the supposition, that all Christians are Unitarians, who hold the Unity of God as one Person.

III. A third reason for the *general* application of the title Unitarian is, that such an application is required by the plain meaning and known derivation of the term.

As the Christians of one class are called *Trinitarians*, because they believe that there are *three* Persons in the Godhead, those of the other class are properly called *Unitarians*, because they believe that there is only *one*. Understanding the terms in these acceptations, we perceive a contrast and a correspondence between them, answering to the etymology of each. The name Unitarian, thus applied, is

expressive and *appropriate*, naturally leading the mind from the sound to the sense. But, if applied exclusively to those who maintain the simple humanity of Christ, the title is not *characteristic* or *distinctive*; it comprises within itself no indication of its meaning.

IV. Lastly, The *extensive* application of the title in question may be recommended as likely to be attended with manifold advantages in the promotion of Christian truth and Christian piety.

The meaning of the term being thus fixed, the Unitarian controversy is reduced to a narrow compass. On the one side, the Athanasian brings, to support the doctrine of three co-equal Persons in the Godhead, a list of texts, which, few as they are, seem for the most part to have no relation to the subject, except that in some view or other we may *count three* in them; and, to prove the Supreme Divinity of Christ, he produces a number of passages, which either state nothing more than the sentiments held by Unitarians, in common with all other Christians, concerning the power and knowledge of Jesus, or, if they seem at first sight to oppose the Unitarian doctrine, may be easily proved to be either interpolated, wrongly translated, or misunderstood. On the other side, the Unitarian states, in the plain and simple language of Holy Writ, and supports by many hundreds of explicit Scripture testimonies, his distinguishing principles, that the Father is the Only True God, that the Father is greater than the Son, and that all the power of the Son is *given* to him. The controversy being placed upon these grounds, the evidence in support of the Unitarian doctrine is so copious, so overwhelming, that no serious inquirer, with a mind tolerably free from prejudice and from the bias of worldly interest, can refuse to embrace it. Having adopted these general principles, he may proceed to the calm, attentive and impartial discussion of the various questions, upon which Unitarians are divided in opinion among themselves. But if, by the definition which we give of the name Unitarian, we require all persons in joining us to disavow the peculiarities of Arianism, we either lead them to be precipitate in professing faith in our system before they have sufficiently studied

its grounds, or we keep them at a distance from us during a long, and perhaps painful course of scriptural investigation. The believers in the simple humanity of Christ, while they are confident that a process of diligent and unbiassed inquiry, once begun, will almost certainly terminate in the adoption of their sentiments, must admit that the explanation of some texts, alleged to prove the *pre-existence* of Christ, is attended with considerable difficulty. Socinians themselves are not agreed respecting the proper interpretation of them. Why should they force a hasty solution of these difficulties upon the serious and humble-minded Christian? Let them also reflect how much detriment is brought to the great evangelical principles of the Unity and universal Benevolence of God, when the Athanasians, completely baffled in all their attempts to vindicate the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, still continue to amuse themselves and their readers with a ceaseless round of ridicule and argument upon the Socinian interpretations of the passages adduced by the Arian brethren.

Mr. Belsham, in his Sermon preached at the Opening of the New Meeting in Birmingham, has admirably illustrated the great principle, on which Unitarians separate from the Established Church and from other bodies of Dissenters, and which is no trifling difference respecting forms of service or modes of discipline, or even respecting *minor* points of doctrine, but a radical and fundamental opposition of opinion concerning *the object of worship*. The principal purpose for which Christians meet in their religious assemblies, is to unite in the worship of the Deity. It is therefore absolutely requisite, that they should be agreed respecting the Person, or Persons, to whom they address their adoration. Hence the Unitarians, if they offer public praise and prayer at all, are under an evident necessity of doing it in distinct societies. They feel themselves further justified in their schism by the opportunities afforded them for the exercise of their natural and Christian liberty in the pursuit of religious truth; by the train of the exhortations addressed to them from the pulpit, which place upon a different ground the prospects of their eternal salvation and the means of

their acceptance with God; and by the sacred obligation imposed upon them of lifting up their voices, together with their hearts, against doctrines unhappily prevalent in the Christian world, but in the highest degree derogatory from the glory of the Almighty Father and from the efficacy of the everlasting Gospel. In order to maintain these commanding distinctions of religious principle, the formation of all the worshipers of the One True God, the Father, into a separate body, together with the use of a particular name to designate them, is a matter of distressing, but unavoidable necessity. But is there any occasion for a separation among those who agree in asserting these fundamental principles? I cannot see that such a separation is either reasonable, or warrantable: and I think that any division of their strength, or alienation of their affections, ought to be most religiously avoided. They are agreed as to the object of worship; they are agreed upon the right of individual judgment and the duty of free inquiry; they are agreed that God does not demand an infinite equivalent, or satisfaction, before he pardons any of the sins of his creatures; in short, they are agreed upon every subject of very material consequence. A minister, either Arian or Socinian, has not often occasion to introduce into his discourses expressions or sentiments to which any Unitarian can object. When he proposes his peculiar interpretations of Scripture, it is universally understood, that each of his hearers is at full liberty either to adopt or to reject them, according to his own judgment. Instead of regretting that there should be varieties of opinion among Unitarians, I think it is rather a beauty and an advantage in the constitution of their societies, that, while united upon all topics of much importance, they have still some subjects left to enliven their curiosity, to exercise their understandings, and to gratify their devotional taste with fresh views and ever-new discoveries.

It will be asked, If the title Unitarian be uniformly applied in the extensive sense, here contended for, how are we to distinguish those who hold the simple humanity of Christ? I answer, that it would perhaps be better not to distinguish them at all. But, if there be any occasion to make even a nominal division of the Unitarians

into two different sects by the use of specific appellations, the terms *Arian* and *Socinian* are now clearly understood, and have been in common use during the last two hundred years: and, although persons of the *latter* description have objected to the denomination bestowed upon them, their objections appear to me groundless; for as, when we call our orthodox brethren *Calvinists*, we never mean to insinuate, that they make Calvin their master instead of Christ, or that they approve of the murder of Servetus, so we need not fear that, by allowing ourselves to be called *Socinians*, we shall be charged with looking up to Socinus as our spiritual guide, or with adopting the sentiments favourable to persecution, which have been extracted from his letters.

Had not my paper already grown to such an exorbitant size, I should have added a few words to express my most cordial approbation of the plan, which has been more than once suggested in the *Monthly Repository*, for combining the efforts of all the English Unitarians by means of an Association similar to that which is established in Scotland, and which, though necessarily upon a small scale, has already been productive of much good. But I must conclude with wishing increased success to your valuable *Miscellany*, and to the great cause of free inquiry and evangelical truth, to which it is devoted.

JAMES YATES.

Mr. Aspland, in Reply to Pastor, on the Term Unitarian.

MR. Aspland is obliged to Pastor (p. 355) for bringing his explanation of the term "Unitarian" into discussion. He is not more desirous than Pastor of "interfering with the question at issue between Mr. Frend and Mr. Belsham," but he is anxious to acquit himself of the want of "frankness," though he is not sure that he can satisfy Pastor that he does not still labour under the want of "discernment."

The best way perhaps of exhibiting Mr. A.'s opinion on the question is to quote the passage referred to in the "Plea for Unitarian Dissenters," and to subjoin two or three remarks. Mr. Norris had avowed a determination, which however he did not always adhere to, of using the word *Socinian*

instead of *Unitarian*, upon which the author of the *Plea* observes, as follows:

"Your use of the term 'Socinian,' with your explanation of your meaning,* indicates, I fear, that your design towards us is less to instruct and convince, than to reproach and irritate.

"*Unitarian* is, as you observe, our 'favourite designation;' and we approve the name, because it is purely and justly descriptive of our faith. Your objection to it betrays your unacquaintedness with its history and its import.

"Unitarian is not opposed to Tritheist or Polytheist; it does not denote a believer in One God as contra-distinguished from a believer in Three Gods, or more Gods than one: it is opposed to *Trinitarian*—*Tri-unitarian*—only, and signifies a believer in, and a worshiper of, One God in One Person, as contra-distinguished from a believer in, and a worshiper of, One God in Three Persons.

"A lexicographer is the proper authority on this subject. Take, then, the following definitions from *Bailey's English Dictionary*,† who, you will perceive, has no theological bias, in our direction:—

"UNITARIAN [of *Unitas*, L.] an Heretic, who denies the union of the Godhead in Three Persons; a *Socinian*."

"TRINITARIANS,—those Christians who strenuously contend for a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead."

"This author needed not to have made the definition of *Unitarian* negative. We deny, it is true, but we deny by affirming; we affirm that the One God is one Person. You assert, you 'contend,' you 'strenuously contend,' that there are three Persons in the One God; you are therefore rightly denominated Trinitarians: we, who assert, and, in apostolic phrase,‡ 'earnestly contend,' for the oneness of the Divine Person, which we take to be 'the faith which was once delivered to the saints,' are truly and properly named Unitarians.

"The sense here given to the term is allowed by one of our opponents, not blameable for an excess of candour, Dr. Berriman. 'But such,' he says,|| 'had been the arts of Socinus to engage and persuade, such his command of temper and appearance of modesty, and such withal his studious application to polish more and more the scheme he had advanced, and to oppose the several sorts of errors that appeared against it, that in the end the various sects of *Anti-trinitarians* had combined in one,

which from him have been usually denominated the *Socinians*, though their own writers chose rather to distinguish themselves by the name of *Unitarians*, to import their assertion of the numerical unity in such a sense, as excludes all plurality of Persons in the Godhead as well as essences.'

"There may have been a misapprehension of the meaning of the term *Unitarian*, occasioned or countenanced by such writers as yourself, amongst Unitarians as well as others; but the misapprehension has never been general. No intelligent member of our denomination thinks to distinguish himself from polytheists or idolaters, by calling himself an Unitarian. If any one amongst us have used the term invidiously and reproachfully, we claim the right of disowning his sense of the word.

"But even if any of us had fallen into your error of considering the terms Unitarian and Tritheist, as fairly and directly opposed to each other, we might reasonably have been forgiven, on the consideration, that some Trinitarians have been Tritheists. You are well acquainted, Sir, with the controversy between *Sherlock* and *South*, two of your greatest Divines, on the subject of the Trinity, in the year 1698; the former maintaining the existence of three eternal minds,—the latter contending for three personal subsistences, modes, respects, relations, or somewhats, in the divine essence. *Sherlock* was censured for Tritheism, *South* for Sabellianism.§ The University of Oxford declared for *South*, and against *Sherlock*.

§ 'The great increase and boldness of this heresy' ('Socinianism,') gave occasion to a celebrated divine of our church, to write his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the holy and ever-blessed Trinity*: who, by some terms he made use of in the explication of that great mystery, gave but too plausible a colour, (in the judgment of some persons) for the charge of *Tritheism*; which became the foundation of a most unhappy controversy, and provoked another great divine of our church to enter the lists with him, and propose a different scheme, which, however it made use of the Catholic expressions, was nevertheless charged with *Sabellianism*. Great was the advantage which our *Socinian* adversaries made by this contention.' Berriman, *Hist. Ac.* p. 426, 427.

'He,' Dr. *Sherlock*, 'thought there were three eternal minds; two of these issuing from the Father, but that these were one, by reason of a mutual consciousness in the three to every of their thoughts, this was looked on as plain tritheism.'—'He' (Dr. *South*) 'explained the Trinity in the common method, that the Deity was one essence in three subsistencies: *Sherlock* replied, and charged this as *Sabellianism*.'

* P. 204. Note.

† I quote the 11th ed. 8vo. 1745.

‡ Jude, v. 3.

|| Historical Account of Controversy on the Trinity, in Eight Sermons, at Lady Moyer's Lecture. 8vo. 1725. p. 410.

"Although the name *Unitarian*, added to that of *Christian*, be, as we conceive, our rightful appellation, we have no wish to limit its use, but shall most cheerfully extend it to all the members of your church and others, who choose to claim it;—never allowing ourselves, however, to bestow it on any who do not acknowledge it, because, to fix on a man a name which he disowns, is of the nature of reproach. This license, which we refuse, you resolve to take; forgetting the lesson, which you must have learned at school, that a *nickname* is an offence against good manners, and deserves the rod.

"You apply to us the term '*Socinian*,' because, you say, it was our '*original title*.' You mistake, Sir; *Unitarian* is an older appellation than *Socinian*: the terms, besides, are not synonymous; *Unitarian* has a general, *Socinian* a specific, meaning; every *Socinian* is a *Unitarian*, but every *Unitarian* is not a *Socinian*: An *Unitarian* is a believer in the personal Unity of God; a *Socinian* is a believer in the personal unity of God, who also holds Jesus Christ to be both a man and an object of religious worship. *Socinus* was an *Unitarian*, but you yourself will scarcely call him a *Socinian*; nor would you, I apprehend, apply this epithet to Francis Davides, who was imprisoned, with the concurrence of *Socinus*, for opposing that inconsistent Reformer's notion of worship being due to Jesus Christ.

"That many *Unitarians* have been, and that the first English *Unitarians* were chiefly, *Socinians*, I do not dispute. Being such, they did not refuse the name. But the race of *Socinians* is quite, as that of *Arians*, another subdivision of *Unitarians*, is nearly, extinct. I know not of a single *Socinian* in England; and to continue the term when the character is gone, is an impropriety of speech, if it imply nothing more.

lianism; and some others went into the dispute with some learning, but more heat; one preached Sherlock's notion before the University of Oxford, for which he was censured: but Sherlock wrote against that censure with the highest strains of contempt. The *Socinians* triumphed not a little upon all this; and in several of their books they divided their adversaries into real and nominal *Trinitarians*. Bishop Burnet's O. T. 8vo. Vol. iii. p. 293 and 295.

"Whether the '*Socinians*' were wise or charitable in triumphing in these disputes, I will not pretend to determine; but it was impossible for them not to have been amused with so angry a contention, on such a fundamental point, between divines who had all subscribed their '*unfeigned assent and consent, to all and every thing contained*' in Thirty-nine '*Articles, agreed upon*—for avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion.'"

"In one and the same short paragraph of two sentences, you rather awkwardly state, that you are resolved to call *Unitarians* '*Socinians*,' and that you beg to apologize to '*Socinians*,' for confounding them and another * class of their brethren together, who have departed from '*Socinianism*,' 'in so many important articles, that Leslie says, the former would not own the latter for so much as *Christians*.' Where is the justice, where is the decency of this? You must wrong, by your own confession, either the *Socinians*, or the *Unitarians*, or both. Modern *Unitarians* are not *Socinians*; they have '*departed from*' these '*in many important particulars*;' but yet you will '*confound*' the one class with the other; *per fas et nefas*, you will have your favourite misnomer.

"It is not without design that you cling to a known error. The name of *Socinian* is refused by us; this is one reason why an ungenerous adversary may choose to give it: and again, the term having been used (with some degree of propriety), at the first appearance of this class of *Unitarians*, which was at a period when penal laws were not a dead letter, and when theological controversies were personal quarrels, it is associated in books with a set of useful phrases such as *pestilent heretics*, *wretched blasphemers*, and the like, which suit the convenience of writers who have an abundance of enmity but a lack of argument, and who, whilst they are reduced to the necessity of borrowing, are not secured by their good taste or sense of decorum from taking, in loan, the excrescences of defunct authors; this is a second reason why the name '*Socinian*,' is made to linger in books, long after *Socinians* have departed from the stage.†

* "Quære, Are the '*Socinians*' then one class of their own brethren?"

† "Once more, I must beg leave to refer you to Dr. South, for an appropriate observation or two, on the fatal imposture and force of words.

'The generality of mankind is wholly and absolutely governed by words and names; without, nay, for the most part, even against the knowledge men have of things. The multitude or common route, like a drove of sheep, or an herd of oxen, may be managed by any noise, or cry, which their drivers shall accustom them to.

'And he who will set up for a skilful manager of the rabble, so long as they have but ears to hear, needs never inquire whether they have any understanding whereby to judge: but with two or three popular, empty words, '*well-tuned and humoured*, may whistle them backwards and forwards, upwards and downwards, till he is weary; and get upon their backs when he is so.'

"You may continue, if you please, Sir, to mislead us; but we shall reply to you, as Andrew Marvell retorted upon that famous Bishop Parker, whom I have before introduced to your notice (p. 26): *No man can tell you truth, but he must presently be a Socinian.*"*

"There are three reasons, Sir, why we disclaim the title of 'Socinians.'

"1. We are not Socinians; we worship not Jesus Christ, though we think we honour him by following his oft-repeated, solemn injunctions, and by worshipping *The Father*. So far are we from Socinianism, in this particular, that we judge that if the charge of *idolatry* can be justly brought against any Christians, of which many of us doubt, it is against such as hold Christ to be a man only and yet pay him divine honours; that is, in fact, against Socinians. Can we then be called, with either sense or equity, after the leader of a sect, in whose religious worship, if he were now living, we could not conscientiously join?

"2. We deem it wrong for Christians to call themselves after the name of any fellow-christian. This is an acknowledgment of human authority in the church; it is making *fathers* of brethren, *masters* of servants. One only is our Teacher; and while our fellow-christians are saying of themselves, some that they are of *Paul*, others that they are of *Apollos*, and others that they are of *Cephas*;† some that they are of Calvin, others that they are of Luther, and others that they are of Socinus; some that they are of Swedenborg, others that they are of Wesley, and others that they are of Whitfield,—we beg leave, in conscientious dissent, to say that we are of *Christ*.†

"3. Although we revere Socinus, as a man of great virtue and an eminent reformer, there is, to our ears, a discordant note, in the sound of his name; for he was a persecutor. He approved and connived at, if he did not procure, the imprisonment of Francis Davides, for the honest avowal of his opinion that Socinus was inconsistent, and went contrary to scripture, in contending for the worship of 'the Man, Christ Jesus.' Strange, that we should be both reviled for maintaining the 'heresy' of Davides, and branded with the name of the polemic, who, as if emulous not only of the fame of Calvin as a Reformer, but also of his infamy as a persecutor, was accessory

"As for the meaning of the word itself, that may shift for itself; and as for the sense and reason of it, that has little or nothing to do here: only let it sound full and round, and chime right to the humour which is at present agog." Serm. Vol. ii. p. 332."

* "Rehearsal Transposed, Pt. ii. pp. 339, 340. 12mo. 1763."

† "1 Cor. i. 12."

to the loading of Davides with bonds. No, Sir, if we were to adopt any name as a religious patronymick, it should be a name at least not blemished by intolerance and persecution. We give up to you all the authority belonging to the learning and character of Socinus, and, if we must choose a patron, renounce the Polish leader, with his courtly friend Blandrata, and their protectors, the Princes Sigismund and Bathoreus, in favour of the poor and old Hungarian, expiring, with the language of the New Testament on his lips, in a prison."‡

Now it is for *Pastor* to say, having the whole passage before him, whether the term *Socinian*, as commonly used, be not inappropriate and invidious. He concedes that such as are called *Socinians* are strictly and properly *Unitarians*.

But the term *Unitarian* embraces more sects than one! True, and so does the term *Protestant*, the term *Christian*, but who would therefore lay either term aside? The Christians and Protestants who wish to distinguish themselves from their fellow-protestants and fellow-christians, have their proper language for doing this,—and the Unitarians who desire distinction from

‡ "How hard is the language of Sandius the biographer of the Anti-trinitarians [*Unitariorum, qui Sociniani vulgò audiunt*], concerning Francis Davides! 'Postmodum in semijudaizantium dogmata delapsus, dum doctrinam de Christo Domino non invocando spargit; *tanquam innovator*, a Christophoro Bathoreo Transylvaniæ principe, condemnatur, atque Devæ in carcerem conjicitur: ubi anno 1579, die 15 Novembris, jam senex, vita fungitur.'

"*Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum*, &c. &c. 12mo. Friestad. 1684. p. 56.

"There is not, I believe, a single English Unitarian writer, who refers to Socinus's treatment of Davides without marked reprobation. Consult Mr. Lindsey's *Histor. View of the Unitarian Doctrine*. Ch. iii. § 1. p. 154, &c.

"After giving an animated character of Socinus, Robert Robertson (whom I may claim as an Unitarian, for I know no other denomination of Christians that will own him,) says, 'I am proud of a friend of mine, who, though an excessive admirer of the doctrines of Socinus, has not suffered his faith to hoodwink his virtue, but has described Faustus Socinus as he really was. His pencil has given him a thousand charms, but it hath also fairly exposed his blemish.' *Eccles. Researches*, 4to. 1792. p. 62b."

* "Joshua Toulmin's *Memoirs of the Life of Socinus*."

their fellow-unitarians need not be at a loss for words. There are Unitarian Jews, Unitarian Mahometans, Unitarian Christians, Unitarian Baptists, and according to Mr. Frend (p. 350), Unitarian Calvinists. In a Christian country, the Unitarian means of course an Unitarian Christian; if no other appellation be assumed, it is taken for granted that the Unitarian rests on the broad ground of the belief and worship of One God, the Father, one God in one Person, and that he has no wish to evade the general opinion that this faith includes the non-belief of the deity or semi-deity of Jesus Christ and of the doctrines thence arising.

Unitarian is no doubt a general term, but its generality is by most Unitarians accounted its excellence. In proportion to its extensiveness, it is favourable to charity. It leaves a happy latitude of judgment upon minor Christian points. It admits under it Socinians, if such there be, modern Arians, Sabellians, and if not Calvinists yet such as, like Mr. Frend, hold some notion of Atonement which they are not anxious to explain. Then, it may be replied, it does not answer the use of language, which is to define. But it is definite to the extent that it goes, and it is for them that choose to mark themselves out more strictly, to employ other and additional phraseology.

There is a hardship in requiring any body of Christians to denominate themselves by *negative, exclusive and proscriptive* epithets. An Unitarian may well be in charity with all his brethren, but an *Anti-Trinitarian*, an *Anti-Satisfactionist*, and the like, carries defiance on his brow. Unitarian is a positive term, it denotes a precise faith, and it implies, without expressing it, unbelief in whatever is contrary to that faith. He that believes that God is one Person, disbelieves all that is involved in the doctrine of the Trinity; how much is involved in that doctrine every one must judge for himself, nor is it likely that men's judgments in this particular will ever be conformable to any one standard.

Such Unitarians as choose to be designated by terms which signify more than their belief in one Divine Person, whether the proper humanity of Christ or his pre-existence, the atonement or the non-atonement, are

at liberty to select or to invent their own appellatives, but let not the Unitarians as such be called upon to map out and to give names to the various sections of the Christian world.

Common usage, in agreement with common sense, supposes that where there is faith in *One God, the Father, as the only divine person*, there will be no faith in what have been called the *offices of Three Divine Persons*, as exhibited in the doctrines of Election, Atonement, preternatural Sanctification, &c. but if any Unitarian receives any of these doctrines, in any sense, he is at liberty not only to do so, but also to take a name which signifies how far, and explains for what reason, he dissents from the majority of his Unitarian, and is in agreement with his Trinitarian, brethren.

Creeds have been in all ages the plague of conscience; and it is no unimportant consideration for such as wish to implicate a creed in a word, whether they may not be unconsciously providing an instrument of inquisition, a bar to free inquiry and Christian fellowship, or even a weapon of persecution against such as claim the birth-right of God's heritage, independence of private judgment and liberty of worship.

Hackney Road, Aug. 3, 1815.

SIR,
WHATEVER may have been the cause of Mr. Belsham's embarrassment, I am sorry that he ever laboured, and still continues to labour under it. His tirade against the Arians is conveyed in rather harsh language; but when his metaphors are reduced to their plain meaning, they imply only, that he, Mr. Belsham, and the Arians, are of opposite opinions with respect to the offices and mode of existence of our Saviour: but they do not in the least go to induce me to believe that the Arians have not as good a right to the title of Unitarians as himself. They both believe that our Saviour is a created being, and are consequently far removed from those who believe him to be uncreated.

With respect to the Unitarian Fund Society, I shall not enter into Mr. Belsham's speculations upon it. If its highly respected missionaries, named by Mr. Belsham, confined them-

selves in speaking of our Saviour to Mr. Belsham's language, namely, that "our Saviour is in no other way distinguished from his brethren, than as being the greatest of all the prophets of God, the revealer of life and immortality, the first begotten from the dead;" I am sorry that they fall short of what appears to me to be a very important feature in his character, namely, that through him the gift of immortal life is conveyed to us. He is not merely the revealer of a future life, but the giver of it under God, having received this commission from the Father.

But a discussion on these subjects would carry us from the point in question. The Unitarians are now a numerous body in England; and there were Unitarians long before Dr. Lardner or Mr. Belsham gave any account of them. Mr. Belsham says, that he has adopted Dr. Lardner's definition of them. This I doubt: but if it is so, then I maintain, that Dr. Lardner does not do the Unitarians justice. The authority of Dr. Lardner's name adds little weight in my estimation to this controversy. He is an excellent compiler, and may be used with great advantage as a guide to young students. But I shall not be carried away by the authority of any name. My position in opposition to Mr. Belsham's is, that all are Unitarians, who believe that God is one, incapable of division into persons, and consequently Jews and Mahometans are Unitarians. But when we speak of Unitarians, we generally speak of them as Christians, without reference to the controversy between Christians and Jews, or Christians and Mahometans. If we were to use precision, we should say Unitarian Christians, when we speak of those who believe God to be one, incapable of division into persons, and that Christ is our Lord and Saviour. With respect to the Unitarian Christians Mr. Belsham thinks, that they must disbelieve certain articles of faith which he lays down. This disbelief in my opinion is not warranted either by the name of Unitarians, or by the opinions of a large body of persons, among whom I am one, who go under this name in this kingdom. I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient,
W. FRIEND.

*Religious Visit of a Company of
"Friends" to Hannah Barnard.*

SIR, Bromley, July 12, 1815.

I SENT you an extract of a letter from Hannah Barnard, which was inserted at p. 321 of the present volume. If the following account from the same letter of a singular "religious" visit paid her by several ministering Friends, be deemed proper to present to your readers, it may amuse some, and instruct others. It exhibits a curious, and I have no doubt a faithful picture of that species of fanatical enthusiasm which is still found among the Quakers. If this were a solitary instance of such ignorant but presumptuous claims to a divine mission, it might be better to consign it to oblivion; but as I have much reason to believe similar pretensions are yet not only frequently set up, but countenanced by those who are appointed by the Society to have the oversight of its Ministers, no suitable occasion of exposing and discouraging such uncharitable and blind bigotry should be lost. Perhaps a more striking example of zeal without knowledge, awed into silence, by a union of good sense and of Christian charity, seldom occurs.

Wishing it may produce its proper effect on such of your readers, as it may most concern, I am your and their well-wisher,

THOMAS FOSTER.

"Pray how do the *Orthodox* part of the Society carry themselves toward thee? I should like to know whether they pursue thee as they still at times do me, literally as a '*Heathen and an Infidel*.' I have often said it would have been a great satisfaction to me, to have had the company of fifty of my most intelligent neighbours and friends present on the evening of the 20th of June last. I was called from a house of mourning—and informed there were some friends wished to call on us that evening. I told the messenger—'we shall be at home.' Accordingly, they came, four in number; and I have great satisfaction in saying, that one of them, Wm. Flanner, a tall fine looking man from Ohio, approved himself through the whole, the true Christian gentleman. He first very politely introduced himself and the other three by name. After taking seats, he asked me which was

the most direct road to Farmingtown, in Genesee, whither they were going to attend a Quarterly Meeting. After tracing the route on a map, he observed, the information would no doubt be of use, but their principal motive for calling was, that they wished to have a little *religious opportunity* in the family, saying 'Art thou willing Hannah?' I replied, 'Yes, I have no objection.'—After a time of silence his companion, one Lloyd, observed—there *was* a few words impressed on his mind, which he should feel most easy to express, before he left the house. And that is, '*Thus saith the Lord unto thee, Hannah Barnard. I raised thee up, and I gave thee a gift in the ministry; and thou hast departed from me, and hewn to thyself cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water.*' Then after a pause of one or two minutes, he resumed, still speaking in the name of the Most High! 'Nevertheless, if thou wilt *repent*, and return unto me, *I will still have mercy on thee.*'

"I waited a few minutes, till he appeared to have said all he had to communicate, and then very deliberately but audibly observed, 'Such well-meant but ignorant denunciations I can pass by. They do not affect me, because I do not feel myself conscious of deserving them.' He said no more. But I observed a young woman who sat near me sigh deeply, and at length began in a strain of deep lamentation to relate how much she had suffered on my account!

"And taking her on her own evidence, she had paid me a superstitious deference, which I never wished, or thanked any one for. She related a Vision, she had before I went to England [in 1798]. She saw a star rise in the west and go to the east, and disappear, and what it could mean, she could not tell. 'Until,' said she, 'I heard of thy departure from the principles of the Society, and then I told some of my friends, I now understood the vision. Nevertheless, I still believe if thou wilt depart from *thy iniquities*, and *repent and turn unto the Lord*, He will *still have mercy on thee*, and favour thee with that peace of mind which *thee is now deprived of.*'

"I thought it was then time to interrupt her, which I did by saying, 'I beg of thee to keep a little more within the limits of Christian charity. Thou undertakest to assert that I have de-

parted from the principles of the Society. I solemnly declare to thee, that if I know my own principles, they are in strict accordance with the rational, sound doctrines of the Society, as laid down in their best and most approved authors, as I have always understood them. Thou goest further and undertakest to judge of the state of my heart! I ask, who gave thee that authority? I am thankful that my Creator has reserved that prerogative to himself, and has not delegated it to mortal man. It is my consolation that He, the searcher of hearts and judge of all the earth, *will do right.*

"And I can say with conscious sincerity, whatever you may think, that I have, through a long life, religiously endeavoured to keep a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. But I have seen the time when I found it utterly impossible for me to escape the censure of superstition and bigotry, without violating my conscience and becoming a hypocrite, which I dare not do. I have had since at several times reverently to thank my Creator, under the prospect of approaching death, for preserving me from it. Perhaps you may think that like Paul of old, I have become a fool in boasting; but I think I have been a little compelled to it this evening. And, as a privilege I am fully entitled to, I shall always take the liberty to defend myself against such uncharitable denunciations. I think it is a great pity that some Aquila or Priscilla does not instruct you both a little more perfectly in the knowledge of your duty, and what true religion consists in; as well as the nature and necessity of Christian charity. For the Apostle expressly asserts, that let us have what gifts we may, ever so excellent, they profit us nothing, and we are nothing, without charity. If we were all of us to take the apostolic admonition along with us, and govern our conduct by it, it would do us good; and that is to judge nothing prematurely, or in the express words of Scripture, 'before the time, but judge righteous judgment,' and leave the judgment of one another's hearts, to the Searcher of hearts to whom it exclusively belongs.'

"A profound pause of some length now ensued, till Wm. Flanner observed it was growing late, and perhaps it was best not to detain the fa-

mily or themselves any longer. When they rose up to go, I asked them to drink some cyder. William excused for them saying, 'we do not need it'—and turning to his companions, he very politely sent them to their lodgings, by saying in a low voice, 'Friends, you may as well move on: I'll follow you soon.' He then took his seat, entered into free conversation and staid I believe an hour and a half. In the course of it he inquired what I was first accused of? When I told him he seemed astonished, saying he could not comprehend it. I smiled and observed, I did not wish him to puzzle his head with it, I was satisfied in my situation after having referred the matter to the tribunal of public opinion. 'What,' said he, 'in print?' I replied 'yes, long ago.' He still seemed astonished that so wise a body as the Select Yearly Meeting in England, should condemn me for such a sentiment respecting war.* I pleasantly observed, that I apprehended he had a very inadequate idea of the wisdom of that body; and then related the observation of the female Elder, who was sure *physic* had never been talked of in any of their meetings.† He could not help laughing, but observed, the weakness of one old woman did not spoil the whole. I told him, it was a very fair sample of the wisdom of many of the rest.‡

"He at length said, he should like to hear me explain myself a little respecting moral evil, for he strongly

* This sentiment was, "that war is in itself, and ever was a moral evil, which man creates to himself, by the misapplication of his powers; or in other words, by the abuse of his free agency." See an Appeal to the Society of Friends on the primitive simplicity of their Christian principles, &c. p. 45.

† The circumstance here alluded to was this. An intelligent friend, now deceased, was explaining in company the distinction between moral and physical or natural evil, on which Hannah Barnard when accused of heterodoxy, had so strongly insisted before the Select Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders in London; when this Elder expressed her surprise that he should have so much mistaken the case, assuring him that she was present at every sitting when it was under discussion, and that nothing whatever had been said respecting *physic*, medicine, or any thing of that kind!

‡ This may seem a harsh censure, but it comports tolerably well, with the account

suspected he should be of my opinion. I told him, I would explain my meaning so that he should clearly understand me. For instance, sickness is what we call a natural [or physical] evil for the sake of distinction. And the act of the will, only, of a moral agent, which is contrary to the will of God, is a moral evil, chargeable on such agent in the sight of his Creator; and when carried into overt act, it becomes an actual moral evil to the injury of one or more. He replied, 'I understand thee perfectly; and I should say that war was such.' I rejoined, 'So say I, and for that I stand condemned by the Society.' He looked at me very pleasantly and said, 'I cannot look upon thee as such a bad kind of woman as some people seem to think thee.'—'But' said he, 'is there no way for the breach to be made up?' I told him the Monthly Meeting of Hudson had disowned me as a deluded infidel, and whenever they became convinced that they had accused me wrongfully, they had only to confess it, and I could freely forgive them. But I had no concessions to make. Finally, after a very friendly interview, we parted, I believe, with mutual esteem and good wishes."

Gift of Tongues.

Lynn, May 13, 1815.

A COUNTRY subscriber to and constant reader of the Monthly Repository, who has been lately perusing Mr. Belsham's Letters to the Bishop of London, begs his respectful compliments to that gentleman and would be exceedingly obliged to him if he would, in any way which he thinks proper, explain and elucidate his assertion that, the gift of tongues mentioned in the book of Acts and other parts of the New Testament, consisted in *the miraculous knowledge of strange languages*. To the writer, this notion is far from satisfactory; and, indeed, the gift of tongues appears to him involved in more darkness and difficulties than most things recorded in the New Testament.

given of their proceedings by a minister who was present, and which he soon after described thus: "We fought Hannah," says he, "with very simple weapons; for at reasoning she was quite too many for all of us." See an Appeal to Friends, p. 40.

Character of Mr. Whitbread.

(From the Dublin Sentinel.)

WE consider the death of this eminent Senator among the greatest calamities which this country could sustain. We are disposed to regard his loss as irreparable, for we know not how it can be repaired.

He was not the leader of the opposition party, but he was *more*—he was a party *in himself*. He attacked the ministry without the opposition—they might follow if they would—they often refused to follow him, but they never did so without loss of character.

He was worth all the opposition put together; he was worth more—

—“They and all their talents
Could not make up the tithe of him.”

He had not all the talents of Fox, but he had all his virtues, and none of his weaknesses. He learned patriotism from Fox, and he could have taught him patriotism. He improved on the lesson. He outdid his master. Unlike Fox, he never was a man of pleasure, and always a man of application.

Perhaps Fox had more learning, but, certainly Whitbread had more information.

He despised that principle laid down by Burke that a man should sacrifice, or, at least suppress *his own opinion* when it differed from that of his party. Whitbread maintained, that in no case whatever should a man sacrifice or suppress his own opinion—that he should regulate his own actions, not by the vote of any set of men, but by the light of his own understanding—that he should support his party so long as he agreed with them, and act for himself when his party would not support him. Burke thought that the opposition should always brigade together in their resistance to a ministry. Whitbread thought that they should brigade together when they they agreed together; and that when they could not agree, the members should act *independently*.—Burke's mode was suited for the attainment of power; that of Whitbread for restraining it.—Burke thought that in the discipline of a regular opposition, the opinions of individuals should be thrown into a common stock—that the heads of the parties should decide on operations, and the leader should conduct them.

Whitbread thought that an inde-

pendent Senator should acknowledge no superior but the law, and that no man on any occasion should put his understanding into commission.

The principle of Burke was adopted by Fox, and acted on by the Whigs.

Whitbread was neither a Whig nor a Burdettite—he acknowledged all the Whig principles, but not the Whig party. He acknowledged most of the Burdettite principles, but not the Burdettite party. He differed from the Whigs and Burdett because he was a friend to a reformed and irresponsible parliament.

He was not a faultless orator—but as a speaker, he was much better than an orator. He was more anxious about *what* should be said, than *how* it should be said. Intent upon facts, he was indifferent to phrases, and engrossed with the subject he rejected ornament.

He was one of the few among the members of opposition, who might be called “a man of business,” and yet he was one of the few who declined place when his friends came into power. No man was more regular in his attendance to his official duties than Mr. Whitbread was to his parliamentary ones. The Speaker receives 4000*l.* a year for discharging his duties in parliament—at three o'clock in the day, or three o'clock in the morning, he could see Mr. Whitbread on his left hand, with Mr. Wynne and Mr. Abercrombie at his side.

His habit of prompt and ready speaking made him an efficient member of parliament. The thought was expressed as it sprung from the mind, in such language as the moment could supply: sometimes the expression was of course inelegant, but often happy; always strong, apt, suitable and impressive.

It was the rule of Pythagoras, that seven years devoted to contemplation, and spent in silence, was a necessary preparative to the study of wisdom.—Mr. Whitbread, as a senator, imposed on himself a more protracted and rigorous discipline. Mr. Whitbread sat fourteen years in parliament, a regular and attentive member, before he considered it becoming, or himself qualified, to hold the attention of the House of Commons.

Indeed, it was not until the trial of Lord Melville, that he became

known to the public as a public man—and since that occasion, his public exertions have never been interrupted.

Whilst Pitt and Fox contended together,

“Like fabled Gods, whose mighty war
Shook realms and nations in its jar,”

Whitbread, though an anxious, was a silent observer; and the modesty which accompanies real merit, restrained his great powers from the service of the country. It was not until the powers of Fox were in the wane that he consented to assume the character for which he subsequently proved himself so well qualified.

The moral influence of his presence in that House must have been considerable on the actions of any ministry. The minister found himself at every movement in the hearing and under the eye of an intelligent, indefatigable, ardent, investigating, honest statesman, ready and capable to detect and expose:—

“Had he but liv’d in spite of pow’r,
A watchman on the lonely tower,
His thrilling trump had roused the land,
When fraud or danger was at hand:
By it, as by the beacon-light,
The Pilot should keep course aright.
Now is the stately column broke,
The beacon-light is quench’d in smoke,
The trumpet’s silver sound is still,
The Warder silent on the hill.”

Hypostatical Union.

Runcorn, July 13, 1815.

THE orthodox notion of the hypostatical union may be stated as follows:—“Such an intimate connexion between the divine and human natures of Christ as to constitute him but one person.” According to this notion Christ must consist of three things—a divine nature, a human nature, and a divine person: for he cannot be a human person without being two persons. I remember, when I was young, being corrected by my minister of an error, in supposing that Christ is a human person.

Orthodoxy (according to the right notion of the *hypostatical union*) requires that when we speak of Christ as God the Son, we should refer to his divine nature, as Christ simply, to his human nature. This fine scheme explains and does away at once with all the difficulties against orthodoxy which arise from numerous passages

of the scriptures taken in their obvious meaning. When Christ is said to know all things, it is said to be by virtue of his divine nature; when he is ignorant of certain things, it is in his human nature. In this distinction, however, it so happens that the *person* of Christ is lost sight of.

This hypostatical union is one of the great mysteries of orthodoxy; and it is certainly entitled to be so regarded, if mystery consist in want of congruity with common sense and reason. It is a most curious assumption that a human being can exist barely as *nature*, without *person*. How is it that the human nature sometimes avails itself to an unlimited degree of its union with the divine nature—as in the *infinite* merits of the human nature’s death, &c.—and sometimes is quite destitute of it—as in the ignorance of the human nature of certain events? Does not possessing a human body and soul constitute a human person? If not, what does? If it does, on what grounds do we deny Christ to have been a human person?

But without endeavouring further to develop the mysteriousness of this doctrine, it is time to observe, that the *hypostatical union* is a thing utterly unknown to the sacred writers. The man Christ asserts, indeed, his union with God the Father, but never with God the Son. It is evident then that this doctrine must have been invented to meet a difficulty created solely by the establishment of reputed orthodoxy. For if Christ were indeed truly God, it would be necessary in some way to account for his *ignorance* and his *inferiority* to the Father. This hypostatical union therefore is a legitimate portion—a necessary consequence—of what is called orthodoxy; and had this orthodoxy been the doctrine of the New Testament, the inferiority of Christ to the Father—his ignorance of certain events, for instance—would have been accounted for in some such manner. How extraordinary is it that those who regarded Christ as God Supreme, should never have been struck with his avowed ignorance, his inferiority to the Father repeatedly and directly asserted (John v.); should never have taken any notice of it, never have attempted to explain it? But, it will be said, have they accounted in any

manner for the super-human knowledge, &c. which they frequently ascribe to him? They have. See John viii. 26—29, and many other passages. This is quite natural; nor would it have been less natural, when the ignorance of our Saviour concerning any thing is most explicitly avowed, to account for such ignorance, if indeed they believed him to be God.

For the above reasons, I consider the *hypostatical union* a baseless figment, an anti-scriptural hypothesis, and a part of that monstrous anti-christian system which has been the growth of ages, and which it will require ages to demolish.

What is orthodoxy?

This is an inquiry not of mere curiosity, but on some accounts very necessary to ascertain. When in opposing what are reputed orthodox opinions you state them with all the fairness and distinctness in your power, the first and sometimes the only reply you receive is, that you refute a phantom of your own imagination, that you attribute to them sentiments which they do not hold, “the misrepresentations of ignorant people,” &c. &c. It is indeed sometimes pretty broadly hinted, *that the carnal man knoweth not the things of the spirit of God*, and this certainly precludes all further explanation.

To me it appears advisable to state the reputed orthodox doctrines in the words of some indisputably orthodox divine, who wrote soon after the Reformation, before the present disputes were much known, and without an immediate reference to them, such as Usher, Perkins, &c.

What is the comprehensiveness of reputed orthodoxy? In other words, what are those points of doctrine concerning which we must adopt an uniform belief in order to be received as sound in the faith, as distinguished from those points concerning which it is allowed to entertain different, and even contrary opinions? What is the extent of that orthodox pale, within which if a man be not found, he is to be excluded or expelled from Christian communion, to be viewed as a damnable heretic, incapable of being saved, placed, as by the Bishop of London, *cum multis aliis*, on a level with infidels, &c.? There is some latitude allowed among the most

strictly orthodox. Baptists and Pœdobaptists, Churchmen and Dissenters, being of the strictest sects of evangelical profession, will coalesce in the main, as being sound in fundamentals. What is the extent of this latitude?

The Devil.

In opposing the very generally prevailing notion of a devil, Mr. Grundy, of Manchester, in his Lectures, represents the general belief as ascribing to him omnipresence, omniscience, prescience, &c. Though this is not specifically stated in any author with which I am acquainted, yet it certainly follows by just consequence from what is constantly ascribed to the devil. He cannot tempt *every* man without being *omnipresent*, or something very like it. He cannot know the thoughts of men to an unlimited degree without *omniscience*, or something very near it. He cannot prophecy without *prescience*. He cannot oppose the Almighty without independent power; and if he opposes him effectually, he must be Almighty too. Now according to the general representations of the reputed orthodox, sin, the works of the devil, are almost infinitely more prevalent than good. It is explicitly asserted by Dr. Watts, that the Devil destroyed in one hour the six days' labour of the Almighty. It is to be observed that of late orthodox writers are become more wary than they used to be in using unqualified expressions on this as on other subjects; while in their discourses, in addressing the prejudices of those who think like themselves, they are under little restraint, and speak often without reserve. I lately heard a sermon in this place, in which the preacher represented all men, except the converted few, as prisoners in the possession of the Devil, successfully deceived and tempted by him, who holds them willing slaves, hiding their situation from their view, until a knowledge of it becomes unavailable to them, it being impossible for them to extricate themselves from his power without a special act of Almighty interference. Sometimes the Almighty Saviour Christ does thus interfere, and draws the helpless captives out of the pit in which there is no water. The whole of the sermon of the very respectable

preacher was devoted to represent the contest between the Devil and the Almighty Saviour, which should have the greatest number of poor mankind: and, horrid, horrid! the Devil succeeds.

Yours, &c.
VARIORUM.

SIR,
I PERFECTLY agree with your correspondent —, (p. 429) in his remark on the severity with which Bereus (p. 233) had chosen to animadvert on the earliest publication of my much respected tutor, Dr. Enfield; a severity which I think might well have been spared, if he had given himself the trouble to recollect that if, in his juvenile compositions, he may perhaps have adopted too much the style of an essay-writer (though they are certainly very beautiful essays, which no one can read without both delight and profit), such was not the strain of his later discourses from the pulpit. Of this he must have been aware if he is, as I suppose, a constant reader of the Repository; in the seventh volume of which, p. 293, &c., he has probably read some excellent extracts from the Sermon on the Progress of Religious Knowledge; or if he had been led by the account of Dr. E. in your eighth vol. p. 431, 2, to the perusal of his Posthumous Sermons, from the admirable preface to which by Dr. Aikin that account was chiefly taken.

He ought at least to have examined these Discourses, before he had returned to the charge on the mere authority of a garbled extract from Dr. Aikin's Preface, inserted in the Biographical Dictionary. Such "more noble" conduct would surely have become Bereus, whose assumed signature might have been expected to suggest to him the propriety of "searching whether these things were so." He would then have found that Dr. Aikin does, indeed, and properly, represent his friend as "a moral preacher," but as one "solicitous to deduce from religion a rule of life enforced by its peculiar sanctions." He would also have found that "he carefully drew up a series of discourses on the principal incidents and moral precepts of the gospel, in which he displayed both his talents as a commentator, and his skill in expanding into general lessons of conduct those

hints and particular observations which occur in the sacred writings." The whole of the third volume consists of a selection from the series above-referred to; it is, in short, an admirable system of practical Unitarianism. And if Bereus had set himself to read and study it thoroughly, instead of sitting down content with Mr. Chalmers's second-hand report of it, I persuade myself that he could not have done this, be he who he may, without becoming a more enlightened Unitarian, and, what is of much greater consequence, a better man.

V. F.

Tenterden, August 8, 1815.

SIR,
THE wish of your correspondent Bereus [p. 429,] induced me immediately to take a slight view of Dr. Enfield's 3 vols. of Sermons; and a slight view was perfectly sufficient to confute the statement of Mr. Chalmers. The fourth sermon of the first vol. is upon Matt. xiii. 44. "The Christian Religion a valuable treasure." He here most beautifully and impressively describes the Christian religion as "a rich treasure of truth, of wisdom and of consolation." To this sermon, I first refer your readers, particularly to that part which applies to the hour of affliction, "when Christianity directs to sources of comfort, more substantial and satisfying than philosophy can boast." As also to "the wounded spirit under a consciousness of guilt, on whom the Christian doctrine of divine mercy sheds a ray of heavenly light over his gloomy prospects, and bids him be of good cheer for his sins may be forgiven him:" that the sincere penitent will ever find mercy. After this he adds the promise of the gospel of a resurrection to eternal life, grounded on Christ's resurrection from the dead.

In the second vol. we have a sermon upon Christians being sons of God, from 1 John iii. 23; a sermon which is throughout also truly evangelical or Christian.

The 3rd vol. consists entirely of evangelical subjects; all the texts being taken from the New Testament: three sermons are upon Christ's last conversation with his apostles, before his crucifixion: the next upon the Lord's supper; and the last upon

that short question, What think ye of Christ? If the readers of Dr. Enfield's Sermons expect to meet in them with a complete system of Calvinistic divinity, they will not find it: but if they look for truly evangelical discourses, i. e. practical and moral instructions, grounded upon truly gospel principles, and connected with gospel promises, they will not be disappointed. Bereus cannot surely have read them, or he would not have requested any of your correspondents to send you the above plain statement. I am, Sir,

Your constant reader,
VINDEK.

Norwich, Aug. 15, 1815.

SIR,

THERE are some remarks on the character of Dr. Enfield as a Christian minister, which appeared in the Repository for April and July, in reply to which I beg your insertion of the following letter:—Your correspondent Bereus, after a quotation from a small volume of Sermons published by Dr. Enfield, in 1769, regrets "the small proportion of what is exclusively Christian in this volume," and infers that "the preacher was more sensible of the advantage than the necessity of revelation." I consider this as a heavy charge against one of the most excellent men I ever knew, and having enjoyed the advantage of Dr. Enfield's public ministrations and his private intercourse, I am happy in this opportunity of bearing my testimony to his zeal for scriptural truth, and his unshaken conviction, to the last moment of his life, of the absolute necessity as well as advantage of divine revelation. Bereus forms his opinion from a small volume of Sermons, published at an early period of Dr. Enfield's ministerial life, and probably given to the world before his religious creed was so firmly fixed as it was during the latter part of it; I found my opinion on a regular attendance on his ministry, and on that personal intercourse with him which I shall always think it an honour and an advantage to have enjoyed. But if your correspondent thinks that Dr. Enfield viewed the progress of Unitarianism with coldness or indifference, I would refer him to a Sermon from which there are some extracts in the Repos. for May, 1812, and I will defy him to produce from the writings of

any author of that time, expressions glowing with such delight and enthusiasm at the increasing spread of rational sentiments of Christianity.* These I know were the genuine effusions of his excellent heart. No man living had less of coldness and indifference about him. With regard to Mr. Chalmers's opinion, I wonder that Bereus should quote it, since he very well knows that it is the fashion among the reputed orthodox to speak of the discourses of the Socinians as mere moral preaching. What is said by Mr. C. of Dr. Enfield, would equally have been applied to any other minister of the denomination.

The remarks in answer to Bereus in the Repos. for July, however true they may be in themselves, cannot be applied to the case of Dr. Enfield and the congregation here with whom he was connected. If — means to say it was in the least degree probable, that "by preaching all he knew" our late excellent minister "would have deprived himself of his situation and support," he asserts what is not correct, and what I am certain, if Dr. Enfield were alive, he would be the very first to deny. My worthy ancestor, Dr. John Taylor, has recorded the following character of the congregation at Norwich in the Dedication of his Paraphrase and Notes on the Romans. "You scorn to practise the unchristian methods of some, who to support a favourite sentiment, foment animosities and divisions, and discourage men of probity and learning. You allow your ministers to read the Bible and speak what they find there." So far from "seeing no rational ground of support," he says in another place, "It is my honour and pleasure, as well as duty, to serve you in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; and your kind acceptance and due improvement of my honest and well-intended labours is the greatest encouragement I desire. Your affections and friendly regards are in fact the whole world to me." Now Dr. Taylor was esteemed one of the greatest heretics of his time, and it was not very likely that the same society which had accepted and encouraged his labours, and had afterwards enjoyed those of Mr. Samuel Bourn, and Mr. George

* See also Mr. Turner's Memoir of Dr. Enfield, in his Hist. of the Warrington Academy.

Morgan should put the least shackle or restraint upon Dr. Enfield. What his opinion of the congregation at Norwich was, at the time of his accepting their invitation, the following quotation will shew. I copy it from the original letter in his own handwriting. It is addressed "to the Society of Protestant Dissenters, assembling in the New Chapel, Norwich," and dated "Warrington, May 2, 1785." "It is a circumstance which has great weight in determining my resolution, that you have long been distinguished for that liberality of spirit, which will allow your ministers full scope for the faithful execution of their office, without hazard of giving offence." The letter concludes thus: "It is my sincere prayer, that the relation, which is commencing, may, under the blessing of heaven, be productive of our mutual satisfaction and benefit, in the most important concerns. I have no higher ambition than to approve myself in the cause of religion and virtue." Those who knew Dr. Enfield, will agree with me that these were not words of course. No minister ever discharged the duties of his station with more unwearied assiduity; none ever enjoyed in a higher degree the esteem and affection of his people.—I will not trespass farther on your readers' time, but I hope enough has been said to vindicate his character from a direct charge brought against it, and the congregation of Unitarians here from an insinuation which they have not deserved. I am,

Yours respectfully,
EDWARD TAYLOR.

St. Ardleon, July 14, 1815.

SIR,

IT may gratify some of your readers to be informed that the apostolic doctrines of *one God, the Father*, and *the man Christ Jesus*, in opposition to those fictions of the schools, a *Triune God*, and a *God-man*, were publicly professed at Reading more than a century and a half before their late revival in that place. This appears by a quotation in Grey's Examination of Neal's fourth volume, (p. 59,) from "Simon Forde's Sermon at the Assizes at Reading, Feb. 28, 1653." (Pp. 21, 22.) Besides the complaint of *Socinianism*, for which I refer to it, the whole passage is curious. Dr. Grey having described the preacher

as "a learned person who compiled too much with the times," represents him as asserting in this Assize sermon,

"That, in the little town of Reading, he was verily persuaded, if Augustin's and Epiphanius's catalogues of heresies were lost, and all other modern and ancient records of that kind, yet it would be no hard matter to restore them, with considerable enlargements from that place. That they have *Anabaptism, Familism, Socinianism, Pelagianism, Ranting*, and what not; and that the Devil was served in heterodox assemblies, as frequently as God in theirs: and that one of the most eminent church-livings in that county was possessed by a *blasphemer*, and one in whose house he believed some there could testify, that the *Devil* was as *visibly familiar* as any one of the family."

At the date of this sermon, some opinions and practices were maintained, as contrary to the design of Christianity as to the operations of a sound mind. Yet many were now reviled for uttering *words of truth and soberness*. Thus Biddle was persecuted as a *blasphemer*, and rescued only by the justice or policy of Cromwell from the power of the Assembly of Divines, who, with misguided zeal, thirsted for his blood. Those divines, all good Nonconformists are taught, from the nursery, to venerate as the *harmless* sufferers of 1662, and are thus prepared to read, as authentic history, the partial narratives of Neal and Calamy.

R. B.

Natural Theology. No. VIII.
Of the Mechanical Arrangement of the Human Body.—The Trunk.

THE trunk of the human body comprises the spine, the pelvis, and the thorax or chest. The *spine* or back-bone is that chain of bones which extends from the skull to the end of the loins. It consists of twenty-four distinct bones named *vertebræ*, from the word *vertere* to turn, because they perform the chief turnings and bendings of the body. They also form a tube or canal along the whole length of the spine for lodging and defending the spinal marrow, and they support the whole weight of the trunk, head, and arms.

The *vertebræ* are divided into those of the neck, back and loins, and the number of pieces corresponds with

the length of these divisions. The vertebræ of the neck are seven in number: these are loose and free, and their motions are the widest and easiest of all the spine. The twelve below these are the vertebræ of the back, which are larger and stronger than the former, and they are so laid over one another, that, together with their connexion with the ribs, they form the steadiest part of the spine, and have only a very limited motion. The vertebræ of the loins are only five in number: these bear the whole weight of the body and perform the chief motions of the trunk, and on this account they are the largest and strongest of the vertebræ, and at the same time they have a wide and free arrangement of their processes.

The form of each vertebra is calculated for producing the different uses of the spine, and it displays at once the astonishing design and execution of the supreme architect. The spine being intended as a support to the trunk, head and arms; for this purpose each vertebra is composed of a main part, called its body, which is a thick, spongy and light bony substance, convex before, concave at the back part, and almost horizontal upon its upper and under sides, when it is joined to similar bodies of the other vertebræ. All these bodies are connected together like the sections of a large cane, and constitute a bony pillar for sustaining the upper parts of the body: but, besides support, these parts require motion: hence, this pillar is furnished with all the means of producing it. For in the first place, we see it divided into many pieces; having a perfectly elastic substance interposed between every two bodies, and which by easily yielding to whatever side we bend, and by a powerful re-action, takes off pressure from the delicate nervous column, and thus preserves it from injury in the violent and sudden motions of the body. During the day this elastic substance is continually yielding to the pressure, so that we are taller in the morning than at night, and shorter in old age than at manhood.

The structure of the spine has excited the notice of Dr. Paley, who calls the attention of his readers to the various difficult and almost inconsistent offices which were to be executed by the same instrument. "It was,"

says he, "to be firm, yet flexible; now I know no chain made by human art which is both these; for by firmness I mean not only strength, but stability: firm to support the erect position of the body; flexible to allow of the bending of the trunk in all degrees of curvature." It was also to be a pipe for the spinal marrow, a substance not only of the first necessity to life, but of a nature so tender, and so impatient of injury, as that any unusual pressure upon it, or any obstruction of its course, is followed by paralysis or death.

The spine was not only to furnish the main trunk for the passage of the medullary substance from the brain, but to give out the nerves, which distribute this supply to every part of the body: it was likewise to afford a fulcrum for the insertion of the muscles which are spread over the trunk of the body. Let a workman endeavour to comprise all these purposes in one piece of mechanism, and he will understand the wisdom which has been employed in the animal frame. 1. With respect to the firmness, yet flexibility of the spine; it is composed of a number of bones joined to one another by broad bases. The breadth of these bases, and the closeness of the junction, give its stability; the number of the joints its flexibility. This flexibility is by the union of the bones least in the back, greater in the loins, and greatest of all in the neck. 2. To afford a passage for the medullary substance, each of the bones is bored through the middle, in such a manner as that when put together the hole in one bone falls into a line, and corresponds with the holes in the two bones contiguous to it; thus the perforated pieces, when joined, form a close uninterrupted channel, while the spine is upright. When the body is bent, the vertebræ, by means of their projections, and of the articulations which these form with one another at their extremities are so locked in as to maintain, in the broad surfaces of the bones, the relative position nearly unaltered, and to bear the load and pressure, produced by flexion upon the cartilages, which admit of all the motion necessary, without any chasm being produced by a separation of the parts: for when we bend our backs considerably, the motion of each vertebra is very small,

such is the advantage received from a chain composed of many links, the spine of many bones. The cartilages or gristles, are thicker before than they are behind, so that when we stoop forward, the compressible substance, yielding in its thicker part, brings the surfaces of the adjoining vertebræ nearer to the being parallel with one another, instead of increasing the inclination of their planes, which would have occasioned a fissure between them. 3. As the medullary canal is to give out a supply of nerves, notches are made in the upper and lower edge of the vertebræ, which when they are put together, these notches exactly fitting, form small holes, and through these holes the nerves issue out in pairs to send their branches to every part of the body. Another purpose assigned to the same instrument is the insertion of the bases of the muscles, and the support of the end of the ribs, for which there is a figure suited to the design. But the strength of the parts, and the security against luxation were still to be consulted. For this purpose, the moveable joints between the vertebræ, so lock in, and overwrap one another, as to secure the body of the vertebræ from being pushed out of its place by any violence short of that which would break the bone. An instance of this may be seen in the chine of a hare. Hence the spine is to be considered under three views, viz. its articulations, its ligaments, and its perforations, from which the body derives advantages with regard to action, strength, and a secure communication with the brain.

The structure of the spine is different in different animals. In the serpent tribe it is considerably varied; but with a strict reference to the conveniency of the animal. For, whereas in quadrupeds the number of vertebræ is from thirty to forty, in the serpent it is nearly a hundred and fifty: in men and quadrupeds the surfaces of the bones are flat, and these are bound tight by sinews: in the serpent the bones play within one another like a ball and socket; so that they have a free motion upon one another in every direction: thus in men and quadrupeds firmness is more consulted; in serpents pliancy; but pliancy is not obtained at the expense of safety. "The back-bone of a serpent for co-

herence and flexibility is one of the most curious pieces of animal mechanism with which we are acquainted. The chain of a watch which passes between the spring-barrel and fusee, and which aims at the same properties, is but a bungling piece of workmanship in comparison with that of which we are speaking." See Paley's Nat. Theol.

The first vertebra of the neck is named the *atlas*, from the circumstance of the globe of the head being placed upon it. Its processes are scarcely distinguishable; it has no body and is in fact simply a ring through which the spinal marrow passes from the great hole of the skull into the rest of the tube formed for its reception.

No mechanism was ever contrived more evidently artificial than that seen in the vertebræ of the human neck. Two things were wanted: the head was to have the power of bending forward and backward; and at the same time of turning itself round upon the body to a certain point. For this, two contrivances are employed. 1. The head rests upon the uppermost of the vertebræ, and is united to it by a hinge-joint, upon which it plays freely backward and forward. 2. For the rotatory motion, there is mechanism resembling a tenon and mortice, not between the head and the uppermost bone in the neck, but between that bone and the bone next underneath it. This second bone has a projection like a tooth, which entering a socket in the bone above it, forms a pivot, upon which that upper bone, together with the head which it supports, turns freely in a circle, as far as the muscles will permit. Thus, when we nod, we make use of the hinge-joint, when we turn the head we use the tenon and mortice. The same contrivance is employed in mounting a telescope. For the vertical motion, there is a hinge, upon which the telescope plays: for the horizontal motion an axis upon which the telescope and the hinge turn round: "and this," says Dr. Paley, "is exactly the mechanism which is applied to the motion of the head; nor will any one here doubt of the existence of counsel and design, except it be by that debility of mind which can trust to its own reasonings in nothing."

The *pelvis* extended to give a steady bearing to the trunk and to connect it with the lower extremities, is a cir-

cle of large and firm bones, standing as an arch betwixt the lower extremities and the trunk: its arch is wide and strong, so as to give a firm bearing to the body; its individual bones are large, so as to give a deep and sure socket for the implantation of the thigh-bone: its motions are free and large, bearing the trunk above, and rolling upon the thigh bones; and so truly is it the centre of all the great motions of the body, that when we believe the motion to be in the higher parts of the spine, it is in truth either the last vertebra of the loins bending upon the top of the pelvis, or the pelvis itself rolling upon the heads of the thigh bones.

The pelvis takes its name from its partly resembling a basin in its form: it is constructed in the adult, of four large bones: of the os sacrum behind; the ossa innominata on each side and before; and the os coccygis below. The os sacrum or hinder bone is the base, on which the spine, and of course the whole trunk rests: it is of an irregular triangular shape, and so formed as to guard the nerves proceeding from the end of the spinal marrow. Within this bone, there is a triangular cavity, which is a continuation of the canal of the spine, and here the spinal marrow ends, and branching into a great many thread-like nerves has the form of a horse's tail. These nerves go out by five great holes, which are on the forepart of the bone to be distributed to different parts. The os coccygis is a continuation of, or rather an appendage to, the sacrum; though called a single bone, it consists of four bones, in middle age, each bone becoming smaller as it descends, till the last ends almost in a point, and by bending inwards serves to contract the lower opening of the pelvis so as to support effectually the viscera within. These two bones, the sacrum and coccygis are a continuation of the spine, and perform part of its motions, supporting, like it, the weight of the body, lodging the spinal marrow, and transmitting some of its nerves; hence certain authors call them part of the spine, but others describe them as connected with the pelvis. The sides and forepart of this basin are composed of two bones, corresponding with each other in size and figure, but from their irregular shape they are called ossa innominata, or nameless bones. In children, each of these

bones consists of three separate pieces, which after the ossification is more perfect, are so firmly united as to make one bone only. They are, however, described as if consisting of three distinct or separate pieces, viz: 1. The os ilium or haunch bone, which is the highest and constitutes the upper side of the pelvis; it has its posterior edged firmly and immoveably articulated to the os sacrum: 2. The os ischium, or hip-bone which lies perpendicularly under the ilium, and is the lowest point of the pelvis on which we sit. 3. The os pubis is the last and smallest piece of the three, forming the fore-part of the pelvis, and completing its brim. Each os innominatum has a cup-like hollow for the head of the thigh-bone to move in.

The pelvis is intended for many important purposes in the human frame: first, it is the base for supporting the superior part of the body: next, it is so constructed, as to receive into its sockets, and to roll upon the heads of the thigh-bones, by which means it connects the lower extremities with the upper parts of the frame, without precluding motion; and lastly, by forming a kind of basin at the lower end of the trunk of the body, it assists in sustaining the viscera; while its outside surfaces, its ridges and projecting points serve as so many convenient places for the origin and insertion of numerous muscles which perform by means of it, with the advantage of a lever, some of the motions of the trunk and many of those of the lower limbs.

The *thorax* or chest, is that large cavity reaching from the neck to the lower end of the breast-bone before, but extending farther downwards at the back, and including all that space which lies between the opposite ribs. It is intended by an All-wise Maker, to afford a secure and commodious residence for the heart, lungs, &c. and is formed *behind*, by the twelve dorsal vertebræ of the spine; on the sides by the ribs and by the breast-bone before.

The ribs, which are generally twelve in number, form the sides of the chest, covering and defending the heart and lungs: they assist also in breathing, being joined to the spine by regular hinges which allow of short motions, and to the breast-bone by cartilages which yield to the motion of the ribs, and return again from their elastic

nature when the muscles cease to act. Seven of these are called true ribs, having their cartilages separately inserted into the breast-bone; the other five, whose cartilages do not reach that bone, but run into each other, and are united by a common cartilage, are named false ribs.

The *sternum* or breast-bone is commonly composed of three bones, joined together by cartilages: it has the ends of the ribs and collar bones articulated with it, by which the cavity of the chest is completed, as far as the bones are concerned. This bone, the ribs, and indeed all the chest stand so much exposed, that did we not guard them with our hands fractures would be frequent; but from serious injuries in these parts frequently the most alarming consequences ensue.

The reciprocal enlargement and contraction of the chest to allow for the play of the lungs, depends upon a simple yet beautiful mechanical contrivance, which is thus explained:—The ribs are articulated to the back-bone, or rather to its side projections, *obliquely*, that is, they bend or slope from the place of articulation downwards. But the base upon which they rest at this end being fixed, the consequence of the obliquity, or the inclination downwards, is, that when they come to move, whatever pulls the ribs upwards, necessarily at the same time, draws them out; and that while the ribs are brought to a right angle with the spine behind, the sternum is thrust forward. “The simple action, therefore, of the elevating muscles does the business; whereas, if the ribs had been articulated with the bodies of the vertebræ at right angles, the cavity of the thorax could never have been further enlarged by a change of their position. If each rib had been a rigid bone articulated at both ends to fixed bases, the whole chest would have been immoveable.” It has been shewn by Dr. Keil, that the breast-bone in an easy inspiration is thrust out one-tenth of an inch, and he calculates that this, in addition to what is gained to the space within the chest by the flattening of the diaphragm, leaves room for forty-two cubical inches of air to enter at every drawing in of the breath. When there is a necessity for a deeper and more laborious inspiration, the capacity of the chest may be so increased by the effort, as that the lungs

may be distended with from seventy to one hundred cubical inches of air. The thorax forms a kind of bellows, such as never has been, and such as probably never will be, made by any artificer.

SIR,

Aug. 8, 1815.

I HAVE a first volume of Wakefield's *Pope*, in which at p. 336, a former possessor has left the following remarks:

“The Honourable Thomas Erskine being taken ill suddenly, when dining at Lady Charlotte Payne's, was entreated by her ladyship to retire into the next room to lie down on a sofa. In a few minutes, however, Mr. Erskine returned, apparently recovered, with the following lines which he had written extempore with his pencil,

Though ill, my dear madam, I cannot complain;

He never knew pleasure, who never knew
PAYNE.

“Qu. Whether the wit did not take the idea from the third verse in this song, which is here ascribed to Mr. Pope.”

The *song* is one of two pieces published and ascribed to Pope in the Annual Register, Vol. 12. The third stanza is as follows:—

Alas! by some degree of woe,
We ev'ry bliss must gain:
That heart can ne'er a transport know,
That never felt a pain.

Charron in his third book of *Wisdom* [ch. 22.] had long before described it as the purpose of Nature, to render grief subservient to ease and pleasure: *il semble que Nature nous ait prêté la douleur, pour l'honneur et service de la volupté et de l'indolence.*

Pope had probably read *Charron*, from whom he appears to have translated that line in his *Essay*:

The proper study of mankind is Man,
for the first paragraph of the first book *De la Sagesse*, closes with this remark, *le vrai étude de l'homme c'est l'homme.* I am not aware that this close resemblance has been noticed by any who have employed themselves to trace Pope through his numerous imitations.

OTIOSUS.

SIR,

Bromley, Aug. 8, 1815.

AN observation by Mr. Fox, in an extract from one of his speeches

which you have given (p. 412. c. 1), brought to my recollection a scene which I witnessed on gratifying my curiosity, one evening, by attending a meeting of the *Protestant Association*, at Coach-maker's Hall, Noble Street. It must have been about the date of 1779.

The Hall was crowded, and Lord George Gordon in the chair. One of the company rose and stated, that there were many persons desirous of signing the petition against the toleration of Papists, who were unable to write their names. He therefore proposed that such should be invited to make their marks. This proposal was carried by acclamation, not without the expression of high approbation by the chairman, whose ardent, or rather inflammatory declamations, and the unqualified applause which followed them, prepared me to behold, with less surprise, those scenes of depredation which, a few months after, disgraced the name of Protestant.

I remain, Sir, yours,

J. T. RUTT.

Some Account of Cheyne's "Rise, Growth and Danger of Socinianisme."

(Concluded from p. 365.)

AFTER the curious Canon framed by Laud (p. 365), the reader may be surprised that he should have been taxed with "Socinianisme:" but he was an Arminian, and Arminianism in the judgment of the Assembly of Divines was a compound of all heresy. A puritan writer once attempted to shew that it was a direct breach of all the Ten Commandments.*

"It is well known," says Cheyne, ch. iv. "that the Archbishop did highly favour and frequently employ men shrewdly suspected for Socinianisme. Master Chillingworth, to speak

modestly, hath been too patient, being so deeply charged by Knot for his inclining towards some Socinian tenets: no man, in St. Jerome's opinion, ought to be patient in such a case, and sure no innocent man would be patient.—The reformed churches abroad wonder that we could find no better a champion amongst all our worthies; they who travailed hither out of forrain parts blessed themselves when they saw so much froath and grounds, so much Arminianisme and vanity in Master Chillingworth's admired peece: what doth it advantage the Protestant cause, if the Pope be deposed from his infallible chair, and Reason enthroned that Socinianisme may be advanced."

Dr. Potter is involved in the same indictment with Chillingworth. "That these two great champions," (pleads our attorney-general of Calvinism) "doe vent Arminian principles, is manifest to any man that hath but peeped into their books; now that Arminianisme is a fair step to Socinianisme, hath been sufficiently proved by Bodecherus, (though he hath been derided, he hath not been answered,) Peltius, Vedelius and others, so that I need say no more in that point."

Cheyne takes up the complaint of the church of Scotland against Laud, for protecting Wederburn, "when he fled from Scotland, for fear of church censures, because this Wederburn had poisoned the young students in divinity with Arminianisme in the New College at St. Andrews." In Ireland too, Laud was spreading the Arminian poison: "Besides, his Grace had two Scouts in Ireland, the Bishop of Derry and Dr. Chappell: Behold three kingdoms infected at once with this deadly disease by the pestilent subtilty of one archbishop."

A near approach to Socinianisme was made, according to Cheyne, by reprinting Acontius (*Stratagemata Satanæ*) at Oxford. "They might as well have printed Bonfinius;—they were both sneaking Socinians; they followed Socinus just as Nicodemus followed Christ, by stealth and in the dark." The proof of their Socinianisme is, that they say, dangerous men! "that nothing is fundamentally necessary to, salvation, but only faith or obedience to the commands of Christ, for they make faith and obedience all one."

* "Arminians make a divinity of men's power, and so are guilty of idolatry. The second command is broke by bowing down to this idol. The third is broke by speaking of ineffectual grace, for to do this is to take God's name in vain.—Arminians break the seventh by committing adultery with this idol, the work of their own hands.—And they break the tenth by coveting their neighbour's interest in God and Christ." Hussey's *Glory of Christ*, p. 526 —quoted in Robinson's *Claude*, i. 125.

"Some later authours" fall under the lash; as Dr. Francis White, who was "countenanced by the Archbishop to write against the sabbath," and who in an Epistle Dedicatory to his grace, "saith that we are beholding to the testimony of the Bishops, for the weightiest matters in religion, and amongst the rest," (which is true enough!) "for the eternall Deity of the blessed Saviour;" and the author of "that little pamphlet about Schisme," the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales, of whom Cheynell says that he was "credibly informed that when he was asked by a great person in this kingdome, what he thought of the Socinians, he answered, If you could secure my life, I would tell you what I think."

Cheynell next turns to Laud's own book, the Relation of a Conference with Fisher, the Jesuit, first printed in 1624 and reprinted 1639, and pretends to trace by the alterations in the second edition "how much his grace had altered his religion in those fifteen yeares." "These," he says, "I call very suspicious passages, you must not expect demonstrations in this point, for I know the Archbishop was too wise to speak plain, though some of these passages are plain enough. And I must professe that I doe not believe the Archbishop ever intended to bring in all points of Arminianisme, Socinianisme or Popery, but to pick out such points as might stand with the great designe; he was to humour all these three factions, that all three might join him to suppress Calvinisme and then admire him as the Apostolike Patriarch, Pope of this other world of Britain."

True, the Archbishop calls Socinianisme "an horrid monster of all heresies," but this does not satisfy Cheynell, for he suffered Socinians to live. A rebuke worthy of attention was passed upon these heretics by our fierce polemic: "It is observable, that our English Arminians and Socinians are nothing so true to their own principles, as the ringleaders of these factions are beyond the seas."

Having done with Laud, Cheynell proceeds: "This may suffice for a taste of the Archbishop's divinity: nor the young students could not but take notice of such passages, and therefore whet their wits to maintain those opinions which his Grace countenanced.

There was a great scholar who asked one of the Canterburian faction, what he thought of the Primate of Ireland's treatise concerning Christ's Incarnation, in which he demonstrates that the word was made flesh and that therefore Christ is God and Man: the Canterburian answered that, indeed there was as much produced upon that argument as could be said upon it, but under correction, saith he, 'I conceive the Primate hath not cleared the point which he undertook to prove.' The men of this strain when they were at their height, began to vary their expressions, they called Christ their great Master, or our Lord and Master, at the highest, so that you could scarce tell by their prayers whether they did respect Christ or their patrone most, for the Chaplaines styled their Patrone their very good Lord and Master. Dr. Taylour in his Epistle Dedicatory to the Archbishop before the sermon on the Gunpowder Treason, seems to affect that expression of calling Christ our great Master: the Socinians will bear them company in such generall expressions, and some have thought of composing such a Liturgy as might give no offence to Arminians or Socinians: that would be an inoffensive Liturgy indeed, and they may doe well to enlarge their charity, and make their Liturgy inoffensive to the Turkes and Jews as well as the Socinians; for any Liturgy which will please one that is a thorow Socinian, will please Turkes and Jews also, if it be but warily composed, and they will keep themselves in such generall expressions as some doe too much affect."

This is an amusing passage. Professor Marsh appears not to be original in his objections to "generalized Christianity."

In the conclusion of this chapter, Cheynell returns to Mr. Webberly: "But of all that I have met with, none comes neer Mr. Webberly, a Batchelour of Divinity and Fellow of Lincoln Colledge, who hath translated a Socinian Book into English, for the benefit of this nation, and prepared it for the press. Now they think they may own the business, they dare appeare in their proper colours and blaspheme Christ in plain language. But because some parts of Socinianisme strike directly at the superstition of Rome so highly extolled in our dayes,

and at the pompe of the clergy which must be maintained by the sword (for what care they though England swimme in blood, so they swimme in wealth and pleasure?) therefore Mr. Webberly tells us very honestly, that Socinianisme was to be corrected and chastised with respect to the nature of our climate."

To the real honour of Socinianisme, but to its disgrace in the eyes of this furious ecclesiastic, one of its tenets was the unlawfulness of war, and he rallies Mr. Webberly upon this point, insinuating that he "may be so far irratiōnall as to be of the Council of Warre, which no strict Socinian would allow."

Wood (Hist. et Antiqu. Univ. Oxon. l. i. p. 405 & Ath. & Fast. ii. 901) gives the following account of this gentleman: "John Webberley, admitted of Lincoln College, 1640, was the son of Thomas Webberley, of East Kirby, in Lincolnshire; was now esteemed by all a high-flown Socinian, and afterwards a desperate zealot for the King's Cause, in the time of the grand rebellion. He had translated into English several Socinian books, some of which he had published without his name set to them, and others which were laying by him were taken out of his study by the Parliamentarian Visitors, an. 1648, in which year he suffered much for his loyalty, by imprisonment first and afterwards by expulsion."

Chap. v. "shewes that the famous Atheists (Anabaptists and Sectaries) so much complained of, have been raised or encouraged by the doctrines and practises of the Arminian, Socinian and Popish party."

A curious cause of Atheism is here stated: "The Socinians doe deny Christ to be God, to the glory of God the Father, as they use to say, and I beleve God the Father hath taken it so unkindly at their hands, that he hath given them over to that cursed atheisme which reigns in the heart of every man by nature."

There is next an attempt at argument—take a specimen: "The scriptures doe clearly shew that God the Father is no more God than Jesus Christ; but say the Socinians, Jesus Christ is not God. Who sees not what conclusion will follow? *ergo*, if they said true, there would be no God at all."

The Anabaptists are now brought

upon the stage: "From whence did they suck their poison, but from the Arminians, Socinians and Papists? From the Arminians they received their doctrine about the fall and free-will of man; are they not pure Arminians in that great point of predestination? They oppose the reformed churches in their doctrine about originall sin: the Socinians have taught them to deny that infants are conceived and born in sin, and this is the true reason why they deny Baptisme to infants."

Their being of his own political party does not incline Cheynell to any moderation towards the poor Anabaptists: "But I beleve the reason why the Anabaptists are complained of at this time, is because they are disobedient to magistrates, for it is commonly said that they have lately taken up armes in rebellion against the King. I must confess I have wondered often when I have heard of this dayly complaint, because I know that an Anabaptist doth not think it lawful to be a cutler, he thinks no sword ought to be made, because he conceives it unlawfull to use a sword. It is well known that the Anabaptists goe to sea without any ordnance in their ships, that they travaile without any sword by their side: But if there be any fighting Anabaptist in these dayes, I suppose the English Socinians have taught the English Anabaptists to deny those principles in practice which they maintain in dispute."

The duty of mercy in the administration of penal justice is another of the well-known damnable heresies of the Anabaptists: they deserved hanging because they doubted of the lawfulness (in a Christian point of view) of hanging men for common offences. What a wretched, contemptible set of men, who would have superseded or narrowed the range of capital punishments! "The Arminians and Socinians," says Cheynell, who had "the heart of an executioner, "make a King of clouts, and put a wooden or painted sword into his hand to affright children, for they say that he must not draw blood, no, not in a legall way, for capitall offences."

The connexion between Anabaptisme and Socinianisme, which is not the most fanciful of Cheynell's notions, is thus made out: "We must distinguish between the first tumults of Anabap-

tisticall men and deliberate Anabaptisme. The first tumults were raised above an hundred years since by illiterate dreamers, such as Nicholas Storke, Thomas Muncer, Phifer Ringus, and the rest; yet Muncer at that time laid a faire foundation for Servetus, Socinus and the rest to build upon; for he denyed the satisfaction of Christ; and what doctrine is fundamentall, if the satisfaction of Christ be not? The Socinians make it their grand designe to persuade men that Jesus Christ hath not truly and properly satisfied for our sinnes. The heresy of the Anabaptists was not backed with any strength of argument, nor methodically digested, till Servetus and Socinus set to work. I must then look upon Servetus and Socinus as the maine pillars of deliberate and refined Anabaptisme."

Amongst the charges against the Anabaptists, are their doctrine of the liberty of prophesying, and their *tubbe-preachers*: the Socinians had not such preachers, but they had the doctrine which authorizes the use of *tubbes* in any way that interferes not with the peace of society or the rights of individuals.

Cheynell is no friend to Liturgies, though he states a fact with regard to them which might have been expected to conciliate a mind like his: "Be pleased to observe that Liturgies were first composed to expell Socinianisme."

One reflection shall conclude this lengthy article: How are the intolerance and fury of divines, from Cheynell upwards and downwards, with regard to "Socinianism," to be accounted for! Is not this the sole reason, that this *ism*, more than any other, has tended to put down the priest and to set up man! As far as modern Unitarianism has the same tendency it will experience the same treatment: accommodate it to the idle forms and fopperies of hierarchies, and you take away its worst features in the eyes of churchmen, but it behoves you to take care that you do not in the same degree destroy its resemblance to the Christianity of the New Testament, and rob it of the sanction and influence which it has hitherto derived from its reasonableness, simplicity and manliness.

Higham Hill, Aug. 9th, 1815.

SIR,

BEING disengaged a few Sundays ago, I had an opportunity of hearing a very good and useful sermon delivered by an orthodox dissenting minister. I did not indeed agree with the preacher in every point, and my ear was particularly struck with words to the following effect; that there are two descriptions of men who are hostile to Christianity, they who reject revelation altogether and they who will admit nothing as an article of revelation which they do not understand, *who rush upon a mystery without any reverence for its awful retirement*. As I have never been accustomed to feel much reverence for the retirement of a *mystery*, I found myself compelled to take my station in this latter class, and there I was led into a train of reflections which I have since committed to paper, and which are now at your service.

My first reflection, if such I may call it, was a feeling of astonishment that Christian divines should be so fond of contending for *mysteries* in religion, after having read the fifth verse of the seventeenth chapter of the book of Revelation. "And on her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." But my astonishment subsided a little when I recollected that theologians, as by a species of infatuation, have not unfrequently sealed the condemnation of their favourite doctrines, by the very terms in which they have expressed them.

I was next led to ask myself what is meant by the term *mystery*, as it has been generally applied to the doctrines of revelation. Is it simply a truth which surpasses the comprehension of the human mind, as the self-existence of the Deity, or is it a proposition which contradicts the most certain conclusions of the understanding, as the doctrine of transubstantiation? Or, is it a term which they who employ it do not wish to have accurately defined, and which as implying *generally* what is incomprehensible, may denote either what is *above* reason or what is *contrary* to it? Is it one of those *ambiguous sounds* which controversialists not unfrequently make use of as though to perplex the subject of inquiry, and by which they not only attempt to de-

ceive others, but often impose upon themselves? Certain it is that *mystery* is a word of very convenient application, and which theologians can employ or not, according as they wish to defend or refute a particular article of belief. Thus the Protestant tells the Catholic that his doctrine of transubstantiation involves absurdity and contradiction; but when the same charge is brought against certain dogmas in his own creed, he finds in them nothing absurd or contradictory, but sees only certain sublime *mysteries*, into which, as they are not to be comprehended, it is impious to pry. Thus *mystery*, it seems, is a term which is conceived to afford a retreat from the persecution of argument, and is employed to soften that which ought to go by a different name into something which, with the appearance of falsehood, possesses the reality of truth.

But are we not obliged in many cases to admit what is *mysterious*? When I am informed what is meant by *mysterious* in this question, I shall immediately be able to give an answer to it. If by *mysterious* is intended simply that which our understanding cannot grasp, I reply that we are often compelled to admit what is mysterious; for instance that the great First Cause is self-existent; but if by *mysterious* is meant what is self-destructive and contradictory, as that a being who is infinitely benevolent should act the part of a cruel, arbitrary tyrant, we *are* not and we *cannot* be compelled to admit it. When therefore any proposition is set before us which seems to come under the general denomination of *incomprehensible*, we should carefully distinguish between that which surpasses our reason and that which contradicts it. Great care should also be taken lest we receive what is self-contradictory, while misled by the vague and ambiguous use of language. Were these simple rules attended to, I conceive we should soon hear no more of what have usually been termed *mysteries* in religion.

But is it not an evidence of becoming diffidence and humility in fallible man to receive on the authority of revelation a truth by which the ordinary conclusions of the human mind are set at nought and confounded? If the authority of revelation were clearly made out on the one side, and on the other a proposition were laid down to

be admitted on this authority which should involve a contradiction, this would be a very perplexing case indeed; but until God can contradict himself this is a perplexity to which we can never be reduced. We may indeed be called, on the authority of revelation, to admit truths which surpass the apprehension of our limited faculties; and that this is perfectly reasonable may be shewn by such a case as the following. A child shall be informed by his father that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. Conceiving his father to be wiser than himself, and that he has no intention to deceive him, he will naturally give credit to this proposition, though he cannot comprehend the evidence on which it rests, and has no reason but authority for believing such to be the fact. But let the child be told that there is no angle, or only one angle in a figure which is affirmed to have three angles, and he would be no very promising child if he did not immediately perceive that there must be some error or equivocation in the use of the terms in which the proposition is conveyed. There is an important and obvious difference between not seeing how a thing *can* be and why it cannot be. I do not see how God should have existed from eternity, but I seem compelled to admit this, that I may not be obliged to admit what is more inexplicable. But I do see why God cannot be eternal and not eternal, self-existent and not self-existent, omnipotent and not omnipotent. Had this distinction, which it has sometimes been very convenient to overlook, been always attended to, certain religious controversies might have been brought to a speedier termination. It deserves also to be remembered that there are certain propositions which though they cannot perhaps be reduced in form to a contradiction, are so repugnant either to our reason or to our moral feelings, that nothing but the most irresistible evidence would lead the thoughtful inquirer to admit them. And yet propositions of this kind are thrust upon us on the faith of detached texts of scripture, which either imperiously demand or easily admit a more rational interpretation.

I was next going to inquire into the *practical utility* of *mysteries*, but as this appeared clearly a non-entity, I

proceeded to ask myself upon what evidence the doctrines which are usually termed *mysteries* are admitted. The evidence in favour of Christianity shall now be allowed to be as strong as it has at any time been represented by its most confident advocates. Is this evidence more satisfactory than those conclusions of the human mind which these mysterious doctrines would set aside? Can I ever be more certain that Christianity is divine than I am that what I taste to be bread is bread and not flesh, and that what my senses inform me to be wine is wine, and not blood? How far the same mode of reasoning will apply to certain Protestant *mysteries* it will become those who receive them to inquire. But it will be said, does it not favour scepticism thus to balance the doctrines of revelation with its evidences, and to admit nothing that we do not conceive more likely to be true than that revelation itself should be false? I answer that the evidences of Christianity are, in my opinion, strong enough to support what I consider as the Christian doctrine, but not strong enough to support any mass of absurdity which the folly of man may choose to erect upon them. Experience indeed has shewn that that *faith* in Christianity which is the result of education and prejudice is strong enough to bear the most cumbersome load of error that the imagination of man has ever piled together; but the intelligent inquirer who should come to the study of Christianity without any prepossession in its favour would certainly demand that when from its external evidence he had seen reason to admit it to be divine he should not be driven by its internal evidence to a contrary conclusion, that when he had thought it *morally impossible* that this religion should be false he should not find it *absolutely impossible* that it should be true. But whoever may charge the above mode of reasoning with being favourable to scepticism, it is to be hoped that this charge will not be brought by the advocate of *mystery*. Not to dwell on the consideration that the *mysteries* which have been annexed to religion have been the fruitful source of scepticism and infidelity, the admission of what has usually been termed a *mystery* shakes the very foundation of all human reasonings, and affords cause

to suspect that those conclusions of the understanding which we should deem most clear and certain may nevertheless be false.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

E. COGAN.

P. S. Allow me to thank your correspondent W. D. (p. 358) for his information respecting the passages from Heliodorus. Just before I read his communication, I had found by looking into a Number of the Classical Journal, that I had been anticipated again and again.

SIR,

Aug. 6, 1815.

I SEE with some satisfaction at p. 429, that my letter (p. 233) has been noticed by, at least, one of your readers. I can easily believe that he "knows nothing of Bereus." Yet, on consideration, he will, I think, admit that whether Bereus be "a young man," or have seen many days; whether "health and prosperity" have been his portion, or he have known their reverses; whether his ministry have been in the world, or in the church; his facts and arguments are all that concern your readers, while the inquiry of first moment to himself is whether in his situation, whatever it may have been, he have endeavoured to *serve his generation according to the will of God*.

I considered myself employed in that service when I took occasion from the letter of Scrutator (p. 95) to call the attention of your readers to the state of *Christian* teaching, especially from the pulpit, among those who, on satisfactory evidence, as I believe, have exploded the theology called *orthodox*. An education and continued intimacy among those who retain that theology had often painfully assured me how our preachers, by *moralizing* Christianity, rather than *Christianizing* morality, had retarded the progress of *scriptural*, which must be *rational*, views of religion, and "suffered their good to be evil spoken of." It has indeed been my opinion for several years, an opinion formed, by some reading and observation, before the existence of the Unitarian Fund, which I hailed as a powerful engine of reform, that *our* art of preaching is yet in its infancy. Nor can it be expected to advance towards maturity unless we allow ourselves freely, though fairly, to estimate the merit

in this view, of those who have gone before us, whose characters and talents have adorned our communion and who cannot fail to become models to their successors.

Your correspondent appears to admit, while he accounts for and excuses the deficiency of "our venerable fathers," upon this point. Of their "integrity" I think as highly as he can do, and that they kept back nothing that was profitable, in their judgment. But their judgment I venture to think erroneous, often clouded and perplexed by the "very trying situations," in which, I readily admit, they were frequently placed. I cannot so readily believe that their successors are "discouraged by seeing no rational ground of hope of support in advanced life if they, by preaching all they know, should deprive themselves of their present situation and support." This passage must have escaped your correspondent, *currente calamo*. He could not seriously mean to describe the preachers of our day and communion as waiting for an indemnity, in this world, before they will incur the hazard, whatever it may be, of *preaching all they know*.

I trust that our preachers "have not so learned *Christ*," but "have heard him and have been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus."

BEREUS.

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

No. CCXXXIV.

Specimen of Papal Infallibility.

An edition of the Vulgate was published by Sixtus the Fifth. His holiness carefully superintended every sheet as it passed through the press; and, to the amazement of the world, the work remained without a rival—it swarmed with errata! A multitude of scraps were printed to paste over the erroneous passages, in order to give the true text. The book makes a whimsical appearance with these pasted corrections; and the heretics exulted in the demonstration of Papal infallibility. The copies were called in and violent attempts made to suppress it; however a few remain for the rapturous gratification of the Bi-

blical Collectors. At a late sale, a Bible of Sixtus V. fetched above sixty guineas—not too much for a mere book of blunders! The world was highly amused at the bull of the Pope and Editor, prefixed to the first volume, which excommunicated all printers, &c. who, in reprinting the work, should make any *alteration* in the text!

In a version of the Epistles of St. Paul into the Æthiopic language, which proved to be full of errors, the Editors allege a very good-humoured reason,—"They who printed the work could not read and we could not print; they helped us and we helped them, as the blind help the blind."

No. CCXXXV.

Courtly Wit.

Francis I. discoursing one day familiarly with Castellanus, asked him if he was a gentleman. Sir, said Castellanus, you know that there were three in Noah's ark; I really cannot inform you from which of those three I am descended. His reply pleased the king.

Castellanus, in a funeral sermon upon his good patron, Francis I. declared his hope that the King was gone directly to paradise. This gave great offence to the Sorbonne, which sent deputies to complain of it at court. But they were coldly received: and Mendoza, the King's steward, told them, that he knew his old master's temper better than they; that he never could endure to remain long in any place; and that if he went into purgatory, he only stopped there just to take a gill of wine, or so, in his passage.

No. CCXXXVI.

A Thought on Life.

A most important hour is life; its occurrences are all a crowd of interesting events that deserve well our observation, being big with purposes of divine love for us. *God is not far from every one of us, we are his workmanship*, and he is ever at work upon us. This is so universally true, and so absolutely the condition of human life, that every man living may say of himself, *jam mea res agitur*, now is my fortune at stake.

Stonchouse. Univ. Restit. 406

REVIEW.

“ Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame.”—POPE.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Richard Price, D.D. F.R.S.* By William Morgan, F.R.S. London: Printed for Hunter, and for R. Rees. 1815. 8vo. pp. 189.

THE subject of these Memoirs, occupied so conspicuous, so honourable and so useful a station in society that strangers may naturally wonder at the interval between his death and the appearance of the present volume. That “so many years (to use this biographer’s language) should have been suffered to pass away before any of the nearest relatives of Dr. Price should have paid the tribute due to his memory of giving some account of his life,” is a circumstance which seems to call for an explanation, and which here receives one that, we presume, will, in general, be accepted as satisfactory:

“ This delay,” says our author, “ arose in the first instance from the premature death of my brother George Morgan, who had undertaken to write a very circumstantial history of his uncle’s life, and had made a considerable progress in it, when, towards the close of the year 1798, a fatal disorder put a final period to this and all his other pursuits.

“ The confused state in which his papers were found, and the indistinct short hand in which they were written,* rendered it impossible either to arrange or to understand them properly; and therefore, after many fruitless attempts, I was reluctantly obliged to give up the investigation, and to take upon myself the task of writing a new, but more concise account;—”

Of the particular qualifications of the gentleman who now comes before the public as Dr. Price’s biographer, for his undertaking, no doubt can be entertained among persons in any degree acquainted with his character and situation. We shall lay before our readers a summary of the principal events recorded in his narrative:

RICHARD PRICE was born, on the

23rd of February, 1723, in the parish of Langeinor in the county of Glamorgan. Till the age of eight or ten years, he was educated partly at home, and partly by a person in the neighbourhood. Being the youngest son, he was intended for trade: but circumstances arose which prevented this intention from being carried into effect. After having been placed successively at three schools, he was moved, at the age of fifteen, to the Rev. Vavasor Griffith’s Academy, at Talgarth in Breconshire; where he was a student at the death of his father, in 1739. It appears that his patrimony was very inconsiderable. Rice Price, the father, a Calvinistic dissenting minister, at Bridgend, in Glamorganshire, singled out one of his children for his favourite, leaving him almost the whole of his property, and abandoning the rest of his family in a great measure to provide for themselves. It is not improbable that Richard had displeased him by his want of faith and orthodoxy: for one day finding the boy reading Dr. Clarke’s Sermons, he flung the book in a rage into the fire, with the most bitter invectives.

Young Price, together with his two sisters, now accompanied his mother to a temporary abode in Bridgend, where she died in the beginning of May in the following year. She was a most generous and excellent woman: and her happy state of mind in the approaches of death, and the prospect of a better world, impressed her son with lasting admiration. Until this event, he continued at the academy of Talgarth; to which place he walked over the mountains of Brecon, in the severe frost of 1740; and it was in his way thither that his mind was first engaged in studying Butler’s Analogy, a work with which he was always enamoured, and the sentiments and reasonings in which had evidently some influence on his own.

When he had attained his eighteenth year, it was determined, in compliance with his own wishes, and the advice of his paternal uncle, the Rev. Samuel Price, that he should be

* We cannot refrain from observing that this is one instance among many, of the disadvantage of gentlemen writing a *short hand* which their families are not taught to read.—Rev.

moved to a Dissenting Academy in London. On his arrival in the metropolis, his journey to which had been performed in the humblest manner, he was admitted into the seminary founded by Mr. Coward, of which Mr. Eames was the principal tutor, and lodged by his uncle (at whose expense he was chiefly maintained) in one of the closest parts of the city. His health suffered in consequence: nor was it till after a summer's residence in his native country that he was capable of resuming his studies. When he had completed his education at the Academy, he removed to Stoke Newington, where he resided, for nearly thirteen years, in the family of Mr. Sneatfield, as his chaplain and companion. Afterwards he was chosen to be the morning preacher at Newington Green: and by the death of his patron and also of his uncle his circumstances were considerably improved. Hence he determined on changing his condition in life; and accordingly, in June, 1757, he was married to Miss Sarah Blundell, then of Hackney, in which village Mr. Price resided during the first year after his marriage.

It was while he lived there that he published his treatise *On the foundation of Morals*; a work which introduced him to an acquaintance with the late excellent Dr. Adams, of Pembroke College, and also with Mr. Hume, some of whose doctrines it controverts with exemplary candour, modesty and benevolence.

In 1758 he moved to Newington Green, and during the first years of his residence on it devoted himself almost wholly to the composition of sermons. At this period, with the exception of Dr. Franklin, Mr. Canton and two or three other philosophical friends, his acquaintance was chiefly confined to the members of his own congregation. His spirits suffered from the want of some diversity of pursuit and scene. In the beginning of 1762 Mrs. Price was attacked by a disorder of which she never perfectly recovered: and this affliction and his own infirmity of health contributed yet further to depress his mind.

From the hope of being more extensively useful as a minister, he was induced to accept an invitation, in

Dec. 1762, to succeed Dr. Benson as evening preacher in Poor Jewry Lane. But neither there nor at Newington Green had he the encouragement of addressing a numerous auditory. Regarding himself therefore as incapable of giving effect to his moral instructions by delivering them from the pulpit, he formed the sermons which he had preached on *private prayer* into a dissertation on that subject, and in the year 1767 published it, with three other Dissertations, on Providence—on the Junction of Virtuous Men in the Heavenly State—and on Historical Evidence and miracles. This work had occupied him, at intervals, for more than seven years; and it was not without great diffidence and hesitation that he was at last prevailed upon to send it into the world.

On the death of his friend Mr. Bayes, of Tunbridge Wells, in 1761, he was requested to examine the papers of that truly ingenious man, among which he found an imperfect solution of one of the most difficult problems in the doctrine of chances, for “determining from the number of times in which an unknown event has happened and failed, the chance that the probability of its happening in a single trial lies somewhere between any two degrees of probability that can be named.” This investigation Mr. Price pursued and finished: and the paper was published first in the Royal Society's Transactions, in 1763, and the following year in the American Philosophical Transactions. A supplement to it was published by him in the Royal Society's Transactions in 1764. He had the honour, too, of being admitted a member of that learned body a few months afterwards. It appears that he had previously declined to become one of the tutors in Coward's Academy, and also to succeed Mr. Richards as minister to the congregation in Lewin's Mead, Bristol.

Nearly about this time a proposal was made to him by the booksellers to publish a complete edition of all Sir Isaac Newton's works. But his diffidence of his own abilities, his want of spirits to engage in so arduous an undertaking, and possibly his reluctance to bestow too much of his time and attention on subjects not

immediately connected with his profession, determined him against forming the engagement.

His writings do not appear to have increased in any great degree his popularity as a preacher. But they added to the number of his admirers and friends. Among these was the late * Marquis of Lansdowne, then Earl of Shelburne. This nobleman on the loss of his amiable and excellent wife, had been recommended by Mrs. Montague, an intimate acquaintance of Mr. Price, to read the Dissertations on Providence and the junction of virtuous men in a future state: and he was so highly gratified by the perusal of them that he immediately expressed a wish to Mrs. Montague to be introduced to the author. A day was accordingly appointed for this purpose at Mr. Price's house at Newington Green, where his Lordship punctually attended. About the same time, he was honoured with a visit from George Lord Lyttelton.

On the death of Mr. Laughier,† morning preacher at the Gravel-Pit Meeting-house in Hackney, Mr. Price accepted an invitation to succeed him in this office. He consented however to remain as afternoon preacher at Newington Green, and, in consequence, resigned that service at Poor Jewry Lane. At Hackney his audience was much more numerous than in either of the places at which he had hitherto officiated.

In 1769 and in 1770 he began to be better known to the public by a paper (printed in the Royal Society's Transactions) on the Expectations of Lives and by his Treatise on *Reversionary Payments, &c.*: and towards the end of the former year he received from the University of Glasgow the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

He published in 1772 his *Appeal to the Public on the National Debt*; of some parts of which pamphlet Lord North spoke in the House of Commons with great respect. And in the

beginning of 1776, he gave to the world his *Observations on Civil Liberty, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*; a work which obtained a rapid sale and a very extensive circulation, and procured for him the freedom of the city of London, presented in a gold box by the Aldermen and Common Council. Though all communication between this country and the North American colonies was now of necessity destroyed, yet Dr. Price was constantly in the habit of having letters transmitted to him from the Western Continent, by his friend Dr. Franklin, who at that time resided in Paris, and who had been a member together with him of a social and literary club at the London Coffee House. Such communications, however, Dr. Price, from prudential motives, soon afterwards discouraged.

In the spring of 1777 he published a second pamphlet, containing additional observations on the nature and value of Civil Liberty—on the War with America—and on the Debts and Resources of Great Britain. Of the fast day Sermons which he preached during the war, he laid before the world those delivered respectively in the years 1779 and 1781: and to the former he added a postscript, in consequence of a violent attack from Dr. Lowth, Bishop of London, whom he answered by quoting a few passages from what the learned Prelate had written in his earlier years.

Being invited by the Congress of the United States, in 1778, to reside among them, he civilly declined the invitation: for he was too much attached to this country, and connected by too many ties of friendship and affection, to think of exchanging his present abode at the advanced age of nearly three-score years.

He published in 1779 an *Essay on the Population of England*. It seems to be now admitted that the returns of the surveyors of the house and window duties, from which he formed his deductions, were incorrect.

His next labours, in the character of an author, were occasioned by Dr. Priestley's *Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit*. In this metaphysical controversy he was the advocate of Immaterialism and of Philosophical Liberty. The discussion of these subjects between the celebrated man whom he opposed and himself, was conducted with per-

* Not strictly the late Marquis; the elder brother of the present noble possessor of the title having borne it, though but for a short time.—REV.

† Not *Law*, as the Biographer spells the name. The Rev. Timothy Laughier is the gentleman spoken of. See the funeral sermon for him, by his friend Dr. Kippis.

REV.

fect friendship: and the volume which preserves it, is a pleasing memorial of their mutual affection as well as of their different casts of mind.

So intimate was Dr. Price's connexion with Lord Shelburne about the year 1782, that his noble friend gravely offered him the place of private secretary; though, as was justly observed, the minister might as well have proposed to make him *master of the horse*!

Immediately on the termination of the war in 1783, Dr. Price published a small pamphlet on the finances of the nation. And in the report of the commissioners for examining the public accounts, he had the satisfaction of seeing recommended in the strongest terms those measures which he had in vain proposed and urged.

Within a year or two afterwards, he published a pamphlet *On the Importance of the American Revolution, &c.*: it was addressed to the United States, and contained much valuable advice on political and financial subjects.

Having now greater leisure for studies more congenial with his profession, he published, in 1786, a volume of sermons, of which half the number were appropriated to doctrinal, the other half, to moral, topics. On this occasion, Dr. Price made his appearance before the world as the advocate of a modified Arianism. A few months previous to the publication of these discourses, he had lost his wife.

In April, 1787, he preached a sermon in recommendation of the New College, Hackney, the students in which seminary he consented to instruct in the higher branches of the mathematics. To the duties of this office however he soon found himself incapable of attending, and therefore resigned it in the second year after undertaking it.

A short correspondence took place between Dr. Price and Mr. Pitt, on the subject of the national debt. But his acquaintance with the premier was closed with the establishment of the Sinking Fund in 1786: and it would seem that the country has not been permitted to reap any substantial benefit from his plans of finance.

In the spring of 1787 he exchanged his quiet abode on Newington Green for another more public in Hackney. At this time, and for the few remain-

ing years of his life, he was sensibly affected by the deaths of the associates of his earlier years: among these were Dr. Shipley, Bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. Adams, Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, the benevolent Mr. Howard and Dr. Franklin.

Of all the events which he had witnessed none interested or agitated him so much as the French Revolution. And, at the solicitation of several of the friends of freedom, he preached the celebrated sermon, of Nov. 4th, 1789, in which he noticed it with uncommon ardour and force of eloquence. This discourse drew torrents of abuse on him from Mr. Edmund Burke, whose rancorous invectives neither disturbed the tranquillity of his mind nor had any other effect than convincing him that the violent passions of the author had deranged his understanding.

Dr. Price was one of the stewards at the dinner in London, July 14th, 1790, in commemoration of the French Revolution. In the beginning of August he visited his relations in Glamorganshire. On his return to London, in October, he lamented his growing infirmities and total unfitness for any work that required either time or attention. However, he added a few notes to the last edition of his discourse *on the love of our country*, in answer to some of the despotic principles of Burke, and made a slow progress in preparing a new edition of his treatise on *Reversionary Payments*.

In the beginning of February, 1791, he attended the funeral of a friend to Bunhill Fields, and observed on his return that, "this method of conducting funerals was the sure way of sending the living after the dead." Within a month he attended the remains of another friend to the same spot, and having staid some time to speak over the grave, with no effectual covering to secure him from the inclemency of the weather, he was seized in the afternoon with shivering and other symptoms of fever, which on the following day increased so much as to render it necessary to apply for medical assistance. In the course, nevertheless, of about ten days, hopes were entertained of his speedy and complete recovery. A far more painful and formidable disorder now succeeded: and after the sufferer had borne very dreadful agonies, for nearly a month,

with a resignation which never uttered a sigh nor a murmur, he was released from the labours and vicissitudes of mortality.

Such was the life of Dr. Price, a man who, by the estimation of all impartial judges, holds a very high rank in the Temple of Fame, for intellectual, moral and religious excellence, and who claims the admiration and gratitude of posterity for his services to his fellow-creatures ! It is at once extremely animating and useful to trace his progress from the mountains of Wales to the scene of his future labours and eminence ; to accompany the diligent, modest, timid and orphan youth through the studies connexions and increasing reputation of his manhood and his age ; to behold him emerging from the comparative obscurity of a Dissenting Academy, and from the solitude which he loved, to no common celebrity in the learned, the political and the religious world. Scarcely less pleasing is it to mark the effect of his early reading and of the events of his younger life on his pursuits, opinions and character. Dr. Price, without doubt, had the qualities of true genius, by which we mean a very distinguished share of mental talent. But the affections of his heart, directed and governed by pure religion, concurred with his exceedingly superior abilities in making him really *great* : and, whatever one class of persons may think as to the soundness of his politics, the accuracy of his calculations or the truth of his predictions, there cannot now, we presume, be any difference of sentiment in regard to the sincerity, the disinterestedness and the patriotism of his motives.

This being our view of the illustrious man whose life is recorded in these Memoirs, we shall proceed, with all the care and correctness in our power, to ascertain the merits, and to point out the defects and faults of the volume before us : we shall then extract from it some curious anecdotes and facts, and shall finally animadvert on a few passages in particular.

N.

ART. II.—*The Progress of Intellectual, Moral and Religious Improvement, during the present Reign*, represented in a Discourse, delivered before the

Unitarian Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, at Essex Street Chapel, on Thursday, March 31, 1814, in commemoration of the Repeal of the Penal Laws against the Impugners of the Doctrine of the Trinity. To which is annexed an Appendix, containing a Summary Review of a Publication of the Lord Bishop of St. David's, entitled "A Brief Memorial, on the Repeal of the 9 and 10 William III., &c." By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel. 8vo. pp. 164. Printed for the Unitarian Society, and sold by Johnson and Co. and D. Eaton, 1814.

OF this animated and interesting sermon we have already given a brief account. [ix. 251.] It is an eloquent exposition, illustrated by a variety of details, of Mr. Belsham's well-known cheerful views of the progressive state of the world, as to knowledge, truth and virtue. The preacher adopts the exclamation of "an eloquent writer, 'I pity the man who can travel from Dan to Beersheba and say it is all a desert.' " * Happy they, who like him, are able from the strength of their minds, the purity of their characters and the steadiness of their piety, to see that God is good, to behold all men and all things in connexion with God, and to trace the march of the scheme of Divine Providence, notwithstanding temporary evils, "from good to better, and better thence again, and better still in infinite progression."

The *Appendix* may be considered as a separate publication. It is a spirited and masterly reply to a weak and intolerant pamphlet of the Bishop of St. David's, who though he had not the courage to oppose, has not been ashamed of the bigotry and folly of lamenting, the repeal of the penal statutes against the impugners of the doctrine of the Trinity. Nay, the Bishop goes farther, and contends not only that the repeal ought not to have taken place, but also that *the old law*

* P. 29. Mr. Belsham attributes the exclamation to *Mr. Wilberforce*. It belongs however to another eloquent, and very different writer—*Sterne*. The passage is in "The Sentimental Journey," and is there, as follows : "I pity the man who can travel from Dan to Beersheba and cry, 'tis all barren."

ought to be restored. What the restoration of the old law implies, M. B. has fully exposed before the Bishop's eyes, and if he can look at this picture of legal persecution without retracting his opinion and his wish, we could almost lament that he does not occupy a more fitting seat upon the episcopal bench of Spain, under the patronage of the beloved Ferdinand, and in the neighbourhood of the Inquisition.

The old proverb says, "Give a dog a bad name and hang him." The Bishop follows the advice, and calls the Unitarians whom he would worry to death with penal statutes—*Miscreants!* Upon this foul language, Mr. B. has the following very proper note:—

"Miscreants, (*mescroyans, mishelievers*). Such is the epithet which the learned prelate in an extract from Blackstone's Commentaries, prefixed to his preface, and likewise in a Note p. 10, of a late Charge to his Clergy, has been pleased to apply to those Christians who disagree with him concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. He qualifies it, however, by explaining the word, as 'an old law term for unbelievers.' But his lordship could not be ignorant, that in common parlance it would be understood in the sense Dr. Johnson gives of the word as signifying '*vile wretches*.' And perhaps his lordship, in his abundant charity, would not be displeased that it should be so understood. For he cites with approbation Blackstone's words, that 'it was thought necessary for the civil power to interpose by not admitting those *miscreants* to the privileges of society, who maintained such principles as destroyed all moral obligation.' And does the good Bishop really think that such men as Sir Isaac Newton, and Mr. Locke, and Dr. Clarke, and Dr. Lardner, and Mr. Lindsey, and Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Priestly, were *miscreants*, who maintained principles which destroyed all moral obligation, and that they were *unworthy* of the privileges of society, because they did not believe the doctrine of the Trinity?—Shade of Gardiner! Ghost of Bonner! How delighted must ye be, if such tidings reach the regions of the nether world! How refreshing, as a drop of water from the tip of Lazarus' finger! How must ye grin horribly a ghastly smile, to hear, that your own intolerant and unrelenting spirit is revived, after so long an interval, in one of your successors in the reign of George the Third!"

Yet, let us do the Bishop justice: he concedes that "the Scotch law enacting the penalty of death, required amendment and mitigation." There are happily lengths in persecution to

which even the Bishop of St. David's would not go, in pursuit of Unitarians: but it would be a fearful experiment were the legislature to grant him all that he asks in order to try whether he would be satisfied. We believe that the rigour of the Scotch law, as proved in the case of poor Aikenhead, had no light influence upon the minds of the members of the government, in disposing them to relieve the Unitarians; and we feel much pleasure in reflecting that that case was brought before the public by means of our pages. (See Vol. viii. pp. 17, 108 and 178.) Mr. B. states the case briefly (p. 45); he might, we think, have done a service to some of his readers, by referring them to this work for farther information.

With wonderful simplicity, Bishop Burgess finds a coadjutor to his mind in Mr. Cobbett, whose lucubrations on the Trinity Bill are fresh in every one's memory.

"The Bishop of St. David's and Mr. Cobbett contract an alliance, and combine their energies to resist the repeal of the persecuting laws. 'I have read Mr. Cobbett's remarks,' says his lordship, p. 17, Note, 'with great satisfaction.'—Indeed, my lord?—Is it possible that your lordship can be serious?—That I suspect is more than Mr. Cobbett himself is. Mr. Cobbett professes himself an advocate for liberty; and I protest I have always read Mr. Cobbett's remarks on the Trinity Doctrine Bill with the impression that, under pretence of defending the persecuting code, he really meant to expose its monstrous absurdity and flagrant injustice."

It is scarcely worth while to speculate upon the ultimate ends of such a writer; but it always appeared to us, we must confess, that Cobbett had a double object in view, namely, to indulge a broad laugh against Christianity and thereby to excite the public curiosity to sustain his declining paper.

Bishop Burgess insinuates that the Trinity Bill was smuggled through Parliament: where then was his lordship, where the other *overseers* (the English of the word *Bishops*) of the interests of the church? But the insinuation is most strange, not to adopt a harder epithet, as the following perspicuous and interesting history of the measure by Mr. B. will shew; we quote the passage, though it is long, in order to render the account of the Trinity Bill in our volumes complete:

"In the session of 1812 it was proposed by Mr. William Smith, the enlightened and liberal member for Norwich, to add a clause to the general Toleration Act, which was then under discussion in the House of Commons, for the repeal of the persecuting laws against the Anti-trinitarians. This clause was however withdrawn, expressly that it might not occasion the slightest obstruction to the progress of a measure universally regarded as of the highest importance. Leave was then asked to bring in a separate bill for the same purpose; but this likewise was withdrawn, because most of the right reverend prelates had retired into the country, 'for their special and local duties,' with an implied understanding that no measure relative to religion would be introduced into Parliament that session, excepting the Toleration Act which was then in progress. But the bill was withdrawn, with an explicit notice that the measure in some form or other would be revived in the next session. When Parliament met in November, a communication was made both to Administration and to those of the right reverend prelates who were then in London, that it was in contemplation to revive the application to Parliament to obtain the repeal of the persecuting statutes; but by mutual consent it was agreed to defer this business till the grand Catholic question was disposed of, which did not happen till late in the session. It is perhaps within the recollection of the learned prelate, that in the meantime an unusual number of bishops were convened for the consideration of the measure proposed to be introduced by Mr. W. Smith; and that, whatever differences of opinion might subsist among themselves upon the question, it was intimated that the Prince Regent's Government (to their immortal honour be it recorded) being willing to conciliate all parties, and not seeing any reason why Anti-trinitarians should be excluded from the benefit of legal protection any more than any other class of Non-conformists, desired that this measure might pass through both Houses without any opposition or animadversion, which, having a tendency to rouse the dormant spirit of ignorance and bigotry, might throw the nation into a flame. And can it have escaped his lordship's recollection, that in perfect concurrence and harmony with this most judicious and liberal intimation of Government, some of the most distinguished of the venerable Bench, for station, talent, character and learning, did concur and assist in framing a bill of the most conciliatory and liberal nature, which expressly repealed 'so much of all or any other Act or Acts of the English, Scotch, British, Irish, or United Parliaments, as imposes penalties on those who interpreted the Holy Scriptures inconsistently with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity?' The business being thus harmoniously and wisely settled, the venerable

prelates might with quiet consciences and heartfelt satisfaction 'leave London for their special and local duties.' The introduction of the bill thus liberally framed, was from unavoidable circumstances deferred till very late in the session, and passed without the smallest opposition, with the single and reasonable amendment, that none of its provisions were to extend to the clergy of the established church. In this state the bill was carried up to the Lords. But there the eagle eye of the Law Lords immediately discovered a want of technical propriety which had escaped the notice of the venerable prelates, and which was fatal to that generous and comprehensive measure to which they had given their countenance. The learned luminaries of the law, without expressing the slightest disapprobation of the principle of the measure, at once pronounced that a bill containing a clause so indefinite could not possibly pass into a law, and that no law could with propriety be repealed without being specifically mentioned. The bill therefore was withdrawn. And leave was given to Mr. W. Smith to introduce the present bill, which is not indeed so comprehensively worded as the preceding,* but being founded upon the same principle and carried, as far as the friends of the measure knew, to the same extent, and being also technically correct, was expedited through both Houses in time to receive the royal assent the day before the sessions closed; with the cordial consent and concurrence of all good men, excepting Mr. Cobbett, who publicly protested against it, and I regret to add the pious and learned Bishop of St. David's, who silently, but I trust, of the Right Reverend Bench, singly disapproved it."

* "The present bill does not repeal the Irish Anti-trinitarian penal laws, if any such there be. This was not an intentional omission. For, the clause suggested or sanctioned by the learned prelates included all. And after this liberal measure was unexpectedly thrown out, by Lord Lauderdale's motion that it might be read this day three months, it was too late to apply to our Irish brethren to inquire whether any such penal laws existed in their Statute Book. Lord Lauderdale, who is warmly attached to religious liberty, and friendly to the principle of the bill, seeing that the objection of the Law Lords was fatal to the bill, instantly moved for its rejection, for the sole purpose of allowing as much time as possible for introducing a new bill and carrying it through all its stages before the conclusion of the session. May I be permitted to add that, if I have been rightly informed, the conduct of the Archbishop of Canterbury through the whole business was marked with a candour, courtesy, and liberality worthy of a Christian metropolitan?"

Prefixed to the Bishop's *Memorial* is "A Demonstration of the Three Great Truths of Christianity—that *there is a God, that there is only one God, and that the three Divine Persons, FATHER, SON and HOLY SPIRIT, are God and only one God.*" (Pref. pp. 19, 20.) But alas! this *demonstration* consists in the Bishop's assertion, and moreover his assertion of what is palpably erroneous: *e. g.* "The Scriptures declare that there are three omnipresent Persons." (Pref. p. 21.) Let the Bishop point out this declaration in the Scriptures or confess his presumption. He adds, "and as there cannot be two omnipresent, that is, infinite Beings, the three omnipresent Persons can be only one God." Here Mr. B. asks

"Do I rightly understand his lordship? There are three omnipresent PERSONS; but there cannot be two, *much less three* omnipresent Beings. Does it not directly follow that persons are not Beings, and consequently that the three persons of the Trinity are three NON-ENTITIES?"

The baptismal commission is a part of the Bishop's demonstration. If baptism were not to have been administered in the name of three divine persons, it would have been, he argues, "in the name of *God, of a man and an attribute:*" upon which his acute *Reviewer* says,

"But perhaps this observation would not appear so conclusive to a person accustomed to the idioms and peculiarities of the Jewish writers, as to a common English reader. When it is said 1 Chron. xxix. 20, that the 'whole congregation worshiped the Lord and the king,' it by no means proves that the two persons so associated were equal in their nature, or that the same kind of homage was paid to both. Nor, when the apostle Paul commends his Ephesian friends (Acts xx. 32) 'to God, and to the word of his grace,' does it at all follow that because God is a person, the word of his grace is so likewise. The argument therefore from the text in Matthew, for the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit, and much more for the proper deity of the three persons in the Trinity, is very infirm, even admitting the text itself to be genuine. The authenticity of this text is however liable to considerable suspicion from the circumstance, that all the baptisms of which we read in the New Testament appear to have been administered into the name of Christ only, and not into those of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, according to the form prescribed in the gospel of Matthew."

This reply is satisfactory; but we

have often doubted, and, with deference to Mr. Belsham, we still doubt whether Unitarians do not rather lose than gain ground with their opponents by suggesting the spuriousness of difficult texts, which are established upon the same *external* evidence as the whole of the sacred volume. If a rational interpretation can be given of a passage which is alleged against us, and which we have no authority to exclude from the text of scripture, it is surely sufficient. To throw out doubts at the moment that we are hampered with difficulties, exposes us to the charge of cutting the knot which we cannot untie.

Mr. B. has one short but all-sufficient chapter (iv) to vindicate the claims of Unitarians to be considered as Christians. We fear, however, that they, whether bishops or curates, who stand in need of such an argument, are impenetrable by it. What reasoning can be expected to reach such a writer as the bishop, who, fearing that he may not succeed in persuading the legislature to go back a century and re-enact persecuting statutes, has another string to his bow, and contends that, in spite of the Trinity Bill, Unitarians may yet be convicted on the *Blasphemy Act*! He is ten years older than when he published his notable "First Principles," which underwent examination in our First Volume (pp. 425 and 633); how much wiser he has grown, let his latest works determine.

Mr. B. has the honour of being singled out by the bishop as an object of attack. His lordship even boasts of being "well acquainted with Mr. Belsham's writings." He must have formed a very inadequate estimate of his antagonist if he supposed that he was to be silenced or confuted by the "demonstration" propounded in the *Memorial*.

In the "Calm Inquiry," Mr. B. had said that "the inquiry concerning the person of Christ is into a plain matter of fact, which is to be determined, like any other fact by its specific evidence, the evidence of plain unequivocal testimony; for judging of which no other qualifications are requisite than a sound understanding and an honest mind:" at this assertion the bishop starts back: his opponent justifies himself by the following statement of the case of "a man of sound under-

standing and an honest mind, who does not know a word of Greek and who has only King James's translation before him," reasoning upon the subject of Christ's person:

"Such a person might rationally argue in the following manner: If Jesus Christ, who appeared in the form of a man with all the incidents of frail human nature, had in truth been very and eternal God,—when this fact was first revealed to his disciples, how must their minds have been absorbed and overwhelmed with astonishment and terror! At Lystra, when the people inferred from the miracles of the apostles 'that the gods were come down in the likeness of men,' Acts xiv. 11, the whole city was in an uproar. Every one was filled with amazement, and priests and people assembled together to worship, and to offer sacrifices to their celestial visitants. All this is natural, and probable, and exactly what might be expected upon an occasion so extraordinary.—What then must have been the feelings and the conduct of Jews, educated as they had been in such exalted ideas of the Great Supreme, when a discovery so new, so unexpected, so remote from all their conceptions and ideas, so amazing, so overwhelming, was made known to them, that the person whom they conceived to be the son of Joseph and Mary, with whom they had conversed for months and years with the greatest familiarity, whom many of them had witnessed as having passed through the various stages of human life, from helpless infancy to vigorous manhood, was, *WHAT?*—no other than the *ETERNAL* and *ALMIGHTY* GOD, the *INFINITE* *JEHOVAH*, the *CREATOR* of heaven and earth!—How would they feel, how would they act when this surprising and alarming discovery was made? Would they associate and converse with him as familiarly as before, would they reason with him, would they rebuke him, would they desert him, would they deny him? Let every one consider with himself what his own feelings would be after such an awful disclosure. Then look into the New Testament, consult the evangelical history, what was the conduct of the disciples of Jesus in the circumstances supposed? They discover no surprise, they abate nothing of their freedom and familiarity; from the beginning to the end of his ministry their behaviour is uniform; they talk to him as a companion, they love him as a friend, they revere him as a master, they bow to him as a prophet of the Most High—but nothing is said, nothing is done which indicates the least suspicion that he was in reality any thing more than he was in appearance, much less that he was the eternal Jehovah himself!

"Let it then be supposed that this important and astonishing fact was not revealed to them till after his resurrection,

till the day of Pentecost. In this case they must have understood the language used in John,* upon which so much stress is constantly laid in this important discussion, as consistent with the proper humanity of Jesus Christ. And would the apostle Peter, immediately upon this grand discovery, when addressing the assembled crowd, impressed and agitated as his mind must have been with the novelty, the magnitude and the importance of the doctrine, would he have spoken of this tremendous being, this 'very God of very God,' under no higher character than that of a *man* approved by God by signs and wonders, who was now exalted to God's right hand?

"How deeply are the minds of Trinitarians penetrated with a sense of the grandeur, sublimity and importance of their favourite doctrine! How seldom, how slightly do they think and speak of Jesus as a man, in comparison with the frequency and earnestness with which they think and speak of him as a God! But how much more deeply must the minds of the primitive disciples have been impressed with the stupendous discovery! It must have seized and kept possession of every faculty of their souls. In the present age the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Deity, and of an incarnate and crucified God, are so common and familiar that they almost cease to shock the mind. But to the primitive believers it must have had all the freshness and the force of novelty; it was an idea which would never be out of their thoughts, it must have occupied and filled the imagination, and must have been the constant topic of their meditation, their conversation, and their correspondence. And in sitting down to write the history of Jesus, his high dignity, his divine nature, his condescension in becoming incarnate, must have been their darling theme, in comparison with which, all other topics must have been frivolous and nugatory; and if they were under a necessity of touching upon them for a time, they would continually recur to that astonishing fact, which could never be forgotten for a moment, and must ever be uppermost in their thoughts.

"But how stands the fact? Observe and wonder.—Matthew, Mark and Luke, professing to write a history which should

* Viz. "That he came down from heaven," that 'he was before Abraham,' that 'he and the Father are one,' that 'he had glory with the Father before the world was,' and all these expressions, which are now understood as asserting the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, made no particular impression upon the apostles, nor any change in their conduct to their master: a plain proof that they understood his language in a very different sense from modern Christians."

contain all that it would be necessary to know and believe concerning their venerated Master, absolutely forget to mention the stupendous fact, that Jesus Christ was the living and true God, and they take no more notice of this awful distinction than if he were a man like themselves. And one of these sacred historians (Luke) continues his history for thirty years after the ascension of Christ, and relates the travels, the labours, the doctrine, and the success of the apostles and first teachers of the gospel; but not a syllable does he mention of the divinity of Christ, or the doctrine of the trinity, and no one would know or suspect from Luke's history that the apostles had ever heard of any such doctrine. Is this credible; is it even possible if the doctrine itself were true? Certainly not. Let every trinitarian lay his hand upon his heart and declare upon his honour and in the presence of God, whether he could himself have been guilty of such an unpardonable omission. How then can they believe that the evangelists would have been so unfaithful to their trust, if they really had it in charge to record, or if they were even apprized of this extraordinary event?

"Again: Jesus Christ (say they) was the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of this and of all worlds. This also would be a most novel and astonishing doctrine, especially to Jews, who had never heard of any Creator but God. This then is a doctrine which we might expect to be blazoned in every page of the New Testament. But what is the fact? It is omitted by Matthew, Mark, Luke, James, Peter, and Jude, and by the apostle Paul in ten out of fourteen epistles. Is it possible, then, that these writers should have given credit to this doctrine? No, No. The thought of it never entered into their minds, and if it had been proposed they would have rejected it with horror.

"And what is there, continues the man of sound understanding and honest mind with King James's version before him, to rebut these weighty considerations, and to command my assent to these astonishing and most improbable propositions, so contrary to all just conceptions of the Unity of God, so contradictory to the most explicit declarations of the Jewish Scriptures, and to the main and avowed object of the Mosaic dispensation, and so inconsistent with the general tenour of the evangelical and apostolic writings themselves, viz. that Jesus Christ is the true God, the Creator of all things, equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Spirit, being three distinct persons, are only one Being, one God? I am referred indeed to one passage here, and to another there, in which it is said that Jesus Christ is called God, equal to or one with the Father; to two or three more in which he is supposed to be represented as the maker of the world; and to a few other

texts, in which it is thought that divine attributes are ascribed to Christ. And when I ask for the texts which prove the Trinity, I am referred to the form of baptism; as if baptizing into the name of a person, of Paul or Moses for example, was an acknowledgement of their divinity. I am sent to St. Paul's valediction to the Corinthians, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, that the grace of Christ, i. e. the blessings of the gospel, the love of God, and a plentiful participation of spiritual gifts, may be communicated to his Corinthian friends—and lastly, I am referred to the exploded text of the heavenly witnesses, which the good Bishop of St. David's so fondly cherishes, though never appealed to in ancient controversy till it was foisted into the catholic epistle by a notorious ecclesiastic of the fifth century, to serve as a fulcrum to his newly-invented Athanasian Creed.* Upon evidence so feeble and unsatisfactory rest the amazing doctrines of the divinity of Christ and of the holy Trinity! And these detached texts being frequently cited by the advocates for these mysterious doctrines, are for that reason believed to be of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures; and in contradiction to the most notorious fact, though not to their sincere persuasion, they represent the New Testament as full of these mysteries from beginning to end; though it is plain that not a shadow of them exists in many of the books, and particularly in those in which we should most naturally expect to find them, the history of our Lord's ministry and of the preaching of the apostles. I conclude therefore, will this man of understanding and integrity be disposed to add, that these passages, which only occur incidentally, and which pass without comment, in whatever way they are to be accounted for or explained, were not and could not possibly be understood, or intended, by the sacred writers, in the sense in which believers in the deity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity now understand and explain them, because these doctrines did not make that impression upon their minds, nor produce that visible effect in their teaching and writings, which they now do in all who receive them; and which they necessarily must and would have done in the apostles and evangelists, and their readers and hearers, if they had believed these doctrines, and if their language had been originally understood, and by them intended to be understood, in the sense in which they are now understood by those who profess the popular creed.

"The intelligent and honest inquirer armed with such considerations as these, which must, one would think, find their way to

* Vigilinus of Tapsun, the reputed forger of a Creed from the doctrine of which the supposed author of it would have revolted with horror.

the hearts and bosoms of all who seriously and impartially seek after truth, will be little affected by curious disquisitions of learned men upon the niceties of grammatical construction, and the force of the Greek particles. He will never be persuaded that it can be necessary for him to study the bulky volumes of Hoogveen, or the more modern subtleties of Dr. Middleton, in order to learn the essential doctrines of the christian religion; which he would naturally and justly expect to find upon the front and surface, and in the general strain and tenour of the New Testament. Let him, for instance, take the text referred to by the bishop, p. 25, Tit. ii. 13, and in opposition to the common version, and to the judgment of Dr. Clarke, and other learned men, let him admit, upon the learned prelate's authority, that the true and only proper translation of the passage according to its exact grammatical construction is *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*. Would he from that expression conclude that the apostle was an assertor of the *supreme divinity* of his crucified master? Surely not. He would naturally argue that, if Paul believed that Jesus Christ was the Supreme God, his mind would have been so full of the amazing doctrine that it must have shone forth in every page of his writings, in every sentence of his discourses. His delight and his duty would have been to insist continually upon this new, unheard-of and astonishing theme, and to have explained the necessity and importance of it in all its bearings in the scheme of redemption. Could he under these impressions have coldly taught the Athenians that 'God would judge the world in righteousness by the *man* whom he had ordained, of which he had given assurance to all men in that he had raised him from the dead?' Could he have written to the Corinthians, what indeed would hardly be reconcilable to the simplicity of truth, that 'as by *man* came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead?'—How then, it may be asked, is this declaration of the apostle to Titus, to be reconciled to his not acknowledging the divinity of Christ?—Upon various suppositions. It may have been a slip of the apostle's tongue in dictating; or a mistake of his amanuensis; or an error of some early transcriber; or there may be a various reading; or the words might be intended in a different sense; or the apostle might not study perfect correctness of language; or there might be some other reason which cannot now be discovered. I will give up the text as altogether inexplicable, sooner than I will believe that the apostle intended in this casual incidental manner to teach a doctrine so new, so incredible, and of such high importance, and which is so little countenanced by the general strain of his discourses and epistles, and so repugnant to the whole tenour of the Christian Scriptures." Pp. 72---83.

The learned prelate flourishes a good deal upon the celebrated passage of Tertullian, with regard to the prevalence of the Unitarian doctrine among the lower classes of believers in his own age, the *idiots* (*idiotæ*) as Bishop Horsley unluckily translated the Latin father: but all his learning and ingenuity are insufficient to deprive the Unitarians of this powerful testimony to the antiquity of their faith. In one particular, Mr. B. allows that the bishop's version of the passage is truer than his own; but this does not affect the sense of it or the argument in the slightest degree. We recommend this part of the review especially to the attention of the reader, as a specimen of sound criticism and successful reasoning.

In the *Calm Inquiry*, Mr. B. had expressed his disbelief in the popular theory of angels; this "heresy" is therefore charged by the bishop upon the whole body of Unitarians; but his opponent very properly explains this to be his individual opinion for which his brethren are not responsible. Unitarianism, certainly, is not involved in the reception or rejection of either a celestial or an infernal hierarchy.

In section vi. of Ch. v. Mr B. enters largely into the character of Marcion, as connected with the question of the genuineness of the introduction to Luke's Gospel, and ably defends this calumniated "heretic," whilst at the same time he freely exposes his crude notions and censures his probable omissions, in his copy of the New Testament, of passages which did not accord with his opinions.

Justin Martyr's important concession to the Unitarians is the subject of the next section, in which Mr. B. points out a palpable misrepresentation of the Martyr's language in the bishop's pamphlet, and we think clearly shews that Justin's reasoning implies that his doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were novelties. It is utterly impossible to account for Justin's language, if he held the present orthodox faith.

Judging very truly that there is not such a superabundance of evidence on behalf of the divinity of Christ that any can be spared, Bishop Burgess will not part with the notorious text of the three heavenly witnesses, 1 John v. 7, 8. His judgment upon this no longer disputed passage, is a better proof of his orthodoxy than of his

erudition. In opposition to a host of evidence,

“The learned prelate would retain these precious words, because he thinks, p. 47, that the connexion requires it, and that Cyprian had the good fortune not to overlook them, and the honesty not to suppress them. He acquits, p. 81, the Arians who have been suspected of the sin of rejecting the offensive passage from the sacred text, and ascribes the daring omission of this holy symbol of the catholic faith to Artemon, an eminent Unitarian of the third century, to whom, no doubt, all the catholics of that age, of all nations and languages, from Britain to India, must have sent their copies of the New Testament to be corrected: for in no other way could a change so universal have been at that time accomplished. What would the learned prelate say if such a mode should be adopted of defending a spurious passage in a Greek or Roman classic?” P. 120.—*Note.*

The bishop is not ashamed to mix up again the nauseous trash, with which the meanest subalterns in the Trinitarian corps begin to be disgusted. It was long a standing dish, but we really gave our learned opponents, at least, the credit of better taste.

“The arguments which some have alleged, and which the learned prelate has not disdained to countenance, see pp. 52 and 75, that Unitarianism cannot be true because it resembles Mahometanism and Deism, are so ineffably ridiculous and so superlatively contemptible, that it is impossible to treat them seriously: viz. The Deists believe Christ to be a mere man, and they reject Trinitarianism,—so do the Unitarians: therefore the Unitarians are Deists. The Mahometans believe in one God, and that Jesus is a prophet of God,—so do the Unitarians: therefore the Unitarians are Mahometans. Just so it might be argued: The Trinitarians worship a deified man. But the worshipers of the Grand Lama worship a deified man: therefore the Trinitarians are worshipers of the Grand Lama. Again: The Trinitarians believe that God became incarnate. But the worshipers of Vishnoo believe that God became incarnate; therefore the Trinitarians are worshipers of Vishnoo. Are such arguments as these to be admitted into a grave discussion concerning the great essential truths of the Christian religion?” P. 145.—*Note.*

A threat is held out by the bishop that he will continue to pursue the Unitarians as long as he has breath in his body; they cannot desire a more useful foe: long may he retail his idle arguments and his silly calumnies, and long may Mr. Belsham be favoured with health and spirits to repeat the services which in this publication he

has rendered to truth and charity, and to expose the impotence of his lordship's reasoning and to chastise the insolence of his aspersions.

ART. III.—*Evidences of Revealed Religion; on a new and original Plan: Being an Appeal to Deists, on their own Principles of Argument.* By Christophilus. 8vo. pp. 120. Mitcham, 67, Whitechapel, and Sherwood and Co., Paternoster Row. 1814.

WE always look with suspicion upon “new and original” ways of deciding old controversies, and we frankly confess that we took up this pamphlet expecting that the contents would not answer to the title. It is however due to the writer, to our readers and to the paramount authority of truth and justice, that we make the farther confession that we have been agreeably disappointed, and have found in Christophilus a most acute and ingenious and able and successful advocate of Christianity, upon principles which are at least novel in the mode of their application.

The pamphlet consists of Eight Letters, which appear to have been published in a periodical work, entitled, “The Freethinking Christians' Magazine.” The *two first* are occupied with introductory remarks, in which there is a masterly examination of some of Mr. Paine's objections to revealed religion and a perspicuous exposition of the origin and meaning of certain terms in frequent use in the Deistical controversy. The *third* is a satisfactory argument on the position—that the Jews always believed and acknowledged one only God, that the book of nature, as it is called, is not a cause adequate to this effect, but that the cause which the Jews themselves have assigned, namely, divine revelation, is an adequate, and the only adequate cause. In the *fourth* letter, on the present state of the Jewish people, there is no pretension to originality, but the argument which is exceedingly strong, is judiciously stated. The reasoning of the *fifth* letter appears to us to be new and is certainly solid: it refers to the objection of Mr. Paine, founded on the late period when the canon of scripture was formed, and the conclusion is briefly, that considering the character of ecclesiastics at that time,

no cause can be assigned for their declaring the present scriptures, which are so condemnatory of that character, to be authentic, and other works quite in the spirit of that character, to be unauthentic, but the notoriety of the falseness of these and of the truth of those. This argument is so important that the author deserves the privilege of stating it for himself :

“I will suppose a case, by way of illustrating my argument :—Had it so happened respecting the Walcheren expedition, the impeachment of the Duke of York, or on the charge against Lord Castlereagh for bartering seats in the House of Commons, on each of which occasions, it was evident to all, that it was the interest and wish of ministers to screen the parties accused; I say, had it so happened that there had been documents of a contradictory nature presented to the House of Commons, one completely condemning, and the other as entirely acquitting the parties; and had the ministers received the documents as genuine which condemned, and rejected as spurious those which would have acquitted them; would it not have been allowed by all, that the motives which prompted them thus to act were, that the evidence was so strong and decisive in favour of one, and so contrary to the other, that they could not act otherwise, however well disposed they might be so to do? Or, suppose a lord chancellor of England sitting in judgment on a case where his own life, honour and fortune, were at stake; that he was in possession of a variety of documents, some of which, if received as true, would entirely acquit him, while the others if received as authentic must condemn him, and that when the matter came for trial he should acknowledge those which were against him to be true, and utterly reject as false those which were in his favour; would any man hesitate in saying that he knew that a different conduct would be of no avail, because he was convinced that such was the evidence in favour of those against him, and against such as were for him, that it was impossible to destroy that evidence by any evasion whatever? And after such an admission, could any person doubt the validity of those writings he had acknowledged to be true, while his disposition and interest so powerfully pleaded in behalf of his rejecting them? But if after he had acknowledged their truth, he wished to avoid the consequences, and keep these writings in his own possession, what should we naturally expect would be his conduct? Why, that he would do all in his power to keep them from public view, and especially from the sight of those persons immediately interested in

them. This, in my opinion, is a case in point with those who voted the New Testament to be genuine records of Christianity, and rejected all others. A clamour had been raised against their usurpations; they were constrained to call a council, and sit in judgment upon themselves; they collected together all the writings respecting Christianity; and such was the force of evidence in behalf of some, and against others, that they were obliged to reject as spurious the documents that favoured their cause, and to receive as genuine those which condemned it; but being in possession of power, they contrived to shut these genuine writings from public view, and at last imposed pains and penalties here and hereafter upon those who even dared to read them, lest they should explain them so as to condemn their conduct. I say, then, it is to the advantage of Christianity that they did not collect these writings till the time Mr. Paine mentions, when the church was at its zenith of corruption; as it offers to us an infallible proof that the writings they have admitted were really genuine and authentic.

“Here then I call for an adequate cause for their having so acted, and I defy any man to assign even a probable one, if we admit the possibility of the writings of the New Testament being otherwise than genuine or authentic; for had there been a shadow of doubt against them, these men must and would have rejected them, their disposition and interest calling so loudly for it; but I will now assign a cause why they did receive them, and why they rejected the others. In the first place, those writings which were received were very extensively diffused; they were read in every Christian society; they were valued and preserved with care by the first Christians, particularly by those who had escaped the general contamination; they had been quoted by all the early writers, and brought with them such evidence, that though they condemned all the doctrines and practices of the council, they did not dare to reject them; while the others which they did reject, were so notoriously known to be false, that although they effectually suited their purpose, they did not dare to retain them; for what other cause can be assigned for their receiving the one in preference to the other, so contrary to their interest and disposition? If any other adequate cause can be shewn, I shall be happy to see it; but if it cannot, and the cause I have assigned is, as I believe it to be, not only an adequate, but the only adequate cause, then Christianity must triumph, and this objection, which has been brought so confidently to prove the New Testament to be false, does most infallibly prove it to be true.” Pp. 67—69.

The Resurrection of Christ is the

subject of the *sixth and seventh* letters, and the truth of the fact is shewn to be necessary to account for the story, as detailed in the scriptures: this argument pre-supposes the authenticity of the gospels and Acts of the Apostles and can be no otherwise convincing to an unbeliever than as it proves the consistency of the recorded sentiments and conduct of the Apostles, in other words, the internal evidence of the truth of the tale. In the *eighth* letter (which is erroneously numbered VII.) the author handles the old argument for the truth of Christianity, from its early, rapid and wide spread, through the instrumentality of teaching and in opposition to prejudice, power and learning, this spread being both acknowledged by the enemies of Christianity and unquestionably predicted by its great Founder; but though the argument be not new, the mode by which it is conducted is by no means commonplace.

Upon the whole, we do, in the most unqualified manner, pronounce this the best defence of Christianity, in so small a compass, with which we are acquainted. We might object to some of Christophilus's phrases and to one or two of his notions, but every author is entitled to his own manner of thinking, and, as far as it is decorous, of speaking; and we are too much pleased with the publication to set about making exceptions to its general excellence. The sale of it will we trust encourage the author to publish a new edition, to the appearance of which it would be gratifying to us to have been in any degree instrumental.

There are some *errata* which, in a new edition, cannot escape the author's correction.

ART. IV.—*Letters to the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D. on the Sacrifice of Christ*: occasioned by his Sermon, preached March 11, 1813, before the Patrons and Students of the Protestant Dissenting Academy at Homerton. By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 64. Johnson and Co. 2s. 6d. 1813.

MR. FOX was a pupil of Dr. Smith's at Homerton, and in these Letters bears ample and honourable testimony to his tutor's candour, judgment and learning. The scholar

dissents however from his master's opinion "of the sacrifice of Christ," and in a manly but courteous manner explains in these Letters the reasons of his dissent, which he hopes (p. 2) will serve as an apology for his relinquishment of a doctrine in the belief of which he was educated and of which it was the object of Dr. Smith's instructions to make him an useful defender. How far Mr. Fox's honest compliments may please such of the Calvinistic Independents as wish to see Homerton Academy distinguished for orthodoxy "above all Greek, above all Roman fame," it is not important to ascertain; but we must acknowledge that we are a little curious to learn what effect Mr. Fox's Letters have produced upon the mind of Dr. Smith himself, whether his objections appear to the worthy preacher to be idle and nugatory, or whether they may not have led him to make some further modification, in that perpetually modified system, Calvinism.

The Letters are seven in number. Letter I. is "On Sacrifices in general." Against Dr. Smith's hypothesis, that the ancient sacrifices were designed representations of the death of Christ, Mr. Fox argues that being vegetable as well as animal, it obviously was not the general principle on which they were founded; that their origin is unrecorded, and consequently their design is incapable of direct proof; that the patriarchs, who offered them acceptably, do not appear to have been conscious of any such reference; that it is unsupported by the Levitical institutions; that no mention of it occurs in the pious meditations of holy men of those ages; and that when they are represented as comparatively worthless, it is uniformly in reference, not to a future and greater sacrifice, but to moral obedience.

Letter II. is "On the application of Sacrificial Language to the Death of Christ." This language is less common than is generally imagined, and much less than it must have been if the Calvinistic doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ had been the doctrine of the sacred writers. Sacrificial terms are plainly used in a figurative sense in the New Testament, and are applied to a variety of subjects. In both Testaments, the strongest terms and phrases which are supposed to

express the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, are found in connexion with common persons and acts. There are also expressions relating to atonements which are very forcible but which are not used in relation to the death of Christ: for instance,

“1 Cor. iv. 13. ‘We are made as the filth of the world, we are the offscouring of all things unto this day.’ Paul here applies to himself, and the other apostles, the terms by which those unfortunate persons were distinguished who, in certain Greek colonies, were offered to the gods as expiatory sacrifices for the cities to which they belonged. Had Christ, instead of the apostles, been the subject of this comparison, the passage would have been regarded as no slight addition to the supposed proofs of the doctrine which you advocate. It would have been classed with similar texts concerning Christ, and we should have been told that ‘presumptuous and nugatory would it be to attempt any addition to the strength and clearness of these divine testimonies.’” Pp. 13, 14.

The following description of the Unitarian view of Atonement (if we may use a word which has been so much perverted) will interest our correspondents who have agitated this subject in the present and the last volume of the *Monthly Repository*:

“Unitarians consider the death of Christ as an important part of the divine plan for the redemption of mankind from sin and misery. ‘It was necessary that the Messiah should suffer*.’ His death perfected his lovely example; sealed the truth of the gracious doctrines which he taught; and was essential to his resurrection and exaltation, on which rest our hopes of immortality and bliss. Hence its tendency to purify the depraved, and console the wretched. Hence we believe, equally with you, that he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity; that his blood cleanseth from all sin; that by his stripes we are healed; that he hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; and we unite with you in ascribing unto him that loved us, and has washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, glory and dominion for ever†! Such passages are beautiful descriptions of the moral influences of his death, and it is our desire to partake of the holy feelings which they so finely express.” Pp. 11.

* Luke xxiv. 46.

† Titus ii. 14. 1 John i. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 24. iii. 18. Rev. i. 5, 6.

In Letter III. are considered the “Propositions implied in the Doctrine of Satisfaction.” It is here inquired, What law was it, to atone for our violation of which Christ suffered? Was it the moral law which he himself established, or some prior law, the law of nature, the law imposed on Adam or the law of Moses? The doctrine of satisfaction, it is urged, takes for granted the implacability of God, an unsupported and odious supposition: it implies that personal divinity of Christ, which is at variance with the plainest declarations of the New Testament; and it proceeds upon the principle of the transferable nature of guilt and innocence, a principle which sets every idea of justice at defiance.

Letter IV. is a successful exposition of the “Inconsistencies connected with the Doctrine of Satisfaction.” On this scheme, God pardons and punishes the very same offence. Calvinistic notions are called “the doctrines of grace,” yet they represent all the divine grace as purchased. Christ is said to be the gift of the Father and was at the same time equal with the Father and supremely independent. He suffered in one nature, in another he could not suffer, though the two natures make but one person. He bore the indignation of the Father, who at the same time never ceased to delight in the Son of his love. He made full satisfaction either for all men or only for a few: if only for a few, how can all be invited to accept purchased mercy; if for all, how can any be condemned? What is the meaning of future judgment if the doctrine of satisfaction be true? Calvinists cry out, Mystery! but all others discover absurdity.

The “Scriptural Evidence for the Doctrine of Salvation by the Free Grace of God” is exhibited in Letter V. where it is proved that both the Old and the New Testament represent God as shewing mercy on repentance, without any reference to the sacrifice of Christ, and concur in declaring his grace to penitents to be completely free and unconditional.

Letter VI. is devoted to a “Comparison of the moral tendency of the Doctrines of Satisfaction and Free Grace.” The result may be expressed in the author’s own eloquent language:

"Unitarianism, Sir, is a cheerful and enlivening doctrine. Its peculiar representations of the character of God, and the ultimate destiny of man, are eminently fitted to inspire satisfaction and delight. We look around us with complacency; we look forward with blissful anticipation; for we trace the operations of that Omnipotent Love from which all things originated, and which will consummate its work by establishing the universal and eternal reign of virtue and happiness. With you the doctrine of satisfaction is the source of Christian joy. But what pleasure can that notion afford to a benevolent mind? Will it teach him to rejoice in a God who knows not how to pardon, and who, but for the interposition of his Son, would have been ever unmoved by the groans of misery, the sighs and prayers of penitence; in a world under the wrath and curse of God, and whose inhabitants are born under a law which they cannot fulfil, and to an infinitely wretched destiny which they cannot avoid; or in a salvation, purchased by innocent blood, designed for only a part, probably a small part, of mankind, and which leaves millions not more sinful than himself in a state of remediless ruin? If there be those who can derive pleasure from such considerations, I envy not their selfish and degrading joy.

"A Calvinistic, to be happy, must steel his heart against those benevolent and sympathetic feelings which God and nature have implanted in our constitution. He must rejoice in prospect of a bliss which it is probable many, deservedly dear to him, will never share. To the sacred claims of friendship, kindred and domestic love, he must be insensible, or in many cases those valuable connexions will be to him sources of misery. What a heart must that man possess who can kindle into rapture at the anticipation of a joy, from which his faithful friend, his father, child, or brother, or the wife of his bosom, may be eternally excluded! who even hopes to be reconciled to their perdition, and to rejoice in it, as demonstrating the glory of his God! Father of mercies! if this be thy will, at least hide from our view the page that unfolds such horrors: take back the gift of revelation; and let us again rejoice in the sweet though delusive hope of nature and of reason, that those over whose ashes we mourn will be one day purged from their failings by a future discipline, and unite with us in grateful adoration at thy footstool, in the regions of eternal peace and bliss!" Pp. 52, 53.

The title of the last letter, VII., is "Miscellaneous Observations." These relate to scattered remarks of Dr. Smith's, and would be scarcely intelligible without the Remarks themselves. One of the "Observations,"

however, must be quoted, as it relates to a passage in our VIIIth volume, p. 182, in which a correspondent expresses a doubt of the propriety of Unitarians, with their notions, calling Christ *a Saviour*. This passage Dr. Smith quotes and animadverts on in a note to his Sermon, under the head, in capitals, of "Christ denied to be a Saviour." Now, doubting is not denying. Besides, the doubts of an anonymous writer in a publication, open to all parties, are not surely to fix the charge of belief or disbelief upon a denomination. On the same ground that this quotation is brought forward as affecting the Unitarian system, might other quotations be adduced from our pages to convict Unitarians of all the contrarieties of religious faith. Mr. Fox's "Observations" are as follows:

"In another note, (p. 76) you have commented on a very heedless expression in a communication to the Monthly Repository, and candidly suggested what, I imagine, must have been the writer's meaning. That many of your party will consider this as 'a large extension of candour,' I have no doubt. You have made them ample amends, however, by asserting of the devotional extracts referred to, that 'the basis of the whole is pure naturalism.' 'There is (you continue) no recognition of a single doctrine of revelation, except it may be reckoned such to admit that the Jews are kept a distinct people by a particular providence. Every other sentiment and expression is perfectly in the character of a Deist.' Let the reader turn to that article—*M. R. March*, 1813, p. 182, and he will ask with me, Is it in the character of a Deist to trace a God of love in every dispensation; to delight in public and in private worship, in religious conversation and instruction; to recognise Christ as our teacher divinely inspired; to anticipate a future state of bliss for the righteous, and corrective punishment for the wicked; to dwell with rapture on that period when God shall be all, and in all? Is this deism? Is this naturalism? I should have thought that none would have hesitated to regard such sentiments and feelings as emanations from that sun of righteousness, before whose rising thick darkness covered the earth. But in estimating the productions of Unitarians, our Saviour's rule is too often reversed. The fruit is judged by the tree, and not the tree by its fruit. Our feelings, motives and actions are condemned, because it is previously assumed that our tenets are radically erroneous. Well is it for us that by a different principle will be regulated the decisions of the tribunal of heaven." Pp. 62, 63.

We have now, though late, discharged the pleasing duty of laying the substance of Mr. Fox's pamphlet before our readers. We would recommend that it be perused together with Dr. Smith's Sermon. The doctor has in our opinion done all that could be done in defence of his thesis; but we err greatly if every dispassion-

ate judge will not allow after an attentive reading of Mr. Fox's Letters that much more remains to be done before the popular doctrine can be entitled to the reception of any one who can read his Bible for himself and who has a head to estimate theological truth and a heart to be affected with moral sentiments.

OBITUARY.

Dr. Parr's Biographical Memoir of the late Mr. WILLIAM HENRY LUNN.

[The following paper is drawn up by the eminent scholar whose name appears above, to preface the new Catalogue of the late Mr. Lunn's bookselling stock, under the title of "An Address to the well-wishers and customers of the late Mr. William Henry Lunn. We give it entire, and shall rejoice if our insertion of it in the *Monthly Repository*, shall in any degree second the object of the benevolent writer. ED.]

It is with peculiar satisfaction that the friends of Mr. Lunn submit the following Statement of Facts to an enlightened and generous Public.

They well know that soundness of judgment, and that liberality of spirit, by which English Scholars are eminently distinguished. They are convinced that, in enumerating the services of Mr. Lunn to the cause of literature, they will find intelligent and attentive readers. They feel that, in their exertions to assuage the sorrows, and to provide for the comforts, of an afflicted Widow and two fatherless Children, they will not appeal in vain to the experience of the learned, and the sensibility of the benevolent.

Mr. Lunn resided as a Bookseller at Cambridge for ten years. In March, 1797, he came to London, and succeeded Mr. Samuel Hayes in Oxford Street. On his removal into Soho Square, in 1801, he, by the advice of Scholars and with the approbation of friends, established the CLASSICAL LIBRARY upon a new and extensive plan. His views were announced in a perspicuous and even elegant Advertisement, in which, with a tone of thinking far raised above the narrow and selfish views of a mind intent only upon profit, he endeavoured to interest in his own favour such persons, as habitually look with veneration to the memory of Bentley, to the erudition of Hemsterhuis, and his illustrious School, and to the sagacity, taste and learning of our celebrated countryman, Richard Porson.

Other Booksellers had been accustomed to provide for purchasers publications in the modern, as well as the ancient languages: Mr. Lunn resolved to act up faithfully and rigorously to the name, which he had chosen for his own collection.

He immediately entered into various and important negotiations with Booksellers upon the continent. He confined his attention to such Works, as were interesting to Scholars only. But, in order to supply their demands, he took a wide and varied range. With an activity, and perhaps we may add, magnanimity, which men of learning cannot fail to applaud, he ventured to bring together many *Principes Editiones*. He did not shrink from the purchase of other editions, expensive from their bulk, their splendour, or their rarity. He amassed large numbers of the *Delphine Editions*, and of those, which are called *Variorum*. He was upon the watch to procure new editions of classical Works published by Foreign Scholars of his own time, and he took the most judicious measures for obtaining them early. To critical and philological Books he was peculiarly attentive; and whether we consider the number or the usefulness of those, which the CLASSICAL LIBRARY supplied, we cannot wonder that the zeal and the judgment of Mr. Lunn in collecting them attracted the notice of the curious, and the favour of the learned.

The ardour of his mind induced him to take a large share in valuable and costly publications from the presses of Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and London. The cost of reprinting Brotier's Tacitus under the superintendence of Mr. Valpy fell upon Mr. Lunn only. Among other Works, in which he was concerned with respectable men of the trade, Wakefield's *Lucretius*, Ernesti's *Cicero*, Drakenborch's *Livy*, Schleusner's *Lexicon*, Morell's *Thesaurus*, improved and enlarged by Dr. Maltby, and Scapula's *Lexicon*, deserve to be enumerated. He had engaged to take several copies of the Herodotus, which is now preparing for the press by Professor Schweighauser; and in consequence of the connexions, which he had gradually formed with the literati of this kingdom, he so far deviated from his original design, as to undertake the publication of a few Tracts in the Oriental Languages.

His vigilance and integrity were manifested in the good condition of his Books; and perhaps we have to commend his munificence, rather than his discretion, in the

fondness which he occasionally indulged for costly bindings. His pride indeed was gratified by the consciousness of pursuing such measures, as were alike agreeable to the opulent collector and the profound scholar.

The fortune which Mr. Lunn inherited from his Father, was very inconsiderable. On his first settlement in London, a part of the property bequeathed to him ultimately by his Uncle, Mr. R. Labutte, a French Teacher in the University of Cambridge, and amounting nearly to 10,000*l.*, came into his possession, and enabled him doubtless for some time to carry on with effect the concerns of the CLASSICAL LIBRARY. For this advantage he was indebted to the kindness of an Aunt, whose confidence in his honesty, and whose solicitude for his well-fare induced her to give up during her life a portion of that money, which by the Will of the Uncle was to descend to Mr. Lunn at her decease. Observing the importance of this concession in facilitating the success of Mr. Lunn, this excellent woman was afterwards led, from the same motives of kindness, to transfer for his use the remainder before the month of January, 1808, when she died. In the growing prosperity of Mr. Lunn, in his probity, and his gratitude she received the just reward of her unfeigned and disinterested friendship.

The whole of Mr. Lunn's property was embarked in his trade, and under circumstances more favourable his accumulation must have been rapid. But he had to struggle with unusual and most stubborn difficulties. Insurances were high.—Goods were often delayed, for which Mr. Lunn had been obliged to pay before they reached him.—The course of exchange ran for many years against England, and the loss, which Mr. Lunn sustained from this cause on the amount of the invoices, was sometimes 20, sometimes 25, and sometimes even 30 per cent. The sale of books procured under these unavoidable and irremediable disadvantages, was in many instances slow and precarious. Mr. Lunn, like every other Bookseller, was doomed to losses from the inability of his employers to make their payments. He dealt with men, whose rank, whose delicacy, and upon some occasions whose poverty protected them from that importunity, with which the generality of tradesmen enforce their claims. He rarely expected immediate payment—he never demanded it—he allowed for it a reasonable discount—and in the mean time, for the support of his credit both at home and abroad, he was compelled to fulfil his own engagements without deduction and without delay.

We have now to record the chief cause of those embarrassments, which disturbed his spirits, and shortened his existence. The return of peace, by opening a free

communication with the continent, was beneficial to other traders, but most injurious to Mr. Lunn. They accumulated their stock without the numerous impediments, which Mr. Lunn had encountered. They were exempt from many of those restrictions upon importation, to which Mr. Lunn had for many years been obliged to submit. They were able to buy, and therefore to sell, at a cheap rate those articles, for which Mr. Lunn had previously paid to foreigners a very high price. They purchased after a favourable alteration in the course of exchange, and with considerable diminution in charges for insurance.

Disappointed in his expectations—alarmed at the prospect of impending losses—perplexed by the application of creditors, whose demands he had frequently satisfied with exemplary punctuality—conscious of having exhausted the whole of his property in procuring books, some of which he might be obliged to sell at a less price than that, which he had advanced for them—unaccustomed to propitiate the severe by supplication, to trick the artful by evasion, and to distress the friendly by delay, he was suddenly bereaved of that self-command, which, if he could have preserved it, would eventually have secured for him unsullied respectability, undiminished prosperity, and undisturbed tranquillity. But in the poignant anguish of his soul delicacy prevailed over reason, and panic over fortitude.—Every expedient proposed by his faithful and affectionate advisers was at one moment adopted with gratitude, and at the next rejected with phrenzy—every present inconvenience was magnified into an insurmountable obstacle—every possible future mischance was anticipated as an inevitable and ruinous calamity.—To his disordered imagination retreat seemed impracticable—to his unaltered and unalterable sense of honour resistance appeared unjustifiable.—By his wounded pride submission was deemed alike ignominious and inefficacious.—He reflected, and was impatient of reflection—---he hoped, and was ashamed of hope---he approved, and disapproved---he decided, and hesitated---he despaired, and perished !

Happily for the human race, all the extenuations which accompany such cases, are reserved for the tribunal of that Being, who knoweth of what we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust. In the mean time many a Christian will be disposed to commiserate the circumstances of Mr. Lunn's death, and many a man of letters may find reason to deplore the loss of his well meant, and well directed labours.

Unfortunately Mrs. Lunn and her daughters have not the means of continuing the business, in which Mr. Lunn was engaged. Their doom is to lament an affectionate

husband and an indulgent father. Their only resources lie in the exertions of their friends, and in the good will of every wise and every virtuous man, who contemplates the acuteness of their sufferings, and who from experience can appreciate the worth of their nearest relative, and most beloved protector.

For the satisfaction of such persons enough has been already stated, and to others, who are seldom inclined to pardon human frailties, or to pity human woes, more would be urged in vain.

It remains for us more directly to lay open the purposes, for which the Catalogue is intended, and the principle, by which it was regulated.

The debts of Mr. Lunn amount to eight thousand pounds. The worth of the property, which he has left behind him, is supposed to exceed that sum. His Executor is anxious to discharge those debts by the speedy sale of his effects, and to employ the surplus in making provision for Mrs. Lunn, and her two daughters. In order to facilitate the sale of the stock in Soho Square, the price of every common and every choice article has been considerably reduced, and every possible encouragement has been given for literary men to partake of the various and precious treasures offered to them. It cannot often happen that books so valuable will be presented to their choice at so moderate a price. It may never be in their power again to gratify at once their curiosity, and their benevolence. They are respectfully invited to mark the good opinion which they formerly entertained of Mr. Lunn himself for skilfulness in his profession, and probity in his dealings. They are earnestly entreated to manifest their good will to a family, deprived of his protection, mourning for his death, and depending upon the successful sale of his books and other property as the only expedient, which can procure for them the necessary comforts and reasonable conveniences of life.

SAMUEL PARR, LL. D.

THOMAS KIDD, A. M. Trin. Coll. Cam.

EDMUND HENRY BARKER, Trin Coll. Cam.

ROBERT MASTERS KERRISON, New Burlington Street.

THOMAS EDWARDS, Executor, Soho Squ.
July the 17th, 1815.

Thursday, July 6, died at his house called Cottington, or Cotmaton, Sidmouth, JOHN CARSLAKE, Esq. at the advanced age of 81. This house was erected in the year 1809, but it almost joins the former mansion, which was the property, and till then, the residence of this gentleman, as well as of his father and grandfather. In the old histories of Devonshire, it is styled "an ancient seat, commanding a pleasant view of the bay." It was sold by the Dukes, an

ancient family of Otterton, in the same county, to William Harlewin, Esq. Sir John Harlewin, who was knighted for his valour by Edward IV. lived at Sidmouth; his descendants resided there in the days of Henry VI. and to the time of Charles II. an old monument in the church, records the name of one of them, Walter Harlewin, Esq.

Mr. Carslake was one of the most respectable and most respected inhabitants of Sidmouth. He was eminently a son of peace himself, and sincerely desirous of promoting the peace and happiness of all about him. His character was sketched in the following terms the Sunday after his interment, by a friend, who well knew the worth he was describing :

It was a bright example which the "hoary headed" friend who is now removed from us exhibited. His life had been a long one. He often repeated, during his lingering decay (being more than eight months confined to his bed) the observation of Moses, in the xc. Psalm. "*The days of our years are three score years and ten, and if by reason of strength they be four score years, yet is their strength, labour and sorrow, for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.*" He could well understand this language, for he had entered the 82d year of his age, and for the last two years of his life, though remarkably healthy before, he had full experience of the affecting truth contained in the last clause of this verse: the little strength which remained was *labour and sorrow*. The bitterness of his trial was, probably, known only to himself. He often declared that he was constantly in pain, and several times, that those pains, were very severe. His whole frame was at times convulsed with agony, *he was chastened with pain on his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain*. In general, however, the conflict he had to sustain was not of this severe kind, and his habitual patience, united with his pious resignation, made it much more tolerable to himself and all about him than it could otherwise have been. I saw a great deal of him, and I can truly say, that I never heard a murmur escape his lips. More than once he said to me, when I was sympathizing with him, *wherefore should a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins! All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come.* The language of scripture was very familiar to him. All his life he had been in the habit of reading the sacred books; and, for the latter years of it, some hours of every day were spent by him in this blessed work. The books of Job, the Psalms, and Ecclesiastes, and many chapters of the Prophets, particularly Isaiah, he could repeat almost by heart. He was also well acquainted with the New Testament, and had very just notions of the gospel dispensation, and of the richness and magnitude of that love of God, which

was manifested to the world by our Lord Jesus Christ. He delighted to view the Almighty, as *no respecter of persons*, and, while he was truly thankful that he was a Christian himself, he could never think so unjustly of God, as to suppose that none but Christians will hereafter be saved. He believed, with the liberal-hearted Apostle Paul, that *those who have not the law, are a law unto themselves, for when they do by nature, (by the very force and structure of their minds, as human beings) the things contained in the law, they shew the work of the law written in their hearts.* In consequence of this view of the matter, he hesitated not to adopt the generous and enlightened conclusion of Peter, when under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, that, *in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, (according to the light which he actually enjoys) is accepted by him.*

Our venerable friend was averse from religious disputes, and never liked to engage in them, but he was, like his father and grandfather, a firm and steady Dissenter, and he knew why he was so. He was well acquainted with that *complete* defence of a separation from the Church of England, which was written by the late venerable Micaiah Towgood, of Exeter,* and he was ready at all times to give a reason for the hope that was in him. While, however, upon these truly consistent and Protestant grounds, he was a Non-conformist, he felt not the smallest dislike to any of those, who conscientiously adhered to the established sect. He was all his life in habits of friendly acquaintance with many of them. Indeed, he was a sincere well-wisher to the whole human race. In his Father's House, he believed there were mansions for, and capacious enough to hold them all.

To the hospitality of his own house, and the unaffected kindness of his heart, many can bear witness. It was his delight to see his friends about him, and to welcome them, at all times to his plentiful table. To the sallies of innocent mirth and cheerful anecdote he was always alive, and within the bounds of temperance, which he never transgressed himself, nor could bear, without great pain, to see transgressed by others,

* Of this valuable work, which ought to be in the possession of every Dissenter, the 9th edition was lately published, by Mr. Benjamin Flower, price in 12mo. with a portrait of the author, 4s. in boards, or on fine thick wove post 8vo. hot-pressed, 7s. 6d. boards. To this edition is prefixed a preface, vindicating the sentiments and character of the author from the recent misrepresentations of the Rev. T. Biddulph, minister of St. James's Bristol, &c. and the Rev. J. Owen, Curate of Fulham, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

he partook of the cheerfulness which he encouraged in all about him. In the relief of distress he was never backward. Many public subscriptions received his countenance and support; and a number of beneficent actions performed with the utmost privacy and modesty will, another day, be noticed by Him, who, except our friend himself, and the parties assisted, were the only witnesses of them. He *dealt out his bread to the hungry, and to the poor which cried*, he was often a merciful listener. A liberal bequest to the place of worship which he so long, and so constantly attended, proved his affection to the cause of liberal piety, and his sincere wish that it might not suffer by his removal from it. This is the part of this good man's character, which I have purposely reserved for the last. In his own house, and in the house of God, he was the same uniform, unostentatious and devout worshiper. The family altar was never neglected, and, like the patriarch Abraham, he always gathered his servants, as well as his relatives about it. In this house of our public solemnities, all who worship with us, are witnesses with what punctual regularity and what deep attention our departed friend always occupied his place. As long as he possibly could he made one of our number, and in the latter part of his days, it was with great difficulty, and often under the pressure of much bodily pain, that he attended. It might truly be said of him that he loved *the courts of the Lord*. No severity of weather kept him at home—neither business nor amusement were ever suffered to invade the duties of the Sabbath, and to crown all, he was remarkably *early* as well as regular in his attendance—he did not come, as if it was to the performance of an irksome task, and disturb by a *late* entrance, either his minister or his fellow-worshippers. His dismissal was remarkably easy—it was the worn-out pilgrim, falling asleep in Jesus. *Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.*

E. B.

Dr. Toulmin's Funeral.

On the morning of Tuesday, August the 1st, the remains of this most venerable and exemplary Christian, were deposited in the burying ground belonging jointly to the members of the Old and the New Meetings, in Birmingham. The congregation of the New Meeting, in the kindest manner, undertook the management and expense of the funeral. After their arrangements were made, it was found that Dr Toulmin had himself written, several years ago, directions on the subject. To these directions, he expressed his hope, in a will of a very recent date, that some deference would be shewn, as circumstances might admit. It was his wish—a wish so characteristic of his sweet, amiable temper—that “his pall

should be supported by six ministers of different denominations and different religious sentiments, who might thus pay their last tribute of respect to one, who, by such an appointment, meant to shew the respect and affection which he thought it to be his duty, and felt it to be his happiness, to cherish towards all Christians, and particularly towards his brethren in the ministry."---A hearse carried the body, attended by four mourning coaches. As the procession passed along the streets, the countenances and manners of the spectators, nor, least of all, of the poor who had come in considerable numbers to witness it, were visibly marked with regret. At the place of interment, the Rev. John Kentish, the Rev. Robert Kell, the Rev. John Corrie of Hardsworth, and the Rev. William Field of Warwick, preceded. The pall was borne by the Rev. John Kennedy, a clergyman of the Establishment, in Birmingham; the Rev. J. A. James, the minister of a respectable congregation of Independents in Birmingham; the Rev. Thomas Bower, of Walsall; the Rev. Richard Fry, of Kidderminster; the Rev. James Scott, of Cradley; the Rev. James Hews Bransby, of Dudley; the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Coventry; and the Rev. Rees Lloyd, of Kingswood, near Birmingham. The Rev. Isaiah Birt, the worthy minister of a large congregation of Particular Baptists in Birmingham was invited: but unhappily he was absent from home. Several members of Dr. Toulmin's family followed as mourners. The coffin was carried into the Meeting-house and to the grave, by eight of "the ancient members of the church which Dr. Toulmin served in the ministry;" to each of whom and to each of the servants employed on the occasion, was presented, agreeably to his desire, "a copy of Mr. Orton's discourses on Eternity, over and above the usual gratuity." The service was conducted by Mr. Kentish, himself a deeply afflicted mourner---principally in the Meeting-house, where several hundreds of sorrowing spectators were assembled. The funeral oration, which exhibited a striking delineation of Dr. Toulmin's excellencies drew forth many tears, and the short address at the grave, chiefly in words which Dr. Toulmin had himself once used at the interment of a minister whom he loved, was peculiarly touching.

On the Lord's day following, the very numerous and respectable congregation, at the New Meeting appeared in mourning, and the pulpit was elegantly covered with black cloth. In the morning Mr. Bransby conducted the devotional service, and read the scriptures, and Mr. Kentish delivered the funeral sermon; which, though unusually long, was listened to throughout with the deepest interest, by a crowded auditory, from 2 John the 8th verse. "Look to yourselves, that we lose

not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward:"---a passage from which Dr. Toulmin desired that his "dear and respected people" might be addressed on the occasion. This excellent, lamented Christian pastor, besides requesting that his people might be thanked for every instance of their kindness and affection towards him, had specified some religious duties, incumbent on them as Christians and as Protestant Dissenters, upon which it was his wish that the preacher should insist. These admonitions Mr. Kentish enforced with singular felicity and effect, by extracts from Dr. Toulmin's own works; so that "being dead," "he was," in a very impressive sense of the words, "yet speaking."---It is unnecessary to enter into a minute analysis of the sermon, as it will doubtless, together with the Funeral Oration be laid before the public. ---In the afternoon, Mr. Bransby preached from 1 Cor. xiii. 10. "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

Funeral sermons have also been preached in various parts of the kingdom; particularly within the knowledge of the writer of this article---at Essex Street Chapel, by Mr. Belsham; at the Old Meeting, Birmingham, by Mr. Kell; at Bridport, by Mr. Howe; at Bristol, by Mr. Rowe, from 2 Tim. iv. 7.; at Coseley, by Mr. Small, from Acts viii. 2.; at Coventry, by Mr. Davis; at Cradley, by Mr. Scott; at Dudley, by Mr. Bransby, from Heb. xi. 4.; at Exeter, by Dr. Carpenter; at Taunton, (the pulpit being covered with black cloth) by Mr. Fenner and Mr. Davies; at Walsall, by Mr. Bowen; and at Wolverhampton, by Mr. Steward, from Acts xi. 24.

Died, at Billingshurst, Sussex, June 14, 1815, in the 36th year of his age, the Rev. John Jeffery.---Though the deep sorrow and regret manifested by his mourning relatives and their sympathizing friends have assured many of his worth, and of the loss sustained by his death, the hand of friendship presumes to communicate some particulars of this late excellent man, as a tribute due to his memory. He was born at Washington, Dec. 7, 1779. His respectable and pious parents, who survive him, have been many years supporters of the General Baptist interest, at Billingshurst. The happiest result attended their pious care in the formation of his character as a man and a Christian. When at the age of 20, the Society at Billingshurst being in want of a minister, he expressed a desire to make himself useful in that character. To promote his acceptability as a teacher in the church, his father placed him under the tuition of his valued friend the Rev. J. Evans, of Islington, who had then undertaken the task of preparing young men for the pulpit. After two years assiduous ap-

plication to his preparatory studies, he left his worthy Preceptor, for whom he ever retained the highest respect and affection and returned to his native place; and though he soon afterwards embarked in the brewing business on an extensive scale, a considerable portion of his time was devoted to the work of the ministry. He continued to fulfil almost gratuitously, the important duties of a Christian teacher, till about five years since, when an affection of the chest, which rendered his articulation scarcely audible, put a period to his public exercises. Yet his zeal for the improvement of his congregation was not diminished, he still watched over them with a truly pastoral affection. The writer of this notice has often witnessed his anxious solicitude to procure for them a constant supply of ministers: when his voice became so low that he could not be heard by those who were only a short distance from him, he was accustomed to express his thoughts in writing at their conferences for the benefit of his flock. His papers, which contained much just criticism and many pious admonitions, were read to them either by one of his amiable sisters, or some other friend. In this manner he continued to the last to be "a burning and a shining light." During the latter period of his existence, when his sufferings were at times very great, he continued to be the kind and affectionate relative, the cheerful and instructive companion, and the sincere friend. In his patience and resignation the precious influence of the doctrines of Christianity were exemplified. On the threshold of eternity, he became more and more sensible of the consolation of a religion founded on the pure love of God; and, expressing his most perfect satisfaction with the appointments of infinite wisdom, and a grateful sense of the affectionate solicitude of his relatives and friends in soothing his passage to the grave, he at length sunk gently into the sleep of death—"Surely the end of the good man is peace." On Sunday the 18th, his remains were interred in the burying-ground of the General Baptist Meeting, by the Rev. T. Sadler, of Horsham, who also preached a funeral sermon on the occasion from Philip iii. 20, 21. J. B.

Rev. Thomas Jenkins.

Bath, 8th Aug. 1815.

SIR,

I beg leave to inform you of the removal from our world, of a reader, admirer and purchaser of your work, who will long live in the memory of all his intimate friends.

On Saturday, the 29th of last month, died at Whitchurch, in Shropshire, after a long illness, which he bore with Christian fortitude and resignation, in the 70th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS JENKINS, the Unitarian Minister of that town; where he had resided and faithfully preached the gospel about thirty-three years. He and the

venerable Dr. Toulmin, took their flight nearly together from the earth, the one, on the first, and the other on the last day of the same week. I little thought, some years ago, when I enjoyed the company and conversation of them both, at my house, that one, who was some years older than either of them, should be permitted to survive, and mourn over them. But, thus it frequently happens in the present state, which is only the infancy of our being, and, hence we should all learn, never to defer until to-morrow what ought to be done, and we find ourselves able to do, to-day.

Mr. Jenkins was a warm advocate of civil and religious liberty, and in other cases uniformly respectable through the whole of his life. Though he was educated a Calvinist, and professed that system as long as he could believe it; he never in his most orthodox days, was afraid to converse with those who were called heretics, but regarding men according to their moral conduct, was accessible to all who had the appearance of honesty and benevolence. In time, he became assistant to Mr. Foot, at his classical school at Bristol; and being impressed with the elevatingly engaging manners of that gentleman, he began to think that heresy might possibly be the truth. In consequence, he did not fly to human compositions to examine how the matter stood, but betook himself to his Bible, which he carefully read over, until he was fully convinced that there is only One Living and True God, even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He then applied himself to the works of Dr. Lardner and of others, until he found himself released from all the shackles of human authority, and embraced the Bible as his only religious creed. In this state of mind he came to Whitchurch, where the discerning few rightly appreciated his doctrines, whilst the slaves to old systems gradually absented themselves from his place of worship. Their departure, with their withdrawing their subscriptions, had not the least effect upon his conduct. He continued to pursue, and to preach the truth as he thought it to be declared in the gospel; and manifested himself always to be the friend of man, an associate with all the sociable, and a true disciple of the Prince of Peace. The only mortification he suffered was, when some who are professed Unitarians in London, countenanced by their presence, the worship of more Gods than one when they came to Whitchurch, being ashamed to appear with the calumniated few. In short, he was a man, whom no money could bribe to prevaricate and who would never crouch to the powerful in his straitest circumstances, though he was always truly thankful to those who extricated him from any difficulties. I need scarcely add, as this is the habitual practice of all consistent Unitarians, that he devoutly worshiped with his family, in the morning and evening of every day.

Above a year before his death, he lost his sight, and was at the same time struck with lameness. But he was humbly submissive to the divine will, and never suffered any murmuring to break from his lips. When he was unable to turn upon his bed, he said to those who assisted him, that he wanted to go home, not knowing that he was then hastily approaching his last home, where he now resteth, and is at peace. He would have rejoiced, if he could have foreseen it, that he is now succeeded by a thorough Unitarian.

This imperfect tribute of respect is paid to him by an old friend,

W. H.

P.S. The Taunton paper says, that Dr. Toulmin died in the 75th year of his age. This is a mistake, as he told me above two years ago that he was 73. I mention this, as you will probably communicate an enlarged account of that excellent man.

August 2nd, died at Barrington, in the county of Somerset, to which place, after a long and diversified life, he had retired, FRANCIS WEBB;—the friend of mankind; and a friend to their sacred rights and liberties both civil and religious. He was born at Taunton in the year 1735.

A regard to the expressed wish, or rather injunction of the deceased, "*that his death may be announced only and precisely in the above form, and that he may not be made the object of posthumous praise,*" prevents the pen of friendship from attempting to give at least a faint delineation of a character, whose splendid talents and eminent literary attainments were surpassed only by the moral excellencies with which it was adorned, and which were cherished and strengthened by a firm faith in the important and distinguishing principles of Unitarianism.

B.

[Notwithstanding the wish expressed by the deceased, we earnestly hope that some friend will favour us with a memoir of him. ED.]

On Sunday, August 6th, 1815, died at Headcorn, Kent, Mr. JOHN COUPLAND, assistant-minister to the Society of General Baptists at that place. This amiable man had not completed the 30th year of his age; he was born (it is presumed) at Coningsby, in Lincolnshire, on August 28th, 1785. His early piety led him to embrace a life of public exertion; he began to preach at the age of eighteen, and in the course of the following year entered as a student, at the Academy of Mr. Dan Taylor, at Mile-End, London. At the expiration of two years he removed from the Academy to Cauldwell, in Derbyshire, where he remained only a few months, being invited to Headcorn in Kent; this invitation he accepted, and removed thither in the be-

ginning of July, 1807. From that period to his death, he discharged the duties of his station in a manner honourable to himself, beneficial to his friends, and ornamental to the cause which he had espoused. By an assiduous application to the acquirement of religious knowledge, his mind was amply furnished, and by mature deliberation, his ideas were generally marked by clearness and precision; in his opinions of religious truth, he had experienced considerable alteration during the last seven or eight years; but as no doctrine was embraced by him in place of his early-received sentiment, till he had deliberately examined it in all its bearings, and duly weighed the arguments on both sides of the question, it is easy to perceive that, on some speculative points his judgment was not decided. Although he was inclined to retain the Arian hypothesis, yet he firmly maintained the perfect Oneness of God, his unrivalled sovereignty and claim to religious adoration. From the Sermon delivered at the General Baptist Assembly as mentioned [x. p. 319.] of this publication, his views of Baptism and General Redemption may be ascertained. In his private conversation he was pleasing and instructive; in his public labours he was affectionate and engaging; his method of conveying knowledge and instruction was easy, yet impressive,—he was fervent without enthusiasm; bold without rudeness; his language was nervous yet plain; in all his deportment there was a modesty, which to a stranger might appear to indicate an uninformed mind; but which spoke to those who knew him a dignity of character and intellect. The duties of a husband and a father were discharged with faithfulness and affection; and we have to lament, that a widow and four small children are left to deplore his early death.

His interment took place on Wednesday the 9th inst. when a tribute of respect was paid to his worth and memory by addresses on the melancholy occasion, from Mr. Robert Pyall, elder of the Society,—Mr. T. Rofe, a preacher in the Wesleyan connexion, resident in Headcorn, and Mr. S. Dobell of Cranbrook. A funeral sermon was preached on Sunday, the 13th, by Mr. Benjamin Marten of Dover, from Heb. xi. 4, "He being dead yet speaketh;" the service was introduced by a short address from Mr. S. Dobell, prior to the devotional exercises; a large company was assembled on the occasion, anxious to shew their attachment to the deceased, of whom it could not be said, "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart."

Lately, at Brunswick, in the 73rd year of his age, Professor ZIMMERMAN, the author of the work on *Solitude*.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Unitarian Chapel at New-church in Rossendale, (see Monthly Repository, Vol. x. pp. 313, 392, 458, 461).

Subscriptions towards liquidating the debt (£350) upon the above Chapel will be received by Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney Road; Rev. R. Astley, Halifax; Rev. W. Johns, Manchester; Mr. William Walker, Rochdale; Dr. Thomson, Halifax.

l. s. d.

Amount reported in the Monthly Repository, page 458 . . .	90	10	0
Ditto at page 461 . . .	13	5	0
The Misses Evansons, Mansfield	3	0	0
A Friend ditto . . .	1	0	0
Collection at the New Meeting Birmingham, by Rev. John Kentish . . .	23	6	0
Robert Phillips, Esq. — Park, Manchester . . .	4	0	0
Rev. John Grundy, ditto . . .	1	1	0
Mr. Jonathan Brookes, ditto . . .	1	1	0
Mr. George Wm. Wood, ditto . . .	1	1	0
James Touchett, Esq. ditto . . .	2	0	0
Mr. Sanderson, Chowbent, ditto . . .	2	0	0
Mr. Samuel Jackson, ditto . . .	1	0	0
Mrs. Heywood, Bolton . . .	0	10	0
Rev. John Holland, ditto . . .	1	0	0
Abraham Crompton, Esq. Walton, Liverpool . . .	1	0	0
Rev. John Yates, Toxteth Park ditto . . .	4	0	0
Mr. Wm. Thorneley, ditto . . .	1	0	0
Mr. Ainsworth, Preston . . .	2	0	0
Mr. Grundy, Jun. Bury, Lanc. . .	1	0	0
Mr. Edmund Grundy, ditto . . .	1	0	0
<i>By Mr. Aspland.</i>			
Southern Unitarian Society, Books value Five Pounds.			
A Few Friends, Mechanics in London, by Mr. W. Hayday . . .	1	3	6
Mr. T. H. Janson, Clapton . . .	2	2	0
Mr. D. Gibbs, Holloway . . .	1	0	0
Rev. T. Howe, Bridport . . .	1	0	0
Mrs. Severn, Broughton, Notts. . .	3	0	0
Miss Smith, ditto . . .	1	0	0
Miss Eliza Severn, Nottingham . .	1	0	0
Rev. J. Rowe, Bristol . . .	1	1	0
<i>By Ditto.</i>			
Mr. Parsons, Upland House, Bridgewater . . .	5	0	0
Dr. Stock, Bristol . . .	1	1	0
Mr. Bromhead, ditto . . .	1	0	0
Mr. Syle, ditto . . .	1	0	0
A Friend, ditto . . .	1	1	0
A Widow's Mite . . .	1	0	0
Mr. Rowe, Brentford . . .	2	0	0
R. A. . . .	0	10	6
<hr/>			
	£178	13	0

Society, was held at Cranbrook, on Wednesday the 7th June. A numerous attendance of the advocates for the worship of the one Jehovah, the common Father of Christians, from many miles round, manifested the lively interest which they feel in this great leading principle of true religion. The reading of the scriptures and the devotional parts of the service were conducted by Mr. Holden and Mr. Blundell, with that enlightened filial fervour, which the gospel in its purity so powerfully incites. Mr. Thomas Payne delivered an impressive discourse, containing many valuable remarks, from Matt. iv. 19. An interesting report of the state of the Tract Society was read, by which it appeared that they had already printed and purchased tracts to the number of 2293. It was proposed to form District Committees at the towns of Maidstone, Tenterden, Cranbrook, Battle, &c. for the purpose of increasing the circulation of tracts, and in other respects promoting the influence of our common principles. The friends (thus uniting as *brethren* in the acknowledgment of God alone as their *spiritual Father*, and of Christ alone as their *master* in things appertaining to his gospel,) to the number of 118, partook of a social dinner at the George Inn. The following sentiments were given, which produced appropriate and animated addresses to the company from several persons present. "Our lawful Sovereign, and may peace attend the celebration of his next birth day." "The Bible Society, and may every poor child in Great Britain be able to read the Scriptures." "May the sentiments which have restored to us the rights of conscience, ever predominate in the British Legislature." "May the throne of conscience never be usurped by Unitarians." "May our faith be grounded on evidence, and our zeal be governed by knowledge." "May our *Master's cause* be ours, and his conduct our copy." Toward the close of the meeting, the attention of the company was engaged by some important and animated remarks, relative to the marriage ceremony of the Church of England, which was represented both in its matter and in its principle, as inconsistent with the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and with the supremacy of Christ in his church; and consequently as a necessary subject for a farther appeal to the Legislature. The day was a day of rejoicing, conducted with Christian zeal and love, in the anticipation of our Saviour's prayer, that he and his disciples may be one, even as he and the Father are one; and that their unity in faith and in spirit may diffuse its salutary influences throughout the world.

P.

Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society.

—The members of the UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY, established in Birmingham, for Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties, held their ANNUAL MEETING, at Kidderminster, on Wednesday, June 21st. In the morning the devotional service was conducted, and the scriptures were read by Mr. Little, of Birmingham. The Rev. Charles Berry, of Leicester, preached from the 3d verse of the Epistle of Jude. "That ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." The sermon, which was distinguished throughout by a most pleasing spirit of piety and candour, contained an able defence of the scriptural doctrine, that there is but one God, the Father. The arguments employed by the preacher, in themselves far from common-place, were exhibited in so striking a light, and were so admirably guarded as to make a deep impression upon his hearers. Mr. Berry was urged to lay the sermon before the public. It is hoped that his reluctance to do this, will at length yield to the earnest wishes of his friends. A discourse has seldom been delivered, on a similar occasion, that appeared more likely to subserve the interests of Christian truth and virtue. At the conclusion of the service, Mr. Richard Watson being called to the chair, the minutes of the last general meeting, and of the subsequent committee meetings, were read by the Secretary. After the usual business had been transacted, and a resolution formed which promises to ensure a regular supply of interesting tracts, upwards of fifty members and friends of the Society dined together. In the course of the afternoon, several gentlemen addressed the meeting: viz. The Charman, Dr. Toulmin, Mr. Berry, Mr. Turner, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mr. Little, Mr. Fry, Mr. Kentish, and Mr. Bransby. Dr. Toulmin spoke at considerable length, entering into a detail of the origin and progress of the different Unitarian Book Societies in the kingdom. He bore what may now be regarded as a dying testimony to the truth and importance of those doctrines, under the influence of which his great character was formed, and of which he was, through a long series of years, the advocate and the ornament. With a fervour of devotion and a glow of countenance, not readily to be forgotten, he expressed his gratitude to Providence that he was led, at a very early period of his life, to see the evidence for the doctrines of the strict unity and unrivalled supremacy of God, and the subordination and dependence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "I thank my God," said he, "this day, that he gave me resolution, at the beginning of my ministry, to avow my belief of these doctrines—a belief which the continued inquiries of fifty-four years have served only to confirm."

In the evening, Mr. Bransby conducted the devotional service; and the Rev. William Turner, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, delivered a very serious and impressive discourse, on the grounds of the love which Jesus bore to good men, from Mark iii. 35, "Whoso shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

Twenty-five names were added to the list of members.
J. H. B.

On Tuesday, 25th July, a meeting was held at Portsmouth, in consequence of the resolutions passed at Salisbury, by the members of the *Southern Unitarian Society*, (see M. R. p. 445) which was attended by the Rev. B. Treleaven, Rev. J. Brent, Rev. B. Travers, Rev. W. J. Fox, T. Cooke, Esq. W. Cooke, Esq. J. Carter, Esq. J. Florance, Esq. J. Fullagar, Esq. and several other gentlemen from different congregations in the Southern district; when it was resolved that a new Society should be formed, under the denomination of the SOUTHERN UNITARIAN FUND SOCIETY; that its objects should be to enable poor Unitarian congregations to carry on Religious Worship, and to reimburse the traveling and other expenses of Preachers, who may contribute their labours to the preaching of the gospel on Unitarian principles, within the Southern district; that a committee should meet once every two months, at Portsmouth, to conduct the business of the Society; and that the Rev. W. J. Fox should fill the offices of Secretary and Treasurer for the ensuing year. Other resolutions were passed for the regulation of the Society, and the furtherance of its objects, and several donations and subscriptions were received. There was service in the evening, at the Baptist Meeting House, when an interesting and impressive discourse was delivered by the Rev. B. Treleaven, of Dorchester, from John iv. 24.

Grenock Unitarian Chapel.

SIR, Greenock, 16th Aug. 1815.

By desire of the Committee of the *Greenock and Port-Glasgow Unitarian Fund*, I beg leave to lay before you, and through the Repository, before the Unitarians of South Britain, a short account of the origin and progress of our infant institution, and to request your and their aid in support of the objects connected with it.

In consequence of the resolutions of the last meeting of the *Scotch Unitarian Association* to send out missionaries, Mr. George Harris, their Secretary, was appointed by the Committee to preach at Greenock on Sunday the 16th July last. By means of advertisements and the exertions of a few friends, the attention of the public was somewhat excited, and nearly 300 persons, being about as many as the place of meeting would seat, were present

at the service. The congregation on the succeeding Sunday was still more numerous. At the dismissal Mr. Harris requested the friends to the cause to remain, when about forty persons came forward, and a meeting being constituted, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to:—
 “Resolved, 1st, That it is a most desirable object to form and maintain a regular correspondence with those different Religious Societies in Scotland, which are united upon the common principles of the strict Unity of God, and of his Universal Love to his creatures. 2d, That no means appear to be better adapted to accomplish this object, than the Institution called the Scotch Unitarian Association, which is held alternately at the places in which such societies exist. 3d, That such an association is calculated not only to unite the societies themselves in a spirit of friendship, most worthy and illustrative of the Christian name, but also will afford an excellent opportunity to explain to the public, the principles avowed by these societies; to expose the misrepresentations which are industriously circulated respecting them, and to remove the general and most unjust stigma under which they at present lie. 4th, That in order to support that Institution, a Fund shall be immediately established, which shall take the designation of the Greenock and Port-Glasgow Unitarian Fund.”

A spirit of inquiry now appeared to be generally prevalent, and hitherto continues. Unitarianism is introduced into general conversation, and has attracted notice in the most respectable circles. In this state of the public mind, the erection of a Chapel in Greenock for Unitarian Worship has become extremely desirable. Accordingly,

“At a Meeting of the friends to the use of Reason in Religion, held in the Buck’s Head Hall, Greenock, August 6th, 1815, Mr. George Harris in the Chair, it was resolved unanimously, 1st, That being firm believers in the strict and proper Unity of the Supreme Being, and of his Universal Love to his Creatures; we esteem it an imperative duty, to promote, by every means in our power, this pure and simple belief among mankind. 2d, That for this purpose a Chapel, capable of conveniently seating 500 persons, shall be erected in this town; in which worship shall be offered to the One God, the Father only, in the name of the One Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. 3d, That every person making a donation of 2*l.* shall be

entitled to one seat in the Chapel when erected; of 3*l.* 15*s.* to two seats; of 5*l.* 10*s.* to three seats; of 7*l.* to four seats; and of 10*l.* to a pew of six seats; which shall belong to them in perpetuity, upon an annual payment of 5*s.* for each sitting. 4th, That persons subscribing 20*l.* or upwards, shall have the amount of their subscriptions received upon the Chapel; and shall receive legal interest thereupon, payable annually. 5th, That such additional regulations shall be added hereto, as the subscribers, or a committee to be chosen from them, may from time to time find necessary. Signed by order of the Meeting, George Harris, Chairman.”

In consequence of these resolutions, above 250*l.* have been obtained in donations and subscriptions. But it is not improbable that the spring has been wound up to its stretch. The number of decided Unitarians here is small, and many of them, even as too often happens in Scotland, stand aloof. Of persons who are merely inquiring, it must be preposterous to expect much. The harvest indeed seems to be plenteous, but it yet requires to be gathered in. Alas! then the blossom which promises such abundance of fruit, if not fostered by the kindly South may soon be blighted.

In the meantime, Mr. Harris is going on with a Course of Lectures, on the distinguishing doctrines of Unitarianism, once a fortnight, which are well attended: and subscriptions for the Chapel have been opened in Glasgow and Edinburgh. But it is from England the committee look for the most considerable foreign aid, and should they in this be disappointed, it is greatly to be feared that the foundation stone of the second Unitarian Chapel in Scotland cannot be laid. But they will not be disappointed. The fair prospects now laid open will kindle enthusiasm in every breast, and the treasury of our much desired temple shall be filled *with the gifts and offerings of the South.*

I have only to add, that the committee respectfully entreat you will take charge of the donations which may be procured in England, and report their amount from time to time.

I am, SIR,

With the highest respect, your most obedient servant,

SAMUEL GEMMILL, Sec.

[N. B. Subscriptions will be cheerfully received by the Editor, addressed Rev. R. Aspland, Hackney Road. Ed.]

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS ;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Vae victis! This is an old saying, and Christianity has not made such an impression on the world, as to render it unnecessary to be repeated. The Britons felt it under our English ancestors, and they in their turn experienced its truth under the

Norman yoke. When Louis the XIVth broke the treaty with his Protestant subjects, they experienced it in tortures, massacres and gallies. The French are now exposed to no small share of the sufferings, which in the hour of their pride they inflicted on neighbouring countries; and they feel it the more bitterly, as their country is in one of the most extraordinary situations, that has ever been described in the page of history.

The capital is in the possession of Prussians, Russians, Austrians, Germans and English. The Emperors of Austria and Russia and the King of Prussia hold there their courts, whilst the Thuilleries, the palace of their ancient kings, is inhabited by a Bourbon, who is decorated with all the ensigns of royalty, and is acknowledged as the sovereign of the country by the allied powers. The country is occupied in various directions by the troops of these powers, but several fortresses are in a state of siege, and whilst they are willing to hoist the white flag, dread the entrance of their sovereign's allies within their walls. An army still exists, not knowing under what banners it should arrange itself; and companies of marauders, the necessary consequence of such confusion, spread dismay in various districts. The supply merely of the allied troops would be sufficiently harassing, if managed under the most friendly terms; but what must be the situation of the wretched inhabitants, who have among them troops, exasperated by the injuries, they themselves received, when France was in the hour of triumph.

It is impossible to pourtray all the complicated horrors that are now taking place in this wretched country: but it is some satisfaction to hear, that the English are every where acknowledged to be the most generous of its enemies. Long may our island retain this character. The war waged by the sovereigns was declared to be against Buonaparte. He no longer is a cause of fear; but the Bourbon was brought back by the bayonets of an enemy, and it is problematical, whether his stay would be secure, if these bayonets were withdrawn!

Louis the XVIIIth is King of France, and issues his ordinances in consequence of that title; but it is evident that nothing can be done by him which should displease the real masters of Paris. He is calling about him his legislative body, which is to consist of a chamber of Peers and a chamber of representatives. Many peers have been named, and the dignity is made hereditary in the male branch. This is a fatal blow to the old nobility of France, of whom there must be many, on whom this privilege will not be bestowed; and their titles with those of the new nobility will command but little respect. It will require considerable time, should this new

constitution succeed before, their Chamber of Peers will be held in the same estimation as our House of Lords. The representatives also will not easily be brought to a ready compliance with the views of the Court; and should they meet before the allies have quitted Paris, their deliberations must be of a complexion to command little respect.

One only instance has as yet been presented of a judicial trial of one, who will be deemed by the reigning party a traitor. An officer of the army has been brought before a court-martial, for going over with his regiment to Buonaparte, and received sentence of death for the offence. He made an animated defence of his conduct, of which the parts most offensive to government were suppressed in the Parisian papers. He drew a parallel between the landing of King William on our coasts and his march to London, with that of Buonaparte's progress to Paris, and exemplified his own conduct by that of several distinguished English characters, who lived on the most familiar and friendly terms with James the Second, and left him for the army of the person, who was proscribed in the Gazette. The word traitor is applied in turns by each party, according to its success, and death or honour follow on the same precarious ground. Labedoyere met his death with great firmness. He was shot in the presence of a great multitude. The mercy of the sovereign was in vain appealed to by his wife and mother, and it is supposed that similar examples will be made. Whether they tend to preserve the Bourbon on his throne, or still farther to alienate his subjects, time will shew.

The liberty of the press is in the mean time completely shackled. Censors are appointed to each paper, and thus every thing that passes through this medium loses much of its due effect. It may be said, that in such a state of confusion this is absolutely necessary, since the allied powers must be treated with great deference, and it is better to infringe for a time on liberty, than to run the risk of its being abused. But here the sovereign is a loser, and in fact, what with his allies and his doubtful subjects, no man perhaps ever wore a more uneasy crown.

But where is the great Hero, the mighty Emperor, who has occasioned all this alarm to Europe? After the battle of Waterloo he gave a full account at Paris of his ill success, and the dangers of his country. His abdication was the result, and he became a fugitive. To remain in the country without heading the Southern army was impossible, and he took refuge on board an English ship. This brought him to the shores of England, on which he was not permitted to land, and myriads availed themselves of the opportunity of viewing

though at a distance, the man who had been the terror of Europe. After a short delay his doom was fixed, and the island of St. Helena was appointed to him for his residence; and in acquainting him with his destiny the grandeur of his former title was suppressed, and the English commissioners saluted him by the appellation of General, to which name and rank he is hereafter to accommodate himself. Thus ends at least for a time the dream of ambition, on which this extraordinary man may philosophize on the waves of the Atlantic.

The transportation of the Emperor to St. Helena has produced a discussion, involving the rights of the subjects of this country, which like that on the legitimacy of the rights of the Bourbon to the throne of France, may for a long time and not uselessly, employ the pens of the learned. It is said, that when the French Emperor had surrendered himself to the English, and was so near the shores of England as to be within the jurisdiction of our courts, he had a right to a treatment under our laws, which could not be infringed upon by the executive power. Consequently it is contended, that he could not be transported but by the civil authority in due course of law. On the other hand it is asserted, that he was a prisoner of war, and might therefore be kept in any place of custody the sovereign might appoint. From thence the discussion has been carried to the policy and magnanimity of the measure, and in whatever way these points are decided, the greatness of Napoleon is allowed by the fears entertained of the danger of permitting him to reside any where on this side of the equator.

The legitimacy of the Bourbon pretensions to the crown of France is not so easily determined. It involves the difficult question of the right of a sovereign to his throne. This is not a matter of any great interest in England. We will not allow the legitimacy of our sovereign's right to the throne to be called into question, for it is founded on an act of parliament, passed in the reign of Queen Anne, which set aside all of the Stuart race except the descendants of Sophia the daughter of James the 1st. The Bourbons had been set aside by an authority once acknowledged by the present allies of Louis, and he is now restored not by the nation but by foreign force. It may be said, that he became a legitimate sovereign in his recal from England, and the small interval of a few months makes no interruption in his title. But the legitimacy of kings bends to circumstances; and, when we pursue the Bourbon claims to the origin of the family in the Capets, we find it vested in the election by chiefs, and the acquiescence of the people in their choice.

Wretched as is the state of France, that

of Spain may be considered as more degraded and deplorable. We can scarcely give credit to the account of the number of persons confined in prisons under charge of disaffection to the Bourbon sovereign. It is said to amount to upwards of fifty thousand, amongst whom are generals, who bled for their country, and senators who protected it by their councils in the absence of the Bourbon chief. Many of them have expiated their offence by the severest punishments. But the priests have gained the ascendancy in that unhappy country, and to complete their wretchedness, the order of jesuits is reinstated in their ancient honours and dignities.

The king of Holland has met his states, and the opening speech from the throne breathes the spirit of good government. His new constitution does not however give universal satisfaction, and the priests in Belgium avail themselves of the opportunity of existing discontent. The galling article is liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship. The inhabitants of the low countries were, except the Irish, the most devoted to the papacy, and the most superstitious of the Romish church. A strict union with Protestants cannot fail to weaken this attachment, and we shall hope that the house of Orange will conduct itself in a manner to conciliate all parties. The heir to the throne was educated at Oxford, not at the University, as he very consistently refused to subscribe the articles of the sect established by law, as is required on the admission of every student. This will probably have made a deep impression on his mind, and he will see the wisdom of admitting all his subjects, whatever may be their religious persuasion to the benefit of education.

The Algerines, though brought into order by the Americans, continue their depredations on other powers, and it will be a singular proof of the superiority of America, if Europeans should not be able to withdraw themselves from that yoke of bondage, which has been so easily broken by a distant power.

The inhabitants of Buenos Ayres are preparing themselves for a visit from their mother country. The spirit of independence seems to be firmly fixed among them, and they are gaining advantages in the neighbouring governments. In this it seems they are not likely to be assisted by Great Britain; but this is of little consequence, as the defect will be amply made up to them by the United States. The Brazilians are making improvements in their country. They have introduced the culture of the tea-plant among them, which promises to be very successful, and may eventually produce a great change in one part of the trade of this country. They have an ample territory, and if they can but emancipate themselves from European politics, will in

a short time form a very flourishing empire.

From events abroad of great political importance, in which our country takes so important a part, we turn to notice, what may appear a trifling event at home. Yet here might be room for much reflection, and connected with the inquiries into the state of our prisons and mad-houses and similar abuses, it seems to indicate a spirit, which may lead to much amelioration in government. It is well known how difficult it is to get rid of a prejudice, and it cannot be more strongly exemplified than in the denial of admission to a great body of subjects to one seat of literature in this kingdom; and the enforcement of subscription to a farrago of articles of faith at Oxford on young students at admission, remains a lasting blot on the character of the country. A similar prejudice once prevailed with respect to a material article of nourishment. It was for a long time thought necessary, that the manufacturing of corn into food should be put under particular regulations under the name of the assize of bread. The impolicy of this measure has been often called into question, and at last the legislature has consented to a tentative, which may lead either to the abolition of the assize or the fixing of it upon other principles. When this reaches our readers the assize will cease in the metropolis and ten miles round. The bakers will sell the bread at their own prices, and competition, it is supposed, will bring it down to a fair standard. The trial is certainly praise-worthy, and it will be some time before the flour-factors and the bak-

ers have accommodated themselves to the change. A hasty judgment is therefore not to be passed on the immediate effects of the new measure. Let it have a fair trial, and whatever may be the result, we have no doubt that in the end the public will be gainers.

The extraordinary state of Europe must fill the mind of every Christian, and we cannot better conclude our report than by a quotation from a work of Mr. Bicheno, written in the year 1806. "The French may please themselves with the proud idea of universal dominion, but we may be sure that their monarchy however prosperous for the present, will soon go into perdition. After having been the instrument in the hand of providence for breaking to pieces the neighbouring governments, or for occasioning destructive commotions in the surrounding nations, it will itself experience that ruin which is never to be repaired, that awful destruction from which no hand will again be able to save it. The events which will so suddenly lead to this catastrophe cannot be conjectured. It may be for a few years to come the instrument, which God will employ for breaking to pieces the existing anti-christian governments, civil and ecclesiastical, for pouring upon the nations which have sinned the vials of his wrath, and of reducing them to the last extremity: but like Assyria, the rod of God's anger, so the proud monarchy of France will be broken and trodden under foot, or in the language of the apocalyptic prophecy, will be cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

CORRESPONDENCE.

We gave in our last Number an *Engraved Portrait* of the *Unitarian Martyr*, SERVETUS, from an Engraving prefixed to *Allwaerden's Historia Michaelis Serveti*, 4to. (See MacLaine's *Mosheim*, iv. 490. Note e.) A few *Proof Prints* have been pulled on fine paper, 4to, uniform with the *Portrait* of DR. PRIESTLEY in Number CIX. and may be had of the Publishers, price 2s. 6d. each. [Some Copies of the Engraving of Dr. Priestley remain, and may be had at the same price.]

We have some reason to hope that our next Engraving will be from a *Portrait* of the REV. DR. TOULMIN.

We give with the present Number the *Report, &c.* of the *Unitarian Academy*: with the next, we hope to give the *Rules, &c.* of the UNITARIAN FUND, when we shall, as desired, insert in the List of Subscribers, the name of the Rev. Thos. Owen, "who for the last twenty-five years has been the Presbyterian Minister at Loughborough, during the greatest part of which time he has been much prejudiced against the Unitarian doctrine, but who now commences an annual subscription to the *Unitarian Fund* to shew his good wishes to what he believes to be the truth."

The Review of *Mr. Patke's Essays* and other works unavoidably postponed, notwithstanding the addition to our usual pages.

ERRATA.

P. 367. col. i. line 3, from the top, for "Henry" read *Heming*.

370. col. i. seven lines from the bottom, place a comma after the word *ability*.

— col. ii. 15 lines from the top, for "Bowell's" read *Boswell's*.

371. col. i. 15 lines from the bottom, for "holds" read *beholds*.

440. col. i. l. 2, from the bottom, for "Cœnioth" read *Cærioeth*.