

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CXLV.]

JANUARY, 1818.

[Vol. XIII.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of the late Rev. T. B. Broadbent, M. A. By the Rev. T. Belsham.

[Extracted, by permission, from the Funeral Sermon, preached at Essex Street Chapel, November 9, 1817.]

THE late Rev. THOMAS BROADBENT, who was well known to most of the congregations of our denomination in the metropolis and its vicinity, as a young minister of great promise, and who lived in habits of endearing intercourse and intimate friendship with many who now hear me, was suddenly cut off, in the midst of life and health and vigour, by a very awful visitation of Providence a fortnight ago, at his father's house.*

On the first Sunday in this month he delivered a very affecting discourse in his father's pulpit, in which he delineated the character of a vicious youth, the slave of bad habits and criminal passions, who, in the prime of life, ruins his constitution, destroys his health, his reputation and his peace, and falls an early victim to his follies and his crimes. His feelings were greatly moved while he was preaching; and the discourse made a very deep impression upon his hearers. The week following he composed another discourse, in which he portrayed the opposite character, and described the honour and happiness of a virtuous youth both in life and death. Before he finished his composition he heard of the decease of the illustrious Princess; and under a strong impression of that calamitous event, he concluded his discourse with some reflections suitable to the melancholy occasion. He finished the whole at twelve o'clock on Saturday night, the 8th instant, when he retired to rest in his usual health and spirits, intending to deliver it the next afternoon.

* At Latchford, in Cheshire, within a mile of Warrington.

But Providence in its mysterious wisdom ordered otherwise. At four o'clock in the morning he was seized with a fit which the physicians pronounced to be apoplexy; and notwithstanding the best medical aid which could be procured, at six he ceased to be an inhabitant of this world.*

The sudden removal of an amiable and exemplary young man is at all times a very affecting event. But in this case there were many circumstances of peculiar aggravation. He was the only child of a pious and indulgent father, who had taken great pains to give him a virtuous and liberal education: he was just come into possession of a handsome property: he had a reasonable prospect of being soon settled with some respectable society in the exercise of that sacred profession which was the object of his own free and voluntary choice; for the duties of which he had made long and diligent preparation, to the objects of which his whole soul was devoted, and in the right discharge of which, it was his earnest desire and his fixed resolution to have employed his life. And this pleasing prospect was crowned with the flattering expectation of speedily forming a nearer and tenderer connexion which was the summit of his earthly wishes, and which promised all the happiness which human life has to bestow. Upon this fair and beautiful scene the curtain of death has suddenly fallen, and all its promised glories are now enveloped in the thick darkness of the tomb.

The incidents of the life of this amiable young person were few,

* His father, who slept in the adjoining chamber, being awakened by an unusual noise, hastened to his son's apartment, where he found him in a state of total insensibility, in which he continued till he expired.

though his virtues were many. He was born at Warrington in the year 1793, and had the misfortune to lose an excellent mother when he was too young to be sensible of her loss. He received the first rudiments of a liberal education under his worthy father; and afterwards he passed some time under the tuition of a learned clergyman at Manchester, who was equally distinguished for his attainments in classical literature and for his skill in communicating instruction. When he had finished his school education, conformably to the express desire of his maternal grandfather, who had conducted, with great ability and success, a considerable manufactory in the vicinity of Sheffield, he, for a short time, made trial of a secular employment; but he soon found that it did not suit him. He had contracted a taste for literature, and an earnest desire of being useful in the Christian ministry; in consequence of which, with the full concurrence of his pious father, who highly approved though he would not influence his choice, he bade adieu to secular business, and entered as a student at the university of Glasgow. Here he passed through the routine of academical studies with a degree of regularity, assiduity and success, which secured the marked approbation of the professors, while his amiable manners and exemplary virtues won the esteem and affection of his associates. He was graced with many academical prizes, and particularly on account of his proficiency in Greek literature, and he graduated with distinguished credit.*

When he left the university he resided for some time at home, where he pursued his theological studies under his father's eye. And three years ago he came up to London in expectation of deriving peculiar advantage in the line of his profession, from the assistance and advice of friends, from access to libraries, and from the opportunities he would enjoy of attending the public services of eminent and approved ministers of different denominations.

* The Rev. T. B. Broadbent was born March 17, 1793: he entered at Glasgow November 1809, and took his Master's degree, April 1813, having received a prize in every Gown class, and in the Greek class, the first.

During his residence in London, which continued for the greater part of the last three winters, he preached for some time with great acceptance to a highly respectable congregation at Westminster, which was then vacant; and afterwards occasionally in other places. For two years he assisted in the classical education of some young men who were candidates for the Christian ministry; and of this department he performed the duties with such diligence, skill and success, as to secure not only the improvement but the affection and gratitude of his pupils, together with the high approbation of his learned colleagues, and the managers and supporters of the Institution.* At the same time he was far from neglecting the main objects of his residence in London. He read and thought and studied, with great application. Nor ought it to be concealed, that the last edition of the Improved Version of the New Testament is greatly indebted for its correctness to the pains which were bestowed upon it by this learned and meritorious young man, in collating its various readings with those of the second edition of Griesbach's Greek Testament, and reducing the text to as exact a conformity as might be with the text of that celebrated scholar.†

While he resided in London he formed a very extensive acquaintance with persons of different persuasions,

* The Unitarian Academy, under the able direction of the Rev. Robert Aspland, assisted at that time by the late ingenious and Rev. Jeremiah Joyce.

† It would be ungrateful not to mention that the principal object of Mr. T. Broadbent's visit to London, last winter, was to assist the writer of this discourse in transcribing, from short hand, his Commentary on Paul's Epistles, with a view to future publication, if that should be judged expedient. It may gratify the curiosity of some worthy friends who are pleased to interest themselves in the subject, to be informed, that Mr. T. Broadbent transcribed the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the first Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus. All the Epistles written from Rome, including that to the Hebrews, have been in readiness for the press some years ago. The Epistle to the Romans is still in hand, and the author is proceeding with it, amidst numerous avocations, as fast as he is able.

and with some whose religious sentiments were very much at variance with his own: and such were his conciliatory and engaging manners that every acquaintance became a friend. And though he never concealed his religious principles, but avowed them upon every proper occasion in the most open manner, and defended them with great animation, yet such was the goodness of his heart and the courtesy of his behaviour that he never gave offence: nor did a difference in religious speculations ever create the least shyness in social intercourse. His youthful appearance sometimes excited a prejudice against him: but this soon wore off with those who had opportunities of conversing freely with him; for with a youthful countenance he possessed a manly understanding and a matured judgment.

His morals were perfectly correct, and his virtue unsullied with a stain. With all the gaiety of his heart and the vivacity of his manner, no expression bordering upon indecency, indelicacy or profaneness, ever escaped from his lips. His regard to truth and honour was stern and inviolable: nor could he restrain his indignation when he saw what he conceived to be the least approach to an infringement of these sacred principles in any who called themselves his friends. And upon such occasions as these, as well as upon any other when he thought it necessary, he would administer rebuke with a gravity and dignity which were highly impressive and generally efficacious.

The virtues of his character were founded upon the piety of his principles. His faith in the Divine existence was the result of rational conviction, and it was firm and unwavering. His conceptions of the Divine character and government were just and sublime, encouraging and practical. They produced in his mind an habitual awe of the Divine Majesty, which was apparent in the deep solemnity of his public addresses to the Supreme Being. He had thought much upon the subject of the Christian religion. He had studied the evidences of divine revelation, both external and internal, with great attention. He understood them completely; and with

the most deliberate and unhesitating conviction, he submitted to Jesus as his Master, and bowed to his authority as a teacher sent from God to reveal the doctrine of eternal life.

He had paid uncommon attention to the great controversy of the age concerning the person of Christ: and after very serious and diligent inquiry he attained a clear conviction of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ. But while he regarded him, in respect to his nature, as in all respects like unto his brethren, he at the same time viewed his character with the profoundest reverence and veneration as the greatest of the prophets of God. It was also his wish, to the best of his abilities, by calm reasoning and gentle persuasion, to contribute his part towards reclaiming the Christian world from the gross errors in which it has been so long involved upon this and other important subjects. But though opposition to antichristian errors is an important duty, it did not, in the judgment of this estimable young man, constitute the whole or even the principal part of the work of a Christian minister. He regarded the doctrine of Christ chiefly as a practical principle; as the great message of God to man enforcing the practice of universal virtue by the awful sanctions of a life to come. As such he felt it in his own mind; and as such it was his desire to inculcate and urge it upon those who might attend upon his ministry. This he plainly evinced by the last discourses which he composed for the pulpit; both of which will, I trust, be shortly communicated to the public. And it was the great object of his virtuous ambition to devote his best powers through life to this important service.

Thus eminently qualified beyond the common lot of his brethren for distinguished usefulness, it was in his heart to build a house to the name of his God: and he did well that it was in his heart. It was his wish to be useful in the church of Christ; to instruct his fellow-mortals in truth, in piety and in virtue. And it was an honourable design; as acceptable in the sight of him to whom the heart was known, and the life was devoted, as if the offer had been accepted, and the desire fulfilled to its utmost extent.

He did well that it was in his heart, and in proportion to his generous zeal will be his ultimate reward.

We cannot refrain from extracting also the following passage, which Mr. Belsham inserted into his sermon, from a letter of his learned and much-respected friend, the Rev. W. Broadbent, father of the deceased:

It is indeed a severe stroke, if I could call any thing severe which God does; peculiarly severe as it regards my feelings and all my views and hopes respecting this world. But these perhaps were wrong, and stood in need of correction; even those which regarded my hopes of service and instrumentality in the church of Christ. We are gratified, and I hope not blameably, in being honoured as instruments in such a cause. But if the service which God requires be performed, and it most surely will, we ought to be satisfied. We have authority, indeed, for believing that it is good that it was in our hearts, though the service is denied us.

But I feel the strongest conviction that this event was appointed in infinite wisdom and benevolence: that it entered into the original plan of Providence, with all its circumstances, the arrangement of which will not fail to produce those consequences both immediately and remotely which infinite wisdom and goodness has intended. Who then am I that I should complain? And I am confident that the distresses which I feel do not, in any degree, exceed what the benevolent and moral purposes of the Divine government require.

In such reflections as these I have experienced invaluable consolation. I wish to bow, and I hope I do bow with dutiful and pious submission to the appointment of God. I am sure it is all wise, all right, all good. My faith also in the great doctrine of the resurrection is cloudless and strong, and greatly strengthens my consolation.

[The *Portrait* of Mr. T. Broadbent, which accompanies this Number, is engraved from a Miniature Painting, by *Partridge*. Ed.]

Additions to and Corrections of the Memoir of the late Rev. W. Vidler.
By Mr. Teulon.

SIR, Dec. 3d, 1817.

I CONFESS myself pleasingly disappointed in your Memoir of my late respected friend, Mr. William Vidler, [XII. 65—72, 129—136, 193—200,] by finding it contain much more information concerning him than I supposed could have been collected; and to nearly the whole I can give my testimony of its correctness. There are some few particulars in which I think it may be amended. Mr. Vidler came to town in February 1794, to baptize, and on Mr. Winchester leaving England in May 1794, he was unanimously invited to come from Battle and keep the congregation together till such time as they could hear from Mr. Winchester. He was to have had an income of £150. per annum: here always appeared to me the mistake of Mr. Vidler and his friends. It was an engagement with any body, every body and nobody. The consequence was, that Mr. Vidler never had £100. a year; yet out of this little, through his abstemiousness, notwithstanding the benevolence of his disposition and the largeness of his family, he had paid off £98. 3s. 6d. in December 1799, of debts that had before accumulated. To my knowledge, these debts preyed much on his spirits, and prevented a great deal of that active usefulness for which he was peculiarly calculated; and though his few encumbrances might have been easily removed had he made them known to a few confidential friends, he had such a sense of the very appearance of being mercenary, that he could not do it. I believe I knew most of his anxiety, and its cause, but I did not know all; and when I did know it, it was too late for my remedying.

You observe [p. 134] that a *small party in the congregation considered themselves as the Church*. This is not strictly the fact. In 1778, a small society began to meet at a large room in Shoreditch: persons of all sentiments were welcome visitors, with full permission, on notice, to controvert any religious opinion. These meetings were held every Tuesday evening, and were frequented by Ministers of the Establishment as well as Dissenters. The heads of this so-

ciety were Mr. John Cue, a very tolerable Hebrew scholar, of warm passions, a Sandimanian and Trinitarian, a benevolent good man; Mr. Richard Clarke, late Rector of St. Philips Charlestown, South Carolina, a very aged gentleman, a polite and classical scholar, an Hebrician and a Mystic; and a Mr. Edmund Clegg, author of an *Essay on the Two Witnesses*. The whole three held the doctrine of the restoration of all fallen intelligences. In 1783, Mr. Clegg left this little band of friends for America, and on his arrival at Philadelphia he introduced himself to Mr. Winchester; and on that gentleman's leaving Philadelphia for London, Mr. Clegg's son gave him a line of introduction to his brother, John Clegg, and his few universalist friends at Shoreditch. Through this introduction, Mr. Winchester preached twice at Blacks'-fields, Southwark. The elegant simplicity of his plain nervous language, its richness in scripture truth, its energy, its persuasiveness, together with the unaffectedness of his manners, convinced and subdued; his hearers became friends and intimates, and were led at last to the taking of Parliament Court Chapel.

The intimacy of Mr. John Cue and his friends with Mr. Winchester led them to become part of the congregation, on Mr. Winchester's consenting that they might assemble in the vestry instead of thus meeting as before in Shoreditch. Here they formed themselves into church-fellowship, and had their officers, and brake bread every Sunday afternoon. Mr. Winchester frequently attended their meetings, and always approved of them, but constantly declined wholly to unite in fellowship with them, either fearful it might contract his public sphere of action, or bring over again those unpleasantnesses he had formerly met with in church-fellowship. But such a society, that had lasted for years before Mr. Winchester's coming to England, could not be called a *small party in the congregation considering themselves as the Church*. The propriety of the agreement perhaps is not defensible: though at the time it was useful, it certainly at last became *imperium in imperio*.

When Mr. Vidler first came to town he lived at Mr. Lee's, in Paternoster-

Row, Spitalfields; it was not till a considerable time after that he came to live with me in Houndsditch; but I am proud to bear my testimony for the many years we did live together, to the tenderness and irreproachable excellency of his character and conduct. His principal failings were, an unbounded confidence till suspicion was excited, and a weakness of benevolence which too often made him the victim of imposition. He was the father, brother and friend; and I can truly say, I place the time we lived together among the white days of my earthly existence; and, differing perhaps from all his friends, I always considered him as a most excellent tradesman. He was honest, industrious and obliging; and that he was not successful in business when in the Strand, did not arise from a deficiency in ability as a tradesman, but from being over persuaded by a speculative man to embark in business with him in a concern he had no knowledge of, and which was foreign to all his pursuits. In three months, the greater part of which time he was ill, nearly to death, a dissolution of partnership took place, and he was left to struggle with a heavy rent, and a large debt incurred solely by the madness or wickedness of this speculation, when at the commencement of it he had accumulated property more than sufficient to pay every debt that he owed in the world. This was, indeed, the beginning of his troubles; his after removal to Holborn could not retrieve what had been done, but left a great man and noble mind depressed and clouded through the remainder of his life with a weight which deadened all his exertions.

It is said [p. 198] that Mr. Vidler *never completely recovered*. This language is not, I think, strong enough: this unfortunate circumstance, of the overturning of the post-chaise literally bottom upwards, destroying from its effects all his former activity, and ever after disabling him from walking without intense pain. He always supposed he had injured the hip-bone as well as some of the finer blood-vessels about the neck and chest. He had a long and painful struggle, endeavouring to walk and dig in his garden for exercise, under the most acute sufferings; those sufferings at length overcame

his exertions, and as his very habit turned every thing into fat, this tendency increased his appetite, and the pain of this eternal craving compelled him to gratify nature, and by so doing feed his disease; but this was but at the close of life. I can speak of years of abstemiousness, when he would seldom eat more than one meal a day, and that was dinner, not for want of appetite, for he was always hungry, but because he would not give way to it.

I cannot say that I think the memoir [p. 193] does justice to Scarlett's Testament. This work was projected by Mr. Scarlett; the translation was made by Mr. Creighton, a Clergyman of the Establishment, but in the Wesleyan Methodists' connexion. Mr. Scarlett, who was an ox in the labours of literature, made all the divisions and the titles of them, and collated all the various translations. Once a week Mr. Creighton, Mr. Scarlett, Mr. Vidler and Mr. Cue met at Mr. Scarlett's, at an early hour, breakfasted and compared Mr. Creighton's translation with all Mr. Scarlett's collations, and with the Greek, and disputed on them till they could agree; when they continued to differ, the place was taken home and privately reconsidered, their opinion sent, and most votes carried it. It was a long and arduous undertaking, carried on for a long length of time with much labour and great integrity, excepting that Mr. Creighton and Mr. Cue leaned too much to the Trinitarian scheme: however, with all its faults, it is a very *Improved Version*, being the most elegant in the English language, and the best ground-work for a more perfect translation. I believe, that, during their whole labour, excepting the first and last day of it, they allowed themselves no refreshment between an early breakfast and tea, that nothing might interrupt the work or take off their attention.

A Note in page 198, says, "When he first settled in London he was of a lean and spare habit of body, and so weakly as to be constrained to preach sitting." When he came to London he was comparatively lean to what he was for some years before his death; but this circumstance was some time before he came to London, soon after he began preaching; and I think I have heard him say, that at that time

he was so bad as to be constrained at times to be carried into the pulpit to preach, and out of it when service was over.

No person could possibly shew more fortitude than he did at his commencing preacher; it was for a long time never without opposition, and frequently at the hazard of his life. To him, in this instance, the promise, *Be not weary of well-doing, for in due time thou shalt reap if thou faint not*, was most amply and unexpectedly realized. In a letter to me, dated 12th March, 1798, he says, "I daily experience the truth of that saying, 'When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.' In my native place and neighbourhood, where I have formerly suffered nothing but scorn and reproach for the truth's sake, I now meet with almost universal respect. And though in the time of my reproach I had many to attend my ministry, yet I have now a great many more. Last Wednesday evening at Battle there were above a thousand persons at the meeting: and though the house is very strong, yet the congregation was so large, that it was thought proper to put pillars under the gallery to prevent its breaking down. I preached twice on Lord's day at Battle, to a great company, and walked to Siddlescombe in the evening and preached to above 300 people in a private house." Another letter says, "The affection of my friends in the country seems unbounded: I have access to their hearts, and can say any thing to them which God hath communicated to me. Wherever I go there are full houses of attentive hearers, and universal respect from men of the world. Thus the scene of usefulness opens before me. I am to preach to-morrow, Lord's day, at Battle three times, and break bread with the brethren; Monday evening I meet the church; Tuesday preach for the last time at Battle; Wednesday at Staple Cross; Thursday at Northiam; Friday at Rolvendon; take horse on Saturday morning to meet the coach at Flimwell; and hope, by the good hand of my God upon me, to reach the Borough at six o'clock."

As I am transcribing from his letters, I cannot, though I have made a longer letter than I intended, forbear making

another extract, as it shews the tenderness of his friendships as well as the elegance of his mind. It is dated July 3, 1798: "Found my aged mother and numerous friends well. The country is beautiful. The extensive and variegated prospects cheer my heart. The corn and hay are abundant; fruit is in great plenty, particularly cherries. I have every thing here to make me happy, save the want of an amiable friend, J. Weeks. His death is esteemed a general loss in this neighbourhood. I shall visit his widow in her forlorn abode this evening. He was buried in the meeting-yard last Saturday, amidst a great concourse of sympathizing friends and neighbours. I am to preach a funeral discourse next Sunday afternoon on the sad occasion. It will be a trial to me. I love my friends, and feel the separating stroke most severely. He was cut off in his 27th year. I shall see his face no more on earth—no more hear his friendly voice—no more tread with him the pleasing paths of science—no more have his example of faith and unshaken integrity to stimulate my sluggish heart in the path of duty—no more shall I take sweet counsel with him—no more mingle my soul with his in the sacred exercises of friendship! Like a rose half blown, forcibly torn off by the east wind, so his fine form is blasted by the hand of death! I now, for the first time, feel the full meaning of that saying, *Thy friend that is as thine own soul*. O how severe is the pang of parting from such! But I correct

the feelings of my heart—I adore the wisdom and goodness of Him who giveth and who taketh away, as seemeth best to himself. But sure his goodness will not blame me for the involuntary exercise of those feelings which he has implanted in my nature. But I must lay my hand upon my mouth, I must be silent. The pleasures of memory are in some circumstances great; but there are pains of memory also: he who has a heart to enjoy the former, must also take a portion of the latter;—well, be it so, the account is wisely balanced. I take that which is allotted to me, and say, 'Father, thy will be done.'

Should a life of Mr. Vidler be ever written, what an excellent opportunity would it be to consider the general state of Christianity prior to the year 1791, and the new era of liberality in sentiment and practice that has taken place since that period, and of the great influence the teaching of Mr. Winchester and Mr. Vidler had in producing it by their widely extended preaching of the doctrine of the Universal Restoration; which, by leading Christians to search the Scriptures as the fountain-head of religious instruction, has laid a foundation for the knowledge of the Unity of God, and the removal of every obstacle to the reception of pure Christianity throughout the world! Thanking you for your indulgence in admitting these addenda to the memoirs of my late much respected friend, I remain,
&c.
T. A. TEULON.

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

From the late Rev. Edward Evanson to the Rev. Thomas Howe.

SIR, Bridport, Nov. 8, 1817.

ABOUT fifteen years ago I was, by the civility of a common friend, introduced to the late Rev. Edward Evanson, and afterwards had the happiness of many interviews with him. Our conversation was generally on theological subjects, and though I was obliged frequently to differ from him in the positions he advanced, yet I always did it with that deference which I knew to be due to a gentle-

man so superior to myself in erudition and literary attainments. Acquainted also with the noble sacrifice he had made to the dictates of his conscience, in resigning his valuable living and all his flattering prospects of preferment in the Established Church, the respect with which I viewed him was raised even to reverence for his Christian fortitude and inflexible integrity. I considered him as a sincere believer of Christianity, though I could not but lament that he thought so lightly of some of the proofs of it, which

were very satisfactory to my mind, I mean its external evidences as exhibited particularly by Dr. Lardner.

In the beginning of the year 1803, when he resided at Lympston, receiving from him a present of his ingenious pamphlet, entitled "Reflections on the State of Religion in Christendom at the Commencement of the Nineteenth Century of the Christian Era," with a request that I would not only read it with attention, but also favour him with such remarks as occurred to me in the perusal, I readily complied, and this led to an epistolary correspondence between us. Some of his letters I have unfortunately lost; two of them, however, which are preserved, I have transcribed (with the omission of a few things of merely a private and personal nature), for insertion in the Monthly Repository, should it meet with your approbation. I did not take copies of my letters to him, but recollect, that in the communication which gave occasion to his remarks contained in the first letter, I expressed my surprise at his not vindicating the authenticity of the Apocalypse of John by any *external* evidences. I gave my reasons for differing from him in the opinion of the necessity of a person's understanding this mysterious book, before he can be qualified to distinguish pure Christianity from its corruptions. I was led to acknowledge, with respect to *myself*, that after many years of attention to it, I was not sure that I entertained clear ideas of some of its symbolical representations. I thought I might, in general, be more usefully employed in the pulpit, by proving and illustrating the plain doctrines and enforcing the pure precepts of the gospel, than by endeavours to explain to my hearers the visionary symbols of Daniel and John, though the latter, I admitted, might with propriety be *occasionally* done. I also expressed a doubt, whether the Apocalypse was written at so *early* a date as my worthy correspondent had given it, referring him to the researches of Lardner and Lowman. These things it seems proper for me to state, as being the *ground* on which his remarks in the first letter were founded. These remarks of Mr. Evanson led me to

largely in my reply. None of the epistles of the Apostle Paul furnished to my mind unequivocal evidence that he must necessarily have seen the Apocalypse of John. The account which the former gives, for instance, of the rise, reign and destruction of the man of sin in 2 Thess. ii. might have been communicated to him by supernatural inspiration, and after some years more *particulars* of the *same events*, presented to the view of the latter by visionary representations, and also others in addition to them. The hypothesis of Mr. Evanson (previously advanced by Sir Isaac Newton in his Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John, p. 239), of the apostles Paul and Peter sometimes alluding in their Epistles to the Apocalypse, I take the liberty to recommend to some of your learned Correspondents, as a subject of curious, useful and important discussion in the pages of your valuable Repository. If it can be *maintained*, it must establish, beyond doubt, both the authenticity and early date of this sublime and wonderful production, and tend to illustrate some of its mysterious passages.

THOMAS HOWE.

LETTER I.

Lympston, April 6, 1803.

DEAR SIR,

AFTER your obliging politeness in sending me a copy of your excellent discourse upon "the Commencement of the New Century," I thought it incumbent on me to trouble you with one of my late publications. It would have given me great pleasure to find, that my little pamphlet had given you the same entire satisfaction that I received from the perusal of yours. You do me justice, however, in supposing me to be influenced only by conscientious motives, and performing what I regard as a very important duty to the cause of true Christianity, and the temporal and eternal happiness of my fellow-creatures. And to a mind so impressed, the censures or more serious consequences of the malice of any interested, mistaken men, seem quite undeserving notice.

Firmly persuaded as I am, that there is no other sufficient evidence of the divine authority of the Christian

covenant, according to the plain dictates of reason and the word of God, besides what arises from the completion of that prophetic, anticipated history of the great leading events (which have produced all the important changes in civil and ecclesiastical affairs from Nebuchadnezzar's time to our own), contained in those visions of Daniel, of which the Apocalypse professes to be both a continuation and more diffuse explanation, and that, without understanding the Apocalypse, it is not possible to distinguish the truths of Christ's gospel from the superstitious errors of the antichristian apostacy, I am sincerely grieved to find you avowing, that, after ten years' particular attention to that important Scripture, you *cannot understand it*. * If, indeed, you have accustomed yourself to endeavours to discover the meaning of certain isolated detached passages, without considering them as *parts only of one whole history*, and therefore closely connected with those parts which both precede and follow, the dissatisfaction which must arise from such a mode of study is sufficiently obvious. The same process, I believe, would render every human history unintelligible. As Sir Isaac Newton, a century ago, demonstrated the futility and falsehood of the slight unfounded report of Irenæus, that John wrote the Apocalypse in the reign of Domitian, I did not imagine that any one could now suppose it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. The passages, however, I have quoted out of Paul's Epistles, written certainly before the end of Nero's reign, some of which cannot be understood upon any principles of divine revelation or of common sense, without supposing them to refer to the Apocalypse, surely afford an external testimony of John's having written that invaluable Scripture in or before the reign of Nero, far more respectable than the evidence deduced from the whole host of fathers of the apostate

* I recollect stating, that though I thought I perceived the *general drift* and *purport* of the prophetic history of the Christian church contained in the Apocalypse, the meaning of some of its *symbolical descriptions* I could not clearly understand.

church. This, indeed, would be the case, if instead of *disagreeing* with each other, as they do, they were all *unanimous* in their testimony. To have attempted to establish its authenticity, would have appeared to me the most idle waste of time and the reader's patience; because there can be but one proper satisfactory criterion of the divine authority of any prophetic scripture, I mean that infallible one of the absolute certainty of the regular strict completion of its predictions, so that each antitype corresponds with the emblematical type in order, time and place. If my explanation has not shewn that they do so, it has done nothing; and as I know by the experiments I have made upon the unsatisfactory parts of the interpretation of other expositors, my errors may, from their inconsistency with other essential points of the prophecies, be most easily proved to be such. Should my well-intended "Reflections on the State of Religion in Christendom," attract so much notice as to induce any body to undertake such a work, I shall rejoice, be the consequence to myself what it may; because the very discussion must lead people in general to think more seriously and attentively of that most important of all the sacred books, than they seem at present inclined to do. All I wish for is the prevalence of truth, genuine unsophisticated Christian truth, as the sure and only means of making mankind wise, virtuous and happy.

I am,
Dear Sir,
yours very sincerely,
EDWARD EVANSON.

LETTER II.
Lympston, April 21, 1803.

DEAR SIR,

So far are the remarks which you did me the honour of making upon my late publication from standing in need of any apology, that I think myself much obliged to you for your friendly frankness in making them; and should be still more so, if, by pointing out the reasons of your objections to any particulars, you would enable me to perceive those errors, which, according to the common lot of humanity, it is highly probable I may have fallen into.

No one can have a higher opinion of the learning, candour and diligence of Dr. Lardner in the investigation of scriptural truths than I have; and so much light do the events which have occurred, since the time of his writing, throw upon the prophecies of Daniel and John, that I persuade myself were he now alive he would not find them so unintelligible as he seems to have done; and from the important information they afford, would have learnt better to appreciate the worth of that evidence which he so laboriously studied to deduce from the writings of those first corrupters of the genuine doctrines of Christ's gospel, the fathers of that apostate church which was afterwards established by Constantine. But, however that might have been, surely, my dear Sir, "*jurare in verba magistri*," is much more unbecoming a Christian, than the Roman poet thought it of a Pagan philosopher, unless that master be Christ, whose dictates the Apocalypse claims to be. If the passages I have quoted from St. Paul's Epistles, can have any rational meaning, without supposing them to refer to the visions of the Apocalypse, it would give me inexpressible satisfaction to see that meaning explained, for it is not in my power to find it out. If they do really refer to these prophetic visions, of which I have no doubt, I am as certain that the only book containing them must have been written in the reign of Claudius, or at least of Nero, as I am when I see characters and passages in Terence's Comedies referred to in Cicero's Oration, though the dramatic poet be not named, that Terence wrote them before the Dictatorship of Julius Cæsar. If your hypothesis, indeed, could be maintained, that the same series of prophetic visions which were revealed to John,* at a later period, had been before revealed to Paul, my conclusion would not be just. But I can see no more reason why such an extraordinary series of emblematic visions, under the New Covenant, should have

* This certainly was not my meaning, but merely that *some* of the *events* might have been supernaturally communicated to Paul, which were afterwards represented more fully and in a regular series of visions to John.

been communicated to more than one of the apostles, than that Daniel's visions of the same kind, should have been vouchsafed also to another prophet under the Old. I am not inclined to believe, that any miraculous interpositions ever occur in the course of the Divine Providence, except such as are absolutely necessary to answer some great and beneficial purpose. Therefore, I can hardly think you mean seriously to advance such a supposition, which not only seems highly improbable in itself, but is entirely unwarranted by any thing that St. Paul has said himself, or by any other document whatsoever.

With respect to the queries you put towards the close of your obliging letter, I fancy they will not in the least invalidate my position, that without understanding these prophecies, it is not possible to discriminate rightly the plain essential truths of the gospel, from the superstitious doctrines of the antichristian apostacy. The situation of the generality of the professors of the Christian faith must remain, till these prophecies are generally understood, just what you yourself must acknowledge it to have been, from the period of the formation of the Gothic kingdoms in the South of Europe to the time of the Reformation, and I think to the present hour; and such, indeed, as these visions predict, it will remain till the apostate church is destroyed. At present, my dear Sir, do you know one single religious society, who, for fear of receiving as the word of God, the unfounded doctrines of erring men, have well discriminated the spurious from the authentic books and passages of the received canonical Scriptures? Or one in which even the Lord's Prayer, given by Luke, is taught or used, according to what Griesbach and Archbishop Newcome have shewn to be the true and original form in which our Saviour taught it? Such subjects, however, are too copious for epistolary correspondence, and I beg pardon for having detained you so long.

I remain,
Dear Sir,
With sincere respect,
Your faithful humble servant,
EDWARD EVANSON.

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LOCKE AND
LIMBORCH, TRANSLATED,
WITH HISTORICAL NOTES.

SIR, *Clapton, Dec. 21, 1817.*
I HAD occasion, not along ago, to look into the letters which passed between Locke and Limborch, and which form a large part of the *Familiar Letters*. Having some leisure, I occupied myself upon that correspondence, then almost new to me, till I had translated the whole. It consists of sixty-nine letters, all in Latin, except three in French; forty-three written by *Locke*, and twenty-six by *Limborch*. They discuss, as might have been expected from the writers, several interesting subjects, and it may not be unsuitable to your purpose to give the translations, in a series, as your engagements shall allow. I will subjoin a few notes, and prefix some account of *Locke's* and *Limborch's* histories prior to the date of the first letter.

J. T. RUTT.

JOHN LOCKE was born at Wrington,* a village near Bristol, August 29, 1632, of parents whom he recollected with great regard. His father was bred to the law, and had inherited a considerable estate in the county of Somerset. This was injured by the war, in which he became a captain in the army of the Parliament. He was also *Steward* or *Court-keeper* to the *anti-royalist*, Colonel Alexander Popham. †

Mr. Locke's father survived his son's advance to manhood, when, according to *Le Clerc*, "they lived together rather as two friends, than as two persons, one of whom might justly claim respect from the other," though the father had been "severe to him, while a child, and kept him at a very great distance." The son "often commended—such a manner," ‡ perhaps more than it might justly deserve.

John Locke was educated by his father, till his removal to Westminster School, then under the tuition of Dr. Busby, and where he remained till he was admitted a student of Christ

Church, Oxford, in 1651. In the "Memoirs of the Life of Dr. South," (1717,) it is said, that "he was elected with the great Mr. *John Locke*, an equal ornament of polite and abstruse learning;" and it is remarkable that two young students should have set out together, whose paths were soon to separate so widely. South, who was Locke's junior by a year, had been also a scholar at Westminster. In 1653, also, their names occur together among the academical panegyrists of Cromwell, on the successful termination of the war with Holland.*

Dr. John Owen, who, in 1652, became Vice-Chancellor of the University, was Dean of Christ Church, during the period of John Locke's academical education. His tutor was Mr. Thomas Cole, who was ejected in 1660 for non-conformity, and lived to witness the celebrity of his pupil. † On the recollection and authority of Mr. Tyrrell, the historian, it is said, "that Mr. Locke was looked upon as the most ingenious young man in the College," though, from disaffection to the mode of education then pursued, "he wished his father had never sent him to Oxford." *Le Clerc* says, "I myself have heard him complain of the method he took in his studies at first;—and when I told him that I had a Cartesian Professor for my tutor, a man of a clear head, he said he was not so happy; though it is well known that he was no Cartesian." He complained that "the only philosophy then known at Oxford, was the Peripatetic, perplexed with obscure terms and stuffed with useless questions." ‡

In 1655, Mr. Locke became B. A., and M. A. in 1658. His first destination was medicine, and he pursued "the usual courses," *practising* occasionally at Oxford till, in 1664, he went into Germany, as Secretary to

* See "State Poems continued," 1698, pp. 6—8, 12, 13, and *Mon. Repos.* V. 232.

† Thomas Cole, M. A., was "Principal of St. Mary's Hall," whence he was ejected by the King's Commissioners in 1660. He died in 1697. See *Palmer's Noncon. Mem.* 1802, III. 249, 252.

‡ *Bib. Chois.* in *Brit. Biog.* VII. 4, 5.

* See *Mon. Repos.* I. 287.

† *Brit. Biog.* VII. 3.

‡ *Bibliothèque Choisie* in *Brit. Biog.* *ubi sup.*

an Embassy. Returning in less than a year, he resumed his studies at Oxford, applying especially to *natural philosophy*.*

Mr. Locke was now to become a politician. In 1666, a trifling circumstance introduced him to an intimate acquaintance with the first Earl of Shaftesbury, then Lord Ashley, who soon consulted him as a physician, and paid him many flattering attentions.† This nobleman had plausibilities which might fascinate a student unacquainted with the great world; but his character, as faithful history records it, though possessing all but the most *important* accomplishments, can add no reputation to the memory of John Locke. Lord Ashley had fought against Charles I., and courted Cromwell, the chief of the regicides, yet, on a change of times, had sat in judgment on Cromwell's associates.‡ He has also been described, on his own authority, as a *libertine*, surpassed only by his royal master, Charles II., § that *most religious King*, according to the liturgy.

Lord Ashley invited Mr. Locke to reside in his family. "He urged him to apply himself to the study of state affairs and political subjects, both ecclesiastical and civil;" and "began to consult him on all occasions of that nature. He also introduced him to the acquaintance of the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Halifax, and some other of the most eminent persons of that age."||

It was to some of these noblemen, according to Le Clerc, that his friend, by a pleasant raillery, declared against the habit of card-playing, among companions capable of improving conversation.¶

The first employment in which Mr. Locke's patron appears to have en-

* Brit. Biog. VII. 5.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. VI. 164.

§ "He is said to have been too much addicted to a licentious intercourse with the female sex. We are told that King Charles II. once said to the Earl, at Court, *I believe, Shaftesbury, thou art the wickedest fellow in my dominions.* To which the Earl replied, *May it please your Majesty, of a subject I believe I am.*" Ibid. 169.

|| Ibid. VII. 6.

¶ Ibid.

gaged him, was to draw up "the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina," which were published in 1669, and collected among his *Pieces* in 1719. If these *Constitutions* were all framed by himself, there are two, at least, which do him little credit, as in No. 23, he proposes to perpetuate feudal vassalage, and in No. 110, *negro slavery*.* There were others, however, so favourable to religious liberty, that they were qualified by an additional article, not approved by Mr. Locke, whose liberal views in religion have incurred the censure of one of his biographers.†

In 1668, Mr. Locke accompanied the Earl and Countess of Northumberland to Paris. Returning, in 1670, with the Countess, the Earl having died in Italy, he again resided with Lord Ashley, who, in 1672, was created Earl of Shaftesbury, and made Lord High Chancellor, when he appointed Mr. Locke "Secretary of the Presentations." He next became "Secretary to the Board of Trade," but the commission was dissolved in December, 1674.‡

In 1675, Mr. Locke wrote, according to *Desmaizeaux*, "what my Lord Shaftesbury did, in a manner, dictate to him," in "A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country," exposing the designs then developing in Parliament to establish an arbitrary power. "This letter was privately printed," and at the close of the same year, "the House of Lords ordered it to be burnt by the common hangman." Of this *bonfire* Mr. Marvel says, "the sparks of it will eternally fly in the adversaries' faces."§ It was remarked in the *Letter*, "that Bartholomew day was fatal to our church and religion, in throwing out a very great number of worthy, learned, pious and orthodox divines." This passage was quoted in 1676, in the preface to "The Presbyterians Unmasked," as from "that late vile letter" of an "able, but more daring author."

In the same year, 1675, Mr. Locke, who had been admitted B. M. at Oxford, passed some time at Mont-

* See Mon. Repos. II. 83.

† See Biog. Brit. V. 2994. Note G.

‡ Brit. Biog. VII. 6, 7.

§ See *Dedic.* to Locke's *Pieces*.

pelier for the recovery of his health. There he communicated to Mr. Herbert, afterwards Earl of Pembroke, the design of his *Essay*. From Montpellier he removed to Paris, and became acquainted with the celebrated Protestant, M. Justel,* at whose house he first saw Mr. Guenelon, a physician of Amsterdam, and M. Toignard, † whose names will often occur in the following correspondence. During this absence from England, he expressed an inclination, had a vacancy occurred, to have become *Gresham* Professor of Physic. ‡ At Paris also he attended, as a physician, the Countess of Northumberland, who had married the "Lord Ambassador Montague." This appears from the following paper, in the *British Museum*, (Ayscough, 4290,) in the handwriting of Dr. Ward.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE sent you enclosed some proofs taken from Mr. Locke's own letters, of what was talked of yesterday at Dr. Mead's, that Mr. Locke did, on some occasions, practise as a physician. You will please to communicate them to Dr. Mead, with my humble service, and esteem me,

Dear Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

JOHN WARD.

G. C. Thursday,

15th August, 1745.

To Dr. Thomas Stack, at Dr. Mead's,
Ormond Street.

December 4, 1677, Mr. Locke wrote to Dr. Mapletoft, from Paris, desiring his advice in relation to a disorder which had seized the Countess of Northumberland, Lady to the English Ambassador; who then committed herself to the care of Mr. Locke, having before tried the French physicians, in a like case without success. Dr. Mapletoft chose to consult their common friend, Dr. Sydenham, upon this occasion, whose opinion was soon dispatched to Paris. But before it got thither the disorder was in a great measure removed by what Mr.

Locke had himself done in the meantime; which proved to be much the same as was prescribed by Dr. Sydenham. And, therefore, in a following letter, written the same month, by Mr. Locke to Dr. Mapletoft, he said, in his pleasant manner, "upon reading our friend's letter, I was ready to cry out, *the spirit of the prophets is upon the sons of the prophets*; I having, in what I have done here, not only proceeded by the same method, but used the very same remedies he directed as to the main."

In 1679, Lord Shaftesbury had again a prospect of court-favour, and prevailed upon Mr. Locke to return, but being soon displaced had no further opportunity of serving him. The Earl became, at length, so obnoxious to the government, that, for personal safety, he retired to Holland, in November, 1682, and died in January following.* Mr. Locke, who had followed him, would not venture a return to England, where he had now become obnoxious to a profligate court, whose resentment he presently experienced, and in November 1684, he was deprived, by royal mandate, of his *student's* place at Christ Church. On the accession of James, W. Penn would have procured for Mr. Locke a pardon, which he refused, being conscious of no crime. In May 1685, the English Envoy at the Hague demanded him to be delivered up by the States General, upon a groundless suspicion of his having been concerned in the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion. † In this demand he was joined with eighty-three other persons.

His situation was now perilous, especially (if Father Orleans may be credited) as the Prince of Orange was then so little inclined to oppose Popery and arbitrary power by force, that he had offered King James to command his army against the Duke. ‡ Yet during his stay in Holland, Mr. Locke had formed some valuable connexions, who were now ready to assist him, and with no one does he appear to have become more intimate than with Professor *Limborch*, the great nephew of *Episcopus*. He was a native of

* Brit. Biog. VII. 7.

† Or *Toignard*, a native of Orleans, born in 1629. He was a great *Medalist*, also author of a *Harmony of the Evangelists*, in Greek and Latin, with notes on *Chronology and History*. He died in 1706.

‡ Ward's *Gresham Professors*, p. 276.

* Brit. Biog. VI. 169.

† Ibid. VII. 8—10.

‡ *Histoire des Revolutions D'Angleterre*, 1694, III. 469.

Amsterdam, one year younger than Mr. Locke, and in 1655, had become a preacher among the Remonstrants. After several situations, in 1667 he was chosen Minister at Amsterdam, and the next year Professor of Divinity in that city.

During this year, 1685, Mr. Locke was concealed two or three months at Amsterdam, in the house of Mr. Veen, father-in-law to Dr. Guenelon, till, in September, he retired to Cleve, a city on the borders of the Rhine,* where he commenced the following *Correspondence*.

The Correspondence between Locke and Limborch, 1685—1704.

No. 1.

John Locke to Philip a Limborch.

Cleve, 28 Sep. 1685.

MY EXCELLENT FRIEND,

YOU will readily believe, that in writing to our friend Mr. Guenelon, ten days ago, I did not omit my respects to yourself. Yet a sense of duty, and a recollection of your favours, demand from me a more direct expression of my esteem and gratitude, lest I should seem to do that, as a matter of course, or negligently, which I feel to be a highly incumbent duty; especially as the silence of our friend Guenelon leaves me in doubt whether he received my letter. I should peculiarly regret its miscarriage, because if it did not reach him, I might appear to disregard or undervalue the numerous services by which you all have obliged me, or you might suppose that, during the interval of a few hours, I could forget those numerous benefits, the remembrance of which no time can efface.

In that letter I also mentioned the kind reception given me by your friend Vander Key, and how zealously he had assisted me. The name reminds me again to express my thanks to you for this introduction to his friendship, though it be but a trifling benefit, compared with your accumulated favours. I am unable also to express, adequately, my sense of the kindness I received from Mr. Veen and his excellent wife. Pray express them for me in your happiest phraseology.

I wrote to Mr. Guenelon that I was

* Biog. Brit. V. 2998. Note O.

inclined to remain here for health's sake. The pleasantness of the place, and, if not absolute indolence, yet the love of quiet and an aversion to the hurry of travelling still detain me. My daily walks, by which I strive against a disposition to idleness, are very pleasant. But how much more agreeable would they be, if I could have some of you as the companions of my rambles! For this I wish continually both for your sakes and my own, especially while the weather is so fine. Such an excursion would, I think, be far from unfavourable to Mr. Guenelon's health, whose tender lungs and delicate constitution, the serene air of this place would suit exactly.

I pray you write to me, and say what is passing among you, especially as to our affairs. But, above all, inform me of your own and our friend's health.

I am, yours, most respectfully,
J. LOCKE.

No. 2.

John Locke to Philip a Limborch.

Cleve, Oct. 3, 1685.

MY WORTHY FRIEND,

I HAVE received from you two letters, full of kindness and good-will, nor will you, I trust, deem me ungrateful if, under my present anxiety, I answer neither of them as they deserve. I only entreat this, that you contrive for my having intelligence of the Earl of Pembroke's arrival, from some of your friends at the Hague, who can send the information either to you or me. The Commander of the British forces was mentioned as coming over, and, if not arrived, is expected daily. I wish particularly to have the earliest notice of his approach.* Having said this, I am satisfied that you will procure for me the most prompt information.

I must reserve other subjects to the next opportunity, as the packet is going. Salute my friends most affectionately in my name. Farewell, and continue to regard me, as yours, most respectfully,
J. LOCKE.

* Mr. Locke seems to apprehend some inconvenience from these British troops; but how they came into a neutral country, or on what authority they could have molested him there, does not appear.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

List of the Petitioning Clergy, 1772.

SIR,

Dec. 24, 1817.

THE accompanying list of the Petitioning Clergy will, I apprehend, meet the wishes of your (literally *nameless*) Correspondent, Vol. X. p. 618, in the desire he has expressed to see the names of the "*Clergymen of the Established Church*," who signed the memorable Petition in 1772, for their Relief from Subscription to the Articles.

To render it, as I trust, the more acceptable, I have arranged the names under the counties in which their respective preferments were situated, rather than in the promiscuous form in which they are now blended in the copy before me. I cannot, at least at present, gratify your inquirer, by any further particulars of the individuals themselves. Many of them, no doubt, in after-life filled, and some few, perhaps, are still honourably filling, different appointments in the Church, from those to which their names are here attached, as (of course) their situations at the period of their signature.

A copy of the petition itself will be found correctly transcribed in the 42d vol. of the Gentleman's Magazine, p. 61, and in the preceding volume an account is given of the meeting held to carry it into execution. This manly and temperate petition, it will be recollected, after a spirited debate, in which the cause of the subscribers was most ably advocated by Sir Wm. Meredith and Lord John Cavendish, was rejected by a large majority*, on Lord North's urging, that "it would tend to revive the flames of ecclesiastical controversy." V. M. H.

List of the Clerical Subscribers † to the Petition presented to the House of Commons, Feb. 6, 1772.

Cambridge.

William Benning, Vicar of Abington.

Thomas Wagstaffe, M. A., Fellow of Christ's College.

* On the division there were Nays, 217
Yeas, 71

Majority, 146

† Exclusively of this list, there were

J. Braithwaite, M. A., Fellow of Jesus College.

William Dealtry, Ditto.

T. Heathcote, B. A., Fellow of St. John's.

Richard Barker, M. A., Fellow of Pembroke.

N. Baldwin, M. A., Fellow of Peterhouse.

James Bindley, M. A., Ditto.

R. Plumtree, D. D., President of Queen's College.

D. Hughes, B. D., Vice President of Queen's College.

George Holt, B. A., Fellow of Queen's College.

R. Morris, M. A., Ditto.

A. H. Newcome, B. A., * Ditto.

T. Fyshe Palmer, B. A., Ditto.

Thomas Preston, M. A., Ditto.

Thomas Thwaites, B. D., Ditto.

Christopher Hunter, M. A., Fellow of Sidney College.

Richard Oliver, B. D., Ditto.

John Charlesworth, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College.

Favell Hopkins, late of Trinity College.

James Lambert, M. A., † Fellow of Trinity College.

Cumberland.

J. S. Lushington, M. A., Vicar of Cross-thwaite. ‡

Derbyshire.

Robert Barker, B. D., § Vicar of Youlgrave.

Joseph Goddard, B. A., Vicar of Horsley.

Thomas Manlove, M. A., Vicar of St. Alkmund, Derby.

John Ward, B. A., Curate of Morley.

Joshua Winter, Rector of Weston on Trent.

Devon.

William Tasker, Monkoakhampton.

John Tooker, Rector of Calverleigh.

Dorset.

Edward Cotes, LL.B., Rector of Bishop Caundle.

John Parsons, B. A., Rector of Pulham.

Durham.

William Addison, Rector of Dinsdale.

John Aspinwall, Minister of Wolviston.

James Horseman, Vicar of Gretham.

Thomas Morland, Curate of Sadberge.

Essex.

Christopher Atkinson, Rector of Yelden.

several other *Lay* Subscribers chiefly belonging to the two professions of Civil Law and Physic.

* I have some doubt whether this gentleman was ever in orders.

† He was also Greek Professor.

‡ After Vicar of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

§ And at the same time a Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

James Brome, Rector of Great Henny.
 John Caldow, *clerk*, * Witham.
 Lilly Butler, Vicar of Witham.
 John Cantley, M. A., Copford.
 Roger Cocksedge, Rector of Waltham.
 Thomas Cooch, LL.B., Malden.
 Thomas Chappell, *clerk*, Witham.
 John Cott, Rector of Great Braxted.
 John Colman, Rector of Bradwell.
 George Dutens, Vicar of Great Baddow.
 William Grainger, Rector of Verley.
 Charles Gretton, M. A., Rector of Spring-
 field Bosvil.
 William Gatton, M. A., Rector of Little-
 bury. †
 John Haggard, M. A., Rector of Little
 Birch.
 P. Harvey, Ramsden Cray's.
 Robert Jegon, B. A., Kelvedon.
 Thomas Keighley, M. A., Vicar of Low
 Layton.
 David Mustard, *clerk*, Colchester.
 John James Neale, B. A., *clerk*, Bille-
 ricay.
 Charles Oulney, Rector of Fordham.
 George Pawson, Rector of Bradsell.
 William L. Phillips, *clerk*, Danbury
 George Shepherd, Rector of Markshall.
 Francis Stone, M. A. F. S. A., Rector of
 Cold Norton.
 S. Summers, *clerk*, Kelvedon.
 William Treakell, B. A., Rector of Had-
 leigh.
 George Watkins, Rector of Fairstead.
 William Williams, M. A., Vicar of Malden.
 Christopher Wyvill, LL.B., Rector of
 Black Notley.
 Robert Younge, Rector of Little Thurrock.
Hants.
 Henry Norman, Rector of Morested.
 Henry Taylor, Vicar of Portsmouth.
 Nicholas Tindal, Rector of Olverston.
Herts.
 Edward Bouchier, M. A., Rector of Brent-
 field.
 Anthony Trollope, M. A., Rector of Cot-
 terel.
Hunts.
 B. Hutchinson, Vicar of Kimbolton.
 J. Kippax, D. D., Rector of Brington.
 Richard Reynolds, M. A., Paxton.
 William Robinson, Rector of Hamerton.
Kent.
 Nicholas Carter, D. D., Rector of Wood-
 church.
 Richard Clarke, Rector of Hartley.
 John Firebrace, B. A., Lecturer of St.
 Paul's, Deptford.
 George Hutton, M. A., Deptford.
 William Lowth, Vicar of Lewisham.

* Many of the signatures were made in
 this way, the individuals signing (it is pre-
 sumed) not being graduates.

† Afterwards, I believe, D. D., Arch-
 deacon of Essex, Head of Magdalen Col-
 lege, Cambridge.

Richard Morgan, Curate of Northbourn.
 Anthony Temple, M. A., Vicar of Eastley.
 William Thomas, B. A., Curate of St.
 Mary's, Sandwich.
Lancashire.
 Reginald Braithwaite, M. A., Minister of
 Hawkeshead.
 J. Hest, Curate of Wharton.
Leicester.
 George Coulton, Rector of Houghton.
 William Lloyd, M. A., Rector of Sad-
 dington.
 George Mason, Leir, Lutterworth.*
Lincoln.
 John Barr, B. A., Rector of Oumby.
 John Bidgell, M. A., Rector of Wellborn.
 Richard Brown, Rector of Aswardby.
 Andrew Chambers, B. A., Curate of Ba-
 singham.
 John Disney, jun., LL.B., Vicar of Swin-
 derby. †
 Sir John Every, Bart., Rector of Wad-
 dington.
 Thomas Foster, LL.B., Rector of Doun-
 ley.
 Charles Hope, M. A., Vicar of Weston.
 J. Lafargue, M. A., *clerk*, Stamford.
 William Murray, D. D., Vicar of Gains-
 borough.
 John Norton, M. A., Stamford.
 John Parnell, LL.B., Rector of Rand.
 Joseph Simpson, Curate of North Searle.
 Thomas Wilberfoss, Rector of All Saints,
 Stamford.
Middlesex.
 Joseph Cookson, Lecturer of Bethnal
 Green. †
 James Davies, *clerk*, Master of Islington
 School.
 George Marriott, Lecturer of St. Luke's.
 William Ramsden, M. A., Charter House. §
 William Rose, M. A., Chiswick.
 Richard Wynne, M. A., Rector of St.
 Alphage, London.
Norfolk.
 John Emeris, M. A., Rector of Thetford.
 Thomas Howes, M. A., *clerk*, Morning-
 thorpe.
 Edward Howman, M. A., Rector of Ges-
 sing.
 William Manning, B. A., Rector of Brome.
 J. J. Woodward, LL.B., Ditchingham.
 Nicholas Wakeham, M. A., Rector of
 Ingham.
Northants.
 William Bidwell, M. A., Grafton Under-
 wood.

* Designated Rector of Leir, but there
 is no such benefice.

† After LL.D., and subsequently quitted
 the Establishment.

‡ He was afterwards Chaplain to the
 Ironmongers' Hospital.

§ Afterwards D. D., and, I believe,
 many years Master of the Charter House.

- William Chambers, D. D., Rector of Achurch.
 Edmund Dana, Vicar of Brightstock.
 John Ekins, Rector of Barton Seagrove.
 William Fonnereau, LL.B., Clapton.
 William Guest, Rector of Colliveston.
 Henry Knappe, M. A., Rector of Rockingham.
 James Quincey, Vicar of Geddington.
 Anthony Sanderson, Rector of Barnwell St. Andrews.
 William Sanderson, Vicar of Little Ad-dington.
 John Scriven, LL.B., Rector of Twywell.
 John Skinner, B. D., Rector of Easton.
 Richard Stough, M. A., Luffwick.
 James Wardleworth, B. A., Tichmarsh.
Notts.
 John Edwards, M. A., Bulston.
 Robert Locke, B. A., Vicar of Farndon.
 Timothy Wylde, Vicar of Beaston.
Oxford.
 Samuel Benzeville, B. A., of St. John's College.
 James Phipps, M. A., of St. Mary Hall.
 Thomas Dalton, M. A., Fellow of Queen's College.*
 Robert Outlaw, Islip.
Rutland.
 William Brereton, Rector of Cottesmore.
 Joseph Digby, LL.B., Rector of Tinwell.
 Thomas Harrison, D. D., Rector of Great Casterton.
 Samuel Hunt, B. A., Curate of Great Casterton.
 R. Wythers, Vicar of Greetham.
Salop.
 Thomas Milner, B. D., Vicar of Stokesey.
Somerset.
 Phil. Atherton, Vicar of Ninehead.
 John Foe, D. D., Vicar of East Coker.
Suffolk.
 John Boldero, B. A., Rector of Ampton.
 John Carter, M. A., Rector of Hongrave.
 Abraham Dawson, M. A., Rector of Ringfield.
 Benjamin Dawson, LL.D., Rector of Burgh. †
 John Gent, B. A., Vicar of Stoke Nayland.
 Christopher Holland, LL.B., Rector of Cavenham.
 William Holmes, B. A., Curate of Holton.
 John Jebb, M. A., Rector of Homersfield. †
 Joseph Lathbury, jun., Rector of Livermere.
 Mich. Marlow, M. A., Rector of Larkford. §

* Now Vicar of Carisbrook and Rector of Northwood, in the Isle of Wight.

† The learned Author of the Necessitarian, &c.

‡ This name occurs in another part of my list, as late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.

§ And, if I am not mistaken, is the present President of St. John's College, Oxon., &c.

Thomas Paddon, M. A., clerk, Bungay.
 Humphrey Primott, M. A., Minister of Higham.
 A. L. Richardson, Rector of Hisham St. Peter's.

Surrey.

John Jennings, M. A., Master of St. Saviour's.

Owen Manning, B. D., Vicar of Godalmin:
Sussex.

S. Carpenter, M. A., Rector of Bignorris.

Thomas Davies, Vicar of Glynd.

William Hopkins, B. A., Vicar of Bolney.*

Allan Robinson, B. A., Curate of Bascombe.

Wilts.

L. Eliot, M. A., Vicar of Steeple Ashton.

Yorkshire.

Daniel Addison, Curate of Thirsk.

Cuthbert Allenson, Rector of Wath.

John Armistead, Vicar of Easingwold.

Francis Blackburne, Rector of Richmond. †

Thomas Cantley, Vicar of Great Usborne.

John Dent, Rector of Soothington.

Timothy Dickinson, Vicar of Grinton.

William Dixon, Curate of Trinity Chapel.

Gregory Elsley, Vicar of Burniston.

John Gray, Rector of Tanfield.

Thomas Harrison, Curate of Patin Bromp-ton.

H. Herd, Vicar of Myton.

Edward Holmes, clerk, Sinton, near Catteric.

Richard Horne, Rector of Marsh.

Thomas Joy, clerk, Smeaton.

William Kay, M. A., Rector of Nunnington.

Theophilus Lindsey, LL.B., Vicar of Catteric.

Thomas Nelson, Rector of Finghall.

Allan Penny, Vicar of Thornton Steward.

John Pigott, Vicar of Hornby.

R. Piper, B. D., Rector of South Kilvington.

Thomas Simpson, Curate of Catteric.

Isaac Wilson, Vicar of Brafferton.

Appendix.

H. Beveley, J. C.

Anthony Clarkson, B. A.

George Hartley, M. A., J. C.

David Simpson, B. A.

William Stables, J. C.

William Robertson, D. D.

Sidney Swinney, D. D.

John Wastle, LL.B.

B. Webb, clerk.

Daniel Wilson, M. A.

John Yorke, LL.B.

P. S. Respecting the individuals named in the above Appendix, it does

* Also Master of Cuckfield endowed School.

† Archdeacon of Cleveland, the learned Author of the Confessional.

not appear what preferments they held, or even where they resided, nor do I exactly see what is designated by the J. C. attached to some of them; but this and any further information relative to the character, writings or history of the whole of this noble phalanx of worthies, would doubtless form an acceptable communication to the readers of the Monthly Repository.

V. M. H.

Dr. Cogan on his Ethical Questions.

SIR,

Dec. 12, 1817.

UPON looking into the Monthly Repository for April, [XII. 226—236,] I perceive that there is an ample and candid review of my *Ethical Questions*; with which the self-love of an author is sufficiently gratified. But as I think that the writer's objections to some of my positions, may have a tendency to invalidate my arguments, in the opinion of many of your readers, upon subjects which I deem of the first importance, without confuting them in reality, I beg leave to reply to his comments upon them, by the same channel through which they were communicated to the public.

If, Sir, I know myself, my prime object is the discovery of truth. Truth, sacred truth, is of such infinite importance, that I am induced to respect a man who advances an ingenious error, the confutation of which introduces a just principle, or establishes it upon a more solid basis; and if my writings shall advance knowledge by the detection of my errors, I shall not have written in vain. I hope, therefore, to receive correction with the docility of a pupil who has mistaken his grammar-rules, or has misconstrued a passage, without being impertinently positive that he is always in the right. In the following strictures my sole object is to rectify what appear to me misapprehensions, and to prove that the positions upon which the writer has animadverted, perfectly correspond with the tenor of the principles I wish to establish, and to which he does not object.

In his review of the third Speculation, on the Existence of a Moral Sense, though he agrees with me upon the whole, he observes, in answer to my argument against its existence, from the imperfection of the analogy between the *physical* senses and this

supposed *moral* sense, that "the advocates for a *moral sense* never could intend to use the word in *precisely* the same meaning, as when it is applied to the faculty of perceiving external objects through the corporeal organs. They applied it *analogically* to the mental power of distinguishing between moral good and evil, and analogies do not require that the cases be perfectly parallel."

To this I answer, many supporters of that doctrine have gone much further; they have spoken of a *sixth* sense, which they deemed equally instantaneous, and equally infallible in its perceptions with either of the five. But supposing this were not the case, I maintain, that in every *argument* from analogy, the analogy must be perfect, or the argument is inconclusive. Analogy may serve as a kind of conjectural solution of a difficulty, or as an illustration, a *metaphorical* illustration, of a subject, where there are but few points of resemblance; but it cannot be the *basis of a theory*, unless there be a concordance in every point, for the point of discrepancy may enfeeble or destroy the whole hypothesis. The minutest deviation from the right point of the compass, at first setting out, and persevered in during the whole of a voyage, will never conduct the mariner to the destined port, nor will the mathematician be able to solve his problem under the influence of the smallest error. Whoever maintains that the endowment of a moral sense is a guide to decision in moral sentiment and moral conduct, must believe that the *faculty* is equally accurate in its reports as the other senses, whether he retain the term of a *sixth sense* or not. He must suppose, that in its *effects* the analogy is perfect, though not in its physical construction, or that there is a peculiar organization in the brain destined to the purpose: and my object is to prove that the analogy is so defective, that all reasonings from it are inconclusive; and that we are not under the necessity of having recourse to so unsatisfactory a mode of solution, when it is not difficult to explain all the phenomena, upon which they found an hypothesis, by the common laws of human nature which are in daily operation.

On the Doctrine of Necessity, my

reviewer alleges, that the arguments I advance cannot be satisfactory to the advocates for human liberty: that "the method of reconciliation proposed is to evade, and not confront the difficulties of the question." He adds, "the objection of the libertarian is this, that, according to the hypothesis of his opponent, the state of the mind which immediately precedes, and indeed produces the physical or corporeal action, that state to which we give the name volition, is itself produced by causes, whether within or without the mind, over which the agent has no controul, and for which therefore, though he may be made accountable in fact, he cannot be responsible in equity:" and he thinks that my expatiating upon the extensive advantages derived to man from our always obeying the dictates of the will, does not remove the objection.

I shall observe in the first place, that to bring the controversy to this point, is of no small importance in the debate. It opposes that wantonness of will, for which the earlier advocates for human liberty so strenuously contended; and which is still conspicuous in the writings of Madame de Stael and some of the German philosophers. Their favourite hypothesis asserts that the freedom of the will is paramount to all motives: that it is an inherent, independent power, over which motives have no controul. If we compel them to acknowledge the contrary, they must abandon one of the fortresses which they held with no small degree of confidence, though we may not have reduced the capital.

Again, to continue my allusion, the statement given of the universal, and also beneficial influence of the human will, has a tendency to draw the opponents out of another strong hold, where they always entrench themselves. Inattentive to all the advantage of right motives, they immediately place before us the dilemma respecting *responsibility* for immoral actions, as being of itself a complete confutation of the whole theory of the Necessarians. It cannot, therefore, be totally irrelevant to the subject, to remind them, that supposing an abuse of the doctrine should occasionally become the parent of vice, which, by the way, is very seldom the case, - this disadvantage is counterbalanced by

the consideration that obedience to the impulse of motives is the parent of every thing useful, ornamental and pleasing in the natural and social world, and of every virtue in the moral world.

I shall further observe, that the habit of drawing the alarming inferences in order to annihilate the doctrine, so universal among them, is in reality a tacit acknowledgment that the Necessarian hypothesis is founded upon arguments which would render it totally unobjectionable, could this difficulty be surmounted. They will admit that they never rise from their beds in the morning, without some cause operating as a motive; and that every action of the day is under a similar influence, that is, under a motive which, although they may have the physical power, they never have the *will* to resist. But upon *moral* subjects they immediately revolt. It is immediately urged, with the utmost emphasis, that it would be *unjust* to punish the most nefarious actions, although they result from the most detestable propensities, because the propensities themselves were formed by causes which were not under the controul of the agent.

But, let it be observed, that under the operation of this grand law, which they are ready to admit in the common concerns of life, it cannot be *unjust* to punish wicked actions, since the motives to punish were under an influence as *compulsive*, as those which induced the offender to transgress. Should the villain act upon the principle so much redoubted, and think himself irresistibly impelled to be unjust and cruel, let him learn that the same impulsive force must inevitably raise, in every virtuous mind, a hatred and detestation of his conduct. If he be guilty of murder, it may be *impossible* for him to avoid remorse upon reflection, however irresistible the motive appeared at the time. His commitment to prison, his trial, his sentence of condemnation, his public execution, all take place under the same immutable law, which influenced the culprit to commit the deed. The conduct of his prosecutors was as *inevitable* as his own; and, therefore, according to his own principles, he cannot be *unjustly* treated. Prosecutors, witnesses, jury, judge, executioner, are exculpated by

the very same argument which the offender uses to exculpate himself. This *argumentum ad hominem*, to me appears unanswerable; if so, the objector is driven out of another strong hold.

One difficulty still remains. It will be asked, how can this constitution of things be reconciled to the equity of the divine administration? Is it not unjust in the Deity to inflict even the miseries of vicious conduct upon subjects, whose depravities he not only foresaw, but which originate from the very arrangements which he himself has pre-ordained?

This objection is doubtless formidable; but it is as much in the province of the advocate for the uncontrolled freedom of the will to solve it, as of the Necessarian. The Supreme Being must have *foreseen* that this boasted freedom would be shamefully abused, in consequence of the state in which the agent has been placed by Divine appointment. It can only be fully solved, when we shall have obtained clear conceptions of the infinite good which shall arise from the permission of evil, under a Governor, all whose attributes are perfect.

Let us, in the mean time, inquire in what this difficulty consists? Is it not founded on a *supposition* only, that no medium can possibly be found to reconcile the justice of God with those conceptions of the nature of justice which he himself has implanted in man? If, therefore, we be able to support the *possibility* of such a medium, the objection is removed. Will it not then be removed by the *supposition*, that all punishments and all sufferings, under the Supreme administration, will finally prove *corrective*, that they will *ultimately* manifest themselves to be of the greatest benefit to the offender? No man in his senses will consider *that* to be an act of *injustice* which was the most proper, as it may be the *only* method of reclaiming him from his vices, forming his character, and preparing him for permanent well-being. Should it be alleged that this is merely a *supposition*, it is still upon a level with the *supposition* that no answer can possibly be given by the Necessarian to the assertion that, upon *his* principles, the Judge of all the earth cannot do right. On the contrary, it evinces

that he cannot do wrong. The *possible* existence of such a plan is a complete confutation of an objection which is solely founded in an *imaginary* impossibility. I may add, however, that this supposition is founded, not upon a mere *possibility*, but upon a high degree of *probability*. It is a supposition consonant with reason, most honourable to all the relative attributes of God, most consoling to every man of every character. It is encouraging to the practice of every virtue; and the absolute certainty of a necessary degree of salutary chastisement will alarm offenders infinitely more than all the tremendous threats of eternal misery; from which every murderer, in the present day, is encouraged to expect an escape by a simple act of faith and the sudden contrition of a panic-struck mind. It could also be shewn, were this the place for enlargement, that the position has a better foundation in the Sacred Scriptures, than most of those speculative opinions or doctrines of inference which have at any time engaged the attention of polemical divines.

As this article is drawn out to a length which threatens to be tedious to many of your readers, I shall reserve my answer to your reviewer's remarks concerning my strictures upon Mr. Hume and his metaphysical writings, for a future Number.

THOMAS COGAN.

A Dorsetshire Clergyman's Treatment of the Dissenters' Dead.

Ringwood,

November 24, 1817.

SIR,
I SEND for insertion, in your liberal publication, an account of a method practised by a clergyman in Dorsetshire, to shew his aversion from and to check the growth of Dissenters in his parish; for the truth of which I can produce numerous testimonies. When a Dissenter is brought to be buried, this clergyman will not allow the corpse to be carried into the church; and, of course, he only reads that portion of the service which is ordered "to be spoken at the grave." Some weak-minded persons have been influenced by the apprehension that this *slight* might be shewn to *their* remains, and have been known to refrain from going to the *meeting*, while *alive*, lest, forsooth, they should

not be carried into the church when dead!! Some time ago this clergyman refused admission to a Dissenter, and would not read the former part of the burial service over the corpse. In consequence of which, a person of some spirit said to him, "Sir, as you will not read one part of the service, you shall not read the other." The clergyman retired, and the corpse was inhumed without any form of words being used. I have been requested, Mr. Editor, to ask, through the medium of your Work, whether a clergyman has the power to keep Dissenters out of the church when they are taken to be buried, and to deprive the attendants of the benefit of hearing the finest part of the church funeral service? For my own part, I am persuaded, he has not; because the church and the yard are not the property of the parson or of the church people, but belong to the whole parish; and all who pay have a right to and an interest in them.

After the repeated insults which Dissenters have received from bigoted priests of the Established Church, I am only astonished that they should not *dedicate* some places of their own, either adjoining their temples of worship or elsewhere, as receptacles for their dead. In a former situation I introduced the practice, and buried the first person, that was ever deposited in our chapel-yard. And I would beg leave most respectfully to recommend to every congregation of Dissenters, to procure, if possible, a piece of land, and preserve it for their burying-place. It would spare them the pain of being insulted at a time when they can least bear it; and it would have a pleasing, soothing effect, if they would plant it with trees and shrubs, similar to the Dissenters' graveyard at Stourbridge, in which, taking *the chapel and the whole premises together*, are shewn more correct taste and dignified elegance than in any other place to which my observation has been extended. Indeed, the managers of that temple and its concerns, are far above *my* praise; and they are a fit example for imitation, to Dissenting trustees and rulers, all over the kingdom.

J. B. BRISTOWE.

Origin of Doubts on the Truth of Christianity.

SIR, January 2, 1818.

THE question of *Scepticus* [XII. 591], seems to admit of an easy answer. In the first age of Christianity there was no *doubt*: for the Gnostic or phantomist heresy was rebuked in the writings of the apostle John: and we find that the believers in *Christ*, as the servant and messenger of the one true God, multiplied with astonishing rapidity in different regions, and that the faith of *the many*, notwithstanding the learned speculations of certain philosophical converts from the Heathens, continued one and the same for at least three centuries. The fondness for *platonizing* in Christianity, added to the desire of throwing a supposed glory round the cross of *Jesus* by exalting his nature into something super-human, gradually introduced metaphysical refinements and sophistications into the simple gospel of *Christ*: till it was finally overwhelmed beneath a mass of dark and intricate theology; which, receiving the improvements of successive councils, at length settled in the corrupt idolatry of the *Romish* church. The *doubt*, therefore, which *Scepticus* seems to regard as irreconcilable with clear and authentic evidence, arises from the great apostacy in the church of *Christ*; which, by darkening and confusing the written word, and perverting the traditions delivered from the apostles, perplexed the truth, and led to endless disputations, "confusion worse confounded," among which a plain understanding would find a difficulty in steering its way. The unchristian alliance of religion with secular authority, strengthened and perpetuated this dogmatic theology, which, contradicting the natural reason and being at variance with the plain declarations of scripture respecting *ONE* God, amazed and stupified the minds of men, and induced *doubt* in some, and in others infidelity. The struggling conjectures of strong thinkers, making their way through the mysteries of human invention to primitive truth, drew men into sects: authority pronounced this choice of modes of faith, suggested by the light of reason, heresy and schism; persecution was resorted to where argu-

ment failed; and amidst these conflicts it is not surprising that some *doubted* and others disbelieved: or, that men who have not patience nor leisure to examine into the historical evidences of the primitive opinions, and critically to analyze the evangelical and apostolic writings, should remain bewildered or incredulous. This apostacy was clearly foreseen and pointed out by *Paul*: and *Jesus* himself emphatically foretold the divisions of religious sentiment which should arise even in *one family*: a most remarkable and striking prophecy! But it is equally foretold that the truth will ultimately make itself manifest, and that doubt will be at an end.

CORNELIUS.

Unitarianism at Geneva.

SIR, December 17, 1817.

A WRITER in the last number of the *Christian Observer*, [p. 712,] animadverting upon the defection of the pastors and professors of Geneva from the doctrines of their patriarch Calvin, has thought proper to ascribe the change to the influence of Rousseau and his irreligious writings. I am not surprised that Calvinists should be desirous thus to confound a renunciation of Calvinism with the rejection of Christianity, because the fact that a body of men, eminent for their talents and exemplary in their lives, pursuing scriptural truth by the investigation of the Bible, remote from the influence of the passions which controversy awakens, and if biassed at all, naturally disposed to lean to the doctrines handed down to them from their ancestors, should with one consent have renounced orthodoxy, is a testimony to the scriptural evidence of Anti-Calvinistic opinions not easy to be got over. Had the writer in the *Christian Observer* known any thing of the history of the church of Geneva, desirous as he is to represent infidelity as the root of its heresy, he would at least have made his charge more plausibly than by connecting it with the name of Rousseau, who has had no more to do with it than Thomas Paine with the Arianism of Mr. Peirce and his fellow-sufferers from the Western Inquisition. Both the principles and the manners of the people of Geneva shew how unfounded is the charge of having embraced

the licentious doctrines of their fellow-citizen: notwithstanding an incorporation of several years with revolutionary France, they are still distinguished by the simplicity and purity of their manners—a distinction which it is to be hoped they will retain in spite of the crowds of idle Englishmen who have taken up their abode amongst them, and the efforts of orthodox missionaries to alienate the minds of the people from their moral and religious instructors. But what decidedly proves that the heresy of the Genevans has no connexion with French infidelity, is, that the same charge of abandoning Calvinism was made and to the same extent, in the middle of the last century, and before French infidelity had disclosed itself. Perhaps many of your readers may not be aware of the circumstances to which I allude,—the insertion of an article in the celebrated *Encyclopédie*, charging the ministers of Geneva with Socinianism, and the steps which they took to vindicate themselves. I have therefore subjoined a translation of that part of the article *Genève* which relates to the faith of the clergy, and also their solemn protest against the imputation cast on them: the former is to be found in the 7th Volume of the folio edition of the *Encyclopédie*, the latter in the *Mélanges de d'Alembert*, Vol. III. p. 465.

The present state of Geneva in respect to religious opinion is certainly very singular, and the Unitarians of this country cannot but be deeply interested in what is now going forward there. For upwards of a century, probably, the great body of the clergy have gradually been renouncing the peculiarities of Calvinism, and confining their preaching and catechetical instruction to the Being and Perfections of God, the duty and expectations of men as made known in Revelation and confirmed by the promise of a future state. Yet it does not appear that they have ever gone beyond a negative Anti-Trinitarianism and Anti-Calvinism, and the result of the present attempts of our evangelical countrymen to bring the people back to the doctrine of the Institutions, is peculiarly interesting, as it may afford a test of the efficacy of that mode of opposing error, which many excellent persons think more safe and effectual

than a direct attack upon popular opinions. They would insist upon the Unity of God, without shewing its absolute inconsistency with every modification of Trinitarianism; they would set forth the benignity, the long-suffering, the graciousness of our heavenly Father, without urging that no equivalent or atonement can be necessary to make such a Being ready to receive the penitent transgressor; they would insist upon the necessity of good works to salvation, without drawing the inference, which they might, respecting the Calvinistic doctrines of absolute decrees and the efficacy of faith alone. To others it seems that though this indirect method of insinuating truth into the mind may be well suited to men of leisure and reflection, it is not adapted to the generality, who do not and cannot pursue principles to consequences not pointed out, and to whom the whole benefit of a process of reasoning may be lost, if the last step be wanting which should connect it with the conclusion. They think that to teach truth but never to shew its inconsistency with popular error, is to dig the mine without laying the gunpowder. The result of the efforts which are now making to re-convert the people of Geneva, may help to decide which of these two methods of propagating truth is most deserving of our imitation. If they succeed in making Calvinism once more popular, in spite of the notorious renunciation of it by the clergy, and even force them, as the only means of preserving their influence, to resume it, we can hardly avoid the inference, that for truth to gain a firm footing, it must be taught *controversially*. Should they fail, it must be allowed that where circumstances permit the system of indirect attack to be pursued so long and uninterruptedly as it has been at Geneva, it accomplishes its object effectually at last.

There is one case indeed in which the ill success of Mr. Drummond and his associates will prove nothing, and that is, if the clergy use their influence with the magistracy to prevent Calvinism from being taught within the territories of the republic, and proceed to censure and depose any of their own body who persist in preaching

it. The former is scarcely conceivable; I wish I could say that no symptom of the latter had appeared. Should they adopt this method of stifling discussion, however we may regret that such an instance of disregard to the right of private judgment should proceed from such a quarter, we may learn this useful lesson, that the spirit of all establishments is too nearly the same, and that the best principles in other respects, are not proof against the corrupting influence of the possession of power.

P. T. L.

Having described the situation, political constitution, &c., of Geneva, M. d'Alembert proceeds, "It now only remains that we should speak of the state of religion, and this is perhaps that part of our present article, in which the philosopher will take the strongest interest. Before we enter into this detail, we must request our readers to remember that we are historians and not polemicists, that our articles of theology are designed as an antidote to the errors of which we are going to speak, and that no approbation is implied in giving an account of them. We refer the reader to the articles *Eucharist, Hell, Faith, Christianity*, to fortify them before-hand against what we are going to say." [The reader will be amused or disgusted with this flimsy affectation of a zeal for the Catholic doctrine, which was necessary to make the *Encyclopédie* pass in a country where Popery was still the established religion, though notoriously designed to bring Christianity itself into contempt.] "The ecclesiastical constitution of Geneva is purely Presbyterian; they have no bishops and still less canons; not that they disapprove of episcopacy; but they see no proof of its divine authority, and they think a poorer and humbler ministry better suited to a small republic.—The ministers are either *pastors*, answering to our parish clergy, or *postulants*, like our unbeficed priests. Their salary does not exceed 1200 livres (£50. sterling) without any perquisites, and it is paid by the state, for the church possesses nothing. No minister is admitted without a rigid examination both of his morals and his literary attainments; nor till he is 24 years of age.—The

clergy of Geneva are men of exemplary morals; they live in great mutual harmony, not disputing fiercely like those of other countries upon unintelligible dogmas, persecuting one another and calling in the aid of the civil magistrate; yet they are far from being unanimous respecting those articles which are elsewhere deemed most essential in religion. Many of them no longer believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, of which Calvin, their leader, was so zealous a defender, and for denying which he brought Servetus to the stake. When this punishment, so little to the honour of their patriarch's charity and moderation, is mentioned to them, they do not undertake to justify it; they acknowledge that Calvin was in the wrong, and, if they are conversing with a Catholic, they oppose to it the abominable massacre of St. Bartholomew, which every good Frenchman would wish to efface from our annals with his blood; and the execution of John Huss, in which humanity and good faith were equally outraged, and by which the memory of the emperor Sigismund must be covered with everlasting infamy.

"*Hell*, which is one of the principal articles of our creed, has ceased to be so in that of many of the ministers of Geneva. According to them, it would be unjust to the Deity, so full of goodness and mercy, to suppose that he is capable of punishing our sins by an eternity of torment. They explain, with as little awkwardness as they may, the positive declarations of Scripture which are opposed to their doctrine, alleging that nothing should be taken literally which is at variance with humanity and reason. They believe in the existence of future punishments, but of limited duration. So that purgatory, one of the principal causes of the separation of the Protestants from the Romish Church, is now the only state of suffering after death, which many of them admit—a curious fact to be added to the history of the contradictions of mankind.

"In short, many of the Pastors of Geneva have no other religion than complete Socinianism, rejecting every thing which is called a mystery, and believing that the fundamental principle of true religion is to propose

nothing for our belief which is repugnant to reason. When they are pressed on the subject of the *necessity* of revelation, an essential doctrine of Christianity, many of them substitute the milder term of *utility*, in which they shew their consistency at least, if not their orthodoxy.

"A body of clergy entertaining such sentiments as these, may be expected to be tolerant, and, in fact, those of Geneva are so to such a degree, as to be regarded with an evil eye by the ministers of other Reformed Churches. It may further be said, without intending to approve in other points the religion of Geneva, that there are few countries in which the theologians and ecclesiastics are more hostile to superstition. On the other hand, as intolerance and superstition serve only to multiply unbelievers, fewer complaints are heard at Geneva than elsewhere of the increase of infidelity. This is not surprising: religion is reduced among them to little more than the worship of one God, except among the vulgar; respect for Jesus Christ and for the Scriptures are almost the only things which distinguish the Christianity of Geneva from pure Deism."

The rest of the article relates to the worship and discipline of the Church of Geneva, and has no immediate connexion with our subject. To the passage which I have translated, the following note is added in the 8vo. edition of the *Encyclopédie*, Lausanne and Berne, 1782.

"The imputation which M. d'Alembert has thrown out against Geneva is not new. As early as 1690, some English ministers had complained on this subject to a synod convoked at Amsterdam. That religious toleration, which is a natural consequence of the principles of the Reformation, may have occasioned Socinianism to spring up in its bosom: but on the 10th of February 1758, the Church of Geneva, by a solemn act, protested against the doctrine which is imputed to it in this article; and by thus putting upon record its abhorrence of all Socinian doctrines, we must suppose, that it will repel for the future all suspicion of the soundness of its faith."

If any reader of the *Repository* can point out any account of the transac-

tion in 1692, which is here alluded to, the writer of this article will be obliged to him to do so: the "solemn protest against the imputation of Socinianism," is the document which follows.

"Extract from the Registers of the Venerable Company of Pastors and Professors of the Church and Academy of Geneva, February 10, 1758.

"The Company being informed that the seventh volume of the *Encyclopédie*, lately printed at Paris, contains, under the head Geneva, some things which essentially concern our church, has caused this article to be read before it, and having nominated commissioners to examine it more particularly, upon hearing their report, and after mature deliberation, has thought it a duty to itself and to public edification to make and publish the following declaration:—

"The Company has been equally surprised and grieved to see in the article in question, that not only the system of our public worship is represented in a very defective manner, but a very false idea is given of our doctrine and our faith; on several subjects opinions are attributed to many of us which we do not hold, and others are misrepresented. In direct contradiction to the truth, it is alleged 'that several of us no longer believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and have no other religion than pure Socinianism, rejecting all mysteries,' &c.; and, as if to compliment us upon being completely philosophical, the author endeavours to explain away our Christianity, by expressions which tend to nothing less than to make us suspected of having none at all; as when he says, that 'religion is very nearly reduced to the worship of one God, expect among the vulgar,' &c. Imputations such as these are the more dangerous and the more likely to diffuse a false opinion of us throughout Christendom, as they are found in a work of very general circulation, and which speaks favourably of our city, of its morals, its government, and, with this exception, of its clergy and ecclesiastical constitution. We deeply regret that the most important point of all, is that on which the author is the worst informed.

"To have done more justice to the soundness of our faith, nothing was

necessary for him but to have adverted to the public and authentic proofs of it, which the church has given, and still continues to give. Nothing is more notorious than that our leading principle and invariable profession is *to receive the doctrine of the holy prophets and apostles, contained in the books of the Old and New Testament, as divinely inspired, and as the sole, infallible and perfect rule of faith and practice.* This profession is expressly recognized by every one who is admitted to the exercise of the sacred ministry, and, indeed, by every member of our flocks, when, as catechumens, they give an account of their belief in the presence of the church. We constantly make use of the Apostles' Creed, as an abridgment of the historical and doctrinal part of Christianity, adopted alike by all Christians. Our ecclesiastical institutions have all the same principles for their basis; our preaching, our religious ceremonies, our liturgy, our administration of the sacraments, have all a reference to the redemption of men by Jesus Christ. The same doctrine is taught in the lectures and theses of our academical instruction, in our manuals of devotion, and in the other works which our theologians publish, especially as preservatives from infidelity, from whose fatal poison we incessantly labour to preserve our flocks. On these points we are not afraid to appeal to the testimony of all ranks, and even of the strangers, who attend upon, and are edified by, our public and private instructions.

"On what then can that different idea of our doctrine, which has been held up, be founded? Or, if the suspicion attaches to our sincerity, as though we did not really believe what we teach and publicly profess, what is there which warrants so odious a suspicion? Was the author not conscious of his own inconsistency, when, after having praised us for our exemplary morals, he taxed us with a degree of hypocrisy to which none are capable of descending, but those unprincipled persons to whom all religion is a jest? It is true that we esteem and cultivate philosophy, not, however, that licentious and sophistical philosophy, of whose extravagancies the present age exhibits so many examples, but that grave and solid

science, which, far from being the enemy of faith, makes the wisest men the most religious. If the topics of our preaching are moral, yet we insist equally on points of doctrine; they are urged from our pulpits in every public service, and we have even two exercises every week, exclusively appropriated to the explanation of the catechism. Besides, our morality is the morality of the gospel, always connected with its doctrines, and deriving thence its strongest sanctions, especially from the promises of eternal life and felicity which it makes to those who reform their conduct, and the threat of eternal condemnation which it denounces against the impious and impenitent. In this respect, as in every other, we think it our duty to keep close to the language of Scripture, which speaks not of purgatory, but of heaven and hell, where every one shall receive according to the deeds done in this life. It is by preaching energetically these great truths, that we endeavour to bring men to holiness. When we are praised for a spirit of tolerance and moderation, let not this be confounded with laxity and indifference. We are thankful that it arises from a very different source; it is an evangelical tolerance which harmonizes perfectly with zeal. On the one hand Christian charity keeps us at the widest possible distance from persecution, and enables us to bear without uneasiness some diversity of opinion on points which are not essential, such as has always existed even in the purest churches; on the other, we neglect no care, no method of persuasion, in order to establish, to inculcate and to defend the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

“When we have occasion to recur to the principles of natural religion, we do it as it is done by the sacred authors themselves, and without any approximation to Deism. While we give to natural theology a more solid basis and greater extent than is usual with them, we always connect revelation with it, as a gift of heaven very necessary for our aid, and without which mankind could never have emerged from the state of blindness and corruption into which they had sunk.

“If it be one of our principles to

propose nothing for belief which is contradictory to reason, this is not as the author supposes, one of the characteristics of Socinianism. The principle is common to all Protestants, and they employ it to reject absurd doctrines, such, indeed, as are not to be found in the Holy Scriptures when rightly understood. But we do not carry this principle so far as to reject every thing which is called a mystery; since we give this name to truths of a supernatural kind, which human reason is incapable of discovering, or which it cannot perfectly comprehend, but which have nothing in them impossible, and which God has revealed to us. Nothing more is necessary to engage us to receive these doctrines, than they be clearly taught in revelation, and that the authority of revelation itself be indisputable, and we adopt them the more readily, because they harmonize so well with natural religion, and form with it that admirable and perfect system which the gospel exhibits.

“Though the worship of one God is the main doctrine of our religion, this does not justify the assertion that it is reduced to this single point, among all but the vulgar. The best informed persons are those also who are most strongly convinced of the value of the covenant of grace, and that eternal life consists in knowing the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, his Son in whom all the fulness of the Godhead bodily dwelt, and whom he has given to us as a Saviour, a Mediator and a Judge, that all men may honour the Son even as they honour the Father. The term of *respect* for Jesus Christ, therefore, appears to us by far too feeble or too equivocal to express the nature and the extent of our sentiments towards him, and we say that we are bound to listen to this Divine Teacher and to the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, with faith, with profound veneration and a complete submission of mind and heart. Instead, therefore, of resting upon human reason, so limited and weak, we build upon the word of God, which is alone able to make us wise unto salvation, by faith in Jesus Christ. This gives to our religion a purer and nobler principle, a wider compass and more effectual power, and invests it with

quite a different character from that which the author has been pleased to attribute to it.

“Such are the sentiments of the company, which, on all occasions, its members will avow and defend, as becomes the faithful servants of Jesus Christ. They are also the sentiments of the ministers of the church, who have not yet entered on the cure of souls, who, on being informed of the contents of the present declaration, have requested to be comprehended in it. We have no hesitation also in declaring that these are the general sentiments of our church, as is proved by the feeling excited among all ranks, by the appearance of the article of which we have complained. After these explanations and assurances, we think ourselves excused from entering into a fuller detail respecting the imputations made against us, and from answering any future publication of the same tendency. Such a contest, besides its inutility, is wholly unsuitable to our character. We are satisfied to have shielded the honour of the church and its ministers, by shewing that the picture which has been drawn of us is unfaithful, and that our attachment to the holy doctrine of the gospel is neither less sincere than that of our fathers, nor different from that of other reformed churches, with whom we consider it as our glory to be united in the profession of a common faith, and between whom and ourselves we have seen, with pain, attempts made to draw a line of separation.

“J. TREMBLEY, Secretary.”

In republishing this declaration with his own article from the *Encyclopédie*, among his *Miscellaneous Works*, D'Alembert has added some notes which he professes not to be his own, but to proceed from some theologian, the object of which is to shew, that the language in which the Venerable Company speak on some points of doctrine is not sufficient to establish their own orthodoxy. D'Alembert himself has also prefixed a preface which concludes thus:—“A philosopher, who takes an interest in the progress of toleration (probably Voltaire), alleges that the article *Geneva*, by imprudently and prematurely disclosing the opinions of the ministers

of this church, would make them change from bad to worse, in order to contradict the author's statement; and from what they now are, tolerant Socinians, would change them into fierce and virulent Calvinists, similar, in short, to the founder of their sect. But the fear is groundless and the scruple unnecessary. If the ministers of Geneva have protested against the article in question, it is evident that they have done so as a matter of form, and that they do not wish to make the Confession of Faith pass for any thing else than what it really is. They will continue to speak and think, in public and in private, just as they did before this Confession was made. This is attested by all the well-informed Frenchmen who have been at Geneva since that time. We may farther observe, that if the Church of Geneva has, for the present, some reproaches to fear from the other Protestant churches, they will be only temporary, and that at a period which is probably not very remote, it will have the satisfaction, according to the prediction of Bossuet, to see all these churches united with it in the same belief. Every thing conspires to give probability to this prediction, in the truth of which I so firmly believe, that I am not afraid to assign the date of its accomplishment.”

Dr. Carpenter on the Case of the Falmouth Unitarian Church.

SIR, Bristol, Dec. 11, 1817.

I AM solicitous earnestly to recommend the case of the *Falmouth Unitarian Church* to the attention of the Fellowship Funds and of liberal individuals, in different parts of the kingdom. The circumstances which led to the establishment of it, cannot be unknown to many of your readers; and it is now sufficient to say, that it is the only congregation in Cornwall, assembling for the sole worship of God, even the Father,—that it is an important central station, from which we may hope that pure views of Christian truth will eventually spread through every part of that intelligent district,—and that, for several years, (without any assistance from their Unitarian brethren, and through much evil report, as well as worldly loss,) they have steadily maintained an open

profession of their sentiments, and constantly met for worship and religious ordinances. I had once the satisfaction of visiting them, with Mr. Worsley of Plymouth; and we had an opportunity of witnessing that Christian harmony, zeal and piety, which encourages the older professors of Unitarianism, and should stimulate among them the spirit of mutual union and co-operation. To their highly esteemed minister, Mr. Philp, who has, from the first, gratuitously given his exertions for their edification, they and the friends of Unitarian Christianity in general, are under great obligations. If Unitarianism obtain a permanent and extensive establishment in Cornwall, it will be greatly owing to his judicious zeal and perseverance.

The place in which our Falmouth brethren have hitherto met for worship, (a school-room which they rent for the purpose,) is in so inconvenient a situation, that they have long found it in some measure burdensome to themselves, and still more discouraging as to their future prospects. From this consideration, and in order to obtain a more permanent settlement, they attempted, some time ago, to purchase a spot of ground for building; but that intolerant bigotry, of which, unhappily, so much still remains in the country, rejected their application; and they waited for better times. After some interval, they had expectations of being able to purchase the theatre, in order to convert it into a chapel; but they were again disappointed. Very recently, however, it was unexpectedly offered them, with only a few hours for deliberation; and they resolved, (as I should have advised them if I had been on the spot,) to make the purchase; and they now desire to throw themselves on the Christian liberality of their brethren, in different parts of the kingdom.

But they do not request the aid of others without making exertions themselves. The purchase-money, (which must be paid immediately,) exclusive of the expenses of conveyance, is £180. They expect to fit up the building (which is 57 feet by 30, within the walls,) in a neat but *economical* manner, for about £200 more, making the

whole expense within £400. They are comparatively "few in number, and generally poor enough, but are disposed to do their best;" and four of their members have subscribed £20 each. This, I think, is a capital beginning. From what I know of them, I have no doubt that they will all give their personal as well as pecuniary efforts, to accomplish the object, as the friends of Unitarianism would wish, and with as little expense to others as possible; sharing, as they must, in the feelings of my friend, Mr. Philp, who says, "believe me, I shall reckon it one of the highest honours of my life, to be in any way instrumental in dedicating a temple to the exclusive worship of the *One God and Father of all.*"

It is from full confidence, and on grounds which I feel satisfactory, that I make this appeal to the Unitarian public, and I shall be rejoiced if it influence any of my more distant brethren, to take an active interest in their behalf.

I understand that Mr. Aspland has given them reason to expect the assistance of the Unitarian Fund: and our indefatigable and judicious missionary, Mr. Wright, will, I am fully persuaded, concur in all I have said on the importance of the object and the merits of the case.

In this, as in a variety of other instances, I view the Repository, not only as a vehicle of intelligence, but as an important bond of union among Unitarians; and I wish it could be said, that every individual in our body gave it a degree of encouragement proportioned to his ability, and to its value to our common cause. With best wishes for its increasing diffusion and success, I remain,

L. CARPENTER.

P. S. I hope I shall find an hour of leisure, ere long, to reply to the friendly objections of L. J. J., in your last Number [p. 665]. I suspect he does not understand me; and I shall be glad to embody my ideas on this very difficult subject.

Perhaps it may be desirable to state, that I have not given up my intention of replying to Dr. Magee, and I propose, at the same time, to consider somewhat at large the ends of the death of Christ. It has seldom been

long out of my thoughts; but I have not hitherto had the power of executing my purpose. I hope, during the ensuing vacation, to make great progress in preparing for the press.

Will your highly-respected Correspondent V. F. excuse me, (in behalf of the various Unitarian churches forming congregational libraries,) in requesting him to supply them, through the Repository, with a list of suitable books, marking those which it would be best for them to procure first, and bearing in mind, that their finances are very limited. Those who have seen the catalogue of the Newcastle Congregational Library, will not wonder at my making this request to one who must have had a great share in the formation of it.

SIR, Crediton, Nov. 30, 1817.
I BEG leave to correct the statement, in your last Number, [XII. 636,] of my being "late of the Baptist Academy Bristol," my acquaintance with the conductors of that Institution not having been of such a nature as to warrant this statement; and that acquaintance having terminated upwards of ten years.

G. P. HINTON.

SIR, Jan. 2, 1818.
THE late impotent prosecution of Mr. Hone, for a parody on the *Athanasian Creed*, has excited great attention to that disgusting and odious formulary, and has brought out many anecdotes which, but for the religious zeal of my Lord Sidmouth, would have slept for ever. Among these is the following, which I extract from The Morning Chronicle of Tuesday, December 30th:

"When the late Rev. Mr. Wright had a small living in the West of England, he refused to read the Athanasian Creed, though repeatedly desired to do so by his parishioners. The parishioners complained to the bishop, who ordered it to be read. Now this very curious Creed is appointed to be said or sung, and Mr. Wright accordingly, on the following Sunday, thus addressed his congregation,—'Next follows Athanasius's Creed, either to be said or sung, and, with heaven's leave, I'll sing it. Now, Clerk! mind what you are about; when they both struck up and sung

it with great glee to a fox-hunting tune, which, having previously practised, was well performed. The parishioners again met and informed their pastor of what they called the indecorum [*query, informed the bishop of the indecorum of their pastor?*];—but the Bishop said that their pastor was right, for it was so ordered: upon which they declared that they would dispense with the creed in future; nor did Mr. Wright ever after either read or sing it."

This is not a bad story, though it is ill told. I have heard it related, again and again, though never with any name to verify it. Even now, I can scarcely regard it as more than a joke. Who was this Mr. Wright, and when and where did he live? And who was his diocesan? If these questions interrupt a laugh, let it be remembered that merriment is good, but truth is better.

Q.

Mr. Belsham on the Argument for Infant Baptism.

Essex House,

January 6, 1818.

SIR,
YOUR worthy Correspondent and my good-natured opponent T. C. H. [XII. 715—717,] shews as much dexterity in puzzling a plain case as any special pleader in Christendom. I should, however, have left his declamation to its fate, had it not afforded me an opportunity of restating, in a somewhat different light, the argument for what I conceive to be an apostolical institution, in the observation of which the whole Christian world is nearly unanimous, but of the grounds of which many intelligent persons, even though they practise it, are lamentably ignorant. I shall begin with briefly remarking a few not very relevant suggestions of your worthy Correspondent.

1. Your Correspondent tells us what he does believe, and what he does not believe concerning baptism.—The true question is, what the apostles taught and what the primitive Christians believed and practised.

2. Your Correspondent kindly refers us to the twelve bulky tomes of Lardner to settle the question, in return for which I beg leave to refer him to the ecclesiastical writers of the three first centuries. And when he

has finished them, "he may if he so please," go on to those of the three next.

3. Your Correspondent greatly prefers immersion or pouring to sprinkling: and he has my free consent to use his own discretion. All I plead for is Infant Baptism.

4. Your Correspondent seems to be sadly puzzled with Tertullian's "si non tam necesse est;" but though the meaning appears sufficiently obvious to those who are acquainted with the controversies of the age, yet I would inform him for his comfort that the words are by many learned men given up as an interpolation.

5. Your Correspondent pleads that upon the same principles upon which I argue the obligation of Infant Baptism, all the early corruptions of Christianity in doctrine and practice might be justified.—My argument is, that Infant Baptism was the institution of the apostles, and the uniform practice of the primitive church. When your Correspondent can with equal justice allege the same argument in favour of any other doctrine or practice, I will readily acknowledge that doctrine or that practice to be a vital part of the Christian religion.

6. But your Correspondent does not seem to be aware that the charge which he urges against my reasoning rebounds with redoubled force upon his own; and that the will-worship which he advocates, but which the Apostle most explicitly discourages, opens the flood-gates to an endless tide of superstition and absurdity. He practises infant baptism because, forsooth, he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another makes the sign of the cross, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another repeats ten Ave Marias to one Pater-noster, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another bows to a crucifix, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another counts beads, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another makes a pilgrimage to Loretto or Jerusalem, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." Another defends image-worship, because he thinks it "innocent and laudable." And another worships and then devours the consecrated bread, because he thinks it

"innocent and laudable." In short, there is no end to these "innocent and laudable" appendages to Christianity: and the apostate church has introduced and authorized such a countless multitude into its code of discipline and worship, that the simplicity of evangelical doctrine and worship is completely overwhelmed under the enormous mass of these "innocent and laudable" excrescences.—So have not we learned Christ. If Infant Baptism is an apostolical institution, let it be observed as such; if not, let it be abandoned altogether: and let not us set ourselves up as better judges of what is fit and right than Christ and his apostles.

Having thus disposed of your Correspondent's arguments, I will beg leave to re-state my own.

Infant Baptism was the uniform, universal and undisputed practice of the Church from the apostolic age down to the fifth century, and even later.

No reasonable account can be given of this singular uniformity in a rite never before administered to the infant descendents of baptized parents, but that which the primitive Christians uniformly assign, viz. the appointment of the apostles.

Had it been left to discretion, some would have baptized their infants and others not.

Had the apostles instituted adult baptism, and limited the application of baptism to adults only, it is absolutely impossible that a change so universal should have taken place so early without notice and opposition.

They who impugn this conclusion must shew either that the practice of Infant Baptism was not universal: they must produce churches, sects or individuals who practised adult baptism, or writers who asserted its authority and obligation, or they must shew how it might be universal without being of apostolical origin. To object to the evidence as *traditional*, because it is *historical*, is puerile and weak. Upon the same principle they might object to the resurrection of Jesus Christ: and in fact with equal reason Tindal does object to Christianity itself as a *traditional* revelation.

The great objection is, that Infant Baptism is not enjoined in the New Testament. But who told us that

nothing is to be admitted as of apostolical authority but what is to be found in the New Testament? How do we know that the Gospels of Matthew and John are of apostolic origin? Not because we are so taught in the New Testament: for not a word is written, not a hint is suggested upon the subject. We believe it upon the uniform, universal, uncontradicted testimony of Christian antiquity. And we do well. Upon the very same evidence I assume the apostolical authority of Infant Baptism.

T. BELSHAM.

Perpetuity of the Lord's Supper.

SIR, London, Jan. 10, 1818.

WHEN Dr. Priestley endeavoured to convince Dr. Price that the mind of man was not immaterial, using this term in the sense he defined, the result was different to what either of the correspondents probably anticipated. For Dr. Price in the end declared that, although he was not convinced the mind of man is not immaterial, yet he was inclined to concede that matter is.

So with our friend Mr. Belsham, if he fails to convince his readers of the apostolic authority for the continued use of baptism, he may shake their faith in the perpetual obligation of the Lord's Supper, as resting upon the recorded authority of the founder of the Christian religion. But, Sir, I believe a little attention will convince us that the two rites rest upon a basis as different as that I pointed out in the letter you inserted in the Repository for November last [XII. 657].

Your readers may incline to think it a hazardous attempt for a layman to oppose Mr. Belsham's comment upon the writings of the Apostle Paul, writings to which he has so long and so successfully attended. But all I shall undertake, and indeed all I apprehend I need to undertake, is, to exhibit the testimony of the Apostle as recorded in the Epistle to the Corinthians; taking it from the text of the Improved Version.

At the end of the sixth chapter of the first epistle, the Apostle commences a long series of remarks and directions upon the abuse, and for the better use of the observances of that Christian community; which he continues to the close of the fourteenth

chapter. He introduces his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper with very remarkable expressions, and concludes it with some not less so.*

"For I have received from the Lord that which I delivered also unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the night on which he was delivered up, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and said, 'This is my body, which is broken for you: do this in remembrance of me.' In like manner he took the cup also, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant through my blood: do this, as often as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.' For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shew forth the Lord's death, till he come."

Should it be objected that the 26th verse is not to be considered a part of the direction received from Jesus Christ, I shall feel obliged to Mr. Belsham, or any other of your correspondents, for their reasons for the objection. At the conclusion of the 14th chapter, and near the end of the Apostle's remarks upon the observances of the Corinthian church, is the following remarkable declaration: "If any man seem to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord."

Thus does the Apostle Paul bear his testimony direct and express to the perpetual observance of the Lord's Supper as a rite instituted by Jesus Christ, and declare that all his directions possess the authority of his Lord and Master: indeed it appears to me very difficult to record them more directly and more expressly. Yet Mr. Belsham says, p. 731 of your last volume, "For though Christ instituted the Eucharist, he gave no precept for its permanent obligation: and though St. Paul *incidentally* mentions that in the Lord's Supper 'we shew forth his death until he come,' such an *oblique* notice is by no means equivalent to an express command." I take the liberty of requesting him, if I am mistaken in my conclusions, to

* I hardly need call to your readers' recollection that the Apostle had no intercourse with his Master before his crucifixion, therefore every other was supernatural.

shew what is the true meaning of the apostolic language. Some persons may perhaps unwillingly alter the opinion they have hitherto cherished of the authority upon which this rite rests; but truth, however unpalatable, will in the end be preferred to error.

Before I conclude, I cannot but remark upon what appears to me an inconsistency in the members of our Unitarian churches. Unitarians claim to be observing and reflecting Christians. How is it, then, that when a rite so simple, decent and impressive, and resting upon such high authority, is about to be celebrated, the majority take their departure as though they had no interest in it? Why other bodies of Christians, who for want of a better term, are called "orthodox," habitually neglect this institution of the Christian religion, is obvious to every one who has escaped from the fold of orthodoxy; but that Unitarians should retain this part of the old leaven, is, to use the mildest phrase, inconsistent with their profession. Much do I wish that the state of public opinion would allow Christian ministers to make this a continued part of the public service—offering to no individual of the congregation, by the interruption of the service, an opportunity to depart. Let the ministers of our congregations reflect upon the favourable opportunity afforded to them to lead their churches into the knowledge and practice of all that is truly Christian, by the freedom they, and they alone of all Christian ministers in this country, enjoy for conducting their public discussions towards such truths and in such manner as they deem most useful.

T. G.

SIR, Nov. 7, 1817.
I COULD not help being struck by the forcible remark of your Correspondent T. [XII. 593,] respecting the remarkable absence of "*facts*" to disprove the prevailing impression, "*that there is nothing in Unitarianism calculated to turn the idolater from his error.*"

For a considerable time past I have been deeply attentive to the progress of the various conversionary efforts of the advocates of this persuasion *at home*; and from minute observation

of the result of those efforts, I cannot but conceive I am warranted in the conclusion, that there is some radical deficiency in the Socinian views* of the gospel to enable them to "convert sinners from the error of their ways."

The easy access with which the more popular doctrines of redemption seem invariably to gain the hearts and rivet the attachment of the lower classes of society, (to whom in fact missionary labours are devoted,) is surely a striking proof, in its contrast to the want of such success in the other case, that no inferior motives to conversion either at home or abroad, of the unreclaimed sinner in our own, or of the ignorant idolater in a Heathen land, will ever be productive of any *material* or permanent success.

And the cause, I conceive, of this contrast is obvious. The system of the gospel, as a whole, appears so inexplicable, there seems such a want of *consistent* explanation of its parts *without* the grounding main-spring of the atonement, that I can never imagine the possibility of any such powerful multitudes being brought to conversion by a system excluding this principle, which the influence of the Christian doctrine enforced *with* it, has been found so eminently and extensively successful in producing. To convert sinners without a *Saviour*,—*σωτήρ*—*Salutifer*—RESTORER—seems a hopeless effort.

Entertaining these views, and I do so from very sincere conviction and on most serious and deliberate investigation of the subject, I would respectfully submit to those who so sanguinely anticipate the success of missionary labours, conducted on Socinian views, whether the tone of the public mind with respect to these sentiments does not argue the strong improbability of such success; and also whether the very partial effects that have yet resulted from these efforts may not be argued as a pretty decisive confirmation of the principle assumed in this letter, viz. the practical inefficacy of (what are called) Unitarian doctrines for the purposes of CONVERSION? SIMPLEX.

P. S. In speaking, as I have done in this letter, of the religious views al-

* Vide P. S.

cluded to under the title of *Socinian*, I beg to be understood as far from wishing (however differing individually from those views), to apply the term in any offensive designation, or in any sense of "*vulgar bigotry*," (XII. 538,) towards the persons or party entertaining them; believing them generally, and knowing them in many particular instances, to be influenced by sentiments and actuated by motives of conduct, that do honour to them as Christians and as valuable members of society. But the appellation more usually adopted by themselves would, in this case, include numerous individuals, to whose views these remarks on the converting inefficacy of doctrines excluding an *atonement* Saviour, could by no possibility of construction be applied.

Letters by Mr. Marsom in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Arguments for the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

LETTER I.

SIR,

Jan. 2, 1817.

HAVING Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses, on the Socinian Doctrines, put into my hands, I was forcibly struck, in reading them, with the weakness and inadequacy of the arguments, in general, which he adduces in proof of those doctrines for which he is so strenuous an advocate; but in particular of those arguments, (in his ninth discourse,) which he makes use of in support of the doctrine of the divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit. This induced me to sit down and make some observations on his mode of reasoning, and to endeavour to establish the fact, that the Holy Spirit is never spoken of as a person, and that in the nature of things, it neither is or can be such a being.

Mr. Wardlaw introduces this subject, * taking for his text Matt. xxviii. 19, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;" and immediately adds, "I should have no objection, with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, to take my stand in this text. It would, perhaps, (he says) be going too far to say, that I should certainly be a firm believer in this doctrine, if there were not another

passage in the Bible affirming it." The doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead. The personality of the Holy Spirit, which it is the object of this discourse to establish, is, therefore, an essential branch of that doctrine. It will be necessary then to inquire, (especially as Mr. Wardlaw has no objection for the proof of it to take his stand in this text,) what evidence the passage affords of the truth of that doctrine. We have in it three names mentioned, the *Father*, the *Son* and the *Holy Spirit*; two of these names, the *Father* and the *Son*, unquestionably denote persons, they are personal names. This needs no other proof than the mention of the names themselves, for they convey at once the idea of personality. The proper names of persons of the male kind are universally of the masculine gender, whereas the proper names of things, which are not persons, are as universally of the neuter gender, that is, they are impersonal names. The proper name, therefore, of any thing will infallibly determine whether that which it is designed to represent be or not a person. Now the Greek word *πνευμα* here used and translated *spirit* is not a personal name, but is a noun of the neuter gender; it is derived from the verb to breathe, and means breath, air, wind, which is also the meaning of the Hebrew word *רוח* *Spirit*. The English word *spirit* is derived from the Latin word *spiro*, to breathe, and signifies *breath*. Had the nature and meaning of the word *πνευμα*, been as distinctly marked and preserved in the translation as it is in the original, there could have been no question whether or no it was intended to denote a person; for every one, on seeing or hearing it pronounced, would at once see that it could not be the name of a person. The nature of the English word *spirit*, as a neuter noun, and its meaning as derived from *spiro*, to breathe, is not understood by the generality of English readers, though it must be well known to Mr. Wardlaw. And the translators of the Scriptures, who were Trinitarians, have been careful, as much as possible, to keep it out of view by rendering *πνευμα* almost uniformly *spirit*, and never *breath* or *wind*, except where the circumstances

* Page 275, second edition.

of the place compel them so to render it, as in the following instances, Gen. iii. 8, it is rendered the *cool* of the day; vi. 17, The *breath* of life; viii. 1, *wind*; so also Exod. xv. 10, Thou didst blow with thy *wind*; and 1 Kings xix. 11, it is three times rendered *wind*; Psalm xxxiii. 6, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by (not the *spirit* or *person*, but) the *breath* of his mouth;" ver. 9, "For he spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast;" John iii. 8, "The *wind*, πνευμα, bloweth where it listeth." In these passages the meaning of the word *spirit* is clearly seen, and so the word should be rendered, John xx. 22, "He *breathed* on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy *Breath*;" thus 2nd Timothy iii. 16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God." The words, *given by inspiration of God*, are but one word in the original, and is literally *divinely breathed*. So the words under consideration might properly be rendered, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the *Holy Breath*;" for as the terms *Father* and *Son*, necessarily convey the idea of personality, so the terms *Holy Spirit*, being of the neuter gender, as necessarily convey the idea of *impersonality*; and we as certainly know, by the very name by which it is described, that it is not a person, as we know, by their very names, the *Father* and *Son* to be persons.

Again, as nouns are the names of persons and things, so the pronouns which supply their place must necessarily correspond with those nouns whose place they supply, in number and gender, or they will not be just representatives of them. A violation of this rule, by substituting personal pronouns for neuter nouns, and neuter pronouns for personal nouns, is confounding all propriety, a perversion of all language and grammar. This is never done, nor can it be done, without the greatest absurdity; for instance, how preposterous would it be to apply neuter pronouns to God and to Christ, and to adopt such language as the following, God *itself*, even our Father, Christ loved our church and gave *itself* for it! God raised Christ from the dead and set *it* at his right hand, &c. This, on the face of it, is sufficiently ridiculous. If then the Holy

Spirit be a proper *person*, and the name πνευμα be of the masculine gender, such pronouns could not possibly be used to supply its place; but such pronouns are used, as for instance, "The Spirit *itself* beareth witness with our spirit;" "The Spirit *itself* maketh intercession for us," &c. The last clause in the next verse ought to have been rendered, "Because *it*, not *he*, intercedeth for the saints according to the will of God." There is nothing in the original to warrant the rendering in the common version. The Holy Spirit, therefore, cannot be a person. On the other hand, if the word *spirit* be a neuter noun, (as it unquestionably is,) it would be equally preposterous and absurd to make use of the personal pronouns, *he*, *him* and *his*, as its substitutes. This, we may venture to affirm, is never the case in the New Testament. Yet, notwithstanding this, Mr. Wardlaw, in violation of so plain a rule of grammar, (which every one understands and uniformly complies with,) almost invariably uses these personal pronouns as the substitutes of the neuter noun *spirit*. "The great work of the *Holy Spirit** (he says) is to bear witness to Christ. He did so by all those supernatural powers, of which HE was the author, in the beginning of the gospel; and HE did so then, and continues to do so now by *his* gracious influences on the minds of men." Such is the influence of system,—and by such a perversion of language as this is, the nature of the word *spirit*, as an impersonal name, and its meaning is completely kept out of the view of the common reader. He is first taught to believe that the *Spirit* is a proper person, and then to support the erroneous idea, personal pronouns are made to supply its place.

If this reasoning be just, on what ground does Mr. Wardlaw's believing the doctrine of the *Trinity* or of the *personality* of the Holy Spirit stand, in the commission of our Lord to teach and baptize? There is not, in this passage, any one of the terms by which those doctrines are or can be expressed; there is in it no such term as *Trinity*, nor does it contain in it the terms *three persons*. There are indeed *three names* mentioned, but one

of them is an *impersonal* name; nor are the three said to be *one God*, one of the persons mentioned in it is said to be the *Son*. The word *son* is a term of relation, expressive of the relation which Jesus Christ bears to God as his Father, which relation implies in it derivation and dependence; but *God* cannot stand in the relation of *son* to any being, or be derived from or dependent on any one. Deity must necessarily be self-existent, un-derived and independent: the term *son*, then, in this passage, cannot be the name of a *divine* co-equal person in God; so that of the three names here mentioned, two of them only are descriptive of proper personality, and but one of them of a Divine person, truly and properly God; the other being evidently descriptive of a derived, dependent and inferior being. If then none of the terms by which those doctrines are expressed are to be found in the passage, how, in the nature of things, can it prove those doctrines?

Mr. Wardlaw himself, however, seems to feel that his "standing in this text" is not very firm, for he immediately adds, "It would, perhaps, be going too far to say, that I should be a firm believer of this doctrine, (that is the doctrine of the Trinity,) if there were not another passage in the Bible affirming it." This is a pretty clear admission that it is not affirmed in this text, for if it was, he could not have had any hesitation in believing it on such evidence; but if this passage does not affirm it, we may venture to assert, that there is not any passage in the Bible that does, because as the terms of it are not to be found here, so neither are they to be found in any other part of the sacred writings.

But in farther proof of the doctrine of the *Trinity* from these words, Mr. Wardlaw assumes, that the ordinance of baptism is an *act of solemn worship to the three persons in the Godhead*. His words are, "That the initiatory ordinance of baptism, prescribed in these words, involves in it an *act of solemn worship*, an *invocation* of the *thrice holy name*, in which it is administered, seems to be beyond dispute." That this matter is not beyond dispute is manifest, for I, myself, cer-

tainly dispute it, as, I believe, all Unitarians (or, as he styles them, Socinians) also do. Baptism is no more an act of worship than circumcision. They are both acts of obedience to a command. Jesus Christ here gives a commission to his disciples to teach and baptize, and instructs them how they were to perform the latter; but this does not necessarily involve in it any *act of worship*, much less an *invocation* of the *thrice holy name* in which it is administered. If baptism involves in it an *act of solemn worship*, an invocation of the name in which it is administered, then must Moses have been to the Israelites an *object of solemn worship*, for they were all baptized, εἰς, into Moses,* and that act must have involved in it the invocation of his name.

But it was not my design to enter upon a discussion respecting the doctrine of the Trinity: I have been led into it by the above passage in Matthew being selected as the foundation of the ninth discourse, which was professedly delivered for the purpose of establishing the doctrine of the *divinity* and *personality* of the Holy Spirit; and I have entered no farther into that subject than as it stands connected with the text, and forms the introduction to the main subject of the discourse.

My object is to shew that the Holy Spirit is not, nor can in the nature of things be, a proper person, and that the reasoning in this discourse is utterly insufficient to support such an idea. In order to this, before I enter on the arguments in support of its personality, I shall make the following observations:

1. I observe that the proper name of the Holy Spirit, is *the Spirit of God*. That the Holy Spirit is the *Spirit of God* must be admitted. The Scriptures are so express on this subject, that a doubt respecting it cannot be entertained for a moment.

2. If the Holy Spirit be the *Spirit of God*, it is the spirit of a person, and not a proper person itself. This I shall attempt to prove by the clearest and most direct evidence. That God is a person, the Scriptures expressly declare. "Will ye speak wickedly

* 1 Cor. x. 2.

for God? Will ye talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his person?" * "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,—who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his (God's) person." † The individual *personality* of the Divine Being, that is, that God is *one* person, and not *three*, is an idea that is kept up in all the language of the Old and New Testament respecting him. The proper name of the God of the Old Testament, and which is expressive of his self-existence, is *Jehovah*. "I am *Jehovah*, that is *my* name, and *my* glory will I not give to another." ‡ This surely is the language of an individual *person*, and not of a nature common to a plurality of persons, or of one person in the Godhead partaking of the Divine nature and perfections in common and equally with other divine persons in the Godhead; but of a single person possessing in *himself alone*, supreme and unrivalled Deity, a glory peculiar to *himself*, which *he* will not give to, and which cannot be possessed by any other *person* or being whatever. "I am *Jehovah* and there is none else, there is no God besides ME." § "That men may know that *thou*, whose name alone is *Jehovah*, art the most high over all the earth." || *Jehovah*, the peculiar name of God, admits of no plural, nor can it admit of any plural or neuter pronouns as its substitute; such a substitution would be highly improper, and would convey an erroneous idea. Accordingly, in every passage in the Old Testament where *Jehovah* is represented as speaking, or as spoken to, or as spoken of, the personal pronouns *I*, *me*, *thou*, *he* and *him*, are invariably used, as the representatives of that name; nor could it be otherwise, consistently with the nature of things or of language. Such is the case also with respect to the word *God* as the proper name of the Divine Being in the New Testament. A plural or

neuter pronoun then cannot possibly be its substitute. Hence it will follow that *Jehovah*, God, is *a person*, and *one person* only, not three; and that *person* the New Testament, in the most explicit and direct terms, informs us, is the *Father*. "There is one God which is the *Father*, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Mr. Wardlaw indeed alleges, that the Hebrew word יהוה God, has a plural termination; and he renders Deut. vi. 4, "Hear, O Israel, *Jehovah* our *Gods* (Aleim) is one *Jehovah*." * But in so doing, he has acted just as absurdly as our translators have done, in applying the word *Gods* to a calf and to an *old man*. † But I observe, 1. That this must be an erroneous rendering, because it is inconsistent with itself, and perverts the design of the writer; for if *Jehovah* be one *Jehovah*, he cannot be *our Gods*, and if he be *our Gods*, he cannot be one *Jehovah*. The design of the writer was, as is very evident, to assert the absolute unity of the God of Israel; but this rendering contradicts that position, by asserting that he is more than one. 2. This rendering proves too much, for if it prove any thing, it is not that there is a plurality of *persons* in God, but that there are a plurality of *Gods*; and, had it been uniformly adopted by our translators, the Bible would have been a system of the grossest polytheism. 3. Our Lord and his apostles, in citing passages from the Old Testament, and this in particular where the word יהוה occurs, as the name of the Divine Being, uniformly render it by the singular noun $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, *God*, and never by the plural $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, *Gods*; but surely they would not have so done, if the word had contained in it such a profound mystery as that of the Trinity.

Having proved that God is a person, which was the point to be proved, it will necessarily follow, that the Holy Spirit, if it be the Spirit of God, is the spirit of a person, and, consequently, not itself a person distinct from him whose spirit it is. This leads me to observe,

* Job xiii. 7, 8.

† Hebrews i. 1—3.

‡ Isaiah xlii. 8.

§ Ibid. xlv. 5.

|| Psalm lxxxiii. 18.

* Page 12.

† Exodus xxxii. 4, and 1 Samuel xxviii. 13, 14.

3. That *spirit* is essential to personality. Every intelligent agent, therefore, every person, must necessarily have his own proper spirit. This is essential to his very existence; it is his life, his energy, that by means of which he is possessed of all his powers of understanding, reflection and action; it is "the breath of life," without which he would cease to be a *person*. One *person*, then, cannot possibly be the *spirit* of another *person*; nor can the spirit of a *person* be a *person* distinct from *him* whose *spirit* it is, unless every person is in fact *two* persons. If then the Holy Spirit be the *Spirit of God*, i. e. the *spirit of a person*, the Spirit of the Father, as it is also denominated, it cannot have any *personality* distinct from *that* of the Father. As spirit is essential to personality, if the Holy Spirit were a person, he must also have his own proper *spirit*, and, consequently, there must be another Divine person in the Godhead, the *Spirit of the Holy Spirit*, and if that also were a *person*, he too must have his own proper spirit, and so we might go on adding persons to the Godhead ad infinitum.

Having made these observations in order to ascertain the meaning of the term Spirit, and the sense in which the Scriptures speak of it as standing in relation to the Divine Being; we now proceed to examine the arguments by which Mr. Wardlaw endeavours to prove that the Spirit is a proper person, another person distinct from *him* whose spirit it is said to be. Before we enter on the subject it may be proper to observe, that on the Trinitarian scheme, when the Holy Spirit is denominated the Spirit of God, the term God cannot mean the whole Godhead, consisting of three Divine persons, for then the spirit must be the spirit of itself, as much so as it is the spirit of either of the other of the Divine persons. The term God, therefore, in this connexion, must be confined to the person of the Father.

JOHN MARSOM.

Islington,

December 6, 1817.

SIR,
I HAVE lately obtained a literary curiosity, with an account of which the young theological reader may be gratified. From off an old stall in

Islington, not much more than a hundred yards from my own habitation, I purchased the *identical quarto manuscript copy* of Dr. Doddridge's principal work, neatly bound and lettered, entitled, "Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics and Theology," in ten parts, with particular references to the most considerable authors on these subjects. This volume he drew up with consummate care for his pupils; and its posthumous publication by the Rev. and learned Mr. Clark, of Birmingham, established his already justly-acquired fame as a tutor of young men training up for the Christian ministry. It has been since augmented in size and value by the notes of Dr. Andrew Kippis, and still more recently by the illustrations of Messrs. Parsons and Williams, in their well-known edition of Dr. Doddridge's Works.

The manuscript is in short-hand, except proper names and technical phrases, which are written at full length. The *title-page* is spread out in small capitals, with the date at the bottom, Northampton, 1740. The neatness of the whole volume, distributed into its several lectures, with opposite blank pages for additional remarks, and ruled with red ink, is inimitable! A transcript of the author's intelligent and pure mind, such a literary relic cannot fail to be held in estimation. Little did the good Doctor imagine when he was passing, as he frequently did through Islington, in his way from Northampton to the metropolis, that *the original copy* of his favourite work, over the pages of which he had passed many an hour by the pale light of the midnight lamp, would lie exposed to sale on a common stall, near a century afterwards, in this same village, and fall into the hands of a Christian minister, who, though not one of his own denomination, has been through life the admirer of his learning, his genius and his piety!

Acquainted with the short-hand which Dr. Doddridge wrote, and which was always taught his pupils upon their first entrance into his academy, I have amused myself by comparing *the original copy* of his *Lectures* with the last printed edition. And I was pleased to remark the strict coincidence of the one with the other, excepting the additions made

by Dr. Kippis and its subsequent editors, to which their own initials are annexed. "How desirable and gratifying," exclaimed I to myself, "would it be to inspect in a similar manner *the autographs*, or the identical copies proceeding from the pens of *Matthew, Mark, Luke and John!*" This, however, must not be expected; it is in the nature of things impossible. They have long ago mouldered into that common dust whence every terrestrial object hath arisen, and by which all human things must be ultimately absorbed and forgotten! But let us, instead of repining, be thankful that we have in our possession a number of *ancient manuscripts*, on which, diligently collated together, we can rely, and from which, for the formation of our faith as well as the regulation of our practice, we may derive every reasonable satisfaction. From this source learned men, both of the Establishment and among the Protestant Dissenters, (witness the *New Version*, founded on *Archbishop Newcome's Translation of the New Testament*;) are educing fresh testimonies to authenticate *the records of eternal life!* And approximating thus nearer to the primitive purity of the sacred writings, it is to be hoped that the professors of Christianity, however diversified their creed or varied their mode of worship, will be yielding more substantial proofs of their virtue and piety.

J. EVANS.

Mr. Jones in proof of Philo and Josephus being Christian Writers.
No. I.

SIR,

Jan. 6, 1818.

THOUGH the Ecclesiastical Researches have been now some years before the public, their contents still remain little known. I avail myself therefore of your wishes, Mr. Editor, that the leading arguments calculated to prove Philo and Josephus to be Christian writers, be laid before the readers of the Repository. In doing this I will be as brief as possible. My proofs will be but inferences drawn from passages in those authors. If they are not conclusive, some of your learned readers will, it is presumed, expose their weakness or fallacy; while on the contrary, if they appear solid and

irresistible, a new and powerful evidence will break forth in favour of the gospel. Indeed, no question connected with the credibility of our faith, seems to me more surprising, interesting and important, than that on which I am now entering: and I trust that this importance being felt to a certain extent by others, will induce the more intelligent part of your readers to peruse them with candour and attention. Before I commence, it is necessary to premise two remarks.

Though Christians are in the habit of distinguishing between Judaism and Christianity, they were originally the same: and they were known and maintained to be so by Christ and his followers in Judea. Moses and the prophets taught the existence and government of one true God; inculcated virtue and piety as the only effectual means of pleasing him; predicted the advent of a Messiah, his death and resurrection, and thus opened the door for faith in the resurrection of the dead and a life of immortality. The gospel is but a fulfilment of these predictions: and hence Christ is not so much the *author* or founder, as the *finisher* of Christianity, having himself taught no new truths, but explained and enforced those already known by new sanctions. Paul, though deemed a heretic, taught only the heresy of Moses and the prophets. Our Lord too assures us that he came to fulfil, not to destroy the law; and he directs his adversaries to examine the Jewish Scriptures as containing eternal life. If Philo and Josephus believed in the Divine mission of Jesus, they could not but entertain the same notion: and my object is to shew that, whenever they speak under any term of the Jewish religion, they meant by it that religion, improved and spiritualized by Jesus Christ. I have to remark,

Secondly, that, when the religion of Jesus was separated from Judaism, properly so called, the zealots, who opposed him, *ceased* to make proselytes to their system among the Gentiles: for however zealous they might be to gain converts among the Heathens, their doctrine was calculated only to insult, and to repel them: they held forth a triumphant Messiah

who should come only to destroy the rest of mankind; they enjoined a submission to rites that were oppressive, painful and ignominious, and the adoption of a name and of a creed that were detested by the whole world. What Heathen in his right mind would embrace such a doctrine, especially as it offered him no advantage whatever to compensate the great and various sacrifices he was called upon to make? The Pharisees felt this; and their attempts to proselyte the nations ended with the promulgation of the gospel. All the efforts they made were to follow the apostles, and to pervert those who had already been brought over to the faith. On the other hand, the preachers of spiritual Judaism, as they had received a commission to convert the Heathen world, received also the necessary means to effect this task, however arduous. They laid aside every burdensome rite; they held forth an illustrious messenger, already arrived from God, not to destroy, but to save mankind; they invited every man, however poor, obscure or illiterate, upon the simple terms of repentance and reformation, to come and receive the most glorious and animating privileges,—the forgiveness of their past sins, the favour of God, and the hope of immortal glory. What rendered this invitation most effectual was the happy effect which the newly-purified religion produced on the lives of those who preached it to others. Under its influence, they exhibited examples of all that is beautiful and sublime in virtue; and thus proved the reasonableness and subserviency of their doctrine to make them happy here as well as hereafter. The deportment and character of the first teachers of Christianity assumed by this means a language more convincing, if not more eloquent than their tongue in recommending their faith to the world. And it is to them and their converts that Philo refers, when he pens the following matchless passage: “The children of wisdom resemble the sand: because the sand is uncircumscribed in number; and because, as the sand which lines the shore repels the incursions of the sea, so the divine word of instruction does the sins of men. This word, accord-

ing to the promises of God, spreads to every corner of the universe, and renders him who receives it, the heir of all things, extending in every way to the east and to the west, to the north and to the south. A good man is not a blessing only to himself, but the common benefit of all other men; as he readily communicates to all others, the advantages which he himself enjoys. For as the sun is a light to all those who have eyes, so the divinely wise are the light of all rational beings. For in thee, says the scripture, shall all the tribes of men be blessed. If any one, therefore, in a house, or a city, or a country, or a nation, is become enamoured of wisdom, those who live in that house, or city or country, or nation, must learn from him to mend their lives. For as the aromatic spices, which exhaling spread on the breeze, fill with their sweet odour those who are near; in the same manner the friends and acquaintances of a good man, derive from the breath of virtue, which emanates far and wide from his character, a perfume that adorns and enriches their own.” P. 592. The inference to be drawn from these remarks is, that where Philo and Josephus speak of Judaism prevailing among the Gentiles, we are to understand them to mean Judaism purified by Christ and disseminated by the apostles.

In the second book against Apion, Sec. 39, Josephus speaks to this effect: “For a long time past multitudes are become zealous for our worship; nor is there a city among the Greeks, nor a nation among the barbarians, to whom many of our customs have not been extended, and who do not endeavour to imitate the cordiality and harmony, the distribution of their property, the industry in their callings, the patience under tortures in support of our laws, which are evinced amongst us. And what is most worthy of admiration in this respect is, that this zeal for our law is not awakened by any allurement from pleasure or profit, but by the internal excellence of the law itself. And as God pervades the whole world, so his law has at length pervaded all mankind; and whoever reflects on his own country, and even his own family, will find evidence of the assertion now made by me. Let those

invidious men then cease to accuse the Jews; or let them accuse those multitudes among all nations who have incurred the voluntary guilt of zealously embracing base and foreign, in the room of their own honourable institutions. If we ourselves were not sensible of the superior excellence of our laws, we should fall below that multitude of converts who glory in them." Here it is stated that the religion of Moses and the prophets had at this time universally prevailed among the Greeks and barbarians; that the law of God, like God himself, had pervaded the world; not a country, nor hardly a family existing where its influence was not felt and acknowledged; that those Heathens who had embraced it practised the same virtues, and evinced in support of it the same patience and constancy with the Jews who taught it and died in attestation of its truth. This assertion was made about *sixty years* after the resurrection of Jesus; and if Josephus meant by the law of God, as he calls it, the Mosaic law, improved and finished by Christ, the assertion is *strictly true*; but if he meant Judaism in the sense now understood, *it is altogether false*, not a syllable of it being justified by the fact.

The sanctions of the Jewish religion before the promulgation of the gospel were *temporal*, its rewards and punishments being till then understood to extend not beyond the limits of the present state. The blessed Jesus drew asunder the veil that hung on the law of Moses in this respect: he brought life and immortality into light, and gave a satisfactory proof of it in his own resurrection. This was intended and represented as a pledge from God of the resurrection of all mankind, as a solid ground of hope in a future state. The notion was prevalent not only in Judea, but in other countries, that the human soul, being immortal, survived its dissolution from the body. Our Lord and his apostles might have adopted this opinion as a powerful auxiliary to the doctrine of a future existence. But they have declined this aid, thinking it either unsatisfactory or altogether erroneous. At all events they knew it to be an *opinion*, and not a *fact*; and therefore, they wisely considered

it as an improper subject of historical testimony. Accordingly, whoever looks into the Acts of the Apostles, will find, that faith in a new life was the principal cause of spiritual Judaism being received by the Gentiles, that the resurrection of Christ was the proof of it; that as he rose from the dead, so all his faithful followers are to rise, thus receiving a new life after the present shall have been suspended during a revolution of ages in the grave. These decisive and characteristic truths are implied in the following important passage of Josephus, where he alludes to the resurrection of Jesus as a *mighty proof*, *ισχυρον πεισμα*, of another life: "The reward of those, who live in every respect conformably to our laws, is not silver or gold, or a garland of olive, but *the testimony*, of the truth of which each of us is convinced that, after a revolution of years, we shall receive a better life, *our lawgiver having foretold this, and God having confirmed it by a mighty proof*. For this reason we stedfastly adhere to, and, if necessary, cheerfully die for them. And I should have been reluctant to write these things, if it had not been proved by facts, and made known to all men, that multitudes in many places have bravely submitted to every species of torture rather than even in words renounce our law." Contra. Apion. L. 2. S. 30.

I shall conclude this paper with two or three inferences; first, that the book dedicated to Epaphroditus, in which Josephus apologizes for the Jews, is really an apology for the Jewish Christians and for the Heathen converts to Christianity; that had no evidence existed to prove Epaphroditus to have been himself a believer, we might hence conclude that he was one; and that in all the other places, where Josephus speaks of Heathens converted to Judaism, he always means Judaism spiritualized and enforced by Jesus Christ.

JOHN JONES.

On Dr. Stock's Conversion.

SIR, Bristol, Dec. 24, 1817.

YOUR Correspondent L. J. J. [XII. 665, 666,] has offered some strictures on what he justly styles "Dr. Carpenter's excellent remarks on the letter of Dr. Stock,"

in which he points out what strikes him as an inconsistency. The passage is as follows: "In one paragraph he has, I think, very properly reprobated my friend Dr. Stock's conviction, that he had adopted his new opinions 'under the special guidance of divine illumination;' but in the succeeding paragraph he says, 'I do not pretend to set bounds to the agency or influence of God. I believe that the Father of our spirits does afford aid to his frail children in ways which philosophy cannot yet explain, to strengthen, to console, and to guide: but I know of no proof that he at present communicates truth by supernatural means.' Now I would ask, what difference does there seem to be between being under the special guidance of divine illumination, and being strengthened, consoled and guided 'by some inexplicable influence of the Father of our spirits?'"

Now, Sir, I can see no inconsistency whatever, nor any parallel in the two cases put by your Correspondent. "The special illumination" is evidently the effusion of the holy energy or spirit of God which was shed upon the apostles; and all who believe in the Comforter as a personal agent, among whom Dr. Stock has now enlisted himself, believe that his agency did not cease with the Jewish age, (the original word rendered in the common version *world*,) but that he acts with equal efficiency, though with less visible effect, at the present time. It is *this* illumination to which Dr. Stock refers: but the aid which Dr. Carpenter adverts to as afforded by the Father to his frail creatures, cannot be called a special or a supernatural aid; for it is that secret mental influence, prompting to good or warning from evil, which God is conceived to vouchsafe to us in the ordinary course of his providence; and which might have been extended to an Aristides or a Socrates: and it is even cautiously contra-distinguished by Dr. Carpenter from the special influence of the Spirit's illuminating energy, which operated by the communication of truth. Surely there is a marked difference between a miraculous guidance to truth and a providential support in despondency, consolation in affliction, and incitement to good resolutions. The former was

always manifested by miraculous evidence; and as such evidence has ceased, we have a right to infer that the special or supernatural illumination has ceased with it, and that men are left to the guide of scripture and their natural understandings: but the latter has never been openly manifested; and it is not reasonable to require such manifestation: it is indeed incapable of proof; it is inferred from the moral government of God, whose character the Scriptures represent, in spite of Calvinism, as essentially merciful and gracious.

Your Correspondent proceeds to say, that "Dr. Stock, as he imagines, does not suppose that truth itself had been communicated to his mind, but that he had been in some unaccountable way guided by the spirit of God to the right understanding of the truth already revealed in scripture." It may be asked, what difference is there between communicating truth and guiding to the discovery of truth? As to the question, "Has then Dr. Stock professed to have received more extraordinary influence than Dr. Carpenter allows?" I have shewn that he certainly has; and that these influences are clearly distinguished: the one supernatural, partaking of the immediate extraordinary agency of a supposed divine being operating on the mind to enlighten it, or what is equivalent, to guide it into light; and the other natural or providential, as inferred by philosophy. Dr. Carpenter in the words quoted disclaims a belief of supernatural illumination being now employed to communicate truth, or guide to truth; and the aid and guidance which he does conceive the Father of our spirits to employ are distinct from his miraculous or extraordinary operations, and are quite of a different nature, and respect different objects from the assistance and direction extended to Peter or Paul.

Of Dr. Stock's re-conversion I cannot entertain the same hopes as your respectable Correspondent. "Let an enthusiast," says Locke, "be principled that he is actuated by an immediate communication of the divine spirit, and you in vain bring the evidence of clear reason against his doctrine." Besides, if I mistake not, the original or implanted principles of Dr. Stock, whatever fluctuations

his mind may since have undergone, were Calvinistic: and he has merely recurred to the still uneffaced or revived impressions of his childhood. "The spirit of superstition has walked into the desert seeking rest and meeting none has returned to his first abode and found it swept and garnished: and he has taken to him seven spirits more powerful than himself, and they enter in and dwell there." The *Bristol* theological public has been edified by polemic pamphlets of all sizes, from *Trinitarians*, *Antinomians*, "white, black and grey, with all their trumpery." Dr. Carpenter, you will be happy to hear, is not yet "buried under the mass of papers." The *Trinitarian* or *Trinitarian* cause, (I know not which of these barbarous terms be the more orthodox,) had never, I believe, such a van-guard of miserable skirmishers. In their estimation of Dr. Carpenter's scriptural knowledge and ability, we are reminded of the Lilliputian savans, who, with considerable geometrical labour, contrived to measure the altitude of *Gulliver's* shoe.

JOHN BUNCLE.

Lanrumney,

January 18, 1818.

SIR,

THE speculations of Mr. Malthus, have been the subject of the most able and satisfactory animadversions of your Correspondent T. N. T., who, by the publication of his letters on this subject in your Repository, has rendered a lasting and highly important service to the cause of truth, political and religious.

The system of Mr. Malthus, as furnishing an easy means of accounting for the ill effects of mis-rule without implicating its authors and supporters, is become very fashionable with a certain class of politicians in this country; and the speciousness of his mode of treating his subject has made many converts. The misapplication of the principles of this system to account for the tremendous increase of pauperism and burdens of the poor-rates in this country, appears to be a subject deserving the farther attention of your most able and enlightened Correspondent. In a pamphlet which I have in the press, and which will be published in a few days, on the

subject of the Poor-laws,* I have been compelled to allude to the principles advocated by Mr. Malthus, but a conviction of their being without foundation in truth or nature, and the perception of their mischievous tendency and application induce me to express a hope that T. N. T. will make still more public his concise but full and triumphant refutation of these heart-chilling principles.

With the sincerest respect for your important exertions for the diffusion of religious and moral truth, and in the hope that their usefulness will be additionally and greatly extended by the rapid increase of the circulation of your invaluable Miscellany, I remain,

JOHN H. MOGGRIDGE.

The Nonconformist.

[A society of gentlemen, who have associated to promote inquiry into the literature and history of the Nonconformists, have promised us a succession of papers under the above title, of which we this month insert the first.

ED.]

No. I.

A Vindication of the Two Thousand Ejected Ministers.

A WRITER who is entitled to some degree of respect, and whose prejudices are on the side of liberty, relating the history of the two thousand† ejected ministers, says, after allowing them high praise for their integrity and conscience, that "when we examine into the reasons of their secession from the church," (he should rather have said their non-conformity,) "we cannot but stand amazed at their extreme frivolousness, and our admiration is almost annihilated by contempt." It is deserving of serious inquiry, and it is the object

* "Remarks on the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Poor-Laws; in which the proposed alteration of the laws of settlement; and pauperism, its causes, consequences and remedies are distinctly considered. By a Monmouthshire Magistrate. Sold in London, by Baldwin and Co., and R. Hunter, (successor to Mr. Johnson,) St. Paul's Church Yard."

† The number of the ejected ministers is not capable of being exactly ascertained. I use the round number of two thousand as being agreeable to usage.

of this paper to inquire, whether this judgment be equitable.

One observation may guide us in our examination, viz. that approbation of an action does not always imply approbation of the reasons on which it is founded. I admire the step taken by Archbishop Sancroft and the non-juring clergy at the Revolution, though I hold the principles on which it proceeded to be extremely erroneous and pernicious. In fact, it is impossible to behold a strict adherence to the dictates of conscience without reverence; at least in those cases where conscience requires acts of disinterestedness, humility and self-denial. This is a spectacle which the human heart is formed to admire; whether we resolve our admiration into sympathy, into the pleasure taken in beholding moral consistency and uniformity, or into the lower principle of approbation of that conduct in our fellow-creatures which lays the surest foundation for our own advantage, as far as we are connected with them.

The motives by which men are led to any great resolution are commonly mixed, and in so large a body as the Ejected Ministers, there were probably many individuals who were swayed by some sentiments of dubious character. There is not a virtue which may not be exercised under the influence of some passion or prejudice which robs it of its merit. But though no one is ignorant of this, we all love virtue, and place confidence in the virtuous.

If it be allowed, therefore, that many of the ever-memorable two thousand were actuated by some reasons which in the present day appear weak, and that few of them were guided by those great general principles on which their posterity justify their own non-conformity, it will not follow that, in their peculiar circumstances and with their habits of thinking and feeling, their self-denying conduct was not magnanimous and entitled to the highest praise.

Kneeling at the sacrament, the sign of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, and other ceremonies of the same class, may be mere trifles, but their insignificance, though a good reason for not imposing them upon Christians, is none for submission to them in opposition to the judg-

ment. To comply with any rite which is regarded as unscriptural and superstitious in its tendency, is hypocritical in a Christian. Any contempt that attaches to the frivolousness of the rite, belongs not to him that resists, but to him that would enforce it. The imposition can be designed only, in the wantonness of power, to exact obedience at the expense of conscience. If one sacrifice of this kind be made for the sake of peace, another may be demanded, and where is compliance to end? *Principiis obsta*, is the only safe maxim, with regard to such unjust and tyrannical demands.

Whilst the Ejected Ministers scrupled, for various reasons, to submit to these ceremonies, they protested against the right of the supreme power to make them compulsory. The Conferences at the Savoy, in which, according to our present notions, we must pronounce the Presbyterians sufficiently yielding, turned chiefly upon this point. It is indeed the hinge of the controversy between conformists and nonconformists. To admit the imposition of the cross in baptism or any other frivolity upon human authority, is to give up religion wholly to the magistrate to be moulded by him at his pleasure; for he has only to represent any imposition, however grievous, as a thing indifferent, in order to stand justified upon this principle in its rigorous enforcement. But it is not the amount of the tax upon conscience, but the right to tax conscience, that is in dispute. *Hampden's* portion of ship-money was inconsiderable, but had it been less, and as small as it could be, resistance of payment would have been equally the part of enlightened patriotism, because the power that could assess him without the consent of the Commons, in the lowest possible sum, could, at its arbitrary will, strip him of all his property, and even overturn the constitution. In the present instance, a power to cause the knee to bend before bread and wine, would be equivalent to the power to constrain the prostration of the body before an idol, in short, a power to annul the plainest commandments of Almighty God.

There are other points of view in which the case of the Ejected Ministers requires no argument whatever;

to state it is to pronounce their justification.

For example, the Act of Uniformity required such of them as had not received episcopal ordination to be re-ordained by a bishop. Now, to have submitted to this demand, would not only have been at variance with their confirmed opinion of the office of bishop and presbyter, as laid down in the New Testament, but would also have been a confession that their previous ministry (in a great number of persons, the ministry of a long and active life,) had been a continued irregularity and usurpation. How could they stoop to this degradation, without forfeiting, besides their own approbation, the esteem and confidence of their respective flocks, on whose estimate of their characters depended the success of their labours!

Again, the Act of Uniformity extorted a public declaration from all the clergy of unfeigned assent and consent, to all and every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer. So extravagant is this demand, the size of the book and its multifarious contents, the work of men of different minds, in periods when contradictory principles prevailed, being considered, that many subterfuges have been discovered by casuists, in order to evade the plain meaning of the law; and without these, it is not probable that any considerable number of men, even in these lax times, could be found to conform openly to the church. But no such expedients occurred, or would have been allowed, to the clergy in 1662. The meaning of the legislators was certain; and an artful course had been adopted, with regard to the Presbyterians, which reduced them to the alternative of nonconformity or deep dishonour: they had been drawn into public controversy just before the Act was passed, and pressed to explain and defend their objections to the ritual and rubric of the church: they were then dismissed, and the statute compelled them to abide, as honest men, by their previous declarations, or to subscribe their own indelible disgrace. Nor was this all: the Book of Common Prayer, to which entire assent and consent was to be acknowledged, was referred to the bishops for revision and correction; and it is an historical fact, that the

new edition was published only on the eve of Bartholomew Day; so that very few of the clergy could possibly have read the book, which they were obliged to profess before God and man to approve in every iota.

Once more; by the Act of Uniformity, the clergy were compelled to subscribe and declare, that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the King, i. e. the Presbyterians amongst them were required, as the condition of retaining their benefices, to acknowledge themselves rebels in resisting the illegal exactions of Charles I. and, in opposing his attempt to govern without a Parliament. This was an unexampled act of tyranny. The most arbitrary rulers had been hitherto content with enforcing obedience and submission, and had never entertained the wish to force their slaves into the hypocrisy of asserting that, in their consciences, they loved tyranny and hated freedom. Had not a considerable body of our ancestors opposed this execrable doctrine and profligate demand, is it too much to assert, that the constitution of England would have been broken up and buried under a despot's throne! The Revolution of 1688, which in fact and in theory declared passive obedience and non-resistance to be contrary to the spirit of the constitution, was in reality a justification of the memorable 2000, who, twenty-six years before, had, with immense sacrifices, maintained the true constitutional principles.*

On either of these grounds, but especially the last, the Two Thousand Confessors, stand justified and honoured in the eye of reason. Their splendid example has associated non-

* I use the words *constitution* and *constitutional*, to express those fundamental political principles to which all the great acts of the English people, whenever they have stood forward to check or reform their government, are referable. The constitution is the *Lex non scripta*, which all our great statesmen have acknowledged and revered, the leading feature of which is, that ours is a commonwealth, under a monarch of our choice. To make the constitution the whole body of existing statutes is a modern legal refinement; a symptom of bad times, and a plea for bad measures.

conformity and patriotism. Let their descendants maintain them indissoluble; and as, according to the acknowledgment of Mr. Hume, the Puritans kindled and preserved the precious spark of liberty in the days of absolute prerogative, so that to them the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution, let the Protestant Dissenters of these times emulate the public virtue of their fathers, and be ready, if occasion serve, by sacrifices or by exertions, to encounter slavish doctrines and to resist constitutionally measures that are unconstitutional, and thus to lay an obligation upon their children to speak of them, in the times to come, as those that stood in the breach to defend their own and their children's liberties, and to save their country and the world from being again subjugated to the tyranny of Divine Right, under the mask of legitimacy.

A.

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

No. CCCXXI.

Savageness of War.

The American papers, at the close of the late war, related the following anecdote with apparent triumph in the military glory of their countryman, whom they dignify with the title of a *sharp-shooter*. Of such stuff is this same *glory* composed!

“Previous to the examination of those of the dead who fell in the affair of the 8th, near New Orleans, it is said, two or three of the riflemen claimed the honour of shooting Lieutenant-colonel Rennie, the brave but unfortunate Briton. Mr. Weathers said, *If he is not shot in the left eye, I shall not claim the MERIT—if he is I shall.* On examination, it was found the ball had perforated the head a little below the left eye.”

No. CCCXXII.

Execution of Charles the First.

This memorable event, which has been described with so much eloquence by our historians, is thus re-

corded in a newspaper of that period, called *The Moderate Intelligencer*, without comment, and on the same type with the common news of the day.

“On the 30th of January, was Charles, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, put to death, by beheading, over against the banquetting-house of Whitehall.”

The newspaper from which the above extract is copied *verbatim*, is printed in a small quarto half sheet, and in some of the numbers, the proceedings of Parliament are shortly mentioned under the head of “*A perfect diurnal of some passages in Parliament.*”

No. CCCXXIII.

Dr. Waring's Testimony to pure Christianity.

The celebrated Dr. Waring, Lucasian Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge, has given, in his Essay on the Principles of Human Knowledge, the following just account of the treatment which Christianity has met with from the men of this world:

“The most pure, the most enlightened religion has, by artful and designing villains, been rendered an engine for their ambitious, self-interested and cruel projects, but this does not invalidate the truth of the religion, which gives no precepts of any such tendency.”

With this statement before our eyes all books of ecclesiastical history should be read, which is, in fact, nothing else but an history of these artful and designing villains, with the exception of a few traits in the characters of honest men who protested against their villainies. F.

No. CCCXXIV.

An Item in a Parish Account.

In the Appendix to the History of Lambeth, there is the following item in the Church-warden's accounts: “1708, November 19, paid Mr. Skinner a bill for prosecuting Clark the Dissenting parson.” Can the reader explain this precious relic of parochial history?

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*Passages in Paul's Epistles illustrated
by one in Ecclesiasticus.*

SIR, Exeter, Oct. 10, 1817.

THE importance of the Alexandrine Version of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the Apocrypha, as helps to the proper understanding of the New Testament, is allowed by all Biblical scholars. The study of them familiarizes us with the dialect employed by the gospel writers, and an attention to their peculiar uses of Greek words is often the greatest assistance to us in interpreting the same words, when we meet with them in the New Testament. They have also another use which is not, perhaps, so generally attended to. As the works of their own earlier writers, preserved in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, formed the whole literature of the Jews in our Lord's time, and from their sacred character were universally read and studied; the Evangelical writings not only contain many *quotations* from them, but also very numerous *allusions* to them, where the thought or the words of the more ancient, dwelling on the mind of the later writer, has influenced his mode of expression, and, in some instances, caused an obscurity to those who are unacquainted with the passage he had in view. And as the Hebrew language, at the time of Christ, was understood only by the learned, and most of the *quotations* from the Old Testament, in the New, are evidently in words of the Alexandrine translation, it is to it that we must look, in order to detect the verbal allusions to the ancient Scriptures, in the language of the Scripture sacred writers, and apply them to the purposes of interpretation.

I think I could produce several examples of the kind of allusion I have mentioned, but my present object, in the remarks I have made, is to introduce an attempt to explain the expression in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, "Redeeming the time," by comparing it with a sentence in the book of Ecclesiasticus, which, I conceive, the apostle had in his mind when he employed it.

The way in which this passage is most commonly understood, "making a good use of the time allowed us upon earth on account of its shortness, and of the evils to which we are here liable," appears to me extremely unsatisfactory. Locke, with his usual acuteness, seems from the connexion to have discovered the true meaning, though it is evident from his note that he did not know how to derive it from the words. He says, on Eph. v. 16, "St. Paul here intimates, v. 16, that the unconverted Heathens, they lived among, would be forward to tempt them to their former lewd, dissolute lives; but to keep them from any approaches that way, that they have light now by the gospel to know that such actions are provoking to God, and will find the effects of his wrath in the judgments of the world to come. All these pollutions so familiar to the Gentiles, he exhorts them carefully to avoid; but yet to take care by their prudent carriage to the Gentiles they lived amongst, to give them no offence, that so they might escape the danger and trouble that otherwise might arise to them from the intemperance and violence of the Heathen idolaters, whose shameful lives the Christian practice could not but reprove. This seems to be the meaning of 'redeeming the time' here, which, Coloss. iv. 5, the other place where it occurs, seems so manifestly to confirm and give light to. If this be not the sense of 'redeeming the time' here, I must own myself ignorant of the precise meaning of the phrase in this place."

Reading the context both in Ephesians and Colossians must, I think, convince us that the expression relates in some way to the conduct of the Christians towards the unconverted Heathens. Eph. v. 15—17, "See then that ye *walk circumspectly*, not as fools but as wise, *redeeming the time because the days are evil*. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is." Coloss. iv. 5, "*Walk in wisdom toward them that are without*, (Gentiles) *redeeming the time*."

Now let us place the apostle's words aside of the 20th verse of the iv. chap.

of Ecclesiasticus, and see whether there is not some resemblance.

Eccl. iv. 20: Συντήρησον καιρον και φύλαξαι ἀπο πονηρῶ.

Eph. v. 16: Εξαγοραζομενοι τον καιρον, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ ἐῖσι.

Συντηρεω. "Generatim omne studium intentum et curam circa aliquid significat." Schleusn. in verb. "Observe," Scapula, &c.

Εξαγοραζω. No. 3, "Toto animo rei alicui deditus sum. *Solicite aliquid et caute observe*, prouti facere solent mercatores." Schleusn. in verb.

Eccl. iv. 20: "Observe the circumstances in which you are placed, and beware of evil."

Ephes. v. 15, 16, "See then that ye walk circumspectly—paying attention to the circumstances in which you are placed, because the days are evil." Prudently regarding in your conduct towards the Gentiles, your dangerous situation, living in *evil*, i. e. violent and persecuting times. Compare Locke's note already given.

If appears to me that the apostle's mode of expression has been influenced by the words of the son of Sirach, which he had in his mind, and that his meaning is illustrated by attention to them.

According to the explanation I have given of Eph. v. 16, and Coloss. iv. 5, we may compare with them the true reading of Rom. xii. 11, "τω καιρω δουλεύοντες."* "Acting with a regard to the peculiar circumstances of the time in which you live." The apostle's meaning in all of them is the same, and it is rather curious that they should all of them have been obscured to the generality of readers, by a false reading or a false interpretation.

W. H.

On Dr. Alexander's Exposition of Phil. ii. 5—11.

SIR, Dec. 21, 1817.

IF capricious and unnecessary refinements of explication are to be deprecated with regard to the profane authors of antiquity, such innovations must be acknowledged to be still more objectionable when the experiment is made upon the sacred writers. Uni-

* Griesbach's reading. Ed.

tarians, who are ignorantly or calumniously accused of practising on the texts of Scripture in order to make them conform with a pre-conceived system, a charge which may be retorted on their adversaries, should be particularly jealous of these needless interferences, as they might tend to afford a colour for the imputation of wanton and whimsical tampering with the passages of holy writ. These observations, Sir, have a reference to Dr. Alexander's novel, and, as I think, most needless exposition of Phil. ii. 5—11, inserted in your number for October [XII. 614—617]. The explanations of this passage by Dr. Price, by Mr. Lindsey, and other eminent biblical critics, are so entirely consistent with the Greek idiom, and with the tenor of Scripture, that, *a priori*, any new sense would appear wholly uncalled for, and the sense proposed seems to me not only lame but even puerile.

"Though in the form of God," is thought to allude to "the transfiguration on the mount where he (Jesus) assumed a divine or luminous, or supernaturally splendid appearance, his face shining as the sun, and his raiment becoming white as snow."

The words rendered in the common version "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," are said to be literally translateable by the expressions "thought not of the robbery of being equal with God;" and this is gratuitously supposed to refer to the accusation of the Jews that Jesus "made himself equal to God."

Now, Sir, I must first contest the proposition that Jesus of himself assumed a supernaturally splendid appearance, or that this appearance was indicative of any thing properly divine in the person of Jesus, which it would seem from the phrase *assumed* is in the idea of the writer. Possibly, although a Unitarian in worship, he may adhere to the Gnostic notion of the pre-existence of Christ, for such, though somewhat modified, is the Arian hypothesis. It appears from the gospel narrative, that "a bright cloud overshadowed them," and that a voice was heard out of the cloud bearing witness that Jesus was "the beloved son of God." This cloud was probably the *Shekinah*, or cloud of glory which

rested on the lid of the ark, and which appeared at the door of the tabernacle. At all events, the splendour was symbolical of the local presence of *Jehovah*, and was only reflected on *Jesus*. The same transfiguration took place in the instance of *Moses*: who, on descending from Mount Sinai, was compelled to put a veil on his face, while speaking to the people, because "the skin of his face shone." Yet no one talks of *Moses* "being in the form of God." As to the strange notion of your Correspondent, that *Jesus* might have retained this splendour in his person, had he chosen, though the cloud of divine glory which was the cause of it ceased to rest upon him, it is difficult to speak of it in any other terms than as insufferable trifling: what purpose could it possibly answer for the person of *Jesus* to be constantly irradiated with a supernatural splendour! The fact is assumed merely to prop the argument, that "being in the form of God," alludes to the transfigured appearance of *Jesus*: as if the "taking on him the form of a servant," referred to his voluntary relinquishment of this accidental splendour; declaratory of the local presence of God and of his favour to the "elect, whom he had chosen."

What Sir! when *Christ* is called "the brightness of the glory" of God and the "express image of his person," does it mean no more than the visible brightness symbolical of the local presence of God, which reflected on the form of *Jesus* in attestation of his son-ship? Is not *Christ* called the "power of God and the wisdom of God"? And is not he who has received of the power and wisdom of *God*, manifested in the words and works which he spoke and wrought, not of himself, but by the Father, whose spirit rested on him, is not this inspired messenger "in the form or likeness of God"?

That the word *ἡγήσατο* literally means *thought not of*, I am by no means convinced: nor do I see any reason for departing from the rational and scholar-like interpretation, adopted by the eminent men above alluded to: "Who being in the form of God did not esteem it a prey to be equal

with God, or rather, *like to God*: but divested himself of his glory." Not surely of "the supernatural splendid form which he assumed on the mount:" but of the majesty which he might have displayed, had he employed his miraculous powers for his own aggrandisement: as he was tempted to do, when undergoing the discipline and probation in the desert, described by a scenical allegory indicative of the process in the mind of *Jesus*, preparatory to his coming forth into the world as the sent of God. To suppose with your expositor, that the "emptying himself of glory," and the "taking the form of a servant," refer to the particular circumstances of his ceasing to exhibit a luminous appearance, and his girding himself to wash the feet of his disciples, is to substitute paltry and insignificant allusions for those grand general characteristics of the ministry of the Messiah, which the apostle had in view. "He who had not where to lay his head," might be said without any violence of metaphor to be "in the form of a servant:" as he who cured madness by a word and raised the dead, might be described as in the form of God, whose representative and agent he approved himself.

His being "in the likeness of men" certainly does not refer to the phantastic heresy of the *Docetæ*: a reference which occurs in the "coming in the flesh" of *John*; it is in close connexion with the foregoing passages; and alludes to his unostentatious use of the power which he received from God, and which he employed to the glory of the "One God the Father," and for the object of his Messiahship, and never for his own personal advantage. "In the likeness of men," signifies, "under the appearance of other men," or, "as a common man:" allusive to his voluntary obedience in a state of humility and suffering. *Samson* in *Judges* xvi. 7, says, that "if they bind him with green withs he shall be weak and be as a man:" which is rendered in the common version "as another man."

C. A. E.

SIR,

Dec. 10, 1817.

I DARE say you have noticed how great and sudden a change of style takes place at the beginning of the 46th chapter of Jeremiah. Can the author of the former be the author also of the latter part of this book? This seems to me scarcely possible. There are peculiarities also in the latter part, which seem to me different from any other part of the Old Testament. The style seems quite peculiar. Can any of your Correspondents on Biblical Criticism furnish a solution of this difficulty? If they can, they will much oblige,

H.

*New Translations of Psalm v. 11,
and cx. 3.*

Alnwick,

SIR,

November 30, 1817.

IN reading the 11th verse of Psalm v. I was much struck with the prayer which the writer offers to the Deity against those wicked characters whom he had described in the preceding verses. Not believing that a human being, who possessed the feelings of a man, omitting the idea of inspiration by the gracious spirit of God, could indite such a prayer, I was induced to examine the original. That examination has satisfied me, that the Psalmist never prayed for their destruction, but merely *stated* what would be the consequence of their vicious and impious conduct. Two of the verbs are in the *simple* active voice, and the rest in the *causal* active, but not one of them (I submit it to Hebraists) is in the imperative mood. These things being premised, I shall divide and translate as follows:

הַאֲשִׁימָם אֱלֹהִים
יִפְּלוּ מִמַּעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם
בְּרַב פְּשְׁעֵיהֶם הִדְיָחֵמוּ
כִּי מְרוּ בְךָ :

God will cause them to be punished;
They shall fall by their own counsels;
By the greatness of their vices they shall
be cast forth,
Because they rebelled against thee.

Let any person contrast this emendation with the common version, and say, if he can, that the standard translation is correct.

It is thought by many, that Psalm

VOL. XIII.

11

cx. has a reference to Jesus Christ, the authority he possesses, and the ultimate success of his mission. The 3rd verse of this Psalm is rendered thus, in the common version, *thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of holiness from the womb of the morning; thou hast the dew of thy youth.* This makes very bad sense, or rather no sense at all; at least to me it is unintelligible. There is certainly considerable obscurity in the original, and the learned are divided respecting it; yet with due deference to the readers of the Monthly Repository, I would divide and translate the passage thus:

עִמְךָ נִרְבּוֹת—
בְּיוֹם חֵילְךָ בְּהִדְרֵי קֹדֶשׁ
מִרַּחֲמֵי מִשְׁחַר כְּטַל
יִלְדֹתְךָ :

Thy people shall be willing—
In the day thou approachest with holy
pomp;
As the dew at the dawn of morn,
So shall be thy converts.

CAMBER.

SIR,

Chichester, Dec. 19, 1817.

IN your valuable Repository, [XII. 681,] a question occurs concerning the author of the 90th Psalm. If no better answer be sent, perhaps the following may be inserted. The titles of the Psalms are known to be of very little authority, and in the present instance every internal mark of time contradicts the title. Verses 7—10 clearly point out that the Jews were suffering some national calamity, in consequence of their sins, and that the calamity would last 70 years, the usual time of the life of man. These circumstances seem to me clearly to point to the time of the Babylonish captivity, as the period during which the Psalm was written, and I think the allusions in the 10th and 13th verses, render it probable that it was written near the conclusion of the captivity, by some aged Jew, who had but faint hopes of seeing Jerusalem re-built, as he had probably been one of the persons who was born in Judea, and carried captive to Babylon.

T. C. II.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Landaff; written by himself at different intervals, and revised in 1814.* Published by his Son, Richard Watson, L.L.B. Prebendary of Landaff and Wells. 4to. pp. 551. Cadell and Davies. (Portrait.) 1817.

THE late Bishop of Landaff* was, on many accounts, an eminent man, and public attention has been, for some time, attracted to this publication, which was known to be prepared for the press before his decease. The interest which it has excited, and the controversy which is now carrying on with regard to it in the newspapers, are a tacit homage to the author's importance in society.

In our last volume (XII. 321—327), we inserted a memoir of the Bishop, which the present work proves to have been generally correct. We shall refer to that article in the present review, as also to the other notices of him which are scattered through the Monthly Repository.

RICHARD WATSON was born in August, 1737, at Heversham, † in Westmoreland, in the neighbourhood of which his ancestors had been for centuries “ tillers of their own ground; in the idiom of the country, *statesmen*.” In 1698, his father was “ appointed head-master of Heversham School, which he taught with great reputation for nearly forty years;” his greatest honour is pronounced by the bishop to have been his educating *Ephraim Chambers*, author of the Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, out of which has grown Dr. Rees's Cyclopædia. “ There are two exhibitions (now of £50 a-year each) belonging to this school, one to Trinity College, in Cambridge, and the other to Queen's College, Oxford.” Richard Watson succeeded his school-fellow Mr. Preston, in the enjoyment of that to Trinity College, and when they were both of them bishops, in 1788, (Watson, of Landaff; Preston, of Ferns, in Ire-

land,) they repaired the school-house, which was much dilapidated, at their joint expense. A Latin inscription by the former, records this instance of their pious regard for the place of their education.

After the senior Watson's resignation of the school, which took place before Richard Watson was born, its reputation declined. Yet here the Bishop was educated, and he says, that he had cause through life to regret his not having had a better classical foundation.

“ It has fallen to my lot, not only to be obliged to write, but to speak Latin, and having never been taught to make Latin or Greek verses, it cost me more pains to remember whether a syllable was long or short, than it would have done to comprehend a whole section of *Newton's Principia*. My mind, indeed, recoiled from such inquiries; what imports it, I used to say to myself, whether *Cicero* would have said *fortuito* or *fortuito*—*Areopagus* or *Areopagus*? And yet I was forced to attend to such things; for a Westminster or Eton school-master would properly have thought meanly of a man who did not know them. My hands have shaken with impatience and indignation, when I have been consulting Ainsworth or Labbe, about a point, which I was certain of forgetting in a month's time. But as I never could remember the face or name of a man or woman whose character did not strike me, so I found it difficult to impress on my memory, rules of prosody which I had acquired a contempt for; nor did this contempt arise so much from my ignorance of the subject (for I had, after leaving school, taken great pains not to be ignorant of it), as, from the undue importance which was given to it. I was confirmed in this sentiment by observing, that the greatest adepts in syllables were not exempt from mistakes. I remember two of the best scholars in the university, Rutherford and Sumner, in the course of a few weeks, pronouncing in the Senate-house, the *penultimam* of *μακροσπυρις* long and short. On another occasion, my friend, Mr. Wilson, of Peterhouse, (afterwards one of the best black-letter judges in England,) having kept under me a very good act in the divinity schools, was censured by two great classics, Bishop of Peterborough and Dr. Symonds, for having read *abolita* instead of, as they thought, *abolita*. Even the very learned Mr. Bryant, with whom I was conversing in 1802, on the subject of

* The Bishop uniformly spells the word as above, with only one *L*.

† In our Memoir written *Heversham*.

man's redemption, spoke of *Jesus* as the *μεσότης* of the new covenant; on my expressing a doubt as to the quantity of the middle syllable, he said no more; but on his going to Eton (that noble mart of metre) he sent me word that it ought to be pronounced *μεσότης*, from its analogy to *οδότης*, for which he had found authority." Pp. 5, 6.

Dr. Watson acknowledges (p. 7), the care of his mother in imbuing his mind with principles of religion, which never forsook him.

The portion which his father left him was only £300, which was barely sufficient to carry him through his education. He commenced his academic studies, he says, (*ib.*) with the more eagerness, from knowing that his future fortune was to be wholly of his own fabricating.

The biographer attaches some importance to the following incident:—

"I had not been six months in college, before a circumstance happened to me, trivial in itself, and not fit to be noticed, except that it had some influence on my future life, inasmuch as it gave me a turn to metaphysical disquisition. It was then the custom in Trinity College (I am sorry it is not the custom still) for all the undergraduates to attend immediately after morning-prayers, the college-lecturers, at different tables in the hall, during term time. The lecturers explained to their respective classes, certain books, such as *Puffendorf de Officio Hominis et Civis*; *Clarke on the Attributes*; *Locke's Essay*; *Duncan's Logic*, &c.: and once a week, the head-lecturer examined all the students. The question put to me by the head-lecturer was, Whether *Clarke* had demonstrated the absurdity of an infinite succession of changeable and finite beings? I answered, with blushing hesitation, *Non*. The head-lecturer, *Brocket*, with great good-nature, mingled with no small surprise, encouraged me to give my reasons for thinking so. I stammered out in barbarous Latin (for the examination was in that language), That *Clarke* had inquired into the *origin* of a series which, being from the supposition *eternal*, could have no origin; and into the *first* term of a series which, being from the supposition *infinite*, could have no first. From this circumstance, I was soon cried up, very undeservedly, as a great metaphysician. When, four years afterwards, I took my bachelor's degree, Dr. Law, the master of Peterhouse, and one of the best metaphysicians of his time, sent for me, and desired that we might become acquainted. From my friendship with that excellent man, I derived much knowledge

and liberality of sentiment in theology; and I shall ever continue to think my early intimacy with him a fortunate event in my life." Pp. 7, 8.

Metaphysics must have been at a low ebb at Cambridge, when the lucky answer of an acute boy caused him to be "cried up as a metaphysician."

In May, 1757, Mr. Watson offered himself for a scholarship, before the usual time, and succeeded; a step which he reckons to have been advantageous, as it introduced him to the notice of *Dr. Smith*, the Master of the College, who gave a spar to his industry and wings to his ambition.

He gives the following lively picture of his studies at this period:—

"I had, at the time of being elected a scholar, been resident in college for two years and seven months, without having gone out of it a single day. During that period I had acquired some knowledge of Hebrew; greatly improved myself in Greek and Latin; made considerable proficiency in *Locke's Works*, *King's Book on the Origin of Evil*, *Puffendorf's Treatise De Officio Hominis et Civis*, and some other books on similar subjects; I thought myself, therefore, entitled to a little relaxation; under this persuasion I set forward, May 30th, 1757, to pay my elder and only brother a visit at Kendal.

"He was the first curate of the new chapel there, to the structure of which he had subscribed liberally. He was a man of lively parts, but being thrown into a situation where there was no great room for the display of his talents, and much temptation to convivial festivity, he spent his fortune, injured his constitution, and died when I was about the age of thirty-three; leaving a considerable debt, all of which I paid immediately, though it took almost my all to do it.

"My mind did not much relish the country, at least it did not relish the life I led in that country town; the constant reflection that I was idling away my time, mixed itself with every amusement, and poisoned all the pleasures I had promised myself from this visit; I therefore took an hasty resolution of shortening it, and returned to college in the beginning of September, with a determined purpose to make my *Alma Mater*, the mother of my fortunes. That, I well remember, was the expression I used to myself, as soon as I saw the turrets of King's College Chapel, as I was jogging on a jaded nag between Huntingdon and Cambridge.

"I was then only a junior soph; yet two of my acquaintance, of the year below me, thought that I knew so much more of

mathematics than they did, that they importuned me to become their private tutor. To one of them (Mr. Luther) it will be seen hereafter how much I am indebted; and with the other (Dr. Strachey) I have maintained through life an uninterrupted friendship. May I meet them both in heaven! I undoubtedly wished to have had my time to myself, especially till I had taken my degree; but the narrowness of my circumstances, accompanied with a disposition to expense, or, more properly speaking, with a desire to appear respectably, induced me to comply with their request. From that period, for above thirty years of my life, and as long as my health lasted, a considerable portion of my time was spent in instructing others without much instructing myself, or in presiding at disputations in philosophy or theology, from which, after a certain time, I derived little intellectual improvement.

“Whilst I was an under-graduate, I kept a great deal of *what is called* the best company—that is, of idle fellow-commoners, and other persons of fortune—but their manners never subdued my prudence; I had strong ambition to be distinguished, and was sensible that, though wealth might plead some excuse for idleness, extravagance and folly in others, the want of wealth could plead none for me.

“When I used to be returning to my room at one or two in the morning, after spending a jolly evening, I often observed a light in the chamber of one of the same standing with myself; this never failed to excite my jealousy, and the next day was always a day of hard study. I have gone without my dinner a hundred times on such occasions. I thought I never entirely understood a proposition in any part of mathematics or natural philosophy, till I was able in a solitary wark, *obstipio capite atque exporrecto labello*, to draw the scheme in my head, and go through every step of the demonstration without book or pen and paper. I found this was a very difficult task, especially in some of the perplexed schemes, and long demonstrations of the Twelfth Book of *Euclid*, and in *L'Hopital's* Conic Sections, and in *Newton's Principia*. My walks for this purpose were so frequent, that my tutor, not knowing what I was about, once reproached me for being a lounge. I never gave up a difficult point in a demonstration till I had made it out *proprio Marte*; I have been stopped at a single step for three days. This perseverance in accomplishing whatever I undertook, was, during the whole of my active life, a striking feature in my character, so much so, that Dr. Powell, the Master of St. John's College, said to a young man, a pupil of mine, for whom I was prosecuting an appeal which I had lodged with the visiter against the College,

—“Take my advice, Sir, and go back to your Curacy, for your tutor is a man of perseverance, not to say obstinacy.” * * * Pp. 9—12.

The Doctor expresses great satisfaction in finding amongst his papers two declamations, which he composed as a voluntary exercise at college. They shew, he says, that a long commerce in the public world only tended to “confirm that political bent of his mind in favour of civil liberty, which was formed in it before he knew of what selfish and low-minded materials the public world was made.” They were suggested to his mind from the perusal of *Vertot's Roman Revolutions*. “Were such kind of books,” he remarks, “put into the hands of *Kings* during their boyhood, and *Tory trash* at no age recommended to them, *Kings* in their manhood would scorn to aim at arbitrary power through corrupted parliaments” P. 13.

Dr. Watson seems to have been of his friend Dr. Law's opinion concerning the human soul. He was led to consider the subject, by being obliged, as an opponent in the philosophical schools at Cambridge, in 1758, to find arguments against the question, *Anima est suâ naturâ immortalis*. Speaking of his “school-boy's faith,” “that the soul was a substance distinct from the body,” he says, “this notion of the soul was, without doubt, the offspring of prejudice and ignorance, and I must own that my knowledge of the nature of the soul is much the same now that it was then. I have read volumes on the subject, but I have no scruple in saying, that I *know* nothing about it.” P. 15.

Notwithstanding this avowed scepticism, we apprehend that he could not have described his Christian belief in the words that follow, and the sentiment is frequently repeated in the course of the narrative, unless he had strongly inclined at least to the material hypothesis:—

“Believing as I do in the truth of the Christian religion, which teaches, that men are accountable for their actions, I trouble not myself with dark disquisitions concerning necessity and liberty, matter and spirit; hoping as I do for eternal life through Jesus Christ, I am not disturbed at my inability clearly to convince myself that the soul is, or is not, a substance distinct from the body. *The truth of the*

Christian religion depends upon testimony: now man is competent to judge of the weight of testimony, though he is not able, I think, fully to investigate the nature of the soul: and I consider the testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus, (and that fact is the corner-stone of the Christian church,) to be worthy of entire credit.” P. 15.

In January, 1759, Mr. Watson took his Bachelor of Arts' degree. He was the second Wrangler of his year, but it was the general opinion that he ought to have been made senior Wrangler. He was elected a Fellow of Trinity College, in 1760, when he became assistant tutor to Mr. Backhouse. At the commencement in 1762, he took his Master of Arts' degree, and was soon after made Moderator for Trinity College. During his year of office the following occurrence took place, interesting from the person and the subject involved in it:

“*Paley, I remember, had brought me for one of the questions he meant for his act, Æternitas pœnarum contradicit Divinis attributis. I had accepted it; and indeed I never refused a question either as moderator or as professor of divinity. A few days afterwards, he came to me in a great fright, saying that the master of his college (Dr. Thomas, Dean of Ely), had sent to him, and insisted on his not keeping on such a question. I readily permitted him to change it, and told him, that if it would lessen his master's apprehensions, he might put in non, before contradicit, and he did so. Dr. Thomas, I had little doubt, was afraid of being looked upon as a heretic at Lambeth, for suffering a member of his college to dispute on such a question, notwithstanding what Titlotson had published on the subject many years before.”* Pp. 19, 20.

By some remarks that are here made, it appears that Dr. Watson was sceptical on the duration of future punishment. He asks, with *unexpected simplicity*, “*But how is it proved that the everlasting punishment of the wicked may not answer a benevolent end, may not be the mean of keeping the righteous in everlasting holiness and obedience?*” P. 20.

On the death of Dr. Hadley, in 1764, he was elected Professor of Chemistry, under circumstances, as he himself explains, not a little extraordinary.

“*At the time this honour was conferred upon me, I knew nothing at all of Chemistry, had never read a syllable on the*

subject, nor seen a single experiment in it; but I was tired with mathematics and natural philosophy, and the vehementissima gloriæ cupido stimulated me to try my strength in a new pursuit, and the kindness of the University (it was always kind to me) animated me to very extraordinary exertions. I sent immediately after my election for an operator to Paris; I buried myself as it were in my laboratory, at least as much as my other avocations would permit; and in fourteen months from my election, I read a course of chemical lectures to a very full audience, consisting of persons of all ages and degrees in the University.” Pp. 28, 29.

Naming Mr. (afterwards *Dr.*) *Jebb*, as bringing on the subject of annual examinations in 1774, the biographer coldly describes him as a “*a very honest and intelligent, but unpopular man.*” P. 30.

In 1766, the professorship of Chemistry, at Cambridge, was endowed, through Mr. Watson's exertions, with a stipend from the Crown of £100. per annum. He became, in 1767, one of the Head Tutors in Trinity College. He printed, in 1768, his *Institutiones Metallurgicæ*, and about the same time was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. In 1769, he preached an Asize Sermon at Cambridge, which he afterwards published, dedicated “*to the only person to whom*” he “*owed any obligation, Mr. Luther. I made it a rule, (he adds,) never to dedicate to those from whom I expected favours, but to those only from whom I had received them. The dedication of my Collection of Theological Tracts to the Queen did not come under either of these descriptions; it proceeded from the opinion I then entertained of her merit, as a wife and a mother.”* P. 34.

In 1771, Dr. Watson succeeded Dr. Rutherford as Regius Professor of Divinity, being created a doctor by royal mandate the day before his election. He found the professorship not worth quite £330. a-year, and he takes credit to himself for having made it worth £1000. at the least. In this situation Dr. Watson was at the head of a theological school, which, we trust, still subsists; the character of which is well described in his account of himself as Divinity Professor.

“*I reduced the study of divinity into as narrow a compass as I could, for I determined to study nothing but my Bible, being much unconcerned about the opi-*

nions of councils, fathers, churches, bishops and other men, as little inspired as myself. This mode of proceeding being opposite to the general one, and especially to that of the master of Peterhouse, who was a great reader, he used to call me *αὐτοδιδάκτος*, the self-taught divine. The Professor of Divinity had been nick-named *Malleus Hæreticorum*; it was thought to be his duty to demolish every opinion which militated against what is called the orthodoxy of the Church of England. Now my mind was wholly unbiassed; I had no prejudice against, no predilection for the Church of England; but a sincere regard for the Church of Christ, and an insuperable objection to every degree of dogmatical intolerance. I never troubled myself with answering any arguments which the opponents in the divinity schools brought against the articles of the church, nor ever admitted their authority as decisive of a difficulty; but I used on such occasions to say to them, holding the New Testament in my hand, *En sacrum codicem!* Here is the fountain of truth, why do you follow the streams derived from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the passions of man? If you can bring proofs against any thing delivered in this book, I shall think it my duty to reply to you; *articles of churches are not of divine authority; have done with them; for they may be true, they may be false; and appeal to the book itself.* This mode of disputing gained me no credit with the hierarchy, but I thought it an honest one, and it produced a liberal spirit in the University." P. 39.

Such language as this is worthy of a Protestant Divine: why has Cambridge ever abandoned this, her proper tongue?

In 1772, Dr. Watson published two short Letters to the members of the House of Commons, under the feigned name of A Christian Whig, dedicated to Sir George Saville, on the subject of the Clerical Petition; and in 1773, a small tract entitled, "A brief State of the Principles of Church Authority:" this latter he read verbatim as a Charge to his Clergy, in 1803, and republished it, at their request, with a Preface and Appendix. He maintains in it the right of every church, conceding the same to every voluntary assembly of Christians, "of explaining to its ministers what doctrines it holds, and of permitting none to minister in it who do not profess the same belief with itself." He avows that he was once of opinion, that "the majority of the members of any civil community

have a right to compel all the members of it to *pay* towards the maintenance of a set of teachers appointed by the majority;" but he confesses that he is staggered when he considers "that a case may happen in which the established religion may be the religion of a minority of the people, that minority, at the same time, possessing a majority of the property, out of which the ministers of the establishment are to be paid." He professes his satisfaction in finding that his thoughts on many points, both religious and civil, were in perfect coincidence with those of *Bishop Hoadley* (Hoadly); and he says "I glory in this, notwithstanding the abuse that eminent prelate experienced in his own time, and notwithstanding he has been in our time sarcastically called, and what is worse, injuriously called by Bishop Horseley (*Horsley*) a *republican Bishop*." P. 43.

Dr. Watson married, in 1773, the eldest daughter of Edward Wilson, Esq. of Dallum Tower, in Westmoreland: in speaking of his wife he uses terms of high, but we presume not extravagant, eulogy.

At this time he received the presentation of a sinecure rectory in North Wales, procured for him from the Bishop of St. Asaph by the late Duke of Grafton: this sinecure he immediately exchanged, through the Duke's unsolicited influence, for a prebend in the church of Ely. He speaks of the Duke's patronage with warm gratitude, since he thought differently from that nobleman, on politics, having always condemned the American war and predicted its disastrous issue. When the Duke abandoned the administration, in 1775, and adopted principles more congenial to Dr. Watson's, our author addressed a letter to him anonymously, in the public papers, to defend him against "the mighty malice" of Junius. Of the Duke, he says,

"At the time I published this letter, I knew very little of the Duke of Grafton as an acquaintance; I had afterwards more intimacy with him, and I was for many years, indeed as long as he lived, happy in his friendship. It appears from some hundreds of his letters which he had ordered at his death to be returned to me, that we had not always agreed either in our political or religious opinions; but we had both of us too much sense to suffer a

diversity of sentiment to deaden the activity of personal attachment. I never attempted either to encourage or to discourage his profession of Unitarian principles, for I was happy to see a person of his rank, professing with intelligence and with sincerity Christian principles. *If any one thinks that an Unitarian is not a Christian, I plainly say, without being myself an Unitarian, that I think otherwise.*" Pp. 46, 47.

The Doctor published another anonymous letter to the Duke, in the newspapers, protesting against his recommending, as Chancellor, an obscure country gentleman to represent the University in Parliament.

As tutor at Trinity College, Dr. Watson had the important office of instructing several young noblemen, amongst whom was Lord Granby, in whose education he says (p. 49), he took singular pains. A correspondence with his lordship is here preserved, which is highly creditable to both tutor and pupil. Lord Granby vows eternal attachment to Whig principles, and Dr. Watson charges him to "be a Whig in domestic as well as political life," adding, that "the best part of whiggism is, that it will neither suffer nor exact domination." P. 54.

In November 1775, the University of Cambridge "played the second fiddle to the Tory University of Oxford," in voting an address to the King, approving of the American war. On this occasion Dr. Watson, who manfully exerted himself on the side of peace and liberty, received a letter from the Marquis of Rockingham, which he leaves behind him in this narrative, "as one proof amongst a thousand of the Marquis's patriotism and good sense." The letter is, however, the production of a mere politician; while the Doctor's answer is replete with philosophic patriotism. "Let the pensioners and placemen say what they will," writes Dr. Watson, "*Whig and Tory are as opposite to each other as Mr. Locke and Sir Robert Filmer; as the soundest sense and the profoundest nonsense; and I must always conclude that a man has lost his honesty or his intellect, when he attempts to confound the ideas.*" P. 57. He concludes his letter with a passage which he himself puts in italics, and on which he makes a short comment: "*It is an insupportable iniquity, next to a crime, to suppose that the*

House of Bourbon, however quiescent and indifferent it may appear at present, will not avail itself of our dissensions in every possible way and to every possible extent; and the moment America is compelled to open her ports and to refuge her distress under foreign protection, there will be an end of our history as a great people." On this he remarks, "How fully this prediction respecting the conduct of the House of Bourbon, was verified by the event, every one knows; and our children will know, whether the other part of it was a groundless prediction." P. 58.

Dr. Watson now assumed a decided political character; of what cast and with what effect the following lively narrative will shew:

"In 1776, it came to my turn to preach the Restoration and Accession sermons before the University: I published them both, calling the first '*The Principles of the Revolution vindicated.*'"

"This sermon was written with great caution, and at the same time with great boldness and respect for truth. In London it was reported, at its first coming out, to be treasonable; and a friend of mine, Mr. Wilson, (the late judge,) who was anxious for my safety, asked Mr. Dunning (afterwards Lord Ashburton), what he thought of it; who told him, '*that it contained such treason as ought to be preached once a month at St. James's.*' It gave great offence to the Court; and was at the time, and has continued to be, an obstacle to my promotion.

"I knew nothing of either Lord George Germaine or the Archbishop of Armagh; but Mr. Cumberland, Lord George's secretary, told Mr. Higgs, one of the Fellows of Trinity College, with a view of what he said being repeated to me, that these two personages had intended to propose me to the King, for the Provostship of Dublin University. I asked what had made them abandon their intention? It was answered, '*your Sermon on the Principles of the Revolution.*' I hastily replied, '*Bid Mr. Cumberland inform his principal, that I will neither ask or (nor) accept preferment from Lord George Germaine, or from any other person to whom these principles have rendered me obnoxious.*' The loss of so great a piece of preferment would have broken the spirit of many an academic; and the desire of regaining lost favour would have made him a suppliant to the court for life. It had no such effect on me. The firmness of this reply was too much for Mr. Cumberland's political virtue; for he afterwards, in two sorry pamphlets, shewed himself mine enemy. I call them sorry pamphlets; be-

cause, though there was some humour, there was no argument in them.

“On the first publication of this sermon, I was much abused by ministerial writers, as *a man of republican principles*. I did not deign to give any answer to the calumny, excepting by printing on a blank page, in subsequent editions of it, the following interpretation of the terms, from Bishop Hoadly’s works:—‘Men of Republican principles—a sort of dangerous men who have of late taken heart and defended the Revolution that saved us.’

“Mr. Fox, in debating the Sedition Bill, in December 1795, said, ‘that the measures of the united branches of the legislature might be so bad as to justify the people in resisting the government. This doctrine he had been taught, not only by *Sydney* and *Locke*, but by *Sir G. Saville* and the late *Earl of Chatham*; and if these authorities would not suffice, he would refer the House to a sermon preached by *Dr. Watson*, the present Bishop of *Landaff*, which in his opinion was replete with manly sense and accurate reasoning, upon that delicate but important subject.’

“I had always looked upon Mr. Fox to be one of the most constitutional reasoners, and one of the most argumentative orators in either House of Parliament. I was, at the time this compliment was paid me, and am still, much gratified by it. The approbation of such men ever has been, and ever will be, dearer to me than the most dignified and lucrative stations in the church.” Pp. 58—60.

The speech of Mr. Fox’s, which the Bishop quotes, was one of the richest effusions of patriotism and eloquence which ever flowed from a noble heart. (See Mr. Fox’s *Speeches*, in 6 Vols. 8vo. 1815. Vol. VI. pp. 62—74.) At this period, when the Whig principle is either forgotten or decried, we think it not useless to refer the reader to this explanation and assertion of it; especially as, with one honourable exception in the See of *Norwich*, *Dr. Watson* was the last of our Whig Bishops.

[To be continued.]

ART. II.—*Unitarianism, Old and New, Exemplified and Illustrated, in Three Letters, addressed to the Editor of the Monthly Repository, &c. with a Preface.* By an Old Unitarian. Mason, Chichester. 8vo. pp. 100. 1817.

THIS publication consists of the Letter which, under the signature of *An Old Unitarian*, appeared

in our last volume [XII. 284—289], of the letter in reply to it by *Mr. Fox*, inserted in the same volume [XII. 333—339], and of a rejoinder to *Mr. Fox*, which was not admitted into the *Monthly Repository*; besides a *Preface*, containing an historical sketch of the progress of religious opinions in this country.

The Old Unitarian complains of our refusing to insert his second letter in this miscellany, “except on terms with which he could not possibly comply. The motives,” he adds, “of this rejection are best known to others; a private communication which has been received, having by no means thrown any light upon the subject.” (*Pref.*)

Now, as we set some value upon our character for impartiality, we think it right to enable the public to judge of our conduct. We have only to give an history of the affair, without any comment. We admit, then, that the Old Unitarian did send us a second letter for insertion; but having received from some of our friends and correspondents, most respectable for years, talents, character and station, a serious remonstrance against the continuance of the controversy, and perceiving from the complexion of the letter that, if the controversy were continued it must become directly personal, we returned the communication to the writer, with a request that it might be withdrawn. The grounds of our wish were fully explained. Our correspondent seemed to admit the force of our objection, and to be inclined at first to accede to our request. At length, he signified to us that he had new-modelled the letter, leaving out the particulars to which we had objected; and inquired whether we would insert it in its amended form? His concession appeared to call for concession on our part, and we replied in the affirmative, but added that, as the magazine was about to be made up for the month, it must be sent to us on or before a given day. The writer then informed us that he had doubts concerning the publication of the letter; that he had put it into the hands of a friend, on whose judgment he relied, with permission either to hold it back or to forward it; and that, if it did not reach us by a particular day, we might conclude that it

was suppressed. Two days after that which had been named, the letter had not been received; and at that time the Editor left home on an absence of several weeks, committing the editorship of the work to a highly-valued and confidential friend, who was to act, as he had most satisfactorily, on former occasions, according to his own discretion. Under these circumstances the delayed letter arrived; and the temporary editor, knowing nothing of any previous correspondence or engagement, and exercising his own judgment upon the communication, determined that its insertion should depend upon the writer's subscribing it with his proper name: this condition was exacted on the ground of its containing personal allusions to a correspondent whose name was given. The Old Unitarian refused compliance, and appealed to the usual Editor, who did not feel himself at liberty, under all the circumstances of the case, to reverse his friend's judgment; and hence, the non-appearance of the letter and the Old Unitarian's complaint.

The Editors of the Monthly Repository may have erred, but some allowance should be made for them by the Old Unitarian, who is now an Editor himself, and in his first appearance in that character has, if we mistake not, fallen into an irregularity, by republishing, from this work, Mr. Fox's Letter, without the consent (not to speak more strongly) of that gentleman.

After what has passed, it may be thought that we are not sufficiently neutral to sit as censors upon the present publication; but we are too much concerned in the Old Unitarian's charges to be able to refrain from making a few remarks upon his Letters. We can write upon the subject with temper, though we shall be obliged to use the language of serious remonstrance.

If we were to denominate the Old Unitarian a *respectable* writer, we should use a term very inadequate to our sense of his talents. He displays a general elegance and an occasional felicity of style, which prove his thorough acquaintance with the best classical models. And, were we at liberty to refer to him under other signatures in the Monthly Repository and else-

where, we could point out instances of his great acuteness and power in argument.

We say so much to shew that prejudice does not wholly blind us to the merits of this controversy; and we are even disposed to go farther, and admit that the Old Unitarian is really solicitous for the best interests of mankind, and, whatever be his misconceptions and prejudices, has attacked those whom he terms "New Unitarians," with no other view than that of protecting and promoting Christianity, pure and unadulterate. But, with this concession, truth requires us to say, that we think that he has hazarded vague and unwarrantable charges, and that his proofs, in all that is of moment, are merely uncharitable surmises.

The radical fault of the Old Unitarian's letters is his employment of undefined terms, which at once allow the enemies of Unitarians to quote him as an evidence against his brethren, and at the same time prevent them from meeting and refuting his accusations. Who, as Mr. Fox asks, are the "New Unitarians?" If they be persons in whom *all* the Old Unitarian's marks are found, we boldly assert, that they are the creatures of his own imagination; if they be persons in whom *any one* mark is found, then nearly the whole body of the avowed Unitarians of the present day will be brought under the designation, and must answer for all the sin which it denotes, and not only the Unitarians of the present day, but the majority of those likewise that have existed within the last fifty years, including Estlin, Toulmin, Lindsey and Priestley.

The correctness of this statement will appear by a detail of the Old Unitarian's charges, compared with Mr. Fox's replies and the Old Unitarian's rejoinders. The charges are *five* in number.

The *first* is, that the New Unitarians court persecution, and the proof is that the repeal of the penal statutes against Anti-Trinitarians was "very little acceptable" to them. Mr. Fox denies the fact on which the accusation rests, and alleges that Mr. Smith's Bill originated in the Committee of the Unitarian Fund, and that motions of thanks to the government for this

signal act of justice were passed at most of the provincial Unitarian associations. The reply seems to be satisfactory even to the Old Unitarian, who, in his 2nd letter (p. 64), acknowledges himself incorrect in this first charge. The acknowledgment is, however, incautious; as it appears to admit, what is elsewhere denied, that by the New Unitarians are meant the supporters of the Unitarian Fund and the members of the various Unitarian associations throughout the kingdom. But the Old Unitarian will not wholly abandon the charge of a fondness for persecution, and he finds, "if not a proof, at least an illustration of it" (p. 52), in Mr. Fox himself, who whilst he denounces the Old Unitarian's observations as calumnious, takes them to himself! This *jeu d'esprit* cannot prevent any reader from returning to the indictment a verdict of *not proven*.

The *second* charge is, that the New Unitarians are disposed to inflict persecution, and the proof is that they make use of bigoted and intolerant language; "not content with thinking Unitarianism a good thing, they will have it that *there is nothing good besides*." The charge is denied by Mr. Fox, who challenges the Old Unitarian to produce a single writer or preacher who has advanced the above position. The Old Unitarian retorts upon Mr. Fox some phrases of his own, culled from his sermon before the Unitarian Fund. These, taken from their connexion, may have a harsh sound, but they cannot be fairly quoted out of that connexion. By this mode of citation, the Old Unitarian represents Mr. Fox as denominating Calvinism "a curse," when the preacher only says that it is "sometimes a curse," and points out a few "examples" of his meaning. The charge of "self-complacency," "self-admiration" and "self-adoration," which the Old Unitarian founds upon Mr. Fox's sermon, for no other reason that we can perceive than that the preacher exhibits the character of the apostle Paul as a model for imitation, is not a happy instance of the superiority of the Old to the New Unitarians in the treatment of an opponent. In truth, all Christians, whether Trinitarians or Unitarians, and all Unitarians, whether Old or New, are

liable to the charge of using harder language than the occasion justifies, and had the Old Unitarian only warned his brethren against a common error, instead of framing an accusation against "these Galileans," as "sinners above all the Galileans," we should have regarded him as a peacemaker and not as an accuser. He might, by his process, convict of persecution the charitable Priestley and even the mild Lindsey. Nay, we suspect that he might by a rigid scrutiny of his own publication, reduce *himself* to the necessity of pleading guilty to the charge of verbal intolerance.*

The *third* charge is, that the New Unitarians undervalue "purity and

* The Old Unitarian will not, we are sure, plead for discarding all decency of language with regard to New Unitarians; but he will be at a loss to reconcile with his own sense of propriety the passage (Letters, p. 13), where, describing the "very great injury and disgrace" done "to the cause" by the Provincial Unitarian Associations, he speaks of "the tongues of not a few *controversial coxcombs*" being "let loose." If, however, the demerits of the New Unitarians justify hard epithets, Calvinists and Churchmen are by his own shewing entitled to toleration; but what would the former say to his representation of their system as almost excluding *infinite benevolence* from the divine perfections (Pref. p. xii.), to his pronouncing the general disposedness to what is termed "Evangelical religion," to be a "hastening back to the regions of implicit faith, of *intolerance* and of other *beggarly elements*" (Pref. p. xviii.), and, above all, to his declaring that "*Insanity* has been either a *pre-disposing cause* of partiality for" "Calvinistic or (as they are called) Orthodox doctrines," "or the *effect* of too warm an attachment to them" (Pref. p. xxviii.): and what would the latter say to his scheme for "sweeping out the *rubbish* and *defilements* which disgrace the national church" (Letters, p. 18), or to his portraying the following "prominent and characteristic features" in the clerical body; "fixed abhorrence of Unitarianism," "abusive language," "designed and deliberate misrepresentations," "disingenuity" and "meanness" (Pref. p. xxii.)? They might say, as the Old Unitarian says, in the next page,—but their *intra* would be his *extra*, and their *extra* would shut him out equally with his younger brethren,—

Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.

correctness of life and manners," palliate "licentiousness" and represent "crimes" "as objects of pity rather than of abhorrence." These are the Old Unitarian's words. Proof he adduces none. Mr. Fox replies indignantly that the charge is unfounded. In his rejoinder the Old Unitarian softens or rather alters the charge: he alleges here (Letters, p. 56), "that the New Unitarians are disposed to contend that the only morality and piety deserving regard, is inseparably connected with their own views of religious truth:" and in proof of his position he quotes a passage from Mr. Fox's sermon, "which claims for the virtue of Unitarians a superiority over that of orthodox Christians"! The charge might have been preferred against Dr. Priestley as a Necessarian, and proved from his dedication of his book on Necessity to Dr. Jebb. But what has this to do with the original charge, which, if true, convicts the New Unitarians, whoever they be, of doctrines and habits which all good men must execrate, and which, *if false*, (and true or false it must be,) ought surely to have been openly retracted, with a confession of its gross and cruel injustice. How would the Old Unitarian feel, if, in order to inflame the passions of the public and to counteract some liberal measure or to justify some instance of intolerance, this very passage should be hereafter quoted, as the character of the New Unitarians drawn by one of their elder brethren? Why has he not put his abandonment of the charge upon record, that we may appeal to it in our own vindication? Or does he still maintain it? If so, let him point out the Antinomians of our sect, for we have never even heard of them. The Necessarians have been reproached with this character, but the Old Unitarian need not be told that they, equally with the New Unitarians, smile at the reproach. We are convinced that, at least, he will not repeat this charge against the New Unitarians.*

* Though the charge of conniving at immorality no longer stands as one of the numbered articles of the indictment against the New Unitarians, it is again preferred with some mitigation in the Third Letter, pp. 49, 50. Having quoted a just observation of Mr. James Yates's, that a rising

The *fourth* charge against the New Unitarians is that of excessive zeal,

sect is likely to contain a larger proportion of men intent upon speculative principles, than of those who are devoted to the practical application of their principles, he proceeds to say, "Now I apprehend it to be an *incontestable fact* that some of the best men among modern Unitarians have suffered their theological zeal so to impair their moral perceptions and feelings, and have been so captivated with talents, energy and intrepidity, when found united with a similar zeal, that *they have not declined a cordial union with persons thus animated and thus endowed, although licentiousness both in principles and practice may have thrown a deep shade over their characters.*" The sect deserves all the Old Unitarian's invectives, if such have been the conduct of some of its "best men." The "incontestable fact" rests however upon no other evidence than the anonymous writer's *apprehension*. Our acquaintance with "Modern Unitarians" is probably as intimate as his own, and we say, without fear of contradiction, that the accusation is utterly groundless, and that no instance can be found of open immorality amongst their members, not being visited by the prompt and decided disavowal of all religious communion and connexion. One of the laws of the Unitarian Fund was expressly framed for the sake of meeting this case. And it may surprise the Old Unitarian to hear that one of the amicable controversies amongst modern Unitarians relates to Church Discipline, those who contend for its introduction resting their plea upon the necessity of some more decisive means of disowning an unworthy member than are possessed under the lax government of the *Old Unitarian* churches, by an unworthy member, meaning always not a heretic but a transgressor of the rules of Christian virtue. On the other side, the argument is, that the instances of unworthiness are too rare, and the force of opinion too strong in favour of virtue, to require a Church to assume the power of excommunication, which has been so often and fatally abused.

The qualifying epithets of *some*, &c., which abound in the Third Letter, lead us to suspect that the Old Unitarian's charges, in so far as they are serious, refer to some single case; it would be curious if further explanation should shew that the individual instance no more appertains to New Unitarians than to Old. We throw out this suspicion, not so much to defend the Unitarians, as to enable the Old Unitarian to relieve his mind of those apprehensions concerning his brethren, which must be exceedingly painful; although certainly

leading them into associations, &c. and disposing them to slight the principles common to all Christians, and to set an inordinate value upon those which are peculiar to Unitarianism. An exception is made in favour of "missionary preaching, conducted on a proper plan, such as that of the able and eminent Mr. Wright and others." Mr. Fox, in reply, maintains the necessity of explaining what is meant by Christianity, when the term is used; and vindicates the Unitarian associations, which are not novel, by setting forth their objects. The rejoinder of the Old Unitarian is *more* complete than under any of the foregoing heads; and if he and Mr. Fox would amicably discuss the question of what there is in Christianity common to all Christians, the result would, we doubt not, be favourable to truth and charity. If the controversy be a mere *logomachy*, it would be still useful to have this ascertained. But which way soever the discussion ends, the New Unitarians are no more affected by it than the Old. No one can set up for another a measure of the value of truth. It is quite new for the Unitarians to be charged with being zealous above measure; but the Old Unitarian could scarcely be expected to *forgive them this wrong*, since he characterizes, disrespectfully we think, "hypothetically" he will say, Dr. Toulmin by a "fondness for running about," and Dr. Priestley by "exuberant zeal" (Letters, pp. 48, 49). The instances adduced of the censurable zeal of the New Unitarians are peculiarly unhappy: respect for the Old Unitarians, the Presbyterians, for a century past, to whom we suppose the title will be given, should have checked the fling at the *sociétés ambulantes*, the moveable association meetings, which are as old as non-conformity; and reverence of piety should, we humbly suggest, have shielded from reproach the act of "assembling together for the purpose of praying."

The last charge against the New Unitarians is *disloyalty*: the evidence

he will not at once find comfort in the conviction, that he has wronged a large party of his fellow-Christians, whom his religious profession would naturally lead him to protect and serve.

is that there are marks of kindness in this Magazine towards Buonaparte and William Cobbett: it has even been suspected, says the Old Unitarian, that "certain Unitarian ministers, of the modern school and of its latest discipline, have been desirous of propagating their religious faith with a view more widely to disseminate their political principles among the inferior classes of society." Mr. Fox in his reply again calls for proofs; and expatiates upon the injustice and cruelty of such an accusation at such a time, "when the suspicions of government are awake and its power uncontrolled." To this the replication of the Old Unitarian is to us most unsatisfying: the substance of it is, that his suspicions were conveyed in a hypothetical form, and that those who suspect and those who are suspected are alike unnamed and unknown. Is not this the very point of which the New Unitarians complain? A general, sweeping charge is brought against a class of men, tending to prejudice them, already under sufficient odium, in the eyes of their neighbours, and whilst it attaches to every one, no one can disprove it, because his own case may be alleged to be an exception.

We know not to what passages in the Monthly Repository the Old Unitarian alludes. His own Letter is evidence enough that we do not approve of all the communications that we insert. In the papers that have been properly our own, we have never either asserted or insinuated any principles that we fear to avow, or that we do not regard as becoming scholars, gentlemen and Christians. We are not ambitious of authorities, where we are conscious of having reason and truth with us, but we will venture to say, that not a single sentiment in relation to public policy has ever appeared on these pages which has not been again and again avowed, defended and gloried in by the most able, the most patriotic, and the purest of our senators and statesmen. Knowing this, we are as indifferent to political as to theological accusations; though we are sorry when our brethren are our accusers, and our foes (even in appearance) are those of our own household.

Loyalty is one of those generalities

in which an accuser may entangle any one who has fixed political principles. It may mean an entire approbation of the King's ministers for the time being; it does generally mean a devoted attachment to the constitution in church and state; it ought to mean, an accordance with the British frame of government in King, Lords and Commons. In the first sense, every Whig is now disloyal; in the second sense, every Protestant Dissenter is disloyal; but in the third sense, we know not an Unitarian, New or Old, who is not loyal in head and heart. Surely the Old Unitarian would not wish to bring back the reign of terror, the worst feature of revolutionary times, when any difference of opinion from the majority, with regard to a political character or a measure of foreign policy, shall suffice to justify one Englishman in branding another with the foul name of *traitor!*

We have now disposed of the Old Unitarian's charges; and may sum up our review of them, by saying, that the *first* is retracted; that the *second* is no more applicable to the New Unitarians than to all other imperfect Christians, not excepting the Old Unitarian himself; that the *third*, the most serious of the whole, is virtually, but *ought to be expressly*, abandoned; that the *fourth* is mere matter of opinion, in which the Old Unitarian would probably stand in a minority, even amongst those willing to bear the same denomination with himself; and that the *fifth*, like the third, is a mere ebullition of anger, and until it be proved, (which we know it never will,) must be accounted one of those unlawful weapons which even good men sometimes throw at those whom they allow themselves to consider as opponents.

ART. II.—*Joy turned into Mourning.*
A Sermon occasioned by the death of her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte Augusta, &c. By W. B. Collyer, D. D. F. A. S. &c. 8vo. pp. 37. Black and Co. 1817.

THE universal regret evinced by our countrymen on the loss of our beloved Princess, was alike honourable to her and to themselves. It was a tribute nobly merited; spon-

taneously and generously paid. There is a fund of good feeling in the community, drawn out by particular occurrences, which ought to shame the pleaders for the natural and total depravity of man. That event amongst others shewed that the irreligious, as well as the devout, were ready to do honour to the good and to sympathize with the distressed. In the sentiments of many publications, designed to express the public grief, and render it subservient to moral purposes, we unfeignedly coincide. Whatever their imperfections, the language of honest sorrow and pure benevolence, is sacred from the shafts of criticism. But they have no claim to such forbearance who abused that mournful occasion by inculcating slavish, sycophantic and unnational principles. This sermon in particular ought not to pass into oblivion unnoticed or uncensured. It has glaring sins both of omission and of commission. Like the whole tribe of courtly mourners, Dr. C. forgets that the lamented Princess had a Mother, to whom her heroic filial attachment, under no ordinary trials, was one of the brightest features of her character. On all topics of panegyric, save this, our preacher is voluble enough; but dumb as the grave on that virtue—so universally estimable and imitable, of which, when future generations are taught goodness by historic examples, she will be selected as an illustrious instance. And for her desolate Mother, has humanity no sympathy, religion no consolation? Banished from our shores, is she also to be cast out from our hearts, our memories and our prayers? On all else is poured the full tide of condolence, and this Royal Mourner is left alone, the only unsolaced wretch in the universe. Bereavement always gives a claim to kindness. To the beggar's widow we talk of Christian hope: and we bestow a word of condolence even on the faithful dog that whines upon his master's grave. From what honourable motive, by what religious principle, is one excepted from the universal sympathy, by whom it was most needed, and to whom it would have been most soothing? The omission is unfeeling to the living, and insulting to the dead. Could that generous spirit revisit the

earth, how indignantly would she trample on such tributes to her memory?

Dr. C. would alleviate our regret for a Princess, who was commended to the nation's love by the declaration of her Father, that she had been educated in the principles of Mr. Fox, by gratitude to heaven for the blessings which remain, amongst which he includes the present Ministry! "We have a government *mild in its administration, and conformed to the constitution.*" And he exhorts every individual to "*strengthen the hands of the government, under which he lives.*" The logic which connects these topics with the late melancholy event is as preposterous, as the feelings are disgraceful which could prompt their introduction upon such an occasion. On the morning of the delivery of this sermon, the news arrived of the disgusting and bloody spectacle which ministeral mildness exhibited at Derby.

At the very moment, numbers of unaccused persons were pining in solitary confinement, by virtue of the suspension of the constitution. We thought the apologists of these measures had been content with calling them "wholesome severities," and "temporary abridgments of liberty unfortunately necessary;" but to talk of their mildness and conformity to the constitution; to demand gratitude for them as blessings; to have them ministered as consolations for the loss of her who promised to be a "*Patriot Queen,*" is a flight of loyal bravery that towers above even the Courier and Morning Post, and makes them "hide their diminished heads." The "hands of government" were strong enough without arming them for destruction with the monumental stones with which a sorrowing country was piling the cairn of its beloved Princess.

W.

POETRY.

HYMN TO THE DEITY.

[These beautiful stanzas have been communicated to us, without any information concerning the author. We insert them, therefore, in the same form in which they have been sent to us. And here we beg leave to say, once for all, that whenever we borrow Poetry we give our authorities, and that whatever is thus unauthenticated is considered by us as *original.* ED.]

"*Thy way is in the sea, and thy path is in the deep waters, and thy footsteps are not known.*"

Oh Thou, whom eye hath seen not, ne'er shall see!
 Whose way is in the deep—whose steps unknown,
 Enshrin'd thyself in clouds of mystery,
 Yet darting beams of heavenly brightness down,
 Thou art *my* God; and prostrate at thy throne,
 And warm in Faith, and strengthen'd by thy power,
 I yield my all—Oh God, accept thine own,
 From the frail heart that seeks to know no more
 Than that *Thou* liv'st and reign'st, to tremble and adore.

Oh, let my soul, content to worship Thee,
 Each daring thought, each prouder wish resign;
 Till thine own voice shall set the spirit free,
 And mortal knowledge ripen to divine!
 Perhaps, (forgive that daring hope of mine,)
 Thine eye of grace the humble thought may view,
 And bid thy heavenly light more brightly shine
 On those who, panting for its beams, yet knew
 To wait in patient hope, till death the veil undrew.

Oh, not on doubt's interminable main
 Let my frail bark by varying winds be tost,
 Where human aid, alas! but shews in vain
 To the wreck'd wretch the port for ever lost:
 Who shall assuage thy woes "when tempest tost"?
 Or speak of comfort, "comfortless" to thee?
 Who, but the Power that knows thy weakness most,
 And in his own good time shall set thee free,
 Spreading the oil of peace o'er thy tumultuous sea?

And let not him who never felt a fear,
Safe in his pride of heart, thy woes
deride;
Perhaps that scornful eye or brow severe
Hath thoughts less hallow'd than thine
own to hide.
E'en the dark days of doubt have purified
My chasten'd soul from many an earthly
stain;
And chas'd, for ever chas'd, the demon
pride
That once had mark'd thee in his menial
train;
But now hath lost his power, and spreads
his lures in vain.

Father of Life, whose "loveliest name is
Love,"
Whose throne the humble seek—the
guilty fly,
Thou art *my* God—around, beneath, above,
I trace no frowns, no terrors in thine
eye.
All breathes of that pervading harmony
Which draws from present ill the future
good:
All leads our spirits to that peaceful sky
Where banish'd far, nor sorrow's gloomy
mood,
Nor fancy's wayward dreams, nor real
ills intrude.

*Latin Epigram, with a Translation,
on Two Brothers, one a Roman
Catholic and the other a Protestant,
who converted each other.*

SIR, Clapton, Dec. 22, 1817.
Your readers have lately been pow-
erfully attracted [XII. 481, 588, 665],
to the consideration of the extraor-
dinary fluctuations which may occur
in a Christian's religious profession.
The most surprising, probably, which
was ever recorded, were those of
"Dr. John Reynolds and William,
his brother," who lived in the early
part of the 17th century. They have
been thus related:—

"William was, at first, a Protestant
of the Church of England, and John
trained up beyond sea in Popery.
The first, out of an honest zeal to re-
duce his brother, made a journey to
him, and they had a conference; when
it so fell out that each was overcome
by his brother's arguments; so that
William, of a zealous Protestant be-
came a virulent Papist, and *John*, of a
strong Papist, a most rigid Protes-
tant."

On this uncommon circumstance
Dr. Alabaster, who is said to have
"tried both religions," made the
Epigram, which I here copy, sub-

joining a translation, for which I am
indebted to a friend, who, as you will
perceive, has well preserved the sense
and spirit of the original.

J. T. R.

EPIGRAM.

Bella inter geminos plus quam civilia
fratres,
Traxerat ambiguus religionis apex.
Ille reformatæ fidei pro partibus instat,
Iste reformandam denegat esse fidem.
Propositis causæ rationibus, alter, utrinque,
Concurrere pares, et cecidere pares.
Quod fuit in votis, fratrem capit alter—
uterque;
Quod fuit in fatiis, perdit uterque fidem.
Captivi gemini sine captivante fuerunt,
Et victor victi transfuga castra petit.
Quod genus hoc pugnae est, ubi victus
gaudet uterq;
Et tamen alteruter se superasse dolet.

TRANSLATION.

Between two brothers, more than civil
foes,
On dubious points a strange contention
rose;
This stood prepar'd for Luther's faith to
fall,
That stoutly argued it no faith at all.
The strife began—they clos'd—and strange
to tell,
Fought till both gain'd the triumph and
both fell.
Each thus obtain'd the champion's wish'd-
for meed,
And each resign'd to each his fav'rite
creed;
Without a chief both foes were captive led,
And victors both before the vanquish'd
fled.
But not alone in this was wonder found,
That both were conquer'd, and that both
were crown'd,
For each retir'd his own defeat to bless,
And each, through life, bemoan'd his own
success.

T. N. T.

THE PRINCESS CHARLOTTE OF
WALES.

The bud of promise nipt, alas! full soon
Reclined the lovely stem in withered
state,
Nor could, "though watered by a nation's
tears,"
The mould its precious charge re-ani-
mate.
But, there's a soil more genial, where this
plant
Shall gain a livelier root, a prospered
rise,
And, cherished there, shall bloom eternally,
The ornament and pride of Paradise.

J. D. B. C.

HYMN.

Jesus wept. John x. ver. 35.

At death's fell power, the balmy tears,
 From our illustrious Teacher fell,
 Yet did they chase away the fears
 Of those that Jesus lov'd so well!

All hail Benevolence! by thee
 Our "Pilgrim Prophet's" life was led,
 Active, while yet he deign'd to be,
 And blessing, when he join'd the dead!

For this thy followers breathe the vow,
 And look to thee in radiance bright,
 And sigh for that "Eternal now,"
 That knows nor death, nor sin, nor
 night!

Yet tho' beset by death and sin,
 Whilst thro' this world we weary move,
 Sweet sympathy may dwell within,
 A ray from God—for "God is love!"
Homerton, Dec. 16, 1817. C.

HYMN.

Nature the Servant, the virtuous Mind the Temple, of the Deity!

Dost thou the Lord of nature seek,
 (Prompted by unremitting care)
 With heart sincere and spirit meek,
 Thro' pathless regions of the air?

Can earth, thro' all her climates shew
 The place of his resplendent throne?
 Her Opal's blaze, her Sapphire's glow
 Are vain, as vainest visions flown!

Go, ask the threat'ning vaults beneath,
 The dwellings of primeval fires,
 If where their flaming billows breathe
 The Lord of nature e'er retires?

Or dost thou think the rolling sea
 Will shew his throne without disguise?
 Search—but alas 'twill fruitless be,
 From tropic unto polar skies!

"No," each will tell you, "we obey
 His will, and change as he ordains;
 Before his frown we fly away;
 His smile our destin'd course regains!

"His temple is the virtuous mind,
 Illum'd with love of human kind:
 Where'er we stop, where'er we stray,
 We are his servants and obey:

"Through him, we change this earthly ball;
 Himself th' unchanging Lord of All!
 And air, and earth, and fire, and sea,
 May change, but He's Eternity!"
Homerton. C.

SLEEP.

Though death's strong likeness in thy form
 we trace,
 Come Sleep and fold me in thy soft em-
 brace;
 Come, gentle sleep, that sweetest blessing
 give,
 To die thus living, and thus dead to live.
 T. C. H.

HYMN.

Jesus Teaching the People.

How sweetly flowed the gospel's sound
 From lips of gentleness and grace,
 When listening thousands gathered round,
 And joy and reverence filled the place!

From heaven he came—of heaven he spoke,
 To heaven he led his followers' way;
 Dark clouds of gloomy night he broke,
 Unveiling an immortal day.

"Come, wanderers, to my Father's home,
 "Come, all ye weary ones and rest!"
 Yes! sacred Teacher,—we will come—
 Obey thee,—love thee and be blest!

Decay then, tenements of dust!
 Pillars of earthly pride, decay!
 A nobler mansion waits the just,
 And Jesus has prepared the way.

A.

VERSES

Written in a Daughter's Biographical Dictionary.

Biography, that lends to fame
 Far more than brass or marble can,
 Through ages bears the favour'd name
 And paints the motley actor, *man*.

His transient scenes of bliss or care,
 Now sunk in more than tragic woe,
 Now midst ambition's strife to dare,
 Or, happier, seek what sages know.

Mark, then, whom science, rank or pow'r,
 Rais'd from the crowd, in other days,
 Nor e'er forget th' advancing hour
 When virtue, only, shall have praise.

PATERNUS.

EPITAPH

On Mr. Joseph Pattison, of Maldon, who died June 11th, 1817, in the 89th year of his age.

The Patriarch, gather'd to his mortal rest,
 His children—they rise up, and call him
 blest;
 The live-long day, with faith and virtue
 pass'd,
 How calm the ev'ning hour, how bright
 the last!

He saw his children's children round him
 stand,
 And left the world, content, at Heav'n's
 command,
 While grateful love would each fond art
 engage
 To soothe the languors of his drooping age,
 And caught, as off'ring still some tender
 care,
 The last faint breath of nature's falt'ring
 pray'r:
 He sleeps in Jesus, to await the hour,
 When Death shall own the deathless Savi-
 our's pow'r.

J. T. R.

OBITUARY.

Brief Memoir of Mrs. Jones, of Manchester, by Mrs. Cuppe.

Important as I may deem it to the living, that a character so admirable as that of the late Mrs. Jones should be long remembered by them for their benefit, I should hardly have ventured upon writing her memoir, conscious of being incompetent to do justice to the subject, had I not been desired to make the attempt by her excellent husband, whose sorrow for her loss will end only with his life; who well knew her worth, and whose great consolation it now is, that for a long series of years he was most happy, to the utmost of his power, in constantly promoting and in enabling her to execute those extensive plans of benevolence and charity to which her life was devoted.

MRS. JONES was the eldest daughter of the Rev. Joseph Bourne, minister of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Hindley, in Lancashire, whose life was published, together with that of his highly-respected father, by the late Dr. Toulmin, in the year 1808, and who died in the year 1765, leaving a widow and six children. Mrs. Jones spent the following three years under the care of her grandmother, Mrs. Bourne, at Birmingham, of whom she always spoke with affection and gratitude for the benefits she received from her excellent religious and moral instruction, and which probably first formed in her mind those just principles of rational and fervent piety for which she was afterwards distinguished, and which were still further cultivated and confirmed by her great intimacy with the Rev. Philip Holland, of Bolton, who, together with Mrs. Holland, took great pains to render permanent those just and important affections. She was married in June 1785, to Samuel Jones, Esq. of Green Hill, near Manchester, a gentleman whose views and principles harmonized perfectly with her own. But though placed by this connexion in circumstances of great affluence, she was not ambitious of being distinguished by any species of vain display, or of engaging in a round of fashionable dissipation, where she might perhaps have figured with some eclat. It was not her desire to attract admiration, but, on the contrary, to make it her daily study how most effectually to shew her gratitude, for the advantages she possessed, to the great Giver of all good, by supplying the wants and alleviating the distresses to the utmost of her power, of every member of his large family with whom she was connected, or to whom her kindness could possibly extend, and this in the wisest and most judicious manner. Not one of her early friends or former associates did she ever forget or neglect, always considering

how best to promote their interests without taking them out of that station in which Providence had placed them. I had not the privilege of her acquaintance till the year 1805, when, being instrumental in bringing forward the effusions of an unlettered muse in this city,* Mrs. Jones was so deeply interested in her story, that she wrote to make her the offer of becoming mistress of a school for forty girls, near her own house, conducted at her sole expense, and which she herself daily visited; and ever since that time I have had the happiness of cultivating and enjoying an intimate and confidential friendship.

She suffered for the last two years under a very painful and distressing disease, which, on the 27th of last month, put a period to her valuable life. I had an excellent letter from her, written on the 17th, in quite her own characteristic manner—scarcely adverting to her own sufferings, although she was fully aware of what must speedily be the termination, but full of the tenderest anxiety for a most amiable young relative, whose every hope of happiness in this world appeared to have been completely destroyed but a very few days preceding, by the sudden and unexpected death of one most deservedly dear to her, and to whom she was very soon to have been united.—It was the leading feature of my friend's mind, to withdraw herself as it were from every selfish solicitude in the unwearied endeavour to alleviate, and, if possible, to remove the anxieties and the distresses of others; thereby fully evincing, that in practice as well as in theory, she was the genuine disciple of Him, who, when about to endure all the indignities and agonies of the cross, exhorted the sorrowing daughters of Jerusalem not to weep for him, but for themselves, and for their children.

Nor was this admirable state of mind shewn only on great occasions; it was equally apparent in the more ordinary transactions, and in the minuter circumstances of life, in what may be denominated the amiable, rather than the exalted instances of virtue.

Of her extensive charities to the poor and afflicted, in clothes, in victuals, in medicines, in books, and in every other mode of assisting or instructing them, it is impossible to obtain, much less to write a particular account; the tears and lamentations of a whole district for her loss, bear testimony!

My friend Mrs. Jones was a firm, conscientious and decided Unitarian. May

* Poems by Charlotte Richardson, by subscription, of which a second edition was published in 1809.

your numerous readers, Mr. Editor, whose creed may harmonize with hers, be equally eminent for the genuine piety, the unassuming temper, the devotedness of their lives to the faithful fulfilment of every personal, relative, and social duty which so singularly adorned her character.

CATHARINE CAPPE.

York, Dec. 17, 1817.

Nov. 8, 1817, at *Stourport*, after an illness of twelve days, MR. WILLIAM ROBERTS, aged 75. He was a native of High Ercal, near Shrewsbury, but spent the chief part of his life in Kidderminster. He has left a daughter to lament his death. He was a very worthy man, a sincere friend, and ever ready to serve his fellow-men to the utmost of his ability. In all his transactions and engagements he was very exact, so that the utmost dependence might be placed on his word. No man was more free from malevolence, envy, covetousness and the selfish passions by which many are actuated. His mind was particularly formed for encountering the vicissitudes of human life. With the lot which Providence assigned him he was always content. He was a member of the New Meeting,* Kidderminster, from its commencement to his death; but in consequence of sometimes living at a distance, and his great liberality of sentiment, he often attended at other places of worship, of a very different persuasion from that to which he was more particularly attached. He thought much practical good was to be learnt from all denominations, and he used to say, when he went to hear the more orthodox, that what he found agreeable to truth he would take and omit the rest. As he claimed the liberty of forming his own opinions, so he allowed the same to others in its fullest latitude. His spirit was truly Christian, and worthy of an enlightened Dissenter. In his religious duties, from which he derived the greatest pleasure, he was most punctual and exact. He never neglected public worship when his health and circumstances would permit, and he often attended other occasional services. He was a sincere lover of the Scriptures, a portion of which he read daily, usually with Orton's or Doddridge's commentary. In the course of his life he had perused the Old and New Testament many times. Having lived free from vice, in all good conscience before God and man, and in habitual preparation for death and eternity, his latter end, as might be expected, was tranquil and happy and full of immortality.

V. V.

December 21st, in the 72nd year of his age, the Rev. ROBERT SIMPSON, D. D.

* At first Arian, now Unitarian.

theological tutor of Hoxton Academy. He was a native of Kinrosshire, in Scotland, and came to England to perfect his knowledge of a trade to which he had served an apprenticeship. Soon after his coming southwards, he became a student in the Dissenting Academy at Heckmondwike, in Yorkshire; on leaving which he settled as a minister, first at Barnsley in the same county, from whence he removed to Hastingden, Lancashire, and then to Bolton, where he resided till he came to Hoxton, to fill the office of theological tutor, which he occupied from the year 1791 to nearly the period of his dissolution. He was less distinguished for his knowledge and attainments than for his consistent and systematic theology, which was in every particular Calvinistic. Amongst his connexions, his students and his family, he was respected and esteemed for his vigorous understanding, his plainness and faithfulness, his disregard of self and the integrity and purity of his life and manners, and his habitual piety, which appeared in his private, no less than his public language and conduct. Funeral sermons were preached for him in various places, and particularly by Messrs. G. Clayton, Leifchild and Cloutt; from which last we have taken these few particulars.

December 28th, CHARLES BURNEY, D. D. He was seized on Christmas-day with an apoplectic fit, just as he was preparing for the service of the day, in his parish church of St. Paul's, Deptford, Kent. He had just completed his sixtieth year, being born on the 23rd of December, 1757. His remains were deposited in his family vault in his own church, on the Saturday following his death. The principal inhabitants of the parish attended his funeral, and having met afterwards in the Vestry-room, agreed to erect in the church, at their own expense, a monument to his memory. He was one of the best Greek scholars of the age, and his classical school was for many years, as it still continues to be, under the superintendance of his son and successor, one of the most distinguished in the kingdom.

The loss of so eminent and useful a man cannot fail to be sincerely deplored, for, having created a noble income by his industry and learning, he disbursed it with the most princely liberality, in giving largely to most of the public subscriptions, but chiefly in contributing to whatever tended to promote literature and science. Amongst a multitude of instances may be mentioned, that his veneration for Dr. Bentley induced him to print a splendid edition of his letters, under the title of *Bentleii Epistolæ*, which he enriched by his own erudite annotations, and distributed every copy of the work gratuitously. He purchased the famous *Townley Homer*,

for which MS. he paid 650 guineas, and refused a thousand, that, it is said, were offered by the University of Oxford for the precious relic, so anxious was he to complete his Greek MSS. by an addition which renders them almost invaluable: indeed his library is altogether one of the most magnificent private collections in Europe. This now passes into the possession of his son, the Rev. Charles Parr Burney, of Greenwich, and we cannot help expressing a hope that he will not allow it to be dispersed; or, rather, that he will not suffer the rare things in it to be purchased for the purpose of enriching foreign libraries. They are so truly valuable, that it would be a precious acquisition for the Bodleian Library, or the Museum.

Dr. Burney is the second luminary, in that bright constellation of learning formed by Porson, Parr and himself, that has now disappeared from our view. His family have all been conspicuous; his father, the Historian of Music, and friend of Johnson, was one of the most elegant writers of that age; his brother, Capt. Burney of the Navy, who accompanied Cook in his two last, long, enterprising, and perilous voyages, is one of the first geographers that this country possesses, a fact well supported by his voluminous and elaborate History of Voyages of Discovery; and Mad. D'Arblay, his sister, has equally distinguished herself by her well known writings.

Dr. Burney was a Fellow of the Royal and Antiquarian Societies, Chaplain to his Majesty, Rector of Deptford, and of Hooe, in Kent, and also Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral.

December 28th, at Framlingham, Mrs. Toms, wife of the Rev. S. S. Toms, of that place. Her age was great, she having been born in the year 1739-40, a year memorable for the hard winter. Infirmities had for some time been growing upon her, more however to her own sensible conviction than to that of her dearest friend: but her firmness of mind and long settled habit of order and diligence in business carried her on usefully, to her own comfort and that of her household, until Thursday, Dec. 25th, when she enjoyed her dinner and seemed as well as usual, but was soon after seized with her mortal illness. She languished till the Lord's day morning, and then sweetly fell asleep in Jesus; and God will bring her with him in the great day, for truly she was a righteous and good woman; she feared the Lord from her youth, and had ever rested satisfied with the simplest and most rational views of religion and Christianity. The funeral took place Jan. 4, the Rev. Mr. Perry, of Ipswich, officiating.

1818, Jan. 17, aged 20, after an illness of nearly three weeks, CHARLES KIRKPATRICK, youngest son of the late John Kirkpatrick, Esq. of Mount Pleasant, in the Isle of Wight. This interesting young man died in London, where he was preparing himself most actively and reputably for commercial life. His remains were interred in Bunhill Fields, in the family vault of Mr. Joseph Travers.

Suicide of Dr. Black.

ALL our readers, says *The Dublin Evening Post*, are acquainted with the name of Dr. Black; all know that as a light of our Presbyterian church, he was one of the most eminent in the north of Ireland, and that as a political character he has filled no inconsiderable space in the history of Ireland. The following particulars we have derived from a letter, dated Londonderry, December 4:—"The Reverend Dr. Black, who, you know, was a leading member of the General Synod of Ulster, Guardian and Treasurer of the Widows' Fund, Treasurer and Distributor of the *Regium Donum*, &c. walked out of his house about midday, as usual with him, and transacted business, without any visible change in his deportment, except that he appeared somewhat more thoughtful and downcast. About a quarter before four o'clock he walked to the wooden bridge, and after he passed through the toll-gate, and had proceeded about half way across the bridge, he took off his outside coat and hat, which he gave to a boy who was near him, and immediately threw himself over the side railing into the river Foyle. The boy gave a shriek, and raised an alarm, but there being no person near at hand, it was some time before any one could even attempt to render assistance. The body was seen twice at the top of the water, and those who had the best opportunity of viewing it say, he struggled against swimming, and endeavoured to plunge downwards. The entire population assembled in less than twenty-minutes, but the body had then totally disappeared. The dead-grapples, &c. were immediately set to work, but to no purpose; indeed, the dusk of the evening, and now the darkness of the night, prevents all hope of the body being discovered, at least till tomorrow. The cries of his family would grieve any one. The whole city is at this moment as if panic-struck. The Doctor preached a most excellent sermon in the Meeting-House here last Sunday. No one can tell, and few venture to give an opinion, as to the cause of this melancholy business. He wallowed in worldly riches, and appeared perfectly happy in his domestic affairs."

DEATHS ABROAD.

Lately, at Paris, **COUNTESS DILLON**, cousin german to Josephine, the first wife of Bonaparte, and mother to the Lady of General Bertrand, now in the island of Saint Helena. Countess Dillon was the relict of the late Honourable Arthur Dillon, Lieutenant-General and Colonel Proprietor of the Irish Brigade Regiment bearing his name in the service of France, and brother to the late Charles Viscount Dillon, and the Hon. Dowager Lady Jerminham. Few persons have suffered greater domestic afflictions than this lady: her husband, General Dillon, to whom she was tenderly attached, perished in 1793 upon the scaffold, among the crowd of victims immolated to the Demon of Revolutionary France: her favourite daughter, the late Dutchess of Fitzjames, fell an early victim to consumption: and she lived to witness the perpetual exile of her sole remaining daughter, under circumstances which precluded even the consolation of complaint.

The sciences have lately sustained a great loss by the death of the Abbé SCOPPA, at Naples. He was a nobleman of Messina, and Director of the Schools of the English

System, lately established in the kingdom: he was in the very prime of life. His work "On the Poetical Beauties of all Languages, considered in respect to the Accent and *Rhythmus*," obtained, in 1815, the prize given by the French Institution.

The **MARQUIS D'ANTONELLE**, better known in the Revolutionary History of France by the name of Pierre Antoine, died lately at Arles, his native place, aged 70. He was a Member of the Convention, in which he acted a very distinguished part; was persecuted by Robespierre; pursued by the Directory; and neglected by Bonaparte. His political writings were numerous and memorable for their ability. He was one of the principal editors of the famous *Journal des Hommes Libres*. At the restoration of the Bourbons, in 1814, he published a pamphlet, in which he openly embraced their cause.

1817. In October, at Vienna, aged 92, the **BARON DE JACQUIN**, one of the first naturalists in Europe, the rival and friend of Linnæus.

REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS.

Protest against the Church Missionary Society, holden at the Town-Hall, in the City of Bath, under the presidency of the Hon. and Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Gloucester, on Monday, the 1st day of December, 1817.

By the Rev. J. Thomas, A.M. Archdeacon of Bath.

My Lord Vice-Patron, and President of this Meeting,

A CHURCH Society holding a meeting within this city, and presided over by a Bishop of the Church of England, will, I presume, allow the right of the Archdeacon of Bath, to declare his sentiments on the subject of their meeting. As I am not in the habit of attending such meetings, and do not choose "to talk without book," I beg leave to deliver my opinions from this paper; to which I can hereafter resort, if I see occasion.

I desire, however, before I proceed, that it be understood, that my attendance on this meeting is altogether *official*: and, therefore, as I conclude that I am addressing a Church Assembly, I shall speak as a Churchman to Churchmen; and if I should bring some strange things to the ears of many, they will be such as the Hon. and Right Rev. Vice-Patron, who presides over this meeting, cannot, as a bishop, disallow;

however obsolete they may have become through disuse.

However I may and do revere the piety and well-intended zeal of some individuals, whom I know to be members of this Missionary Society, I scruple not to express my convictions:

I. That this Church Missionary Society was originally unnecessary; because the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, was, and is in existence, and in action.

II. That several of the rules and regulations of this Church Missionary Society, and especially the means which it employs to increase its funds, are utterly unworthy of the name which it *would assume*—that of a Church of England Society.

III. That this Church Missionary Society tends to the subversion of ecclesiastical order, and to promote and augment divisions among the members, and especially the Clergy of the Church of England; being plainly supported in conformity to the views of a NEW SECT in the Church: a Sect, of which the adherents distinguish themselves by the names of SERIOUS CHRISTIANS and EVANGELICAL MINISTERS.

IV. That the formation of a branch of this Missionary Society, in this city, will be pernicious; because it will promote religious feuds here, as similar speculations

have done in other places.—Of each of these in their order.

1. I said that this institution was originally unnecessary:—The Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts has been in existence and in usefulness, but, though a Church of England Society, little encouraged, more than a hundred years. It is probable that many of this auditory, in all respects qualified to be members of that Society, never heard of its name. To them I take leave to recommend it, not as a new project, but as an established and orderly system. And certainly the zeal and the liberality of members of the Church of England, would be more consistently employed in the support of that, than in the formation of any new Society.

2. I said that I considered some of the Rules and Regulations of this Church Missionary Society, and especially the means which it employs to increase its funds, to be utterly unworthy the name which it would assume; viz. that of a Church of England Society. For example—Is it worthy of the Church of England, is it worthy of the members of the Church of England, to authorize persons to go about, collecting pence and farthings from servants, school-boys and apprentices, in order that the collectors of one shilling per week, or five shillings per month, may be elevated into members—of a Church of England Society? And, moreover, be tempted to the additional honour of voting at meetings, of receiving copies of the Annual Report and Sermon; and one number of the Missionary Register? This is the statement in Rule VI. of your Report: but I proceed to other matter.

3. I said that this Society tends to the subversion of ecclesiastical order, and to promote and augment divisions among the members, and especially the Clergy of the Church of England. Can a stronger proof of this assertion be offered than is, at this moment, exhibited before your eyes? Here you have the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Gloucester presiding in the chief city of the diocese of Bath and Wells, over the formation of a Society, which the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells **DISCLAIMS**. Does the honourable and Right Reverend Vice-Patron of this Church of England Missionary Society know this fact? If not, by what rule, not of apostolical authority, but of common propriety, does he invade the province of his venerable brother? By what right does he come hither, thrusting his sickle into another man's harvest? Perhaps he thought the husbandmen asleep! I trust that he will find us waking and watchful.—But if his Lordship *did* know the sentiments of *his* venerable Diocesan as well as mine (for the Dean of Wells is as much under canonical rule as any other clergyman), I ask, if his Lordship *did* know the sentiments of his venerable Dio-

cesan as well as mine, could he give a more decisive proof of his indifference to the dignity of the high office to which he has been but a few years consecrated, as well as of his contempt of ecclesiastical order?

BUT THIS IS A CHURCH OF ENGLAND SOCIETY!! Where are the majority of the Established Clergy of this city and of the neighbourhood, that they attend not to support a meeting, convened under that assumption? Did they not hear of it? Was it possible for them not to hear of it? Did not the newspapers announce, not only the public meeting of this society, but that, *to promote the views of this Institution a Sermon would be preached by the Honourable and Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, at the OCTAGON CHAPEL?* (I quote the very words of the Advertisement.) I ask again, where are the majority of the Established Clergy of this city and neighbourhood, that they attend not to support this Church of England Society? Perhaps it may be said that the archdeacon influenced their minds. The archdeacon solemnly declares, that he has not communicated, nor authorized any person to communicate, to any one of them his intention to be here.

But I have said, that this Church Missionary Society is plainly supported in conformity to the views of a **NEW SECT** in the Church; a Sect, of which the adherents distinguish themselves by the names of **SERIOUS CHRISTIANS, and EVANGELICAL MINISTERS**. I go further. That this society is in any respect calculated to promote the sober, orderly, manly, intelligent and intelligible piety of the Church of England, I do utterly deny. I look at the names of the prime and principal promoters of this project; names, I allow, of the highest respectability on many accounts, but certainly of very little weight in the balance of the Church of England; since some of the parties, to whom those names belong, have not scrupled to communicate with those, who renounce her doctrines and discipline.

Do not imagine that I mean to speak with disrespect of **CONSCIENTIOUS DISSIDENTS**. I quarrel with no man for his religious creed. I love honesty, though I may think it perverse. I venerate piety, though I may think it erroneous. But those respectable Dissenters do not halt between two opinions; they are not of the church to-day, and of the meeting-house to-morrow; and we know their meaning. But do the ministers of any Dissenting community go about proclaiming the insufficiency, the worldly-mindedness, and the want of gospel-zeal in their own brethren? Does any party of Ministers, in any communion, among them, assume to itself all the piety and all the virtues of the common function; or look down with supercilious horror on their less assuming bre-

thren? Does any minister among the Dissenters, intrude upon the charge of a brother-minister, not only without leave, but in defiance of all denial?—No. These are perfections of religious zeal, peculiar to certain elect persons, who have set up this, and some other institutions, calling themselves serious Christians, and Evangelical Ministers.

SERIOUS CHRISTIANS! What? Is no man in earnest respecting the mercies of God in the redemption of mankind? Is no man serious in his faith, and earnest in his religious and moral duties? Has no man a regard for the salvation of souls, except this party?

EVANGELICAL MINISTERS too! Why more evangelical than their brethren—who have received the same apostolical ordination; profess the same faith; have taken the same oaths; use the same form of sound words in the services of the same church, and exercise the same priesthood at the same altar? I speak to members of the Church of England (for such, by the title of the meeting, I may fairly conclude all present to be): and I ask, in what sense, but as the Shibboleth of a party, this exclusive title of *Evangelical* can be assumed by ministers of the Church of England over their brethren; over men, in every respect, whether of piety, of morals, or of learning, *at least*, their equals? I ask, why I cease to be a true minister of the gospel, because I disdain to join a Sect, whose disorderly proceedings I disapprove?

Respecting this Church of England Missionary Society, I beg leave to call the attention of the meeting, to two extraordinary circumstances:—*First*, that on looking over the list of Vice-Patrons, I see the names of *only two bishops*: one, the Hon. and Right Rev. Prelate here present; the other, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Norwich! Now, if this Society were founded on principles so firm and so evangelical, by what fatality did it happen that the other bishops did not join it at first? Nay, how comes it to pass, that they have *not come in on conviction*? I can readily account for the reluctance of a man to tread back the hollow and rotten ground over which he has travelled: *but this reluctance to set foot on firm ground; on the ground of the Church of England!* This is a mystery too deep for me to fathom.

Secondly, the next extraordinary circumstance is, that among the list of high persons on THE REPORT of this Church of England Missionary Society for THE EAST, I see not the name of the only person who can give either order or consistency to their proceedings in that quarter of the globe. I mean THE TRULY LEARNED AND SOUND BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.—What! was that great man solicited to take under his care and controul—which, as the Hon. and

Right Rev. Vice-Patron knows, the Church of England would demand—was that great man solicited to take under his care and controul the pious missionaries, who should be sent into his diocese from this society; and did he refuse to receive them? Or, did the steady adherents to the Church of England, who projected this society, never apply to his Lordship for that purpose? I profess myself utterly ignorant on both these questions. But of this I am certain, viz. that “the concerns of the Society in the North of India” are stated in THE REPORT, under the article MISSION, to be under no other authority or controul, than “the management of a corresponding committee.” A Church of England Missionary Society, under the MANAGEMENT (that is the word) of A CORRESPONDING COMMITTEE!!! I have indeed heard, but I will not assert it as a fact, a circumstance, that would solve these difficulties, to wit, that the leading persons of the London Missionary Society, which consists of persons of *all kinds of religious persuasions*, are on the best of terms with the leading persons of THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR AFRICA AND THE EAST. This circumstance, if true, would also account for other circumstances in the history of restless and disorderly pietists, compassing sea and land to gain proselytes, and disturbing their own country with religious contention.

4. I now proceed to the last consideration, viz. that the formation of a Branch Society in this place would be pernicious.

The peace of the city is hardly yet restored from the confusion occasioned by a religious feud, in which, (where the blame lay is no question at present), but in which the Rector was not only insulted, grossly insulted, in the performance of his duty, in his own parish-church; but was compelled to resort to the police officers to protect him from personal outrage. For my part, I declare my opinion, that if you proceed to gratify the same PARTY, who generated that feud, with the triumph of a Church Missionary Society, in the furtherance of which that PARTY is chiefly interested, *and they too are members of the Church*, you will renew the feuds, which may otherwise sink into oblivion; and will render Bath, like a neighbouring city, a hot-bed of heresy and schism. And sure I am, that the mischiefs which you will occasion at home, will never be compensated by any good that a society, so formed and managed, can do abroad.

Permit me here to observe, that if any person supposes me to be hostile to the *professed* object of this Church Missionary Society, viz. the universal diffusion of the knowledge of the mercies of God in Christ Jesus, he totally mistakes both my principles and my character. The *professed*

object of this society is, I trust, as dear to my heart, as it is to the most zealous of your members, as it is to the Honourable and Right Reverend Vice-Patron himself. But that grand purpose will never be furthered, much less accomplished, by such means as are offered or afforded, by an irregular association like this; an association of a character so equivocal, that had not the Lords Bishops of Gloucester and of Norwich honoured it with their exemplary names, it might as well be supposed a Church of Rome Society, or a Scottish Kirk Society, or a Swedenborgian Church Society, as to pertain to the Church of England. No—the conversion of the Heathen to the faith of the Son of God, must be founded, as at the beginning, on a system of ORDER and of UNION; ministered by men duly qualified and orderly consecrated to their holy office. On such system, and on such men *alone*, can the grace of the Eternal Spirit, the God of order and of unity, and not of confusion, be reasonably expected to descend. The ground-work, and little more than the ground-work of such a system is now laid in the EAST, founded on a regular apostolical commission, under the superintendance of a sound apostolical bishop. But with neither of these, it seems, does this Church Missionary Society hold communion. But, whether that be the fact or not, I call on you, as members of the Church of England, to look to that Church.

You are summoned hither to discuss the propriety of establishing a Branch of this Church Missionary Society in this city, under the patronage, not of the Lord Bishop of this Diocese, but of the Lord Bishop of Gloucester; who, himself, as Dean of Wells, owes canonical obedience to the Bishop of Bath and Wells; and who, moreover, has no manner of jurisdiction in this city, nor in this diocese, beyond his deanery.

AS THE ARCHDEACON OF BATH,—

In the name of the Lord Bishop of this Diocese, in my own name, in the name of the Rectors of Bath, and in the name of nineteen-twentieths of the clergy in my jurisdiction,—

I PROTEST against the formation of such society in this city.

Whether, or in what manner, the Hon. and Right Rev. Vice-Patron and his friends will condescend to notice THIS PROTEST, I shall not stay to see.

Address of the Dissenters at Derby to the Prince Regent: agreed upon December 1, 1817.

To His Royal Highness George Prince of Wales, Regent of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

May it please your Royal Highness,

We, the undersigned, the Ministers of the Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist

Denominations of Protestant Dissenters in Derby, on behalf of ourselves and the members of our respective congregations, approach your Royal Highness with feelings of dutiful and loyal attachment and of unfeigned sympathy.

It would be vain to attempt the expression of that sorrow which fills our hearts at the recollection of the irreparable loss which your Royal Highness has been called to sustain. That heavenly Providence which rules over all, and whose wisdom we can neither fathom nor arraign, has removed from the world your illustrious daughter; and at a time, and under circumstances, which to human apprehension rendered her continuance here the most to be desired.

To dwell on the virtuous and amiable character of Her Royal Highness, would be only to repeat the praises which fall from every tongue; and we fear to dwell on a subject which, in the poignancy of your Royal Highness's affliction, might tend rather to renew your sorrows than to alleviate them. If effectual consolation were in our power, it would be our greatest happiness to open every source of it to your Royal Highness; but He alone can bind up the heart who has broken it, and to the Source of all good, whose ways, though mysterious, are always merciful, our prayers are addressed, that he will grant such portions of his all-powerful aid as may support your Royal Highness under this awful dispensation of his power.

We trust, also, that your Royal Highness will derive some alleviation of your grief, from the assurance of the affectionate and loyal attachment which pervades all ranks of people in these United Kingdoms.

We offer it to the consideration of your Royal Highness as a source of no mean satisfaction, that a spirit of union and loyalty exists among the people of these realms which cannot be exceeded, and that every attempt to disturb the tranquillity of the empire has proved abortive.

Addressing your Royal Highness from a county which has been represented (unjustly as we believe) to be disaffected to the government of your Royal Highness, we have the highest pleasure in congratulating your Royal Highness on the very decisive testimony which was repeatedly borne by the Judges on the bench during the late trials for high treason, to the steady loyalty of the people at large, a loyalty which no intimidation could for a moment shake.

It was with infinite regret that we observed occasional statements of the transactions which have disturbed our county, in which it was attempted to implicate the Dissenters in the recent outrages. That undeviating fidelity which the Protestant Dissenters have ever exhibited to the illus-

trious family of your Royal Highness, ought to have been sufficient to secure them as a body from such unfounded insinuations. And on mature inquiry, we have a confident satisfaction in assuring your Royal Highness, that not an individual connected with any religious society of the Three Denominations of Dissenters was in any degree implicated in the disgraceful occurrences so promptly and so happily suppressed.

In veneration of those principles of civil and religious liberty, which we have ever been foremost to avow, principles which seated and maintain the family of your Royal Highness on the throne of these United Kingdoms, and in zealous attachment to the venerated institutions of our country as secured by our invaluable constitution, we trust we shall steadily persevere.

To defend the land of our birth against foreign aggression, its tranquillity against the efforts of faction, its institutions against the encroachments of power, are our duties as patriots; to yield a ready submission to the laws and constituted authorities of the State, is the first lesson which we learn as subjects; to embrace every fit opportunity of expressing our dutiful attachment to our Sovereign and his family, is our privilege as Britons. In these characters we now address your Royal Highness, beseeching your Royal Highness to receive our professions of loyalty and affection, and our assurances that your Royal Highness will ever find us among the most faithful of his Majesty's subjects.

Williams's Library, Red Cross Street.

December 9, 1817.

At an Extraordinary Meeting of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations,

Resolved unanimously, That having so recently been admitted into the presence of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, to offer our congratulations on the auspicious nuptials of his Royal Daughter and his Serene Highness Prince Leopold of Saxe Cobourg, and having had the honour of personally addressing the Illustrious and Happy Pair on the same event, we cannot but feel, most powerfully, the sad reverse of circumstances occasioned by the lamented death of the Princess Charlotte and her Son.

That though we deem it most expedient and respectable to abstain from such communications of our condolence on the mournful occasion, as might revive the painful sensations which must have agitated the minds of her Royal Parents and his Serene Highness Prince Leopold; we do, nevertheless, consider it our duty, as a body, to testify our deep sense of the great loss which the nation has sustained by that afflictive event.

That, from the talents and acquirements of her Royal Highness, from her attachment to those principles of true freedom, civil and religious, which have been the basis of our country's felicity and glory, from the countenance which her public conduct and domestic virtues afforded to the interests of good morals, and the exercises of devotion and piety, and from her courteous and condescending manners, we were led to anticipate, in common with the country at large, extensive blessings to the community under her rule, if she had lived to fill the throne of this United Kingdom.

That the Almighty having been pleased, in the course of his Providence, to disappoint our sanguine hopes, by removing her, we trust, to a better world, we bow in humble submission beneath his chastening rod, and hope and pray, that the Universal Sovereign will cause good to arise out of this national affliction, and that he may still continue to be "a wall of fire round about, and the glory in the midst" of our land.

(Signed) JOHN RIPPON, Chairman.

Ukase, addressed to the Legislative Synod at Moscow, by Alexander, Emperor of Russia.

Dated from Moscow, Oct. 27, 1817.

DURING my late travels through the provinces, I was obliged, to my no small regret, to listen to speeches pronounced by certain of the Clergy in different parts, which contained unbecoming praises of me, praises which can only be ascribed unto God. And as I am convinced, in the depth of my heart, of the Christian truth, that every blessing floweth unto us through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ alone, and that every man, be he who he may, without Christ, is full only of evil, therefore to ascribe unto me the glory of deeds, in which the hand of God had been so evidently manifested before the whole world, is to give unto men that glory which belongeth unto Almighty God alone.

I account it my duty, therefore, to forbid all such unbecoming expressions of praise, and recommend to the Holy Synod, to give instructions to all the Diocesan Bishops, that they themselves, and the Clergy under them, may, on similar occasions, in future, refrain from all such expressions of praise so disagreeable to my ears; and that they may render unto the Lord of Hosts alone, thanksgivings for the blessings bestowed upon us, and pray for the outpouring of his Grace upon all of us; conforming themselves in this matter to the words of Sacred Writ, which requires us to render to the King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the only wise God, honour and glory for ever and ever.

ALEXANDER.

INTELLIGENCE.

*Unitarian Fellowship Fund at St.
Thomas's, London.*

Jan. 26, 1818.

SIR,

SINCE the appearance in your valuable Miscellany of Dr. Thomson's excellent plan and regulations of Congregational Fellowship Funds, its pages have been occasionally occupied by accounts of the establishment of such Funds in various parts of the country. I have now the gratification of reporting the formation of another of them in the metropolis, in the religious society with which I have the honour of being connected. At a general meeting of the congregation of St. Thomas's, in the Borough, held yesterday, in the chapel, after the morning service, it was unanimously resolved, that there should be established, at that place, a Fellowship Fund, to be called "The St. Thomas's Unitarian Fellowship Fund," and the names of about a hundred subscribers were instantly announced. The regulations differ in no material respect from those of other similar institutions. The monies to be raised are to be applied "to aid, as occasion may require, in defraying the expenses of conducting public worship at St. Thomas's chapel, to furnish contributions towards the erection or the repairs of other places of worship, to assist small and indigent congregations in procuring religious instruction, to aid in the education of young men for the ministry, to support the Unitarian Fund, and any other society instituted for the promotion of Christian truth and piety, and to grant occasional relief in cases of personal distress."

A subscription of one penny a week, or five shillings annually, to constitute a member; a payment of three guineas at one time to constitute a member for life; and donations of any amount to be received.

For the management of the business, a committee of twelve gentlemen has been appointed, of whom eight have been selected from among the young persons in the congregation; it being thought highly expedient to give this important class in our religious society an interest in such proceedings, and thus to train them up for more extensive services hereafter in the advancement of the same great cause.

The office of president has been conferred on the minister for the time being. S. S. Spyring, Esq. of the Borough, has accepted the office of treasurer; and Thos. Wood, Esq. of the Kent Road, that of secretary for the present year.

VOL. XIII.

L

I am induced to trouble you with this statement, in order that the subject of these institutions may be kept continually before the public mind, and that other congregations may be stimulated by such examples to adopt them. There is no calculating on their importance were they to become general among us.

THOMAS REES.

Kidderminster Fellowship Fund.

SIR,

Nov. 11, 1817.

Esteeming the Fellowship Fund as being well calculated for the important purpose of bringing Unitarian congregations into greater co-operation for serving the cause of truth and benevolence, I have been gratified by seeing the several instances of its being adopted, as recorded in your useful Repository. And considering it proper, and conducive to its further success, that Unitarians in general should have the means of knowing how extensively this valuable institution is approved, it appears desirable that every instance of its being established should be similarly announced. I therefore send for insertion in your next, if room can be spared, a copy of the resolutions of the Fellowship Fund Society lately formed at Kidderminster.

RICHARD FRY.

New Meeting Fellowship Fund Society.

At a meeting of the congregation, assembling at the New Meeting-House, Kidderminster, held in the Vestry, October 26, 1817, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, 1. That in the opinion of this society, it is desirable that a Fund should be forthwith established, to be called the New-Meeting Fellowship Fund.

2. That the objects of this Fund be, to afford some assistance to such congregations as may stand in need of help for providing places of worship, and for the support of the Christian religion—to contribute aid to academical institutions for the education of young men for the ministry—to exhibit relief to infirm or incapacitated ministers—and to co-operate with similar societies in such other beneficial purposes as may appear expedient; all the cases entertained being viewed as consistent with a strict regard to the Divine Unity.

3. That the above Fund be formed and maintained by voluntary donations, and a quarterly contribution of at least one shilling, to be paid in the vestry to the Treasurer or his Deputy, on the Lord's day immediately preceding every quarter day,

of which public notice shall be given a week before, together with some statement of the cases to be then proposed to the attention of the society.

4. That on the days when the quarterly subscriptions are paid, such occasions as may occur for exhibiting benefactions, agreeably to the previous notice, are to be submitted to the consideration of all the subscribers who may choose to attend, and that no part of this Fund shall be appropriated to any purpose but with the approbation and concurrence of those who are present; to be decided by a majority of votes, the chairman having the casting vote.

5. That should any case arise appearing to some of the members of this society such an emergency as is worthy of its immediate attention, a special meeting of the subscribers may be called by the Secretary on any other Lord's day, for taking the same into their consideration.

6. That a Treasurer and Secretary be annually appointed by the subscribers; and that Mr. Watson be now requested to be the Treasurer, and Mr. Fry the Secretary for the year ensuing.

7. That the foregoing resolutions, as containing the standing rules of the New-Meeting Fellowship Society, be inserted in a book to be provided for its use, in which the names of the subscribers, and the accounts of their Fund shall be regularly entered, and which shall be open for their inspection at every meeting.

P. S. Under a persuasion of the importance of observing the scriptural rules, "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased;" and, "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ," all, to whom it may appear eligible, without distinction of sex or age, are invited to become subscribers to the above institution, which promises, in conjunction with others of the like nature, to be extensively useful; and the contributions are brought so low as one shilling per quarter that it may include a considerable proportion of the congregation. Donations towards the first establishment of the Fund, and for speedily administering assistance to cases already known, will be received by the Treasurer at any time, and the smallest will be very acceptable.

State of the Fellowship Fund, Swansea.

Sat, Swansea, Jan. 13, 1818.

In the name of the Unitarian church in this place, I congratulate you and the friends of the interest in general, on the formation of new Fellowship Funds, which almost every new number of the Repository

is announcing. We rejoice that a scheme, which we were among the first to adopt, appears likely to be generally adopted; because we are persuaded that by the small contribution of a penny a week, which scarcely any individual will feel to be an effort, it is calculated to become a very powerful instrument for the promotion of our common cause. We have no desire to make an ostentatious display of our own zeal. But now that our scheme has been in operation a year, we think we may be doing good by informing the Unitarian public of its progress. It may serve to keep up attention to the subject, and perhaps encourage and stimulate the exertions of others.

The Penny Subscription (strictly so called, because it has been limited to a penny a week from each subscriber) has produced, in the year, fourteen pounds, in addition to the money raised in our small congregation for general purposes, such as the minister's salary, the repairs, the warming and the lighting of the chapel, the servants, the poor, &c. This contribution has been perfectly voluntary and cheerful, and is likely to be continued without diminution. The fund has been preserved untouched for the first year. It will continue to be kept distinct from our other funds, and will be applied to no private uses of the congregation. At our last quarterly meeting, Dec. 31, some resolutions were passed for commencing its application to use. Our first resolution was to present two pounds to the New Unitarian Church at Stainforth; which would be much more than the share of such a small society as ours towards the liquidation of their debt, if the scheme were generally adopted,* and will be sufficient, we hope, for that purpose, if followed by a proportionate contribution from the other Fellowship Funds already formed.

We next resolved to subscribe a guinea annually to the Western Unitarian Society; conceiving that we should thus be serving two useful purposes, procuring Tracts for circulation at the lowest expense, and at the same time contributing to the support of that important institution.

We determined also to take in some numbers of the Christian Reformer.

The distribution of books, and the assisting of newly formed Unitarian Societies, will be our two principal objects. And we flatter ourselves, that we shall be able to make our little fund considerably useful, and contribute to put an end to the inconvenient and unpleasant method by which money has usually been raised for building Dissenting chapels.

The intimation which you have given

* See Mon. Repos. XII. p. 251.

respecting the sale of the Monthly Repository, has not passed unnoticed among us. It is greatly to be regretted, that almost the only periodical work which is open to the free and impartial discussion of religious subjects, and which is the only public channel of mutual communication and almost the only bond of union among Unitarians, should want support, while other Magazines, which are notoriously devoted to the support of a system and a party, are in an unprecedented degree flourishing. Some pains will be taken here to procure additional purchasers for the Repository; and we trust that the general body of Unitarians will attend to the case, and not suffer so useful a work to languish for want of encouragement.

It is at the request of the members of the Swansea Fellowship Fund I make this communication. The only design of it is to excite attention to the Fellowship Scheme. We trust you will approve of it, and by giving it a place in the Repository, and inviting other similar communications, by degrees effect the union of the whole body of Unitarians in a method so easy, and at the same time so effectual, of raising the necessary funds for supporting their growing interest.

R. AWBREY.

Subscriptions for the Chapel at Tiverton.

By Mr. Aspland.

Robert Wainwright, Esq., Gray's Inn	2	2	0
Unitarian Fund	5	5	0
Unitarian Fund, Plymouth, by the Rev. I. Worsley	2	0	0
Michael Castle, Esq., Bristol	2	0	0
Amount already inserted in Mon. Repos.	87	2	3
	98	9	3

Subscription for the Unitarian Baptist Meeting-House at York.

By Mr. Eaton.

Robert Wainwright, Esq., Gray's Inn	3	3	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---

Manchester College, York.

The following sums have been received on account of the College.

Benefactions.

Rev. Matthew Anstis, Bridport, eleventh benefaction	£5	0	0
Richard Hall Clarke, Esq. Bridwell-House, near Collumpton, Devon	5	5	0
John Davis, Esq. Uckfield, Sussex,	21	0	0
Arthur Palmer, Esq. Park-Row, Bristol	21	0	0

New Annual Subscriptions.

Mr. Thomas Small	1	1	0
------------------	---	---	---

Mr. Robert Darbshire, Folds, near Bolton	1	1	0
William Walker, Esq. Potternewton, near Leeds	2	2	0
Mr. John Harrison, Manchester	1	1	0
Mr. Samuel Alcock, ditto	2	2	0
Mr. John Alcock, Gatley, near ditto	2	2	0
John Wood, Esq. Liverpool	2	2	0
Thomas Jevons, Esq. ditto	2	2	0
Rev. Joseph Brooks, Hyde, near Manchester	1	1	0
Rev. J. W. Morris, Dean-Row, near Wilmslow	1	1	0
William Mann, Esq. Rochdale	2	0	0
Rev. S. Fawcett, Yeovil, (by Mr. Aspland)	1	0	0

£71 9 0

GEO. WM. WOOD, Treasurer.

Manchester, November 1, 1817.

The Unitarians at Stainforth have very great pleasure in being able to state, that several donations to their chapel have lately been received; but that it has been deemed proper not to publish them at present. When the subscriptions shall be considered as closed, a complete list will be printed and attached to the Monthly Repository.

J. G.

Stainforth, Dec. 15, 1817.

By Mr. Aspland.

A Friend, Barrington, Somerset	5	0	0
Rev. S. Fawcett, Yeovil	1	0	0
Robert Wainwright, Esq., Gray's Inn	2	2	0

P. S. Farther subscriptions to the Stainforth Chapel will be thankfully received by Rev. R. Aspland; Mr. C. J. Y. Benson, Gray's Inn Square, London; Dr. Thomson, Leeds; Rev. P. Wright, Sheffield; and Rev. John Gaskill, Thorne.

Subscriptions to the Unitarian Chapel, Glasgow.

Additional assistance towards defraying the debt upon Union Chapel, Glasgow. [See pp. 564, 635, Vol. XII.]

Sums relinquished.

Mr. Charles Bowring, Exeter,	10	0	0
Mr. Isaac Cox, Honiton,	10	0	0

FARTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS,

By Rev. W. Hincks.

Mr. T. M. Kingdon, Exeter,	1	0	0
Mr. James Terrel, ditto,	1	0	0

By the Rev. J. Evans.

Michael Kingsford, Esq. Canterbury,	5	0	0
Rev. Sampson Kingsford, ditto,	2	0	0
Anonymous,	0	1	6
Birmingham New-Meeting Fellowship Fund,	5	0	0

SIR, Glasgow, 16th Dec. 1817.

It is with pleasure, that I am enabled to announce the foregoing contributions towards defraying the burthensome debt upon Union Chapel, Glasgow, in addition to the hundred pounds which the liberality of a few consistent friends to Christianity enabled me to bring back with me, from my visit to England last summer. I need not caution your readers, lest they suppose that the contributions recorded page 635, Vol. XII. for which the society are duly grateful, deduct any thing from the *existing debt* as announced in the Repository for last June; since these were received in the year 1812, but owing to some informality were not then publicly announced. I rely upon my knowledge of the liberality which characterizes the English Unitarians, and upon the need which the Glasgow Unitarians have of their support, when I express my expectation that they will receive still farther assistance: because there still remains a considerable amount, consisting of a part of the sum which, ever since the building of the Chapel, has by the indulgence, and contrary to the interest of an individual, remained a book debt;—and also of several sums originally lent by a few in the society, who have generously relinquished, even beyond their ability, a considerable portion of their *loans*. It is a fact, Sir, which should be announced to many of your readers, that there are Unitarians in this neighbourhood who can associate with Unitarians when in town, who will not join our party, nor give us any countenance, because, forsooth, we belong not to the “same class of society!” with yourselves. The very same reason in the primitive age would have prevented such persons from giving their countenance to the “sect every where spoken against;” among whom there were “not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble.”

I refer to this well-authenticated fact with the *sole view* of exciting the emulation of English Unitarians of worldly ability to lend a helping hand to their brethren in North Britain, struggling with difficulties from which they have power to relieve them. Never were the words of Scripture which we heard last summer so forcibly employed by Mr. Fox, more truly applicable than to the case under consideration, “Come over to Macedonia and help us;” come hither, ye friends of religious truth, when it may be convenient to you, in person; we shall be glad to receive your *countenance* and *support*, while we are worshiping our Maker, “after the way which they call heresy.” But in the meantime come hither by your pecuniary aid, which will make your presence afterwards more satisfactory to yourselves. Say

not, as some have said, “that Glasgow is a great way off;” for that liberality can scarcely be Christian liberality, which, over so insignificant a river as the Tweed, “is hardly able to force a passage.”

Nor say, that “we first incur expenses and then solicit the generosity of our brethren to enable us to discharge them.” For this objection would I fear apply but equally well to most of the cases on which your liberality has been exercised; and all impartial judges will be of opinion that few of these are superior if equal in importance to one which has for its object the progress of Unitarianism in Glasgow. Nor intimate that in the year 1812, the society were “too sanguine,” and built “too large a chapel!” for it appears to me that one containing about six hundred sittings, could scarcely be too large to accommodate the probable number of Unitarians that would issue from a population of more than 12000 souls, in the midst of whom, science, and the arts, and literature flourish; and the want of *places of worship* among whom, has been computed by Dr. Chalmers to be so great, that he recommends the erection of *twenty new churches*.

I may have written, Sir, with more boldness on this subject, than would be becoming in one of the *Glasgow Society*; but as I still consider myself as an English Unitarian, though separated by so great a distance from my relations and my early friends, perhaps some may be found who will pardon me this wrong.

I am, Sir, with best respects to yourself, and to all your able coadjutors in the cause of pure religion, and with best wishes for the increasing reputation of your useful Miscellany, as a means of advancing the same great end,

BENJAMIN MARDON.

[It is submitted to the consideration of those gentlemen who have the management of the liberal contributions towards the proposed *Greenock* chapel, whether, as that design seems to be for the present abandoned, the monies might not be properly transferred to the use of the brethren at *Glasgow* and *Edinburgh*? ED.]

LITERARY.

SIR, Clapton, Jan. 28, 1818.

I BEG leave, among your Intelligence, to inform the Subscribers to Dr. Priestley's Works, that the Third Volume, containing the *Examination, Introductory Essays, Disquisitions, &c.*, is now ready for delivery at Mr. Eaton's; and that a fourth volume, including the *Free Discussion*, the remainder of the *Metaphysical Works*, and the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, will be ready for delivery, at the same place, on Friday, the 27th February next.

J. T. RUTT.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

SEVERAL occurrences have taken place since our last report of a very important nature, such as indicate in a strong manner the feelings of the country on the situation in which it has been placed by the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the apprehended danger from attempts to destroy the liberty of the Press. A very extraordinary proceeding in the courts of justice was attended with as extraordinary a result. A poor man had been taken up on an *ex officio* information from the Attorney-General early in the last year, confined for some time in the King's Bench prison, and liberated with the prospect, though doubtful, of being brought to trial. In consequence of his confinement in prison he had made applications to the court for release, to which no other attention was paid than to order his return to it; and it is probable that the appearance of the poor man in court, who was at that time suffering much under illness, had given the Attorney-General no idea of the powers, which he afterwards displayed, but on the contrary, led him to expect an easy victory over so weak an antagonist. After the lapse of a considerable time, the poor man was summoned to appear to answer the charges of libel, for three publications, being parodies on part of the Liturgy or Common Prayer Book, sanctioned by act of parliament. The parts thus parodied were the Catechism, the Litany, and the Creed, vulgarly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, a creed which is represented by a Correspondent in a former volume of this work, to have been composed in the fifth or sixth century, as a *jeu d'esprit*, by an unbeliever in those days, to turn into ridicule the doctrines, about which the pretended Christians were quarrelling so much with each other.

Before the trials, a person who had published these parodies, had been brought up for judgment in the Court of King's Bench, and been condemned to a fine and imprisonment; and thus the opinion of the court was manifest, before the poor man, the original publisher of the parodies, was brought to trial. In this state of things the trials commenced. The Attorney-General laid down the heinousness of the offence in parodying sacred things, and had no doubt that the jury would see the subject in the same light he did. He was not a little astonished, however, at the quantity of books with which the table of the court was covered by the defendant, nor had he

the least idea of the defence to be made. The defendant pleaded his own cause, and in such a manner as no counsellor could have done it for him. He entered boldly, fully and firmly into an examination of the charge, stated plainly what his parodies were, namely, political squibs, of the same nature as those used by the Right Hon. George Canning, and for a similar purpose, and without the least intention of bringing any part of the Common Prayer Book into contempt. In the course of his defence he introduced parodies of all kinds, from the time of Luther to the present day, shewing that there was not the least idea of ridiculing the thing parodied, as it was used only as a vehicle to strike more forcibly the imagination. To give a detail of the defence would exceed the limits allotted to this Survey, but it is understood, that the defendant will publish his trials with all the parodies and engravings from the prints and caricatures, which were exhibited on this occasion. A lively interest was excited by his remarks on the parodies written by Mr. Canning, whose conduct towards his adversaries is so well known to the public, and the bitterness of whose sarcasms has been scarcely exceeded by any political writer in any age of the world. Each trial occupied a whole day; the court was crowded, and at the close of it some thousands of people were collected in Guildhall to hear the result. The judge on each day solemnly declared it to be his opinion, that the publication on trial was a libel, and the jury upon oath more solemnly controverted that opinion, by declaring the defendant to be *not guilty*. This verdict was received with unbounded applause by the audience; the shouts were re-echoed by the multitudes in Guildhall; the news rapidly spread through the whole town, and the kingdom at large, kept in anxious suspense during the three days, joined with very few exceptions in a cordial approbation of the verdict.

Soon after the trial, a number of gentlemen met together to consider the sufferings of the defendant, and the many defence he had made. It was agreed that a subscription should be immediately entered into, which was favourably received by the public. In a short time, several noblemen of the first consequence sent their drafts for a hundred pounds, and a distinguished nobleman, then in bed from a dangerous illness, sent his draft for a hundred guineas,

accompanied with a letter, in which he manifested in strong terms his indignation at the prosecution, and his high approbation of the conduct of the defendant. This letter, with other similar ones, will, it is presumed, form a part of the volume to be published by the defendant, and increase the interest in the publication.

Some circumstances on the trial deserve to be here particularly noticed. In that for the parody on the Athanasian Creed, the defendant produced the doubts of several divines on the propriety of the use of this creed; among them Archbishop Tillotson, who wished the church "well rid of it," Bishop Tomline, the present Bishop of Lincoln, who objects most strongly to the damnatory clauses, and Bishop Law, the late Bishop of Carlisle, the father of the judge on the bench. On the subject of the latter, the defendant made an energetic appeal to the judge, which was manifestly felt by him on the bench. He appealed to him, that his lordship's father did not believe in this creed; and the judge did not contradict the assertion, though he did not venture to deny it. To the readers of this Survey, who have read the excellent work of Bishop Law on the Theory of Religion, and compared together the alterations made in it during the several successive editions of it in his life-time, there cannot be a doubt on the subject.

The Attorney-General corrected the general misapprehensions that had gone forward on what is called the Unitarian act, stating distinctly, that though the Unitarians were relieved from the acts of parliament, which, with respect to them, were by the last act repealed, yet they remained as before amenable to the common law for transgressions against the established doctrines. How far this extends no one can tell, till it has become subject of public investigation: yet it may be useful to put Unitarians on their guard, that they may not be brought into difficulties. One obvious method occurs, which is, never to mention the name, by which the attributes of the Supreme Being are designated by various Sectarians; and which is not to be found in Scripture. In maintaining the Unity of God, as it is clearly and explicitly laid down in Scripture, they cannot incur the censures even of the Attorney-General. We worship the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if any person or persons are worshiped, to whom the name of God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be applied, we can have nothing to do with such persons. We are to impress it strongly on the minds of all, that there is no other God but the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and as to those who worship another god, by whatever name he is called, they are to be reminded that it is a matter of comparatively

speaking little importance, whether they worship two, or three, or four, or four hundred gods.

If the political world has been greatly agitated by these trials, the religious world has been affected no less sensibly by an occurrence, that has taken place in the sect established by law. A meeting was holden at Bath, at which the Lord Bishop of Gloucester was president, with a view to establish in that district what is called a Church Missionary Society, or society consisting of members of the established sect, to convey religious instruction to idolatrous nations by means of missionaries. At this meeting the Archdeacon of Bath in his own name, and the names of his bishop and the clergy of his archdeaconry, entered a violent protest against the meeting and the propriety of its proceedings. The meeting, however, went on, and carried their purpose with customary resolutions. The protest of the archdeacon was answered in a very able manner by a clergyman in London in a pamphlet, and also an advertisement in the Times in the same terms, consisting of five columns. The protest was also circulated in a very extensive manner, and the public is thus in possession of all that can be said on the points in dispute. It is not worth our while to enter into this discussion. It involves a question of discipline, on which both sides display considerable ability. But it is a point of great importance in its consequences, which may produce considerable results in the sect established by law.

It is well known, that for a long time has existed a sort of schism in this sect, and one party is generally known by the name of the Evangelicals. The clergy of this description are generally most followed in all the towns in which they reside, and this naturally excites a jealousy in those, whose tenets are of a more quiet nature. The Evangelicals affect to hold the articles in the highest respect, and to believe them according to what they deem their true interpretation, which is Calvinistical. A considerable latitude has been for a long time allowed on this subject, by the other clergy, and the stricter discipline of the Evangelicals by no means suits them. At present the Evangelicals are in the minority, but what they want in numbers, they amply make up in zeal. The two parties are now openly at variance. The Archdeacon's protest may be considered as a declaration of war, and he has received the thanks of his clergy: the answer of the evangelical clergyman is the counter manifesto. The controversy between them will not be easily settled. There will be many skirmishes before they come to a pitched battle. In the mean time, as it will be necessary to designate the parties by appropriate terms, the one

may usefully retain the name which they have acquired, and of which they need not be ashamed, that of Evangelicals: the other party may be denominated the Latitudinarians. A tenth part of the time which will be consumed on their respective differences, would be more than sufficient to point out how far both are from the plain declarations of Scripture.

Another subject occasions some little embarrassment to the sect established by law, but, happily for the times we live in, it is more likely to excite a smile than to occasion any of those serious quarrels in which the Sectarians of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries were involved. The disputes between the eastern and the western factions in those times on the subject of Easter, are well known. They were in great measure assuaged by the politicians, who met together from all quarters at the council of Nice. They devised a very ingenious plan, by which they attempted to do two things, first to perpetuate the celebration of Easter on a Sunday, and secondly to make that Sunday follow the first full moon after the vernal equinox. Their scheme was a very ingenious one, but unfortunately as it depended on numbers, and the numbers on which they founded their calculations were not correct, after a certain length of time the arrears of their calculation necessarily became manifest. This is the case in the present year, in which the first full moon after the vernal equinox falls on a Sunday in the afternoon on the twenty-second of March. By their own rule, therefore, they ought to keep the Easter-day on the twenty-ninth: but the calculators not heeding this circumstance, and going upon a false rule, have determined the Easter-day to be on the twenty-second. Consequently the services of the sect established by law will be wrongly performed on Easter-day, and on all the following Sundays throughout the year. The twenty-second of March now stands in all the Almanacks for the Easter-day. This error inevitably arose from the inaccuracy of the tables by which they calculated, and if it is persisted in, more curious errors will arise in a course of time. To us this is a matter of no consequence. We have no services for these days, nor do we require calculations: but to the members of the established sect it will not be pleasing to think, that they are commemorating the resurrection of our Saviour at a time, when the positions of the sun and moon are so different from what they were at the resurrection: for of all things well ascertained in history, this is certain, that our Saviour's resurrection did not take place till after the full moon.

Every one must rejoice that there has

been a general release of all persons confined in various prisons under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act. Yet this event has not taken place without some remarkable circumstances. Two persons confined in this manner, refused to accept their proffered liberty as others had done, on a recognizance to appear, when called upon, in the courts of law. They firmly maintained their innocence of the charges imputed to them, demanded the names of their accusers, and threatened a prosecution against them for the injuries they had sustained. They were in consequence remanded to their prison, but in a short time discharged without any recognizance. Many of the persons discharged by recognizance made their appearance in the courts of law, complained much of the hardships they had sustained, and requested that having made their appearance, they might no farther be called upon. This request was not acceded to, but it was generally understood that they would not again be called upon. Their case will probably give rise to a discussion in the approaching sessions of parliament.

The parliament of France goes on slowly with its deliberations, which occasion but little interest. They have been chiefly occupied with the liberty of the press, the Concordat, and the establishment of their army. The first has not suffered so much as was expected, though they have continued the censorship on public papers during this year; in other words, they have given to the administration the power of telling what lies they please, and of preventing all others persons from telling the truth. The Concordat produces a great deal of trouble; and they are embarrassed on every side on account of the army. One good motion was made, that the supplies for it should be voted every year; but it met with no encouragement. A new mode has been struck out of gratifying the vanity of Frenchmen. They read their speeches at select coteries, in which fashionable ladies sit in judgment, and then they are printed and circulated. At any rate, one good effect is produced; that this frivolous nation has more solid topics for their meditation, than they were accustomed to in former times; and, if the women become politicians, their men will in time be taught to think.

Spain has entered, it is said, into a treaty with Great Britain, in which one thing is certain, namely, the payment of four hundred thousand pounds by us for the discontinuance of the slave trade; the second is uncertain, whether the trade will in consequence be suppressed. The money will be useful to Spain to enable it to enslave its colonies, but the slavery of the whites is ill compensated by the de-

liverance of the blacks. However, we have every reason to believe, that all the efforts of Spain in most of its colonies will be unavailing: but apprehensions are entertained for the safety of Mina, so that the deliverance of Mexico from the Spanish yoke may still be a work of time.

The speech of the President of the United States is filled with the good news of their prosperity, in which every lover of freedom will rejoice. In that part of the world is an asylum for the oppressed of Europe, and it is to be hoped, that these states will continue to cherish the sentiments of freedom and independence. They have enough to do in their own immense territory, which is improving every day; and if they can but abstain from the sin that has so grievously afflicted the old world, the love of war, this country will be far more distinguished for all the arts that improve and embellish life, than any of the boasted nations of the civilized world.

The readers of this Survey may have, perhaps, looked for an answer from the writer of it to the letter of our friend Bel-

sham in the last Magazine. But enough has been said, and many perhaps will say, and with reason, more than enough on the subject in discussion. It may well drop. The writer of this Survey does not feel his personal regard for our friend Belsham diminish, though he entertains the same opinion that he has already advanced, namely, that the custom of babe-sprinkling has no foundation whatsoever in Scripture, is not a Christian rite, and is used chiefly by persons who wish to assimilate the kingdom of God to the kingdoms of this world. It is in vain that our friend Belsham attempts to prop up his rotten fabric.

“Non tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis, Tempus eget.”

It must be added, that the signature of Ignotus was taken without recollection that it had been previously assumed. Should the writer think it necessary to write again under this title, he will add to it *Secundus*, by which he will be sufficiently designated from his predecessors.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley, LL. D. F. R. S. &c., with Notes by the Editor. Vols. II. and III. [Vol. I. containing the Life and Correspondence of the Author, to be published hereafter.]

Illustrations of the Divine Government. By T. S. Smith, M. D. second edition, enlarged. 8vo. 9s. boards.

Narrative of Proceedings in a late Prosecution against John Wright, on a Charge of Blasphemy. By F. B. Wright. 9d.

Observations on the Expediency of publishing only Improved Versions of the Bible, for the Continent. By Theoph. Abauzit, D. D.

The Evidences of Revealed Religion, on a new and original plan; being an Appeal to Deists on their own principles of Argument. By S. Thomson. Second edition. 2s.

An Examination of the Various Texts of Scripture, adduced by the Rev. Thomas White, to prove the Doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement. By a Member of the Church, Jewin-Street Crescent.

Sermons on the Death of the Princess Charlotte. (From Vol. XII. pp. 696 and 746.)

The Transitory Glory of the World: at Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds, Nov. 19. By the Rev. Thomas Jervis. 2s.

In the Tron Church, Glasgow, Nov. 19. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. 1s. 6d.

At the Unitarian Chapel, Sheffield, Nov. 19. By Nathaniel Philipps, D. D. 8vo. 1s.

At the Old Chapel, Mansfield, Nov. 19. By John Williams. 8vo. 9d.

At the Baptist Meeting-House, Shrewsbury, Nov. 20. By John Palmer. 1s.

At the Baptist Meeting-House, Leicester. By Robert Hall, M. A. 2s.

The British Empire in Tears; at the Baptist Meeting-House in Bow, Middlesex. By William Newman, D. D.

The Nation's Condolence; at St. Andrew Undershaft, London, Nov. 19. By H. J. Knapp, M. A., Curate. 1s. 6d.

Athanasia: a Discourse, inscribed to the Memory, &c. By an Under Graduate of the University of Oxford. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

ERRATUM.

In the title of the Biographical Article, p. 1, the date of Mr. Belsham's Funeral Sermon is wrong; for Nov. 9th, read Nov. 22nd.
