

THE
Monthly Repository,
&c.

No. CXXIX.]

SEPTEMBER, 1816.

[Vol. XI.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*Estimate of the Philosophical Character
of Lord Bacon.**

[From Dissertation I. by Dugald Stewart,
prefixed to Supplement to Encyclopædia
Britannica, Vol. I. p. 48—59.]

THE state of science towards the close of the sixteenth century, presented a field of observation singularly calculated to attract the curiosity, and to awaken the genius of Bacon; nor was it the least of his personal advantages, that, as the son of one of Queen Elizabeth's ministers, he had a ready access, wherever he went, to the most enlightened society in Europe. While yet only in the seventeenth year of his age, he was removed by his father from Cambridge to Paris, where it is not to be doubted, that the novelty of the literary scene must have largely contributed to cherish the natural liberality and independence of his mind. Sir Joshua Reynolds has remarked, in one of his academical Discourses, that "every seminary of learning is surrounded with an atmosphere of floating knowledge, where every mind may imbibe somewhat congenial to its own original conceptions."† He might have added, with still greater truth, that it is an atmosphere, of which it is more peculiarly salutary for those who have been elsewhere reared to breathe the air. The remark is applicable to higher pursuits than were in the contemplation of this philosophical artist; and it suggests a hint of no inconsiderable value for the education of youth.

The merits of Bacon, as the father of experimental philosophy, are so universally acknowledged, that it would be superfluous to touch upon them here. The lights which he has struck out in various branches of the

philosophy of mind, have been much less attended to; although the whole scope and tenor of his speculations shew, that to *this* study his genius was far more strongly and happily turned, than to that of the material world. It was not, as some seem to have imagined, by sagacious anticipations of particular discoveries afterwards to be made in physics, that his writings have had so powerful an influence in accelerating the advancement of that science. In the extent and accuracy of his *physical* knowledge, he was far inferior to many of his predecessors; but he surpassed them all in his knowledge of the laws, the resources and the limits of the human understanding. The sanguine expectations with which he looked forwards to the future, were founded solely on his confidence in the untried *capacities of the mind*; and on a conviction of the possibility of invigorating and guiding, by means of logical rules, those faculties which, in all our researches after truth, are the organs or instruments to be employed. "Such rules," as he himself has observed, "do in some sort equal men's wits, and leave no great advantage or pre-eminence to the perfect and excellent motions of the spirit. To draw a straight line, or to describe a circle, by aim of hand only, there must be a great difference between an unsteady and unpractised hand, and a steady and practised; but to do it by rule or compass it is much alike."

Nor is it merely as a logician that Bacon is entitled to notice on the present occasion. It would be difficult to name another writer prior to Locke, whose works are enriched with so many just observations on the intellectual phenomena. Among these, the most valuable relate to the laws of memory, and of imagination; the latter of which subjects he seems to

* Born 1561, died 1626.

† Discourse delivered at the opening of
the Royal Academy, January 2, 1769.

have studied with peculiar care. In one short but beautiful paragraph concerning *poetry* (under which title may be comprehended all the various creations of this faculty), he has exhausted every thing that philosophy and good sense have yet had to offer, on what has been since called the *beau idéal*; a topic, which has furnished occasion to so many over-refinements among the French critics, and to so much extravagance and mysticism in the *cloud-capt* metaphysics of the new German school.* In considering imagination as connected with the nervous system, more particularly as connected with that species of sympathy to which medical writers have given the name of *imitation*, he has suggested some very important hints, which none of his successors have hitherto prosecuted; and has, at the same time, left an example of cautious inquiry, worthy to be studied by all who may attempt to investigate the laws regulating the union between mind and body.† His illustration of

* “Cum mundus sensibilis sit anima rationali dignitate inferior, videtur *Poësis* hæc humanæ naturæ largiri quæ historia denegat; atque animo umbris rerum ut-cunque satisfacere, cum solida haberi non possint. Si quis enim rem acutius intros-piciat, firmum ex *Poësi* sumitur argumen-tum, magnitudinem rerum magis illustrem, ordinem magis perfectum, et varietatem magis pulcræ, animæ humanæ com- placere, quam in natura ipsa, post lapsum, reperiri ullo modo possit. Quapropter, cum res gestæ et eventus, qui veræ historiæ subjiciuntur, non sint ejus amplitudinis, in qua anima humana sibi satisfaciat, præsto est *Poësis*, quæ facta magis heroica conformat. Cum historia vera successus rerum, minime pro meritis virtutum et scelerum narret, corrigit eam *Poësis*, et exitus, et fortunas, secundum merita, et ex lege Nemeseos, exhibet. Cum historia vera obvia rerum satietate et similitudine, animæ humanæ fastidio sit, reficit eam *Poësis*, inexpectata, et varia, et vicissitu- dinum plena canens. Adeo ut *Poësis* ista non solum ad delectationem, sed ad animi magnitudinem, et ad mores conferat.” (*De Aug. Scient. Lib. ii. cap. xiii.*)

† To this branch of the philosophy of mind, Bacon gives the title of *Doctrina de fœdere, sive de communi vinculo animæ et corporis*. (*De Aug. Scient. Lib. iv. cap. i.*) Under this article, he mentions, among other *desiderata*, an inquiry (which he recommends to physicians) concerning

the different classes of prejudices inel- dent to human nature, is, in point of practical utility, at least equal to any thing on that head to be found in Locke; of whom it is impossible to forbear remarking, as a circumstance not easily explicable, that he should have resumed this important discus- sion, without once mentioning the name of his great predecessor. The chief improvement made by Locke, in the farther prosecution of the argu- ment, is the application of Hobbes's theory of association, to explain in what manner these prejudices are originally generated.

In Bacon's scattered hints on topics connected with the philosophy of the mind, strictly so called, nothing is more remarkable than the precise and just ideas they display of the proper aim of this science. He had mani- festly reflected much and successfully on the operations of his own under- standing, and had studied with un- common sagacity the intellectual cha- racters of others. Of his reflections and observations on both subjects, he has recorded many important results; and has in general stated them with- out the slightest reference to any phy-

the influence of imagination over the body. His own words are very remarkable; more particularly, the clause in which he re- marks the effect of fixing and concentrating the attention, in giving to ideal objects the power of realities over the belief. “Ad aliud quippiam, quod huc pertinet, parce admodum, nec pro rei subtilitate, vel utilitate, inquisitum est; quatenus scilicet ipsa imaginatio animæ vel cogitatio per- quam fixa, et veluti in fidem quandam exaltata, valeat ad immutandum corpus imaginantis.” (*Ibid.*) He suggests also, as a curious problem, to ascertain how far it is possible to fortify and exalt the imagination; and by what means this may most effectually be done. The class of facts here alluded to, are manifestly of the same description with those to which the attention of philosophers has been lately called by the pretensions of Mesmer and of Perkins: “Atque huic conjuncta est disquisitio, quomodo imaginatio intendi et fortificari possit? Quippe, si imaginatio fortis tantarum sit virium, operæ pretium fuerit nosse, quibus modis eam exaltari, et se ipsa majorem fieri dectur? Atque hic oblique, nec minus periculose se in- sinuat palliatio quædam et defensio max- imæ partis *Magiæ Ceremonialis*.” &c. &c. (*De Aug. Scient. Lib. iv. cap. iii.*)

siological theory concerning their causes, or to any analogical explanations founded on the caprices of metaphorical language. If, on some occasions, he assumes the existence of *animal spirits*, as the medium of communication between soul and body, it must be remembered, that this was *then* the universal belief of the learned; and that it was at a much later period not less confidently avowed by Locke. Nor ought it to be overlooked (I mention it to the credit of *both* authors), that in such instances the *fact* is commonly so stated, as to render it easy for the reader to detach it from the *theory*. As to the scholastic questions concerning the nature and essence of mind,—whether it be extended or unextended? whether it have any relation to space or to time? or whether (as was contended by others) it exist in *every ubi*, but in *no place*?—Bacon has uniformly passed them over with silent contempt; and has probably contributed not less effectually to bring them into general discredit, by this indirect intimation of his own opinion, than if he had descended to the ungrateful task of exposing their absurdity.*

While Bacon, however, so cautiously avoids these unprofitable dis-

cussions about the nature of mind, he decidedly states his conviction, that the *faculties* of man differ not merely in degree, but in kind, from the instincts of the brutes. “I do not, therefore,” he observes in one occasion, “approve of that confused and promiscuous method in which philosophers are accustomed to treat of pneumatology; as if the human soul ranked above those of brutes, merely like the sun above the stars, or like gold above other metals.”

Among the various topics started by Bacon for the consideration of future logicians, he did not overlook (what may be justly regarded, in a practical view, as the most interesting of all logical problems) the question concerning the mutual influence of thought and of language on each other. “Men believe,” says he, “that their reason governs their words; but, it often happens, that words have power enough to *re-act* upon reason.” This aphorism may be considered as the text of by far the most valuable part of Locke’s Essay,—*that* which relates to the imperfections and abuse of words; but it was not till within the last twenty years, that its depth and importance were perceived in all their extent. I need scarcely say, that I allude to the excellent Memoirs of M. Prevost and of M. Degerando, on “Signs considered in their connection with the Intellectual Operations.” The anticipations formed by Bacon, of that branch of modern logic which relates to *Universal Grammar*, do no less honour to his sagacity. “Grammar,” he observes, “is of two kinds, the one literary, the other philosophical. The former has for its object to trace the analogies running through the structure of a particular tongue, so as to facilitate its acquisition to a foreigner, or to enable him to speak it with correctness and purity. The latter directs the attention, *not* to the analogies which words bear to words, but to the analogies which words bear to things;”† or, as he afterwards explains himself more clearly, “to language considered as the sensible portraiture or image of the mental processes.” In farther illustration of these hints, he takes notice of the lights which the different genius of

* Notwithstanding the extravagance of Spinoza’s own philosophical creed, he is one of the very few among Bacon’s successors, who seem to have been fully aware of the justness, importance, and originality of the method pointed out in the *Novum Organon* for the study of the mind. “Ad hæc intelligenda, non est opus *naturam mentis* cognoscere, sed sufficit, *mentis sive perceptionum* historiolum concinnare modo illo quo VERULAMIUS docet.” *Spin. Epist.* 42.

In order to comprehend the whole merit of this remark, it is necessary to know that, according to the Cartesian phraseology, which is here adopted by Spinoza, the word *perception* is a general term, equally applicable to all the intellectual operations. The words of Descartes himself are these: “Omnes modi cogitandi, quos in nobis experimur, ad duos generales referri possunt: quorum unus est, *perceptio*, sive operatio intellectus; alius verò, *volitio*, sive operatio voluntatis. Nam sentire, imaginari, et pure intelligere, sunt tantum diversi modi percipiendi; ut et cupere, aversari, affirmare, negare, dubitare, sunt diversi modi volendi.” *Princ. Phil. Pars. I. § 32.*

† *De Aug. Scient. Lib. vi. cap. 1.*

different languages reflect on the characters and habits of those by whom they were respectively spoken. "Thus," says he, "it is easy to perceive, that the Greeks were addicted to the culture of the arts, the Romans engrossed with the conduct of affairs; inasmuch, as the technical distinctions introduced in the progress of refinement require the aid of compounded words; while the real business of life stands in no need of so artificial a phraseology."* Ideas of this sort have, in the course of a very few years, already become common, and almost tritcal; but how different was the case two centuries ago!

With these sound and enlarged views concerning the philosophy of the mind, it will not appear surprising to those who have attended to the slow and irregular advances of human reason, that Bacon should occasionally blend incidental remarks, savouring of the habits of thinking prevalent in his time. A curious example of this occurs in the same chapter which contains his excellent definition or description of universal grammar. "This too," he observes, "is worthy of notice, that the ancient languages were full of declensions, of cases, of conjugations, of tenses, and of other similar inflections; while the modern, almost entirely destitute of these, indolently accomplish the same purpose by the help of prepositions, and of auxiliary verbs. Whence," he continues, "may be inferred (however we may flatter ourselves with the idea of our own superiority), that the human intellect was much more acute and subtile in ancient, than it now is in modern times."† How very unlike is this last reflection to the usual strain of Bacon's writings! It seems, indeed, much more congenial to the philosophy of Mr. Harris and of Lord Monboddó; and it has accordingly been sanctioned with the approbation of both these learned authors. If my memory does not deceive me, it is the only passage in Bacon's works, which Lord Monboddó has any where condescended to quote.

These observations afford me a convenient opportunity for remarking the progress and diffusion of the *philosophical spirit*, since the beginning

of the seventeenth century. In the short passage just cited from Bacon, there are involved no less than two capital errors, which are now almost universally ranked, by men of education, among the grossest prejudices of the multitude. The one, that the declensions and conjugations of the ancient languages, and the modern substitution in their place, of prepositions and auxiliary verbs, are, both of them, the deliberate and systematical contrivances of speculative grammarians; the other (still less analogous to Bacon's general style of reasoning), that the faculties of man have declined, as the world has grown older. Both of these errors may be now said to have disappeared entirely. The latter, more particularly, must, to the rising generation, seem so absurd, that it almost requires an apology to have mentioned it. That the capacities of the human mind have been in all ages the same; and that the diversity of phenomena exhibited by our species, is the result merely of the different circumstances in which men are placed, has been long received as an incontrovertible logical maxim; or rather, such is the influence of early instruction, that we are apt to regard it as one of the most obvious suggestions of common sense. And yet, till about the time of Montesquieu, it was by no means so generally recognized by the learned, as to have a sensible influence on the fashionable tone of thinking over Europe. The application of this fundamental and leading idea to the natural or *theoretical history* of society in all its various aspects;—to the history of languages, of the arts, of the sciences, of laws, of government, of manners, and of religion,—is the peculiar glory of the latter half of the eighteenth century; and forms a characteristical feature in its philosophy, which even the imagination of Bacon was unable to foresee.

It would be endless to particularize the original suggestions thrown out by Bacon on topics connected with the science of mind. The few passages of this sort already quoted, are produced merely as a specimen of the rest. They are by no means selected as the most important in his writings; but, as they happened to be those which had left the strongest impression on my memory, I thought them as likely

* *De Aug. Scient.* Lib. vi. cap. i.

† *Ibid.*

as any other, to invite the curiosity of my readers to a careful examination of the rich mine from which they are extracted.

The ethical disquisitions of Bacon are almost entirely of a practical nature. Of the two theoretical questions so much agitated, in both parts of this island, during the eighteenth century, concerning the *principle* and the *object* of moral approbation, he has said nothing; but he has opened some new and interesting views with respect to the influence of *custom* and the formation of *habits*;—a most important article of moral philosophy, on which he has enlarged more ably and more usefully than any writer since Aristotle.* Under the same head of *Ethics* may be mentioned the small volume to which he has given the title of *Essays*; the best known and the most popular of all his works. It is also one of those where the superiority of his genius appears to the greatest advantage; the novelty and depth of his reflections often receiving a strong relief from the triteness of his subject. It may be read from beginning to end in a few hours,—and yet, after the twentieth perusal, one seldom fails to remark in it something overlooked before. This, indeed, is a characteristic of all Bacon's writings, and is only to be accounted for by the inexhaustible aliment they furnish to our own thoughts, and the sympathetic activity they impart to our torpid faculties.

The suggestions of Bacon for the improvement of political philosophy, exhibit as strong a contrast to the narrow systems of contemporary statesmen, as the inductive logic to that of the schools. How profound and comprehensive are the views opened in the following passages, when compared with the scope of the celebrated treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis*; a work which was first published about a year before Bacon's death, and which continued, for a hundred and fifty years afterwards, to be regarded in all the Protestant universities of Europe as an inexhaustible treasure of moral and jurisprudential wisdom!

"The ultimate object which legislators ought to have in view, and to which all their enactments and sanctions ought to be subservient, is, *that*

the citizens may live happily. For this purpose, it is necessary, that they should receive a religious and pious education; that they should be trained to good morals; that they should be secured from foreign enemies by proper military arrangements; that they should be guarded by an effectual police against seditions and private injuries; that they should be loyal to government, and obedient to magistrates; and finally, that they should abound in wealth, and in other national resources."*—"The science of such matters certainly belongs more particularly to the province of men who, by habits of public business, have been led to take a comprehensive survey of the social order; of the interests of the community at large; of the rules of natural equity; of the manners of nations; of the different forms of government; and who are thus prepared to reason concerning the wisdom of laws, both from considerations of justice and of policy. The great desideratum, accordingly, is, by investigating the principles of *natural justice*, and those of *political expediency*, to exhibit a theoretical model of legislation, which, while it serves as a standard for estimating the comparative excellence of municipal codes, may suggest hints for their correction and improvement, to such as have at heart the welfare of mankind."†

How precise the notion was that Bacon had formed of a philosophical system of jurisprudence (with which as a standard the municipal laws of different nations might be compared), appears from a remarkable expression, in which he mentions it as the proper business of those who might attempt to carry his plan into execution, to investigate those "*LEGES LEGUM*,

* *Exemplum Tractatus de Fontibus Juris*, Aphor. 5. This enumeration of the different objects of law approaches very nearly to Mr. Smith's ideas on the same subject, as expressed by himself in the concluding sentence of his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. "In another discourse, I shall endeavour to give an account of the general principles of law and government, and of the different revolutions they have undergone in the different ages and periods of society; not only in what concerns justice, but in what concerns police, revenue, and arms, and whatever else is the object of law."

† *De Aug. Scient. Lib. viii. cap. iii.*

* *De Aug. Scient. Lib. vii. cap. iii.*

ex quibus informatio peti possit, quid in singulis legibus bene aut perperam positum aut constitutum sit.* I do not know if, in Bacon's prophetic anticipations of the future progress of physics, there be any thing more characteristical, both of the grandeur and of the justness of his conceptions, than this short definition; more particularly, when we consider how widely Grotius, in a work professedly devoted to this very inquiry, was soon after to wander from the right path, in consequence of his vague and wavering idea of the aim of his researches.

The sagacity, however, displayed in these and various other passages of a similar import, can by no means be duly appreciated, without attending, at the same time, to the cautious and

* *De Fontibus Juris*, Aphor. 6.

From the preface to a small tract of Bacon's, entitled *The Elements of the Common Laws of England*, (written while he was Solicitor-General to Queen Elizabeth), we learn, that the phrase *legum leges* had been previously used by some "great civilian." To what civilian Bacon here alludes, I know not; but, whoever he was, I doubt much if he annexed to it the comprehensive and philosophical meaning, so precisely explained in the above definition. Bacon himself, when he wrote his Tract on the Common Laws, does not seem to have yet risen to this vantage-ground of universal jurisprudence. His great object (he tells us) was "to collect the rules and grounds dispersed throughout the body of the same laws, in order to see more profoundly into the reason of such judgments and ruled cases, and thereby to make more use of them for the decision of other cases more doubtful; so that the uncertainty of law, which is the principal and most just challenge that is made to the laws of our nation at this time, will, by this new strength laid to the foundation, be somewhat the more settled and corrected." In this passage, no reference whatever is made to the *universal justice* spoken of in the aphorisms *de Fontibus Juris*; but merely to the leading and governing rules which give to a municipal system whatever it possesses of analogy and consistency. To these rules Bacon gives the title of *leges legum*: but the meaning of the phrase, on this occasion, differs from that in which he afterwards employed it, not less widely than the rules of Latin or of Greek syntax differ from the principles of universal grammar.

temperate maxims so frequently inculcated by the author, on the subject of political innovation. "A stubborn retention of customs is a turbulent thing, not less than the introduction of new."—"Time is the greatest innovator; shall we then not imitate time, which innovates so silently as to mock the sense?" Nearly connected with these aphorisms, are the profound reflections in the first book *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, on the necessity of accommodating every new institution to the character and circumstances of the people for whom it is intended; and on the peculiar danger which literary men run of overlooking this consideration, from the familiar acquaintance they acquire, in the course of their early studies, with the ideas and sentiments of the ancient classics.

The remark of Bacon on the systematical policy of Henry VII. was manifestly suggested by the same train of thinking. "His laws (whoso marks them well) were deep and not vulgar; not made on the spur of a particular occasion for the present, but out of providence for the future; to make the estate of his people still more and more happy, after the manner of the legislators in ancient and heroic times." How far this noble eulogy was merited, either by the legislators of antiquity, or by the modern Prince on whom Bacon has bestowed it, is a question of little moment. I quote it merely on account of the important philosophical distinction which it indirectly marks, between "deep and vulgar laws;" the former invariably aiming to accomplish their end, not by giving any sudden shock to the feelings and interests of the existing generation, but by allowing to natural causes time and opportunity to operate; and by removing those artificial obstacles which check the progressive tendencies of society. It is probable, that, on this occasion, Bacon had an eye more particularly to the memorable *statute of alienation*; to the effects of which (whatever were the motives of its author) the above description certainly applies in an eminent degree.

After all, however, it must be acknowledged, that it is rather in his general views and maxims, than in the details of his political theories, that Bacon's sagacity appears to advantage. His notions with respect to

commercial policy seem to have been more peculiarly erroneous ; originating in an overweening opinion of the efficacy of law, in matters where natural causes ought to be allowed a free operation. It is observed by Mr. Hume, that the statutes of Henry VII. relating to the police of his kingdom, are generally contrived with more judgment than his commercial regulations. The same writer adds, that "the more simple ideas of order and equity are sufficient to guide a legislator in every thing that regards the internal administration of justice ; but that the principles of commerce are much more complicated, and require long experience and deep reflection to be well understood in any state. The real consequence is *there* often contrary to first appearances. No wonder, that, during the reign of Henry VII. these matters were frequently mistaken ; and it may safely be affirmed, that, even in the age of Lord Bacon, very imperfect and erroneous ideas were formed on that subject."

The instances mentioned by Hume in confirmation of these general remarks, are peculiarly gratifying to those who have a pleasure in tracing the slow but certain progress of reason and liberality. "During the reign," says he, "of Henry VII. it was prohibited to export horses, as if that exportation did not encourage the breed, and make them more plentiful in the kingdom. Prices were also affixed to woollen cloths, to caps and hats, and the wages of labourers were regulated by law. IT IS EVIDENT, that these matters ought always to be left free, and be entrusted to the common course of business and commerce."—"For a like reason," the historian continues, "the law enacted against inclosures, and for the keeping up of farm-houses, scarcely deserves the praises bestowed on it by Lord Bacon. If husbandmen understand agriculture, and have a ready vent for their commodities, we need not dread a diminution of the people employed in the country. During a century and a half after this period, there was a frequent renewal of laws and edicts against depopulation ; whence we may infer, that none of them were ever executed. *The natural course of improvement at last provided a remedy.*"

These acute and decisive strictures on the impolicy of some laws highly

applauded by Bacon, while they strongly illustrate the narrow and mistaken views in political economy entertained by the wisest statesmen and philosophers two centuries ago, afford, at the same time, a proof of the general diffusion which has since taken place among the people of Great Britain, of juster and more enlightened opinions on this important branch of legislation. Wherever such doctrines find their way into the page of history, it may be safely inferred, that the public mind is not indisposed to give them a welcome reception.

The ideas of Bacon concerning the education of youth, were such as might be expected from a philosophical statesman. On the conduct of education in general, with a view to the developement and improvement of the intellectual character, he has suggested various useful hints in different parts of his works ; but what I wish chiefly to remark at present is, the paramount importance which he has attached to the education of the people,—comparing (as he has repeatedly done) the effects of early culture on the understanding and the heart, to the abundant harvest which rewards the diligent husbandman for the toils of the spring. To this analogy he seems to have been particularly anxious to attract the attention of his readers, by bestowing on education the title of *the georgics of the mind* ; identifying, by a happy and impressive metaphor, the two proudest functions entrusted to the legislator,—the encouragement of agricultural industry, and the care of national instruction. In both instances, the legislator exerts a power which is literally *productive or creative* ; compelling, in the one case, the unprofitable desert to pour forth its latent riches ; and in the other, vivifying the dormant seeds of genius and virtue, and redeeming from the neglected wastes of human intellect, a new and unexpected accession to the common inheritance of mankind.

When from such speculations as these we descend to the treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, the contrast is mortifying indeed. And yet, so much better suited were the talents and accomplishments of Grotius to the taste, not only of his contemporaries, but of their remote descendants, that, while the merits of Bacon failed, for a

century and a half, to command the general admiration of Europe,* Grotius continued, even in our British universities, the acknowledged oracle of jurisprudence and of ethics, till long after the death of Montesquieu. Nor was Bacon himself unapprised of the slow growth of his posthumous fame.

No writer seems ever to have felt more deeply, that he properly belonged to a later and more enlightened age;—a sentiment which he has pathetically expressed in that clause of his testament, where he “bequeaths his name to posterity, after some generations shall be past.”

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

On Poetical Scepticism.

No. V.

(See pp. 157, 217, 278, 383.)

— “I must tread on shadowy ground,
and sink
Deep: and aloft ascending breathe in
worlds
To which the heaven of heavens is but a
veil.”

WORDSWORTH.

— “I cannot go
Where universal love shines not around,
Sustaining all these worlds and all their
suns
From seeming evil still educing good,
And better thence again and better still
In infinite progression.”

THOMSON.

SIR,
THOSE who contend for the affinities of religion and poetry, can scarcely refuse to give the preference to that system which teaches that all the children of men are destined to be finally and immortally happy. This doctrine has more of the grand, the beautiful and the joyous: it opens to imagination more glorious vistas; it encircles us with more beatific visions; it supplies more firm and abiding objects on which the soul can repose, than any other hope of future joy which “it has entered into the heart of man to conceive;” it bursts upon us in all “the glory and the freshness of a dream;” it enables us to extend our anticipations far into the abyss of fu-

turity without trembling, to dwell on the idea of God with nothing but delight, to identify the feeling of immortality with that of joy; it does that for the species which the orthodox system of Christianity does only for the individual who receives it; it robs death of its sting and deprives the grave of its victory.

The happiness which the most confident believer in the doctrines of Calvin anticipates in heaven is both selfish and imperfect: it is built on the ruins of the best and tenderest affections, for it implies an eternal separation from many who are objects of regard now, from some perhaps who have been more passionately loved even for their errors, or who are knit to the heart by ties so strong and sacred that no human frailty can sever them. In order to enjoy it, the most disinterested of all emotions must be torn from the heart, attachments cemented by the courtesies and the distresses of life must be rent in twain, early loves must lose their charm, and the holiest instincts of nature must wither and die within us! Not only must the profligate child, on whom the heart delighted, as it were, to waste its tenderness—the Absalom loved in the midst of rebellion and vice above his brethren—be dear to us no more; but we must forget the friend who, though associating with us in deeds of charity, professed not to have experienced any supernatural change; we must learn to think with tranquillity on the sufferings of him, who, though the benefactor of earth, was not the favourite of heaven; we must be callous to the misery of an old and dear companion, who, endowed with all that could render life delightful, did not agree with us in certain speculative points of faith! With those who cheered our passage through this vale of tears we must sympathize no longer. The deathless agonies of those on whose

* “La célébrité en France des écrits du Chancelier Bacon n’a guère pour date que celle de l’Encyclopédie.” (*Histoire des Mathématiques par Montucla*, Preface, p. ix.) It is an extraordinary circumstance, that Bayle, who has so often wasted his erudition and acuteness on the most insignificant characters, and to whom Le Clerc has very justly ascribed the merit of *une exactitude étonnante dans des choses de néant*, should have devoted to Bacon only twelve lines of his Dictionary.

bosoms we have leaned as a sacred resting place, must have no power to break our blissful repose.* We must, in short, become different beings, not merely in being purified from the pollutions of earth, but in losing our best and most virtuous affections, our most serene and unfading joys. Our human hearts must die away within us. I confess myself I have no interest in another life, if it is to bring with it such a change. It is not *I* who am to be happy hereafter—this heart which is to beat, these sympathies that are to flourish, these powers that are to be unfolded, these tastes by which I am to enjoy. And who is there who would change his individuality for that of another, even to be made better, wiser, or happier? Who would resign his friends and relatives for those who would be greater or worthier of his esteem? Who, that is worthy the name of man, would forget for ever those who have loved and cherished him, to be the companion of saints and martyrs, or the favourite of angels?

Not such are the everlasting hopes which the doctrine of Universal Restoration awakens within those who receive it. This belief not only assures us of personal happiness, but it makes that happiness consist, in a great degree, in its diffusion on all around us: it enables us to associate all whom we esteem in our joys: it opens to us the grandest prospects of human improvement, discloses the statelier vistas of increasing knowledge, happiness and virtue, and gives us the noblest ideas of the dignity of our nature which is preparing for such glorious destinies: it realizes youth's most gorgeous and visionary dreams: it enables us to look back on the mighty deeds of past times with a new interest, for it displays them as so many deathless monuments of the innate dignity of man, and as glorious

proofs of what he will be hereafter: but it is chiefly welcome to the heart, as making its sweetest emotions deathless, and leaving its own peculiar objects of desire to rest on the splendid prospects which it reveals. It is this principle and this alone which renders friendship and love immortal.

According to the orthodox system of future punishment, the noblest and most divine faculties must, in many instances, be left to perish.* The "strong divinity of soul" has sometimes been mingled with human frailties, and the intoxication of heart produced by poetical inspiration has caused the poet to overleap the virtuous usages of life, and to follow without moderation the impulse of his pleasurable sensations. The pure and deep spring of celestial delight has been sullied in its passage through the world: and yet the generous would discern, even amidst irregularity and vice, the stirrings of a principle allied to the noblest sublimities of virtue, vast capacities for excellence, and bright indications of a celestial origin. "The light that led astray was light from heaven." The kindest virtues and the most sublime energies have been too often linked with imperfections which have shaded or rendered them useless. But how inspiring is the belief that these powers and these excellencies shall yet be immortal, assoiled from the corruptions of earth when its temptations are removed from them, and tuned to heighten the joys of Paradise! How cheering is the thought that the heroes and sages of ancient story, who, amidst error and darkness, displayed a majesty of soul which has awed distant generations, are destined to obtain yet greener lau-

* The orthodox heaven would be an exact realization of Mr. Godwin's theory of Political Justice. As recommended by that ingenious speculator, all peculiar regards must cease, gratitude must be done away, natural affection must be extinguished, and we must love and esteem only according to the abstract merit or godliness of the individual. The Calvinist may perhaps be surprised to find that the system against which on its promulgation, he lavished every expression of scorn and disgust, is to be realized by himself—in heaven!

* Soon after the commencement of the Eclectic Review, some writer opposing theatrical entertainments, with something more than usual zeal, alluded to the spirit of Shakspeare as mourning in the everlasting torments of hell the evils caused by his writings. It was formerly said with reference to the disposition of the two reformers, "that it would be better to go to hell with Melancthon than to heaven with Calvin;" and some perhaps would be inclined to make the same choice between Shakspeare and the Reviewer. It is but just to add, that the Eclectic Review has since that time greatly improved both in talent and feeling, and would now probably treat the fate of the greatest poet who ever lived only with a mysterious silence.

rels, and to rise up again in the light of a holier virtue! How glorious is the prospect of mighty minds, on earth benighted, bursting into the full enjoyment of truth—of unknown energies unfolding their native grandeur—of genius here debased or unknown, tasting of ever fresh inspiration from “Siloa’s brook that flows fast by the oracle of God!”

Around those who are enabled to realize the doctrine of Universal Restoration the arrows of misfortune fall harmless. The malignant passions can find no resting place in their bosoms. They look on the most wretched and depraved of the human race as brethren, as ultimately destined to become worthy of their esteem and affection, as erring children of their own Father, who will finally bring all the wanderers home. The ills of life and the burden of all material things are lightened to them by the fond belief that all are parts of one generous system of fatherly compassion. To them the face of nature seems enlivened by new smiles, for all the beauties which surround them appear indications of that universal goodness which will harmonize all the jarring notes of this discordant world. Every summer breeze whispers to them of unutterable love. The “splendour in the grass, the glory in the flower,” which delighted them in childhood, seem almost to sparkle again before them. Their virtue is unimpelled by fear and unmingled with pride, for its origin and its essence is joy. Death seems to them as a placid slumber, as a genial repose which will take away all evil thoughts and desires, and will leave them refreshed from their labours, and purified and fitted for heaven. When they weep over friends whose eyes they have closed for awhile, no sad misgivings will disturb the serenity of their sorrow, or cloud over the sweet remembrances which they delight to cherish. To them the memory of buried love will have all its unearthly charms, for the sanctity of their grief will be unbroken. They will be elevated above the world, and yet taste with more exquisite relish all its genuine blessings. Their delight will be to look on the better and more engaging parts of human nature; they will follow the domestic affections to their loveliest seclusion, trace out the nice and delicate indications of good-

ness, which others pass by unheeded, and derive from them all fresh proofs of the noble destiny for which we were created. They will rejoice in the joy of all men, trace the progressive advancement of truth and virtue with honest pride, and catch, as if it were the music of angels, the low breathed voice of humble gratitude, or the first lisps of infant prayer—

— “to which God’s own ear
Listens delighted.”

Here I might conclude these Essays. I trust I have, in some degree, shewn that the poetry of religion is not confined to the orthodox creed, nor the best feelings of the heart exclusively possessed by the followers of Calvin. But let me not offend my Unitarian friends, if I entreat them to cultivate and cherish those emotions to which, I apprehend, their opinions should conduct them. Let them not think that man is ennobled by his reason alone, or that abstract truth is the only object he ought to pursue. Let them remember that he has imagination to be called into exercise, veneration to be bestowed, and tender affections to gratify. Let them not return persecution with scorn. Let them never despise prejudices which are honest, or speak with contempt of doctrines which have consoled the hearts of thousands, because they regard them as erroneous. Let not the pride of reason or the fastidiousness of criticism pollute the sources of their joys. Let them remember that the toleration is imperfect which is not extended to intolerance itself; and that even in the bigotry of those who think their opinions dangerous, there is a feeling of zeal for their welfare to venerate and esteem. While engaged in the defence of truth let them remember that it is of more consequence to feel right than to argue well; that the best orthodoxy is that of the heart; and that while sentiments and creeds and systems perish, the best and purest feelings of the soul remain unchanged—the same in all sects, countries and generations—and that they will continue while God himself endures.

S. N. D.

SIR,
YOUR Correspondent, *An Occasional Reader*, (p. 323,) refers. I apprehend, to the 3d Book of “The

July 1, 1816.

"Last Day" and the exhortation of the damned soul, which thus begins—

"Who burst the barriers of my peaceful grave?"

Ah! cruel Death! that would no longer save,

But grudg'd me e'en that narrow, dark abode,

And cast me out into the wrath of God."

Towards the close of his address, the miserable victim of divine vengeance is thus made to recollect the paternal character of God:

"And canst thou then look down from perfect bliss,

And see me plunging in the dark abyss,

Calling thee *Father*, in a sea of fire,

Or pouring blasphemies at thy desire?"

Mr. John Wesley, many years before his death, and during the life of Young, re-published, in a Collection of English Poems, (3 vols. 8vo.) "The Last Day." He was aware of the inconsistency into which the orthodox poet had fallen, and annexed to the lines I have just quoted the following note, in substance, if my memory has failed me as to the exact words: "Impossible! Could a damned soul speak thus, would he not in a moment be in Abraham's bosom?"

Your Correspondent (p. 326) appears not to be aware of the question which has been raised whether the Treatise to which he refers was written by *Jeremy Taylor*. I suppose he intends the "Contemplations of the State of Man in this Life and in that which is to come," the eighth edition of which, 8vo. 1718, is now before me. It is confessedly *posthumous*. Prefixed are two Addresses to the Reader. The first signed B. Hale, D.D. is highly commendatory, without a word as to authenticity: the second Address, signed Robert Harris, describes Bishop Taylor as "having left these *Holy Contemplations* in the hands of a worthy friend of his, with a full purpose to have printed them if he had lived."

I have understood, on the best authority, that the Editor of "Specimens of Early Dramatic Poets," a gentleman critically versed in the fine writers of *Jeremy Taylor's* age, is of opinion that the *Contemplations*, though containing passages in his manner, were not written by the Bishop. There appears no evidence for assigning them to him,

except the testimonies of the unknown *Robert Harris* and the equally unknown *worthy friend* to whom they are said to have been entrusted.

J. O. U.

SIR,

Bath, Aug. 13, 1816.

I BEG leave to transmit to you a short extract from a letter of an enlightened clergyman of the Establishment to a Dissenting minister, whose Unitarianism lately compelled him to resign his congregation, with whom he was connected almost twenty-six years.

"Dear Sir.—Those who wish to worship any more Gods than one, ought to go to the East Indies, and prostrate themselves before the idol of that country."

The whole letter is written in the same strain, virtually acknowledging no God but the One God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and condemning all encroachments upon the dictates of reason, and all impositions upon the rights of conscience, as diametrically opposite to the glorious doctrines of the gospel. As there are well known to be a great number of clergymen of the same sentiments, why do they not unite in petitioning the legislature, and, to use the language of sailors when they are aroused to exert their utmost exertions, with a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together, claim the privileges of the children of God, and desire to be permitted to obey his voice, in the language of their own hearts, and according to their most strenuous endeavours to understand and propagate the revelation he has given them. Our legislators are not at present Calvinists or Laudeans. Many of them are lovers of truth, and none of them can stand up and say that this or that Shibboleth should be required of men, when contrary to the light of their own minds, and what they believe to be the word of God. Whatever erroneous sentiments many of them may entertain at present, let them all be allowed to declare themselves unequivocally, and truth will be a gainer in the end. It will shine with glory by a free discussion. Or if any subscription be yet thought necessary in those who undertake the office of minister, let it be this only,—“I believe in the Holy Scriptures, and by the divine blessing”

will endeavour to explain them in their original purity, according to the uniform declarations of the unadulterated Bible." But this latitude, it will be said, will produce almost as many creeds as there are men. I think, on the contrary, that it will soon terminate in the universal reception of the good word of truth, and lead all men to embrace that holy church, in which there is no spot, nor wrinkle, nor any such thing. Voltaire, notwithstanding his great infidelity, believed that there is one God, one great and good God, the God of all beings, of all worlds, and of all ages: and, had he not supposed, without making that inquiry which became him, that the Trinity and some other unfounded doctrines were contained in the Bible; or, had he perceived that the Divine Unity, and that true holiness, &c. contained in the New Testament, were the real doctrines which the Lord Jesus taught, he never could have become an infidel, nor have ridiculed what he did not rightly examine, and therefore did not understand.

A NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIAN.

SIR,

August 1, 1816.

I HAVE heard it occasionally remarked, that at one period of the history of the Christian church, it was in agitation, by some synod or council, to place the Virgin Mary as a person of the Trinity, in the room of the Holy Ghost. In referring to the remarks of *Theolotus*, M. Repos. Vol. VI. page 399, I find some confirmation of it, as represented by the Novogorod Idol, and in the censures of such a Trinity by the Arabian Impostor: but setting aside such authorities, I should be glad to be informed by your more learned readers, if there be any other and better authority for such an assumption.

J. W.

SIR,

August 2, 1816.

IN this our sad season of logomachy, may I take the liberty of requesting from some of your more polemically given Correspondents, the proper name for a denomination of fellow interrogators with Pilate—"What is the truth?" Who, (*not more firmly assured of the existence of the Christ than of the divinity of his mission*), while, on the one hand, sitting at the feet of Jesus and hearing from his own lips

that he knew not the precise date of an event which he was yet empowered to predict (Mark xiii. 32); that he might well assume the very title about which so much controversy has arisen, and found his apology for assuming it on the ground that other missionaries of God had in Elohim arrogated a higher one than he did in that of Ben Elohim, John x. 36; that *of himself* he *could* do *nothing*, viii. 54; that if he bare witness of himself his witness were not true, v. 31; that the very words he spake, he spake *not of himself*, xii. 49, xiv. 10; hearing him, in short, referring every thing he said, and did, and was, as unequivocally, as invariably, as absolutely to that Being whom he called his Father, as any other pious man whom he had taught to address by the same endearing appellation could have done:—then superadding to this unimpeachable testimony the still (if possible) more unambiguous attestations of the Most Highest Himself at the several periods of his baptism, transfiguration and crucifixion, so admirably adapted in kind and in degree to the "beloved Son," in whom of all human kind God deigned to express himself emphatically "well pleased," so palpably *infra dig.* to a Being of an infinitely superior order:—and last and least, recollecting the remarkable incidents of the temptation, when this heavenly personage is accosted by another (whom later ages have almost invested with the character of omniscient) as a "Son of God," who might haply not only be seduced from his allegiance to his Father by such a consideration as the kingdoms of this atom of the universe, yclept our world, but to transfer it, and with it the homage of religious worship, to his seducer, as the donor of them:—who, ruminating I say over thus much, and more that might be adduced of a kindred description, regard the Christ in no other light the Son of God than as figuratively so constituted, or at most so miraculously born as no other human being ever was before him. Yet, on the other hand, reading the proem of St. John's Gospel, surprising as they think they do the interpolation of the reporter at the 16th verse of his third chapter, not to mention a multitude of appositions, turns and probable emendations, sufficiently indicative as they hold of the historian's construction of the more

genuine phraseology—looking indeed at the *general tenour* of our Saviour's discourses as edited by that Evangelist, and collating them with the subsequent original letters of the same author: then again turning to the Epistles of St. Paul, observing his repeated classifications at the beginning of them, his closing sentence to the 2d Corinth. his Lord of Glory, his 5th and seq. verses 2d chapter Philippians, in spite even of their unlucky *υπερυψωσε*—remembering too the exclamation of Thomas, the prayer of Stephen—can scarcely dispossess themselves of something very much like a conviction that these first disciples of their heavenly Master recognized in him (consistently however always as they thought at least, with their most palpably fundamental doctrine of the unity of their ancestors' Jehovah in the sole person of his God and Father) a Θεός πρὸς (apud) HIM their One ο Θεός, an homousian the subordinate Logos, an only begotten Son from the beginning, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, a *One Lord* by whom are all things, the Associate of a *One God* of whom are all things, HIS co-eternal but not co-equal image, delegate, minister, representative.

How indeed these excellent men could reconcile some of these doctrines with others; how they could make up their minds to believe (as in the opinion of our inquirers they most unquestionably did, not more unquestionably any one tenet they published) that *such* a Son of God *died*, *such* a Lord of Glory was *crucified*, in the person of Jesus, or how (compatibly with their hypothesis) one of them could *dispose* of *such* a Being in the manner he does in the 15th chapter 1st Corinthians, they avow themselves quite incompetent to conjecture. Not less perplexed, aghast rather, (their reason and faith both utterly confounded) do they confess themselves upon the recollection of the familiarity, the chit chat, the rebuke, the lying on the bosom, the probable concurrence in the opinion that HE was beside himself, of these HIS contemporaries. As willingly do they avow themselves unable to reconcile the argumentation in the 1st chapter of Hebrews with the Scripture on which it professes to be founded, or that in the chapter of the Philippians already quoted, with the antecedently sempiternal claims of *such* a "Christ Jesus."

The Orthodox now would perhaps look no further than 2 Tim. iii. for a title for our Catechumens, but *illi in nos sæviant* if they will! You will not I hope be so short or severe with an almost conscious semi-proselyte to their heresy, in your Correspondent and Constant Reader,

TE TACE.

P. S. And *quære* against our heretic—On what Son of God does St. John suppose the Chief Rulers to have *believed*, when he *expressly states*, that though they did *believe on him*, they had not the consistency to confess him, John xii. 43, on a *presens Deus* of any kind, or in the anointed Messenger of their One only true God? Could so monstrous a practical faith have ever existed in any human breast? And again, Martha, when she took it for granted HE had no power to bring back her brother from the grave though he might have prevented his going thither? Or the Disciples when they all forsook him and fled?

SIR,

August 1, 1816.

IT is pleasing to know that there is *one* publication connected with religious inquiry, which has for its main object the reconciliation of the doctrines of revelation with the conclusions of reason. It appears to be one of the great evils of establishments, that they often operate in the prevention of their members, from speaking fully their convictions, on the most important subjects. Thus we see Paley, when he reviews the popular objections to Christianity, wholly silent about the only weighty objection which exists—its future punishments. His situation, I think, must have been the cause of this, for there is nothing in all his writings which shews his belief in lasting or everlasting misery. We see those men who were independent of establishments, Hartley, Priestley, Simpson and others, quite explicit on this great subject. Paley says at the end of his "Natural Theology," that man lives in God's continual presence, and that death resigns him to his merciful disposal. This is language scarcely consistent with the popular doctrine concerning the final destination of mankind. Indeed this is the one fundamental objection to Christianity, for if the popular idea of its punishment be true, every human being must wish it to be false.

There are certain facts with which we are all acquainted that fill us with dismay, if this popular objection be the doctrine of revelation: That the great majority of human beings have not lived up to the acquirements of Christianity: That sensuality and selfishness (the true original sin of nature) have generally prevailed: That natural evil (of which our native passions and appetites are the greatest beyond all estimation) has universally produced moral evil: That the Scriptures seem to say that there are few that be saved, and if only those be who have completely overcome animal nature, the language of Scripture appears to be correct. Now when we take into the account the original strength of human appetites, and the unfavourable circumstances in which men are placed for their innocent gratification, the final lot of mankind becomes a most tremendous question. There is so much misery in this life, that it is a momentous question whether, considering this life alone, it be right for a man to become the father of a human being; but if the popular doctrine concerning futurity be true, no man that exists should in any case or circumstances become a father. This is the one moral duty, which must swallow up every other. And that men become fathers, professing this belief, shews that no one does indeed believe it to be true; for a man believing it true, and becoming a father, is a monster, little better, though not indeed so bad as the God whom he professes to worship.

Unprejudiced reason tells us, that although it may be right that the obtaining of eternal felicity should be very difficult, yet that the escape from eternal misery should at least be very easy, if in any case a Creator could be justified in making it possible for any being to involve himself in such a calamity. Besides what is this world and what are its enjoyments? Taken singly and of itself it is what no human being would have on such a condition, and very few would have it upon no other condition, than what their present circumstances impose.

It may be proper that very few should be saved, but it never can be just, that any should be damned, if by that be meant any thing more than destruction. A human legislator can

only punish, a divine can reward and to an extent more than equal to any difference of character. How can then the popular doctrine stand—and if it be Christianity—how can that religion be defended. All other objections are as dust in the balance, this is first, last, amidst, around and above them all, and I should hope that your publication would ever keep it in its eye, for the time will soon come, that this doctrine must be otherwise explained, or Christianity will be universally discarded.

SENEX.

SIR,

July 30, 1816.

AS truth ought to be the sole object of religious as well as philosophical inquiry, men who pretend to be friends to the human race, will not be permitted by those who really are so, to impose their conjectures on the world as so many facts. The art of thinking justly on interesting subjects, especially on religion, is nevertheless generally speaking, but little understood. The multitude are dazzled too much by authority and prejudice, to view with steadiness, or to measure correctly the perfect symmetry of unveiled truth. They are used to think as they have been taught, and believe what they have been told; thus many things which are received, as obvious and essential truths, concerning natural and revealed religion, are certainly no better than vulgar prejudices;—often, pernicious errors, as dishonourable to God as they are contradictory to the concurring dictates of reason and revelation. Commonly these errors lie at the root of a system, consequently the data being false, the reasoning from them is sophistry, and its moral tendency often detrimental to the interest of virtue. Such, I am fully convinced, are the popular opinions concerning original sin. In this paper I purpose with your permission to lay before some of the occasional readers of your *Miscellany* who hold that doctrine, my reasons for rejecting it. Educated as I was in the Established Church, where the Calvinistic articles of that Church were constantly enforced, as well in the domestic circle as from the pulpit, it was natural that till I began to examine for myself, I should receive them as others do, without hesitation. I supposed that they were believed by

all people who had any title to the Christian name. Time however convinced me, chiefly by study of the Scriptures, that amongst the rest this doctrine of original sin, was not to be found in revelation. Experience and observation, equally led me to feel, and think, that its tendency was very bad, dishonourable to God, and productive of much evil to men; that it was not merely a doctrine on which Scripture was silent, and that therefore it might be true, but that it was an error which both Scripture and reason condemn. I would advise my friends, who are the subjects of religious depression, arising out of this soul-harrowing doctrine, to take the method that succeeded with me: if they can find a better I shall not object to it. My method was this: I took the sacred volume and determined to abide by its dictates whatever they might be; I kept my mind as indifferent as I could to every thing except the decision of truth; I would not admit during the investigation for a moment, that the belief or rejection of this doctrine was of any consequence whatever with respect to my future state, for had interest or fear prevailed while the question was pending, the decision would have been dictated not by reason, but passion. I kept all my thoughts together, as much as possible, upon the one point I was investigating, and I tried to dismiss every thing foreign to it. I had no business with the existence of moral evil, nor with the universal mortality of creatures, nor with the frailties, follies, and imperfections of mankind. I had nothing to do with catechisms, creeds, the opinions or impertinences of fathers, priests or expositors. I cared as little for the mere assertions of those about me on either side: when they quoted texts, I compared them with others, and suffered no hypothetical explanation to contradict plain evidence; I was to see and examine for myself; I prayed to God as a believer in Jesus Christ, for his assistance and blessing, and opened the Bible. I began with the Mosaic account of the creation of man. There I read, Gen. ii. 7, that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," and that he placed him in circumstances suited to

his nature. I read of a tree of life, and a tree of knowledge which grew in the garden of Eden, that to the former man had free access, and that from the latter he was prohibited; but I read nothing of the natural immortality of his creature, made of the dust, nor of any powers, either of body or mind, that he possessed in a superior degree over many of his descendants. He appeared to me to be the same frail, fallible and peccable creature in his original state that his posterity have ever been. My reason told me that he could have but few wants, few ideas, very limited knowledge, that his language must have been barren, that he could have no acquaintance with either science or arts, that without a miraculous communication of ideas from the fountain of intelligence, he would have continued in this state of imbecility and ignorance, till he slowly, and by degrees, acquired ideas. I saw that his positive duties were but few, and that as his nature was frail, the test of his obedience was simple. I conceived of him as a youth whose capacity is indeed good, whose passions are strong, whose experience is nothing. His passions prevailed, his reason was vanquished, he took of the forbidden fruit, he sought happiness, more happiness, a higher degree of glory, he fell, and found death; he was told by his Creator the consequence of his disobedience, he was capable of understanding what he was told, but in an evil moment he transgressed. Were a man to be found with an equal simplicity of nature, and placed in the same circumstances, he would doubtless act in the same manner, and precisely the same consequences would follow. Reason weak, passion strong, temptation urgent, the man falls, and the sinner dies. "All die for that all have sinned." "It is appointed to all men once to die." It appeared to me therefore that death is an ordinance of nature and that it is only an evil to an accountable creature, who has broken the laws of God. "Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return." As I read nothing of the death of the soul in this account of the fall of man, I found nothing there to support the modern doctrine of destruction or that of eternal future torment, nor indeed could I gather from any thing in that history, the evidence of a future state,

and I saw nothing there to induce me to think that a just God would impart any moral incapacity, or radical and inherent depravity to Adam's descendants, much less the imputation of his sin. By a necessity of nature, I perceived, that the first man must produce creatures in his own image, by which I understood frail, fallible, and peccable beings like himself, liable to sorrows and death, but possessed of equally high mental powers of reason and conscience, the image and superscription of God; and therefore accountable like their original parent for their moral actions, and in many instances more than he was, because placed in different and more favourable circumstances. I therefore think, that to represent, as some have done, the venerable parent of the human race as the greatest of all sinners, is an instance of the folly of hypothesis, and of shameful disrespect to the first of men, nor is it at all calculated to give glory to God his Creator. Josephus says well, that Moses spake philosophically concerning the fall of man, he meant I suppose figuratively. Many truths historical and moral were thus according to the eastern wisdom, given to the world by the ancient sages. To take the story literally, is to receive a fable without its moral, the account would be very lame and absurd. It is indeed a description of the triumph of passion over reason and conscience, and thus the birth of sin, misery, and death. Read the subject in this light, and it is intelligible, the imagery awfully sublime, well adapted and beautiful, and the moral in the highest degree impressive. Let our sons contemplate Adam, and our daughters their first mother, in their happy state of simple and satisfied nature, before the riotous passions began their wild uproar, before irregular desire awoke in their bosoms, before reason quitted her throne, and sensation assumed the sceptre. Then let them consider these parents of the world the victims of remorse, dissatisfaction, guilt and death. And let them fly with horror the pursuing and fascinating serpent, the first temptation to vice. Child of the dust! to taste is death. "Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men, avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away."

I then proceeded to the examination of such other passages of Scripture, as I knew were advanced with a view to establish this doctrine of original sin. The next I considered was that awful one recorded in Gen. iv. 8, 9, the murder of Abel, the fruit of envy and revenge; but I hear the Creator exhorting Cain to do well, and promising him acceptance on that condition; and I read, Heb. xi. that Abel obtained witness that he was righteous: he believed and obeyed—"God testifying of his gifts;" yet both were the sons of the same parents, consequently both partook of the same nature. I supposed that both had the same moral capacity, and were therefore liable to the same degree of responsibility. I saw no difference in the brothers in the eye of God, beside moral difference evinced by their conduct; hence I concluded that not nature but habits made one brother a murderer and the other a righteous man. The next portion of Scripture I considered was the account of the moral state of the world before the flood—Gen. vi. 5, 11, &c. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." This passage I knew was advanced as a stock text, to prove the radical and inherent corruption of human nature, derived from the fallen Adam; yet, while I admitted all this strong language, as giving a just description of universal degeneracy of manners and corruption of hearts, I saw nothing in it to prove the original and radical corruption of nature; I knew that bad habits deprave the heart and imagination, and that if partial corruption of principles existed, universal corruption might also prevail, that men might become desperately wicked, that the voice of conscience might be stifled, and a moral death ensue. I knew that when men "like not to retain God in their knowledge," he might "give them over to a reprobate mind." I knew that "what may be known of God is nevertheless manifest in them," for "God hath shewed it to them." I knew that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, (before and after the fall of man) are clearly seen being understood by the

things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so they are without excuse." I was convinced therefore that the Antediluvians could not lay their sins to the door of Adam, or their Creator, by pleading the original and radical corruption of their nature as the cause why "their foolish hearts were darkened, and every imagination evil continually." I found also that Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and a just man before God even in these bad times.

I read in Gen. viii. 2, that "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," (not from his birth or nature,) a sad proof this of human frailty and the proneness of man to degenerate, like Adam, from that nature, at an early period of his existence. Accordingly this is assigned as a reason not for judgment, but for mercy, "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, neither will I again smite any more, every living thing as I have done." I suppose the most ancient portion of the Bible except Genesis is the Book of Job. Some have quoted a passage in the fifteenth chapter of that poem, to prove the doctrine of the total depravity of nature. "What is man that he should be clean, or he who is born of a woman that he should be righteous, behold he (God) putteth no trust in his saints, yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight, how much more abominable and filthy is man who drinketh iniquity like water." Thus speaks Eliphaz, and the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, "my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends, for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right as my servant Job hath." Job xlii. 7. It would be therefore highly improper to exalt the reveries and dogmas of this man into the language of unerring revelation; but suppose his assertion to be strictly true, we are not attempting to disprove that all men are sinners, but to know whether all men are so by a necessity of nature, whether they are born one entire mass of moral corruption derived from Adam. If a man "drink iniquity like water," the poisoned beverage is no part of his nature, and to drink is a voluntary act. In this instance we have an old trite proverb verified.

The next passage I turned to, is read in Psalm li. 5. "Behold I was

shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." I always thought that "sin was any transgression of or want of conformity to the law of God." I knew that this definition was totally inapplicable to the condition of a new born infant, or to the conception of a human being. I knew that God "made us and not we ourselves." I read Job x. 8, 12, that "God's hands had made and fashioned him, granted him life and favour, and that his visitation had preserved his spirit." I heard the same man asking (Job xxxi. 15,) concerning the poor slave, "did not he that made me in the womb, make him, and did not one fashion us in the womb?" I shuddered at the idea that God was the author of sin, I considered the situation of the man who used the language quoted in Psalm li. I supposed it to be David, an adulterer, a murderer, but an humble penitent, and I could not think that he was seeking to palliate the enormity of his crimes. I knew nothing of the character of his parents, but I supposed that all he derived from them, with his animal nature, were a human soul subject to constitutional frailty and strong passions, peculiarly prone to excess, peculiarly susceptible of certain impressions, which if not restrained by reason and conscience, were liable to carry him away from the path of rectitude. I read his history; I saw this man a potent and ambitious monarch, with a great soul, but I never saw him so great as when he humbled himself before God, and confessed, and forsook his sin. I was sure that he knew better than to excuse it by condemning the nature of his parents, much less the nature of man formed by that God "who fashioneth the hearts of men alike," who hath done whatsoever he pleased, "and whose tender mercies are over all his works."

In the strong, and figurative language of Eastern poetry, the Psalmist describes the constitutional weakness which plunged him into guilt, and he justly censures himself, but not his parents nor his God. I had not lived so long in the world, without observing that human beings constitutionally differed, that one man was heavy, phlegmatic, and stupid, a second sanguine, a third irritable, a fourth a mean, poor and timid animal, some

were cold and barren spirits without capacity, and destitute of invention, that others were unable to compare two ideas together and draw a rational conclusion; that some were as destitute of memory as others of invention, I had seen idiots and creditors with good memories, and poets and debtors with none at all; I had seen souls of fire and souls of ice. Seriously, I accounted for the poetic imagery of David in Psalm li. from the depth of his guilt, the strength of his feelings, and the radical nature of his penitence, expressed in the figurative language of an highly wrought Eastern imagination.

I knew that there was nothing to be found in the sacred records which David possessed to justify the literal sense of his remark, a sense as contradictory to the tenor of his own writings as to reason. I could not therefore help rejecting that passage considered as a proof of the universal propagation of a radical and corrupt moral nature, derived from the first sinner or the imputation of his guilt to all his descendants. I turned over the pages of revelation till I came to Psalm lviii. 3. There I read that "the *wicked* are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." This passage I had heard frequently quoted to prove the universal and original depravity of the heart of human beings. I could not accept this as a proof of it; I knew that new born infants had no power to do good or evil, that they were incapable of a moral choice, that they were destitute of the faculty of speech, that they were too helpless to go astray, and that so far from speaking lies, they could not speak at all. I was free to admit that the children of the wicked might be corrupted in early life by the bad example of their parents, that they might go astray from nature and virtue, and thus be estranged from the womb, and I had been often grieved to see the direful contagion of vice spreading itself, like a fatal plague, infecting the very souls of youth and childhood. I had seen with terror lying, deceit, dishonesty, debauchery, villainy, pride, illiberality and hypocrisy, propagated in the heart's core of the rising generation, by the wickedness and folly of parents. But I was directed also, (blessed be

God for his goodness) to "train up a child in the way he should go," and was encouraged by the delightful hope that when he shall "come to be old, he will not depart from it."

I had seen that "a wise son useth his father's instruction and maketh a glad father," therefore I said "My son be wise and make my heart glad that I may answer him that reproaches me." I said to my neighbour "correct thy son and he shall give thee rest, yea he shall give delight unto thy soul." I read Prov. x. 7, that the just man walketh in his integrity, his children are blessed after him,—that "even a child is known by his doings whether his work be pure and whether it be right," ver. 14. I read Psalm cxxxvii. that "Children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward." I knew who had said, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not see the kingdom of heaven." I therefore began to think that they did not "as soon as they were born deserve God's wrath and eternal damnation."

I now looked around me with pleasure: I thought I had travelled through half my journey, that the prospect was clearing up, the clouds dispersing, light rising out of obscurity, the heart-cheering sun began to spread around me its life-nourishing beams; but a Reverend Gentleman quoted a passage in Jer. xvii. 9, on the deceitfulness of the heart: he asserted indeed that all who did not believe his explanation must be bad men; he seemed to glory in the baseness of his nature; he told me that the will, the conscience, the understanding, all the powers of the mind, and all the propensities of the heart of every man under the sun were by nature deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; he added that whoever denied this fact, proved it by the very denial! I read the passage, and context. There I found, Jer. xvii. 1, that "the sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond, graven upon the table of their hearts, and upon the horns of the altar." I saw that the man whose heart departs from the Lord and trusts in man shall be like the heath of the desert, inhabiting the parched places of the wilderness.

ness, where falls no dew, no former nor latter rain, whose sandy plain yields no nourishment, produces no green thing, and no seed for the support of the famished traveller, no spring, no purling brook to quench his thirst, where only the dry and worthless sand moss, "the heath of the desert," preserved the semblance of vegetation,—like that moss, he shall never partake of the gentle dew from heaven, nor of the blessings of the fertile earth, "he shall not see when good cometh." I saw that sinners were ingenious to deceive themselves and others: I saw that the heart of Judah with sin engraved upon it thus must be deeply and desperately wicked, and that the altars upon which sin in its blackest colours was written (altars consecrated to idols) "whilst their children remembered them, and their groves by the green trees upon the high hills," where they worshipped Baal and Moloch and the Queen of heaven, must be an abomination in the sight of God, "who searches the heart, and tries the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." I might err, I was not infallible, my heart might deceive me, but I sought evidence, I think I was not influenced either by hope or fear to reject this passage, like the rest that went before it, as wholly inconclusive testimony when produced to witness the universal, radical, original and moral corruption of human nature.

I went on, I opened the New Testament, I read Christ's Sermon on the Mount: there I found every thing to prove that man was a frail, sinful mortal, but not a vessel filled by nature to the very brim with moral corruption, made under the wrath and curse of God. I read of the pure in heart, of the merciful, of inherent righteousness, of a righteousness that must be produced, very far beyond that of the Scribes and Pharisees, to fit a man for the kingdom of heaven. I read of attainable perfection, of a good tree producing good fruit, and a corrupt tree evil fruit: I read of doing the will of God, and hearing, and doing the sayings of Jesus Christ, that the wise man built his house upon *this* rock. I read John ix. of a blind man restored to sight by Jesus Christ, and was surprised to hear the disciples asking him "whether this man had

sinned or his parents that he was born blind," but I wondered not at all, at Christ's answer, "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents." I read of evil thoughts and evil deeds proceeding out of the heart of man, and I knew that nothing upon earth besides could produce them.

I heard the human heart described, Matt. xii. 35, as a treasury. "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth evil things." I read in the parable of the sower, Luke xv. of seed "sown in the good ground of an honest and good heart." I saw the man Jesus, the son of Adam, Abraham, Judah, David, Manasseh, one of the wickedest tyrants that ever lived, and traced among his ancestors many great sinners, and I was sure that he derived *his* nature from his parents, yet I believed that he was "without sin," touched with a feeling of our infirmities, tempted in all points as we are, our brother, partaker of our flesh and blood. Here a good old lady interrupted me; she said that she was satisfied of the existence of corrupt nature, because infants cry when they are born! Good old lady! If you could be literally born a second time, and have all your teeth to cut over again, you would cry too, but they evince passion before they can speak; yes, they are not blocks of marble, they have nerves and feel, they express their sense of uneasiness, hunger, cold and pain: blind puppies, too, whine from the same causes; but if you cannot distinguish between the natural expression of animal feeling, want, and passion, and original sin, neither probably do you see the difference between a sinner and a fool by nature, an unhappy circumstance, which will effectually prevent us from plunging together into this deep subject.

I certainly found nothing in the Old Testament to support this doctrine; but I am again interrupted. A philosophical Calvinist, one of the rational brethren, who accounts for every thing, came forward with his text, "He answered and said, verily, no one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean," Job xiv. 4, and context. "Certainly not, therefore God will not require more of such a creature, than he is capable of performing, nor

cause him to suffer more than is necessary and salutary." "His days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass, turn from him that he may accomplish as an hireling his day." Corrupt nature, he replied, is produced by natural generation, for all men existed in Adam, and all fell in him. So then, may it please your reverence, moral evil is propagated, like the king's evil. I thought a flame nourished by foetid oil, and glimmering in a dirty lamp, might kindle a thousand gems of light, as pure as the flame of an altar produced by the lightning of heaven. I had no conception before that moral qualities were animal secretions. I read the four Gospels, not a word nor a hint did I find in them to countenance this strange opinion of corrupt nature, but much, completely to destroy it. Man is addressed there as a free moral agent, and as an accountable being; his reason and conscience are addressed, his sins are laid at the door of his inclinations, "Why do ye not of yourselves judge that which is right;"—"men love darkness rather than light, because their *deeds* are evil;" "ye will not come to me;" "every one that doeth evil hateth the light neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be re-proved, but he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." "The hour is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of Jesus Christ, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Thus our Lord taught, nor could I reconcile these truths with the unaccountable doctrine of radical, total, universal, moral corruption. I examined the Book of Acts: there I saw nothing about the fall of man, nothing about corrupt nature, though I read much of the wickedness of the world, of the sin of idolatry, many exhortations to faith and repentance, and the practice of righteousness. I heard Paul addressing the reason and consciences of his hearers, at Lycaonia, at Athens, at Ephesus, at Jerusalem, and at Rome. Yes, he *reasoned* with them

out of the Scriptures, he told them that "forasmuch as we are the offspring of God in whom we live, move, and have our being, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone graven by art, and men's device, that God overlooked the times of ignorance but now commandeth all men every where to repent." I thought that if some had preached to these Heathen they would have begun with the total depravity of human nature, as the cause of all their idolatry and vices; that they would have shewn them the need of a Saviour by teaching their utter helplessness as dead sinners; that they would have taught them that they had no hearts to understand and obey the gospel; and that therefore it was in vain to preach it to them, that such sinners have no business with it, and that in consequence (the consistency of these people is complete) they have no Christ to offer them.

Others more inconsistently would teach them the universal corruption of nature by the fall, and yet spur on these dead sinners to faith, repentance, and all the moral duties enjoined by Jesus Christ; that, instead of God's "winking at" (overlooking) the ignorance of these idolaters in times past, they were all born so ignorant and sottishly opposed to the true God, as to be by nature not the objects of his forbearance but of his abhorrence! that it was yet their duty to love this God, and to serve him perfectly, which as they neither could, nor would do, they must perish everlastingly; yet if they believed and did what they by nature could not believe and do, they might be saved; that somehow or other there is a natural ability, and a moral inability, both arising out of nature as it now is, but that his moral inability is total, and universal, completely preventing all men from taking a step in the narrow road that leads to life; that even the will and choice are by nature wholly blind, and corrupt, so that no man can choose what is good, though his judgment may perceive it. I thought if Paul had believed all this he would not have preached as he is recorded to have done.

I now proceeded to examine the apostolic writings: I read in Paul's Epistles an awful description of the state of the world, at the time of our

Lord's appearance, but I did not see that he complained of nature but of the abuse of it. He tells us that when men knew God, they glorified him not as God neither were thankful. He taught that all had sinned, and all needed mercy: he shews to what an extent vice prevailed among the idolatrous Gentiles, and superstitious and bigoted Jews. He says nevertheless, that "man is the image and glory of God." 1 Cor. xi. 7. He tells us that glory, honour and peace shall be to every man that worketh good, that when the Gentiles who have not the law do *by nature* the things contained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another: and I thought that these facts were wholly subversive of the doctrine of original, universal and total depravity. I read of the reconciliation of sinners to God, of the carnal mind, of the works of the flesh, and of men dead in trespasses and sins, and that in this state the people at Ephesus, and the Jews among the rest, were by nature the children of wrath even as others in similar circumstances: I was certain that a man destitute of revealed religion, and one whose morals had been neglected, would grow up a savage, a victim to numberless evil passions, and I was not surprised to hear Paul describing the condition of the Jews as not being much better than that of the Gentiles "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind," for I had read their history, and did not doubt that a state of uncultivated nature would produce this evil fruit: I saw an instance of it in Adam, I read of sin entering into the world by one man and death by sin, and that by one man's disobedience many were made sinners. I knew that the carnal mind was enmity against God: I had seen and felt it to be so; I had suffered by it, and I thought that if men were less carnally minded, they would not be so ready to find excuses for their sins, be more humble before God, and not plead their nature as an hardened criminal pleads an *alibi*. I thought that this would be but a poor excuse at the day of judgment: I knew that where bad habits and the love of sin governed the heart, men were dead to

God and righteousness. I thought of that passage in Jer. xiii. 23—"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do well that are accustomed to do evil." I knew that the first man was the first sinner, and that death entered by sin. I doubted not that many became or were made sinners by this man's disobedience, that his posterity were exposed to a thousand natural evils, and consequently temptations to the commission of moral evil, which would never have existed had Adam never transgressed. I saw that men were naturally prone to wander from God; the conduct of our first parents proved that they were; therefore I was the less astonished at the abounding wickedness and folly of mankind. "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Eccles. vii. 29. I read through the Epistles, but I could find nothing in them to countenance the doctrine of a nature universally, totally, and radically corrupt. Nothing in Paul, nothing in Peter, James and John, not omitting Jude.

I wondered with great astonishment! Where could this doctrine originate? I thought it began in the synagogue, that it was a refinement upon the Brahminical doctrine of the metempsychosis: I suspected that the apostles were tainted with this error till better taught by Jesus Christ, or why did they ask that strange question—John ix. 2, 'I traced it to Africa, to Europe, to the Vatican, to Lambeth Palace, to the convocation, to the synod;—I saw original sin approaching me in the habit of the holy office, an inquisitor of the order of St. Dominic, I bowed not, but I thought it high time to retire.

SIGMA.

SIR,

August 12, 1816.

UPON perusing with usual interest the last Number of your valuable Repository, I was sensibly affected by the indirect information contained in page 386, (and the more official intelligence page 392), that the proposal of Mr. Rutt for a New Edition of Dr. Priestley's Theological Works is languishing for want of sufficient support from the Unitarian public. Allow me to state that when I first became acquainted with the proposal, by means

of the Repository, I experienced the genuine pleasure which results from the contemplation of the noble and dignified character of Dr. Priestley, and the probability that by this additional means the world would become still better acquainted with his excellencies, and still more enlightened by his serious and sagacious investigation into true religion. From that period to the present I have had little opportunity of learning what progress might be made towards the accomplishment of the design, except by the occasional hints which have been given in the Repository. Confiding in the high sense which is so generally and deservedly maintained among us of Dr. Priestley's religious and theological character, I had continued to cherish the expectation that the plan would ere long be in actual preparation, and had on various occasions contributed, I venture to say, to excite the interest I felt myself in the minds of others.—Let it not be supposed that I am induced to occupy your present attention by the selfish feeling of disappointment in my individual and anxious hope. I have no doubt whatever that the information which your last Number contained has produced similar regret in the breasts of many of your readers; and whether they adopt the same plan as myself, are ready to pronounce sentence upon that *indifference* to which alone the possible failure of such an object among us can be owing. Happy should I be if by any thing which I can offer, in conjunction with the appropriate suggestions of your worthy Correspondent in your last Number, such feelings may be inspired into the breasts of our *young laymen*, as may place the projected plan beyond the probability of failure.

There are *four classes* of persons to whom we might appeal for assistance in the publication of the new edition of Dr. Priestley's Works.—The *respectable laymen* in our connexion, who duly prize the importance of rational information on religious subjects; the *ministers of some standing*, who have had much experience in the prevalent opinion, and have learned duly to estimate these Works, which have been so great a means in the hands of Providence of contributing to the reformation which is going on; the *young ministers*, who have been taught indeed to make the Bible their chief book of

theology, but are aware how much they are indebted to Dr. Priestley for the present improved principles of theological education; and lastly, the *sons of our respectable laymen*, many of whom, I doubt not, have the cause of rational religion at heart, and who are from time to time collecting those books by which they will store their minds with the most valuable materials for future reflection and meditation.

With respect to the first class, many have Dr. Priestley's Works already in their possession; and though probably a fair proportion of the hundred subscribers which have hitherto been procured, are from this class, yet it is not perhaps from them that the prosecution of the object may be expected. The second class have probably nearly all the Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Dr. Priestley in their present collection; and as a superfluity of money can seldom fall to their lot, their personal contribution would hardly secure the plan under consideration. The third class, or young ministers, no doubt feel peculiar interest in the object under consideration; but of these, the greater proportion, having it may be but recently surmounted the difficulties of an expensive education, however they could wish it, are not in a condition to spare the ten or eleven guineas out of their scanty salaries. The object devolves then pretty much upon the fourth class, consisting of the sons of respectable and wealthy laymen, to whom the expense, divided probably into two or three years, can be no hinderance whatever, and who would by their assistance, have a most excellent opportunity of testifying their concern for the religious welfare of their fellow men. This appeal is not made to those young men, who, attracted by the false glare of fashion, are, to the unspeakable regret of their families, in danger of forsaking those principles and that cause, which their fathers after much patient investigation, and severe sacrifices of family consideration, have nobly supported: such can hardly be expected to lend their helping hand to the cause of virtue and truth:—the appeal is more to the truly interesting (and it is hoped numerous) class of young persons, who, blessed with the means of benevolent exertion and with the inestimable blessing of a liberal education, have conceived a deep interest in the religion of Jesus, soberly and

rationality explained—who have derived from the perusal of the Bible, and the works which are calculated to illustrate and authenticate its contents, the utmost improvement and delight, and who have resolved to devote a part of their leisure time in extending their acquaintance with such productions:—to these the appeal is made in favour of the proposed edition of Dr. Priestley's Works, and it is ardently hoped it will not be made in vain.

Two or three trivial objections have been made to the Proposal in the course of my conversation; and as these may possibly prevent some of your readers from yielding to the natural impulse of generous feeling, it may be well to bestow upon each a passing consideration.

1. There may be and probably are some copies of the larger Theological Works on hand; but this is no real objection to the proposed edition. This must have been the case with Dr. Lardner's Works, which consist almost entirely of two or three principal works; and yet happily for the celebrity of that useful critic, and for the progress of theological science in general, this was considered no sufficient obstacle to Dr. Kippis's edition. The fact is, that a great proportion of the eighteen volumes which it is computed Dr. Priestley's Works will occupy, would be made up of the smaller publications, many of which are little if any thing inferior in importance to the larger works; and many of these are almost inaccessible:—this is particularly the case with one of the most valuable, "The Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever." The consequence of the new edition will be a reduction in the price of the former ones, which will thus become accessible to that interesting class of the community—men who, amid the daily toils for their subsistence, find time to ruminate on the grand truths of religion, and whose minds are often more enlightened on these subjects, than many of those who are favoured with a higher place in the scale of society. Every suitable exertion should certainly be made to secure the efforts of such persons who labour to convey to those of their own rank a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

2. Are there not some of Dr. Priestley's theological writings which partake

rather of the nature of ingenious conjecture, than of sound and mature investigation? And would it be advisable, when the Christian world is so extensively combined in warfare against our little (but daily increasing) band, to place in their way any of those parts of the Doctor's writings, which may have already afforded occasion for our opponents to cavil? If the objection had not been actually made, it would not have been deemed deserving of consideration in this connexion. Your present Correspondent, Sir, has learned too highly to prize Dr. Priestley's excellencies both of heart and head, to entertain any apprehensions of the general effect that would arise from a perusal of his works. Let a man of ordinary understanding do this with candour and seriousness, and I pronounce it impossible that he should rise from the employment without being a much wiser and better man than he was before. The state of the case is indeed this: occasion has been taken to revile Dr. Priestley's character, and to shudder at the thought of giving him a place in company with others of considerable name, (but in reality vastly inferior to him*), from a very partial acquaintance with his writings, and the unjustifiable selection (according to the too common practice of orthodox men) of a few passages out of their connection, upon which they found their erroneous and unjust conclusions. Present the whole of the Doctor's gigantic labours in morals and religion before the eyes of the discerning public, and no other refutation will be needed of the vile clamours so industriously circulated. The candid will be struck with the piety and intelligence evinced in his numerous productions; the bigot will be suffused with shame from a comparison of his own littleness; and the fair fame of Priestley burst from the ignoble chains in which she is at present confined, and soar aloft amidst the general shout of admiration and gratitude.

* "Who, that was not bent on giving his system popularity and *eclat*, would ever have thought of classing together in the same theological list the names of Dr. Isaac Watts and Dr. Joseph Priestley? Have there existed two men antipodes in religious sentiment and religious feeling, these are the two."—*Wardlaw's Unitarianism incapable of Vindication*.

The only remaining objection that I know of, arises from the depression to which trade is at present subject.

If the appeal in this letter had been made to the lower classes of the community, it is admitted the objection would have had its force. If it had been made solely to our laymen of easy fortunes, but who have themselves families to provide for, and whose benevolent hearts deeply commiserate the sad condition of the poor around them, there would still perhaps be some appearance of reason:—but the appeal is made, as before stated, to the young men of fortune either in or out of trade who have yet little of the cares of the world, who have just passed through their elementary education, whose minds are deeply impressed with the value and efficacy of truth, and who can easily spare a small portion of their spending money, to the promotion of the noble object which is now contemplated. To such of our body, all who feel interested in the progress of our plans for improvement in knowledge and religion, must look with the utmost confidence. The preachers who are successively educated in our seminaries, may raise their voices in the support of truth, they may contribute by their labours in public and private to the respectability of the cause; but after all, their success will very much depend upon their lay brethren who possess wealth to strengthen the hands of their ministers, and give them their sanction and assistance. If any such, influenced by these friendly and well-intended suggestions, should come forwards to raise this monument to the memory of one who laboured incessantly for the young in particular, to contribute their individual efforts to rescue eminent talents from abuse and calumny, to dissipate the mists of prejudice, bigotry and superstition which envelope the religious atmosphere,—happy will the writer of this letter deem himself to be, and fully compensated for the little trouble which it has occasioned him; though this has been already sufficiently rewarded by the mere prospect of the disinterested efforts which he has now contemplated.

I am, Sir, with best wishes for the success of your very useful Repository,

A SUBSCRIBER OF THE
THIRD CLASS.

The Gipsies.

[From the Liverpool Freeman; or Weekly Magazine. Price 6d. No. 6. Aug 6, 1816.]

OF late years some attempts have been made to reduce the numbers or at any rate to civilize the habits, of that vagabond and useless race, the Gipsies. In pursuance of such purpose, a society of gentlemen have been making all the preliminary inquiries requisite to a proper understanding of the subject. A series of questions have been proposed to competent persons in the different counties of England and Scotland; and answers have been received. Our readers will, we think, be amused with the following specimen of these answers:—

1. All Gipsies suppose the first of them came from Egypt.

2. They cannot form any idea of the number in England.

3. The Gipsies of Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, parts of Buckinghamshire, Cambridge and Huntingdonshire, are continually making revolutions within the ranges of those counties.

4. They are either ignorant of the number of Gipsies in the counties through which they travel, or unwilling to disclose their knowledge.

5. The most common names are Smith, Cooper, Draper, Taylor, Boswell, Lee, Lovell, Loversedge, Allen, Mansfield, Glover, Williams, Carew, Martin, Stanley, Buckley, Plunkett, and Corrie.

6 and 7. The gangs in different towns have not any regular connexion or organization; but those who take up their winter quarters in the same city or town appear to have some knowledge of the different routes each horde will pursue; probably with a desire to prevent interference.

8. In the county of Herts it is computed there may be sixty families having many children. Whether they are quite so numerous in Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, and Northamptonshire, the answers are not sufficiently definite to determine. In Cambridgeshire, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, Wiltshire, and Dorsetshire, greater numbers are calculated upon. In various counties, the attention has not been competent to the procuring data for any estimate of families or individuals.

9. More than half their number follow no business: others are dealers in horses and asses: farriers, smiths, tinkers, braziers, grinders of cutlery, basket-makers, chair-bottomers, and musicians.

10. Children are brought up in the habits of their parents, particularly to music and dancing, and are of dissolute conduct.

11. The women mostly carry baskets with trinkets and small wares; and tell fortunes.

12. Too ignorant to have acquired accounts of genealogy, and perhaps indisposed by the irregularity of their habits.

13. In most counties there are particular situations to which they are partial. In Berkshire is a marsh, near Newbury, much frequented by them; and Dr. Clarke states, that in Cambridgeshire, their principal rendezvous is near the western villages.

14. It cannot be ascertained whether, from their first coming into the nation, attachment to particular places has prevailed.

15, 16, and 17. When among strangers, they elude inquiries respecting their peculiar language, calling it gibberish. Don't know of any person that can write it, or of any written specimen of it.

18. Their habits and customs in all places are peculiar.

19. Those who profess any religion represent it to be that of the country in which they reside: but their description of it seldom goes beyond repeating the Lord's Prayer; and only few of them are capable of that. Instances of their attending any place for worship are very rare.

20. They marry for the most part by pledging to each other, without any ceremony. A few exceptions have occurred when money was plentiful.

21. They do not teach their children religion.

22 and 23. Not one in a thousand can read.

taking notice of some of his statements; in doing which I shall endeavour to be as brief as the subject admits.

To expose to the world the failings of a fellow-creature, must necessarily prove a painful task to a benevolent mind; but publicly to advance, or even insinuate, a charge of *immorality* against an individual unable to defend himself, without substantiating such allegation, appears to me a procedure altogether unwarrantable. Your Correspondent, however, seems to me placed in this awkward predicament, by his unnecessary and unproved insinuation against the Count. The injurious reflection he threw out in his first paper, I am sorry to find reiterated by him, after what had been advanced by myself. Since what he regards as evidence is not produceable in a work designed for general readers, why advert to so ungrateful a topic at all? Christian charity, not to mention justice, would in my opinion have here dictated silence. But your Correspondent assigns the following reason for his insinuation to the prejudice of the Count. "I considered it my duty, to guard the memories of such men as Watts and Doddridge, from the imputation of an unqualified approbation of Count Zinzendorf." A strange mode of acting this, to exalt one character by depreciating another! But whoever regarded the Count with unqualified admiration? That he was a great and good man I have no doubt, but he had his defects and weaknesses; and in persons of his ardent cast of mind they are always most prominent.

In reference to the religious poems to which your Correspondent alludes, (for they were *not* used as *hymns*,) let me inform him that scarcely any had the Count for their author; and, as already noticed, as soon as he perceived that they were open to misrepresentation, he checked their further circulation. Yet even these poems, objectionable as their original phraseology is, become far more so in Rimius's hands; and I affirm cannot be justly appreciated from his exhibition of them: his illegitimate renderings, and utter neglect of the connexion in which the passages quoted by him stand, necessarily preclude his work from implicit credit. Permit me, Sir, to add, that the only clue to

SIR,

Exeter, Aug. 7, 1816.

I HOPED to have had no further occasion to engage the attention of yourself, or your readers, to the subject of my former paper, (p. 264;) but your Correspondent's reply in the last Number of your estimable Repository, (p. 390,) seems to require my

a just exposition of such phraseology, is to be found in an intimate acquaintance with the theological and moral views of Count Zinzendorf and the brethren of that day. Such phraseology, though open to abuse, was, however, I am warranted in affirming, only employed in a spiritual sense by the brethren themselves, and I am satisfied, from experience and observation, gave rise amongst them to no other than the purest ideas and emotions. Had the excellent Jortin been aware of this circumstance, however he might reprehend such language, he would have refrained from implicating in his censure the *character* of the Count.

But I am blamed by your Correspondent for not having verified my allegations against Rimius; in answer permit me to adopt his own words: "I did not conceive such a discussion adapted to a work designed for general readers." Your Correspondent and myself are here placed in similar circumstances; however with one material difference: my estimate of Rimius's work appeared necessary, whereas your Correspondent's attack on the Count's character may be considered optional. That I may not however be thought to have advanced charges wholly without foundation, I shall take the liberty of adverting to one instance amongst others of Rimius's unfairness, would I could say incapacity, as a translator: the example I select is his unjustifiable rendering of the German termination *lein* by *little*, instead of *dear* or *precious*; as in the words *lacmlein*, *wundlein*; the literal rendering of these words is I admit *little lamb*, *little wound*; but the connexion in which they stand, plainly pointed out to Rimius that they ought to be translated *precious lamb*, *precious wound*; Christ and his sufferings being the theme, and the brethren of that time being in the habit of using that termination to express *holy endearment*. Thus a translator, deficient in ability, or in rectitude, may pervert an author's meaning without infringing any grammatical rules.*

* In my last paper I noticed the line of conduct the brethren thought proper to adopt, with regard to Rimius's publication; though your Correspondent seems

Your Correspondent tells his readers, that my appeal to the case of Dr. Gill "has very little, if any connexion with the subject;" but let me, notwithstanding, still adduce it as well calculated to confirm my position, viz. that there is no necessary connexion between impropriety of language and impropriety of thought and feeling; though I would decidedly protest against the use of any such language myself. On this account I cannot approve of your Correspondent's use of the word *amatory*, where *divine love* is the subject, because that word being usually expressive of *sensual attachment*, will be thus associated in the mind.

The compliment paid by your Correspondent, to the brethren of the present day, at the expense of their esteemed predecessors, will I apprehend scarcely be accepted by them.

It remains for me only to apologize for the length of this paper, and in conclusion (to avail myself once more of your Correspondent's words) will say that "I am not aware that I ought to trouble him, or any of your readers, further on the disagreeable subject which has very unexpectedly been forced on my attention," but which a sense of duty prompted me to undertake, in behalf of an esteemed individual, whose character I consider unjustly aspersed.

With every sentiment of regard,
J. T. B.

On the Divine Government.

SIR,

I FEAR that I do not fully understand your Correspondent, *An Old Inquirer*,† in the *Répository* for June, (p. 322,) who animadvertes upon the first scheme of Divine Providence

to have overlooked what I there said, for he observes, "Crantz and La Trobe have left it unimpeached." As *historians*, an answer to that work did not fall within their province, had they been so inclined; but I will inform him that he may find a full, and I think according to the Count's view of Bible truth, a satisfactory reply, to all the charges brought against him, in a quarto volume published in the German language about the year 1754.

† It will have been seen that this Correspondent has ceased from his labours, and fallen into his place in our *Obituary*, p. 487.
Ed.

without touching upon the second, (p. 74,) which I should have presumed would have had his approbation.

If we admit the existence of God, as the Creator of all things, I think it will follow as an unavoidable consequence, that all lifeless matter that he has formed must obey the laws with which it is impressed, and that therefore not an atom is to be found, which did not necessarily occupy the station and perform the office for which it was appointed. I mean when such atom has not been acted upon or influenced by living existence. So far we seem to proceed, without the intervention of hypothesis, upon grounds absolutely certain, taking for granted only, that matter and its laws were created and made by an intelligent being. If *An Old Inquirer* deem this a gratuitous hypothesis, namely, that intelligent being created all matter, and impressed it with its laws, I confess it to be an hypothesis—but one, which seems not only reasonable, but what is now generally admitted. So far then, as lifeless matter is concerned, I think we need not enter upon any farther illustration. A vast class of living beings, which we do not deem rational and moral agents, next invite our inquiry, the birds in the air, the fishes in the sea, and the innumerable irrational animals on the earth. The question then will be, do these ever act, or can they act, in contrariety to the laws to which their Creator has subjected them? Have they independent powers, or do they necessarily follow the laws of their nature? For it will not, cannot be denied that they are created subject to certain laws. They have feeling, feel pleasure and pain, and necessarily avoid the one and choose the other. Their actions, are they the simple result of those feelings, or have they a liberty of self-determination? In as far as we can judge from observation, they appear to follow their feelings simply, for we cannot perceive that they have any thing to oppose to these feelings. We kill the tyger because he destroys us, not because in so doing, we imagine him to abuse his liberty and act contrary to his nature. All the actions of these immense tribes of animals, if they be the simple result of the laws of their nature, and not

the effect of independent powers, are therefore as much the appointment of God, as the place and action of every atom of lifeless matter. We may be confounded by the variety of effect, and wonder how any mind could comprehend such a vast machinery; but we are no less confounded by the powers of creation. Thus then all matter and its effects, and all animals which we see, and their actions, are of divine appointment, or the necessary effects of creating power; except indeed the actions of men, which must now be examined.

Either man is governed in his whole conduct by the fixed laws of his nature, or he is emphatically free in all his voluntary conduct—there is no middle supposition which is tenable, and under these opposite suppositions, the greatest names have arranged themselves in argument and disputation. I presume not to determine the question, but only to reason upon the consequences of either supposition. If man then be an agent perfectly free in all his voluntary conduct, it will follow that he possesses a power from his Creator, which he exerts at pleasure, concerning the effect of which nothing can be predicated. Whatever evils men occasion by their voluntary conduct, and whatever good, is ascribable to them, and not to their Creator.

If God formed the first male and female with such powers, then he appointed not the existence of the human race, for it depended upon their voluntary co-operation whether the race should proceed. God gave the powers, the use or abuse of them belongs only to man. According to this reasoning, the maximum of happiness and misery may be fixed; but whatever of happiness or misery be the effect of the voluntary powers of men, as these are free and independent powers, are not of divine appointment, but arrange themselves under Dr. Paley's scheme of chance. Whatever sufferings come upon brute animals, by the voluntary conduct of man, as it was not foreseen or appointed, is not resolvable into the will of God. This supposition places man in an awful situation, and he cannot but wish that the first pair had died without issue.

On the opposite supposition that

the actions of man, are the necessary result of his nature and circumstances, he has the consolation of a less tremendous responsibility, but then it is in contradiction to all the general systems of religion.

AN INQUIRER.

P. S. I will take the liberty of adding a few remarks upon Dr. Paley's Scheme of Chance. He says that there may be chance in the midst of design; two men travelling by design between London and York, meet by accident, or chance, on the road. Here is chance in the midst of design. This principle must be admitted to its full extent, when human design only is contemplated. Thus the consequences of nine tenths of the actions of men are consequences of chance. No man by design injures his circumstances, few by design injure their health, thus every man's death nearly, is by chance. Very few men when they marry design children, this is not their motive or design, therefore, every man's birth is by chance. There is according to this scheme, very little that affects the being or happiness of sensible beings the effect of design. And this is perfectly agreeable to my second scheme of the Divine government, which is the only doctrine consistent with the philosophical free agency of man, and which, as it excludes foreknowledge of effect from the Deity completely as to whatever relates to man in this world, excludes also effective design. God wills that if men are born, they should possess a definite organization, and be subject to certain general circumstances, and there the design of the Deity stops. Their future, not their present destination, depends entirely on his will, and if there be either justice or goodness in it, must be as various as the variety of human character. This is Dr. Paley's doctrine of chance, and seems to be agreeable to appearances, and the common apprehensions of mankind.

Every middle scheme is a system of confusion and contradiction, or of constant miracle, so that there appears to be no alternative between Paley's Chance, and Hobbes's Necessity. This is the full extent of my assertion, I meddle not with the question as to which scheme is the true one.

Newington Green,

SIR,

September 10th, 1816.

I OFFER a few remarks on a communication in your last Number, (p. 448), respecting the Greek Article, but without the smallest intention of stepping in between your Correspondent and Dr. Charles Lloyd. I have not the least doubt that a gentleman of the Doctor's learning can "prove to demonstration that the Deity of Christ is not to be inferred by any right application of the Article to passages in the New Testament;" and shall be glad to see such proof in the Monthly Repository or in a separate publication.

Your respectable Correspondent will not, I trust, be offended with my remarks on some parts of his letter. His object seems to be useful knowledge, and therefore I presume that my notice of his communication will be as well received as it is well intended. "The Article (your Correspondent remarks) is only an index." I thought so when I wrote the following sentence in *Reason the Arbiter of Language*: "*This and that are merely two indexes or pointers, such as we often see on way-posts or buildings to direct the eye to some object, and which are properly printed as a hand, because they supply its place. So that or this supplies the place of a hand, or rather of a finger, and was originally nothing but its name.*" Such was my opinion at that time: whether I invented or borrowed it I cannot now ascertain; but I recollect well that even then the nature and origin of the *parts of speech* had cost me much hard thinking and tiresome searching. But on further inquiry (and, I trust, clearer, deeper reflection), I was compelled (somewhat reluctantly, for I had published an opinion), by what I deemed convincing evidence, to abandon the idea of *index*, and proclaim the fallibility of my understanding. The final decision of my erring judgment is expressed very fully in *Philosophic Etymology*. If your Correspondent will favour my Work with a perusal, he will find that my opinion coincides with that of Aristotle and that of Dr. Middleton at the same time. In representing the Greek as having no resemblance to the English Article, indeed I suspect the Doctor knew not what he said nor whereof he affirmed. He was right in saying that the Greek Article is the pronoun relative *ο*; but

he would have been equally right had he said that the relative pronoun is the Article. The terms *relative* and *article* seem both to have originated in just conception.

Your Correspondent remarks:—"though it be granted that 'o was originally a pronoun, it is no more a pronoun now than it is a verb or adjective." Dugald Stewart employs similar language in his remarks upon the Diversions of Purley, which I do not wonder at; but I would submit to the re-consideration of your Correspondent, whether such language be suited to rigorous inquiry and just conception. The question of any importance, is not what technical names have been applied to 'o, but what it is. What is its nature or use? Will your Correspondent have the goodness to explain what a pronoun or a verb is? I can assure him the question is not capacious, for if he can give a simpler, more intelligible and satisfactory account of these matters than I have endeavoured to give, he shall have my best and sincerest thanks. "The Monthly Reviewer (it is said) has justly maintained the superiority of the English over the Greek in precision, by the means of the indefinite—*an*—in combination with the definitive." But I suspect if the Monthly Reviewer were asked this simple question—what is the definite or what is the indefinite article? he would not give a very ready or very intelligible answer. What is called the definite article has no necessary connection with *definiteness*; and what is absurdly called the indefinite article is merely a varied spelling and pronunciation of the numeral *one*.

There is a gentleman with whose remarks on these subjects I should be extremely glad to see your pages enriched, for I consider his understanding of a much higher order than that of either the mere linguist or the mere metaphysician. He has only to think as freely, clearly and profoundly on philology, as on Philosophical Necessity, to render important services to true grammar and sound logic. He has with much candour (I ought perhaps to say generosity after the poignancy of some of my strictures) acknowledged that I have successfully illustrated several obscure points; and if he will point out some of the more essential particulars wherein I may have failed

in developing the principles of language satisfactorily, I trust that I shall treat his remarks with becoming respect.

He may have more reverence for scholastic authority than I can admire, but I feel confident that he will be at the trouble of understanding my meaning, though I fear much that some of my readers will resemble those alluded to in the following sentence: "When men have once acquiesced in untrue opinions, and registered them as authentic records in their minds, it is no less impossible to speak intelligibly (or convincingly) to them, than to write legibly upon a paper already scribbled over." Unfortunately for useful learning and true science, the minds of many teachers are scribbled over with school-boy nonsense; but as the judicious Locke justly remarks: "It is not strange that methods of learning which scholars have been accustomed to in their beginning and entrance upon the sciences, should influence them all their lives, and be settled in their minds by an overruling reverence, especially if they be such as universal use has established. Learners must at first be believers, and their master's rules having been once made axioms to them, it is no wonder they should keep that dignity, and, by the authority they have once got, mislead those, who think it sufficient to excuse them, if they go out of their way in a well beaten tract. And when fashion hath once established what folly began, custom makes it sacred, and it will be thought impudence or madness to contradict or question it."

If I have not already occupied too much of the room allotted in the Repository to communications of this nature, I should be glad to have some queries inserted in reference to a subject which has received some notice in your pages, hoping that some of your readers will be induced to reply to them.

What are the principal advantages and disadvantages of the different forms of *government*? Wherein consists true national prosperity? Is the doctrine of Malthus an insurmountable obstacle to the perfectibility or *improvableness* to any great degree of human society? In other words, are vice and misery necessary to keep population down to the level of the means of subsistence?

Are private vices public benefits? In other words, is what is called a great, powerful and flourishing state of society, necessarily corrupt or vicious? What are the advantages and disadvantages of foreign commerce? What are the advantages and disadvantages of luxury—of the fine arts—of large towns—of immense fortunes—of hereditary wealth and titles—of abridging labour by machinery, &c. &c.? Have public amusements, as the theatre, the opera, &c. a good or bad tendency? Have works of *fiction*, as plays, novels, poesies, &c. a good or bad tendency? What are the true origin, nature and tendency of gallantry, cicisbeism, &c.? What are the origin, nature and tendency of politeness? Is it (as Mandeville represents it) essentially insincere or hypocritical, the slavish offspring of despotic courts? What is the real value of what are called accomplishments? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the modern plan of education? What parts of modern education are useful—what parts are useless—what parts are mischievous? What are the advantages and disadvantages respectively of universities, colleges, day-schools, boarding-schools, &c.? Is it probable that there might be more of useful learning and true science without any of them? Whether are maxims and manners or laws and institutions of greatest importance to the well-being of commonwealths? Is it possible to have a system of laws so simple as to preclude the necessity of professional lawyers? Is it possible to have justice administered in a well ordered commonwealth without a code of laws? Are there any absolute or abstract principles of justice? What is the firmest and broadest basis of equity? What is the fairest or least arbitrary title to property? What are the best preventives of faction, commotion, fraud, violence, discontent, &c. in a commonwealth? What are the most effectual means of preserving a commonwealth in the even tenour of progressive improvement, equidistant from despotism and anarchy? What is the great central principle, round which a commonwealth must constantly revolve, to have the greatest sum of freedom, dignity and happiness, and most security from despotism and anarchy—external and internal war? Is it possible and desirable to raise a

whole people into a philosophical society? What are the best means for that purpose? What are the advantages and disadvantages of ecclesiastical establishments? Are they compatible with the peace, security and progressive improvement of a well-ordered commonwealth? Are any religious sects or factions (two or more congregations united into one body), whether established or tolerated, compatible with the well-being of commonwealths? Are *charities* of any description benefits or injuries to society?

These, Sir, are a few of such queries as I should be glad to see well answered in your pages. Crude thoughts in loose remarks will serve no good purpose; but if some of your readers will digest or *think* any of the above queries into simple, clear, distinct, self-evident, or demonstrable propositions, they will confer a benefit on society, and very much oblige

Your Correspondent,
JAMES GILCHRIST.

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

No. CCLXXII.

Lord Clarendon's Character of the Emperor Julian.

“ And now succeeded Julian in the Empire; whether an apostate or no, may for aught I know be lawfully doubted. That he was a great enemy to the Christians, and that he found a way more to discredit and dishonour Christianity by his wit and mirth and scoffs and discountenance, (which made a greater impression upon the Christians of that age, and made more of them to renounce their faith, than any one of the fiery and bloody persecutions had done) is very clear: yet I have never seen ground enough to conclude that he ever embraced the Christian faith, or was instructed in it; for though he had conformed in some outward appearance, to the commands of his uncle the Emperor Constantine, yet he appeared always addicted to the religion of the Gentiles, in which he was very learned; and taking him as a Gentile, he may well be looked upon as a prince of extraordinary virtue, and one, who if he had not been carried by a wonderful providence, and against all the advice of his friends

and several predictions (to which he was naturally superstitious enough) into that war where he was slain, it is probable might have extended his empire to as great an extent of dominion and reputation as ever it had under any of his predecessors. And here it may not be unfit (though I believe it will be very unpopular) to observe how much passion and prejudice contribute to the corruption of history: for we know not to what else to impute all those relations of the manner of his death, and his last speech in contempt of our Saviour, than to the over zeal of religious persons of that age; who, believing his apostacy, thought they could not load his memory with too many reproaches, nor sufficiently celebrate God's mercy in the vengeance acted upon him in so extraordinary a manner. And the Spaniards do still believe that he was killed by Saint Mercurius with one of the lances which was always kept in that Saint's tomb, as it was missed on the day in which Julian was killed, and found again the next day in its place, all bloody. Whereas, if we will believe Ammianus Marcellinus, (who is incomparably the best writer of that age and was himself in that battle,) he was hurt in a very sharp charge of the enemy when great numbers fell on both sides; and being carried out of the field into his tent, where he lived some days after he found his wound to be mortal, he sent for the principal officers of his army, made a long discourse to them of the public affairs and of his particular person and his actions and intentions, full of wisdom and magnanimity, and died with as great serenity and tranquillity of mind as any Roman general of whom we have received very good account in story."

Religion and Policy, 8vo. 1811. I. 23—25.

No. CCLXXIII.

Magnanimity of a Scottish Prince.

Malcolm the Third having received information, that one of his nobles had conceived a design against his life, he enjoined the strictest silence to the informer, and took no notice of it himself, till the person accused of this execrable treason came to his court, in order to execute his intention. The

next morning he went to hunt, with all the train of his courtiers, and when they were got into the deepest woods of the forest, drew that nobleman away from the rest of the company, and spoke to him thus: "Behold! we are here alone, armed and mounted alike. Nobody sees or hears us, or can give either of us aid against the other. If then you are a brave man, if you have courage and spirit, perform your purpose; accomplish the promise you have made to my enemies. If you think I ought to be killed by you, when can you do it better? when more opportunely? when more manfully?—Have you prepared poison for me? that is a womanish treason. Or would you murder me in my bed? an adulteress could do that. Or have you hid a dagger to stab me secretly? that is the deed of a ruffian. Rather act like a soldier; act like a man; and fight with me hand to hand; that your treason may at least be free from baseness."—At these words, the traitor, as if he had been struck with a thunderbolt, fell at his feet and implored his pardon. "Fear nothing: you shall not suffer any evil from me," replied the king, and kept his word.

The above story is related (from the mouth of Malcolm's own son, David the First, to Henry II. of England, his great grandson,) by Ethelred, Abbot of Rivaux. [De Genealogia Reg. Angl. p. 367.]

See *Lord Lyttelton's Henry II.* 8vo. I. pp. 94, 95.

No. CCLXXIV.

Spiritual Comedy at Rome.

"The Father-Jesuits at Rome have had a play, or spiritual comedy, acted in their *Casa Professa* (or part of their college where they read their lectures) concerning the conversion of Japan. In the first scene of which there appeared a Jesuit making a sermon to the pit about this subject. That God, being upon the work of renewing the world, has in this age raised up their society, which his Divine Majesty hath been so gracious to, that no human power has been able to oppose it, and such other *jimcracks*, which they brought in a Japanese to reply to: who said, that they did not believe that God sent them thither, but that some enemy of mankind wafted them over into their

country, and there they make it their business to set people together by the ears, and to spy out the nakedness of their country, and divers others such conceits. And so the play went on, with divers other remarkable passages spoken by the actors, all against them. And I cannot imagine how this came into their heads, unless it be to tell the world to their teeth, that they know what folks talk and think of them; and that they value no man a farthing for it."

*Father Paul's Letters, p. 326,
Venice, 1612.*

No. CCLXXV.

Jesuits Outwitted.

"At Palermo these sweet fathers have met with a pretty accident. A certain wealthy gentleman died there, that was hugely devoted to them; and having made his will, and left *his only son* and *those fathers* together, his heirs, making them his executors, with a

power of dividing the estate as they pleased, and of giving the son what they should see convenient; the fathers have divided it all into ten parts, and fairly given one part to the son, and kept the other nine for themselves. The son hereupon has made his complaint to the Duke of Ossuna (the viceroy) of this great inequality; who hearing both parties, has made good the division that the Jesuits made of the whole estate; but changing the terms, has ordered that the nine parts do (by the will) belong to the son, and one part (and no more) to the fathers, because they were to give him what pleased them."

The Same, p. 326.

No. CCLXXVI.

A Canonization.

Not many years ago, a Dominican of Toledo was ranked among the Saints for having remained thirty years in his cell alone and without smiling or speaking.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

July 27th, 1816.

Observations on MATT. xi. 27.

WHERE MYSTERY exists, there is no REVELATION: and, again, in points which are *revealed* there can be no *mystery*. If the sun burst on us in his splendour, darkness is immediately put to flight. To speak of the mysteries of Revelation, is at once to employ phraseology as incorrect as can well be conceived, and to arraign the Divine wisdom, goodness and fidelity in the doctrine of the Gospel. It is to say that God, having professed to give mankind the most important knowledge respecting himself, and the designs which he executes by Jesus Christ, has, nevertheless, failed of his intention, has withholden what, according to the persons whom I have in view, is yet essential to be believed; inasmuch as without the belief of it we can have no salvation.

The question concerning this supposed alliance of mystery with Revelation, may be brought within a short compass and to an easy issue. Let all those passages of Scripture where the word *mystery* occurs be collected and

compared together. This being done, if a single text can be produced which asserts the mysteriousness of any revealed doctrines, I will consent to retract as erroneous my opinion on the utter irreconcilableness of the term *mystery* with the term *revelation*.

What then, it may be asked, is the import of the passage to which reference is made at the head of this paper? Must we not pronounce it somewhat favourable to the notion that even Revelation has its mysteries? So it may be thought, when torn away from its context, when interpreted by readers whose minds have received a bias from human creeds: so it will not be considered after it has been thoroughly examined.

As error is best confuted by the establishment of truth, I begin with endeavouring to ascertain the just sense of our Lord's declaration, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

The Gospel was rejected by numbers

of those to whom it had been first offered, and especially by the leading persons in the Jewish nation, by the sect who possessed the chief honour and influence among them. It was a consolation however to the benevolent mind of Jesus Christ that some of the lower classes of the people had received his doctrine with willing hearts, and that he could look forward to the further diffusion of it, particularly beyond the limits of Judæa. On this account, he, accordingly, presented to the God whom he worshipped the following devout acknowledgment: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent," from men who are such in their own conceit, "and hast revealed them unto babes," to persons of humbler attainments and pretensions, and of teachable dispositions—"Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Here it is observable that our Lord expressly distinguishes between what is *hidden* and what is *revealed*: and to this admirable devotional address succeeds the declaration, "all things, &c. &c."

From this reference of the passage to its *connexion*, we learn that Jesus is speaking throughout of *the designs* of the Father, and of *the instrumentality and commission* of the Son, in the scheme of the Gospel.

Let us now consider somewhat more minutely *the words themselves*:

"All things," all matters relative to the Christian dispensation, all *persons* of every nation, who are to be the subjects of it, "are delivered unto me of my Father," committed unto me by God, the only possessor of underived and essential power: or, as the same fact is expressed, John iii. 35, "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "And no man knoweth the Son," or is as yet acquainted with the comprehensive object of his office, "but the Father," who putteth the times and seasons in his own power, and worketh according to the counsel of his own will: "neither knoweth any man the Father," no one is in possession of the extent of the plans of Divine grace, "save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him;" which latter sentiment is illustrated and supported by our Lord's words in John vi. 46—"not that any man hath seen the Father—save he who is of God, he hath seen

the Father'—where the term *seen* is manifestly equivalent with *known*.

To justify this exposition, which, in its principle, agrees with Dr. S. Clarke's,* and with Rosenmuller's,† it may be remarked that in the New Testament *persons* are not unfrequently denoted by the word *things*,‡ as in 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; that *the Father* is the appropriate name of God under the dispensation of the Gospel, and expressive of his parental relation to *all* mankind; that *the Son* is a title of office; that nothing is more common than to state general propositions in an absolute form; and that the concise modes of speech in use among the Eastern people admit and receive light from the occasions and the subjects in respect of which they are employed.

The true sense then of the passage before us I take to be the following, 'that at the time when these words were uttered, no one, but the Father, the only God, knew the extent of our Saviour's commission, including, as it really did, the whole human race; and, on the other hand, that no man save the Son, none but Jesus Christ, possessed a knowledge of the merciful designs of the Father being thus unlimited—although it was a truth which the Messiah had the privilege of communicating at his pleasure.' How well this interpretation accords with facts, and with our Lord's character and circumstances, it is unnecessary to represent.

Of a double meaning the passage does not appear to be susceptible. Consequently, if I have succeeded in ascertaining its just signification, all other paraphrases of it must be erroneous.

If, for example, any persons will infer from these words that the nature or the essence of the Father and of the Son are known mutually to themselves, and to those who are favoured with this knowledge by Jesus Christ, let such expositors be informed that they substitute their own imaginations for the language and the meaning of the Bible. The Bible does not profess to instruct us in the essence of the Deity, but declares that he is a perfect spirit, and conveys to mankind the most valuable knowledge with regard to his character,

* *A Paraphrase, &c.* in loc :

† *Scholia in N. T.* in loc :

‡ *Hammond, &c.* in loc :

government and will. And of the great Messiah, the Mediator of the covenant of the Gospel, it invariably speaks as *the man Christ Jesus*; never even intimating that his nature and person are mysterious, and certainly holding forth no such intelligence in the sentences on which I am commenting.

Further; It ought not to be concluded from the last clause, 'he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,' that Jesus communicates to any of his followers a private or individual revelation of the nature or the mind of God. This mistake is very current, and tends to produce in some men spiritual pride, in others religious despondency. It is a *public* revelation which our Lord here mentions; one that was made in part by his own instrumentality, in part by that of his apostles. There are two passages in the New Testament with which the words before us ought especially to be compared: John i. 18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father," i. e. who has a compleat acquaintance with the Divine counsels for the salvation of the world, "he hath declared him:" Matt. xiii. 16, 17, "— verily, I say unto you that blessed are your eyes, &c.; for many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them."

So far therefore is the phraseology which has been the subject of these remarks from stating or implying the existence of a mysterious union between the Father and the Son that it declares a plain and most interesting truth: I mean, the concurrence of God and Christ as to the grand objects and vast extent of the Christian Revelation; a truth particularly valuable to those professors of the Gospel who are of Gentile parentage! N.

August 7th, 1816.

Supplementary Remarks on the Priesthood of Christ.

[See pp. 402, 403.]

IT is usual with writers on systematic theology to represent Jesus Christ as sustaining the several offices of *prophet, priest* and *king*. This division, though not exactly this arrangement,

of his characters, is adopted in *The Racovian Catechism*;* a manual which, I hope, will soon be more extensively known among my readers, and from which I shall now make two extracts on a subject to which their attention has lately been directed:†

"— was he [Christ] not a priest till he entered into the heaven? not when he hung upon the cross?"

"A. At no hand; for, as you heard even now, the divine author to the Hebrews, ch. viii. 4, expressly saith that if Christ were upon the earth, he would not be a priest. Besides, forasmuch as the same author testifieth that Christ ought in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a faithful and merciful high priest to God ward, it is evident that until he had been made like unto his brethren in all things, that is in afflictions and death, he was not our merciful and faithful high priest."

The following question and answer, deserve the notice of careful inquirers into the sense of Scripture:

"Why doth the Scripture, treating of Christ's priesthood, say that he intercedeth for us?"

"A. Both that the care which Christ takes of our salvation might, by the requests which he is said to make to God, appear to us; and also that the prerogative and eminency of the Father above Christ might remain entire and inviolate."

Here the compiler of the Catechism alludes to Heb. vii. 24, 25. But the word *intercession*, which occurs in that passage, does not necessarily and exclusively import *the act of offering supplications for the welfare of others*. It is a term of very extensive signification, and means *the management of the concerns of our fellow men*.

The intercession of Christ, therefore, is not his pleading with offended justice, or his interposing to avert Divine wrath: it is *a part of his mediation or ministry as the APPOINTED Messenger of God and Saviour of mankind*; and thus, in the language of this Catechism, it illustrates "the prerogative and eminency of the Father." N.

* Translated into English. Amsterdam, 1652. pp. 163, &c. *Catechesis Ecclesiarum Polonicarum*. 325, &c.

† M. Repos. XI. 402, 403.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*An Essay on the Existence of a Supreme Creator, possessed of Infinite Power, Wisdom and Goodness*: containing also the Refutation from Reason and Revelation of the Objections urged against his Wisdom and Goodness; and deducing from the whole Subject the most important Practical Inferences. By William Laurence Brown, D.D. Principal of Marischal-College and University of Aberdeen, &c. &c. 2 vol. 8vo. pp. 782. Hamilton.

WE opened this book with considerable expectation. After the great minds which have engaged in the investigation of the subject of which it treats, the number and importance of the facts which they have left upon record relative to it, and the variety and beauty of the illustrations with which they have adorned it; though we did not anticipate much that was new, yet we did allow ourselves to hope that the benevolent and pious bequest of Mr. Burnett would call forth a work of ability and usefulness, possessing at least closeness of reasoning and clearness of illustration—a work which the philosopher might read with pleasure, and the theological student and the general reader with profit. When we heard that the prize had been adjudged to the Essay of the Principal of Marischal-College, we were still willing to believe that our expectation was well founded: page after page, notwithstanding the misgivings which soon began to gather on our minds, we clung fondly to this hope, trusting that the author would rise with the interest and importance of the subject;—but after having read to the end, we closed the book with the melancholy regret that the munificence of the worthy founder of this prize should only have added another proof to the sad catalogue which shows that the best efforts of benevolence are doomed in this world to disappointment.

The Reverend Principal divides his Essay into Three Books. The First treats of the Evidence of the Being of God; the Second of his Perfections, namely, his Power, Wisdom and Goodness, and enters particularly into

the consideration of the objections to the two latter, arising from the existence of natural and moral evil; and the Third comprehends the solution given to these difficulties by Revelation, especially by the Gospel, together with some Practical Inferences deducible from the speculative part of the Essay.

After some observations on the meaning of the terms Necessary Existence, Cause and Effect, the author arranges his proofs of the existence of God into the metaphysical proof; the proof from design; from the constitution of the faculties of the human mind; from the almost universal assent of mankind to the truth of this opinion; from the appearances which the world exhibits of a recent origin, and the traditions concerning it; and from the testimony of Scripture.

The metaphysical proof stated originally by Clarke with an acuteness and force, which, notwithstanding an extreme prolixity, and even when his arguments fail to produce conviction, awe the mind into veneration of the strength and profoundness of the understanding that conceived them, is here given without closeness and without ability: it extends through nearly thirty pages with an uncommon feebleness; it has scarcely the strength of the echo of an echo; and in the very midst of an argument which supposes the greatest precision and accuracy, there occur such affirmations as the following:

“ We have evidence *equally* strong for the existence of mind as a *substance entirely distinct* from the body, as we have for the existence of this last, and of its peculiar properties, namely, consciousness and the internal perception of our mental energies, as entirely distinct from any quality of matter. Nay, perhaps this evidence is *stronger* than that of our *external senses*, by which we ascertain corporeal substance and the properties belonging to it.”—P. 64.

And again:

“ Nor in reality is it *more difficult* to admit the creation of matter, that is, its original production, than the production of any thing which did not exist before. The only difference lies in the superior power required and in the nature of the effects.

To all genius a species of creative power, that is, a faculty of producing something new is ascribed. A fine statue is indeed hewn out of a block of marble; but where were the beauty, the symmetry, the proportion and exquisite composition which the statue displays?"

Again:

"In fact, if the case be accurately examined, it displayed perhaps a *greater* exertion of divine power to superinduce on rude, uninformed matter, that symmetry, beauty and admirable construction which the universe exhibits, than to call into being the chaotic mass."—Pp. 70. 72.

So that according to the learned Principal, it is more difficult to conceive how a beautiful statue should be hewn out of a block of marble, than how marble itself should be produced out of nothing.

The proof of the being of God, from the manifestation of design in the works of nature, is in itself complete and decisive. On this rock the Theist may take his stand; and it is not possible for all the artifice which human ingenuity can employ, to shake for a moment the firm foundation of his faith. Wherever there is design there must have been a designer; wherever there is contrivance there must have been a contriver. This simple argument is level to the comprehension of every capacity; and to him who is worthy of the name of a philosopher, it appears with an evidence which is absolutely irresistible. Show to any rational being a piece of mechanism, explain to him how one part is adapted to another, and how all the various parts are fitted to bring about some one particular result; and he must admit the existence of a wisdom to conceive and of a power to execute that result. If he affirm that he does not, all reasoning must be at an end with him; for it is no longer possible to hold an argument with a person who declares that he does not perceive the relation between what is admitted to be contrivance and what is termed a contriver. In the great controversy therefore between the Theist and the Atheist, the only question of real importance is—Are there or are there not indications of design in the works of nature? Doctor Brown says there are, and he *refers* in general to several things in evidence of the fact, but he does not *prove* the fact. He does not give, and he does not attempt to give any illustration of it, any in-

stance which brings it home to the understanding with irresistible persuasion, and upon which the mind may rest in those moments of doubt and difficulty which sometimes come to all. Nothing it is true was more easy; it had indeed been perfectly done before; but Paley by no means exhausted the subject; and if Doctor Brown did not chuse to repeat what this admirable writer has said about the structure of the valves of the human heart, or the ligament attached to the head of the thigh bone, all nature was open before him—the sublime and most interesting adaptations of objects to each other on the most magnificent and on the humblest scale with which chemistry has made us acquainted; the structure of the simplest flower or the formation and the fall of the dew of heaven that ministers to its sustenance. And the omission to state in detail at least some one of those striking and wonderful adaptations with which by the light of philosophy we know that every part of nature abounds, and the simple statement of which baffles the sceptic and silences his sophisms in the same manner as the philosopher by the act of walking silenced the sciolist who endeavoured to persuade him that there was no such thing as motion in the world, appears to us to be a capital defect, because it is neglecting by far the most convincing argument in support of the truth, for the clear and popular illustration of which the prize was instituted.

In the next chapter Doctor Brown, wonderful as it may seem, endeavours to prove the existence of God from the *immateriality* of the soul. Now without entering into the dark and difficult dispute which has been agitated about the nature of matter and of mind, we are humbly of opinion that no judicious person who has at all attended to that controversy, or who is even acquainted with the opinions of Metaphysicians and Theists in the present age, would have ventured to ground such a truth upon such a basis. But indeed there is in every part of this work a looseness, an inattention to the strict accuracy of the statements, the appositeness of the illustrations, the proper selection and the judicious application of the arguments, which take from it all its value as a philosophical, and much, very much, of its usefulness as a popular work. What is to be thought of the

sentences of the man as a philosopher, and of his attainments as the Principal of a University, who could give the following account of conscience, and endeavour to confirm it by the illustration with which it is concluded!

"By conscience, or a moral sense, I understand that internal perception which we have of right and wrong, of moral good and evil, of virtue and vice, antecedently to any reasoning concerning the more remote consequences of habits and actions, either to individuals or to society. This internal sense furnishes principles for judging of moral subjects, as intellect affords principles for truth and error. The exercise of the moral faculty, however, it is to be remarked, is always accompanied by certain feelings either of complacency or disgust."

"We feel contempt or indignation rising in our minds towards those who have acted in an unworthy and base manner, and love and esteem for such as maintain a conduct just and beneficent. These principles, whether of morals or of speculative reason, are not the mere effect of education, but are implanted in the soul. *For without study or inquiry they present themselves to the mind.* Nay, what is more, if they were not innate principles, education could no more be carried on, than a building could be raised without a foundation, or a tree produced without its original seed. All that education does is to direct, improve and enlarge these original principles, and to lead them to their proper results. *Whoever contests this affirmation, may try to instruct a dog or a horse in morality!*"—Pp. 112. 116.

Here the learned Principal affirms that conscience, or as he terms it the moral sense, is an innate principle; and his proof is that if it were not so, education could no more be carried on than a tree could be produced without its seed: and why? Because do what you will you cannot instruct a dog in morality! But the worthy Principal would find it rather a difficult task to teach a dog mathematics, or even to make it enunciate his favourite proposition that the whole is greater than a part: yet because his labour would be entirely thrown away upon such a pupil, but would not be wasted upon a boy, the learned Principal must admit, upon his own showing, that mathematics and even the very faculty of speech are in the boy innate principles.

Passing over the chapters on the proof of the being of God, from the

almost universal assent of mankind to this opinion, which is not a very solid argument; from the appearance which the world exhibits of a recent origin, and from the traditions concerning it, which is equally equivocal and inconclusive; from the Scriptures, which in this argument cannot be referred to as affording any proof without really, not apparently, reasoning in a circle; and omitting also the chapters on the conclusion which follows these various proofs of the existence of God, and on the causes of Atheism, which are the commonplace observations of a thousand sermons expressed in a most commonplace manner; we come to the Second Book, which treats of the perfections of the Deity, namely, his infinite power, wisdom and goodness. And here we are happy to say the author writes with somewhat more closeness and accuracy. He seems to have formed in the abstract a just conception of the divine goodness, for he defines it to be—

"That affection and habit of mind which prompts to communicate and to diffuse happiness, which is gratified by the contemplation of it; and is averse from the infliction and the view of misery."—

"The goodness of the Deity being an attribute strictly moral must be a constant and immutable disposition to communicate and extend the highest measure of happiness to all his creatures. This definition when applied to omnipotence and infinite wisdom implies the communication of all possible happiness to the whole and to every part of his sensitive creation."—

"If it could be shewn that in any case such faculties were clearly designed for misery, and the beings to which they belonged were irresistibly impelled to the exercise of them, the inference would be unavoidable that the Supreme Power was malevolent. But the first branch of this supposition is contrary to universal fact, and the second is in itself incomprehensible. For it is impossible to conceive that any being, endued with activity, would delight to exercise powers which were constantly attended with pain and misery. Inactivity must in this case be the inevitable result. We must therefore conclude that he also has bestowed on every sensitive being its powers of perception and action; must desire those to be exercised and to produce their natural results; and since in the exercise and gratification of those the happiness of every such being

in reality consists, *that he intended the utmost happiness of which every living creature was susceptible*; that is, he is infinitely good."—Pp. 222, 223, 228.

After this will any intelligent person believe that Principal Brown advocates the cause of Endless Torments, and endeavours to show that it is not inconsistent with the infinite goodness of him who possesses Almighty power, while the very notion of infinite goodness comprehends, according to Doctor Brown, the design to promote the *utmost happiness of which any living creature is susceptible*. Admitting the sincerity, what can be thought of the understanding of a man who can assert with all the gravity of the philosopher such a palpable contradiction. In the senseless declaimer of the tabernacle, who despising the aid of human learning and reflection to qualify him for the office he assumes, and following only "the inspiration from above," suspends his hearers nightly over a bottomless gulph, foaming with fire and brimstone, prepared for all who despise the message of the man of God, for all heretics of all sorts, as well as for all who plume themselves on being adorned with "the white-wash of morality;"* in this man we do not wonder at inconsistencies and contradictions, for we know that they have taken such possession of his mind that he does not perceive even the impieties which he continually utters, and that he has most solemnly and piously renounced reason; but in the man who pretends to have taken her as his guide and by the light with which she has illumined his mind to have investigated the wonders of nature, to have looked through them up to their great Author, and to have contemplated his excellencies till he has come to the sublime conclusion that it must be his constant and immutable disposition to communicate all possible happiness to the whole and to every part of his sensitive creation,—for him to affirm that it is perfectly consistent with this constant and immutable disposition to doom myriads and myriads of his creatures to unutterable torments in hell-fire for ever, awakens our pity at the weakness which can thus permit

his prepossessions to impose upon his own understanding, or our indignation at the insult which he presumes to offer to that of his reader. But the occasion on which these absurdities are affirmed, together with several others connected with them, much more than the ability with which they are defended, appears to us to justify a more particular comment; and we shall endeavour to show the utter fallacy of the reasoning, if reasoning it can be called, attempted by Doctor Brown. The learned Principal of the University of Aberdeen has undertaken the task of clearing up all the difficulties which rest on the works and the dispensations of the Deity, and of reconciling with his constant and immutable disposition to communicate all possible happiness to the whole and to every part of the sensitive creation, the doctrine of the endless misery of the great majority of mankind, by the aid of free agency! We shall see what he makes of it.

S. S.

[To be Continued.]

ART. II.—*Philosophic Etymology, or Rational Grammar*. By James Gilchrist. 8vo. pp. 270. Hunter. 1816.

BY the title prefixed to his work, our author, who loves to speak out, intends it should be understood that Grammar is no where else to be found in company with reason. Perhaps, there is not in the history of letters an instance that can parallel the arrogant manner in which Mr. Gilchrist advances to demand audience of the public. He steps forwards with an air of bold superiority, plants himself firmly at the bar of opinion, and requires that his book be "rigorously examined, well and truly tried." This indeed is right; but if his own book should not have a fair and impartial trial, he will have principally himself to blame. Mr. Gilchrist's peculiar manner has made it impossible that his work should be tried dispassionately by many of those who are (if any are) qualified to sit in judgment upon it. He who writes for the instruction of the public must chuse his own manner, or rather if he possesses original powers, nature has determined it for him;—but it is unfortunate for the writer, and for the reader too, when instruction is given,

* A favourite phrase of the Rev. Rowland Hill's.

if the manner be such as must disgust many and offend all. Our author's manner is precisely of that kind, and in so remarkable a degree as to make it probable that the merits of his production may never be fairly examined. It is the insolence of triumph before the battle is won. Such vaunting of his own powers and contempt of all who have gone before him or who stand beside him, have made it impossible that he should fail without utter disgrace. For him *μεγαλως απολυσθαιεν ομως ευγενες αμαρτημα* would be an insufficient apology, and one which he would disdain to make even if it had not classical authority. Like some performers whom we have seen, he moves to the front of the stage with so confident an air, that wonder or ridicule, applauses or hisses must pursue him as he withdraws. We introduce our notice of this extraordinary production with these remarks both from regard to justice, and with a view to prevent those who may open the book from throwing it down instantly in disgust. As to the writer himself, we fear that animadversion will be lost upon him. His feeling is that of a man, who has risen upon a dark world to enlighten and astonish it by his brightness. The voice of rebuke may provoke a smile at the admonisher; but the man who thinks it an act of condescension on his part to instruct his kind, is a hopeless subject of correction. Indeed, Mr. Gilchrist appears to anticipate with great satisfaction censure and condemnation from the greater part of literary men.

"I mean to use great freedoms with some of the literary idols; and to deliver some very *illegitimate* doctrines concerning style: the giants of taste, criticism and learning may be expected to rise in a body; if, however, they will stipulate to keep lightness and delicacy out of the fray, I will undertake single-handed to put them all down with such weapons only as etymology supplies: I have some confidence in myself—much confidence in my weapons—very great confidence in the goodness of my cause."—P. 204.

Again, in yet more chosen phrase:

"I expect a thousand classical tongues to be darted at me for my provoking doctrines; and much literary dribble—many rotored morsels and critical crudities, with the very quintessence of established

opinion and general consent to be spitefully spit in my face: but delicate mouths, never spit fire; and the saliva of polite taste has the singular property of taking away all the dangerous and deadly qualities of the venom of classical hostility; so that the bite of a well-trained literary viper is as harmless as the hiss of a goose. Perhaps some great critical gander will come flapping and flourishing out of the flock to peck at the legs of the present author; but a single kick or two (and it cannot surely be unpolite to kick *gander-champions*), will send the hero back into his own crowd and muddy hole. I know what courtly simperers will think and say (or rather *hint*—for the timid things dare not speak out), of this contemptuous, uncharitable, unpolite, *unphilosophic* style of writing; but I should despise myself if I could admire what they admire, or praise what they praise; and I should loathe my existence with consciousness of hypocritically cloaking my real opinions and feelings to appear orthodox, or become popular among a canting, mystical, visionary race of rotters, eternally saying after consecrated authorities."—Pp. 216, 217.

If the present volume had contained nothing better than invective of this sort against schools and scholars, we should have left to others, if any should think it worth their while, to invite attention to such odious effusions of angry vanity. But the author believes that he has made a great discovery, that he has solved the problem of language in all its varieties, that, in short, he has in his hand the key of grammar, and he is graciously willing, though in a most ungracious manner, to put it into the hands of as many as are not too much stultified by scholarship to make use of it. Our readers will not be displeased to hear him speak for himself on this subject; for though, meaning to be the plain blunt man, he continually violates the respect which man owes to man, still there is matter in him, and his coarseness is not without originality. Mr. Gilchrist has introduced his discoveries by a history of his own mind in its progress to knowledge.

"When the author of the following work began to study philology, it was with a logical rather than grammatical view. He had found his learning, such as it was, an inconvenience and intellectual cumbrance: nor was it merely *foreign speech* that he found as a veil of obscurity or net of entanglement upon his understanding; even the English language

was to him as Saul's armour to David—cumbersome because it had not been proved. He had wandered ten years (for he became a student somewhat late in life) in the wilderness of words; often looking wistfully up the hill of knowledge, but as often despairing of climbing to the summit. Frequently indeed he returned to his fruitless efforts with a kind of desperate courage; but as frequently did he retire from the hopeless contest, under a mortifying sense of disappointment and useless effort.

“The truth is, he at last sunk into despair of ever knowing even the English language to his own satisfaction; or so as to be able to experiment with it accurately as an instrument of science; and it had actually become one of his fixed opinions, that man is fated to be the dupe of his own inventions; that *language* of which he so much boasts is the greatest of all impostors; and that no remedy could be found for verbal, that is metaphysical deception and mischief. Thus for a considerable time he heartily despised not only the systems of learning that owe their origin to language, but language itself, as a mere Babel-jargon intended or calculated to be a curse rather than a blessing—the parent of error, metaphysical nonsense, false-reasoning, endless controversy, contention and animosity.

“With this opinion and contempt of language, it is probable that the author would have been content to pity and deride the learning that prevails, without endeavouring to rectify it, had not an incident which it is unnecessary to name, roused him into a resolution of attempting to rid the world of intellectual bondage and metaphysical imposture. He had always (he means from the time he became a student) a kind of intuitive perception and conviction that all the systems of grammar, rhetoric, logic, &c. which prevail, are wrong; but believing the origin of all learned absurdities to be language itself, he perceived not how the evil could be remedied; and supposed that learned men must go on as they had done, boasting of their technical nonsense. He at last, however, perceived, he thought, how the labyrinth might be demolished, and the Babel-systems confounded into silence. As the radical evil was perceived to be in language, it was evident that there the remedy must be applied. He resolved therefore to create another kind of grammar and lexicography than had hitherto prevailed; in attempting which, the principles he laid down were as follow:—

1. That language was a human invention. 2. That it was a simple invention. 3. That the true nature of true philology

must lie on the very surface of obviousness. 4. That all the dialects must be essentially but one language. 5. That the whole wilderness of words must have arisen from a few expressive signs originally connected with sensible objects. 6. That therefore the whole multitude of parts and varieties in language, or that all words must be resolvable into a few simple elements, indicating by resemblance visible objects. 7. That there could be nothing arbitrary about language. 8. That no words could be primarily or properly insignificant.”—Intro. pp. i.—iii.

“As the author continued to study his subject, it became progressively more simple to his perceptions than he thought it could possibly be in its own nature; for we are so educated and disciplined into the belief of abstruseness and ingenious mysticalness, connected with learned and philosophic questions, as to be constantly overlooking obvious truth, or deeming it not worth finding and raising into the dignity of science. Every man of any pretension to philosophic thinking, would blush to refuse for his motto: Simplicity is the seal of truth. But who does not seem to consider it the badge of intellectual poverty? Frequently has the author felt over his discoveries as Bruce did at the source of the Nile. Frequently has he been ready to exclaim with the good Parisians, who had anticipated a grand spectacle at the *entrée* of the allies: Is this all!

“As may be supposed, the more that he studied words in different dialects, the more did he ascertain their true nature and origin. It was not, however, till he analyzed the alphabet and resolved its diversities into their primary form, that he could experiment with certainty on etymology. It was now discovered and proved at every step, that as men have few ideas, few senses, and are familiar with few objects, so there are few primitive words.”—Intro. pp. v. vi.

That our readers may see at once the object of the present work, we shall lay before them the author's analysis of his philological principles, “which, he says, he has given in his introduction, that they may be seen and examined in their most naked form.”

“1. There is nothing arbitrary about language. 2. All the dialects as Hebrew, Celtic, Greek, Latin, &c. are essentially but one language. They have such diversities as may be termed idioms; but with all their circumstantial varieties, they have substantial uniformity: they proceed on the same principles and have the same origin. The philosophic grammar and lexicography of one, is in reality

that of all. 3. There are no words primarily and properly insignificant. 4. There are many words that have ceased to be significant, as they are commonly employed. Many of the particles, including affixes and prefixes, conjunctions, prepositions, articles, &c. are of this description, and may be termed the *mummies* of language. 5. Every word that cannot be identified with the name of a sensible object, is either partly or wholly *mummified*. 6. The use of insignificant words, or using words insignificantly, is the chief, if not the only cause of verbal, that is metaphysical imposture; and all unintelligible or false reasoning is merely metaphysical imposture. Metaphysics as a science could have never existed but for the *mummies* of language, and the relics and ghosts of meaning. 7. All words are primarily and properly metaphorical; or to vary the expression,—language whether spoken or written, originated in simile; and metaphor is commonly explained to be—"a simile comprised in a word." The author does not wish to dispute about such unmeaning or half-meaning terms as metaphor, &c.; but he wishes it to be distinctly understood, that the vulgar errors—he means the errors of the literary vulgar, respecting metaphorical and literal terms, are the cause of much metaphysical imposture, much critical, logical, grammatical and rhetorical nonsense. What are called literal terms, such as *time*, *space*, *mind*, *spirit*, &c., are like worn out coin, or effaced inscriptions, the meaning or value of which, being never ascertained, occasions everlasting conjecture and controversy. 8. Almost every sentence is elliptical. 9. Almost every word is put elliptically. 10. Almost every word is a compound of two or more words. 11. All words are resolvable into a few primitives; or thus, all the seeming multitude of words are merely various spellings and pronunciations of the names of a few striking and familiar objects; as the head, foot, hand, eye, ear, mouth, &c. 12. As all words are resolvable into the letters of the alphabet, so all the letters of the alphabet are resolvable into one primary form. 13. That primary form was employed as a sign or representation of visible objects. 14. This method of signification by similitude, is the origin of all written language. 15. There are very few words, which were primarily unwritten, or which originated in an imitation of natural sounds.

"If these principles can be overturned, the philology of the author will prove of course a baseless fabric."—Intro. pp. ix. & xxii.

It has been and is still the opinion of many men of sound understanding,

and not more guilty of fanaticism than our author is of modesty, that language had a divine origin. Since it is plain that man must soon have perished had he been thrown at his creation naked upon the earth, abandoned to the unassisted efforts of his own untutored powers, it might seem to require no great stretch of faith to believe that the Being who fostered him, gave him also language. But an opinion so unphilosophical and childish our author has refuted in his arrogant and easy way, simply by declaring that "as for those who still continue to consider language as arbitrary, or as invented and taught by the Deity, they must not be offended if I tell them that they are unworthy of notice."

We may venture to assure the writer that they will not be offended. Their vanity must exceed, if possible, the measure of his own, could they be offended, that they are not thought worthy of notice by a man of such lofty genius that to his mind "Virgil is a dull versifier, and Tully a petty rhetorician;" and whose taste is so exquisite, that he is able to say—

"Twenty times have I attempted to read the writings of Addison, but I could never succeed in getting through a single volume. I did get twice through Virgil by the gracious aid of an etymological motive; but I believe twenty etymological motives would not drag me through the volumes of Addison; and I declare, upon my honour and conscience, as an author, that I would rather fairly eat them up and digest them down, (all, saving and excepting the boards,) than give them my precious days and nights."—P. 215.

In reviewing a work written in the intolerant and supercilious manner of our author, it is difficult to refrain from making at every step such remarks upon the spirit and style of the production as may create prejudice against the substance and argument of the book. Since, however, it is to the interest of knowledge, that, if any advance has been made in illustrating the principles and history of language, the discovery should be known, and circulated as soon as possible, we shall present our readers with a few extracts that will shew what has been done or attempted in the present treatise on grammar; having first taken leave of the writer by recommending to his notice, what his faith and calling must have taught him to re-

spect, the apostolic exhortation to Christians and Christian teachers, "Think not more highly of yourselves than ye ought to think, but think soberly."

The work is divided into five parts: in the first, the nature and origin of Alphabetic Signs is considered; in the second the canon of Etymology is established; in the third, the principles laid down in the two first parts are applied to unfold the component parts of speech; in the fourth, the common system of English grammar is considered; and in the fifth, a standard of Orthography is established. The reader, whose object is knowledge, will read the three first parts with that awakened attention which is natural, when we expect continually some great light to break in upon the mind. The fourth part will afford entertainment to those who read principally to be amused; they will acknowledge that, whether right or wrong, the author is not dull. In the first part, which respects the origin of the alphabet, the following propositions are maintained;—that "letters of smoother and easier utterance are to be considered as growing out of those of harsher and more difficult utterance, but not *vice versa*. Thus gutturals (or letters formed in the throat) become dentals (letters formed by putting the teeth together); dentals become labials (letters formed by closing the *lips*); consonants become vowels; but vowels do not become consonants, nor labials gutturals." That "those forms of letters most speedily and most easily written, or rather graved, (for graving on leaves of trees, on stone, wood, lead, brass, &c., was the first mode of writing and printing,) are to be considered as derivatives, varieties, or corruptions of those forms graved most slowly and difficulty, but not *vice versa*." That "significancy by signs was prior to any significancy by sounds"—and that "the first attempt at articulate sounds or speech was by expressing with the mouth the form of curiologic signs, that is of circular marks or variations of the circle." For the proof of these propositions we must refer to the treatise itself, in which the curious will find enough to entertain, if not to convince them; for though Mr. Gilchrist deals much in assertion, he does not merely assert.

In the second part the following propositions are laid down. That "*meaning*, rather than *pronunciation* and *spelling*, is to be considered as the great guide of etymologic investigation;"—that "every word is to be considered significant;" that "every syllable of every word is to be considered significant;" that "every letter of every syllable is to be considered significant;" that "all words are primarily and properly the *signs* of *visible* objects;" that "every word is primarily an adjective, [that is expressive of some quality, circumstance, or manner of being];" that "almost every word is a compound;" that "the constant tendency of words in passing from mouth to mouth is to contract, not to dilate—to lose, not to assume letters;" that "all the vowels, labials, dentals, in brief, all the letters of the alphabet are resolvable into gutturals, and all the gutturals into one character." "When I say one character," the author adds, "I mean one form of character or kind of sign, namely, the circular form; but there might be originally many *sizes*, bearing some proportion real or supposed to the magnitude of visible objects, with other contrivances to distinguish one particular visible object from another, as a whole circle to represent the sun, and a half circle to represent the moon; and the sign might be repeated or compounded into two, three, or any number." The result is, which we give in Mr. G.'s own words, to shew that he has honesty as well as rudeness:

"The whole of written language, or that system of alphabetic signs, originally addressed to the eye, is resolvable into CR, CL; or LC, RC, &c. signifying round or *roundlike*. This is the foundation of what shall hereafter be called the New Philology. If this can be overturned, my system of language must fall, and therefore I show its opponents (if it shall be opposed) where to strike; only, if they would not retire from the attack with disgrace, they must proceed with judgment, and must not rashly infer that because *they* cannot resolve all the parts of written language into such a simple origin, the above proposition is false. But that no one may, through misconception, enter upon useless controversy and verbiages, let it be observed that there are many names given to objects, whose form (the form of the objects) is not round or round-

ish, and whose form was not contemplated in the imposition of their names; yet their names are after all resolvable into CR, &c., signifying round or roundish."—Pp. 75, 76.

We cannot forbear to insert the author's note at this place, for it is a literary curiosity.

"I hesitated for some time, whether I should not leave the *eighteenth* (I ought to apologize for giving so many) proposition wholly unsheltered by explanation and proof, to invite attack, and draw on controversy; for I do not expect it to be generally admitted without resistance: but on further reflection, it appeared unwise to induce war, which comes soon enough through all precautions for peace."—Note, P. 76.

As the contents of the third part, which consists of an application of the above principles to the analysis of the component parts of speech, could not be presented in a form very much abridged with fairness, we shall content ourselves with an extract which our readers may consider as a fair sample of the whole dissertation.

"The verbal terminations are merely connective.—There is strictly but one verbal termination, though it be diversified by various spelling and pronunciation: *ath*, (the very same as the Hebrew *ath*), *aith*, *eth*, or *ith*, &c. was the older form, which became *ed*, *et*, *es*, *est*, *an*, *en*, &c.; *en* (which is now in Dutch the conjunction answering to our *and*) is still connected with many words; as *seen*, *known*, &c. in what is called the past participle: it is also firmly grafted into many words, as *brighten*, *lighten*, *drown*, &c.; nay, it is both prefixed and postfixed to some words, as *enlighten*, *enliven*. The reader will perceive in these instances how liable words are to be used superfluously and insignificantly: in *enliven* the connective is put twice; in *enliveneth* it is put thrice; in *enlivenedst* it is put four times."—P. 99.

"It is always a certain sign of idolatry, or of a Babel-system, when the tongues of those employed about it are divided. There has been wonderful gibbering about the wonders of THE VERB; and among the rest Dr. Crombie is seriously alarmed lest this important part of speech be degraded from its true dignity into a mere participle.

"It would be superfluous to explain *eth* to the intelligent reader; he must perceive that like *en*, *ed*, *es*, it is merely a connective, whether affixed to what is called a verb, an adjective, a noun, or any word whatever; and it would be easy to convince him that this is the primary use of

all verbal terminations in all the dialects. It has been the fashion of late, indeed, with some Greek and Latin grammarians, to consider them as primarily pronouns: in this they are nearer the truth than themselves are aware of, (for *eth* however diversified, is originally the same as what are called pronouns,) yet it is not as they mean it. Horne Tooke seems to have considered *th*, *do* and *to*, as the same word, but what he considered *do* he did not communicate. In Hebrew, *ath*, the grammarians say truly, "seldom admits of translation into English after an active verb, (nor does the verbal termination *eth* in English, admit of translation into any other language): when prefixed to a person it commonly signifies *with*." Wilson's Hebrew Grammar.—This is always its signification when it has any signification, whether it be called a preposition, as *ad*, *at*; or a conjunction, as *and*, *et*; a termination as in *amat*, *amat-us*, *amans*, *amant-is*, &c. The reader must be now convinced that verbal, participial and simple adjective terminations, (those which do not denote negation, diminution or augmentation,) are all alike merely connective, and in fact the same *copula*, somewhat varied in its form by the accidents of pronunciation and spelling."—Pp. 100—102.

Whether our author has or has not solved the great problem of language, whether he has untied the knot or merely cut it, we shall leave to the sagacity of his readers to determine. He has, as he is fully persuaded, followed up the most remote parts of speech, through every winding, and sometimes up passages sufficiently rugged and abrupt, to one common channel; he has also pursued that to its fountain, the supposed source of all written language, and he declares it to be neither more nor less than the cypher which is raised from insignificance into significance almost infinite, or the circle, under all its variations into greater or less, single or double, more or less regular, &c. We do not certainly intend prediction; but as the author in a moment of extraordinary diffidence has imagined what may happen, we shall annex the passage, both as it shews that he is prepared for the worst, and as it presents him to the reader in a gentle and even tender and elegiac mood.—"He," (meaning the author of *Etymologicon Magnum*, to whom in very gratitude our author owed an elegy)—

"He was almost within sight of the proper starting post of etymological in-

vestigation, yet deviated far from the right way

‘And found no end in wandering mazes lost.’

This notice which I have been led unintentionally to take of the labours of Mr. Whiter, diffuses a tender melancholy over my mind; for in turning from them I have often said to myself with an involuntary sigh, what a poor fallible thing is the human understanding! Perhaps after all this anxious thinking and toilsome inquiry I shall only make a book to lie on the same shelf, or to be thrown to the same heap, with Etymologicon Magnum.”—P. 78.

ART. III.—*A Unitarian Christian's Statement and Defence of his Principles with reference particularly to the Charges of the Rt. Rev. the Ld. Bp. of St. David's.* A Discourse, delivered at Langyndeirn, near Carmarthen, on Thursday the 6th of July, 1815, at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Unitarian Christians in South Wales, and published at their request, with Notes. By John Prior Estlin, LL. D. 8vo. pp. 88. Hunter. 1815.

BISHOP BURGESS is entitled to the thanks of the Unitarians for keeping alive the Trinitarian controversy. He means not, certainly, to confer any favour upon them, but he cannot write against them without making their principles known, which is all they ask. Even his gross misrepresentations and wretched personalities have in one view a good effect, for they lead honest, candid and intelligent minds to suspect very properly that the prelate is conscious of the weakness of his cause, and is afraid to let it rest upon its own merits.

The good Bishop may see the impotence of episcopal fulminations by looking around his diocese. There Unitarian churches have been recently formed and they hold their associations under his lordship's eye. This sermon preached before one of these may shew Dr. Burgess that elevated as he is in his own church, he is esteemed by his Unitarian neighbours like any other writer, and that the mitre cannot give weight to idle declamation or hide the meanness and malignity of slander.

Not confining himself to the ordinary plan of a sermon, Dr. Estlin takes occasion from Acts xxiv. 14, to state, defend and enforce the prin-

ciples of Unitarians, and to vindicate himself and his brethren from the charges of their opponents, and particularly Bishop Burgess. The discourse is marked by so much sound sense, so much becoming solemnity, and such correct Scriptural knowledge, and contains so many passages of great beauty, that we cannot but wish it were in the hands of all those readers that have been taught by the Bishop of St. David's and a few like-minded writers, that Unitarians are not entitled to the privileges of Christians, the courtesy of scholars or the rights of men.

“In the name of justice, of humanity and of Christianity, what is that great superiority of intellectual and moral worth, which he who has received the Trinitarian system, or who professes to have received it, enjoys over the person whose understanding can only admit the Unitarian system; that wealth and honours, and all the advantages of this life, should be open to the one, and that the other should not only be subject to the most degrading privations, but “be everywhere spoken against;” and to crown all, that one should be admitted into the regions of everlasting happiness, and the other be exposed to the curse of God for ever?

“O Lord! how long!”—P. 41.

Dr. Estlin speaks thus “comfortably” to the Unitarians on the subject of *fashion*, the whole current of which he admits is now against them:

“This last circumstance we know is of a temporary nature; and although we consider it as the circumstance which operates *most powerfully* against us, yet we feel a full confidence from the general circulation of the Bible and the increasing light and liberality which that occasions, that its operation will soon cease. Nothing is more changeable than fashion. If ever the ideas of superiority of intellect should be associated with the religious tenets of a Newton and a Locke—of coarseness, inconsistency and even nonsense with some modern systems which have attracted the notice of the gaping crowd—of sublimity of conception, correctness of taste and propriety of feeling with unadulterated Christianity; if ever this period should arrive—surely it cannot be very remote! the *thousands* who now only *think* with us, will *speak* and *act* with us; and those whose minds are composed of “matter too soft a lasting mark to bear,” will then exhibit the visible impression of Unitarianism. In the mean time, all that we want

is, that the soil of the human mind should not be suffered to lie fallow or to produce only tares. That the seeds of truth may be sown, is all we ask. The harvest we leave to Heaven."—P. 5.

The Doctor considers the Unity of God and the humanity of Christ as doctrines totally distinct, and (p. 68,) retracts an opinion which he formerly advanced "that the proper humanity of Christ should be a necessary article of belief in a Christian society." On this controverted point, he says,

"In a conversation which I once had with Dr. Priestley on the very point, I took the liberty of telling him that his definition of Unitarianism in excluding those who hold the pre-existence of Christ appeared to my mind an illogical definition, and that Dr. Price, with whom I then coincided in opinion, was as much a Unitarian as himself. At that time I did not foresee that prejudice would proceed so far as to affix an odium to the very word. I thought that the definition itself was incorrect; that justice was not done by it to those who hold the pre-existence of Christ, but do not worship him, and that their exclusion was dividing and weakening a party, the union and strength of which could not be too sedulously promoted. I once for all enter my protest against the exclusive use of the word: and what I always mean by it is expressed in the following definition.

"A UNITARIAN IS A PERSON WHO BELIEVES IN AND WORSHIPS ONE GOD ONLY.

"I add *another* definition, for the denial of which, or the substitution of any other for it, I demand the authority of Scripture.

"A CHRISTIAN IS A PERSON WHO BELIEVES THE DIVINE MISSION OF JESUS CHRIST.

"In the sense of these definitions, I claim for myself, and I doubt not that each of you will claim for himself, the appellation of a *Unitarian Christian*."—Pp. 25, 26.

The following observations on *the miraculous conception* appear to us worthy of attention:

"The authenticity of the two first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, on which so much has been written, and on one side with so much acrimony, has nothing to do with the subject of Unitarianism. And even the *pre-existence* of Christ, a doctrine which many Unitarians hold, is no more connected with the *miraculous conception* than it is with the *miraculous appearances* which were seen, or the *miraculous voice* which was heard at the baptism of our Lord. Many Unitarians have believed the miraculous con-

ception, and others from some interesting texts in the narrative, and an apprehended *consistency* in the circumstance, that the *second Adam* should have been produced without an earthly father as the first was, have *wished* it to be true. Griesbach, however, it is thought by some, has not proved these chapters to be authentic: nor do Unitarians profess to follow him implicitly, although they have a high opinion of his learning, his assiduity and his impartiality. See Dr. Priestley's *History of Early Opinions*, Vol. IV; and Grundy's *Lectures on this subject*."—Pp. 33, 34.

The reader will peruse with some interest, Dr. Estlin's explanation of his view of the *Sabbath*:

"Unitarians can agree to differ. I am not a materialist, and I disagree in opinion with Mr. Belsham and my nephew, Mr. Grundy, on the subject of the Sabbath. The statement of my particular view of the case will probably not be deemed a digression, as I have been informed that what Mr. Belsham has said on this subject in his Letters to Mr. Wilberforce, has injured the cause of Unitarianism in Wales. I beg leave then, just to state, that it appears to me, that the institution of a Sabbath has made a part of every dispensation of Revealed Religion; that there was a Patriarchal and a Jewish Sabbath; and that there is a Christian Sabbath called the Lord's Day; that Christ himself instituted a rite in commemoration of his death, and that his Apostles after his ascension, when they were authorised legislators in his kingdom, appointed a day to be set apart to commemorate his resurrection as well as to answer the general purposes of a Sabbath; and that they instituted it by their *conduct*, which speaks a language stronger than words, at a time when any other mode of institution would have subjected them to endless disputes with the Jews."—Notes, pp. 62, 63.

Referring to Bishop Burgess's arguments, Dr. Estlin says, in a beautiful passage with which this article must conclude—

"If such are the weapons of orthodoxy, Unitarianism may stand unarmed before her without fear of injury. I express myself with confidence, because I know, that if in the intellectual world it is still twilight, it is the twilight of *morning*. The fogs which linger in the West will be scattered by the rays of the rising Sun. The Eastern horizon is clear, and bright will be the day."—Notes, p. 48.

ART. IV.—*The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches, &c.*

[Continued from p. 414.]

THE successive ministers at *Crosby Square*, a Presbyterian church, now extinct, furnish us with a series of interesting biographical articles. The following relates to a worthy man little known :

“ John Hodge, D. D. a learned and respectable minister of the Presbyterian denomination, of whose life it is not in our power to lay before the reader many particulars. He received his academical education at Taunton, under the learned Mr. Henry Grove, for whom he ever afterwards retained an affectionate remembrance. The place where he spent the first years of his ministry was, we believe, at Deal, in the county of Kent. From thence he removed to Gloucester, where he continued to labour with great reputation, for a considerable period. Dr. Grosvenor being disabled for public service, which made it expedient for him to resign the pastoral office in 1749, Dr. Hodge accepted an invitation to succeed him at Crosby-Square. At the time of his settlement in that place, the congregation was in a very low state. And notwithstanding his pulpit composures were very sensible and devotional, and his manner of delivery just, though not striking, he was not so happy as to raise the church ; but as the old members died, or families removed, it continued sinking. At length, the infirmities of advanced life, obliged him to resign the pastoral relation, about the year 1761 or 1762. After this, he lived for some time in retirement, preaching only occasionally, till he was removed by death, August 18, 1767. As an acknowledgment of the benefits he received during the course of his academical studies, he bequeathed to the academy of Taunton, his valuable library of books. Upon the dissolution of that seminary, they were removed to Exeter.

“ Dr. Hodge was a learned and respectable man, of moderate sentiments, and an excellent preacher. He favoured the republic of letters with a valuable set of discourses, in one volume, octavo, upon the Evidences of Christianity. They are written in a comprehensive, judicious, and nervous manner, and have been highly spoken of by good judges. He also published several single sermons : as one upon New-year's day, at St. Thomas's, Southwark—another at the morning lecture, Little St. Helen's, August 1, 1751—and a third occasioned by the death of the Rev. John Mason, author of the treatise on Self-knowledge, preached at

Cheshunt, Herts, Feb. 20, 1763. Dr. Hodge also drew up an account of Mr. May's Life, prefixed to his sermons. 1755.—Pp. 354, 355.

In the memoirs of Mr. Benjamin Robinson, minister of the Presbyterian congregation, *Little St. Helen's*, which no longer exists, we have an account of a controversy once esteemed of importance by the Nonconformists :

“ In 1709, he published, “ A Review of the case of Liturgies, and their imposition ; in answer to Mr. Bennet's Brief History of pre-composed set Forms of Prayer, and his Discourse of joint Prayer.” To this Mr. Bennet wrote a reply, which was answered by Mr. Robinson, and produced a second letter from Mr. Bennet. This was a controversy of some importance, and called forth no inconsiderable talent. Some sentiments advanced by Mr. Bennet, were considered not only contrary to the general sense of Dissenters, but as a shock upon the reason of mankind. It is no wonder, therefore, that his book met with animadversion. Two pamphlets by way of answer to it, were written by Mr. John Horsley, ancestor to the late bishop of that name. It was also severely reprehended by some of his own brethren, particularly by Dr. Wainwright, Mr. Ollyffe, and Dr. John Edwards, in his “ Christian Preacher.”—Pp. 379, 380.

Few names in the Dissenting *Fashi* are more respectable than that of Mr. Samuel Jones. We are obliged to Mr. Wilson for a sketch of his life in a note affixed to the memoir of one of his pupils, Mr. Edward Godwin, the grandfather of Mr. William Godwin, the celebrated author, now living.

“ Mr. Samuel Jones, who was of Welsh extraction, received his education in Holland, under the learned Perizonius. He kept his academy first at Gloucester, from whence, in 1712, he removed to Tewkesbury, where, we believe, he was also pastor of a congregation. Of his method of education, a very interesting account may be seen, in a letter written in 1711, by Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Secker, then one of Mr. Jones's pupils, to the celebrated Dr. Isaac Watts.* Mr. Secker speaks highly of the advantages he enjoyed at this seminary, which he calls “ an extraordinary place of education.” Mr. Jones obliged his pupils to rise at five o'clock every morning, and always to speak Latin, except when they mixed with the family.—“ We pass our time very agreeably (says

* “ See Gibbons's Memoirs of Watts, p. 346.”

Mr. Secker) betwixt study and conversation with our tutor, who is always ready to discourse freely of any thing that is useful, and allows us either then, or at lecture, all imaginable liberty of making objections against his opinions, and prosecuting them as far as we can. In this and every thing else, he shews himself so much a gentleman, and manifests so great an affection and tenderness for his pupils, as cannot but command respect and love."—When Dr. Doddridge set on foot his academy, his friend Dr. Clark communicated to him Mr Jones's Lectures on Jewish Antiquities. A copy of these, very neatly written, in two volumes octavo, is preserved in Dr. Williams's library. Of Mr. Jones's ability as a tutor, we cannot but form a very high opinion from the merit and eminence of many of his pupils, among whom were the following:—Dr. Samuel Chandler and Dr. Andrew Gifford, of London; Mr. Thomas Mole, of Hackney; Mr. Richard Pearsall, of Taunton; Mr. Henry Francis, of Southampton; Mr. Jeremiah Jones, the learned author of "A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament;" Dr. Daniel Scott, well known to the world by his learned and valuable writings; Dr. Joseph Butler, afterwards Bishop of Durham, the author of that most learned and valuable performance, "The Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion;" and Dr. Thomas Secker, who also conforming to the Church of England, rose to the See of Canterbury."—Pp. 381, 382.

Under the head "Devonshire Square—Particular Baptist," we have a very full biographical account of Mr. *William Kiffin*, the first pastor in that place, who was an eminent and wealthy merchant. He had been apprentice to John Lilburn, the brewer, who in the civil war held a colonel's commission in the parliament service. Casting his lot amongst the Nonconformists, Kiffin endured a variety of persecutions, religious and political, under the hateful reigns of the Second Charles and James, from some of which he extricated himself only by means of his riches. It is related that on one occasion the prodigal and needy Charles sent to Kiffin to borrow of him *forty thousand pounds*. The "Anabaptist" teacher apologised for not having it in his power to lend his Majesty so much, but told the messenger that if it would be of any service he would *present* him with *ten thousand*. The offer was accepted, and Kiffin used afterwards to

boast that he had saved thirty thousand pounds.

In Monmouth's unfortunate rebellion, two grandsons of Mr. Kiffin, Benjamin and William Hewling, took part, and being taken prisoners were put to death, under circumstances of great barbarity. We are told that their sister going to court to present a petition to the king on their behalf, was admonished by Churchill, afterwards Duke of Marlborough, not to indulge hope, for, said he, pointing to the chimney-piece, "that marble is as capable of feeling compassion as the king's heart."

James, who was as foolish as he was heartless, afterwards applied to Kiffin with a request that he would promote his designs in the city, and received the same sort of rebuke which was given him on an application for support to the old Earl of Bedford, father to Lord Russell. Having pleaded his age and infirmities, Kiffin added, his eyes fixed steadfastly on the king, and tears running down his cheeks,—“besides, Sire, the death of my grandsons gave a wound to my heart, which is still bleeding, and never will close but in the grave.” The king shrunk from this manly refusal and cutting reproach into silence.

Kiffin survived the Revolution. He died in peace Dec. 29, 1701, in the 86th year of his age. Mr. Wilson has given a good portrait of him.

It should have been mentioned in a memoir of Kiffin, that he had a controversy with John Bunyan on the subject of adult baptism by immersion being a term of Christian fellowship. Mr. Wilson, however, takes no notice of this, but simply states in a note, p. 430, that Mr. Kiffin published only "*A Sober Discourse of Right to Church Communion*, in which he pleads for strict communion." This was not Kiffin's only publication, but it may be observed that it was the first piece published professedly on this subject. Robert Robinson, in his ingenious tract entitled "*The Doctrine of Toleration applied to Free Communion*," [Works, III. 143,] gives the following account of another work in which Kiffin had a share: "In 1672, Mr. Bunyan, then in prison, published his *Confession of Faith*, and in it pleaded warmly for mixed communion. In answer to this, Messieurs Kiffin and

Paul published a piece entitled—*Some Serious Reflections on that part of Mr. Bunyan's Confession of Faith touching Church Communion with Unbaptized Believers*. These gentlemen treated John very cavalierly. Your conclusion, say they, is *devilish topfull of ignorance and prejudice*: but this we forgive them, for John was a tinker without dish or spoon, and at best but a country teacher, and the Rev. Mr. William Kiffin was a London minister and worth forty thousand pounds." The interest which we take in this controversy, and our regard to the name of Bunyan, induce us to lengthen this extract from Robinson. "The next year, Mr. Bunyan published an answer, entitled *Differences in Judgment about Water Baptism no Bar to Communion*. To this piece of Mr. Bunyan's, Messieurs Danvers and Paul replied, and John answered them in 1674, in about two sheets in twelves, entitled *Peaceable Principles and True*. In all these he continued uniform in his sentiments, declaring he would abide by his faith and practice till *the moss should grow upon his eye-brows*. I mention this because the editors of his Works in folio have inserted a Discourse entitled *An Exhortation to Peace and Unity*, in which it is declared that baptism is essential to church communion; but it is evident Bunyan never wrote this piece."

Our author is a friend to religious inquiry and discussion, but he is not always consistent. For example he says truly and well, p. 428, "It is a distinguishing feature of truth that it invites inquiry: to stifle it is the mark of a bad cause, and the certain resort of bigots." In two pages afterwards, however, he relates of Kiffin's second son, that "having an inclination to travel abroad, he was accompanied by a young minister as far as Leghorn, and proceeding by himself to Venice, there *entered too freely into conversation upon religious subjects, and was poisoned by a Popish priest*." This narrow-minded reflection we are willing to believe that Mr. Wilson has injudiciously copied from some one of his old authorities.

We meet in the History with frequent stories of the judgments of God upon persecutors, and in p. 436 there is an apology for them. We must remark, once for all, that such narrations

betray great credulity and an evident inattention to the ordinary course of Divine Providence, under which *all things come alike to all*.

There is an offensive vulgarism, in p. 441, where, relating a journey which Sayer Rudd made to France without the consent of his congregation (Devonshire Square), Mr. Wilson says "he took which [*what*] is commonly called *French leave*."

In the account of John Macgowan, pastor in the place last-mentioned, who is known by his audacious and malignant pamphlets against reputed "Socinianism," Mr. Wilson is not sparing of his censures on controversial outrageousness and artifice: he says very judiciously, p. 453, "We have better evidence for the doctrines of the gospel than those afforded by ghosts and spectres." This refers to a piece of Macgowan's, entitled "The Arian's and Socinian's Monitor," in which a story is told of a young minister who saw his tutor (the learned and venerable Dr. John Taylor) rolling in hell-flames, and received of course due warning against 'damnable heresies.' Is it credible that Trinitarians should still circulate this abominable libel, and that any readers should be found (as we are informed there are) of such depraved understandings, as to receive the impudent and wicked fiction for truth?

Macgowan published another notable piece, in letters to Dr. Priestley, entitled *Christ proved to be the Adorable God or a Notorious Impostor*. On this instance of polemic craft, the decorum to which we are constrained forbids us to make the proper comment. It is akin to the wisdom of certain disputants in conversation, who declare if some favourite notion be not scriptural *they will burn their Bibles*. In the same temper and with the same degree of understanding, the Pagans, when their prayers were unanswered, in the rage of disappointment demolished their gods.

Of Macgowan, Mr. Wilson yet declares, p. 451, "his humility was very remarkable!"

A fact related of the Meeting-house in *Miles's Lane* reminds us of the late proceedings against the Protestants in France: it has been said of *popery*, but may more truly be said of *persecution*, that it is *always the same*.

"Though the exact date of the building is not now to be obtained, there is good evidence that it must have been erected very soon after the restoration of Charles the Second. Being a large and commodious place, it was fixed upon as a prey to the parish minister, when his church was consumed in the fire of London, A. D. 1666; nor could the rightful owners regain possession till the new church was built. This was the fate of many other meeting-houses, at that time, and places in a strong light the unprincipled power of the ecclesiastical government, during the reign of Charles the Second."—P. 462.

ART. V.—*The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews Examined, and the Pretensions of the Converted Jew Investigated, &c. &c.* By B. R. Goakman, late Printer to the Institution. 8vo. pp. 64. Simpkin and Marshall. 1816.

WE know not what degree of credit is due to the "late Printer to the Institution" for converting the Jews, but if the tenth part of what he relates be true, the conductors of the society owe an apology to the public for the costly delusion which they have been the means of supporting. According to this statement, almost the only Jew of fair character who has been connected with the society was one who never professed conversion and who, wanting the qualification of hypocrisy, was ill-used by the managers.

One short story will explain the design of this pamphlet:

"A man of the name of *Marinus* came from Germany into this country, for the purpose of obtaining a sale for some *Cologne Water*, of which he professed to be the Inventor. Finding himself run short of cash, he applied to the London Society for assistance. I asked him if he had embraced Christianity; his reply was,

I am not yet converted, but if I can get a good sale for my Cologne Water I soon shall be."—P. 64.

The "late Printer" sums up his pleadings against the Society, in a few words:

"What has the London Society done? —expended 70,000*l.* and have made their proselytes worse characters than they were before!"—P. 64.

ART. VI.—*On Persecution.* A Discourse delivered in the Protestant Dissenting Chapel, Lewin's Mead, Bristol, June 16, 1816, in recommendation of a Subscription for the Relief of the Protestant Sufferers for Conscience-Sake in the South of France. By John Prior Estlin, LL. D. 8vo. pp. 38. Longman and Co. 1816.

THE benevolent preacher exposes and reprobates Persecution, as pre-supposing "that a perfect knowledge of religious subjects is attainable by all men, and consequently, that an uniformity of belief is practicable; that those who practise it have attained this knowledge and are infallible; that errors of the understanding, merely are criminal; that those who have arrived at speculative perfection themselves have a right to compel others to come into the truth; and that pains and penalties are the means to accomplish this purpose."

An opinion is stated in p. 20, which is well worthy of discussion; and we insert the statement of it to invite the notice of our Correspondents, viz. "Wherever the doctrines of the eternity of hell-torments, of inspiration or infallibility, and of exclusive salvation or salvation depending on opinions, are received together in a heart prepared for their reception, a persecuting spirit appears to me to be a natural and legitimate consequence." X

POETRY.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR, Reading, Sept. 15, 1816.

THE humble tribute I send you for insertion in the Repository, to the memory of Mr. Vidler, is but a very feeble attempt to express the emotions of respect with which his memory is cherished by those who had the pleasure of his acquaintance here.

VOL. XI.

4 B

From his conversation they not only derived the highest intellectual gratification, but have to date the best and holiest feelings which Christian truth is calculated to inspire. They remember him with an enthusiasm of reverence, which it would be impossible for much higher powers than mine to express. It is gratifying to reflect that

as this town was among the last scenes of his labours, so it was one in which they were most eminently successful. In future times, when the cause of truth may have advanced to a much greater eminence than it has yet attained in this place, his name will be recollected with gratitude as its first supporter; and of him, in the midst of the Unitarian congregation, might be most truly applied the epitaph on a celebrated architect—" *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice.*"*

T. N. T.

A Tribute to the Memory of
THE REV. WILLIAM VIDLER.

Hush! 'twas no strain of anguish or despair

That softly floats on ev'ning's stillest air,
Celestial bliss the distant note reveals,
Though from the grave the solemn music steals;

An angel's lyre, through shades of fun'ral gloom,

More sweetly mild from sweeping o'er the tomb.

Yes; there remov'd from mortal cares, he sleeps,

Whose soft repose affection scarcely weeps,
Whose earthly days in such sweet concord ran,

Earth sunk from view ere death's control began;

Who, 'mid the storms of life, with cloudless brow,

As calmly rested as he slumbers now;
To evil dead while here he drew his breath,
And living yet triumphant in his death.

Here long shall friendship's tend'rest mem'ry trace

The mild effulgence of his speaking face—
The eye where kindness beam'd, and fires of youth

Still kindled joyous at the voice of truth—
Li't up, not dim'd by care or quench'd by years,

Sparkling with joy or eloquent in tears;—
The conscious dignity by nature giv'n,

The hope that had its resting-place in heav'n,

The heart-felt eloquence, the manly sense,
The genial wit that gave no ear offence;

The courteous mien that, grac'd by rev'rend age,

Disarm'd the bigot in his fiercest rage,
The pow'r that flash'd conviction on the mind,

The heart that knew no party but mankind:

* If you require a monument, look around you.

All live more tender seen through friendship's tear,
While gen'rous hearts shall feel and kindle here.

Methinks I see, by hope's great theme inspir'd,

That form rever'd in sudden light attir'd,
Pursue the path immortal prophets trod,
To trace the deepest charities of God.

Then as delight his raptur'd eye bedew'd,
Each mind amaz'd the glorious prospect view'd,

Death's icy fetters seem'd by mercy broke,
And sorrow dropt her sceptre as he spoke.
Deep 'mid the fading gloom as man could trace

Shone vistas fair of universal grace;
Heav'n seem'd all op'ning to the ravish'd sight

With fanes half viewless from "excessive bright;"

Hell sunk a trembling spectre 'mid the blaze,

And earth bloom'd ever young 'mid joy and praise.

Then notes of gladness from the vision clear,

Stole in sweet whispers on the list'ning ear;

Prophetic strains of bliss to reign on high,
Join'd with the mellow voice of years gone by;

Then light from heav'n seem'd freshly still to glow,

Like pure enchantment o'er these realms of woe,

Gleam'd like a holier moon-beam through the bow'rs,

Blush'd in the clouds and sparkled in the flow'rs,

Shed on the genial earth a softer green,
And gleam'd on angel's wings at distance seen,

Cast on the woods a tint of gentler spring,
Till earth appear'd a visionary thing:

Man seem'd again in hope and bliss a boy,
And life one cloudless dream of love and joy.

Then let no tear, save such as hope may shed,

Bedew the flow'rs that deck his lowly bed;

But there let breezy whispers greet the ear

Like first sweet concords of a jarring sphere;

There let young hearts pursue his glorious theme,

And sink absorb'd in virtue's holiest dream;

There let the soul oppress'd delight to stay,

Think on his name and muse its griefs away;

Let artless childhood lisp its earliest pray'r,
And contrite sinners taste forgiveness there:

And when the soul all mortal cares above,
Is wrapt in thoughts of universal love,
From eyes uprais'd with tearful rapture
dim,
The purest, tend'rest drop shall flow for
him.

From the Portuguese.

THE MANIAC.

Look at yon sad mourner there !
Chilling thoughts bedew his cheeks,
And in rapt loneliness he seeks
Comfort in despair !
In midnight cold—and noontide heat
He wanders o'er the mountain wild,
The rude crags wound his weary feet ;—
Yes, that is mis'ry's child !
He wants no guide, he owns no friend,
No voice of joy he hears ;
Darkness and dread his steps attend ;
He hates the morning's loveliest
beam,
And the sun never shines for him
Except in clouds and tears !
Brightest to him the blackest gloom ;
His only paradise, the tomb :—
Pity yon child of woe !
Pray that he soon may lay his head
Where his own hands have made his bed,
And weeds and flow'rets grow,
Water'd by tears himself has shed ;—
Those tears have ceas'd to flow.
That troubled, madden'd soul hath been
Composed, and happy, and serene,
As 'tis abandon'd now :
Poor mis'ry's child,
The tempest wild
Is calmer far than thou !

But it shall blast, and rage and roar
When sweet repose shall still thy breast,
When thy mind's tempest beats no more,
And thy lov'd grave shall give thee rest,
So long denied before.
A little while, sad maniac ! and thou'rt
free—
Nor woe, nor thought of woe, shall visit
thee.

A.

DESPAIR.

From Bocage.

What ! scathed with desolate curses,—no-
thing left ;
Of hope, of heav'n, of ev'ry thing bereft ?
O no ! I still may rage and weep and
sigh :
Pour forth the bitterness that blasts my
mind,
Tell all my agony to the list'ning wind,
And (O ! most privileged of blessings,)
die !

A.

MORNING.

See the new light in ruddy mantle clad
Come dancing o'er the mountains ;
darkness flies
From its gay footsteps ; trees, and plants,
and flow'rs
Put on their brightest, richest liv'ries :
Smiles gild the path of early morning
hours,
And heav'n is full of joy—and earth is
glad.

A.

OBITUARY.

REV. WM. VIDLER.

WE announced in our last (p. 491) the death of this able and truly respectable Christian preacher. He had scarcely outlived the usual period of the vigour of man. His age was 58. He had long suffered under an asthma, arising from internal disorganization. His affliction was extreme and his death slow. His conversation to the very last day of his life was characteristic of his mind : he felt no raptures, but he yielded not to despondency ; he looked forward with Christian hope, and, in nearly his last expression, *his heart was fixed on God*. Throughout his illness and death he derived great satisfaction from the system of divine truth which he had publicly professed and taught, and took peculiar pleasure in dwelling on the character

of Christ, as the son of man, the friend and brother of his disciples, and on the universal, inexhaustible love of God.

By his particular desire, he was interred by Mr. Aspland in the Burial-ground belonging to the Unitarian Church, Hackney. The funeral took place on Wednesday, August the 28th. A long train of mourning coaches and a great crowd of spectators attested the sensation created by the melancholy event. The corpse was carried into the Gravel Pit Meeting-House, and an address was delivered over it, the substance of which will be found in the *Christian Reformer*.

On the following Sunday Evening, Mr. Aspland, in fulfilment of the last request of the deceased, preached the funeral sermon, at the Chapel in Parliament Court, to a vast concourse of

sorrowing friends. The text was 2 Tim. iv. 6, 7, 8, which was used as an introduction to a memoir and character of Mr. Vidler. His congregation had caused the pulpit and galleries to be hung in black, and had adopted other measures of respect towards their lamented pastor.

Mr. Vidler has left behind him some manuscripts, which he has consigned to the discretion of Mr. Aspland; and it is in contemplation to publish a selection from these, with as ample a memoir as can be compiled. A memoir will also appear in this work, and it is hoped that a *portrait* will be obtained for an accompaniment. Probably both may appear in the opening number of the next volume.

In the mean time, we are happy to gratify the affectionate curiosity of Mr. Vidler's numerous friends, by the following character of him, being the conclusion of a funeral sermon, preached by Mr. Evans, on the Sunday following Mr. Aspland's funeral sermon.

A Tribute of Respect to the Memory of the REV. WILLIAM VIDLER, being the conclusion of an ADDRESS delivered by John Evans, at Worship Street, Sunday Morning, Sept. 8th, 1816, founded on Luke ix. 26—“Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels.”*

These remarks (illustrative of the passage on which my ADDRESS is founded,) lead me to notice the character and conduct of my worthy deceased friend, the *Rev. William Vidler*. I had the pleasure of being acquainted with him for these *twenty* years past, and my knowledge of him enables me to declare that he acted upon the principles I have described. He endeavoured to attain just views of the Christian religion, and assuredly he without disguise communicated them to mankind.

Possessing naturally a vigorous mind, my friend applied himself to the study

* The crowded attendance on the delivery of the ADDRESS is here acknowledged as respectful to the preacher, and as an honourable token of regard to the memory of the deceased.

of the Old and New Testament. Unaided by education, he exercised his faculties in the best manner he was able for the acquisition of truth. *Persuaded* thus far in *his mind*, he laboured to instruct and improve his fellow-creatures according to the views he then entertained of the principles and practices of Christianity.

But when on further inquiry he had reason to believe that the tenets of *Calvinism* which he had adopted were false, he relinquished them. His first step was the renunciation of the doctrine of the *eternal misery of the wicked*, and the adoption of the heart-exhilarating tenet of UNIVERSAL RESTORATION! Much esteemed for his talents and zeal by his brethren, he was upon his change of sentiment subjected to their reprobation. The charge of *heresy* was thundered against him in every direction—he was said to be led astray by the snares of Satan; and suspicions of his safety in another world were scattered about in profusion. One would have thought from this treatment of an erring brother, that forbearance formed no part of the religion of Jesus Christ.†

It is somewhat singular that one of Mr. Vidler's bitterest opponents lately deceased (the Rev. A. Fuller,) has in his diary just published in his *Life* by Dr. Ryland, acknowledged the *great corruption* of the Christian religion, and confessed that accounts of *Heretics* should be received with caution. His words are these—“I cannot help lamenting in reading

† A delectable specimen of this anti-christian spirit may be seen in a review of the controversy between Mr. Fuller and Mr. Vidler, in the *Life* of the former gentleman, by J. W. Morris, late of Dunstable; a man from whom Mr. Fuller thought it “his duty” to withdraw his friendship, and who ought not to forget that it is possible for individuals to be eager in pointing out the faults of others while “they refuse to acknowledge any of their own!” See page 560 of the *Life of the Rev. Andrew Fuller*, by John Ryland, D. D. This same Mr. Morris declares very authoritatively that some of the *sects* are grossly misrepresented in the *Sketch of the Denominations*: but his gratuitous assertion cannot be admitted for proof; and the unparalleled success of that little work, constitutes a sufficient refutation of the falsehood, with the more intelligent classes of the Christian world.

Mosheim's Church History, *how soon and how much* was the religion of Jesus corrupted from its primitive simplicity. And the partial account of the *English Baptists* leads me to indulge a better opinion of various sects who have been deemed *Heretics!*" Much indeed must the religion of Jesus have been corrupted from its primitive simplicity, since other tests of Christian fellowship are imposed than that of acknowledging CHRIST to be the *Messiah or the Son of God*; and surely the writer who makes the declaration contained in the concluding sentence of the above paragraph, might have indulged more tenderness towards the reputedly *heretical* advocates of universal restoration. It is a curious phenomenon in the annals of theology, that those who as to their *faith* take most pains to be right should be generally declared most wrong; and that those who as to *practice* abound most in the exercise of Christian charity should be pronounced destitute of true piety. But certain it is that without free inquiry and a patient, candid investigation of opposite systems of faith—we the inhabitants of this highly favoured island, might have been at this day "plucking misletoe with the Druid or mixing a little flour and water into the substance of the incomprehensible God!"

My deceased friend, however, was not deterred by the unchristian treatment of his brethren from holding fast what he deemed Scriptural truth. He even pushed his inquiries still further so as to renounce other popular errors and to maintain the glorious doctrines of the *Divine Unity*, and the *unpurchased love* of the Supreme Being in the redemption of the world. "Blessed be the GOD and FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ: In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."† On doctrines contained in this as well as similar passages of the New Testament, he dwelt with satisfaction and delight. Contrary views are to be found only in creeds and confessions of faith, which with him were in no estimation. Embodying human error

and consecrating human infirmity, he justly deemed them encumbrances to the progress of truth. And yet, strange to tell, for attaching themselves to the above Scriptural views of the character of the Supreme Being, Dr. Ryland in his *Life of Fuller*, declares a certain class of *General Baptists*, (to whom I and my deceased friend have the honour to belong), "to have gone from GENERAL REDEMPTION to *no redemption!*" Such are the gross and abominable misrepresentations in which party writers indulge at the expense of truth and to the utter destruction of Christian charity.‡

It should be added that our venerable brother, whilst he maintained the prime leading doctrines of revelation, did not relinquish the ordinance of *Christian Baptism* by immersion, but administered it to its only proper objects, those who make a profession of their faith. Having preached for him more than once on those occasions, I have witnessed his administration of it in this place with pleasure. He conducted it with a solemnity which became its importance, making candid allowance for those otherwise minded, and pointing out its happy tendency in promoting the purity of the professors of Christianity.

As the treatment received by this good man from his particular Baptist brethren, on account of difference of sentiment, has been mentioned, it is but justice to add that he was similarly treated by a minister of that class who style themselves *Free Grace General Baptists!* This Reverend brother from whom better things were to be expected, endeavoured to prevent Mr. Vidler from becoming a member of the respectable GENERAL BODY of Dissenting ministers of the Three Denominations meeting at Red-cross Street. It is with no small pleasure that I now recollect the successful exertions made by me in his behalf on that occasion. An end was soon put to this unwarrantable and odious ebullition of bigotry.

Thus like his great Master, *through good report and through evil report*, did my friend pursue the even tenor of

† Ephes. i. 3, 7.

‡ In the Second Edition of my *Letter to Dr. Hawker*, will be found a discussion of the doctrine of GENERAL REDEMPTION.

his way, till resting from his labours he was laid in the peaceful tomb. The particulars of his life, and of his last long severe illness, which he bore with exemplary resignation, have been laid before his congregation by a friend every way capable of rendering justice to his benevolence and piety. I have thought proper to touch only on the leading traits of his character as a minister of Jesus Christ. His love of free inquiry, his endeavour to divest himself of prejudice, and his intrepid avowal of his religious creed, are creditable to his memory. These are essential requisites of ministerial fidelity. Though we agreed in many important articles of faith, yet as to others we were agreed to differ. Friendly and cheerful, he often conversed with freedom on religious topics, but never to the breach of Christian charity. He could bear with those who did not accompany him in all his convictions. And we both heartily acquiesced in the sublime and awful asseveration of Jesus Christ—"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels."

To conclude—the minister of Jesus Christ, be he *Churchman* or *Dissenter*, *Trinitarian* or *Unitarian*, who, imploring the blessing of heaven, indulges free inquiry, endeavours to divest his mind of prejudice, and honestly proclaims his convictions, on every proper occasion, sanctioned and emblazoned by a correspondent temper and practice, will receive the final eulogy of the Saviour—"Well done good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

"Lo! with a mighty Host HE comes,
I see the parted clouds give way,
I see the banner of the cross display;
Death's conqueror in pomp appears—
In his right hand, a palm he bears,
And in his looks—REDEMPTION wears!"

"The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seem to die, and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction; but they are in peace, for though they be punished in the sight of men,

yet is their hope full of immortality: and having been a little chastised, they shall be greatly rewarded, for God proved them and found them worthy of himself.*

September 10, at *Cheltenham*, having nearly completed his 81st year, RICHARD REYNOLDS, of *Bristol*, a highly respected member of the Society of Friends. For a long series of years in the possession of an ample fortune, he made it subservient to the purposes of benevolence. His numerous charities, public and private, rank him among the most eminent philanthropists of the present age. After a gradual decline, he closed a life of great usefulness in the faith and hope of a Christian.

MRS. ELIZABETH HAMILTON.—It would be with feelings of sincere sorrow, for a private and a public loss, that the lovers of elegant literature heard of the death of one of the most amiable, useful and popular of the female writers of the present age; one who has done honour to her sex and to her country.

Mrs. Elizabeth Hamilton was born at *Belfast*, in *Ireland*; and the affection for her country, which she constantly expressed, proved that she had a true Irish heart. She was well known to the public as the author of "*The Cottagers of Glenburnie*," "*The Modern Philosophers*," "*Letters on Female Education*," and various other works. She has obtained, in different departments of literature, just celebrity, and has established a reputation that will strengthen and consolidate from the duration of time—that destroyer of all that is false and superficial.

The most popular of her lesser works is "*the Cottagers of Glenburnie*," a lively and humorous picture of the slovenly habits, the indolent *winna-be-fashed* temper, the baneful content which prevails among some of the lower class of people in Scotland. It is a proof of the great merit of this book, that it has, in spite of the Scottish dialect with which it abounds, been universally read in England and Ireland, as well as in Scotland. It is a faithful representation of human nature in general, as well as of local manners and cus-

* Wisdom iii. 1, 5.

toms; the maxims of economy and industry, the principles of truth, justice, family affection and religion, which it inculcates by striking examples, and by exquisite strokes of pathos, mixed with humour, are independent of all local peculiarity of manner or language, and operate upon the feelings of every class of readers, in all countries. In Ireland in particular, the history of "the Cottagers of Glenburnie" has been read with peculiar avidity; and it has probably done as much good to the Irish as to the Scotch. While the Irish have seized and enjoyed the opportunity it afforded of a good-humoured laugh at their Scotch neighbours, they have secretly seen, through shades of difference, a resemblance to themselves; and are conscious that, changing the names, the tale might be told of them. In this tale, both the difference and the resemblance between Scottish and Hibernian faults or foibles are advantageous to its popularity in Ireland. The difference is sufficient to give an air of novelty that awakens curiosity; while the resemblance fixes attention, and creates a new species of interest. Besides this, the self-love of the Hibernian reader being happily relieved from all apprehension that the lesson was intended for him, his good sense takes and profits by the advice that is offered to another. The humour in this book is peculiarly suited to the Irish, because it is, in every sense of the word, *good humour*. The satire, if satire it can be called, is benevolent; its object is to mend, and not wound, the heart. Even the Scotch themselves, however national they are supposed to be, can bear "the Cottagers of Glenburnie." Nations, like individuals, can with decent patience endure to be told of their faults, if those faults, instead of being represented as forming their established unchangeable character, are considered as arising, as in fact they usually do arise, from those passing circumstances which characterize rather a certain period of civilization than any particular people. If our national faults are pointed out as indelible stains, inherent in the texture of the character, from which it cannot by art or time be bleached or purified, we are justly provoked and offended; but, if a friend warns us of some little accidental spots, which we had, perhaps, overlooked, and which we can,

at a moment's notice, efface, we smile, and are grateful.

In "the Modern Philosophers," where the spirit of system and party interfered with the design of the work, it was difficult to preserve throughout the tone of good-humoured raillery and candour: this could scarcely have been accomplished by any talents or prudence, had not the habitual temper and real disposition of the writer been candid and benevolent. Though this work is a professed satire upon a system, yet it avoids all satire of individuals; and it shews none of that cynical contempt of the human race which some satirists seem to feel, or affect, in order to give poignancy to their wit.

Our author has none of that misanthropy which derides the infirmities of human nature, and which laughs while it cauterizes. There appears always some adequate object for any pain that she inflicts: it is done with a steady view to future good, and with a humane and tender, as well as with a skilful and courageous hand.

The object of "the Modern Philosophers" was to expose those whose theory and practice differ; to point out the difficulty of applying high-flown principles to the ordinary, but necessary, concerns of human life; and to shew the danger of trusting every man to become his own moralist and legislator. When this novel first appeared, it was, perhaps, more read, and more admired, than any of Mrs. Hamilton's works: the name and character of Brigettina Botheram passed into every company, and became a standing jest—a proverbial point in conversation. The ridicule answered its purpose; it reduced to measure and reason those who, in the novelty and zeal of system, had overleaped the bounds of common sense.

"The Modern Philosophers," "the Cottagers of Glenburnie," and "the Letters of the Hindoo Rajah," the first book, we believe, that our author published, have all been highly and steadily approved by the public. These works, alike in principle and in benevolence of design, yet with each a different grace of style and invention, have established Mrs. Hamilton's character as an original, agreeable and successful writer of fiction. But her claims to literary reputation, as a useful, philosophic, moral and religious author, are of a

higher sort, and rest upon works of a more solid and durable nature; upon her works on education, especially her "Letters on Female Education." In these she not only shews that she has studied the history of the human mind, and that she has made herself acquainted with what has been written on this subject by the best moral and metaphysical writers, but she adds new value to their knowledge by rendering it practically useful. She has thrown open to all classes of readers those metaphysical discoveries or observations, which had been confined chiefly to the learned. To a sort of knowledge, which had been considered more as a matter of curiosity than of use, she has given real value and actual currency: she has shewn how the knowledge of metaphysics can be made serviceable to the art of education; she has shewn, for instance, how the doctrine of the association of ideas may be applied, in early education, to the formation of the habits of temper, and of the principles of taste and morals; she has considered how all that metaphysicians know of sensation, abstraction, &c. can be applied to the cultivation of the judgment and the imaginations of children. No matter how little is actually ascertained on these subjects: she has done much in wakening the attention of parents, and of mothers especially, to future inquiry; she has done much by directing their inquiries rightly; much by exciting them to reflect upon their own minds, and to observe what passes in the minds of their children. She has opened a new field of investigation to women, a field fitted to their domestic habits, to their duties as mothers, and to their business as preceptors of youth; to whom it belongs to give the minds of children those first impressions and ideas, which remain the longest, and which influence them often the most powerfully, through the whole course of life. In recommending to her own sex the study of metaphysics, as far as it relates to education, Mrs. Hamilton has been judiciously careful to avoid all that can lead to that species of "vain debate," of which there is no end. She, knowing the limits of the human understanding, does not attempt to go beyond them into that which can be at best but a dispute about terms. She does not aim at making women expert in the "wordy war;" nor does

she teach them to astonish the unlearned by their acquaintance with the various vocabularies of metaphysical system-makers.

Such jugglers' tricks she despised; but she has not, on the other hand, been deceived or overawed by those who would represent the study of the human mind as a study that leads to no practical purpose, and that is unfit and unsafe for her sex. Had Mrs. Hamilton set ladies on metaphysic ground merely to shew their paces, she would have made herself and them ridiculous and troublesome; but she has shewn how they may, by slow and certain steps, advance to a useful object. The dark, intricate and dangerous labyrinth, she has converted into a clear, straight, practicable road; a road not only practicable, but pleasant, and not only pleasant but, what is of far more consequence to women, safe.

Mrs. Elizabeth Hamilton is well known to be not only a moral, but a pious, writer; and in all her writings, as in all her conversation, religion appears in the most engaging point of view. Her religion was sincere, cheerful and tolerant; joining, in the happiest manner, faith, hope and charity. All who had the happiness to know this amiable woman will, with one accord, bear testimony to the truth of that feeling of affection which her benevolence, kindness and cheerfulness of temper inspired. She thought so little of herself, so much of others, that it was impossible she could, superior as she was, excite envy. She put every body at ease in her company, in good humour and good spirits with themselves. So far from being a restraint on the young and lively, she encouraged, by her sympathy, their openness and gaiety. She never flattered, but she always formed the most favourable opinion, that truth and good sense would permit, of every individual who came near her; therefore all, instead of fearing and shunning her penetration, loved and courted her society.

Her loss will be long regretted by her private friends; her memory will long live in public estimation.

Much as Mrs. Elizabeth Hamilton has served and honoured the cause of female literature by her writings, she has done still higher and more essential benefit to that cause by her life, by set-

ting the example, through the whole of that uniform propriety of conduct, and of all those virtues which ought to characterize her sex, which form the charm and happiness of domestic life,

and which in her united gracefully with that superiority of talent and knowledge that commanded the admiration of the public.—*Monthly Magazine.*

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Manchester College, York.

THE REV. WILLIAM SHEPHERD, of Gateacre, has offered a prize of five guineas for the best classical scholar in this Institution, in the ensuing session. The merits of the candidates to be decided on at the examination at the close of the session.

Manchester, August 21, 1816.

The following sums have been received on account of this Institution.

Collection at Chesterfield Chapel, by the Rev. R. W. Wallace. - - - - -	11	10	7
Rev. Israel Worsley, Plymouth (Annual). - - - - -	1	1	0
Mr. T. Holt, Liverpool, An. - - - - -	1	1	0
W. Ridge, Esq. Chichester, do. - - - - -	1	1	0
Mr. W. Bayley, Chichester, do. - - - - -	0	10	6
Hinton Castle, Esq. Clifton, do. - - - - -	2	2	0
Mr. Richmond, Temple, London, do. - - - - -	1	1	0
	18	7	1

G. W. WOOD, Treasurer.

Manchester, September 6, 1816.

The thirtieth Annual Meeting of Trustees of Manchester College, York, was held at Cross Street Chapel Rooms, in Manchester, on Friday August 30, 1816, Abraham Crompton, of Lune Villa, near Lancaster, Esq. in the chair.

The proceedings of the Committee during the past year were read over, and confirmed, and the Treasurer's Accounts were laid before the Meeting, approved of, and passed.

Benjamin Gaskell, Esq. M. P. of Thorns House, Yorkshire, was re-elected President, and James Touchet, Esq. of Manchester, Joseph Strutt, Esq. of Derby, Peter Martineau, Esq. of Canonbury, and Daniel Gaskell, Esq. of Lupsett, were re-elected Vice Presidents. Mr. George William Wood, of Manchester, was re-chosen Treasurer, and Mr. Edward Baxter, Mr. Jonathan Brookes, and Mr. William Duckworth, of Manchester, and the Rev. Joseph Ashton, of Duckinfield, were added to the Committee, to supply the places of the Gentlemen ineligible from non-attendance.

VOL. XI.

4. C

The Deputy Treasurers for the past year were re-elected, with the addition of Mr. Robert Philips, Jun. of Manchester, and Mr. Cyrus Armitage, of Duckinfield.

Mr. Thomas Henry Robinson and the Rev. John Gooch Robberds, of Manchester, were re-appointed Secretaries.

The thanks of the Meeting were voted to the President, Vice-Presidents, and other Officers of the College, for their services during the past year.

The Report made of the state of the Funds was encouraging and satisfactory. The Trustees have been enabled to discharge the debt that was owing to the Treasurer at the commencement of the year; to appropriate 400*l.* to the farther liquidation of the debt on the York Buildings, and to make a small addition to the Permanent Fund.

The means of accomplishing these desirable objects have been principally afforded by the receipt of several considerable benefactions, and of a legacy of 200*l.* bequeathed to the College by the late Swann Downer, Esq. of London. The Trustees have likewise made arrangements for the admission of twelve Divinity Students on the foundation next session, and for an addition to the emoluments of the Tutors.

The number of Students in the College during the last session was reported to have been 21, viz. 11 Lay-students, and 10 intended for the ministry; of the latter Mr. Mardon and Mr. Morris have finally left the College, and Mr. Mardon is settled with the Unitarian Congregation at Glasgow, as successor to the Rev. James Yates.

Thirteen Divinity Students and seventeen Lay-Students are expected in the College next session.

When the business of the meeting was closed, the chair was taken by Isaac Harrop, Esq. of Altringham; and the thanks of the meeting were unanimously voted to Abraham Crompton, Esq. for his services as Chairman.

The Trustees and friends of the College afterwards dined together at the Spread Eagle Inn; Nathaniel Philips, Esq. of the Dales, in the chair. The attendance was not so numerous as on former occasions, but the day was spent with much hilarity and interest.

Manchester, September 4, 1816.

Meeting of Ministers at Coventry.

On the 6th instant, a *Meeting of Ministers* was holden at *Coventry*, and a religious service was performed in the great Meeting, in that city. The Rev. James Scott conducted the devotional parts; and the Rev. John Yates delivered the Sermon, from 2 Cor. vi. 1. It is not intended to analyze this learned and singularly excellent discourse, nor will it be attempted to point out its numerous and various merits; but it may be permitted to say—that it discovered an extensive acquaintance with the writings of the ancients, and the several systems of philosophy which have prevailed in the world; and which, however they may have been extolled by some, were yet clearly proved by the preacher to be as inferior to Christianity as the light of the twinkling star is to the refulgent light of the mid-day sun: Mr. Yates disapproved of our British youth learning their morality from the pages of Homer, (the beauties of whose poetry, however, he freely allowed) while the Christian religion furnished a far superior and purer system of moral conduct. And it was finely remarked, that sooner than the heroes of Homer could become disciples of the mild, the forgiving, the benevolent religion of Jesus, should Satan and Beelzebub and Moloch have retained their stations in heaven! The preacher pathetically described the vast difference between the effects produced by the orations of the Pagan philosophers and the discourses of the ministers of Christ; and while the former could boast the mighty consequences that followed their eloquence, the latter had often cause to lament the little influence which their labours had upon the conduct of their auditors! The *reason* of this difference is a subject of serious inquiry to both ministers and people. Some judicious and kind advice was given to the ministers on the subjects of their preaching; which, coming warm from the heart, and flowing from a quarter, in every point of view, so highly respectable, and delivered with so much energy and feeling, could not fail of making a deep impression on the hearts of those to whom it was addressed. Nor was the congregation overlooked; but exhorted diligently to improve the superior light and means of virtue and knowledge with which they were favoured: the hearers were respectable in point of number, and appeared unusually attentive. The following ministers were present on this interesting occasion—Messrs. Bransby, of Dudley; Bull and Bristowe, of Hinckley; Davies, of Coventry, (who gave out the hymns); Field, of Warwick; Kell and Kentish, of Birmingham; Kenrick, of York College; Lloyd, of Kingswood; Scott, of Cradley;

Small, of Coseley; Yates, of Liverpool; and James Yates, late of Glasgow.

The writer of this hasty, brief and defective account cannot withhold the expression of the great satisfaction and pleasure, which he felt during the day; and he has reason to believe that similar sentiments were experienced by others of his respected brethren in the ministry.

J. B. B.

Hinckley, Aug. 11, 1816.

*Additional Subscriptions to the Unitarian Chapel, at Thorne.**At Altricham, by the Rev. W. Jevons:*

Mr. Rigby, - - - - -	5	0	0
Mrs. Worthington - - - - -	3	0	0
Mr. Hugo Worthington, - - - - -	3	0	0
Mr. J. Worthington, - - - - -	3	0	0
Mr. Js. Harrop, - - - - -	2	2	0
Mr. W. Whitelegg, - - - - -	1	0	0
Mr. C. Hankinson, - - - - -	1	0	0
Rev. W. Jevons, - - - - -	1	1	0
Mr. Burgess, - - - - -	0	10	6
Anonymous, - - - - -	0	6	6
Joseph Dobson, (London,) - - - - -	1	1	0

By Mr. Aspland:

Mr. David Walker, Hoxton, - - - - -	1	1	0
Mrs. Severn, Broughton, Notts, - - - - -	1	0	0

Unitarian Chapel, New Church, Rossendale.

[See M. Repos. X. 313. 392. 458. 461. 527. 596. 660. 721. XI. 124.]

Donations in aid of liquidating the debt, (350*l.*) upon this Chapel, will be thankfully received by the Rev. R. Aspland, Hackney Road; Rev. R. Astley, Halifax; Rev. W. Johns, Manchester; Mr. W. Walker, Rochdale; and Dr. Thomson, Halifax.

It is intended to proceed to liquidate the debt as soon as may be, and as far as the liberality of the public may enable the above-mentioned gentlemen to do so; to whom all who have entrusted themselves in behalf of the Rossendale brethren are requested to report the Subscriptions in their hands without delay.

An accurate account of the Subscription and of its appropriation will be given in the Monthly Repository.

Amount Reported, XI. 124. -	249	5	0
A Legacy from the late Mr. Mason, of Bolton. - - - - -	5	0	0
Unitarian Fund. - - - - -	20	0	0

274 5 0

MISCELLANEOUS.

Curious and Important Recent Religious Prosecution.

Religious liberty is so well established in Great Britain, that we rarely hear of persecutions or prosecutions on the ground of faith or worship. When Lord Grosvenor was lately charged with an indirect

persecution of some of his labourers who were Dissenters, his friends came forward to explain away the charge. How Lord Romney's friends will proceed remains to be seen: his Lordship has acted the part of an Informer against, prosecuted and convicted, (not a Dissenter, but) a brother Churchman, for *unlawful religious worship*! The Penal Statutes regarding religion have been repealed with respect to Dissenters, and are in force only against the members of the Establishment!

But the reader will be better pleased with a history than a commentary, and therefore we extract the following account of this curious case from a pamphlet just published at Maidstone, entitled "*A Narrative of the Prosecution of the Honourable Charles Noel—Intended as a Friendly Caution, by a Friend to Religion, Order and Law.*" The writer of the pamphlet appears to be a friend of Mr. Noel's, and to be intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the case.

"The Honourable Charles Noel having travelled some time on the Continent for the recovery of his health; on his return to England, he came to reside at the family mansion, Barham Court, in the parish of Teston, where it was the first wish of his heart to render his influence, from his rank and situation, subservient to the best and most essential interests of all who were dependant upon him,—tradesmen and labourers; and being duly sensible that family religion is a most important part of practical Christianity, and that family worship is a duty that may be practised by persons of every rank in life, and that without the observance of this privilege, as well as duty, every other duty will be regarded with luke-warmness:—it was a reasonable hope and expectation that example would have its use, and prove productive of religious improvement in the parish.

"It may here be necessary to remark, that it is Mr. Noel's constant practice, and his general rule of conduct, to assemble his domestics and servants the mornings and evenings of every day for the exercise of this duty. When alone, he is his own chaplain; when favoured with the company of any friend on whom with propriety it can devolve, it is resigned to such friend.

"Such a commitment of this duty occurred on Sunday the 31st of December, 1815, and on Sunday the 7th of January, 1816—the two Sundays named in the complaint and information made against him, when the family worship at Barham Court devolved on Mr. Noel's friend: and from the attendance of this friend, twice on every Sunday, at the parish church, during the whole of his visit at Teston, it would justly have been thought a breach of Christian charity, to have considered

this friend of Mr. Noel's as a person hostile to the establishment, or to have suspected him of forming designs injurious to the interests of the church.

"But however pure and unmixed were Mr. Noel's motives, it has been proved that he erred in his judgment, in the intimation given to his tradesmen and the workmen upon his estate, that they were allowed the privilege of attending at his family worship; as the law prohibits any congregation or assembly of Protestants for religious worship, exceeding the number of twenty, in addition to servants and domestics in any unlicensed place; of which limitation Mr. Noel was not aware, and has expressed his regret that he should unintentionally, or from the purest motives have violated any law.

"What contributed to lead Mr. Noel into this error, was the constant, uninterrupted, unopposed practice of the late Lord Barham, who, for a considerable number of years, had himself attended some religious services on a Sunday evening, at a school his Lordship had erected in the village for the instruction of the poor of those parishes where he had any interest, at which the parents of the children, and any other of the inhabitants might attend, and where his Lordship was very generally accompanied by any friends, visitors at Barham Court.

"As no objections had ever been heard against this practice, and Mr. Noel's state of health not rendering it prudent to be out in the evening air, at that season of the year, he was not aware that the transferring this long continued practice at the school, countenanced by the presence of Lord Barham and his friends in general, to his own house for a few evenings, was in contradiction to any existing law.

"In Mr. Noel's first intentions, the privilege of attending the evening service at Barham Court was limited to his own dependants, and that it extended beyond this, arose from circumstances not under his control. But soon after this had occurred at Barham Court, a rumour was in circulation, that a nobleman of high rank had commenced a prosecution against Mr. Noel, a report pretty generally discredited: strong reasons were urged by many against its being worthy of any credit, and it seemed to be dying away; when a second report positively stated that the same nobleman had called upon a most respectable solicitor, desiring to put into his hands the conducting the intended prosecution, which, by this solicitor was politely declined:—this second report seemed to rest on some evidence, but the solicitor applied to having declined the conducting the prosecution, it was supposed it would not be persevered in—when a third report came into circulation that a very respect-

able solicitor from Maidstone had actually been to Watlingtonbury to take the deposition of John King, lately a servant at Teston Vicarage, and who had asked and obtained permission to attend the family worship at Barham Court, on the two Sundays mentioned in the information. This report was soon proved to be founded on fact. By duplicates of a summons, one for each offence being served upon the Honourable Charles Noel, upon David Thompson, steward to the estate, upon the Rev. John Kennedy, vicar of Teston, upon the Rev. Richard Wood, curate of Nettledsted, upon — Nettlefold, parish clerk of Teston, upon John King, servant to the Rev. John Kennedy, and upon Gardiner Jeffery, of Yalding, gentleman, a copy of which is here added:—

“Kent to wit.—To the Constable of the Lower Half Hundred of Twyford; to Edward George Buds, and to all others His Majesty’s Officers of the Peace for the said County, and to each and every of them.

“Whereas information and complaint have been made before us, his Majesty’s justices of the peace for the said county, by the Right Honourable Charles, Earl of Romney, that the Honourable Charles Noel, of Barham Court, in the parish of Teston, in the said county, the occupier of the mansion house and premises called Barham Court aforesaid, situate in the said parish of Teston, and county of Kent aforesaid, did on Sunday the seventh day of January last past, knowingly permit and suffer a certain congregation or assembly for religious worship of Protestants (at which there were present more than twenty persons, (to wit) thirty or thereabouts, besides the immediate family and servants of the said Charles Noel), to meet in the said mansion house and premises, occupied by him the said Charles Noel as aforesaid, in the parish and county aforesaid, the said mansion house and premises not having been duly certified and registered under any former act or acts of parliament relating to registering places of religious worship, nor having been certified to the bishop of the diocese, nor to the archdeacon of the archdeaconry, nor to the justices of the peace at the general or quarter sessions of the peace for the county, riding, division, or place in which such meeting was held, according to the directions of the statutes in such case made and provided, whereby he, the said Charles Noel hath forfeited for the said offence a sum not exceeding twenty pounds, nor less than twenty shillings, at the discretion of the justices who shall convict the said Charles Noel of the said offence, if he shall be by them thereof convicted—and that the Rev. John Kennedy, vicar of

Teston aforesaid, the Rev. Richard Wood, curate of Nettledsted, in the said county, — Nettlefold, clerk of the said parish of Teston, David Thompson, steward at Barham Court aforesaid, James Gardiner Jeffery, of Yalding, in the said county, gentleman, and John King, late servant to the said John Kennedy, and now servant to the Rev. Dr. Willis, of Watlingtonbury, in the said county, are material witnesses to be examined concerning the same.—These are therefore to require you, or any one of you, forthwith to summon the said John Kennedy, Richard Wood, — Nettlefold, David Thompson, James Gardiner Jeffery, and John King, severally to be and appear before us, or such other of his Majesty’s justices of the peace for the said county, as shall be assembled at the Swan, in West Malling, in the said county, on Monday the first day of April next, at the hour of eleven in the forenoon of the same day, then and there to testify their several knowledge concerning the premises.—And be you then there to certify what you shall have done in the premises. Herein fail you not.—Given under our hands and seals, the fourth day of March, 1816. *John Larking, Henry Hawley, G. Moore, Thomas Cobb, H. W. Brooke.*

“When this cause came before the bench of magistrates at their monthly meeting, held at the Swan Inn, Town Malling, the six witnesses attended, of whom, only Mr. Thompson, the steward of the estate, and the Rev. John Kennedy, vicar of Teston, were called.

“Mr. Thompson having proved the occupancy of the house by Mr. Noel, and delivered a letter from him to the chairman of the sitting—which being read, was, as far as can be recollected, expressive of regret that any mistaken views of his own privileges had led to the violation of any law enacted for the regulation of human conduct, and leaving to the decision of the bench to what degree of penalty, by his mistake, he had made himself liable: this, as far as can be recollected, was the substance of the letter.

“When Mr. Kennedy, being sworn, was asked by the chairman whether more than twenty persons, in addition to servants and domestics were present—and by Lord Romney, whether any persons besides the parishioners of Teston were present—To both which questions, he answered in the affirmative.

“As the witness from frequent conversations with the Honourable Mr. Noel, was well acquainted with his principles, views, and sentiments, he requested permission of the bench to offer a few remarks to their observation; which being granted, he began by observing, that the name of

the Noble Lord at the head of the Paper he held in his hand—

“Here Mr. Kennedy was interrupted by the Noble Lord himself, saying he could not permit Mr. Kennedy to proceed; and this interruption appeared to arise from an entertained idea that some censure was intended against his Lordship, for the part his Lordship had taken in this prosecution;—but such an idea, if entertained, was immediately removed by an immediate appeal from Mr. Kennedy to the Earl of Romney, whether in any one instance during the many years he had been known to his Lordship, he had ever given any ground for a suspicion, that he was capable of any disrespect to his Lordship; that what he meant to observe was—that from the name of the Noble Lord at the head of the summons he held in his hand, it was impossible to ascribe any but the best motives that actuated his Lordship in this prosecution.—Here Lord Romney observed, that Mr. Kennedy’s remarks had taken a different turn to what he expected, and he had no objection to his proceeding; but that he thought it necessary here to state, that as complainant and informer he took the whole matter upon himself, and added he had learned with surprise and astonishment that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Wood, two clergymen of the church of England, should countenance by their presence the illegal proceedings at Barham Court. To this, Mr. Kennedy begged leave to impress upon the minds of his Lordship and the bench, that for the reasons assigned in the letter read by the chairman, he was equally unconscious with Mr. Noel, that the assembly at Barham court was *illegal*—and referred to what had been the practice at the school, during the life of Lord Barham.

“Here it was observed from the bench, that by Mr. Kennedy’s reference to the practice of the school, Mr. Kennedy was injuring the cause he meant to serve—and Lord Romney remarked, that the master of the school was not content with reading to his scholars a chapter in the New Testament, but that he actually preached.

“Mr. Kennedy was about to proceed in his observations, when Mr. Brooke, a magistrate, whose name is affixed to the summons, objected to his being heard any further upon the subject.

“As this required the determination of the bench, Mr. Kennedy was requested by the chairman to withdraw, and being soon recalled was informed that the bench acquiesced in his proceeding, as it was not his intention to justify any breach of the law, but merely to speak in mitigation of any penalty incurred.

“Mr. Kennedy now observed he had little more to say in addition to what Mr. Noel had addressed to the bench—that he

could assert from Mr. Noel’s authority, and from the conversations with him, that no one could more venerate our laws, or was more desirous to pay all due respect to magistrates; that his error had been unintentional and arose from misconception, and respecting his public sentiments he need not intrude more upon their time. But as Mr. Noel was not present, being called to attend the death-bed of a beloved sister in a distant county, he requested the indulgence of the bench, to speak a few words upon his private character, to which, in his absence, he could speak more freely. He had known him from infancy to manhood, and hesitated not to say, that a person of more solid practical Christianity, of more amiable manners, of more humane benevolence, of greater generosity of mind, or with a greater degree of the milk of human kindness, he had never known—and he was persuaded he might affirm, he would not knowingly do the least injury to any human being, but would rejoice in any opportunity of doing good to all, and more especially in that good that ended not with the present life: in a word, he was the gentleman and the Christian.

“With such dispositions, such views, and such intentions, the degree of criminality attached to an error in his judgment; and the degree of punishment it merited, might cheerfully be submitted to the judgment and decision of the bench.

“Mr. Kennedy now begged a further indulgence for a few moments, to make an observation he considered as due to himself.

“He must confess that when the summons was delivered to him by a clerk to Messrs. Burr and Hoar, he read the names of the selected witnesses with some degree of surprise, as being classed with his servant boy, to give evidence against Mr. Noel.

“Here Mr. Kennedy was interrupted by Earl Romney, who remarked that Mr. Kennedy was the first person he had ever heard object against a servant and his superior being required to give evidence to a fact in a court of law; where, to prove the fact, a nobleman and his groom might be equally necessary, and he did not suppose Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Wood would appear as voluntary witnesses.

“Mr. Kennedy observed, that where a peer of the realm and his groom were equally necessary to prove a fact, certainly no objection could reasonably be made; but where more than an hundred other persons were equally competent to prove the fact, it had been thought singular by many that out of five selected witnesses—Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Noel’s parish priest, Mr. Wood, his curate, Mr. Nettlefold, his parish clerk, and John King, his servant

boy, were four out of the five summoned to appear before the bench to give evidence against a person he considered as his patron and his friend.

"The Earl of Romney here remarked, that to exonerate Mr. Hoar, the solicitor in this cause, he thought it right to declare that he was the sole selector of the witnesses, as well as being the complainant and informant. It was his wish to have avoided all discussion;—simply to have proved the offence, and to have left to the magistrates the amount of the penalty; but on this point his mind was now changed:—Mr. Kennedy had objected to being called to give evidence against Mr. Noel, whom he termed his patron and his friend. Mr. Noel was not his patron, nor had Mr. Kennedy ever received any benefits from that family, as he well knew.

"To this Mr. Kennedy replied—that for every favour he had received from Mrs. Bouverie, he stood indebted to the friendship of the late Lady Middleton.

"Here the discussion ended, and Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Thompson were desired to withdraw, but in a few minutes were recalled, and informed that the bench had convicted Mr. Noel in the *full* penalty of *forty pounds*, which was immediately paid into the hands of the chairman by Mr. Thompson, with an enquiry whether one moiety of the penalty did not belong to the poor of Teston parish; and was answered by the chairman, that when the expences of the prosecution were paid, of what remained, one half went to the informer, and the other half to the poor of the parish where the offence was committed."

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE conflict at Algiers is over, and it has terminated with a treaty of peace, highly honourable to this country. For the time it lasted, and the small space in which the combatants were engaged, it may be considered as one of the great actions for which an eventful period will be celebrated in the annals of history. The Algerines, confident in the strength of their batteries, kept up the fight for above six hours; but nothing could stand against the bravery and skill of the English sailor. Their batteries were demolished, their ships burnt, and great part of the town became a mass of ruins. This severe chastisement brought the sovereign to his senses, and fearing a worse disaster, he complied with the terms proposed to him.

The first article of the treaty abolishes the infamous traffic that had subsisted for many centuries, of selling for slaves the unfortunate persons that the chance of war had thrown into the hands of these barbarians. Whatever contempt we may cast upon the name of infidel in this country, it is a thousand fold greater at Algiers: but there the term of infidelity is appropriated to a confession of the Christian faith. Slavery in all its forms is wretched enough, but the Christian slave amongst the Algerines was treated worse than and called by the name of a Christian dog. The system is now changed: the States of Barbary are no longer to indulge in this horrid custom: their prisoners of war are not to be subjected to the horrors of slavery. This article is beneficial to the conquered as well as the conquerors; for instead of their abominable piracy, the former may in time be brought to exercise their talents in honest industry.

A strict eye will of course be kept upon the execution of this article of the treaty; and it will be an honour to England to have acted more for the benefit of Europe than for its own—for few if any of the English had been kept in these disgraceful chains of bondage.

Another article provided for the release of all the Christians held in slavery, who thus through our means have been restored to their country and their friends. Many a captive now made free will, whilst gratitude remains, offer up prayers for the welfare of that power which has conferred on him the greatest kindness; and the prayers of our fellow creatures are to the generous mind a source of the greatest satisfaction. Besides this the Dey was compelled to refund a considerable sum sent to him by European powers for the redemption of slaves; and now for some time at least the Mediterranean will be freed from the ravages of the pirates. Its shores will however remain subject to the Mahometan name, and Christianity will lament that the bad conduct of its professors drove them from a country, which they disgraced by their contemptible disputes, and disregard of all that is most valuable in religion.

France presents to us a new picture. The sovereign seems at last to be sensible that he can no longer govern his country on the principles of faction: that the benefit of the whole must be consulted, not that of the few who arrogate to themselves the exclusive title of royalists. He has dissolved his parliament; a new one is to be called, according to the charter, which he now declares to be the rule of his conduct.

Germany is on the point of entering, in

good earnest into the consideration of a constitution, fitted for their present wants. The deliberation of their diets have always been noted for their slowness; and the variety of interests to be consulted will probably make their present a work of great difficulty. The King of Wurtemburgh, one of Buonaparte's kings, still keeps at variance with his subjects. Their dissensions tend however to promote a spirit of inquiry among the neighbouring states; and it is evident that they will no longer be governed in their former despotic manner. Their nobility must consent to consider themselves men, and their distinctions, which have long been held in contempt, will no longer serve to separate them from the great body of their countrymen. Prussia has not yet obtained a constitution, but the courage of their Landwehr will in due time procure it.

The legislature of the Netherlands is employed on a very important object, namely, to reconcile together the interests of commerce, manufactures and finance. As the greater part of this nation was at one time commercial in a very high degree, it may be supposed to be well acquainted with every circumstance relative to trade; and thence we may derive lessons by which this country may be much benefited. Here we have an interest, lately much talked of, namely, the agricultural interest, and its policy has been seen in that very injudicious measure, the Corn Bill. With a view to bolster up its own interest, the landholders forgot their real situation, namely, that their wealth and importance depend on the flourishing state of our commerce and manufactures, and that cheapness of provisions is essential to their success. A landholder from a false view of his own interest looks to the dearness of provisions as his summum bonum; thence he conceives that his rents will be increased, and that he will enjoy increasing prosperity: but his view of the subject is fallacious: all the advantages of commerce and manufactures ultimately tend to the profit of the land owner; his lands are better tilled, and are thence capable of producing him a greater rent. If he is content to derive this advantage in the proper manner, then all parties flourish; but if he looks to his own aggrandizement merely, he injures himself and all parties. Without commerce and manufactures the land will fall to what it was a few centuries back, to ten or twelve years purchase, the roads will be unfrequented, the canals dry: every thing will stagnate. A few landholders may consume in sullen luxury the produce of their estates on their own backs and bellies and those of needy dependents, but all spur to industry and improvement will be lost. Besides, the term agricultural in-

terest is very much misunderstood with us. In conversing with the people, who are fond of using this term, it is easily discovered that they mean only the interest of the land owners, not of the cultivators of the land: but the latter are the true agriculturists, and the land owner stands to them exactly in the same situation, as what is called the monied does to the mercantile interest. The report, which is now in circulation, proceeding from the board of agriculture, must be read therefore with great caution. It is under the direction not of agriculturists, but of land owners; and the latter are little calculated to understand the complicated interests of such a kingdom as ours. A land owner talks of ruin when his rents are lowered, not recollecting that during the late war those rents had been raised out of all proportion to the profits of the other classes of society; and if he has derived for many years a very great advantage over his countrymen, it does not become him to grumble when the change of the times reduces him nearer to his pristine situation. How many are there in this class of life, who, by prudently applying the inordinate profits of the late years, have so increased their estates, that, if they were now let at the rate they went at before the war, still from the accumulation of land their yearly income will be increased doubly, trebly and more. But we shall be curious to see in what manner the great question is settled by the legislature of the Netherlands. We may persist, if the land owners please, for they are the legislators of this country, in pursuing their misunderstood interest. We may keep up the price of bread, but it must be recollected that other nations are not bound by our decisions. The road to commerce and manufactures is open to them, and they will not fail to avail themselves of it. Providence has supplied checks to imprudent and inordinate desires. We have been highly favoured. If we give up the advantages which industry will procure us, we shall only afford to the world another example, that riches make to themselves wings and fly away. Commerce and manufactures dwell only in those countries, where they are duly protected and held in honour.

The Americans are making claims on the Court of Naples for property which had been seized under the late regime, and it is said that they will be content, by way of compensation, with some island, which will afford them a secure harbour for their ships and a good depot for their commodities. This may occasion a new era in the commerce of the Mediterranean. We have the island of Malta, which is highly beneficial to us, and the Americans will look to similar advantages from a port of the same

nature. In what manner this matter is considered by the Court of Naples and the other European powers time will shew.

Spain has promulgated its successes in the new world, but we may be allowed to doubt whether they will be permanent. It will take time before the natives are assisted by arms and ammunition, and a sufficient number of French military can make head against the discipline of European troops; but the experiment will shortly be tried, and no one except a Spaniard can contemplate the independence of the Spanish colonies in any other light than as a gain to the world at large. An English ship has been carried it is said into Spain, which had a cargo from Buenos Ayres. This may occasion a correspondence between the two courts, and settle the question relative to the true situation of the inhabitants on the Southern banks of La Plata.

A considerable sensation has been experienced by the publication and general circulation of a report of the House of Commons relative to the police of this country, and many extraordinary facts have

been produced on the licensing of public houses. The matter will probably engage the attention of parliament at its next session, for when a grievance is universally felt and very generally understood and complained of, a change in the system is not far distant. This is a great advantage of our country, that by the free circulation of opinions, every matter is brought under general inspection.

A temporary alarm has been excited on the subject of the silver coinage, but it soon subsided. Its defects have been long known, and in due time a new coinage will sweep before it the miserable pieces which are now in circulation. It is to be hoped that the nation will learn from the experience of the past, and never suffer their coin to fall again into so miserable a state. The time must come when a bad coinage must give place to a good one; but in the change many will be the sufferers. How much better would it not be to prevent the recurrence of such an evil, by never permitting a piece of coin to pass, which has not upon its face the legal stamp.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We are requested by the Treasurer of the *Unitarian Fund* to say that in the published list of Subscribers, the name of *Mrs. Severn*, of Broughton, Notts, has been by mistake omitted; and that the notification of any other errors in the list, will be esteemed a favour.

In our next Number we shall be able to give a *Memoir of the late Mr. William Matthews, of Bath*.

We have received a variety of interesting communications from America, of which we shall make an early use.

A Correspondent, familiar with Spanish literature, has furnished us with a curious account of an *Auto de Fé*, compiled from official documents.

“*Recent Case of Bigotry in Private Life.*”—The reader probably recollects a letter under this title in the *Monthly Repository* for June, p. 320. The persons who suppose that they are referred to by our Correspondent, J. W. have shewn a very laudable anxiety to clear themselves of the suspicion of bigotry; but we are sorry to say that their defence leaves the principal part of the charge in its full force. The only part of their correspondence with us which is to the point is the following paragraph, which we print as we received it: “but it is due to the public weal that we should [should] answer the imputation of crime:—One branch of our family has for these fourteen years past attended a chapel: a present inmate in our service has long been and now is a regular attendant at a chapel. The facts are now before the public: we anticipate the result.” We are enjoined, indeed, to publish the whole of the letter from which this extract is made, and in spite of the manner in which the injunction is laid upon us, we should have inserted it if, with the exception of the part already copied, it were not wholly irrelevant and scarcely intelligible; not to mention that it contains insinuations of a dark and serious nature. A plain fact is plainly stated by J. W. and that fact is not disproved but confirmed by the correspondence. We have said thus much to shew that we have not been inattentive to the subject, though we might have fairly stood excused for passing by a correspondent who concludes a letter with the threat “that if there is any reply or further notice of this transaction,” the persons referred to “will seek redress in another form.”

A Correspondent wishes us to insert the following notice: “If the person who in the *July Repository* subscribed himself J. H. will please to inquire at the shop of Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, in Paternoster Row, he will find a small parcel directed for Mr. J. H. containing some small sets of sermons, such as he is desirous of seeing.”

ERRATUM.

XI. 403. 2d, col. 3d. line from the bottom, for *sacerdotam*, read *sacerdotum*.