

THE
Monthly Repository,
&c.

No. CXXXVIII.]

JUNE, 1817.

[Vol. XII.]

BIOGRAPHY.

*Memoir of the late Right Reverend
Dr. Richard Watson, Bishop of
Llandaff.*

(From "The Annual Biography and Obituary, for the Year 1817.")

THIS celebrated Prelate possessed many claims to public attention, as a theologian, a chemist, an agriculturist and a man of letters. It would be unpardonable, therefore, to allow such a name to sink for a moment into oblivion; or even to permit his memory to remain unhallowed with the just meed of praise.

Richard Watson, a native of Westmoreland, was born at Eversham, about five miles from Kendal, both situate in that county, in the year 1737. His father, a clergyman, who possessed but a very trifling preferment, enjoyed for many years the Mastership of the Free Grammar School in Kendal, where the son was brought up. That his education was carefully attended to, and that he was not only early, but thoroughly initiated in the elements of human learning, appears probable; his knowledge, indeed, seems to have been all that he carried with him to Cambridge, except a very scanty stock of money, the most persevering economy, and a habit of application that defied imitation, and almost belief. He was admitted of Trinity College about the year 1755; and his ~~true blue worsted stockings and coarse mottled coat~~, both of which doubtless evinced themselves of home-spun manufacture, together with a northern or provincial accent, are still commemorated by tradition in the annals of that celebrated institution. Nor ought such trifles to be overlooked in this place: for when it is recollected, that his unimpeachable morals, rapid progress and uniform good conduct, either served to overcome or to obliterate the prejudices

arising from these petty obstacles, the very mention of them conveys an appropriate lesson to the raw, young and uninformed *Tyro*.

Mr. Watson was twenty-two years old when he took his first degree, having obtained that of B. A. in 1759; he proceeded A. M. in 1762, when he stood high among the *Wranglers*; and finally crowned his academical promotions as D. D. in 1791. The Doctor appears at an early period to have obtained the respect of his own college, which could not be long unconscious of his worth; and to this was added the esteem of the whole University, in consequence of an incident which might have proved prejudicial to a person less discreet. The late Duke of Grafton, who was then their Chancellor, having made an improper recommendation of a candidate for a vacant office, he gave a spirited opposition to the appointment; but took care at the same time to mingle his objections with so much suavity of manner, as actually to obtain the friendship of the nobleman in question. Indeed, at an early period, he appears to have imbibed a due knowledge of the world and its affairs: for although he never excelled in *mathematics*, a study, then, as now deemed so essential at Trinity College; yet he soon obtained precedence of those who were deeply versed in all its most abstruse branches. Thus Postlethwayte, one of his ablest opponents as a *Wrangler*, could demonstrate himself fit only for a small rectory in the country, while Watson was soon enabled to become his Diocesan!

A fellowship obtained some time before, afforded something like present independence, while a college tutorship led to future honours and emoluments. The present Lord Carysfort was one of his early pupils; and to another, the late Mr. Luther, after-

wards M. P. for the county of Essex, he was indebted for a large portion of that affluence which accompanied the latter period of his life; while by means of a third—the late Duke of Rutland, he was at length enabled to attain a mitre.

At the period alluded to, modern chemistry, then in its infant state in Great Britain, appears to have been unknown, or at least unattended to in the University of Cambridge. This may be fairly deduced from the circumstance, that a gentleman elected Public Professor of this science, was notoriously ignorant of the first principles of the art. Luckily, however, the office fell to the lot of Mr. Watson in 1764, who determined that it should not be a *sinecure*. Immediately after his nomination, he associated Hoffman, *supposed* to be a good practical chemist, in his labours, and by his means learned the rudiments of the art, in which he was to instruct others. It is well known in the University that their first attempts were rude, awkward and unsuccessful. During the course of their joint experiments, both they and their workshop are said to have been “blown into the air!” but luckily escaping with only a few bruises and contusions, they proceeded in their doubtful and dangerous labours, until considerable progress had been effected. Immediately on this, the subject of the present memoir having commenced his public lectures, adopted the *nomenclature* then in use, but since become obsolete, and exhibited his apparatus and his experiments to a crowded and admiring audience. The discourses of the new Professor were of a popular nature; he did not pretend to enter into the depths of science, but contented himself with explaining the more obvious principles, and above all demonstrating the intimate connexion between chemistry and manufactures.

His fortune was now assured. In 1771 he was created Doctor of Divinity by royal mandate; and in the course of the same year was unanimously elected Regius Professor of Divinity to the University of Cambridge; to which office the rectory of Somersham, in Huntingdonshire, is annexed. On this, he married a lady of respectable connexions, with whom he had been long acquainted, and soon began to have a family around

him, for which he was now enabled to provide.

By this time his reputation had extended throughout the whole kingdom, and the Royal Society, anxious to incorporate a man of such talents among its members, immediately proceeded to his election. Many of his papers, soon after, were published in the Philosophical Transactions; and those connected with chemistry were at length selected, and engrafted into his Essays.

Meanwhile, his friends and admirers were not inattentive to his clerical interests: for in 1774 he was presented to a prebendal stall in the church of Ely; and in 1780 succeeded Dr. Plumptre, as archdeacon of that diocese. In the course of the same year he obtained the rectory of Northwold, in Norfolk; while his patron and former pupil, the Duke of Rutland, now presented him to the valuable rectory of Knaptoft, in the county of Leicester, as an earnest of his future intentions.

It may be here fairly and truly stated, without intending any insult to Oxford, that anterior to the French Revolution, the University of Cambridge was uniformly distinguished by Whig principles, and all those liberal notions both in respect to politics and religion, which were introduced with, or rather confirmed by William III. It was not until the year 1776 that Dr. Watson had an opportunity of publicly maintaining his own opinions on those interesting subjects. Being then nominated to preach before his own University, on the anniversary of the Restoration, he delivered a discourse, which was soon after printed, under the title of “The Principles of the Revolution Vindicated,” which attracted a considerable share of notice and popularity. Another of the same nature, and professing the same tenets, on the anniversary of his present Majesty’s accession to the throne, produced a controversy; but like all similar contentions, the disputants were soon lost in their own smoke; and we now only recollect “An Heroic Epistle to Dr. Watson;” the author of which, supposed to be the same with that “to Sir William Chambers,” remains still unknown.

Having thus vindicated the principles of general liberty, and justified the revolution of 1688, Dr. Watson

next proceeded to justify Christianity itself, from the attacks of sophistry, scepticism and infidelity. The late Mr. Gibbon, fond of ease, luxury and enjoyment, had relinquished his political opinions for a place; but in his religious tenets, he appears to have remained firm and sincere until the very last. In two of the chapters of his celebrated work on "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," he had attacked the religion of Christ; and he was now answered by means of a work, entitled, "An Apology for Christianity, in a Series of Letters, addressed to Edward Gibbon, Esq." This immediately became a popular production; for, instead of calling in the assistance of the secular power, or commencing his attack with the violence of bigoted zeal, Dr. Watson displayed all the mildness of a true Christian, and all the good manners of a well-bred gentleman.

In 1780, he published another Sermon, preached before his own University, in the beginning of the same year (Feb. 4th), on the day appointed for the general fast; and in 1781, he produced his first volume of "Chemical Essays." This was soon after followed by four additional ones.

At length, by the influence of the Duke of Rutland, to whom this work was inscribed, he obtained the mitre; and thus owed to a lucky incident, what his own merit had fully entitled him to. From that moment he seems to have abandoned his once favourite pursuit, as will be seen from the following quotation from the preface to his fifth and last volume:

"When I was elected Professor of Divinity in 1771, I determined to abandon, for ever, the study of chemistry, and I did abandon it for several years; but the *veteris vestigia flammæ* still continued to delight me, and at length seduced me from my purpose.

"When I was made a Bishop, in 1782, I again determined to quit my favourite pursuit: the volume which I now offer to the public is a sad proof of the imbecility of my resolution.

"I have on this day, however, offered a sacrifice to other people's notions, I confess, rather than to my own opinion of *episcopal decorum*—I have destroyed all my chemical ma-

nuscripts. — A prospect of returning health might have persuaded me to pursue this delightful science, but I have now certainly done with it for ever; at least, I have taken the most effectual step I could, to ~~wear~~ ^{wean} myself from an attachment to it; for, with the holy zeal of the idolators of old, who had been addicted to curious arts — *I have burned my books.*"

Soon after his consecration, the new Bishop attracted the notice of both the clerical profession and the public at large, by "A Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury," on the equalization of the Church Revenues. His Lordship, on this occasion, proved himself the sincere friend of the great body of the clergy, by demonstrating the hardships to which those who possessed scanty livings were subjected. Yet, although his arguments were conclusive, and his facts incontrovertible, neither the Metropolitan himself, nor any of those possessed of rich livings, were much pleased, perhaps, with this address.*

* As this work, which has been lately re-published in the Pamphleteer (No. XVI.) formerly excited much attention, and is still worthy of perusal, we shall here give an analysis of it. After some prefatory remarks complimentary to the clergy in general, and the Bench of Bishops in particular, Dr. Watson fairly states his object to be two-fold, viz. "An Alteration respecting the Revenue of the Bishops and the inferior Clergy;"—"not by means of a parity of Preferments, but a better apportioned Distribution of what the State allows for the Maintenance of the established Clergy."

1. He wishes to make the Bishoprics more equal to each other, both with respect to income and patronage, by annexing part of the estates, and part of the preferments of the richer bishoprics, as they become vacant, to the poorer; which would prevent the holding of preferments *in commendam*, on the part of some of them; and produce a greater independence of the prelacy in the House of Lords; and lastly, by restricting them to their original sees, superinduce a longer residence in their respective dioceses, which would thus also be the means of rendering their places of abode more comfortable and commodious, when no translation was expected.

The Doctor maintains that the whole revenue of the church, including bishoprics, deans and chapters, rectories, vicarages, dignities, and benefices of all kinds, did not, when he wrote, amount to more than

The late Mr. Cumberland, however, was the only person who attempted to answer it; and his reply lost much of its effect from the appearance of haste and violence in which it was composed.

The Bishop of Llandaff was now considered as a very able and popular prelate; and on being chosen to preach before the Lords on January 30, 1783, the Abbey was crowded on the occasion. But those who expected any violent declarations, or extraordinary political sentiments, returned home disappointed; on the other hand, such as were fond of a discourse admirable in its composition, and cautious as well as temperate, in respect to its sentiments, were delighted upon this occasion.

In 1786 appeared "A Collection of Theological Tracts," in 6 vols. 8vo. of which his Lordship was the avowed editor. This was published at Cambridge, and designed entirely for the use of students in divinity: it may be considered as an official publication,

1,500,000*l.* a year; and that, estimating the clergy at 10,000, this would not produce a clear revenue of above 150*l.* a year to each individual. Now, although the whole revenue of the church is so inconsiderable as not to admit of any diminution of it; "yet," adds his Lordship, "a somewhat better administration of it might be introduced, with much, it is apprehended, advantage to the state, and without the least injustice to any individual." He accordingly proposes to endow the poorer, out of the revenues of the richer benefices, so as at the end of 60 or 70 years, to render *all* the clergy comfortable; whereas by the operation of Queen Anne's Bounty, this cannot occur, in less than two or three hundred.

"As to any censure," adds the good Bishop, "to which I may have exposed myself, in becoming, as some will scoffingly phrase it, a reformer; in disturbing, as others will seem to apprehend, the repose of the establishment, I will, as the Apostle recommends, *take it patiently*: it is much easier to bear the reproach of other men's tongues, than of our own minds; and that I could not have escaped, had I done less than I have done. I flatter myself, however, or rather I have good reason to expect, that many of my brethren will see the subject in the same light that I have done, and will concur in recommending it, when the more urgent concerns of the state are in some measure settled, to the notice of Parliament."

as *Regius Professor*; and the series, of itself, forms an inestimable library to every candidate for holy orders. It could add nothing to his Lordship's fame, as it required selection alone; it was therefore considered merely in the light of a duty.

As the Bishop of Llandaff had now become a legislator, the eyes of the public were steadily fixed upon his political conduct. During the discussion of the commercial treaty with France, his Lordship supported Ministers in that measure, which must be allowed to have proved highly beneficial to this country. During His Majesty's first illness he joined the opposition, and was one of those who considered the Prince of Wales as possessing an unqualified right by birth alone to the assumption of the Regency. But Mr. Pitt, on this occasion, deemed it more constitutional, that the two remaining states should supply the temporary vacancy of the throne. The sudden and unexpected recovery of the Sovereign put an end to all the changes then meditated; and among other incidental speculations of that day, the vacant Bishopric of St. Asaph was assigned to Dr. Watson.

Meanwhile, a great and singular event occurred in Europe, which, from the very beginning, seemed portentous; and in a short time appeared pregnant with the most serious and important results. Different opinions prevailed as to the manner in which the French Revolution ought to be viewed by the English people; and ministry and opposition were, as usual, divided, both as to the nature and the treatment of this national convulsion. The Bishop of Llandaff, as a friend to peace, appears to have deprecated all intervention on our part; and it was not until long after the commencement of hostilities, that he gave his avowed sanction to the war. In 1791 he delivered a charge to the clergy of his diocese, in which this and a number of other points were touched upon; particularly respecting the present condition of the Church, and the pretensions of those who dissented from the established faith. To avoid the possibility of misrepresentation, he soon after deemed it necessary to publish this address.

His attention seems now to have

been divided between his attendance in the House of Lords, where he spoke frequently, and always in the spirit of conciliation, and his prelatical duties, when called on as a preacher, to promote the great charitable institutions of our metropolis. Accordingly, he twice preached sermons for the benefit of the Humane Society, both of which were admirable of their kind, although neither of them has ever been printed. He also delivered a discourse in behalf of the Westminster Dispensary, which has been praised by an author, by no means favourable to his political sentiments:—

“I am not in the habit of perusing many of the various single sermons which are published; but I cannot resist the opportunity of recommending three, which I think are at this time important, and written with ability and spirit. One by the Rev. Dr. Vincent, head Master of Westminster School (a gentleman of very considerable erudition, diligence, ability and most exemplary conduct), preached for the Westminster Dispensary; another by Doctor Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, preached for the Westminster Dispensary also; with an Appendix, containing Reflexions on the Present State of England and France: the Appendix is of peculiar merit;—and a third ‘On Gaming;’ written with great energy, patriotism and eloquence, by the Reverend Thomas Rennel, D. D. Prebendary of Winchester.”

In 1796, an opportunity occurred, and was happily seized by the Bishop, which enabled him not only to distinguish himself as an advocate for, but also to be of eminent service to the cause of Christianity. It was at that period that the “Age of Reason” was encountered by “An Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters, addressed to the Author of that Work.” On this occasion, he made use of the same mildness and urbanity that he had before displayed, when encountering the infidel opinions broached by Mr. Gibbon; and it must be allowed that in both instances he was deemed not only a very opportune, but a very able champion in behalf of that faith, which pervades the whole of civilized Europe. In short, Doctor Watson’s well-timed and celebrated tract against Paine, although it did

not, like Horsley’s contest with Priestley, lead to preferment, yet, for a time, turned the tide of loyalty and religion in his favour, and procured him admirers among a class of writers who had before been his enemies.*

At the commencement of the year 1799, his Lordship published an “Address to the People of Great Britain.” In this political pamphlet he prudently waved all discussion of the merits or demerits of the war, in respect to its origin; but took a new view of our then situation, after six

* The author of the “Pursuits of Literature,” thus compliments the good Bishop, both in prose and verse, upon the present occasion:—

“Yet all shall read, † when bold in strength divine,
Prelatic virtue guards the Christian shrine,
Pleas’d from the pomp of science to descend,
And teach the people as their hallow’d friend;
In gentle warnings to the unsettled breast,
In all its wand’rings from the realms of rest,
From impious scoffs and ribaldry to turn,
And Reason’s Age, by reason’s light discern;
Refix insulted truth with temper’d zeal,
And feel that joy which WATSON best can feel.”

† “See the important, convincing and eloquent Letters addressed to Thomas Paine, author of the ‘Age of Reason;’ Second Part, by the Right Rev. Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, styled ‘An Apology for the Bible.’

“To write such a book as this, is to do a real service to mankind. A cheap edition of it is printed, and it is hoped will be circulated throughout the kingdom.

“I think that his ‘Defence of Revealed Religion,’ in two short sermons, is of great merit, and of general utility. Bishop Watson should often write, but with the utmost caution, accuracy and consideration; because his works will always be read.

“I would also particularly recommend the perusal of the Sixth Letter of the series of letters which the Bishop addressed to Mr. Gibbon. To young men of fashion and of abilities, originally good, but obscured by libertine life and conversation, it will be peculiarly serviceable; as well as those who are led astray by some modern pretended discoveries in *natural philosophy*, now a favourite mode of introducing and enforcing scepticism and infidelity.”—P. 230—232.

years' conflict with an enemy, which becoming stronger daily, during the contest, now menaced us with retaliation, and even threatened invasion itself. Assuming the proposition, that the nation was reduced to the alternative of absolute submission on one hand, or a vigorous prosecution of the contest on the other, he declared in favour of the latter. His Lordship accordingly maintained, that great sacrifices and great exertions had become necessary; and he conjured his countrymen to make these in behalf of their liberty, their property, and all that is dear to man.

This address of course produced a multitude of replies. Some accused him of dereliction of both principles and character; while others animadverted on the laxity of his opinions, and the prudent conformity now evinced to the established order of things. The pamphlet in question, however, produced a great effect on the public mind. The Government too, as if impressed with new zeal, in consequence of this timely co-operation, immediately unsheathed the flaming sword of prosecution against his opponents, two of whom were convicted of seditious libels; while all other writers were appalled from engaging in so dangerous a controversy. But the gratitude of Ministers ended here; for no *translation* ensued, and it was now found that the labourer who came in at the twelfth hour was not to be rewarded like him who appeared at the ninth.

But notwithstanding his Lordship had no fewer than six children, and his bishopric was always accounted a poor one, yet his revenues from the church could not be deemed scanty, nor his fortune contemptible. By the death of Mr. Luther,* in 1786, he had also obtained a legacy of 20,000*l*. Immediately after this, he determined to make an acquisition to that amount in his native county. He accordingly

purchased Calgarth Park, in Westmoreland, and erected a house, delightfully situate, in the immediate vicinity of the lakes. Here he considered himself as a country gentleman, and dedicated much of his time to agricultural pursuits. For many years Mr. Curwen, M. P. for Carlisle, was either the associate of his labours or the occasional companion of his retirement. Under his auspices, and at his own expense, the neighbouring mountains, up to their very summits, were clothed with wood of all descriptions, particularly the larch. Of this favourite tree he planted many millions, and obtained on that account not only the applause of all men interested in the improvements of their native country, but the gold medal of the Society of Arts, Manufactures, &c. His leisure moments were also occupied at intervals, with literary pursuits, and he is said to have been busily employed for many years past in writing an "History of his Own Times."

The good Bishop, who had now attained almost a patriarchal age, began of late years to stoop, and exhibit symptoms of decay. A fit or two of apoplexy, warned both himself and family of his impending fate; and he at length uttered his last sigh at Calgarth Park, in the county of Westmoreland, amidst the woods he had planted, and the hills where he was born, on July 5th, 1816.

Thus died Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, in the 79th year of his age. As a divine, he must be allowed to have been orthodox; for although a friend to reform, he broached no new tenets, but was a vigorous, able, and zealous supporter of the established church. In his person, he was tall, stout, muscular and dignified. As a bishop, he was always the patron of unfriended merit, and added dignity to the bench by his learning, his intelligence, his ability and his independence. As an orator, his action was graceful, his voice harmonious, and his delivery both chaste and correct. As a writer, he displayed a great knowledge of composition; his style was neat, and even elegant, while his diction was pure and argumentative. But it is as a controversial writer that he is entitled to great, deserved and undiminished praise.

* This gentleman was not only indebted to the Bishop for the care taken of his education and morals, but also for his friendly and spirited intervention on a singular occasion. Mr. L. was addicted to play, and having fallen into the hands of sharpers in France, was actually rescued from their fangs by Dr. Watson, who repaired to the Continent on purpose.

In all his contests, he made use of the language befitting a scholar and a gentleman; and he both detested, and scorned to imitate, the vituperative attacks of those who, by recurring to scurrility and personality, forget the first duty of a Christian divine.

List of the Works of the late Dr. Watson, Lord Bishop of Llandaff.

1. Ricardi Watson, A. M. Coll. S. S. Trin. Soc. et Chemiæ Profess. in Acad. Cantab. Inst. Chemic. in Prælect. Acad. Exp. Pars Metallurgica, 8vo. 1766.
2. An Essay on the Subjects of Chemistry, and their General Divisions, 8vo. 1771.
3. An Apology for Christianity, in a Series of Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq. the Historian, 12mo. 1776. 3 editions.
4. Chemical Essays, 2 vols. 12mo. 1781; since published in 5 vols. 12mo.
5. A Letter to Archbishop Cornwallis, on the Equalization of the Revenues of the Church of England, 4to. 1783.
6. Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Llandaff, 4to. 1784.
7. Collection of Theological Tracts, selected from various Authors, for the use of such of the younger Students of the University of Cambridge as are intended for Holy Orders.
- N. B. His Lordship, on this occasion, acted merely as Editor.
8. Sermons on Public Occasions, and Tracts on Religious Subjects, 8vo. 1788.
9. Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy, and Articles of the Church of England, 8vo. 1790. *Anon.*
10. An Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters addressed to Thomas Paine, 12mo. 1796. *Many editions.*
11. An Address to the People of Great Britain, 8vo. 1798.
12. Substance of a Speech intended to have been spoken in the House of Lords, 8vo. 1803.
13. Thoughts on the intended Invasion, 8vo. 1803.
14. Miscellaneous Tracts on Religious, Political and Agricultural Subjects, 2 vols. 8vo. 1815.

Also a variety of papers in the Philosophical Transactions, and in the

Transactions of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society.

Charges and Single Sermons.

15. An Assize Sermon preached at Cambridge, 4to. 1765.
16. A Sermon preached at do. on the 29th of May, 1776, 4to.
17. A Sermon preached at do. on the Anniversary of His Majesty's Accession, 4to. 1776.
18. A Sermon preached at do. on the Fast Day, 4to. 1780.
19. A Discourse delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Ely, 4to. 1780.
20. A Sermon preached before the Lords, in Westminster Abbey, on the 30th January, 4to. 1784.
21. Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Llandaff, 4to. 1784.
22. The Wisdom and Goodness of God in having made both Rich and Poor; a Sermon, 4to. 1785. 2 editions.
23. Address to Young Persons after Confirmation, 12mo. 1789.
24. Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, in 1791. 4to. 1792.
25. A Sermon preached in 1785, for the Westminster Dispensary, with an Appendix, 4to. 1792.
26. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, 4to. 1795.
- 27 & 28. Two Sermons preached in the Cathedral of Llandaff, 4to. 1795.
29. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of the London Hospital, 4to. 1802.
30. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, 4to. 1802.
31. A Sermon preached in the Church of St. George, Hanover Square, before the Society for the Suppression of Vice, 8vo. 1804.
32. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, in June, 1805. 4to.
- 33, 34 & 35. Two Sermons, and a Charge, in Defence of Revealed Religion, 8vo. 1806.
- 36 & 37. Two Sermons, constituting a second Defence of Revealed Religion, preached at the Chapel Royal, 8vo. 1807.
38. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, 8vo. 1808.

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

SIR, Clapton, June 1, 1817.

ABOUT ten years ago I had some conversation with Mr. Granville Sharp on the subject of his first attempts, forty years before that time, to vindicate the freedom of Negroes in England. He soon after very obligingly communicated to me the following papers, the copies of his letters being endorsed, corrected and signed by himself. I am persuaded you will readily judge these authentic documents on such an interesting subject, to be worthy of preservation. The condition of Negroes in England, when Mr. Sharp undertook their cause, cannot be shewn more clearly than by the following advertisements, which I copy from p. 87 of his first publication, "A Representation of the Injustice and Dangerous Tendency of Tolerating Slavery; or of Admitting the least Claim of Private Property in the Persons of Men in England." 1769.

PUBLIC LEDGER, Dec. 31, 1767.

"For sale, a healthy Negro Girl, aged about fifteen years, speaks good English, works at her needle, washes well, does household work, and has had the small pox. By J. W. at Mr. M'Auley's, the Amsterdam Coffee-House, near the Exchange, from twelve till two o'clock every day."

GAZETTEER, April 18, 1769.

Horses, Tim Wisky, and Black Boy.

"To be sold, at the Bull and Gate Inn, Holborn, a very good Tim Wisky, little the worse for wear,—a chesnut gelding, a very good grey mare,—and a well made good tempered Black Boy; he has lately had the small pox, and will be sold to any gentleman. Enquire as above."

Such were the *reputed* human brutes, mere marketable commodities, for whom Mr. Sharp, fifty years ago, *solely* adventured to claim the rights of men, and submitted to be smiled upon as a humane visionary, if not censured as a *busy body in other men's matters*. But the *wisdom* with which he pursued the impulse of his benevolence was, at length, sufficiently *justified*. I have been informed, probably from himself, that he persevered, after his legal advisers

had given up the cause as hopeless, entering upon a very laborious historical and legal research, to which the work I have mentioned bears ample testimony. It may, indeed, be fairly questioned whether more unwearied industry were ever employed in the accumulation of wealth, than Mr. Sharp exerted through life, in finding occasions for its benevolent distribution.

It is remarkable that what was not considered as the established law of England till 1772, and after so severe a conflict, had been described as the known law of *France* one hundred years before, in the reign of Louis XIV. The following passage is a translation from *Les Delices de la France*. 18mo. Paris, 1671, Prem. Part. p. 246, by an author sufficiently courtly:—

France is so fond of liberty that she cannot endure a *slave*. Thus neither Turks nor Moors, and still less Christian people must bear fetters or be chained in that country. So that slaves arriving in France, are no sooner landed than they exclaim for joy, 'France for ever, with her delightful liberty.' I once observed, in a certain city of the kingdom, a Moor, in the train of a Portuguese lady. Immediately on quitting the vessel, he threw himself on the earth, kissing it tenderly. Then raising his arms to heaven he cried aloud, 'France for ever! I am free! I am no longer a slave!'

* "La France est si amoureuse de la liberté, qu'elle ne peut pas souffrir un Esclave: de sorte que les Turcs, & les Mores, bien moins encore les Peuples Chrestiens, ne peuvent jamais porter de fers ny estre chargés de chaines, estans dans son pays: aussi arrive-t'il, que quand il y a des Esclaves en France, ils ne sont pas si tost à terre, qu'ils s'escrient pleins de ioye; Vive la France avec son aymable Liberté; & ie puis dire que i'ay veu estant dans une Ville du Royaume une More à la suite d'une Dame Portugaise, laquelle ne fut pas si tost hors du vaisseau que se iettant à terre, elle la baisa tendrément, haussant ensuite les bras vers le ciel, & criant à pleine teste; Vive la France, ie suis libre; vive la France, ie ne suis plus Esclave."

An extract from Mr. Sharp's second letter was given in your second volume, (p. 346). It was all I thought proper then to publish, but there can now be no occasion for reserve. I esteem it indeed a becoming respect for the memory of my father's much valued acquaintance and my own, to record especially Mr. Sharp's prevailing sense of religion and his anxiety for the moral improvement, according to his own views of Christianity, of those who had become the objects of his benevolent attention.

J. T. RUTT.

Letter I. Copy of a Letter to Mr. Harry Gandy, of Bristol, in Answer to his Representation of the Case of Harry Harper, a Poor Negro, that was Trepanned to be sold as a Slave.*

DEAR SIR, 8th August, 1796.

I AM sorry that a very particular engagement in business prevented me on Saturday from answering your obliging letter by the return of the post.

If the indenture or writing on which Captain Alleyn has made a mark (when he forcibly directed the hand of poor *Harry Harper*, by way of a signature,) has been signed also by the mate and the owner's clerk, who were present, they are both of them as well as the Captain himself, and also the owner, if he advised the measure, equally liable to penalties of £500 each, on the Habeas Corpus Act, by mere actions of debt, which the Negro, or any other person, may sue as that Act directs, with triple costs besides a premunire: if the mate and clerk have actually set their hands to any writing intended as an instrument for the purpose of an involuntary transportation of any man whatsoever, out of this kingdom beyond the seas, contrary to the express prohibition of that Act, they are certainly liable to be charged as principals in the conspiracy, whereby the captain will not be able to avail himself of the pretended testimony of

these two men, that the mark was voluntarily made by *Harper* in their presence: for when they are included in the charge as writing or signing, or as aiding, advising or assisting so heinous an attempt, in any other way whatsoever, they are principals in the crime, and as such cannot be admitted as witnesses in their own cause. A writ of Habeas Corpus is therefore the surest mode of relief.

But if you want to gain time, in order to draw up proper affidavits of the charge, and to consider better of the proper mode of proceeding—you may bail the man for his appearance in answer to the pretended charge of debt, for which he is now held in prison, in case the captain should venture to proceed in that charge,—in which case you must previously obtain the evidence of some of the ship's crew, that *Harper* was actually employed and did work as a seaman by the captain's orders, going aloft, &c. during the passage. Such proof will not only effectually bar and set aside the captain's charge against him for passage money (because no men that work as seamen are ever liable to be charged as passengers), but will, at the same time also, entitle the man to wages during the passage; for whenever labour is performed the wages are due in law, even though there was no previous agreement for wages. And as to any pretence or claim that the captain may set up against *Harper*, as having by his escape from the island on board his ship, rendered him liable to the penalty of £100, this cannot entitle the captain to any remedy or consideration whatever by the laws of England, which cannot effect any thing contrary to the laws of God (the foundation of the laws of England); for "to deliver up to his master the servant" (or slave), "that has escaped from his master"—is EXPRESSLY FORBID by God himself. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee even among you, in the place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." Though this is a part of the Mosaic law, (Deut xxiii. 16,) yet it is no

* This gentleman first received Mr. Clarkson at Bristol, when he went on his mission of inquiry from the committee in 1807. Hist. Abol. I. 294. R.

part of the ceremonial law of the Jews, now superseded and become obsolete, but it is manifestly a moral law, a branch of the moral revealed law of God, which is of eternal obligation. And all the colonial laws, that are contrary thereto, are *ipso facto* null and void according to the constitution of England, and cannot be effectual to recover any such pretended penalties, if this proper plea be opposed to them: for even a statute of Parliament, enacted and formed by all the requisite authority of king, lords and commons, must be deemed equally null and void for any purpose that is directly contrary to an express law of God!

Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. H. Thornton are at a great distance in the country, and indeed most of the leading members of our society are out of town: and, besides, we have no funds, having spent all long ago! As to myself, I have sunk so much money in a variety of litigations on behalf of the poor Blacks, that it is absolutely out of my power to afford any further pecuniary assistance; but, as I have actually established the practice of rendering the Habeas Corpus Act effectual for relief in all such cases, I hope you will find no difficulty in proceeding under the direction of some honest and intelligent lawyer.

I remain with great esteem,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate friend and

Humble servant,

GRANVILLE SHARP.

Mr. Harry Gandy, at Bristol.

Letter II. Mr. Gandy in Reply to Mr. Granville Sharp.

Bristol, 8th of 8th Mo. 1797.

DEAR FRIEND,

THY obliging favour, dated this day twelve months, was, for its important contents, perused by such a number of friends here to the African cause, that for a while I actually knew not where it was; so that when I found it, the time for answering it was so far elapsed, that I omitted, through that and some other causes, doing it to this day: which I mentioned a few days since, with real concern to our worthy friend Richard Philips, who justly reproved me for

the neglect, and said that "*even now it was better late than never,*" or words to that effect.

It is therefore under a painful sense of this inexcusable neglect that I take up the pen, not with a view to apologize for the shameful omission, because I know it will admit of none, but just to say, what ought to have been said almost a year since, that thy acceptable letter had its desired effect: for in a day or two after it came to hand, I had another opportunity with the merchant and Captain Alleyn, who, on perusing thy letter, and finding us determined to defend poor Harry Harper, they readily relinquished their claim and released the prisoner, and settled the matter to mutual satisfaction: previous to which we had employed an attorney, who on reading thy letter, asked me if the gentleman who wrote it, was not a counsellor. I told him he was not professionally so, but in point of legal knowledge, he was superior to most of them.

I dont know that ever I was guilty of such a breach of correspondence before, which is the more reprehensible as the end, by that now alluded to, was so fully and completely answered; so that it justly and deservedly precludes even the hope of a reply to this, although such, comprised but in a single line, would administer great relief to the uneasy mind of thy obliged and affectionate friend,

HARRY GANDY.

Granville Sharp, London.

Letter III. Copy of a Letter to Dr. Fox, (Falmouth,) respecting a Negro Boy.

No. 1, Garden Court, Temple,

SIR, London, 11th July, 1798.

LAST week on my return from the country I found on my table a letter from Mr. William Phillips, (son of your friend James Phillips,) inclosing your letter of the 29th ult. respecting a poor Negro boy in danger of being sent abroad as a slave, &c. It was never an object of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, to undertake the defence by law of individual slaves against their oppressors, but only to solicit a

general abolition of the infamous traffic by the legislature: and, besides, the society has not met for a long time, and their funds are entirely expended. I am not a member of the Philanthropic Society, and am quite unacquainted with their rules, but I apprehend that it would not come within the usual practice or rules of that society to advance any money towards paying the expense of sending the boy to London.

To satisfy your third question—“What success has attended similar attempts to rescue from slavery poor Negroes who have accidentally been brought into other British ports?”—It is necessary that I should acquaint you that I was obliged to defend myself at a heavy expense against an action at law for having set a Negro at liberty in the year 1767, one Jonathan Strong;* that my prosecutor, James Kerr, Esq. a Jamaica planter, was at length nonsuited and paid triple costs; that I then printed the arguments which I had drawn up for my own defence against an opinion formerly given by the Lords Hardwick and Talbot jointly, when the one was Attorney General and the other Solicitor General (a copy of which had been produced to intimidate me), stating, “that a slave by coming from the West Indies to Great Britain or Ireland, either with or

* Whom “Mr. David Lisle had brought over from Barbadoes,” and afterwards “used in a barbarous manner, particularly by beating him over the head with a pistol.” The consequence was, that Strong became afflicted with a complication of disorders, “and being therefore wholly useless, was left by his master to go whither he pleased.” Mr. G. S.’s brother, Mr. William S. was an eminent surgeon. Among his poor patients, Strong applied. Mr. G. S. thus met with him, gave him money, and when cured, provided for him a place. Lisle, “his master, happened to see him,” contrived to kidnap him, and sold him to Kerr “for thirty pounds;” but Mr. S. rescued him from “the Poultry Compter,” where “he was conveyed without any warrant,” till he could be put on board a ship for Jamaica. Clarkson. Hist. Abol. I. 67—70. This circumstance seems to have first turned Mr. Sharp’s attention to the condition of Negroes. R.

without his master, doth not become free,” &c. “and that the master may legally compel him to return again to the plantations.” (Signed) P. York and C. Talbot, and dated 14th Jan. 1729.† All which I disproved as being contrary to the foundations of the English law.

After the publication of my book, in 1769, I set many more Negroes at liberty, recovering them, by writs of Habeas Corpus, from on board the ships in which they were confined: and by prosecuting their masters, until Lord Mansfield, in the case of James Somerset (whom I protected) was compelled to give up the point in 1772, and to acknowledge from the Bench (in opposition to the above-mentioned opinion of York and Talbot, which he cited, as well as against his own former assertions and practice), that “a case so odious as the condition of slaves must be taken strictly: that tracing the subject to natural principles, the claim of slavery never can be supported. That the power claimed by this return,” (viz. the return made by James Somerset’s master, Mr. David Lisle,‡ a Lawyer, who afterwards challenged me to fight him, because I had liberated his servant,) “was never in use here or acknowledged by the law. That no master “was ever allowed here to take a slave by force to be sold abroad because he had deserted from his service, or for any other reason whatever.

† “OPINION. We are of opinion that a slave by coming from the West Indies to Great Britain, or Ireland, either with, or without his master, doth not become free; and that his master’s property or right in him, is not thereby determined or varied; and that baptism doth not bestow freedom on him, nor make any alteration in his temporal condition in these kingdoms. We are also of opinion, that the master may legally compel him to return again to the plantations.

P. YORK,
C. TALBOT.”

Jan. 14, 1729.”

Representation, &c. p. 2. R.

‡ This must be a misnomer by the copyist, which escaped Mr. Sharp’s correction. According to Clarkson, I. 76, Somerset’s master’s name was Charles Stewart. R.

We cannot say" (here his Lordship spoke in the name of all his brethren, the Judges on the Bench—"We cannot say" "the cause set forth by this return is allowed or approved of by the laws of this kingdom, and therefore the man (meaning James Somerset), must be discharged." This clear decision of the Court of King's Bench has since been recognized and admitted by other courts as unquestionable, particularly in the case of Cay and Chrichton in 1773, in the Prerogative Court (Doctors' Commons), by the then Judge, Dr. Hay, and afterwards in the High Court of Admiralty, on the 29th of June, 1776, in the case of Rogers, alias Rigges, against Jones. And yet I have still been obliged, even afterwards, to interfere for the relief of several other poor Negroes, and I always succeeded (God be thanked) in obtaining their liberty; but I never proceeded so far in the prosecutions against their masters, as to press them for the pecuniary penalties to which they are really liable by the Habeas Corpus Act, because I was always contented to stop proceedings as soon as they submitted and gave up the poor oppressed people.

As this long contested point is now so clearly determined, and the modes of proceeding for the relief of poor injured Negroes so thoroughly established, I think myself justified (after so much labour and expense) in declining to take upon myself any further burthen of expense either of time or money, because I cannot really afford either of them at present: yet, as a farther answer to your third inquiry above-mentioned, I have subjoined the copy of a letter which I wrote on the 8th of August, 1796, to Mr. Harry Gandy, of Bristol, on his application to me in behalf of a poor Negro. I did not receive his answer till the next year; it was dated exactly on the anniversary of my date, twelve months afterwards, (viz. 8th of 8th mo. 1797,) and contains a very handsome apology for having so long neglected to make his acknowledgment, and he added as follows:—"Thy acceptable letter had the desired effect: for in a day or two after it came to hand, I had another opportunity with the merchant and Captain Alleyn, who, on perusing thy

letter, and finding us determined to defend poor Harry Harper, they readily relinquished their claim and released the prisoner, and settled the matter to mutual satisfaction: previous to which we had employed an attorney," &c.

With respect to the present case of the poor boy at Falmouth, be assured that any person who shall attempt to carry him away out of the kingdom, against his will, must certainly be liable to a penalty of £500, besides triple costs; and that every person that shall have been advising, aiding or assisting in any such forcible carrying away, or even any attempt to carry him away, will also be liable to actions of debt for the same penalties: and this mode of proceeding by actions of debt is prescribed by law to facilitate the recovery of the penalties, for which, either the boy himself or any other person is entitled to sue by the Habeas Corpus Act.

The only difficulty of the present case consists in the bad character of the boy, as he "has been detected (you say) more than once in a theft." Now an habitual thief is, indeed, a slave in the very worst sense, being actually the property, as well as the son (by a fatal regeneration the wrong way) of the most cruel of all slave-holders, the devil* himself, that "prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." (Ephes. ii. 2.)

But as the spiritual slavery of the poor lad has, probably, been occasioned by the unchristian negligence of a West Indian education, we may hope that a plain and friendly remonstrance addressed to his conscience—to his "natural knowledge of good and evil," with the addition of a little Christian instruction and charitable advice how he ought to resist the impulses of his worst master, (his master's master, the spiritual slaveholder,) by praying for the assistance of the Holy Spirit (which is absolutely promised to all that will faithfully ask for that supreme gift in our Lord's name; so that PRAYER for it,

* Among a great variety of tracts, Mr. S. wrote one in support of diabolical agency and possessions in the most popular sense.

setting aside all delusive evasions about waiting,† is really a command,

† Here is a hint of disapprobation at the peculiar opinions of his correspondent, who was one of the Society of Friends. In the *Representation*, &c. pp. 69, 70, speaking of a law in Barbadoes "to prevent people called Quakers, from bringing Negroes to their meetings," Mr. S. adds, "though I am sufficiently aware of the enormous errors of the Quakers, having carefully perused most of their principal authors, yet am I convinced, that their charitable endeavours to instruct these poor slaves, to the best of their knowledge and belief, will render them more acceptable to God, than all the other sects of nominal Christians (howsoever orthodox in profession of faith) who either oppose or neglect the same. O that this exemplary charity of the Quakers (however despicable their doctrines appear in many other respects) may provoke to jealousy and amendment those lukewarm Christians who profess and dishonour a more orthodox faith." R.

which ought to be obeyed by all Christians, who hope to obtain "the exceeding great and precious promises" of being "partakers of the Divine Nature"), will, altogether, prove the most effectual means of rescuing the poor lad from his spiritual tyrant: for "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is LIBERTY." And if he be afterwards taught to read, and placed as an apprentice to some useful artificer, as a carpenter, smith, or cooper, &c. he may certainly retrieve his character and become a useful and respectable member of society.

I am, with esteem for your benevolent character,

Sir,

Your humble servant,

GRANVILLE SHARP.

Dr. Richard Fox.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

SIR,

June 20, 1817.

A COMMUNICATION in your last Number (p. 284), signed "An Old Unitarian," cannot fail of exciting some attention. I hasten to answer it, not from a desire to outstrip abler defenders, but because I am not an unhired advocate. I owe so much to the kindness and virtues of those whom your Correspondent has attacked, that my silence would be both unjust and ungrateful. It is not easy to meet an opponent who insinuates at least as much as he asserts; who designates ambiguously the class to which he belongs, and that which he accuses; and who seems a perfect master of that covert mode of attack by which Gibbon and others did much more injury to revelation than infidels of greater frankness. Such a style, however it may pain and wound, is not favourable to friendliness in controversy, for it seldom happens, as at the sacrifice of Iphigenia, that the knife is concealed from tenderness to the victim.

Who are the *old* and the *new* Unitarians, of whom your Correspondent talks so familiarly, as if they were well-known parties? From his Letter

we learn little more of them than that the latter have very great faults, and the former very little charity, except for Calvinists and Churchmen. The terms are not new to me, but they are very variously applied. Sometimes they merely distinguish age; and certainly a Unitarian of sixty is *old* compared with one of five and twenty. But this is not your Correspondent's sense of the term, for many of the "*sociétés ambulantes*," at which he sneers, owe their existence and prosperity to the powerful recommendation and exertions of such Old Unitarians as the late venerable Dr. Toulmin, and others resembling him in character, talent, zeal and age, who happily still survive. I have sometimes heard those of the present generation called *new* Unitarians: but who that lives is more zealous or active, more bold in stating unpopular, or more forcible in attacking popular doctrines, or more open and heretical in politics, than Dr. Priestley? Those who hold the pre-existence of Christ, are called occasionally Old Unitarians; and the highly respectable gentleman whose talents, literature, celebrity and character deservedly place him at the

head of that class, calls himself "one of the old school." But, Sir, he does not object to unite with new Unitarians, both for "preaching and praying," and "eating and drinking," and on such occasions delights them in his "eloquence, whether sacred or convivial," by a warmth and flow of feeling, which I fear your Correspondent would trace to the German drama. I have, indeed, heard something, and seen something of another description of persons called Old Unitarians, who deem an avowal of their opinions unwise because it may expose them to inconvenience, and proselyting sinful because the attempt may excite bad passions; who give liberally at Calvinistic collections, and let their own institutions and academies languish or perish for want of support; who can overlook speculative differences, such as worshipping an additional God or two, &c. and attend the services and even the sacraments of the church in preference to mixing with trades-people and such folks at a country Unitarian chapel; who object to evening lectures because the smoke of the candles would soil the ceiling of their chapel, or its floor be dirtied by the vulgar feet of the hearers who might be attracted on such occasions; who are vexed that Unitarianism should be spoilt for a refined and genteel religion, by its communication to poor and ignorant people, who had better been left to the Church or the Methodists. I hope your Correspondent does not belong to this class of Old Unitarians. If he does, he has no reason, in my opinion, to be proud of his associates, though they are certainly very respectable, (using that word in its common acceptation of very *rich*). His Letter is, however, strongly tainted with that fictitious candour for which these people are so clamorous—a candour more absurd in the view of none than of its objects, and to them ridiculous enough. When they receive guineas, withheld from Unitarian buildings, to raise chapels in whose pulpits they pronounce the damnation of the donors; when they insert names, withheld from Unitarian publications, among the subscribers to their books about dying Deities; when they obtain donations, withheld from Unitarian academies and missionaries, to

teach Hottentots the Assembly's Catechism—they must laugh at this Satan with an angel's vizor among the sons of God; they must think it good to sojourn amongst these Egyptians who so readily despoil their own temples to furnish out the faithful Israelites.

Whether *these* Old Unitarians agreed with Mr. Belsham in thankfulness for the Trinity Bill, I do not know. I met with no public expressions of their gratitude on that occasion, but with many from the persons whom they censure. I cannot, however, deny their joining with Mr. B. in that particular; but I wish they would join with him in some others—in his manly statements of the whole truth of God; in his powerful and incessant efforts for the destruction of Anti-Christian error; in his justice and candour to *friends* as well as adversaries; and in his liberal support of the Unitarian Fund, the Unitarian Academy, "the *Sociétés Ambulantes* of our modern heretics," and similar institutions.

The most definite characteristic of those whom your Correspondent calls New Unitarians, is his identification of them with the provincial societies for the diffusion of religious knowledge and virtue:—a circumstance very unfortunate for his first charge against them, of ingratitude for Mr. Smith's bill because it took away their chance of being persecuted, inasmuch as those societies, I believe without an exception, and some at extraordinary meetings called for the purpose, passed resolutions of thanks both to the Mover of the Bill and the Government. How could such a charge be made in the face of such a fact? Where are the proofs by which the public and unanimous language of these truly respectable societies is convicted of hypocrisy? Doubtful as it now is, and must be till the next Lancashire assizes, whether that bill affords us any efficient protection, I do not believe there is a New Unitarian in the kingdom who is not ready, even at the present moment, to do honour to the liberality of the Government in permitting it to pass without opposition. The men who wish to be persecuted have escaped my notice; but as your Correspondent knows where to find them, and acts as At-

torney-General in taking cognizance of all our offences, I deliver them over to his castigation, *that they may learn not to blaspheme*. He has advanced his accusation, I suppose, knowing that he can prove it; or at any rate knowing that he and the Old Unitarians are secure from its being retorted upon them.

It may not be amiss to remind your Correspondent of the fact, that Mr. Smith's bill originated in the *Committee of the Unitarian Fund*. They are, I suppose, New Unitarians, and therefore not entitled to either candour or gratitude. And yet surely he might bestow on them the *crumbs which fall from the table*, on which so plentiful a feast of those dishes is set out for the Government and the Bishops.

The New Unitarians, we are next told, are "not at all averse to manifest that degree and measure of intolerance which they have it in their power to exercise." I would not stoop to the degradation of implying, by a defence, that there was some plausibility in such an accusation, were it not that this unfounded charge is propped up by an unfounded assertion. He states as a general fact, what I verily believe is not true of a single individual, that the New Unitarians "are disposed to contend that the only morality and piety deserving regard is inseparably connected with their own views of religious truth." I challenge him to produce a single writer, amongst the whole body that he has arraigned, who denies to his opponents such morality and piety as will not merely deserve regard, but ensure salvation! I defy him to produce a single preacher by whom the position has been advanced which he ascribes to the whole party. There is none such but in the writer's imagination. And on the deposition of this phantom-witness, which none but he can hear, we are all to be convicted of "the most intolerable species of intolerance!"

Some young minister, it appears, to whom rather an equivocal compliment is paid, has offended by asserting that "unless Christianity be professed under some particular form, it is in itself but a name." If the minister alluded to be a reader of the Repository, he will probably animadvert

upon this passage himself. I must be permitted, however, to observe that, in my opinion, the Old Unitarian is not quite regular in this attack upon an individual who, if the obnoxious assertion was made in the pulpit or in public, will of course be recognized by many of his hearers, and thus, perhaps, without being aware of it, become personally charged with the follies and vices ascribed to the New Unitarians; with a love of persecuting and being persecuted; with inculcating a lax and false morality, and being careless about the character of his associates; with fondness for convivial meetings, and disaffection to the Government. Now, though a whole party may laugh at these imputations, yet to an individual they may be of serious consequence, and should not have been advanced by an anonymous writer. If the military practice be imitated in controversy, of aiming at officers from behind bushes, let it be remembered that riflemen have been judged not entitled to quarter.

The proposition itself is not very clearly or happily expressed; but, if I understand it, is much nearer the truth than your Correspondent is willing to admit. By calling himself a Christian, a man does not inform me whether he worships the Father only, or two other divine persons in addition to him, or some hundreds of saints and angels in addition to this Trinity; whether *the moral government of the world* be for the good of a whole, a part, or none of its inhabitants; whether *the terms on which sinners may be reconciled to God* are repentance and reformation only, or faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, or whether it be not independent of any terms; whether *the redemption that is in Jesus Christ* be his purchase of our salvation by his merits and suffering, the procurement of the influences of the Holy Ghost for believers, a change of our relation to God by moral means, or a confirmation of our immortality; whether a *resurrection from the dead* be a revival of existence, or merely its continuation in another mode; or, whether *future retribution* be reward and punishment for our own offences and obedience, or punishment for the sin of Adam, and reward for the merits

of Christ. How much more than *a name* is the profession which leaves all this ambiguity ! Now, this list of topics on which Christians differ, is precisely your Correspondent's list of those on which they agree. These are *our common Christianity* ! And why are they not our common Islamism ? For, with the exception of one point, *the redemption that is in Jesus Christ*, on which no Calvinist or Arminian will allow that he has more than a *verbal* agreement with us, they are subjects on which the Mahometan is "under no uncertainty." I am no advocate for restricting the name of Christian to a party ; let all who claim it, have it in peace. But to talk of its representing a common faith, of unrivalled importance, and then to give a list of topics on which it communicates nothing, and discriminates nothing, is as much like "quackery" as any thing which has been detected in the New Unitarians. Your Correspondent is, I think, under no great obligation to the late worthy Bishop for the loan of his very correct statement, and very laudable indignation, on the present subject. They are articles, too, which he seems to have more ability to lend than necessity to borrow.

The New Unitarians inculcate "*a system of ethics drawn from the German drama* !" This is gratifying intelligence, as it was apprehended that their sermons were so stuffed with controversy as to leave no room for any morality at all. And as the Old Unitarians argue, when they support Calvinistic missions, &c. that a corrupt religion is better than no religion, why should not a corrupt morality be better than no morality ? How uncharitable of them, thinking the morality of the Gospel a good thing, to contend "that there is nothing good besides !" How improper to use language "producing irritation," when by gentle and gradual means these German moralists might be brought to the English and Gospel standard ; and though "this, from the nature of the thing, must be a process requiring time, moderation and caution," it is a task on that account so much the more suited to the Old Unitarians.

Your Correspondent is doubtless a good judge of the source and standard

of our morality ; for his rapid transitions from what irresistibly produces laughter to what excites a very opposite emotion, shew an intimate acquaintance with the German drama, and a happy imitation of its structure. Such is the connexion of the foregoing charge with that of indifference to the moral character of proselytes, palliating "licentiousness both in principles and practice," &c. a charge which, to use the softest applicable word in the dictionary, is as *unfounded* as the other is ridiculous. Unitarian congregations and societies will not suffer by a comparison with those of any other denomination. In their individual associations there is generally (I imagine, universally,) a power, by written law or allowed practice, to exclude from their lists any improper persons who may have volunteered their names and subscriptions — a power which your Correspondent on inquiry will find, as I hope and believe, has not lain dormant when immorality called for its exercise.

I have always been disgusted with that cant of candour which talks of the momentous topics on which the Christian world is divided as "speculative opinions," "subjects of doubtful disputation," "matters about which its votaries have always disagreed, and will probably always disagree," and "opinions merely speculative." What is the object of this mock liberality ? Or is the writer in good earnest ? Does he really mean to assert that there is only an unimportant and speculative difference between his system and that which, by his own account of it, leads its professors to deny his "claim to the appellation of Christian ;" "indisposes them to set a proper value on moral qualities and distinctions ;" makes them not likely to furnish their pupils' minds "with any very correct or vivid ideas of moral truth and beauty ;" makes them "from principle intolerant ;" and consists of "absurdity and intolerance," of "rubbish and defilements ?" Separation from a communion is justifiable on the ground of practical differences, but not on that of merely speculative differences. As those of the Old Unitarian with us are of the former description, and with Trinitarians, of the latter, he should, I think, prefer their worship, and not desert those who

hold "the institutions of their forefathers in great veneration" from such trivial and abstract reasons. Why does he not, like a good Christian, overlook such doubtful and merely speculative differences, and join with one class in beseeching God by his "holy nativity and circumcision," his "agony and bloody sweat," his "precious death and burial;" or with others who sing of him, the rich drops of whose blood calmed the Father's frowning face,

"This infant is the mighty God
Come to be suckled and ador'd!"

or with the thousands who devoutly vociferate,

"The Unitarian fiend expel,
And send his doctrines back to hell."

Indeed there are some who are too candid to be kept from the worship of believers in *our common Christianity*, by these petty diversities; but their reasons always appeared to me more weighty in the commercial than in the theological scale.

As your Correspondent's residence would appear to be in London, I may perhaps be able to inform him better about the provincial *sociétés ambulantes*, which I do the more readily as he cannot have learned much from his Old Unitarian friends in the country, they being generally kept away, by unforeseen accidents, from such meetings. Sometimes they are appointed for the same day as the Bishop's dinner party, which it would be illiberal not to attend, or they are held at the very moment that the sacrament is administered at church as a qualification for office, or just when it is indispensably necessary to visit a neighbouring town, where the meeting was held the preceding year, just when it was indispensably necessary to remain at home. These unfortunate coincidences have prevented your Correspondent's obtaining such accurate information of this as of our other faults and follies. The object of these societies is the distribution of books, controversial and moral. The former written by Priestley, Lindsey, Law, Hartley, Cogan, Belsham, and other zealots; the latter by Lardner, Mason, Wellbeloved, Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. H. More, Mrs. Hughes, and other advocates for licentiousness and the ethics of the German

drama, as your Correspondent may see by reference to their catalogues. To proselyte by preaching is no part of their plan. In varying the place of their annual meeting, and accompanying it by a sermon and a dinner, they have only followed the innocent and useful practice of those from whom the Old Unitarian differs on merely speculative points. Such meetings have answered their design of being frequently useful to the congregations visited. Interesting cases of distress have been made known and relieved: measures have been adopted favourable to the comfort and prosperity of different congregations: the publication of useful works has been facilitated: and to many the intercourse thus occasioned with the ministers and members of other societies has been both pleasant and beneficial. Poor societies have been cheered by the countenance of their wealthier brethren; and the solitary professor of Unitarianism been animated by becoming acquainted with numbers of similar faith and dispositions. I am sorry that to the Old Unitarian the expense of this apparatus is "much more obvious than the utility;" his diminished estimate of the latter arises perhaps from the 'infirmity' lamented at the commencement of his letter; and the habits of some of his brethren make it not very uncharitable to surmise that their extravagant idea of the expense may be accounted for by his remark that "an attention almost exclusive to any particular object—necessarily enlarges its dimensions, enhances its importance, brings it forward into the strongest light, and throws every thing else into the shade."

Worthless as our peculiar opinions are represented, it is nevertheless admitted to be desirable that they should be propagated; and this it seems would be done by the "moderation and caution" of the Old Unitarians, were they not obstructed by the "intemperate zeal" of the New. And what have these moderate men done, that they are entitled to sneer and hint away the multiplied proofs which recent institutions and efforts have given of their efficacy? Let them take the range of fifty years, and what have they to throw into the balance against a single report of

the Unitarian Fund? Why, they have conjectures and suspicions that this success has been overrated.

It is a pity that all proper tenderness should not have been shewn towards the "worthy but mistaken individuals," who, "holding the institutions of their forefathers in great veneration, are afraid to inquire, lest they should find cause to give them up as indefensible." Not to respect their failing shews certainly a gross departure from the morality of the German drama, which is known to be particularly lenient towards amiable weaknesses. Notwithstanding their disgust at the boisterous honesty of men who profess what they ascertain to be truth, and propagate what they believe to be important, it is my conviction that such are most likely to win over men of principle from all parties. I know that those amongst us who are most esteemed by the Calvinists, are not the timid men who profess nothing but *our common Christianity*; not the mere moralists whose ethics (not German) have no intermixture of that truth, which alone gives virtue a foundation and a motive; not the second Lardners, as spruce academics call one another, who speak contemptuously of popular preaching and seem to think the tree of life only planted for critical squirrels to crack nuts in its branches; not the men of ultra-candour who dismiss questions on the object of worship, the work of Christ, and the terms of salvation, as merely speculative points; but those who seem in earnest about Divine truth; who are manly in its profession, and laborious in its diffusion. To such is frequently rendered unasked a candid judgment, which the liberality of those who are illiberal to their brethren fails of purchasing.

To defend the Monthly Repository is your business, Mr. Editor; and I shall leave you to rebut as you can, the charge of partiality for *two personages*, of political notoriety, whom you, of all men, ought to have detested, as each of them is an irrefragable proof of an orthodox doctrine; it being ascertained that one is an incarnation of the devil, and the other a striking demonstration of the total depravity of man.

How grateful must the friends of

order, property and loyalty, be to your Correspondent, for his acute penetration into the latent design of the New Unitarians, to employ the "dint of numbers and physical force!" From what an explosion has he preserved us by this timely discovery of the plot! Why, but for him they might ere this have risen in arms to massacre all the friends of war and bloodshed; to hang all the advocates for capital punishments; to liberate Bonaparte; to crown Cobbett King of England; and to divide the estates of the Old Unitarians between themselves and their brethren the Luddites. After which they would probably have changed the standard of faith and morality, by solemnly canonizing the German drama in place of the Holy Scriptures!

At a time when political offences are heavily visited; when the suspicions of government are awake, and its power uncontrolled; it is no friendly work to give those suspicions a new direction. Especially did this not become a brother, though he were an offended and an elder one. He might not rejoice at the birth of New Unitarianism, nor like its features; but they might have been criticised without holding it up to be blasted by the lightnings of authority. What is this accuser about? If he possess the feelings of humanity, there can no bitterer curse befall him, than the accomplishment of that which it is the obvious tendency of his charge of disaffection to produce. I, Sir, for one, have always spoken my political opinions the more freely because on many points they were so unlike those of many of my brethren, that none could connect them with our religious tenets. Those opinions are at the service of the Old Unitarian, or any body else, but I shall not make you responsible for their publication. Gladly, however, would I avow, and take the consequences of political heresies, much more obnoxious than my own, rather than have penned the following paragraph: "If, 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," &c. Who have suspected this? Who are suspected? Where are the proofs? No man should have whispered such a suspicion without being disposed and able to answer these questions. At such a time as the present, he who could give such a hint should have been prepared to volunteer as an informer and a witness. Better at once to drag the culprits, if such there be, from the chapel to the Court of Justice, than to expose a whole sect to the evils of dark and undefined accusation. Who knows what ministers some may think are here intended? Who knows but that local circumstances may give a point to these innuendoes by which the character, usefulness, comforts, and prospects of a respectable man may be destroyed, and his personal liberty endangered?

And this is done by one whose "Christianity admits of no connexion with politics!" Sir, I am no friend to the use of physical force, but I love civil and religious liberty, and have not learned, like your Correspondent, by misapplying Scripture, to change the epistles of Paul into the *Gospel according to Hobbes*. How amusing his aversion to Bonaparte, to whom, in certain circumstances, his concluding political Christian principle would have made him his as well as your "most humble servant!" Censures on a fallen or a banished man come ungraciously from one who is avowedly slavish upon principle. Should their fortunes change, he would of course change also, seeing that "Christianity admits of no connexion with politics, except that it enjoins that *every soul be subject unto the higher powers*." Were Bonaparte crowned to-morrow in Westminster Abbey, he would therefore be a loyal subject. Were Peter Porcupine to cut the Regent's throat and instal himself in St. James's, he would be dutiful and obedient.

"And if in Downing Street Old Nick should revel
England's prime minister, then bless the Devil!"

However favourable such a maxim may be to the *peaceable lives* of its admirers, doubts will arise in the minds of some about its tendency to produce *all godliness and honesty*.

It is wholly out of my power to ascertain the object of the Old Unitarian's letter, or to account for the irritation and suspicion which pervade it; but I am satisfied that, as to what is most important in it, his assertions may be denied and his inferences disproved.

W. J. FOX.

Letter from Mr. Fry to a Calvinistic Minister, on his want of Charity.

MR. EDITOR, May 19, 1817.

IF the following letter, written on occasion of personally witnessing one of those specimens of bigoted harshness against Anti-Trinitarians, not unfrequent in the present day among some religious sects, shall appear suitable to the design of your useful publication, perhaps its insertion will not be displeasing to some of your readers, at least to such of them as have had their ears assailed with the like demonstrations of determined hostility. It may be proper to observe that no answer to it has been received, though a week has elapsed since it was sent. Whether this omission is to be ascribed to an idea in the mind of the minister to whom the letter was addressed, that the remonstrance of an Unitarian on such a subject was not worthy of a reply; or to his feeling that the reprehended though common outrage against charity and decorum could not be justified, and that therefore he could not answer me without making some apology, which would be too grating to his orthodoxy, I cannot determine. But having been informed that some remarks on my observations are to appear in one of the magazines devoted to the interests of Calvinistic tenets, I am induced to solicit the insertion of my letter in the Monthly Repository.

R. F.

Letter addressed to the Rev. T. W.

Kidderminster, May 12, 1817.

SIR,

Last evening I attended the service at the Old Meeting, under an expectation of hearing Mr. B——, with whom I have been long acquainted, in which I was disappointed; and feeling aggrieved by a part of your discourse, I scarcely know how to refrain from expressing to you my dissatisfaction. I do not complain of

what you advanced concerning the necessity of Christ's coming to judge the world for the purpose of testifying his eternal Deity, because you have an unquestionable right to deliver doctrinal sentiments which you believe to be true and important; though I conceive such a representation to be inconsistent and at variance with the Holy Scriptures, which declare this great office to be sustained by him in consequence of his designation to it, or by the appointment of the supreme authority of his God and Father. What I complain of is, your placing those of your fellow-christians who disbelieve the Deity of our Saviour, upon a level with the worst rejectors of revealed religion, by using the following expressions, when speaking of the enemies of true piety who must receive condemnation in the last day: "Some there are who deny the Deity of Christ, some trample upon his blood, and some despise the whole system of his divine revelation." This statement to me appears very disingenuous, as it imports a refusal to admit those to be numbered among the disciples of our Lord who differ from yourself on this disputed point, the Deity of Christ; and it has an injurious tendency on the minds of the hearers, especially the more ignorant sort, even to inspire them with similar illiberality. Such rash language indicates, what you would probably feel some reluctance more plainly to avow, that you are conscious of having formed an infallible judgment respecting a doctrine which has been a subject of controversy among wise and good men in various ages. To this I may add, that it is preposterous to associate the deniers of Christ's Deity with despising infidels, because those who believe that he is in every respect dependent upon the only true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, regularly assemble together for divine worship according to the Christian revelation, and to hear its truths and precepts dispensed. So that they must either believe in the divine mission of Christ, and consequently esteem the Gospel as true and divine, or be mere hypocrites in their religious profession; the latter of which can hardly be your deliberate opinion of them, especially if you consider the able defences of Christianity which

some of them have produced. Without doubt your mind is fully persuaded that the doctrine for which you are so strenuous, of Christ's having a proper equality with the Father, is explicitly taught in the sacred writings, and you value it highly as being essential to your doctrinal system. But it is not unworthy of any Christian to maintain his sentiments with charity for those who differ, as they have a right to judge for themselves, and may have substantial reasons for their dissent. However confident you may be of the truth and importance of this notion, I am equally persuaded that it has no real foundation in the word of God, but that it is a corruption derived from popery.

In your present temper it is not likely that you will deign to enter a place of worship used by Unitarians; perhaps you may disdain to peruse any of their treatises in vindication of their principles; but I will venture to assert that in either case you would not meet with an instance of an Unitarian's so dishonouring himself and degrading his religion, as invidiously to unite descriptions which have no kind of analogy. But supposing that on any occasion you had heard one of that sect, in his over-heated zeal for his opinions, arrange the deniers of the sole Deity of the God and Father of Jesus Christ, or Trinitarians, in the same lists with Deists, scoffing infidels, and trampers on the blood of the Mediator, what would you have thought and felt? You would no doubt pronounce this to be a species of bigotry of which the avower ought to be ashamed. Reflect on your manner of classing characters, which perhaps may be too familiar, and recollect that persons who have other views of the Christian doctrine than those which you profess, may have equal sensibility with yourself; as much integrity of heart and uprightness of life as you may be known to possess; as sincere and strong an attachment to what they conceive to be divine truth; and as earnest a concern to witness the prevalence of their principles as you can entertain—though the credulity of mankind with regard to unscriptural and unintelligible mysteries, and their deeply-rooted prejudices in favour of what is sanctioned by worldly authority and power,

may forbid their having equal success. Wishing that in future a spirit of Christian candour may have a due restraint upon your zeal, and render your labours in the Gospel of our common Master more worthy of general acceptance, and of cordial approbation, I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,
RICHARD FRY.

SIR, *Stourbridge, May 5, 1817.*
YOUR Correspondent from this vicinity [p. 210], may be assured that no designed misrepresentation or accidental error occurred in the biographical memoir inserted in your publication for January last, relative to the late Rev. B. Carpenter. At the very time when he is represented as resuming the pastoral charge (Oct. 12, 1806), he was officiating as a supply during a vacancy; and at the close of his discourse on the morning of that day, delivered an address to the congregation which contains the following passage, alluding to an invitation which had been sent to him on the 10th September preceding:

"I think it better not to give a decisive answer to it at present, but only to engage to supply this congregation in person or by proxy till Christmas." This plan was adopted. Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Ward officiated during the remainder of the quarter. The vacancy was prolonged till the end of the first quarter of 1807, during which Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Scott performed the services as supplies, and became stated pastors from March 25th of that year.

This statement not only agrees with facts well known to all whom they concern, but is engraved on the monument erected to the memory of Mr. Carpenter.

W. S.

SIR, *W——n, near Taunton, May 9, 1817.*
LOOKING some time since into your Tenth Volume, I observed in the Repository for November, 1815, a prospectus of a Greek and English Lexicon, by the Rev. John Jones. Having several times ordered the work, and the bookseller repeatedly receiving for answer that it is not yet published; give me leave to request of that gentleman, by means of the

Repository, a few lines respecting the state of the work, and what time may possibly elapse before its appearance.

Allow me also to make an inquiry after Dr. Lloyd's proposed pamphlet on the Greek Article, as connected with the Deity of Christ. Are the Unitarians to be gratified by its publication?

G. B.

SIR, *May 16, 1817.*
YOUR Correspondent N. [p. 210], in his Essay on Vitality observes, "whether it (the body), increases or decreases; whether it preserves all its members or is mutilated of them all, the rational principle is not injured, but in many instances strengthened by the loss of limbs; all proving the complete distinction between body and mind."

This is an argument frequently produced for the distinct nature and indestructibility of the human soul: but I should not have expected to see it produced by so philosophical an observer of natural history as your Correspondent. The mutilation of the limbs affects not the rational principle any more than their decay by old age; for the plain reason that the rational principle is not there. How then does this fact prove a complete distinction between body and mind? The seat of the sentient principle is the brain: if the brain continue sound, the faculties are sound even to extreme old age and in the hour of death; if the brain lose its healthful fibre, the faculties are prematurely enfeebled: if the brain be seriously injured, as by the concussion of a blow, the rational principle is injured, and madness or idiocy ensues. The inference to be drawn is directly opposite to the conclusion drawn by your Correspondent.

As N. argues the point on philosophical grounds, I make no use of the arguments which may be drawn from Scripture against this hypothesis of a vital principle distinct from man's physical organization. His position that "organization alone is a mere machine wholly void of all sensation," merely begs the question: which is, whether Almighty power has not impressed this organized matter with a principle of vitality and a thinking faculty?

This point is, I think, proved, no less philosophically than scripturally, by Dr. Priestley, in his "Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit:" where also may be seen a defence of the form and properties of that, which your Correspondent, in conformity with the popular physics, calls "*inert matter*."

E.

—
On Vitality.

May 10th, 1817.

MY former letter on this subject, [p. 210], went to shew, that throughout all nature, every living body with whose origin we are acquainted, received its being by a two-fold instrumentality, and, that being *ab origine* of a two-fold nature, and so continuing through life, the death and dissolution of the body did not necessarily involve in it a destruction of the vital animating principle. The purport of my present letter will be to shew from nature, marked distinctions between the body and the vital principle which animates it, the conclusion from which evidence must necessarily be, that it is the animating principle or mind, and not the organized body, which constitutes the man.

The commencement of all animated existence, whether animal or vegetable, is so infinitely minute to the human eye, as to be wholly incapable of human observation; yet to whatsoever magnitude the being may attain in the oak, the chesnut, the elephant or the mammoth, the whole is but the enlargement of this invisible atom, and of course but an addendum of liquid or solid matter accumulated by the organic secretions of the animated being. In animal bodies, these are in a proportion of about one-sixth solid materials to five-sixths of liquid, and in vegetables of about three-fourths solid to one-fourth liquid, and even the small proportion of solid animalization is but accidental and transient, being at first gelatinous, and naturally tending after death, to enter into the putrefactive fermentation and dissolve and pass away in aerial and liquid forms, to unite with its native elements, again to form other substances for fresh animation. All these transitory, solid, and liquid substances, must be necessarily considered as no part of vitality. Their

union attains to the firmness of maturity; it decreases also to the imbecility of age. It cannot stand still at any one moment of existence without corrupting; the accessions by the secretion of the day push off the external particles formerly secreted as worse than useless, when they have ceased to give vigour and strength. How different is the animating principle; this inhabitant of the house of clay continues through life! It is this gives identity to the body, always at home; it recollects the endearments and afflictions of childhood, the follies and gaities of youth, the reasonings and anxieties of manhood, and the sound determinations from the experience of age. The loss of an eye or an ear, an arm or a leg, even a total dismemberment, whilst the vital organs are preserved, instead of reducing its powers have given strength to its energy, and enabled it to overcome, by its more powerful exertions, that tendency to decomposition which had begun in the body before such dismemberment had taken place.

Observe the opposite actions of body and of mind. By a slow and certain progress the body attains to maturity, and by an equally marked-out process it goes on progressively to decay. During the whole of this period, physiologists observe, that there is an unceasing strife between the vital power and the powers that govern inanimate bodies. In health the contest is successful on the part of vitality: in disease it is doubtful. In death the contest is ended; vitality is no longer able by its exertions to controul the mechanical and chymical laws of nature, though during life it had modified, influenced and altered their effects. After full maturity has taken place on the body by a complete developement of the germ, as strength increases in the midst of this contest till corporeal maturity, from that period, for a long time, perhaps insensibly, weakness commences and keeps increasing, till the corporeal functions are stopped for ever. Not so the mind: equally helpless with the body in infancy, it soon commences to add knowledge to consciousness, and through the longest life keeps constantly increasing in its powers of determination or

judgment: all its infirmities seem to be corporeal infirmities, or those arising from ignorance. Idiotism does not appear ever to be in the mind; for on removing the corporeal impediment, the mind again manifests its former energies. That there should be this difference between the two we cannot be surprised at when we consider the difference of their composition; the whole corporeal development manifests the fleeting nature of the materials of which it is formed. It is diseased when any particle of it is not passing away: detention for a moment beyond its due time is the commencement of all the maladies of life: such an ever-passing cause cannot possibly be more than an instrument to the enduring and ever-improving principle of vitality, the seat of consciousness and knowledge, the mind or more justly the man, as being the only part that can feel happy in its own identity, and conscious of its past and present existence.

That organization is only the instrument of vitality, and that the peculiar principle of vitality has a seat or throne of action from whence by its energy, through the instrumentality of the organized system, it rules the whole animal fabric, is evident from the uses of the two sets of nerves, the cerebral and the sympathetic. In animals without vertebræ, the sympathetic appear to be the only nerves, and the sole conduits of the action of vegetable life. It is by them absorption, digestion, circulation, secretion and nutrition are carried on without the interference of the will. To them it is supposed that the numerous diseases received by impression may be referred, whilst the peculiar point or theatre of vitality is exclusively the seat of thought, consciousness, determination and action.

In the animal system, the sympathetic nerves extend from the base of the skull to the lower part of the sacrum, and are nourished by all the nerves of the spinal marrow from which they receive branches; numerous ganglions, considered by some as little brains, divide them into systems, in which ganglions, or bulgings, is elaborated the fluid they transmit to the nerves. The numerous filaments of these nerves are

endowed with the most acute sensibility; and as they regulate all the offices of the viscera, such is their sensibility that bruises, wounds and disorders in the epigastic region will sometimes occasion such an intensity of pain, as not only to disorder the whole functions of life, but even to extinguish the vital powers. It is through them that life depends not on the fickleness of the mind: the heart, the stomach, the viscera, &c. &c., are all independent of the will. Wherever they unite with the cerebral nerves, there, and only there, the mind has, according to such union, power over the nervous action: when internal inflammation takes place, the irritation is conveyed to the brain, and from the brain by an internal nervous sensation to the heart, and the organs of respiration. Wherever there is intensity of pain in any part of the body, the knowledge of it is conveyed by the sympathetic nerves to the cerebral, and by the cerebral to the seat of consciousness. By a pressure sufficient to deaden the action of the sympathetic nerve in the part affected, though the disorder is not abated, the sensation of the existence of the disorder ceases, by the pain being immediately stopped, and proves by this consequence, that life is not actually present, if I may so express it, through all parts of the body, though its action extends to all parts. If it was universally present, it must be at all times and under every circumstance in a state of consciousness; but it is evident from this circumstance, that when the communication with the affected part is interrupted, its consciousness respecting what passes in that part ceases. Nerves therefore are not mind, but instruments for its use.

It has been proved by numerous experiments on animals, that whilst the spinal marrow is not injured, life is not destroyed even by the removing of all the intestines, but you destroy or rather paralise all below the vertebra above which you cut the spinal marrow, beginning from the last vertebra, and ascending one by one to the top: the circulation remains in the parts below, the remaining nerves and muscles exist, but consciousness is gone. The com-

munication being cut off with the seat of government, the mind no longer has dominion over the parts beneath the injured spinal marrow, ascending from vertebræ to vertebræ: in this manner, similar efforts follow each fresh injury, and yet life continues, and consciousness also. Nor are the senses injured; but the moment the origin of the eighth pair of nerves is touched, consciousness ceases, and death ensues. From these, and very many other experiments which have been made, a conclusion must necessarily be drawn, that no where is the seat of vitality and consciousness in the spinal marrow, or in the sympathetic nerves, but that these are all instruments used by the vital power; and that any injury done to them, or any of them, is no injury done to the vital principle itself, any farther than by rendering it unable to perform those functions which cannot be performed without the aid of the injured parts. Indeed, so far is it from being necessary to have the organized system perfect to enable vitality to act with its utmost vigour, that it will on the contrary be often found, that as pruning the plant has often revived it from the borders of death, so has the loss of limbs removed tumours and glandular swellings, and given to the whole system an energy before unknown to it.

The seat of vitality is not, then, in the nervous system, neither is it in the brain. Monsieur Le Gallois opened the cranium of a young rabbit, and cutting the brain horizontally from before, he removed it backwards, and found he could thus remove, not only the cerebrum, but also the cerebellum, and even a part of the medulla oblongata without interrupting perspiration; but when the origin of the eighth pair of nerves were included in the slice of the medulla oblongata, perspiration and respiration ceased; life, therefore, must there commence. Humboldt, Halle and Perry, by order of the National Institute, examined and confirmed these experiments. I have now beside me twenty-four cases, in which the brain has in almost every part been injured, without destroying life or sensibility; and some farther cases, in which the whole of the brain has been destroyed, without the individual's sensibility

being affected. Life, therefore, connected with consciousness, that vital principle which is the animating mind, and may be said to constitute the individual man, is not in the cerebral more than in the sympathetic nerves, neither is it in the brain. Whatever it be, or which may be the exact and precise point from which it acts, though we may be unable to say with absolute certainty, there appears at least to be full and sufficient evidence to conclude it is not flesh, nor blood, nor bones, but something distinct from these, and possessing a capability of unknown endurance, and unceasingly progressive improvement; it never passing away like the body, but during its mortal existence increasing in strength and judgment, and therefore is that which is to constitute man's future identity.

N.

Restriction of the Term Unitarian.

[Extract from a Letter from Philadelphia, dated Sept. 25, 1816.]

I HAVE often regretted that Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Priestley, and others, have restricted the term Unitarian to the believers in the humanity of Christ. I know it is alleged that Arians, to be consistent with their principles, ought to worship Jesus Christ; but admitting the correctness of this deduction, and that they are inconsistent, still, as they address only the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, their worship and ours is precisely the same, and they are real and practical Unitarians. It does not appear to be correct to judge our brethren according to our views, and contrary to their avowed declarations. We complain, and with reason, when we are classed with infidels; yet the reputed orthodox may say with equal plausibility that although we call ourselves Christians, and imagine that we are entitled to the name of Christian, it does not properly belong to us; because, according to *their* views of Christianity, we deny its most important truths. They do not question our sincerity, but will not permit us to decide for ourselves. We may be unable to reconcile the belief that Jesus Christ is our Maker, with the refusal to pay him divine honours; but there are persons who are sincerely

persuaded that all this is perfectly consistent with Scripture and reason. Surely it is enough to say that in *our* view of these matters there is inconsistency in this, and that were *we*, with our opinions and convictions, to act as our Arian brethren do, we should be guilty of criminal neglect in not worshipping our Lord. The same process of reasoning is applicable to what has been called "Christian idolatry." Surely no idolatrous rites can be Christian. With equal propriety we might speak of Christian superstition, Christian falsehood, theft, &c. If by Christian idolatry is meant the idolatry of Christians, the language used is not warranted by the New Testament. Before we thus denounce and call names, we ought to ascertain our own infallibility, if not as to conduct, at least as to faith. We may be perfectly correct in saying that the worship of Jesus Christ, or of any other being except the One God and Father of all, would in *us* be an act of daring and presumptuous disobedience to the divine law, and that we should stand self-condemned; but in no part of the New Testament which I am acquainted with, is there either a command, a direction, or license to any Christian, to call his brother an idolater: against judging him there are many dissuasives, and some very solemn admonitions.

—

Dr. Barret and the Dublin Manuscript.*

[From "Narrative of a Residence in Ireland during the Summer of 1814 and that of 1815. By Anne Plumptre." 4to. 1817. Pp. 19, 20.]

AMONG the greatest curiosities in the library (of Trinity College, Dublin), is a work executed by

* Miss Plumptre, who has so freely drawn the character of this gentleman, yet living, seems not to have been aware of his rank in the University. He is described in the Biographical Dictionary of Living Authors, as D. D. Vice Provost and Senior Fellow of Trin. Col. and Professor of Oriental Languages. The following works are ascribed to him: An Inquiry into the Origin of the Constellations that compose the Zodiac, and the Uses they were intended to promote. 8vo. 1800.—Essay on the Earlier Part of the Life of Swift. 8vo. 1808.

Dr. BARRET, one of the Fellows of the College, a very remarkable character, in whom a passion for books and learning even rises above another very prevailing feature, the love of money. In looking over the manuscripts, he discovered one which, upon a close inspection, he perceived to be written over another of much older date, the former writing having been effaced, though not so effectually but that faint traces of it were discernible. He immediately applied himself to making out as much of the original manuscript as could be deciphered, and succeeded so far as to ascertain it to be a *Greek manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel*. He has since had the text printed as far as sufficient remains of the characters can be traced to admit of it, for some are wholly effaced, supplying the blanks with points. In front of the page, it is printed in a fac-simile of the original characters, and on the back, in those of the modern Greek. The whole has been a work of immense labour; but from the peculiar turn of the Doctor's mind, has afforded him no less gratification than toil.

This gentleman never stirs beyond the college walls, excepting twice in the year to the Bank, which is close by, to receive his half-yearly dividends, an office which he would not on any consideration depute to another; and on an annual visit with the board to the college observatory at Dunsink, four miles from Dublin. The consequence of this secluded life is excessive simplicity of manners and utter ignorance of the world. He has been forty years Fellow, and for many years his fellowship has produced an income of £2000 a year, of which he, perhaps, scarcely spends twenty pounds, excepting in books; of these he buys a great number, and often very expensive ones. At the same time, his penuriousness in other respects is such, that were not his dinner provided free of expense by the College, he would run some hazard of being starved. His memory is astonishing: not long since, in answer to some question which was asked him, he not only ran over a list of all the gentlemen who had been provosts and vice-provosts of the college since its foundation, but gave every circumstance attending

the election of each individual. He knows every book that has been brought into the library since he became Fellow.

SIR,

June 2nd, 1817.

IN your very just and useful account of *Mary Ryan's* deplorable case, in your department for Intelligence, in the last No. [p. 314,] you have named three elder heroines, who risked every thing in obedience to natural affection. The case of *Madame Lavalette* is recent; Lord Byron has given it wide circulation and permanence amongst the English people, by his beautiful stanzas on her conjugal virtue: I wish he or some other of our bards would commit the name of *Mary Ryan* to never-dying song.

Mrs. Walkinshaw has been introduced to the knowledge of the public, by the biographer of Lord Kames, whose account is as follows: "Mr. Walkinshaw having been engaged in both the rebellions, 1715 and 1745, was confined for some time in the castle of Stirling, from whence he escaped by the courage and address of his wife, a sister of Sir Hugh Paterson, of Bannockburn, who exchanged clothes with him, and remained a prisoner in his stead. This remarkable woman, *splendida mendax, et in omne ævum nobilis*, lived to the age of ninety, in the full possession of her faculties and of the esteem of all who knew her." *Tytler's Memoirs*, &c. 8vo. 2nd ed. 1814. Vol. I. p. 2. Note.

Of *Lady Nithsdale* I know of no good account, and should be glad to be referred to some book which relates her magnanimous adventure. Sir James Mackintosh, in the debate in the House of Commons, on the 7th of May, described her as the *wife* of the Earl; but Smollett in his *History of England* (8vo. 1803. II. 338,) seems to consider her as his mother: "Nithsdale," he says, "made his escape in woman's apparel, furnished and conveyed to him by his own mother." The relation in my copy of *Howell's Mellus* (8vo. 12th ed. 1766 [by a typographical error 1666] p. 503) is as follows:—"the Lord Nithsdale found means to escape out of the Tower, disguised as a woman in a riding-

hood, the night before the execution."

Perhaps some of your correspondents can clear up this matter; and having pen in hand, I beg leave to ask whether any certain information has been received in England of the place to which *Lavalette* fled on his escape, so honourable to the British triumvirate, Wilson, Bruce and Hutchinson, or of that in which he now is?

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Birmingham, 7th of 4th Mo. 1817.

IT was with some degree of surprise that I observed in a late Number of the *Monthly Repository*, [XI. 595,] an attempt to prove that the early members of the Society of Friends were Unitarians.

Being myself a member of that Society, and having endeavoured to obtain a correct knowledge of its principles, by a perusal of its publications, I think that such an opinion is not founded in truth. I therefore annex some extracts from the writings of its early and most approved members, which I think clearly and unequivocally prove, that they believed in the Divinity or Deity of Jesus Christ, although they rejected the idea of three distinct and separate persons, and also the term Trinity, as not to be found in the Sacred Writings. With respect to William Penn's "*Sandy Foundation Shaken*," on a review of the circumstances under which it was composed, it appears to me to have been written on the negative side of the question only, and the sentiments advanced in the apology* for that work, published a few months afterwards, confirm me in this opinion. Indeed W. Penn himself, about five years afterwards, asserts that this was the case. (See 12th extract annexed.)

In judging of the sentiments of any writer whose publications are numerous, I conceive we should not confine ourselves to one composition only; for if this mode of deciding were fair and correct, it would be no difficult task to adduce numerous extracts from the works of professed

* Innocency with her Open Face.

Trinitarians, which no Unitarian would disapprove—but which notwithstanding were written by those who believed in the Athanasian Creed. It is therefore, I think, uncandid, to put that construction upon an author's writings which he himself disavows.

The writer of the paragraph alluded to, considering that in reference to Unitarianism "it is a purely historical question"—I hope that the extracts I have adduced, will, as it relates to the Society of Friends, set the question at rest. I have no wish by what I have written, to excite any thing like controversy; my object and earnest wish is to allay it, as I fear it must be acknowledged in the words of a late writer,* that on subjects like these, "it is usually a trial of dexterity, rather than of virtue."

I would therefore be understood as producing the extracts merely as "historical evidence"—and in justice to the society, being myself of opinion that, waving the discussion of speculative subjects, uninfluential on our lives, it should be our primary concern, our most earnest engagement, to regulate our conduct by the sublime precepts and divine spirit of the Gospel.

B.

EXTRACTS.

From the Yearly Meeting Epistles.

1. WE tenderly salute you all in our Lord Jesus Christ, and blessed union of his precious life; who hath eminently appeared amongst us, &c. Blessed be his glorious name for ever! 1691.

2. To our dear and tenderly beloved friends and brethren in our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

This, our solemn Yearly Meeting, sendeth greeting and salutation in him who is our life, in whom our living union, peace and safety, for ever stand. Blessed, praised and renowned be his most glorious power and excellent name; to whom be glory and dominion, in and over his whole church and heritage, for ever and ever. 1695.

3. The faithful witness, the first-begotten from the dead, the Prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him

that loved and washed us from our sins in his own blood, be glory and dominion for ever. 1697.

4. Dear and well-beloved friends and brethren in Christ Jesus,

We tenderly salute you in his dear love and life, whereby we were made alive unto him, and hitherto helped and preserved, to be a peculiar people to his praise and glory, who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light. Blessed be his glorious name and power for ever. 1700.

5. To whom (Christ) be "glory and dominion for ever and ever." 1706.

6. Our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom, with the Father, be glory and dominion for ever. 1712.

And in several Epistles since that time.

From GEORGE FOX.

7. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us a mind to know him which is true, and we are in him that is true; mark, that is, in his Son Jesus Christ. This same is very God and eternal life, and this we the people of God, in scorn called Quakers, do witness.

Doctrinals, p. 446.

8. The priest of Drayton, the town of my birth, whose name was Nathaniel Stevens, asked me, why Christ cried out upon the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And why he said, "if it be possible let this cup pass from me; yet not my will, but thine be done." I told him at that time the sins of all mankind were upon him, and their iniquities and transgressions, with which he was wounded; which he was to bear, and to be an offering for, as he was man; but died not, as he was God: so, in that he died for all men, tasting death for every man, he was an offering for the sins of the whole world. 1645.

Journal, p. 3. 3rd edition.

9. The apostle, speaking of the fathers, saith, "of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever, Amen." This was the apostle's doctrine to the church then, which we do witness, both as to his flesh, and as he was God.

A testimony of what we believe of

* Thomas Prichard.

Christ—both as he was God, and as he was man.—About 1675.

From WILLIAM PENN.

10. Thou must not, reader, from my querying thus, conclude we do deny those glorious three which bear record in heaven; the Father, Word, and Spirit; neither the infinity, eternity, and divinity of Jesus Christ; for that we know he is the mighty God. *Guide Mistaken*, 1668.

11. After quoting some Scripture texts, in which Christ is called the Saviour: he says, "From which I conclude Christ to be God; for if none can save, or be styled properly a Saviour but God; and yet that Christ is said to save, and properly called a Saviour, it must needs follow that Christ the Saviour is God." Again—"In short, this conclusive argument for the proof of Christ the Saviour's being God, should certainly persuade all sober persons of my innocency, and my adversaries' malice. He that is the everlasting wisdom, the divine power, the true light, the only Saviour, the creating word of all things (whether visible or invisible) and their upholder, by his own power, is, without contradiction, God. But all these qualifications and divine properties are, by the concurrent testimonies of Scripture, ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ: therefore, without a scruple, I call, and believe him really to be, the mighty God."

Innocency with her Open Face. 1669.

12. At the time of our disputation with T. D., T. V., T. D., and W. M., at the Spittle, being engaged in the negative concerning the common doctrine of distinct and separate personality, he, T. F., and some others, fell into great intimacy with us, &c. &c. When my book intitled "The Sandy Foundation Shaken," came out, &c. these men, at least T. F., was ready to believe me nearer akin to them, than God knows, I was; that is to say, in denying the Divinity of Christ. At this time what would he not have done for me, if I might have believed him! and in reality the man was wonderfully taken; but which was grievous, he was shamefully mistaken; and when he came to read my confession to Christ's eternal Godhead, in my little book, entitled

"Innocency with her open Face," (though he had another, called "The Guide Mistaken," that, p. 28, abundantly doth the same, which was writ, and read by him before the "Sandy Foundation" was thought of,) he deserted me, broke all bonds of friendship, &c. &c. He would have it a retraction, &c. &c. And though I sought his friendly behaviour, &c. &c. yet so invincible was his displeasure, that there was no holding for me of his good will, and believing Christ to be God.*

13. Reader, thou plainly seest that they believe the light to be divine, and the Scriptures to be of divine authority; that they own the Scripture Trinity or Holy Three, of Father, Word, and Spirit, to be truly and properly one; that Christ is God, and that Christ is man; that he came in the flesh, died, and rose again, ascended, and sits at God's right hand, the only sacrifice and mediator for man's happiness.

Key opening the Way to every Capacity, &c. 1692.

14. We believe him (Christ) according to Scripture, to be the Son of Abraham, David, and Mary, after the flesh; and also God over all, blessed for ever.

Testimony to the Truth of God. 1698.

15. Even so come Lord Jesus, and more and more set up thy kingdom in the souls of the children of men; that the holy will of thy Father may be done in earth: that mercy and truth, righteousness and peace may embrace and kiss each other; so shall the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, who is God over all blessed for ever.

Conclusion of a Reply to a nameless Author.

From ROBERT BARCLAY.

16. Among the Protestants, I know the Socinians are great pretenders to the Scriptures, and in words exalt them as much as any other people; and yet it is strange to see how, that not only in many things they are not agreeable to them, but in some of their chief principles quite contrary; as in their denying the Divinity of Christ, which is as expressly mentioned as any

* As this passage is rather long in the original, I have made a few breaks in it.

thing can be, "and the word was God," John i. as also in denying his being from the beginning, against the very tenour of that of John i. and divers others, as at large is shewn in the third chapter of this treatise.—Again, Question, But what Scriptures prove the Divinity of Christ, against such as falsely deny the same? Answer, "And the word was God."

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

Catechism, 1673.

17. After quoting the texts, "No man knoweth the Father, but the Son, or he to whom the Son will reveal him:"—"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me;"—he adds, "Hence he is fitly called the mediator betwixt God and man. For having been with God from all eternity, being himself God, and also in time partaking of the nature of man, through him, is the goodness and love of God conveyed to mankind, and by him again man receiveth and partaketh of these mercies."

Apology, Lat. 1676.

Eng. 1678, p. 10.

18. His (John Brown's) next perversion is yet more gross and abusive, p. 238, where from my denying "That we equal ourselves to that holy man, the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily;" he concludes, "I affirm him to be no more than a holy man; and because I use the words *plenitudo Divinitatis*, that I deny his Deity, which is an abominable falsehood. I detest that doctrine of the Socinians, and deny there is any ground for their distinction; and when I confess him to be a holy man, I deny him not to be God, as this man most injuriously would insinuate; for I confess him to be really both true God, and true man."

Reply to John Brown's Examination of his Apology.

FROM RICHARD CLARIDGE.

19. We do also believe that he (Christ) was and is both God and man, in wonderful union, not a God by creation or office, as some hold, nor man by the assumption of a human body only, without a reasonable soul, as others; nor that the manhood was swallowed up of the Godhead, as a

third sort grossly fancy; but God uncreated.

An Essay on the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction for the Sins of Mankind.

20. We distinguish between a Scripture Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which we unfeignedly believe; and that humanly devised Trinity of three distinct and separate persons, which we receive not; because the Holy Scriptures make no mention of it.

Same Work.

FROM SEWEL'S HISTORY.

(Ed. 1795.)

21. When the priest (Geo. Brooks) was speaking of the Trinity, T. Salt-house had asked him, where that word was to be found in the Scriptures; saying farther, "I know no such Scripture that speaks of the three persons in the Trinity; but the three that the Scripture speaks of, are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One." Page 211, (1655) Vol. I.

22. Extract from a Paper printed in 1693, entitled "The Christian Doctrine, and Society of the People called Quakers, cleared," &c.

We sincerely profess faith in God by his only begotten Son Jesus Christ, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and also our only mediator and advocate with the Father.

That God created all things; he made the worlds, by his Son Jesus Christ, he being that powerful and living word of God by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one, in divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God blessed for ever.

We sincerely confess (and believe in) Jesus Christ, both as he is true God, and perfect man, &c.

That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon, (as the primitive Christians did) because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and the Son, &c. Page 542 and 546, Vol. II.

Signed by George Whitehead and Seven other Friends.

P. S. I have to apologise for occupying so much room; but in the words of a writer whom I have before

quoted,* "the trouble of transcribing prevents the accumulation of extracts, (which might be carried to the extent of a folio volume,) of matter illustrative of the sentiments of the primitive Quakers, in which no Unitarian could possibly unite."

SIR, May 22, 1817.

I WAS at the time when it first appeared in your Magazine, [XI. 578,] much pleased with and interested in the success of Doctor Thomson's admirable plan of establishing funds, to be subscribed in small weekly or quarterly sums, by the members of our numerous churches, for the purpose of assisting poor congregations in carrying on their worship, building chapels, supporting aged ministers, and other Unitarian purposes; and I hardly need say how highly gratified, to find his ideas so judiciously acted upon by our brethren at Birmingham and Swansea. I earnestly and confidently hope that this excellent example will be followed without a single exception, by the members of every place of Unitarian worship in the island: it will be a present bond of union amongst us, and a most powerful means of promoting the great cause, from which all who justly appreciate the efficacy of the "*truth as it is in Jesus*," look for the reformation of the Christian, and the conversion of the Jewish and Heathen world.

Unitarians seem hitherto to have worked only by *hand*; and though some have laboured hard, and done much, still the business has been imperfectly and heavily carried on. But the general adoption of this admirable plan, will set a *powerful machine* in motion, which will execute all that we want, by the assistance of all, and without requiring the painful exertion of any. I am, with ardent wishes for the spread of genuine Scripture doctrines,

M. II.

The Spaniard's Letters from England.
(Continued from p. 284.)

7. *English Clergy—Clerical Traders.*

THE sermon is read, not recited, nor delivered extemporaneously; which is one main difference between the regular English clergy and the sectarians. It has become a branch of

trade to supply the priests with discourses, and sermons may be bespoke upon any subject, at prices proportioned to the degree of merit required, which is according to the rank of the congregation to whom they are to be addressed. One clergyman of Cambridge has assisted his weaker brethren, by publishing outlines which they may fill up, and which he calls skeletons of sermons; another of higher rank, to accommodate them still further, prints discourses at full, in the written alphabet, so as to appear like manuscript to such of the congregation as may chance to see them. The manuscripts of a deceased clergyman are often advertised for sale, and it is usually added to the notice, that they are warranted original; that is, that no other copies have been sold, which might betray the secret. These shifts, however, are not resorted to by the more respectable clergy; it is not uncommon for these to enter into a commercial treaty with their friends of the profession, and exchange their compositions. But even with this reinforcement, the regular stock is usually but scanty; and if the memory of the parishioners be good enough to last two years, or perhaps half the time, they recognise their old acquaintance at their regular return.

If, however, this custom be burthensome to one part of the clergy, they who have enough talents to support more vanity fail not to profit by it, and London is never without a certain number of popular preachers. I am not now speaking of those who are popular among the sectarians, or because they introduce sectarian doctrines into the church; but of that specific character among the regular English clergy, which is here denominated a popular preacher. You may well imagine, that, as the tree is known by its fruits, I have not a Luis de Granada, nor an Antonio Vieyra to describe. Threadbare garments of religious poverty, eyes weakened by incessant tears of contrition, or of pious love, and cheeks withered by fasting and penitence, would have few charms for that part of the congregation for whom the popular preacher of London curls his forelock, studies gestures at his looking-glass, takes lessons from some stage-player in his chamber, and displays his white hand and white hand-

* Thomas Prichard.

kerchief in the pulpit. The discourse is in character with the orator; nothing to rouse a slumbering conscience, nothing to alarm the soul at a sense of its danger, no difficulties expounded to confirm the wavering, no mighty truths enforced to rejoice the faithful,—to look for theology here would be * seeking pears from the elm;—only a little smooth morality, such as Turk, Jew, or Infidel, may listen to without offence, sparkling with metaphors and similes, and rounded off with a text of Scripture, a scrap of poetry, or, better than either, a quotation from Ossian.—To have a clergy exempt from the frailties of human nature is impossible; but the true church has effectually secured hers from the vanities of the world. We may sometimes have to grieve, because the wolf has put on the shepherd's cloak, but never can have need to blush at seeing the monkey in it.

These gentlemen have two ends in view; the main one is to make a fortune by marriage,—one of the evils this of a married clergy. It was formerly a doubt whether the red coat or the black one, the soldier or the priest, had the best chance with the ladies: if, on the one side, there was valour, there was learning on the other; but since volunteering has made scarlet so common, black carries the day;—*cedunt arma togæ*. The customs of England do not exclude the clergyman from any species of amusement; the popular preacher is to be seen at the theatre and at the horse-race, bearing his part at the concert and the ball, making his court to old ladies at the card-table, and to young ones at the harpsichord: and in this way, if he does but steer clear of any flagrant crime or irregularity, (which is not always the case, for this order, in the heretical hierarchy, has had more than one Lucifer,) he generally succeeds in finding some widow, or waning spinster, with weightier charms than youth and beauty.

His other object is to obtain what is called a lectureship in some wealthy parish; that is, to preach an evening sermon on Sundays, at a later hour than the regular service, for which the parishioners pay by a subscription. As this is an addition to the established ser-

vice, at the choice of the people, and supported by them at a voluntary expense, the appointment is in their hands as a thing distinct from the cure; it is decided by votes, and the election usually produces a contest which is carried on with the same ardour; and leaves behind it the same sort of dissension among friends and neighbours, as a contested election for parliament. But the height of the popular preacher's ambition is to obtain a chapel of his own, in which he rents out pews and single seats by the year: and here he does not trust wholly to his own oratorical accomplishments; he will have a finer-tuned organ than his neighbour, singers better trained, double doors, and stoves of the newest construction, to keep it comfortably warm. I met one of these chapel-proprietors in company; self-complacency, good humour, and habitual assentation to every body he met with, had wrinkled his face into a perpetual smile. He said he had lately been expending all his ready money in religious purposes; this he afterwards explained as meaning that he had been fitting up his chapel; “and I shall think myself very badly off,” he added, “if it does not bring me in fifty per cent.”

8. *Frequent Executions for Forgery.*

The frequent executions for forgery in England are justly considered by the humane and thinking part of the people, as repugnant to justice, shocking to humanity, and disgraceful to the nation. Death has been the uniform punishment in every case, though it is scarcely possible to conceive a crime capable of so many modifications of guilt in the criminal. The most powerful intercessions have been made for mercy, and the most powerful arguments urged in vain; no instance has ever yet been known of pardon. A Doctor of Divinity was executed for it in the early part of the present reign, who, though led by prodigality to the commission of the deed for which he suffered, was the most useful as well as the most popular of all their preachers. Any regard to his clerical character was, as you may well suppose, out of the question in this land of schism; yet earnest entreaties were made in his behalf. The famous Dr. Johnson, of whom the English boast as the great ornament of

* *Pedir peras al olmo.*

his age, and as one of the best and wisest men whom their country has ever produced, and of whose piety it will be sufficient praise to say that he was almost a Catholic,—he strenuously exerted himself to procure the pardon of this unfortunate man, on the ground that the punishment exceeded the measure of the offence, and that the life of the offender might usefully be passed in retirement and penitence. Thousands who had been benefited by his preaching petitioned that mercy might be shewn him, and the Queen herself interceded, but in vain. During the interval between his trial and his execution, he wrote a long poem, entitled *Prison Thoughts*; a far more extraordinary effort of mind than the poem of Villon, composed under similar circumstances, for which, in an age of less humanity, the life of the author was spared. Had the punishment of Dr. Dodd been proportioned to his offence, he would have been no object of pity; but when he suffered the same death as a felon or a murderer, compassion overpowered the sense of his guilt, and the people universally regarded him as the victim of a law inordinately rigorous. It was long believed that his life had been preserved by connivance of the executioner; that a waxen figure had been buried in his stead, and that he had been conveyed over to the Continent.

More persons have suffered for this offence since the law has been enacted than for any other crime. In all other cases palliative circumstances are allowed their due weight; this alone is the sin for which there is no remission. No allowance is made for the pressure of want, for the temptation which the facility of the fraud holds out, nor for the difference between offences against natural or against political law. More merciless than Draco, or than those inquisitors who are never mentioned in this country without an abhorrent expression of real or affected humanity, the commercial legislators of England are satisfied with nothing but the life of the offender who sins against the Bank, which is their Holy of Holies. They sacrificed for this offence one of the ablest engravers in the kingdom, the inventor of the dotted or chalk engraving. A mechanic has lately suffered who had made a machine to go without horses, and proved its suc-

cess by travelling in it himself about forty leagues. A man of respectable family and unblemished conduct has just been executed in Ireland, because, when reduced by unavoidable misfortunes to the utmost distress, he committed a forgery to relieve his family from absolute want.

9. *Miserable Condition of the English Poor.*

The beadsman at the convent door receives a blessing with his pittance, but the poor man here is made to feel his poverty as a reproach; his scanty relief is bestowed ungraciously, and ungraciously received; there is neither charity in him that gives, nor gratitude in him that takes. Nor is this the worst evil: as each parish is bound to provide for its own poor, an endless source of oppression and litigation arises from the necessity of keeping out all persons likely to become chargeable. We talk of the liberty of the English, and they talk of their own liberty; but there is no liberty in England for the poor. They are no longer sold with the soil, it is true; but they cannot quit the soil, if there be any probability or suspicion that age or infirmity may disable them. If in such a case they endeavour to remove to some situation where they hope more easily to maintain themselves, where work is more plentiful, or provisions cheaper, the overseers are alarmed, the intruder is apprehended as if he were a criminal, and sent back to his own parish. Wherever a pauper dies, that parish must be at the cost of his funeral: instances therefore have not been wanting, of wretches in the last stage of disease having been hurried away in an open cart upon straw, and dying upon the road. Nay, even women in the very pains of labour have been driven out, and have perished by the way-side, because the birth-place of the child would be its parish. Such acts do not pass without reprehension; but no adequate punishment can be inflicted, and the root of the evil lies in the laws.

When volunteer forces were raised over the kingdom, the poor were excluded; it was not thought safe to trust them with arms. But the peasantry are, and ought to be, the strength of every country; and woe to that country where the peasantry and the poor are the same!

Many causes have contributed to the increase of this evil. The ruinous wars of the present reign, and the oppressive system of taxation pursued by the late premier, are among the principal. But the manufacturing system is the main cause; it is the inevitable tendency of that system to multiply the number of the poor, and to make them vicious, diseased, and miserable.

To answer the question concerning the comparative advantages of the savage and social states, as Rousseau has done, is to commit high treason against human nature, and blasphemy against Omniscient goodness; but they who say that society ought to stop where it is, and that it has no further amelioration to expect, do not less blaspheme the one, and betray the other. The improvements of society never reach the poor: they have been stationary, while the higher classes were progressive. The gentry of the land are better lodged, better accommodated, better educated than their ancestors; the poor man lives in as poor a dwelling as his forefathers when they were slaves of the soil, works as hard, is worse fed, and not better taught. His situation, therefore, is relatively worse. There is, indeed, no insuperable bar to his rising into a higher order—his children may be tradesmen, merchants, or even nobles—but this political advantage is no amendment of his actual state. The best conceivable state for man is, that wherein he has the full enjoyment of all his powers, bodily and intellectual. This is the lot of the higher classes in Europe; the poor enjoys neither—the savage only the former. If, therefore, religion were out of the question, it had been happier for the poor man to have been born among savages, than in a civilized country, where he is in fact the victim of civilization.

10. *Mercenary Conduct of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's.*

Some five-and-twenty or thirty years ago the best English artists offered to paint pictures and give them to this cathedral;—England had never greater painters to boast of than at that time. The thing, however, was not so easy as you might imagine, and it was necessary to obtain the consent of the bishop, the chapter, the lord mayor, and the king. *The king loves the arts,*

VOL. XII.

2 Z

and willingly consented; the lord mayor and the chapter made no objection; but the bishop positively refused; for no other reason, it is said, than because the first application had not been made to him. Perhaps some puritanical feeling may have been mingled with this despicable pride, some leaven of the old Iconoclastic and Lutheran barbarism; but as long as the names of Barry and of Sir Joshua Reynolds are remembered in this country, and remembered they will be as long as the works and the fame of a painter can endure, so long will the provoking absurdity of this refusal be execrated.*

11. *Dissenters—"Socinians."* †

I have related in my last how the Dissenters, from the republican tendency of their principles, became again obnoxious to government during the present reign; the ascendancy of the old high church and tory party, and the advantages which have resulted to the true religion. Their internal state has undergone as great a change. One part of them has insensibly lapsed into Socinianism, a heresy, till of late years,

* A story, even less honourable than this to the dean and chapter of St. Paul's is current at this present time, which if false should be contradicted, and if true should be generally known. Upon the death of Barry the painter, it was wished to erect a tablet to his memory in this cathedral, and the dean and chapter were applied to for permission so to do; the answer was, that the fee was a thousand pounds. In reply to this unexpected demand, it was represented that Barry had been a poor man, and that the monument was designed by his friends as a mark of respect to his genius: that it would not be large, and consequently might stand in a situation where there was not room for a larger. Upon this it was answered, that, in consideration of these circumstances, perhaps five hundred pounds might be taken. A second remonstrance was made: the chapter was convened to consider the matter, and the final answer was, that nothing less than a thousand pounds could be taken.

If this be false it should be publicly contradicted, especially as any thing dishonourable will be readily believed concerning St. Paul's, since Lord Nelson's coffin was shown there in the grave for a shilling a head.—TR.

† This passage was quoted in our account of *The Spaniard's Letters* on their first appearance, M. Repos. II., 500. ED.

almost unknown in England; and into this party all the indifferentists from other sects, who do not choose, for political motives, to join the establishment, naturally fall. The establishment itself furnishes a supply by the falling off of those of its members, who, in the progress of inquiry, discover that the church of England is neither one thing nor the other; that in matters of religion all must rest upon faith, or upon reason; and have unhappily preferred the sandy foundation of human wit. *Crede ut intelligas, noli intelligere ut credas*, is the wise precept of St. Augustine; but these heretics have discarded the fathers as well as the saints! These become Socinians; and though many of them do not stop here in the career of unbelief, they still frequent the meeting-houses, and are numbered among the sect. With these all the hydra brood of Arianism and Pelagianism, and all the anti-calvinist Dissenters have united; each preserving its own peculiar tenets, but all agreeing in their abhorrence of Calvinism, their love of unbounded freedom of opinion, and in consequence their hostility to any church establishment. All, however, by this union, and still more by the medley of doctrines which are preached as the pulpit happens to be filled by a minister of one persuasion or the other, are insensibly modified and assimilated to each other; and this assimilation will probably become complete, as the older members, who were more rigidly trained in the orthodoxy of heterodoxy, drop off. A body will remain respectable for riches, numbers, erudition and talents, but without zeal and without generosity; and they will fall asunder at no very remote period, because they do not afford their ministers stipends sufficient for the decencies of life. The church must be kept together by a golden chain; and this, which is typically true of the true church, is literally applicable to every false one. These sectarians call themselves the enlightened part of the Dissenters; but the children of Mammon are wiser in their generation than such children of light.

From this party, therefore, the church of England has nothing to fear, though of late years its hostility has been erringly directed against them. They are rather its allies than its enemies, an advanced guard who have

pitched their camp upon the very frontiers of infidelity, and exert themselves in combating the unbelievers on one hand, and the Calvinists on the other. They have the fate of Servetus for their warning, which the followers of Calvin justify, and are ready to make their precedent. Should these sworn foes to the establishment succeed in overthrowing it, a burnt-offering of anti-trinitarians would be the first illumination for the victory.

12. *Little left of Magna Charta.*

The grave of king John is here, [Worcester] a monarch remarkable in English history for having signed the Great Charter, resigned his crown to the pope's legate, and offered to turn Mohammedan if the Miramolin would assist him against his subjects. As there were some doubts whether the grave which was commonly supposed to be his was really so, it was opened two or three years ago, and the tradition verified. It appeared that it had been opened before for other motives; for some of the bones were displaced, and the more valuable parts of his dress missing. As this was at the time when the revolutionary disposition of the people had occasioned some acts of unusual rigour on the part of government, it was remarked in one of the newspapers, that if king John had taken the opportunity to walk abroad and observe how things were going on, it must have given him great satisfaction to see how little was left of that Magna Charta, which he had signed so sorely against his will.

[*To be continued.*]

State of Religion in France.

[Extract from a Private Letter, dated Paris, May 12, 1817.]

YOU seem to wish for some general account of the theology of France. Except some devotional books for the routine of the liturgical worship of the country, I know scarcely of any new theological publication whatever. The Catholics always refer you to the well-known and certainly elaborate work of Bossuet on the Variations, as also to a treatise very logically drawn up on the *Perpetuité de la Foi*: but at this period I know of no very eminent

mén among them. In their church the idea that the great mass of the Christian world can be in an error respecting any doctrine of revealed religion would not be attended to: in such a case, say they, God would not always have been with his church, a notion they regard as subversive of the whole system of Christianity; they therefore consider their antiquity and their extensive dissemination as marks of their being in possession of the only true Christian doctrine. As to the Protestants they bear a small proportion to the population of France, and publish little or nothing in defence of their peculiar tenets. The literary and political writers of the country either look upon the Christian religion as a system of opinions falling gradually away, or as a political machine to be taken up so far as useful or necessary to the governors. The church is here a sort of *caput mortuum*: the vital principle has long since taken its flight, but as it has a sort of prescription of fourteen or fifteen centuries, it goes on because no other system is prepollent enough to destroy it. The cause of Protestantism was lost in France by the desertion of Henry IV. and by the persecutions of Louis XIV. and I see no probability of its revival. Few persons support energetically any system in this country. It is true in the large towns there is commonly one Protestant church; at Nismes and at Montauban, there are more than one, but the zeal is lukewarm. The Protestants seem on all occasions afraid of exposing the paucity of their numbers: their pulpit eloquence is displayed in enforcing the admirable morality of the gospel, and very seldom is it you hear among them a sermon on any particular dogma. Their ministers are far from avowing any sentiment you would look upon as genuine Christianity: the articles of the church of Geneva still bind them, though they are practically softened down to something like Arminianism: but no one of their ministers would I suppose publicly call in question the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the atonement: and several would mildly plead in their defence. The Crypto-Arians and Socinians

would shelter themselves under some equivocal scriptural expressions, which the greater part of the audience would interpret in nearly an orthodox sense, while a chosen few might perhaps associate with that phraseology a more latitudinarian meaning. If you are at all acquainted with the French Church in Threadneedle-Street, you may have a tolerable idea of the Protestant theology of this country.

SIR, *Norwich, May 1, 1817.*

IN the year 1581, many Catholics were imprisoned by Queen Elizabeth, "for refusing to conform themselves to that order of religion," which was then "public in this realme of England." The Queen, after she had made sure of the bodies of these men, resolved to bestow some care upon their souls. Two clergymen of the Church of England were accordingly dispatched to the Marshalsea and the other prisons in London, "to confer with them." One of them, (Robert Crowley,) states that "after some conference had with certain that were close prisoners, we came to one Maister *Thomas Pownde*, gentleman, in the lodging where he then lay: and finding him unwilling to enter into any conference by speeches, because (as he said) he feared to fall into danger of law thereby." Crowley then vindicates the goodness and clemency of Her Majesty, and reminds "*Maister Pownde*" that "if she would proceed against them in rigour of law, and not in mercy, she might cut their heads from their shoulders, and make no more to do with them; but being desirous that they might become obedient subjects to her, as she sheweth herself a loving prince to them, she had provided, that by conference with such as be learned, they might be either drawn from their errors, or else found to be obstinate and wilfully blind. But none of these speeches could move *Maister Pownde* to like of any conference by speeches. Yet, he said, he was ready to confer by writing. Whereunto I answered, that we had no commission to deal that way, but yet if he would write, I promised to answer him in writing. Upon this, he pulled a pamphlet out of his

bosom, and called in such as he thought meet to hear it read. And after he had read it, he delivered it to me to be answered."

After Crowley had finished his answer, he published it, (together with Pownde's pamphlet) under the following title: "An Aunswer to Sixe Reasons, that Thomas Pownde, Gentleman, and prisoner in the Marshalsey: at the commaundement of Her Majesties commissioners, for causes ecclesiasticale, required to be aunswered. Because these reasons do move him to think, that controversies and doubts in religion may not be judged by the Scriptures, but that the Scriptures must be judged by the Catholique Church. 1st, For that the Scriptures are mute and dum. 2nd, For that they be full of harde and deepe mysteries. 3rd, For that St. Peter sayth, *No Scripture is to be taken after any private interpretation.* 4th, For that to appeale to the Scriptures, dooth seeme to denie all unwritten verities. 5th, For that it were a great absurditie, not to have a certaine judge of absolute authoritie, in the interpreting of Scriptures, &c. 6th, For that in refusing the authoritie of the churches absolute judgement herein, we seem to denie the Holie Ghost to be the spirite of trueth. Written by Robert Crowley, London, 1581."

So much for the history of this tract. There is nothing worth extracting under the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd heads, but I think the 4th will amuse some of your readers.

"The 4th reason, (says Pownde) is, because by appealing only to the Scriptures, you seem to give men liberty to deny all unwritten verities, which we have received of the church, either by express definition in general council, or but by tradition. And I believe at my first naming of *unwritten verities*, Maister Crowley and his fellows will laugh straitway, as though all such were but fables. But to temper their folly (I will not say their pride) a little in that point, I ask them all this question—How they prove the trinity of persons in the unity of substance in Godhead by the express Scriptures? Or the two distinct natures in Christ, and but one person—or God the Father to be

Ingenitus—or the proceeding of the Holy Ghost, both from the Father and from the Son, as from one fountain—or the descending of Christ into hell, by plain words of Scripture—or the custom of baptizing infants, seeing the Scripture rather soundeth as though they should be first taught their faith, before they were baptized, saying—"Go and *teach* all nations, baptizing them," &c.? Yea, and why not may any heretic deny all our three creeds: both the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed as it is called, and the Creed of St. Athanasius, seeing never a one of these is written in Scripture expressly, but all left us upon credit of the church? Mark you not how these Bedlam Scripture men would shake all the foundations of our faith, by binding us to believe nothing but Scripture. Do not these blind guides, think you, lead us a trim dance toward infidelity?"

Crowley thus undertakes to prove "the trinity of persons in the unity of substance in Godhead, by the express Scriptures." "The Prophet David hath written thus: Ps. cx. 'The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send out of Zion the sceptre of thy power: bear thou rule in the midst amongst his enemies.' 'The Lord.' That is God the Father. 'Said to my Lord.' That is God the Son. Here we have two distinct persons, the Father and the Son. And in the second verse he saith, 'The Lord shall send out of Zion the sceptre of thy power,' which is the word of the gospel: and this sceptre was sent out of Zion, by the Holy Ghost, in the feast of Pentecost. So that here we have the third person, and consequently three distinct persons."

Whether Crowley's reasoning wrought any conviction in Pownde's mind, I have no means of ascertaining; but I think many of the modern defenders of Trinitarianism must have felt the truth of Pownde's prediction, and that "these Bedlam Scripture men have shaken all the foundations of the orthodox faith, by binding us to believe nothing but Scripture."

EDWARD TAYLOR.

SIR, Clapton, June 8, 1817.

I HAVE expected to see in your pages some biographical notices of the late Mr. Joyce, which, I trust, may yet be communicated. In the mean time give me leave to indulge my recollection of his valuable acquaintance, by bearing a willing, yet faithful testimony to his character and conduct on some points of no inconsiderable consequence.

Thirty years have nearly, if not quite, elapsed since our first acquaintance, while he was a theological student. In 1792, I joined him as a member of the *Society for Constitutional Information*, in connexion with which, as is well known, he suffered a political prosecution. Yet treachery, though bribed to make discoveries, could not, after all, substantiate any criminality. In that society there were persons, justly distinguished by talents and political sagacity, who made no pretensions to a religious character. With these Mr. Joyce zealously co-operated to promote the useful objects of the present life without losing himself, even in such fascinating company, as if he had no other life to expect. For this conduct he was rewarded, besides his own peaceful reflections, by the respect with which his political associates always regarded him. He has, indeed, left an edifying example to professors of religion, yet in the vigour and activity of life, whom eventful times may call out to arduous and political duties. They will learn, from his experience, that respect and influence are not likely to be forfeited, but rather acquired, by maintaining, in every situation, an unobtrusive, yet consistent Christian deportment.

There was another point of conduct on which I had frequent occasions to know that Mr. Joyce was exemplary. I mean his regard to the wants and sufferings of those who became the victims of *ministerial* vengeance at the period to which I have referred. Not to mention living characters or to repeat my acknowledgements for his attentions to Mr. Palmer and his associates, I will instance the case of Mr. Holt. He had been a bookseller at Newark, and was convicted of re-publishing a declaration, sanctioned by Mr. Pitt, while he professed to be a Political Reformer. To remove him far from the kind offices of his friends, he

was imprisoned in Newgate, where I visited him in 1797. He then appeared to be suffering under consumptive symptoms, and in a place most unsuitable to such a patient. He died, as might have been expected, soon after his return to his family. I am ashamed to recollect that the case of that interesting, unassuming man was, at first, in danger of being unaccountably overlooked, and it was in no small degree owing to the interference of Mr. Joyce, whom Mr. Holt gratefully mentions, in a letter now before me, that, at last, he was not neglected.

I could recount, with much satisfaction, my friend's endeavours, especially in an official capacity, to promote those views of religion which he regarded as Christian truth; also the various and valuable objects of moral and intellectual improvement to which he applied his habits of literary industry. These, however, are too well known, and such as others can better appreciate. I have here designed, with the advantage of near observation, and as one of the small and rapidly decreasing number of his early associates, to describe the consistency of his character and conduct as a Christian, laudably engaging in the active duties of political life.

J. T. RUTT.

85, Basinghall-street,
June 16, 1817.

SIR, OBSERVING in the last part of the Memoir of Mr. Vidler, in your Number for April last, [p. 196,] a misstatement of the stipend received by him from the Congregation of Parliament Court, I beg you will, in your next, insert the following correction, which I have extracted from my account, for the seven years commencing in 1808, during which time, being the acting treasurer, all the money passed through my hands.

From my accounts it appears that Mr. Vidler received

In 1808,	£133	10	6
1809,	78	7	6
1810,	102	7	6
1811,	84	16	0
1812,	89	10	0
1813,	90	5	6
1814,	44	13	6

Total in these 7 years 623 10 6

which averages, for that period, 89l. per annum, which is very different from the statement in the Memoir, a difference which, I have not the least suspicion, arose from wilful misrepresentation in the compiler of the Memoir, but from his not knowing where to apply for better information on that subject. I am particularly solicitous that this correction should be noticed for two reasons; first, for the sake of truth; and, second, that it may take away some of the disgrace that attaches to our congregation from the former statement.

BENJ. BAKER.

Note. The money paid to Mr. Vidler, as stated above, arose from the produce of the Seat Tickets, Quarterly Collections, and Donations.

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

—
No. CCCIV.

Employments of noble and mean Men.

Heylyn relates the story, in his *Examen Historicum*, of a nobleman, in Henry the Eighth's time, who told Mr. Pace, one of the king's secretaries, in contempt of learning, *That it was enough for noblemen's sons to wind their horn and carry their hawk fair and leave learning to the study of mean men.* To whom Mr. Pace replied, *Then you and other noblemen must be content that your children may wind their horns and keep their hawks, whilst the children of mean men do manage matters of state.*

—
No. CCCV.

Pope's Epigram on Dr. Freind.

Dr. Freind, the head master of Westminster School, was a celebrated writer of Latin epitaphs; which yet Mr. Pope, who was as great a composer of epitaphs in English verse, and could not well bear a rival in any way, thought too prolix and too flattering, if Dr. Freind be really intended, as he was generally supposed to be intended in the following epigram:

Friend, for your epitaphs I'm griev'd,
Where still so much is said,
One half will never be believ'd,
The other never read.

No. CCCVI.

An Apostle to the Pope.

Rome, Jan. 3, 1743.—We have had a strange mad fellow amongst us, one *George Hutchinson*, a weaver or taylor, by trade, who lately came from Ireland, by God's command, as he says, to convert the Pope. Though a Presbyterian by profession, he went constantly to the Protestant chapel here: but all the arguments that were used could not convince him of the vanity of his undertaking, and persuade him to return to his family, which he has left starving at home. He asserted, that the Pope was the *Whore of Babylon*, and that her worshippers, if they did not repent, would be destroyed within a year. He preached mightily against statues, pictures, umbrellas, bag-wigs, and hoop petticoats; so that I came under his censure; and he advised me, very earnestly, not to follow a business that promoted idolatry.—This prophet having made a great disturbance at St. Peter's, when his holiness came to give the benediction, has been seized, by his orders and sent out of sight.

—
No. CCCVII.

St. Winifred,

Called also Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz and Cologne, was born at Crediton, in Devon, A. D. 670. After becoming a monk, acquiring great reputation as a learned man, and making great exertions in disseminating the Christianity of the times, he was advanced, by Pope Gregory III., to the archbishoprick of Mentz in 732. He took great pains to convert the inhabitants of *Friezland*, and though he had no inconsiderable success, yet, in that country, he was at length killed in a tumultuous attack, A. D. 754, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. Fifty-four of his companions and attendants are said to have perished with their bishop. While he was thus employed upon the continent, he appears not to have been unconcerned for the spiritual welfare of his own country. For the better promoting the faith at home, he wrote a letter to Ethalbald, King of Mercia, which had such an effect, that the Scriptures were read in the Monasteries, and the Lord's Prayer und the Creed, in the English tongue.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I. — *Dr. Laurence's Remarks upon Griesbach's Classification, &c.*

[Concluded from p. 241.]

A SOUND Biblical Critic is formed by experience, and habits of practical skill, rather than by theoretic rules.* This was Griesbach's distinction, but has not belonged to his censors.

The subjects of which Dr. L. professes to treat in the fifth chapter of these *Remarks, &c.* are intimated in the following table of it's contents: *More correct mode of ascertaining the class of a manuscript. Comparison of A with Origen. With G or the Western text. Affinity of A to the Byzantine greater than to the Western, or Alexandrine.*

He begins the chapter by speaking of his own endeavours “to prove, that Griesbach's mode of investigation is unsatisfactory, and his statement of the number of readings inaccurate.” Now the Remarker's *proof* does not accord with his *declaration*. If we receive his account of his labours, he has done that *generally* and *completely* which, at the furthest, he has done but *partially*—in a single case, and with regard to one class of examples. Not deeming it sufficient however to overthrow error, without erecting an accurate system on it's ruins, he attempts to describe what appears to him “a more satisfactory mode of investigation” than that which Griesbach has prosecuted!

In making this attempt, he needlessly repeats doubts and fears which he had before expressed, and then says, 50, 51, that error

“is most to be apprehended in Griesbach's favourite text, the Alexandrine; because, if it really be a distinct text, which [adds Dr. L.] I much doubt, it is the least complete of the three, the quotations of Origen, which are published in the *Symbolæ*, being only applicable to particular parts of the New Testament, and not to the whole.”

We must here call the recollection of our readers to Griesbach's emphatic

language, “in the *Symbolæ* :” *neutrius recensio[n]is [sc: Occid: et Alex:] codex ullus ad nos pervenit, quin plurimis locis interpolatus sit. Nulli enim codici tantum deferimus ut lectiones ejus quas-cunque probemus.*† “A distinct text” is a *characteristic* text, not one which is absolutely pure. Nor do the readings of the Alexandrine *edition* occur solely in Origen, but are also found in Clement of Alexandria, and in other ancient Christian authors.‡

The Remarker, as though he designed to throw contempt on Biblical Criticism, observes, p. 51, note, that the manuscript A “is commonly called the *Alexandrine*, because it was brought into England from Alexandria: but,” he subjoins, “even the knowledge of the country, in which it was originally written, is only attainable by conjecture.” If by *conjecture* he means *the exercise of a sound and well-informed understanding on the evidence presented*, he is in the right. Michaelis considers it as “very probable”§ that the *Alexandrine* M. S. “was written in Egypt.” And his accomplished annotator thinks it “reasonable to suppose” that this *codex* was “really written” there. The *conjectures* of such individuals, are better than some men's *proofs*.

Dr. Laurence proceeds to “detail” what he conceives “to be a more correct mode of ascertaining the relative classification of a manuscript, than that which Griesbach has adopted:” and, in order to reduce his remarks to a moderate compass, he limits them to the classification of the manuscript A in the Epistles of Paul. That he may likewise bring the Western text into some sort of comparison, he takes into consideration the readings of the Boernerian marked G.

As however he merely *numbers* readings, and does not *weigh* them, we must be excused from accompanying him in his investigation. On the unsoundness of this principle of the Re-

† Tom. I. cxix.

‡ Ib. I. xxvi. II. 241, &c.

§ Introd: to N. T. II. 197, 651.

* Allgem: Biblioth: der biblisch: Literatur: 5r. Band. 25, 26.

marker's "textual" criticism we have before animadverted. And it is curious to perceive how complacently he avails himself of those imperfect documents—imperfect, because they are at once ancient and human—for the use of which he appears to censure Griesbach. Thus, he says of "the Boernerian M.S. marked G," which is "only applicable to particular parts of the N. T., and not to the whole,"

"It cannot indeed be regarded as a pure specimen of the text to which it seems evidently to belong; nor will this be said of the quotations from Origen: but each may at least serve for the purpose of a general comparison, in the defect of a better."—Pp. 53, 54.

Here we subscribe to the Remarker's opinion: we acquiesce, so far, in his method of investigation. For Griesbach however we claim the privilege exercised by Dr. Laurence—that of employing such a *specimen*, and such a document, as he can procure, *in the defect of a better*; and one which *may at least serve for the purpose of a general comparison*.^{*} The learned German Professor indeed regarded Biblical Criticism in a higher light than the performance of operations in addition and subtraction: the comparisons which he instituted, were superior, in their nature and relations, to those which are made merely by the aid of elementary arithmetic.

"Plain and simple," exclaims Dr. L., when speaking of his own *numerical* calculations, "as this species of elucidation seems to be, it nevertheless escaped the penetrating eye of Griesbach, who, too much dazzled perhaps by the splendour of intricate and perplexing research, overlooked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own, without having first totally demolished their's; forgetting, that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text." 56, 57.

The language in which these unfounded charges are conveyed, tempts a smile. We have frequently heard of men being dazzled by excess of light: and *luminousness*, we know,

may become *splendour*. But we had not before read of the *dazzling* qualities, and *splendid* appearance, of what is "intricate and perplexing." Let Dr. Laurence, if he please, enjoy and exemplify this effulgence: but, for his credit's sake, let him cease to make insidious thrusts at Griesbach's reputation, which he assails with much variety and mixture of metaphors. Though he had admitted that the Professor was distinguished by patience and by modesty (pp. 6, 8), still he objects to him a supposed fondness for adventurous and innovating critics (15), and a vanity that was "dazzled by the splendour of intricate and perplexing research;" habits of mind not less mutually discordant than the Remarker's group of images! Assuredly, something was due from this gentleman to Griesbach's character, and to his own.

It is gravely alleged that the Professor's "*hostility to every standard text*" was "the very nerve of his criticism." Who, with the exception perhaps of Dr. L., and of one or two other English writers of the present age, will maintain the propriety of considering the text of the Elzevir edition, of 1624, as the *standard* text? Is not Bengel with reason thought to have been needlessly and unfortunately scrupulous in his adherence to the text of former *printed** editions? Why should he have refused to exemplify as well as state his theory? Nothing but Criticism, in the hands of learned and judicious men, can frame a text which deserves to be a standard: nor should that be imputed to Griesbach as an error which, in truth, entitles him to our respect and gratitude.

In p. 62, Dr. L. has transcribed, from one of the Professor's works, a sentence representing this editor's minute accuracy in his catalogue of certain readings.† Yet the Remarker seems to have overlooked an important clause in the note of which that sentence makes a part—*consensus in GRAVIORIBUS lectionibus*. Such, precisely, is the difference between the two systems of criticism; Griesbach's being a process of skill and judgment, —Dr. Laurence's, one of numbers.

* "Some sort of comparison." Dr. Laurence.

* Michaelis' Introd. &c. II. 466, 885.

† Symbol: Crit: I. cxxiii.

Dr. Laurence's fifth chapter is entitled,

Comparison of the Colbert manuscript with A. Mistakes of Griesbach. Controverted reading 1 Tim. iii. 16. Existence of the Alexandrine text problematical. Conclusion.

In p. 64 he informs us that Griesbach, "notwithstanding his theory of classification, in deciding upon the purity of a reading, seems principally guided by critical conjecture."

Now this remark virtually acquits Griesbach of the charge of being unduly attached to any "theory of classification," whether it be *established* or his own. And what does Dr. L. mean by *critical conjecture*? Surely he employs these words in a very different sense from that in which they are commonly understood. He shall explain this apparently formidable accusation. In the next page he tells us that Griesbach endeavours "to point out, from general maxims of criticism, by investigating the internal marks of validity in their respective readings, the relative habits and value of" the Alexandrine and of the Western text. And this process our author thinks fit to style *critical conjecture*! We leave the inference to our readers.

It was with reason that the learned Professor considered *manuscripts* as the most important of the sources whence corrections of the received text are to be derived. 65, 66. This also was the opinion of Michaelis,* who says, "they alone can be admitted as evidence, who simply report what they have heard and seen."

Griesbach professed to extract from six chapters in the Codex Colbert [17] *all* those readings on which he had formed a definite judgment—*lectiones omnes, de quibus certo mihi constat*.† His investigation of these was undertaken in order that he might fully illustrate the character and value of the Alexandrine and Western texts. But his enumeration is, according to the Remarker, "strangely incorrect; as he omits *one* reading in the agreements, and not less than *eighteen* in the disagreements." We think that Griesbach purposely limited himself to the readings which we have just

described, and concerning the quality of which his mind had acquired a sufficient degree of satisfaction. If however we even take the fact to be such as Dr. L. represents it, Griesbach's principle of classification remains unimpeached. This intelligent and laborious editor was not, after all, completely accurate. He did not claim to be so: nor do we recollect that any such claim has ever been advanced in his behalf. We should feel and acknowledge some obligations to the Remarker, for assisting us to decide on the correctness or incorrectness of Griesbach's "enumeration" of readings, had the assistance been offered with greater modesty and distinctness.

For Dr. L., whose experience in the collation of manuscripts is comparatively slight, to assume the individual readings of one of them as "characteristical of it's class, in the absence of more direct testimony," might indeed be a bold measure. 71. Let it, nevertheless, be recollected that the eye and the discernment of Griesbach had long been habituated to this task. It was not till after patient examination that he pronounced on the age and character of a manuscript. If by *more direct testimony* the Remarker means *external evidence*, let him shew whence it is to be obtained: or if he intends to speak of plainer and stronger proofs than the manuscript itself affords, he will do us a favour by saying, where these are to be discovered.

He attempts to illustrate this part of his reasoning by a number of observations on "the celebrated, the often discussed, and the long tortured reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16," in which Griesbach "proposes to substitute $\delta\varsigma$ for $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$."

Griesbach's notes, in loc. to the last of his editions of the N. T., contain his final and maturest thoughts on the reading of this passage. It is a case which demonstrates beyond contradiction that he relied on *the native excellence*, and not on the *number*, of *Codices manuscripti*. The mass of manuscripts was opposed to him: but the best and the most ancient were on his side. "It is admitted," writes Dr. L., with a solemn air, "that *all* known manuscripts, with the exception of *four*, which have $\delta\varsigma$, read $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$." To the suffrages of the $\delta\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ Dr.

* Introd. &c. Vol. II. 159.

† Symb. Critic. II. 89.

L. shall be perfectly welcome, while he leaves us in possession of a few competent and approved witnesses.

Our readers will do well to make themselves masters of the Professor's statement of his reasons for printing $\theta\varsigma$ in his text. In receiving it as genuine, he submits to competent judges the evidence of its being such—*salvo uniuscujusque lectoris judicandi facultate pollentis judicio*. He alleges that his decision is formed agreeably to the established principles of criticism: and of the deductions which he draws from his researches one is that *antiquity* cannot here be claimed for the vulgar reading, of which he adds, *numero et recentiorum patrum græcorum ancipiti fide nititur, nec in ullo antiquitatis monumento, seculo quarto exeunte anteriore, reperiri potuit*.

Cyrrill, the Remarker concedes, 75, "quotes the passage more than once; yet," says this gentleman, "although the printed copies of that Father's works have $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, it is maintained that the context requires a different reading. If we do not perceive a little wire-drawing in this species of proof, which, being ingeniously deduced from the very materials furnished by the adverse party, was commenced by Wetstein, and completed by Griesbach, we cannot surely admit it as *direct and decisive* evidence of a reading attributable to the Alexandrine fathers."

It is *sufficient* evidence: whether it be *direct and decisive*, or whether evidence strictly so termed be attainable on such a subject, are questions practically unimportant. With regard to Cyrrill, does Dr. Laurence believe in the immaculateness of the editions of this father, as well as in the antiquity of the Byzantine text? If his belief, or rather his credulity, extend so far, reasoning cannot impress his mind. On the other hand, if his power of *digesting the crambe recocta* of a scholastic literature and theology be not quite so strong, justice and decorum, united with taste, should have preserved him from the use of such invidious language as "a little *wire-drawing*." We refer the Biblical student to the Symb. Critic. T. I. xliii. &c.

Of the ancient versions it is remarkable that not one reads $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$: whether

$\theta\varsigma$ or θ be the reading of some of them, is an inquiry of far less moment—and in their answers to it Griesbach and Dr. Laurence differ.

A note occurs, in p. 83, which causes us to suspect that Griesbach's censor is little of a proficient in the history and the exercise of Biblical Criticism. "Griesbach supposes that $O\Sigma$ was mistaken for $\Theta\Sigma$, because the transcriber knew that the passage was usually interpreted of God, the word. But surely," proceeds Dr. L., "transcribers by profession (and such, before the invention of printing, were those who transcribed manuscripts) are never in the habit of reasoning upon the sense of what they copy. Ask a law-stationer of the present day, after he has engrossed the conveyance of an estate with a long description of the title, whether that title accrued by descent or purchase; and he will perhaps be puzzled to answer the question."

The cases are not analogous to each other. "A law-stationer of the present day" is not a student or practitioner of the law, but owes his name and his subsistence to his ability of writing "a fair round hand" or of engrossing. On the contrary, and from the very nature of the thing, the copyists of ancient manuscripts of the N. T. were men conversant with the theology and literature of the age, and personally or ecclesiastically interested in the determinations of Biblical and Scriptural Criticism. Such individuals could and did reason upon the sense of what they transcribed: and many of them must be included in the following description,

"Sæpissime et librarii et editores in transcribendis vel recensendis allegatis e bibliis sacris tam fuere vel negligentes vel temerarii, ut in locum lectionis genuinæ subderent aliam, cum eo textu, cui ipsi adsueta essent, consentientem, aut e discrepantibus plurium codicum lectionibus eam deligerent auctoriq[ue] suo supponerent, quam textui S. S. recepto præ cæteris consentaneam esse viderent." *

Dr. Laurence recollects the occasion of this statement, and has not forgotten Cyrrill of Alexandria, and his editors!

The willing censor of Griesbach,

* Symb. Crit. T. I. xliii. &c.

conceives, 86, that this editor's "arrangement of classes is not intended to supersede, but to act in subordination to, conjectural criticism." He ought to have said that *it is not intended to supersede the application of sound critical principles to the contents of manuscripts*. Griesbach's criticism was not *conjectural*. We have before exposed the impropriety of this language of the Remarker's, who is unable to overthrow the decisions of Griesbach in the two several examples of John vii. 8. John i. 18. In the former of these passages the editor substitutes *οὐκ* for *οὐπω* (*εἶπε οὐπω ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὴν ἐορτὴν ταύτην*) on high external authority, and, further, on strong internal presumption; the *οὐπω* of the received text being borrowed, as is most probable, from the succeeding clause, where it indisputably occurs: in the other reading *θεός* has no probability whatever, but the reverse; it being indeed impossible to suppose that the sacred historian wrote, "no one hath seen God at any time: the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him"—and the word *θεός*, for which Dr. L. appears to contend, being really a gloss, and no various reading. We are satisfied that in this latter instance the only critical question, as to the text, is, whether or not *υἱός* should be omitted? Griesbach retains the word: and we presume that it will not be in the Remarker's power to set aside the sentence. On this head our readers will perhaps arrive at the same conclusion with ourselves when they have carefully weighed Griesbach's rules of criticism, particularly the 1st, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 12th, 13th, and 14th. *

Dr. Laurence chuses to be sceptical respecting the existence of "an Alexandrine text more valuable as well as more ancient than either the Byzantine or the Western." 88. Now, in the first place, that there are *appropriate* readings in the manuscripts and in the fathers usually denominated *Alexandrine*, cannot be fairly denied by those who are acquainted with the works of Griesbach: and the *number* of these readings is of far less consequence than their *nature*; it being difficult to explain their occurrence

unless we refer them to a separate text. In the next place, "the possibility that manuscripts written in Alexandria might have been adapted to the Latin text," weighs nothing against this conclusion. All the texts (*recensiones*) were subject to mutilations and corruptions. Michaelis and Bishop Marsh believed in "the existence" of an Alexandrine *edition*, notwithstanding their concessions in regard to the influence of *Latinizing copies* on *Greek manuscripts in Alexandria*. A falling man catches at a twig. Dr. L. is eager to represent a *possibility* as a *fact*.

The Remarker indeed is aware, 91, that his reflections "run counter to public prejudice [opinion]," to the judgment of many whose literary talents conciliate his esteem, and whose critical acumen commands his respect. "But, in the republic of letters," he says with great correctness, "no supremacy is admissible but that of truth, and I flatter myself," adds Dr. L., "that I possess the same claim to the candour of others, which Griesbach has to mine."

What *candour* he has shewn to Griesbach, let certain quotations that we have made from his *Remarks*, &c. attest. That the authority of names should never be opposed to the evidence and the demands of *Truth*, we agree with him in thinking. What indication however is afforded by Dr. L. of his capacity of demolishing the critical fabric of Griesbach? And how unbecoming is the attempt to convert the effect of the Professor's *modesty* into an argument against his system! Griesbach declines to reason from materials which are not in his possession: and this cautious spirit is charged upon him as a fault!

Even the concluding paragraph of the body of the Remarker's pamphlet insinuates accusations of Griesbach. Dr. Laurence is pleased to speak of "an intricate and involved analysis," and of "exalting possibilities into probabilities, and probabilities into certainties." He contrasts "the gambols of imagination" with "the soberer exertions of reason" and "wildly wandering in the dark" with "walking in the broad light of day." It is pleasant to observe how Dr. Laurence can point a period, after he has wearied himself and his readers by his

* Prolegom. LIX—LXIX.

critical lucubrations. But these inuendos against Griesbach are neither just nor decent: and they betray the Remarker's forgetfulness of the claims of the Professor to his *candour*.

The larger portion of Dr. L.'s *Appendix*, consists of *Readings from Origen, and from the M.SS. A. G and C. in relation to that father, to the received text, and, in some degree, to each other*. This is the least exceptionable part of the pamphlet, and may have its uses for those who are desirous of appreciating Griesbach's efforts in Biblical Criticism. The student should be reminded however that the mere number of readings is not decisive of the class to which the manuscript containing them belongs.

* *Precipuus recensio in criseos sacræ exercitio usus hic est, ut earum auctoritate lectiones bonas sed in paucis libris superstites defendamus adversus juniorum et vulgari codicum innumerabilem pene turbam*. This is the nature, this, the excellence, of Griesbach's system. By this standard let it be tried. It is idle to complain of him, in one page, 92, that he has recourse to *analysis*—in another, 134, that he *dogmatizes by synthetical reasoning*. Dr. Laurence may have succeeded in winnowing some chaff from the wheat: let him take the chaff for his pains!

ART. II.

UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY IN SCOTLAND.

[Continued from p. 299.]

Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy. By Ralph Wardlaw.

A Vindication of Unitarianism, in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. By James Yates, M. A.

Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication: A Reply to the Rev. James Yates's Vindication of Unitarianism. By Ralph Wardlaw.

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.

IN reply to the body of evidence which Mr. Yates advanced in support of the Unitarian doctrine, and in answer to his animadversions on Mr. Wardlaw's *Discourses*, the latter gentleman has written a large volume, in which he endeavours to defend his former reasonings, and professes to bring forward additional evidence of the Divinity of Christ, &c.; and not only to refute Mr. Yates's arguments, but even to turn most of them against him. In endeavouring to accomplish these objects, he has indulged in much declamation; introduced a great deal of extraneous matter, and, we are sorry to add, exhibited much less of the deportment of the gentleman and the spirit of the Christian even than in his *Discourses*. With a strict adherence to the main points in dispute, and with much temper and mildness, Mr. Yates replies to his opponent, with great brevity, but with a strength of argument which appears to us to be decisive of the controversy. We earnestly wish that every person who has not made up his mind on these important subjects, would calmly and impartially compare what Mr. Wardlaw has advanced in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the proper Deity of Jesus Christ, with the arguments urged by Mr. Yates against these opinions; and the evidence he has adduced in support of the doctrine that, according to the Scriptures, there is but one God, in one person; that this one God is the Father; and that Jesus Christ *derived* all his dignity, power and authority from him. Our previous convictions may possibly lead us to form a higher estimate of the number who would, by this means, become Unitarians than the experiment would justify; but we are fully satisfied, that no person of a sound understanding and candid mind, would rise from such an investigation, without a conviction, that Unitarians pay as entire a deference to the Sacred Scriptures as any class of Christians whatever; and that the arguments by which they endeavour to establish their system, whether capable of sustaining it or not, are at least of a nature to deserve the most serious and impartial attention.

Were we to give any thing like an abstract of the volumes before us, it would swell this article much beyond

* *Symbol. Crit.* T. I. cxxii.

the limits prescribed to it : and this, we hope, is not necessary, since what we have already said, must be sufficient to induce those who place any confidence in our recommendation, and who feel any interest in the subject, to consult the works themselves. We shall, therefore, rest satisfied with quoting a single specimen of the manner in which Mr. Yates has conducted his reply, and which will at the same time afford an example of the kind of arguments advanced by both writers : and then we shall proceed to state an observation or two which the perusal of the controversy has suggested.

“ Mr. Wardlaw writing in the treatise before us upon the Doctrine of the Trinity, repeats what he had asserted in his Discourses that he ‘ believes *the fact*, although he is ignorant respecting the *mode* or *manner of the fact*.’—The fact stated in his own language is this ; that ‘ in the Unity of the Godhead there are three distinct Subsistences or Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.’ This fact he wishes me to believe. Before assenting to it, I am desirous, as in every other case, to understand the meaning of the proposition.—You repeat to me a fact which you say ‘ is of superlative importance ;’ before I can believe it, I must know what it is : you announce a proposition, I wish to be informed what ‘ ideas you annex to the terms of the proposition.’—To this query Mr. Wardlaw appears to me to return two different answers, varying his explanations according to the purpose, which he has in view in each particular case.

“ In the first place, he replies, that ‘ the subject is so completely removed beyond the view of the human understanding, that it is impossible for us to form upon it any clear or accurate conceptions.’—Of the precise import of the terms ‘ *Unity*,’ ‘ *Distinct*,’ ‘ *Person*,’ and ‘ *Subsistence*,’ which are employed in the proposition, ‘ I shall not attempt,’ says he, ‘ to convey to your mind any clear ideas. I cannot impart to you what I do not possess myself. I however assert, that the proposition contains an important truth, because the truth is declared by divine authority.’ ”*

“ I answer, Shew me that it is declared by divine authority, and I shall assent to it with submissive reverence. But observe, that, in order to do this, you must shew me in the word of God the identical proposition which you have announced. For, since no distinct ideas are annexed to the terms of the proposition, we cannot *prove* its truth by

any comparison of those terms with other phrases to which distinct ideas are attached.”†

“ If,” says Mr. Wardlaw, “ *the terms themselves are unintelligible*, you are clearly right ; for in that case it would be impossible for us to substitute *other* terms, with any degree of certain assurance that we were enunciating the same doctrine. The man who knows not at all the meaning of the words *Ellipse*, *Conic*, and *Sections*, would in vain endeavour to convey in other terms than those, in which it has been announced to himself, the proposition that an *Ellipse* is one of the *Conic Sections*. He must satisfy himself with repeating the *ipsissima verba*.”‡

“ Shew me then, in the word of God, the identical proposition, which you have announced.”—At this point of the argument Mr. Wardlaw changes his ground. The proposition in question, he knows, does not occur in the Scriptures ; he is therefore obliged to maintain only, that it may be *PROVED* from the Scriptures. But *proving* implies *DISTINCT IDEAS* ; and hence he is under the necessity of representing the proposition as not merely true, but intelligible, and the ideas suggested by it so clear, the conceptions so accurate and distinct, that the truth of the proposition may be inferred with absolute certainty from a great variety of phrases and declarations contained in the Sacred Scriptures, all of which may be shewn to have a manifest bearing upon the subject, and to contribute testimony, more or less abundant, in support of the proposition.

“ The terms themselves,” says he, “ are NOT unintelligible. The *fact*, stated in the proposition, is revealed, although the *mode* of the fact is not revealed. Reasoning from the Scriptures is, therefore, the proper mode of establishing the fact, or proving the truth of the proposition.”§

“ With the *mode* of the fact, I answer, we have, as is admitted on all hands, nothing to do. The Scriptures, you say, assure us of a *fact*, and you maintain, that the terms of the proposition, in which you announce that fact are intelligible. Permit me, therefore, to repeat the question, with which I set out, and to ask again, *What ideas do you annex to the terms of the proposition?* In the first place, what do you mean when you assert *THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD*.”

† Vind. of Unitarianism, pp. 41—44. 129—132.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 52.

§ Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 52, 53.

* Discourses, p. 11. 19. 26. 30. Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 63.

“ I mean,” replies Mr. Wardlaw, “ that the universe is subject to one simple and undivided mind, one all-wise Designer, who is uncreated, unchangeable and everlasting, sufficient without the aid of any counsellor, assistant or associated God, for the production of every effect, which is exhibited throughout endless time and infinite space.” ||

“ What do you mean by the term PERSON or Subsistence?”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “ By a Person, I mean that which possesses *personal properties*.” *

“ Of course; that is no more than saying, that a Person is a Person. But what are ‘Personal properties’?”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “ Personal properties are the properties which constitute personality. Now *that which can contrive, which can design, is a Person*. There capacities constitute personality.” †

“ What do you mean when you say that *the Holy Spirit is a Person*?”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “ I mean that he is not a mere attribute or power, or influence, but AN INTELLIGENT AGENT.” ‡

“ When you affirm, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are three *Persons*, do you mean, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are three *Intelligent Agents*?”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “ I employ PERSON and INTELLIGENT AGENT as synonymous expressions.” §

“ You have now explained sufficiently the meaning of the proposition, which you wish me to believe. My answer is, that I could not believe it, even though I found it clearly stated in the Scriptures; because its *intrinsic absurdity* would be stronger evidence against it than any evidence in its favour, which could possibly be exhibited.” ||

“ I allow,” replies Mr. Wardlaw, AGAIN CHANGING HIS GROUND, “ that a doctrine clearly self-contradictory, could not be proved even by the testimony of the Scriptures. But the doctrine which I have stated, cannot possibly be proved to be self-contradictory, because it is a subject, on which we are left in *total ignorance*, and, unless we have *some notion* of the thing itself, on what principle can we possibly make out the contrariety?” ¶

“ Presuming to urge this discussion a little farther, I observe, you just now explained yourself as meaning by the ‘Unity of the Godhead,’ that the order of events

in the universe is entirely directed by the will and agency of one simple and undivided mind.”

“ I did.”

“ But you asserted that there have existed from all eternity in the Unity of the Godhead three Persons; and you have explained yourself as meaning by a Person an *Intelligent Agent*. Your doctrine appears, therefore, to imply that three distinct Intelligent Agents, form one simple and undivided mind, which is a direct contradiction.”

“ I have explicitly declared,” answers Mr. Wardlaw, “ that when I used the term ‘*Person*’ and others employed in the proposition, I would not be understood as pretending to any precise and definite conception of the nature of that distinction in Deity, which these terms import. Was it an unreasonable expectation, that you should carry this declaration along with you through the remainder of the discussion, and that, when those terms were used again, they should be used with the qualification previously affixed to them? A generous disputant would certainly have felt himself bound to proceed on this reasonable principle.” *

“ You said, that when you asserted the Unity of God, you meant that all things are made by the power of one Designer. But you also asserted, that in the Unity of God there are three Persons, and that by a *Person* you mean that which can contrive or design. Does not your doctrine then imply, that *three Designers* are *one Designer*?”

“ I employed the term ‘*Person*’ in compliance with established usage, and because I do not know that another could be devised more appropriate. But of its precise import, as applied to a distinction in the Divine Essence, I have professed my own incompetency and my conviction of the incompetency of others, to form any clear conception. Justice and generosity alike required, that you should have taken along with you the qualifying explanation which I gave in the outset, and which I certainly intended should accompany, to the close of our discussion, my use of the terms *distinct*, *subsistences*, *person*, and *personality*, in their application to Deity.” †

“ Such appears to me to be the exact state of the controversy, as it has been carried on between Mr. Wardlaw and myself, respecting *the nature* of the doctrine of the Trinity, and *the evidence* requisite to prove it.”—Sequel to Vind. of Unit. pp. 57—63.

In this controversy there is some approximation to the spirit in which

|| Vind. of Unit. p. 51, compared with Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 62, 301, 302.

* Discourses, p. 281.

† Discourses, p. 282.

‡ Discourses, p. 286.

§ Ib.

|| Vind. of Unit. pp. 39, 40, 128, 129.

¶ Discourses, p. 23.

* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 65.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 67, 68.

all discussion, and particularly all religious discussion, ought to be conducted. The acrimony which usually mingles with, and poisons religious controversy, has long excited the malignant smile of the unbeliever, and the sigh of the enlightened Christian. That the disciples of a Master whose spirit was gentle as the dove, the emblem of the Divine approbation which descended on his sacred head; and whose religion is nothing but benevolence, speaking in its sweetest accents and inspired by its Eternal Source, should exemplify even in their inquiries relative to its doctrines and duties, the very temper which it is its great object to destroy—can be accounted for only by the philosopher who looks deeply into the human heart, and perceives through all the appearances and names it assumes, the true and most hateful and pernicious egotism of which it is full. To defend the doctrines of the religion of Jesus with animosity, is as if one should dilate on the loveliness of the meek and gentle disposition which turns with agony from the sight of human suffering, and end by the application of the rack: or dwell with impassioned language on the value of the friendship which knows neither suspicion nor bound, and as the accents fall from the lips, Judas-like, to betray to death with a kiss the most confiding of friends.

Yet it is a certain and mournful truth, that even the enlightened have displayed on this subject, a bigotry of which ignorance itself might have been ashamed; and the amiable indulged an animosity of which none but the malignant might have been supposed capable. They have offered incense to their own vanity, while they imagined, perhaps sincerely believed, that, animated only by a zeal for the glory of God, they were sacrificing on the altar of truth, every human infirmity. Often too, this violation of the spirit of Christ arises from a most unworthy source: from the wish to display what talent is possessed for smartness and repartee: with what severity and sarcasm it is possible to chastise the insolence which presumes to differ from us: and with what ease a small oversight may be magnified into wilfulness, perversity and guilt. Few controversialists in-

deed, are conscious, at the time, of the littleness of the feeling which prompts these unhallowed sallies of imagination and criminal ebullitions of passion; but that feeling is not the less real or active for being concealed. And it is curious to observe how it prevails over the firmest resolutions against it. Almost all disputants begin with profession of moderation and candour: most, with a sincere desire to exemplify these excellencies: but gradually the imagination becomes heated: the mind, feeling strongly the evidence which it endeavours to illustrate and establish, wonders at the ignorance which does not perceive, or the perverseness which will not yield to it: becomes irritated and provoked, forgets its good resolves and delivers itself up to the evil spirit which, at length, entirely possesses it. And what is deeply to be lamented, this disgraceful violation of the spirit of the Christian religion, is generally applauded and cherished by the partisans of the cause it is supposed to favour.

We are not a little gratified that Mr. Yates has manifested a deep consciousness of this aptitude of the mind to sin against the Christian law: that he appears, therefore, to have exercised a vigilant guard over himself through the whole controversy and in general with success. The gentleness of his spirit, and the courtesy of his manner, are exemplary. Without pretending to humility, there often occur in the works before us traces of the genuine feeling. Fixing on the great arguments which have produced conviction in his own mind, stating them plainly and simply, and leaving them to make their own impression on the mind of the reader, he neither attempts to flatter nor seeks to awe or to persuade him. He points out the misconceptions, the misrepresentations and the fallacious reasonings of his opponent, without affecting to wonder at his ignorance, to tremble with horror at his presumption, to be scandalized at his impiety, or to be in doubt whether he deserve the Christian name, or can be admitted to a participation of the Christian's happiness. There are indeed some exceptions to this prevailing urbanity and modesty: occa-

sionally an unkind surmise, a harsh expression, a sentence, which in the language of his opponent, "could hardly have been used without a certain scornful elevation of the upper lip," have escaped him, which we are persuaded no one can regret more deeply than their author.

"My object in the following work," says Mr. Yates in the introduction to his Sequel, "will be, First, to correct the inaccuracies, which I have been enabled to discover in my 'Vindication of Unitarianism,' by the perusal of Mr. Wardlaw's Reply; and secondly, to defend the statements and reasonings, which I have advanced, where they appear to me to be partially represented or unjustly attacked, by my opponent. I make no pretension to security from errors: I am so far from feeling any unwillingness to acknowledge those which I have been able to detect, that I think it my duty to bring them prominently into view, as the only means of atoning for my inadvertency and preventing others from being misled by my want of information: and I esteem it a great advantage to myself and to my readers, that the endeavours of an ardent, acute, and able disputant, to destroy the reputation and expose the fallacies of my work, are likely to leave few errors unnoticed, and may thus be made subservient to what ought to be our only object, the attainment of truth.

"In such a situation I feel it incumbent upon me, to retract as quickly and as publicly as possible every error into which I have fallen; to make every just and reasonable concession, however unfavourable to the consistency and stability of my own opinions, in translating any passage of Scripture, to give the *exact sense* of the original words, although, taken by themselves, they should appear to present the most formidable objection to Unitarianism or even to Christianity; and, through the whole investigation, to labour to free my mind from every prejudice and false seduction, to suppress every emotion of pride, resentment or party-spirit, and to preserve a single eye to truth, duty and the approbation of God."—Sequel, p. 7.

Had such passages occurred in Mr. Wardlaw's works, we should have directed the attention of our readers to them, with much greater pleasure, than we have experienced in referring to those indications of correct and generous feeling in Mr. Yates; because they would have marked the prevalence of genuine diffidence and humility, among a class of Christians, who have hitherto shewn, in their

theological writings, a lamentable deficiency in these virtues. Constantly declaiming on the fallacy of reason, they speak as though their own reasoning were infallible: eulogizing humility as the most eminent of all the virtues, they advance their opinions with the confidence of inspiration, and deny the Christian name, and exclude from the Christian's hopes all who do not believe them. Their assumption that the doctrines they oppose lead to the utter destruction of all piety, and the direct appeal which they often make to the feelings and conduct of persons of their own faith, in proof that the tendency of their views of Divine truth is to cherish all that is pure and holy, affords a curious example of the manner in which the human heart imposes on itself. For it is to attempt to prove their humility, by affirming that they are the only humble persons in the world: it is the very spirit of the Pharisee assuming the attitude and adopting the language of the publican.

Though there occur in Mr. Wardlaw's publications not a few traces of this pride of lowliness, yet, we fear, he must be ranked among the most meek and candid of the orthodox polemics. He too, like hundreds before him, is astonished at the ignorance of the Socinian writers; trembles at their impiety; is shocked at the irreverence with which they treat the Sacred Scriptures; amazed at the interpretations they presume to offer: and, in the following singular language, mourns over the frost which is in their system, and the ice which is in their hearts:

"And fully satisfied as I am, that the meanings which Mr. Yates and his friends are so anxious to explode, are the source of the purest, the happiest, the most elevated and the most practical feelings of the renewed soul, even of all those feelings which are peculiarly *Christian*, I cannot but pity those, who immerse these passages of the Divine word in the freezing mixture of a cold and heartless philosophy, or who play upon them the ether of a refined and spurious criticism, till they have cooled them down to the very zero of infidelity."—Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 40.

Yet of the grossness of abuse, and the virulence of invective, with which Unitarians are generally assailed, Mr. Wardlaw is innocent. He is often not candid, but never malignant: he

sometimes misrepresents, but it appears to be only because he misconceives; and though it is much to be lamented, both on his own account, and for the sake of truth, that his imagination has not been more under the controul of his reason, and his expressions more moderate and chastised; yet we sincerely believe, he has too much integrity and piety to be guilty of any thing approaching to disingenuousness and falsehood. His manner towards his opponent personally, is in general tolerably respectful; and if not altogether such as a gentleman, a scholar and a Christian has a right to expect from another, it is, at least, an approximation to it, and most happy should we be to hail it as the commencement of a new mode of conducting this controversy.

There are moments when an ingenuous mind must feel deeply mortified and humbled at having given representations of the opinions of its opponent which are less consistent with the truth than serviceable to a particular cause. Of the injustice which results from this partial statement and false colouring of facts, Unitarians

have constant occasion to complain: and there is no person, with whose writings we are acquainted, who, in this respect, has sinned more deeply against the law of justice and charity than Mr. Wardlaw. The truth of this accusation, which, if the heat of controversy and the thirst for victory, shall have left in his bosom any room for the operation of the feelings of a generous mind or of a sincere Christian, he will be most anxious to repel—must, we think, appear evident to every unprejudiced person, who attends to the manner in which he has spoken of the regard which Unitarians pay to the Scriptures. He has availed himself of the ignorance, the prejudices and the fears of his hearers, in order to fill them with horror of Unitarianism; we do not say, knowing that his representations would convey to them false impressions, but certainly less anxious about the truth than the effect of his statements.

[To be concluded in the next No.]

POETRY.

SONNET TO FREEDOM

(From the Monthly Magazine for May, 1817.)

Immortal Genius of my native land!
That gave to Hampden's breast its dauntless ire,
And bade his soul intrepidly withstand
The brunt of evil power—and then expire;
Leaving his fame in glory to expand,
And rouse in patriot hearts the slumbering fire!
Deign e'en on me thy holy beam to shed,
For clad in thy pure light my soul shall shine,
Honour'd on earth, and worthy of the skies;
And fit me one dear dangerous path to tread,
To add one more to Freedom's deathless line;
Haply to fall a martyr'd sacrifice;—
Should such illustrious destiny be mine,
O be thou with me when my spirit flies.

From the Portuguese of Theodoro Souza Maldonado.

Come Muse,—come with me to the gloomy cell,
Where death and darkness in communion dwell,—
Where the damp floor with human wrecks is spread;
And the loose pillar's made,
Of undistinguished fragments of the dead,
Decaying and decay'd.
Daughter of memory!—tremble not, but come,
See rude destruction's triumphs;—read the doom
Of the proud pageantry of this vain world;
The captive's fetters,—and the monarch's crown,
The rich, the poor, the conqueror and the clown,
All in a pile of general ruin hurl'd.

Go, weigh that dust, inquirer!—and declare
 Its once-possessor in earth's vanished sphere—
 What!—is it equal all?—In that vast heap
 All that remains of sages, saints and slaves,
 In one promiscuous mound all-blended, sleep;—
 Thou canst not trace distinctions in their graves!

The arch of victory,—the triumphal car,
 The fane of peace,—the pomp, the pride of war,
 Lie mingled there in dark and dull decay;
 Come, muse on nature's general funeral!
 Nought left but ashes, dust and clods of clay—
 All, all is o'er;—'tis past,—'tis perished all!

Victors and vanquished, there confounded lie;
 The prisoner finds eternal liberty,—
 And death's cold chains have bound the free;
 Where are the wise—the Platos of their day?
 The beautiful,—in all their soft array?
 Involved with meaner dust in common destiny!

All holy Virtue! child of heavenly clime!
 Thou liv'st amidst the wrecks of earth and time,—
 Thou only—and thy influence can give
 Brightness to night,—and ecstasy to gloom,
 Can wake the dead, and bid the dying live,
 And with immortal radiance fill the tomb!

A.

SONNETS

*Supplementary to Wordsworth's Sonnets to Liberty.**

I.

O thou who lov'st o'er ancient times to brood
 With fondest retrospection—do not weep
 When freedom starts from her inglorious sleep

* It is almost needless to observe, that the author of these Sonnets deprecates all comparison with those of the great poet whom he has endeavoured to imitate. Indeed, he knows of no compositions of a similar kind, in this or any other language, which, for majestic simplicity and natural grandeur, equal the Sonnets of Wordsworth. He only regrets, that this great poet has not chosen the subjects of these effusions for the exercise of his elevated powers. Had

In naked majesty—and earth is strew'd
 With temples that have frown'd from ages rude
 The gorgeous tomb of reason—though the plea
 Of sacred thoughts and deep antiquity
 Should touch thy bosom in its kindest mood!
 Those guilty towers are creatures of a span;
 Are not the clouds borne freely on the breeze,
 The everlasting hills and roaring sea
 And the blue heavens' immortal majesty,
 And high-born beatings of the heart of man
 Of holier birth and older far than these?

II.

To the Spanish Patriots in Prison.

Think not unconquer'd heroes! that ye sigh
 In vain within your dungeons;—not a pain
 That such as ye endure is sent in vain,
 And not a gleam of fortitude can die!
 No! these shall kindle in the peasant's eye
 A lightening such as in the times of old
 Shook mightiest tyrants—they shall all be told
 In each sweet vale and vine-encompass'd plain;
 And the young voice of cherub infancy,
 Trembling with new-born ecstasies, shall sing
 Your deeds within their fathers' hearts enroll'd,
 And your mild dignity of suffering;
 Till the glad voice of renovated Spain,
 Give to your virtues glory manifold.

III.

To the South American Patriots.

Think not undaunted champions! that the sea
 With all its waves can part us from the cause
 In which you struggle;—that 'neath English laws
 We sit in cold and mute tranquillity,
 When mightiest nations combat to be free.
 No! we are form'd of one celestial blood,
 The children of one Sire;—and we have stood,
 For freedom's cause in earth's Thermopylæ!
 E'en nature mingles feelings from afar—
 The ocean, and the winds, and clouds are free,

he done so, it may readily be believed, the author would have been contented to admire. But he is silent;—and there are some feelings, which, by the power of their own enthusiasm, force those to give them utterance who are most incompetent to do them justice. Thus it is with the writer of these Sonnets—the only apology for which must be, the strength of the emotions by which they were prompted.

And the unbridled coursers of the sun,
And the sweet moon and every silent star,
All that both Continents can look upon
Breathe, with one deathless voice, of LI-
BERTY!

IV.

To the Same.

Strength, strength, Americans! a little time
And ye *must* triumph!—never shall we see
A Continent of heroes held in fee,
By low inheritors of ancient crime!
It is not to be thought that realms sublime,
Where herds untam'd for countless years
have stray'd,
Through vales by mortal rovers never trod;
Where forests have frown'd on in lasting
shade,
While thrones have sunk and empires have
decay'd;
Lands—on the viewless summits of whose
hills

The last dread footsteps of ascending God,
Are yet imprinted—through whose bound-
less plains
Flow ocean-rivers with their million rills,
Should rest beneath an earth-born despot's
chains!

T. N. T.

Temple, 18th June, 1817.

EPIGRAM

*On Mr. Robert Southey's Letter to
W. Smith, Esq. M. P.*

Thus the veer'd Laureate of our time,
So juicy ripe for royal rhyme,
His lofty praise rehearses;
“What's the good friend of Liberty,
The Patriot, Senator, to me?
Great *I* have written verses!”

R. F.

Kidderminster, May 19th, 1817.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Unitarian Fund.

THE anniversary of this Society was held on Wednesday, the 28th of May, in the chapel, Parliament Court, Artillery Lane. Divine service was introduced by the Rev. Mr. Hutton, of Walthamstow; the Rev. Dr. Morell offered the general prayer; and the sermon was preached by the Rev. W. J. Fox, the minister of the chapel. The congregation was numerous and the collection nearly equal to that of any former year.—A very great impression was made upon the audience by Mr. Fox's eloquent vindication of the Society, and one of the first motions on the Society being formed, was for a vote of thanks to the preacher, united with a request that he would lay his sermon before the public. The Treasurer's Report announced an increased expenditure during the last year, owing chiefly to the sums contributed to various chapels. An abstract of the Committee's Report, which was of considerable length, is designed for separate publication and will appear in this work. The following gentlemen were chosen into office for the year ensuing, viz.

JOHN CHRISTIE, Esq. *Treasurer.*

REV. R. ASPLAND, *Secretary.*

Committee.

Mr. BAILEY,

Mr. EATON,

Rev. W. J. FOX,

Rev. J. GILCHRIST,

Mr. S. HART,

Mr. DAVID TAYLOR,

Mr. RICHARD TAYLOR.

Auditors.

Mr. ALEX. HUTCHISON,

Mr. JOHN TODHUNTER.

Dr. Philipps, of Sheffield, was reported to have engaged to preach at the next Anniversary. A resolution was passed of warm thanks to Mr. Wright, now labouring as a missionary in Scotland; and another resolution related to the loss sustained by the Society since the last Anniversary in the death of the Rev. W. Vidler: it was as follows, “That the thanks of the Society be given to the minister and managers of this chapel, for the use of it on the present occasion; and that the Society cannot pass by the present opportunity of expressing their sympathy with the congregation, here assembling, on the melancholy event of the death of their late revered pastor, the Rev. W. Vidler, who was from the first, the cordial friend, the zealous supporter, and, as occasion served, the able missionary, of the Unitarian Fund, and whose praise is in the churches; but that at the same time they congratulate the congregation on the goodness of Divine Providence, in raising up for them a successor to their late revered friend, animated by the same spirit, pledged to the same cause and already distinguished by his talents, his zeal and his success.”

The annual meeting of the Governors of the *Unitarian Academy* was afterwards held in the chapel, of which we hope to receive the particulars. Three students leave the academy this year, in order to accept churches.

The subscribers and friends to the Fund afterwards dined together at the London Tavern, in number Three Hundred and

Eight, Mr. Rutt in the Chair. The usual sentiments were proposed to the company and expatiated upon with great spirit and eloquence. The Chairman paid a handsome panegyric tribute to the memory of the late Mr. Vidler. The health of the preacher was received by the company with great enthusiasm. Mr. Wright was not forgotten though he was absent: allusions were of necessity made by various gentlemen to the case of his brother, now under prosecution for Blasphemy. The concluding address of the Chairman was affecting, from the review which it took of years gone by, and of former associates who rest each one from his labours, and from the expression which it contained of certain anticipations of time future, which in the vicissitudes and uncertainties of life may well excite the tenderest feelings of a social being.

The meeting was distinguished by the greatest order and harmony; in relation to which too much praise cannot be given to the Stewards.

General Baptist Assembly.

ON Whit-Tuesday, May 27th, the Annual Assembly of the Old General Baptists was held, as usual, in the Meeting-house, Worship Street, London. The Elders and Representatives of the churches in connexion with the Assembly, who were present, were about as numerous as at former Assemblies. After the letters from the churches, containing cases for the consideration of the meeting, or detailing the present state of the several congregations had been read, the public service commenced.

Mr. Evans, of Islington, desirous of shewing his respect to his old friends whom he had so often met on the same occasion, though still greatly afflicted, was present and opened the service by reading the Scriptures and giving out the hymns. The devotional service was conducted by Mr. Smallfield, and an appropriate discourse was delivered by Mr. Kingsford, of Canterbury. The preacher's text was a part of Matthew xi. 19, *Learn of me*. These words were illustrated by a reference to numerous traits in the character of Jesus Christ, shewing its superlative excellence, and the suitableness of his example for the imitation of ministers in particular, and professors generally. The preacher in an especial manner insisted on the duty as well as inalienable right of private judgment, and strenuously enforced the exercise of charity on the avowed admirers of the meekness and gentleness of the greatest of Teachers, though he was instructed immediately by his God and Father, the Fountain of Truth.

Soon after the public service was concluded, the business of the Assembly re-

commenced. The letters from some of the churches contained a cheering account of increasing numbers and unabated zeal. The increase on the whole, however, appeared not to have been great since the last Assembly; but the Sunday Schools belonging to some of the congregations were described as being well attended, and as being apparently very beneficial in their influence.

The Committee, appointed by the Assembly three years ago, in their Report, reiterated the advice they had given in the last year's Proceedings—the necessity of establishing a *fellowship fund* in each congregation, to afford every professor, however limited his pecuniary resources might be, an opportunity of contributing his mite towards the support of the sacred cause of truth and righteousness. This advice, it appeared, had not been given in vain; for, several of the churches have made collections, and in their letters expressed their full conviction of the propriety of the advice, and the necessity of acting in conformity with it.

About four o'clock, the ministers and their friends having retired to the White Hart Inn, Bishopsgate Street, sat down, nearly sixty in number, to an economical dinner. Mr. Kingsford, the preacher for the day, was called to the chair; and after the cloth was removed, several pertinent sentiments were given. In the course of the evening these sentiments called forth some animated speeches, which were characterized by that love of free inquiry, on theological subjects, in the exercise of which the Old General Baptists have, perhaps, never come behind their fellow-christians; by universal philanthropy, and consequently by a marked disapprobation of every infringement of the natural rights, whether civil or religious, of their fellow-countrymen, or of their brethren of mankind at large.

G. S.

Kent General Baptist Churches.

THE Annual Association of the Kent General Baptist Churches, was held this year at Cranbrook, May 6th. An appropriate discourse was delivered by Mr. Pound, of Dover, to a respectable audience. After the public service, the business of the Association commenced—when Mr. Sampson Kingsford, was unanimously called to the Chair.

Amongst other things, an interesting conversation took place relative to a list of theological questions, which had been drawn up by recommendation of the last year's Association. These questions were chiefly designed for the use of young people, to excite and promote a spirit of free inquiry. The plan of a Benefit Society

having also, at the request of the last Association, been drawn up by Mr. Michael Kingsford, of Canterbury, was, by that gentleman, printed and laid before the meeting. This plan, which had been carefully arranged, appeared to meet general approbation; and particularly as it seems (to use Mr. Kingsford's own words), "likely to prove to them (its members) a stimulus to early habits of industry and economy, and to promote in them a uniform attention to public worship, and an habitual connexion with our churches, whose incumbent duty it will be to strengthen every good and virtuous disposition in them, and to watch over and guard them against any impropriety of conduct, the inexperience of youth may expose them to."

The friends dined at the George Inn, and afterwards took tea with the ladies in the chapel; and harmony prevailed throughout the day.

In the evening a large party retired to the above inn to supper, and spend a little time in friendly conversation. When the cloth was removed, it was suggested, as the most interesting mode of spending the time, to adopt a subject for general discussion, which appearing to meet the approbation of the company, the following question was proposed:—

Upon what principle can the cause of Christianity be injured by free, unlimited inquiry?

This subject called forth many excellent remarks from numerous speakers, when, after a discussion of more than two hours, the chairman in closing the debate remarked, that he was happy in recognising in the sentiments of that company the characteristic of the Old Unitarian General Baptist Body, which had so long and so nobly advocated the cause of free inquiry in matters of religion. Several gentlemen in the course of the debate were particularly anxious to impress the idea that, although inquiry ought to be free and unshackled, that yet it should be pursued with a prudent attention to times and circumstances.

B. M.

Dudley Double Lecture.

On Whit-Tuesday, May 27, 1817, the Annual Meeting of Ministers, denominated, "The Double Lecture," took place at Dudley. The Rev. James Scott, of Cradley, conducted the devotional service. Two sermons were preached: the former by the Rev. John Kentish, of Birmingham, on the degree in which a Christian minister may lawfully conform to the sentiments, the practices, the circumstances, the prejudices and the infirmities of those around him:—from 1 Cor. ix. 22, "I am made all things

to all men, that I might by all means save some:" the latter, in the absence of the gentleman who was to have officiated, by the Rev. James Hews Bransby, of Dudley, on the efficacy of the faithful preaching of the gospel, from 1 Thess. ii. 13, "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God: which effectually worketh also in you that believe."

Mr. Kentish thus concluded his discourse: "The grand extremes against which, as Christian ministers, we must guard, in our deportment, are considerable seclusion from the world, and indiscriminate association with mankind: habitual singularity and habitual accommodation. Our intelligent and affectionate hearers may well complain of us, if we shun their society as though it were pestilential: yet we shall as naturally and deservedly incur their censure, if we do not make a wise division of our time, between the retirement of the closet and the engagements of active life.

"We cannot, in the apostolic sense, become all things to all men, unless we be true, at the same time, to our religious principles and character. Our situation requires, if I mistake not, a happy union of integrity and candour, of zeal and circumspection and benevolence. Even if we cannot wholly escape reproach from an ill-judging world, may this reproach, however, fall on us only in respect of the law of our God. Yet as knowledge and piety increase, every tendency to persecution will be discountenanced; and the Protestant Dissenting Minister, who, without surrendering or compromising his secular rights, devotes himself entirely to his office, will not fail of possessing the esteem of those whose esteem is praise.

"Seldom have we perceived a man who exhibited, in a higher degree, a just superiority to the world, while he mixed with various classes of its inhabitants, for their benefit, than an excellent minister,* whose name and whose memory we cannot but associate very intimately with the recurrence of this yearly lecture. His place knoweth him no more: and those anticipations of his dismissal from our earth, which, three years since he here expressed,† have been fully realized. Perhaps, however, it may not be so generally known that from this pulpit, and as on this day, he once illustrated the nature, and urged the claims of Christian candour, in circum-

* The Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, of Old Swinford.

† See Monthly Repository, IX. 511.

stances which rendered those subjects particularly seasonable and interesting. * Indeed, he was uniformly and deeply anxious that our periodical religious meetings should be fraternal and harmonious; with which view, he was accustomed to recommend, that the topics and the reasonings we address to each other, on these occasions, should not be polemical. In this recommendation there was the greater propriety, and it came with increased weight, inasmuch as it had the sanction of his own example. Still I should do injustice to his character did I refrain from saying, that he declined not, at fit times, to avow and defend the theological sentiments which he deemed scriptural and important: and we may well admire the honesty of his avowal and vindication of them, even though all of us may not acquiesce in his conclusions. No variety or opposition in our views, could render me insensible to his excellencies. Mournfully pleasing is the recollection of his virtues as a Christian and a Christian minister. The elements of his character were, fervent devotion, strict integrity and genuine catholicism and benevolence. His soul was erect and independent, far superior to the artifices, to the mean compliances and expectations of little minds. In simplicity and godly sincerity, not by fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, he had his conversation in the world. Those who best knew, and who, therefore, most esteemed and loved him, have cause of gratitude, that amidst frequent attacks of disease, during a large period of his public life, he was spared to them so long. The vacancy, nevertheless, which his death has left in our circle is especially affecting, when we consider that, for a series of years, he was, by his standing in the neighbourhood, the father, as it were, of the ministers assembled at this lecture. His removal from us to the silent grave, is like the removal of the single link which connected the generation of our predecessors here with ourselves: and soon the remaining links of this part of the chain will be displaced, soon the existing chain itself will be broken: and, by degrees, we too shall be followed by another race. Let us exercise, my brethren, fresh and unremitted diligence, while it is called to-day. Let us remember that the end of the conversation of our departed associates and friends was—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, whose gospel is immortal, though its advocates decay. Let us prepare for meeting them in that temple whence they shall go out no more.

And, may a double portion of the spirit

* "Difference of Sentiment no Objection to the Exercise of Mutual Love." Preached at Dudley Lecture, 1780.

of the valuable man whose image has now presented itself particularly to our thoughts, rest on us all, eminently on his successor in the pastoral charge, * and not least eminently on the relation who bears his name, † who, animated by his exhortations, and aided by his instructions, has entered on the same public office, and who experienced from him what may truly be styled, a parent's love! Amen."

Eleven ministers were present. The Rev. Richard Fry, of Kidderminster, and the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Oldbury, were appointed to preach at the next anniversary. J. H. B.

Tiverton Unitarian Chapel.

Amount of Subscriptions inserted in Monthly Repository			
for May	- - - - -	60	15 3
<i>Subscriptions since received</i>			
Rev. Samuel Fawcett, Yeovil..	1	0	0
Two Friends to the cause at Crewkerne, H W. 11. S. S. 11.	2	0	0
<i>Per Rev. John Jervis.</i>			
Lympstone Congregation, Devon	5	0	0
<i>Per Rev. John Jervis.</i>			
Miss Stogdon, ditto - - -	1	0	0
<i>Per Rev. Edmund Butcher.</i>			
Wm. Leigh, Esq. Slade, near Sidmouth - - - - -	1	0	0
<i>Per Rev. Dr. Carpenter.</i>			
J. F. Barham, Esq., Exeter, 11.			
Mr. Mountjoy, ditto, 11. a Friend, 11. - - - - -	3	0	0
		73	15 0

The Friends to the cause at Tiverton have great pleasure in informing those who are interested in the promotion of the pure worship of the One God, even the Father, that the services of their chapel have been attended by a continued increasing number; and they flatter themselves that the opposition they have met with from their Calvinistic Brethren will eventually promote, much more than it has already injured, their cause, as one large family, who were disgusted at an illiberal attack made on the works of Priestley and Belsham, and the principles of Unitarians, have thereby been induced to search the Scriptures, and judge for themselves, of the truth or fallacy of what they had heard; the result has been, what would generally be the case, would all who oppose the simple and plain truths of the Gospel professed by Unitarians, examine with dispassionate and unprejudiced minds the scriptural evidences in favour of them. In short, they have openly avowed

* Rev. Mr. Warren, just removed to Stourbridge from Ringwood.

† Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, recently chosen as successor to the Rev. Joseph Bowden, Call Lane, Leeds.

their conviction and joined this society. A Fellowship Fund has been formed, which has been already joined by a considerable number of the members of the chapel. They are now commencing the establishment of their Congregational Library, which, they flatter themselves, will produce very beneficial effects. Any books or tracts, in aid of which, will be thankfully received, and they earnestly solicit further contributions from any who may be disposed to assist them in paying off the remaining part of the expenses that have been incurred in the fitting up and establishing the chapel. Subscriptions are received by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter, Exeter; Rev. Thomas Howe, Bridport; Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney-Road; Mr. George Dunsford, or Mr. M. L. Yeates, Tiverton.

17th June, 1817

M. L. Y.

Unitarian Chapel, Glasgow.

SIR,—THE Unitarian Society in this city having (in a printed circular) taken the liberty of submitting a full statement of their case, relative to the debt which remains on their chapel, to the consideration of their brethren in England, and of soliciting their friendly aid; apprehending that there may be many friends of Unitarianism whom their circular will not reach, beg leave, through the medium of the *Monthly Repository*, to submit the following short account to the Unitarian public.

The Unitarian Chapel, in Glasgow, was erected in the year 1812, after a congregation had been collected, and Mr. J. Yates had become its minister. The erection of a pretty large and commodious place of worship seemed essentially necessary, to give full effect to the valuable labours of the worthy Pastor, who has since so ably defended the Unitarian cause, and for the promotion of the pure doctrines of Christianity in this large and increasing city. The chapel is respectable, and contains seats for 650 persons. The public services are well attended, and there is a prospect of the congregation continuing to increase. Ground in Glasgow being extremely dear, it was thought prudent to make the most of the site purchased for erecting the chapel; consequently, cellars were made beneath it, for which a rental of 70*l.* per annum was obtained, until the change of times, which has reduced the rental to 45*l.* per annum. Connected also with the chapel is a small building, which was erected with a view of making the most of the ground, a sufficient quantity of which it was necessary to purchase backward, to prevent any high building being erected so near as to obstruct the light. This building, besides furnishing a dwelling for the person who has the care of the chapel, brings a yearly rent of 13*l.*

The total amount of the expense of erecting the Chapel and other buildings - - £2300 0 0

Towards the defraying of which, there has been raised by donations - - - - 439 12 0

Borrowed on bond, for which the buildings are a security, and the interest of which is defrayed by the rental obtained for the cellars and other buildings - - - - - 1000 0 0

Loans granted to the Society by different friends * - - 525 10 0

£1965 2 0

[* Several of these friends have kindly intimated their readiness to relinquish their claims.]

Still owing to the Contractors for the erection of the Chapel, &c. - - - - £334 18 0

The persons to whom this is due require payment in a short time.

This statement is submitted to the consideration of such friends of the Unitarian cause, as the circular letter of the Glasgow congregation may not reach, and their liberal aid is earnestly solicited to enable the Society to pay the outstanding debt of 334*l.* 18*s.*, and such of the small loans as are owing to friends, whose circumstances will not allow of their relinquishing their claims. Desirous of doing every thing in their power to promote the Unitarian cause in the district around, which in no small degree depends on its prosperity in this city, the Glasgow Unitarians look with confidence to the known liberality of their brethren in England to assist them in their present difficulties; and for any aid they may be pleased to give them, they shall have their most grateful acknowledgments, which they hope to evince by their steady and persevering zeal in the common cause.

Signed on behalf of the congregation,

JAMES BROCK, JOHN BROCK,
WM. RAE, JAMES LAMBE.
JOHN M'KENZIE,

Glasgow, June 17th, 1817.

N. B. The Rev. B. Mardon is now the Pastor of the Glasgow Unitarian congregation.

Removals amongst Unitarian Ministers.

Mr. HINCKS, late of Cork, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the congregation at *Exeter*, to succeed Dr. Carpenter as co-pastor with Mr. Manning.—Mr. HORT succeeds Mr. Hincks, at *Cork*.

Mr. PARKINSON, from Glasgow, formerly of Dukinfield, has undertaken the charge of the united congregations of *Loughborough* and *Mount Sorrel*.

Mr. WARREN, late minister at Ringwood, Hants, has removed to *Stourbridge*, to undertake the joint pastoral charge of the congregation there, with Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. BENJAMIN CARPENTER has accepted an invitation from the congregation in *Call Lane, Leeds*, to succeed Mr. Bowden.

FOREIGN.

RELIGIOUS.

South America.

THE Monthly Repository has been again and again censured for its decided opinion on certain political questions, such as the *Restoration of the Bourbons*. If it were merely a question of what man, of what name and of what family, sat upon a gaudy bench, called a throne, the censure would be most just. But the characters of the men who reign, determine the condition of the multitude over whom they reign, and thus humanity is deeply concerned in political changes. The writer of this article always foresaw that the Restoration of Ferdinand, whom he never could bring himself to pronounce *Beloved*, would carry with it the revival of the Inquisition and the destruction of liberty, civil and religious: for this reason he formerly deprecated, and now deplors that event. Those that hailed it in the name of freedom, may surely applaud any quality of their minds sooner than their sagacity. Look at South America. There the genuine fruits of Bourbonism grow luxuriantly, and will grow, unless the Patriots shall destroy the tree of despotism, root and branch. Whatever be the event, the wishes and prayers of all good men follow the insurgents, or in the court language, the Rebels. The following is part of the latest intelligence, dated in the middle of January, from Buenos Ayres:—"The *Inquisition* had been re-established in a most solemn manner at Lima, and its first labours had been to destroy all traces of the late Spanish constitution, as well as of all the free periodical papers, &c., published in every part of the monarchy during the administration of the Cortes."

Tithes in Canada.

On Thursday, May 22, in the House of Lords, Earl BATHURST laid on the table a Bill of the Canadian Parliament, pursuant to an act of the 31st of the King, by which it was directed that when any change was made in the state of the Established Church in Canada (which is *Roman Catholic*)! the circumstance should be communicated to the British Parliament. It had been directed that when grants of Land were made, a seventh should be reserved for the Clergyman of the Parish; and a doubt had arisen whether this was in lieu of or in addition to Tithes. By this Bill it was declared that the received seventh was in lieu of Tithes. The Bishop of the Diocese had been consulted and was satisfied.

Libels on the Inquisition.

"AT a time when laurelled critics are writing up the religious *one-heartedness* of the Spaniards in ministerial Reviews, our readers will be startled to hear, that the Spanish Minister at *Brussels* is prosecuting a Journalist for a Libel on the Holy Inquisition! What a harvest for the Attorney General should a similar measure be found expedient in London! The charge which moved the indignation of the Holy Fathers, was their former predilection for burning Heretics and Jews; which of course has not a word of truth in it! Happily for the English Journalists, the prosecutions here must commence with one half of the members of the Cabinet, who, with some inconsistency, employ the iniquities of the Inquisition, which they have so happily assisted to restore, against the claims of the Catholics."

Guardian. May 24.

NOTICES.

THE General Annual Meeting of the *Western Unitarian Tract Society*, will take place at Exeter, on Wednesday the 9th of July, on which occasion a Sermon will be preached by the Rev. John Kenrick, of York.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Southern Unitarian Society*, will be held at *Peole*, on Wednesday, July the Sixteenth, 1817. Mr. Bennett, of *Ditchling*, is expected to preach.