

THE  
**Monthly Repository,**  
&c.

No. CXXXIX.]

JULY, 1817.

[Vol. XII.]

**HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.**

*Some Account of Mr. William Manning, an Ejected Minister and an Unitarian.*

[Communicated by the Rev. S. S. Toms.]

*Framlingham, Jan. 10, 1817.*

SIR,

**P**ERUSING the Review of Wilson's Dissenting Churches, in your Number for December, (XI. 725,) last night, my attention was arrested by a paragraph respecting Mr. William Manning; and fearing it might be passed over in silence by others, I thought it incumbent on me to communicate to you what I could respecting him, having been long situated in the neighbourhood where he resided.

Had Mr. Wilson turned to the name of Manning in Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial he would have seen that Peasenhall, (there spelt Pesnall) was in Suffolk, from whence Mr. John Manning was ejected, a worthy man, well known in most of the jails in the county for his undeviating adherence to the dictates of his conscience—that Mr. Samuel Manning was ejected from Walpole, and early joined himself to an Independent Church formed there in 1647, which is about three miles from Peasenhall on the road to Halesworth, and that William Manning was ejected from Middleton, which is about the same distance from Peasenhall, adjoining to Yoxford, on the road to Leiston.

Report has said that these three gentlemen were brothers, and that Mr. W. M. gathered a Nonconformist church at Middleton, and it is most probable it was there, from among those who sat under and approved his ministry while in the church established by law. Descendants of the family have resided in the neighbourhood, particularly at Peasenhall, till within a few years. I have never

heard of there having been a Nonconformist church there.

Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, (Vol. II. p. 434,) says, "Mr William Manning was a man of great abilities and learning, but he fell into the Socinian principles, to which he adhered to his death, which was in February 1711."

His works are said to have been, "Catholic Religion, and some Discourses upon Acts x. 35, 36," but from the title of his book, now before me, in 12mo., it appears to be one and the same work, viz. "Catholic Religion, or the Just Test or Character of every Person that in any Nation is accepted with God: discovered in an explication of the nature of the true fear of God, and working of righteousness, with which the same is connected. In some Discourses upon Acts x. 35, 36, wherein several important doctrinal truths, more immediately influential upon practice, are plainly opened and vindicated from their too common misunderstanding. By William Manning." "Happy is the man that feareth alway," Prov. xxviii. 14. London: Printed for Dorman Newman, at the King's Arms, in the Poultry, 1686."

That the piece merits the title of Catholic appears from the following quotation, from p. 29:—"Whether or no there be any now in the world, out of the church, that have not heard of Christ, that are strangers to the covenant in its peculiar advantages now under the last edition of the gospel, that be true fearers of God, (the candle of the Lord being so far extinct among them, Gal. ii. 22, 1 Thes. ii. 16,) may be a doubt; but whether if any such there be, they shall be accepted with God cannot be doubted; for Cornelius was such a one; the faith that he had, purified his heart and influenced his

life, and he was accepted of him; though his faith was short of what was necessary to his salvation afterward, when he had more revealed unto him. Ch. xi. 14." The work is creditable to the author—entirely of a practical nature—nothing is advanced concerning the nature or person of Jesus the Christ at all inconsistent with Unitarianism, but he expresses himself on the atonement in terms not common with Unitarians—his explanation of it, however, would be well approved of by them, e. g. "Perfecting holiness in the fear of God: This is the whole design of the gospel, hereby God is honoured, and without it, the design of our blessed Saviour were frustrated in his redemption of mankind, which was to retrieve and bring back the fear of God," &c. An analysis of the work by an able hand would doubtless be acceptable to many of your readers.

In 1767 Mr. Walker removed from Framlingham to be minister at Walpole, and took me and the rest of his scholars with him. He there succeeded Thomas How, who settled at Yarmouth, in Norfolk, and had been successor to the venerable John Crompton, who had been pastor at Walpole from the beginning of the last century. After residing there with Mr. Walker about a twelve-month, I was sent to Daventry, August, 1768, and returning to Framlingham, August, 1773, my old master became my particular friend and intimate, and on visits to him he repeatedly spoke of Mr. William Manning and what he had heard of him from the aged in the society, who in their younger days were contemporary with him, as matter of their own knowledge, or what they had received from their seniors, all tending to establish his reputation as a scholar, a Christian and Christian minister, but of a heretical cast; and it seems clear in my recollection that Mr. W. said he had been informed that Mr. W. M. published a catechism or summary of religious principles, doctrines and duties, but he had never been able to procure a copy of it.

In the year 1778 I met with a MS. letter from Mr. Crompton, who was for several years contemporary with W. M. which I then copied in Rich's short hand, and am happy to

have now found it, as it probably contains the only authentic account of W. M. and his congregation any where to be met with. It consists of sixteen close written octavo pages, and was addressed by him from Walpole, August 2, 1754, to the Rev. Mr. Staunton, of Debenham, Suffolk, where Mr. S.'s ministry was much approved till the cry of heresy was raised against him, and that principally by means of a religious gossip, (whom I well knew in my youth) who travelling the country used to be employed by Mr. S. and Mr. Wood, of Framlingham, in carrying books and letters from one to the other and thought that there could be no harm in seeing what books good ministers read and what they wrote to each other, and therefore with a safe conscience opened their parcels and letters, and thence drew matter of accusation and condemnation against them, which issued in Mr. Staunton's removal from Debenham to Colchester, where he became minister of the old Presbyterian church and afterwards received a diploma of D. D. He ended his days at Hapton, an endowed place (generally styled *the Dissenting sinecure*) in Norfolk. His widow and two daughters removed to Hackney.

Mr. Crompton's letter does honour to himself and to Mr. S., and it is natural for those who have struggled hard with doubts and difficulties on controversial points of divinity to be candid towards those who are tried in like manner, even though they may ultimately differ from each other. If it be not too long for your insertion, I will copy the introduction and close of Mr. C.'s letter entire. The body of the letter states the reasons which hushed his doubts, and re-established him in the belief of the proper Deity of Christ, which I shall briefly state, and from whence I wish to make a quotation or two as illustrative of the workings of his mind, but you, Sir, are at liberty to compress or suppress my communication as you please.

*The Rev. Mr. Crompton's Letter to Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Staunton [commonly spelt Stanton].*

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,  
"IF I am over officious in this

address, it is purely out of regard to the interest of Christ and the gospel; and the great value and affection I have for you, and therefore hope you will pardon my freedom.

"I hear with concern from persons of undoubted credit, that you are *wavering*, if not quite gone off from some of the peculiar and important doctrines of Christianity, particularly the proper Deity of Christ and his equality with the Father. I say, *wavering*, for I still hope that you are not so far gone as to be irreclaimable, or unwilling of a reconsideration.

"When I first entered upon the ministry, my lot was providentially cast among this people, with whom I have now continued above fifty years. I found some among those who attended at our meeting who denied the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ. Their sentiments they imbibed from an ejected minister\* in the neighbourhood, a professed Socinian, and a gentleman of considerable parts, learning and sobriety, under whose care and instructions they had been for some years, but he had then wholly laid aside the ministry, being deprived in a great measure of his hearing, which I suppose was the occasion of some of them attending at our place of worship.

"Coming immediately from the academy, and not having studied the controversy, I was so greatly discouraged on that account, and the shattered condition I found the church and congregation in, that I soon determined to return to my native country; but being over-persuaded to make trial for a time, I at last settled among them, and with great solicitude and seriousness set myself assiduously and impartially to inquire into and study the controversy, not without importunate prayer to God that he would lead me into the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, by his spirit, without whose gracious influences I knew all my endeavours would nothing avail.

\* Mr. C. mentions not the name of Manning, but he doubtless referred to him. Mr. M. lived in the neighbourhood of Walpole, and was contemporary with Mr. C. at least seven or eight years, Mr. C. being there prior to August, 1704, and Mr. M. dying in February, 1711.

"I not only examined the Scripture, but read authors on both sides the question; had Mr. Emlyn's tracts put into my hands, and those of other Unitarians; had frequent conferences with some of them that were most strenuous for their opinions, and very zealous and industrious to propagate them. I consulted several divines, among others Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Calamy, of London, and the Rev. Mr. Parkhurst† in the neighbourhood, an eminently pious divine of the Church of England, with whom I had a great intimacy, who, when I argued in their favour the plausible profession they made of religion, replied (he being acquainted with them) that what good was in them they received before they imbibed those notions, which in themselves, he said, had no tendency that way.

"The result of my inquiry was a confirmation of my faith in the fore-mentioned doctrines (for which I hope I shall eternally bless God); and it pleased God to make my ministry instrumental to bring off some from the Socinian scheme, who joined with our church, and declared "they never had any peace and comfort in their former sentiments." Others indeed there were that retained their notions to their dying day, but it pleased God they died with them, and spread no further.

"I have given you this long narrative, Sir, to acquaint you (among other things) how my faith was shaken, as I suppose, yours may be, that I may offer to your serious consideration a few things that were of use to me, and which I hope, with the blessing of God, may be of some service to you in settling you in *that*, which I apprehend to be the truth.

"Though the doctrine of the Trinity is so nearly connected with the proper Deity of Christ, that one cannot be believed without believing the other, yet I shall, in what I have to offer, confine myself to the latter."

"N. B. I know the Unitarians (as

† Of Yoxford. At my first coming to Framlingham, he was spoken of in terms of high commendation by some of my aged friends, and some single sermons printed by him were put into my hands.



they call themselves) have prudently quitted the Socinian scheme and embraced the Arian, as much more plausible and defensible, but there is no essential difference between them, both denying Christ's divine nature, and acknowledging him to be no more than a made or created God—the Arians holding him to be an older—the Socinians a younger God, having no existence before he was born of the Virgin."

I think it probable that there were Arians in the congregation at Walpole in Mr. Crompton's latter days. I knew and visited an elderly gentleman of that denomination among them, and often heard Mr. Walker speak highly in his commendation for reading, information, good sense, firmness of mind and power in argumentation.

Mr. C. proceeds, "And here, 1. I considered with myself, that the proper Deity of Christ must either be an important truth or an important error; either one side is guilty of blasphemy or the other of idolatry. 2. If Christ be not God by nature, I could not see how with any propriety, there could be attributed to him the incommunicable names and titles of God.

"But after all, my reason opposed the doctrine. Here are two, the Father and the Son (I may add three, and the Holy Ghost) distinguished from each other by personal properties, acts and operations, and yet all three partaking of the Godhead, or communicating in the same divine infinite nature; whereas both Scripture and reason assure me, 'there is but one only living and true God,' so that I was ready to cry out with Nicodemus, 'How can these things be?' *Hic labor, hoc opus est!* Here I found the greatest difficulty, and indeed a very painful one, which I would gladly have got rid of. What shall I do? Often did I spread my case before the Lord, pleading with him to set me right in this important point, for I looked upon my eternal interest to be concerned therein, and therefore dreaded leaning to my own understanding. And that which at last gave me satisfaction, to the settling of my mind, were such as the following considerations:—

"1. Supposing only the doctrine of

the Trinity to be true, and expressed in the most clear, plain and intelligible terms imaginable, yet it is not possible we should have clear and distinct ideas of it for want of faculties equal to the object.

"2. I thought it highly unreasonable to reject a doctrine (for which there is so much evidence) on account of insuperable difficulties attending it, specially when those very difficulties naturally and unavoidably arise from the sublimity of the doctrine, and the weakness and scantiness of our capacity, which is here the case.

"3. I further considered that we ought to distinguish between the doctrine itself, and the evidence of it.

"The doctrine may be of so sublime and mysterious a nature, that it may be very difficult to conceive of it, and yet the evidence clear and full. Pure faith is founded only on testimony. When once therefore it is made to appear that, 'thus saith the Lord,' reason ought to be silent, and give place to faith.

"I have, Sir, enlarged the more on this head, because I think it is of great importance in deciding this and other points of revealed religion, though I think not duly attended to by many of the present age, who would have all things demonstrated by reason.

"I speak my own experience, having observed in conversation with those of the opposite opinion, that all their arguments from Scripture centred here. The doctrine is contrary to reason, and therefore cannot be true. What is the consequence? Why, such an interpretation is to be put upon the text as is consistent with *their* reason. Yea, I have been told to my face by my antagonist, when pinched with an argument from Scripture, that were the proper Deity of Christ delivered in the most plain and express terms imaginable, he would not believe it, because contrary to all reason, and this by a person who professed a great reverence for the Scriptures, and a willingness to be determined by them in this point. This, you will say, was plain dealing, but knowing the man, his meaning was, as I charitably believe—the doctrine is contrary to all reason, i. e. to his reason, and therefore it is not at all revealed in



Scripture, and consequently whatever the Scripture says about it, is to be understood in some other sense.

“ Do not mistake me, dear Sir, I only tell you what I have met with, and therefore would not have any thing I have said, construed to your disadvantage.

“ 4. I was very sensible that reason is a proper judge, whether we have the divine testimony in the Scriptures for this important doctrine, or not; and upon examination I thought it was apparent that we had, from a multitude of texts of Scripture.

“ 5. I could not but believe it was the design of God in revealing any important doctrine, that it should be received, and that we are not left to our liberty whether we will believe it or not, and consequently that it is expressed in such intelligible terms, that his mind may be known therein by the lowest class of Christians.

“ 6. I also thought we ought to distinguish between the doctrine itself and the explanation of it.

“ The explanation is not of the same authority with the original revelation. To instance in the doctrine of the Trinity—the original revelation is, that there is one living and true God—that this one God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or that these three equally partake of the same divine nature or Godhead; but that there is nevertheless expressed in Scripture such a distinction between the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as that each of them take a part in the œconomy of our redemption, and have personal properties, &c. &c. ascribed to them. Now these propositions being the principal object of our faith, there is no need of any farther explication, &c.

“ I know it is usual for those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, to urge the distinction against the Unity, and the Unity against the distinction, as inconsistent, and here they make their strongest efforts against the doctrine; but whether they be inconsistent, let the Scripture determine, since one is as expressly revealed as the other, and therefore both ought to be believed—but after all, if there be an inconsistency, the Holy Ghost (not we) must account for it, on whose bare authority and testimony we solely rely.

“ 7. I considered that if my reason

be nonplused, in the apprehension of this important point, it is no more than I may expect, since we are told, it is a mystery, and that without controversy. I was always afraid of using such boldness, as to trifle with or ridicule the term mystery, for fear of grieving the Holy Ghost and provoking him, &c.

“ 8. I considered, that the excellency of a divine faith lies in resting upon the bare testimony of God in the face of difficulties; yea, the greater and more difficulties it has to struggle with, arising from natural and carnal reason, the more God is honoured by it.

“ 9. I considered (which, indeed, as a moral argument was of great weight with me) that the church of God has been in possession of this doctrine ever since the apostles' times, if any credit may be given to ecclesiastical history. However, the very adversaries of it cannot deny, but she was possessed of it for above 1500 years, and it is certain that at the time of the reformation from Popery, the churches of Christ in Germany, &c. &c. harmonized in it. Now whence is it they should all fall into the same way of thinking, so very different from those who glory in the new light they have received, and this in a doctrine so very mysterious? The truth is, they better understood the nature of faith, paid a just and reverent regard to the authority of God in his word, resigning up their understandings to him as a *Rasa Tabula*, &c. We are told it was a common saying of Luther, ‘Reason, thou art a fool! hold thy peace and let truth speak.’ Must they all then pass for fools and madmen? Be it so. It was, however, no small comfort to me, that if I be in an error, it is with good company! I therefore was \*unwilling, though a hard task to proud nature, to sacrifice my purblind reason to faith founded upon the unerring testimony of God, and backed with such a cloud of witnesses as a corroborating evidence.

“ 10. I considered that Christ, in his highest capacity, must either be a finite or infinite Being, there being no possible medium between, and consequently the error must be great on

---

\* Is not this an error in the copy, and should it not be read, *willing*?

one side or the other. The question then is, which will appear the more safe or dangerous at the great decisive day, when Christ shall judge the world in righteousness. The wise man would gladly take the safer side, how painful soever to flesh and blood. Now, if my error be, that I have ascribed more honour to Christ than really belongs to him, the sacred Scriptures, the very words of God, led me and a thousand of God's faithful servants into it. May I not hope the Judge will pity? &c. &c.

"These considerations, dear Sir, with some others, had their weight with me, whatever they may have with others. Besides, I thought it would be very imprudent to part with a doctrine (so well-founded and so universally received) on account of some difficulties attending it, for the opposite scheme, that is clogged with as great or much greater difficulties; and still the more so, as I could not part with it, but at the expense of quitting several others of great moment and importance that depend upon it, &c.; but I shall not enlarge upon these topics, fearing I have been too tedious already, and must ask pardon for my prolixity as well as freedom. Only I would take notice of a maxim among philosophers and divines, viz. that an opinion taken up and embraced upon just grounds and reasons, is not to be quitted merely because we cannot answer every objection against it.

"Thus, Sir, I have given you an account of the wavering of my faith, and by what means it was established, and hope you will take in good part what I have imparted to you of my own experience; and I assure you it is honestly meant, however it may be taken. I only beg leave to add one word more—the doctrine of the Trinity has been generally deemed by the church of Christ, to be not only an important, but a fundamental point, and as fundamental in revealed, as the existence of a God in natural religion, since we are initiated into Christianity upon the solemn profession of our faith in, and dedication to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Whether it be so or not, I shall not determine, but it certainly becomes every Christian, and especially every minister of the gospel, seriously to consider, because if it prove so in the

upshot of things, his doom must be heavy, who not only denies this doctrine himself, but may have been the unhappy instrument of leading many others into so pernicious and fatal an error—a thought, the weight of which is enough to make one tremble.

"And now, Sir, I beg the favour you would inform me, what your thoughts are of these considerations, whether well-founded and of weight, for if neither be true, I ought not to have been influenced by them. That the Father of light may lead you by his spirit into all necessary, saving truth, is the sincere desire and earnest prayer of

"Reverend, worthy and dear Sir,  
Your affectionate Friend,  
and well-wisher, &c. &c.  
J. C."

"P. S. I should be glad of two or three hours' conversation with you upon the subject, in an amicable and friendly manner, without any other company, if a proper time and place can be appointed; or if you please to come over to my house, and stay with me a night or two, you shall be heartily welcome, and received with the kindness and friendship of a brother, by

"Your humble Servant,  
J. C."

"*Walpole, Aug. 2nd, 1754.*"

Sir,—Unitarian sentiments, and more especially societies of Unitarian Christians, are deemed novel in this eastern part of Suffolk; but it hence appears that those sentiments were embraced, strenuously maintained, and zealously and industriously propagated, and the professors of them formed into a worshipping society by an ejected minister in the neighbourhood of Walpole, a professed Socinian, and a gentleman of considerable parts, learning and sobriety, much more than a century back; and that when infirmity incapacitated him for conducting their worship, some of them, more than a hundred years ago, joined the congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Walpole, made a plausible profession of religion and were bold in support of their opinions; and though some apostatized and abjured them on joining the church, others retained them to their dying day, undoubtedly because they had satisfaction in them. There must have appeared to be

some considerable force in their arguments in behalf of their creed, or Mr. Crompton's faith would not have been so shaken and his mind so grievously distressed as he represents. If the history of the workings of every minister's mind down to the present day, who has been set a thinking on this subject, could be brought to light, portrayed as honestly, freely, faithfully and feelingly, as Mr. C. has here portrayed his own, it would evidence that it has been a prolific source of painful temptation to many. Mr. C. appears to have been for a long time a stranger to peace and comfort, but the considerations here stated by him, at last established him in the belief of the Trinity and Deity of Christ.

In what light they were viewed by Mr. Stanton, when presented to his wavering mind more than sixty years past, may be inferred from the sentiments he maintained through his following days, and they have not proved effectual to re-establish others who have been alike painfully exercised with doubt, fear and dread as himself; but on the contrary, they have had cause to bless God that they were finally settled in the firm belief of Unitarianism, and found it to be a harbour of rest to their souls, from the tossing waves and terrifying billows which ever beat upon them while traversing the troubled, unfathomable, benighted ocean of Trinitarianism. But though those considerations have not been effectual to convince and establish some others who have been in doubt, like Mr. C., yet with him they have learnt, by severe experience, to exercise candour and brotherly love (as appears, to Mr. C.'s honour, throughout his epistle) towards the doubting, and those who saw reason to differ from them. That unity of spirit may be maintained in the bond of peace among professors of religion of all denominations, is the hearty wish of your constant reader,

SAMUEL SAY TOMS.

P. S. I send with this Mr. Manning's Catholic Religion for your perusal, and Mr. C.'s letter to Mr. S., that any friend who can decipher Rich's shorthand, improved by Dr. Doddridge, may read or copy it.

*Hamlingham, March 2d, 1817.*

2nd P. S. THE preceding has

been detained far beyond my intention, but I do not now regret it, as I have been able to consult Mr. Gillingwater's History of Lowestoft, and have not been disappointed in my expectation from it.

P. 346, it is said of the Vicar, William Whiston—"He constantly preached twice on Sundays; and all the summer season, at least, had a catechetical lecture at the chapel in the evening, designed more for the benefit of the adult than for the children themselves." Mr. G. has the following Note: "To these lectures came many of the Dissenters. This may be easily accounted for when we consider that the noted Mr. Emlyn had officiated as minister to the Dissenters of this town eighteen months, about ten years before. (Mr. Whiston was instituted 19th August, 1698.) Mr. Emlyn had adopted the Arian principles, and probably had introduced the same sentiments among many of his hearers, who, consequently, were pre-disposed to attend the lectures that were given by a minister of the establishment who entertained opinions similar to those of Mr. Emlyn, as was the case with Mr. Whiston. There appears to have been the most intimate friendship between these two divines, for when Mr. Whiston, in 1715, held a weekly meeting for promoting primitive Christianity, which subsisted for two years, the third chairman of that meeting (which was also the last) was Mr. Emlyn, June 28th, 1717."

Mentioning p. 347, Mr. John Baron, minister of Ditchingham, afterwards Dean of Norwich, Mr. G. has the following Note. "The Dean, who was bred among the Dissenters, died, it seems, an Unitarian, according to the epitaph for his monument. Mr. Whiston says, he had some share in bringing him over to the church, &c.; that though he accepted the deanry of Norwich, yet he refused the bishopric, of which he had an offer." See Whiston's Memoirs.

P. 358. "In the year 1688, Mr. Emlyn was invited by Sir Robert Rich, one of the Lords of the Admiralty, to his house, at Rose Hall, near Beccles, in Suffolk, and was by him prevailed upon to officiate as minister to the Dissenting Congregation at Lowestoft, which place he supplied about a year and a half, but refused



the invitation of being their Pastor." P. 355, Note. "When Mr. Emlyn came first to Lowestoft, (in 1689) he had not adopted those religious principles which afterward proved to him a source of the heaviest afflictions." P. 359. "It was during his residence there that reading Dr. Sherlock's piece upon the Trinity, he first began to entertain some scruples concerning the received doctrine in that point of faith." Ib. Note. "Here also he contracted a close and intimate acquaintance with Mr. William Manning (there were several of that name in Suffolk, as the Rev. Samuel Manning, of Walpole, formerly of Emanuel College, Cambridge), a Nonconformist Minister, at Peasenhall, in this county, and corresponded with him during Mr. Manning's life. As they both were of an inquisitive temper, they frequently conferred together upon the highest mysteries of religion, and Dr. Sherlock's book upon the Trinity became a stumbling block to both. Manning even became a Socinian, and strove hard to bring his friend into those opinions, but Mr. Emlyn could never be made to doubt either of the pre-existence of our Saviour, as the Logos, or that God created the material world by him."

P. 361. "We have an account of one Mr. Manning, who was an occasional preacher at Lowestoft, in the latter end of the reign of Charles II., or in the time of his brother James, but who this person was does not appear. I think it not improbable but he was the Rev. Mr. Manning, of Peasenhall, mentioned above, (see note, p. 359,) who was the intimate friend of Mr. Emlyn."

Mr. Gillingwater was a native of Lowestoft, and settled in business at Harleston, in Norfolk, where he died a few years ago. He was a man of research, ingenuity, good sense, and liberality towards those who differed from him in sentiment and mode of worship, (he being strongly attached to the church by law established,) as his history evidences, which is more free from a party spirit than the generality of local histories. Many quotations might be adduced in proof of it, but one may suffice. After relating the sufferings of Mr. Emlyn, for conscience' sake, p. 360, note,—“To behold a learned, sensible and pious divine

thus degraded, insulted and punished, for no other crime than that of mere difference in opinion, is a spectacle that would wound even the feelings of an Infidel! Nevertheless, it affords one consolation—it demonstrates how greatly the benign and liberal influences of our most holy religion have diffused themselves since the last century, and that the unchristian spirit of persecution is now almost wholly extirpated."

The history was published about the year 1790, in quarto, but the copy before me wants the title page.

Mr. G. carried on a friendly debate with the Rev. Thomas Harmer, of Wattesfield, in this county, on the time Jesus continued on the cross, which, through the favour of a mutual friend, I had once an opportunity of perusing. Mr. G.'s account of the Dissenters at Lowestoft might prove an acceptable article for your valuable Miscellany.\*

S. S. T.

### *Brief History of the Dissenters from the Revolution.*

[Continued from p. 203.]

**B**UT to return to the history of Dissenters. The last event relating to religion in the reign of Queen Anne, was the bill to prevent the growth of schism, by which all Dissenters were prohibited from teaching any schools, and it was enacted that if any schoolmaster or tutor should be willingly present at any conventicle or assembly of Dissenters for religious worship, he should suffer three months' imprisonment, and be disqualified from teaching school for the future. This was brought in by the tory ministry, who now, under the direction of Lord Bolingbroke, had gained possession of the government, and who were endeavouring to take measures for placing the Pretender on the throne. These measures, however, were frustrated by the death of the Queen, on the very day on which the act to prevent the growth of schism was to have been carried into execution, and by the succession of George I., the first of

\* We shall be glad to receive this account from any correspondent possessing the work and willing to extract the passage. ED.

the present royal family. One of the first acts of his reign was to repeal the persecuting laws, which had been passed in the reign of his predecessor. In the second year of his reign the Tories raised a rebellion in favour of the Pretender. On this occasion the Dissenters distinguished themselves by their attachment to the present royal family. Two of their ministers in Lancashire particularly deserve to be mentioned. Mr. Wood, minister of Chowbent, and Mr. Turner, minister of a chapel in Walton, near Preston, who placed themselves at the head of the young men of their respective congregations, and joined the royal army, to the easy success of whose operations their efforts very materially contributed, and for their exertions they received the thanks of the general. Many other Dissenters took commissions, and contributed very much to the ease with which the rebellion was suppressed. By these acts, however, they had rendered themselves liable to all the penalties of the Test Act, but the government passed an act of indemnity for them: an act of *pardon* for having assisted in suppressing the rebellion; an act of *pardon* for having been main instruments in preserving the government! Can any argument prove more clearly than this simple fact, the folly and absurdity of the Test Act, and the injury which it must produce to the country? Whenever that law is executed, it deprives the nation of the benefit which it might derive from the exertion of the talents of some of the best men in it; and if on this occasion it had been put in force, these men must have been punished for having assisted the government, and rendered the suppression of the rebellion much more easy and speedy than it otherwise would have been. In the year 1717, Dr. Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, a great favourite with George I., having published a Sermon on the Nature of the Kingdom of Christ, which was very favourable to Dissenters, the Lower House of Convocation censured it in very severe terms. The King put a stop to their proceedings by a prorogation, and since that time no more Convocations of the clergy have been called in this country. In the year 1721, a bill was brought into the House of Lords, inti-

tled For the Suppression of Blasphemy and Profaneness, but containing many persecuting clauses, and re-enacting the worst parts of the bill against Occasional Conformity. It was supported by several bishops, but was rejected. On this occasion the Earl of Peterborough said, that he was for a parliamentary king, but not for a parliamentary God, or a parliamentary religion; and should the House declare for one of this kind, he would go to Rome and endeavour to be chosen a cardinal, for he had rather sit in the conclave than with their lordships upon those terms. About this time the disputes about the Trinity, which had been excited by the writings of Whiston and Clarke, began to shew their effects among the Dissenters. While they had been carried on in the church, whose ministers are confined to an established liturgy and to established articles, they had had little effect, but among the Dissenting ministers, who were not under these restraints from freedom of inquiry, their effect was great. It was, however, principally apparent among the Presbyterians. The Dissenters who went under that denomination, which in England was a mere name, had no church-government among them, and no one was excluded from them on account of thinking more freely than the rest of the congregation; but among the Independents, any one who should express doubts concerning the truth of orthodox opinions was prevented from attending at the Lord's supper, or from having any share in the concerns of the congregation. This church-government, by which they certainly forfeit their claim to the title of consistent Dissenters, still remains among those who call themselves Independents, but who are in fact, on this account, far less independent than those who are styled Presbyterians, and it has had the effect of restraining freedom of religious inquiry both among their ministers and people, and of keeping them strict Calvinists. The first place where the effect of doubts concerning the Trinity began to appear among the Presbyterians, was at Exeter, where Mr. Pierce left the old chapel, and established a new congregation on Arian principles. The Devonshire

ministers at that time held a kind of annual synod, which assumed great authority, and disowned Mr. Pierce from all connexion with the other ministers. Now, however, both these chapels in Exeter are occupied by Unitarians, as are most of the congregations whose ministers formed that synod.\* At the same time with Mr. Pierce, a few other Arian ministers were obliged to leave their situations. Among them was Mr. Foster, who removed to London, and was afterwards celebrated by Pope in the well known lines,

“Let modest Foster, if he will, excel  
Ten metropolitans in preaching well.”

He has left behind him four volumes of very admirable sermons. From this period the Arian doctrines spread rapidly among the more learned of the Dissenting ministers. The doctrine of the simple humanity of Jesus had yet but few supporters, but among them must be reckoned the learned Dr. Lardner, himself a host.

The last year of George the First's reign was distinguished by the trial of Mr. Elwall, for publishing a book intitled, “A True Testimony for God and his Sacred Law, being a plain honest Defence of the First Commandment of God against all the Trinitarians under Heaven. Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.” For this he was prosecuted at the Stafford assizes, in the year 1726. No copy of the indictment had been given him, and the judge offered to put off the trial, if he would give bail, but he refused and desired liberty to plead. This being given, after pleading many texts from the Old Testament, he told them that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Prophet like to Moses, held forth the same doctrine that Moses had done, and particularly mentioned, as very remarkable and worthy of all their observation, the words which are recorded in John xvii. 3, that Christ used in solemn prayer to his Father, “This is life eternal to know *thee* the *only true God*, and Jesus the Christ whom thou hast sent;” and then turning to the priests his prosecutors, he said, “Since the lips of the blessed

Jesus, which always spoke the truth, say his Father is the only true God, who is he and who are they, that dare set up another in contradiction to my blessed Lord, who says his Father is the only true God?” And here he stopped to see if any would answer, but none of them spoke. He then warned the people not to take their religious sentiments from men, but from God. The judge asked him, if he had ever consulted any of the bishops. He said he had exchanged several letters with the Archbishop of Canterbury, but had received no satisfaction; “for in all the letters I sent to the Archbishop,” said he, “I grounded my arguments upon the words of God and his prophets, Christ and his apostles, but in his answers to me, he referred me to acts of parliament: and whereas I told him, I wondered he should be so weak as to turn me over to human authority in things of a divine nature; for though in all things of a temporal nature I will be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, yet in things of a spiritual nature, and which concern my faith, I will call no man Father upon earth, nor regard popes or councils, prelates or priests of any denomination, nor convocations nor assemblies of divines, but obey to the best of my judgment, God and his prophets, Christ and his apostles.”

The judge wished him to promise not to write on this subject again, but this he nobly and spiritedly refused to do. Then the judge laying hold of some informalities in the proceedings against him, declared him at liberty, and the priests perceiving his boldness and the temper of the bench to favour him, did not choose to renew the prosecution, though certainly Mr. Elwall was legally liable to three years' imprisonment and outlawry. This is the last trial which has taken place on the laws against Unitarians. A few prosecutions of this nature have been attempted since, but they have been frustrated before they came into court. The laws, however, on which those prosecutions were founded, remained a disgrace to the statute book of this country till the year 1813, when they were repealed. Mr. Elwall published an account of his trial, which has been often reprinted and is well known. The beginning of the reign of George the

\* Can any of your Devonshire correspondents give us a more particular account of this synod?



Second was distinguished by the prosecution of an unbeliever of the name of Woolston, for having written a book against the miracles of Jesus. Of all the books which have been written against Christianity, this is the most futile, the most utterly devoid of any reasoning, which can impose for a moment even on the weakest understanding. It is therefore a great pity that, by his prosecution and imprisonment, an opportunity was afforded to unbelievers to say, that they have stronger arguments than any that are published, but that they dare not print them for fear of being prosecuted. Such an assertion must indeed appear, as it really is, very absurd, when we consider that such men as Hume and Gibbon have written against Christianity without being molested; but it is a pity that any pretence should have been given for such an assertion, by the prosecution of any unbelievers. The words of Dr. Lardner, the most able and learned defender of the truth of Christianity that has ever appeared, in his answer to Mr. Woolston, are very deserving of consideration:—"If men should be permitted among us to go on delivering their sentiments freely in matters of religion, and to propose their objections to Christianity itself, I apprehend we have no reason to be in pain for the event. On the side of Christianity I expect to see, as hitherto, the greatest share of learning, good sense and fairness of disputation, which things, I hope, will be superior to low ridicule, false argument and misrepresentation. And suppose the contest should last for some time, its effect will be that we shall all better understand our Bibles. Possibly some errors may be mixed with our faith, which by this means may be separated, and our faith become more pure. Being more confirmed in the truth of our religion, we shall be more perfect in the duties of it. Instead of being unthinking and

nominal, we shall become more generally serious and real Christians. Each of which advantages will be a large step towards a complete and final victory." These arguments of Dr. Lardner fully prove, that it is a great disadvantage to Christianity for any one, either of any Christian sect or of the opposers of Christianity, to be either prevented from publishing his opinions, or punished for doing so, and that the fullest and freest discussion possible must be most favourable to the real truths of the gospel. In the year 1736, an ineffectual attempt was made in Parliament for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. The minister, Sir Robert Walpole, not wishing this attempt to be repeated, sent for some of the principal of the London ministers, and in order to induce them not to renew their application to Parliament, promised them an annual grant of 2000 pounds, which they might distribute as they pleased among their brethren. This grant has been continued ever since, under the title of the Regium Donum. It is given to such of the London ministers as the government choose, and they distribute it according to their own pleasure. A great number, however, of the Dissenters decline receiving any thing from it, considering it, as it certainly is, an abandonment of their principles to receive such a bribe. Very few, I believe, of the Unitarians have disgraced themselves by accepting it. In Ireland this Regium Donum is much greater than in England, and has had a great effect in keeping up the Presbyterian form of church government, and in suppressing free religious inquiry among the Dissenters in that country, where even yet, a zealous Unitarian minister would probably be disowned by every Presbytery in the island, and consequently be excluded from all the chapels which at present exist there.

---

## ORIGINAL LETTERS.

---

*Two Letters from Mr. Emlyn to  
Mr. William Manning.*

(Communicated by Mr. John Taylor, of  
Norwich.)

SIR, May 20, 1817.

**I**N consequence of the inquiry concerning the Rev. William Manning,

in the Mon. Repos. for December, [XI. 725,] I applied to my worthy and venerable friend, William Manning, Esq. of Ormsby, in this county, for information concerning his great-grandfather, the friend of Emlyn; and through his kindness, I am enabled to

send you copies of two letters from that sufferer in the cause of truth, to Mr. Manning. From their date, I should conclude that they were written in London. I am also favoured with the perusal of some letters written by Mr. Manning, and addressed to his son at Yarmouth; but these being letters of condolence on account of losses by death in his family, I have not thought them sufficiently interesting to have a place here, although valuable for the sentiments of affection, resignation and piety which run through them. Mr. Manning was ejected from the living of Middleton, in Suffolk, and resided afterwards in the adjoining parish of Peasenhall.

JOHN TAYLOR.

*Letter I. To the Rev. Mr. William Manning, Peasenhall.*

DEAR SIR, Oct. 10, 1710.

I WAS glad to receive yours; I find you were nigh to have put into the quiet harbour and to have landed on the shore of the good land, along with your consort, who rests from her labours: but you are put back into this troublesome ocean again a little longer: 'tis probable you lye but at the mouth of the haven, and some favourable gale will soon blow you in, and I hope, with full sails of faith and hope, and then adieu, vain and miserable earth! *Inveni portum, Spes et Fortuna, valet.* Methinks I read (and I do it often) with great pleasure the words of the ancient *Cicero de Senectute* at the end; how noble and generous are his thoughts of the vanity of this life, and the excellency of the future state, which in a Pagan, I can't but admire greatly, and find his discourse very pathetick and useful; and yet all this is much below the triumphant courage and assurance of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Here are no trembling doubts and uncertain ifs. Who that has the treasure of a good conscience, should not be glad to die and to drop these infirmities and bodily necessities and trifling cares, and to shake off a body of death that so depresses and debases the mind! Who that is ambitious of wisdom and knowledge, will not covet those noble and enlarged views which will present themselves when we get out of this dark and narrow

sphere; and above all, to taste and feel the satisfying sweets of infinite Almighty Love! I doubt not but your own mind have (has) many more serious speculations about the matter: we all lye at the door of eternity, ready to be called in; may God help us to set our affections on things above.—The publick is in great ferment; and violent animosities make all people uneasy. The high church hitherto hath gained considerably in the elections that are over: though in this city, I suppose, the whigs will keep their ground. Our poll is not yet over. 'Tis well we have better views than this world affords. May we come safe, at last, to the general assembly, &c. and to the spirits of the just made perfect.

Yours,

T. EMLYN.

[What follows is in the hand-writing of Mr. Manning, to whom the letter is addressed.]

—“this suited my then case, but God thought fit to alter the scene with me, and to bring me back again on a new trial into this darksome tempestuous world, wherein I am unavoidably exposed to a number of daily cares, detrimental to the concern of my soul: to divert me also, a shattered head and state of body prevents me from a sedate thinking on and pursuit of things above, relating to my change at the door, as it behoves me to attend unto.”

*Letter II.*

DEAR SIR, Dec. 5, 1710.

BY yours of October 18th, I find you are somewhat raised again from your languishing state: I am glad that you are free from acute pains, amongst the other sorrows that do attend old age. You are come to Barzillai's case, who was eighty years old, and could not taste when he did eat, nor hear the voice of singing men; and you enjoy his desired retirement. Wonder not if your affections and passions, even as to spiritual objects, become flat and slow, nor that your impressions from death and eternity should be less than under the thoughts of your late nigh approach to them: all this is natural and almost necessary. I know they are days of no pleasure; but the wise Author and Lord of Life

knows best when 'tis fittest to put a period to it.

I cannot say much of public matters yet; our Parliament are but just beginning, and 'tis hoped they will vigorously maintain the Revolution, and the present war, but especially in Spain; and if the publick credit and loans do but go on prosperously, we may hope we are recovered from the late shock; but time must shew that.

Mr. Whiston, after some years' open profession of the Arian doctrine, and having published proposals for printing an account of the primitive faith, which, in manuscript, has been shewn to many of the learned clergy, has been lately expelled the University, and 'tis like to make some stir, but with what success, God only knows. He is allowed to be a person of great ability and sincerity: but truth and religion hath (have) not many sincere inquirers after them. I pray God fill you with joy and peace in believing, and that your inward man may still be renewed daily; and when the crazy earthly tabernacle is cast off, may be perfected among the spirits of the just.

I am, with all true affection,

Yours,

T. EMLYN.

Letter of Dr. Priestley's, communicated by Dr. Philipps.

SIR, Sheffield, July 3, 1817.

THE letters of pious and learned men constitute a most valuable treasure, and I am happy to find that many such precious relics of departed worth have found their way into your Repository. I send, for insertion in that work, a letter from my late friend the Rev. Dr. Priestley, which he wrote me a short time before he left England. It was written in consequence of a remittance of 30*l.*, which had been raised by subscription at the Annual Meeting of Protestant Dissenters of the county of Suffolk, held at Stowmarket, and which, as its chairman, I was directed to send him. I think it right to inform you, that the majority of persons who were present, whether ministers or laymen, were Calvinists, or of the Independent denomination of Dissenters. Indeed, at the time which I refer to, there were only three Unitarian Societies in the county; but all the ministers of that district, of whatever denomination, and the Dissent-

ing laity in general, were very friendly with each other, and being united in support of a society which was instituted for the relief of the necessitous widows and orphans of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, they had then, and still have, a yearly meeting for the purpose of receiving and applying the congregational collections, as well as promoting union and friendship among one another. I do not remember from what quarter the proposition came, which led to that offer of sympathy and respect to Dr. Priestley, which I had the honour of making in obedience to the general will: but this I know, that it met with the *instant* concurrence of every person in the room. There was at that time, and I trust there still remains, in the county of Suffolk, a spirit of true Christian liberality, which disdained to scowl on any man for his opinions, and which held all religious persecution in absolute abhorrence.

The following is the letter, so far as it relates to the writer himself, and is a proof, among many others, of the calmness, the resignation, and the benevolence of his mind, under the weight of that unprovoked hostility and persecution, which compelled him to leave his native country for ever.

NATH. PHILIPPS.

DEAR SIR,

I AM much affected with the generosity of my friends in your neighbourhood, and beg you would return them my warmest thanks for their kind benefaction. It is with sincere regret that I leave this country; especially after flattering myself that I was *fixed for life*. But all my sons are already in America, and their situation, together with the state of things here, make it expedient for me to go to them. Our captain has fixed our departure for the 25th instant, but it will probably be about the beginning of April. However, I shall be ready in good time. I leave this *country with every good wish*, not only to my friends, but to my enemies; and hope that when prejudices are removed, we shall meet in a better state.

\* \* \* \*

I am, dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

Clapton,

J. PRIESTLEY

March 8th, 1794.



## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

### *Critical Notice of Duncan's Edition of Griesbach.*

SIR, Exeter, June 16th, 1817.

**Y**OU will oblige a constant reader and a sincere friend to the cause which is so warmly supported by your useful Miscellany, by the insertion of the following *critical notice of Duncan's Edition of Griesbach*. Your readers, Mr. Editor, have often been favoured with just eulogiums upon the late celebrated Professor Griesbach, whose life was devoted to the laborious and important pursuits of biblical criticism, but whose impartiality as an editor of the Greek Testament led him to adopt alterations by no means favourable to his own orthodox opinions. The Improved Version has given those whose study of the Scriptures is confined to the English language, a correct idea of the importance of his learned and impartial labours to the defence of pure and primitive Christianity; and numbers I have no doubt, who have never seen a work of Professor Griesbach's, have learnt to pay a just tribute of reverence and gratitude to his unwearied industry, profound learning and unsullied impartiality. Your learned readers are probably at this time deliberating on the force of the objections lately made to the system according to which this eminent man conducted his labours, although few can have failed to observe the extreme partiality and inferior learning by which his opponents have been denoted. As long, however, as Griesbach retains that exalted rank, which he at present holds in the estimation of every true critic, (and which he will continue to enjoy, till one mightier than he shall be found to attack his principles,) it will be the sacred duty of every friend to the progress of religious truth, to guard his unsullied reputation, and to defend the conquests he has so decidedly won. An accurate copy of the text of his last edition, has not I believe issued from a British press, although I have seen several which have disappointed the expectations which they had raised. This is the case with an edition of the Greek Testa-

ment, published in 12mo. by Dakins, which professed to be formed from the edition of Mill and Griesbach. Now, Mr. Editor, it is well known Mill's text, underneath which was given the great bulk of various readings, was not a professed critical edition, and differed very little from the Textus Receptus, being the *third* edition of Stephens. By the addition of *Griesbach's* name, one might reasonably suppose that *his* text formed the basis of alterations, whereas upon inspection it is found that all the aid which Griesbach could so richly furnish, is confined to a few insignificant readings which are placed in the margin. I cannot profess to have been much better gratified with the edition lately published by Dr. Valpy, especially considering the profession made by the Editor, and the time taken to prepare it for the press. I say nothing of the copious notes, nor of the nature of their selection, but object particularly to the authority assumed by the Editor over Professor Griesbach himself, in choosing to follow him in some places and to reject him in others, without regard to critical evidence. I leave these, however, to present to you, Mr. Editor, the observations which have occurred to me, while examining the edition of the Greek Testament, published this year by A. and J. Duncan, of Glasgow, which has in its title-page, "*curâ Leusdenii et Griesbachii.*" I am not aware that the text of Leusden's Greek Testament differs from the received text, and cannot therefore conceive why his name should have been presented in the title-page, unless to decoy the unwary by the appearance of a double authority, or to reserve some latent excuse for a most unjust use of the name of Griesbach. In fact, Mr. Editor, on inspecting this edition, set off with the vaunted names of Leusden and Griesbach, so far from finding it a valuable aid to the biblical scholar and a benefit to the sacred interests of religion, it is found to have been conducted with the grossest partiality to preconceived theological opinions, to bid defiance to any system of se-

lection, and to be a confused mixture of the received text of Griesbach, and of other readings adopted in part from both. In short, instead of the title which it has assumed, its character would have been appropriately expressed thus: "An Edition of the Greek Testament in which Griesbach is followed in all readings of no importance, and disdainfully rejected where his alterations might be supposed to diminish the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, or the Incarnation." Upon the supposition that these doctrines are a part of the Christian system, it might indeed be granted to be a politic thing to introduce, by degrees, to the world those alterations in the common text which might perhaps weaken the evidence for revealed truth in the mind. If this then were the motive of the present editors, why have they not in some way communicated it to the learned world? And is it consistent with common honesty in the present state of religious opinion, or with common justice to the labours of Professor Griesbach, to publish a mangled edition of such a book, or to attempt to deprive, by an unworthy artifice, the Unitarian cause of the proofs which an unbiassed and thoroughly competent judge had deliberately bestowed upon it? The language which I have used may be thought strong, Mr. Editor, but I apprehend it is called for by the circumstances of the case, in order not merely to preserve your readers from *imposition*—this would be an inferior concern—but to preserve the sacred cause of Christian truth, as it is served by the Unitarian controversy, from suffering from this ill-judged and unmanly behaviour.—I shall notice then in the first place, as being of the most importance, the three passages—Acts. xx. 28, 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 John v. 7, which are, as all your readers well know, materially affected by Griesbach's edition, and, from speaking a language consistent perhaps with orthodox Christianity, are deprived of every iota inconsistent with Unitarianism. All your readers will be able to understand the quality of this edition of Griesbach, when they are informed that these three passages are in it, precisely as they are found in the

received text. Matt. vi. 13, the doxology to the Lord's Prayer is retained as Scripture, contrary to Griesbach's judgment. Luke xi. 2. 4, the petitions in this evangelist's copy of the Lord's Prayer, which Griesbach has proved to be interpolated, are here in opposition to every principle of correctness retained. John vi. 69, is a bungling mixture of the received text with Griesbach's: thus, *συ εἰ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*. Acts xxiii. 9, *μη θεομαχῶμεν* is retained in opposition to Griesbach. Rom. viii. 1, the latter part of the verse is retained: xiii. 9, *συ ψευδομαρτυροῖς* is retained. The change of the verses at the end of the 16th chapter of this epistle to the end of the 14th chapter is adopted; but neglecting the prudent plan of Griesbach, that of retaining the old numbering of the verses, the present edition has given them a running order where they now stand, so as to furnish occasion for the most inconvenient mistakes. Phil. iv. 13, is a singular proof of theological prejudice: *Χριστῶ* is retained after the words *ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντι με*. Col. ii. 2, is a glorious proof of a determination to uphold the falling cause of orthodoxy, by retaining the clause upon which a pitifully slender argument has been founded for the distinct divinity of the Holy Spirit, so that it reads with the received text, *τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. I produce these as a few specimens only, and let it be repeated, the edition which differs from Griesbach in these particulars agrees with him in almost all readings of no importance. It is of the more consequence to take this public notice of Messrs. Duncans' "Griesbach," from the local circumstances in which the work issues from the press. With all the advantages of a small and beautiful type, a moderate expense, and a portable size, and with the high sounding phrase *ex prelo Academico*, it may be conceived that the students of the Glasgow University might be very likely to make a purchase of this edition of Griesbach's Greek Testament, to which so much attention has of late years been paid in the learned world, and which no liberal critic is found to disregard.

Without one word of preface, with no other information respecting the edition than that which is afforded in the title-page, "curâ Leusdenii et Griesbachii," it is very conceivable, that many would flatter themselves with the idea that they would be able to examine the amount of the statements which the odious Unitarians are sending throughout the island: and what think you, Mr. Editor, would be the disdainful feelings, even of the ingenuous youth, who, upon referring to 1 John v. 7, finds the passage of the three heavenly witnesses, of whose spuriousness Unitarians are wont to feel so secure, staring him in the face even in the text formed by that "vaunted authority," Professor Griesbach himself? And how would his feelings be excited against this presumptuous sect, when, upon a reference to Acts xx. 28, and 1 Tim. iii. 16, he finds the wonted props of orthodoxy apparently unaffected by that artillery in which Unitarians had professed the securest confidence? In short, Mr. Editor, who can say to what extent the enmity excited even in a single mind by this manœuvre of Messrs. Duncans, might proceed in confirming the minds of those who are already prejudiced, and in stifling the beginnings of free inquiry in those whose prejudices had received the shock of education and knowledge? It so happens, Sir, that in one instance, which has come under the writer's notice, a copy of Duncans' "Griesbach" was purchased by a student who possessed Griesbach's own edition already, but who was induced to buy so neatly printed and portable a copy of the text merely, and who was happily led in the course of reading with a friend, to detect some of those discrepancies which have occasioned the present communication. If the incident itself or the trifling investigation to which it has contributed on the writer's part, should at all tend to facilitate the spread of sound criticism and rational religious inquiry, your readers will be furnished with one of numerous proofs of every day's occurrence, in which great events are seen to spring from little causes.

GRIESBACHIANUS.

P. S. Since writing the above, I have had the means of knowing that

this Glasgow edition of Griesbach, contains the Greek Text of an edition reprinted in the same press from a continental edition of Leusden's. This will supply the reason for the employment of Leusden's name, though it also furnishes a striking proof of the ignorance of the printer, since he has, in the edition to which this paper refers, omitted the marks of the occurrence of the same word in his copy which were the only characteristics of Leusden's edition.

SIR,

July 4, 1817.

YOUR Correspondent, Ignotus, in the Repository for January, [XII. 32,] having quoted a passage from Whitelocke's Memorials, in which Mr. Patrick Young is mentioned, as "having in his hand an original *Tecta* Bible of the Septuagint translation"—very naturally subjoins this question:—"Can any of your readers say what was a *Tecta* Bible?" I am sorry that none of your readers have ventured to answer the question. It is certainly not undeserving of attention.

It has occurred to me, that the only answer to be given, is this:—That *Tecta* is a misprint, or a mistake of Whitelocke's, for *Tecla*, and that the Bible alluded to is the *Alexandrine Manuscript*; said to have been written by a Lady of the name of *Thecla*, or, according to the spelling we sometimes meet with in works of Young's days, *Tecla*.

"I do not hear," says Sir H. Bourchier to Archbishop Usher, "of any books, brought by Sir Thomas Rowe, besides the ancient Greek Bible, which was sent to his Majesty, by him, from Cyrill, the old Patriarch, some time of Alexandria, but now of Constantinople. It is that which went amongst them, by tradition, to be written by St. *Tecla*, the Martyr, and scholar of the Apostles," &c. &c.

Dr. Brian Walton also, writing to the Archbishop, and mentioning a scheme of Whelock's relating to the Polyglott, that all the homogeneal languages should be published with one Latin translation for them all, says, "So the Roman LXX. with the Complutense and that of *Tecla's*, and our Latin translation," &c. Usher himself, in a letter to Lud. Cappellus, describes this M.S. in a similar manner: "Codicem



τῶν ὁ Alexandria a Cyrillo Patriarchâ in Angliam transmissum (*quem Theclæ vocant*) edere cœpit eruditissimus Patricius Junius."

It is well known that the Alexandrian M.S. upon being brought into England, A. D. 1628, was placed in the King's Library, of which Patrick Young had the care; that he communicated readings from it to Usher, Grotius, and others; that he published the text of Job from that M.S. at the end of a Catena on Job; and that he long meditated a complete copy of it, but, by various untoward circumstances, was prevented from proceeding further than a short specimen of his proposed edition, consisting of the first chapter of Genesis. But I will not intrude further upon your valuable pages, which may be much more usefully occupied. Ignotus, and others, who may wish to see more upon this subject, will have recourse to Dr. T. Smith's interesting Life of Young, in his "*Vitæ quorundam Eruditiss. et illustr. Virorum.*" And, as for the conjecture which I have advanced, I will only add, in the often cited words of the poet—

— Si quid novisti rectius istis,  
Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum.  
PAMPHILUS.

SIR, Feb. 3, 1817.

I LATELY found a paper written more than twenty years ago, when on reading the poetical works of Cowley, I was occasionally reminded of some passages in more modern poets. I will offer a few instances to those of your readers who pursue such harmless amusements. My edition of Cowley is the 12th, 1721.

At p. 7, *On the Death of Sir Henry Wotton*, is the following couplet:—

Justly each nation's speech to him was known,  
Who for the world was made, not us alone.

Pope may have thought of the first line, when he said of Roscommon,  
To him the wit of Greece and Rome was known.

And Goldsmith of the second, when he described Burke, in his Retaliation, as one

Who born for the universe narrowed his mind,  
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind.

At p. 15, *On Friendship in Absence*, the 6th stanza begins thus:—

Friendship is less apparent when too nigh,  
Like objects, if they touch the eye.

Dr. Young has applied the same allusion to a very serious purpose, where he says

— like objects pressing on the sight,  
Death has advanc'd too near us to be seen.

In the *Davideis*, Book I., it is said of heaven—

On no smooth sphere the restless seasons slide,  
No circling motion doth swift time divide;  
Nothing is there to come and nothing past,  
But an eternal now does ever last.

Watts, on *God's Eternity*, Book II. H. 17, says—

While like a tide our minutes flow,  
The present and the past,  
He fills his own immortal Now,  
And sees our ages waste.

Those who have read Watts's Elegy on Gunston, may perceive that he was not unacquainted with Cowley's *Ode on the Death of Mr. William Harvey*. Lyttelton was also probably indebted to that Ode for some turns of expression in his Monody.

In the *Davideis*, Book III., it is said of the young Son of Jesse—

Bless me! how swift and growing was his wit,  
The wings of time flagg'd dully after it.

I know not whether Johnson might think of the last line, when he said of Shakspeare, that

— panting time toil'd after him in vain.

I omit a few instances already noticed by Bishop Hurd, in his *Cowley*, and Mr. Wakefield on Pope and Gray.  
OTIOSUS.

SIR, June 6th, 1817.

IF your Correspondent, Mr. Holden, (p. 291,) takes the trouble to consult the General Biography, he may find that the Life of Dr. Caleb Fleming has not been wholly withheld from the public.

T. M.

SIR, July 10th, 1817.

THE admirable letter of Mr. Fox to the *Old Unitarian*, [p. 333,] has noticed most of his remarks; but has not paid such an attention to one of them as it seems to merit. The *Old Unitarian*

accuses Modern Unitarians, with rather regarding the vicious with pity than indignation. Can any man otherwise regard them, who believes that they will suffer much more than they enjoy by their crimes, whatever be the ultimate result of such sufferings? He who thus believes, must believe, that he who injures another, injures himself much more, and consequently is an object of the deepest compassion. He who would not suffer death, rather than inflict it, is not a practical Unitarian. This was surely the doctrine of Priestley, and this is the doctrine of the Rev. Dr. Smith, in his late work. Men at their ease, with all their natural wants supplied, are apt to express great *indignation* at the conduct of others, in opposite circumstances, but their circumstances being changed, might alter their feelings, and indignation might become pity. As vice leads to misery, let it not be forgotten, that it originates in misery. Pain, of one sort or other, is the source of all vice. No one who is happy, can voluntarily injure another. Dr. Smith justly resolves all vice, in its origin, to *want, weakness and error*. Can any one shew that this is false? It was a saying of Mr. Bradbury, who was not a Modern Unitarian, when he saw any one carried to execution, there should Bradbury have been carried if it had not been for the grace of God; and there was as much true philosophy, as religion in that saying.—There is many a man, who passes through life, in the midst of enjoyments, all called innocent, with the full approbation of his own mind, and a high character for goodness, as being free from malignity, and, from his abundance, in a certain degree beneficent. But let it not be forgotten, that all moral differences in character, are resolvable into the degree of self-denial, voluntarily imposed by the individual for the good of others, or a sense of duty. By this let every man try himself! And then let him regard the vicious, with pity or with indignation. Bad morals grow not from the Unitarian doctrine, and an Old Unitarian, in this particular, brings an accusation, that is, perhaps, not disgraceful to his more Modern Brethren.

A. R.

SIR,

Clapton, July 3, 1817.

I HAVE just had great pleasure in reading Dr. Toulmin's edition of Neal's History of the Puritans, and have sent you a note by the editor, as being particularly applicable to the present times. It refers to what Mr. Neal very justly calls, the "mad insurrection" of Thomas Venner, and a small number of enthusiasts, who expected "a fifth universal monarchy under the personal reign of *King Jesus* upon earth, and that the saints were to take the kingdom themselves."

I take this opportunity to recommend the above work, more particularly the notes of the late venerable and excellent editor, to your correspondent "An Old Unitarian" [p. 284]; he will there see that Dr. T., though an *old*, very pious, and I believe in every respect, most exemplary Unitarian minister, was as great a lover of, and advocate for liberty, as any of the Modern Unitarians. If a man may not be a good Unitarian Christian, and yet a firm supporter of civil and religious freedom, we are of all sects the most unfortunate; and I much wish that your Correspondent had taken an opportunity to recommend his own slavish principles, without bringing such gross charges against those who differ from him.

"It plainly appeared on the examination of these insurgents, that they had entered into no plot with any other conspirators. The whole transaction was the unquestionable effect of the religious frenzy of a few individuals. Yet it was the origin of a national burthen felt to this day. At the Council, on the morning after the insurrection was quelled, the Duke of York availed himself of the opportunity to push his arbitrary measures. On the pretext, that so extravagant an attempt could not have arisen from the rashness of one man, but was the result of a plot formed by all the sectaries and fanatics to overthrow the present government, he moved 'to suspend at such an alarming crisis, the disbanding of General Monk's regiment of foot,' which had the guard of Whitehall; and was, by order of Parliament, to have been disbanded the next day. Through different causes the motion was adopted, and a letter was sent to the king to request him to approve

and confirm the resolution of the Council, and to appoint the continuance of the regiment till further order. To this the king consented; and as the rumours of fresh conspiracies were industriously kept up, those troops were continued and augmented, and a way was prepared for the gradual establishment of a *standing army*, under the name of *guards*. This should be a memento to future ages, how they credit the reports of plots and conspiracies thrown out by a minister, unless the evidence of their existence be brought forward. The cry of conspiracies has been frequently nothing more than the chimera of fear, or the invention of a wicked policy to carry the schemes of ambition and despotism.—*Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.* Vol. I. p. 346-7. Editor.—Vol. IV. p. 320.

T. H. JANSON.

P. S. Your Correspondent, Cantabrigiensis, [p. 346,] has fallen into a very general error, in attributing the stanzas on *Madame Lavalette's* conjugal virtue, to Lord Byron; they were written by a friend of mine, who is one of the Society of Friends, and were sent by him to the Examiner, signed with his initials B. B.: it is curious that they are placed in most of the editions of Lord Byron's Poems. B. B. once published an anonymous volume under the title of *Metrical Effusions*, with a Dedictory Sonnet to Mr. Roscoe, which is, I believe, now out of print; and he is at this time publishing a quarto volume of Poems, of which a very limited number will be printed, price One Guinea: if Cantab. or any of your readers are desirous of seeing more of his poetry, I shall be happy to forward any names to him as subscribers.

SIR, March 26, 1817.  
YOUR Correspondent, A. B. C. [p. 96,] inquires, "why should that degree of credit be extended to the historians of Jesus, who, we know, were frequently reprov'd by him for their gross and inadequate apprehension of the nature of the Messiah, and the quality of his dispensation, which is withheld from all other historians" (with respect to supposed miracles)?

That the miracles to which the evangelical historians bear witness, differ from the doubtful and superstitious tales of cures of the king's evil,

&c. in their nature, degree of publicity, and other circumstances, seems a waste of time and ink to shew: this has been done by Campbell, in his reply to Hume.

The gross apprehension of the Messiah's character and office, was common to the evangelists and to the more learned and enlightened Jews: this argument against their competency therefore falls to the ground.

These natural misconceptions, in which the wisest scribes partook, cannot affect their evidence as to what they saw and handled, if they were honest men.

That they were honest men, is proved by the very objection of your Correspondent—that they were reprov'd by Jesus for their gross and temporal notions: for the knowledge that they were so comes from their own candid statement.

If we believe the testimony of these honest men, we must believe that the facts which they relate were matters of notoriety. The apostles appeal openly to the senses and recollections of the people: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, wonders, and signs which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know."

Christianity was promulgated by preaching. The gospel histories were successively composed amidst contemporaries, who might have contradicted their story. The records were read in Christian societies as registers of publicly received facts.

Paul was not one of those who were reprov'd for grossness of apprehension; he was a learned man, invested with authority, prejudiced against the Christians; yet he became a Christian and a zealous apostle.

Luke, his secretary, was not one of the reprov'd historians; yet Luke records in the *Acts* miracles equally striking with those which Matthew recorded, or which Peter dictated to Mark.

In attestation of the facts thus preached and thus recorded, the evangelists and apostles, and Jewish and Gentile converts, braved shame, persecution and death. Is this common testimony?

An indirect evidence to the miraculous agency of Jesus is afforded by the early corruption of his religion, which ascribes to him a superhuman



nature. The Gnostics, with their celestial pre-existent spirit and phantom humanity; the Cerinthians, with their incorporation of the celestial and human natures; the ancient Platonizing fathers, with their incarnate second God, bear witness to something extraordinary, and out of the course of nature in the acts of Jesus. The Jewish converts, familiar with the signs wrought of old by Moses and other prophets, and with the ascension of Elijah, continued Unitarians like the apostles before them; but the Gentiles were ready to exclaim "Deus, Deus ille!" This is unaccountable on the hypothesis of mere moral reformation; it is unaccountable on any other theory, than that of actual signs and wonders performed through Jesus in the sight of men, by the finger of God.

Your Correspondent quotes Luke ix. 49, as a proof that the power of working cures was common to others, and was therefore no evidence of a direct communication from God to Jesus. The reference is unhappy. "Master, we saw one casting out devils *in thy name*." It was on an appeal to the name of Jesus, accompanied, no doubt, with faith in him as the Christ, that God poured out his energy in the healing of lunacy.

To call Newton a messenger from God, seems little better than playing upon words. What is meant by a messenger from God, is an immediate and extraordinary messenger: and the only test of a divine commission is, a power to suspend the ordinary laws of nature by the working of miracles.

But it is asked, why such a supernatural exertion of power should have been necessary? And it is urged, that if the doctrines of Jesus were true, truth is its own evidence, and needs no proof. This position is contradicted by all human experience. Mankind are *not* disposed to embrace truth. In despite of philosophy, they are not even agreed as to "what is truth."

If Jesus be only a moralist and reformer, raised up, like Socrates, in the ordinary course of God's providence, what is to render his precepts obligatory? They who acknowledge the supernatural character of his mission, however they may differ as to its design, or as to the person of the messenger, agree in their submission to

the gospel laws of morality, because they conceive them to have a divine sanction. They who question their divine authority, are not so unanimous in admitting their self-evident truth. Some cavil at their want of philosophical precision; others at their justness or fitness. Truth then is not its own evidence.

The writer's scepticism seems founded on an idea that the object of Christ's mission was to teach morals. The Christian covenant was prepared from the very infancy of the world; announced by prophets; and hailed with triumph by those who "saw the day of Christ," which had been appointed "before Abraham was." *What* was this day of Christ? What were these prophecies, and wherefore this exultation?—That a reformer was to arise? That a new system of morals was to be promulgated? *Incredulus odi*.

Jesus, indeed, taught the love of God and man; but he taught more: he confirmed the free pardon of "his God and our God," his "Father and our Father," on the condition of "our ceasing to do evil and learning to do well." If he had not divine authority for this joyful message, what is its value? Does it demand assent by intrinsic truth and fitness? Will such an assurance, proceeding from a sage and benevolent moralist, supply a balm to remorse, or an opiate to despair?

But neither was *this* the grand object of Christ's mission. It is said, that Jesus taught none but natural doctrines. Is the resurrection of the dead a natural doctrine?

Jesus was sent to lay down his life that he might receive it again. He was sent to reveal the stupendous mystery that the grave should yield up its dead. Was not a supernatural interference of Deity necessary for such an object as this? But, it may be said, we knew that the soul was immortal; Plato knew it; Deists recognise it: on what *proof*? All the phenomena of our nature are against it. The natural immortality of the soul—the very existence of a soul at all independent of the corporeal organization of man, is mere hypothesis: it rests on conjectural philosophy; it stands on heathen inventions; it is disowned by Scripture. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return:" but "the dead shall be raised incorrupti-

ble, and we shall be changed." This is the Bible immortality, and this Jesus revealed. How could he reveal it, but from direct intercourse with God? How could it be proved, but by his own resurrection?

If the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus be true, we must accept the evidence for Jesus himself having also raised the dead by the power of God directly imparted to him.\* If it be not true, we shall lie in the grave; death is an eternal sleep; and immortality the dream of poets and the romance of philosophers.

If Jesus were "the best and wisest of men," it must be believed that he had direct communication with God, for he himself declares so. If he declared so falsely, he was an impostor; and although he might be the *wisest*, he could not be the *best* of men. The ascribing the cures of Christ to any other means than supernatural agency, whether *magical*, as with the ancient sceptics, or *medical*, as with the modern, constitutes the blasphemy against the holy spirit.

C. A. E.

SIR, April 21, 1817.  
 "A CONSTANT READER," [p. 101,] does not seem aware, that vengeance, as it respects God, can only be used in accommodation to human speech and comprehension; so resentment, repentance, and many other terms. As to his question, "are not all punishments vindictive?" I answer decidedly, no.—Does a father punish his children from a spirit of vengeance? Such a father is accountable for this indulgence of his evil passions. A good father punishes to reform. God is said to pity us, "as a father pitieth his own children." Eternal torment, as "Constant Reader" acknowledges, does not consist with the attribute of benevolence: but neither could annihilation answer any other end but that of vengeance, and vengeance is inconsistent with the character of a father.

The dealings of Providence with respect to criminals in this life, and the peculiarities of human character strengthen the probability that future punishment is remedial. Such is the tendency of all the penal consequences attached to vice and immorality in the present world. We

see also many depraved characters of whose possible correction and amendment there is a moral certainty, were occasion allowed and proper means applied: yet they are cut off from life. There is in fact no character so depraved, as that a philosopher would be hardy enough to pronounce the depravity incurable. Is it credible that our Maker, who saw us before we were formed in the womb, would deny his creatures those means of amelioration hereafter, which the circumstances in which they were placed denied them here?

But is not the justice of the Creator, no less than his benevolence, impeached, by either hypothesis of eternal conscious pain, or lingering annihilation? Man is the work of God's hands. In creating him, he foresaw that he would err; yet he created him. In foreseeing the existence of moral evil he therefore willed it. Even on the ignorant supposition of a personal evil being, derived from the allegorical language of Scripture, moral evil could only exist by God's permission; and this is equivalent to his will. Isaiah, however, speaks of God from authority, as the creator of evil as well as good in the mysterious, but beneficent dispensations of his providence. "I make peace and create evil: I, the Lord, do all these things." xlv. 7. May we not then, with reverence and humility, inquire, whether it is just to have created man in the first instance liable to error? Or, in the second, to consider him, when erring, as an object of vengeance? Is the justice of the Creator reconcileable either with the theory of everlasting misery, or of painful destruction?

From abstract reasoning we are, however, referred to Scripture. The passages and terms referred to, are by no means conclusive; they are at most ambiguous. The original word for *torment* and *punishment*, means in its primitive sense, a *touch-stone*; and implies therefore *question*, *search*, *corrective suffering*. As to the word rendered *everlasting*, it is limited or extended by the word in connexion with it, and is sometimes used in the same sentence to designate measured and infinite duration: the *punishment* may therefore be for a period of ages, the *life* for ages without end. As to the "second death," a phrase which,

it must be observed, cannot by any figure be made to express an eternity of living torment, it does certainly seem to justify the doctrine of extinction of being: but to make the parallel complete, as the first death is followed by a resurrection, so should the second death be followed by restitution to life.

“The worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched,” do not necessarily imply either eternal conscious torment, or lingering annihilation. This allusion to the cast-out carcasses of malefactors, and to the fire in the valley of Hinnom, for the consuming refuse of the city of Jerusalem, may imply that the instruments of salutary wrath will not cease their agency, *till* their purpose be effected: and this purpose may be, not the destruction of the *being* of the wicked, but only of their sinful natures. The declaration of Jesus, “every one shall be *salted* with fire,” seems to contain a reference to *purifying* chastisement.

The parable of the adversary (a plaintiff) dragging the debtor before the judge, by whom he is cast into prison, may illustrate this question. It is said, “Verily, thou shalt not come out thence, *till* thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.” I cannot regard this parable as conveying only a rule of life, or a lesson of worldly prudence. It seems to me an evident allegory of our relations with God: and the adversary at law is the emblematic evil one, or sin, who is represented as having a suit against us at the bar of the Almighty Judge. If this be so, the final restitution is at once proved.

If this interpretation be rejected, we may still contend that if definite punishment be not absolutely *expressed* in Scripture, it may be *inferred* from it. God’s mercy is said “to endure for ever:” he is said “not to keep his anger for ever:” he is said “in judgment to remember mercy:” and finally, it is said, that “God is love.” These declarations cannot be true, if eternal torment be true: but can they be true, even on the mitigated hypothesis of destruction?

It is well observed, by Hartley, that the Jewish nation appears to be a type of the general human race. With the Jews the angry visitations of Providence are clearly remedial. The prophesied restoration of the

dispersed tribes of Israel may prefigure the restitution of the reformed wicked. E.

#### Principles of Government.

[In these times of political degeneracy, we esteem it a duty to use our influence to awaken men’s minds to the true principles of government, and therefore insert the following admirable passage from Stonehouse’s series of Letters, entitled, *Universal Restitution further Defended*, printed at Bristol, in 1768, Let. VII. It contains a compendium of Mr. Locke’s Treatise on Government. The author is replying to an argument for the necessity of the doctrine of reprobation from the destination of *the mighty men* who are doomed in the book of Revelation to be *mightily tormented*. Ed.]

NOW as to the expression *mighty men*, we shall fix its import upon this very principle, as follows, 1 Cor. xi. 3, “Christ is the head of every man;” but, whereas men are fallen or apostate creatures, and therefore subject to vicious appetites and passions, which will prompt them to fall foul on, and oppress each other; their Lord has authorized them to form themselves into societies, or associations, for their mutual protection from injuries foreign and domestic: and the men chosen of them, and constituted from among their brethren to be administrators to this their protection, are called *mighty*: they are *mighty* in that they are supported by the united force of the whole society, occasionally contributed, with a view to preserve to the society, who are their constituents, the free use of their rights, liberties, and prerogatives, and the uninterrupted enjoyment of the products of their labours. And I dare assert, that in this appointment, they are justly and innocently *mighty*.

But you object, that the *mighty men* of whom I speak are invested with their authority from God: and that these are so, is also true. It being insisted upon by us that every people and nation, even all whom the blood of Christ has purchased, are Christ’s absolute property, and to be considered as his vassals or peculium; and that this vassalage is not partial, but, by the exactest law of justice, absolute, unlimited, and without ex-



ception or restriction; it will follow that men can have no authority of their own, no reserve of right to themselves; and consequently, neither can they duly convey any; or in other words, they can have no right to act or choose or constitute without Christ their Lord. And because they can duly convey no authority but with their Lord, and by virtue of his licence, this authority by the Lord's licence conveyed may be justly called the Lord's, and not the people's, authority. But it is certain, that the Lord authorizes every association or imbodyed people to choose and approve of their own temporal officers, so far as this may be done consistently with the good of others, with whom they are justly allied by a prior contract; which has been religiously and inviolably observed. Power is singly the Lord's prerogative; therefore, as it were injurious to him, to consult concerning the conveying or investing this without him, it were *also* insolence to presume upon a choice wherein to vest it unwarranted by his justice. Yet this choice being duly and equitably made, by virtue of the authority given of God, and according to the rules of his justice; the officers themselves so chosen, may not only be justly said to have their authority from him, but to be his people's officers by his ordinance or appointment.

In evidence of the soundness of his reasoning, we have several precedents and declarations transmitted to us upon Scripture record. Thus, although it is beyond all question, that the elders of the primitive churches were chosen altogether by the suffrages of the whole church or people, yet are they notwithstanding said to be made their overseers or elders by the Holy Ghost; Acts xx. 28: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

And if it be true, that this authority of free choice is from God, it is an impiety to deny it. Truths have their foundation in God, the images of whose perfections and realities they are; to deny these there-

fore is to deny the perfections and realities of God, which is diabolical, and imports a rebellion against God, as well as truth.

Having then shewn that by mighty men we are to understand the chiefs or elders of the people, and that these derive their due authority from God, and by his consent from his people, it will follow, that being related to both in the authority they bear, they are answerable to both for the due exercise of this authority; to the people, as constituting them, or as, (1 Pet. ii. 13,) *ανδρωπινη κλισις*, an human constitution, and to God as approving and ratifying his people's choice. And this authority being an authority only to do the people good, where this purpose of good is not answered, this authority ends, it ends with it—especially in the eyes of God, who authorizes no one to act contrary to, or beyond his gracious will; or, in other words, who gives no one authority to act contrary to, or beyond his given authority.

And here again I am bold to assert, that if these mighty men preside over the people as with an authority worthy of God, they are and may be inculpably mighty. And whereas, Acts x. 35: "In every nation he who feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him;" it is not to be doubted but that, if these mighty men, as faithful trustees for their brethren, are jealous for their native rights, interests and prerogatives, and animated with an industrious zeal to secure them, and resign them with their dying breath intire, sound and indeliberated; and that if with singleness of heart they seek, not their own, but the good of mankind, and are studious of an humble, modest, disinterested and generous discharge of their trust; they will surely find mercy in their degree, and so far as they are ready to receive it, from the throne of God; and *shall* not be destined to be *mightily* tormented on account of their might.

But if they betray their trust; if by gradual encroachments, through favour of a popular connivance or inattention, or by specious and plausible names and pretences, they seek to usurp an authority which they have not by derivation; if they make use of their

authority in trust to deprive their brethren of those rights and prerogatives, for the preservation of which they were intrusted with their authority; and, by the artful abuse thereof, are studious to render themselves, as far as possible **ALMIGHTY**, the sources of wealth, power and dignity, seating themselves in the throne of Christ; if instead of watching over their charge with piety, self-abasement and devotion for good, they watch for opportunities to ensnare, impoverish, debase and subdue their brethren; *THEN*, and in such case only, will they, as *mighty men*, *be mightily tormented*; for their portion will be with that great oppressor and deceiver, the common enemy of mankind, whose condemned dominion is now no longer by authority, but by permission and delay, and is the effect of craft and force as yet undefeated, and animated by appetite, despair and impudence.

The mighty are set up to public view by their brethren, and by God, as examples of temperance, frugality, moderation, continence, humanity, justice, benevolence, godliness, and of whatsoever thing is holy, of whatsoever thing is just, pure or virtuous: if therefore by their example, connivance, countenance, pusillanimity, or for profit, and a desire to serve themselves, they promote or encourage vice, idleness, vanity, luxury, delicacy, perfidiousness, debauchery, wantonness, gambling, ungodliness, reprobation, ignorance, stupidity, effeminacy, falsehood, injustice, treachery, rapine, wildness, tyranny, unreasonableness, servility, pomp, glitter, knavery, audaciousness, extravagance, riot, revelling, profaneness, profligacy, drunkenness, bribery, venality, perjury, and such like; they therein more than participate with the corrupted. But if they associate with them, and, presuming falsely upon the connivance of the divine justice, accept the wages of unrighteousness, notwithstanding they are taught that *this eateth, or corrode like fire*: or if they in any-wise contribute towards the extinguishing their brethren's fear of God, or the sensibility and remonstrances of their consciences, or their gospel light, or their graciously in-born dread of wickedness: *THEN*

will their guilt accumulate indeed, proportionably with their mightiness, and they will hardly escape the judgment of Satan, and of his chief angels, and ministering tools to corruption; namely, the being, together with them, *mightily tormented*. The corruption and ruin of mankind, and the populating the infernal regions, is effected principally by example, and most of all by the example of the *mighty*.

These reflections are by no means to be considered as novelties and nostrums of my own, but as principles advanced by the best authors, and occasionally introduced by me to illustrate the point in hand. He must be a man of very little reading who knows not that Mr. Locke has long since maintained that,

#### AS TO PROPERTY,

It being the command of God to all men that they should subdue, or cultivate, the earth, the improver, in doing so, annexes thereto his labour, which being his own natural property, no other man can have any title to.—This labour, annexed to lands before unoccupied, that is unappropriated, gives him an appropriating title to them, on condition only that he leave as much to others, as they can make use of.—Labour therefore is the just ground of every man's title to property, the son inheriting the fruits of his father's toils. For every man, being naturally master of himself, and proprietor of his own labours, will thus have, even within himself, this ground of property—the products of his labours being as it were his creatures, and to which no other man, or body of men, but himself and his offspring only, can have any claim or pretence at all; the exclusive right thereto, and enjoyment thereof, becomes the just foundation of all wealth, or opulency, constituting the difference between a rich man, the son of the industrious, and the poor man, the son of the idler.—Riches then, acquired in righteousness by industry, are the natural reward of industry, either in ourselves or ancestors; and justly so, because, whereas he who cultivates ten acres will thereon produce more fruits than one thousand uncultivated acres will produce, such a cultivator may be

said to give nine hundred and ninety acres out of one thousand to mankind.

That,

#### AS TO NATURAL RIGHT,

Every man's child, being the workmanship of his God, to whom we are all infinitely indebted, has a right to his parent's protection during his minority. The father is only the child's guardian, and as such guardianship, when no longer needed, ceases, the father's power, and right of prescribing, ceases with it. When grown up to manhood, (the state which made his father free,) the son has the same natural right belonging to him, as his father had originally.—Therefore a man's posterity cannot be bound by the compact of his father; for no act of the father can give away the son's natural right, his independence, his liberty, his power of creating, possessing, judging, &c. Every man, when at the age of maturity, has a right to choose what country or government he pleases; he is to choose for himself as an independent creature, born no man's subject, obnoxious to no man.

That, AS TO LIBERTY,

All men are by nature equal and independent, and have equally a right to dispose of their actions, their properties and their persons, as they like, with innocence and justice. It is every man's duty to protect and secure these natural rights and the enjoyment thereof as piously, as steadily and as industriously, to his brethren, as to himself, Exod. ii. 11, 12, and to transmit the same down to posterity unembarrassed.—Licentiousness, which is the greatest enemy to liberty, paying no regard to the natural equality and independence of man, but acting as though power, quâ power, gave a right to every thing, talks as follows, *In armis jus fero, omnia fortium sunt virorum*; who shall forbid me to appropriate to my own use the fruits of diligence; to lay my iron yoke upon the necks of others; to harness them into my service; to force them to do my drudgery? God regardeth it not. In other words, it denies the inseparable relation between nature and liberty, and renounces the principles of humanity, equity and truth; yea it denies the providence of God, dis-

claims his impartial benevolence towards all his creatures, tramples upon his rule of right, defies his omniscience, challenges his vindictive justice, and is the very kingdom of Satan triumphant.\*—And, being an intolerable incendiary among mankind, the peaceable friends of liberty form themselves into an association against it, and lay their restraints upon it, professing that the right of *resisting* is always equal to the right of *commanding* among equals.

That,

#### AS TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT,

This is a community incorporated to prevent the evils arising from licentiousness, its individuals uniting their power, and contributing of their property, for the good of the whole, and to preserve and enlarge their freedom, and to protect each other from unnatural restraint. Hence tribute is due to the just purposes of government, though to the unjust purposes of it, none is due. Whereas no man can transfer to others more power than he has in himself; these associations can only give a power to preserve, and cannot give any power to destroy, enslave, or impoverish individuals. Neither can any human sanctions be good or valid against the

---

\* It is somewhere observed by Mr. Milton, though I cannot find the passage, that "Ignorant and wicked men are naturally lovers of licentiousness, and haters of true liberty." From hence I conclude, that the impetuous zeal of ignorant mobs is always to be suspected; while ignorant and wicked, whatever their cry may be, the spirit of violence, oppression and injustice will infallibly prove their conducting principle; they can never be cordially affected in favour of truth and liberty, so long as impiety, which is the very root of servility and meanness, thrives in their hearts: *semper sola libera est virtus*. Cic. Virtue only is ever free. And it is therefore a Machiavelian maxim, that *If you can but debauch a man's morals, you make sure of him as a slave*. I must however believe that righteous, pious, well-taught mobs (and such mobs will most certainly exist in every righteous, pious, well-taught country) would be able to sustain the character of true majesty, and the reverence of a multitude, with an awe and dignity sufficient to confound the most violent efforts of oppression: *tantum in virtute et fide fiducia atque auctoritatis inest*!



welfare of mankind; the provision for which is the true and just end of all government. Lib. ii. Ch. xi. Absolute power made licentious by impunity, being inconsistent with a society's free exercise of her united and associated force, cannot be justly called a form of government.—Since whatever tends naturally to the good of society, must naturally justify itself; whatever tends naturally to the harm, or to the enfeebling, or to the inconvenience of society, must be as naturally self-condemned.—Hence arises the old proverb, *Summum jus est summa injuria; salus populi suprema lex*. [Law (human) in its rigor, is rigorous injury. The welfare of the people is the greatest law.] That therefore, pretended privileges and customs, when the reason of them ceases, should likewise cease, as being no longer reasonable. For that arguments from what *has* been to what *should* be of right can have no force;—and that otherwise it may happen that men, by entering into a society, may lose those very benefits for which they entered; and be in a worse condition than before they entered, having thereby contributed to, and armed their trustees with their own power, to their own injury.

That,

#### AS TO HUMAN AUTHORITY,

It being impossible for any society to give a right (which it has not itself) to do its members harm, authority abused is no authority at all.—A man may indeed be commissioned to act unjustly, but this argues nothing; for it is not commission, but authority which gives the right of acting; and since no man, or body of men, can have in themselves any right to act unjustly, neither can they transfer such right, or authorize laws under pretence thereof, or as made in pursuance thereto, or vest any such right in any other person or persons whatsoever.\*

---

\* According to these and other like propositions of Mr. Locke, a legislature must be a body constituted by a people to specify and determine, in particular cases, circumstances and occurrences, what is the law and will of God, (for God alone has an absolute right to our obedience) and what rules and customs are conformable or repugnant to the divine truth,

In defiance of their commission and presumption, the right will still continue to every man to act, as freely as ever, in whatsoever is innocent, kind,

---

justice, and universal charity, these being the standards or common measures, whereby right and wrong are always to be decided.—For this purpose and service were the elders or earls among the Jews. Exod. xxiv. 1—10. xii. 16. iv. 29. They were neither Priests nor Levites, but civil, and, in modern phrase, lay-members of the community, men of property, learning and equity, and dignified by public voice for their known worth and abilities, to decide, as their earls, elders, or inferior magistrates, in all their civil controversies, and terminate the common differences of the people. And out of their number was chosen the Sanhedrim, which consisted of seventy-three Senators, six out of each tribe, Num. xi. 16, *to bear the burden of the people* as making one body, and their Nasi or President, who was also, not the high priest, but a civil member only. The power of this court was so supreme, that they not only decided in such causes as were brought before them, by way of appeal, from the inferior courts, but even their kings, high priests and prophets, were under their jurisdiction. See in *Calmet's Dictionary* the word Sanhedrim, paragraph the 5th. They presided to provide, that all their civil laws and usages might be reduced and accommodated, in all points, to the divine law; and it cannot be disputed but this must also be the business of all legislatures. There is indeed strictly, (James iv. 12. Isa. xxxiii. 22,) *but one lawgiver*, who is Christ. Others therefore must be his deputies. And they must be deputed to provide, 1st, That the laws of God be not violated, and 2dly, That they be so extended and particularized to the several occasions and conditions of their constituents, as to answer to them in equity. The law of God is indispensable, therefore all human laws must be made to consist with it. And whereas the natural rights and prerogatives which God has given man, import his revealed will towards man; it becomes a divine law to all men, to secure to every individual among them these native rights and prerogatives unhurt. These must be supported and vindicated as God's free gift and bounty, as claims and immunities against the free and full enjoyment of which no law may be made, or being made, be suffered to operate so as to defeat or invalidate them. The good-will of God to man speaks as his law for him, and, farther than this, as a law *que non tum denique inceptit Lex esse, cum scripta fuit, sed tum cum orta fuit, orta autem*

and just; neither can any one be commissioned to defeat this native freedom; neither will any human decree whatsoever alter the natural equality among men, or make man other than he is;—and since to ordain a thing repugnant to truth is the

*simul est cum mente divina.* Cic. which begun not then only to exist when revealed as such, but from the very time when the divine bounty first begun to exert itself towards him; and this begun at one and the same time with the decreed beneficence of God to the sons of Adam. To this you object, that “a man may part with his natural rights, because such natural rights are every man’s own, and no other’s property.” I reply that this proposition has never yet been proved; but if it were even true, that every man’s natural rights are his own property, and such as he may relinquish personally, and for himself, yet he cannot relinquish them for posterity; and to relinquish them *at all* is in effect, at least as far as we are able, to give away what belongs to posterity; and experience and history shew us, that, by tame surrenders of this kind, posterity is usually enslaved; and where otherwise, that we may however embarrass and distress posterity with such difficulties in the recovery of their native rights and prerogatives, by us so sordidly conceded, as import the highest degree of injustice done them. *It may be presumed*, that to part with the prerogatives given us by God, is an act injurious to his divine bounty, affrontive to his majesty, and such as may obstruct his great, generous and secret purposes in us; *but it is known* that, in condescending thus, we hurt posterity as superlatively as we possibly can, for the natural gifts of God are more valuable than all other goods, *potior metallis libertas.* Hor. Liberty is preferable to riches. Also, posterity being daily born, such injury becomes daily multiplied, repeated, diffused, exaggerated.

In short, (for this point is only a corollary in my dispute with you, I can no longer dwell upon it) unjust laws continued, being a continued act of injustice, must amass vast guilt by continuance, and prove a crying curse in the court of heaven, not only against those who instituted them, but also against those whose duty it is to have them abolished. And every legislature must be blind who sees not this truth so evidently as to be animated with all zeal, indignation, expedition and resolution, to erase such laws at all events and hazards, as abhorrent to the will of God, (which is the one true law throughout the universe) and detestable in his sight.

same thing as to ordain that *what is true shall be false*, and vice versa, such absurdity must denote an extreme blindness and brutality in no-wise better than a disqualifying madness. Also, intrusted power and property, are only fiduciary, or to act for certain ends; therefore whenever the end is manifestly opposed, or defeated, the trust is forfeited, void and insignificant. In this case, the power devolves into the hands that gave it; for, the law of self-preservation being unalienable, no one can have any right, even by donation, to defeat it. So soon as persons intrusted with power act against that trust, and by and according to their private wills and interests, they thereby degrade themselves, perhaps into debtors and criminals, at least into single, private persons, without power, without command, and without any right to obedience: the members of a society owing no obedience immediately to any other than the public will of the society. Lib. II. Ch. xiii.

#### That, AS TO RESISTANCE,

Every intrusted power, when found to be no longer a remedy against the evils it was given to redress, but to be vainly increased without effecting its business, ought to be suppressed by wise and good men. But much more ought every man’s power to be suppressed who seeks his commodity with the injury of others, and is found to be aiming at interests separate from those of the individuals or members, who are his constituents. If it be a part of civil society to prevent their constituents being injured, much more is it so to prevent their being devoured.

Therefore when men in trust have quitted their reason, and renounced the way of peace which this teaches, they have revolted, from their own kind, to that of beasts, by making force to be their rule of right; and are as liable to be destroyed as are other wild beasts, or noxious brutes, with whom mankind can have neither society nor security. Lib. II. Ch. xv.

#### That, AS TO WAR AND CONQUEST,

As voluntary agreement gives a political power, and constitutes the condition of a free people, so a just forfeiture, by a state of war unjustly

begun, gives despotic power, and constitutes the condition of slaves. Although a man may forfeit his own life or liberty by invading or threatening another's life or liberty; yet the aggressor's posterity or children cannot forfeit thereby their lives or liberties; the miscarriages of the father being no fault of his children. An unjust aggressor can never gain a just right by conquest; as a robber, who breaks into your house, and forces you, with a dagger at your throat, to seal deeds conveying your estate to him, gains not thereby any title to your estate. For your plundered property is equally your right when in your plunderer's hands, as while in your own custody, and ought to be restored to you during every minute he withholds it; and while withheld, it amasses the guilt of a continued robbery. Also, the promises extorted by force without right, bind you not at all; in that the law of nature, laying an obligation on you only by the rule she prescribes, cannot oblige you by the violation of her rules.

The trustees of the public may not only forfeit their power to their constituents, but put themselves into a state of war against them; and this they do whenever they manifestly endeavour to destroy the people's authority, or to invade their rights and properties, or to reduce them to a state of dependence, which is slavery, and unnatural. And this endeavour, when overt and manifest, will justify the forfeiture; because when a man's chains are on, it may be too late for him to complain; and to bid him then to beware of his liberty, were mockery instead of relief. Lib. II. Ch. xix. No body of people can, by the faults of others, lose their natural rights.

That, **AS TO REBELLION,**

The use of force without authority puts him who uses it into a state of war, and renders him liable to be treated accordingly. The word rebellion imports a putting one's self into a state of war. He who begins this state of war, by exercising force without right, is the rebel. When they who rebel, or bring back the state of war, by exercising force without right, are the very people chosen to be their protectors and guardians,

whose right they invade, they are rebels with the greatest aggravation of guilt, and the true causes of all the disorders and bloodshed occasioned in the society by its members' efforts to recover their rights. The consequent evils are the effects of the unjust invaders' acts, and must and will undoubtedly be chargeable upon them. Lib. II. Ch. xix. Usurped power having no title to a people's obedience, the rebelling against it is innocent; so we read 2 Kings xvii. 17, "And the Lord was with Hezekiah, and he prospered, wherefore he went forth, and rebelled against the king of Syria, and served him not." If to shake off power gotten by force, and without right, were in itself wrong, it would follow, **NOT ONLY**, that people are sufferers by being innocent, and that they forfeit their natural right of self-defence and protection, because they deserve to enjoy it; **BUT ALSO**, that it is right for the innocent to quit their all, for peace' sake, to every plunderer; and then the labours of mankind would be pursued, and their peace maintained, only for the benefit and enjoyment of robbers and oppressors; which is absurd. Lib. II. Ch. xvi. xix.

These are the principles of Mr. Locke, and I might cite many other approved writers, speaking the same things; but Mr. Locke's universal credit, and renown all over Europe, is a sufficient evidence, that the little above advanced by me on this subject is no novelty, it being fully comprehended in these quoted passages from Mr. Locke, and, I apprehend, justified by them.

June 4, 1817.

*What is Blasphemy ?*

**O**F this horrid crime, Sir, our Saviour was frequently accused by the Jews, who were so blindly attached to their established church; and he forewarned his disciples, that if they called the master of the house Beelzebub, much more would they those of his household. And so indeed it has been. Those who have been most courageous in exposing error, and most active in disseminating truth, can best speak of the tender mercies of those institutions which arrogate to



themselves the name of Christian churches.

Our Saviour frequently foretold his disciples, that they should be persecuted, imprisoned, brought before tribunals and kings, &c. for his name's sake; but he never told them that they should serve others so, if ever it should be in their power. How is this?

But what is *blasphemy*?

Until lately, it was blasphemy in England, a country of boasted freedom, to speak against, or deny, the doctrine of the Trinity; but thanks to the bishops, the English meaning of the word blasphemy has undergone some little modification. We are now allowed to speak against that mysterious and unintelligible credendum. But a sapient critic, if I remember right, has told us by way of monition, that we must use this liberty very gingerly: and so it seems.

Blasphemy is, to speak injuriously of or concerning God, his attributes, his works, his word or his providence, and that intentionally; for without the intention there can be no injurious meaning, no impiety in the speaker. A person may speak in an injurious manner concerning God through mere ignorance or prejudice; in that case, however, he is chargeable with error, not with blasphemy.

In this free and happy country (who will not blush for England?) it is the daily, habitual practice of more than one half of its inhabitants to commit the sin of blasphemy intentionally. For what is the profane language which assails our ears so incessantly; the impious oaths, the savage curses, the hellish imprecations? And the blasphemers are totally destitute of the plea of ignorance and intending well. On the contrary, their habitual conversation possesses all the character of presumptuous sin, of spontaneous wickedness, of wanton guilt, of professed conscious profligacy. In this I am not aware that there is one syllable of exaggeration. No; blasphemous curses urge down the vengeance of heaven on every city, on every town, on every village, on every hamlet, and almost on every house in England. Where are the informers? Where are the prosecutions?

According to the usage of the times in which we live, denying the truth of the Christian religion, or of a future

state, or speaking irreverently concerning curious specimens of composition, which derive their religious character wholly and entirely from acts of the English legislature, is blasphemy.

It must be confessed, that on comparing the evils respectively stated in the two last paragraphs, the latter are much more aggravated than the former; and no one surely can be surprised that their demerits are so admirably appreciated in so enlightened an age.

But how in the name of common sense and consistency, are the Voltaires, the Humes, the Gibbons, the Rousseaus, allowed the privilege of a free toleration, and appear to be welcome guests in the highest circles, in the most genteel society; while poor Tom Paine, and Wat Tyler, and such unfortunate urchins, must hide their diminished heads?

I will next, Sir, state what I am afraid is blasphemy. If a poor preacher, having been himself convinced by the authority of Martin Luther, the renowned Reformer, the potent reasons of the late Dr. Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, father of Dr. Law, the present Bishop of Chester, and of the late Dr. Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland, that the soul has no separate existence from the body, that with the body it dies, and that it will be raised again with the body—should deem it his duty to declare the whole counsel of God to his audience, and this among the rest; and if some blundering wrong-headed animal, with just as much theology in his head as charity in his heart, should choose to understand this as denying a future state, and should make a deposition before a magistrate to that effect; I am afraid, Sir, it would turn out in the end to be blasphemy.

If a person tired with the dulness and ill-success of reasoning soberly against a favourite *abracadabra*, consecrated by the prejudice of the learned and the ignorance of the vulgar, should amuse himself with burlesquing it, in these good times, he would be charged with blasphemy. And though there should be in this self-same *abracadabra* some impious expressions, this would by no means alter the blasphemous character of the travestie; it being in that case the *blasphemy of a blasphemy*. And that certainly must greatly en-

hance its blasphemous quality, being as a square number is to its root.

I have supposed a few cases, concerning which I should be glad to learn from some of your Correspondents whether they think them of a blasphemous character or not.

If upon the death of the most wicked person in a parish, the most reverent person in it should think proper upon a most solemn occasion to say, in the most public manner, that he believed him now a sainted spirit in heaven, would the lie itself, the solemnity of the occasion, the injury to morality by totally confounding the merits of the good and wicked, &c. render him justly liable to the charge of blasphemy?

If a person should be induced on particular occasions to risk the salvation of his soul on the bare ground of his telling the truth, what would be the character of the act? What means, "So help me God"?

If a dissipated, vicious, or irreligious young fellow should avow in the most solemn manner, that he chose a profession in consequence of a solemn mandate communicated immediately from the Deity, while no sensible man can doubt but his choice originated in very different motives, would he be guilty of blasphemy? And if guilty, which of the persons of the Trinity would be blasphemed?

At present I shall say no more on this important subject; but I issue a warning voice, that if any further progress should be made by the furious eruptions vomited forth from the volcano of intolerance, it will behove thousands to provide for their safety.

To be at the mercy of perjurious informers, deposing their vile lies before officers of tried bigotry, and whetted to mischief by the mad rant of renegade versifiers! Good heavens, what a situation!!

#### HOMELY.

#### *The Spaniard's Letters from England.*

(Continued from p. 354.)

##### 13. *Mr. Roscoe.*

**L**ITERATURE also flourishes as fairly as commerce [at Liverpool]. A History of Lorenzo de Medici appeared here about eight years ago, which even the Italians have thought worthy of translation. The libraries

of Florence were searched for materials for this work, and many writings of Lorenzo himself first given to the world in Liverpool. This work of Mr. Roscoe's has diffused a general taste for the literature of Italy. It has been said of men of letters, that, like prophets, they have no honour in their own country;—but to this saying to which there are so few exceptions, one honourable one is to be found here. The people of Liverpool are proud of their townsman: whether they read his book or not, they are sensible it has reflected honour upon their town in the eyes of England and of Europe, and they have a love and jealousy of its honour, which has seldom been found any where except in those cities where that love was nationality, because the city and the state were the same. This high and just estimation of Mr. Roscoe is the more praiseworthy, because he is known to be an enemy to the Slave Trade, the peculiar disgrace of Liverpool.

##### 14. *University of Cambridge.*

"What a happy life," said I to our Cambridge friend, "must you lead in your English universities! You have the advantages of a monastery without its restrictions, the enjoyments of the world without its cares,—the true *otium cum dignitate*." He shook his head and answered, "It is a joyous place for the young, and a convenient place for all of us,—but for none is it a happy one:"—and he soon convinced me that I was mistaken in the favourable judgment which I had formed. I will endeavour to retrace the substance of a long and interesting evening's conversation.

It is a joyous place for the young,—joy and happiness however are not synonymous. They come hither from school, no longer to be treated as children; their studies and their amusement are almost at their own discretion, and they have money at command. But as at college they first assume the character of man, it is there also that they are first made to feel their relative situation in society. Schools in England, especially those public ones from which the universities are chiefly supplied, are truly republican. The master perhaps will pay as much deference to rank as he possibly can, and more than he honestly ought;—it is however but little that

he can pay; the institutions have been too wisely framed to be counteracted, and titles and families are not regarded by the boys. The distinctions which they make are in the spirit of a barbarous, not of a commercial calculating people; bodily endowments hold the first, mental the second place. The best bruiser enjoys the highest reputation; next to him, but after a long interval, comes the best cricket-player, the third place, at a still more respectful distance, is allowed to the cleverest, who in the opinion of his fellows always takes place of the best scholar. In the world,—and the college is not out of it like the cloister,—all this is reversed into its right order; but the gifts of fortune are placed above all. Whatever habits and feelings of equality may have been generated at school, are to be got rid of at college,—and this is soon done. The first thing which the new student perceives on his arrival is, that his school-fellows who are there before him pass him in the street as if they knew him not, and perhaps stare him full in the face, that he may be sure it is not done through inadvertency. The ceremony of introduction must take place before two young men who for years have eaten at the same table, studied in the same class, and perhaps slept in the same chamber,—can possibly know each other when they meet at college.

There is to be found every where a great number of those persons whom we cannot prove to be human beings by any rational characteristic which they possess; but who must be admitted to be so, by a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*, because they cannot possibly be any thing else. They pass for men, in the world, because it has pleased God for wise purposes, however inscrutable to us, to set them upon two legs instead of four; to give them smooth skins and no tail, and to enable them to speak without having their tongues slit. They are like those weeds which will spring up and thrive in every soil and every climate, and which no favourable circumstances can ever improve into utility. It is of little consequence whether they shoot water-fowl, attend horse-races, frequent the brothel, and encourage the wine trade in one place or another; but as a few years of this kind of life usually satisfy a man for the rest of it, it is convenient

that there should be a place appointed where one of this description can pass through this course of studies out of sight of his relations, and without injuring his character; and from whence he can come with the advantage of having been at the University, and a qualification which enables him to undertake the cure of souls. The heretical bishops never inquire into the moral conduct of those upon whom they lay their unhallowed hands,—and as for the quantity of learning which is required, M. Maillardet who exhibits his Androides in London, could put enough into an automaton.

Such men as these enjoy more happiness, such as their happiness is, at the University than during any other part of their lives. It is a pleasant place also for the lilies of the world, they who have neither to toil nor to spin; but for those who have the world before them, there is perhaps no place in their whole journey where they feel less at ease. It is the port from whence they are to embark,—and who can stand upon the beach and look upon the sea whereon he is about to trust himself and his fortunes, without feeling his heart sink at the uncertainty of the adventure? True it is that these reflections do not continue long upon a young man's mind, yet they occur so often as insensibly to affect its whole feelings. The way of life is like the prospect from his window,—he beholds it not while he is employed, but in the intervals of employment, when he lifts up his eyes, the prospect is before him. The frequent change of his associates is another melancholy circumstance. A sort of periodical and premature mortality takes place among his friends: term after term they drop off to their respective allotments, which are perhaps so distant from his own, that years may elapse, or the whole lease of life be run out, before he ever again meets with the man, whom habits of daily and intimate intercourse had endeared to him.

Let us now suppose the student to be successful in his collegiate pursuits, he obtains a fellowship—and is, in the opinion of his friends, provided for for life. Settled for life he would indeed have been according to the original institution, and it still is a provision for him as long as he retains



it,—but mark the consequences of the schism,—of altering the parts of an establishment without considering their relations to the whole. A certain number of benefices belong to the college, to which as they become vacant the fellows succeed according to seniority, vacating their fellowships by accepting a benefice, or by marrying. Here one of the evils of a married clergy is perceived. Where celibacy is never regarded as a virtue, it is naturally considered as a misfortune. Attachments are formed more easily perhaps in this country than in any other, because there is little restraint in the intercourse between the sexes, and all persons go so much from home into public. But the situation of the college-fellow who has engaged his affections, is truly pitiable. Looking with envious eyes at those above him on the list, and counting the ages of those who hold the livings for which he is to wait, he passes years after years in this disquieting and wretched state of hope. The woman in like manner wears away her youth in dependant expectation, and they meet at last, if they live to meet, not till the fall of the leaf,—not till the habits and tempers of both are become fixt and constitutional, so as no longer to be capable of assimilating, each to the other.

I inquired what were the real advantages of these institutions to the country at large, and to the individuals who study in them. “They are of this service,” he replied, “to the country at large, that they are the great schools by which established opinions are inculcated and perpetuated. I do not know that men gain much here, yet it is a regular and essential part of our system of education, and they who have not gone through it always feel that their education has been defective. A knowledge of the world, that is to say of our world and of the men in it, is gained here, and that knowledge remains when Greek and geometry are forgotten.” I asked him which was the best of the two universities; he answered that Cambridge was as much superior to Oxford, as Oxford was to Salamanca. I could not forbear smiling at his scale of depreciation: he perceived it and begged my pardon, saying, that he as little intended to undervalue the establish-

ments of my country, as to over-rate the one of which he was himself a member. “We are bad enough,” said he, “heaven knows, but not so bad as Oxford. They are now attempting to imitate us in some of those points wherein the advantage on our part is too notorious to be disputed. The effect may be seen in another generation; meantime the imitation is a confession of inferiority.”

“Still,” said I, “we may regard the universities as the seats of learning and of the Muses.” “As for the Muses, Sir,” said he, “you have traversed the banks of the Cam, and must know whether you have seen any nine ladies there who answer their description. We do certainly produce verses both Greek and Latin which are worthy of gold medals, and English ones also after the newest and most approved receipt for verse-making. Of learning, such as is required for the purposes of tuition, there is much,—beyond it, except in mathematics, none. In this we only share the common degeneracy. The Mohammedans believe that when Gog and Magog are to come, the race of men will have dwindled to such littleness, that a shoe of one of the present generation will serve them for a house. If this prophecy be typical of the intellectual diminution of the species, Gog and Magog may soon be expected in the neighbourhood of their own hills.

“The truth is, Sir,” he continued, “that the institutions of men grow old like men themselves, and, like women, are always the last to perceive their own decay. When universities were the only schools of learning, they were of great and important utility; as soon as there were others, they ceased to be the best, because their forms were prescribed, and they could adopt no improvement till long after it was generally acknowledged. There are other causes of decline.—We educate for only one profession: when colleges were founded, that one was the most important; it is now no longer so; they who are destined for the others find it necessary to study elsewhere, and it begins to be perceived that this is not a necessary stage upon the road. This might be remedied. We have professors of every thing, who hold their situations and do nothing. In Edinburgh, the income of the pro-

essor depends upon his exertions, and in consequence the reputation of that university is so high, that Englishmen think it necessary to finish their education by passing a year there. They learn shallow metaphysics there, and come back worse than they went, inasmuch as it is better to be empty than flatulent."

[To be continued.]

SIR, Warrington, 8th April, 1817.

IT having long been a desideratum with all classes of Dissenters to have every civil disability, on account of religious sentiment removed from our code of laws, I conceive it to be incumbent upon each individual to do all in his power towards the accomplishment of such an object. Permit me then to lay my thoughts before the readers of the Repository upon the Ceremony of Matrimony. I am one of those who think this ought to be considered a civil, rather than a religious service. As, however, this change can only be effected by a legislative enactment, of which as yet there seems but little probability, we must be content to be joined in wedlock by the dictum of a minister of the gospel: and as the law now stands, this minister must be one of the Established Church. One sect only is exempt from this servile submission. I shall not now notice the many objectionable passages in the prescribed form, which are obnoxious to purity of taste and purity of mind. But as an Unitarian, I do protest against a statute, which allows no alternative, but that the great bulk of our fellow-subjects shall, in such cases, repair to a temple, consecrated for Trinitarian worship, join in a service with a minister ordained to such worship, and at the close of the ceremony receive from him a benediction, which, to say the least, bears the stamp of inconsistency to one who believes his God to be one undivided person. As in the instance of the Slave Trade, we have witnessed the march of mind caused by the laudable perseverance of individuals in a virtuous cause, I think a similar perseverance in each successive session, pursued by the enlightened and indefatigable advocates of civil and religious liberty in the great senate of the nation, would as certainly, and perhaps

VOL. XII.

3 G

more speedily, procure for the Dissenters the privilege to be married by their own ministers, as well as the removal of all illiberal restrictions for conscience' sake.

The case referred to by J. F. [XI. 591,] of a clergyman having refused to marry a person, because she had not been baptized, materially enhances the importance of speedily procuring such relief: for I fully agree with J. F. that the number of Anti-baptists is rapidly increasing.

It is nevertheless certain, that the established clergy will defend most strenuously their exclusive right to the performance of this service, so long as it is accompanied by any considerable emoluments. By curtailing the emoluments, we should greatly facilitate the object in view. And such curtailment is completely in our power. The legal fee for the performance of a marriage service is trifling. It has, however, been customary with all classes, except the poor, gratuitously to enlarge the fee according to the rank of the parties. Besides which, the happy pair or their attendants are assailed by a whole host of subaltern church officers. The clerk, the ringers, the singers, (and in one instance which I witnessed, the sexton and the sexton's assistant) levy a contribution upon the poor bridegroom's benevolence; thinking, I suppose, that the happy man will at such a moment hesitate not to reward every one attached to the sacred edifice, which has been the instrument of his induction, as J. F. emphatically expresses it, into "the only bliss of paradise which has survived the fall."

Let then the minister of each Dissenting society compose a form of marriage service, and henceforth let every Dissenter be married by his or her own minister, and pay to him, and to him only, such gratuitous fee as they can afford and think proper. And since the existing law requires that the service shall be repeated by a clergyman of the Established Church, the already wedded pair must submit to be again married *secundum legem*. But let them not pay one iota more than the fees enjoined by law. Thus will the scanty incomes of our own ministers be increased, and when the church finds itself thus deprived of the

pecuniary object in this arbitrary obligation, she will soon abandon the obligation itself.

I would urge the immediate adoption of my plan, if approved. I, myself, have no personal interest or object in the arrangement recommended. I am already happily united in J. F.'s "paradisaical bliss," and I pray Divine Providence to continue my present connexion, until the time shall arrive when I shall with pious resignation, have my views more nearly fixed upon that future world, where there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage.

MARITUS.

SIR, Bath, 10th May, 1817.

THE mayor and town clerk of Liverpool appear to be either totally ignorant of the gospel, or disposed to persecute all its rational expositors. If they had had any acquaintance with its true doctrines, they must have known that Unitarianism is its uniform foundation from beginning to the end; or they must have charged Jesus himself with blasphemy, on the same declaration, on which they have urged this accusation against Mr. Wright. For the Lord Jesus, in his solemn address to the Father, calls him the only true God, and declares himself to be his ambassador. The apostle Peter also says, Jesus Christ was a man approved of God by many signs and wonders, which God wrought by him in the midst of the Jews, and that God raised him from the dead, whereas God himself can never die: and the apostle Paul declares, that though there be many who are called gods, yet Christians acknowledge only one God, the Father. Besides, persecutors always bring false charges against those who are obnoxious to their displeasure. There were many false witnesses employed against the Lord Jesus himself. Heathen and Popish persecutors have always ignominiously aspersed the victims of their malice. The persecutors of Mr. Wright have followed their example. We should, therefore, in all cases distinguish falsehood from truth; and, as Christians, we should judge no man, lest we bring judgment on ourselves, but leave every one to follow the faith which was once delivered to the saints, according to

the dictates of his own mind. Otherwise, we shall become the degraded followers of the present Pope Pius, who is so great an enemy to the reading of the Scriptures, unless we first adopt his explanation of them—which may be, for aught we know, that we must believe what we cannot understand, or what we understand to be impossible, else we must perish everlastingly. Alas, when shall men become wise and good, treating one another as they would be treated themselves? When shall we all come to receive the truth as it is in Jesus? How happy a world should we then behold, seeing heaven to begin on earth! There would then be no more wars and fightings, no calumny, no hypocrisy, nothing but love to God and good-will to men, all striving together to become pure and holy, and to do all the good in our power to all our fellow-creatures.

W. H.

P. S. In your last Number, [p. 224,] you inserted *Root* instead of *Booth*, Boston.

SIR, June 1st, 1817.

THE subject of registration of places for Dissenting worship, is one that interests most materially every class and denomination of Protestant Dissenters; and each class will find subject of alarm, in the detail of the investigation of the case of Mr. John Wright, before the Quarter Sessions, at Liverpool. The point more particularly requiring the serious consideration of the larger body of Dissenters, is that which was very strenuously maintained by the supporters of the information, respecting such places as are registered "*being set apart*" for religious worship. The cause of Dissent has owed so much in its rise and progress, in most parts of the kingdom, to the exercise of religious worship in a room or in apartments of a dwelling-house; and this plan is now so much more generally in practice among those who preach in villages, or visit them for the purpose of assisting in religious worship in places where no particular building is devoted to that purpose, that it becomes a matter for serious consideration whether legal objections can be maintained successfully against



such practices—if they can, it will seem, that one of the Rev. Mr. Raffles' congregation, in his zeal, by legal modes, to suppress a meeting of persons espousing sentiments opposed to those of his class, has been drawing down more mischief on his own party than they will thank him for; and it is to be hoped, this will induce the whole party to shew, that in future they have their zeal exercised only under the direction of knowledge. But my object in troubling you with these lines is, to request of some of your legal friends, to consider the subject and give such information upon it, as will satisfy the friends (and practisers) of freedom of religious worship, of their security in persevering in their plans.

NON CON.

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

No. CCCVIII.

*"No man can serve two Masters."*

Burnet (Hist. of his Own Times,) relates, under the date 1675, that Charles the Second's measures were so plainly French and Popish, that "many of the court were glad to be out of the way at critical times," and "on some occasions would venture to vote against the court;" of which he gives "a noted instance," in "the memorable answer of *Harvey's*, who was treasurer to the Queen." "He was one whom the king loved personally, and yet upon a great occasion he voted against that which the king desired. So the king chid him severely for it. Next day, another important question falling in, he voted as the king would have him. So the king took notice of it at night, and said, *you were not against me to-day*. He answered, *No, Sir, I was against my conscience to-day*."

No. CCCIX.

*Murders in Battle.*

It appears strange that in an age which hallowed and consecrated knighthood, a synod assembled in England, under William the Conqueror, should have enjoined every knight or military tenant, who had been with that monarch at the battle

of Hastings, to do penance during one year, for every man whom he knew he had slain there, and during forty days for every man whom he knew he had struck, and if he was ignorant of the number whom he had slain or struck, to do penance, at the discretion of the Bishop of the Diocese, one day in every week as long as he lived; without even excepting those, *who*, they say in the preamble to these very canons, *did of right owe military service to William Duke of Normandy*. But an alternative was granted by the church to these delinquents, which may explain the motive of the seeming humanity of the canons; the penances might be redeemed with perpetual alms, by building or endowing a church. There is one of these canons, however, which for the benefit of mankind, one could wish were received by all nations. It is the sixth, which says, *Let those who fought only for hopes of a reward know, that they ought to do penance as for murder*.

No. CCCX.

*A Patriot's Sentiment.*

I have never loved any parties, but with my utmost zeal have sincerely espoused the great and original interest of this nation and of all nations, I mean *truth and liberty*, and whoever are of that party, I desire to be with them.

*De Foe. Hist. of Union, p. 213.*

No. CCCXI.

*A Prayer from Arnobius.*

*Da veniam, Rex Supreme, tuos persequentibus famulos; et quod tuæ benignitatis est proprium, fugientibus ignosce tui nominis et religionis cultum. Non est mirum si ignoraris; majoris est admirationis si sciaris.*

Forgive, Almighty Power, the persecutors of thy servants; and in the peculiar benevolence of thy nature, pardon those men whose unhappiness it is to be strangers to thy name and worship. That they should be ignorant of thy Divine nature, is less the subject of wonder, than that any finite being should presume to know Thee aright.

## REVIEW.

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

### ART. I.

#### UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY IN SCOTLAND.

[Concluded from p. 269.]

*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.

UNITARIANS revere the Scriptures; but they do not hold the English translation sacred: Unitarians revere the Scriptures; but they know that every syllable of the received text is not an exact transcript of the original record; they are therefore anxious to distinguish what is genuine from what is spurious, and in this investigation they prove their willingness to follow the best guides, and to adhere rigidly to those rules by which all agree, that questions of this sort ought to be decided. Unitarians revere the Scriptures; but they prefer those interpretations of doubtful and difficult passages, which agree with natural, and harmonize with the clear and uniform tenour of revealed religion, to those which contradict both. Unitarians revere the Scriptures; but they wish to shew their reverence by deducing their religious opinions entirely from a pure text, aided by liberal and enlightened criticism: not by assuming an hypothesis, and endeavouring to establish it on the corruptions which the lapse of time has introduced into the Sacred Records, and the obscurities which have arisen from ancient manners, usages and phrases. Yet Mr. Wardlaw uniformly speaks as though

it were an indisputable and undisputed truth, that Unitarians never respect the Scriptures, but when the Scriptures seem to favour their preconceived opinions: that they make reason their God, and Scripture its throne; that whenever any difficult passage comes in their way, they observe no sort of ceremony; they make the shortest work imaginable of it: without reason or pretence of reason they say—“ Oh, the text is certainly wrong here: this will not comport with the system; this must be an interpolation!” and then by the aid of Griesbach, the Improved Version and the most “ latitudinarian and licentious principles,” the grand peculiarities of the gospel, all that gives it vitality and soul, are made to disappear. Then an alarm is sounded against “ the pride of philosophy, misnamed theology, whose only object is to pervert the Scriptures from their obvious and simple meaning” (Pref. to Unit. Incap. of Vind.), against the wickedness which endeavours “ to make the common people jealous and distrustful of that translation of the Bible in which they have been accustomed to confide:” (ibid.) against a most dangerous and faithless set of personages called “ Unitarian geographers,” who “ endeavour by the discovery of false readings, false renderings, and false interpretations, to lay down a map of the way to heaven, entirely different from the one which is there so distinctly delineated.” (Pref., &c.) Next when a syllable must not be breathed against the authorities to which Unitarians appeal, bursts forth “ indignant disdain of that provoking yet pitiful disingenuousness, which is for ever, in the case of the uninformed, vaunting of the authority of Griesbach; making its incessant appeal, in terms of unqualified generality, and in tones of triumphant confidence, to the text of Griesbach,—as if no one could reasonably pretend to know any thing of apostolic doctrine, unless he were familiar with Griesbach;—as if the whole texture of the New Testament,

warp and woof, had, on this subject at least, been thoroughly changed by him; as if 'Scripture and Scripture's laws lay hid in night,' till 'God said, 'Let Griesbach be, and all was light.''' (Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 33, 34.) And last of all is assumed a louder and deeper, and more threatening tone: "To wrest the Scriptures is, in the highest degree, dishonouring to their Divine Author. It is doing to him what is felt and revealed by a fellow-creature, as one of the grossest of insults. By wilfully perverting from its true meaning, (that is, from the meaning which we are sensible the spirit of truth intended it to convey,) any passage of the word of God; or by applying it to a purpose which it was not designed to serve, we are guilty, not of a slight and venial fault, but of a crime of deep and aggravated enormity; a crime, the very thought of which should make us tremble. It is nothing less, than imputing to the Author of truth, sentiments contrary to what he meant to express; making the God of immutable veracity a liar; attempting to impress the seal of heaven on falsehood and forgery. This is high treason against the Divine Majesty."\* (Discourses, pp. 36, 37.)

Why is all this? Why are Unitarians thus incessantly charged with perverting the Scriptures, and menaced with the fury of the Divine wrath for this heinous crime? Their language is—"Prove that a text is a genuine part of Scripture; prove that the interpretation you propose is most consistent with the terms in which the passage is expressed, and with the clear and uniform tenour of Scrip-

ture, and we will admit its truth, however difficult or mysterious it may be." "Let me but know clearly, that God has signified his mind and will; and then, let the subject be ever so unfathomable by me, I will receive and believe it; because no better reason can possibly be given for any thing, than that God hath said it." (Lindsey.)—The language of Trinitarians is—"This is the word of God, and if this be not the meaning of it, all Scripture is fallacious and absurd. If the Bible do not contain such and such doctrines,—the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, for example, we will burn it!"—Which language indicates the greater reverence of the Scriptures?

The very principle on which the system of Trinitarianism is founded; that without which it cannot stand a single instant, and which Mr. Wardlaw himself calls the principle of Trinitarian interpretation, namely, that the second person in the Trinity was so united to the man Christ Jesus as to form but one person, retaining the Divine in conjunction with the human nature, appears to us to imply a greater practical contempt of the Scriptures than is to be paralleled in the whole history of Unitarianism. It places an hypothesis, previously assumed as true, above the revelation which it affects to explain; it fills the mind with a theory, which must prevent it from attaining the truth, should the truth, (which the most staunch believer in the Trinity must allow is *possible*) be contrary to the theory; it uniformly, and as a matter of course, brings the text to the system, not the

\* It is true this passage is not expressly applied to Unitarians, but one can hardly help suspecting Mr. Wardlaw designed that his hearers should apply it to them: for he appears always to take it for granted that Unitarians alone can pervert the Scriptures. Trinitarians are in no danger of incurring the guilt: the idea of the probability of it seems never to enter their minds. "I am precluded," says Mr. Wardlaw, (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 38,) "from the use of points of admiration; but the intelligent reader, I should fancy, will be disposed to supply a triad of them, when he finds Mr. Yates censuring Trinitarians for their non-adherence to those severe and unaccommodating rules of interpretation which he has laid down. This from a Unitarian! Mr.

Yates must excuse me, but I really could not read the charge without a smile!"—This self-complacency would be very amusing, if one could avoid pitying the person, who in reply to the evidence adduced of his having grossly mis-stated the opinions of a whole body of Christians, deems it sufficient, with an air which shews that he is upon the very best terms with himself, to repeat his calumny. "Truly, the laxity of *their* views respecting the plenary inspiration and universal authority of the Scriptures, is a matter of such flagrant and lamentable notoriety, that I feel no anxiety to defend myself on this head from the charge of misrepresentation, to any who are at all acquainted with their writings." Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 23.



system to the text; it leads the mind to inquire, not, What says the Scripture? What is the precise meaning of these terms? What is the scope of this argument? What is the object of this series of observation? What should I think had I never heard of systems or isms or wonderful keys?—But how can this passage be reconciled with the hypothesis? How can it be made to support the system? How may the key be introduced so as to move among the wards of this intricate lock without a touch of interruption? And accordingly this hypothesis is so dear to the persons who assume it, that they always value it far above the Scriptures: the real feeling of their mind is—Whatever the Scriptures teach, it *must* be something consistent with this hypothesis; and many, very many of them say, if it be not so, the Scripture must be false: it is full of contradiction and absurdity; it will not do; we will give it up; we will burn our Bibles.

There is nothing for which Unitarians have been visited with more obloquy; nothing which has excited against them more horror; nothing which has tended more to represent them in the view of the multitude, as “contemners of God and enemies of the cross of Christ,” and to make even the more candid orthodox believer say, without doubt they must perish everlastingly, than their rejection of the doctrine of Atonement—and certainly there is no impression which the modern advocates of this doctrine have laboured with more earnestness and more success to keep up and to strengthen. And yet these very advocates themselves totally abandon the doctrine: they no more believe it than they believe the doctrine of purgatory; they deprive Unitarians of the Christian name and consign them to unutterable torments in hell-fire for ever, for not admitting the truth of what they themselves expressly deny. Every one who has read with care the modern defences of this dogma must have been struck with this fact; but Mr. Wardlaw has afforded such demonstration of it, that we cannot help directing the attention of the reader particularly to it, and offering this gentleman our sincere congratulations on the light which, on this subject, has beamed upon his mind. He has

levelled with his own hand this middle wall of partition between us; he is no longer a stranger and an alien; with a safe conscience may he give the right hand of fellowship to his revered and beloved friend Mr. Belsham, for on this one point at least, they are agreed, that the doctrine of the atonement is “utterly inconsistent with the grandeur and majesty of the Divine administration.”

What is the doctrine of atonement? Hear Luther,—“Christ became the greatest transgressor, murderer, thief, rebel and blasphemer that ever was or could be in all the world; for he being made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, is not now an innocent person and without sin, is not now the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, but a sinner. When, therefore, the law found him among thieves, it condemned and killed him as a thief”! Hear Calvin,—“Christ makes the Father favourable and merciful unto us—God appeases himself through the blood of the cross. There is no other satisfaction by which God being displeased may be made favourable and appeased.”—Hear the Confession of Faith,—“Christ, by his obedience did fully discharge the debt of all those who are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf.”

If, then, these standards of the orthodox faith may be presumed to know what the doctrine of atonement is, and if there be any meaning in language, this doctrine teaches, that Christ did endure in the garden and on the cross all the misery which, on account of their transgressions, would have been inflicted upon those who are saved throughout eternity; that in consequence of this suffering God was appeased, and became “favourable and merciful,” being pleased to accept the sufferings of his Son, in the place of those due to the real offenders.

In his discourse on the doctrine of atonement, Mr. Wardlaw proposes to illustrate and prove the five following propositions:—

“1. It is in consideration of the sacrifice of Christ, that God is propitious to sinners. 2. In pardoning the guilty on this ground, God displays his righteousness. 3. The ground on which the pardon of sin is bestowed, has been, in every age, and under every dispensation, the same.

4. An interest in the pardoning mercy of God, through Jesus Christ, is obtained by faith. 5. In resting our hope of forgiveness on the atoning sacrifice of Christ, we build on a sure foundation." \*

"The proper idea of *propitiation*," he adds,† "is, *rendering the Divine Being propitious or favourable*.—We must beware, however, of understanding by this, any thing like the production of a change in the Divine character; as if the blessed God required a motive to pity, an inducement to be merciful, a price for love and grace. Far be such a thought from our minds! We ought to conceive of Jehovah as eternally, infinitely, and immutably compassionate and merciful. That any transition is produced in his nature, by the mediation of Christ, from previous vindictive cruelty to benevolence and pity, (as the advocates of the doctrine of atonement are, either through ignorance or a worse principle, accustomed to speak) is a supposition full of blasphemous impiety. God has been from eternity, and to eternity must continue the same; 'without variableness or the shadow of turning.' Being absolutely perfect, he cannot change to the better; for perfection cannot be improved. The slightest alteration, therefore, of what he is, would deduct from that infinite excellence, without which he could not be God."

This is still farther illustrated by the following important observation, which we could wish every reader to impress upon his mind, as the opinion of one of the most zealous and popular defenders of the orthodox faith.

"The rendering the Divine Being propitious, in this view, refers, it is obvious, (and the distinction is one of great importance on this subject) not to the *production* of love in his character, or in the particular state of his mind towards fallen men, but simply to the *mode* of *its expression*. The inquiry is, how may the blessed God express his love, so as effectually to express, at the same time, his infinite and immutable abhorrence of sin; and thus, in making known the riches of his mercy, to display, in connexion with it, the inflexibility of his justice, and the unsullied perfection of his holiness."—P. 207.

Now this is not the orthodox, but the Arian view of the doctrine of atonement, expressed too, in the very language of the Arian hypothesis.

"By offering himself a sacrifice on the cross, he vindicated the honour of those laws which sinners had broken,

and rendered the exercise of favour to them consistent with the holiness and wisdom of God's government." *Sermons on the Christian Doctrine. By Richard Price, D. D. S. III. p. 85.*

We would therefore earnestly appeal to the good sense and correct feeling of Mr. Wardlaw, whether it be ingenuous or just to judge so harshly of Unitarians, and to endeavour to exhibit them to that part of the Christian world whose ear he has, as objects of so much horror; as persons who are in the utmost danger of perishing everlastingly, for rejecting a doctrine, respecting which a great many of them think as he himself does; and the remaining number of whom depart much less widely from his own opinion than he does from the orthodox standards.

At page 212 of the discourses, occurs the following singular passage:—

"While it appears a most important scriptural truth, that something equivalent, in the eye of Divine justice, to the punishment of the sinner, was, in the view and for the reasons which have been stated, absolutely necessary in order to his escape, I do not think there is any thing in the word of God, that warrants the representation which has been given, by some of the friends of this doctrine, as if the sufferings of Christ formed what they call an *exact equivalent*—neither less nor more—for the sins of all who shall be saved by his atonement. This sentiment seems derogatory to the infinite dignity of the sufferer, and the consequent infinite value of his sacrifice. The sufferings of the Son of God ought not to be brought into comparison, as a display of the Divine righteousness, with even the eternal sufferings of millions of his creatures. The idea of exact equivalent proceeds on the supposition, that the sufferings of Christ possessed just as much virtue as is sufficient for the salvation of all who shall be saved; whose precise proportion of punishment he is conceived to have borne, according to the guilt even of each particular sin. I know not how *you* may feel, my brethren; but *my* mind, I own, revolts from this sort of minutely calculating process on such a subject; weighing out the precise quantum of suffering due to each sin of each individual who obtains forgiveness; and there, of course, limiting the sufficiency of the surety's mediation.—Such views have always appeared to me utterly inconsistent with the grandeur and majesty of this wonderful part of the Divine administration."

Here Mr. Wardlaw distinctly affirms, that the language generally held

\* Discourses, p. 193.

† Ib. p. 205.

on this subject is inconsistent with its grandeur and majesty, and derogatory to Christ; yet while he pleads for the term *equivalent*, he objects to the phrase *exact equivalent*. Jesus Christ paid an equivalent to the Divine justice, but he did not pay an exact equivalent; and while it is absolutely essential to salvation to believe that he paid an equivalent, it is derogatory to him to suppose that he paid an exact equivalent! Now this is a distinction, which, as coming from a grave polemic, one should think it impossible ever to forget. In precise language (and where eternal salvation is at stake, surely it ought to be precise) there cannot, in the nature of things, be an equivalent without its being exact: the addition of the term exact to that of equivalent is a tautology; for if I pay an equivalent for a thing, I pay precisely what that thing is, upon the whole, deemed to be worth. Whatever objections therefore lie against the application of the phrase—"an exact equivalent," to this subject, must in the nature of things apply to the term *equivalent*; for the first is nothing more than a redundant expression of the last.

If it be said that a person may receive as an equivalent what is not really so, it must be admitted that he may; but then it is a palpable inaccuracy to say, that he receives an equivalent. If it be argued that the case is similar with regard to the subject we are considering; that Jesus Christ does not pay to God an equivalent, but something which he is pleased to accept as an equivalent, this is a proof that the original doctrine of satisfaction is abandoned and ought to be distinctly marked.

Mr. Wardlaw adds, p. 239:—

"It is common to speak of the *blessings of salvation* as purchased by the death of Christ for his people; nor is there any heresy, or material error, in such modes of expression. In the New Testament, however, I think it is almost invariably the case that when the idea of *purchase* is introduced, it is the purchase of the persons themselves. For them the price is paid. They are 'the redeemed of the Lord,'—his 'purchased possession'—his peculiar property:—redeemed from the bondage of sin and Satan, into 'the glorious liberty of the children of God;' redeemed from death and hell, to the possession and hope of spiritual and eternal

life. 'Ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price.'"

This again is precisely the Unitarian view of the subject, and that view can scarcely be stated in more exact language. If theologians deemed it an imperative duty to affix a precise meaning to the terms they employ, and were anxious to ascertain the exact sense in which they are used by each other, how much less would the differences which divide them appear! How many uncharitable feelings would be checked! How many angry invectives would be suppressed! How much true glory would be shed on our common Christianity!

Mr. Wardlaw charges the Unitarians of Scotland with giving an exaggerated account of their number, and being very boastful of their day of small things; and accompanies his accusation with a pious prayer, that it may long continue a day of small things and a confident prediction that it shall long continue such.

"It is not of *their* doctrine," he says, (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 396), "that God hath said, 'It shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.' It is not to *their* 'planting,' or to *their* 'watering,' that he has promised to 'give an increase.' They have sown their 'handful,' not of 'corn,' but of tares; and they are looking for a plentiful crop. But, 'the Lord of the harvest,' we trust, will disappoint their expectations. Their seed want the showers of the Divine blessing; and never, either on the mountains or in the valleys of Caledonia, shall it 'shake with prosperous fruit.' It shall be 'as the grass on the house-tops, which withereth before it groweth up; wherewith the mower filleth not his hand, nor he that bindeth sheaves, his bosom.'"

Notwithstanding the bold presumption of infallibility and the self-complacent spiritual pride which this language implies, and even notwithstanding the fearful prediction it contains, we hope and believe the Unitarians of Scotland will persevere undismayed in the unreserved and intrepid avowal of what they conceive to be the truth as it is in Jesus. They may not be numerous; the applause of listening and admiring multitudes, the reward of the cherisher of deep-rooted prejudices and favourite passions may not be their's; and for their fidelity, they



may be visited with all sort of obloquy, misrepresentation and abuse. Mr. Wardlaw, and such men as Mr. Wardlaw, may do every thing in their power to increase the popular odium against them, and to make the whole religious community of Scotland regard them with horror. They will not be moved. They have duties to perform to their conscience and their God, which make them look with comparative indifference on the good and the ill opinion of their fellow-men. With calm and steady attention to the evidence before them, to form their own judgment on the great concerns of religion and obedience; boldly to avow the conclusions to which their investigations may conduct them; and to worship their Creator according to the dictates of their conscience, are rights of which, thank God, they cannot be deprived; and which they know how to value and how to exercise. They may suffer in their reputation; they may even suffer in their property, and they may suffer from the importunities and resentments of their families and friends: but their duty to the truth they know is paramount to every earthly consideration, and will not allow them to hesitate a moment respecting the course they must adopt. The time, they reflect, is short; an awful responsibility, they feel, attaches to them; and when their last earthly hour shall arrive (as soon it must arrive) and the mind shall involuntarily look back upon the conduct of life, they are well aware, they will be unable to endure the consciousness that they have countenanced what they conceived to be error on the most momentous subjects, because it was countenanced by the multitude; that they have suffered the ignorant and bigoted cry of heresy and blasphemy to frighten them from their adherence to the simplicity of the gospel; that they have sacrificed their integrity to their ease, and purchased a false peace at the expense of a blameless conscience. No,—they tremble at the thought of standing before the bar of him who is appointed to be their judge, and who died a martyr to the truth, with the inward conviction that they have shrunk from the few inconveniences to which an adherence to it may now subject them; and they

are resolved not to expose themselves to the peril of his disapprobation, because the multitude clamour against them, and because they are reproached with being few—from fear or from shame. To meet together for public worship, and to conduct that worship according to their own views of scriptural truth, is a duty from the obligation of which nothing can release them; and where circumstances will not allow them to form a society, or to join in public worship, their own dwellings ought to become their temples and themselves the ministers, offering to the Great Father of their spirits, the only God, the sincere adoration of their hearts, according to the simplicity of the uncorrupted gospel, and through their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is not to gain converts that they hold their public meetings; it is to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience: it is not the zeal of proselytism which animates them; it is the wish to discharge their duty. And if they do avail themselves of these public occasions to state their opinions; if, while there is a combination of all classes against them; while the churchman and the seceder, the minister and the people, the pulpit and the press all join in one general shout—"Heresy, blasphemy, the contemners of Scripture, the enemies of the cross of Christ are come hither;" if, while all thus condemn them, and all condemn them unheard, they do associate together, to endeavour in some degree to check the torrent, to silence the calumniator, to expose the malignant reviling of the bigot, to supply the deficiencies of the half-informed, to remove the misconceptions of the ill-informed, to answer the sophist, to reprove the scorner, to reason, to expostulate, to instruct and to defend, who will censure them?—With intrepidity and perseverance, with meekness and charity, with hearts glowing with benevolence and devotion, and with a conduct, wholly and uniformly consistent with the genuine spirit of Christianity, let them go on. And then if "the Lord of the harvest" should not give an increase to their planting and to their watering; if, on the contrary, it should please him to make the heart of this people fat, and to make their ears heavy and to shut

their eyes, so that they see not with their eyes, nor hear with their ears, nor understand with their heart, nor be converted and healed: if the seed they sow shall indeed be as the grass on the house-tops which withereth before it groweth up, the disadvantage will not be to them, they will have discharged their duty; and He who rewards the conduct of his creatures, not according to its success but its virtue, will fill them with a more elevated and lasting joy than those have ever experienced, who are "in great power, and who spread like a green bay-tree!"

S. S.

*A Series of Discourses on the Christian Revelation, viewed in Connexion with the Modern Astronomy.* By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. Minister of the Tron Church, Glasgow. Fifth Edition. Glasgow and London. Pp. 275. 1817.

**I**F popularity were an unerring test of the merits of authors, the work before us might safely defy criticism. It has not only exceeded in speedy circulation any collection of sermons within our memory, but has fairly surpassed the most popular poems of the day, and rivalled the newest and most fashionable novels. Nor has the success of its author, in his personal ministrations, been less splendid. He has drawn together, by the fame of his eloquence, all ranks and classes and characters; senators and artizans, peers and mechanics, patriots and pensioners, ladies of every rank and of every age, persons of all religious and persons of no religion, who have eagerly pressed to catch even the most distant accents of this Northern Prodigy. Never perhaps were heat, and crowd, and want of accommodation represented in the newspapers with such attractive force since the days of the "Critic"—and never were these charming announcements more successful. And if we are to believe the same faithful and disinterested authorities, the auditors felt that their highest expectations had been more than exceeded. "A wave of delighted sensibility," such as Dr. Chalmers sent through the "mighty throng" of innumerable angels,\* seems to have un-

dulated over all the benches;—and, if we are rightly informed, the more decisive and apparent wave of handkerchiefs was only restrained by a timely recollection, that the place of worship was not a theatre. To crown the whole, the newspaper admirers of the orator called on the nation to award to him the palm of modern genius, and to place him next to Milton in the British temple of fame!

All this, however, goes but a little way towards proving his intrinsic excellence. Those who are carried away by eloquence of popular preachers are not precisely the parties who confer that permanent renown, which is the decisive proof and the true reward of genius. The voice of the people may be very potent in political discussions, but it is feeble in all abstract questions and matters which relate to imagination and taste. The majority of those who occasionally read or hear might, indeed, confer a certain duration on things in themselves worthless—if they would be constant in their admiration. But this they cannot be. Having no fixed principles of taste; no real perception of intellectual excellence; no nice and fine discrimination of beauty or truth; no lasting sympathy with sublimity or grandeur; they love a perpetual variety, and are ever transferring their applause to new favourites. Those, on the other hand, who are gifted with a true sensibility to the works of genius, judge from feelings which are uniform and deeply interwoven with the whole tenour of their existence. They love works of imagination, not merely for their brilliant and *effective* passages, but for those retiring beauties which escape all eyes, ungifted by something of "the vision and the faculty divine." These too do not lose their attraction, by frequent observance; for they are calculated to awaken delicious trains of meditation, "ever charming, ever new." They become more dear to the man of taste the more he observes them. He recurs to them as to recollections of infancy, which time and frequent contemplation only render more sacred. His admiration, therefore, is calculated to endure. And as the sentiments by which his love and veneration are excited are common to minds of a similar temperament—to all, in fact, who have a real and genuine sympathy with the

\* See p. 169.

works of genius; one opinion, on all productions really worthy of remembrance, will be transmitted to the most distant periods of time. Thus, true merit, though originally perceived by few, necessarily outlives the successive idols of the crowd. Long duration consecrates the sentiment which arose, at first, in the hearts of a small number, and forces acquiescence even from the unthinking. This assent, after all, is the mere natural deference of the weak to the strong—the respect paid by those of “the ignorant present time” to the voice of ages. The real lovers of those great poets of our country, whose names all profess to revere, have not perhaps very greatly increased since the days when they were themselves candidates for public applause. How few among the “reading public” of the present “enlightened age,” know more than the names of Chaucer, of Spenser, and of our elder dramatists! How small a number of the admirers of Dr. Chalmers have given even a fair reading to the works of that immortal poet to whom they have dared to compare him! They may have looked through *Paradise Lost*, because it seems to support their religious system; but did they ever luxuriate in the natural loveliness of *Comus*, or muse with a sobered joy over the classic melancholy of *Lycidas*? The world in general profess to idolize Shakspeare; but how small is the number who know any more of him than they gather from the exhibition of his plays! Thus the applause conferred by the mass of mankind on the most celebrated authors, arises from little more than the magic of a name. But while the real immortality of a poet is in the hearts and affections of a few, the multitude will, at last, be compelled to profess a sympathy with the wise and great of other times. Thus real excellence is almost sure to be lasting. It has a deep root in the feelings of its admirers, while the successive favourites of the populace pass away like the kings of Banquo's issue. It keeps its steady progress, undisturbed by the fluctuations of opinion and the caprices of fashion, until authority has pronounced it sacred. It appeals to natural beauty and grandeur, which are the same in every age; and

it must, therefore, live while these shall endure, and there shall remain hearts to love and revere them. Successive generations only add to its fame an additional tribute, and shed over it a more venerable sanctity—while numberless idols of the public have had their praises successively pronounced immortal, and successively forgotten.

We shall, therefore, proceed to examine the merits of the author before us, unbiassed by the amazing popularity which he at present enjoys. And this we shall endeavour to do by inquiring *first*, what additional support he has given by his reasoning to our common faith; and *secondly*, what new stores of beauty and grandeur his imagination has been able to unfold.

1. It is to be remembered, that the professed object of these *Discourses* is to defend the Christian religion, against an objection which the discoveries of modern astronomy have been supposed to countenance. Since it has been established that this world is but a small part of the universe; that there are millions of spheres superior to it in size, which even we are able, by the assistance of art to discern; it may have struck the contemplative mind, as something almost too marvellous to believe, that the Maker of these innumerable globes, and all which inherit them, should, in order to save one of the least of them, take the nature of its guilty inhabitants, become bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh; be tempted like as they are, live among them in fashion as a man, in poverty and in suffering for thirty years; be beaten, and reviled, and put to death by his creatures in this comparatively insignificant portion of his own creation, and finally wear their nature united to his own through the whole of his eternal existence:—now, such as this objection is, it manifestly applies only to Christianity in its Trinitarian form. No one who admits the being of a God, and that he continues to sustain the works of his hands, could ever make the vastness of the universe an objection to Divine revelation, except on the supposition that it taught the absolute Deity of Jesus. Surely, it could excite no surprise that he, in whose hand are “the issues of life”—without whose Providence not a spar-



row falls, should provide for the moral as well as the natural wants of his intelligent creatures. It is not marvellous that he who has implanted in our bosoms the desire of immortality, should give us some information of a life to come. Nor is it incredible that, for this purpose, he should confer a divine commission and miraculous powers on one of the most exalted of his children—or that he should employ some celestial being who was with him before all worlds, in a mission so important and so gracious. Indeed, it would have been more wonderful had no revelation of his will been vouchsafed—had we been created with powers “little lower than the angels,” and yet been left ignorant of their immortal destiny; had we been amply supplied with all the delights which the senses can require, and no food had been provided to satisfy the cravings of the heart. This would have been a difficulty indeed, which might almost have led us to doubt the existence of our common Parent. It is not then, that he who made all worlds, should have found leisure to reveal his will to mortals; it is not that he should have regarded “this goodly frame, the earth,” as worthy of attention, that can with any plausibility be objected. It is, that he should have himself died in our stead, and exist as “God and man in two distinct natures and one person for ever.” Now, it is evident, this difficulty could not be raised even against the Arian hypothesis. If Christianity were regarded, as comprised in the formulary called the “Apostles’ Creed,” there would be no such objection to answer. But let us not be mistaken. We most sincerely disclaim all intention of urging the argument against our orthodox brethren. In its greatest force, it seems to us capable of a very simple reply. We think it would be sufficient to say, that we are wholly unacquainted with the nature of other worlds, and, therefore, can draw no inference from their existence; that we are ignorant of the plans of the Almighty, and therefore, cannot find him out unto perfection; that if we have a revelation, bearing on it the impress and mark of heaven, we are bound to receive all that it inculcates, though we may not be able to reconcile it to certain fancies of our own, respecting those works of God, of

the relations and nature of which we know nothing. In short, the line of Pope, “What can we reason but from what we know,” seems to us a sufficient answer to such vague and presumptuous objections.

Dr. Chalmers *is*, however, of another opinion. He thinks fit to reply, in seven discourses, instead of seven lines; and we must, of course, attend him through the whole of this triumphant progress.

The first of these Sermons is entitled “A Sketch of the Modern Astronomy.” So far from answering the objection, it is a statement of the grounds from which it has arisen. It is an elaborate defence of the plurality of worlds; which, we believe, no one disputes. It also contains a speculation that these worlds are not uninhabited, which we remember to have seen in every little book of astronomy for children. In addition, however, to these mighty discoveries, it anticipates such a progress in science as shall enable us to discern the cities, to watch the changing seasons, and to trace the arts, in the planets and the stars! Dr. Chalmers ought to have known, that such a result is not within the capabilities of science. There is an imperfection in the organs of sight, which must ever deprive us of so gratifying a prospect even were our telescopes a hundred times as large as that of Herschell. This discourse certainly presents us with an elaborate description of the universe; but it is all comprised in a single paragraph of the Spectator.

The second Discourse is entitled, “The Modesty of True Science.” It opens with a long piece of declamation on the peculiarity of each man’s private feelings to himself, which “prepares the way” for the observation, that the public are little able to comprehend the internal cares of the retired and studious; and thus, at last, the “way” is opened to a long panegyric on Sir Isaac Newton. The great features in his character which receive this applause from our author, are his determination, never to admit any hypothesis without strict evidence; his resistance of “the meteors” of imagination; and his firm adherence to evidence, and evidence alone. These Dr. Chalmers thinks constitute the “Modesty of True Science;” what

name then will he give to his own fancy respecting the improvement of telescopes? It is quite amusing to hear him say of his favourite, "had he been like the majority of other men he would have broken free from the fetters of a sober and chastised understanding, and, giving wing to his imagination, had (have) done what philosophers had (have) done after him;—been carried away by some meteor of their (his) own forming, or found their (his) amusement in some of their (his) intellectual pictures, or palmed some loose and confident plausibilities of their (his) own upon the world." \* There is no occasion for the reader of Dr. Chalmers to go far in order to find an example of the faults which are deprecated thus:—except, indeed, that though the fancies they will discover are sufficiently "loose and confident," they are not very "plausible." It is proper here to observe, that the Preface contains an abatement from the praise so liberally bestowed on Newton. We are told that "amid the distraction and the engrossment of his other pursuits, he has not at all times succeeded in the interpretation of the book (Bible); else he would never, in my apprehension, have abetted the leading doctrine of a sect or a system which has now nearly dwindled away from public observation." † The allusion is here, of course, made to those who deny the Trinity. Now, whether these persons are diffusing error or truth—whether their numbers are large or small, they are the constant objects of attack in all the orthodox pulpits within these realms. Half the controversies of the present age have respected their obnoxious system. This assertion, at first, therefore, a little surprised us. We soon, however, remembered, that as Dr. Chalmers, like Tilburina, in the Critic, sees a great variety of objects that are "not in sight," it is only poetical justice, that like the same immortal heroine, he should overlook the things immediately before him. He seems to have looked at the heavens till he has become blind to things of earth! He has a telescopic eye. He can see the "blush of vegetation" ‡ in

Jupiter; but he knows nothing of the controversy which has just been carried on in the city where he preaches. § How unreasonable would it be to expect that one who is surveying the contest between the armies of heaven and hell for the "strong-hold" of this world, should be acquainted with petty discussions which arise among his fellow mortals!

Here Dr. Chalmers thinks it time to consider the question which he had proposed to discuss. He conceives it may be the feeling of all his readers, "that he has hitherto indulged in a vain expense of argument." || We will undertake to obviate his scruples on this subject, as we can honestly assure him we have not yet discovered any argument at all. If the "expense" has been "vain," it has, at least, been of less costly materials.

At length the "argument" begins. It consists of two branches; 1st, It is contended that the assumption of the Infidel, that Christianity extends only to this world, may be untrue; and secondly, that, supposing it correct, the inference he wishes to deduce from it will not follow. The amplification of the first of these propositions occupies the residue of this discourse. Persons of less brilliant genius might have thought it sufficient simply to have observed that, as we know nothing of the moral condition of other worlds, we cannot ascertain that the Christian religion has no influence over them. But this is not enough for our author. Even when the whole amount of his argument is, that the human mind can obtain no information respecting the systems we dimly behold, he cannot refrain from exhibiting the knowledge respecting them which he imagines himself to possess. Did it never occur to him that he was thus defeating his own cause? Surely the Infidel has as much right to one negative guess as he has to a thousand positives. He is not

getation of the stars, is not like ours, sober green, but a beautiful crimson. What pretty worlds! Even the common grass "bears its blushing honours thick upon it." What an enviable condition is that of a Scotch Doctor endowed with second sight!

§ See Month. Repos. for May and June last, pp. 292, 364, and preceding article.

|| P. 76.

\* P. 66.

† P. 8.

‡ The reader will not fail to observe the discovery implied in this phrase. The ve-

contented with stigmatizing an objection as visionary, but he must give it a visionary answer. He is resolved to have a monopoly of phantoms: and he actually supposes that he can vanquish infidelity with the ever-shifting machinery of a dream!

The third Discourse entitled, "On the Extent of the Divine Condescension," is intended to support the second proposition, which we should have thought admitted of easy proof. Fortunately for the admirers of Dr. Chalmers, we were again mistaken. The Sermon consists of a continued series of declamations, intended to shew that the insignificance of our world only serves to display more strikingly the goodness of God in providing for the interests of those who inherit it. We are referred to the discoveries of the microscope, as evincing that his power is as clearly to be traced in the formation of the meanest insect, as in the most stupendous works of his hands: we are loaded with accumulative proof that an Almighty Being is not subject to weariness, and oppressed, with illustrations of the newly discovered truth that benevolence to a whole, does not exclude attention to its most obscure parts. There is not a word in all this which can be disputed, and scarcely one that bears upon the question. The difficulty is not that we should be within the view of an all-seeing eye, not that we should be provided for by the goodness of the Universal Parent, not that the Maker of all worlds should be able to regulate the concerns and to watch over the happiness of each; but that he should unite himself to our nature and die to redeem us. To this, amidst all his profusion of eloquence, Dr. Chalmers has given *no answer*. His tinsel degrades the noble subjects on which he touches. He tries to illustrate great first principles, which nature has stamped upon all our hearts, by the petty objects of time and sense. Why must we be perpetually taught by microscopes and microscopic reasoning, that the "tender mercies of God are over all his works"?

Our author has now, to his own satisfaction at least, demonstrated his two propositions; and yet it should seem that infidelity has not received

its mortal wound, for we are not arrived at the middle of the volume. His fourth Discourse, "On the Knowledge of Man's Moral History in the Distant Places of the Creation," exhibits a bolder flight into untried regions than any which precedes it. It, therefore, appropriately begins by rebuking all daring speculation, and exposing the folly of those who desire to be wise above that which is written. The author is resolved, at least, to start from solid ground; for he sets out with informing us that "while man *keeps by* the objects that are near (how can he do otherwise?) *he can get the knowledge of them conveyed into his mind* through the ministry of the senses." This proposition which, "oft was thought but ne'er so well expressed," is briefly illustrated by reference to the uses of the touch, the smell, the taste and the ear; but the eye is reserved for a more magnificent encomium, since it is the most important "of all the *tracts of conveyance* which God has been pleased to *open up* between the mind of man and the theatre by which he is surrounded." We are told, however, that there is a limit beyond which it cannot penetrate; and, therefore, a due humility ought to check our inquiries. The philosopher is exhorted "*not to forget* that he sees not the landscape of other worlds; that he knows not the moral system of any one of them; nor athwart the long and trackless vacancy that lies between, does there fall upon his listening ear the hum of their mighty populations."

All this, however ingenious, does not seem exactly to bear on the proposed thesis. At last we approach the mighty subject—but softly and by regular steps. After it is established that we cannot see what is taking place in other worlds, it is suggested that angels *might*, if so commissioned, supply this defect of our telescopes. The Bible too *may have given* us some hints respecting distant systems; though, as we are not directed to the precise chapter, we are unable to judge of their clearness. But possibilities are enough for our author. He surmises that *perhaps* the inhabitants of other worlds are yet sinless; that, if so, angels *probably* visit them as they did our first parents in Eden;



and, admitting this, it is not *impossible* that their heavenly visitants may give them intelligence of the condition of distant systems. By this golden chain he arrives at his grand conjecture, that "thus as we talk of the public mind of a city, or the public mind of an empire, by the *well-frequented avenues of a free and ready circulation, a public mind might be formed throughout the whole extent of God's sinless and intelligent creation.*" All the rest of the Sermon is, of course, anti-climax after this. There are, however, passages on the probable view taken by angelic beings of the dispensations of God, which almost border on eloquence. For the third time, the peculiar goodness of God in bestowing his blessings on so small a portion of his universe, as the earth, is expatiated on at length, and illustrated by the glory an earthly sovereign would acquire from an act of benevolence performed on a private family. We cannot endure these petty sentimentalities, when applied to the character of the Almighty, or to those universal blessings which he delights to scatter over every part of his creation.

The fifth Discourse, entitled "On the Sympathy which is felt for Man in the distant places of the Creation," opens with the old topic with which the preceding Sermon closes. At length, after due preparation, we are introduced to the company of the angels. But, whether it be from the "wave of delighted sensibility" which Dr. Chalmers has sent among them,\* or the "flood of tenderness" he has made them "lavish,"† or the "tide of exuberancy" he has poured out every where,‡ or from the dizziness of our own perceptions, we have acquired no distinct ideas of these celestial messengers. In point of fact, no description was ever half so wretched. The glorified spirit is only presented to us as a pure abstraction of all that is perfect; not arrayed in any ætherial beauty, or endowed with peculiar properties. He is Mr. Wilberforce with wings, and nothing more. Even this grand idea we are only permitted to attain, as Doctors do their honours—by degrees. First we are to imagine a man who is an amiable private character, and thinks of nothing beyond his

immediate circle; secondly, one who goes a little further, and extends his benevolence to the town in which he lives; thirdly, one whose heart embraces his country; and fourthly, a philanthropist, such as the worthy gentleman just named, who not only unites all these good affections, but desires the welfare of the whole race of man. "At this point of his argument" Dr. Chalmers pauses to eulogize the charity of the present age, in one of the best passages of his work, but rather out of season, considering that we are still impatient to be introduced to the angel. After this celestial inhabitant has been described as surpassing the best of our fellow-men, we return once more to earth; not feeling dizzy as though we had been wafted on an aerial voyage, but wearied as from a journey in a lumbering family coach, which has stopped for a proper length of time at every stage.

The sixth Discourse bears a most appalling title. It is "On the Contest for an Ascendancy over Man amongst the higher Orders of Intelligence." Nor does it threaten in vain. It not only maintains the doctrine that satanic influence is yet permitted in the world; it not only intimates that strength from on high may be given to overcome temptation, but it represents the armies of hell and heaven, of demons and of angels, as still arrayed against each other, and fighting for dominion over man! The idea of this warfare is evidently taken from Milton, but how has Dr. Chalmers improved on it! The author of *Paradise Lost* represented it as lasting only for a few hours, but he has made it at least six thousand years in duration. He has left it as a mighty field for future bards. He knows not, indeed, precisely its extent—"if our rebellious world be the only strong-hold which Satan is possessed of,§ or if it be but the single post of an extended warfare, that is going on between the powers of light and darkness." But his ignorance on this point is more than compensated, by his nice and accurate information on the original designs of the fallen archangel. We must give this

---

§ This term seems to imply, that Satan is completely master of the field; and yet he is said to have been vanquished at the death of Christ!

in Dr. Chalmers' own words, or we shall be suspected of an irreverend sneer at the popular doctrines respecting the powers of Satan :

" — a gleam of malignant joy shot athwart him, as he conceived his project for *hemming our unfortunate species within the bound of an irrecoverable dilemma*; and as surely as sin and holiness could not enter into fellowship, so surely did he think that if man were seduced into disobedience, would the truth, and the justice, and the immutability of God, lay their insurmountable barriers on the path of his future acceptance." \* We forbear to quote how and when Satan " met with a wisdom which *overmatched him*," † for it seems like a gross caricature of that system of faith which the author intends to support. And we close this sermon, hoping that he comes fairly by his minute knowledge of Satan's thoughts, and heartily congratulating him that the days of Lord Hale and of witchcraft are over.

The *seventh*, and we are happy to announce, the *last Discourse*, has fortunately no connexion with the stars. It is, therefore, more intelligible, more rational, and more consistent than any of the preceding orations. Its object is to warn the hearers and readers of Dr. Chalmers that they are not to consider the delight they may have experienced from sacred eloquence or sacred music, as the essence of religion. In this sentiment we fully coincide; and, though we are probably disposed to attribute a greater degree of moral influence to taste than our author would concede, we are well aware that no feeling, however sublime, which does not dispose the heart to good affections, and the conduct to a holy course, will be of any avail when the pleasure it excites shall have faded away. In itself, indeed, it is excellent, and worthy of the fondest cherishing. Even when it is excited in a bosom stained with sin, it shews that human nature can never wholly lose the traces of its original excellence, and may well serve to inspire us with hope for the future recovery of man. But, it too often leaves no immediate trace behind it :—

" Like the snow-falls in the river,  
One moment white—then gone for ever!"

\* P. 205.

† Ibid.

Our readers will now be able to appreciate the merits of Dr. Chalmers as a defender of our common faith. In this capacity, we fear his efforts will be worse than useless. Of those who regard this work as exhibiting a very brilliant imagination, we would anxiously inquire whether they think a book which professes to confute the objections of the infidel is not, in reality, censured by the very encomium they are eager to pass? Surely the high architrave of the Temple of Divine Truth is not the proper place even for Poetry "to make its bed and procreant cradle in." The majestic simplicity of that venerable pile can only be injured by the fairest forms, even of angelic spirits, which the daring hand of a mortal may wish to carve out on its pillars. Sion's hill is not ground on which every man may erect the "buildings of his fancy." Had even Milton published his immortal work as a serious defence of the Christian faith, he would have done it an irreparable injury. He would have left it, distinguished only by his own superior genius, on a level with a fairy tale. This Dr. Chalmers will not do, simply because he has not the power. He has done his worst; though, no doubt, with the best intentions. In a work professedly written to defend Christianity, he has represented the most absurd chimeras as part of it; and thus afforded a great advantage to the infidel whose objections he purposed to demolish. His efforts are calculated to have the same effect on the credibility of Christian truth, as the labours of a man professing to write authentic history would have on the authenticity of his tale, who should interweave with the narration the adventures of the immortal Gulliver!

Having investigated the claims of Dr. Chalmers to a place among the distinguished champions of our common faith, we shall now inquire into the justice of the encomiums lavished on him as a man of genius. His *imagination* is the perpetual subject of wonder to his admirers. For our own parts, we must confess, that we have looked for it in vain. Indeed, so strong is our conviction, that there is not even the lowest degree of this divine faculty exerted in the *Discourses* before us, that we can account only for the prevalence of a contrary opinion,

by supposing that those who entertain it must have formed a very indistinct idea of the elements of which imagination consists. We shall, therefore, endeavour to explain our own views of this interesting subject, in order to shew on what grounds our judgment of Dr. Chalmers is founded.

There are two things which appear to us necessary, in order to support a claim to imagination in its highest sense. *First*, the power of presenting clear, distinct and beautiful images to the mind; and, *secondly*, the nobler faculty of rendering those images the representations of some natural element in general, or the expressions of some quality of the human mind. The first requisite, it is perfectly easy to comprehend. It must immediately be seen that imagination can never consist of mere swelling language, of pomp of diction, or profusion of epithet. It must employ words only as the means of conveying its pictures to our intellectual perceptions. It must give us something which, at least in its material forms, a painter could express. But this is not all. Many who are wholly destitute of this faculty, have given accurate descriptions of various scenes of life, and faithful delineations of individual character. Mr. Crabbe, for example, has eminently succeeded in these, in some of the most revolting of his pieces. These are but the outward forms in which the true poet embodies his divine perceptions. They are the "tenements" which he has to "inform." They only afford the medium through which his ideas can be conveyed to mortals. They are the representations, not merely of particular scenes or of certain individual characters, but of the grand elements of nature, or whole classes of intelligent beings. Thus, the descriptions of Eden, in *Paradise Lost*, do not merely convey to our minds individual scenes, but fill us with a thousand images of natural beauty, to be discerned in every part of creation. Thus, the principal characters of Shakspeare are not mere likenesses of individual men, but they stand as representatives of whole classes; for while they present the most distinct images to the mind, they perpetually refer us to those elements which are as universal as the human soul. Imagination, then, is not displayed in the analysis of general qua-

lities, however exalted, nor in the description of natural imagery, however beautiful; but in the expression of the former, by the means of the latter. It is the faculty that connects the things which belong to our spiritual part, with the lovely creation around us. It is the power of embodying the most sublime and beautiful conceptions in the most sublime and beautiful of material forms. It is the pure and exquisite medium by which things that are unseen, abstract qualities which belong to the soul or to the universe, are made to appear in the most exquisite shapings forth which earth can supply. A spirit "shines through" all its images. Not a feature but has its expression, far beyond the mere beauty of an accurate colouring. There is the same difference between the works of a man of real imagination, and of a mere accurate observer of life, as between the excellent likenesses which the painters of the Royal Academy take of ladies and gentlemen, and the noblest productions of the great masters of Italy. The former give us accurate ideas of Mr. A. and Mrs. B., while the latter present to us not only the most glorious of material shapes, but fill us with delightful conceptions of pure and angelic beauty, kindling inspiration and apostolic zeal.

Now we not merely assert that Dr. Chalmers is wholly destitute of the latter property; but we maintain that he does not even possess the former. He is not only without imagination, he is without images. His most gaudy passages may be examined in vain, in order to find a single object, in itself beautiful, presented with distinctness to the mind. Whole pages are filled with illustration, and yet contain no picture. For instance, Dr. Chalmers has frequent recourse to the ministry of angels, and speculates boldly on their nature, their occupations, and their properties. But, even when on such a theme, he affords no glimpse of a beatific vision. He draws down no form of celestial beauty to dazzle our intellectual eye: no gorgeous shapes seem to crowd upon our delighted view, when his eloquence is most fervent. He merely eulogizes the benevolence and the purity of the hosts of heaven, which he asserts they possess in a higher degree than the



most gifted of mortals. In one of his Discourses he supposes a contest between the higher orders of intelligence for the dominion of this world, and dwells on the supposition with all the pomp of language. But, through the whole of this Sermon, not a glimpse is afforded us of the awful combatants; not even the dim form of an infernal enemy is seen through the gloom. Every epithet, appropriate and inappropriate, is lavished; but not a single image presented to our view. In short, our author dwells merely on abstract qualities, and is incapable of embodying them in lovely or awful forms. Instead of this, he tells us, they are lovely or awful; and he may tell us truly, but there is no sublimity in this. His admirers have mistaken words for ideas, that is all. His speculations relate to things which are in themselves grand; to the extent of the universe, to the softer excellences of the Divine character, to the glorious multitudes of higher orders of beings. Having chosen sublime themes, he dilates on them in high-sounding language; dispenses the terms "magnificence," "immensity," "darkling," "brilliant," "inaccessible," and a number of superlatives with the most magnanimous profusion, and adorns every subject with the most generous variety of epithet. Thus he pours on other worlds "the bloom of vegetation and the blessedness of life;" he throws "around radiance" a "sweet and softening lustre;" he sheds "tides of ecstasy," and "floods of tenderness" over clusters of stars and millions of beings; and for his labour, is regarded as a master of the true sublime. He

might as soon become wonderful by the aid of an extra number of notes of admiration, or witty by the assistance of italics. The error of his admirers lies in taking quantity for quality; a certain number of adjectives for a description—a pomp of words for a succession of images. As the giants of old heaped Pelion on Ossa, he piles epithet on epithet, and fancies he shall scale heaven; but, like them, he is earthborn, and like them must fail. His efforts stand in nearly the same relation to the sublime, as Swift's verses to a Lady of Quality do to the beautiful, only the Dean is in jest while the Doctor is serious.

Were we shortly to characterize the work before us, we should do it by repeating the reply of Hamlet to Polonius, "Words! words! words!" Of these we readily admit our author possesses no common store. It is not, therefore, surprising that he should make a great impression on an audience, assembled for the express purpose of being delighted, and for the most part unused to hear any thing which makes a glittering pretension to eloquence. He has his fit reward in their praises. Of this boon he is more worthy than some who have possessed it before, and perhaps than many to whom it may hereafter descend. But he must substitute argument for assertion, thought for verbiage, and imagery for epithet, before he can reasonably hope that his writings will be held in undying remembrance by the great and good of future times.

T. N. T.

## POETRY.

*To a Daughter, on having left her attending the last hours of her Grandfather, a pious Calvinist.*

Eliza, still thy duteous cares engage!  
To rock the cradle of reposing age,  
To watch tir'd Nature in her last decay,  
As temp'rate life, though ling'ring, ebbs away:  
Still in that school of sacred wisdom wait,  
The chamber where the good man meets his fate,

While faith divine, that looks beyond the tomb,  
Anticipates a better world to come;  
The faith sincere, each humble Christian's joy,  
Though error mix the gold with base alloy,  
Though creeds and systems veil a father's face,  
In vengeful frowns o'er all his mortal race,  
Save the predestin'd, those for whom alone  
A Saviour would almighty wrath atone,

Yet doom the accurs'd, should they his gos-  
pel hear,  
To make their sure damnation more severe;  
And this a *Calvin*, with unblushing face,  
Proclaims glad tidings, and supernal grace.  
Rejoice, dear Girl, 'twas thine, in earliest  
days,  
To lisp the Universal Father's praise;  
And, through this varying scene, be still  
thy care  
His aid to seek, till life's last falt'ring  
pray'r;  
And, ever, the mild, guardian influence  
prove,  
Of the glad sound from heav'n, that God is  
love;  
Not the vain love, like human passion wild,  
That fondly greets an unrepentant child,  
But love, with purpose gracious, though  
severe,  
That kindles hope, yet mix'd with awful  
fear;  
That, ere his heav'n of holy bliss begin,  
To save the sinner shall correct the sin:  
Then bid *Messiah* the new age unfold  
By truth inspir'd, by raptur'd seers fore-  
told;  
When death shall be no more, nor grief,  
nor pain,  
But love, o'er all, assume an endless reign.  
Accept these strains, though from no  
sportive lyre,  
Strains that a death-like scene might well  
inspire;  
And, trust me, wise was he that taught to  
know  
The moral uses of the house of woe;  
There be it our's, with happy art, to learn  
Life's high design, and mortals' chief con-  
cern.

J. T. R.

Clapton, May 30th, 1817.

VERSES

*On seeing, in a list of New Music "The  
Waterloo Waltz:" by a Lady.*

(Copied from an Aberdeen Paper.)

A moment pause, ye British fair,  
While pleasure's phantom ye pursue,  
And say, if sprightly dance or air  
Suit with the name of Waterloo?  
Awful was the victory!  
Chasten'd should the triumph be,  
'Midst the laurels she has won,  
Britain mourns for many a son.

Veil'd in clouds the morning rose,  
Nature seem'd to mourn the day  
Which consign'd, before its close,  
Thousands to their kindred clay.  
How unfit for courtly ball,  
Or the giddy festival,  
Was the grim and ghastly view  
'Ere ev'ning clos'd on Waterloo!

See the Highland warrior rushing,  
Firm in danger, on the foe,  
Till the life-blood, warmly gushing,  
Lays the plaided hero low!  
His native pipe's accustom'd sound,  
'Mid wars infernal concert drown'd,  
Cannot soothe his last adieu,  
Or wake his sleep on Waterloo!

Crashing o'er the Cuirassier  
See the foaming charger flying,  
Trampling, in his wild career,  
All alike, the dead and dying.  
See the bullets through his side  
Answer'd by the spouting tide;  
Helmet, horse, and rider too  
Roll on bloody Waterloo!

Shall scenes like these the dance inspire?  
Or wake th' enlivening notes of mirth?  
O! shiver'd be the recreant lyre  
That gave the base idea birth!  
Other sounds, I ween, were there,  
Other music rent the air,  
Other waltz the warriors knew,  
When they clos'd on Waterloo.

Forbear, till time, with lenient hand,  
Has sooth'd the pang of recent sorrow,  
And let the picture distant stand,  
The soft'ning hue of years to borrow.  
When our race has pass'd away,  
Hands unborn may wake the lay,  
And give to joy alone the view  
Of Britain's fame at Waterloo.

To Lord Byron.

(Written in 1814.)

O! I have drunk the rapt'rous cup of joy,  
Fill'd with the swelling bliss, that mantled  
high;  
O! I have pour'd affection's bitter tear,  
When she, whom most I lov'd, hath press'd  
the bier.  
Yet, from the bitter tear affection shed  
Over that breast now number'd with the  
dead,  
E'en from that tear a gentle comfort stole,  
Its cordial drops reviv'd my fainting soul,  
Not e'en the brimming bowl high swell'd  
with bliss,  
On memory dwells with such delight as this.  
O! it was sweet'ned by the rapt'rous  
thought,  
That I should find the bliss she then had  
sought,  
That, purified from ev'ry earthly stain,  
Our souls should meet no more to part again.  
May equal hopes on all I love attend,  
And may we all on heav'n's high will de-  
pend,  
So death shall not our swelling hearts  
affright,  
But lead us gently to the realms of light;  
So God to each the heav'nly bliss shall give,  
And ever blest together we shall live.

Say not then "it were better not to be,"  
Life's bitt'rest hours are full of bliss to me;  
And if beyond the tomb thou, too, hadst  
seen  
Union with all thou lov'dst, they so to thee  
had been.

T. C. HOLLAND.

*On the Re-establishment of the Inquisition.*

How is departed, Spain, thy ancient praise!  
Go, boast thy famous schools of former days,  
Where Europe studied wisdom. Boast thy  
plain,  
Where liberty once spread her golden reign;  
Thy hills, where pure religion first appear'd,  
And whence her standard to the world was  
rear'd;  
Thy bold reformers, who the mystic yoke,  
First from their necks, of papal tyrants  
broke.  
But boast in vain—oppression clouds thy  
day,  
And superstition all thy sons obey.  
No new Servetus \* now adorns thy plain;  
No new Waldenses † now thy hills retain.

\* Servetus was a physician of Arragon, who first discovered the circulation of the blood, and was burnt by Calvin, because he was a Unitarian.

† One of the principal seats of the Waldenses, the heralds of the reformation, was among the mountains which separate Spain from France. Soon after the reformation they retired into Berne and other districts on the French side of the Pyrenees, where they were protected by Henry the Fourth.

Hope whisper'd late, thy sun again should  
rise,  
And beam in splendour from unclouded  
skies;  
But ah! 'tis vain, and hope once more de-  
ferr'd  
Makes the heart faint, and is no longer  
heard.

Yet we rely on thee, all-ruling Power!  
In each event thy providence adore;  
Oh! clear these clouds that dim our mortal  
sight,

Dispel these thickening shadows of the  
night!

All is for good, some future happier age  
Shall turn with joy this sad historic page;  
Shall view, with pleasing wonder and de-  
light,

The whole eventful plan brought forth to  
light;

Shall deeper scan th' Almighty's wond'rous  
ways,

And find them worthy of their highest praise.  
And though not yet reveal'd to feeble sense,  
Still may we trust thy guiding providence;  
May we depend upon our Father's care,  
And, 'mid these shades, prefer our humble  
pray'r;

—Father thy will be done, our bounded  
sight

Discerns not through these clouds the dawn-  
ing light;

But it will come—another happy day  
Will chase these shades of doubt and fear  
away,

Teach us upon thy goodness still to trust,  
Nor e'er to doubt thee faithful, kind and  
just.

Instruct us to rely upon thy love,  
And evermore thy providence approve.

T. C. HOLLAND.

## OBITUARY.

1817, May 27th, at *Osborn Street, Whitechapel*, in the 53rd year of his age, JOSEPH COOPE, ESQ. Throughout life he was the *steady friend* of the poor, and at his decease bequeathed some valuable legacies to his *friends* as well as to some excellent charitable institutions. *Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*

J. E.

*Right Hon. George Ponsonby.*

(From the *Morn. Chron.* July 9th, 1817.)

We lament to say that the Right Hon. GEORGE PONSONBY expired at six o'clock yesterday morning. His death was tranquil—his pulse declined so gradually that he breathed his last without a perceptible struggle. His second son arrived express from Ireland, at his house in *Curzon Street*, only a few minutes after his death. He

had been taught, as he passed through Oxford, to believe his honoured parent was in the fair way of recovery; and therefore our sympathizing readers may conceive the extent of the shock he had to suffer on the unexpected and melancholy tidings of his almost instantaneous departure.—Every feeling heart, every friend of freedom, justice and humanity, will join with him and the rest of his afflicted family in deploring the loss of this virtuous patriot and truly amiable man. Indeed, his death is universally felt as a national calamity, for his life was dedicated to the public service, and he lost it in the assiduous discharge of his duty as a faithful representative of the people. He may be said to have fallen at his post as truly as an officer who falls in the field or on the deck, since it was by the effect of his persevering attendance on Committees (which deprived him of the habitual strong



exercise necessary to his health), that he fell a sacrifice at so early a period of life.

Mr. Ponsonby was the second son of the Right Hon. John Ponsonby, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, and consequently brother of William, the first Lord Ponsonby. He was born on the 15th March, 1755, and was called to the bar, at which he practised with eminent success. He was married on the 18th May, 1781, to Lady Mary Butler, daughter of the Earl of Lanesborough, who, with two sons and a daughter, survive him. His daughter is married to the Hon. F. Prittie, brother to Lord Dunsally. In 1806 he was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, which situation he resigned when his political friends ceased, in 1807, to hold the reins of government, and he has ever since been what is termed the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, in which he conducted himself with an integrity, independence, candour, and suavity which secured him the respect, confidence and affection of all parties. Good sense, the foundation of every excellence, he possessed in a superior degree, improved by study and intercourse with the world in public and private life; his understanding was vigorous; his conception clear; his language chaste, natural, and unaffected; his manner impressive, and his voice well modulated. He addressed himself to the head, laying aside that species of eloquence which seeks through the passions to mislead the judgment. A sound discretion, and an ardent love of justice and humanity governed all his actions.

As the leader of a great political party, no man was ever more free from party spirit. He was in feeling and principle the very man contemplated by those who consider a systematic opposition a necessary safeguard to the constitutional rights and liberties of England. The ingenuousness of his mind, the kindness of his heart, and the placability of his manners, conciliated his opponents, and assuaged all those feelings which defeat excites; and if his triumphs were not more numerous, it is because the candour and generosity of his mind disdained to take advantage of his adversaries whenever he thought them right. Where that was the case, all party feeling vanished before his political integrity, and on many critical occasions he gave his adversaries the support of his learning and talents. Nobly disdaining all selfish views, he was here no longer the leader of a party. He shewed himself the resolute, fixed, and unalterable friend of constitutional freedom.

His complaint, of only a week's duration, was that species of paralytic affection called *Hamiplegia*. He received every aid that medical skill and attention could afford. On his first attack, he was bled by Mr. Lynn, and he was attended by Dr. Baillie, Dr. Warren, and Mr. Tegart. The two last gentlemen remained in the house dur-

ing the last three days of his illness, and were in his chamber when he breathed his last. He was connected by blood with the Noble Houses of Devonshire, Portland, Bessborough, Shannon, Fitzwilliam, Grey, &c. but the whole nation will deplore with them the premature death of a patriot so honest, so able, and so disinterested in their service, as he always proved himself to be.

July 20th, at *Dorking, Surry*, after a painful and lingering illness, which she bore with the greatest fortitude and resignation, JANE, the eldest daughter of the late Rev. Owen MANNING, Rector of Poper Hara, and Vicar of Godalming, in the same county.

Lately, at *Paris*, the celebrated *Madame de STAEL*, the wife of the Baron de Stael Holstein, and the daughter of the unfortunate M. Neckar, French Minister of Finance at the time of the Revolution, by Susan Curchod, the object of the early, perhaps the only, passion of Gibbon, the Historian of the Roman Empire. The genius of this conspicuous and celebrated woman was splendid. Her writings, which are voluminous, may be considered as indicating more knowledge than they impart: her reasonings are ingenious and sometimes profound: her thoughts frequently original: her imagination active, brilliant and profuse, now and then perplexes the subject, which it is the province of imagination to illustrate. Her power of luminous and eloquent expression must give the works of Madame de Stael a passport to every cultivated circle: but they belong much more to the class of luxuries than of sound and healthful diet for the mind. Her moral system must be searched for among the folds of rich and voluptuous sensibility, with which she has invested it; and we are not sure that it will always bear the light. Few people, we are persuaded, have risen from her compositions with their taste purified, or their principles strengthened. The debt which the present generation owes to the alluring author of "*Delphine*" and "*Corinne*," bears some resemblance in character, though not in amount, to that which was imposed upon the age preceding, by the sentiment of Rousseau. Where she counsels the reader to virtue, he does not feel more virtuously disposed; as, where she professes to treat of literature, she adds little to the common stock of learning. Madame de Stael was well known in England, where she mingled in the best and highest classes of society, and where her tone of conversation, though somewhat restless and authoritative, was admired for its elegance, vivacity and power. The remains of Madame de Stael are to be conveyed for interment to her estate at Copet, near Geneva.

## INTELLIGENCE.

*Proceedings in Chancery with regard to the Meeting House at Wolverhampton, deeply affecting the Property of Unitarian Congregations.*

SIR,

BEING accidentally in the Court of Chancery, at the opening of the late case on the subject of Protestant Dissenting foundations, I took a note of it, (particularly of the Lord Chancellor's judgment,) which I send you for the purpose of insertion, if you consider it as I do, most important.

I will add a few observations suggested by it.

1st. The case seems to decide that the Court will, in carrying Dissenting foundations into effect, consult the original intent as to worship and doctrine of the founder, and not suffer even the whole of the congregation to divert the trust from that precise object; and that as a rule of construction of such deeds, where they do not express any particular form of doctrine, the Court will look to what doctrines were, at the time of the foundation, legal or tolerated, and conclude that the founder did not intend to establish a system that was illegal, as Unitarianism undoubtedly was previously to the repeal of the laws for the protection of the Holy Trinity.

On this head I would observe, that there were only two other courses that the Court could have adopted in administering these trusts, both of which, perhaps, would have been more agreeable to Dissenters than the one adopted, viz. either to have considered all dissent as illegal at common law, and therefore (though the Court is by the recognition of Dissenters by law obliged to carry into effect trusts for their benefit) to have contented itself with merely securing the trust for Protestant Dissenting worship, in the general sense, leaving the majority to settle how that worship should be carried on, and not considering itself as judicially bound to measure degrees of (what is in its eyes) error:—or, secondly, to have recognised the principles of dissent, (namely, the right of free inquiry and judgment on religious subjects, considering the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, and the doctrine of to-day as not at all binding for the morrow, but liable at all times to change with the progress of knowledge and the views of the congregation,) and where the deeds prescribed no doctrine or form of worship, but merely that of Protestant Dissenters, to have left (as the true principles of Protestant Dissent ought to do) doctrines out of the question, the congregation for the time

being, being considered as the persons intended by the founders to have the benefit of the trust, and thus making the ~~law~~ follow opinion, instead of making opinion follow the ~~law~~.

The Court has chosen neither of these courses: perhaps it was never to have been expected that it should, especially if they were not pressed upon it, and therefore trust deeds, where the founders intend to establish an institution on Protestant Dissenting principles, ought to specify what they understand them to be; and if it were thus prescribed that the opinion of the congregation, for the time being, should be the opinion supported by the trust, the Court must carry it into effect. Trust deeds, where that is the intent of the founder, must take care of this in future.

It may be further observed, however, that the question cannot be considered as being finally settled upon proper argument on both sides, for the counsel for the defendants seem to have been taken by surprise, and to have merely occupied themselves in contending, that the point (which in reality turned out to form the most material part of the case, and decided it) did not arise, without at all entering into the merits of it. It might surely have been urged that this was the first time of such a question coming before the Court; that this was a foundation expressly for the worship of God on Protestant Dissenting principles; and that if it were inquired what those true principles are, the Court would not wonder that no form of doctrine was prescribed; that it would appear, on inquiry, that the foundations formed on those principles expressly recognised the right of all bodies and individuals to adopt and even form such opinions as should seem to them most consonant to the Scriptures; and therefore that it would not be contrary to their intent, that congregations should go on improving with the improvement of the rest of their fellow-creatures; and that they should no more be confined for ever within the then bounds of legality, than those which then existed of biblical criticism and inquiry. Surely it might have been told the Lord Chancellor, however strange it might sound to the ears of the Court, that Protestant Dissenters, as Protestant Dissenters, know no form of faith or opinion which is to stand still while the world is going on, and that if a Master in chancery can find it out, he will accomplish an arduous task.

The matter being still perfectly open by the reference to the Master, it is to be hoped that before him the true nature and object

of Protestant Dissent will be explained, and the case will then come again before the Court on his report, to be fairly argued on its merits. The Unitarians should by no means let a case of this sort be established as a precedent against them; and perhaps the safest way would be to undertake the defence of it as a body. I believe it will be found, that by far the greater part of the foundations made at the time the present institution was formed, were upon these enlarged principles with regard to doctrine; some institutions certainly provided against the trust being applied to any of the other rival systems of *church government*, (the three only divisions on that head being Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist,) but very few made any stipulation as to *doctrine*, and those which did so expressed it clearly and distinctly.

Surely if the nature and principles of Protestant Dissent were once fully explained and recognised, it would be very clear that the congregation are as perfectly at liberty to embrace Unitarianism as any other opinion. We have a right to assume in a Court of Justice, that till the 53rd of the King, there were no such persons as Unitarians, (it being a crime by law, and no conviction having taken place, till which every person must be considered innocent,) but in 1817, Unitarianism having ceased to become illegal, may be as lawfully and as consonantly with the intent of the founder, embraced as any other opinion, unless it is maintained that no opinions but such as were held and known at the time when the trust deeds were executed, can be adopted by a congregation. Suppose this deed could by fair inference be shewn to recognise on the face of it, the authenticity of the passage in 1 John, v. 7, and consequently to imply that the founder must have contemplated that the belief in such authenticity must always form part of the faith of the congregation, and as such, be inculcated by the minister, (nothing having at that time appeared satisfactorily to impugn its genuineness,) can it be contended that, when by the progress of criticism, the discovery of MSS., &c., the passage has been proved beyond all doubt, by the confession of all, spurious, such new opinion cannot be adopted by the congregation, because it may be demonstrated to be repugnant to the opinion and intent of the founder. Other instances might be pointed out, of entirely new opinions having arisen on very important subjects; and when once the principles of Protestant Dissent are established, it can no more be contended that the congregation cannot adopt an opinion which, though illegal at the foundation, has ceased to be so since, than that no opinion can be embraced by a congregation which was not then in vogue.

2nd. There seems to be no doubt, according to this decision, that institutions (if there are any) founded for Unitarianism, prior to the repeal of the Trinity laws, are illegal and void, as in the Jewish case alluded to by Sir S. Romilly; perhaps nothing can be done to secure these foundations except by the interference of the legislature, but the next point must probably be first determined.

3rd. It is gravely argued, and argued by Sir S. Romilly, (upon what grounds he did not think proper to state) that impugning the doctrine of the Trinity, was an offence at common law originally, and has continued so after the repeal of the acts, and therefore that any institution formed since the repeal, for supporting Unitarianism, would be illegal.

This point shews the extreme importance of the decision in Mr. Wright's case. That gentleman has been held to bail, and an attempt will be made to get an indictment found against him by the Grand Jury of Lancashire, at the ensuing assizes. It is to be hoped (in order that the question may be decided) that they will find the bill, and in that case he will probably be tried at the spring assizes, and the Court of King's Bench must decide the point. I mention this, because Mr. Wright's case seems hitherto to have been considered by Unitarians as not very important to them, and the Unitarian Fund in particular has declined interfering,\* on being advised that the question, whether impugning the doctrine of the Trinity was an offence at common law, was idle and impossible to be seriously agitated; which advice it is still more singular to say, was given them by the gentleman who conducts the case reported below, on the part of the plaintiffs, in which his counsel vehemently argue the point, and contend that it is so clear, that the Chancellor ought to dismiss the trustees, and take away the endowment of a congregation on the strength of it, citing in support of their argument the prosecution against Mr. Wright, which the Unitarians are advised they need not defend.

If this point should be decided against the Unitarians, † it appears to be absolutely necessary to apply to Parliament for a Tolera-

---

\* The Committee of the Unitarian Fund volunteered their aid to Mr. Wright in an early stage of the proceedings; their "declining to interfere," we believe, respected primarily the question of the legality of the Meeting-house in which Mr. W. officiated,—at least, respected the blasphemy case only so far as it appeared to be a mere question of the veracity of witnesses on the alleged point of the denial of a future state. ED.

† The prosecution of Mr. Wright for blasphemy is abandoned. ED.



tion Act at least, and security to their foundations; but if it will not be trespassing too much on your limits, I hope to submit to you next month some observations on this supposed common law offence, when I trust we shall see, on looking into the cases on the subject, that there is no foundation for the *assertion* of the counsel for the plaintiffs. It is much to be lamented that Sir S. Romilly should have given the sanction of such a name as his to the assertion, without giving any authority for it, especially where (as will be seen by the Chancellor's judgment) the point was not necessary to the decision of the case.

4th. The comparative insignificance of the nominal plaintiffs in this case, and of the object for which they contend at so great an expense, (coupled with the circumstance of this attempt being conducted by one of such weight, among the class of Dissenters to which he more peculiarly belongs, as the gentleman above alluded to,) gives strong colour to the suspicion that this question has been raised in order to establish a principle upon which similar proceedings will be instituted in other like cases, which we know exist in several places. It is to be regretted that Dissenters should agitate these questions in Courts of Law, which do not understand or recognise the principles upon which their congregations are founded, particularly when it is considered that such principles as are contended for by counsel in this case, may indeed answer the purpose for which they are intended, but will, if pushed to their legitimate consequences, involve all differences of doctrine from that of the Established Church. The whole case shews, that it is absolutely necessary for Unitarians (in the most enlarged sense of the word) to form some closer union to make common cause in protecting their liberties and property from these attacks, not leaving an individual congregation to fight their battles against so powerful a body, but establishing some society of deputies for obtaining and maintaining civil rights, for the only class of British subjects which appears from the principles laid down to have at present, collectively, none.

EDGAR TAYLOR.

*Inner Temple, 21st July, 1817.*

#### LINCOLN'S INN HALL.

*Maunder & another v. Pearson & others.*

14th July, 1817.

IT appeared by the statement of the facts of this case by the counsel, that it was a bill filed at the relation of Mr. Maunder, a trustee of a meeting-house and land at Wolverhampton, and Mr. Steward the minister of that congregation, against several gentlemen the defendants, who are also

trustees of the premises; praying for an injunction to restrain the defendants from carrying on an ejectment commenced by them for recovering possession of four-fifths of the trust premises, the remaining fifth being vested in Mr. Maunder; and praying that the trust might be administered, &c. It appeared that land had been purchased in 1701, and a meeting-house built and conveyed to trustees. Other land had since been purchased and conveyed in the same manner. The trust was merely for supporting the worship of God, without providing any particular mode or tenets. Nothing was provided as to who was to have the choice of the minister, but it was provided that in case such worship should at any time cease to be tolerated, the trust should go to charitable uses, the trustees to be always twelve. About 1782, the trust had been filled up, and Mr. Maunder was one then appointed. In 1792, a fresh deed had been prepared for filling up the trust, which Mr. Maunder refused to execute, and the trustees were now reduced, we understood, to five; the other four being the defendants. It did not appear that Mr. Maunder had ever acted in the trust, being of different opinions to the rest of the congregation, who it seemed were Unitarians, and had been long so, though it was not clear what were the opinions of the founders, the trust deed not noticing the subject. Mr. Maunder had not for thirty years joined the congregation, but attended elsewhere. In 1812, the congregation and trustees sent a letter to Mr. Steward, one of the plaintiffs, inviting him to be their minister for three years, from 23rd April, 1813; and in his answer he said, "he accepted their invitation." The pleadings stated that he was so chosen, having expressed and preached doctrines conformable to those of the congregation, and that he continued doing so till soon after the three years elapsed, when it was discovered that his sentiments were Trinitarian, and the whole congregation in consequence, in September 1816, wrote to him, stating that his term had expired at April last, and they did not wish to continue him as their minister. He, however, declined giving up possession, being supported by Mr. Maunder, who now for the first time appeared to have acted in the trust, and the remaining trustees therefore brought an ejectment to recover four-fifths of the property, in order to replace themselves in their share of the management which they had thus lost.

Sir Samuel Romilly shortly opened the case; he contended that in the case of the Attorney General and Fowler, it had been held that institutions of this nature were considered and acted upon by the Court as any other public charity. That in this case the point to be agitated, was, whether the Court would permit the trustees to divert

the object of it. The place was now occupied by Unitarians, which he maintained was not the intent of the founder. He contended that that could not be the design, (although nothing appeared either one way or another upon the trust deed,) because Unitarian worship was not then legal or tolerated, and no public place of worship could therefore exist in the eye of the law on that system. He contended also, that Unitarianism still remained illegal at common law, although the penal statutes against the impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity had been repealed. Was Mr. Steward therefore to be turned out (as he contended was the intention here) merely because he had become a Trinitarian? On the contrary, it seemed that he thereby became more consonant to the intent of the founder. He contended also, that it was the intention of the founder, that the trustees should not have any power to choose a minister for a limited period or otherwise than for life, or that the minister should be turned out except for objections on the score of immorality. It was also pressed that the trustees had neglected their duty in not filling up the number of trustees, which instead of twelve, were now only five.

Mr. Hart followed on the same side, insisting particularly on the diversion of the trust from its proper object, by devoting it to Unitarian worship, which, he contended, was illegal and contrary to the intent of the founders. He argued also against the impolicy of letting the trustees exercise a capricious power over any person appointed to the situation of minister, (which appointment he held ought to be for life,) for that it had ever been the policy of that Court to prevent the possessor of any living, whether schools or churches, from being dependent on the people, as it evidently followed that a clergyman so situated would become the tool of his flock, and must in fact conform to whatever doctrines they choose to prescribe to him. He argued also, that they had suffered Mr. Steward to continue three months after the three years had expired, and had therefore waved that agreement and appointed him generally as their minister.

Mr. Shadwell at considerable length supported the proposition, that impugning the doctrine of the Trinity was still an indictable offence at common law. He began by citing the cases before Chief Justice Hall and Lord Raymond,\* in which it was

held that "Christianity is part of the common law of the land," and as such, any offence against it is indictable as a breach of the peace. The question then arose what was this Christianity, and he contended that the doctrine of the Trinity was the essence of it, and that Unitarianism struck at the very vitals of it. He traced back the Creed of the Church of Rome, as settled by the various councils of Nice, Trent, &c., in all which the Trinity was a prominent and leading feature. That this was the religion consequently of England prior to the Reformation, and therefore any offence against it must have been the kind of offence that the law would have punished regarding that establishment as Christianity. That at the Reformation various abuses were swept away, and the present Protestant religion established, which still in all its main features of belief, certainly as to the doctrine of the Trinity, was the same. That the Christianity, therefore, recognised and protected by the law, was that of which the Trinity formed the basis and essence, and that any doctrine contrary to it was therefore an offence against the law of the land and indictable by it.

The Legislature had thought proper to fix some determinate punishment upon this offence, which had been repealed, but this did not alter the nature of the offence.

The act which inflicted this penalty recited, that various persons had blasphemously and wickedly impugned the Trinity, and a particular punishment was therefore prescribed, but the repeal of this act left the offence still as recited by the act blasphemous and wicked. *In fact, he said the Court ought to be informed that prosecutions were at this moment pending against individuals for impugning the doctrine of the Trinity.* He contended, therefore, that the founders of this trust must have meant by inculcating the worship of God, that of the Trinity, especially as provision was made by the deed for devoting the charity to other purposes, if their worship should

Christianity is parcel of the law of England, and therefore to reproach the Christian religion, is to speak in subversion of the law." Lord Raymond says, "Christianity in general is parcel of the law of England, and to be protected by it;"—"and they laid their stress upon the word *general*, and did not intend to include disputes between learned men upon particular controverted points." "I would have it taken notice of, that we do not meddle with any differences of opinion, and that we interpose only when the very root of Christianity is struck at, as it plainly is here, the whole life and miracles of Christ being denied." What language can draw the line more precisely and correctly than this?

E. T.

\* 1 Ventr. 293, and 2 Strang. 294. It would have been more fair to have stated these cases as they are, than to have quoted this passage out of its connexion. Lord Hale's words are, "to say religion is a cheat, is to dissolve all those obligations whereby civil societies are protected; and

be no longer tolerated; though if they meant to preach Unitarianism, they must have known that their object was at that moment not tolerated. Mr. Shadwell protested against its being supposed, that he intended, or wished to prevent persons from thinking as they pleased on these subjects, but contended that preaching and propagating such opinions was attacking the very vitals of Christianity, was contrary to the law, which had by the recitals of its acts pronounced it blasphemous and wicked, and ought not to be countenanced by the Court.

He then commented on the other points of the case.

*Mr. Ching* followed in the same line of argument, and suggested that it ought to be the policy of the Court to render the minister independent of his congregation.

*Mr. Solicitor General* appeared for the defendants, and said he should not enter into the doctrinal questions that had been raised, conceiving the case lay in a very narrow compass, whether the majority of the trustees should have the management of the trust; and whether a trustee who had never acted for thirty years, and who had left the place, ought not to be considered as deserting the trust.

The question as to the change of sentiments of the minister did not at all arise; the defendants stated, that they themselves were of various opinions on some religious subjects; all they insisted for was the liberty of choice, having chosen the present minister for three years, and being now desirous of another election. If, as Mr. Maunder alleges, this trust is misapplied, why had he quietly laid by more than thirty years, knowing that the congregation were as they have always been Unitarian; and why did he now, in 1817, come forward to complain of those doctrines being taught? He contended that the doctrines had nothing to do with the question, and that the defendants were entitled, under the trust deed, to the management of the charity.

*Mr. Benyon* also argued in the same way. He could not see that this doctrinal point had any thing to do with the question, and was therefore totally unprepared to argue it; but as Mr. Shadwell had made so extraordinary a speech on the subject, he could not sit down without protesting against it. If the Dissenters of this country were really in the situation he described, they had gained very little. He was exceedingly sorry to hear such a speech, and trusted that Mr. Shadwell would before the case closed, retract what he stated, for nothing could be more mischievous or more void of foundation in law. He had attempted to prove that impugning the doctrine of the Trinity was an offence at common law—and how? By two cases which settled that Christianity was part of the

law of the land, and as such, the impugners of it were indictable; and who doubted this? Nobody contested that point; but was this proving his case? To do this, he had supposed in the absence of any kind of legal decision on the subject, that this Christianity meant the doctrine of the Trinity, and had given them a learned account of the councils of Nice, Trent, &c. to shew what nobody doubted—that these councils and the Church of Rome had been believers in the doctrine of the Trinity. He had then shewn that this was not one of the points on which the Protestant Church of England differed from the Roman Catholic, and from all this it followed that the doctrine of the Trinity was the Christianity which formed part of the law of England. If all this is so, it extends to every article of the Church of England, and every one who impugns any one of those articles, is liable to indictment and punishment. And this is the state in which all Dissenters, but particularly Unitarian Dissenters are, to stand. We have been used to bless ourselves for being born in a happy country, a country of free inquiry and toleration; but if this is the law, we have been very much deceived in our estimation. He considered the question as irrelevant, but he could not let such a mischievous statement of the law pass without raising up his voice to deny it. He had always understood, and still did believe, that the law did not take cognizance of particular opinions, except such as impugned the divine authority of religion and the Holy Scriptures; and the cases which Mr. Shadwell had cited, would be found carefully to guard against the law being extended any further.

*Mr. Phillimore* followed on the same side, arguing that it was perfectly competent for the trustees to choose the minister for a term of years. That in this case they had done so, and that Mr. Steward had accepted the situation, which he now refused to give up on those terms. That the congregation were all unanimous on the subject, and had actually chosen another minister in Mr. Steward's place, and that he and Mr. Maunder ought not to be permitted to prevent the general wish of the whole congregation.

*Sir Samuel Romilly* in reply, observed, that the question was, what was proper to be done by the Court; it being quite clear that something must be done to put an end to the present discordant state of this congregation, and whether defendants were to be suffered to get possession of four-fifths of this endowment, for it was admitted on all hands that the whole could not be recovered. He contended that the injunction must, if granted, extend not only to stay execution but also trial, for all they could recover was four-fifths, and what good would that do? Mr. Maunder would still



(as having the legal estate of a part) be enabled to keep Mr. Steward in his present situation.

As to what had been said on the subject of Mr. Maunder's having, as was contended, abandoned the trust by never having acted, and having left the congregation thirty years, &c., he could only observe, that Mr. Maunder had thought the objects of the charity mistaken or disregarded, and therefore withdrew; he merely declined attending to hear doctrines which his conscience disavowed: in short, he was in a minority, and therefore submitted, as he must do, to the majority.

The counsel on the other side had contended, that the Court had nothing to do with the doctrinal question that had been raised; they had endeavoured to lay that point quite out of the question as irrelevant, but if the nature of the charity was as the plaintiff contended, could they keep that question out of view? If the Court is to see the trust, to consider it in order to carry it into effect, it must look what it is, and what is the intent of the foundation. How can they avoid this?

The Solicitor General has stated the question to be merely, whether the defendants have committed any breach of their trust, and if they have not, whether they are not entitled as the majority of the trustees to regulate the charity; but then the question must arise, can they divert the purposes of that charity, as we say they have diverted it; the majority can only have the power of managing the trust as established, they cannot alter the object of it. The only important question, therefore, Sir Samuel Romilly contended was, whether they had diverted the charity from its original and legitimate object. "In 1701, land had been settled and a meeting-house built for the service and worship of God," and there can be no question that this meant the worship of the Trinity. It must have meant so, because the opposite doctrines had at that time no legal establishment or toleration, being expressly excepted by the Toleration Act. A change had now taken place in the opinion of the persons having the management of the trust—a difference of opinion from what must be taken to be the opinion and intention of the founders; and can they divert the charity by applying it to the support of these new opinions, especially if (as we contend) those opinions are illegal? And can they call upon the Court to carry into effect a trust for such illegal purposes? I apprehend they cannot. *I am confident that if a man were now to make an endowment for the support of lectures for the propagation of Unitarianism, that the Court must refuse to carry such a trust into effect. The Court could no more carry into effect a trust for promoting Unitarianism*

*than Judaism, which it refused to do in the case of Decosta and Depass, which was a foundation for lectures on the Jewish law. There can be no doubt that both are illegal at law. God forbid that any persons, whether Unitarians or Jews, or holding any description of religious opinions, should be prosecuted on that account. There can be no person so illiberal as to cherish such idea, and in my opinion it would be most illiberal to attempt any legal interference on such subjects; but at the same time I apprehend that a Court would be bound to say, that it would not carry any trust for such purposes into effect.*

The question, therefore, is solely whether these gentlemen can be suffered to divert the object of the charity, by preaching any other doctrines than the doctrines of Christianity, as they were tolerated when the trust was founded.

Another point in the case, Sir Samuel Romilly observed, was not a light one, viz. whether the trustees were competent to appoint the minister for a limited term, as in this case they had done of three years, and not for life. He contended that this was inconsistent with the intent of these trusts and good policy. In the case of trusts for the support of schools, the trustees have in many instances, and sometimes very laudably, endeavoured to keep a proper controul over the master, by making him dependant on their will, but the Court has always said that such limitations are illegal, and that the appointment must be free of any stipulations whatever of that sort. This case, he contended, was one of similar policy, and nothing in the trust deed empowered such limitation.

The foundation was here to teach the gospel, and the regulation of such an establishment ought to be considered, and might be very properly regulated with reference to the religious establishment of the country. The policy of that establishment has been to make the minister independent of the will of his hearers, and to give him a freehold interest. The congregation must not be set up as the censors at their caprice of their minister. Because he preaches on a particular Sunday a sermon which clashes somewhat with their notions, which may perhaps give offence because some particular vice or action is reprobated, which comes home to and offends some of his hearers, are they to be allowed to cashier and dismiss him at their pleasure? Such a power of giving notice of quitting, he thought had never been allowed by the Court.

Sir Samuel Romilly then adverted to some remarks made by Mr. Phillimore on Mr. Steward, contending that it did not appear by his answer, that he had but lately adopted Trinitarianism. He would not trouble the Court with reading passages,

to shew defendants' intention as to the future conduct of the trust; it was quite clear and admitted that they intended to alter the object by preaching Unitarianism, and that in fact it has been always of late appropriated to preaching the Unity of God; they admit this, adding that there are various opinions on that question among them, but that all agree on the point of contending for the liberty of choice of their minister.

*Lord Chancellor.*—There are so many considerations in this case of great importance, not only as regards the parties to it, but also the public, that I should not execute my duty if I stated my final opinions as to the various points of the case, till I had read the bill and answer. There are many and very different questions. If this was an application for no other purpose than to get trusts of an institution of Protestant Dissenters, which trusts were well known, administered, there would be no difficulty. There would be no occasion to disturb ourselves with questions as to the practice of injunctions, &c., because the Court would say there shall be no injunctions, no trials at law, nor any expense of that sort to the ruin of the institution, incurred, as we might save it all by making an order upon the parties for regulating and adjusting all matters in pursuance of the trust; and if I find it clear that the parties are all before the Court, and that the legal estate is vested partly in plaintiff and partly in defendants, it is quite competent to the Court to put the whole matter at rest, and in just as good a state, without wasting the charity in trials, and without any ejectment or legal proceedings whatever. If the case, however, be any thing more than such a common application to the Court to administer a common trust estate, of which the object is well known and defined, I must precisely understand the nature of it, and all the facts of the case.

It is stated and urged upon the Court that this is an institution for the benefit of Protestant Dissenters, and to apply property to maintain a preacher; and that it is highly expedient and necessary to have some decision as speedily as possible. Although it must be granted that this Court is bound to administer such a trust, and that with all the expedition it can give, yet I cannot say that I have often found a case of this sort where it was easy to do so. Amongst the various questions that arise, especially when it is considered (as I am sorry to say I have generally found the fact to be), that cases of this sort, on religious and controversial questions, are conducted with greater acrimony between the parties, than most other matters that come before the Court:—if, as is often the case, the trust is rendered multifarious and ambi-

guous by, in some trust deeds of this sort, requiring the assent of the congregation in the choice of ministers, in others the assent of only a select portion of the congregation, in others that of the trustees only, in others by prescribing no form at all, as in the present instance;—it is easy to come to this Court for a remedy, but not so easy for this Court to find it.

It is here contended that this was originally a Protestant institution to celebrate divine worship generally; and it is also insisted that the very instrument which creates the trust, bears on the face of it proof of the intent that the doctrine intended to be inculcated was the doctrine of the Trinity; and the clauses in the deed are referred to, which provide for the application of the fund in case of the Legislature rendering it unlawful to carry on that kind of worship. It is then observed that the act of Toleration, with a view to which the parties must be supposed to have looked, and which had passed before this trust, did not extend to the toleration of any doctrine impugning the Trinity. And it is therefore contended that those who instituted this trust must have thought they were establishing it for a lawful purpose: whereas the Toleration Act did not tolerate the impugnors of the Trinity, and therefore an establishment for that purpose would have been illegal.

It is said, on the other hand, that the Acts of Parliament on this subject have been repealed: it is certainly true that the Legislature has repealed such laws with respect to the Trinity; it has also repealed the Scotch laws on the subject, which, I believe, even went so far as to inflict the punishment of death. It has also, I believe, within the last week, passed an Act for the same purpose with regard to the Irish laws on the subject; but I can confidently state that in one House, at least, it was never intended, by so doing, to alter or affect the common law.

I do not presume, however, to state here, and as sitting in a Court of equity, what is the effect of these acts on the common law; but if the common law is not altered, and it should be held that impugning the doctrine of the Trinity is an indictable offence at common law, then I cannot here execute a trust for the support of what would thus be decided to be illegal opinions.

It is not for the Court here to say how much or how little of toleration it is proper and desirable to extend; but it must look to what is the law of the land, and to the state in which the Legislature has placed the question.

But there is another view of the question: when these institutions are established for religious worship, and you cannot find from the deed declaring the trust, what species

of opinion or form of worship was intended, the Court can find no other means of deciding it than by inquiring what has been the usage; and if any particular usage can be settled and supported, the Court must administer the trust in that manner, which may be supposed, from usage, to have been established, and to exist, as it were, in contract between the parties. But, (and I think the point has been settled in a case which came from Scotland in appeal to the House of Lords,) if an institution is established to carry on worship or to teach doctrines thought by the founders to be most conformable to Christianity, I do not apprehend that it is in the power of any members who may hereafter have the management of that institution, to alter the frame and object of it because their views vary. They cannot say to the rest we have changed, and therefore, as we are the majority, the constitution of the trust must change.

The case referred to settled, I think, that if they differed amongst themselves, you must look to the origin of the trust and settle it upon that foundation.

In this view it is important to see what the record says on this subject. Without entering into the effect of the repeal of the laws on the subject, which it would be improper for me, sitting in a Court of equity, to decide, and which, if it should arise, would much better be decided by the judges of the courts of common law; without deciding this question (having myself an opinion on the subject, but not called upon here to pronounce it), do the deeds manifest, with regard to the allusions to the Toleration Act, that this is an institution requiring the inculcation of the doctrine of the Trinity? Because, if that was the doctrine intended by the founders, and if the trustees have changed that object, I apprehend that it is not in the power of part or the whole of the congregation or trustees to call upon another trustee to effectuate that purpose. Even if Unitarianism had then been legal, yet if Trinitarianism was appointed and intended by the deed founding the trust, Anti-trinitarianism cannot now be supported by it. Meaning to speak with all reverence on the subject, it would be merely a question whether a trust for the benefit of A. could be diverted to the benefit of B. If this is the state of the question, it decides the case.

I am fully aware of the importance, with a view to conciliation, and abating the heat with which I am sorry to see controversies of this sort generally carried on, that a final and speedy determination should be made; yet if parties will frame such deeds with such obscure and undefined trusts, the Court must inquire, and time must be taken up; but it is their own fault.

With respect to the choice of the minister, I am not much acquainted with the practice in institutions of this sort: it is perhaps very uncertain, and probably in general they do not choose their minister for life. This Court would not perhaps much like this mode of appointment; but if the trust of the institution direct it, it must carry it into effect. The policy of the established church has been to make the minister independent of the congregation; but I do not apprehend that this policy can govern the decision of the Court, if the trust directs any other form.

So with respect to the persons who are to elect, I apprehend the Court must look to the usage. Some deeds of this kind confer the power upon some parties, some on others; but where it is wholly unascertained, the Court cannot administer the trust, till they know all these points by inquiring into the subject. On the face of the deeds nothing is said; inquiry, therefore, must be made: I can only say, I will read the Bill and Answer, and ascertain the facts as well as I can; and if I can get out of the *affliction*, I will decide the case on Thursday.

There certainly shall be no trial; there never shall be any expense of that sort incurred. If I can find out the state of the questions in this cause, so as to make an order on the subject, it will save every thing of that sort.

17th July, 1817.

Lord Chancellor.—The motion before me on Monday arose upon a bill filed by the Attorney General, at the relation of Mr. Maunder and Mr. Steward, who alleges himself to be minister of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters assembling at Wolverhampton, against Mr. Pearson, together with others who assert that they are, together with Mr. Maunder, the trustees of the property in question, which is expressed in the trust-deeds to be a charity for the maintenance of "*the service and worship of God*" at that place, and who contend that Mr. Maunder ought to be considered as being no longer a trustee, or that if he has part of the legal estate of the trust property vested in him, that he ought to be considered as holding it for the purpose of being administered, as the other trustees or the majority shall direct, and that he is himself incapable of acting. And this information, as I collect from reading it, is filed to prevent those from acting as trustees who it contends have no such character; or if they are legally invested with such character, then the information is to be considered as filed for the purpose of insisting that the defendants being invested with the character of trustees for one purpose, mean to execute that trust for another purpose, contrary to the intention of the founders; and, upon



these grounds, which afford a civil question in this Court, the information contends that it is entitled to certain relief, and particularly to an injunction to prevent the present legal proceedings of the defendants.

The deeds upon which the questions in this case arise, are the deed of 1701 (the particular effect of which it will be necessary to state carefully), another in 1742, to carry on this part of the trust, and lastly, the deed of 1772, by which last the premises were conveyed to Mr. Maunder and others. Another part of this trust is an acre of land, given for the purposes of the trust, and originally settled thereto in 1720, which is in 1772 vested in Mr. Maunder and eleven others. It appears also, that there have been two sums of £200 each, given for the same purpose, which, with £99, accumulations of rents, &c. of the other trust property, was laid out in the three per cents., part of which stock has been sold and laid out in leasehold property (it does not appear in whom vested), and the residue was invested in a promissory note given to four of the trustees, which still remains so invested. A further sum of £100 has been given by another person, which is for the benefit of the minister. In 1793, a stable was purchased by the trustees, and in 1794, a school-room, &c. erected, but it is alleged by the answer, that previous to that time dissensions had arisen in the congregation, and that the plaintiffs did not subscribe to such erection. It appears also, that the dwelling-house on the trust has been usually, but not always, the residence of the minister, it having been sometimes let, and the rent appropriated for his benefit.

It becomes here necessary (not for the purpose of expressing any opinion on doctrinal points, but in order to see what can be referred to as ascertaining the nature of this trust), to discover, if possible, the meaning of the original founders as to the purposes to which it was to be applied. Observing that the first trust deed is dated in 1701, it is important to remark that in 1689 the Act of the 1st of William and Mary, commonly called the Toleration Act, was passed, which exempted certain persons coming under the description of Protestant Dissenters, from the penalties of certain laws therein mentioned; and I observe again, the object seems to have been merely as stated in the title to exempt the persons therein described "from the penalties of certain laws," that is to say, certain particular statutes, therein mentioned and enumerated; and it does not appear to have done, or to have been intended to have done, any more—leaving the common law exactly as it was with regard to any offences recognised by that common law against religion or the esta-

blishment. And in that Act there is an express provision, that nothing in that Act contained shall extend to give any ease, benefit or advantage to any Papist, &c., or "to any person that shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the blessed Trinity as it is declared in the aforesaid Articles of Religion;" this, I repeat, was enacted in 1689, and the original creation of this trust was in 1701. Afterwards, in 9 and 10 William III. an Act passed, entitled "An Act for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness;" and it recites, that whereas many persons have of late years openly avowed and maintained many blasphemous and impious opinions, contrary to the doctrines and principles of the Christian religion, greatly tending to the dishonour of Almighty God, &c.: wherefore, "for the more effectual suppressing of the said detestable crimes, it is enacted, that if any person, &c. shall, by writing, teaching, &c. deny any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God," or shall assert that there are more gods than One, or deny the divine authority of the Scriptures, he shall suffer certain pains. *You will observe the recital to be not that the opinions are contrary to those of the Church of England, but to the Christian religion, and then to repress such doctrines so declared by the Statute to be contrary to the Christian religion, it is enacted as in the Act mentioned.* The information, however, was required by the Act to be given within a limited period, and an opportunity was given to the offender to renounce his error. There can be no doubt that prior to this statute, blasphemy was an offence punishable at common law; and it is impossible, as it appears to me, to contend that the preamble is not to be taken as proof, that in the eye of the legislature these doctrines, against which it is directed, amounted to blasphemy. And nobody can contend that this statute by any means affected the common law, but left it exactly in the same state as before. As the late Act which repealed this Act repealed also the Scotch law on the same subject, I have here one of those Acts; it relates to and is directed against denying the doctrine of the Trinity expressly under the title of blasphemy; and it enacts that those who denied that doctrine should be punished with death. These Statutes remained in force till the 53rd of the present King, when the Act passed which repealed the excepting clause in the Toleration Act, and the 9th and 10th King William, so far as relates to the doctrine of the Trinity, and also the Scotch laws; and I should observe that there seemed to be no difference of opinion in any individuals of either House; that, without considering what offence there was at common

law, or what common law punishment existed,—I do not recollect any difference of opinion on the point that, the penalties enacted by these statutes—that it was difficult to say that the penalties enacted by these statutes, were proper to be inflicted. The Act, therefore, of the 53rd of the King repealed the clause of the 9th and 10th William III. against denial of the doctrine of the Trinity; but I apprehend that it left the common law exactly where it was: and conceiving the object of the present application to be to contend that the defendants are not the persons entitled under the circumstances to the management of the trust, or if they are legally invested by the deeds with the character of trustees, that they are not *bonâ fide* administering this trust, but under colour of the trust created in them by the deeds, they are in truth creating a new trust; and that they are so executing and creating a trust directly at variance with that contemplated by the founders: and whatever may have been stated and argued at the bar, as to the criminality or not of parties, with which I conceive that I have in this case nothing to do, I have here only to administer civil rights, and in this instance to go no further than to determine the points arising upon the pleadings, having no office to determine what is or is not crime or offence at common law, except where the Court is of necessity called to determine it by being called upon to interfere in a case which depends upon such determination, or to aid such crime or offence. I shall therefore confine myself to the civil question,\* because the other does not in this case arise.

You will recollect, that by the Toleration Act, the benefit of it is not given to impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Attorney General, by this information, contends that the trust is about to be applied to doctrines which the Legislature, when it was extending toleration to the mass of Protestant Dissenters, did not think proper subjects for such toleration. The first deed is that of 1701, which declares the trust to be for the worship and service of God, with various provisions; and it is especially provided that if at any time such meeting for the worship and service of God should be prohibited by law, and the meeting-house thereby become useless, the same should go to other uses. Several passages in this deed were particularly commented on at the bar. I shall now only state that there is quite sufficient of allegation in the information, that this was a foundation made by a body of Protestant Dissenters, established with a view to pro-

\* Namely, what was the intent of the founder as to doctrine.

E. T.

mote the teaching of doctrines to which they were attached, and especially for the purpose of inculcating the doctrine of the Trinity, or at least, that the original founders' intent and opinions were such that the teaching of Unitarianism would be at variance with their object. I observe upon this particularly, because I take it that if land or money were given in such a manner, as to be legal notwithstanding the statutes concerning charitable uses, and given to build a house, &c. to maintain the worship of God, and nothing precise appeared as to the particular intent, the Court would consider it made for worship according to the established religion; but it is now clearly established that if the mode and intent of the trust be clearly expressed to be by Protestant Dissenters, for promoting their particular doctrines, *not amounting to crime*, the Court must administer that trust according to the intent of the founders. In this case, however, I repeat there is sufficient allegation on the bill and on the deeds, to leave no doubt that this trust was originally to maintain Protestant Dissenting worship, and therefore it cannot be said that the worship intended was that of the Established Church. I take it, however, from experience, that if any body of persons mean to create a trust, and to call upon the Court to administer that trust according to the intent of the foundation, whether connected with religion or not, it is incumbent on them in the instrument creating such trust to let the Court know enough of the nature of that trust to enable it so to act; and therefore, where a body of Protestant Dissenters establish a trust without any precise definition of the object or mode of worship, I know of no means the Court has of ascertaining it except by looking to what is past, and collecting by usage what may, by fair inference, be presumed to have been the intent of the founders. From this deed I can collect that it was for the maintenance of Protestant Dissenting worship, but it shews nothing more, except as I can collect from some of the clauses, particularly the clause contemplating the future prohibition of that worship, which seems to shew that they did not mean to establish an institution not then tolerated by law, and that they did not mean to give an unlimited power to vary the plan of doctrines whenever the majority thought proper. Looking at the date of the Deed of 1701, and that of the Act of Toleration, and of 9th and 10th William III. and what I find in the deed of 1742, it is impossible to say that while they look to a dissolution of the existing system of toleration, and to the Legislature prohibiting their worship, that they meant to create by that deed an illegal system, a system which the Legislature had just thought

improper to be included in the toleration it extended to Protestant Dissenters; and this clause, therefore, appears to give extremely strong countenance to the opinion that those who originated the institution intended, at least, that those doctrines should not be taught which impugned the doctrine of the Trinity. With respect to the power given to the trustees to make orders and regulations, I think they cannot be considered to be thereby empowered to change the whole purpose of the institution by diverting it to the maintenance of a different sort of doctrines—as different indeed as if it should be considered that it gave them a power to change it from a place of Dissenting worship to that of the Church of England; for it seems to me that it is just as contrary to the intent of the founders to change it from one mode of Dissenting worship to another, as to that of the Established Church. As to the clause which it was supposed affected Mr. Maunder's character of trustee, from his having withdrawn, I apprehend that if the parties meant to divert the charity by teaching such doctrines as the bill charges, this Court would never have discharged a trustee under that clause, because it would have considered him as guarding the trust according to the intent of the founders.

Another part of the trust is settled by the deed of 1720, for the benefit of the minister for the time being, and not as in the former deed; and then it is provided that if the Toleration Act should be repealed, and the congregation prevented by law from assembling, (observing in passing that it is extraordinary that they should provide against that Act being repealed, if they knew they were establishing doctrines which were exempted from the benefit of that Act, or that they should at any rate not have added to these provisions, "in case that Act should be held not to extend to their class of worship, and they should be prevented assembling in consequence",) then the estate was to be sold for the benefit of the then minister. Then arises the question whether the minister can be appointed for three years only, and that must depend upon the usage, whether the one gives and the other accepts such nomination. It appears highly probable that the person who gave that part of the fund contemplated a provision for the minister for life, and yet it may certainly be shewn and turn out to be the usage of the congregation to do otherwise.

As to the power of appointing trustees, it is provided that if trustees die, desert the congregation, or become of any other religion or doctrine whatever (and I would observe on these words, that if the question came before the Court whether a trustee

had or had not become of a different persuasion, it would then be necessary for the Court to inquire what was the religion intended, not for the purpose of making observations upon this or that religion, but to inquire into that religion, in order to determine whether such person could be duly removed on account of that new class of opinions or religion to which he had addicted himself, and that with reference to civil rights only, except in very special cases indeed), it is provided that if the trustees did not keep up the number, the minister might appoint them. This trust, in 1792, became vested in Maunder and eleven others, including a person who never acted, it is said. It is alleged in the information that Maunder is now to be considered as the only trustee, or that if the defendants have any part of the legal estate vested in them, that they are introducing a doctrine directly contrary to the intent of the founders. If the defendants are not duly elected, then Maunder is certainly the surviving and only trustee; and defendants admit that the legal estate in one-fifth part of some of the property and one-sixth of another part has not passed to them; but that Maunder, not having acted, ought now to act as the majority direct.

With respect to the intent of the donors; on these questions the defendants by their answer state that they cannot say whether the meeting was originally built by Trinitarians, and whether and how long such principles were professed, save that in 1780 some of the congregation were Trinitarians, and others professed different sentiments: they deny that the trust was intended to promote a belief in the Trinity. And they charge that the trust was for the worship and service of Almighty God, without any mention of Trinitarianism or any other doctrine, and that the funds have accordingly been so applied. They cannot say of their own knowledge whether the former ministers were or were not Trinitarians, or what they were: they do not believe the intent of the founder was to promote a belief in the Holy Trinity; but they believe the intent was to promote the worship of God as Protestant Dissenters generally. They admit having been in possession of the meeting-house, and that the doctrine of the Trinity has not been taught, except by the plaintiff, Mr. Steward, who, having taught Unitarianism three years, has lately begun to preach Trinitarianism; and they say they are not all of the same opinions, but that they all believe in God, and the propriety of worshiping and serving God; that they consider peculiar opinions irrelevant, and that the intent was for the service of God, without regard to any particular tenets. They seem to have gone on harmoniously



till the election of a Mr. Jennison by some part of the congregation, and a Mr. Griffiths by another part, which discussion seems to have ended by Mr. Griffiths keeping possession of the meeting-house and pulpit; and I understand he was an Unitarian, and kept possession till 1804.

It appears that in 1793 a feoffment was made to twelve trustees, which Mr. Maunder refused to execute, and another of the former trustees, but who had never acted, also did not execute. The legal estate thus vested in them, therefore, did not pass to the new trustees; and in this kind of transaction the Court must have interposed, because it would never admit so inconvenient a thing to the trust as splitting it into portions.

I collect their reason for not executing to be, that they considered the congregation as maintaining different doctrines from the purpose of the founders. There is a doubt also, whether this conveyance was duly perfected by levy of seizin.

The major part, however, in 1813 elected Mr. Steward, and in 1816, upon his change of opinions, they say they called upon him to quit with the consent of the congregation, at the same time hinting that if he continued in his former opinions, they would have no objection to his continuing, and at any rate that he might remain for three months. I repeat that I have nothing to say, or any opinion to pronounce as to any particular religious doctrines; but that this case must be discussed as if it were the case of common trust property, with no relation to any religious purpose, and a case where the parties contended that that trust was diverted from its principal object. Perhaps we can easily say where the legal estate is vested; but still comes the question for what purpose that estate is so vested. When a clergyman of the Church of England is presented to a living, we know his duties; but as the Legislature of the country has permitted seceders from that church, and as it is now the duty of the Court to enforce trusts for these institutions, we must look at the deeds creating those institutions only, to say what are the proper purposes to which they are to be applied. Where a charitable institution is founded of this kind (or say for civil purposes, in order that we may discuss the subject more temperately than we usually do religious ones), the Court must see that the trustees apply the fund for the benefit of their trust and no other; but if upon inquiry (and I cannot find it sufficiently clear upon this record), it shall be found that this was originally such an institution as plaintiffs contend, then the persons in whom it is vested must do their duty to prevent any change from the proper object; and if congregations do change in the manner stated,

though they certainly do impose great difficulties upon the Court, yet I apprehend that the Court must, as was settled in the Scotch case in the House of Lords, referred to by me the other day, refer to the intent of the founders, and let that be the rule of their decision. Institutions of this kind must not be sacrificed to the changes of the persons in whom they are vested, who have no right over their charge but to perform their duty to the founders. It is necessary to make these inquiries; and in the meantime it is absurd ejectments should be going on: and I shall therefore grant the injunction to stay proceedings till further order of the Court, the parties undertaking to account for rents, &c., and refer it to the Master to inquire in whom the legal estate is vested, including the leasehold; and to inquire what is the nature and particular object with respect to worship and doctrine, for the observance and teaching which this institution was created, and to report who are proper persons to be trustees, subject to the direction of the Court.

Mr. Hart for the plaintiffs suggested an additional order to call in the £200 out on note.

Lord Chancellor.—If the Court is to call in this money, with a view to investing it for the benefit of the trust, it will become necessary to agitate the question, which I have avoided, whether the law stands so that the Court can lend its aid in support of an institution for supporting Unitarianism. It is for you to consider whether you will entangle yourselves with that question.

The plaintiffs' counsel did not press it further.

### *Northern Unitarian Society.*

*Sheffield, July 3, 1817.*

THE Annual Meeting of the *Northern Unitarian Society*, and the ministers of the Presbyterian association for the midland counties of Derby, Nottingham, Leicester, Lincoln, and the south of Yorkshire, was held on the 20th of last month, at Sheffield. The Rev. Mr. Hawkes, of Lincoln, delivered a discourse in the morning, from John xxi. 15, addressed principally to his brethren in the ministry; and in the evening, the Rev. Mr. Turner, of Newcastle, preached to the people from Eph. vi. 24. The interval between the services was very happily spent at the Tontine Inn, where the ministers, with many members of the congregation in Sheffield, and other gentlemen, partook of an economical dinner.

It was proposed, and unanimously agreed, that henceforward the meeting should be quarterly; the first to be held at Mansfield, in the county of Nottingham.

*Southern Unitarian Society.*

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held on Wednesday, the 16th July, at the Unitarian Chapel, Poole. The morning service was introduced by the Rev. Russell Scott, of Portsmouth, who also read the Scriptures, and offered the general prayer; the sermon was preached by the Rev. A. Bennett, late of Ditchling, but now minister of the congregation at Poole; and the Rev. N. Walker concluded the devotional exercises. The sermon delivered by Mr. Bennett excited great interest, and made a strong impression on a numerous audience. The object of it was to shew that the Unitarian system is a complete system, complete in its articles of faith, in its motives to piety, and in the joys and consolations which it affords to sincere and upright believers. The worthy preacher established this position by a candid examination of the tenets of reputed orthodoxy. There was a religious service in the evening, which was introduced by the Rev. Mr. Lewis, of Dorchester; the Rev. William Hughes, of the Isle of Wight (in the absence of the Rev. Mr. Blake, of Crewkerne, who was prevented from attending the meeting), preached, and in a very able discourse explained the nature of sacrifices, and shewed that they afford neither countenance nor support to the Calvinistic doctrine of Atonement. Upwards of six hundred persons were present.

The business of the Society was transacted immediately after the morning service; the thanks of the society were unanimously voted to the morning preacher, accompanied with a request that he would consent to the printing of his sermon, to which request he kindly assented. A newly arranged and improved list of the books distributed by the Society was proposed by the Rev. Russell Scott, and adopted; and Thomas Cooke, Jun. Esq. was re-elected Treasurer and Secretary for the ensuing year.

The members and friends of the Society dined together at the London Tavern, High Street. Several new members were added to the Society.

*Newport, Isle of Wight,*  
*July 19, 1817.*

A. C.

*Scotch Unitarian Christian Association.*  
*Glasgow, May, 1817.*

ON Sunday the 27th April, was held, at Edinburgh, the Fifth Annual Association of the Unitarian Christians of Scotland. The religious services of the day were conducted in the Unitarian Chapel, Carubber's Close. The morning service was introduced by Charles Wallace, M. A. late student of Glasgow College. The Rev. John Gaskell, M. A. preached a truly interesting and animated discourse, furnished from the

words of the Apostle Paul, 2 Cor. ii. 14, "Thanks be unto God who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place." Mr. Gaskell also introduced the afternoon service; and the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, Unitarian Minister of Glasgow, preached from 1 Cor. xv. 14, on the validity of the evidence for our Saviour's resurrection, with a view to establish the broad line of distinction between Unitarians and the advocates for mere natural religion. Mr. Mardon also introduced the evening service, when the Rev. Richard Wright, Unitarian Missionary, delivered an interesting introductory address, and preached from 1 Cor. iii. 11, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The preacher's aim was to give an explicit statement of the rank which Christ occupies in the Unitarian scheme. The congregations, if not numerous, were respectable and attentive.

On Monday the 28th, at eleven o'clock, a meeting was held in the chapel, to transact the yearly business of the society. After the usual introduction by singing and prayer, the Annual Report of the Committee of the Association was read, with much interesting communication from the corresponding members, by which it appeared, that the prejudices against Unitarians are wearing off in several places of Scotland, and many of the common people are ready to acknowledge us in our true character as Christians, though, to use the phrase of one correspondent, we are placed "in the rear rank." The report stated, that during the last year, 3676 Tracts, belonging to the Society, had been distributed, and 2600 remain on hand. Of these Tracts a considerable proportion are copies of Dr. Carpenter's Unitarian's Appeal, Extracts from Dr. Priestley's Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham, and Elwall's Trial, which have been lately reprinted by the Society, and appear excellently adapted to promote the cause of Unitarianism. Agreeably to a recommendation of the last year's Committee, the meeting resolved, that the funds of the Society should, for the present, be exclusively devoted to the printing and circulation of small tracts. The Committee for the subsequent year is chosen in Edinburgh, Mr. Wm Tennant, jun., being Secretary, and Mr. L. Scott, Treasurer. Mr. Wright was requested to print, for cheap circulation, the substance of the Address which he prefixed to his Sermon; (the latter forms one in the volume of Discourses now in the press), to which request he has very kindly conceded. Among other good wishes expressed by this meeting, was a tribute of grateful acknowledgment to the Rev. James Yates, for his late "Sequel to the Vindication," a work which evinces

the most accurate and extensive learning, a judicious acquaintance with Scripture, and a truly candid, liberal and pious spirit, and which, in conjunction with the Vindication, to which it forms an excellent Supplement, cannot fail to be of essential service to the cause of truth and godliness.

After the business of the Society was transacted, the friends repaired to Barclay's Tavern, Adam's Place, where a select company partook of an economical dinner. The following sentiments were given by Dr. Gairdner, the Chairman, and contributed, in the speeches connected with them, to inspire the company with the most pleasurable and grateful feelings; The Scotch Unitarian Christian Association, which he introduced with a very able address, concluded by the following striking passage from Dr. Johnson's Rambler, which, as a very happy illustration of the manner in which moral difficulties may be overcome, the writer hopes that gentleman will not be displeased to see inserted in this place: "All the performances of human art, at which we look with praise or wonder, are instances of the resistless force of perseverance: it is by this that the quarry becomes a pyramid, and that distant countries are united with canals. If a man was to compare the effect of a single stroke of a pickaxe, or of one impression of the spade, with the general design and last result, he would be overwhelmed by the sense of their disproportion; yet these petty operations, incessantly continued, in time surmount the greatest difficulties, and mountains are levelled and oceans bounded, by the slender force of human beings."—(No. 43.) The King and the British Constitution; upon which Mr. Wright took occasion to enlarge on the obligations of Unitarians to the house of Brunswick.—Peace to the shades of the Penal Statutes against Unitarians.—British System of Education.—Manchester College, York, and the Unitarian Academy at Hackney.—Mr. Belsham, the terror of Bishops.—Mr. Aspland and the Unitarian Fund.—Memory of Dr. Priestley, (drunk standing.)—The Rev. R. Wright.—Dr. Southwood Smith, late Unitarian Minister at Edinburgh, now of Yeovil.—The Rev. James Yates, now of Birmingham.—Mr. Gaskell and the congregation at Thorne.—The Congregation at Glasgow and Mr. Mardon, their present minister, who took occasion to introduce the memory of the Rev. Dr. Dalrymple, and the Rev. Dr. McGill, late ministers of Ayr. The meeting broke up at an early hour, all seemingly impressed with the importance of the glorious cause in which they are engaged, and willing to employ their individual and united efforts to advance its interest; persuaded that the general adoption of Unitarianism, "the truth as it is in Jesus," must issue in glory to God in the

highest, in peace on earth, and good will towards men.

The writer of this paper, earnestly recommends to the friends of Unitarianism, and of free inquiry in England, the interests of their brethren in Scotland, particularly of the churches, established for the sole worship of the Father, in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Labouring under the disadvantages to which, in general, Dissenters have been subject, the cause which they have espoused from conviction, will flourish more abundantly by the co-operation of their southern neighbours. The Scotch Unitarians are deeply grateful for the assistance afforded by the Unitarian Fund, in favouring them with the visits of that able and active missionary, Richard Wright, and will be pleased with the occasional visits of other English ministers, who may find it convenient to come among them.

B. M.

#### PARLIAMENTARY.

##### *Athanasian Creed.*

Thursday, June 26, General THORNTON moved that a Clause should be inserted in the Clergy Residence Bill, enforcing the due performance of the Established Service, and particularly the reading of the Creed of St. Athanasius, which was now frequently omitted. The honourable mover thought this point was of the utmost importance, as the Unitarians were putting forth cheap publications in refutation of the doctrines of Athanasius. Sir J. NICHOLL said, such a clause was unnecessary, as the bishops had already the power of enforcing the desired objects.—Motion negatived.

IN the course of the month, on the motion of Sir John Newport, a bill was carried through the House of Commons, and thence through the House of Lords, (and in both without a single objection or remark,) and at length received the Royal Assent for the relief of Irish Unitarians from all penalties on account of their faith and worship. This act does for Ireland what the Trinity Bill, in 1813, did for England and Scotland, though what that was, remains, according to the doctrines maintained in Chancery, to be yet determined.

#### FOREIGN.

##### RELIGIOUS.

##### *Unitarianism in America.*

WE have received letters from Philadelphia, from which we learn that the Unitarian Church there is in a state of peace and prosperity. Messrs. Eddowes and Taylor are the officiating ministers; Mr. Vaughan having lately retired from public service on account of the delicate state of his health. The brethren receive occa-



sional visits from the Boston Unitarian Clergy. They have just formed a Congregational Theological Library. Feeling the weight of the debt upon their place of worship, which is no less than 14,500 dollars, they lately raised among themselves, in addition to former subscriptions, about 3,000 dollars, as a sinking fund: the income of the church, from pew-rents, is pledged to the payment of the debt. The services of the present ministers are gratuitous; but, as they cannot always reckon upon having this benefit, they have raised another fund of about 1,600 dollars to accumulate for the salary of a minister, should it be hereafter needed. On account of the known situation of Great Britain, the Transatlantic Unitarians make no direct appeal to them for assistance; but, at the same time, they wish it to be intimated, that should any persons here be disposed to contribute towards the means for giving permanency to the first church that has been built in the New World for Unitarian worship, their contributions will be most thankfully accepted. The members of the Philadelphian Church have made great exertions, for their number is not great, and the greater part of them consist of persons in the middle, or rather under the middle, classes of the community. Some families have lately gone over from England, who will, we trust, enlarge their number; though it is not to be expected that such as emigrate to America should be able, when they arrive there, to aid the pecuniary exertions of the societies to which they may attach themselves.

The orthodox preachers in America, like those in Great Britain, endeavour to make the Unitarians suspicious and odious, by every species of reproach and accusation. One of these adventurous orators, at Baltimore, lately asserted a mischievous falsehood, in the pulpit, with regard to the Unitarians, and was compelled to unsay, as openly and publicly, what he had before declared to be a well-attested fact. In the town just mentioned, the Unitarians are more numerous than at Philadelphia, though they have none among them who are able or willing to conduct the public services. They have resolved to build a church and have already engaged the ground, intending to procure a regular minister. The venerable Dr. Freeman, of Boston, lately made them a visit, and preached among them three Sundays.

Our correspondent expresses his high satisfaction in the advantages which Unitarianism possesses in the United States, in the excellent character of the clergy who profess it. With regard to these, he says:—"The heretical part of the Boston and Eastern ministers are respected and esteemed; for, in all Christian virtues, they are patterns to their flocks. Totally des-

titute of the stiffness and austerity of the old school, they are affable and cheerful.—I know not whether you have been apprised of an excellent plan amongst them for promoting the general objects of their profession and drawing closer together the cords of brotherly love. It is this:—Once every fortnight the congregational ministers of Boston and its vicinity, Trinitarians and Unitarians, meet at each other's houses in rotation; during the winter months in Boston, and, during the summer, at the houses of the country members. These meetings are held on Monday afternoons, from four to seven or eight o'clock. They are opened by a prayer. The senior minister presides. Candidates for the ministry are examined, or submit their preparatory exercises to the judgment of the meeting. Any member who wishes for advice, either mentions the subject publicly, or confers privately with such individuals as he deems most judicious and experienced. No laws are made: nothing like domination is attempted. Sometimes the hours are passed (with a short interval for tea and coffee) in pleasant and improving conversation. The cases of vacant churches are here considered, for it is natural to apply to such bodies of men for candidates to fill empty pulpits. As it is usual for the Eastern ministers to make frequent exchanges with each other, for half the Lord's Day in town, and the whole day in the country, these arrangements are often made at the meeting of the Association. In a word, speaking for myself, I can truly say, that, having repeatedly been present, the time so spent seemed to me to pass swiftly and delightfully away. One thing is certain, there is much cordiality and kindness among the ministers of Massachusetts who adopt this custom. In Connecticut, Calvinism is almost universal, and the spirit of intolerance is predominant."

The same correspondent writes as follows with respect to the prospects of *Emigrants*:—

"Mr. K., being a mechanic, will, I am persuaded, do well; but those who cannot labour with their hands, unless they bring a fortune with them, will seldom find their account in coming to this country: and such persons should be advised to invest their property in the United States' 6 per cent. stock, particularly at its present low price in England. On their arrival, it can easily be sold at a good profit; or, if held, the interest would be equal to 7 per cent. and the security is unquestionable."

We have also received a variety of pamphlets from America on the Unitarian controversy, and several successive numbers of the Tracts published by the Peace Society, of which we intend to lay an account before our readers.

NOTICES.

MR. GILCHRIST has in the Press, "*The Intellectual Patrimony, or a Father's Instructions.*"

THE Thirty-first Annual Meeting of the Trustees of *Manchester College, York*, will be held at Cross Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Friday, August 1st, 1817.

The Friends of the College will afterwards dine together as usual, at the Bridge-water Arms, Manchester, when the Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool, is expected to preside.

SECRETARIES.

THOS. H. ROBINSON,  
J. G. ROBBERDS,

Manchester, July 12th, 1817.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

*The Christian's Survey of the Political World.*

ESPIONAGE is a term become unhappily familiar to the English ear. It is derived from the French, among whom the system, which it expresses, had been brought to the utmost pitch of perfection, if perfection can be applied to a species of villainy, exceeding in atrocity any that has ever been practised amongst mankind. It means the science, art, or profession of employing spies over the conduct of every individual, so that all his motions and actions and thoughts at any time may be discoverable. It does not, as is imagined, require any great skill in the conductors of the machine. A cold depraved heart is sufficient for the prime mover, who finds or makes agents suited to his purpose. A few large volumes fill up his study, and at his desk he can refer with ease to every name that may be brought under his cognizance.

A slight instance may shew the nature of this system. An English gentleman, not long ago, was travelling in France, and had a letter of recommendation to the chief officer of police at Paris. When he arrived there, he called upon this gentleman, and on being admitted found him with a large book before him. After the usual compliments his letter was produced: but without opening it the officer entered into conversation with him on his journey from Calais, and on the places at which he had stopped out of the usual route. "But why do you call yourself Monsieur," said the police officer, "when your usual style is Captain?" The gentleman explained the circumstance—that as he was only a Captain of Militia, he did not think it necessary to keep that title in France. Here is your card, however, said the Frenchman, producing one from his great book: and the Englishman, with some difficulty, remembered, that at a post town he had found this card in his pocket, and flung it into the fire-place as of no use. You had better keep your title, said the Frenchman; and as the Englishman wished to go to the south of France, he begged for a passport, but, recollecting himself, observed to the

police officer, that as he wished to see several places out of the common road, he hoped that circumstance would be attended to. To this, after a passport had been drawn out, the reply was, "Sir, with this you may go over all France, and it matters not where you go, for every place where you change horses, or where you stop will be noted in my book in the same manner as your preceding route." The Captain then read a full account of himself with the circumstance of his being styled Monsieur instead of Captain. He pursued his route a few days after with the full conviction, that what the police officer had predicted would be verified, and without any great difficulty: for the post-boy that drove him carried the same letter from the last stage which had been regularly given to the other post-boys, so that when the traveller came to a place where he intended to stay, this letter was sent to the police at Paris, containing the remarks of the post-officers, and a consequent detail of his route, which was duly entered in the great book.

The espionage system is carried on with, comparatively speaking, very little expense. The inferior agents are post-masters, post-boys, servants, laquais de place, and espions or a set of spies, whose business it is to be on the lookout, and to bring to their superiors a detail of what they have observed in the course of each day. These latter wretches frequent the coffee-houses and places of resort, note the conversation, mark the persons, and some are particularly employed in watching the motions of those individuals, who on any account labour under suspicion. When a traveller arrives at Paris, he generally takes a laquais de place. This man is almost always under the pay of the police, and consequently there is little difficulty of knowing through his means the conduct of the master. Through him the person of his master is made known to the espions, and in less than a day it becomes familiar to them, so that he cannot move in any part of the town without his actions being

known to some one or another. If he is invited to a dinner he may be sure that some one of the servants is in the employ of the police, to give an account of the conversation that passes at table: and this was so well known under the old regime, that at great tables nothing was more common than for the servants to withdraw immediately after a course had been set upon the table. Contrivances were made behind each chair for the plates and glasses that had been used, which were regularly taken away on removing the course. This fashion is beginning to be adopted in England, and with the system of *Espionage* it will become more general.

It is said, that the English excel more in improving what is put into their hands than in invention, and this seems likely to be the case with *Espionage*. For it does not appear that the French made any other use of their espions than to discover every thing that was taking place around them. They do not seem to have entrusted any other power to their agents. They had no idea of employing those wretches to go about the country to delude idle, ignorant, distressed, or disaffected persons, to exaggerate their grievances, real or supposed, and to stir them up to acts of outrage, insurrection or rebellion. But this comes evidently into the system of *Espionage*. By such a mean the superior in the office may wield his instrument with very great success. He may form any plot he pleases; may bring it out at any time that suits his purposes; may involve in it the names of the most meritorious persons in the state; may injure their characters and reputation, and obtain, at a very little expense, the merit of putting down a most dangerous rebellion.

The consequences of the system of *Espionage* being introduced into a country are these:—All confidence between man and man is gradually undermined. Friendship cannot subsist; intrigue becomes the general employment. The master fears his servant, for the servant is either, or is apprehended to be, a traitor. Government suspects and is suspected by every body. As *Espionage* takes place, all that social intercourse, for which England has been celebrated, vanishes. Adieu to the freedom of the table, to the settling of the interest of the nation or the interests of a county. The men become idle, silly, frivolous; fit only to make a witty speech at a lady's toilette, but incapable of uttering a noble sentiment, or of harbouring within their breasts a generous feeling.

It must be some time before such a system can be established in England. Our manners and customs are very adverse to it. The name of a spy carries with it at present something odious and contemptible. Even they, who might be inclined

to use them, feel a horror at such a practice. At the utmost they can be considered only as necessary evils, and it becomes us to pause before we allow this feeling to be annihilated. The necessary consequence of *Espionage* is the demoralization, to use another French term now becoming fashionable among us, of the governors and the governed. Bad as the spies were under the old French regime, it may justly be doubted, whether their guilt was half so great as that of their employers. Perhaps much of the evils of the French Revolution may be traced to this source; for the system prevailed, whatever party held the reins of government: and the espions under one party, with very great ease, transferred their services to the next that came into power; and we may safely predict, that, as long as the system continues, the French will be incapable of enjoying the blessings of legitimate government.

One evil arising out of the system of *Espionage* deserves to be noticed, as it is not likely to strike those who have happily lived unacquainted with this system, and government often suffers very considerably from it:—This is the handle it gives to private malice. It cannot be expected that charges will be very accurately examined when the accused is never to be confronted with his accuser, or, perhaps, never knows him. This happened once to an English gentleman, who, during the American war, was hurried from a town at a considerable distance from Paris, to the Bastille. There he remained six weeks; but it is to be observed, that he was there treated with all the respect due to a gentleman, had a good apartment, a plentiful table, and excellent wine. The governor supplied him with books from his library, and he had nothing to complain of but the loss of his liberty. At that time, though the two countries were at war, there was that degree of intercourse between them which admitted of a full inquiry into the character of the gentleman. This was made in the course of about six weeks, and proved satisfactory. The gentleman was released, paid his compliments to the secretary of state, had full liberty to return to England or reside in France as he pleased, and was assured, that the state had only to regret that he had been put to so much inconvenience. The fact was, that an individual took this method of gratifying his malice on an unfounded cause of complaint; and, wherever this system prevails, many an innocent individual must suffer the pains of unnecessary confinement.

These observations have been suggested by the melancholy circumstances in which this country has so unhappily been placed, and the discussions to which they have



given rise both in and out of Parliament. It has been contended on the one hand, that the use of spies is improper; and, on the other, that whatever may be said of the morality of the practice, there was no government yet, which under certain circumstances, did not employ them. It is not necessary to enter into the arguments used by either party. If we allow that there are times when the use of spies may become expedient, this is a very different thing from Espionage being the allowed and general practice; much less does it justify spies not to discover an evil, but to excite persons to acts of sedition or treason. There is a great difference between a government occasionally using a base instrument on an extraordinary emergency and making it their regular and settled practice. The question, and an awful question it is, What did the circumstances of the times really require?

The outrages in London that attended one of the meetings in Spa-fields have given occasion for a trial for high treason, on whose fate depended that of several others. The Court of King's Bench was employed seven days in the investigation, and the foundation of the charge rested on the evidence of a man to whom no credit could be given. Such a scene of folly was scarcely ever exhibited in a court of justice, so that the verdict of acquittal was received with universal approbation. The Attorney-General in consequence withdrew his charges against the other prisoners.

A little before, the Attorney-General had been equally unsuccessful in two charges for libel, which were attended with some extraordinary circumstances. On the first charge a verdict was given of guilty, with the reserve, that if truth was a libel this was the case, and the verdict was taken by the judge of guilty, without seeing the jury and knowing whether they agreed in their verdict. On the second charge the accused was found not guilty. On the following day the judge, who tried these causes, gave an account of the whole proceeding in the Court of King's Bench, allowing that he did not see all the jury, and was not certain, in consequence, whether they agreed in the verdict. Of course the verdict of guilty was set aside, and the question is, whether the accused is to be brought to trial again for this offence. He defended himself in the most eloquent manner, justifying all he said in his publication, and maintaining that it was a political question in which the legal talents of the Attorney-General could be of no avail. The judge was asked, in the course of the first trial, whether truth was a libel, and he maintained, on authorities, that it was so; and this answer merits serious inves-

tigation. If we put it into plain language it must mean this, that the speaking of truth may deserve punishment. Now this is a bad doctrine to teach our children, for in general every good parent considers that the speaking of truth is a great set-off against that punishment, which the case really required. We may conceive a case where an individual may imagine himself very much aggrieved by the publication of a truth, through which he is highly disgraced. For example, suppose him to be a minister of state, and to have been guilty of employing the public money in trafficking for seats of Parliament, or suppose him to have received presents from foreign powers, by which the interests of the country have been deserted; is the person who declares these truths to be considered a proper object of punishment? What harm can arise to the state, if, when the facts are allowed, the declaration of these facts should be pronounced innocent? Whatever may be the maxim of the law courts, there is something so abhorrent to the general feelings of humanity in treating truth in this manner, that it can never be admitted to be punishable without some appropriate epithets of malice; and, perhaps, the old language is the best, that every libel, which means only a little book or writing, should be set out as false, scandalous and malicious.

The Habeas Corpus Act has been again suspended. The question has been discussed most fully, both in and out of Parliament. Several cities and counties have petitioned against it. It is a melancholy thing, that such a deprivation of the rights of Englishmen should be deemed necessary by any party, and it is some satisfaction to think, that even the causes alleged for it by its warmest advocates, do not reach the great body of the people; and that the places where disturbances have arisen, are those where, from the stagnation of manufacturing employment, great distress has been occasioned and severely felt. Where also this distress has prevailed, there is too much reason to apprehend, that it has been aggravated by ill-designing persons, and measures have been suggested to the people labouring under them, which would not otherwise have occurred to their minds. At the end of such a harassing war, and after an untoward season, difficulties were to be expected. Whether the wisest method has been taken to obviate them, time must discover; but, if Englishmen should once cease to esteem the Habeas Corpus Act as of little consequence, they must learn to bear the consequences of its absence. Commerce and manufactures will not flourish but on a soil where liberty exists; and it is to commerce and manufactures, that England is indebted for its past greatness.

A singular circumstance has occurred in consequence of the feelings of the House of Commons respecting the Habeas Corpus Act. Some justices in Berkshire were denied access to the state prisoners confined in their prison, and this gave rise to a correspondence between them and the ministers, and a subsequent discussion in the House of Commons, which thought it right to leave our fellow-subjects entirely at the mercy of the ministers. This did not satisfy Lord Folkstone, whose conduct upon this occasion is above all praise. As a magistrate for the county, he called the attention of his brother magistrates to this point, who exercised the authority vested in them with the greatest propriety. They considered that the jailor was their officer, but they excused his conduct on account of his ignorance in such a delicate subject, but they maintained their right of inspecting the whole of the prison whenever they thought proper. Thus Englishmen are not left entirely to the men who confine them in prison, and it must be satisfactory to every one that this is the law of England, for the history of other nations must convince us, that there is no degree of cruelty which has not been exercised by men in power, over those who are unfortunately or deservedly within their clutches. That Englishmen or Irishmen will be better than other men in the same situation, may be asserted in Parliament; but it is dangerous both for people in power and for the subject that the experiment should be tried.

A trial in Scotland has also produced considerable sensation. Such tampering with a witness has seldom been displayed before the British public, and it will pro-

ably lay a foundation for an inquiry before the legislature. The prosecutors were again foiled in their charge against a person for administering unlawful oaths.

The importance of matters at home renders us less attentive to circumstances abroad. By all accounts, the revolutionary party in the Brazils has been foiled, and a conspiracy to a great extent has been detected at Lisbon. An attempt to vindicate the liberty of the press is going forward at Paris, where a child was for a short time added to the Bourbon family. Its death took place soon after its birth, but not till a priest had admitted it into the number of the faithful, and given it, according to his speech to the clergy of St. Dennis, where its remains were deposited, a right to a place in the angelical choir. But we must not be too severe in our strictures on this abuse of baptism, when even in our own body is found a writer to set up the strange notion of the propriety of infant sprinkling, as a Christian rite derived from the apostles. The true Christian will not, however, be led away by such strange fancies; he will consider what baptism really was, and that it could not be introduced till the parties were prepared to be disciples. Make disciples was the precept, the initiatory rite was a consequence; and how a disciple is to be made of a babe who cannot assent to any proposition, it is in vain for any learned Rabbiniism to attempt to explain. We must not set the plain terms of a law aside to bring it within the pale of tradition. For had the tradition been well-grounded, and we believe that there is no foundation for it, this could no more justify the practice than it would justify Peter's error, who was by Paul so justly condemned.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

THE account of the *Proceedings in Chancery*, for which we could make no preparation, excludes some reports of the meetings of the Unitarian Societies; they will be given in the next number.

We shall be glad to receive the continuation of Dr. Alexander's paper.

An anonymous Correspondent from *Tenterden*, desires that some one will answer Dr. Nares's Book against the Improved Version: he was entitled to state his wish, but he should not have made us pay for it.

The list of names from *Thorne*, came too late for use this month.

---