

THE
Monthly Repository,
&c.

No. CXXXVII.]

MAY, 1817.

[Vol. XII.]

BIOGRAPHY.

*Brief Memoirs of the late Rev. John
Disney, D. D. F. A. S.*

(Extracted from his Funeral Sermon, by
the Rev. Thomas Jervis.)

DESCENDED from an ancient and respectable family in Lincolnshire, Dr. DISNEY was born on the 28th of September, 1746. Having passed with great credit through the usual course of study at Peter-house in the University of Cambridge, he proceeded to the degree of Bachelor of Laws. Endowed with a native ardour and activity of mind, he appears to have distinguished himself at an early period of life as a zealous friend of civil and religious liberty. And, on taking orders, he received an honourable testimony to his conduct, his talents, and his principles, by the appointment of honorary chaplain to the venerable Dr. EDMUND LAW,* Master of his College, and Bishop of Carlisle, who was himself a distinguished advocate of the same great cause. He was afterwards presented to the Vicarage of Swinderby, and then, jointly, to the Rectory of Panton, both in his native county.

In these situations he discharged the parochial duties of his sacred function, with exemplary zeal, activity and usefulness, happy in the attachment of his parishioners, and the esteem of his friends. A strenuous and intrepid assertor of the cause of free inquiry, and the right of private judgment, to many it will not be matter of surprize, that his enlightened and honourable mind should have conceived scruples upon the controverted subject of subscription to creeds and articles of faith. A decided enemy to all human impositions, and all human authority in the concerns of religion, those who

understood his character, would be still less surprized, that, disdaining the meanness of all subterfuge, evasion, and equivocation, in a matter of such vital importance, involving, as it appeared to him, the opposing interests of this world and those of another; yet without harshly judging the conduct of others, or condemning with uncharitable censure and unchristian insinuation, those who viewed this subject in a different light—he resolved to obey God rather than men; and, upon the most serious inquiry, mature deliberation and the fullest conviction, he ultimately made up his mind to relinquish his preferments in the Established Church, and his further prospects, which were considerable. This important measure he adopted with a decision, a disinterestedness, and a consistency of conduct which, even by those who entertained sentiments and views entirely different from his own, could not but be respected;—while he felt the inward conviction, that

“A still and quiet conscience is a peace
Above all earthly dignities.”

He resigned the respectable situation which he held, and the emoluments attached to it, when the just claims of an infant family pleaded hard* against his conscientious determination, and while he possessed only the comparatively slender provision of a younger brother. Some years previous to this event, he married the eldest daughter of the Rev. FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, Rector of Richmond, and Archdeacon of Cleveland, in Yorkshire.

Dr. DISNEY, on quitting his preferments, as a beneficed clergyman in the Church of England, removed to

* Father to the present Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench.

* Dr. Disney's own words; See his “Reasons for quitting the Church.”

London, where he officiated during many years at the Unitarian chapel in Essex Street; first, in conjunction, with the late worthy and exemplary Mr. LINDSEY; and, on the resignation of the latter, Dr. DISNEY was unanimously chosen by the trustees of the chapel to succeed him, as sole minister of that respectable congregation.

As this brief memoir is intended only as a sketch of character and talent, not as a regular and digested biography of the excellent person whose lamented death has given rise to it,—it is unnecessary for the writer to enter into a minute chronological detail of the events of his valuable life. This object may be more elaborately and more ably executed at some future period.

In the mean time, it may be noticed, as a fact in his history too striking to be omitted—that the late Thomas Brand Hollis, Esq. who was a member of his congregation, in consequence of great personal friendship, which originated in a high respect for his character and conduct, and the uncommon sacrifice which he had made, by resigning his ecclesiastical preferments from a principle of conscience, bequeathed to Dr. Disney by his will, entirely unknown to him, having never received any intimation of such a design—his entire estates in Essex and Dorsetshire, without any condition, limitation or restriction whatsoever.*

Of that system of religious opinions strictly Unitarian, and of those principles, respecting the worship of the One God, the God and Father of Jesus Christ, which, as we have seen, he had embraced from motives, the most pure, disinterested, and conscientious, and therefore the most honourable—he was uniformly and invariably to the latest period of his life a most decided, able, manly and consistent advocate. Thus was Dr. Disney highly distinguished in that heroic band of confessors, who sacrificed upon the altar of truth the honours and endowments of the world; who renounced its alluring prospects, for the rights of conscience, for the honour of God, for the faith of the gospel and for the hope of a

better resurrection. To the truth of this statement, his writings, various, enlightened, liberal and candid, bear the fullest attestation. Of these, one of his earlier productions, is, “Reasons for quitting the Church of England,”—a most interesting little tract, which develops the progressive operation of an ingenuous, upright mind in a matter of the most serious investigation, and the conscientious result of such inquiry in opposition to all worldly considerations, and to all the powerful and affecting remonstrances of his most attached friends and family connexions. Many other publications appeared at different periods, biographical, controversial and theological, which though of great merit and interest, it is impossible in this short sketch to enumerate. But amongst those of the former description, the Memoirs of Dr. Sykes, of Dr. Jebb and of Dr. Jortin, hold a principal place. He printed also, *The Book of Common Prayer Reformed*, for the Use of Unitarian Congregations, in 1792; and a second edition of the same, with the *Book of Psalms*, and a *Collection of Hymns*, in 1802. But the last of his works, published in the course of the year 1816, and carried through the press but a few months previous to that which at once closed the natural year, and terminated a life useful, honourable, and highly important—consisted of two volumes of “*Sermons*,” forming a sequel to two former volumes, published in 1793, and which are now out of print. This recent publication, and especially the preface will be read with a peculiar and affecting interest, by those who are qualified to appreciate that intellectual vigour, and soundness of judgment, which he retained to the last.—An inflexible integrity, an unshaken constancy, and determination of character, combined with firmness and elevation of mind, sustained him in circumstances the most trying and afflicting, amidst the sufferings of severe and almost uninterrupted sickness,—standing on the verge of the grave, the noble wreck of what once he was—the ruined temple in which his heroic and unbroken spirit sat enshrined!

His health had been sensibly declining for a considerable time; but he endured a painful and lingering illness with a fortitude and composure

* N. B. Mr. B. Hollis's will was dated twelve years before his death.

which were truly admirable. — Perfectly aware of his situation, he one day told a friend who was near him, “he had hoped all would have been over before that time; but he supposed a little more discipline was necessary; and all was ordered right.” At another time, he said to his physician, “I hope I shall not have to go through all this long.” — When momentarily expecting his awful change, he was most perfectly tranquil and collected in that expectation, and anxious for his release. He said, not long before his death, “he felt completely free from pain, happy and comfortable to the greatest degree.” — Again, to one who was most dear to him, he observed, — “Amidst my severe afflictions, I have many comforts, and much to be thankful for, though I do suffer a good deal; but I endeavour to be patient; and I wish to bring my mind to believe, that this bed is the best place for me. Some have a much rougher journey out of this system than I have.” — It was a striking observation of a neighbouring gentleman, for whom he entertained great personal regard — who, upon seeing him in his sick room not many days previous to his dissolution, remarked, that “His was the only composed, or happy countenance in the house.”

He frequently expressed his desire to be released, and that he thought his time long. When a word or sentiment escaped him, he was the same precisely as ever, unchanged in sickness, suffering and in death. When rapidly advancing to the most awful and tremendous of all moments, he continued calm and serene, kind to others, and composed and dignified in his own views, — till at length he breathed his last without a struggle or a sigh, — sunk into a state of sweet and gentle repose, and closed his eyes for ever on this world.

“The chamber where the good man meets his fate,
Is privileged beyond the common walk
Of virtuous life, quite in the verge of heaven.”

Such were the interesting, awful scenes, such the sad train of concomitant circumstances, which I have partly witnessed, or which have been

* On Thursday evening, the 26th of December, 1816.

represented to me with great accuracy and distinctness, as well as with deep interest, and the liveliest sensibility. So consistent, so dignified was the conduct of this approved servant of God in circumstances the most trying to human nature, — so enlightened, so vigorous were the principles which sustained and carried him through no common sufferings, — so bright and cheering, the hopes which inspired his breast even within the precincts of the tomb. “His body is buried in peace” — but his “memory is blest.” — His good deeds are recorded on high, and his name is registered in heaven.

The death of such a man exhibits a solemn and impressive scene. It will long be felt, and deeply regretted, as a loss to the world — to which, to his surviving family and to his long tried and approved friends, he has left a bright example of genuine merit and of sterling excellence — an example, in which the virtues of the man were admirably blended with the acquirements of the Christian. It is, indeed, a subject of deep and unfeigned regret, that, in his death, theological science has lost a shining ornament; Christian truth and liberty, an able advocate; and the cause of humanity, a generous friend. Those who know his various merits need no memorial of his virtues; they bear it in their own bosoms; they will not cease to remember him, as long as genuine piety, disinterested benevolence, unaffected candour, probity and singleness of heart, retain a place in the esteem of mankind.

If testimonies were wanting to the virtues of so exalted a character, it were easy to adduce them without number. I shall content myself with quoting two or three passages from the correspondence of persons of eminence and long-established reputation for integrity and worth.

“Human nature,” says one, “cannot be viewed in a more dignified attitude, than that which your last short, but most affecting, letter presented to my eyes. Even the tenderest performance of all the duties of a daughter to a worthy parent in declining health, meritorious as it is in a very high degree, seems to me less affecting than his calm fortitude, and truly Christian resignation to his Maker’s will. Few can hope to reach

so exalted a character; but many will feel its superiority to the tinsel virtues of the world, and may hope to be the better for it."

These are the appropriate and emphatical sentiments of the truly venerable Mr. Wyvill.*

In another letter to a common friend (dated January 16, 1817,) he observes—"Mr. Disney's letters express the best sentiments, and the justest, on his father's uncommon merits, which were truly exemplary, and place the friend we have lost in the most distinguished station as a moralist, a Christian, and a friend to his country."—And again, in a letter to the same correspondent, (February 17,)—"To have had such a father, and such a friend, is one of the greatest blessings that this life could afford; if we know how to value it as we ought."

Another worthy and excellent person expressed himself in the following terms, in a letter of February the 6th:—"Dr. Disney's death is both a private and a public loss.—The value of the encomiums bestowed is enhanced and confirmed by the sanction of truth.—I believe his real character and conduct fully deserved them. This persuasion is general,—and must render that tribute to his memory acceptable to the lovers of literature, and especially of moral worth among his numerous acquaintance, and peculiarly grateful and consolatory to his family and intimate friends. I can form no better wish for them, than that they may imitate, in their respective spheres, his probity, his virtuous fortitude, his conscientious regard to the rights of God and man, and be entitled to a similar future reward."

Nor can I decline the satisfaction of adding the following extract from a letter addressed to a gentleman most nearly connected with the deceased, by a person of an elegant, correct, and highly accomplished mind, and possessed of very superior intellectual endowments and acquirements—to whom she observes, in terms that do honour to her own discriminating judgment, integrity, and indepen-

* In a letter to Dr. Disney, of Nov. 8, 1816, in answer to the last letter he received from his lamented friend deceased.

dence of character.—Her words are these:—"The sad event you announced, though by no means unexpected for some weeks past, does not fall the less heavily. You have lost a father, whose name will command more respect for his descendants than his estates, a hundred times multiplied, could give them consequence."

A Catalogue of Dr. Disney's Works.

1. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D. With an Appendix, 8vo. 1785, 5s.
2. The Works, Theological, Medical, Political, and Miscellaneous, of John Jebb, M. D. F. R. S. With Memoirs of the Life of the Author, 3 vols. 8vo. 1787, £1. 1s.
3. Discourses on various Subjects. To which are added, Considerations on Pluralities. By Samuel Disney, LL. B. late Vicar of Halstead, Essex. With a Preface, 8vo. 1788, 6s.
4. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Jortin, D. D. 8vo. 1792, 5s.
5. The Book of Common Prayer Reformed, for the Use of Unitarian Congregations, 1792, 2s. 6d.
6. The Book of Common Prayer Reformed, for the Use of Unitarian Congregations, with the Book of Psalms, and a Collection of Hymns, 1802.
7. Memoirs of T. B. Hollis, Esq. 4to. 1808.
8. Sermons, Vols. 1 and 2. 8vo. 1793.
9. Sermons, Vols. 3 and 4. 8vo. 1816.

Tracts.

1. Animadversions on Dr. Rutherford, 1769.
2. Loose Hints on Nonconformity, 1773.
3. Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1774.
4. Rational Christian's Assistant, 2nd ed. 1774.
5. Remarks on Dr. Balguy's Consecration Sermon, 1775.
6. Short View of Confessional and Clerical Petition Controversies, 2nd ed. 1775.
7. Thoughts on Licensing Public Alehouses, 1776.
8. Remarks on Bishop Hard's Charge, 1777.
9. Considerations on the Clergy acting in the Commission of the Peace, 1781.

10. Reasons for Quitting the Church of England, 2nd ed. 1783.
11. A Friendly Dialogue, 2nd ed. 1787.
12. Address to the Bishops, 1790.
13. Observations on the Homilies, 1790.
14. Arranged Catalogue of Publications, on Toleration, Corporation and Test Acts, 1790.
15. Letter to the Students of Divinity in the Diocese of Chester, 1791.
16. Letters to the Rev. Vicesimus Knox, D. D. 1792.
17. Short Memoir of Bishop Edmund Law, 1800.
18. Short Memoir of Michael Dodson, Esq. 1800.
19. Six Brief Letters occasioned by the Institution of an Auxiliary British and Foreign Bible Society, 1812.
20. Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's (Tomlin's) Charge, 1812.
21. The Great Importance of a Religious Life, revised, 2nd ed. 1812.
22. Short Memoir of the late Rev. R. E. Garnham, 1814.
23. Short Memoir of the Rev. William Hopkins, B. A. 1815.

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

Letters from Thomas Muir, Esq. and the Rev. Thomas Fyshe Palmer.

SIR, Clapton, May 4, 1817.

THE following letters may very suitably appear in the same volume with the letter from Mr. Palmer (p. 204). The first of them was written by Mr. Muir, on board the *Surprize*, and the second while the vessel touched at *Rio* on the voyage. The third and fourth are printed copies which I received from Dr. Disney, who had employed the press, from his usual courteous disposition to gratify his friends. The fifth was, I believe, the last letter which reached me from Mr. Palmer, though probably, he wrote again before he left *Sydney*.

I ought, perhaps, in justice to his memory to have mentioned in my former letter the treatment which he experienced, immediately on his removal to the Hulk, at Woolwich, from on board the vessel which conveyed him from Scotland. Mr. Palmer once shewed me the place which was, at first, his only dormitory. This was the hold of the vessel, where he had a hammock slung to the ceiling. A great number of convicts lay around him on bulk-heads, without any separation. As obvious consequences, he was presently robbed of his watch and every thing valuable, obliged to hear the most horrible conversations, and subjected to other inconveniences which cannot properly be described.

Whether this treatment were the effect of criminal inattention or more

criminal design I know not. It should however be added that the evil had been redressed before the time when I first visited Mr. Palmer. He then was permitted to have all the accommodations which such a situation could afford, and messed with the captain, whom he, not unreasonably, considered as a spy on his conduct and his associations, though the captain seemed to me to overact his part by expressing the most unqualified democratic sentiments. Mr. Muir was, I believe, under the same specious surveillance; for when I first visited him, there was present a gentleman, yet living, who had lately published a work, quite out of the track of courtly politics. A copy of this work he had presented to Mr. Muir, and the captain of that Hulk complimented the author in my hearing, by telling him that the mate of the vessel so admired the work that he would scarcely suffer it to go out of his possession. A man must have known little of the world not to have set a guard on the door of his lips in such company.

J. T. RUTTEN

Letter to Mr. Palmer, 12 March 1794.

MY DEAR SIR,

I RECEIVED your card last night, with a copy of Mr. Flower's Treatise. I likewise some time ago received your polite and friendly letter, along with a chest of medicines, for which I return you my sincerest thanks. I have already written to our friend in Cambridge.

We shall sail the first fair wind. Two days ago our convoy gave the signal to the different ships to hold themselves in readiness. I leave this country with no other regret than in being so soon separated from a circle of friends in England whose memory shall ever live in my affection. I shall cheerfully embrace every opportunity of writing you, but in the mean time you would readily excuse these few hurried lines, if you knew the inconvenient situation in which I write.

Believe me to be, my dear Sir,

With sincere esteem, your's,

THOMAS MUIR.

Remember me in the warmest manner to your friend Mr. Gurney, and present my congratulation on his late appearance in publick.

J. T. Rutt, Esq.

Letter II.

Rio di Janeiro, 20 July, 1794.

MY DEAR SIR,

IT is a pleasant, but at the same time a painful duty, for me to write to my friends. The remembrance of former happiness, the recollection of hours never to be recalled, and the uncertainty of the fate of the persons to whom I address myself; fill my mind with such mixed sensations as render me both willing and afraid to take a pen in my hand. For you and for those common friends, who along with you walk the same path of honour and of freedom, I can only pour out unavailing prayers. The storm may, perhaps, have passed over me, but you and they stand yet exposed in the midst of the conflict of the elements. May he who can temper their wildest fury, temper it in that hour when ready to burst over your heads, or if burst it must, enable you to stand unmoved by the shock.

Painful and disagreeable circumstances have occurred in the course of the voyage. Soon enough will you be acquainted with them. To me they have been the fruitful sources of many melancholy days. But I know that my mind, however agitated by private affliction, never can be shaken by publick suffering.

Your's truly and sincerely,

THOMAS MUIR.

J. T. Rutt, Esq.

[Received Feb. 2, 1795.]

Sydney, N. S. Wales, June 13, 1795.

MY DEAR SIR,

WHEN Mr. White, the principal surgeon of this settlement, sailed last December in the *Dedalus*, I entrusted him with what is dearer to me than life,—my character. I was under the necessity of defending this against the infernal machinations of _____ master of the *Surprize* transport, who had hired and suborned some of the outcasts who sailed with him, to swear away my life by the accusation of mutiny, and the intended murder of him and his principal officers. Of this murderous attempt of _____ I sent the most indubitable evidence of many depositions made before a magistrate. In the hurry, Mr. Ellis* sent the attested copies, as well as the originals, so that my character depends on the safe arrival and honesty of Mr. White. They were accompanied with the dismal narrative of my sufferings (of which last I have a copy) and entrusted to the care of Mr. _____. I am extremely anxious for the fate of them.† My history since then is little else than a register of vexations and persecutions.

The officers have monopolized all the trade of the colony. They suffer no one but themselves to board any ship that may arrive. They alone buy the cargo, and sell it at 1, 2, 3, 400, and even 1000 per cent. profit. Mr. Ellis and Boston were ordered into confinement for entering a ship and endeavouring to purchase things, not prohibited, for their use. With great respect, but firmness, they remonstrated against this invasion of the common rights of British subjects. This was construed into an audacious attack upon the privileges and interests of these military monopolists. And from that time (now many months ago) they have set their faces against them and me. They have had no grants and no servants. Mr. Boston, though

* He had been in Mr. Palmer's service in Scotland, and procured leave to accompany him.

† These numerous documents came safely to my hands, and from them Mr. Joyce compiled his *Narrative*. There is an affecting enumeration of the sufferings endured by Mr. Skirving and Mr. Palmer in Mr. P.'s letter to the Rev. T. Lindsey, dated Sep. 15, 1795. See Rev. T. Bell's *Memoirs*, &c. p. 525. R.

sent out by government principally to cure fish and make salt, has been the whole time unemployed. My men, which I bought at a monstrous rate, with a farm, have been taken from me. A message has been sent me to pull off my hat to the officers, or I should be confined in the cells, and punished. Public orders have been twice given for no soldier to speak to me, under the penalty of 100 lashes. Now I never had omitted the ceremony of capping the officers, and never conversed with the soldiers. The most impudent claims on my property from the most unprincipled thieves were listened to, and enforced, without deigning to hear a single word I had to say.

The situation the colony is in at present is dreadful. It is put on half allowance, and even at this rate there is not enough in the stores to last three weeks. They have begun to kill the live stock. The cows are condemned, but all the stock in the colony will not last a month. The only resource is about three months provisions of Indian corn, a food inadequate to labour. In this state Mr. Boston wrote to the commanding officer that he was sent out by government on purpose to make salt and cure fish, and that he would undertake, with the assistance of boats and men, to supply from Lord Howe's Island, in the neighbourhood, a full or even a double allowance of well cured fish, at a third of the price of beef and pork. Can you conceive that little or no notice was taken of this, and nearly a flat denial given?

Yesterday a large ship came in from India, the Endeavour, Bampton, with the company's colours flying. These were called American, by others the colours of Britain,—of a frigate sent to fetch us over. Good heavens! What were my sensations! mocked with groundless joy to be plunged again into melancholy. She brings live stock, arrack, tea, sugar, muslin, buffalo-fat, but only fourteen barrels of provisions. Fowls sell at 8s. each; cabbages 6d.; pork 1s. 6d. per pound. I have never accepted any provisions of any kind from the stores, that no pretence might be made to demand my labour, and find living enormously dear. Mr. Muir, myself, Mr. and Mrs. Boston and Ellis live together, and are all well.

It gave me great pleasure on landing

to see the harmony between the natives and whites. This was owing to the indefatigable pains of Governor Phillips, to cultivate a good understanding with them. When himself was speared he would suffer no vengeance to be taken, and on no account an injury to be done them by a white man. The natives of the Hawkesbury (the richest land possibly in the world, producing 30 and 40 bushels of wheat per acre) lived on the wild yams on the banks. Cultivation has rooted out these, and poverty compelled them to steal Indian corn to support nature. The unfeeling settlers resented this by unparalleled severities. The blacks in return speared two or three whites, but tired out, they came unarmed, and sued for peace. This, government thought proper to deny them, and last week sent sixty soldiers to kill and destroy all they could meet with, and drive them utterly from the Hawkesbury. They seized a native boy who lived with a settler, and made him discover where his parents and relations concealed themselves. They came upon them unarmed, and unexpected, killed fire, and wounded many more. The dead they hang on gibbets, *in terrorem*. The war may be universal on the part of the blacks, whose improvement and civilization will be a long time deferred. The people killed were unfortunately the most friendly of the blacks, and one of them more than once saved the life of a white man.

Governor Hunter, whose arrival is so anxiously expected, will come out with just and liberal ideas, I trust, of policy, and correct the many abuses and oppressions we groan under, as well as those of the poor natives. It seems a strange time to drive these poor wretches into famine, the almost certain consequence of driving them from their situation, when we are so near it ourselves.

Ever since I landed I have been attacked by the malady of the country, sore eyes; so that I have been obliged to give up writing and reading. I have now blisters behind my ears, from which I find some relief. Some lose their sight, but, in general, after the first attack, their vision is as good as ever.

You may be sure I am all anxiety concerning the fate of those men who are suffering for the welfare of others. Remember me to them, if you have

opportunity, with all the sympathy they deserve; and to . . . those friends endeared by distance, who are pleased to interest themselves about me.

I am, dear Sir,

Your much obliged and affectionate

T. F. PALMER.

The Rev. Dr. Disney.

[Received May 4, 1796.]

Letter IV.

Sydney, N. S. Wales, Aug. 14, 1797.

MY DEAR SIR,

I BEG leave to return you my warm thanks for your most friendly and consoling letter. It would be the severest drop in my cup to be forgotten by such men. The esteem and approbation of the worthy are next to that of one's own mind.

I received two or three little pamphlets, with all the MorningChronicles to April, accompanying your letter. We have read over and over all our little stock of books, therefore any celebrated pamphlets that our friends have done with, it would be charity to send. Your noble gift of the Encyclopædia has been of infinite use and entertainment to us.* It has instructed us in arts necessary to a livelihood: an interested and powerful monopoly of trading officers, who have the art to persuade an old man to just what they please, have thrown every impediment possible to our getting an honest one. But, in spite of all, we have weathered our point. In a great measure owing to the help of your Encyclopædia we have built and navigated a little vessel. We meant it for fishing, but as we could not have the smallest encouragement for what was so evidently for the public good, we have made it a mercantile vessel, and trade from hence to Norfolk Island, a thousand miles distant. To be sure we are obliged to sail without licence or certificate (which the governor, poor man, positively refuses), and are liable to be hanged as pirates by any body that chuses to give himself that trouble. If paper should continue of value, I hope we shall not return to Europe poorer than we came.

* As many volumes of the Scotch Encyclopædia as were then published, were presented to Mr. Palmer, by the joint contributions of a few friends, before his departure from England. D.

The short allowance in 1795, that poor Skirving thought was the cause of his death, brought a rupture on me, and otherwise disordered my frame. The quick and extreme vicissitudes of the climate are rather possibly too much for a broken down old man like me. To the young and the robust they are nothing, who lie out in the woods without harm. My fellow-sufferers laugh at me, but I have no scruple in saying it is the finest country I ever saw. An honest and active governor, who could administer an equal government, might soon make it the region of plenty. In spite of all possible rapacity and robbery, I am clear that it will thrive against every obstacle. There may come a time when the settler shall reap what he has sown; at present, from necessity, he is obliged to sell to an avaricious huckster his wheat at 3s. per bushel, who turns it into the stores at 10s. the price which government gives for it. He buys liquor at 3s. per gallon, and charges it at £3. £4. and perchance five pounds per gallon. Tobacco he buys at 15d. and sells it to the poor farmer and labourer at 7s. and 10s. a pound. The same of every thing else. If he raises Indian corn, or wheat, it is of little use to him. He must sell it for what he can get to these hucksters. He cannot, like them, turn it into the stores. This is a matter of interest. We have laid out what would sell here for £300. on a farm, and we never could have interest to turn only forty bushels in, from the time we have been in the island. If, like other settlers, from necessity we have been driven to deal with these hucksters, nothing so easy then as to turn in to the amount of the debt, be the stores shut or open, but not one farthing on our own account.

By these means the colony is ruined. All the necessaries are double the price they were when we landed. Every farmer and settler is only a tenant at rack rent to the officers. Government is at an immense expence for no other purpose than to put money into the pocket of these officers. All of them keep hucksters' shops, where you may buy from a dram to a punchoon of spirits,—from a skeign to a pound of thread. I cannot affirm it to be with,—I hope that it has been without,—the governor's knowledge, but the greatest and most extortionate shop

in the colony has been that of government house. They sell indigo at this moment for its weight in silver. In short, reformation may long be in vain expected in these remote dependencies so far removed from the eye of control. Such a man as Capt. King, however, late governor of Norfolk Island, would do much. I have reason to think him as honest as he is active and enlightened. Such a man with a fourth, I believe a tenth, of the present expence, might make this the cheapest and most plentiful market, and most plentiful country in the empire of Great Britain.

Of this wonderful country we have little or no knowledge, except a small portion of the sea coast of a corner of it. With two armed ships and a schooner, on purpose for the use of the colony, no discovery has been attempted. Such things are never thought of; and if a private adventurer undertakes them, he is discouraged. Chance however has done something. The Sydney-cove, a large ship from Bengal to this place, was wrecked on this coast in lat. 41. 47. The mate and others left the wreck in the long boat unfortunately in the tempestuous winter season, and this was again wrecked on the coast. But the supercargo and two others, after innumerable hardships, arrived safe. By this means we learn, that where the Sydney-cove was wrecked, there is an archipelago of islands, with a strong tide and current from east to west, and *vice versa*; from which a rational conjecture may be formed that there is a passage quite through the island. Should this conjecture be true, and this passage should be navigable, the passage to India would be very considerably shortened. The country is described as totally different from this, very rich and fertile, abounding in pines and firs, of which there is not one here. In all the intercourse of whites with the uncorrupted natives of this country, they have found them most kind, humane, and generous. Where the mate and supercargo were wrecked, no civilized Europeans could exceed them in kindness. They supplied them in abundance, and successive parties of fresh natives, equally kind, shewed them the way. The mate represented to be an amiable man, walked till he could walk no longer.

Unfortunately, the carpenter staid to keep him company, and the rest proceeded and arrived safe. The carpenter churlish and avaricious, and without sense or foresight, seized their fish, would give them nothing in return and offended them so much, that the first mate, whom they were fond of, fell a victim to his folly, and they both perished. My most worthy friend Mr. Bass, surgeon of the *Reliance*, went out on purpose to find these two. He found only their bones. He was accompanied by the most scientific people in the language, though by none more than by himself; and natives of his acquaintance told him the above. He returned only yesterday. He confirms the above account of the country. He says there are several species of trees not found here. But, what is more important, he has discovered a seam of coal, seven miles long, great part of which, by the inequality of the ground, is above ground. He has brought home three bags, it burns capitally, some of which the governor sends by this ship (the *Britannia*, Capt. Dennet) to Sir Joseph Banks. The coal is not distant twenty yards from the sea, and about 45 miles distant, by sea, from hence.

We are told by people who have been there, that in the tropical regions of this country all kind of tropical productions abound. A little beyond port Stephens, about a degree and a half north of this, the country and its productions change. There is a sort of apple of a deep red, both within and without, with four pips. It grows to the height of 80 feet, without branches. The fruit is represented as large and luscious, and highly nutritious. The country producing more, the natives are larger and more numerous than here. Seven convicts lived five years among them. I have repeatedly conversed with them. They were received and supported with singular kindness and hospitality. If these people are to be believed, they took the whites to be the ghosts of their departed friends, whom death had made white. They inquired very particularly after their fathers, mothers, and all their relatives, and how they employed themselves. I believe this account, because when Capt. Broughton, of the *Providence* sloop of war, took these convicts away, the natives brought two dead young men on board, begging Capt. Broughton

you to bring them back again in a year or two.

Two or three natives of my acquaintance have begun to cultivate the ground, and, with a little attention on the part of government, they might soon be civilized. Ellis and I staid with them a week, and we promised to return to hoe up the ground and plant it for them. But I am now too infirm. They are quick, ingenious, vivacious and happy, read countenances and characters with singular penetration, and take them off with great humour.

It is singular that no dialect, or rather language, reaches above forty miles extent, some not half so far, so that a native of one district is totally unintelligible to another. They are as free as the air they breathe, and pay respect only to bravery and talents. They have no chief or priests. They have a discipline by which every member of the commonwealth is coerced into good order. For slight offences so many spears are thrown at the offender, which he may ward off, if he can, with his shield. For great offences these spears must not only be thrown, but broken. If the offender is wounded, and justice be satisfied, nothing can equal their care and kindness to the wounded person.

If I should not have time, being taken by surprise by the ship sailing, will you tell our common friend, Mr. Rutt, that, with no little difficulty, I obtained a large deal box, which came in the Ganges, directed for Messrs. Muir, &c. It contained some brown paper parcels from you and Mr. Rutt, some newspapers, and a large deal box and some letters directed to Mr. Muir, and two counterpanes. Mr. Muir's letters and box, indeed the whole contents, I opened before the governor.* The last mentioned deal box contained private property from Mr. Muir's father; this was given to the provost-marshal to be sold for the benefit of his creditors. The letters I opened before the governor, and, by his permission, burnt. The only property from the committee, the two counterpanes, I kept.

I have been so often defrauded of

* Mr. Muir had escaped from the colony in an American vessel which touched there. After various adventures he died in Spain. R.

boxes and parcels, that unless they are booked in the log-book, or mate's book, they may be reckoned as lost. Between the rogues on ship-board, and on shore, a convict is sure not to get them, because he has no redress. Excepting books, I beg nothing more may be sent me. There are some modern publications, which I will not mention because expensive; but such smaller books or pamphlets which my friends have done with, I will thank them for. I shall write to my nephew for the publications I allude to.

I am, my dear Sir,

Most sincerely your obliged
T. F. PALMER.

The Rev. Dr. Disney.

[Received Feb. 11, 1799.]

Letter V.

Sydney, N. S. Wales, Sep. 10, 1799.

DEAR FRIEND,

I HAVE the pleasure to receive a letter from you, dated September 28, 1798, by the Hillsborough. On the receipt of it, I applied for permission to take Joseph Larkin* to my house: but no such person could be found, nor has there been such a person embarked. It is most fortunate for him that he did not come in this murderous ship. Of two hundred and sixty convicts put on board, ninety-seven died before they reached the harbour, and ten since. They were whipped, confined in pestilential air and starved. The Captain, H——, would not allow them a swab to clean out their place. I saw their filth. In consequence, the jail fever made its appearance. Eight died in one night at the Cape. It is painful to relate the barbarity, the tyranny, the murderous starvation of this wretch. This is the fourth who has exercised these atrocities while H—— has been governor, and no inquiry made!!!

* A young man who had been capitally convicted at Lancaster, on a charge of forgery. On account of some favourable circumstances in his case, his punishment had been commuted to transportation for life. Mr. Girle, who is mentioned in the Obituary (VIII. 280), and who then resided at Lancaster, took a very benevolent interest in the fate of Joseph Larkin; and at his desire, I had recommended the young man to Mr. Palmer's attentions. If my memory serves me, Dr. Barnes, of Manchester, also interested himself on the same occasion. R.

I was very much pleased with Wakefield's pamphlet. I sent a servant with it to a friend some miles distant, who unfortunately was robbed of it because it was tied in a silk handkerchief. I must beg you therefore to send me another, and Llandaff's also.

Mr. and Mrs. Boston and two children, Ellis and myself have always lived together since we have been on the Island. We have engaged in many schemes to make a living. Among the rest, brewing and farming, and what every officer civil and military does here, buying goods on board a ship and selling them on shore. We built a vessel at considerable expence to trade between this place and Norfolk Island, and a very beneficial trade it was. But the Governor of Norfolk Island for the time being (Captain T———), being a great trader himself, found that it interfered with his profits, and raised the strongest clamours against the enormous price we sold at. We sold liquor at 25s. per gallon, and he at that very time sold it at five pounds. At last he would not suffer us to land it at all, notwithstanding we had Governor Hunter's permit. We suppose the crew on this rose and seized the spirits, for we never more heard of captain or ship. It would have made our fortune soon. I am ashamed to say how much we lost. We were not disheartened. We set to and built another at a great expence, loaded her with a cargo that would make good returns, and sent her to Norfolk again. We had previously made a good quantity of salt to cure the cheap pork of Norfolk Island, and to put it into the stores here where it is so much wanted. This has been gone now five months. The gales have been dreadful, and we have every reason to fear that she is lost likewise: so that we have nearly the world to begin again.

As there is little chance of my being able to draw any thing out of the company's stock to enable me to get home, I must take another method. * * *

I find that the cerated glass of antimony with ipecacuanha, will cure the most inveterate fluxes of this country in a day or two. So little attention is paid to the sick, that I am obliged to doctor some, though I know that I do it with a rope about my neck. I

would not change my residence for a week without these medicines, so very subject I am to this disorder. I know that I should long have been dead but for them. I give seven or ten grains of cerated antimony and alternately small doses of ipecacuanha. Oh had I known of this remedy at Spithead, what lengthened misery and wear and tear of constitution I should have escaped. Possibly Gerald and Skirving might now have been alive! Pray tell this to Dr. Hamilton and Blake.

I wish Mr. Holcroft would send me the remaining volumes of Hugh Trevor. I was delighted with the three first. I think the first volume as good as any I ever read. The infancy of Hugh is inimitable. It is odd that I never saw but one person in this country who could perceive the tendency of the work, though it is so very conspicuous. I have not seen a Review since 1796, nor an Annual Register since 1793, and only four numbers of that excellent work the London [Monthly] Magazine. I cannot speak enough in praise of the C——— I———. Tell Mr. F——— to be careful. I am going to fit up a room for the worthy editor, well knowing he will come out here. If I deserve to be sent to Botany Bay, he ought to be sent to the Georgium Sidus.

The following is the price of articles at present. Rum 20s. a quart; tea 5s. an ounce; bread 4d. a pound; butter 4s.; mutton 2s.; pork 1s. 3d.; wheat 10s. a bushel; wine 10s. a bottle; shoes from 20s. to 25s. a pair. That you see it is absolutely necessary to do something for a livelihood. I forgot to tell you that we have nearly built a windmill, which we are in great hopes will turn to good account.

Recommend me to those worthy friends, the very mention of whom in your letter I could not help being affected with, viz. Hamilton, Gurney, Lindsey, Dyer, Vaughan, Friend, Tooke, Disney, Blake, and all who are pleased to interest themselves about me.

Farewell, dear Sir, with my best respects to Mrs. Rutt,

I am,

Your much obliged and affectionate

T. F. PALMER.

J. T. Rutt, Esq.

[Received April 3, 1800.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

To S. T. COLERIDGE, Esq.

On his Attack upon the Unitarians contained in his Second Lay Sermon.

LETTER II.

"Such tricks hath strong imagination."

MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM.

SIR, *Temple, May 1, 1817.*

HAD your attack on Unitarianism been confined to the declamation which my first letter was intended to expose, I should scarcely have thought it required a reply. But you have condescended to make use of other weapons, which though unworthy of hands like yours, are more dangerous than the fair and lawful arms of intellectual combat. You have stooped to misrepresentations of our creed which are only to be met by a positive denial. At the same time, I do not believe you intended falsely to blacken us. Strange as it may seem, I have no doubt that you really believe your own portrait of Unitarianism to be faithful; and yet I will venture to affirm that a more unjust representation of any sect has never been made, since the good old times when holy men were attired previous to their martyrdom in dresses on which the figures of demons were sketched out and the flames of hell depicted.

Venerable, however, as the art is, it will not now avail. "It is the eye of childhood that fears a painted devil." As, however, the picture is drawn professedly "as an act of kindness to the unwary," it will be right to shew, for the advantage of this numerous class of your readers, how unlike it is to the original. For the benefit of any other set of men the task would be undoubtedly superfluous.

The first "affirmative article" of faith which you impute to us is the proper oneness and unimpersonality of God and the mere humanity of Christ. To this statement I have only to make two objections. *First*, that many Unitarians believe both in the pre-existence and super human nature of Jesus; and *secondly*, that though you have professed to bring together all the "affirmative articles of our faith," you have actually omitted to state that we receive Christ as the Messiah to

whom all the prophets bore witness—as the author and finisher of our faith—as our spiritual and triumphant master—as the captain of our salvation, "made perfect through sufferings." So that, in a catalogue of the doctrines we receive, drawn up expressly for the purpose of shewing their scantiness, you insert what we hold in common with the Deist, and only omit all which gives us a right to the name of Christian. Nay, more, you state the opinions which part of us reject concerning Christ, and then set them down as an "affirmative article of our faith." And afterwards you triumphantly assert, "These are all the positives of the modern Socinian creed!" You must, indeed, congratulate yourself that, on this occasion, you addressed "the unwary."

But you make ample amends for this omission in the second article. "They (Unitarians) believe men's actions necessitated, and consistently with this AFFIRM that the Christian religion (i. e. *their* view of it) precludes all remorse for sins, they being a present calamity but not *guilt*."

Now, in the *first* place, it is utterly untrue that the doctrine of philosophical necessity, in any form, and the belief in Unitarianism are in their nature united. It is false that, as a body, the believers in the latter connect them. The opinion that men's actions could not have been otherwise than they are, may be part of the creed of a Unitarian, but it is no part of a Unitarian creed. True, it has been maintained by Dr. Priestley and is held by Mr. Belsham; but it has also been powerfully enforced by Edwards, and is implied in the dogmas of Calvin. It is a doctrine peculiar to no sect; but much more essential to the support of the orthodox than of the heretical creed. From the opinions of those who entertain milder views of the Divine intentions towards man, it naturally acquires a gentler colouring. But, in itself, it is a doctrine of philosophy and not of religion, much less of any particular sect of believers. Unitarians might therefore as well be charged with all the theories of Dr. Priestley on the subject of chemistry, or of all his

speculations on that of politics. In common justice you ought to have added these; for, in that case, the "affirmative articles of our faith" would have formed a much longer catalogue.

In the *second* place, supposing a belief in necessity to be justly imputed to Unitarians as part of their faith, it is utterly false that they draw from it the absurd deductions which you declare them to affirm. When and where, Sir, did Mr. Belsham or any other Unitarian maintain that "the Christian religion precludes all remorse for our sins?" When indeed was it asserted that necessity was a part of the Christian religion at all, except by the late eloquent Bishop of St. Asaph, who was no *intentional* supporter of Dr. Priestley's cause? Above all, where is the necessarian, or the writer understanding English, who ever maintained that sins were not guilt? Perhaps he also asserted that guilt was not sin, and that sin was not sinful. But to pass by the absurdity of the expression, it is not true that the advocates of the doctrine of necessity affirm that it destroys all moral distinctions between good and evil. Had you merely asserted that such a deduction would follow from the admission of their premises, it would have been a matter of argument, not of denial. But you have taken a different course: you have declared that they maintain the conclusions in their most absurd and obnoxious form; nay, that they derive them, not from the doctrine of necessity, but from their view of the Christian religion. This is a most important charge on a point of fact, and you have not the shadow of evidence to support it. You first unjustly represent necessity as a doctrine of Unitarianism; and then put into the mouth of Unitarians at large, supposed deductions from it that even those of them who received it never made, clothed in language which no man of common sense could condescend to utter!

The third "article" is thus expressed: "They believe the gospels, though not written by inspiration, to be authentic histories on the whole, though with additions and interpolations. And on the authority of these writings, confirmed by other evidence, they believe in the resurrection of the

man Jesus Christ from the dead." On the subject of inspiration Unitarians differ. They also entertain various opinions respecting the extent of the additions made in the gospels; but that some additions have been made to Scripture you will not venture to deny, until you think fit to take up the defence of the exploded passage respecting the "Three which bear record in heaven."

The fourth "article" contains as strange a clustre of misrepresentations as was ever found in the same number of lines. It stands as follows: "On the historic credibility of this event (the resurrection of Jesus) they believe the resurrection of the body, which, in their opinion is the whole man, at the last day: and differ from other churches in this only, that while other Christians believe that all men will arise in the body, they hold that all the bodies that had been men will arise."

Now *first* it is not on the "historic credibility of Christ's resurrection" only that Unitarians believe in the resurrection of man. It is impossible that the mere fact, though ever so clearly established, could prove even that another individual would be re-animated by a similar miracle. They believe the resurrection of all men because it was taught by Christ and his apostles; and they believe Christ and his apostles, because the fact of his being raised set the seal of divinity upon his mission and proved the veracity of his character. They regard it also as a visible symbol, as a marvellous and a prophetic sign, of the redemption of all from the power of death and the grave. In this sense they agree with St. Paul that all who have fallen asleep have perished if Christ be not risen; and that faith and hope would in this case be mere delusions. But it has never been asserted that taken alone, the resurrection of one demonstrated the reanimation of all. The censure, therefore, implied in this statement is utterly without foundation.

Secondly, It is not true that Unitarians *as such* believe the body to be "the whole man at the last day." Taking this proposition in its literal sense, it is too absurd to have met with any sensible advocate. That these our mortal frames which, in this life, are perpetually changing,

should be raised from the corruptions of the grave with all their human infirmities about them, is no less contrary to Scripture than to the evidence which our senses afford us. Some, indeed, have supposed that there are certain stamina of the material frame which are preserved amidst the decay of the rest, and form the link which connects the present mortal with the future incorruptible man. But, generally speaking, materialists themselves are contented with believing that we shall hereafter be to all moral purposes the same, by retaining the consciousness of our past in the new attire of our immortal being. They, as well as other Christians, believe we shall rise again to a new and a glorious life, and are willing to trust the Divine goodness and wisdom respecting its mode, of which we can here form no adequate conceptions.

But, *thirdly*, supposing there were any class of men who believed in the resurrection of the bodies of all, in a literal sense, it is utterly unjust to confound them with Unitarians. Indeed, the system of materialism, in any form, has no connexion with a single distinguishing doctrine of the Unitarian creed. It does not affect the oneness of God or even the mere humanity of Christ. It may, indeed, be "verified from the writings of Mr. Belsham"—though, even there, you will search in vain for the absurdities you have imputed to us. But, highly as we esteem Mr. B. we do not acknowledge all his sentiments as our own. He is our instructor, but not our oracle. We look higher for our leader than any living writer however excellent, or even any dignitary however invested with spiritual powers or adorned with external grandeur. We subscribe to no creed but the Scriptures; we acknowledge no master but Christ.

Fourthly, Supposing that the Unitarians at large held that "all the bodies that had been men will arise," it would be untrue that "in this they differ from other churches." In fact the very reverse of the proposition is true. They do not hold the resurrection of the body as a part of their religious creed; but the Church of England thus inculcates it. What, Sir, have you forgotten "THE APOSTLES' CREED?" Do you not recol-

lect that, in the plainest language, it asserts the doctrine against which your indignation is directed? Are you so little acquainted with the formularies of the church you reverence, as not to know that all her members, on almost every occasion of divine service, solemnly assert that they believe in "THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY?" And yet it is, in the supposed belief of this absurdity, that you represent us as "differing from other churches!"

The fifth "article" of our faith relates to the future condition of man. To the substance of this statement I have no material objection to offer. True it is that some Unitarians believe in the destruction of the wicked, and that others hope for the restoration of all men to the blessings of holiness and peace, while all admit the peculiar rewards of the righteous. If it be a crime to regard the Almighty as a Universal Father, in all times and to all beings, we plead guilty to the charge. We are perfectly willing you should be left to the full exultation in your own brighter and happier creed which this concession may afford you.

The sixth "article" is utterly false. It assumes that we "hold only an intellectual and physical, and not a moral difference in the actions of men, they not being free agents, and therefore, they not being more responsible beings than the brute beasts." This is little more than the repetition of a charge I have already refuted. For the benefit, however, of "the unwary," it may be proper to repeat two facts which sufficiently prove it to be a groundless slander. 1st, the doctrine of necessity is not an article in the Unitarian creed; 2dly, not only has no Unitarian writer who has incidentally received it denied the moral difference of human actions and the proper responsibility of man, but it has been contended by all Christians who have embraced it, that it is on the supposition of necessity alone that men become accountable to God, that the distinctions of virtue and vice can be maintained, or that rewards and punishments can be applied to effect any beneficial purposes. This is a matter of fact not of reasoning. Dr. Priestley and those who think with him may have drawn false conclusions from the premises they

have maintained; but they have ever asserted the contrary to those which you impute to them. Of course, the long chain of consequences you have built on these false assertions cannot now demand our scrutiny.

Here you close your "catalogue," but not your censures. You attack the Unitarian scheme, still confounding it with those of materialism and necessity, on the ground that it degrades the nature of man. You assert that "if man be no nobler creature *essentially* than he is represented in their system, the meanest reptile that maps out its path on the earth by lines of slime, must be of equal worth and respectability, not only in the sight of the Holy One, but by a strange contradiction even before man's own reason." In order to support this astonishing proposition, you first take for granted that without free-will, in a sense opposed to necessity, there is no ground for love and esteem; next you assume that man's intellect independently of the will is more than counterbalanced by his vices; next speak of intellect as a more shewy instinct; and then conclude that "compared with the wiles and factories of the spider, or with the cunning of the fox, it would be but a mere efflorescent, and, for that very cause, a less efficient salt to preserve the hog from putrifying before its destined hour." Now, Sir, supposing this lamentable conclusion true; admitting your picture of man as faithful; taking him to be less distinguished from the beasts by intellect than by vice; does allowing him free-will, or a two-fold nature, turn the balance in his favour? On your own principles, it only renders him more criminal, without making him more exalted. You assume, as a point of fact, that man, in action, is lower than the beasts that perish; and then you ask, unless he is distinguished by will, how is he above them? What, Sir! is it then an alleviation of his wretchedness that it is all of his own voluntary choice? Is he less degraded because he has been his own degrader? And what consolation do you offer him by asserting that he is "*essentially*" above the brutes, if you, at the same time, argue that he is *practically* below them?

No, Sir, the real nobleness of man

consists not in speculation but in fact. It depends on no metaphysical system. It is proved by his actual and present greatness, by his glorious energies, his never-dying loves, his generous virtues, his universal conscience, his unbounded powers, and his high desires and reachings forth of spirit far beyond the limits of earth or of time. However this grand piece of Divine workmanship is constituted, or rather by whatever names its frame is distinguished, whether it is termed matter, or spirit, or a combination of both, its actual and inherent grandeur remains the same. There is breathed into it the breath of God. The image of the Divinity is stamped on it. Call it by what appellation you please, it is still the most glorious of God's visible works, the fit subject for the admiration of angels. After your deepest researches, you must deduce the superiority of man to the brutes from that which he is, independently of all systems and theories. Here he is with dominion over earth and affinity with heaven—holding communion with all ages and with all worlds—joyous in life—"splendid in ashes and pompous in the grave."* If you do not know and feel this, whatever may be your theories of free-will, it is we who would elevate and you who would degrade our species.

I gladly pass over all the rest of your incoherent declamation against us. While others accuse us of giving undue honour to the understanding, you speak of us as rendering it too little. You declaim against us as if we appealed not at all to the reason but entirely to the affections.† You accuse us of "plucking away *live-asunder* as it were, from the divine organism of the Bible textuary morsels and fragments," and yourself actually apply to us some dreadful prophecies in Isaiah! To these charges reply is needless. And as to the accusation of paying Christianity "no other compliment than that of calling by its name the previous dictates and decisions of our own mother wit," we are too accustomed to such unsupported assertions from the lowest order of Calvinistic Lay-preachers, to regard them any

* Sir Thomas Browne on "Urne Burial."

† See pp. 60, 61.

more than the burthen of an old song, or even the dampatory clauses of the Athanasian creed.

There was a time, Sir, when your portrait of Unitarianism would have been very different from that which you have recently drawn. If we now see you joining with a far inferior race to represent our principles as shocking or absurd, it affords us some consolation to remember that you were once their advocate. You thought and felt with us in the vernal freshness of your genius. Of this remembrance no efforts of your's can deprive us. You too must recollect the "Religious Musings," or you are the only one who could ever forget them.* They are a living—may they be an immortal!—proof of what you felt and thought in some of the brightest moments of your earthly being. I allude not to these evidences of your former creed for the purpose of reproaching you with the change. He who upbraids another for an alteration in his sentiments, must suppose that all knowledge is intuitive, and that, in the progress of human life, the same unvarying scenery is perpetually around us. But at the close of these animadversions I would fondly dwell on the memory of what you were, and console myself for the present animosity you bear to our creed with the thought, that in estimating the whole man, if the Church of England should be found to have numbered you among

* This beautiful poem exhibits the most striking indications of a brilliant though youthful genius. It is full of bright visions, half unveiled—of unbounded and indistinct prospects—of noble aspirations after all kinds of imaginary excellence. As a system of religion or metaphysics, it is neither very intelligible nor very consistent; but it is decidedly opposed to most of those sentiments which the author has since learned to admire. The following is the tribute paid to the great Reviver of Unitarianism in England:

"Lo PRIESTLEY there, PATRIOT and
SAINT and SAGE,
Him full of years from his lov'd native land
Statesmen blood-stain'd, and priests ido-
latrous
By dark lies madd'ning the blind mul-
titude
Drove with vain hate. Calm, pitying, he
retir'd
And mus'd expectant on these promis'd
years."

her sons in the maturity of your intellect and the plenitude of your knowledge, your youngest and brightest hopes, your earliest aspirations, your first religious loves were entirely ours.

But, after all, it is not to us, but to poetry that I should most cordially hail your return. In the lower walks of controversy, political or religious, the light from heaven serves only to lead astray. You are bewildered by the splendours of your own genius. Your mind is like the throne in Milton's heaven, "dark with excessive bright." Why, I ask with fond impatience, is not this light carried into the pure regions of the imagination, where it may shine unveiled for ever? Surely it will not pass away from the earth behind the clouds of mysticism and politics—only leaving on them its golden tinge. They must fade away, and the temporary lustre lent them will sink when they disappear. But surely this can never be the lot of one "whose fame should share in nature's immortality, a venerable thing"—of one who can be entangled only in the filmy nets which his own fancy spreads—of one whose proper sphere is above this world and not amidst its storms—of one who may live in the hearts and imaginations of brighter ages, when the very names of those whose cause he now condescends to gild over are utterly forgotten.

S. N. D.

SIR,

April 21, 1817.

HOMO [p. 152] will permit me to point out what I conceive to be an undoubted error in his statement, that Christ and his apostles discouraged marriage, and only sanctioned it as a prevention of immorality. The gospel opinions as to marriage have a *particular*, not a general reference. They respect the peculiar circumstances of the early Christians, and especially apostles or missionaries, living in a time of persecution and various trial, when marriage would be *inexpedient*, and when celibacy, from the motive of entire devotion to the gospel interests, would be meritorious. Paul, however, expressly disclaims having any authority for his injunctions on the subject: "Now as to virgins, I have no commandment from the Lord, yet I speak according to my judgment." It is remarkable that "the forbidding to marry" is pointed out as the mark of

the great Christian apostacy in the latter times, when "many should depart from the truth."

A discussion of the theory of Mr. Malthus would lead me too far: but I do not see how he can be said to "show human life with the most dreadful aspect," because he argues that the instincts which we share in common with the animal species, require the check of rational thought.

E.

Mr. Fox's Rejoinder to R. L. on the Argument from Scripture for Universal Restoration.

SIR, April 20, 1817.

I WILL trouble you with a few brief animadversions on the last communication of my friend R. L. [p. 157, &c.], and then take my leave of a controversy which must, I fear, to most of your readers be very uninteresting.

Whether R. L. or Simpson has given the best account of the word *kolasis*; whether Christ's universal spiritual authority have any thing to do, or not, with the final purity and happiness of its subjects; whether bowing in the name of Jesus, and confessing that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father, be voluntary or constrained homage; and whether God can command that which he does not desire, or desire that which he will not accomplish, are questions which I shall leave to be solved by what has been said already. If answered as I think they must be, the doctrine of Restoration will remain in quiet possession of several direct predictions:

It is admitted by R. L. [p. 158] that the resurrection of *all* men is announced as a *glorious deliverance*, a *blessing*, and *the gift of divine grace*. He *infers* from these expressions that the wicked will be subsequently reformed and finally happy, but does not perceive that it is *predicted*. I would not quarrel about a word; but if a resurrection be no blessing independently of its results, if there be *but one event* which can make it a blessing to the wicked, if their resurrection being a gift of grace and a glorious deliverance *depend altogether* upon their subsequent restoration, then Paul's assertion of the blessedness, &c. of their resurrection is a prediction of their restoration. The expressions are *equivalent* and may be substituted for each

other. The one is not deduced from the other by a chain of consequences, but is the meaning of the words; unless indeed there be theological sense, for certainly there is not common sense, in talking of the free and gracious gift of endless misery.

My friend has abandoned his former restricted interpretation of Rom. viii. 19—23, and now admits its universal reference. But there is still another restriction which I hope he will break through. He is content to believe that the deliverance of the wicked "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," means no more than that they shall be raised from the grave to suffer punishment. Surely this limitation, as well as the other, is in his mind and not in the text. Putting his two interpretations together, we may come to an agreement. By the first, the "liberty of the children of God" is a state of pure enjoyment, and by the second, this liberty is promised to all mankind.

It is true that "the word *afterwards* does not necessarily imply a distant period," but it must at any rate indicate a *subsequent* period. The enemies which R. L. supposes to be meant in 1 Cor. xv. 24, will be put down *before*, and not after, the day of judgment. Sin and suffering are spiritual enemies of Christ; they will then be the *only* enemies; and all his enemies shall be put down. This appears to me to be plain fact and not dubious inference.

I shall conclude with a single remark on the mode of interpreting the vision of John, and other passages in which it is allowed that terms implying universality are employed. It seems to be taken for granted by R. L. and others, that because such terms are sometimes used with obvious limitations, they are not to be admitted in evidence on this subject. It is true that words must be interpreted by things, and as Simpson observes, "In all languages there are several words which must be understood in different senses according to the subject to which they are applied." But then, Sir, in the present case it should be shewn that there is in the subject some necessary limitation of the universality of the expressions. Something should be indicated in the declarations of Scripture, in the character of God, or the nature of man, that

makes the restoration of the wicked an impossibility. If this cannot be done, if the final happiness of all men be a probable expectation, and a fair inference from "many very plain declarations of Scripture," I think it follows that the passages which seem to assert it ought to be taken in their obvious sense. There is, as to them, no good reason why universal terms should have a limited meaning, but every guarantee which can rationally be demanded, for their retaining their natural and most extensive signification.

W. J. FOX.

SIR, *Dublin, 10th April, 1817.*

I BEG leave through the medium of your Repository to call the attention of the public to what I consider will be an indelible stain on the character of the British nation, if they suffer the subscription for erecting a monument to Mr. Locke to remain longer in its present state. It was originally intended when £1000 should be raised to purchase the block of marble. For some years the subscription has remained at about £700: let the present subscribers deposit half the amount of their former subscriptions, or purchase a smaller block of marble which may now be had at a reasonable rate. The *cere perennius monumentum* will perpetuate the name of the man—but it is a disgrace to the British name that a statue to commemorate the man who in these latter ages first taught us how to reason and to think, has not been long since erected.

J. H.

Review of the Letter to W. Smith, Esq. M. P. from R. Southey, Esq.

(From a Correspondent.)

THIS letter is written in consequence of some expressions uttered in Parliament by Mr. Smith, which Mr. Southey thinks of slanderous import. It appears that certain societies with some of the members of which Mr. Smith was acquainted, and of whom he had a favourable opinion, were accused in Parliament of the worst designs; and Mr. Smith willing to shew that some who had held opinions of the same nature as those imputed to his friends, were by his opponents esteemed good men, produced the Poem called "Wat Tyler" in proof of this, and in the

heat of his feelings thus excited, applied the term RENEGADE to the author of Wat Tyler, and quoted some violent expressions in a paper in the Quarterly Review, ascribed, without contradiction, to Mr. Southey. In this letter Mr. Southey avows himself the writer of Wat Tyler, and very satisfactorily accounts for the change of his political opinions. That Mr. Southey is, and has been from his earliest youth, a most excellent moral character, of great benevolence of feeling and the strictest integrity, we firmly believe, and we see nothing either wrong or surprising in his change of opinion. He values himself highly upon the purity of his morals, and we believe with reason; but, perhaps, his censure of others expressed and implied is too severe. Married at twenty-two to a most attentive and affectionate woman, willing to live with him in "absolute retirement," he has been greatly favoured and exempted from many temptations; and although, until the days of Mr. Malthus, this conduct was ever esteemed virtuous and excellent, yet we trust that it is not of a character so exalted as that few examples of it are to be found. In married life we believe infidelity on either side to be very uncommon, and we think Mr. Southey is not authorized by implication to involve ALL the opposers of government or the administration, in the indiscriminate charge of abandoned vice and impurity. Mr. Smith, too, has lived in the "bosom of his family" with an unsullied character, another favoured individual, and thousands and tens of thousands, both of the opponents of government and of its supporters, are entitled to the same praise. We see nothing in political opinions, which exclusively entitle their holders to the censure of vice, or the praise of virtue, and this apparent bias we cannot approve. Mr. Southey deliberately writes "slanderer" upon the forehead of Mr. Smith, but we think with very little reason. The term RENEGADE is often used, without any intention to convey its most malignant meaning, as indeed all words are. How common is it to call a man a deserter, when it is meant merely to say that he has changed sides, without any implication of the worst motives, or even any mental reference to his motives

at all? **RENEGADE** may be a term of Spanish origin, and Mr. Southey, as a master of that language, may be able to affix to it a very inalignant signification; still, we have no notion that it is never used in any other sense, or was indeed on this occasion; but was merely meant to convey the charge of a change of opinion, or associates, without any charge of moral turpitude. We think then that if Mr. Smith is never guilty of a greater crime than the loose application of this term to Mr. Southey, he may recline without remorse on a dying pillow. We think too, that Mr. Southey speaks rather from the effervescence of his mind, when he calls Mr. Smith a **SLANDERER**, than from any impression of deep depravity that he conceives to rest on Mr. Smith.

There runs, however, through this letter, a spirit of censure and contempt which we think is not entitled to praise. As to Mr. Smith's knowing nothing, but from common report, who was the author of the article in the *Quarterly Review*, we cannot agree with Mr. Southey. Evidence of such a fact is not difficult to be obtained, and in the presence of some external evidence, **INTERNAL** evidence in the works of so voluminous a writer as Mr. Southey will turn the scale. Mr. Smith believed he had sufficient evidence of this production being Mr. Southey's—and there is a bitter spirit in this article. He who calls his opponents "the greatest of **SCOUNDRELS**," has little reason to criticise with severity the language used by others. In this letter, Mr. Brougham is classed with the Roman Tribune Clodius; with what colour of justice we know not.

At a time when the commerce of the sexes was not strictly guarded by public opinion, this unhappy Tribune was the scandal of his age. Licentious, adulterous, incestuous, a profaner of the mysteries, a murderer, the enemy of all excellence, the burner of the House of Cicero, he directed all his power to purposes of the most depraved selfishness. Is no less than all this the character of Mr. Brougham? Is this the equity of the amiable and benevolent Poet Laureate? How detestable is party feeling, if such excellence as that of Mr. Southey, is capable of thus feeling its influ-

ence? Should it be proved, that Mr. Brougham is as pure in morals as the Duke of Wellington, or even the amiable (for such he was) Lord Nelson, the two favourites of Mr. Southey, it will require all the eloquence of Mr. Southey to reconcile his writings either to truth or decency!

If all the advocates of administration were happy moralists, and all its opponents corrupt and impure, Mr. Southey's severity were not only justifiable but meritorious; but if this be not the fact, there should be more discrimination in his censure.

Why he sneers at the Unitarians, (except it is on supposition of their bad morals) we cannot tell—for this is the same author, who declares in his memoirs of Kirk White, in the spirit of true integrity, that he then entertained opinions concerning the Christian institute, in direct opposition to that amiable youth. The opinions of Mr. White were those of the Church of England; what then were those of Mr. Southey? Is Mr. Southey's rage against the opposers of administration capable of fixing his hatred against Unitarians? Perhaps every sect of Christians should be humble when they speak of their morality; but the Unitarians are not below others in moral rank. The Lardners, the Hartleys, the Newtons, are not inferior in morals to the Lauds, the Waterlands, or the Southneys. "Let another praise thee and not thine own lips." How many thousands, who have no view to the opinions or biographical dictionaries of remote ages, have lived with unsullied character in the bosom of their families, more thankful for the favour of heaven, which preserved them in virtue, than boastful of their own invulnerable purity! The language of the publican has often been theirs, in the midst of all their excellence, "Lord be merciful to me a sinner!"

There may, however, be such as "need no repentance," and Mr. Southey may be one of them. But when we see the pious hypocrisy of our Lardner, who was as pure as Mr. Southey, without the same prejudicing circumstances, we cannot but be struck with the difference of their mental character.

If this letter had been wholly political we should not have noticed it:

in reference to character and morals only we regard it. It affords a proof that men who are the quickest to resent affronts, are the most apt to give them—that Mr. Southey, like many other good men, is not deeply learned in self-knowledge, for if Mr. Smith be a slanderer, what is Mr. Southey? “The snuffers of the tabernacle were of pure gold.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Southey, if nothing worse can be shewn of them than they shew of each other, may go down to posterity with faultless reputation, unequal, perhaps, in the turn of their genius, but equally estimable as men and as citizens.

We conclude with one remark, that whoever caused the publication of the beautiful poem of Wat Tyler, without consent of the author, is entitled to a very different censure, than either Mr. Southey or Mr. Smith.

A. R.

SIR,

May 1, 1817.

IN the short notice of the affair of Mr. Wright in the House of Lords, I was particularly surprised that Dr. George Law, the Bishop of Chester, should have been the man to vindicate the persecution of this poor Unitarian preacher, on the ground of his denying the natural immortality of the soul, and its separate state after death, when he must know, what every theological scholar knows, that this very doctrine, whether true or false, constituted the leading feature in the literary history of his venerable father, Bishop Edmund Law, of Carlisle; whose Appendix to his Theory of Religion, containing an examination of all the texts where the words soul or spirit occur in the Scriptures, in the opinion of the learned Archdeacon Blackburne, “shook the cause of conscious intermediate existence to its very foundation.” It surely required no small “strength of face” in the Reverend Prelate now on the Bench, to charge this doctrine with involving the denial of a future state, when (I repeat it) he must know, that his father’s object (and no doubt that of Mr. Wright) was to shew, that life and immortality were brought to light in the gospel, and thus to place the hope of a future life on its surest ground “of faith in God’s promise contained in a well-authenticated revelation.”

SIR,

April 22, 1817.

IF I were not to send a reply to the letter of your Correspondent, T. H. Janson, (p. 160), my silence might be misunderstood. I was not aware that what I called a few queries were any thing but what I called them; and I wish that I had not (for it was unintentional, mere involuntary error) “thrown some discouragement in the way of their being answered.” I certainly did intend however to throw much discouragement in the way of crude thoughts and loose remarks being sent to the Monthly Repository as replies to my queries. If this intention or the manner of expressing it has given offence and called forth sarcasm, the effect undesignedly produced can only serve to prove how easy it is to offend and how difficult it is to please.

I was not aware that many hundred volumes have been written on the subjects comprised in my queries, and shall be obliged to your Correspondent if he will take an opportunity of mentioning the names of two or three hundreds of such volumes; for I know not of a single book that professedly discusses some of the questions which I sent for insertion in your Miscellany: I know not of any book in which a single chapter may be found having any reference to some of my queries. The writings of that “ingenious speculator William Godwin,” are nearly as foreign (for any practical purpose) to the points which I proposed, as the remarks of your Correspondent.

I was willing to hope that some of your readers who have studied the nature of political principles, institutions, &c. might be induced to give the results of their inquiries and reflections in the shape of axioms, as a foundation and beginning of the most desirable of all desiderata, a true system of political science, a system of political science that shall make the well-being of the commonwealth the aim and end of all its deliberations and determinations—that shall make social happiness the rule and measure of all social excellence, of all national wealth, greatness, power and glory.

It is easy to talk of parliamentary corruption being the original sin of all our political evils, as if parliamentary reform could of itself rectify all political wrongs and remedy all

existing calamities; but the origin of all social complaints must be deeper in the social constitution, than either the quacks, or the most skilful political physicians have generally perceived and confessed. Parliamentary reform might (and I think would) cure *Old England* of galloping consumption; but most old constitutions have a complication of diseases which cannot be eradicated from the system, because the medicine which removes one only aggravates another. In this case the patient cannot expect complete recovery, but must resign to death in hope of a blessed resurrection.

The masterly dissector (in the opinion of the person writing this) of human nature and human society, concerning whom your Correspondent inquires, is Mandeville, author of the *Fable of the Bees*. If all readers derive as much benefit from the above work as I think I have derived, they will speak as highly of the author. But of opinion and taste, &c. there is no absolute standard. If I thought that this notice of Mandeville would by any accident come under the eye of Dr. Malthus, I would request of him as a special favour that he would point out a few of those dexterous misnomers in which he says the reasoning consists by which the author of the *Fable of the Bees* supports his shocking system; I cannot believe that Dr. Malthus would join the common hue and cry against an unpopular author, the better to escape popular clamour himself; yet though in consequence of the foregoing heavy censure I took up the *Fable of the Bees* for the very purpose of examining its dexterous misnomers in support of a shocking system, I have not been very successful in detecting that worst kind of verbal deceptions which consist in specious misnomers.

J. GILCHRIST.

Christian Equality: A Discourse, &c.

(Concluded from p. 209.)

BUT the most formidable obstacle to gospel-equality, and the widest aberration from the principles laid down by the Apostle in our text, remains yet to be noticed. "I say," says he, "through the grace given unto me,"—in virtue of the commission I have received to preach the unsearchable riches of him who was "meek

and lowly in heart," "who came not to be ministered unto but to minister," and who, by example, precept and prohibition, discountenanced among his disciples every thing that looked like an affectation of pre-eminence and superiority,—I say, "to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think;" and, reckoning himself together with the rest, he declares, "we are every one members one of another." Nevertheless, from a period very shortly subsequent to that in which Paul wrote, down to the present, there has been an order of men in the Church claiming distinctive titles, exclusive privileges and dictatorial powers. It would be both tedious and invidious to enter at any length upon a detail of the mischiefs and corruptions which have disturbed and defaced the pure institutions of the gospel, and in which men of this description have been the principal agents: they are sufficiently known to all who have the slightest acquaintance with history, civil or ecclesiastical. Neither do I intend any thing personal; my business is only with the nature of the powers they exercise, and which is known at once by an inspection of their respective constitutions. By these, under the collective, but misapplied title of *the Church*, they are authorized to decree rites and ceremonies; to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; to be stewards of the mysteries of God; to have the custody of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, the power of admission or exclusion; to retain and remit sins; to inflict and remove censures; to pronounce and revoke sentence of excommunication; to give validity to ordinances; and, as it appears in practice, and as we have repeatedly experienced too, as members of courts of judicature, and decide upon the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of the opinions, not only of their own party, but of others who belong not to their communion, nor recognize their authority. These are indeed high prerogatives, and the question instantly presents itself—*from whence are they derived?* Now, although many will be disposed to deny that most of the ordinary powers with which the immediate successors of Jesus were invested, and which were necessary in the infancy of the Church, have any specific applicability, or those

of an extraordinary kind any existence in these its mature periods, yet these points have been settled by the clergy themselves to their own satisfaction: they have, in many material instances, identified their office with that of the apostles, and, by virtue of the imposition of hands, have transmitted their privileges and faculties entire from one generation to another, thus constituting themselves a corporation, with spiritual jurisdiction and perpetual succession. Now it cannot but appear wonderful, that in a country where there is so great, so just and so general a jealousy of the least encroachment upon civil rights, such an invasion of those which ought to be yet more highly prized, should meet with so little opposition, or rather with so tame an acquiescence. Certain it is, that if a self-created aristocracy were to start up among us, and assume such an unwarrantable supremacy over our temporal concerns as the clergy do over our faith, every hand and every voice would be instantly raised for its subversion. It is, however, of little consequence from what quarter ecclesiastical authority is derived, or supposed to be derived, whether divine, apostolical or popular, if it confer upon its possessors, and all they say or do the attribute of *sacred*, and give them that lordship over God's heritage which the apostles themselves disclaimed. And with whatever tranquillity we may hear the heinous charge of confederacy with Satan, or the solemn sentence of heresy from such a tribunal, we cannot but observe and regret so total a departure from the precept and spirit of our text, and wish that the duties of the ministerial department were better understood, and the meekness and gentleness of Christ more closely copied. By no means let me be thought to cast indiscriminate reflections, or to insinuate that humility, charity, benevolence, the love of liberty and every Christian virtue, may not or do not adorn and dignify the pastoral office among all religious persuasions; but I believe there can be no question whether those things upon which I have adverted, have not a natural tendency to make men think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, to foster many of those dispositions which the Apostle so pointedly condemns, and must therefore be, on the whole, unfriendly to

the progress and effect of the pure and unadulterated religion of Christ.

That the privileges of the order might be guarded from invasion, there was an obvious necessity for the utmost caution as to those who should be admitted to a participation of them. Accordingly we see that in many seminaries of education for the ministry, one of the earliest lessons inculcated is a dutiful attachment to the systems and articles of faith which are deemed fundamental laws of the institution, and a departure from which would incur no less a penalty than expulsion. To these it is frequently required of the

* *From the North American Review.*—

Mr. Loring D. Dewey has published a Discourse delivered before a private society of the students of the Theological Seminary in New York, of which he was a member. It is the principal object of this Discourse to show that being *justified*, in the language of the New Testament, means being *pardoned*. This heinous proceeding of the young gentleman was the occasion of the following letter.

New York, 12th March, 1816.

TO MR. LORING D. DEWEY.

SIR.—It is matter of grief to us, that any of our pupils whom we have been endeavouring to lead into the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, should turn away from the Holy commandment delivered unto him. This misguided youth, is your own case. The doctrines which you have avowed in your Discourse submitted to us, and in your conversation with us relative thereto, are so deeply erroneous, so radically subversive of the whole gospel scheme and so ruinous to the souls of men, that they cannot be tolerated in the seminary under our care. It shall not here be so much as questioned, no not for an hour, whether attacks upon the essential parts of our Redeemer's work, are to be permitted in any shape or upon any pretence whatever.

We are therefore under the afflictive necessity of informing you, that your connexion with our seminary ceases from this day. You will consider the present decision as peremptory, and not to be altered, unless it shall please God to give you a sounder mind, and enable you to recover yourself out of the snare of the devil. That you may be your happiness is our heart's desire and prayer for you.

J. M. MASON, Principal Th. Sem.

A. R. C. New York.

J. M. MATTHEWS, Asst. Professor
Th. Sem. A. R. C. New York.

pupil that he should signify his assent and consent by subscription, at an age so early that his understanding cannot be supposed to have any share in the transaction. In embracing the doctrines of the Church which thus receives him into her maternal bosom, he arrives at once at the utmost boundaries of divine knowledge, all farther inquiry is superseded, and he has only to conduct his examination of the Scriptures and his other theological studies upon the prescribed model. Thus qualified, he becomes one of the appointed number, out of whom the people, if they are permitted to choose at all (which is not always the case), must take their spiritual guide and instructor; and, according to all the rules of probability, both pastor and flock will continue to walk in the good old track which has been marked out for them so carefully, and under the awe of those salutary severities from the courts above which would be the consequence of their deviation. Is this then that knowledge of the truth which Jesus declared should make them free who were his disciples indeed? Can that be truth which would keep the minds of men in a state of perpetual pupillage, and which would resist those appeals to the understanding which our Lord and his apostles, divinely inspired as they were, did not disdain to make? Or shall we, as Christians, contentedly wear such trammels, as in the capacity of citizens we would indignantly shake off? The liberal and enlightened spirit of this age and this country will not much longer submit to such unworthy restraints. I rejoice when I see religious societies, of the lowest order, exercising their undoubted right in the choice of their ministers, as the first step towards the knowledge of the truth, and the building up the universal Church of Christ upon its proper foundation. The people only ought to be the judges of that man's qualifications who may serve them most acceptably. They may take him from any condition or occupation in life, they think fit, and their choice is a sufficient passport to the exercise of his office. The connexion maturely and judiciously formed, he is entitled to their respect, to their "high esteem in love for his work's sake," and, if necessary, to a comfortable and honourable maintenance. But the authority, which in some cases he may be

called to exercise, is not his own, but theirs, and to be used for their credit and advantage. Harmony is most likely to be lasting, when people and minister meet upon terms of reciprocal freedom—when it is perfectly understood that they are not to be lords over his faith, any more than he of theirs—when he lays before them the result of his inquiries, not to supersede their own, but to incite and assist them, and that they may approve or dissent as mature consideration shall warrant. If there arise any difference upon points, by either party deemed essential, there are but two proper ways of settling it—either by mutual concession or peaceable separation. But the words of the late excellent Mr. Lindsey, on the opening of his place of worship, are so apposite to my purpose, that I cannot forbear to quote them. "Your minister," said he, "claims not any spiritual powers, more than belong to every one of you. He considers himself only as one whom you have chosen for your instructor in the gospel, on the good opinion of his diligence and probity, but to whom you are tied no longer than he shall discharge his office with fidelity and to your approbation. His province will be, not to speak any thing of himself, or dictate aught to you of his own authority, but to lay before you the words of Christ and the mind of God as revealed in the Sacred Writings, with such interpretation as may seem to throw light on that inestimable book, and afford the most powerful motives to a holy life, which is the prime end of all instruction."

That such may be the dispositions and views of the man who shall sustain the office of pastor in this society—that such may be the temper and spirit to be found among us—and that the time when they shall all be called into exercise may soon arrive, is my most devout and earnest wish. Blessed be God, we walk at perfect liberty; we are in bondage to no prescribed system of doctrine; the Bible is our only rule of faith; with that in our hands we are free to pursue divine truth wherever it leads us, and according to that (when thoroughly understood) infallible guide, to amend our mistakes and rectify our misconceptions. Equal as all are in point of privilege, there will still be, as among any associated body of men, a disparity in other respects. Even the miraculous gifts imparted to the early

Christians were given in different measure, and the proper, the designed use of them was, when every one knew how to make a sober estimate of his own, and applied them faithfully to the common advantage. So it is now with respect to the difference between one and another in abilities and attainments which are as truly the gift of God, as were the powers of speaking with tongues, prophecy, healing and such like, and such ought to be their application. But if instead of all "submitting themselves one to another in the fear of God," there should appear in some a forwardness to intrude into departments for which they are manifestly unqualified, or in others who are really distinguished by superior talents, to set at naught and overbear those whose advantages and attainments are less conspicuous;—if the harmonizing, equalizing spirit of the gospel, which exalts the humble and humbles the exalted, be lost; then enters the fell spirit of party, and in its train, discord, envy, strife, confusion and every evil word and work, to the disgrace of Christianity and the grief and shame of all its real friends. My brethren! may we ever keep our doors fast closed against such a train of destructive intruders.

I conclude with this general observation.—Upon a correct view of the principle of equality, and as it affects the state of the world at large, it seems perfectly to coincide with the equitable and impartial tendency of the divine dispensations. Whether we look back through the history of all past ages, or attentively consider the events of our own time, we shall find that the grasp of any exorbitant degree of pre-eminence has always carried in it the seeds of its own disappointment and final overthrow. We see clearly that the extension of commerce, of civil liberty, of the useful arts and of knowledge of all kinds, is lessening the distance between the several nations and classes of mankind; while the religion of Jesus, in proportion as it is delivered from the corruptions which have stained its purity, and from the disgraceful and unnatural bondage in which for ages it was held, is gently melting the asperities, uniting jarring interests, and removing discordant opinions, and opening the way for that brotherly love, peace and peace of which the most blessed promises shall

be Sovereign—in which his name shall be one and his praise one. For thus spake the herald who proclaimed its approach, agreeably to the sure word of prophecy—"Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert an highway for our God. Every VALLEY SHALL BE EXALTED, AND EVERY MOUNTAIN AND HILL SHALL BE MADE LOW, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and ALL FLESH SHALL SEE IT TOGETHER, for the mouth of JEHOVAH hath spoken it."—Amen! So be it!

PRAYER.

Almighty Creator, and Universal Sovereign! Who hast made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and who hast not left thyself without witness, in that thou doest them good, giving them rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, and fillest their hearts with food and gladness. We esteem ourselves happy that we are subjects of thy just and equal government—that we are members of that great family who are all objects of thy parental care. We believe that all thy judgments are according to truth and uprightness; and that those dispensations of thy Providence which are beyond our limited comprehension, proceed upon such principles as are best calculated to secure universal order and happiness. If we appear to be distinguished by privileges which are not vouchsafed to many others of our race, let not our hearts be lifted up on account of that which we owe solely to thine unmerited grace and favour. If we are intrusted with talents, let us not despise our brother who hath received but one, and with whom we are to stand or fall before the same Master. Mindful of our own frailty and fallibility, may we never presume to usurp that province which is thine alone, nor sit in judgment over the faith of those, whose humility and sincerity, whatever may be their involuntary errors, may render acceptable in thy sight.

We pray, in faith, that the truly fraternal and charitable spirit of thy Son's gospel may go forth conquering and to conquer, all pride and envy, all emulation and strife, and subvert the lowest and most degraded idol.

condition, thy children of mankind may be raised to a participation of the high privileges it bestows; and that it may cast down imaginations, and every high thing which would exalt itself in opposition to the sacred cause of liberty, civil and religious. May all our fellow-citizens, duly sensible of the invaluable advantages of this nature which they possess, act worthy of them, by cultivating a spirit of mutual toleration, harmony and concord; and heartily unite in endeavours to promote that general order which is founded on the basis of equal rights. Blessed be thy name for the unrestrained privilege which we of this Christian society enjoy of worshipping thee according to the dictates of our consciences, and the prescriptions of thy holy word. While we stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, may every grace and every virtue which his gospel enjoins, both personal and social, be found among us. Thus adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour may we shine as lights in the world, and be fabled to join the general assembly and church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven—which shall be gathered from all nations and tongues and people, and unite in grateful adoration and joyful thanksgiving before the throne of Him who liveth for ever and ever.

The Spaniard's Letters from England.

SIR, May 1, 1817.
I HAD employed myself the other day in reading Wat Tyler and the Quarterly Review and a Letter to William Smith, Esq. M. P. from Robert Southey, Esq. when being completely wearied and disgusted, I turned to my book-shelves for some work that would amuse and instruct me and recover me to a good opinion of human nature. My hand was led almost without a motive to three little volumes which I had not looked into since their first publication in 1807, I mean "Letters from England; by Don Manuel Alvarez Espriella, Translated from the Spanish;" and I am happy to say that this ingenious work fully answered my purpose. I was in truth so much pleased as I went through the Letters that I made several extracts of choice passages which I thought might be worthy of a place in your Repository. You will

perceive that they breathe a mild spirit of liberty which in the present day is rare. They were happily written before the Quarterly Review was set up to digest slavery and corruption into a system, and before Mr. Southey had applauded the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and hallowed on the government to the curbing of the liberty of the press and the punishing of free writers.

The inquiry frequently broke from me as I read, who was this Don? for, it is clear, Mr. Editor, that this is an assumed name, taken no doubt for the sake of saving without inconvenience more spirited things than the author could have uttered in propria persona. Perhaps you can furnish me with a satisfactory answer. On the negative side, I can affirm that the Spaniard was not the Poet Laureate of that day; and on the positive, I think I hazard little in asserting that he must have travelled in Spain and have been conversant in Spanish literature, that he must have had what are called Jacobin connections in early life and have been "a good hater" of Mr. Pitt, and that he must have been somewhat attached to the literary Dissenters and in no slight degree disaffected to the Established Church. Esteeming him as I do, I should not point him out by these marks or institute any public inquiry concerning him, if I did not surmise that he is *defunct*; for were he living, how would it delight some anonymous ministerial scribe in the Quarterly to worry him with foul accusations and then how eagerly would the Poet Laureate set the Attorney General upon him! His silence for so many years proves indeed that he is out of the reach of *Lettres de Cordes* and Letters from Robert Southey, Esq. and therefore I proceed with the extracts, premising only that they are in the order of the Letters and not the writer in order to maintain his fictitious character sometimes speaks as a good Catholic.

RENEGADE NORTHY.

1. Gilbert Wakefield.

When I— passed through the town on his way to Spain, he visited Gilbert Wakefield, a dissenting minister who was confined here by a fever of the French Revolution. One of the bishops had written a book upon

the state of public affairs, just at the time when the minister proposed to take from every man the tythe of his income: this the bishop did not think sufficient; so he suggested instead, that a tenth should be levied of all the capital in the kingdom; arguing, that as every person would be affected in the same proportion, all would remain relatively as before, and in fact no person be affected at all. This curious argument he enforced by as curious an illustration; he said, "that if the foundations of a great building were to sink equally in every part at the same time, the whole pile, instead of suffering any injury, would become the firmer."—"True," said Wakefield in his reply, "and you, my Lord Bishop, who dwell in the upper apartments, might still enjoy the prospect from your window;—but what would become of me and the good people who live upon the ground-floor?"

Wakefield was particularly obnoxious to the government, because his character stood very high among the Dissenters for learning and integrity, and his opinions were proportionately of weight. They brought him to trial for having in his Answer to the bishop's pamphlet applied the fable of the Ass and his Panmiers to existing circumstances. Had it indeed been circulated among the poor, its tendency would certainly have been mischievous; but in the form in which it appeared it was evidently designed as a warning to the rulers, not as an address to the mob. He was, however, condemned to two years confinement in this prison, this place being chosen as out of reach of his friends, to make imprisonment more painful. The public feeling upon this rigorous treatment of so eminent a man was strongly expressed, and a subscription was publicly raised for him, which amounted to above fifteen hundred pieces of eight, and which enabled his family to remove to Dorchester, and settle there. But the magistrates, whose business it was to oversee the prison, would neither permit them to lodge with him in his confinement, nor even to visit him daily. He was thus prevented from proceeding with the education of his children, an occupation which he had ever regarded as a duty, and which had been one of his highest enjoyments. But, in the midst of

vexations and insults, he steadily continued to pursue both his literary and Christian labours; affording to his fellow-prisoners what assistance was in his power, endeavouring to reclaim the vicious, and preparing the condemned for death. His imprisonment eventually proved fatal. He had been warned on his expiration to accustom himself slowly to his former habits of exercise, or a fever would inevitably be the consequence; a fact known by experience. In spite of all his precautions it took place; and while his friends were rejoicing at his deliverance he was cut off. As a polemical and political writer he indulged an asperity of language which he had learnt from his favourite philologists, but in private life no man was more generally or more deservedly beloved, and he had a fearless and inflexible honesty which made him utterly regardless of all danger, and would have enabled him to exult in martyrdom. When J— had related this history to me, I could not but observe how far more humane it was to prevent the publication of obnoxious books than to permit them to be printed and then punish the persons concerned. "This," he said, "would be too open a violation of the liberty of the press."

2. *Conduct of the Populace at the Execution of Governor Falk.*

On the morning of his execution, the mob, as usual, assembled in prodigious numbers, filling the whole space before the prison, and all the wide avenues from whence the spot could be seen. Having repeatedly been disappointed of their revenge, they were still apprehensive of another respite, and their joy at seeing him appear upon the scaffold was so great, that they set up three huzzas,—an instance of ferocity which had never occurred before. The miserable man, quite overcome by this, begged the hangman to hasten his work. When he was turned off they began their huzzas again; but instead of proceeding to three distinct shouts, as usual, they stopped at the first. This conduct of the mob has been called inhuman and disgraceful; for my own part, I cannot but agree with those who regard it in a very different light. The revengeful joy, which animated them, unchristian as that passion

certainly is, and whatever may have been its excess, was surely founded upon humanity; and the sudden extinction of that joy, the feeling which at one moment struck so many thousands, stopped their acclamations at once, and averted them into a dead silence when they saw the object of their hatred in the act and agony of death, is surely as honourable to the popular character as any trait which I have seen recorded of any people in any age or country.

3. *Martial Law of England.*

The execution of Governor Wall is considered as a great triumph of justice. Nobody seems to recollect that he has been hanged, not for having flogged three men to death, but for an informality in the mode of doing it. Yet this is the true state of the case. Had he called a drum-head court-martial, the same sentence might have been inflicted, and the same consequences have ensued, with perfect impunity to himself.

The martial laws of England are the most barbarous which at this day exist in Europe. The offender is sometimes sentenced to receive a thousand lashes;—a surgeon stands by to feel his pulse during the execution, and determine how long the flogging can be continued without killing him. When human nature can sustain no more, he is remanded to prison; his wound, for from the shoulders to the loins it leaves him one wound, is dressed, and as soon as it is sufficiently healed to be laid open again in the same manner, he is brought out to undergo the remainder of his sentence. And this is repeatedly and openly practised in a country, where they read in their churches, and in their houses, that Bible, in their own language, which saith, "Forty stripes may the judge inflict upon the offender, and not exceed."

4. *Necessity of arming the People.*

But the sure and certain way to secure any nation for ever from alarm as well as from danger, is to train every school-boy to the use of arms: boys would desire no better amusement, and thus, in the course of the next generation every man would be a soldier. England might then defy, not France alone, but the whole continent leagued with France, even if the impassable gulf between this

happy island and its enemy were filled up. This will be done sooner or later, for England must become an armed nation. How long it will be before her legislators will discover this, and how long when they have discovered it, before they will dare to act upon it, that is, before they will consent to part with the power of alarming the people, which they have found so convenient, it would be idle to conjecture. Individuals profit slowly by experience, associations still more slowly, and governments the most slowly of all associated bodies.

5. *Character of Calvinism.*

Without doubt, these (May-day) sports were once connected with religion. It is the peculiar character of the true religion to sanctify what is innocent, and make even merriment meritorious; and it is as peculiarly the character of Calvinism to direct piety of all cheerfulness, and cheerfulness of all piety, as if they could not co-exist; and to introduce a graceless and joyless system of manners suitable to a faith which makes the heresy of Manes appear reasonable. He admitted that the evil principle was weaker than the good one, but in the mythology of Calvin there is no good one to be found.

6. *Evil of encouraging Informers.*

They talk here of our Holy Office as a disgrace to the Spanish nation, when their own government is ten times more inquisitorial, for the party purposes of revenue. Shortly after his last return from Spain, J. stepped into a hosier's to buy a pair of gloves; the day was warm, and he laid his hat upon the counter: a well-drest man came in after him for the same sensible purpose, either learnt his name by inquiry, or followed him till he had discovered it, and the next day my friend was summoned before a magistrate to answer a charge for wearing his hat without a stamp. It was in vain he pleaded that the hat had been purchased abroad; he had been in England more than six weeks, and had not bought a stamp to put into it, and therefore was fined the full penalty.

This species of espionage has within these few years become a regular trade; the laws are all so perplexed, and so others so vexatious, that matter for prosecution is

never wanting, and many of these families of the tax-offices are amassing fortunes by this infamous business. The most lucrative method of practice is as follows:—A fellow surcharges half the people in the district; that is, he informs the tax-commissioners, that such persons have given in a false account of their windows, dogs, horses, carriages, &c. an offence for which the tax is trebled, and half the surplus given to the informer. A day of appeal, however, is allowed for those who think they can justify themselves; but so many have been aggrieved, that when they appear together before the commissioners, there is not time to hear one in ten. Some of these persons live two, four, or six leagues from the place of appeal: they go there a second, and perhaps a third time in the hope of redress; the informer takes care, by new surcharges, to keep up the crowd, and the injured persons find it at last less burthensome to pay the unjust fine, than to be repeatedly at the trouble and expence of seeking justice in vain.

Willbree is nothing, however dishonourable or villainous, to which these wretches will not stoop. One of them, on his first settling in the province which he had chosen for the scene of his campaigns, was invited to dinner by a neighbouring gentleman, before his character was known; the next day he surcharged his host for another servant, because one of the men employed about his grounds had assisted in waiting at dinner. Another happening to lame his horse, borrowed one of a farmer to ride home; the farmer told him it was but an uneasy going beast, as he was kept wholly for the cart, but rather than that the gentleman should be distressed he would put the saddle on him;—he was surcharged the next day for keeping a saddle-horse, as his reward. Can there be a more convincing proof of the excellent police of England, and, what is still better, of the admirable effect of well-executed laws upon the people, than that such pests of society as these walk abroad among the very people whom they oppress and insult, with perfect safety both by day and by night!

Governments do not seem to be aware, that when they offer premiums for registry, they are corrupting the morals of the people, and thereby

weakening their own security. There is reason sufficient for pardoning a criminal, who confesses his own guilt, and impeaches his accomplices; the course of law could not go on without it, and such men are already infamous. But no such plea can be alleged in this case: it is a miserable excuse for encouraging informers, to say, that the taxes are so exorbitantly laid on, that they can easily be eluded. A far worse instance of this pernicious practice occurs in the system of pressing men for the navy, which the English confess to be the opprobrium of their country, while they regret it as inevitable. In the proclamation issued upon these occasions, a reward is regularly offered to all persons who will give information where a sailor has hidden himself.

The whole system of England, from highest to lowest, is, and has been, one series of antagonisms; struggle and struggle—in every thing. Check and countercheck is the principle of their constitution, which is the result of centuries of contention between the crown and the people. The struggle between the clergy and the lawyers unfettered their lands from feudal tenures. Their church is a half-and-half mixture of Catholicism and Puritanism. These contests being over, it is now a trial between the government and the subject, how the one can lay on taxes, and how the other can elude them.

[To be continued.]

SIR, I send you a copy of *MRS. HAMILTON's* "Series of Popular Essays," published about three years before her lamented death, directs the attention of her readers to what she calls "the selfish principle," or "the propensity to enlarge the idea of self," which she supposes to be a part of the human constitution, and to the indolence and excess of which she justly ascribes much of the errors, follies and crimes of mankind. I am not disposed to assert that throughout these amusing and instructive volumes the excellent author is always correct in the use of her terms and arguments; but here as in every other part of her works she displays her good sense, her admirable talents in observing and delineating human characters and dispositions, and above all, that consistent and

earnest desire to do good, which was the distinguishing feature both of her writings and her life. In the tenth chapter of the fourth of these Essays, the author considers the influence of the selfish principle as connected with the belief and profession of certain religious opinions, and on this subject she has many observations which well deserve the attention of zealots of all sects, parties and systems.

Your extensive and accurate acquaintance with life and manners, Mr. Editor, must have brought before you instances of the great variety of forms and modes under which the selfish principle shows itself and operates. In most instances it disposes a man to regard with peculiar favour those of his own kindred, name, or party, to magnify their virtues, and to overlook or palliate their imperfections. I am sorry to say that, with myself, the case is different. I have the misfortune to be liable to regard *the mote in my brother's eye* with more attention than that in the eye of a more distant relative or stranger. Whether this be owing to the bulk and shape of *the beam that is in my own eye*, to the influence of temperament for which I am not altogether accountable, or to the effect of habit, the fault of which is all my own, I do not pretend to determine. The fact I am obliged to acknowledge and lament, and to this infirmity I must request you to be so candid as to ascribe the desire I now feel of obtaining a place in your pages.

I am drawing fast to the close of a long life. From the earliest years of it in which I could institute any inquiry or form any opinion on the subject, I have never ceased to possess the full conviction that Unitarianism is the doctrine of the gospel. The times when the open profession of this persuasion exposed him who made it to great and general obloquy, is fresh in my remembrance. I have lived to see the hostility which this obnoxious system has always had to encounter, not indeed less violent, but certainly more adequately opposed by numerous and able defenders. Of the present state of Unitarianism, so far as respects its external relations and its internal progress, I conceive that any of its partisans can complain except such as are not easily satisfied. The repeal of the penal statutes, which till within

a very few years hung over them, is an event of very great importance, not less honourable to the distinguished individual that procured, and to the government that conceded it, than advantageous to the classes of dissenters favoured by it. The laws in question were, indeed, become almost a dead letter, however distinctly it may since have appeared that there are not wanting persons of no small authority and influence desirous of restoring them with all their original life and activity, and of arming the magistrate with the means of defending the faith, and inflicting salutary chastisement on obstinate and unrepentant heretics.

The old Unitarians, I believe, to a man, join with Mr. Balamy in thankful acknowledgments to the executive and legislature for so readily consenting to annul laws inconsistent with the spirit of the British constitution, and disgraceful to the statute book. They well remember that, less than thirty years ago, petitions, although numerous and respectfully signed, failed of obtaining the desired repeal, which has at length indeed brought about with little difficulty by the representations and exertions of the individual above alluded to.

But a new class of Unitarians has arisen, whose gratitude for this boon (if we may judge from appearances and from the language held by some of them) is less than problematick, and to whom the repeal in question has proved very little acceptable. They have expressed themselves as if they were ambitious, not perhaps of the crown of martyrdom, but of some of the inferior honours to be conferred by persecutors for conscience's sake on the objects of their unblinded and antichristian zeal, forgetting to think that such distinctions so obtained imply the greatest possible wickedness on the part of those who grant them. This is an inordinate exercise of the selfish principle, which, I believe, has escaped the animadversions of Mr. Hamilton, probably from that amiable writer not conceiving the existence of such an extravagant action possible in this (as it is called) liberal and enlightened age.

History has in too many instances shown that those who have proved themselves capable of suffering with the most heroic resolution in defence

of what they deemed to be the truth, have not always been the least willing to make others suffer on the same account. In like manner those of our own times who have so little objection to persecution that they are almost prepared to invite its attacks on themselves, are, in their turn, not at all averse to manifest that degree and measure of intolerance which they have it in their power to exercise. They do not wield the sword either of civil or ecclesiastical authority: they cannot imprison or excommunicate; but they are not content with thinking Unitarianism a good thing: they will have it that there is nothing good besides. Justly provoked at the foolish and unchristian attempts of their opponents to prove that Unitarianism is unfavourable to morality and piety, they fly to the other extreme, and are disposed to contend that the only morality and piety deserving regard is inseparably connected with their own views of religious truth. They forget that devotion is seated in the heart, and moral virtue in the habits of man, and that the former may be deeply and permanently affected, and the latter immoveably fixed, whatever may be the speculative opinions of the individual on points which have long been, and will long continue to be, subjects of doubtful disputation. I request you, Mr. Editor, to pardon any unseemly warmth in my expressions; but I must declare that, to my mind, this is the most intolerable species of intolerance. With the foolish violence of the orthodox may be joined a compassionate solicitude for the eternal welfare of its object, and there must be joined a painful apprehension of his everlasting misery; but the intolerance of the heretic is a cold, philosophic pride, unconnected (so far as I can perceive) with no social affection, with no hope, and with no fear, save the hope of victory and the fear of defeat, in the war of controversy.

Justly is the Calvinist reproved for attaching to his particular creed an unreasonable degree of importance; and for almost refusing to admit that those who differ from him have any claim to the appellation of Christians. Not as something to balance this, I have heard it asserted by a young heretical minister of the new discipline, to which his language may be supposed

not to do less justice than his talents and attainments do honour to it, that unless Christianity be professed under some particular form, it is in itself but a name; the plain English of which seems to be, that, if we take from our holy religion the subjects and matters about which its votaries have always disagreed, and will probably always disagree, that which is left, and in which they agree, is of little or no value. I flatter myself that many Unitarians will not be found to concur in this sentiment, or to adopt this language. Such as are disposed to do so, I would refer to the preface to the late Bishop of Llandaff's *Collection of Theological Tracts*. "We as Christians," says this excellent prelate, "are under no uncertainty as to the being of a God; as to his moral government of the world; as to the terms on which sinners may be reconciled to him; as to the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; as to a resurrection from the dead; as to a future state of retribution; nor with respect to other important questions concerning which the wisest of the Heathen philosophers were either wholly ignorant, or had no settled notions." I would ask, are these points of no value? Does the man who, withdrawing his attention from every other subject, yields a cordial and practical assent to them, adopt only a name? I am so much shocked at this imputation, that I scruple not to use the indignant language of the enlightened and truly catholic writer I have just cited.—"What! shall the Church of Christ never be freed from the narrow-minded contentions of bigots; from the insults of men who know not what spirit they are of! Shall we never learn to think more humbly of ourselves, and less despicably of others?"

Further: it is objected, and, I believe, with reason that the system of Calvinism indisposes its professors to set a proper value on moral qualities and distinctions. This will not surprise any one who considers attentively the leading tenets of that system; but I am much mistaken if I have not observed something of the same kind in Unitarians of the new school. An attention almost exclusive to any particular object, and an ardent pursuit of it necessarily enlarges its dimensions, enhances its importance, brings it forward into the strongest light, and

throws every thing else into the shade. Accordingly, proselytes are eagerly received among these modern heretics without much inquiry being made into any thing beyond their faith and zeal. Talents, however employed, and mental energy, however directed, are held in the highest estimation. Licentiousness, both in principles and practice, is not indeed justified, but it is candidly palliated. Crimes are represented as objects rather of pity than of abhorrence. A system of ethics drawn chiefly from the German drama seems to have superseded the old-fashioned English morality. Purity and correctness of life and manners is undervalued. A fantastic, false, and, in my apprehension, a most pernicious standard of morals is exhibited, so that every thing tending to the amelioration of the world is hoped for from every thing, save from orthodoxy, and (what in these eventful times is its usual concomitant), loyalty.

If the young and ardent Unitarian happens to be a convert from Calvinism, the danger of his becoming the victim of these delusions is much increased. The lessons of his earlier instructors having for the most part been directed to infuse a theological system and a vehement zeal, were not likely to furnish his mind with any very correct or vivid ideas of moral truth and beauty. The change produced by subsequent inquiry (honourable as it may be regarded to the talents and spirit with which it was pursued) may well be conceived to be a change in the speculative system, but no change in the temper or in the moral feelings. This evil, great as it is, seems to me to be very possible; that it has actually happened in the case of any individual I would not positively assert; but the intemperate zeal usually found in proselytes is, in circumstances like these, hardly to be avoided. *To be zealously affected in a good thing* is, indeed, a state of mind recommended by a very high authority, but the connexion in which the recommendation stands makes it extremely obvious that the diffusion of opinions merely speculative was not the good thing in the contemplation of the writer.

But without zeal (it may be asked) what great good has ever been effected in the way of reforming a corrupted religion? — While I admit the necessity of zeal, I admit the necessity of a right direction of it, and of a right

necessity of zeal in this important work, I would remark that changes the most beneficial to mankind have been brought about by actions and characters which we would by no means propose as models for imitation. Luther did much more towards rescuing Europe from the debasing chains of superstition and imposture than Erasmus either performed or approved; but this is totally unconnected with any opinion we may be led to form of the personal qualities and Christian dispositions and virtues of these great men.

As connected with the zeal and animation of the pupils of the new Unitarian school may be considered their fondness for assembling together for the purposes of praying, preaching, eating, drinking, toasting, &c. with all the concomitant exhibition of eloquence whether sacred or convivial. Far be it from me, Mr. Editor, who am an old recluse, wishing indeed well to the world, but not mixing in it, to blame or ridicule the social enjoyments of enlightened men; but I conceive the great cause of the diffusion of religious truth is not likely to be much assisted by these means. The *sociétés ambulantes* of our modern heretics, their visitations at different places in a district in succession, their public preachings and advertised festivities, accord all with that reserve and modesty which is most suitable to the introduction of unpopular notions into a large community, of which a great majority are either hostile or indifferent. Public attention may, indeed, be somewhat excited, and occasional recruits are doubtless obtained to extend the ranks of the societies alluded to; but it may be questioned whether any number worth mentioning have been induced by these public efforts to review calmly the foundation of their religious belief, to discard former prejudices and to adopt from conviction the system recommended by an apparatus, of which it may be truly said that the expence and show of it are much more obvious than the utility, and by which persons of reflection and moderation, who are of a different way of thinking, are extremely disgusted. It is not at all unlikely that some very respectable individuals may be thus irrecoverably lost to the cause, and it is next to certain that the tongues of not a few controversial combatants have been thus let loose to its very great injury and disgrace. We

must be careful to distinguish between an actual change of sentiment and stating from orthodoxy to the belief and profession of Unitarianism, and the mere enrolment of names of such as were previously Unitarians in the list of the associated members. The former only is of any consequence. The number and importance of conversions of this description accomplished by the efforts of Unitarian societies travelling from place to place is a question of fact, which perhaps might be ascertained without much difficulty, but which, until ascertained, it would be impertinent to discuss on merely conjectural grounds.

To Unitarian missionary-preaching conducted on a proper plan, such as that of the able and eminent Mr. Wright and others, I should be disposed to ascribe much more of useful efficacy. Certainly many congregations professing Unitarianism have been lately formed, and their number seems to be increasing; but whether the individuals composing them have been reclaimed from an opposite system, or, having experienced some deflection from a faith not very dissimilar, have merely assumed a different name, I have no means of determining. Whatever the fact may be, I conceive that if a late very distinguished advocate of our common Christianity has reference to Unitarians in the following sentence, very few of that description of heretics will be able to read it without a smile. Speaking of Sir Isaac Newton and his theology, Dr. Chalmers * says, "I do not think that, amid the distraction and engrossment of his other pursuits, he has at all times succeeded in his interpretation of the book; else he would never, in my apprehension, have abetted the leading doctrine of a sect or a system, which has now nearly dwindled away from public observation."

The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say lo, here, or lo, there. I have long persuaded myself that the same may be said of religious truth; and this persuasion has led me to view without alarm the apparently rapid growth of absurdity and intolerance assuming the titles of *evangelical Christianity, vital religion, &c. &c.* and not without pain the

of Heresies of Discourses on the Christian Religion viewed in Connection with the Modern Astronomy. Preface, pp. 7, 8.

quickness and ostentation of some late attempts to render an opposite system of speculative doctrines popular.

Happening to live on terms of familiarity with several persons zealously attached to the communion of the Church of England, I have no hesitation in affirming that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, they shew the marks and bear the fruits of pure and undefiled religion in as eminent a degree as can any where be found, at least if we agree with the Apostle James in his definition of these terms [chap. i. ver. 27]. Persons of this description have a claim to much consideration and respect. Many of them, holding the institutions of their forefathers in great veneration, are afraid to inquire, lest they should find cause to give them up as indefensible. I conceive that much tenderness is due to these worthy but mistaken individuals. To liberate them from speculative error and from the slavery of prejudices, which, when pursued to their consequences, must materially injure their mental peace, is a most desirable object. Now this object is set at an immeasurable distance by the language and deportment of several modern champions of the Unitarian faith, who, when they cannot persuade, appear to think that they have done something by producing irritation and alarm. If they entertain the hope of spreading their heresy through the world by dint of numbers and physical force, their plan of operation, although not very promising, might be considered as not wholly unsuitable to the end in view, inasmuch as the generality of mankind are more disposed to yield to vehemence than to any other attribute or quality in a speaker or writer; but on the supposition of a different object, it is of all others the least likely to succeed. The means that are best fitted to infuse into the minds of moderate and well-informed lay-members of the Church of England an attachment to the pure and simple doctrines of the New Testament, and to rescue them from the influence of a priesthood either on the one hand fanatical, and, from principle, intolerant, or, on the other, secular and crafty, are also the means most likely of bringing them to the adoption and profession of Unitarian principles, and ultimately of diffusing these through the land, and, by inevitable consequence, of sweeping

out the rubbish and defilements which disgrace the national church. This, from the nature of the thing, must be a process requiring time, moderation and caution; but its effects will have that lasting character which belongs to things of slow growth: very ill-suited, however, it is to that intemperate zeal which it is the object of this paper to deprecate.

There is another form which modern Unitarianism assumes in some particular cases, and which to many persons is peculiarly revolting: I mean when it exhibits itself in alliance with certain political characters whom I know not how more correctly or less offensively to designate than by calling them *ultra-reformists*. Any distinct specification of the principles of these politicians would be here altogether superfluous. It is sufficient to say that a subversion of the present order of things and the complete subjugation of those who govern by those who are governed, if not the actual object of these political theorists, would be the certain result of their success. A decided hostility either to the laws and institutions of their country, or to the authorities by which they are framed and executed, is their essential character. Even in your pages, Mr. Editor, abounding as they are in much better things, I perceive evident marks of kindness towards two personages, of whom few impartial men can bring themselves to believe, that if either of them wielded a despotic sceptre, he would exercise his talents and his power in advancing the cause of civil freedom, genuine religion, or public or private virtue. That those philanthropists who neglect no opportunity of deprecating war between states and communities, and vehemently denouncing its authors and abettors, should be at the same time the panegyrists of *Bonaparte*, is not a little inconsistent and surprising: nor is it less so that the disciples and admirers of Dr. Priestley, and the assertors of religious liberty, should forget the *Peter Porcupine* of 1794, and tolerate the *William Cobbett* of later fame.

It, as has been suspected, certain Unitarian ministers of the modern school, and of its latest discipline, have been desirous of propagating their religious faith with a view more widely to disseminate their political principles

among the inferior classes of society. I cannot easily find terms sufficiently strong to express my disapprobation of the employment of such means to such an end. In place of seeking for terms which, if found and applied, might be deemed opprobrious, I would remind the persons in question that, as our Divine Master disclaimed for himself and his immediate followers the possession of temporal power, he certainly never meant to encourage in the future teachers of his religion any attempts to dispossess those who actually hold it. Christianity admits of no connexion with politics, except that it enjoins that every soul be subject to the higher powers, and that supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

AN OLD UNITARIAN.

Archdeacon Hook's Charge.

THE *Monthly Review* is happily waking up from its long theological slumber. The Number for April contains a very just and spirited review of an effusion of bigotry in form of a Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Huntingdon, by the Rev. James Hook, LL.D. F.R.S. S.A. If the same spirit which animates this article had pervaded the later volumes of this long-established and respectable Journal, the proprietor would not have had such good reason to lament the withdrawal of the patronage of the public.

It appears that Dr. Hook complains of the prevalence of *Antinomianism*, meaning by that term strict Calvinism. This leads the reviewer to refer the learned divine to some of the articles of his own Church, which contain the very doctrines which he reprobates. On this subject the following passage is worthy of notice:

"Some theological doctrines, which have made a prominent figure in other communions besides those of the Churches of Geneva and Rome, have a strong tendency to relax the force of moral obligation, and to scatter perplexity and confusion over the whole region of ethics. Yet truth and falsehood, humanity and cruelty, are not matters of mere arbitrary convention."

but have fixed and immutable lines of difference.—What should we think of a moral code which represented the purest and most beneficent virtues as owing all their claim to approbation, not to their motives or their effects, but to a reflection of splendour from some remote and foreign source? What is the first sentiment which rushes on the unsophisticated mind, when the most flagitious enormities are represented as transmuted into high moral qualities by the agonies of extraneous innocence? What could we say of the justice or mercy of that government, which should condemn such a hero as the Duke of Wellington to a lingering death, in order to expiate the cowardice of all the recreants in the land; or which should sentence such a philanthropist as Howard to the rack or the gallows, as the fittest mode of effecting the purification of all the thieves and prostitutes in the empire? What motives to patriotic courage could be furnished by such an act as the first, or to a diffusive beneficence by the last? In fixing the criterion of right and wrong, we should never outrage the common sentiments of mankind; which will be found to merit more attention than all the mystic jargon of visionaries or polemics, to whatever party they may belong.

Another part of the zealous divine's Charge is directed against a class of people whom he calls *liberalists*. Amongst these are included the supporters of *Bible Societies* and the unfortunate *Unitarians*, who are as much as tythes in the dreams of the clergy. With regard to them, the Archdeacon piously bewails the repeal of the Act which subjected them to corporal penalties, mingling with his lamentations a strong expression of sympathy with Bishop Burgess, poor man, who having written against these misbelievers has been answered by them! The passage is a curiosity and should be preserved:

“Vice (says the learned dignitary) is without odium and virtue without attraction, when viewed through the equalizing medium of what is called *liberality*; a term which in its present application has no fixed or determinate meaning, but which involves in its operation” [the two last sets of italics are not the divine's] “the confusion of all principles and the encouragement of all errors. A solemn act of the le-

gisature has removed the veil which our ancestors considered necessary to exclude from the public eye the licentiousness of blasphemy against the Son of God; and hence” [the italics again are not to be ascribed to the Archdeacon] “a learned and distinguished prelate has been libelled and arraigned for supporting the dignity of our Saviour in the discharge of one of his most important functions, against the *Scripture-mutilations*” [once more the Archdeacon of Huntingdon must be exonerated from responsibility for the italics] “of the promoters and abettors of Socinianism.”

SIR, Clapton, May 15, 1817.

I CANNOT withhold from you an additional circumstance, which came to my knowledge several years since, respecting *Jewel*, mentioned in the note (p. 200) of your last number.—While in Chelmsford Jail, awaiting the vengeance of our sanguinary jurisprudence, he was visited by a friend of mine, from motives of Christian compassion. To him the unhappy misguided man recounted the great kindnesses of Mr. Vidler, and confessed the unworthy return he had prepared for his benefactor, to whom I once related the story, which could not fail to interest him.

I am now convinced that Mr. Palmer (p. 204) was correct in his account, and that Mr. Muir and his associates were conveyed on board the *Surprize* hand-cuffed. This appears from additional papers which I have very lately examined, and which may enable me to offer some further contributions to your department of *Original Letters*. Mr. Palmer appears to have been sent on board the ship alone, and not to have been hand-cuffed. There was probably some consideration of his clerical character, in compliment to the *Alliance between Church and State*.

I take this opportunity of informing the subscribers to Dr. Priestley's Theological Works, that the number of subscriptions having reached very nearly 200, I have determined, *Deo volente*, to proceed immediately, and I trust the first volume will be in the press before this notice can appear. On account of the customary rates of printing, the number of sets must be confined strictly to 250, unless, which cannot now be

expected, the subscriptions should increase considerably beyond that number. I must therefore request any who may still be desirous of subscribing, to write immediately to me at Clapton, Middlesex, or to Mr. G. Smallfield, Printer, Homerton, lest subscriptions should be received for more than the 50 copies yet unappropriated. The list of subscribers will, now, accompany the edition.

I shall be thankful for any assistance towards the literary execution of the design which I have ventured to undertake; and request such communications as early as possible.

J. T. RUTT.

SIR,

May 4th, 1817.

AS your work is so peculiarly devoted to Unitarian literature, I would earnestly recommend to such of your correspondents as are acquainted with German writers, to favour us through the medium of it, with accounts of the most celebrated Antitrinitarian authors in that language, who, I understand, are neither few nor small. There are two in particular of whom I wish to know something, viz. *Eberhard* and *Basedow*, and I shall be sincerely obliged to any one who will inform me of the particulars of their lives and works in an early number.

E.

SIR,

Tenterden, May 7, 1817.

PERMIT me to inquire whether there is any probability that the *Life of Dr. Caleb Fleming* will be introduced into your Repository. If not, although I should much wish it to be drawn up by some person more competent than myself, I am inclined, with the assistance of some materials sent me by one of the Doctor's relations, to undertake it; as it has been already much too long withheld from the public. Dr. F. was a decided Unitarian, cotemporary with Dr. Lardner, with whom he lived on terms of the closest intimacy and friendship. They lived also only a few doors from each other in Hoxton Square. They were senior to Dr. Priestley both in years and Unitarianism, and with much satisfaction beheld his rising fame.

L. HOLDEN.

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

No. CCCII.

Original of Brandy and Gunpowder : a Fable.

THE government of the north being once upon a time vacant, the prince of the power of the air convened a council in Hell, wherein upon competition between two Demons of rank, it was determined they should both make trial of their abilities, and he should succeed who did most mischief. One made his appearance in the shape of Gunpowder, the other in that of Brandy. The former was a declared enemy and roared with a terrible noise, which made folks afraid and put them on their guard. The other passed as a friend and a physician through the world, disguised himself with sweets and perfumes and drugs, made his way into the ladies cabinets and the apothecaries shops, and under the notion of helping digestion, comforting the spirits and cheering the heart, produced direct contrary effects; and having insensibly thrown great numbers of humane kind into a lingering but fatal decay, was found to people Hell and the grave, so fast as to merit the government which he still possesses.

Minute Philos. Dial. II.

No. CCCIII.

Bon Mot of Dr. Savage's to George I.

Dr. Savage, who died Lecturer of St. George's, Hanover Square, had travelled in his younger days with the Earl of Salisbury, to whom he was indebted for a considerable living in Hertfordshire. He was a lively, pleasant, facetious old man. One day at the levee, George I. asked him how long he had stayed at Rome, with Lord Salisbury? Upon his answering how long, *Why*, said the king, *you stayed long enough, why did not you convert the Pope?* Because, Sir, replied he, *I had nothing better to offer him.*

This story is told by Bishop Newton (in his own Memoirs), who succeeded Dr. Savage in the Lectureship.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.

UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY IN SCOTLAND.

Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy. By Ralph Wardlaw, Minister of the Gospel, Glasgow. London, Longman and Co. 8vo. pp. 443.

A Vindication of Unitarianism, in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. By James Yates, M.A. London, Eaton. 8vo. pp. 276.

Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication: A Reply to the Rev. James Yates's Vindication of Unitarianism. By Ralph Wardlaw. London, Longman and Co. 8vo. pp. 416.

A Sequel to "A Vindication of Unitarianism," in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Treatise, entitled, Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication. By the Author of the Vindication. Liverpool, Robinsons. Eaton, London. 8vo. pp. 156.

A FEW years ago there was not only no religious society in Scotland in which public worship was conducted on Unitarian principles, but there was scarcely, it is said, an avowed Unitarian in that country. When a chapel was erected in Glasgow, dedicated to the worship of One God the Father, the worshippers of a "triple God" were alarmed; the kirks and chapels resounded with invectives against heresies and heretics and blasphemies and blasphemers, and when the heretic who opened the chapel, published his sermon, containing a statement of the Unitarian doctrine, the faithful of all denominations were extremely scandalized. They were indignant that "the leading doctrines of Christianity were openly impugned and denied," it being always taken for granted, by those persons, that the leading doctrines of Christianity and the leading doctrines of Trinitarianism and Calvinism are different expressions for the same thing. Mr. Wardlaw in particular, who is the minister of a Dissenting

congregation in Glasgow, felt his spirit stirred within him; and having had from an entirely different cause, his thoughts directed towards the principal points of the Socinian controversy, and at this very time, revolving various subjects for a series of Monthly Sabbath Evening Discourses, he thought it would be a criminal dereliction of duty, to neglect this opportunity of extirpating, root and branch, the horrid heresy which was beginning to grow up amongst them; especially as it is not consistent with the laws and customs of Britain, in the present age, to pull down the chapels of heretics as soon as they are erected, or to burn them and their temples together, with fires kindled by their own books. Alas! that the good Bishop of St. David's and the Very Reverend the Dean of Cork should have so much occasion to lament, that they are as persons born out of due time!

Mr. Wardlaw accordingly delivered a series of Monthly Sabbath Evening Discourses, on the principal points of the Socinian controversy, which were afterwards published; in answer to which, Mr. Yates wrote his Vindication of Unitarianism. After a considerable refreshment from the battle, Mr. Wardlaw again comes forward, defiance on his brow, brandishing his arms with a more terrible fury and determined to prove, or perish in the attempt, that Unitarianism is Incapable of Vindication. Mr. Yates calmly marches out to meet his irritated antagonist, and his own account of the result is told very simply and briefly in the Sequel to the Vindication.

Such is the history of this controversy. The important question whether it be the duty of Christians to worship One God the Father, or "One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance," is here debated with great ability. The leading arguments on each side are acutely stated and forcibly urged, and these volumes, which are of a moderate bulk, afford any person who will take the trouble to peruse them with

attention and impartiality, the means of forming an enlightened judgment on the most important controversy which has ever been agitated among Christians, and of which every intelligent Christian ought to be ashamed to be ignorant.

In our notice of these publications we shall endeavour to enable the reader to form a correct opinion of the scope of the arguments they contain and of the manner in which they are conducted, not so much with a view of superseding the necessity of his reading the works themselves, as of exciting him to a careful perusal of them; for if he have not thoroughly investigated the subject of which they treat, and if it be his wish that his religious opinions should be the result of conviction, his leisure moments may be very profitably employed in this study.

Mr. Wardlaw's volume contains twelve Discourses: 1. On the Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. 2—5. On the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ. 6. On the Test of Truth in Matters of Religion. 7. On the Doctrine of Atonement. 8. On the Practical Influence of the Doctrine of Atonement. 9. On the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Spirit. 10, 11. On the Influences of the Holy Spirit. 12. On the Christian Character.

This plan includes several interesting subjects, which do not particularly bear upon the controversy between the Unitarian and the Trinitarian. Mr. Yates, however, strictly confines himself to the discussion of the points in dispute, between the worshipper of One God the Father, and the worshipper of "one Godhead, containing three distinct substances, denominated for the want of a better word, persons—the Father, the Son or Word, and the Holy Spirit." Cheerfully, and from a conviction of its justice, according the name of Unitarian to every person who believes that there is One only God the Father, and that religious adoration ought to be paid to him alone, Mr. Yates still farther narrows the scope of the controversy, by confining his argument to the establishment of two great truths, the evidence of which, from the Scriptures, he contends is overwhelming; namely, that there is but

One only God, One individual Being, without a distinction of persons, commonly designated in the New Testament by the term Father, and that whatever power and glory Jesus Christ possessed, he derived from this Being who is styled his God and Father. The minor questions relative to the pre-existence of Christ, his creation of the world, &c. he leaves to be settled by Unitarians themselves after they are agreed in these first great principles. In like manner, Mr. Yates declines entering on the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement, "because the Calvinistic view of atonement, according to Mr. Wardlaw's own confession, falls with the doctrine of our Saviour's Supreme Divinity;" and on the influences of the Holy Spirit, "because it is enough to observe, that they proceed throughout upon a misrepresentation of Unitarianism." This plan of restriction has evidently been adopted from a wish to fix the attention of the reader on the main questions to be decided in this controversy; and though it is not without inconvenience, since truth is never seen to such advantage as when the whole of it is clearly stated and boldly defended, yet considering how little the public mind in Scotland has been directed to inquiries of this nature, it is perhaps upon the whole a judicious choice.

Mr. Yates divides his work into three parts. The first part contains a statement of the general principles to be followed in investigating the truth of religious doctrines, together with some observations on the regard paid to the Scriptures by Unitarians; on the proper method of ascertaining the sense of Scripture and on the propriety of believing in mysteries. In the second part the opinions and arguments of Unitarians concerning the Unity of God, the subordination of Jesus Christ and the use of the terms Holy Spirit and Spirit of God in the Scriptures, are adduced; and the third part contains an examination of the objections by which Mr. Wardlaw has attempted to invalidate the Unitarian opinions.

Mr. Yates commences his examination of Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses with bearing the following generous testimony to the worthy motives by which his opponent has been actuated,

and the superior ability with which he has executed the task he has undertaken:

"Having heard Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses with great interest, and afterwards read them with great care, I have found much to admire, but nothing to change my conviction of the strict Unity of God and the subordination of Jesus Christ. I have no doubt that the delivery of them proceeded from laudable motives. It gives me great pleasure to express the approbation due to the eloquence with which they are composed and the powers of reasoning which they display. I heartily join in the universal confession that the Trinitarian system could not have been more ably defended. Mr. Wardlaw has shown peculiar judgment in confining himself to those arguments which have usually been considered as clear and decisive, instead of bringing forward all the passages of Scripture which have been conceived to bear remotely upon the subject, and by insisting upon which other advocates have weakened the cause they intended to support. Whilst I have been pleased with the ingenuity and alertness displayed in defending points of difficult and abstract speculation, I have been edified by the useful observations of a practical nature which are scattered through the volume, and which I would hope may redeem it from oblivion, when men have learned to value plain truths pertaining to life and godliness, above what is mysterious and inexplicable."

—H. 3.

Having thus acknowledged his excellencies, Mr. Yates states, in language equally unreserved, what appears to him to be his opponents defects:

"Mr. Wardlaw affirms solemnly (p. 99), that his only object is TRUTH; and doubtless the defence of the Calvinistic doctrines which he believes to be true, was his only object. But there is a wide difference between defending a particular system, previously assumed as true, and pursuing truth independently of system—a difference, which will materially affect the manner in which a man states his own doctrines and views the arguments of others. Mr. Wardlaw's whole style and language in this controversy show, that he has never put his mind into that state of calm and impartial deliberation, which is necessary to collect and arrange the proofs on either side and to judge in favour of which opinion the evidence preponderates. On the contrary he has set out with a bold, undaunted and impetuous zeal for a certain system; and believing

this system to be true, and that with its establishment and progress are connected the glory of God and the salvation of men, (Preface, p. iii.) he exerts his utmost powers to impress it upon the mind, and labours to fortify his argument by bringing out all the images and strong expressions, all the affecting and solemn tones, all the facts and allusions, all the faults and errors of his opponents, by which he can strike his hearers with astonishment and horror at the folly, the blindness, the perverseness of those who refuse to be converted by such brilliant and decisive evidence. That an orthodox preacher should have recourse to those expedients, in order to rouse the languid conviction of his own flock, may be perfectly proper; but they are utterly subversive of that temper of cool, patient and unbiassed investigation, which may be expected in one, who makes it his simple and exclusive object to ascertain truth. We find also in Mr. Wardlaw's volume a kind of *management* and *generalship* which a votary of truth would scorn. Having very few proofs to adduce, he makes the best use of what he has, brings them forward many different times, dwells upon them at great length, turns them about and shews them in the most pleasing variety of lights. Yet, lest after all they should fail to make a sufficient impression, he takes care to inform his hearers, that these are only a *specimen* of what he might have brought forward; the passages, which contain his doctrine are so numerous, that he would weary their patience and exceed his own strength, if he were to produce them all, and hence he is obliged to select a few of the more prominent. This 'PRINCIPLE OF SELECTION,' as Mr. Wardlaw calls it, I fear, I shall have frequent occasion to expose, and to shew that where he professes merely to bring out a sample, he has nearly or entirely exhausted his store."

We cannot pass over the chapter on mysteries with which the introductory part of Mr. Yates's work concludes, without earnestly recommending it to the attention of all our readers whether learned or unlearned, orthodox or heterodox. No one who attends to it can afterwards be perplexed with the mysteries of the New Testament, or be for a moment deceived by the unmeaning declamation in which it is so common to indulge on this subject; and the object of which always is, to place a belief in contradictions and impossibilities on the same footing as a belief in mysteries.

Mr. Wardlaw in his first Discourse on the Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, from Deut. vi. 4, "*Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,*" adduces the following evidence, that the hypothesis he maintains is indeed the doctrine of Scripture:

"I would first of all observe that while the text as it stands in our English translation, appears simply to affirm the unity of God, it affirms it according to the proper import of the words in the original language, in connection with the plurality of persons in the Godhead.—Hear, O Israel, JEHOVAH, our Gods (ALEM) is ONE JEHOVAH. Unity and plurality are here both asserted, and the plurality is emphatically declared to be consistent with the unity. The use of a plural noun for God, in the Hebrew language, and the construction of that noun with other nouns and with verbs and pronouns, sometimes in the singular number and sometimes in the plural, have often been noticed as remarkable anomalies, and these anomalies or irregularities are at the same time connected on some occasions with particular modes of expression, such as seem to be utterly unaccountable on any other principle than that of a plurality of persons in the Divine Unity. For example: in Gen. i. 26, Jehovah is represented as saying, with regard to the creation of man, '*Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.*' It is worthy of notice, that while in the declaration of the Divine purpose, '*God said let us make man in our image,*' terms are employed expressive of plurality, the style of unity is resumed, in the record of the execution of the purpose, '*So God created man in his image; in the image of God created he him.*' Not unfrequently, however, this name itself in the plural, is associated in syntax with verbs, adjectives and pronouns in the same number. For example: '*Ye cannot serve Jehovah: for he is a holy God:*' the adjective *holy* as well as the name of God, is in the original in the plural number. '*Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth.*' In the Hebrew '*thy Creators.*' '*Thy maker is thy husband, Jehovah of hosts is his name.*' Both the nouns *maker* and *husband* are plural, *thy makers, thy husbands, &c.*'—Pp. 11, 12, 14, 15.

"Then after stating that a variety of other proofs might be adduced, such as,—"*And now the LORD GOD and HIS SPIRIT hath sent me,*" "*Seek ye out of the book of the Lord and read, for My mouth it hath commanded and HIS SPIRIT it hath gathered them,*"

and giving up without hesitation the celebrated passage in 1 John v. 7, Mr. Wardlaw proceeds—

"I shall confine myself at present to a few remarks on two passages only. The first is the form of baptism prescribed by our Lord to his apostles, immediately before he left the world, and which you will find in the nineteenth verse of the twenty-eighth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew:—'*Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*' On the very first aspect of this text, it seems most unreasonable to suppose that the One true God is here associated with two of his creatures: or with one of his creatures and an attribute or energy or mode of operation. It appears to me that the simple statement of such an interpretation should be sufficient to ensure its immediate and unqualified rejection."—Pp. 16, 17.

The second passage is the form of apostolical benediction used in the conclusion of the second Epistle of the Corinthians—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all! Amen." That this form of blessing includes in it a prayer, it would be a waste of words to prove. To whom then is this prayer addressed? Had it been simply said, the love of God be with you all! Amen, no one I suppose would have hesitated to say that when the apostle thus expressed himself, he presented in his heart a petition to the Father of mercies for the manifestations of his love to the believers at Corinth. On what principle of criticism then are we to interpret the expression "*the grace or favour of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" an expression so precisely the same in form, in a different sense? in a sense that does not imply Jesus Christ's being the object of a similar inward aspiration? And the same question might be asked, with regard to the remaining phrase, "*the communion of the Holy Spirit.*"—P. 18.

Such are the proofs on which Mr. Wardlaw rests the doctrine of the Trinity; and considering what that doctrine really is, namely, that there are in the Godhead three distinct and infinite minds and therefore three distinct persons; that these three distinct and infinite minds or persons are each truly and properly God, and yet that

there is properly and truly but One only God, the evidence here adduced of this wondrous doctrine is to be sure overwhelming: yet Mr. Yates, unconvinced and unappalled, thus replies—

“If this translation (Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Gods is one Jehovah) had been proposed by a Unitarian, I have no doubt it would have been said, that he did it with a direct intention to *burlesque the Scriptures*. I believe that Mr. Wardlaw had not this design; but his version certainly produces this effect. To my mind nothing can sound more offensive. I do not however reject this argument from the force of mere feelings, however justifiable, but from the following considerations: 1. If the plural termination of ALEIM, &c. indicates plurality at all, it denotes not only a plurality of persons or subsistences, but a plurality of Gods, for on this supposition, Mr. Wardlaw's translation is undoubtedly correct, *Jehovah our Gods*. But this I presume is more than even Trinitarians will be inclined to admit. 2. I observe, secondly, that the true explanation of the use of the plural number in this case is known to every tyro in Hebrew literature. The whole mystery may be resolved by a short quotation from that useful book, the Hebrew Grammar:

“Words that express dominion, dignity, majesty, are commonly put in the plural.” —Wilson's Hebrew Grammar, p. 270.

“Thus it is evident to mere English readers, that the plural termination of the Hebrew names for God, far from being an *anomaly* as Mr. Wardlaw calls it, is agreeable to a common rule of syntax. I shall illustrate this rule by a few examples. Gen. xxiv. 9, 10. On account of the great dignity and authority of the patriarch Abraham, the word ADONIM, translated *master*, is put in the plural number. The literal translation of the passage is therefore as follows: ‘And the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his masters, and sware to him concerning that matter: and the servant took ten camels of the camels of his masters and departed; for all the goods of his masters were in his hand.’ Potiphar is called the masters or lords of Joseph. Pharaoh is styled the lords of his butler and baker, and Joseph as governor of Egypt, is denominated ADONIM or lords. What then becomes of Mr. Wardlaw's argument from the Hebrewism, ‘If I be masters, where is my fear?’ 8. The plural termination is employed in speaking not only of the true God, but also of false deities. Exod. xxxii. 3, 4—7, 8. 1st. Judges viii. 22. xxi. 22, 24, &c. &c.

4. This argument has been rejected by many of the most learned Trinitarians. Among others Calvin himself denies that the plural termination is any evidence of the plurality of persons in the Godhead.

“Mr. Wardlaw argues for a plurality of persons in the Godhead, from the construction of the Hebrew names for God, which verbs are sometimes in the singular number and sometimes in the plural. He calls this construction an anomaly or irregularity. But those who have learned Hebrew know that when a plural noun is used to denote a *single* object (which is the case in various instances), the verb is sometimes put in the plural out of regard merely to the plural termination of the noun. See Patrick and Le Clerc on Gen. xx. 4. 8.”—Pp. 135, 136, 138.

Our limits will not allow us to follow Mr. Yates in his reply to the other arguments adduced by Mr. Wardlaw in proof of a plurality of persons in the Godhead. The passages we have quoted exhibit a perfectly fair specimen of its style and manner. To us it appears to be most satisfactory and complete throughout.

Mr. Wardlaw thus represents the importance of his own view of the person of Christ:

“If it be indeed a truth that Jesus Christ is GOD OVER ALL, it is utterly impossible that it can be a truth of subordinate magnitude. The simple statement of it is enough to shew that it must rank as a *first principle*—an article of prime importance—a foundation stone in the temple of truth—a star of the very first magnitude in the hemisphere of Christian doctrine. For my own part I believe it to be even more than this; a kind of central sun, around which the whole system of Christianity in all its glory and in all its harmony revolves. This view of its importance is confirmed when we consider it in connection with our most interesting and solemn duties, I mean the duties which we owe to the great Object of supreme reverence, worship and obedience. If Jesus Christ be not God, then we, who offer to him that homage of our hearts which is due to God alone, are without doubt guilty of *idolatry*, as really guilty as the worshippers of the deified heroes of Greece and Rome.

“The same thing is manifest from the intimate relation which this doctrine bears to others. It is an integral part of a system of truths which stand or fall along with it. It is connected, for example, in the closest manner, with the purpose of Christ's appearance upon earth and the

great design of his sufferings and death; that is, with the vitally important doctrine of *atonement*; this doctrine, again, is inseparably connected with the corruption of human nature and the universal guilt of mankind; from which it is that the necessity of such atonement arises: this, in its turn, essentially affects the question, respecting the ground of a sinner's acceptance with God; the necessity of the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit; the principle and motive of all acceptable obedience, and other points of similar consequence. It is very obvious that two systems, on which the sentiments on subjects such as these are in direct opposition, cannot with any propriety be confounded together under one common name. That both should be Christianity is impossible; else Christianity is a term which distinguishes nothing. Viewing the matter abstractedly, and without affirming, for the present, what is truth and what is error, this I think I may with confidence affirm, that to call schemes so opposite in all their great articles by a common appellation is more absurd, than it would be to confound together those two irreconcilable theories of astronomy, of which the one places the earth and the other the sun, in the centre of the planetary system. They are in truth *essentially different religions*."—Pp. 31—33.

The great principle on which Mr. Wardlaw endeavours to establish the doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, as well as a man, the creature and servant of God is, that it affords the most easy and complete reconciliation of the passages of Scripture, relative to his person, which appear to contradict each other, and the fairest solution of the difficulties which thence arise; that it is "a key which fits all the wards of this seemingly intricate lock, turning amongst them with hardly a touch of interruption, catching its bolts and laying open to us in the easiest and completest manner the treasures of Divine truth." But then, before this wonder-working hypothesis can be admitted, it must be established by the clearest evidence—evidence rising in magnitude in proportion to the extraordinary nature of the doctrine it is intended to confirm: it can never be adopted from a *bare inference* deduced from a comparison of one set of passages with another, especially if those passages can be reconciled in an easy and simple manner without having recourse to any extraordinary suppo-

sition whatever. Such an hypothesis can only be admitted on its being demonstrated that the authors of those apparently contradictory passages had it in their mind, and employed it as a key which fitted all the wards of this seemingly intricate lock. This every candid and intelligent believer of the divine and human natures of Christ must admit. Where then we demand is this clear and certain evidence that the writers of the New Testament were acquainted with this wonderful key, and that they constantly turned it in this intricate lock with hardly a touch of interruption, thus catching its bolts and laying open in the easiest and clearest manner the treasures of Divine truth?

There is one passage in Mr. Yates's work on this subject which we do not see how it is possible to get over:

"All Trinitarians believe that Jesus Christ was but *one person*, although possessing *two natures*. Their doctrine is, that one of the three infinite minds in the Godhead was so united to a human soul, as to form one intelligent being, retaining the properties both of the God and of the man. By the *nature* of any thing we always mean its *qualities*. When therefore it is said that Jesus Christ possessed both a Divine and a human nature, it must be meant that he possesses both the qualities of God and the qualities of man. But if we consider what those qualities are, we perceive them to be totally incompatible with one another. The qualities of God are *eternity, independence, immutability, entire and perpetual exemption from pain and death, omniscience and omnipotence*. The qualities of man are *derived existence, dependence, liability to change, to suffering and to dissolution, comparative weakness and ignorance*. To maintain therefore that the same mind is endued both with a Divine and a human nature, is to maintain that the *same mind* is both *created and uncreated*, both *finite and infinite*, both *dependent and independent*, both *changeable and unchangeable*, both *mortal and immortal*, both *susceptible of pain and incapable of it*, both *able to do all things and not able*, both *acquainted with all things and not acquainted with them*, both *ignorant of certain subjects and possessed of the most intimate knowledge of them*. If it be not certain that, such a doctrine as this is false, there is no certainty upon any subject. It is vain to call it a *mystery*; it is an *absurdity*, it is an *impossibility*."—P. 160.

Mr. Wardlaw states that the doctrine

for which he contends is, that Jesus Christ is truly God; that in his person there subsisted when he was on earth and still subsists an union of the Divine and human natures; and after observing that our only business is with the fact and not with the mode of the fact, he says, "This is a question with regard to which it is manifest our appeal must be made exclusively to the sacred volume. The sole inquiry is, What saith the Scripture?" On reading this passage, we hoped that the direct and positive Scriptural evidence of the alleged fact, that in the person of Jesus Christ there subsisted, when he was on earth, and still subsists an union of the Divine and human natures, was about to be adduced: that the intimate knowledge and constant use of the writers of the New Testament of this wondrous key was about to be placed beyond all dispute by citations from their own writings. But instead of this, Mr. Wardlaw merely produces in a string, the passages which are commonly quoted to prove the Divinity of Christ, together with several which at most only favour the doctrine of his pre-existence, without troubling himself in the least to shew, how these texts establish the grand principle, that in his person there subsisted, when he was on earth, and still subsists, a union of the Divine and human natures; or attempting to prove that the authors of those passages had this hypothesis in their view when they wrote them: and yet without this, as we have already shewn, Mr. Wardlaw would not have advanced a single step towards the establishment of his doctrine, were these passages a hundred times more numerous and a hundred times more clear and decisive than they really are.

But the passages adduced are totally inadequate to establish the doctrine of the proper Deity of Christ, and this in our opinion Mr. Yates has completely shewn. We intended to have proved that this conviction is well-founded, by exhibiting an abstract of the arguments adduced on each side, but of this we find the limits which we must prescribe to ourselves will by no means allow. We can therefore only exhort those of our readers who feel an interest in the subject (and we hope many of them do feel an interest in it) to read with attention and can-

dour what these able disputants have advanced on this most important topic. He who confines his attention to one side of the question (provided he has not already made himself thoroughly acquainted with it, and in that case if he consult what is advanced on either side, it will be on that which is opposed to his own), must be either too proud to be taught or too ignorant to be aware that he is ill-informed or too conscious of the instability of his own system to allow him to contemplate an attack of it with steadiness and composure. Though we are firmly of opinion that the great doctrines that there is but One God, the Father, to whom alone religious adoration ought to be paid; and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who, though honoured as no other being ever was, yet owes all his dignity and power to the favour of the Supreme and only Potentate, and holds it for the advancement of the wise and gracious purposes of his Providence, are truths of primary importance; and are persuaded, that even the benevolent influences of the gospel will never be felt as they may and will ultimately be experienced, until these doctrines are generally and cordially embraced: still we endeavour to remember, that this conviction, firm and undoubting as it is, may possibly be founded on inadequate or fallacious evidence; and therefore sincerely and earnestly wish our fellow-Christians to examine for themselves, with the utmost impartiality and diligence, both sides of this important controversy. If we know any thing of the feelings of our hearts, we are more desirous that converts should be made to the truth, than to our own peculiar opinions; and this appears to us to be a zeal of proselytism which every enlightened Christian must be anxious to cherish, and it is the only one he can cherish. Let every one read, compare, reflect under the solemn impression, that the eye of God is on him; and that he must give an account of the improvement he has made, of the means of gaining religious information, no less than of any other talent committed to his charge. Let him rise from his studies, if he can, thoroughly persuaded in his own mind; but whether his conviction be unhesitating and firm, or whether doubts and difficul-

ties perplex him, let him see to it, that there be in his heart no bitterness, no animosity, no uncharitable, no unfriendly feeling of any sort: this he can help and this he must help, or whatever knowledge he may possess of the person of Christ, it is certain he is destitute of his spirit: let his language, the dictate of his generous feeling be, "We are children of the same Father: we are disciples of the same Master: let us endeavour to enlighten each other: if possible, let us bring each other to the same opinions: but if this cannot be, let us at least agree to love one another and our heavenly Father and our heaven-inspired Master; and await the future light which shall be vouchsafed to us, with unfeigned gratitude for what we have already received, and with that best preparation for farther illumination, a heart the abode of charity, of meekness, of humility, of piety, of glowing affection, of active, unwearied, unbounded benevolence."

We must defer our notice of the other works at the head of this article, together with some observations which this controversy has suggested, to a future number.

S. S.

ART. II.—*A Lay Sermon, addressed to the Higher and Middle Classes, on the existing Distresses and Discontents.* By S. T. Coleridge, Esq. 8vo. pp. 166. Gale and Fenner. 1817.

THE "wandering bards," "Coleridge, Southey and Co." whom in 1798 the Anti-Jacobin represented as moving "in sweet accord of harmony and love" and tuning all their "mystic harps to praise Lepaux," the French Théo-philanthropist, are still consentaneous in their movements but their harps are tuned to another theme, the demerits of the Unitarians. These hard-headed Christians have little liking for fiction in the articles of their faith, and none for "mystic" rant, and hence they are singled out by the Lake poets for reprobation. It may be an amusing speculation whether the praise or the censure of these mystics will be accounted honourable half a century hence.

Mr. Coleridge laments, with his Holiness of Rome, that "we hear much in the present day of the plainness and

simplicity of the Christian religion," and that hence the necessity of believing in Christ is transformed "into a recommendation to believe him." This is we allow a hopeful beginning of the removal of Christian plainness and simplicity. The Lay-Preacher proceeds: "The advocates of the latter scheme grew out of a sect that were called Socinians, but having succeeded in disbelieving far beyond the last footmarks of the Socini, have chosen to designate themselves by the name of Unitarians." Is this writer, who lays claim to "all knowledge and all mysteries," really ignorant of the history of the sect which he denounces? Did he read none of their books and learn nothing of their early advocates when he was amongst them? During the time that he officiated as an Unitarian teacher at Shrewsbury and elsewhere, did he never look into the *Fratres Poloni* or any other of their standard volumes? But perhaps he has not only, like the Poet Laureate, "outgrown his opinions," but also, like Mr. Pitt, whom he and the Laureate cannot now be ashamed to resemble, lost the faculty of memory with regard to all past connections that do not flatter his present humour. Let us then remind this "some time" Unitarian preacher, that the term *Unitarian* is not of modern invention, nor a name of choice; that it is as old as the Reformation; that *Socinian* was always the epithet of an adversary; and that fair and honourable foes have for two centuries and a half spoken of such as believed in and worshipped One God in One Person as Unitarians. It is of no consequence therefore whether the word be etymologically correct; custom has assigned it a definite sense; it serves truly to designate the worshipper of One Divine Person in contradistinction from the Trinitarian who worships Three Divine Persons; and in this signification it will continue to be used when it shall have been forgotten that Mr. Coleridge was a Unitarian preacher, and the inquiry shall have ceased what arguments have transformed him into a Trinitarian layman.

"This is a word," says Mr. Coleridge, referring to the name of *Unitarian*, "which in its proper sense can belong only to their antagonists: for Unity or Union and indistinguishable *Unicity* or Oneness, are incompatible terms; while in the exclusive

sense in which they mean the name to be understood, it is a presumptuous boast and an uncharitable calumny." The Trinitarians will not thank the Lay-Preacher for this gloss: according to this exposition of terms, the Polytheist who believes in a number of Divine Persons united in one common nature is a proper Unitarian; and again, the orthodox believer in the Trinity is not a believer in the *Oneness* of God, though he may hold the Unity of the Deity, or the composition of parts in a whole. Such a comment as this was well preceded by a complaint of the Christian religion being erroneously supposed to be plain and simple.

"Their true designation," adds the Lay-Preacher of the Unitarians, amongst whom he is no longer numbered, "which simply expresses a fact admitted on all sides, would be that of *Psilanthropists*, or assertors of the mere humanity of Christ." Many a man has wished to christen the Unitarians anew; the name that our quondam preacher proposes is amongst the oddest that ingenuity or envy or bigotry has suggested, *Psilanthropists*, that is, if it may be Englished, *Mere-Humanists*. Passing by the *humour* of this nickname, we may remark it as rather singular that Mr. Coleridge should denominate a sect not from what they believe but from a part of that which they do not believe, and in his new *nomenclature* should overlook wholly that which they believe and carry into practice with regard to the great object of worship and which is in truth their only distinction. All Christians believe in the humanity of Christ; and no Christians that we are acquainted with profess to believe in the mere humanity of Christ. How would Mr. Coleridge have named the Apostle Peter, who preached "Jesus of Nazareth—a man—approved of God, by miracles, wonders and signs, which God did by him!" Yet the inventor of the memorable term *Psilanthropists* charges those that take the antient and universal name of *Unitarians*, in the sense of the believers in and worshippers of One God in One Person, with "a presumptuous boast and an uncharitable calumny."

"Wissowatius" and the *Fratres Poloni* are allowed to have been "undeniably men of learning;" but this cannot be said of divines that have long been

dead costs nothing, and it serves for a cover to the insinuation that since their time there have been no "learned Socinian divines." How base is the spirit of party! What stuff will not bigotry feed upon! Mr. Coleridge has withdrawn his stock of learning from the Unitarian church, and he affects to pity its intellectual poverty. Without him, however, the Unitarians have sufficient learning and vigour of mind to detect sophistry, to unmasque misrepresentation, to expose absurdity, though hidden in the trappings of mystic phrases, and to trace up the *odium theologicum* to its source in a disordered head or (in language which Mr. Coleridge may understand) an unregenerate heart.

The only other point on which we shall remark is the *creed* which the Lay-Preacher has fabricated for the Unitarians, and which shews his deplorable ignorance of the people whom he sets himself at once to reprove and instruct. His creed contains six articles, of which only three are Unitarian! The Unitarians believe, says their former friend, 1. In One God.—True. 2. In the necessity of human actions and in all remorse for sins being precluded by Christianity.—Not true. On this philosophical question there is as much diversity of opinion amongst the Unitarians as amongst other Christians. 3. In the Gospels and in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—True, and in the Epistles also, and in the "*inspiration*" of all these books as far as inspiration was necessary to constitute them an authentic revelation of the will of God. 4. In the resurrection of the body.—Not true. They differ widely as to what constitutes "the whole man," but they all agree in condemning the substitution of the *modern* notion of the resurrection of the *body* for the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the *man*. 5. In the final happiness of the righteous and the corrective punishment of the wicked.—Can this latter article of faith outrage the feelings of one who like our author professes a benign and bland philosophy? 6. In a redemption, but (as they hold that there is no moral difference in the actions and characters of men, and that men are not responsible beings, and as they merge all the attributes of Deity in Power, Intelligence and Benevolence, making nothing of the Holiness of God and representing his anger as a mere metaphor addressed

to a barbarous people) not by the cross of Christ.—Not true. The premises, including all the Unitarians, are absolutely false; the conclusion is false applied to any Unitarians. It is the peculiar doctrine of Unitarianism, because it is the peculiar doctrine of the New Testament, that Christ is *the way, the truth and the life*, that he is *the Saviour of the world*, and that the cross was the instrument and is the symbol of salvation.

"These," says Mr. Coleridge, with great faith in his reader, "are all the positives of the modern Socinian creed," and half of these are his own dreams. We might enlarge the number of Unitarian "positives," but the Lay-Preacher has succeeded so ill in creed-making that we are not tempted to follow his example. In this apocryphal creed appear two marked features of the author's mind; first, an incapacity of conceiving that a body of Christians should not be disciplined under the faith of a leader but should each think and judge for himself; and secondly, a secret persuasion that a creed like an ingot is valuable according to its bulk, so that the Apostles' Creed would be greatly improved if it could be extended to the length of the Athanasian, and on the same principle the Lord's Prayer, which is a creed in another form, would be indefinitely more excellent if it were spread out into the size of the Book of Common Prayer.

ART. III.—*A Letter to William Smith, Esq. M. P. from Robert Southey, Esq.* 8vo. pp. 48. Murray.

THE author of "Wat Tyler" seems to think that no one is entitled to call ill-names but himself. He finds that he is generally censured and ridiculed, and he flies into a rage, and while the fit is on him raves about his consistency and virtue and superiority to other folks and his immortality. Mr. Smith, the Member of Parliament for Norwich, took occasion in a debate concerning the political consistency of certain persons, to refer to two compositions which were generally ascribed to the same writer; one, *Wat Tyler*, which preaches equality and rebellion, and the other an article in the *Quarterly Review*, which holds out that the advocates of reform in Parliament design nothing less than a sanguinary revolution: comparing the two pieces, Mr.

Smith pronounced the man who could have written both a RENEGADE. The word was never more justly or naturally applied. Whatever baseness it implies is chargeable in all its odiousness upon the public writer who first avows republicanism and then accuses his neighbour of being a revolutionist, merely because he seeks by peaceable means a constitutional reform.

The Poet Laureate, for such the author of *Wat Tyler* has become, could have vindicated himself only by denying his being the writer referred to in the *Quarterly Review*, or by shewing that the passage in that publication had been mistaken. He does neither, but proceeds to laud himself and to curse all that do not admire at one and the same time *Wat Tyler* and the *Quarterly Review*.

Mr. Southey's unparalleled self-sufficiency provokes the inquiry, Who is he? And in spite of all his vapouring, he himself must confess that he is best known as author of *Wat Tyler* and Poet Laureate. Although he has written more epics than Milton and probably as much history as Hume, we are not fully convinced of the equity of his title to immortality, which he holds up in Mr. Smith's face with a plain intimation that this gentleman has no chance of being known to posterity except in the character of "a certain Mr. William Smith" who "insulted" him, the author of *Wat Tyler*. Yet we predict that the Journals of the House of Commons, which for thirty years have recorded the minute of Mr. William Smith in connection with every plan for the abolition of the slave-traffic, the relief of conscience, the preservation and extension of civil rights and the removal or mitigation of the crimes and horrors of war, will last as long as Joan of Arc, to which the Poet Laureate with so much proud consistency refers us, or *The Spartan's Letters*, or the *Quarterly Review*, or *Wat Tyler*, or even the sonnet in praise of Harry Martin, the regicide.

Not only Mr. Smith, but Mr. Brougham also and the reformers generally are assailed by the Poet Laureate with every virulent and scurrilous epithet which the language supplies. They have thought, and some of them have spoken, ill of Mr. Southey, since he shouted "Glory to God! Deliverance for mankind!" on the return of the Bourbons, the revival of Papal

power, the restoration of the Inquisition and the spoliation of the liberties of Europe by the Vienna Congress, and therefore they are "miscreants who live by calumny and sedition," "libellers and liars by trade," "panders of malice and pioneers of rebellion." He says that "the biographical dictionaries" will hereafter say of him "that in an age of personality, he abstained from satire;" probably they may, though Mr. Southey may as probably err in foretelling that "it will not be supposed that the ability for satire was wanting:" but will they say that he abstained under a sense of injury from that outrageous abuse which makes even him that is in the right seem in the wrong, and takes away at once the character of gentleman, scholar and Christian?

In the conclusion of the Letter, the author of Wat Tyler draws out his political creed, some of the articles of which certainly prove that, as he expresses himself, "his intellect has not been stationary," he has "outgrown his opinions." He believes that the laws lately enacted for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act and preventing the meetings of the people were necessary. He believes that "the cry for retrenchment" is "senseless," that there has been too much retrenchment on the part of government, and that the national expenditure is, in proportion to its magnitude, the sign and measure of national prosperity. He believes that education is a good thing, but that the people "must be instructed according to the Established Religion," "must be fed with the milk of sound doctrine," that "parochial education" must be "so connected with the Church as to form part of the Establishment." Moreover, the author of Wat Tyler believes that "*the government must curb the seditious press and keep it curbed.*" For this purpose" (adds the said author of Wat Tyler,) "*if the laws are not at present effectual they should be made so; nor will they then avail unless they are vigorously executed.*"

But we leave Mr. Southey and his political creed, which even "the Beloved Ferdinand" would acknowledge to be orthodox and willingly reward with the laurel, putting only two or three questions on the answer to which the merit of this Letter must rest:

1. Did not Mr. Southey tempt more

than one bookseller to publish Wat Tyler soon after it was written?

2. Failing in this, did he not give the manuscript of Wat Tyler to a political friend, with express permission to do with it what he pleased?

3. In the last number but one of the Quarterly Review, of which Mr. Southey is well known to be one of the writers, was there not an article which rumour assigned to his pen and which bears internal evidence of being his, in which the most criminal designs were attributed, not to the Luddites or to the Spenceans merely, but to the great body of the active pleaders and petitioners for Parliamentary Reform?

ART. IV.—*Six Letters addressed to a Congregation of Independent Dissenters, upon separating from their Communion.* By a late Member, a London Merchant. 8vo. pp. 112. Hunter, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Harwood, Great Russel Street, Bloomsbury. 1817.

THE "London Merchant" is what this title imports. He is a respectable layman, whose attention has been directed to theology, and whose inquiries led him from the Established Church to the "Independent Dissenters" and, in the end, from them to the Unitarians. These "Letters" are designed to explain and vindicate his present faith, and are addressed to his late religious connections, "the members of the church stately worshipping at Tonbridge Chapel, in the New Road, Somers's Town."

The writer is well-read in the Trinitarian and Calvinistic controversy and familiar with the Scriptures. He states his arguments with clearness, and maintains them with ability. In exposing the weakness and absurdity of the system which he has renounced, he displays much acuteness of understanding.

A very few quotations will shew that the "London Merchant" is no mean reasoner or common writer.

Urging the consequences of allowing Three equal Divine Persons in the Deity, he says,

"If we admit that the Three Persons of the Trinity are independent, each of the other, we are yet to be informed by what means it happens that they do not will, or intend, diversely from each other, having of course the power to do so. Has a com-

fact been entered into from all eternity, which it has not been judged proper to make the subject of revelation, that they shall neither *will* nor *execute* any thing contrary to each other, for fear of disturbing the harmony of Heaven? Or must we call in *mystery* to our aid, and feign to believe that the Three Persons, being independent and almighty, are yet unable to will contrary to the mind one of the other? Or that they are so absorbed in the contemplation of their *hypostatic* union, as to be unconscious to themselves of being distinct Persons?"—Pp. 25, 26.

The following remarks on the contradictory doctrine of the Athanasian Trinity, that the Second Person was begotten by the First and that the Third proceeded from the First and Second, and yet that "in this Trinity none is afore or after the other," appear to us unanswerable:

“Admitting for a moment, that the Three Persons in the Godhead are equal in power, and all endued alike with every faculty and attribute of perfect God, each must be able to generate, and each ought to have generated, if any one has, a person or persons equal to himself, in the same manner as the Father produced or generated the Son. But we hear of no such person produced by the Son alone; and it was evidently an unnecessary concurrence of the Father and the Son that produced the person called the Holy Ghost, when either the Father or Son, being almighty, was capable of it. Nor is it an unfair question to ask, why the Holy Ghost should not have given birth to a divine, equal, and coeternal person? and what is the law that limits the persons of the Godhead to *three*, since millions upon millions might have been produced with as much ease as the two already acknowledged? These are points of which the truth and mysteriousness are alike maintained by an appeal to Scripture; and there we ought to find them fully proved. But, if not stated there with the fulness and clearness that such doctrines demand, from the tone of high pretension with which they are urged, we have a clear right to reject them, and in place of them to adopt such views of the nature and existence of the Deity, as may be more reconcileable with reason, and at the same time more consistent with the plain and intelligible language of sacred writ.”—Pp. 27, 28.

One of the first doctrines of the *so-called* Evangelical sect which alarmed our author was the inefficacy of good works, and upon this subject he says, with becoming solemnity,

“If the whole end of religious instruc-

tion be to prove knowledge useless, or worse than useless; if the lamp of wisdom is to be extinguished, only that we may call the midnight darkness that succeeds it light; if men are to be persuaded that their earnest and well-directed efforts to promote their present and future happiness by a diligent investigation of whatsoever is true in principle, or by a steady adherence to whatsoever is virtuous in practice, cannot advance them a single step on their way, what incitement is there to a virtuous conduct, what recompense for those who make a sacrifice of their present ease for a good conscience or through a noble desire to promote the welfare of their neighbour and their species? It cannot but excite emotions of the most painful kind in the breast of every friend of rational and true religion, to observe whole classes of religious teachers zealously employed in undermining the foundations of morality and virtue, by inculcating the incompetency of such principles to obtain for the good, any thing more than some partial convenience, or some deceitful reputation.”—Pp. 60, 61.

The author manifests great zeal for the benevolent character of the Father of the Universe, which he shews to be strangely and frightfully distorted and discoloured by the Calvinists, and, with much felicity of illustration, thus concludes his Letter on this subject:

“The church and meeting-house resound alike with these abuses of truth and Scripture; in maintaining which, Christians seem a great deal more bent upon displaying their own ingenuity and hardihood in supporting a favourite *hypothesis*, than in exalting the character of their Maker, or setting forth his dealings toward mankind in such colours, as to engage them by feelings of gratitude and affection on the side of obedience. In this respect, a wholesome lesson may be learned from the wisdom of a celebrated philosopher of antiquity, Socrates, who, being accused of having turned aside the youth from the religion of their country, and encouraged them by his own example, admitted, in his defence, that “he had inveighed against the superstitions that had been introduced into religion, because he could not endure that *hatred* and other *shameful passions* should be ascribed to the gods.”* If for such gods as, in compliance with the custom of his country, this celebrated man ignorantly worshipped, he consented to lay down his life, what sacrifice would he not have made for the honour of that God, if he had been so fortunate as to know him, who “*hates nothing that he has made, and whose mercy endureth for ever.*”—P. 68.

* *Alcibiades' Travels*, chap. ix.

Whilst the letters are explicit and bold they are not in a single instance intemperate, much less reproachful. The author feels as a Christian and writes as a gentleman. His pamphlet is peculiarly adapted to laymen in the superior ranks of life; and to their serious notice, as far as our influence reaches, we cordially recommend it.

ART. V. — *Religious Reading recommended as an Instrumental Duty.* A Sermon preached at the Unitarian Chapel, Mosley Street, Manchester, on Thursday, Jan. 2, 1817. For the Benefit of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Book and Tract Society. By William Jevons. Manchester, printed. Sold, in London, by Longman & Co. and by Eaton. 8vo. pp. 24.

FROM 1 Tim. iv. part of ver. 13, "give attendance to reading," Mr. Jevons exhorts Christians at large to devote some of their time and thoughts to religious reading in general. He properly observes, in a note, p. 5, that "the preferable interpretation" of his text restricts its meaning to "the public reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue." Taking the passage however in the spirit of the sentiment which it conveys, and understanding by religious reading "all reading which relates to the duty of man, considered as a moral and accountable agent," he recommends this exercise very sensibly and forcibly. With this view, he divides such reading into three kinds; speculative, devotional and practical,—under which several heads we shall produce a specimen of his reasoning:

"Religious reading of the speculative kind, is that which treats of all the doctrines of religion, concerning the being and attributes of God, the design of man's existence, and the grounds and means of future salvation. Right sentiments on these momentous subjects are essential as the basis of all our obligations. * * * Speculative reading should, therefore, doubtless have a share of our attention as part of our instrumental duties. It may not, however, be needless to admonish you against suffering it to engross too large a share. Instances are not rare of persons devoting their attention exclusively to speculative religion; who, accordingly, give attendance to no religious reading but that of the controversial kind. Did the whole of human duty consist in

merely forming a right system of faith, there would be nothing unreasonable in this conduct. But if religious knowledge be something more than a mere matter of speculation; if it be only so far valuable as it serves to direct us in the government of our actions; then it is plain, that an exclusive attention to speculative reading, can by no means answer all the purposes of an instrumental duty. Such a practice may make us learned theologians or bigoted zealots; but it cannot make us good men."—Pp. 7. 9.

* * * * *

"It is highly desirable, in a moral point of view, not only that our understandings should be convinced of the great truths of religion, but that our hearts also should be impressed with the feelings which they are fitted to inspire. For this reason, devotional reading should form a part in the religious exercise I am recommending. It is not sufficient for the purposes of morality, that we merely acknowledge, by the cold assent of our understandings, the being and perfections of God. Before such conviction can have any influence on our conduct, it must be attended with all those feelings of piety which the idea of such a Being should naturally excite. We must realize his existence to our minds by that habitual sense of his presence, which will cause us, at all times, to stand in awe of him and sin not. We must form within our hearts that warm admiration of his character, which will incite to imitation; that ardent love of him, which will transcend every earthly affection; that lively sense of gratitude, which will add zeal to our obedience and cheerfulness to our submission." 10, 11.

* * * * *

"The third species of religious reading, to which as an instrumental duty we should give attendance, is practical reading. In this class are included all books which impart directions and motives for the right government of our conduct, by describing and recommending virtue, by pointing out the folly and danger of vice, and by shewing how we may attain the one and avoid the other. Without the constant study of these important subjects, which is only to be pursued by the aid of practical reading, we cannot form those just and adequate apprehensions concerning them, which are necessary to influence our conduct." 13.

Of religious reading Mr. J. observes that it is

"the great and important object which a Tract Society has in view, and which indeed is the field, and urgent the call for its exertions." 21.

ile remarks, too, that

"By circulating Unitarian tracts, we penetrate, as it were within the entrenchments of orthodoxy." 23.

The subject of this discourse is so interesting and appropriate as to claim the attention of all the professors and friends of Christianity: and the judicious manner in which it is treated by Mr. Jevons and the excellent spirit which pervades his observations, further entitle him to our gratitude.

ART. VI.—*Vice Triumphant, the Remedy Proposed Easy and Effectual: With the Statement of a New Hypothesis to Explain Accountableness.* By Samuel Spurrell. London, Sold by Hunter. 1817. 12mo. pp. 83.

THIS little work consists of two parts, in the former of which a new hypothesis is submitted to explain accountableness; while the latter is a practical essay, built upon the preliminary theory, and designed to arouse the feelings, and to direct the youthful mind to the easiest and most effectual means of resistance to vicious inclinations. The author seems to assume that vice is triumphant, or has a "general prevalence." But we doubt whether he intends to say more than that it exists in a very great and alarming degree: and we give him ample credit for the zeal of his efforts and the benevolence of his motives.

We lay before our readers, in his own words, an *analysis* of his hypothesis: 38, 39.

"Man is placed in circumstances in which he becomes accountable for his actions. Obedience to the will of his Maker is the requirement; a competent mean is afforded whereby to ascertain it, in the *invaluable gift of reason*, capable of being improved or not by himself; and it is for its improvement or neglect that he becomes responsible—all subsequent moral results depending upon it. Or, if any doubt could for a moment be entertained on the subject, the example of the idiot, so born, and the melancholy derangement of intellect in after-life, incident to a few, prove it to a demonstration. In the former case, having at no time had

the capacity of improving the gift of reason, responsibility never applied; and in the latter, unhappily, it no longer continued to do so. If the reasoning power be cultivated and improved to the utmost, a willing and easy obedience to the Divine commands follows as a consequence; if neglected altogether, or in part, man is alike unable and unwilling to execute them. Present comfort and future happiness are the reward of obedience; disquietude here, and misery hereafter, the punishment of disobedience."

These remarks prove that no accountableness can exist where the *invaluable gift of reason* is withholden: they do not shew however that accountableness is independent on the state of the will. Mr. Spurrell's new hypothesis reminds us of those writers on ethics who resolve moral obligation into a just *perception* of the qualities of actions. But we ought to distinguish between the *foundation* of virtue, considered as the command of the Universal Lawgiver, and the nature of the capacity for virtue in an individual agent. A course of conduct which is not *voluntary*, can be no proper object of praise or blame, reward or punishment.

We are of opinion that our author should have taken *habit* into the account in his ethical definitions and arguments. Yet, although we think his theory in some points defective, and in others less clear and satisfactory than might have been wished, we greatly admire his *concluding address to the young*, a few sentences of which we extract:

"Remember, that on your active exertions and judicious decision now, every valuable expectation either here or hereafter eventually depends. * * *. If years roll on, the period at length arrive, when passion having at last exhausted itself in your weakened frame, a better principle and practice should bear sway: the greatest benefit to be then experienced, could at the utmost amount to no more, than to stay for a while the fell ravages of bodily disease * * *. Sooner, far sooner, shall virtue cease to be virtue, and vice to be vice, than their inevitable consequences will be found to have been dispersed with. As easy were it to deprive the honey of its sweetness, and the salt of its savour."

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

MR. JOHN WRIGHT.

(*From Liverpool Mercury, Apr. 25.*)

On Saturday last, Mr. John Wright, attended by his professional friends, Mr. Venables and Mr. H. Dennison, appeared at the Town Hall, on the subject of the registering of the Long Room, the further hearing of which had been postponed to that day. Mr. Wright had been at Chester, and on inquiry at the Registrar's Office, he found, to his surprise, that the registry had been kept in loose papers on a file, and that no books had been kept nor any regular entries made so far back as the time he wished to refer to.

Mr. Venables wished to have obtained a re-hearing of the evidence by which the informations had been supported on a former day; but this was overruled by the Bench. After mentioning the extreme negligence of the late Registrar at Chester, for the truth of which he appealed to Mr. Statham, he proceeded to the proof of the place having been registered about twenty years ago. Mr. Robert Weston being sworn, deposed, that between the years 1796 and 1798, a certificate of the registry of this room was obtained by the congregation of Methodists of the New Connexion, of which he was, and still is, a member;—this was done by a Mr. Lionel Special (since dead); that he saw the paper called a certificate; and that after this was obtained, he and his followers met for public worship in the said room; that there were four preachers, whom he named, who officiated in rotation; and that after their chapel, called Zion Chapel, was built, they removed from this to the chapel where they continue to worship; that the room was afterwards occupied as a place for religious worship, by a congregation to whom Mr. Fleming officiated as minister; that the certificate was given to Mr. F. (Mr. F. is somewhere in Ireland); that the room has since been occupied by the Rev. Dr. Stewart, the Rev. Mr. Ralph, a congregation of Welsh Baptists, and was, for many weeks, during the year 1816, again occupied by the

congregation of Zion Chapel, while their own chapel was undergoing alterations.

Mr. Venables observed, that a right to road would be established by usage for a much less time, as the law would presume the original right or original grant, although no higher proof could be given—and in this case he contended that the evidence was good, as he could not for a moment think the magistrates of Liverpool had been so remiss and so negligent of their duty, as to suffer such a place to exist for twenty years, without instituting an inquiry into the legality of it. And therefore, he concluded, that the place must have been originally certified.

The Town-clerk, in reply, said, that admitting all that was proved, and he saw no reason to doubt the testimony of Mr. Weston, but admitting this, he was of opinion that it would not serve the present purpose, for the act, as he understood it, required the place to be registered afresh for every new congregation. The Bench then agreed to withdraw two of the informations, and considering that Mr. Wright had erred unwittingly, convicted him in the lowest penalty, viz. 20s. Against this conviction the defendant appealed to the Quarter Sessions, which appeal will be heard to-morrow, Saturday, at 12 o'clock precisely.

(*Liverpool Mercury, May 2.*)

WE stated in our last, that in consequence of the strong circumstantial evidence produced by Mr. Wright, on the subject of the registration of the Long Room, the magistrates had withdrawn two of the three informations laid against him, and had only convicted him upon the remaining one at the lowest penalty, namely, 20s. Mr. Wright, however, conceiving that his evidence was sufficiently strong to obtain a decision in his favour, appealed against the conviction to the Quarter Sessions. On Saturday morning last, at 10 o'clock, the court (Mr. Alderman Gerard, Chairman,) assembled to hear the appeal, and in a short time the Town Hall was filled with a very respectable audience.

Mr. Lambe appeared as Counsel to

support the conviction, and called Mr. Campbell to prove that the room had been let to Mr. Wright, and Mr. Rees Davies to prove that a meeting for worship had been held in the room at the time stated. The Town-clerk was examined to prove that Mr. Wright, when the conviction took place, produced no certificate of registration. Mr. Ward, the deputy registrar of the Bishop's Court at Chester, deposed that he had searched the records of the court in order to discover if any certificate of registration could be found, but that he had searched in vain. The witness admitted, however, that previously to the time when he entered upon his present office, which was in 1809, the papers relating to this department were kept in a very irregular state, and he did not imagine that more than one-fifth, probably not more than one-tenth of them, were now in existence. This was the case of the prosecution.

Mr. Venables and Mr. Lawrence were Counsel for Mr. Wright, in speaking of whom, the former pronounced a well-merited eulogium upon the excellent character he had ever maintained as a man, as a friend, as a father and as a member of society. He conceived that the evidence he had to produce in favour of the supposition that the room had been registered about twenty years ago, and the fact of the undisturbed possession of the room by various congregations of Dissenters from that time to the present, would be sufficient to annul the conviction. There was no doubt whatever of the registration having been made, and a copy of it might now have been produced had there been any regularity in the Register Office at Chester. But the fact was, that no books had been kept, and they had now been informed by the Deputy Registrar, that probably not a tenth part of the papers filed previous to 1809 had been preserved! Was Mr. Wright, then, to be accountable for the want of care at Chester? He thought not, and as the place had been used so long for public worship, it was strange that Mr. Wright should have been singled out as the subject of these proceedings. But from the circumstance of Rees Davies belonging to the Liverpool Courier Office, and from the publication of an article, which he would not here allude to, on

the subject of Mr. Wright's meetings for worship, he felt no doubt in what place and in what motives the information had originated. Rees Davies had indeed denied being an informer, and declared that he attended the Long Room merely from curiosity. Now he had also stated that he generally attended Mr. Raffles' Chapel, and yet mere curiosity, he would have us to believe, had led him three nights together to Mr. Wright's meetings!

Mr. Robert Weston, on being called and sworn, deposed, that between the years 1796 and 1798, a certificate of the registry of this room, in the Bishop's Court at Chester, was obtained by a congregation of Methodists of the New Connexion, of which community he was, and still is, a member. This certificate was procured by Mr. Parry, who then lived and is still living in Chester, and it was placed in the hands of Mr. Lionel Special, who is since dead. On the authority of this document they used the place as a chapel until the erection of Zion Chapel, and on quitting it handed the certificate to the succeeding occupiers. He believed one Mr. Fleming had the paper, but he was now in Ireland. Several congregations had occupied the room up to the year 1816, when the New Connexion of Methodists again met in it while their own chapel was undergoing alterations. He was certain of the registration, as it was applied for during the time that the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and they should not have felt themselves safe without it.

Dr. Stewart, a clergyman of the community of Scotch Burghers, was also called, and proved that he preached in the Long Room, Marble-Street, from November, 1807, to February, 1808, and that several other preachers both preceded and followed him. He had always been under the impression that the room was registered.

Mr. Venables and Mr. Lawrence then contended that as every proof, but the actual document, had been produced, the conviction must be dismissed, as the Act inflicted the penalty on those only who knowingly hold meetings in unregistered places. They cited several cases to prove the operation of the word knowingly. But the Recorder considered the word to apply to the fact of meeting and not to the want of registration; a place might be used

for worship in the absence of the owner, and in this case the word would defend him from penalty; but of the registry it behoved persons holding meetings to be quite certain.

In the progress of the inquiry, and while the appellant's witnesses were under examination, a question arose whether the room in Marble-Street had not, since the time of obtaining the alleged certificate, been used for secular purposes. And Mr. Benjamin Ellis, on the part of the prosecution, was called and deposed, that some three or four years ago, he attended at a debating society in that room, of which Mr. Ryley, the comedian, had the management. He also swore that about seven or eight years ago, a conjuror, the Sieur Rea, occupied the room for the display of his slight-of-hand feats.

The appellant's Counsel said this could not affect the registry of the room. Theatres and barns had frequently been registered for religious meetings.

Mr. Lamb then replied at length to the various arguments advanced by the appellant's Counsel, contending for the propriety of the conviction.

The Court, in giving their decision, said the case resolved itself into two parts. 1st, Whether there had at any time been a registration of this room? and, 2d, Whether, supposing that to have been the case, there had been, by the purposes to which the room was applied, a discontinuance of that registration? On the first of these points it must be admitted, said the Recorder, that the evidence of the fact is very incomplete. Why was not Mr. Parry, by whom it was said that the certificate was obtained, and who, it was admitted, was still living in Chester, called to prove this fact? It was a rule of law to require the best evidence that could be produced, and as the *onus* lay upon the appellant, it was for him to have produced Mr. Parry. On the second point, though the Court could not go the length of saying that it was necessary that every fresh congregation should have a fresh registry of their places of worship, yet as the applications of these certificates generally expressed that the place to be registered was "*set apart*" for religious worship, it certainly did appear that the continuity was broken by the introduction

of concerns of a secular and profane nature, and this had confessedly been the case in the Long Room in Marble-Street. Under these circumstances, the Court felt it their duty to confirm the conviction, which was confirmed accordingly.

Mr. Venables then took several legal objections to the form of the conviction, and insisted that it should be quashed, as the information did not appear to be on oath; that no time was stated when the adjudication was made; that the conviction was bad, inasmuch as it did not aver that the information was given within three months; and, particularly, that the evidence given at the hearing of the information on the part of the defendant was not inserted in the conviction, but totally suppressed: but these, among many other objections, were overruled—the Court saying, that they appeared on the record, and might be taken advantage of elsewhere, in a future stage of the proceedings,—and the appellant, by his Counsel, intimated his intention to remove the conviction by certiorari into the Court of King's Bench. The discussion lasted three hours and a half.

Manchester College, York.

There will be two vacancies on the foundation of the College at the close of the present Session. Applications for admission, with the requisite testimonials, are requested to be immediately sent to the Secretaries, Thomas Henry Robinson, Esq. Manchester, and the Rev. John Goodrich Roberts, Manchester.

Testimonials must be signed by three Dissenting ministers resident near the candidate, who are required to certify that he will have attained the full age of sixteen at the commencement of his course—that on their personal knowledge and examination, his moral character, natural endowments, and classical attainments are such as to qualify him for becoming a student for the Christian ministry and that the profession is the object of his own voluntary choice. An ability to read Homer and Horace are considered as essential to admission.

Manchester, May 1, 1817.

1A

9

Manchester College, York.
The following sums have been received
on account of this Institution:

Collection at the New Meeting,
Birmingham, Rev. J. Yates.. 44 4 6
Joshua Stanger, Esq. London,
Benefaction..... 21 0 0

New Annual Subscriptions.
James Stanger, Esq.
London..... 2 2 0
Samuel Hibbert, Esq.
Manchester..... 2 2 0
— Mackintosh, Esq.
Exeter..... 2 2 0
Michael Bentley, Esq.
Stourbridge..... 1 1 0
James Belcher, Esq.
Birmingham..... 1 1 0
8 8 0
73 12 6

G. W. WOOD, Treasurer.
Manchester, May 15, 1817.

The Annual Examination of Students will take place at the close of the present Session, in the College Library, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, the 24th, 25th and 26th of June, 1817.

The York Annual Meeting of Trustees will be held at Etridge's Hotel, York, on the evening of Wednesday the 25th, when the vacancies on the foundation will be filled up from amongst the candidates whose testimonials have been previously transmitted to the committee for examination.

Applications for admission for the ensuing Session, as Lay Students, are requested to be sent as early as convenient, addressed to the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, Manchester College, York, in order that the necessary accommodations may be prepared.

The Trustees and Friends of the Institution will dine together on Wednesday and Thursday, the 25th and 26th, at Etridge's Hotel.

Manchester, May 16, 1817.

N. B. The period allowed for sending in Essays for the Rev. William Lamport's Theological Prize is extended to January 1, 1818, and not May 1, 1818, as erroneously stated in the Monthly Repository, for April, 1817, p. 249.

Unitarian Chapel, Tiverton.

On Sunday the 27th of April, this Chapel was opened for the worship of the One God, even the Father, by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter, of Exeter, whose exertions in behalf of the cause have been unwearied from the moment of the plan being submitted to him, by the friends of the object at Tiverton.

There were three services during the day, at each of which the Chapel (which will seat about 160,) was completely filled, together with the aisles. On this occasion a great number of most respectable friends to the cause, from Breedwell, Dorchester, Callington, Crediton, Honiton and Exeter, attended; all of whom expressed their high satisfaction of the services, and their best wishes for the success of the undertaking.

Dr. Carpenter most kindly consented to undertake (with the assistance of Mr. Yeates's reading the Scriptures and the long prayer in the afternoon) the whole of the services. His discourses were, in the Morning, from Phil. iv. 6. Afternoon, Acts xxi. 11. Evening, 1 Pet. iii. 15, which, like all his other compositions, were most truly judicious, and delivered in a most energetic manner, and were heard with the most fixed attention. In the first he made a most powerful appeal to Scripture, for the proof that religious worship was alone due to God, even the Father; and his arguments were such as to fasten conviction on the mind; at the same time conveyed in such a liberal and interesting style, as to excite the highest admiration, even from those whose sentiments were contrary to his own. The afternoon discourse earnestly enforced the duty of searching the Scriptures, and from them alone forming our religious faith, unawed by worldly influence, and firmly to relinquish whatever would not bear this test of examination. The evening discourse was a general view of the Unitarian doctrine, and its beneficial tendency, which was most ably advocated. At this service many respectable members of the Establishment residing at Tiverton attended. There were collections at the door after each service. (The amount see the list below).

The friends to the cause at Tiverton were highly gratified by the

countenance they received on this occasion, as also, by several most kind and animating letters, containing contributions from other friends at a greater distance from them, who were unable to attend. They earnestly solicit the further assistance of any who may be disposed to contribute thereto, to enable them to discharge the whole of the expences that have been incurred, which amount to about forty pounds more than they have at present received. They have also great pleasure in stating that on the two Sundays that have since elapsed (on each of which Mr. Yeates has conducted the services), the chapel has been attended by a much greater number than was expected; and they trust, (although their views and principles are much misrepresented and opposed by their Calvinistic brethren,) that the cause of truth will ultimately succeed and increase amongst them; feeling assured that when their creed is better understood, it must cease to excite that alarm and prejudice which always prevents a dispassionate inquiry and examination. They propose as soon as possible to establish a Sunday school (which some ladies have already kindly offered to superintend) and also a Fellowship Fund on the principle recommended in the last Numbers of the Monthly Repository and Christian Reformer. Dr. Carpenter and C. Gifford, Esq. of Exeter, have been good enough to present to them several books and tracts, as a commencement for establishing a congregational library; any further addition to which will be most thankfully received. Subscriptions are received by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter, of Exeter; Rev. Thomas Howe, Bridport; Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney Road; or Mr. George Dunsford and Mr. M. L. Yeates, Tiverton.

M. L. Y.

Tiverton, May 13, 1817.

Amount of Subscriptions inserted in Monthly Repository for March	9	0	0
Collection at George's Meeting, Exeter, after Dr. Carpenter's Evening Lecture, per Dr. C.	9	3	10
Mr. B. Staley, Camberwell.	1	0	0
Collection at the Door at the opening of the Chapel.	14	9	11
Carried up	33	13	11

Brought up	33	13	11
Mr. Harry Dunsford, Tiverton	1	0	0
Mr. Peter Batterscombe, ditto	0	10	6
Rev. John Rowe, Bristol	1	1	0

Per Rev. Edmund Butcher.

Isaac Cox, Esq. Honiton	1	0	0
John Carslake, Esq. Sidmouth	1	0	0
H. J. Carslake, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
William Stocker, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
Francis Stevens, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
Rev. Edmund Butcher, ditto	1	0	0
Mrs. Braddick, ditto	0	10	0
Mrs. Leigh, Slade, near ditto	1	0	0
Miss Leighs', ditto	1	0	0

Per Rev. Thomas Howe.

Thomas Colfox, Esq. Bridport	2	0	0
Joseph Gundry, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
Samuel Gundry, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
J. G. Downe, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
Rev. T. Howe, ditto (Annual)	1	0	0
Mr. John Lee, ditto	1	0	0
Mr. William Hounsell, ditto	1	0	0
Miss Hounsell, East Street, do.	1	0	0
Senex Cornubiensis, ditto	1	0	0

Stephen Shute, Esq. Cullumpton	1	0	0
--------------------------------	---	---	---

Fellowship Fund, New Meeting, Birmingham	4	10	0
--	---	----	---

Rev. James Yates, Birmingham	1	0	0
------------------------------	---	---	---

60 16 3

The Unitarian Society for Promoting Knowledge and Virtue by the Distribution of Books.

THE Twenty-sixth Anniversary of the Society was holden on Tuesday the 15th of April. In the morning, a discourse was delivered before the Society at the Chapel, in Essex Street, by Mr. Rees, the present Secretary, recommending the objects for the promotion of which it had associated. A meeting for business was afterwards held in the Vestry; whence the members present adjourned to the London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, to dinner. On this occasion, the new Treasurer, Thomas Gibson, Esq. was called to the Chair. The company was somewhat less numerous than last year, owing probably, in part, to the day having been unavoidably changed, but principally to some other public meetings being held at the same time, at which several of the members were obliged to attend. The meeting was however rendered highly interesting by the observations of the chairman on proposing the different toasts, and by the speeches of the gentlemen who

successively addressed the company. Among these were Mr. Belsham, in connection with the new edition of the Improved Version, just published; Mr. Aspland, in connection with the Unitarian Fund; Mr. Fox; the former Treasurers, Mr. Ebenezer Johnston and Mr. Hinckley; Mr. Rutt, and the Secretary, who gave a brief account of the present state of the Society. On the memory of the late Secretary, Mr. Joyce, of whose valuable co-operation the Society had been deprived by death since its last anniversary, being given from the chair, Mr. Rutt, who was well qualified, by long and intimate intercourse, to form a just estimate of his character, delivered a very eloquent and affecting address, comprising a just eulogy on the many virtues, private and public, which had obtained for him the cordial esteem and friendship of all who knew him.

Clerical "Loyal Address."

THE Gazette lately contained a Loyal Address to the Prince Regent "from the most dutiful and loyal subjects of his Majesty, the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, and expressing their utmost detestation of the most wicked and atrocious attempt to take away the life of his Royal Highness," and concluding with the following passage:

"We daily offer our prayers to God for the long continuance of those blessings, the fair prospect of which is open to us by the exercise of every public and domestic virtue which so highly distinguish your Royal Highness both in your public and private character, and which have laid the surest foundation for the future happiness of your people, together with your own, and ensured to your Royal Highness that glory and prosperity, which is the never failing reward of every good and virtuous King in the love and affection of a grateful people."

Parliamentary Debates on the Catholics.

The often-agitated question of Catholic Emancipation has been again debated in both Houses, and decided against the Catholics. The debates exhibited the curious spectacle of the ministers taking opposite sides; some of them contending that the proposed

measure was a debt of justice, and others that it was big with enormous mischief.

The subject was brought into the House of Commons on Friday, May the 9th, by Mr. GRATTAN, who moved that the House should resolve itself into a committee to take into consideration the laws affecting the Roman Catholic subjects of the empire, alleging that in the committee he should move such resolutions as should give the securities necessary for preserving the religion established at the Revolution, and at the same time give the Catholics that participation in civil and military rights to which the constitution entitles them. The motion was supported, amongst others, by Lord CASTLEREAGH and Mr. CANNING, and opposed by Mr. L. FOSTER, Sir J. C. HERPISLEY, Mr. BATHURST and Mr. PEELE. On a division, there were Ayes 221, Noes 245. Majority against the Catholics, 24.

The question was brought into the House of Lords, on Friday, May the 16th, and the discussion was preceded by petitions against the Catholic claims from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Here the debate was much more animated than in the Commons. It was introduced by the Earl of DONOUGHMORE, as "the chosen advocate of the Catholics," whose speech was able, manly, spirited and eloquent. With regard to the securities which the Catholics should give, he adverted to the domestic nomination of the prelates, and explained that the Catholics undertook to procure a Concordat from the Pope, by which the nomination should be compulsory, and thus the objection to foreign influence would be done away. To the *Veto* the Catholics objected, and if they did not, he should. He thought the payment of the Catholic clergy (a favourite plan, we believe, of Lord Castlereagh's) decidedly objectionable: it would increase the influence of the crown, and it was not asked for by that clergy themselves, who were content with the voluntary contributions of their respective flocks. His Lordship then replied to the various popular objections to Catholic Emancipation, amongst which was the Pope's Bull against Bible Societies; he could not vindicate this measure, but he read an extract from a book of Herbert

Mash's, the present Bishop of Llandaff, who was present, to show that the Pope was not alone in his dislike of associations for circulation of the Bible only: *this passage, he said, was in substance the very doctrine of the Papal Bull.* He concluded with a motion for a Committee, similar to Mr. Gratian's in the Commons.—

The Bishop of Llandaff (in his maiden speech) opposed the motion at some length, considering the question as one not of religious liberty but of political power. His objection was not to the Catholics as religionists, but as under foreign influence, which might interfere with their obedience to their lawful sovereign. He declared himself for religious liberty, and made a distinction between the Protestant Dissenters and the Catholics, from which we may hope that should the former apply for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts they would have his Lordship's support.—

The venerable Bishop of Norwich followed in behalf of the Catholics, allowing, however, that some apology might be necessary for taking this part in the debate, "in this intolerant country, for so it had lately become."

He maintained that the Catholics were excluded from offices solely on the ground of their religious opinions. The question, he urged, was whether the union with Ireland should be nominal or real and substantial. He bore testimony to the labours and merits of the Roman Catholic clergy. He appealed to Mr. Locke in favour of a different line of policy from that which had been pursued towards Ireland. "The Roman Catholics of Ireland," said the Right Reverend Prelate, "had for more than a century displayed the greatest moderation. They had shewn this too while they had been exposed to a degree of insult and oppression, which was not only unjustifiable but justified resistance itself, as the only means of escaping servile degradation. He could not see how it was possible to reconcile a continuance of harshness towards the Roman Catholics with good policy, and still less with Christian charity."

In the course of his speech, which he thus concluded, he intimated in language not we hope prophetic that this was probably the last time he should trouble the Lords on this or any other

question.—On the other side, the Bishop of Ossory made an able speech against the motion, arguing that the opinions and resolutions of the Catholics were too fluctuating to be relied upon, that the spirit of many Catholic publications was adverse to peace and loyalty, and that papal influence in these realms was inconsistent with the Constitution.—

The Earl of Harrowby spoke warmly in favour of the motion, correcting what he supposed to be an indiscretion in the speech of the Bishop of Norwich (the concluding passage, just quoted); and replying most able to the objections of the prelates of Llandaff and Ossory.—

The Earl of Liverpool differed from the last speaker in every point of view. His

speech may be briefly summed up in his own words: "The glorious principle established at the Revolution was that Church and State were inseparably connected, and it was well known that no civil government could possibly exist without practical religion, for indeed the protection of religion was necessary to government. It was, therefore, his determination not to risk in this country what he considered an innovation on the constitution."

"If their Lordships adopted this motion of unlimited concession, he would ask them why not on the very same grounds extend it to the Dissenters?"

"If all classes of his Majesty's subjects were placed on an equal footing with the Established Church, there would be an end to Parliament being any longer a Protestant Parliament."—

Earl Darnley characterized Lord Liverpool's Speech as "declamation on the dangers to the connexion of Church and State." After many pertinent and judicious observations on the debate and on the present state of the question, he concluded with assuring the Catholics that "though they might be disappointed at present, they had no reason to despond."—

Lord Grenville followed on the same side, with his wonted clearness, decision and force of argument, but his speech will not admit of epitomizing. Every sentence

was an argument or a complete answer to what was not argument. He paid a high compliment to Lord Harrowby on his speech, and pronounced an animated eulogium on the Bishop

of Norwich. He vindicated the character and celebrated the virtues of William III. In reply to the Anti-Catholic Bishops he contended that this was not a question of the schools, but one of large state policy, and he shewed that all the reason of the case was in favour of concession.—Earl BATURST spoke against the motion. He did not know for what purpose they were to go into a Committee. No specific measure was proposed. An allusion had been made to Scotland, but it was impossible to deal with the Catholic religion in the same manner as they could deal with any sect of Protestant Dissenters. They must next give to the English Catholics, what they were now asked to give to the Irish Catholics, and repeal all their Test Laws. Were they prepared to go as far as that?—Earl GREY could not reconcile it to his sense of duty to give a silent vote. He rejoiced to find in this debate some charges against the Catholics, such as not keeping faith with heretics, dropped. He had heard with pain, however, that the Protestant Religion did not admit of toleration to the Catholics; he had always thought that the Protestant faith excelled the Catholic in its more tolerant spirit. The Irish Catholics were oppressed: what was the answer? That the Constitution of this country was essentially Protestant! He denied that proposition, and perfectly agreed with Lord Grenville, that the Revolution was equally founded upon liberality in all that concerned religion, and upon liberty in all that related to political conduct. After an acute examination of the various pleas of the advocates of things as they are, the noble Earl thus concluded: "It was said that this would lead to the repeal of the Test Act. He could not see any danger in this consequence: he, on the contrary, thought that the Catholics of Ireland ought to have all the lines of promotion open to them; that the Catholics of England who were worse off than the former, though their loyalty had been conspicuous, ought also to receive the same advantage; and that with regard to the Dissenters, of whose loyalty and attachment to the Government there could be no doubt, the Test Act ought to be repealed, which in fact had become a nullity, by the passing of an annual Indemnity Bill."—The LORD CHAN-

CELLOR opposed the motion; he could not consent to remove those guards and fences which our ancestors had thrown around our constitution for the express purpose of rendering it essentially Protestant. As to the argument that the Test Act became a dead letter by the passing of the annual Indemnity Bill, he denied the inference, because the power of refusing the annual Bill still remained.

Their Lordships then divided—

Contents 54—Proxies 36	90
Non-Contents 82—Proxies 60	142

Majority against the Catholics	52
--------------------------------	----

MISCELLANEOUS.

Blasphemous Libels.

WILLIAM HONE, a bookseller in the Old Bailey and author and publisher of a weekly two-penny pamphlet, entitled "The Reformers' Register," in the manner of Cobbett's late periodical work, has been arrested on three ex-officio informations filed against him by the late Attorney General, Garrow, and is now in the King's Bench Prison. The warrants, signed by Lord Ellenborough, were served upon him in the street, within a few doors of his own house, on Saturday afternoon, May 3rd, and he was immediately taken in a coach by the officers to a lock-up house. Here he was kept till Monday morning, when being put into a coach he was driven down to Westminster to the Court of King's Bench and called upon to plead immediately to the three criminal informations. One was filed against him for publishing *The late John Wilkes's Catechism of a Ministerial Member*, adapted to the present times, being a parody upon the Catechism of the Church of England. The second was for publishing, "to the great displeasure of Almighty God," *The Political Litany*, a parody upon the Litany of the Book of Common Prayer. The third was for publishing, *The Sinecurist's Creed or Belief*, another parody, "tending" (such is the language of the information) "to scandalize and bring into contempt another part of the service in the Common Prayer, entitled the Creed of St. Athanasius." Mr. Hone complained of being detained in custody since Saturday night without power of giving notice of bail, and of

being now brought up to plead without a moment's previous notice or knowing with what he was charged. He was told that he might *impe* to the next term, i. e. might put off his pleading till then. He replied that he wanted no such time; if he were furnished with a copy of the information he should be prepared to plead the next morning. The Attorney General said he had no right to a copy, and Lord Ellenborough said that the time of the Court must not be occupied in vain discussions, the prisoner must plead guilty or not guilty; perhaps he might hereafter be allowed if he chose to retract his plea, and in the mean time his attorney might obtain a copy of the information at the proper office. Mr. Hone said he had no attorney and persisted in his demand of a copy. The Court, Lord Ellenborough said, had no power to give it; they had no funds out of which to pay for it: upon which Mr. Hone assured their Lordships that he had no funds either. Lord Ellenborough said, if a copy of the information were given to him, by the same rule every person charged with a crime might claim a copy of the indictment, a claim never before preferred, and certainly never before allowed. Whilst the informations were reading, Mr. Hone, who was unwell, asked permission to sit, to which Lord Ellenborough answered, No. After the reading of the informations, Mr. Hone renewed his application for copies, alledging that funds were found to pay his Majesty's Attorney General for filing these informations, and he should think that he against whom they were filed might be supplied with copies out of the same funds. The request was again put aside as being unprecedented, and the Defendant was committed till the first day of next Term, that is we believe *Trinity Term*, which commences Friday June the 6th. At the same time, Lord Ellenborough stated that he would be liberated in the interim, on putting in sufficient bail, which he explained to mean that for the first libel the Defendant must be bound himself in £200, and two sureties in £100 each, the same for the second, and in the third, himself in £100 and two sureties in £50 each. Mr. Hone requested now to have copies of the warrants on which

he was apprehended, but Mr. Justice Bayley said, the Court had no power to grant them. In his *Register* which continues to be published, Mr. Hone pledges himself to refute the charge of Blasphemy.

Melancholy Case of Mary Ryan.

On Friday morning, May 2nd, was executed in the Old Bailey, for highway robbery, *Patrick Ryan*, known also by the name of *Paddy Brown*. He had some time ago planned his escape from Newgate, and nothing was wanting to the success of his plan but a rope, which his wife was detected in carrying into prison twined round her body. The scheme was thus defeated, and the wife was detained in Newgate to take her trial for aiding in it. By a most unhappy coincidence, the wife was tried for this offence on the very day that the husband suffered. She was of course found *guilty*, but the jury, *agonized* (as they expressed themselves) at her condition,—a widow, just become such, by so awful an event, with a babe at her breast,—recommended her in the most urgent manner to the mercy of the Court. She was sentenced to *one month's imprisonment*. In a flood of tears she begged the Court would suffer her “to go to the *wake* of her husband and see the last of him.” This the Court replied it was not in their power to grant.

Here the matter did not end. On Wednesday, May the 7th, *Sir James Mackintosh* brought the case of *Mary Ryan* before the *House of Commons*. In a speech of great eloquence he characterized the proceedings against her by every indignant epithet: he could not trust himself, he said, to comment upon the conduct of those who in such circumstances pushed forward the prosecution. Amidst general cheers, he concluded with moving for papers on the subject. *Mr. H. Addington* reported that *Mary Ryan* had been pardoned on the recommendation of Lord Sidmouth, and Lord Castlereagh pressed *Sir James* to withdraw his motion, as it would seem to imply a censure on the administration of justice. But *Sir James Mackintosh* refused to withdraw the motion; the pardon did not extenuate the aggravated nature of the case. The prosecution was carried on at the instance of the city, why had not measures been taken to prevent its

coming on? why were witnesses called? He would persevere in his motion that the House by adopting it might make a public declaration of their opinion, and hold up this fatal, and horrible transaction as a warning to all magistrates in future.—*Lord Castlereagh* now said that on a question of so serious a nature he should give the motion his support rather than cause any difference of opinion in the House.

This unanimity is most honourable to the House of Commons, and effaces from the nation, if not from the city, the foul stain of this barbarity. In higher life and in other circumstances, especially in other times, *Mary Ryan* would have been celebrated as a heroine. What did *Lady Nithsdale*, *Mrs. Walkinshaw* and *Madame Lavalette* more than this poor woman attempted? They succeeded, she failed; but her failure awakens our sympathy for her condition. She followed the promptings of nature, and the House of Commons, not fettered by positive laws, have uttered the voice of nature in her favour.

NOTICES.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Eastern Unitarian Society* will be held at Framlingham, on Wednesday and Thursday the 25th and 26th of June.

THE next Anniversary of the *Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association*, will be holden at Fenton, on Wednesday, June 25th next, when a Sermon will be delivered by Mr. Thomas Rees.

THE Annual Meeting of the *South Wales Unitarian Society* to be held this year at Carmarthen, has been postponed, owing to local and incidental circumstances, from the regular time (the Thursday next after the 21st of June) to Thursday the 10th of July. There will be service on the preceding evening at six.

MR. T. N. TALFOURD, of the Middle Temple, is preparing for publication a *Practical Treatise on the Laws of Toleration and Religious Liberty* as they affect every class of Dissenters from the Church of England, intended to form a compendium of the civil, political and religious rights of all his Majesty's subjects, as they are, at present, affected by the profession of religious opinions; with an Appendix containing the most important statutes on the subject of Toleration, and forms of proceedings by indictment and before magistrates for infractions of the acts protecting worship, and other offences relating to religion—in one volume octavo.

THE REV. JOHN EVANS has in the press, *An Excursion to Windsor*, interspersed with Historical and Biographical Anecdotes for the Improvement of the Rising Generation—to which will be annexed, *A Journal of a Trip to Paris, by Way of Brussels and Waterloo*, by John Evans, Jun.

IN the press, and speedily will be published, in one volume octavo, *An Essay on Capacity and Genius*; endeavouring to prove that there is no original mental superiority between the most illiterate and the most learned of mankind; and that no genius, whether individual or national, is innate, but solely produced by and dependent on circumstances. Also an Enquiry into the Nature of Ghosts, and other Appearances supposed to be Supernatural.

MR. NICHOLAS will publish in the course of this month, in 2 vols. 8vo. *The Journal of a Voyage to New Zealand*, in company with the Rev. Samuel Marsden, with an Account of the State of that Country and its Productions, the Character of its Inhabitants, their Manners, &c.

OBITUARY.

On 28th Jan. 31, at Melbourn, in Cambridgeshire, in the 77th year of his age, Mr. THOMAS BARRON, who had been nearly sixty years a preacher in the General Baptist connexion. He was a man of a most excellent disposition and exemplary character, and respected by all parties of

Christians in that part of the country where he had always lived. He laboured in his Master's work until the last, and was a good minister of Jesus Christ. For several years he preached and supplied the place of pastor to the General Baptist Churches at Melbourn, Fulbourn and Saf-

from Walden, until the settlement of Mr. Stephen Philpot, at the last-mentioned place, in the year 1791. His ministry of late years hath been very successful at Melbourn. A tribute of just respect was paid to the memory of so very worthy and respectable a Christian brother, by a sermon being preached on occasion of his death, in his own meeting-house, by Mr. George Compton, from Nehemiah vii. 2, "He was a faithful man, and feared God above many;" By the Rev. Mr. Carver, Independent minister, at his meeting in Melbourn, from Matt. xxv. 21, "Well done thou good and faithful servant," &c. And likewise at Saffron-Walden by Mr. Stephen Philpot, from Genesis xv. 25, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age." Of him it may indeed be said as our Lord said of Nathanael—Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile. The General Baptist Church at Melbourn is destitute of a minister. S. P.

Walden, March 12, 1817.

March 22, Miss MARSH, of Cannon Street, after a painful illness of 6 months, which she endured with singular fortitude and serenity. By those who had the pleasure of her acquaintance, her loss will be long and severely felt, for she was the bond of union and peace to a numerous circle of acquaintance and friends. Possessed of a strong and well-regulated mind, mature judgment, and a warm and affectionate heart, she was beloved and respected by all: her conduct was exemplary in all the relations of life. In the midst of her protracted sufferings, and even up to the period of her dissolution, she was calm and cheerful, being perfectly resigned to the will of her Maker, and firmly persuaded that what he creates in mercy, in mercy he will preserve and restore; so that as her life was the practice of holiness, her end was peace.

On the 25th April expired easily, and almost imperceptibly, at his apartments in Jesus College, Cambridge, the Reverend ROBERT TYRWHITT, formerly Fellow of this College. His father was Residentiary of St. Paul's, and grandfather, on the mother's side of the celebrated Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London. With these and other connexions he had every reason to expect high preferment in the church; but his conscience forbade him to make use of such advantages, and he resigned his fellowship, and all his expectations from the Church, on the deliberate conviction of his mind, that one God only—who is emphatically styled in Scripture the Father—and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

is the only object of religious worship. On the resignation of his fellowship he was reduced to a very narrow income, in which he lived cheerfully and contentedly; but, by the death of his brother, Clerk to the House of Commons, he came into possession of a property which enabled him to act up to the dictates of a generous heart. It will be incredible to the generality of readers how little he spent upon himself, and how much upon others. In every profession, Divinity, Law, Physic, Navy, Army, are many to lament his loss, and to remember the kindness of a most liberal benefactor. His benevolence was not confined to any sect or party. He looked upon all as children of one common Parent, and himself as a steward merely under Providence, for what remained to him after the gratification of his natural wants and very moderate desires. Notwithstanding his separation from the Church he lived in College highly respected by that Society, and by the most distinguished Members of the University. For the last eight or ten years he was confined by the gout chiefly to his rooms, and he had not slept out of College for twenty or thirty years. He was particularly well acquainted with the statutes of the University, was associated with Jebb in his plan for the improvement of education, was a friend of the late Bishops Law and Watson; and a more strenuous advocate for liberty, civil and religious, as distinguished from anarchy and misrule, never existed. He published two sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, the one on the Baptismal Form, the other on the Creation of all Things by Jesus Christ; and whoever reads them will lament that the author has not explained his sentiments more fully on many other parts of Scripture. His nephew, Sir Thomas Tyrwhitt, is now the head of the family of this name.

April 27, BENJAMIN TRAVERS, Esq. aged 65 years. Few characters have been more strongly marked than that of the man whose departure from this world is here announced. Ardour of mind combined with warmth of feeling; independence of thought which disdained to yield to authority, decision in forming resolutions, followed by equal promptitude in action, were its most prominent and conspicuous features; and these must have forced themselves on the observation of all who knew him. But it possessed other qualities which, as is the case with most men, could be remarked only by its intimates and friends. Among these one of the most striking was an insatiable thirst after knowledge, which the labours and

anxieties of a busy commercial life, were unable to extinguish, and which, he indulged for a few years before his decease with an eagerness and interest by no means common at the period to which he had then advanced. Through life he lamented that his early years had not been spent in circumstances more favourable to mental improvement; and had his mind been nurtured in a soil in which its powers could have been fully expanded, his love of letters would probably have led him to attainments which might have proved a fertile source of benefit to others, as well as of satisfaction to himself. Being destined for business, he engaged in its concerns with that constitutional ardour which went with him into all that he did, as though he had been moving in the very sphere for which his nature was formed. But a sanguine mind which saw no obstacle to the completion of its wishes, and which viewed that as certain which to minds of a cooler temperament would at best have appeared but probable, a hastiness of determination in cases that required slow and mature deliberation, and a precipitancy in executing what had been once determined upon, at length plunged him into difficulties, and finally brought on a train of

misfortunes, such as will not unusually overtake men whose mental constitution is characterized by the qualities for which he was so remarkably distinguished. This reverse of fortune, however, he bore with firmness and fortitude, though at the same time touched with deep concern for those who had unhappily suffered with him. His character indeed had in it no small portion of sympathetic and benevolent feeling, which rendered him a pattern of conjugal and parental affection, and which, united with his natural ardour and enthusiasm, framed him to be the sincere and zealous friend. Of the justice of this remark there are living witnesses who attribute the origin of their worldly prosperity and comfort to his unsolicited and disinterested exertions. Among the subjects which engaged his inquisitive mind, religion always occupied a primary place, and on this subject he strictly and truly thought for himself, and his reflections led him to entertain the most reverential and at the same time the most encouraging views of the Divine Being, which were highly consolatory to him in the time of affliction, and on which he reposed with a cheerful and steady confidence for this life and for the next.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE question of the reform in Parliament, supported by a greater number of petitions than have ever been presented on any one occasion to the Lower House, was introduced into it by Sir F. Burdett, in a cool, temperate and most invaluable speech. It contained the usual arguments in favour of this necessary return to the constitutional government of the kingdom, giving an historical summary of the question, and some admirable remarks on the different forms of government, as they prevail in the world. These are well known to be divided by writers under three heads, each of which has its respective admirers; but there has never been found any one to panegyricize an oligarchy, such as is supposed to exist in England. The reason is this, that in the other forms the individuals who possess power, are influenced by honour or shame in many of their proceedings; but in the case of a varying oligarchy, where its members are not clearly and decisively pointed out, and which acts by substitutes, the most odious measures may be carried into execution, and both sovereign and people brought into a debasing subjection, injurious to both their interests.

This it is contended, is the growing state of the House of Commons, brought into this situation by various circumstances. And in a petition to the House of Commons, the relation of a great number of members to an existing oligarchy is stated with great confidence, and the statement has never been contradicted. Now, if the fact is really so, the consequences of it can be easily developed. For it is essential to the nature of a House of Commons, that each individual member should be able to speak his free and independent sentiments on any measure; and, if he acts under the control of another person, the great advantages of a representative body are lost. Such a House of Commons may bear the form of a representation of the people; but, whatever may be the benefits of an institution of this kind, they are in danger of being lost or perverted by the prevailing influence, which guides their proceedings. The fact, therefore, deserves a serious investigation. If they are true, whatever arguments are used in favour of the representative system, are inapplicable to a House of Commons so constituted, and the demoralizing effects of such a system

cannot fail of increasing to an extent which may alarm every well-wisher to his country.

These demoralizing effects attach to the oligarchist and his substitute. The one will grow more and more insensible to the real good of his country: for every man is most alive to his own personal interests, and these may be enveloped in the furthering of measures adverse to, or preventing those, which are beneficial to the country. The mind of the substitute will naturally grow debased and servile by the daily subjection of his voice and opinions to the decision of his patron; and thus the two parties corrupting and corrupted will gradually grow more and more callous to the feelings of honour and patriotism.

That this is the natural and necessary effect of the oligarchical system no one can deny. How far it exists in this country is another question. It may be some time, supposing it to exist, before all its baneful consequences can be developed: but as sure as the dry rot if not prevented in time, will destroy every beam of timber in a building to which it can have access, so sure is it, that the corruption necessarily produced by an oligarchical system, will increase, till it has destroyed every particle of manly spirit, and left to the constitution the frame only without the substance.

The arguments, if they can be called by that name, which were brought forward against Sir F. Burdett, were very feeble. They rested chiefly on the danger of change, the horror of innovation, and the flourishing state of the empire under its present system. On the danger of change it may be observed, that the persons, who are against change, should be for the motion at least in some degree; as the nature of the present system is to change more and more the actual state of the government. They, who dread innovation, should be the more on their guard against the innovations of time, and the present system is innovation; for it is only within these few years that the purchase and sale of boroughs could be talked of openly, and wherever such a transaction took place, it was carried on under every species of concealment that could be imagined. And as to the flourishing state of the country, if such a thing could be mentioned at present, this was owing not to the corruption, which is said to have taken place, but to the energies of the country, which that corruption had not as yet subdued. It is a long time before the full effects of a system are developed. What was done in the reign of George the First by a House of Commons perpetuating by its own vote its existence for four years,

might at the time have had a plausible argument in its favour, but the lengthened duration of parliament, necessarily and gradually made the members of the House of Commons a very different set of men, from what they would have been, if they had been returned every three years to their constituents for their approbation. In the same manner the system of purchase and sale of seats of parliament, when once established to a considerable extent, occasions a change in the persons, who by these means obtain their seats: and it cannot be denied that there is more chance for integrity and ability, when the conduct of a member is to undergo a scrutiny, than when his situation depends merely on the length of his purse.

But time reconciles man to the greatest absurdities, and they are defended often with the greater pertinacity, the more glaring they are in the eyes of those by whom they are exposed. Otherwise how can we account for the fatal errors of idolatry, the bigotted attachment to the Papal See, the infant God of Thibet, or the Caaba of Mecca. In this question of reform we are not therefore to be surprised, if one should venture to declare, that he would as soon part with the representation of Yorkshire as that of Old Sarum; i. e. of the most populous county of England, as that of a place which has no inhabitants: in short, that the accidental purchaser of a spot could choose two representatives, as useful to the kingdom as a populous county. This is bringing the question of representation to an issue indeed; and it comes to the question, whether in a succession of purchasers it is likely that their substitutes would equally attend to the interests of the kingdom, as those nominated by the people, who would know by experience the characters of the persons they sent to parliament.

But in this question a paradox has been seen. One of the members for Yorkshire declared himself against reform. Now this may seem passing strange that a person, who is reported to have spent about a hundred thousand pounds to attain the dignity of representing Yorkshire, should like to be placed on the same level with a man, who has been sent to the House on the nomination of a person, who has acquired the right of sending two members of parliament for ever for a much less sum. This paradox however is not difficult of explanation, for Yorkshire itself does not differ so much from a borough as is imagined. The expence of contesting the county upon the present system is so great, that the choice of representatives is confined to very few

houses, and the peace of the County as it is called may be kept by them, though the individuals to be returned to parliament may be of opposite sides of the question. If the interest of a member for Yorkshire should be connected with that of the borough-holders by the prospect of having some boroughs in his own possession, the paradox is solved. It requires a great freedom from prejudice, that is, a previous judgment, a judgment not formed by an examination of the question in all its bearings, to examine the representation in a proper manner. Age, experience, freedom from passions, and a determined resolution to speak the truth, independent of all parties, seem to be requisite to place this question in its true light, and to enable every man, who will study it properly, to be convinced in his own mind of the propriety of every step to be taken on so important a subject.

That such a man should be produced in a nation, and exactly at the time when his talents were most wanted, is one of those extraordinary circumstances which are not without example in the history of the world. Rendered illustrious in every part of Europe by the development of the principles of legislation, from which every kingdom may derive advantage—dignified by age, and by the concurrent testimony of all that is great and good in this kingdom—Mr. Bentham has concentrated the powers of his mighty mind upon the subject of the representation of this kingdom. His work is now studied in the closet by every man of thought and reflection. It can be read only by such men. The language and diction render it in a great degree inaccessible to the generality of readers. It is a study by itself, and every one who has the capacity to enter into the profoundness of his investigation, to fathom his reasonings, to perceive the bearings of every part of his argument, will be improved by the study of his work; and, whether he agrees with him or not ultimately, he cannot fail of discovering where the truth lies: and we are much mistaken if the man who should sit down with a determined resolution to confute it, would not arise the more convinced of the propriety of every sentiment maintained in this extraordinary work. We shall of course be understood to mean this, with the reserve of what may appear to be exasperations, as applicable to those individuals in the present or former times, who justly or unjustly may have become objects of the severity of censure. The work is destined to be a standard book on representation. The comments on it may be voluminous; the substance of it will find its way gradually into public notice.

Whatever may be the result, the historian of this country cannot fail of recording that it had the fullest means of being enlightened, by being forewarned on the general tendency of different modes of representation.

Sir F. Burdett took up the general question of reform, desirous only of a committee to inquire what steps should be taken to produce that which is suited to the present state of the country. Mr. Brougham has given notice of a particular reform; that is to bring back the duration of parliament from seven to three years. This will be a point gained, for the present duration has a very bad tendency. It renders the representative less dependent on, and less attached to his constituents. The annuality of parliaments is considered by many persons as more desirable, and they who are of this opinion cannot at any rate object to the duration being brought nearer to their system. However, it is not apprehended that Mr. Brougham will meet with more success than Sir F. Burdett.

These questions naturally interest us most at home. Abroad, new appearances perplex the political world. It is well known that a matrimonial connexion has united together the Courts of Brazil and Madrid, and it was supposed that the seizure of Monte Video by the former had been concerted in unison with them both. A state paper, however, signed by several foreign powers, has set this matter in a very different light, and it made its appearance in the public papers at the same time with intelligence from the Brazils, which may render nugatory all the plans of the Christian powers to restore peace and amity between the contending courts. Several foreign powers, among which is England, have drawn up a spirited remonstrance to the King of the Brazils, founded on their Christian zeal for the preservation of peace, the expectation that the connubial engagements would have produced more favourable dispositions, and the injustice of an unprovoked attack on the King of Spain's transatlantic dominions. In this situation they have been solicited by the King of Spain, and have undertaken to mediate between the two powers, so unfortunately at variance with each other. The answer of the King of the Brazils is not arrived, and upon it will depend the resolves of the high and mighty powers in this difficult conjecture.

The bone of contention is the possession of Monte Video, and the country on the northern bank of La Plata, the country opposite Buenos Ayres, which has withdrawn its allegiance from the King of Spain, and which assuredly would never let him have a foot of the disputed terri-

tory. The vulnerable points of the King of Brazil's dominions are Portugal, and if the high and mighty powers choose to give it to Spain, the latter country will have received ample compensation for the injury it has sustained; and besides the King of the Brazils would in vain attempt to resist the invasion of his European dominions.

But a new scene is opening. At the time we are writing perhaps there is not a King of the Brazils. Not that the person so named is not in existence, but his power in the Brazils is annihilated. An account is brought that the people of that country have some how or another acquired certain notions of liberty and independence, which makes them think that they may be happier without the Inquisition and the fostering care of the House of Braganza. An insurrection to a very alarming extent has taken place. Seizing the opportunity, when the troops were gone to La Plata, the people have risen and have determined to imitate the conduct of the United States, to enjoy freedom of religion and freedom of commerce, to have laws of their own, and to be governed by representatives of their own nation. The accounts of course

are very general, and it may be exaggerated; but the probability of the circumstance is so great, that a considerable degree of credit is given to the report. A short time, however, will develop the evil to its full extent, and in the mean time the intelligence which the Court of Madrid is receiving cannot be very pleasing. Its power in Chili seems to be annihilated, and in the Caraccas a signal victory over its troops has established independence in that part of its dominions. It has quelled insurrection at home, but a general, the principal of the insurgents, has not suffered the fate assigned to him by law, and it is doubtful whether it will be expedient to make away with him. The press, however, is in such complete subjection in that country, that very little dependence can be placed on any accounts from it. One paper asserts, that the Spaniard is devoted to the reigning system, whilst another maintains that general dissatisfaction prevails. Time will unravel all this, but probably matters will not be settled without the interference of the Holy Alliance.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Owing to our being under the necessity of putting the sheets of the present Number to press earlier than usual, the conclusion of the Review of *Dr. Laurence's Remarks upon Griesbach* is unavoidably deferred to the next month. The lateness of the day of the month of the anniversary of the *Unitarian Fund* prevents us also from reporting the proceedings of the meeting in this Number.

C. A. E. and *Scrutator* on the paper signed A. B. C.; *E.* on Vindictive Punishments; and various other communications, too numerous to be specified, have been received.

We are desired again to say that the parcel, before promised but delayed, lies at the publishers' for our Liverpool correspondent.

The following subscriptions are in hand:

<i>York Baptist Chapel,</i>			
Thomas Hardy, Esq. Walworth,	. . .	1	1 0
Mr. David Eaton, High-Holborn,	. . .	1	1 0
<i>Neath Chapel,</i>			
Richard Cooke, Esq. Bath,	1	1 0
<i>Oldham Chapel,</i>			
Richard Cooke, Esq.	1	1 0
<i>Edinburgh Chapel,</i>			
Richard Cooke, Esq.	1	1 0
<i>Tiverton Chapel,</i>			
Richard Cooke, Esq.	1	1 0

* * A few copies remain of the proof print of the late Mr. VIDLER, which (together with the proof prints of Dr. PRIESTLEY, Dr. TOULMIN and SERVETUS) may be had of the publishers, price 5s.—Very few more copies of the MONTHLY REPOSITORY are printed than are actually sold at the beginning of the month, and therefore subscribers are advised to be punctual in filling up their sets.—The same plan is now pursued, and the same advice is given, with regard to THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER, of which Two VOLUMES are completed, and may be had of the publishers, price 6s. 6d. each in boards.

ERRATA.

P. 168, col. i. 5 lines from the bottom, dele "they" and read *these questions*.

— 240, col. i. 5 lines from the top, "the" should have been printed in the Roman character.

— 241, col. ii. 17 lines from the top, for "Now" read *How*.