

THE
Monthly Repository,
&c.

No. CXX.]

DECEMBER, 1815.

[Vol. X

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Some Account of the late Rev. Samuel Cary.

SAMUEL CARY was born at Newbury Port, Massachusetts, in the year 1785, the son of the Rev. Thomas Cary, of that place, a minister much respected and beloved. He entered the University of Cambridge, New England, in the year 1801, and graduated in the year 1805. At Cambridge, he studied divinity for three years, preaching occasionally. In November, 1808, he was called to preach on probation at King's Chapel, Boston, and after six weeks was ordained joint pastor of the church with Dr. Freeman, January 1st, 1809. In 1811, he was married to the lady who survives him and who has furnished these brief particulars.

The following is an extract from the Funeral Discourse for Mr. Cary, delivered at Essex-Street Chapel, on Sunday, the twenty-ninth of October, 1815, by the Rev. Thomas Belsham:

"Those of you who are acquainted with the Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey, may probably recollect that about ten years after his happy settlement in this place, a correspondence commenced between that venerable man, and the minister of the episcopalian church at Boston, in New England. This excellent and respectable clergyman, who had lately been appointed to officiate in that chapel which was by way of distinction called the King's Chapel, and in which antecedently to the Revolution the governor and principal officers of the state usually attended divine worship according to the rites of the Church of England, informed Mr. Lindsey that the majority of his congregation had adopted Unitarian principles; and that although in deference to the prepossessions of some of the older members, he was prevented from introducing the Liturgy which was used in Essex

Street; the society had nevertheless consented to a reformation of the public liturgy so as to render it nearly if not completely Unitarian. From that time this able and eloquent confessor and teacher of evangelical truth communicated occasionally to his venerable friend the pleasing intelligence of the gradual progress which the grand doctrine of the One God and Father of all, the sole object of religious worship, was making in the American States, and particularly in New England. And these favourable accounts have been from time to time confirmed by the testimony of young ministers of different denominations; all of them men of exemplary characters, and some of them distinguished by transcendent talents, who have successively visited this country from the United States. It is a pleasing and undoubted fact, that in many of the most respectable religious societies in the New England States the worship of God is conducted upon Unitarian principles, and that great numbers of the enlightened inhabitants are in the strictest and properest sense of the word, Unitarians, whose character reflects the greatest honour upon their profession, being distinguished by the excellence of their example as eminently as by the simplicity and purity of their faith.

This interesting correspondence continued till the increasing infirmities of Mr. Lindsey brought it to a period. And soon after the decease of that venerable man, his respectable correspondent, Dr. Freeman, after twenty years' active service in the church, finding his health beginning to decline, requested and obtained from his numerous and flourishing congregation the assistance of a colleague. That colleague was the Reverend Samuel Cary, a young man of dis-

tinguished ability and piety, who on the first of January, 1809, was ordained co-pastor with the Reverend Dr. Freeman. The talents and the virtues of this excellent young man are spoken of in the highest terms by all who had the happiness of his acquaintance, and especially by those who enjoyed the great privilege of attending upon his ministry.

"The greatest advantages were naturally anticipated from this auspicious connexion. The venerable pastor of the society whose precarious health led him to apprehend that his own labours might be speedily terminated, or at least frequently interrupted, was delighted with the prospect of leaving the people of his charge, the objects of his affectionate solicitude, and particularly the rising generation, in whose welfare and improvement he felt a peculiar interest, under the care of one who would follow his steps, and perfect the work of instruction and edification which he had so happily begun. The members of the society also rejoiced that they had found a minister who inherited so large a portion of the spirit of their admired and beloved pastor; and one who would be so well qualified, with divine assistance, to support and to carry on the great cause of truth and goodness when his venerable colleague should in the course of nature be dismissed from his labours, or by declining health and the infirmities of advancing years be under the necessity of retiring from his official duties. 'With such an affectionate people' (saith this exemplary minister of Christ, in a charge delivered upon the solemn occasion of Mr. Cary's settlement as a co-pastor with him) 'my brother has reason to hope that his life will be happy. And you, my friends, on your part have cause for pleasing expectation. The youth and health of your new pastor promise you many years of usefulness and love. And long after I am laid in the grave, the light of his instructions will shed a kindly influence upon your children.'

"Alas! how little can we see what lies before us. For what is human life? It is even a vapour, which appears for a little time, and then vanishes away.

"How much nearer to the truth, much nearer indeed than any one at

the time could have suspected, were those sadly prophetic words which occurred a few sentences before in the same discourse, and upon the same occasion. 'You are still young: but *death will soon overtake you*. This solemn truth furnishes you with a strong motive to diligence. The world abounds with comforts and even pleasures. It is a world every part of which displays the goodness of God. But the present scene is not permanent. All its joys are passing rapidly away, and you look for something more substantial.'*

"These prophetic words have been but too literally and exactly fulfilled. After a connexion of six years, the result of which was the increasing attachment of his reverend colleague, of his numerous congregation, and of all who had the honour and the happiness of his acquaintance, Mr. Cary was arrested in the midst of his days, and in the prime of his usefulness, by the hand of death. 'His purposes were broken off, even the thoughts of his heart.' His sun is gone down while it was yet day. All his schemes of usefulness, all his flattering hopes of glorifying God and Christ, and of contributing to the diffusion of truth and virtue and genuine evangelical piety in the world are cut off in the bud. And his family, his colleague, his congregation, his friends, and the public, are left to deplore their irreparable loss, and to adore the unfathomable mysteries of Divine Providence which baffle all human sagacity, and whose ways are past finding out.

"Endued with a vigour of constitution which promised length of days, and which perhaps occasioned the neglect of prudent caution, he was seized in March last with an accidental cold, which not exciting immediate alarm, was not treated with sufficient attention, and which of consequence went on increasing in violence, and gradually sapping his excellent constitution, till in the month of July he found himself incapable of continuing his public services, and retired for a few weeks to what was conceived to be a more salubrious climate. He returned somewhat relieved, but without any radical im-

* Dr. Freeman's Sermons, pp. 294, 295.

provement. Some of his friends then suggested, and he was himself inclined to hope, that a voyage across the Atlantic might be of service to his health; and that a winter spent in the mild climate of England might perfect his recovery. He accordingly left Boston in the month of September. His passage was remarkably expeditious. But the weather being uncommonly wet was unfavourable to an invalid. About three weeks ago, he landed at Liverpool, and proceeded to Yorkshire, where he passed a few days in the house of a friend. But finding himself a little revived he was anxious to continue his progress towards the south: being desirous after passing a few weeks near the metropolis to spend the winter in the West of England. He traveled slowly, and by short stages, as he was able to bear it (accompanied by Mrs. Cary, whose tender solicitude for his health and comfort animated her to endure the fatigues of a long voyage, and of a residence in a land of strangers, together with another friend). Being refreshed by gentle exercise and change of air, he pleased himself with the hope that upon some early day, perhaps at this very hour, he should be able to assist in divine worship in the Chapel which Mr. Lindsey had founded, in which that great and good man had statedly officiated, and where the doctrine which he himself regarded as of the first importance, that of the sole unrivalled majesty and worship of the one God and Father of all, was still publicly taught. But this favour was denied. Last Lord's Day (October 22,) he was at Cambridge, in better spirits than usual; and expressed his delight in the transient view which he enjoyed of the venerable and majestic buildings of that ancient seat of learning. In the evening he pursued his journey, but a mile before he came to Royston, he was seized with a difficulty of breathing, and an acute pain across the chest. With much difficulty he was taken forward to the end of the stage: and notwithstanding all the assistance which could be given, and the humane attention which he experienced not only from the few friends who accompanied him but from the strangers who surrounded him, Mr. Cary expired within two hours after his arrival.

"Almost with his latest breath he expressed a wish that his remains might be taken to London, and that his funeral service might be performed by the officiating minister of Essex-Street Chapel; to whom he had brought a letter of introduction, and with whom he had expressed a desire to become acquainted, and who, on his part would have been truly gratified had an interview, however short, been permitted with a character so interesting. All that Divine Providence in fact allowed was, that he should fulfil the dying request of his unknown friend by officiating at his funeral. Such was the will of Him who doth all things well. And may his will be done, and ever be cheerfully acquiesced in by all his reasonable creatures. Nor, after all, was the disappointment of great account. Pass but a few fleeting years, and the virtuous of all countries and of all ages, will meet, to part no more.

"Events like these are not intended to excite curious inquiry and speculation concerning the divine conduct, but to impress upon the mind the most important lessons of wisdom: they are loud and awakening calls to a careless and thoughtless world, they teach us to acknowledge the government of God, to adore his sovereign authority, to bow to his supreme disposal, to resign our will and wisdom to his: to disengage our affections from sublunary objects, and to prepare for that awful but unknown hour when our Lord shall come, and shall require an account of our stewardship. And in particular such events as these beyond all others are calculated to fix upon the mind the important and affecting lesson, cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?"

To this interesting and affecting tribute of respect to Mr. Cary, we have only to add the testimony of the human being in the world that knew him best, that habitual piety and devotion, perfect resignation to the will of heaven, love of the truth, liberality towards those who differed from him on religious points, and ardent desire to improve the talents committed to his trust, were virtues which shone in him with distinguished lustre.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Charles James Fox.

(Continued from p. 685.)

40. *Equality.* (Feb. 1, 1793.)

THE use of the word "equality" by the French was deemed highly objectionable. When taken as they meant it, nothing was more innocent; for what did they say? "All men are equal in respect of their rights." To this he assented; all men had equal rights; equal rights to unequal things; one man to a shilling, another to a thousand pounds; one man to a cottage, another to a palace; but the right in both was the same, an equal right of enjoying, an equal right of inheriting or acquiring, and of possessing inheritance or acquisition. The effect of the proposed address was to condemn, not the abuse of those principles (and the French had much abused them) but the principles themselves. To this he could not assent, for they were the principles on which all just and equitable government was founded.

41. *Whig Principles.*

Mr. Fox said, he had already differed sufficiently with a right honourable gentleman (Mr. Burke) on this subject, to wish not to provoke any fresh difference; but even against so great an authority, he must say, that the people are the sovereign in every state; that they have a right to change the form of their government, and a right to cashier their governors for misconduct, as the people of this country cashiered James II.: not by a parliament, or any regular form known to the constitution, but by a convention speaking the sense of the people: that convention produced a parliament and a king. They elected William to a vacant throne, not only setting aside James, whom they had justly cashiered for misconduct, but his innocent son. Again, they elected the House of Brunswick, not individually, but by dynasty, and that dynasty to continue while the terms and conditions on which it was elected were fulfilled, and no longer. He could not admit the right to do all this, but by acknowledging *the sovereignty of the people as paramount to all other laws.*

42. *Constitutions.* (On a Motion for a Reform in Parliament.)

Without attempting to follow his right honourable friend, when he proposed to soar into the skies, or dive into the deep, to encounter his metaphysical adversaries, because in such heights and depths the operations of the actors were too remote from view to be observed with much benefit, he would rest on practice, to which he was more attached, as being better understood. And if by a peculiar interposition of divine power, all the wisest men of every age and of every country could be collected into one assembly, he did not believe that their united wisdom would be capable of forming even a tolerable constitution. In this opinion he thought he was supported by the unvarying evidence of history and observation. Another opinion he held, no matter whether erroneous or not, for he stated it only as an illustration, namely, that the most skilful architect could not build, in the first instance, so commodious a habitation as one that had been originally intended for some other use, and had been gradually improved by successive alterations suggested by various inhabitants for its present purpose. If then so simple a structure as a commodious habitation was so difficult in theory, how much more difficult the structure of a government? One apparent exception might be mentioned, the constitution of the United States of America, which he believed to be so excellently constructed, and so admirably adapted to the circumstances and situation of the inhabitants, that it left us no room to boast that our own was the sole admiration of the world. The objection, however, was only apparent. They had not a constitution to build up from the foundation; they had ours to work upon, and adapt to their own wants and purposes. This was not the present motion recommended to the House—not to pull down, but to work upon our constitution, to examine it with care and reverence, to repair it where decayed, to amend it where defective, to prop it where it wanted support, to adapt it to the purposes of the present time, as our ancestors had done from gene-

ration to generation, and always transmitted it not only unimpaired, but improved to their posterity.

43. *Liberty.* (On a Motion for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.)

Was every man who had liberty in his mouth to be considered as a traitor, merely because liberty had been abused in France, and had been carried to the most shocking licentiousness? He would venture to say, that if this was to be the consequence, fatal, indeed, would it be for England. If the love of liberty was not to be maintained in England; if the warm admiration of it was not to be cherished in the hearts of the people; if it was not to be revered as our chief good, as our boast and pride and richest inheritance: what else had we worthy of our care? Liberty was the essence of the British Constitution. *King, Lords, Commons, and courts of judicature were but the forms; the basis of the constitution was liberty, that grand and beautiful fabric, the first principle of which was government by law, and which this day they were going to suspend.*

44. *Christian Religion.*

Mr. Fox declared, that with regard to what he had said on the subject of the Christian religion, the right honourable gentleman had entirely misunderstood and mis-stated him; which he did not conceive possible, as he had taken particular pains to make his meaning clear and obvious. What he had said was, that the Christian religion owed much of its success to persecution; not insinuating from that, that it was deficient in point of divinity; *it was a religion of which he always had been accustomed to speak with reverence, and which he had ever professed; and further to elucidate that point, he had observed, that not only the Christian religion, but other sects, which had no just claim to divine institution, had flourished under persecution.*

45. *Peace.* (Dec. 3, 1795.)

There was a maxim from a celebrated character of antiquity, of which he was fonder at this time than when the ardour of youth had greater influence on his passions. The more

he thought, the more he was convinced of the philosophy of the maxim, *Iniquissimam pacem justissimo bello antefero.* "I prefer peace, though ever so unfair, to war, though ever so just."

46. *Sympathy of Rulers with the People.* (Dec. 14, 1797.)

You cannot pretend to call yourselves the *actual* representatives of the people, but you say you are the *virtual*. Prove yourselves so, then, by obeying their united voice. I hope and trust that you will shew yourselves, in some degree, entitled to the name of virtual representatives. I will fairly tell you that even if you were to do so, I should not consider it as a sufficient proof that you are the virtual representatives of the people, unless I see you also sympathizing with the people. You must make common cause with them. You must invite them to sacrifices by your own example. You must lead the way. Mr. Burke once illustrated this principle by a story very much in point. A French regiment, in speaking of an old colonel whom they had lost, and of a new one that had succeeded him, extolled the first to the skies. "What particular reason have you for your ardent affection for the old colonel, rather than the new?" said a person to them. "We have no other reason," said they, "than this—the old colonel always said *Allons, mes enfans!* (Let us on my boys!) The new colonel says, *Allez, mes enfans!* (On ye, my boys!) This was, indeed, a striking contrast; and just in this manner we ought to act towards the people. We ought not to say to them, *Go, make sacrifices!* but, *Let us make sacrifices!* To rouse the energy of the people, let us hear of the sacrifices of the crown. It is from the highest place that the example ought to be given. It will animate and cheer the heart of the kingdom:

Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.

47. *War for Religion.* (Feb. 3, 1800.)

Sir, if I understand the true precepts of the Christian religion, as set forth in the New Testament, I must be permitted to say, that there is no such thing as a rule or doctrine by

which we are directed or can be justified, in waging a war for religion. The idea is subversive of the very foundations on which it stands, which are those of peace and good-will among men. Religion never was, and never can be, a justifiable cause of war; but it has been too often grossly used as the pretext and the apology for the most unprincipled wars.

48. Abolition of the Slave Trade.—
Mr. Fox's last Speech. (June 10, 1806.)

In pursuance of the notice he had given, Mr. Secretary Fox rose and spoke as follows :

Before, Sir, I proceed to state the grounds on which I look with confidence for the almost unanimous countenance of the House in this measure, I feel myself called upon to say a few words by way of apology, for being the person to come forward upon the present occasion. For the last sixteen or seventeen years of my life, I have been in the habit of uniformly and strenuously supporting the several motions made by an honourable gentleman (Mr. Wilberforce) who has so often, by his meritorious exertions on this subject, attracted the applause of this House, and obtained the admiration of the public. During the long period that I found it in such excellent hands, it was impossible for me to feel the slightest disposition to take it out of them. I am still of the same opinion ; and cannot but think it would have been much better, if the same honourable member and his friends had retained it in their own hands, and they might certainly have depended upon me and those with whom I have the honour to act, for the same ardent support which we have uniformly given them. But, Sir, the honourable member and many of his friends seemed so strongly to entertain different sentiments in that respect, from me, that I submitted my own opinion to theirs, and now assume the task, reluctantly, on that account, but on every other, most gladly. So fully am I impressed with the vast importance and necessity of attaining what will be the object of my motion this night, that *if, during the almost forty years that I have had the honour of a seat in parliament, I had been so fortunate as to*

accomplish that, and that only, I should think I had done enough, and could retire from public life with comfort, and the conscious satisfaction, that I had done my duty.

Having made these preliminary observations, I now come to the main question, but do not think it necessary to stop at present, for the sake of referring in detail to all the entries on your journals, made at different periods since the year 1792, the different motions made by the honourable gentleman, the resolutions of the House, and the bills brought in to abolish the trade, particularly that which received the sanction of this House, though it was unfortunately negatived in another place. I have not lately had time, from other occupations, to prepare myself by referring minutely to dates and details; and must, therefore, content myself with a general reference, in which, should I fall into any mistake, I am sure there are gentlemen who will be certain to set me right. In the execution of this duty, I am happy to reflect, that whatever difference of opinion might have prevailed upon some points of this subject, between a few members, and, at one time, unhappily, so as to defeat the measure, the opinion of this House upon the subject was, I will not say unanimous, for in that I may be contradicted, but as nearly unanimous as any thing of this kind could be, "that the slave trade is contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and sound policy." These, I believe, were the words of the resolution, adopted after long and serious deliberations; and they are those which I mean to introduce into the resolutions which I shall propose this night. Surely, Sir, it does not remain yet to be argued, that to carry men by violence away to slavery, in distant countries, to use the expression of an illustrious man, now no more, (Mr. Burke,) a man distinguished in every way, and in nothing more than for his great humanity, "is not a traffic in the labour of man, but in the man himself." I will not now enter, for it would be unnecessary, into that exploded argument that we did not make the negroes slaves, but found them already in that state, and condemned to it for crimes. The nature of the crimes themselves (witch-

craft in general) is a manifest pretext, and a mockery of all human reason. But, supposing them even to be real crimes, and such as men should be condemned for,* can there be any thing more degrading to sense, or disgusting to humanity, than to think it honourable or justifiable in Great Britain, annually to send out ships in order to assist in the purposes of African police? It has, I am told, been asserted, by an authority in the other House of Parliament, that the trade is in itself so good a one, that if it was not found already subsisting, it would be right to create it. I certainly will not compare the authority just alluded to with that of my honourable friend (Mr. Wilberforce), who, in the efforts he has made in order to abolish this dishonourable traffic, has done himself so much honour. I will not compare that authority with the authority of a right honourable gentleman now no more (Mr. Pitt), whose talents have always so justly been entitled to admiration, and whose eloquence was never more powerfully displayed on any occasion than in opposition to this scandalous traffic. I will not compare it with that of a noble viscount (Sidmouth), one of your predecessors, but not your immediate one, in that chair, than whom, though he opposed the manner in which we wished to obtain an abolition, yet as to the principle, no man ever enforced more strongly or with more feeling his utter detestation of it. Another noble lord also (Lord Melville), who took a lead in constantly opposing our attempts at a total and immediate abolition, yet in regard to the principle, when he prevailed in his measure of gradual abolition, recorded his opinion on the journals, by moving, that the House considered the slave trade to be adverse to policy, humanity and justice.

I do not, therefore, suppose, that there can be above one, or perhaps two members in this House, who can object to a condemnation of the nature of the trade, and shall now proceed to recall the attention of the House to what has been its uniform, consistent and unchangeable opinion for the last eighteen years, during which we should blush to

have it stated, that not one step has yet been taken towards the abolition of the trade. If, then, we have never ceased to express our reprobation, surely the House must think itself bound by its character, and the consistency of its proceedings, to condemn it now. The first time this measure was proposed, on the motion of my honourable friend, which was in the year 1791, it was, after a long and warm discussion, rejected. In the following year, 1792, after the question had been, during the interval, better considered, there appeared to be a very strong disposition, generally, to adopt it to the full; but in the committee, the question for a gradual abolition was carried. On that occasion, when the most strenuous efforts were made to specify the time when the total abolition should take place, there were several divisions in the House about the number of years, and Lord Melville, who was the leader and proposer of the gradual abolition, could not venture to push the period longer than eight years, or the year 1800, when it was to be totally abolished. Yet we are now in the year 1806, and while surrounding nations are reproaching us with neglect, not a single step has been taken towards this just, humane and politic measure! When the question for a gradual abolition was carried, there was no one could suppose that the trade would last so long: and in the mean time, we have suffered other nations to take the lead of us. Denmark, much to its honour, has abolished the trade; or, if it could not abolish it altogether, has at least done all it could, for it has prohibited its being carried on in Danish ships or by Danish sailors. I own, that when I began to consider the subject, early in the present session, my opinion was, that the total abolition might be carried this year; but subsequent business intervened, occasioned by the discussions of the military plan; besides which, there was an abolition going forward in the foreign trade, from our colonies, and it was thought right to carry that measure through, before we proceeded to the other. That bill has passed into a law, and so far we have already succeeded; but it is too late to carry the measure

of abolition through the other House. In this House, from a regard to the consistency of its own proceedings, we can indeed expect no great resistance; but the impediments that may be opposed to it in another, would not leave sufficient time to accomplish it. No alternative is therefore now left, but to let it pass over the present session; and it is to afford no ground for a suspicion that we have abandoned it altogether, that we have recourse to the measure I am now about to propose. The motion will not mention any limitation, either as to the time or manner of abolishing the trade. There have been some hints indeed thrown out in some quarters, that it would be a better measure to adopt something that must inevitably lead to an abolition; but after eighteen years of close attention which I have paid to the subject, I cannot think any thing so effectual as a direct law for that purpose.

The next point is, as to the time when the abolition shall take place; for the same reasons or objections which led to the gradual measure of 1792, may here occur again. That also I leave open; but I have no hesitation to state, that with respect to that, my opinion is the same as it is with regard to the manner, and that I think it ought to be abolished immediately. As the motion, therefore, which I have to make, will leave to the House the time and manner of abolition, I cannot but confidently express my hope and expectation, that it will be unanimously carried; and I implore gentlemen not to listen to that sort of flattery which they have sometimes heard—and particularly from one of the members for Liverpool—that they have abolished it already. When the regulations were adopted, touching the space to be allowed for each negro in a slave ship, the same gentleman opposed it as being destructive, and exclaimed, “Oh, if you do that you may as well abolish it at once, for it cannot be done.” Yet, when we propose an abolition altogether, they use, as arguments against us, the great good already done by regulating the slave ships, and bettering the condition of negroes in the colonies. In the same way, when we first pro-

posed the abolition of the foreign trade, they told us it would have the effect of a general and total abolition; and I beg of them not to forget that declaration now; and having made it once, I must use to them a phrase, in common life, “Sir, if that be the case, I must pray you to put your hand to it.” As to the stale argument of the ruin the measure would bring upon the West India islands, I would refer gentlemen to perhaps the most brilliant and convincing speech that ever was, I believe, delivered in this or any other place, by a consummate master of eloquence (Mr. Burke), and of which, I believe, there remains in some publications a report that will convey an inadequate idea of the substance, though it would be impossible to represent the manner; the voice, the gesture, the manner, were not to be described. “*O! si illum vidisse, si illum audivisse!*” If all the members of this House could but have seen and heard the great orator in the delivery of that speech, on that day, there would not now be one who could for a moment longer suppose that the abolition of the slave trade could injuriously affect the interests of the West Indian colonies. I am aware that a calculation was once made, and pretty generally circulated, by which it would appear, that were the importation of negroes into the island put an end to, the stock of slaves could not be kept up; and, if I recollect right, the calculation was made with reference to the Island of Jamaica. Fortunately, however, for our argument, the experiment has been already tried in North America, where the trade has been abolished; and the effect of it shews, that the population of the negroes is nearly equal to that of the whites. As that is the part of the world where population proceeds more rapidly than any other, and as we know that within the last twenty years the population of the whites has doubled, and that of negroes very nearly so, without importation, it affords, I will not say a damning, but a blessed proof that the adoption of a similar course would ultimately produce gradual emancipation and an increasing population, and that it would enable the negroes to acquire

property as the reward of long servitude, and that thereby these islands would be placed in a state of safety beyond any which could be effected by fleets or armies.

Nothing now remains for me, Sir, but to address a few words to those members opposite me, who are so fond of quoting the opinions of a right honourable gentleman deceased (Mr. Pitt), and who profess to entertain so profound a respect for his memory. They all know, that there was no subject on which that right honourable gentleman displayed his extraordinary eloquence with more ardour, than in support of the abolition of the slave trade. His speeches on that subject will not easily be forgotten; and, therefore, in supporting the present motion, they will not only have an opportunity of manifesting their private friendship for him, their admiration of his splendid talents, and the sincerity of their zeal and respect for his character and memory; but also the opportunity of quoting him with great advantage; added to which, they may now display all this for the public good, and on a subject upon which they cannot be suspected of making that respect and admiration only a vehicle for party purposes.

Mr. Fox then moved the following resolution:—“*That this House, conceiving the African Slave Trade to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and sound policy, will, with all practicable expedition, proceed to take effectual measures for abolishing the said trade, in such manner, and at such period, as may be deemed advisable.*”

[The motion was opposed by Gen-

eral Tarleton, Mr. Gascoyne, Lord Castlereagh, Sir William Young, Mr. Rose and Mr. Manning: and supported by Sir Ralph Milbanke, Mr. Francis, Sir Samuel Romilly (the Solicitor-General), Mr. Wilberforce, Lord Henry Petty, Mr. Barham, Sir John Newport, Mr. Canning, Mr. William Smith and Mr. Wyndham.

The House divided on Mr. Fox's motion,—Yeas, 114, Noes, 15.

This was the last motion made by Mr. Fox in the House of Commons. About the middle of June, he became so seriously indisposed, that he was forced to discontinue his attendance in parliament. Symptoms of both general and local dropsy declared themselves, and so rapid was the progress of his complaint, that after the middle of July, though informed of every step taken by his colleagues in the negotiation with France, he could seldom be consulted by them on that or any other public measures till they had been carried into effect. It was at length thought necessary by his physicians, to have recourse to the usual operation for his relief, which was accordingly performed for the first time on the 7th of August, and repeated on the 31st. After both operations, he fell into a state of languor and depression, but his medical attendants never absolutely despaired of his case till Monday, the 7th of September, when he sunk into an alarming state of lowness, in which he languished till the evening of Saturday, the 13th, when he expired in the arms of his nephew, Lord Holland, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

On the Atonement.

SIR, Manchester, Nov. 18, 1815.

I DID not say that Mr. Frend is an invidious and uncharitable man. There is surely an essential difference between ascribing these qualities to a man's character generally, and to a sentiment or expression used in the heat of dispute. If in the opinion of the judicious and candid, my expression of disapprobation against the part of Mr. F.'s argument referred to be too strong, and chargeable (as in that case it

must be,) with the fault of which I complain in him, I would most cordially ask them and Mr. F. to excuse my inconsideration in using it. I must, however, confess, that I must see very differently from what I do at present, before I can admire the complexion of the paragraph in question. “Next year, perhaps,” says Mr. F. “another Unitarian may have found out some point in theology, which he thinks equally necessary or unnecessary to the faith of an Unitarian.” He then places the

following subjects in this predicament:—*infant baptism, liberty and necessity, the existence of the devil, the Mosaic account of the creation and fall, the canonical authority of the book of Revelation.* In whatever manner these subjects may be “chatted over,” it is creating an envy surely against any person to suppose that he should magnify his opinions concerning any of these subjects to the importance of the question concerning the person of Christ. No man will either next year, or ever, identify the above subjects with the profession of Unitarianism. The selection, too, cannot but strike a person acquainted with the parties as being calculated, to use the rhetorician’s expression, *ad invidiam excitandam*. I have the highest regard for the character of both Mr. Frend and Mr. Belsham, as far as I know them; but both those gentlemen, I hope, will bear with me, if I strongly express my disapprobation of the polemical style sometimes adopted in personal disputes.

I never had a right to call upon Mr. Frend for explanations certainly, yet the importance which he attaches to his particular views, and some expressions used by him in the number for January, p. 32. led me to *expect* some important communications from him on the doctrine of *atonement* or *redemption*. I for one exceedingly regret that the discussion proposed by Mr. F. and others should not have taken place, but should have been devoured, like Pharaoh’s fat kine, by a lean and ill-favoured dispute. I particularly wish that the sacrificial terms, borrowed from the Mosaic ritual for the sake of illustration by the writers of the New Testament, and applied to the redemption by Christ, were better understood by the general body of Unitarians. They would then be completely invulnerable against the specious arguments of the orthodox, derived from the use of such terms, they would understand the scriptures to their own complete satisfaction, and they would be able with good effect to turn the edge of scriptural argument against their antagonists. To effect this, I expected much from the discussions which should appear in your present volume, particularly those of Mr. F. I intended to do some-

thing myself—*pro virili*—which want of time has not so much precluded, as a want of spur from the co-operation of others. I propose now, however, with your leave, Sir,—not indeed to enter fully into this important subject—but barely to state the *result* of some of my inquiries.

In a course of reading the Greek and Roman classics—confined, it is true—I could no where discover the notion which is essential to the orthodox atonement, viz. *the transfer of moral qualities from one moral agent to another*; but I observed much that is inconsistent with such a notion. The sacrifices are generally represented of no avail, without a reparation of the wrong. This remark might be supported by innumerable references; but see particularly the beginning of the *Iliad*; where, in order to appease the displeasure of Apollo, it was required not only to offer the magnificent sacrifice of a hecatomb, or hundred beasts, but likewise to repair the wrong—to restore the daughter of the priest without ransom.

The sacrifices are generally represented acceptable as a tribute, an homage, or a mode of worship.

“Et quisnam numen Junonis adoret,
Præterea, aut supplex aris imponet honorem.”—*Virgil*.

The worshipers were frequently said to appease by sacrifice when they had committed no sin or particular offence against the deity in question.

“Sanguine placastis Ventos.”—*Virgil*.

Sacrifices were thought of no avail without purity and sanctity in the worshiper. The gods are said not to regard the gift, but the mind of the giver.

I have thought it necessary to say so much—though, indeed, it be but very little,—concerning the heathen sacrifices; because interested writers appealing to the ignorance and prejudices of mankind, have supported the popular doctrine of the atonement by the authority of profane no less than of sacred writers.

Notwithstanding the hardy assertions and inimitable criticisms of Dr. Magee, I will venture to affirm, that the question concerning the first institution of sacrifices is effectually hidden in the impenetrable obscurity of antiquity.

In regard to the sacrifices instituted by Moses, they were an adaptation of what had existed before to the service of God in the sanctuary—under particular regulations; and they were adapted (as we are informed in different parts of the Old Testament—Jer. vii. 22, Hos. vi. 6, Mic. vi. 7,) not because God delighted in them, but because of hardness of heart on the part of the Israelites. The whole account which we have of the admission rather than the institution of sacrifices by Moses, and the passages just referred to in particular, clearly evince that they were not, that they could not be accepted by the Deity as a reparation for moral offences, as Dr. Magee would have us believe.

The expressions which were used in the law of Moses concerning sacrifices, are in different ways applied by the writers of the New Testament to the scheme or mode of redemption through Christ. He is our Redeemer, he bought us with his blood, he gave himself for us, he was slain the just for the unjust, he was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Now it is evident that expressions taken from their proper connexion, and adapted to a new subject, cannot stand for ideas or notions which did not originally belong to them. The doctrine of the atonement, then, if indeed true, must be supported by some other evidence than the use of sacrificial terms; because these terms never had such an extension of meaning—they never signified the transfer of moral qualities.

It is a mode of speaking frequently used by the writers of the New Testament, that Christ becomes for us, or is made unto us, every thing in which our salvation consists:—I use the term salvation here in its real scriptural sense, of being truly Christians, and not as equivalent to eternal life. Thus (1 Cor. i. 30,) "Christ is made unto us of [by] God, wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption." In another place: "He is sin for us, and we are the righteousness of God in him." What! Is all this perfectly literal? What! Are we wise by a substitute? Are our sins as truly and properly Christ's as they are our own? And are we then not virtuous and holy in our

own persons? The mode of the figure (so to speak) is very evident surely to every one that will use his common sense and understanding. Christ, through whose instrumentality these blessings become ours, is said himself to be these things to us; and for no other reason, and in no other sense. But we shall be told, that this latitude of interpretation is unpardonable. Yet what is there in it half so absurd, half so extravagant, as to understand the whole in a purely literal sense?—As will be shewn more particularly below. The terms *redeeming, purchasing, buying, &c.* are frequently used in the Old Testament in a sense implying temporal deliverances and advantages, and surely these strong and significant terms are particularly well calculated to set forth the great deliverance through Christ from ignorance and vice, and from the burden of ancient carnal institutions, and degrading superstitions.

The notions entertained concerning *appeasing the wrath of God, giving satisfaction to divine justice, appropriating the active and passive merits of Christ*, and others equivalent to them, are wholly unscriptural and unworthy of consideration.

Whatever Christ is to believers in him in the accomplishment of their salvation, he is so by the appointment, and as the instrument of God, acting as he received commandment and power from on high. When our Saviour says that he had power over his life and death, he adds that he received this commandment from his Father. John x. 18. Is Jesus Christ the *resurrection* and the *life*? He raises Lazarus after a solemn prayer to the Almighty: and it is expressly said, John v. 26, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Will he judge the world? It is expressly said to be by the appointment of God. It may be said, indeed, that many passages ascribe our salvation, our redemption, our resurrection and everlasting life *immediately* to Christ; but as many other passages ascribe the same to him expressly, as the *instrument* of God, it is surely evident enough, that the same instrumentality is implied where it is not specifically mentioned. And let the reader be

apprized that this important observation is applicable to all the super-human attainments and actions of Christ. Every work which Christ performed as the messenger of the Most High, we should always ascribe to the power of God, operating through Christ as his instrument. Because this is *frequently* asserted in direct terms, it must *always* be implied.

If any thing different from this, or inconsistent with it, is meant by Mr. Friend and those who think with him on this question, it can surely be stated and explained; and it is, I think, incumbent on him to explain, although I may have forfeited all right to interrogate him. "Jesus Christ," says Mr. F., "is the necessary medium through which we enter into eternity." Is not Jesus Christ the medium through which we receive every privilege peculiar to the new dispensation? Who denies this? A great difference surely can be stated with clearness; and an *important* difference ought to be stated, and the scriptural evidence for it adduced.

But I will now proceed to state another result of my inquiries.—Though the pardon of sin is an act absolutely of free grace and unmerited favour; yet in the scriptures we are represented as *accepted* with God on account of the goodness of our dispositions and conduct. We *please* him by virtuous actions or good works. 1 Thess. iv. 1, &c. The redemption which Christ has accomplished—the state into which he bought us with the price of his blood—was the introduction of a new dispensation, under which spirituality of worship, and goodness of character, *alone*, would be acceptable to the Almighty. *In the new creation*, i. e. under the gospel dispensation, to worship God *in spirit and in truth*, to *fear God and work righteousness*, are the only essential conditions of acceptance with our Maker.

The undeniable import of innumerable plain and unfigurative passages in the New Testament is, that we must keep the commandments, abound in good works, and that we shall be judged at last according to our works. "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." Some indeed set aside the authority of this important passage by understanding it in the following sense. "If thou wilt keep

all the commandments, even that which Adam broke before thou wast born, thou wilt enter into life; though I know very well that neither thou nor any other man, can comply with this condition." A comment this worthy of a bad cause!

Good works, or personal righteousness, are the only solid foundation of hope unto eternal life. Our Saviour's sermon on the mount wholly consists of moral precepts, (now-a-days denominated *legality*) and yet he says, that "the man who doeth these words of mine hath built his house upon a rock:" his foundation on good works is perfectly safe and secure.

Our Saviour frequently speaks of *reward in heaven*—"Great shall be your reward in heaven." Who can wonder that this expression should sound discordant in the ears of those who wholly exclude good works from the scheme of redemption?

Improving our talents and being faithful, are, according to the evangelists, means of "entering into the joy of our Lord."

Peter, in the affair of Cornelius, seeing more clearly than ever he had before—the *moral constitution of the new dispensation*—cried out with great emphasis, as is natural to one making a great discovery—"Now of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that *feareth him and worketh righteousness* is *accepted* with him."

In fine, for I must come to a conclusion, what man of a sane and unprejudiced mind will contend in the face of all this evidence, that those expressions on which the doctrine of the Atonement is solely built—as when we are said to have been bought with a price, to have been redeemed with the blood of Christ, to have been washed clean in his blood—are to be understood in the literal meaning? Can those who will say so be aware of the consequences? According to them, our salvation is a downright bargain between the Father and the Son, as much so as merchandize in the market: our salvation is an equivalent consideration for value received, a *quid pro quo*, a debtor and creditor account between the Father and the Son. (I do not say this in jest, but for the sake of clearness of ideas.) But if our salvation was not of this character, it was some-

thing of a very different nature. For there is no medium between the figurative and unfigurative meaning of *buying and selling*. The two ways of understanding these terms are essentially different, in the very nature of things. We must have been bought either in the strict literal, or in a figurative and accommodated sense. Let no man therefore deceive himself in understanding these expressions in some dark, ambiguous, undefined sense, which in fact means nothing; and let him not build on the acceptance of words thus dark and uncertain a doctrine irreconcilable with the genius of Christianity.

What was the grand design of the glorious gospel of the grace of God? To teach us "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world:—that they who have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works." What did Jesus Christ redeem believers from? "From all iniquity" to be "zealous unto good works"—from the previously vain conversation of the world, from the power of sin, from their evil habits. What did he purchase for them? The means of moral reformation through the gospel, with the favour of God as a necessary consequence. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Christians are "a peculiar [margin, *purchased*] people, to shew forth the praises of him who called them out of darkness into marvellous light."

How astonishing is it, that ages of ignorance and barbarism should have so far tarnished the glory of Christianity, that men, instead of understanding its obvious and plain principles, should be irretrievably bewildered by the occasional use of a few phrases adapted to the notions of those who had been brought up under the old dispensation! What can the most metaphorical of those expressions mean—that *we are washed white in the blood of the lamb*—but that the new moral dispensation introduced by that innocent person, whose testimony was sealed with his blood, has been the means of freeing all who have truly received it from their moral pollution and sinfulness? How long will the New Testament be read in vain? When will its words be understood in the sense and meaning in which they were originally delivered?

J.

Hackney, Nov. 23, 1815.

SIR,

IF you think the following notice explaining why a late Bible Meeting was not to be held *in a church* but *in a chapel*, is worth preserving in your pages, as a specimen of the genuine spirit in which the circulation of the Scriptures without the Prayer Book, has been recently opposed by a beneficed clergyman of the Established Church in this neighbourhood, it is at your service.

The Rector's letter was sent to Mr. Bragg, "the churchwarden," late on Monday night, the 13th inst., and the "adjourned" Bible Meeting, which was large and respectable, was held on Tuesday, the 14th, Mr. Byng, *the member for the county, in the chair*.

Whether the frequent repetition of the Athanasian Creed, with its damnable clauses, which are required by law to "be sung or said at morning prayer, *instead of the Apostles' Creed*," no less than thirteen times in the year, on certain festivals and Saints' days, "by the minister and people standing," and the reverend gentleman's inability to find any thing like it in the scriptures, excited his vindictive zeal against those who promoted the circulation of the *latter* without the *former*, or from what other cause such zeal may have arisen, is not for me to determine. But I cannot help thinking, that the periodical profession of *such a creed* has a natural tendency to beget an uncharitable and intolerant disposition of mind, or, what is alike to be lamented, a total disregard to all religion, but that of the state, and an equal zeal to defend that, whether it be true or false.

I am, your constant reader,

PHILEMON.

"ST. MATTHEW, BETHNAL GREEN.

"The Rector of this Parish, claiming his right of opposing the circulation of the Holy Scriptures amongst his parishioners, sent, late last night, (the 12th of Nov. 1815) the following letter to the churchwarden:

"COPY:

"Rectory House, Nov. 13, 1815.

"SIR,

"As the church is my freehold, and is consecrated for the celebration of divine worship *alone*, I cannot but call to mind, with merited indignation and abhorrence, the conduct of those parish officers who, shrinking

from legal investigation, and stimulating their ignorant and deluded adherents to outrage and insult those whose duty prompted them to expose their mal-practices, have heretofore too often successfully contrived to convert so sacred an edifice into a Bear Garden. Determined, if possible, to prevent a recurrence of such disgraceful scenes, or, at least, to prevent the church from being turned into a conventicle, I give you notice, (and desire you will communicate the same to your colleagues, and the rest of the fraternity,) that, if you, or any person or persons shall presume to enter the church on the 14th inst. for the purpose of holding a meeting for the Bible, (as it is miscalled) or for any other association, that I will vindicate my rights against such invasion, and enforce such penalties against the offenders as the ecclesiastical and civil law may enjoin.

“I am, Sir, yours, &c.

(Signed) “JOSHUA KING.”

“To William Bragg.”

“For the purpose of avoiding contention the meeting is adjourned to GIBRALTER CHAPEL, Bethnal Green Road.”

SIR,

IS it too much to assume that an act of Almighty power, wisdom, and goodness, must be so immutably right, so altogether worthy its divine original, that a parallel act under all its circumstances must be as immutably right as altogether worthy, &c.? What now should he think of the Supreme Being multiplying *ad infinitum*, or only indefinitely such an achievement as was, on the Calvinistic hypothesis, the creation of man! Can the human imagination on the contrary, conceive a case of which the repetition in a single instance should be, reasoning *a priori*, so utterly, so ineffably improbable?

CLERICUS.

SIR,

Nov. 27, 1815.

I COPY the following from the Public Ledger of this morning:

“We are concerned to notice, that the spirit of superstition seems not to have been abated, by all the calamities which Europe has suffered. The King of Naples has made a present to the *Virgin of Monte Leone of a dia-*

mond necklace, and one of Murat's decorations.”

Perhaps some of the readers of your Repository may have overlooked this important information. It is fitting they should know what is the fruit of British instruction during the royal exile in the Island of Sicily. J. W.

Comment on a passage of Horace by Mr. W. Friend.

[Extracted from the Evening's Amusements, for the year 1816.]

IN the midst of the gross darkness, in which the nations were enveloped before the coming of our Saviour, faint glimmerings of light beamed through the surrounding gloom, and we should be astonished, that in the highly cultivated state of the human intellect at some periods, they did not produce a greater effect, if we, who have been blessed with the divine effulgence, had not witnessed in our own times, to what degree it may be obscured by passion and prejudice. Three distinguished poets flourished in the age of Augustus. They were, I am persuaded, all of them more or less acquainted with the holy scriptures. The Pollio of Virgil has led many to attribute to him the perusal of the prophet Isaiah: the first lines of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid scarcely admit a doubt, that the first chapter of Genesis was familiar to him: and a passage in Horace convinces me, that an attempt had been made to impress on his mind the great truth inculcated in the Hebrew scriptures. Yet their hearts were hardened; and in spite of the opportunities of superior knowledge, they perverted their fine talents to the support of the prevailing superstitions and the most degrading notions of the divinity.

That Horace was acquainted with the sacred scriptures we cannot doubt, when we consider, that one of his most intimate friends was a frequenter of the synagogue. This circumstance we learn from his own works, and it cannot be imagined, that Fuscus Aristius, a scholar of great eminence, could be attached to the Jewish religion, without imparting to his friends Virgil and Horace, some of the sublime truths, which he derived from it. But we have internal evidence, that puts it beyond all doubt, that this would be at times a subject of conversation.

Horace in one of his odes is led to speak of the attributes of Deity, and, in utter contradiction to the general tenor of his writings, bursts forth upon us with this sublime stanza.

Unde nil majus generatur ipso;
Nec viget quicquam simile, aut secundum;
Proximos illi tamen occupavit
Pallas honores.

Nothing exists greater than himself, neither has he a similitude in any thing, nor does he admit of a second. Next to his throne, and most highly honoured, stands Pallas. My readers will recollect, that in the vain mythology of the ancients, Pallas is represented as the Goddess of Wisdom, but so far from being superior to their other abominations, their Jupiter admitted even of a partner on his throne in Juno. How Horace made this slip in his theology may thus, I think, be accounted for.

I can conceive from the character of Horace, that he might have been bantering his friend Fuscus Aristius, on what he would call the Jewish superstitions, when the latter, with that seriousness which the subject would suggest, might have thus addressed him and his friends. Ye worship ye know not what. "Ye split your Deity into numberless persons, and fall prostrate before the vain idols of your own imaginations. But we are better taught. We know that the true God is and can be only one, and our scriptures abominate the idea of any likeness being formed of him, or any person being supposed to be equal or second to him. His unity is not to be compared with the unity of any created being. When we are speaking of the unity of any thing created, as of the sun, moon, earth, man, tree and the like, another of the same kind either does or may be conceived to exist. But it is not so with God: he is one, one only person, and when we think aright of him, we feel that his unity excludes the possibility of conceiving a second God to exist. This is the great tenet of our faith. Of this our scriptures are full; and, wherever this truth is adopted, all the abominations, under which you represent your Gods, fill the mind with horror." In corroboration of his sentiment he would probably produce to them many sublime passages of scripture, and among them not unlikely those in which wisdom is so

beautifully described in the book of Proverbs. A momentary conviction was produced on the mind of Horace; he penned his stanza; could not, or would not, divest himself of his vain mythology; exchanged wisdom for Pallas; and then relapsed into all the idle tales which were familiar to and congenial with the reigning religion.

The passage I have quoted was not we may presume entirely without effect, and many may have been prepared by it to think better of the Deity. It is a pleasing satisfaction to find these traces of divine truth in profane writers; and as our holy apostle Paul has not disdained to make use of similar passages, my readers will, I am persuaded, not be displeased with this apparent digression from the general tenor of the work. But when we are dilating on the works of nature, how can we forbear from looking continually up to the author of it. To him the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only true God, be all our adorations paid, and may we never, like Horace, pollute our imaginations by the prostration of our intellect to any vain superstition.

*Mr. Aspland's final Reply to Pastor.
Hackney Road, Dec. 2, 1815.*

AS the dispute between Pastor and me will naturally drop with the present volume of the Monthly Repository, I shall make but a very short answer to his last letter [p. 710] and shall avoid introducing any thing to which he might wish to reply.

What "reflections against" Pastor I have dropt, I know not. His own tone appeared to me to be growing angry, I rebuked him gently, and he recovered his temper. If, however, I have fallen into the fault which I censured in him, of which I am not aware, I beg that every expression of mine that is offensive to him personally may be considered as cancelled.

Pastor cannot see how the term *Unitarian* which denotes my agreement with other Christians should also mark the peculiarity of my faith. But I must again assert that the peculiarity of it consists in that agreement. All Christians hold the divine unity, but most of them hold with it opinions that appear to me to subvert it; I agree with them in their first principle, but I agree with them no fur-

ther. Their peculiarity consists in their additions to the doctrine of the divine unity, mine in my adhering to this doctrine without additions, and in my believing this doctrine to be of supreme importance.

It is true that I profess other opinions besides that of the Unity of God, but I have none that I esteem of equal importance, for this appears to me to include the benevolence of the Supreme Being and to exclude all those doctrines concerning the person and office of Jesus Christ which distinguish the bulk of reputed orthodox Christians.

No one term can express all that a man believes. Pastor might call himself an Arian, and yet no one would know from this that he embraced or rejected the doctrines of satisfaction for the sins of mankind by the death of Christ, of original sin, of infant baptism, of the divine ordination of bishops, of an intermediate state of existence and of eternal torments. "I call myself an Arian," he might say, "because I must have some religious distinction, and I choose that which explains my difference from others on the most important and comprehensive subject." He might not be shaken in his attachment to the term if he were told that between the primitive and the modern Arians there is as wide a difference as between the first Arians and Athanasians. His answer might be that custom modifies and fixes the use of terms, and that in the present day every one understands sufficiently by the appellation in question what he wishes to set forth as his most important religious belief.

In some circumstances the words *Christian* and *Protestant* would be justifiable terms of distinction, even in Protestant and Christian countries; as, for instance, when the persons taking them should suppose that the principles implied in them were violated, or at least overlooked by the majority of those who were ordinarily known by them. Has Pastor never heard of, or does he object to, the denominations of *The Christian Tract Society*, and *The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty*?

I will here take the liberty to say that I rejoice that Mr. James Yates abandons the term *Socinian*; but I

doubt the expediency of reviving the use of the word *Humanitarian*. It is very uncouth and ambiguous. What necessity is there for a name expressly to distinguish our opinion concerning the person of Christ, when we already have one [Unitarian] which clearly points out our disbelief of his Deity? The few Arians that are left do not hesitate, I believe, to call themselves such—they who call themselves Unitarians only will be generally understood to be not Arians. We may not object to conceding to Arians the name of Unitarians, but they probably will not content themselves with this denomination indicative of their agreement with us; they seem to conceive their peculiarity to be Arianism rather than Unitarianism.

In closing this paper, I trust, I need not assure the reader that I feel no ill-will and mean no disrespect towards either Arians or Trinitarians.

ROBERT ASPLAND.

SIR,
I PERCEIVE that Mr. Yates has in your last number retracted his opinion respecting the adoption of the term *Socinian*, as applicable to that class of Christians to which he belongs; and having in a former paper quoted with approbation a sentence or two of his on that subject, I beg leave to observe that although he has altered his opinion, yet the reasons he assigned for it are before the world, and many will probably continue to think with me that they are good and sufficient. I agree with him, however, in a reluctance to apply that name to those who disown it. And on that account am sorry that no other has been selected by themselves that can be generally admissible. Till this is done I have no doubt but that the term *Socinian* will continue to be given them by the world at large.

Mr. Yates recommends the term *Humanitarian*. This does not appear to me so objectionable as that which they commonly use among themselves; for although the real *humanity* of Christ be admitted and believed by all sects, yet there are none besides themselves who consider the Saviour to have been a mere man, and consequently they are alone in believing him to be possessed only of *simple humanity*. The term therefore which

is recommended by Mr. Yates cannot be said to have "no *allusion* to their peculiar faith." It refers directly to one of their peculiarities, or one of those tenets "by which they are distinguished from all other Christians." This cannot be said of the term Unitarian.

But after all, may I be permitted to ask why must any term be chosen which refers to *one* article only, among several, by which that sect is distinguished from all others? I can see no reason for this. Would it not be desirable to fix on a term which should mark their system generally, instead of any one which relates only to a particular point? If, for instance, the word *Priestleyan* were agreeable to the party, the world, I am persuaded, would at once concur with them in the use of it, not only as unobjectionable, but also as descriptive and definitive. Not that they must be considered as believing every thing that Dr. Priestley believed, but as receiving and supporting those leading theological opinions of which he was the principal reviver and the most conspicuous defender. It is mere trifling to say "we are to call no man master," and so forth. No man would think of putting that interpretation on the term, any more than on the term Arian or Calvinist. The general sense of mankind and the common practice preclude any such idea. And I should think it an honour to the sect, to be distinguished by the name of a man so justly celebrated. It would at the same time be distinctly understood by all mankind, and be universally acknowledged as equally expressive and appropriate.

PASTOR.

Highgate, Dec. 2, 1815.

SIR,

ALTHOUGH I did imagine that the very excellent letter of Mr. Belsham, p. 416, of the present volume, might have settled the dispute on the term *Unitarian*, which was thought by others as well as myself to have proceeded quite far enough, yet as the subject is still in progress, I beg leave to make a few observations, to which I am induced by the proposal of my excellent friend Mr. Yates, in your last number, who suggests that the believers in the proper humanity of Christ should content them-

VOL. X.

selves with the distinguishing epithet of *Humanitarians*, to avoid giving occasion of offence to our Arian brethren, who now claim to be ranked as Unitarians. I know the well-earned influence which Mr. Yates has in a particular part of our island, and that what he recommends needs little more for its general adoption; I beg leave therefore to offer some reasons, why I think his proposal ought not, hastily, to be admitted.

Mr. Lindsey, in the Appendix to his Farewell Sermon (1793) says, "the name of Arian I remember, in my youth, to have been a name full of horror with the great majority in all places"—"but this term of reproach has been comparatively little heard of for the last thirty years and upwards."

Now, Sir, I remember the opening of the New Chapel in Essex Street, in 1778, and though I was certainly very young at that time, yet I was old enough to enter very feelingly into the controversy respecting the person of Christ, and to be, in my own estimation, at least, a zealous and eager Arian. I was a constant attendant upon the preaching of the late Rev. Hugh Worthington; yet I suspect, that at that period, and I may add, and still keep within the boundaries of truth, for 12 or 15 years afterwards, no Arians stood forward in their claims for the title of Unitarian. That term was then as much a term of reproach, as the epithet Arian had been half a century before, and the followers of Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Priestley might very readily appropriate it to themselves. It is true the ignorant and malignant, to render these excellent men more odious, frequently reproached them as Socinians, as did others, still more malignant, with the epithet of Atheists, or believers in no God, because they would not worship three Gods under the uncouth denomination of a Trinity.

The term "Unitarian," Sir, as a term of reproach, has, to use Mr. Lindsey's language, been little heard of during the last fifteen or eighteen years, and therefore the Arians are desirous of applying it to themselves: but that is not the only reason; the epithet Arian is well nigh worn out, as is the doctrine itself, and hence it should seem the believers in the pre-existence of Christ and atonement

are desirous of shifting it off their shoulders. Let them if they please rank themselves under the general term Unitarians, but those who simply believe in the humanity of Christ, and in the unpurchased love of the Almighty, ought not to abandon it for another which to my ears is extremely barbarous; and, if I mistake not, in the north, where Mr. Y. has justly acquired so high a reputation, liable to be mistaken.

I have a still stronger and, in my opinion, a much more important reason why the believers in the pre-existence of Christ and the other doctrines usually attached to it, should not be left in the exclusive possession of the term Unitarian. I do not mean to speak with the smallest disrespect of this class of Christians, in which I am proud and grateful to reckon some of my best and steadiest friends in the worst times, but, Sir, if the current goes on for the next twenty years with as much force and velocity as it has the last, there will, probably, be scarcely a remnant of the sect remaining, and then, with the sect, we shall lose, next to the term *Christian*, the most appropriate denomination by which the worshiper of the true God can be designated.

J. J.

P. S. In answer to a "Young Scholar and no Middle-Man," p. 693, allow me to say that for many years I was a constant attendant at Salters'-Hall, and during that whole period it was impossible to hear Mr. Worthington many successive times without knowing his religious sentiments on almost every topic: he never scrupled to attack in the same sermon, often in the same sentence, Trinitarians, on the one hand and those who believed in the simple humanity of Christ on the other: he was also a zealous advocate for the doctrine of an atonement, scrupling not to say he had drawn it in with almost his earliest breath, and that by the blessing of God he would continue in it till his death. He had a great abhorrence to the leading tenets of Calvinism, Predestination and Reprobation, nor was he less inimical to the philosophical doctrine of Necessity. The writer of this likewise well knows that he was a believer in the existence of a Devil, for having once hazarded a doubt on the subject he irrecoverably lost that

warmth of his tutor's friendship with which he had been previously honoured.
J. J.

Essex House, Dec. 6, 1815.

SIR,

PERMIT me through the channel of your widely circulating Repository to acknowledge my great obligation to my friend Dr. Estlin, for his kind and spontaneous defence of my character in his late excellent publication addressed to the Unitarians in South Wales, against the unfounded and ungenerous aspersions of the Bishop of St. David's.

My obligation is the greater, as my friend professes to differ from me in some points of considerable importance. "I am," says he, p. 62, "*not a MATERIALIST.*" Now this must be understood to imply that Mr. B. is a materialist. And this being asserted by a friend, after forty years acquaintance, will naturally pass as a well-authenticated fact. And by ninety-nine in a hundred of my friend's readers, Mr. B. will be regarded as maintaining, that the intellectual and active powers of the human mind are properties of a gross, extended, solid, and essentially inert substance: this is the only idea which the multitude annex to materialism, and if this notion were seriously entertained by Mr. B. it would entitle him to offer himself as a candidate for the first vacancy in St. Luke's Hospital, or for an appropriate habitation in the New Bedlam.

Whether I have ever conversed with my worthy and learned friend upon the subject of philosophical materialism, I know not. But that I ever declared myself a materialist in any sense of the word I greatly doubt. For it is a subject upon which it is difficult to form clear ideas: and so far as I do understand it, I hesitate concerning the conclusion.

The simple question between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Price was, whether the principle of perception was separable or inseparable from certain modifications of attraction and repulsion. Dr. Priestley maintained that they were inseparable, and Dr. Price that they were never separated. Just as in the case of the two churches of Rome and England, one claims to be infallible, and the other maintains that it never errs. But for this dif-

ference, so trifling in itself and so little understood by the million, Dr. Price is applauded as an immaterialist, and Dr. Priestley is vilified as a materialist. I certainly go as far as Dr. Price, and I do not go quite so far as Dr. Priestley. Because my philosophic friend regarded attraction and repulsion as divine energies; which appeared to me to verge upon pantheism. But whether that which is never actually separated from its adjunct be naturally absolutely inseparable from it, I really am not metaphysician enough to determine, so that in truth I cannot say to which of the two appellations I am entitled: whether I am a poor, despised, degraded materialist who believe that perception, attraction, and repulsion are inseparable, or a sublime and exalted immaterialist who believe that though not inseparable they are in fact never separated. My true position is, I believe, in the centre of oscillation.

Such are Mr. B's notions of materialism and immaterialism. How far his friend's ideas may coincide with his own upon this subject it is not for him to say.

And perhaps even upon the subject of the Lord's day, Mr. B's ideas may not be quite so much at variance with those of his worthy friend as he may imagine.

I quite agree with Dr. Estlin, that the apostles instituted the first day of the week as a religious festival for the commemoration of the resurrection of Christ and for the celebration of Christian worship. And I am sure that my friend will agree with me that it is not explicitly set apart as a day of sabbatical rest in the New Testament, nor was it observed as such by the primitive church. Upon this question there can be no difference of opinion among those who have read and are well-informed upon the subject. And if my friend is of opinion that it is *expedient* that a day of *religious solemnity* should also be observed as a day of *sabbatical rest*: I content myself with the decision of the apostle: if one Christian regards one day above another, and another regards every day alike, let every one freely follow his own judgment. Let not him who regardeth the day condemn him who does not regard it: and let not him who disregards the day despise him who regardeth it.

For we must all give an account of ourselves to God.

But it seems that my friend has been informed, that what Mr. B. has said on the subject of the sabbath "has injured the cause of Unitarianism in Wales." I am sorry for it. But when I see it to be my duty to speak unpalatable truth or to oppose popular error, it is not my custom to inquire who will like it or who will dislike it; or what party will be offended and weakened, and what will be gratified and promoted by it.

My sole object is, at least it is my desire that it should ever be, to approve myself to conscience and to God. As to the acceptance and success of my honest, however humble, exertions I am willing to leave it in the hands of Him who will carry on his own cause in the way and by the instruments which he shall himself select and qualify for the work. I am satisfied to have had it in my heart.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

T. BELSHAM.

Higham Hill, Dec. 8, 1815.

SIR,

I AM aware that when I said in my last, that the Calvinistic system can send a man triumphing to glory from the scaffold, I brought forward a case which the more intelligent and moderate of Calvinistic divines will consider as an enthusiastic abuse, not a just consequence of their doctrine. But the system itself does not positively exclude such a case, as it admits conversion to be wrought at the very close of a vicious life. I think my memory is strictly correct with respect to an instance recorded in the Obituary of a work published under the sanction of respectable names, the Evangelical Magazine. The writer visits a prostitute on her death-bed. He awakens her to a sense of her sad condition, goes through the usual process, and concludes his account with expressing a full conviction that he shall meet that poor creature in glory.

To the observations of my last perhaps you will allow me to add the following:

It will strike most minds with the force of an axiom, that it must be a general blessing to any species of beings to be under the government of

an infinitely wise, just and benevolent Creator. This axiom, Calvinism, if admitted, proves to be false.

The first and great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;" this commandment Calvinism sets aside by rendering the observance of it impracticable. On the other hand, the command refutes the doctrine.

Calvinists with other Christians admit, on the evidence of scripture, that God is infinitely good; but Calvinism reduces this infinite goodness to mere theory which fact most woefully contradicts. And, strange to tell, the causes which prevent the exercise of this attribute are found in the Divine Nature itself!

Scripture assures us in various ways that mercy is what God delights to exercise; but Calvinism sets up in its stead an infinite indignation at a supposed infinite evil, which reigns in the divine dispensations, triumphs over wisdom, equity and goodness, and which nothing can satisfy but the eternal sufferings of myriads of creatures, whose grand crime (as they were born with a nature radically corrupt) has been, that they were destined to exist!!!

And now, Sir, as it is not probably that I shall trouble you again on this subject, I should like to take my leave of it with saying a word on the *tone* in which my observations have been written. Conceiving Calvinism to be a most gross corruption of the best gift of God to man, I have exhibited its inconsistencies and its horrors as they have struck my own mind with unrestrained freedom, but without even an evanescent feeling of ill-will towards those from whom I differ thus widely. Strong as is my conviction of the absurdity and impiety of the system itself, I shall ever lose sight of the theoretical Calvinist when found in the person of the practical Christian.

I am, Sir,
Yours respectfully,
E. COGAN.

Islington, Dec. 10, 1815.

SIR,
AS I am not the author of Mr. Dendy's *Obituary* I should be justified in treating with silence the *Young Scholar's* modest call on me to

furnish him with a confession of my faith. But as my life has been devoted to the instruction of young people, I must not withhold the desired information on the present occasion. My religious opinions will be found detailed in my *Twentieth Anniversary Sermon*, preached at Worship Street, November, 1811. And should the inquirer wish to see *the Middle Scheme* perspicuously stated and ably defended, he is referred to Dr. Richard Price's *Sermons on the Christian Doctrine*; the attentive perusal of which may afford *Young Scholars* (if not too confident and opinionative) considerable improvement. As to my revered friend, the late Rev. Hugh Worthington, it is passing strange that any one individual of Salters' Hall congregation can have any doubt of his disbelief of the Trinity, since he is known to have delivered from the pulpit this memorable declaration—"I must first lose my understanding and likewise my sight before I can believe my *Saviour* equal to my God!" I am, Sir,

Yours respectfully,
J. EVANS.

SIR,
THE promotion of a subscription for the suffering, persecuted Protestants of France is truly honourable to the Dissenting Ministers of London. Besides relieving distress, it will hold out to the French an assurance of our hailing peace, in the spirit of peace. It will shew the government of that unhappy people that there is a tribunal to which even generalissimos, prime-ministers and kings are subject, the tribunal of public opinion, before which persecutors, oppressors and destroyers stand condemned.

Oliver Cromwell set on foot a general collection, in 1655, for the sufferers for conscience' sake in the valleys of Piedmont, heading the subscriptions with a donation of 2000*l*. This might not be princely, but it was Christian, and the example was not without effect, the collections amounting to about 40,000*l*. Amongst the distributors of this bounty were Calamy, Caryl and other nonconformist divines.

AN OLIVERIAN.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Miscellaneous Notes intended to explain the Christian Eucharist.

(See p. 571.)

THE commemorative acts, which were performed by Jesus Christ and his associated disciples and friends in the primitive rite of the Lord's Supper, seem very clearly and strongly, if not demonstratively, to forbid the belief—that the sufferings, crucifixion and death of Christ were specially commemorated on that occasion; or indeed that they were ever intended to be made the special objects of commemoration in any subsequent observance of that rite. For suppose (what is far from being improbable), that Jesus Christ was a communicant at that time, and that he communicated in common, or on a footing perfectly level with his disciples,—will it not necessarily follow, that the object or objects then commemorated, was or were precisely the same both to our blessed Lord and to all the associated guests? Now if the object commemorated at that time, both by Jesus and his apostles and friends was precisely the same; and if that object, according to common estimation, was the blood (i. e. the sufferings and death) of Jesus Christ, must we not infer—That, as the disciples drank some part of the Eucharistic cup, or wine, (expressly called the blood of Christ), so Jesus himself also drank some part of the same cup, or wine (i. e. his own blood) to commemorate his own death, even before his decease had actually taken place? It will perhaps be said that as the blood of Christ is mentioned twice in this statement, it may be supposed to denote both the resemblance of Christ's blood, and also his real or true blood. But, allowing the propriety of this deduction from the present statement, doth it equally result from the words of Christ's institution, in which the term *blood* is mentioned but *once*? In expounding, or rather in administering the Lord's Supper, according to its prevalent signification, are not the expositors perpetually obliged to shift their ideas and consider this self-same, single term *blood* in a *two-fold* sense? That is to say (1) as the resemblance

of Christ's blood, meaning the Eucharistic wine; and (2ndly) as Christ's real blood, denoting his sufferings and death, or the commemorated object of the Eucharistic rite? What then can possibly be more arbitrary or more unscriptural, and consequently more injurious, than the insertion of the word *resemblance* in the expositions or administrations of the Lord's Supper; and employing it with manifest ambiguity? Even in imagination alone, can any one possibly believe, that the very same word, in one and the same place, hath more than one plain single meaning?

Considering the time and circumstances of the Eucharistic institution, and its immediate and intimate connexion with the Jewish passover;—would it not be far more rational and correct to ascertain the true intention and use of the Eucharistic body and blood (i. e. of the Eucharistic bread and wine) by retrospective, than by prospective means and principles? In other words, may not the adoption, the use, and the true meaning of the Eucharistic bread and wine be more commodiously and satisfactorily illustrated and justified, by simply deducing them from the ancient passover, than by any arbitrary or conjectural applications of them to the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, which are neither warranted by the Eucharistic records nor by any other scriptures of the New Testament. Let this be exemplified only in one of our Christian symbols: at the end of the last Jewish passover, which Jesus ever attended, he transferred from the remains of that rite some wine, or a cup of wine, and called it his blood.

Doth this appear wonderful to us? Or was there really any thing mysterious in the action or expression? When Christ had appropriated the wine to the formation of his own new rite, might he not justly call it *his* wine, in opposition to that which had been previously used in the paschal rite? And as to the figurative term *blood*, which was given to that wine, may it not be fairly justified by considering that it was now substituted, as a commemo-

rative symbol in the eucharistic institution, to supply the place of the paschal symbol, which was hereby contrasted, and, indeed, silently exploded and excluded from the pure and spiritual worship of Almighty God? At the time and in the circumstances of setting up the Christian Eucharist, our Lord Christ could not possibly entertain any immediate designs other or less than (1), the complete and universal subversion of superstition, idolatry and all false worship of Almighty God: and (2), the universal introduction and establishment of his most pure and spiritual worship: and as a compendious ritual for the gradual and effectual accomplishment of these purposes, the human mind can scarcely conceive that a more wise and adequate plan was ever offered to the Christian world.

The institution of the Lord's Supper was the institution of the public and Christian worship of the Deity; or there is no other to be found:—and what other institution was there ever offered to the world which so commodiously disseminates right sentiments concerning the Almighty, and so effectually inculcates practical virtue and piety on the human temper and conduct? Celebrating the Christian Eucharist, on the broad and comprehensive ground on which our divine Christian Teacher undoubtedly intended it to be celebrated, perpetually presents to the minds of sincere Christian worshipers the whole economy of divine benevolence and mercy; that is to say, a compendious view, in its origin and process, of the new Christian covenant for the accomplishment of human salvation. My fellow-Christians, to the love and labours of Jesus Christ, our elder brother, our obligations are unspeakably great, and should pervade our whole temper and conduct; but the eucharistic law, which he hath enjoined on us, directly calls upon us to contemplate, solely or chiefly, the gracious designs and operations of infinite benevolence and mercy; yea, as it presents to our devout commemorations the new covenant of remissions and recompenses, in the most generous and condescending point of view, it furnisheth us with themes the most ample, and subjects the most grand and sublime

for exciting our praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God, and securing to him our everlasting obedience, devotion, love and gratitude. But some may say, have we still got these means and motives to the obedience, love and worship of Almighty God in our view, and still in our hands? Blessed be God! we have. The object to which Jesus invited our contemplations remains unaltered:—"Do this in remembrance of me"! No proleptic device could ever enter into his divine precepts. Had such a device been adopted, without avowing it to his associated friends, it would necessarily have stamped the conversation and conduct of the Son of God with a brand of base artifice and disingenuity. The holy and beloved Jesus, the faithful and true witness, did not speak one thing and mean another; and therefore we may rest assured that his eucharistic teachings have, at this day, precisely the same meaning as they had when they first dropped from his gracious lips, when he first instituted and exemplified *Christian communion for the religious and social worship of Almighty God*.

To the preceding notes it seems expedient still to add one more, to shew that St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 26, probably intended to teach something quite different from the eucharistic commemoration of Christ's crucifixion and death. It is generally allowed, that this noted verse doth not lie within the letter and limits of the eucharistic record; and therefore, unless we take the institution, or the main part of it, from the authority of Paul, and not of Jesus, it cannot be admitted as having any imperative construction, or any weight to justify the meaning and use of any particular clause, which doth not explicitly occur in Christ's original and authentic law.

The sentiment and language of this *ex* and *post institute* remark of the apostle most probably arose out of the early and peculiar history and circumstances of St. Paul and his Corinthian correspondents, who, nearly home to the time of this correspondence, had been habituated to use animal sacrifices in the service of that God whom they worshiped. Of this mode of worship, both the Jews and Gentiles seem to have been very

fond; and they are generally supposed to have laid an inordinate stress on the meritorious virtue of their sacrificed animal victims; thinking them to be peculiarly acceptable to the God whom they worshiped, and to be sufficiently efficacious to compensate even for their immoral as well as for their ceremonial transgressions. Is it then any matter of wonder to find the mixed members of the infant church in Corinth entertaining some such persuasion? And under its influence, with their having heard that Jesus had sacrificed himself for the benefit of his followers, would they not be naturally and strongly induced to consult the founder of their society to ascertain whether, in their Christian worship, they were bound to respect the death of Christ as having (like their ancient sacrifices,) any sacrificial or federal influence and efficacy for gaining the future and final favour and acceptance of Almighty God? From a regard both to his own recent prejudices and engagements, and to those of the Corinthian converts, we should expect to find the apostle's reply to be exactly such as we now find it; that is to say, peculiarly cautious, mild and tender;—not enjoining on his correspondents any precise or specific duty, but simply informing them what would and ought to be the certain effects of their eucharistic devotions or Christian worship.

Commemorating and shewing the Lord's death, are doubtless two different acts or things; for such was evidently the apostle's distinction. The former (which was probably the notion entertained by the Corinthian worshipers,) seems to imply an estimate and recollection of the certainty and expiatory virtue, efficacy and benefits of Christ's death during its access, and home to its actual accomplishment. The latter, on the other hand, might only denote a declaration of the early result or issue of that death, together with its appointed, necessary and beneficial tendency to (what it actually and soon attained, namely) a resurrection from the dead. And hence St. Paul, without enjoining the stated commemoration of the

death of Christ, seems to have been fully warranted in the implied distinction he made between "commemorating" and "shewing the Lord's death;" and also in the ground and reason of the instruction, on this point, which he gave to his Corinthian correspondents:—"As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death;" (i. e.) "your eucharistic and devotional acts, or your Christian worship, plainly shew and declare the actual result and beneficial tendency of your Lord's death." This, it is presumed, is the true and accurate meaning of this apostolic reflection on the eucharistic rite; being fairly justified by the circumstances in which it was penned, and also by the true sense of the original words in which it was expressed: for *Ἀχρὶς οὗ ἂν ἐλθῇ*, connected, as it ought to be, with its subject, *Θάνατος*, and not *Κυριος*, should have been rendered into the following English terms: "The Lord's death ye shew" [not "till he (Jesus Christ) come," but] "to what it went or tended." If the elliptic phrase, *Ἀχρὶς ἂν οὗ*, be supplied and completed, as Mr. Wakefield did to the writer of this critique, it would assume this form, *Ἀχρὶς ἂν πρὸς οὗ σκοπεῖ ἐλθῇ*, and might then be translated, in its reference to or connexion with *Ὁ Θάνατος*, "to what issue, object or termination it went or did go." For the verb *ἐλθῇ*, being the second Aorist, may be rendered by the preterimperfect tense as well as by the future. This 26th verse, which is subjoined to the apostle Paul's eucharistic record, is often cited to prove the perpetuity; but relative to the Corinthian Christians, this application of the words would have been quite irrelevant or incongruous; for the Corinthian worshipers were censured for the intemperate and indecent use of our Lord's rite, but not for its omission or infrequent observance. And the period prescribed for its duration is expressed in a term so extremely indefinite and ambiguous, that the most learned and pious divines are at a loss to ascertain its true extent and meaning.

P. K.

POETRY.

SIR,

Dec. 3, 1815.

In the following attempt to translate the Latin verses (p. 716), I have supposed a reference by the learned author, in the last line of his verses on Mr. Fox, to the resemblance, personal and mental, between the nephew and his illustrious uncle. Though I wished not to weaken the panegyric on Dr. Bell, I cannot help remarking, that his claims on British gratitude had been much stronger but for the principle on which his system has been applied in our misnamed *National Schools*. Did it not occur to M. Marron that, on such a principle, in France, all the children of Protestants would be excluded from a pretended general education, unless their parents resigned them to the religious instruction of the Romish ritual? Such parents would, indeed, cease to be Protestants, and thus escape the persecution which all but the most inconsiderate might have expected from the fall of Napoleon and the return of *Louis le desiré*.

J. T. R.

TRANSLATIONS

From the Latin of M. Marron.

Fox.

VOTARIES of freedom! ye, on ev'ry shore,
Who hate the tyrant, and the slave deplore;
Who spurn the servile yoke, that dire disgrace,
Behold a man, the glory of our race!
Freedom on him the choicest gifts bestow'd,
His tongue, her voice; his breast, her lov'd abode.
'Twas Virtue's praise arous'd thy gen'rous strife,
O, Fox! who liv'st in Holland's honour'd life.

Holland.

The love of freedom, long to Britons dear,
A patriot's zeal, from base corruption clear,
Religious rev'rence, manners frankly kind,
And knowledge, by no scanty bounds confin'd,
Persuasion eloquent, whose pow'rful sway,
Reason directs, and raptur'd minds obey;
All join a Holland's well-earn'd fame to raise,
Albion! be just, and give his merit praise.

Andrew Bell.

Haste! British youth! with grateful haste bestow,

A civic wreath, meet garland for his brow.

Imperishable seed, with ceaseless toil,
He, lib'ral, casts on childhood's tender soil;

Awakes the fear of heav'n, a country's love,

And bids rude minds with gentler passions move.

Bell's honour'd name through ages shall be known,

And Envy's malice wound herself alone.

J. T. R.

Verses on the Irish Melodies.

1814.

Erin's wild harp long time had hung
Silent, but to the rising gale,
Laurels around the chords were flung,
Entwin'd with lilies, deadly pale.

And there, sigh'd many a blushing rose
'Midst cypress' shade, of deepest gloom;
Like Love, too closely link'd to woes,
Or Beauty, blooming for the tomb.

When Moore each intertwining flower
With magic fingers light enwreath'd;
The harp confess'd a master's pow'r,
And to his touch responsive breath'd.

While thus th' enchanting minstrel swept
The tuneful chords in Erin's praise,
To native airs that long had slept
He wak'd her pride of former days.

Wak'd, too, the bright indignant glow,
As, with his nation's pow'rful soul,
He sang her plaintive tale of woe,
Beneath oppression's harsh controul.

IGNOTA.

Address to the Spring of 1814.

Meek ush'rer of a new-born year,
Sweet Spring, thy verdant mantle cast,
O'er chilling plains and forests drear,
Just 'scap'd relentless winter's blast.

Fit emblem thou of happiest youth,
Calm op'ning of tumultuous life,
Ere folly dim the light of truth,
Or love expire 'mid passion's strife.

At thy last dawn, a welcome guest,
How many 'raptur'd hail'd thy sight,
Whose eyes now clos'd in lasting rest,
Nor heed thy smile, nor mourn thy flight.

IGNOTA.

TO THE EDITOR,
On the completion of his Tenth Volume.
— *incipient magni procedere menses.*
VIRGIL.

Ten years, as told by ev'ry classic boy,
Greece mark'd, indignant, the high walls
of Troy ;
Valour, in vain, and martial pow'r as-
sail'd,
Proudly they stood till treach'rous art pre-
vail'd.
Not thus a ten years' war thy champions
wage
'Gainst wily error, and polemic rage ;
'Tis theirs the sword of argument to
wield,
Beneath the orb of Truth's impervious
shield.
And still may learning aid thy just de-
sign,
And pay due homage at the hallow'd
shrine,
Science each path explore that sages trod,
Who lock'd through Nature up to Nature's
God,
And classic taste, in polish'd strains, re-
hearse
Immortal themes that dignify her verse.
Proceed,—through many a *lustrum*, still
be thine
To prompt the virtuous deed, the hope di-
vine,
Till peace erect an empire, ne'er to end,
And *Man* describe a brother, and a friend.
Bright scenes I thus anticipate for thee,
Which years, and cares forbid my hope to
see.

J. T. R.

To C. S. on his Lines entitled "The
Storms of Life." [See p. 716.]

Yes, my dear Charles, when gath'ring
storms
In the bleak hail-clouds, spread around
The gloomy day, with hollow sound,
When chilling north-winds blow, and
forms
Of Heav'n's avenging fires, with horror
gleam
In the flashing lightnings beam,
And on a weak and shudd'ring nature
lour,
When persecuting tempests beat,
Upon a head defenceless, that's the hour
To try the man, amid the pelting show'r
Stands he where duty bids, erect, serene !
As if to steer some little bark, mid shoals,
And rocks, and hidden sands, and tempests'
rage,

The skilful Pilot, all the crew should
greet,
While his strong hand th' obedient helm
controuls,
While he rules all, or guides with counsel
sage
Nor heeds the foaming billows at his feet !
He knows his ground, his compass, and
his chart,
And eyes the nearing haven, nor of rest
At present dreams, with hope (not fear)
his heart,
Honest and firm, beats high within his
breast,
Mourns not the port he left, with foolish
sorrow,
He has no time to nourish black despair ;
His duty plain before him lies, and there
He guides his course, nor thinks about to-
morrow.

Harlow.

B. P. S.

True Pleasure,
From the Masque of Comus, By Dr.
Dalton.

(Plupmtre's Collection of Songs, II. 234.)

Nor on beds of fading flowers,
Shedding soon their gaudy pride,
Nor with swains in rosy bowers,
Will True Pleasure long reside.

On awful Virtue's hill sublime
Euthroned sits th' immortal Fair ;
Who wins her height must patient climb,
The steps are peril, toil and care.
For thus does Providence ordain
Eternal bliss for transient pain.

Peace at last.

(From Heber's Translations of Pindar.)

Our life in peace resign'd
Shall sink like fall of summer eve,
And on the face of darkness leave
A ruddy smile behind.

Epigram,

Ascribed to a Young Gentleman of Ox-
ford, on Sir Nathaniel Wraxall's Me-
moirs of his Own Times.

(From the Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1815.)

Men, Measures, Seasons, Scenes and
Facts all
Misquoting, Misstating,
Misplacing, Misdating,
Here lies Sir Nathaniel Wraxall !

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Nine Sermons, on the Nature of the Evidence by which the Fact of our Lord's Resurrection is established*; and on various other subjects. To which is prefixed, a Dissertation on the Prophecies of the Messiah dispersed among the Heathen. By Samuel Horsley, LL. D. F. R. S. F. A. S. Late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. London, 1815. Longman and Co. and Rivingtons. 8vo. pp. 352.

"**M**ORE last words"* of Bishop Horsley!† Not any of his "loose and unconnected sheets," not any of his "scattered and mutilated manuscripts," seem to be withheld from the public. "The Dissertation which stands first in the following pages," is "confessedly an incomplete work": *the manuscript was not left in that state in which the author, had he been living, would have published it*—"indeed a note found in one of its pages expressly states that it was his intention to have revised it." Our readers will judge, whether, in these circumstances, it ought to have been laid before the world!

The *Advertisement* is dated from *Dundee*. Of course, we presume that the Rev. Heneage Horsley is the editor, and though we are ignorant of the motives of this gentleman in thus exposing to the eye of day every crude, unfinished essay which he finds in his father's study, yet we really think that he would have shewn greater respect to the memory of a parent and to the discernment of the age by suffering the *Dissertation* and the *Nine Sermons* to enjoy their peaceful slumbers. It were inequitable to represent them as altogether unworthy of seeing the light: we content ourselves with insisting on the fact that they were not prepared or designed by the writer for publication, and that, according to the editor's concession, the manuscript, so far as regards the more important part of the volume, "was not left in that state in which Bishop Horsley,

had he been living, would have published it"!

Among the theologians of his time, among the scholars and divines raised to the episcopal bench during the present reign, the prelate of whom we are speaking held a considerable place. Perhaps it is an advantage flowing from that kind of *posthumous* knowledge of him which the Rev. Heneage Horsley has abundantly communicated, that we possess somewhat of a more intimate and familiar acquaintance with the Bishop than we could otherwise have formed. At least, we obtain, in this way, a clearer view of his literary character, and are better able to perceive the cast of his mind, the direction of his studies, the extent of his attainments and the peculiarities of his style. Towards the conclusion of this article, we shall endeavour to make an estimate of his rank as a theological author and of his merits as a writer. The duty previously imposed on us, is that of examining the contents of the present volume.

Of these "A Dissertation on the prophecies of the Messiah dispersed among the Heathen" *stands first*, in singularity as in order. It "appears by the form of compellation to have been originally delivered from the pulpit." This is the remark of the editor, to the justness of which we feel some, though no great, difficulty in subscribing. A rational curiosity would have been gratified could he have informed us to *what audience* so curious a production was addressed. To the wants, the taste and the qualifications of a parochial congregation nothing can be more unsuitable: and, assuredly, the dissertation is much too "unfinished" to have been hazarded before an academical or a clerical assembly.

"For the fact that the Gentile world in the darkest ages was possessed of explicit written prophecies of Christ," Bishop Horsley relies on "the contents of a very extraordinary book, which was preserved at Rome under the name of the oracles of the Cumæan Sibyl." Yet he admits (9) that "among heathen writers it

* Spectator, No. 445.

† Mon. Rep. vol. viii. 332.

would be in vain to seek for any *quotations* of particular passages from the Sibylline oracles." If therefore no such *quotations* can be found among "heathen writers," whence, it is natural to ask, were they derived by Christian authors? And how can we be certain that the prophecies adverted to are *explicit*, and not vague and general?

Let us attend to the opinion of a more competent judge. "THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES," says Jortin,* "were composed at different times, by different persons, first by Pagans, and then perhaps by Jews, and certainly by Christians.—The Sibylline oracles† seem to have been all, from first to last, and without any one exception, mere impostures. We have a collection of them in eight books, which abound with phrases, words, facts and passages taken from the LXX and the New Testament, and are a remarkable specimen of astonishing impudence and miserable poetry." To the same excellent scholar we are indebted for a summary‡ of "the judgment which Fabricius, after a diligent examination, formed upon this subject," and which fully supports his own. In confirmation of it we could produce numerous and unexceptionable authorities. But we imagine that few persons of thought and learning will now maintain that the book of the *Cumæan Sibyl* contained "explicit written prophecies of Christ." The wretched effusions which in an age of pious frauds were cited as prophecies of this description, have been weighed in the balance of criticism, and proved to be "light as air."

"I see not," observes Dr. Jortin, "why we should have a more favourable opinion of those" Sibylline oracles "which are lost" than of those which are extant.§ We add that if, according to Bishop H., any of them were collected in *different nations of Asia* and in Sicily, we may very reasonably conceive that some of these compositions would be formed, in part, from the poetry of the Jewish Scriptures already translated into Greek; on which principle we

can easily account for certain images, &c. in Virgil's *Pollio*.

Thus much for the oracles of the Cumæan Sibyl, in respect of which the late prelate of St. Asaph's argument is nearly as conjectural and paradoxical as his speculation concerning the existence of a church of orthodox Jewish Christians at *Ælia* after the time of Adrian!

Dr. Horsley introduces, in the following paragraph (58, 54), a favourite topic:

"Paganism in its milder form [acknowledging the Supreme Providence and retaining the fear and worship of the true God, but adding the superstitious worship of fictitious deities], was rather to be called a corrupt than a false religion; just as at this day the religion of the Church of Rome is more properly corrupt than false. It is not a false religion; for the professors of it receive, with the fullest submission of the understanding to its mysteries, the whole gospel. They fear God. They trust in Christ as the author of salvation. They worship the three persons in the unity of the Godhead. The Roman church therefore hath not renounced the truth, but she hath corrupted it; and she hath corrupted it in the very same manner and nearly in the same degree in which the truth of the patriarchal religion was corrupted by the first idolaters; adding to the fear and worship of God and his Son the inferior fear and worship of deceased men, whose spirits they suppose to be invested with some delegated authority over Christ's church on earth. Now the corruptions being so similar in kind and pretty equal in degree, the idolaters of antiquity and the papists of modern times seem much upon a footing."

We know not what "the papists of modern times" will think of this reasoning and this parallel. Nor are we immediately concerned to weigh the difference between a *false* and a *corrupt* religion; though we cannot but suppose that a theological system which teaches for divine doctrines the commandments of men, and which introduces false objects of worship must necessarily be *false*. And Bishop Horsley might have been asked, "what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Or, in other words, "Are mystery, idolatry and bloodshed characteristics of the religion of Jesus?"||

* Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. i. 283.

† Ib. 284.

‡ Ib. 289—295.

§ Ib. 292.

|| Garnham's Sermon at Trinity College, Cambridge, (12mo.) p. 18.

"It is a circumstance," remarks this writer, "that deserves particular attention (70, &c.) that Job prophesies of the Redeemer, not without manifest allusion to the divinity of his nature, and express mention of the resurrection of the body as the effect of his redemption."

Then follows a criticism on Job xix. 25, &c.:

"I know, saith Job, that my Redeemer liveth; I know, that he now liveth; that is, that his nature is to live. He describes the Redeemer, you see, in language much allied to that in which Jehovah describes his own nature in the conference with Moses at the bush."

What however is the extent of the alliance between the *language* in the one passage and that in the other? Is not the verb in the former the same which the Hebrew writers employ to denote *life* in general, and therefore frequently *human life*? In 2 Sam. xv. 21, *Itai* is represented saying to *David* "as my lord the king LIVETH:" it is no other word in the original as well as in the translation than what the author of the book of Job uses when he makes the patriarch declare, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Would Dr. Horsley have deduced from the expression "the divinity of" David's "nature"?

Equally curious is the Bishop's comment on the clause "in my flesh shall I see God":

"though the form of this body will have been long destroyed; notwithstanding this ruin of my outward fabric; the immortal principle within me shall not only survive, but its decayed mansion will be restored. It will be re-united to a body, of which the organs will not only connect it with the external world, but serve to cement its union with its Maker. For in my flesh, with the corporeal eye, with the eye of the immortal body which I shall then assume, I shall see the divine majesty in the person of the glorified Redeemer."

Here, notwithstanding Job himself affirms "*in my flesh shall I see God*," the late Bishop of St. Asaph forces him, as by torture, to assert, "with the eye of the *immortal body* which I shall then assume I shall see," &c. But in scriptural phraseology, the *flesh* is a term appropriated to the mortal body and to present objects. Consequently, the prelate's criticism is altogether gratuitous and chimerical.

We shall notice one other sentence in the Dissertation.

The writer is substantially correct when he observes (117) that "a magus in the old sense of the word, had nothing in common with the impostors that are now called magicians." However, the term occurs once in the New Testament, in an unfavourable signification, Acts xiii. 6, 8. Nor should it be unnoticed that the *magi*, even in the earliest times, "applied themselves to the study" of *astrology*: whence the transition was natural to those incantations and other idolatrous practices the idea of which is commonly and justly associated with the word *magicians*.*

Bishop Horsley's "four discourses on the nature of the evidence by which the fact of our Lord's resurrection is established" are from the appropriate text in Acts x. 40, 41, *Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly*; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God. And they contain some valid and ingenious reasoning, the effect of which, however, would have been heightened by greater compression and a more careful arrangement. The preacher vigorously repels the objection that our Saviour, when he had risen from the tomb, appeared only to select witnesses. To one of his arguments we must, nevertheless, refuse our assent. Our author supposes that the body of Jesus had now *undergone its change*. "The corruptible (205) had put on incorruption. It was no longer the body of a man in its mortal state; it was the body of a man raised to life and immortality, which was now mys-

* The view taken by the late Bishop of St. Asaph of Balaam's character and pretensions (74—103.), seems altogether erroneous: and we refer our readers to Butler's Sermons at the Rolls, No. vii. for a correcter statement. On the whole of Dr. Horsley's Dissertation, &c. we may observe that it presents a memorable contrast with the truly philosophical spirit and well-digested though comprehensive knowledge which characterize Bishop Law's *Considerations*, &c.: an admirable introduction to the study of which work, will be found in a sermon of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved's, lately published, and entitled, *The religious and moral improvement of mankind, the constant end of the divine government*.

teriously united to divinity." Again (209); "Jesus was no longer in a state to be naturally visible to any man. His body was indeed risen, but it was become that body which St. Paul describes in the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, which, having no sympathy with the gross bodies of this earthly sphere, nor any place among them must be indiscernible to the human organs, till they shall have undergone a similar refinement. The divinity united to the blessed Jesus, produced in a short space that change in him, which, in other men, according to the mysterious physics of St. Paul, must be the effect of a slower process—every appearance of our Lord to the apostles after his resurrection, was in truth an appearance of the great God, the Maker of heaven and earth, to mortal man." Once more (211); "Would you now ask, why Jesus after his resurrection was not rendered visible to all the people? Will you not rather stand aghast at the impiety of the question? Ask, why God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? Ask, why he who conversed with Abraham as a man talketh with his friend, conversed not but in judgment with the vile inhabitants of Sodom?" &c. &c.

But enough of such quotations. In the case described Bishop Horsley has thrown the reins on his imagination: and the sacred writers are profoundly silent concerning these "mysterious physics." We hesitate not to say that the prelate's speculation destroys the testimony of the apostles to "the fact of our Lord's resurrection:" for how could they be proper witnesses of the *identity* of his person if *before* that event he had a *mortal* and immediately on its taking place an *immortal* body? Plain men will be satisfied with the declarations of the Christian scriptures, without additions and refinements: and it is not undeserving of our regard, that among the "many infallible proofs" by which Jesus "shewed himself alive, after his passion," to his chosen associates, one was *his eating and drinking with them after he rose from the dead*.* Indeed, they had the authority of nearly all their senses† for considering him not as a phantom, but as a real

man. The error of Dr. Horsley resembles "the error of the Docetæ" (198).

To justify this fancy of his brain, he would translate Acts x. 40, as follows: "Him God raised up the third day, and *gave him to be visible*;" as though he "was no longer in a state to be naturally visible." The words, in the original, are, *εδωκεν αυτον εμφανη γενεσθαι*, *appointed him to be seen*: and he who consults Schleusner on the word *εμφανης*, and the passages where it is found in the LXX and in the Greek Testament, will be sensible that Bishop Horsley's version of it is not more accurate than that of King James's translators.

Of the five remaining sermons, the first is on Ps. xcvi. 7. *Worship him all ye Gods*; which text the preacher alleges in proof of our Lord's divinity. For this purpose, he appeals to Heb. i. 6, where these words of the Psalmist are quoted from the Septuagint translation, and employed in illustrating the dignity of the Messiah's office, and not that of his person and nature.

Granting that this Psalm is "a prophecy of the establishment of Christ's kingdom by the preaching of the gospel, and the general conversion of idolaters to the service of the true God," still, the Bishop is unfortunate in the reasoning by which he endeavours to sustain the proposition. In God's universal kingdom, says he, "a great majority of the ancient world, the idolaters, were considered not as subjects who might rejoice in the glory of their monarch, but as rebels who had every thing to fear from his just resentment (239)." *Rebels* indeed they were: yet they were comprehended, nevertheless, under the Divine administration. Further; it does not appear that *they* are exhorted to "*rejoice* in the glory of their monarch." The invitation in the first verse, is addressed to inanimate nature: that in the twelfth, to the Jews, the worshipers of Jehovah. *Mudge*† with reason considers the Psalm as "occasioned by some victory, in which God had declared his award from heaven in favour of his people, by some extraordinary manifestation of his glory in storms of thun-

* Acts i. 3. x. 41. † 1 John i. 1.

† On the Psalms (in loc.).

der and lightning." The clause "worship him, all ye Gods," i. e. all ye idol-deities,* is introduced with singular beauty and force by the denunciation, "Confounded be all they that serve *graven images*, that boast themselves of *idols*!" By *the righteous, or the just one*, in ver. 11, Bishop H. understands *Christ in his human character*; than which a more gratuitous and chimerical notion was never conceived by the wildest theologian. *The righteous* is the righteous nation, in opposition to the wicked mentioned in the preceding verse.†

In the next discourse [Rom. iv. 25, *Who was delivered for our offences, &c.*] the prelate labours to shew that Christ's death was "an expiatory sacrifice in the most literal meaning of which the words are capable." His reasoning has no originality. Some pertinent and sensible reflections, however, are intermixed with the doctrinal part of this sermon: and towards the conclusion we meet with a passage of considerable energy and eloquence. This we shall transcribe, after we have laid before our readers Dr. Horsley's ideas on *justification*. 265.

"Our justification is quite a distinct thing from the final absolution of good men in the general judgment. Every man's final doom will depend upon the diligence which he uses in the present life to improve under the means and motives for improvement which the gospel furnishes. Our justification is the grace "in which we now stand." It is that general act of mercy which was previously necessary on the part of God, to render the attainment of salvation possible to those who had once been wilfully rebellious," &c.

"Whoever thinks without just indignation and abhorrence of [*on*] the Jewish rulers, who in the phrenzy of envy and resentment—envy of our Lord's credit with the people, and resentment of his just and affectionate rebukes,—spilt his righteous blood? Let us rather turn the edge of our resentment against those enemies which, while they are harboured in our own bosoms, 'war against our souls,' and were, more truly than the Jews, the murderers of our Lord. Shall the Christian be enamoured of the pomp and glory of the world when he considers that for the crimes of man's ambition the Son of God

was humbled? Shall he give himself up to those covetous desires of the world which were the occasion that his Lord lived an outcast from its comforts? Will the disciples of the holy Jesus submit to be the slaves of those base appetites of the flesh which were indeed the nails which pierced his Master's hands and feet? Will he in any situation be intimidated by the enmity of the world, or abashed by its censures, when he reflects how his Lord endured the cross and despised the shame? Hard, no doubt, is the conflict which the Christian must sustain with the power of the enemy, and with his own passions. Hard to flesh and blood is the conflict; but powerful is the succour given, and high is the reward proposed. For thus saith the true and faithful witness, the original [*beginning*] of the creation of God, 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit down with me in my throne,' &c.

This style of address is simple and manly, and far unlike what passes for eloquence with the bulk of auditors and readers.

The third of these nine discourses is, on Matt. xx. 23, "To sit on my right hand and my left, is not mine to give," &c. Here the preacher endeavours to evince that our Lord does not "disclaim all property in the rewards and honours of the future life and all discretionary power in the distribution of them." And he further reasons against the doctrine of unconditional predestination.

Towards the conclusion, he remarks,

"Confirmed habits of sin heighten the difficulty of repentance, but such are the riches of God's mercy that they exclude not from the benefits of it. This our Lord was pleased to testify in the choice that he made of his first associates, who, with the exception perhaps of two or three who had been previously tutored [*instructed*] in the Baptist's School, had been persons of irregular, irreligious lives; and yet these we know are they who hereafter shall be seated on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Let our readers cast their eyes over the catalogue of the apostles of Christ, and say whether this representation of them be agreeable to truth?

The two remaining sermons have for their text, Ephes. iv. 30, "And grieve not the holy spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." In these the Bishop treats first of the visible gifts of the Spirit that were communicated to the

* *Tous les Dieux des nations*. Genev. Vers. (1805.)

† Mudge, Ps. xlvii. 11.

Christians of the earliest age, and next of its ordinary moral influences. When he affirms that the latter, "by which every believer must be regenerated in order to his being saved, are conferred in baptism," we require evidence of the declaration. In another passage he says, "we neither abolish nor weaken the testimony of the Spirit by bringing it to rest upon the testimony of conscience:" and, allowing him to be correct in the principle of his argument, many of his observations are forcibly conceived and perspicuously expressed.

No inconsiderable portion of the time and thoughts of Bishop Horsley appears to have been bestowed on the study of the scriptures. His learning was extensive: but he possessed not the sound, discriminating judgment which is necessary to form an accomplished theologian. Hence there is a great inequality in his sermons; and the reader's admiration yields quickly to weariness and disgust. Some critics* have lamented that this author did not animadvert on the famous fifteenth and sixteenth chapters in Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The truth is, the late Prelate of St. Asaph was much better prepared, and perhaps more inclined to be the champion of an established creed than the advocate of our common Christianity. For another Bishop, of very different and superior endowments, the honour was reserved of successfully resisting one of the most formidable attacks on the religion of Jesus. Yet strange to say, these same critics have overlooked the labours and the merits of the venerable Dr. Watson!

We cannot dismiss the volume before us without adding a few words on the style of Bishop Horsley. In these pages it is usually strong, though often coarse and careless. But in his more finished compositions, and above all in his controversial tracts, its excellence stands confessed. There are passages in his archidiaconal charge and in his *Letters to Dr. Priestley*, which we first read, thirty years since, with exquisite delight: and lately we have again perused them with almost unabated pleasure. Of course, we speak chiefly of the *language*, and not,

without numerous exceptions, of the *temper* and the *sentiment*. It is remarkable, that whenever his positions are most untenable, his reasoning weakest and his insolence greatest, he is especially studious to select his words and to arrange his periods. There are workmen who conceal, or attempt to conceal, defects in a fabric by covering the flaws with much external ornament: and experience has taught us to suspect the soundness of those parts of Dr. Horsley's polemical labours in which he is exhibited with most advantage merely as a *writer*.

ART. II.—*Letters addressed to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London, in Vindication of the Unitarians.* By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street. 8vo. pp. 92. Hunter. 1815.

WE have already reviewed the Bishop of London's Charge, (p. 576, &c.) and in pp. 305—308 we extracted the whole passage which relates to Unitarians. This denomination of Christians may justly complain of his lordship's language, but they may well rejoice that from the episcopal chair attention has been called to their doctrines: these "Letters" shew that they welcome every opportunity of making their faith public.

The Letters are Five in number.

Letter I. is introductory, and contains a statement of the religious opinions of the Unitarians. The statement is remarkably clear, and we think perfectly correct. Every Unitarian does not believe all the articles here confessed, or disbelieve all the articles here renounced, but they certainly describe both the belief and the disbelief of the majority, from whom alone the faith of a community is to be determined. We make no exception to Mr. Belsham's correctness on account of his excluding Arians from the Unitarian name, whatever be our own conviction, because this is matter of opinion and not of faith.

In Letter II. Mr. Belsham refutes the allegation of the Bishop that the Unitarians are in alliance with other sects to overturn the Established Church. He maintains that the Establishment is perfectly secure, resting upon the law of the land; that the Dissenters in general hold the maxim

* Quarterly Review. Article, *Gibbon's Works*.

that it is absolutely unlawful upon any occasion whatever to propagate religion by force; and that the Unitarians have no peculiar motive for desiring the downfall of the Church as by law established. We perfectly agree with Mr. Belsham, and are persuaded that any alteration in the Establishment which should be made by any of the powerful religious parties now in being would be at once and decidedly unfavourable to the Unitarians. But Mr. Belsham goes further, and states that one half at least of the Unitarians "approve of a civil establishment in religion, are attached to the hierarchy of the Church of England, greatly prefer the established liturgy to any other form of worship, and reluctantly withdraw, if indeed they do withdraw, from the communion of the Church solely upon the strong ground of dissent concerning the object of worship." Does our author mean only that the number of Unitarians in the Church of England is equal to the number out of it? The last clause of the sentence just quoted suggests this question. If this be meant, no one can contradict the assertion, for it is impossible to calculate how many remain in a communion with dissatisfied consciences. But if, as the general argument of the letter implies, it be intended that a moiety of the known Unitarians, declared such by their habit of worship, are advocates for a national religious establishment and friends of the English hierarchy, we beg leave respectfully to aver our decided conviction of the extreme incorrectness of the statement. There is unquestionably a difference of opinion amongst Unitarians on the expediency of liturgic forms, though as far as our knowledge of the denomination extends we should not hesitate to say that three-fourths of them are adverse to printed forms of prayer, with responses. Their practice, indeed, determines their opinion. With no hindrances to any improvement in their worship, and with a general marked and eager desire to conciliate their neighbours of the Church of England, who can scarcely conceive of prayer without a Prayer-book, there are not we believe half a dozen of their congregations in England which make use of a liturgy. This practice, however, would not, if it

were general, infer the principle of a national church. It is not the magistrate's imposing a liturgy to which enlightened Dissenters object, but his imposition of any thing in religion. That the Unitarians agree with other Dissenters in this principle is, we think, evident from their writings: we scarcely know another Unitarian writer besides Mr. Belsham who pleads for a civil establishment of Christianity; or rather, we scarcely know, with this exception, an Unitarian writer who has not, in one form or other, protested against the principle of the interference of the secular power in spiritual concerns.

Mr. Belsham thinks, that "if the scriptures were substituted for the Thirty-nine Articles and the Liturgy were reformed upon the principles of Dr. Clarke, the benches of our chapels would be greatly thinned, and a very considerable majority of the Unitarians, at least in the upper and more cultivated classes of society, would become members of the Establishment." With regard to these "classes," who have never been generally the most laborious inquirers or the most persevering reformers, it *might* be so; this is a mere speculation; but *ought* it to be so? What "cultivated" mind could safely declare unfeigned assent and consent to any one translation of the scriptures, or even to any one copy of the scriptures in the original languages? Who that has just notions of religious liberty would be content with a Liturgy, however "reformed," which would be unalterable, except at the will of the magistrate?

With a frankness, which even opponents must admire, Mr. Belsham states "the grand principle of dissent," as laid down by Dr. Kippis, and declares his disapprobation of it, viz. "that religion, like philosophy and medicine should be left to itself, to make its way by its own intrinsic worth and native energy." It was not within the plan of the Letters to give the reasons for rejecting this favourite principle of the modern Non-conformists, and, as we believe, of the Unitarians in particular; but we should rejoice if Mr. Belsham would lay them before the public in some other form. We are open to conviction, but we are at a loss to conceive what arguments can be adduced to

prove the insufficiency of the Christian religion to preserve and perpetuate itself without the fostering care of the civil power; especially since for three hundred years it had to struggle against the state, and was always successful. Even churchmen have acknowledged that the preservation of the spirit of piety in England has been owing more to the Nonconformists than to the Established Church.

There appear to us to be certain great evils inherent in a national religious establishment; such as political patronage in the church and the consequent nullity of the suffrages of the people, the imposition of creeds and tests, the impossibility of reformation or at least of reformation without convulsion, and the persecution of the minority. The magistrate may exercise only what is called a *public leading* in religion, but this patronage amounts to nothing if he do not apply some portion of the revenue of the state to the support of certain external offices: now these very offices may be objectionable and offensive on the ground of conscience to a part of the community. They may withdraw themselves into separate congregations, and will be tolerated in their secession! This is so far well; in the mean time, however, their property or labour is taxed for the promotion of what they hold to be error and are compelled to protest against. Is this equitable in a Christian view?

That the will of the majority should bind the minority is a necessary evil; but it is an evil; and the object of all good government is to limit and soften the cases in which the principle is brought into action. Religion is not, we think, one of the cases which calls for its exercise. Man is naturally prone to religion, and all that is worthy of the name individuals will take care of for themselves, whether with or against the mind of the magistrate. The province of the civil ruler is the public morality of a community: he cannot enter into the private opinions or the religious forms which help or hinder good morals: as far as he restrains or punishes overt evil actions he is a common benefactor; this is done every day without regard to religion: but if he step beyond this line and establish

religious forms with a view to their probable secret moral influence, he may do no real service to any man but must certainly do injury to some men.

For these and other reasons, we are not of the number of those who would, as Mr. Belsham predicts, rejoice in seeing "*not only liberty, but protection and support*" granted to the Roman Catholic system of faith and discipline in Ireland. A state-religion is likely to last as long as the state itself; but, with every good wish to Roman Catholics, we ardently desire the downfall of their system and deprecate its being so morticed into the government of the country that the one must sink with the other.

Letter III. is designed to vindicate Unitarians from the preposterous charge of unbelief. "He," says Mr. Belsham, "who receives Jesus Christ as a teacher sent from God is a believer: he who does not allow the divine mission of Christ is an unbeliever. What room is left for degrees of infidelity?" In reply to the imputation, which is not confined to the Bishop of London, of *straining* the scriptures, Mr. Belsham very happily replies for the Unitarians,—

"If indeed our adversaries could allege that, when our Lord expressly and solemnly asserts, 'that he knew not the day nor the hour when he should come to judgment,' the Unitarians explained the text by imputing to the Saviour of the world the mean equivocation, that he was ignorant of it in his human nature, though he knew it in his divine:—if it could be shown that when our Lord says, 'My Father is greater than I,' the Unitarians understood by it that he was in all respects equal to the Father, and neither greater nor less;—and if when St. Paul says, 'by *man* came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead,' the Unitarian expositors, misled by an attachment to system, insisted that the apostle's meaning must be, that though by man came death, it was *not* by a man, but by a superior being, a GOD-MAN, came also the resurrection of the dead:—if such interpretations as these could be fixed upon the Unitarians, your Lordship might reasonably express your astonishment"——.

Mr. Belsham proceeds, in Letter IV., to consider the curious fact so confidently asserted by the Bishop, that unbelievers have embodied themselves in one faction with Unitarians.

He pleads total ignorance of it, and assures the Prelate that he is misinformed. What advantage, he asks, could unbelievers find in an Unitarian profession? We have no civil dignities, we have no ecclesiastical preferments to bestow. *The world is not with us, nor the world's law.*—His Lordship is reminded, that by looking nearer at home, he would stand a better chance of finding the remains of the infidel corps. The deserter of religion commonly finds it convenient to call himself a member of the Established Church. Bolingbroke was a high Churchman, and a persecutor of the Nonconformists. Gibbon was a placeman and professed great zeal for orthodoxy of faith. And, it may be added, that Mr. Cobbett, who omits no opportunity of jesting on revealed religion, protested against the bill for the relief of Unitarians, on the ground that he and other *good Churchmen* were obliged to believe all the Prayer Book, and he saw no reason why the Unitarians should have their consciences less

taxed than their neighbours.—In the conclusion of the Letter, Mr. Belsham traces, with an able pen, the progress of an enlightened, ingenuous mind from reputed orthodoxy to Unitarianism, and sets in striking contrast the creeds of the Unitarian and the unbeliever.

The Vth and last Letter is miscellaneous. The remarks on the "prostration of the understanding," recommended by the Bishop as a token of Christian docility, and on his use of the term "enemy" in relation to Unitarians, are particularly pointed and excellent.

All the Letters are distinguished by courtesy of manner. The reasonings are forcible, the avowals bold and the statements perspicuous. The publication is peculiarly suited to Churchmen in the higher walks of life, and will perhaps be more acceptable and effectual with them, on account of that part of the second Letter, on which we have made some free, but we trust respectful and candid, animadversions.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Portsmouth, 5th October, Mrs. ELIZABETH PRICE, aged 54, wife of Mr. Samuel Price. Her remains were interred in the General Baptist Chapel, of which she had been a useful member from an early period of life.

Nov. 11, aged 70, Mr. MAURICE MARGAROT, who was more than twenty years ago Chairman of the London Corresponding Society united for a Reform in Parliament. He was sent as a delegate from that Society to the British Convention, which met at Edinburgh, for the same object, in the year 1793, where he was accused of sedition, with the whole of the Convention. He was tried before the Court of Justiciary, and sentenced to fourteen years' transportation to Botany Bay, with Gerrald, Muir, Skirving and Palmer. He was the only one of the four, who survived the term of his banishment and returned home.

Nov. 11, died, at his house, in Chi-

chester, in the 81st year of his age, JOHN BAYLY, M.D.

His father, Dr. George Bayly, had, during the long period of almost half a century, practiced physic in that city with distinguished reputation and success, and left behind him a name dear to his friends, to the numerous objects of his skill and bounty, and to all who knew him, and who, at the same time, possessed a proper sense of the value of great learning, fervent and unaffected piety, inflexible integrity, and diffusive benevolence.

His mother was the daughter of—Carter, Esq. of Portsmouth, whose political and religious principles may be inferred from an anecdote which his descendants have been well pleased to relate. He had the honour of being imprisoned by Gibson, the Jacobite commander of the garrison, for the heinous offence of bringing thither the first intelligence of the decease of Queen Anne, and of the accession of George I. to the throne of these realms: nor was he released till the news was confirmed by the

official account. The late Sir John Carter, of Portsmouth, whose useful life and distinguished character are recorded in the 3rd volume of the Monthly Repository, was first cousin to the subject of this article.

Dr. John Bayly was born on the 17th of February, 1735. Although, as a child, his constitution was feeble and valetudinary, he was, at a very early age, sent to a grammar school at Lymington, then taught by the Rev. Mr. Pearson. Before he had attained his twelfth year he was transferred to the more efficient instruction of Mr. Wood, of St. Albans, a gentleman who at that time enjoyed a very high and deserved reputation as a schoolmaster, and who had had the honour of educating Mr. Hollis, Dr. Doddridge, and other eminent persons among the Dissenters. At this school Dr. B. laid the solid foundation of those classical attainments, which, to the latest year of his life, opened to him sources of pure and elegant gratification. The death of his valuable and respected preceptor occasioned his removal from St. Albans at an earlier age than his friends or he himself wished. After a short interval passed under the tuition of his father, who, though excellently well qualified for the business of instruction, had too much business of another kind to attend to it, he was sent to the academy at Taunton, at that time under the superintendence of the learned and worthy Dr. Amory, than whom no man was more fitted by his example to infuse into his pupils a fervent and rational piety, and the love of every thing excellent. In the year 1754, having completed his third year at the academy, Dr. B. repaired to Edinburgh and entered on the studies preparatory to his future profession. After attending with great diligence the public and private lectures delivered at that celebrated university, being received as a member by several of the more reputable societies there, and having passed with great credit through the usual examinations, he took his degree of Doctor of Physic. On this occasion he published and defended a thesis *de Frigore quatenus morborum Causa*, a performance in which excellence of matter, skill in arrangement, and a pure and flowing latinity are alike conspicuous. Having passed one win-

ter in attending on the medical practice of the largest hospital in the metropolis, he returned to his native city in the spring of the year 1759, and immediately took a part in the professional labours of his father. This connexion, so useful to the young physician, and so agreeable to both, was, in the month of December, 1771, dissolved by the lamented death of Dr. George Bayly.

From his earliest youth Dr. B. was liable to frequent attacks of severe head-ache, and to catarrhus and febrile complaints. Notwithstanding many painful interruptions from these causes he continued, during more than twenty years, to exert himself in his profession with unremitted diligence, with signal success, and with a liberality and disinterestedness of which there are few examples. Increasing ill health rather than advancing years induced him gradually to withdraw from the constantly recurring causes of great bodily and mental fatigue, and to enjoy in retirement and in the society of a very few select friends the fruits of early study, and the retrospect of maturer years devoted to active and benevolent exertion. The comfort of his declining life was much lessened by occasional attacks of sickness, and by the almost constant pressure of slighter indisposition, and his last illness, though short, was accompanied by so much pain as to unfit him for attending to any thing but his bodily sufferings.

He needed no death-bed preparation for the change that awaited him. His whole life was a preparation for eternity. If moral conduct the most pure and correct, integrity the most perfect, benevolence the most diffusive, and piety not less fervent than rational—if these qualities united form an example to be imitated by contemporaries and successors, such an example was furnished by our lamented friend.

His opinions and principles on political and religious subjects were such as might be expected from a mind endowed and cultivated as his was. No man could be more devoted to the cause of civil and religious liberty. This attachment descended to him through successive ancestors on both sides of his house, and he regarded it as by no means the least valuable part of his inheritance. It is

probable that, in the course of his theological studies and inquiries, of which he was very fond, his sentiments underwent some change; but it is certain that, during the last twenty-five years of his life, he was a firm and zealous Unitarian. He was one of the earliest members of the Essex Street Society: yet he laid no undue stress on speculative opinions of any kind, nor did he imagine that any theory of religion was exclusively connected with devotional and moral habits. On his intimate and critical acquaintance with the scriptures, on the soundness of his understanding, and the liberality of his disposition, were founded his objections to any thing approaching to Calvinism, as well as his no less decided opinions respecting the character and value of hierarchical pretensions.

The support, which during life he afforded to the society of Unitarian Dissenters in this city, he has perpetuated by a legacy, and the same scrupulous regard to justice, the same impartial benevolence, which guided and animated all his exertions, were manifested in the testamentary distribution of his property among his numerous relatives.

To him who has thus attempted to pay a slight tribute to his memory, he was a most generous and constant friend. His kindnesses were unremitted, and of the most valuable description.

Ὡς τε πατήρ ὦ παιδί, καὶ ἔποτε
λησόμεαι αὐτῶν.

* * *

Chichester, Nov. 27, 1815.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

Unitarians in America.

Under this head we gave extracts from the letters of a Philadelphia correspondent in our number for October, pp. 657—659. We have lately received another letter, of which we shall proceed to make use. Our communications from America will, we trust, be frequent, and they promise to be exceedingly interesting, on account of the attention which, it will be seen, the Unitarian controversy is beginning to excite in the United States.

“*Philadelphia, Sept. 13, 1815.*

—“I suppose you have heard every thing relative to our new church. We go on very comfortably, though I cannot say that during the last year we have had any accessions. It is possible that the clamour, the misrepresentations, and the calumnies of the orthodox may have frightened some timid people; several churches have been erected since our church was opened; and during the conclusion of the war several families removed from the city. It is so far pleasant that no instance of desertion to any other church has occurred, and so far as I can judge our people seem strongly attached to our worship; I only wish they would shew this *twice* a day on Sundays.”

“Mr. Cary, of Boston, sailed for Liverpool with Mrs. Cary on 2nd September. It grieves me much that he is far gone in a consumption. He was here in June for two or three days, but much out of health and is lately much worse. I sent him letters to ——— but fear he will not long survive his voyage—he is a most excellent man.”

“In the Monthly Repository there is a mistake as to the expected cost of our church; it is there stated at 5,000 dollars, whereas it ought to have been 5,000*l.* sterling—the actual cost was about 5,500*l.*, including the ground, a sum which may appear extravagant in England, though not so here, where land is so high, as well as the materials for building. Our debt is heavy, say 14,600 dollars. *We had hoped that in England there were some zealous and wealthy Unitarians, who would have patronized us, as ours was the first attempt to erect a Unitarian Church in the United States.* So long as Mr. Eddowes and I are able to go on, we may do well enough as to paying interest and current expences; but when it is necessary to have a fixed minister, I do not see how he can get a decent salary, unless something is previously done to diminish and pay off the debt.

As we are a mere handful, our efforts have been considerable.—Whether—has represented these facts to the public through the medium of the Repository, as I suggested four years ago, I cannot undertake to say—several Nos. of the Repository having been lost during the war and not yet replaced. I confess I did calculate on his zeal in stimulating those who were able to render essential aid, though I am necessarily ignorant as to the probability of success. *Perhaps, as we are now political friends, this may be a better time to represent our case than when I first wrote.*"

"A Dr. Morse in the vicinity of Boston, and a Calvinistic minister, lately published a piece, entitled, 'American Unitarianism,' extracted from Mr. Belsham's Life of Mr. Lindsey. The same person as editor of a periodical publication entitled 'The Panopist,' published therein an article called 'Review of American Unitarianism,' containing not only misrepresentations of facts, but various calumnies against the Boston ministers and others of liberal sentiments. This brought out Mr. Channing, who declares himself an Unitarian, speaks of those with whom he is most intimately connected as holding similar opinions, denies the charges of concealment, duplicity, &c. A Dr. Worcester has rejoined in a very—article, to which Mr. C. has well replied. Lastly, as Harvard College had been attacked, John Lowell, Esq. one of the most active of its trustees, has written ably on its behalf. I shall send some of these pamphlets for your perusal. They will serve to shew the temper of the orthodox. Mr. Channing is correct in stating that the generality of his brethren believe in the pre-existence of Christ; but he appropriates the term Unitarian to all the worshipers of the Father. As our church was implicated in one paragraph, where Dr. Kirkland also was implicated, I have enabled Mr. Lowell to disprove the fact and have thereby fastened on—a notorious falsehood."

So far our correspondent. Several of the pamphlets which he mentions are received; some use may be hereafter made of them. We heartily wish that we could render assistance to our Transatlantic Unitarian bre-

thren. The case of the Philadelphian church is fully entitled to consideration and deserving of British liberality. We are aware of the happily repeated calls upon the charity and zeal of Unitarians, and therefore we cannot urge any one particular case upon their notice: but we feel it to be a duty to say, that we shall experience great pleasure in receiving and transmitting the contributions of any who may be disposed to testify their Christian affection towards the infant church of Philadelphia.

Blasphemy Laws in America.—An American paper states, that in October last a man of the name of *Ruggles*, was tried at New York and found guilty of *blasphemy*, in uttering certain expressions of and concerning Jesus Christ, in contempt of the Christian religion and of the laws of New York. He was sentenced to pay a fine of 500 dollars.—*Examiner.*

Persecution of the Protestants in France.

ORDONNANCE OF THE KING.

Louis, by the Grace of God, &c.

An atrocious crime has sullied our city of Nismes. In defiance of the Constitutional Charter, which recognizes the Catholic religion as the religion of the State, but which guarantees to other worships protection and liberty, a seditious mob has dared to oppose the opening of the Protestant temple. Our military commandant in endeavouring to disperse them by persuasion before resorting to force, has been assassinated, and his assassin has sought an asylum against the pursuit of justice. If such an offence should remain unpunished, there would be no longer either public order or government, and our ministers would be guilty of a non-execution of the laws.

For these causes we have ordered and do order as follows:—

Art. 1. Our Procureur General and our Procureur Ordinaire shall proceed without delay against the assassin of General Lagarde, and against the persons concerned in the riot which took place at Nismes on the 12th instant.

2. A sufficient number of troops shall be sent to Nismes to remain there at the expence of the inhabi-

tants, until the assassin and his accomplices have been brought before the tribunals.

Such of the inhabitants as are not entitled to form part of the National Guard shall be disarmed.

(Signed)

LOUIS.

Dated Nov. 21.

The atrocious assassination of General Lagarde at Nismes, it was of course impossible to pass over, and we find in the *Gazette Officielle* an ordonnance of the king, directing a prosecution to be commenced against the assassins, and against the individuals concerned in the riot at Nismes, aimed against the re-opening of the Protestant Churches. Troops are ordered to be quartered on the inhabitants till the assassins are brought before the tribunals; and those of the inhabitants who are not entitled to form part of the national guard, are ordered to be disarmed. It cannot, however, escape notice, that the burden of supporting troops, and the disarming, are applied to the inhabitants generally, and must, therefore, from a variety of circumstances, affect more particularly the Protestants. The preamble of the ordonnance is an acknowledgment of the persecuting spirit against that body of men which prevails at Nismes; and we trust that far different measures than the present will be without delay adopted, to put a stop to those scenes of barbarity and outrage which have disgraced the age we live in. The Duke d'Angouleme, it seems, in consequence of this event, suddenly left Toulouse for the purpose of returning to Nismes. We hope he will apply himself actively to the real causes of the outrages, and not be content with making formal speeches, meaning nothing, and leaving a bigoted mob to infer that they may commit murders with impunity.—*Morn. Chron. Nov. 27.*

The *Rhenish Mercury* says, "The insurrection in the South, excited with the one hand, repressed with the other, has been another of those weak misdeeds of the present times; the blind rage of the people has been roused, and disowned; the effects have been nothing but the murder, robbery, and assassination of private individuals, without aim or object, to the horror

of the whole world, and to the disgrace of those who let loose the profligate."

Our letters from Paris yesterday, contain authentic particulars of the late horror at Nismes. The following is the extract of one of our letters:—

"The Duc d'Angouleme on his arrival at Nismes, had the indiscretion, to say no worse of it, to walk bare-headed and bare-footed in a procession of Monks with images, relics, and other symbols of superstition, through the streets, and by this solemn demonstration of his religious principles, after all the horrors that had been committed by the zealots, to whom his own cockade had been previously given in contradiction of the orders of his sovereign, animated and inflamed the rabble anew. He did this at the very time when he told the Consistory of Protestant Ministers, that he should not oppose any obstacle to the free exercise of their religion—for such were the terms of his answer. Sufficiently cold and unsatisfactory as it was, some few of the Protestants assembled in their principal church to hear divine service, on the day after this public exhibition of his sanctity, when he left the town. The persons going to the church were at first insulted and afterwards assailed with stones by banditti, evidently placed for that purpose in the adjacent streets. The General Count Lagarde, a good and loyal soldier, (faithful to the letter of the instructions he had received) had assured the Protestants that he would protect them to the utmost of his power—and he accordingly called out the only troops he had in the place,—but unfortunately at Nismes, as well as through the whole of the South of France, the only troops, with the exception of a few regulars, are the volunteer bands raised and organized by the Duc d'Angouleme himself (the most bitter and infuriated enemies of the Protestants), and they had no sooner arrived on the spot where the rabble was collected than instead of paying obedience to the orders of the gallant General, they joined the assassins. One of the Lieutenants of Trestaillon, the chief of the band, fired a pistol at the General, by which he was severely wounded.

"This happened in the front of the Protestant place of worship. The

few persons within the church were ignorant of this assassination, and divine service was begun. But no sooner did the mob hear the sound of the organ, than they cried out to burn the edifice and sacrifice the heretics with it. The horrid cry reached the ears of the poor people, chiefly women, within—and by the noble exertions of a few individuals of authority, they were preserved from instant death, by being carried out at a back door leading into an adjoining lane. The ruffians then broke into the church, demolished the pulpit, the seats, &c. The organ was brought out in triumph and a bonfire made of it in the front of the place—the volunteer army of the Duc d'Angouleme assisting in the conflagration! M. de Lagarde was not dead of his wound, but he was not expected to live."

We can assure our readers that the above comes to us from a known and respectable source. Several letters that we have seen, besides others that we have ourselves received, confirm the principal points in it. And we are informed, that our own ministers have an account of the *indecorum* of the Duke d'Angouleme in marching through the streets *bareheaded and barefooted* in the procession of the bigots who had provoked the rabble to all the previous massacres. Is it too much then to expect from the British government, that as they support the king on his throne—they shall not merely remonstrate with him on these continued horrors—but actually withdraw our troops from his capital, if he does not forthwith maintain the constitutional charter by which he promised civil and religious freedom to the people?—*Morn. Chron. Nov. 28.*

While every day increases the melancholy detail of the enormities and designs of the bigots of France, we rejoice to record the regular and benevolent efforts of the friends to natural and religious rights.

The Dissenting ministers of London, who have set the example to the British nation in these honourable exertions, have determined to correspond with their friends throughout the United Kingdom, and to recommend collections in all their congregations—their Resolutions, breathing the most noble and Christian spirit, we insert this day, and in addition to

the tone which they will give to public feeling, by the circulation of such sentiments, they are entitled to the gratitude of their countrymen and Europe, for the diligence and accuracy with which they have obtained and furnished information, as the ground of proceeding for other persons.

The assurances which their deputation received from ministers is encouraging to those who feel for the miserable victims of relentless bigotry, to use their strongest efforts—to avert calamities which threaten to be augmented in an incalculable degree.

The following extract of a letter from one of the most respectable persons in France, we have from the best authority, and are requested to make public:—

"Places of worship are shut up throughout nearly the whole southern provinces of France. The flourishing churches of Nismes and Uzes are nearly annihilated. Although we enjoy a state of comparative tranquillity as citizens, we fear that the professors of the college cannot long hold out. They have received no salary for nine months, and the time when any part of this may be expected is very far distant, and sooner or later they must look out for some other means of subsistence and labour in a less offensive profession.

"We have yet much reason to be thankful, that we have been hitherto spared and strengthened. So many provinces laid waste—so many houses in flames—so many of our brethren mercilessly murdered—so many pastors without asylum and without bread! Alas! alas! Still let us adore the incomprehensible, but always wise ways of Providence with resignation. Let us hope, and let us pray."—*Morn. Chron. Nov. 29.*

PARIS, Nov. 25.—The wounds of General Lagarde are not mortal. A ball which had lodged in his false ribs, had caused in the first instance a good deal of apprehension. The last letters from Nismes state, that he is not only out of danger, but even in a state of convalescence.

NISMES, Nov. 15.—It was reported yesterday that search had been made at the house of the assassin of General Lagarde, and that he had fled. Every thing is, in the mean time,

tranquil, and such good precautions are taken, that the repose will not be disturbed, some of the national guards of Montpellier and of the environs of Nîmes, have arrived, and more are expected from Toulouse and Marseilles; but it is probable they will receive a countermand.—The Duke of Angoulême arrived this morning.

The following is the proclamation which the Marquis of Arbaud-Jouques, prefect of Gard, published on the 12th, in consequence of the atrocious events which had nearly cost the life of General Lagarde:—

“People of Nîmes!—All the French, whatever religion they profess, are the subjects and children of the king, the father of the country.

“The orders of the king are to protect all sorts of worship: to secure the property, the life, the liberty of conscience of all the French.

“We have received these sacred orders for every good Frenchman. We have executed them. We will maintain them to the last breath of our existence.

“A wretch, concealed in the groupes of the people, which, perhaps, fancied they were only rioters, but were absolutely rebels to the king, has attempted to assassinate the brave general to whom this department owes so much esteem, gratitude and affection.

“The sentence alone of this infamous assassin may henceforth save the country and absolve the people. He has not been seized at this unfortunate moment; but you know him; you who surrounded him at the moment of his crime.

“I promise, in the name of the department, a reward of 3000 francs to him, or them, soldiers or inhabitants, who shall give information of him, and bring him before me.

“(Signed)

“Marquis of ARBAUD JOUQUES.”

“Nîmes, Nov. 12, 1815.”

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

The last autumnal Quarterly Meeting in Manchester and its vicinity was held at Bolton on the 19th ult. The service was introduced by Mr. H. Turner, *vice* Mr. Elliot. Mr. Whitelegg preached the sermon, on the moral obligations of Christians. Though the day was exceedingly unfavourable, the meeting was re-

spectably numerous. Between thirty and forty gentlemen dined and passed the afternoon together. The Christmas quarterly meeting will be superseded by a meeting to take place at Oldham, for the purpose of opening the Unitarian chapel lately built there. It will be held on Wednesday, January 3rd, 1816.

Messrs. Wright and Cooper's Missionary Tour in Cornwall.

[Concluded from p. 718.]

OBSERVATIONS.

The foregoing is a mere outline, given with all possible brevity, of proceedings which gave me very high pleasure, and will be long remembered with satisfaction and joy. It will be proper to add a few observations, explanatory of the plan we pursued, the present prospect of success to the Unitarian cause in Cornwall, and the measures most likely to ensure it.

1. It will be perceived that my labours and exertions were limited to the western part of that county: this did not arise from the impracticability of finding people disposed to hear in other places; but, after mature deliberation, it was thought most judicious, and that it would be most useful, to adopt this plan. The congregation at Falmouth being the only one yet formed in Cornwall, and still in its infancy, it was judged of essential importance, to make every possible exertion to confirm and establish it, as the parent society and first fruits of Unitarian missions in that remote part of the island. It was further thought, that to visit and preach at places to which some attention could be afterwards given by the society at Falmouth, where some persons could be brought into acquaintance and correspondence with some of the brethren belonging to that society, and have an opportunity of frequently receiving books from them, would be more likely to produce permanent effects, than the going to places which must be immediately left, and to which continued attention could not so well be paid. Besides, in the west of Cornwall there appears to be the most seriousness, and disposition to religious inquiry. Such were the considerations which determined us to adopt the plan we pursued.

2. The success of the plan adopt-

ed was beyond our expectation. One or more of the brethren from Falmouth or Flushing accompanied us to all the places we visited. We found their assistance of great use. In a number of places they formed an acquaintance with persons who are favourable to the cause: it is hoped this acquaintance will be cherished, a correspondence kept up, and that the persons who liberally offered to receive and distribute books will be supplied with them: nor can I doubt, after all I have seen of the truly Christian spirit and ardent zeal of the members of the Unitarian church at Falmouth, their readiness to do all they can to water the seeds already sown, in different places, and to carry on the work which is begun.

3. Justice requires that I should distinctly and particularly mention the obligations we are under to the friends at Falmouth and Flushing, for the facilities they gave to our exertions, their ready assistance in the labours we engaged in, and their many kind attentions. Without such aid, we could not have gone through such an incessant and extended course of public labours in so short a time. They generally called together the congregations for us, conducted the singing, aided us with their counsel, and conversed with individuals so far as opportunity offered. May our brethren every where imitate their firm, judicious and unwearied exertions, to promote what they believe to be the truth of God! They also undertook the distribution of tracts, in the different places we visited.

4. The plan we adopted consisted of three parts:—public preaching, the distribution of books, and conversation. We found no great difficulty in collecting congregations any where in the west of Cornwall. The methods adopted to do this were various. We had handbills printed at Falmouth, with spaces left to be filled up with an account of the time and place of preaching. These were posted up or circulated, when there was time for it to be done before the commencement of the service. In a small town two or three friends would walk round, call at most of the houses, and so give notice of the meeting. Sometimes we were under the necessity of employing the public

crier to make known the time and place of meeting; this is not thought inconsistent with delicacy and respectability in Cornwall, as it is done by different religious parties. Sometimes books were distributed at the close of the service. At other times persons came to us at our inn for them. The plan which we most approve is, to deposit them with judicious persons, on whom we can rely, for them to distribute them, either by lending or giving them to such as would read them. This plan we adopted whenever practicable. We held conversation with those who were disposed for it either in a more public or private way as we had opportunity.

5. Our places of meeting were most commonly in the open air. Public buildings could rarely be procured for the purpose. Other denominations of Christians would not lend us their places of worship: indeed if they would, an Unitarian missionary could hardly accept of them, as he must preach his own views of the Christian doctrine; and to do this in a Calvinist or Methodist chapel would be thought uncandid, and give offence. Jesus and his apostles preached in the open air, and it cannot be wrong to imitate their example, when it can be done with order and solemnity. In Cornwall, congregations meet in the open air with the same seriousness and decorum as they would in a church or chapel; and larger congregations may be procured abroad than in any building.

6. The success of our mission in Cornwall very far exceeded the expectation we had previously formed. Every where we found the people disposed to hear; we had generally large congregations, and most of the people who came together were deeply attentive. They had been told frightful tales respecting Unitarianism; but many were determined to hear for themselves. Some expressed their surprise at finding that instead of our rejecting Christ and the gospel these formed the subjects of our preaching. We distributed a large parcel of tracts, which were received with much eagerness, many persons followed us to our inns begging for books; had we taken a cart-load of them with us we should no

have had too many to have satisfied the urgent call of the multitude for them. I suppose, during my stay in this county I did not preach to fewer than 10,000 different persons.

7. Unitarianism has made considerable progress in Cornwall during the last four years. I had the honour of being the first Unitarian missionary who visited that county. It was in the spring of 1811. I then found one determined and avowed Unitarian, and several other persons who were favourable to the doctrine; now I found a respectable congregation, and friends to the cause in many other places. The controversy has become public through the medium of the press, and a great many tracts on the subject are got into circulation. Even the conduct of our opponents tends to keep the spirit of inquiry alive.

8. From the preceding remarks it may be concluded, that the prospect of success to the Unitarian cause in Cornwall, is not a little promising: properly to estimate this, several things should be considered:—as, 1. The state of society in that county. The people possess a considerable degree of intelligence for persons of their rank and condition. The Methodists have done a great deal of good to the Cornish people, notwithstanding all the religious extravagances which have at times appeared among them; they have brought the mass of them to seriousness, diffused a general sense of the importance of piety and virtue, and effected a great moral change. Such orderly conduct, moral correctness and serious attention to religion, will be found among the lower orders of the people, in few, if any, other districts in England. The Methodists have, in a considerable degree, prepared the way for the Unitarians. 2. Among the Methodists there are Universalists, and persons whose inquiries go beyond the system of their party. 3. A disposition to hear serious discourses on religion, and read theological publications, seems extensively to prevail among the Cornish people, and no small degree of curiosity to attend to what appears novel. 4. An Unitarian may preach any where without danger of interruption, and need seldom fear obtaining a considerable and attentive audience. 5. Unitarian publications may be extensively cir-

culated, and there is good reason to think will be read with seriousness. On the whole, I know of no county in England that offers a more promising field for the propagation of the Unitarian doctrine than Cornwall, or to which I think the attention of Unitarians ought to be more carefully directed, or which is more deserving of their assistance and steady exertion.

9. It is a highly important inquiry, what are the best steps to be taken for the effectual promotion of the great and good work begun in Cornwall. In answer to this inquiry, I take the liberty of suggesting:—1. That every thing possible should be done to strengthen the hands, encourage the exertions and aid the labours of the brethren at Falmouth and Flushing. 2. That they should be, as far as practicable, from time to time, furnished with books to distribute, and send to different towns, where they may be lent out or given away. Any gentleman who has it in his power to contribute his allotments of tracts from any of the book societies for this purpose, will serve the cause. 3. That as soon as it can be made practicable, a minister should be employed five or six months regularly out of the twelve, as a missionary in Cornwall: the rest of his time he might be employed as the minister at Moreton Hampstead; where one is wanted. This plan would be agreeable to the congregation at Moreton, the leading members of which have been consulted on the subject. 4. That till some such plan can be adopted, it is desirable a missionary should visit and labour at least for a month in every summer, among our Cornish friends. It is hoped, the importance of these matters will be felt by the Unitarian public, and that nothing practicable will be neglected in so good a cause.

I conclude these observations with expressing my fervent wish and prayer, that God in his infinite mercy may guide all our efforts to promote his glory and crown them with success.

Postscript.

One thing I omitted in its proper place. It relates to the excellency of the plan of the Unitarian Fund, in enabling its missionaries to act without receiving any thing of the people

among whom they go, and whom they call together to hear them. Persons of opposite religious sentiments in Cornwall, I was told, said, "Whatever may be the opinions of these men, however erroneous their doctrine may be, they must be sincere; for they want nothing of us but a patient hearing, they take no money of us: and they not only travel and preach to us for nothing, but give us books without being paid for them."

Before I lay down my pen, justice requires that I should thank the Committee for so agreeable and worthy an assistant in my late journey, as my traveling companion, Mr. Cooper, whom I found a great comfort and help to me in so long and laborious a mission. To say I was perfectly satisfied with his conduct, would fall far short of what I ought to express; his deep seriousness, steady piety, good sense and rational zeal, rendered his company and assistance highly acceptable. He participated, with much propriety, in a variety of conversations, and conducted the devotional part of services in public in a truly edifying manner. His pulpit services, also, as far as I could learn, were generally acceptable. Throughout, he shewed his heart to be in the work. During the whole of the journey, Mr. Cooper preached twenty-four times.

R. WRIGHT.

The Address and Remonstrance of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to his Holiness Pope Pius VII., resolved upon at their Aggregate Meeting held in the City of Dublin, August 29th, 1815,

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE, BART. in the Chair.

To his Holiness Pope Pius VII. the humble Address and Remonstrance of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

MOST HOLY FATHER,

We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, most humbly approach your Holiness, imploring for five millions of faithful children, the apostolical benediction.

We desire, Most Holy Father, to address your Holiness in respectful and unreserved terms; that so, your Holiness may be perfectly informed of our fears, our desires, and our determinations.

We deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to remind the Sovereign Pontiff of our Church, of our peculiar claims to his protection and support; for we cannot, for a moment, imagine that your Holiness is unmindful of the constancy and devotion manifested towards the Holy See, by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in despite of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people.

We cannot, however, abstain from reminding our Most Holy Father, that although the persecution which we and our ancestors endured, was notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon us, on account of our adherence to, and connexion with, the Holy See; nevertheless, the Roman Catholics of Ireland never solicited the predecessors of your Holiness, at any period of that persecution, to alter, in the slightest degree, that connexion, or make any modification of the existing discipline of our Holy Church, to obtain, for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the repeal or mitigation of those cruel laws which proscribed them.

With sentiments of most sincere sorrow, we have heard that, notwithstanding the uniform manifestations of our spiritual attachment to the Holy See, it has pleased your Holiness to favour a measure, which would enable a Protestant government to controul the appointment of our prelates; against which the Catholic voice of Ireland has protested, and ever will protest with one accord. No spiritual grounds are alleged for the proposed alteration in our ecclesiastical system; it is not pretended that it would advance the interests of religion, or improve the morality of the Catholic people of Ireland; on the contrary, it is proposed in opposition to the well-known and declared opinions of our spiritual guides, and is offered as an exchange or barter for some temporal aid or concession: it therefore becomes our duty, as Catholics and as subjects, to state, in most explicit terms, our sentiments upon it.

It is considered right to assure your Holiness, in the first instance, that although the penal laws, which were framed for the oppression of the Catholics of Ireland, have been considerably relaxed during the reign

of our present most gracious sovereign; nevertheless, the hostility to our holy religion continues to exist in full force: and every artifice is practised, and every inducement held out, to seduce the Irish Catholic from the practice and profession of his religion. Rewards are given to every Catholic clergyman who apostatizes from his faith; public schools and hospitals are maintained, at great expense, in which hostility to the creed and character of Roman Catholics, constitutes the first principle of instruction; commissioners are appointed to prevent Catholic institutions receiving any benefit from the donations of pious persons; societies are established, under the favour of our rulers, for proselytizing the Catholic poor; and bribes offered and given to Catholic parents for the purchase of their children's faith; at the same time that every effort of bribery and corruption is exerted, to influence Roman Catholic schoolmasters, to seduce the Roman Catholic children, intrusted to their care, from an attachment to their creed. Every member of the legislature, every minister of the government, every judge of the land, every superior naval, military or civil officer, and almost every individual in an official situation, is obliged to swear, and has actually sworn, in the following words: viz. "I do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do believe, that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose, by the Pope, or any authority or person whatsoever, or

without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void from the beginning."

It is to persons who have taken these offensive oaths of hostility against our holy religion, that we are now required, Most Holy Father, to confide the selection and appointment of the prelates of our church; and thus, the efforts of persecution having been found unsuccessful, it is now sought to accomplish, by intrigue, the destruction of that church, whose pre-eminent perfection has excited the jealousy and the hatred of our religious opponents.

We cannot suffer ourselves to suppose, that your Holiness would, knowingly, sanction so pernicious a measure; for, it is our decided conviction, that any such concession to our Protestant prince, or to his Protestant ministers, of a right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of our prelates, would inevitably destroy the Catholic religion in Ireland. Its first consequence would be, a general indignant revolt against the framers or favourers of the detested system, without regard to rank or station; and it is not difficult to imagine, that so lamentable a breach would lead to such a state of distrust and dissatisfaction, as might end in the dissolution of that confidential connexion, in spiritual concerns, which at present so happily subsists between the Holy See and the Roman Catholics of Ireland. The prelates and priesthood would be shunned and despised; the altars and confessionals would be deserted; a state of irreligion and immorality would succeed in the place of the religious and moral conduct, which at present distinguishes the people of Ireland; public disorders and private misfortunes would follow, and our neglected Church would become an easy prey to those who now labour for the extirpation of the Roman Catholic faith from this nation.

We desire to assure your Holiness, that the Roman Catholic laity of Ire-

land feel, towards their prelates and their priests, the most enthusiastic esteem and attachment; they look up to them not merely as spiritual guides, but, also, as confidential friends and faithful advisers. The trials of persecution created a system of mutual affection and support, which enabled each to bear up against the severities of sanguinary laws. These mutual services are not forgotten; the sentiments which they generated remain unchanged; and, therefore, we never can consent, that our pure and pious hierarchy should be contaminated by such a connexion, as must endanger their just influence, and render them objects of dislike and distrust among their faithful flocks.

These are some of the results expected, by the favourers of the proposed measure, to follow its enactment; but there are other objects also in their contemplation. They seek, and ardently desire, to destroy the spiritual authority of the Holy See in this country; and we are confident, that their expectations would be ultimately fulfilled, if they could establish the desired revolution in our ecclesiastical system; because experience has taught us, that wherever any interference of the ministers of the British crown has been allowed, they have ultimately succeeded in obtaining absolute and exclusive controul.

Your Holiness must be sensible of the injustice of the imputations directed against our venerable hierarchy, by those persons who express a desire to provide further securities for their peaceable and loyal conduct. Their correspondence with the Holy See is, of course, open to the inspection of your Holiness; and we entertain no doubt but they may, with perfect safety to their political characters, challenge the most scrutinizing and jealous reference to the communications which constitute that correspondence. Again, their conduct at home is watched with more than common vigilance; the most trifling instance of dissaffection would be gladly exposed, and yet their characters not only remain unimpeached, but the highest officers of the crown, resident in this island, have borne testimony to their loyalty, and to their laudable exercise of that influence, which their station and conduct

had obtained for them, over their respective flocks. The ministers of the crown are already invested with ample powers to correct any subject, or stranger, who may disobey the laws; and no instance has occurred in this country, of any man, of any station, having escaped punishment, in consequence of the insufficiency of the existing laws to provide for his correction.

Neither should it be forgotten, that our venerable prelates are bound, by most solemn oaths, to observe strictly loyal and peaceable conduct; of which oaths we annex copies hereto, and humbly submit them to the inspection and consideration of your Holiness. And we are, therefore, confident that this demand for further securities is not founded upon any apprehension of the existence of a necessity for them; but that it has originated solely from a desire to enable the enemies of our holy religion, by the admission of such interference and encroachments, to accomplish the destruction of a Church which they have so long, ineffectually, assailed.

We feel that we should be wanting in the practice of that candour which it is our pride to profess, were we not further to inform your Holiness, that, we have ever considered our claims for political emancipation, to be founded upon principles of civil policy. We seek to obtain from our government nothing more than the restoration of temporal rights; and must, most humbly, but most firmly, protest against the interference of your Holiness, or any other foreign prelate, state or potentate, in the controul of our temporal conduct, or in the arrangement of our political concerns.

We, therefore, deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to state to your Holiness, the manifold objections of a political nature which we feel towards the proposed measure. We have confined ourselves, in this memorial, to the recapitulation of objections, founded upon spiritual considerations; because, as, on the one hand, we refuse to submit our religious concerns to the controul of our temporal chief; so, on the other, we cannot admit any right, on the part of the Holy See, to investigate our political principles, or to direct our

political conduct; it being our earnest desire, and fixed determination, to conform, at all times, and under all circumstances, to the injunctions of that sacred ordinance, which teaches us to distinguish between spiritual and temporal authority, giving unto Cæsar those things which belong to Cæsar, and unto God those things which belong to God.

Thus, then, Most Holy Father, it appears—while this obnoxious measure is opposed by every order of our hierarchy, that we, for whose relief it purports to provide, feel equally ardent and determined in our resistance to it; solemnly declaring, as we now do, that we would prefer the perpetuation of our present degraded state in the empire, to any such barter, or exchange, or compromise of our religious fidelity and perseverance.

We, therefore, implore your Holiness, not to sanction a measure so obnoxious to the most faithful and disinterestedly attached portion of the universal flock. Our hostility is founded on experience and observation; whereas, the remote situation of your Holiness renders it necessary that the Holy See should rely upon the representations of others, who may have been interested in the practice of delusion or deceit; for the Roman Catholics of Ireland never can believe, that their revered Pontiff, who had endured so much of suffering in maintenance of his spiritual station, would, knowingly and intentionally, invade or oppress the conscientious feelings of a Catholic people, who had endured nearly three centuries of persecution, in consequence of their devotion to the same religious system.

If this our determination be erroneous, we should regret that we and our ancestors had not long since discovered the error; as the Catholics of Ireland could, by making such sacrifices, have readily obtained relief from the penal code which oppressed them. But, we do not lament our perseverance; on the contrary, we are confirmed in our conviction, that a conscientious adherence to the same course, will ultimately obtain the approval of the Holy See, and ensure the admiration of every faithful member of the Christian church.

If it shall please our temporal

rulers to impose this obnoxious regulation upon us, we must bow down our heads before the ordinance of the All-Seeing Providence; and, humbly confiding in his merciful protection, meet this new trial with the same religious spirit as has enabled us to survive every similar persecuting provision. Grievously, indeed, would we lament, if our enemies should succeed in alienating the mind of your Holiness from so many millions of faithful children. Should it, however, unhappily appear, that the influence of our opponents is more powerful than the prayers of such a people, we would still proceed in the course which practice and persecution have tried and proved.

We will not, however, anticipate so calamitous and so portentous a determination on the part of your Holiness; we will rather cherish our accustomed confidence in the Holy See, and, resting on the benign providence of the Divine Founder of our faith, we will look forward to such a determination on the part of your Holiness, as will allay our religious anxieties; preserve, undisturbed, the peace of a church enthusiastically devoted to its spiritual chief; and thereby perpetuate, by indissoluble bonds, the spiritual connexion which has been so long maintained between the See of Rome, and the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

For these purposes, and with these views, we lay this our humble Address and Remonstrance at the feet of your Holiness, praying a favourable consideration; and again imploring the apostolical benediction.

THOMAS ESMONDE, Chairman,
EDWARD HAY, Secretary.

I certify that the above Address and Remonstrance was framed by the Association of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, pursuant to the directions of the Aggregate Meeting, held on Tuesday, the 29th day of August last.

NICHOLAS MAHON, Chairman of
the Association.

Dublin, Sept. 16, 1815.

Oaths taken by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and referred to in the above Address.

(No. I.) "I do take Almighty God and his only Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, to witness, that I will be

faithful, and bear true allegiance to our most gracious Sovereign Lord, King George the Third, and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty, and his heirs, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his Majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of Prince of *Wales*, in the life time of his father, and who, since his death, is said to have assumed the style and title of King of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, by the name of *Charles* the Third, and to any other person claiming, or pretending a right to the crown of these realms; and I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as unchristian and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pretence of their being heretics; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics: I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject and abjure the opinion, that Princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or by any authority of the See of *Rome*, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed, or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever; and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain or abet any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this declaration; and I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of *Rome*, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly within this realm; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and of his only Son Jesus Christ my Redeemer, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this Oath, without any evasion

equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of *Rome*, or any person whatever; and without thinking that I am, or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.

“So help me GOD.”

(No. 2.) “I do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman Catholic Religion.

“I do swear, that I do abjure, condemn and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle, that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being a heretic; and I do declare solemnly before God, that I believe, that no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by, or under pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever. I also declare, that it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible, or that I am bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the Pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such order, but on the contrary, I hold that it would be sinful in me to pay any respect or obedience thereto; I further declare, that I do not believe that any sin whatsoever, committed by me, can be forgiven at the mere will of the Pope, or of any priest, or of any person or persons whatsoever; but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness; and that any person who receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament; and I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being; I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and

solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic Establishment in its stead; and I do solemnly swear that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in this kingdom.

“So help me GOD.”

Irish Catholic Excommunication.

A very extraordinary act on the part of an Irish Catholic prelate, has become the subject of general animadversion in Ireland, and must be heard of with astonishment in this country. We understand, that the prelate alluded to, took the liberty to excommunicate a Catholic school-master for being a Free Mason, in consequence of which excommunication, the school-master lost all his pupils, and was reduced nearly to pauperism, while he was abandoned by his connexions. Such a proceeding must surely be cognizable by the laws of the country, to which, we hope, an appeal will be made by the aggrieved. At all events, we trust that such an alarming instance of ecclesiastical arrogance and gross illiberality, will not fail to be brought under the notice of parliament. The sufferer in this case may be tampered with by undue means or restrained by sectarian principles from seeking legal redress: but parliament owes it to the country to make some provision against the repetition of such ty-

ranny, and parliament will, we hope, discharge its duty. Our readers will recollect, that one of the first acts of the Pope upon the recent restoration of his temporal authority, was to prosecute the Free Masons—but need we offer any argument, in defence of an institution, comprehending among its members some of the first philosophers and princes on earth, in order to shew that the imitation of the Pope's example is not to be endured for a moment wherever the British Constitution retains any influence. The human mind must indeed make extraordinary retrograde motion before the Pope's authority can recover such a sway.

Thanksgiving Day.—The Gazette of Saturday the 16th inst, contains a Proclamation for a Public Thanksgiving on account of the Peace with France, to be religiously observed on *Thursday, January* the 18th, by all his Majesty's subjects, “on pain of suffering such punishment as may be justly inflicted on all such as contemn or neglect the same.” By order of the Prince Regent.—Will not this be a proper occasion for Congregational Collections on behalf of the suffering persecuted Protestants of France! Such an use of the day will be welcoming Peace in the true spirit of Peace.

Subscription to the Greenock Chapel. (See Vol. x. p. 722)

A Collection in the York College - 5*l.* 10*s.*

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE Court of Common Council of the City of London has had a meeting on the subject of the persecution, experienced by the Protestants in France, and have come to the unanimous resolution of addressing the Prince Regent to interfere with his good offices in their behalf. As the Bourbons are so much indebted to him for their restoration to the throne, it is to be presumed, that such an interference will not be ineffectual: and it cannot be imagined,

that our Prince does not feel a poignant grief, that an occurrence has taken place, which renders it thus necessary for him to stand forward in a cause, in which his family has been so much distinguished. They were among the first to oppose the Romish See, and to advocate the rights of every man to religious toleration. The asylum afforded to the Bourbon princes in this country, and the sums expended on them and the emigrant nobility and clergy of France, surely

entitle the Protestants here to remonstrate in favour of their brethren abroad; and it must assuredly have some influence on the French cabinet to find that both prince and people equally feel for the insult that has been offered to religion by men, who have obtained the power to commit it entirely by the assistance that has been afforded them by Protestants.

Whatever may be the result with respect to our unhappy brethren abroad, this general movement at home cannot fail of having a good effect. It proves, that the doctrine of toleration is well understood among us; or at least that the idea of persecution on account of religion is held by this nation in abhorrence. The sentiment must be cherished: for if we are not greatly mistaken, bigotry will not be put down without many efforts to regain its influence. What has been done in France and Spain and is now doing at Rome is sufficient to put us on our guard. The age is by no means so enlightened as is generally imagined; and there are persons, who stand in need of toleration themselves and yet would hesitate in granting it to others. Thus a dissenting minister not long ago wondered, that a dissenting minister, his neighbour, should be permitted to promulgate his doctrines. The former was a disciple of Calvin, the latter taught the truths, for which Servetus was condemned to the stake. Yet it would be wrong to assert from this instance, that all Calvinists would be persecutors; as there are, without doubt, numbers among them, who hold in abhorrence the conduct of the murderer, from whom they are not, however, ashamed to derive their name.

A delegation is in Rome with the famous Remonstrance of the Catholics in Ireland, which has been presented to his pretended holiness. An account of its success has been published in the papers, but the ambassador may be a little more sanguine in his expectations than the result will justify. It is wonderful, that in these days men should be so blinded as to agitate a question at Rome relative to their religion in Ireland; and that these men should in so doing think they are acting as Christians. What has his pretended holiness to do with the subjects of another coun-

try? How strange it is that Irishmen do not see the degradation of submitting any question in which they are concerned, to the determination of a set of Italians. A Cardinal it seems has told the Bishops, that "an appeal from a whole nation must be attended to, so that" (says the ambassador) "I expect a favourable answer, though I fear I must wait a considerable time for it." Thus the whole nation of Catholics in Ireland must wait the leisure of an Italian quorum, to determine a plain question. How much better would it not be for them, if they must have a Pope, to elect a Pope of their own: for assuredly the Irish prelates are just as capable of conferring infallibility on one of their own body, as the Italian Cardinals on their pretended holy father.

The treaties with France and the allied powers have been made public, and with them several documents relative to the negotiation. One particular must be noticed with respect to the treaties, which are signed by the sovereigns of the only Greek Church and the chief Protestant and Romish Churches in Europe. They are all made in the name of what they all hold up as an object of religious worship. In the reign of Bonaparte this form was omitted. These public instruments may now be considered as recognizing the union of the Greek, Romish and Protestant Established Churches in one faith, as far as relates to the object of worship; though we must observe that they are not completely agreed upon this subject. For in the compound Deity, one of the supposed persons is declared by one party to proceed only from the Father, whilst the rest maintain that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son. It may be, however, that this heading to a treaty was considered merely as a matter of form. Yet forms are of consequence; and we are grieved, that an unscriptural term should receive the sanction of such high authorities. Let us hope, however, that in every nation, in which these treaties may be published, there are many, who from the revival of this mode of heading them, will be led to consider the import of the terms; by whom they were introduced; and on what authority they rest; and when they

consider, that they are totally unscriptural, will draw a comparison between a doctrine that is founded merely on the traditions of men, and that which has God for its author, and our Saviour as the grand promulgator of it to heathen nations, and who made it binding on all who are called by his name.

The mockery of amnesty that was introduced into the French legislature, has given way to milder measures, which have been introduced by the cabinet. How they may be modified in their passage through the houses, time will shew: but it is strange, that men who have so long been under adversity, should have so little feeling either for themselves or their enemies. They do not seem to consider, that the edge of the laws, which they now make, may be turned against themselves. But the French character remains the same, though the actors are changed. Already a club is formed much upon the same principle as the Jacobin club; and though the avowed object is the support of the throne, yet an ascendancy may be gained as fatal to the interests of the crown and people, as that which occasioned such bloody scenes in the republic. The royalists, as they are called, have much to learn. It is in vain that they attempt to bring things back to the ancient regime. They cannot destroy the people born during the years of revolution, and who have lived under the Napoleon code.

The peers of France have exercised their judicial authority in the trial of a peer, who was also marshal of France. To those who are accustomed to the solemnity of a trial by our House of Lords, the whole of the proceedings will appear to want that dignity which the occasion required. After the arraignment for high treason, examination of witnesses, and the council of the crown had advanced what they thought necessary in support of their cause, the counsel for the defendant endeavoured to repel their arguments, but were stopped when they introduced the convention at Paris signed by Wellington and Blucher. The accused, finding that he was thus debarred from defending himself upon this ground, prohibited his counsel from proceeding farther, and the court

then retired to pass its judgment on the case. The peers were not, however, unanimous. A very great majority voted for death, and the sentence was executed with very little ceremony early next morning, by shooting the criminal in the presence of a few spectators, who were accidentally in the place chosen for the purpose. How far the court was justified in refusing to admit the convention is a question on which the public at Paris is much divided, and it has given occasion for much discussion. Be this as it may, the French have still to learn the respect that is due to man. Whatever may be the degree of criminality, life ought not to be taken away, but with that degree of solemnity which tends to shew, that it is not vengeance but justice which requires the execution of the fatal sentence. The most atrocious murderer in this country is allowed two nights, and, by the intervention of Sunday, they are generally made three, to prepare for his awful change: but in France, they have been so long accustomed to slaughter, that human life is held there in as little estimation as that of a dog.

Let us hope, however, that a better spirit will gradually be infused into that unhappy country. Other nations are likely to derive some lessons of wisdom from the scenes that have taken place in it, and Germany will be among the first to improve its institutions. The dispute between the king of Wirtemberg and his subjects is carried on much to the advantage of the latter, and a constitution is likely to be settled in which the people will have some share as well as the sovereign. In this petty state, changes may be made without much difficulty. To reform Prussia is a more arduous task. Nothing scarcely could be worse than its government, if a government carried on by the military is deserving of that name.

A change is taking place in Prussia, which promises much for its future welfare. It is proposed to exchange despotism for a limited monarchy, and this with the consent of the sovereign himself. A representative government is to be established, suited to the different classes of the inhabitants of his former and newly-acquired states. The liberty

of the press, the trial by jury, and the freedom of the subject on a plan similar to that of our Habeas Corpus Act: these, with religious liberty, are to form the bases of the new constitution, and it has been ably argued, that the sovereign will be a gainer and not a loser by these regulations. This is a hard lesson for kings to learn: yet, if they would consult history, they would find that the despot is far from being in an enviable situation. He enslaves the press, and is made the dupe of his courtiers; he throws subjects at will into prison, and is ill-served; suspicion is the constant attendant on his person, which falls a sacrifice to secret conspiracy or open rebellion. Prussia owes its deliverance from the yoke of Buonaparte entirely to the people, and this may teach its rulers to think less of the army and more of its subjects. Indeed, the conduct of the French army cannot fail to have a good effect upon all governments: for the love of the people is the best prop of every throne, and miserable is the monarch whose dependence is on the support of an army.

The slave trade is not likely to recover from the decisive blow struck at it by Buonaparte. The flight of the Bourbon to Ghent was attended with this advantage, that efficacious remonstrances were made on this subject during his stay there, and our minister lost no time on his return to Paris to give stability to what had been done by the preceding govern-

ment. He very properly observed, that the trade could not be revived but by an actual law upon this subject, since it was evidently abolished *de facto* if not *de jure*. The French denied the validity of the preceding law, but the determination of the sovereign was announced, that the trade should not be revived. The correspondence on this occasion has been published, and thus humanity has gained one point at least by the late commotion.

Spain complains much of the interest taken in our country in the fate of the patriots who so gallantly defended their own, and restored, to their own disadvantage, the return of the present sovereign to his throne. But how can that unhappy country expect, that a nation which cherishes sound principles of liberty, should look with either satisfaction or indifference on the measures which have blasted all their hopes of seeing liberty and religion revive under their auspices? A cloud seems to be hanging over part of the dominions formerly subject to Spain in America. A great armament has crossed the main, and it is doubtful at present, whether Carthage has not fallen before it. In that case, torrents of blood will be poured forth, and the war will be lengthened out: but still the cause of independence is far from being hopeless; and what man of humanity can wish success to a nation, so far removed from all just ideas of religion and liberty?

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications from Mrs. Cappe, Dr. Morell and others, are designed for the next number, the first of Vol. XI. With the same number, to face the Volume, will be given a handsome engraved Portrait of our late venerable friend and correspondent, Dr. TOULMIN, in which we trust our readers will recognize the mild intelligence, simplicity and amiableness which marked his countenance.

We have received several letters in *vindication* of Mr. Worthington's heresy, which we were not able to bring into the present volume, and the letters of Mr. Joyce and Mr. Evans may perhaps set the matter at rest. We are disposed to say to our correspondents on this subject,

“No farther seek his merits to disclose,”

though, in our respect for the memory of the gentleman alluded to, we do not continue the quotation, lest we should be thought to convey an insinuation which we do not mean.

In answer to the complaints of the printed circulars being sent from Greenock, *the postage unpaid*, we are instructed by the Unitarian Committee of that place, to apologize for this inadvertence. The practice in question is more customary in Scotland than in England. As soon as the Committee received a remonstrance on the subject from the editor of this work, they discontinued the issue of unpaid letters.

We purpose in our next number to review *Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches*, *Mr. Cappe's* last volume of *Sermons*, &c. and to introduce the review of *Grundy's Lectures*, which has been some time waiting at the Printers, for want of room.

We must defer to our next the corrections of, and additions to, the *Unitarian Fund* List of Subscribers. Communications on this subject may be addressed to the Treasurer or Secretary.

The next Volume will record all the proceedings in this country with regard to the persecuted Protestants in France, together with such authentic accounts of their sufferings and condition, as may from time to time reach us. In a letter to the Editor, dated *Paris*, the 11th inst., *Mons. Marron*, President of the Protestant Consistory, states, that the measures taking by the Dissenting Ministers of London produce a *strong sensation* in France, that our Protestant brethren are consoled and gratified by them, and that the result is likely to be very beneficial. We trust that we shall have to register numerous and liberal collections on behalf of these persecuted Christians. These public collections are a practical protest against despotism and persecution.

Having a blank space, we here insert the following *Notice*, which could not be brought into its proper place.

NOTICE.

Mr. WORSLEY, of Plymouth, has in the press a Sermon, preached on the occasion of the death of Dr. Toulmin, in which the Doctor's character is considered rather in a political than a religious point of view, and the persecutions are stated which he, with many others, encountered at the period of the Birmingham riots. It will be accompanied with copious notes and addenda, the objects of which are two-fold, to give a narrative of the progress of our Presbyterian societies from their abandonment of the Calvinistic and Trinitarian schemes, to the present time, when they avow their belief of One God *the Father*, and of one Lord, the man Jesus—and to shew, from a review of the principal manufactories of Great Britain, which were first established by the Presbyterian Dissenters, and have been improved and chiefly maintained by them, that it is to this class of its society may justly be attributed the prosperous state of England for the last half century, the great wealth of its inhabitants, and the high tone it has been able to assume amongst the cabinets of Europe and in its relations with all the world.
