

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CL.]

JUNE, 1818.

[Vol. XIII.

**BIOGRAPHY.**

*Life of John Biddle, by Anthony Wood,  
in Athenæ Oxonienses, 1692.*

Clapton,

May 31, 1818.

SIR,  
I AM aware that the circumstances of Biddle's Life must be well known to most of your readers, by several biographical accounts of him, and especially by Dr. Toulmin's *Review* of his Life and Character. Yet I have supposed that the *Article Biddle*, in the *Athenæ Oxonienses* of his contemporary Wood, may be a document worthy of your preservation. I have, therefore, sent it, *verbatim*, supplying some farther information, in notes, chiefly from "A Short Account of the Life of John Biddle, M. A., some time of Magd. Hall, Oxon," which is prefixed to his pieces, in the first volume of *quarto* tracts, 1691, and appears to have been first written in Latin, by Mr. Farrington, of the Inner Temple. My edition of Wood, whose few notes I have distinguished by his initial, is that published by himself in 1692. The Life of Biddle may be easily divided into two parts, the first concluding with the decline of the Presbyterian influence in the Long Parliament, which produced an abatement of religious persecution.

J. T. RUTT.

JOHN BIDDLE, or *Biddellus*, as he is by some authors written, son of Edward Biddle, a tailor,\* was born at Wotton-under-edge, in Gloucestershire, baptized on the 14th of January, 1615, and afterwards being a youth of great hopes, was, by the benevolence and exhibition of George Lord

\* He "was of a middle sort of yeomen, and also dealt in woollen clothes." He appears to have died before his son's removal to college, where John Biddle is said to have given "dutiful assistance to his mother, become a widow." *Short Account*, pp. 3, 4.

Berkeley,\* educated in grammar learning in the Free-school there, by John Rugg and John Turner, successive masters thereof. Under the last he made so great proficiency in his studies, that he Englished Virgil's *Bucolics* and the two first *Satires* of Juvenal. Both which were printed at London, in 1634, in 8vo. and dedicated to John Smith, of Nibley, in the said county, Esq., *Mæcenus* of the *Wottonian Muses*. In the beginning of that year† (having, a little before, composed and recited, before a full auditory, an elaborate oration in Latin, for the gracing the funeral of an honourable school-fellow), he was entered a student of *Magd. Hall*, and for a time, if I mistake not, was put under the tuition of John Oxenbridge, a person then noted to be of no good principles.‡

\* "Who, in respect to the early blossoms of a rare wit, great probity and ingenuity in our young scholar, conferred upon him the exhibition of £10 per annum, among other the poorer scholars; although by his age, being not of ten years, he was not qualified, according to common method, for that donation. And this favour, it seems, added greater vigour and industry to the youth's studies; for, after this, he did not only with ease surpass those his school-fellows of the same rank, but, in time, even outrun his instructors, and became tutor to himself." *Short Account*, p. 4.

† It was 1632, for, according to the *Short Account*, "the want of fit teaching on the one hand, and the benefit of that exhibition on the other, or, perhaps, the want of fit provisions for a student in the University, detained him longer in that school, than was otherwise for his improvement; for here he continued till he was about seventeen years of age." *Ibid.* p. 4.

‡ In the estimation of *Church and King*. Wood says, that John Oxenbridge "became a commoner of *Linc. Coll.* in 1623, aged eighteen years, and thence translating himself to *Magd. Hall*, took the

Before he had taken the degree of Master of Arts,\* (being about that time a tutor in the said Hall,) he was invited to take upon him the care of teaching the school wherein he had been educated, by the overseers thereof, but refused it; and after he had completed the said degree, which was in 1641, he became master of *Crypt School*, † within the city of

degrees in arts, and soon after became a tutor there: but being found guilty of a strange, singular and superstitious way of dealing with his scholars, by persuading and causing some of them to subscribe, as votaries, to several articles framed by himself, as he pretended for their better government, as if the statutes of the place wherein he lived, and the authority of the then present government, were not sufficient, he was distutored in the month of May, 1634." He retired to Bermuda till 1641, when he returned and became Fellow of *Eaton*. On the *Restoration* he went to *Berwick*, "where the Act of Conformity silenced him, an. 1662. Afterwards he went to the West Indies. Having received a call, he went to New England," where "he died, at Boston, in 1674." "In the church or chapel belonging to *Eaton College*, was a monument with a large canting inscription set up by this D. Oxenbridge, for his first wife, Jane Butler, wherein, it is said, that while he preached abroad, she would preach and hold forth in the house. But the said inscription or epitaph giving great offence to the Royalists at the restoration of King Charles II., they caused it to be daubed or covered over with paint." *Athen. Oxon.* II. 391, 392. Mr. Oxenbridge, on his *ejection*, "went to Surinam, and from thence, in 1667, to Barbadoes." He appears to have projected the *christianizing* of the natives, for among his few publications is "A Proposition of Propagating the Gospel by Christian Colonies, in the Continent of Guiana." See Calamy's *Account*, p. 110. *Noncon. Mem.* Ed. 2, I. pp. 299, 300.

\* "He proceeded M. A. with good applause, and was reckoned among those of his rank, that did in an especial manner commend the learning of that academy. Here he did so philosophize, as it might be observed, he was determined more by reason than authority: however, in divine things he did not much dissent from the common doctrine, as may be collected from a little tract he wrote against dancing." *Short Account*, p. 4.

† Attached to the Church of *St. Mary de Crypt*, "a free-school, erected by Mrs.

Gloucester, where, for a time, he was much esteemed for his diligence in his profession, severity of manners and sanctity of life.

At length the nation being brought into confusion by the restless Presbyterians, the said city garrisoned for the use of the parliament, and every one vented his or their opinions as they pleased, he began to be free of his discourses of what he had studied there at leisure hours, concerning the Trinity, from the holy Scriptures, having not then, as he pretended, conversed with Socinian books. But the Presbyterian party, then prevalent there, having notice of these matters, and knowing full well what mischief he might do among his disciples, the magistrate summoned him to appear before him; and after several interrogatories, a form of confession, under three heads, was proposed to him to make, which he accordingly did, May 2, 1644, but not altogether in the words proposed. Which matter giving then no satisfaction, he made another confession in the same month more evident than the former, to avoid the danger of imprisonment, which was to follow if he should deny it.\*

Cooke, who endowed the master with £10 per ann. if a priest, and £9 a-year if a layman." *Mag. Britan.* 1720, II. pp. 767, 768. It was, "upon ample recommendations of the University," Biddle was appointed to this office by the magistrates of Gloucester. "At his approach thither he was met and received by them with much joy and honour. Neither did he deceive their expectations—whilst he discharged that employment with such skill and faithfulness, that they thought themselves not a little happy in that behalf, who could commit their sons to his instruction. Whence it came to pass, that not so much by the salary, which is not great, but by the gratuities of parents, he reaped considerable profits." *Short Account*, p. 4.

\* "Diligently reading the Holy Scripture, (for Socinian books he had read none,) and fervently imploring Divine illumination, he perceived the common doctrine concerning the holy Trinity was not well grounded in revelation, much less in reason. And being as generous in speaking, as free in judging, he did, as occasion offered, discover his reasons of questioning it: which some zealots not being able to bear, they accused him to the ma-

Afterwards being more satisfied in his mind by reading various authors, he drew up several arguments against the generally-received deity of the Holy Ghost, which he intended shortly after to print; but being betrayed by one, whom he took to be his sure friend, who had, as it seems, a copy of them, he acquainted the magistrate and parliament committee, then in the said city, of the matter. Whereupon, after they had perused them, they committed the author, then labouring under a fever, to the common goal there, on the 2d of December, 1645, to remain in that place till the Parliament\* should take cognizance of the matter. But a certain person of note, dwelling in Gloucester, who had a respect for Biddle, (for the truth is, except his opinions, there was little or nothing blame-worthy in him,) he procured his liberty, by giving sureties for his appearance when it should please the Parliament to send for him.

About the month of June, in 1646, the learned Usher, Primate of Ireland, travelled through that city in his way to London, and having before heard of, spake to, and used him with

magistrates, of heresy in that point, before whom he exhibited in writing this confession:

‘ May 2, 1644.

‘ 1. I believe that there is but one Infinite and Almighty Essence, called God.

‘ 2. I believe that as there is but one Infinite and Almighty Essence, so there is but one person in that essence.

‘ 3. I believe that our Saviour Jesus Christ is truly God, by being truly, really and properly united to the only person of the Infinite and Almighty Essence.’

“ But when this did not satisfy the magistrates, but they did still press upon him to acknowledge three persons in the Divine Essence, and he, it seems, knowing that the word persons, when ascribed to God, is taken both by the ancient fathers and by modern writers, in various significations, did, about fourteen days after, confess that there are three in that one Divine Essence, commonly termed persons.

“ By this it appears, that how distinct soever he might be in his conceptions concerning the Trinity, yet he was not determinate enough in his expressing of that matter, as he became not long after.” *Short Account*, pp. 4, 5.

\* “ Which was then inflamed with Geneva zeal against such heretics.” *Ibid.* p. 5.

all fairness and pity, as well as with strength of arguments, to convince him of his dangerous error, telling him that either he was in a damnable error, or else that the whole church of Christ, who had in all ages worshiped the Holy Ghost, had been guilty of idolatry: but Biddle, who had little to say, was no whit moved either by the learning, gravity, piety or zeal of that good Archbishop, but continued, as it is said, obstinate.

After he had remained about six months at liberty in Gloucester, he was cited to Westminster to make his defence; but being put off by the Parliament to a committee to be examined, his crime was by them laid closely to his charge. The crime he denied not, and desired withal that some theologist, whom they should appoint, might dispute with him concerning that criminal matter in hand. But it being delayed from day to day, Biddle desired\* a certain knight (Sir Hen. Vane) of that committee that his cause might be heard or he set at liberty. The Knight proposed it and shewed himself a friend to Biddle, who thereupon was confined more close than before.†

Whereupon came out his book for the satisfaction of all people, with this title:—“ Twelve Questions or Arguments drawn out of the Scripture, wherein the commonly-received opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, is clearly and fully refuted.” Printed 1647, in quarto. Before which is printed a Letter tending to the said purpose, written to the said Sir Henry Vane, a member of the House of Commons: and at the end is “ An Exposition of five principal Passages of the Scripture, alleged by the Adversaries to prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost.” ‡ These, I say, being published, and making a great noise in the world, the author was summoned to appear at the bar of the House of Commons, and being asked whether he owned that book, or *Twelve Questions*, &c. and the opinions therein, he answered Yea, and that they were his: whereupon being remitted to his prison,

\* In a Letter dated April 1, 1647. *Short Account*, pp. 12—16.

† His “ restraint continued for five years ensuing.” *Ibid.* p. 6.

‡ *Unit. Tracts*, Vol. I.



they ordered, on the 6th of September, 1647, that the said book, blasphemous against the deity of Christ, be called in and burnt by the hand of the common hangman, and that the author be examined by the committee of plundered ministers: both which were done, viz. the book burnt on the 8th of the same month, and he examined.\* While these things were in doing, the book vended so fast, that the same year it was printed again in 8vo. and afterwards answered by Matthew Poole, M. A., of Eman. Coll. in Cambridge, in his *Plea for the Godhead of the Holy Ghost*, &c. †

Soon after, or at the same time, was published of Biddle's writing, "A Confession of Faith touching the Holy Trinity according to the Scripture." Lond. 1648, 8vo. It consists of seven articles, each of which is confirmed all along by subjoined proofs and reasonings on them; which, for the most part, tend to disprove the deity of our Saviour. Before the said Confession is put a Preface against the Holy Trinity; and about the same time came out, of our Author's composition,

"The Testimonies of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Novatianus, Theophilus, Origen, (who lived in the two first centuries after Christ was born, or thereabouts,) as also of

Arnobius, Lactantius, &c., [Eusebius, Hillary and Brightman,] concerning that one God and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, together with observations on the same." Printed in 8vo.\* Upon the coming out of which things, the Assembly of Divines, sitting at Westminster, made their endeavours to the Parliament, that he might suffer death in the month of May, 1648, but what hindered it I cannot tell, unless it was the great dissension that was then in the said Parliament: † however, his confinement was made close.

Some time after the publication of Biddle's first book, it happened that John Cloppenburg, D. D. and Professor in the University of *Frisia*, [Friesland,] was at *Bristol*, in England, where meeting with William Hamilton, a Scot, lately Fellow of Alls. Coll. in Oxon. the said William did not only then furnish him with a copy of that book, but debated the controversy with him. Afterwards upon the return of Cloppenburg to his own country, he did excellently well answer it in Latin, which he had translated (so much as he answered) in a small treatise, entitled "*Vindiciæ pro Deitate Spiritûs Sancti, adversus Pneumatomachum Johan. Bidellum Anglum*," ‡ printed at *Franecker*, 1652,

\* See Whitelocke's Mem. 1682, pp. 270, 271.

† "Matthew Pole or Poole, M. A., of Emanuel College. He was minister of St. Michael's in Le Querne, in London, from whence, being ejected for nonconformity, an. 1662, he set himself to the writing of those admirable and useful books, entitled 'Synopsis Criticorum Bibliorum,' &c. The two first volumes of which were printed at London, 1669, and three more afterwards, besides one in English, all in folio. He hath also written, 'The Blasphemer slain with the Syord of the Spirit; or a Plea for the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, wherein the Deity of the Spirit is proved against the cavils of John Biddle.' Lond. 1654, 12mo." *Athen. Oxon.* II. 796.

Wood mentions another opponent of Biddle, "William Russel, educated in the grammar school of Wotton-under-edge," who, "became master of the Public College School, in the city of Gloucester." He published "*Βλασφημιόκτονη*. The Holy Ghost Vindicated. 8vo. Written against John Biddle." *Ibid.* II. 150.

\* The whole of these Tracts were reprinted 1691. See *Unit. Tracts*, Vol. I.

† "The Assembly of Presbyterian Divines—solicit the Parliament, in whose hands was the supreme power at that time, and procure a *Draconick* ordinance (May 2, 1648) for inflicting the punishment of death upon those that held opinions contrary to the Presbyterian points about the Trinity and other doctrines, whom they named blasphemers and heretics, and severe penalties upon those that differed in lesser matters. This seemed a damnatory sentence against Mr. Biddle, which there was no escape from. But it pleased the Almighty to make way for him, by a dissension in the Parliament itself; to the better part whereof the army joined its power, as for other reasons, so for that there were in it many, both officers and soldiers, liable to the severities of that mentioned ordinance, which, therefore, from that time for divers years lay unregarded." *Short Account*, pp. 5, 6.

‡ The Deity of the Holy Spirit vindicated; against that Spirit-opposer, John Biddle, an Englishman.



quarto. It must also be noted, that upon the publishing of the said book of Biddle, (I mean his *Twelve Questions*,) Samuel Maresius, D. D. \* and chief professor of that faculty at Groningen, did take occasion (in his *Epist. Ded.* before his first vol. printed at Groning. an. 1651, quarto, entitled *Hydra Socinianismi*, written against Joh. Volkelius and Jo. Crellius,) to give this account of the growth of Socinianism: *Vigesimus jam præterit annus ex quo pestilentissima hæc nutrix, viz. Socinianismus in Sarmaticis paludibus primum nata, caput erexit, et per Germaniam, ac Belgiam nostram sibilis et halitu fædissimo grassata, etiam tetrum suum virus superato oceano intulit in Angliam, in quâ tristi hoc tempore dicitur incredibiles progressus fecisse, &c.* † As for the Confession of Faith, &c., before-mentioned, it was examined and confuted by Nich. Estwick, Rector of Warkton, in Northamptonshire, in a book published by him in quarto, an. 1656: which being dedicated to Edward Lord Montague, of Boughton, he takes occasion to say, that "Biddle's writings have not been enclosed within the confines of our nation, but have taken their wings and have fled beyond the seas, to the disreputation of our dear country, in the Reformed Churches, insomuch that Maresius, Professor of Divinity at Groningen, is bold to avouch, (I cannot say either truly or charitably,) that Socinianism hath fixed its seat here in England, and displayed openly the banners of its impiety." The said Estwick also had, some years before, held forth an antidote against the poison of Biddle's "Twelve Arguments against the Deity of the Holy Ghost." Since which, as it is usual in deceivers, (so Estwick words it,) Biddle grew worse and

worse, and levied his forces against the holy Trinity, and published, notwithstanding, other matters replenished with Socinian tenets.

Our author Biddle continued yet in restraint, and none of the Assembly durst venture to give him a visit, either out of charity or to convince him of his errors; nor indeed any divine of note of the other party, only Mr. Peter Gunning, \* who had several friendly conferences with him. At length, some of the laity of London, and others of the country would come to him, either to see or converse with him; who, being taken with his religious discourse and saint-like conversation, a certain justice of peace of Staffordshire prevailed so far with his keeper, that, upon security given for his appearance upon the least summons, he should be surrendered up to him. Whereupon he was conveyed into Staffordshire, and not only made by him his chaplain, but also preacher of a church there. †

These matters soon after being known at London, John Bradshaw, President of the Council of State, his capital enemy, sent a messenger for, and committed him more close than before. Soon after the said justice of peace died, and left Biddle a considerable legacy, but in a short time devoured by the frequent paying of the fees of a prisoner. ‡ So that being in a manner reduced to great indigence, he was employed by Roger Daniel, a printer of London, to correct the Greek Version of the Septuagint of the Old Testament, which he was about most accurately to publish: and this he did, knowing full well that Biddle was an exact Grecian, and had time enough to follow it. Which employment, and another in private, did gain him, for a time, a comfortable subsistence. §

(To be continued.)

\* Samuel des Marais, who died in 1673, aged 74. He wrote against Catholics, Socinians and Grotius. See *Nouv. Dict.* 1772, IV. 346. *Biog. Dict.* IX. 68.

† Twenty years have now passed since that foul nurse of pestilence, Socinianism, born in the Sarmatian marshes, reared its head, and prowling through Germany and our *Belgia*, with its hisses and noxious breath, conveyed the mischievous poison over the sea into England, where in these evil times it is said to have made incredible progress.

\* He became Bishop of Ely, and died 1684. See *Short Account*, p. 6.

† *Ibid.*

‡ "He spent even all his substance, insomuch that instead of an ordinary for repast, which he could not pay for, he was glad of the cheaper support of drinking a draught of milk from the cow, morning and evening." *Ibid.*

§ "Being also most acceptable to J. Biddle, because his delight was in the law of God." *Ibid.*

## ORIGINAL LETTERS.

SIR, May 2, 1818.  
**P**REVIOUS to my publishing the volume of Posthumous Works of the late Robert Robinson, of Cambridge, a few years since, I made every inquiry in my power after his remaining sermons, letters, &c.; but notwithstanding my endeavours, several of them were not received till some time after the publication of the volume above-mentioned. As it is improbable that what remain will ever be published collectively, it is my intention to send to your Repository two or three of his letters, in my possession, and, if I can, prevail on the parties who have others, to send them also. I am persuaded that there are *very few* of your readers who will not be both entertained and edified in perusing these effusions of a man, of whom the Christian world in general, and his own denomination in particular, were "not worthy;" but of whom, when I consider the peculiar excellencies of his life, his character, and his writings, I am apt to exclaim in the language of *Horatio*, concerning *Hamlet*:—

"He was a man, take him for all in all,  
 We shall not look upon his like again."

The following letter, your readers will perceive, refers to a subject which has thrown some of your learned Correspondents, as it has many others, learned and unlearned, into *hot water*!  
 B. FLOWER.

To H. K. Esq.

Chesterton, March 12, 1787.

MY DEAR MR. K.

..... No! I have written that line too quick: you are none of my dear Mr. K.—you are become another man. You resemble my violets this cold, frosty morning:—violets in shape and colour, but not in scent; for the frost has nipped them, checked their perspiration, and they emit none of their fragrant effluvia. What, in the name of goodness, ails you, that you never write? Do you run poor? Are all your members of parliament dead? Are you afraid of interrupting me, now that I have nothing to do? The limitation of franking has been a great blessing to me, for it has checked a boundless correspondence with me

about *Tobit and his dog*; but you are one of the correspondents whom I wished to preserve; not for your sake, be it known to you, but for our own; for your letters used to give us so much pleasure, without any mixture of pain, that we broke open the seal, in confidence of the same success as follows opening an aromatic box of perfume: the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. And what was there in it? Nothing but—friendship! but divine friendship,—

"Was like the oil, supremely sweet,  
 On Aaron's reverend head:  
 The trickling drops perfum'd his feet,  
 And o'er his garment spread."

Last year, Mr. F. chanted—"I hope we shall see Mr. K."—Then came H., and he fluted—"Mr. and Mrs. K. will indulge us with a visit soon." My poor credulous wife exclaimed—"Next month we shall have the happiness of seeing our good friends, Mr. and Mrs. K." But I, wiser than all, I growled—"No such thing; I tell you they will not come; your good man is good for nothing. To-day he goes to buy and to plant a new-fashioned auricula, which is nothing but a bear's ear when he hath got it. To-morrow he meets the ministers and messengers. The day after, he dines with the worshipful company of fishmongers. Then comes the church meeting; and after all, the wharf; and when he hath nothing else to do, he would rather creep up four pair of stairs, in some blind alley, to give heavenly counsel, and half-a-crown, to some grunting old granny, than come and see us." Here, against my intention, my censure faltered, and the pent-up tear burst out. The benedictions of heaven rest upon the head of good Mr. K. for copying his Divine Master, and for administering comfort to the wretched! An ounce of this against a pound of faith!—Yet sure he could ask his pensioners one week's leave of absence.

I bless the Lord, our church continues to increase. Last church meeting, a son of Dr. — joined the church. He was trained up to the law, and studies in term-time in town, at the bar, and the rest of the year

here. As wise as Lord Chancellor, as innocent as a primitive Christian. I speak my heart, my friend: although I have tutored all these chaps from their youth, they have grown so, that I feel an awe of their wisdom, when I preach before them. Old fool that I am! Afraid to preach before a church, as *harmless as doves*, because they are *as wise as serpents*. I hope it is not a slavish fear: I think it is a just sense of my own inequality to speak of such a subject, and a clear conviction of, and a due respect for, superior understanding. *What hath God wrought?*

"First of your kind! Society divine!  
Still visit thus my cot, for you reserv'd,  
And mount my soaring soul to thoughts  
like yours.

Silence, thou lonely power! The door be  
thine:

See on the hallow'd hour that none intrude,  
Save a few chosen friends, who sometimes  
deign

To bless my humble roof, with sense refin'd,  
Science digested well, exalted faith,  
Unstudied wit, and humour ever gay."

Father Winch used to reproach me for farming: well—I have done farming, and done nothing the last two years but study and preach. I have no other employment but my garden, and no animals but two cats, who daily remind me that I have not lost all esteem. Daily we make a journey to the river side, and compliment Walworth in a weeping willow, once a little twig over a bason of gold fish in Paradise, now like me, pendent over a river.—My wife says it weeps for the absence of Mr. K.:—I, who love to contradict, say—No; it weeps for her foolish attachment to a naughty man, who will not, once in three years, step aside to ask how she and the willow do.

I often smile to myself in recollecting Tarquin, the Sybil, and you. The old Sybil carried nine books to Rome, and offered them to Tarquin at a high price: the king refused them: she burnt three; and offered the six again at the same price: he refused: she burnt three more, and then Tarquin gave her the first proposed price for the three. You recollect how little, Dr. G. entered really into our views of a Baptist history. You remember how little, C. contributed by a loan of books. You remember the mor-

tification I met with at finding you absent, when I came to consult you, and the advice you gave me on a rapid sketch to draw up a plan, and print by subscription. Glad I am I did not, for I should then have printed a meagre plan, and an incomplete work. I thought I had the Baptist history, and only rejected your advice, because having been bitten by book-sellers, (you know where,) I dreaded subscription, or any thing to do with them. A great revolution has since been produced in my mind, and not having, by giving out proposals, tied up myself to any plan, I found myself quite at liberty to create what form I pleased. I have, therefore, dissolved all the first mode, and taken up another, perfectly new. I was led to do so by a happy circumstance, which gave me a free access to the inexhaustible mines of information in the University library—perhaps one of the first in Europe. In all languages, on all subjects, of all editions an exuberant plenty. I have done nothing for almost two years, but study the Baptist history, and I have had many loads of books to go through. The little despised article of believer's baptism is inexhaustible, and evidently on your side of the question. It hath not happened to me as to the Sybil. I have not burnt and diminished my commodity to raise my price. On the contrary, I have increased my work to near three quarto volumes.\*

I being, as most Baptists are, a Baptist for New Testament reasons, never troubled myself for years about the history. It was Scripture, *that* was enough for me. After I read English history, I thought I knew it. No: I never knew the history of Baptism till lately. How should I? Public libraries were impenetrable to me, and no private libraries can afford to purchase the books necessary. When I met with the Spaniards, I could not do any thing till I had learned a little Spanish. I conquered that. Then the Italians stared at me, and I at them; but we had no con-

\* The work was put to the press by Mr. Robinson, but not published till after his death. It was comprised in one volume, 4to. of 653 close-printed pages, illustrated by ten beautiful engravings.



versation till I procured grammars and dictionaries, and learned a little Italian. Lately, a young clergyman of my acquaintance returning from Germany, brought me four huge folios, full of authentic documents of German Baptists; but all in the old black German letter, and the German of the last century. How provoking is this? A casket of jewels locked up: hungry to death for German materials, and now I have got them, I know no more of them than a calf of a crown piece. "Surely," exclaimed I, "the Devil hath a spite against me!" "Softly," said my friend, "my servant is bringing another parcel from the earriage: a grammar, a dictionary, and a German Testament, and as I shall spend a fortnight with you, I will teach you both to read and speak German." "But," replied I, "I will not learn; and neither you nor any man in England shall make me twist my jaws, and goosify my throat, to speak German. I shall brew up the tooth-ache; and who are the Baptists that I should get the tooth-ache for them? Beside, I am not come to the German Baptists yet; and why should a man meet sorrow half way? When I do arrive at that part, I shall not need to speak German; enough, of all conscience, if I can read it." "Well," subjoined my friend, "I shall come again for another fortnight, about three months hence, and then perhaps you will honour me by being my pupil." Thus I go on. And now I am half angry with myself, aye, with ownself, dear ownself, for losing so much time as to write such a long heap of stuff to you. Go from my presence, Mr. K.; there's witchcraft in you. Wife's love to the lady of the house.

Ever yours,  
R. ROBINSON.

*Two Letters from Rev. G. Hesselink \*  
to the Rev. W. Ashdowne.*

[Communicated by Mr. A.'s family.]

LETTER I.

REV. SIR,

Amsterdam,  
June 21, 1792.

**Y**OUR letter, signed Dover, 24 April, I have but newly received.

\* "M. A. Professor of Divinity and Philosophy in the Society of Baptists," Amsterdam; and author of "An Explanatory Dictionary of the New Testament."

I have seen that you had the goodness of sending me, by a captain of an Amsterdam trader, a Dissertation concerning the Devil, or Satan, as having no foundation in Scripture.\* As I see that you calls [have-cause] to doubt, that this dissertation is not come to my hand, I send you, on your request instantly by the post, an answer, to inform you that I have not received it; and because the name of the captain is not mentioned, all inquiry is impossible. If you will have opportunity of sending me another copy, I shall feel myself much obliged to you.

But few Baptists of this country do perform the rite of the Baptism by dipping of immersion: it is almost by all of them administrated by sprinkling, or rather by a large effusion of water.

The year past, I have received of the Rev. John Rippon, Baptist minister at London, *The Baptist Annual Register*, first publication; wherein I find a list of the Particular Baptist Churches and ministers in England and Wales, for 1790; but I have not found *Dover* at [in] this list. Perhaps your church is not of the denomination of the Particular Baptists. In the Register mentioned, I find no account of the General Baptists in England. If you, in your answer, can favour me with any account of the state of them, you will very much oblige me.

Your servant,  
G. HESSELINK.

You will excuse the faults or mistakes. Though I am acquainted with the English language, yet I do not write it. If I, therefore, have occasion to write again to you, I will rather answer in Latin.†

*The Rev. Wm. Ashdowne, Baptist Minister, Dover.*

natory Dictionary of the New Testament." See N. An. Reg. 1790, XI. [260,] 1792, XIII. [305].

\* "Attempt to shew that the Opinion concerning the Devil, or Satan, as a fallen Angel, and that he tempts Men to sin, hath no real Foundation in Scripture." By W. Ashdowne. 1791.

† With these Letters we have received Remarks, in Latin, on the *Attempt*. They are dated Oct. 19, 1792; and are of some extent.

LETTER II.

Amsterdam,

REV. SIR, December 6, 1792.

THE observations which you have communicated [to] me, in a letter signed 8 Nov., have, I think, the state of [the] question better fixed. The question is now coincident with, or depends only upon, another question, viz. *How far Jesus and the apostles, in using the language and phraseologies of the country, may be supposed to have accommodated themselves to the opinions adopted by the Jews?*

The year past, we have received in [the] Dutch language, of the learned Society of *Teyler*, at Haarlem, two Dissertations on this important subject: the authors of which are *P. van Hemert*, Professor [of Philosophy and Literature] by [among] the Remonstrants, and *W. de Vos*, minister by [among] the Baptists at Amsterdam. A large recension of them I have seen in the last *Appendix to the Monthly Review*. \* Perhaps some of your learned divines have likewise written on this subject.

Your Dissertation upon the Unitarian Hypothesis I received, after

\* See N. Ann. Reg. 1792, XIII. p. 305. The questions proposed by the Society were, "Did not Christ, in his discourses, and the evangelists and apostles, in their writings, sometimes accommodate their expressions and arguments to the popular notions then prevalent? If so, in what particular instances, and how far did they act thus? Of what use is this hypothesis, well defined and rightly apprehended, in explaining the Scriptures of the New Testament?"

sending my last letter to you, for which I am obliged to you.

None of the ministers of the Baptist congregations of this country baptize infants, but only adults, on the confession of faith. The Remonstrants do both. But the Baptists, tho' they [do] not perform this rite to the infants, exercise, notwithstanding, an universal ecclesiastical toleration to all Christians of every denomination, and therefore do invite to the holy communion, all them who profess the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; for which reason, they have not any other confession of faith, which they do subscribe, as [except] the holy Scripture. But not all Baptists do practise this universal toleration.

The rite of laying on hands, on the person baptized, is not usual by the Baptists; because the supernatural workings of the Holy Ghost are only restraint at [to] the first age of the Christian Church.

To your last request concerning the church discipline, it is sufficient, I think, to remark, that we conform [conforming to] the preceding universal confession of faith, cannot exercise a strict church discipline, and so never excommunicate any body for erroneous opinions.

These brief remarks, I hope, will be sufficient to your requests.

Wishing you health and happiness, I am, with sincere esteem,

Your friend,

G. HESSELINK.

The Rev. W. Ashdowne, Baptist Minister, Dover.

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

The Correspondence between Locke and Limborch, 1685—1704.

(Continued from p. 299.)

No. 18.

John Locke to Philip à Limborch.  
London, Nov. 14, 1691.

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

THE intention I have for some time entertained of sending you a long letter, is the reason why you have received none. I have been waiting for such a portion of leisure, as might enable me to commune with

you freely and at large, as an acknowledgment of your last most friendly letter, which I ought long since to have answered.

It has happened, I know not how, that affairs that do not properly belong to me, have so occupied my leisure, that I have scarcely had time to attend to my own immediate concerns. Yet do not think me busied in public affairs. Neither my health, strength, nor political information, would allow this. And when I recollect, that now

for three months I have found myself thus interrupted, it seems like enchantment that every day should bring engagements in succession, for which I could neither provide before-hand, nor avoid, however I desired it.

Lady Cudworth [Masham] and I have read together the *table* of the books and chapters of the History of the Holy Office, with great pleasure. This foretaste excites our eagerness to see the whole work, which, I rejoice to find, is now in the press, as I heard lately from a Scotsman just returned from your country. May a work so important to the Christian world, proceed under the most favourable auspices!

My hostess, a determined foe to ecclesiastical tyranny, often commends to me your ingenuity and judgment, and the labour you have bestowed so seasonably upon this work. She firmly believes that whatever zeal may be displayed for the reformation of religion and the spreading of the gospel, is in vain, while ecclesiastical tyranny, or civil controul over the concerns of religion, (as it is now the fashion to call it,) or under whatever more specious name it is concealed, prevails and is applauded.

What is done at last with that learned divine\* who has been teaching such strange things concerning angels, in his book on the existence of spirits? Will he not excite the zeal of his brethren, for religion, for truth, for

\* *Balthasar Bekker*, who published a very learned work against the common opinions of *possessions* and the agency of spirits. Of this work, which was divided into four parts, the first part preceded by "an abridgment of the whole," was printed in 1695, as "translated from a French" version of the Dutch original, "approved of and subscribed by the author's own hand." The title is, "The World Bewitched; or an Examination of the common Opinions concerning Spirits; their Nature, Power, Administration and Operations. As also, the Effects Men are able to produce by their Communication. By Balthasar Bekker, D.D. and Pastor at Amsterdam." The French version is in four volumes, 18mo., with a portrait of Bekker, who appears to have been very *ill-favoured*, and his name written, probably an *autograph*, to the dedication of each volume. It is in the library of the British Museum. See Vol. XII. p. 450.

orthodoxy? It will be strange, indeed, if he escape with impunity.

Among us, the press, so far as I perceive, produces nothing which foreigners would much desire to read. Amidst the universal din of arms,\* the strains of the Muses can be scarcely heard. Theological contention, indeed, is now in a great measure composed and laid asleep, I would fain hope, with the good-will of all parties. But that is a vain expectation, nor can the controversies of divines be so easily appeased. Yet, however uncertain in its continuance, a truce is good that may give exercise to mutual charity, and who can expect more?

I have great need of your kind consideration to forgive my long silence. Be assured, that it cannot be justly imputed to disinclination, or the least diminution of regard. You have always the chief share in my esteem, friendship and affection, and I shall ever so regard you. Continue to me the same, and believe me

Yours most respectfully,

J. LOCKE.

No. 19.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Oates, February 29, 1692.*

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

**I**F you have estimated my friendship by the delay of my letters, I fear that you have suspected me of being inattentive to the claims of a correspondence which, if circumstances allowed, I would improve in a very different manner. But if I am dilatory, it generally happens when I ought to write to those for whom I especially desire to testify my good will and friendship, by the expression of deeds rather than of words. Whether you will allow this excuse, I know not, but I hope you will thus consider it: for none can admire, esteem and love you more than myself. It is my present feeling, and thus I must always feel.

The delay of Wetstein, in editing the History of the Holy Office, does not please me, except as you will be induced to read it over repeatedly; and thus often bringing it on the anvil, we shall have the work at last more

\* Referring to the war between England and France.



correct and polished. One thing I will notice to you, which just occurs to me, namely, that there was at Montpelier, about twelve years ago,\* another volume, different from that you mention; for there were two volumes on the same subject.

Theological zeal, it seems, is always and every where the same, and acts in the same manner. I wish, therefore, to know, what is at last to become of the author of the paradoxes concerning angels?† It will be wonderful if he escape, although things looked that way when you wrote; for, however favourable to him the sloth of the preachers at Amsterdam may be, he will scarcely come off with an acquittal. These champions of orthodoxy are not accustomed thus to excuse the erroneous.

What the Presbyterians in Scotland are doing, you may learn better from others than from me. Zeal, in that cold region, appears to grow warm, as if by way of antithesis to the climate. They exercise their discipline fervently enough, but let them take care they do so prudently, and with sufficient moderation.‡ But when theologians persuade themselves that they are promoting the cause of God and his church, what will they not think to justify, under the supposed sanction of divine authority?

I met M. Le Cene§ at London

\* See p. 12.

† Bekker was displaced by the Consistory, but his salary was continued by the magistrates of Amsterdam, till his death, in 1698, at the age of 64. See Vol. XII. p. 450.

‡ The following passage from the Biog. Brit., Article *Carstares*, may, perhaps, refer to this subject: "The Presbyterian ministers, instead of conducting themselves with that temper and moderation, which sound policy dictated, and the king earnestly enjoined, disgusted him so much, by narrowing the terms of assumption for the episcopal clergy, and by rejecting the plan of accommodation which was offered in their name, and approved of by his Majesty, that his commissioner to the General Assembly, according to his instructions, suddenly dissolved that court, in the year 1692; and William the Third was not easily prevailed with to countenance its meeting for the future." Biog. Brit. 2nd Ed. III. 257.

§ Charles Le Cene, a Protestant mini-

only once, and that was at the celebrated [Robert] Boyle's, so that I had no opportunity of conversation on his own affairs or our Amsterdam friends. Since that time I have scarcely been in London, as my health requires the country air, for my lungs cannot bear the smoke of the city. The Prelate to whom you recommended Mr. Le Cene is, I believe, sincerely desirous of the church's peace.

I am anxious about the health of our friend Veen. He has a narrow chest, and I fear for his lungs. I am fearful too, lest, from a habit of continual occupation for so many years, he should grow dull in a country retirement. I wish him a long, vigorous and happy old age. I owe him much, as I shall always gratefully acknowledge.

You have done right in confining yourself to the persecution of religion by Papists. And if you choose from among Christians, a sect distinguished from the rest by its cruelties, you are to be commended, although persecution is every where the same, and properly pontifical. For whatever church arrogates to itself orthodoxy, in words, it claims, in fact, infallibility.

Lady Cudworth [Masham] continues highly to esteem you. Pray present my kindest remembrance to your wife and family, Veen, Guenelon and all theirs. Farewell, most valued friend, and still regard me as yours,

Most affectionately,

J. LOCKE.

I wish for information concerning miracles after the apostolic age. I am not enough versed in ecclesiastical history to know what opinion to form

ster of Paris, who had retired from France on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantz, first to Rotterdam, and afterwards to London, where he died in 1703, aged 56. There was published in 1722, at Amsterdam, his *Nouvelle Critique de toutes les Versions Françaises de la Bible*, which had first appeared in 1696. This was translated without acknowledgment, by Hugh Ross, and applied to the Common English Version. A Translation of the Bible, by Le Cene, was published by his son, at Amsterdam, in 1741. See *Nouv. Dict. Hist. Art. Le Cene*, and *Lewis on the Translations of the Bible*, 2nd Ed. p. 338.

respecting them. I, therefore, intreat you to inform me, as I am very desirous of knowing, whether there have been any records of miracles in the Christian church since the Apostolic age; who were the authors of them, and by what tradition they are supported? Whether they were frequent and continued to the time of Constantine or later? \* Also, who was Thaumaturgus, and from what act he derived that high title which has come down to us? † I do not ask for a list of all the miracles which occur in ecclesiastical writers, but whether it appears from credible histories, that there have been really such miracles, whether few or many, and how long the gift of working them continued in the church?

In this year, 1692, Mr. Locke visited Cambridge, as appears from one of his MS. Letters in the British Museum. It is dated from Bishop Stortford, 13th May, and addressed to his friend Mr. Clarke, M. P. for Taunton. Mr. L. says,

"I am got thus far homewards from Cambridge, where I have been for two days, drawn thither by business that was necessary to be dispatched. I staid there less time than I could well have spent there, and was much importuned to."

In the same letter he thus describes his dissatisfaction with the practice of medicine then prevailing.

"The consultation you would have me to be at, about the health of our infirm friend, I know not what to say to; you know I wish him very well, but my notions in physic are so different from the method which now obtains, that I am like to do little

good, and not being of the college, can make no other figure there, but of an unskilful empiric, and, no doubt, any thing I could offer would seem as strange to his physicians, as the way you tell me they take; which seems strange to me. But as every one's hypothesis is, so is his reason disposed to judge, both of disease and medicines."

No. 20.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*London, June 30, 1692.*

MY EXCELLENT FRIEND,

ON receipt of your letter, dated 27th June, I went this day into the city, and immediately waited on the Archbishop [Tillotson]. I no sooner mentioned your name, than he acknowledged having received from you your disputation with the Jew [Orobio], excused his silence from his interrupted health, weak eyes and other hindrances, which had prevented him from yet completing his perusal. He praised much both the work and its author, and acknowledged that he owed you thanks, which he had not yet offered you.

He considered the History of the Holy Office as now peculiarly seasonable. He read with great pleasure, and highly approved, the Table of Chapters; and when I explained to him your design as to the Dedication, he discovered such courtesy and respect in his manner and language, that had you been present you must have been satisfied that it would not be disagreeable to him. Therefore, as I know the modesty of the man, and highly approve your plan, first send over the Dedication that he may read it before it is published. I will shew it to him, because I am sure he will deem it respectful; and, if he should wish any thing altered, I will inform you.

In the mean time he told me, that he had a book, published in Portugal, concerning an Act of the Inquisition in that country, in the beginning of which is a curious collection of papal bulls and other documents, by which the power of the Holy Office is defined and sanctioned. He could not recollect the name of the author, and though he searched for the book, his library not being yet in order, it could

\* Mr. Locke was now probably engaged in writing his "Third Letter concerning Toleration," which is dated June 20, 1692. In that letter he says, "He who would build his faith or reasonings upon miracles, delivered by church historians, will find cause to go no farther than the apostles' time, or else not to stop at Constantine's." *Third Letter*, Ch. x. Works. Folio, II. 474. See also *Middleton* on this passage. *Free Inquiry*, Pref. p. v. Works, quarto, 1752, I.

† See an Account of Gregory, the Wonder-worker, in *Middleton's Works*, I. 13, and 104—122, or *Lardner*, III. 25—57.

not be found. It is said to be a volume in 8vo. I shall soon visit him again, and he has directed one of his servants to take care that the book may be ready for me. I will then give you the name of the author, and if you have not seen that book, the worthy Archbishop will readily send it.

Make my remembrances to Grævius, Guenelon, and all the Veens. To our Le Clerc, whom I respectfully

remember, I wrote several weeks, or rather I may say months, since. I am ignorant whether he received my letters; for since that time I have heard nothing from him. Pray request him to inform me immediately, if my letter has not reached him.

With my kindest regards to your dear wife and your children, I remain, most worthy friend,

Yours, most respectfully,  
J. LOCKE.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

---

*The Testimony which Josephus bears to Jesus Christ.*

SIR, May 6, 1818.

NO portion of ancient records, since the revival of learning, has so much engaged the attention, or for a time so widely divided the opinion of learned men, as the celebrated passage, found in the *Jewish Antiquities*, concerning Jesus Christ. During a whole century it has been the subject of much dispute among the critics, Catholic and Protestant, in every country throughout Christendom; till at length those who agreed in nothing else, came to agree in this, that the passage is the forgery of some Christian of the third century; nor, perhaps, does there exist a learned man of any estimation in Europe, who thinks it the production of the great Josephus. The passage is to this effect: "And about this time existed Jesus, a wise man, if, indeed he might be called a man; for he was the author of wonderful works, and the teacher of such men as embrace the truth with delight. He united to himself many Jews, and many among the Gentiles. This was the Christ: and those who from the first had been attached to him, continued their attachment, though he was condemned by our great men, and crucified by Pilate. For he appeared to them alive again the third day: and these, with innumerable other marvellous things concerning him, being foretold by the divine prophets. And the race, who from him still call themselves Christians, have not fallen away." \*

---

\* I shall here quote a few instances, to shew in what manner the learned have

In opposition to the general opinion, I maintain that this important paragraph is the genuine production of the Jewish historian; and I shall here briefly state the several arguments which, when fully attended to and enforced, must triumphantly restore its lost credit, and raise it above the suspicion of forgery to the end of time.

1. For nearly fifteen hundred years it existed in the *Jewish Antiquities*, apparently without any suspicion of forgery: nor have those critics, who, after the revival of learning, brought it into disrepute, been able to produce any testimony against its genuineness. The same historical evidence authen-

---

spoken of this passage. "We conclude," says Warburton, *Div. Leg.* I. 295, "that the passage where Josephus, who was as much a Jew as the religion of Moses could make him, is made to acknowledge that Jesus is the Christ, is a rank forgery, and a very stupid one too." Dr. Priestley says, *Early Opinions*, I. 100, "The famous passage in Josephus concerning Christ, is not a more evident interpolation, than many in these epistles of Ignatius." The judgment of Mr. Gibbon is particularly worthy of notice: "The passage concerning Jesus Christ," writes he, *Vol. II. ch. 16*, "which was inserted in the text of Josephus, between the time of Origen and that of Eusebius, may furnish an example of no vulgar forgery. The accomplishment of the prophecies, the virtues, the miracles of Jesus are distinctly related. Josephus acknowledges that he was the Messiah, and hesitates whether he should call him a man. If any doubt can still remain concerning this celebrated passage, the reader may examine the pointed objections of Le Febvre, and the masterly reply of an anonymous critic, whom I believe to have been the learned Abbé de Longuerne."



ticates it which authenticates all the works of Josephus, no manuscript, no version, no copy being ever known to exist without this celebrated testimony to the character of Jesus Christ.

2. The style of the passage is in exact unison with the style of Josephus: the same conciseness and comprehension, the same dry and unvarnished recital of facts distinguish it, which distinguish all his other works. Daubuz, in a learned work, annexed to the second volume of Havercamp's edition, has shewn that one egg is not more like to another, than this paragraph is in composition to the other writings of Josephus.

3. Josephus has dedicated his *Antiquities* and his books against Apion, to an eminent Christian, the friend and coadjutor of the apostle Paul; and signifies that his object in publishing them was to gratify the wishes of those who believed in Christ; and with such an object it was morally impossible that he should leave the character and claims of Jesus unnoticed.

4. Josephus considered the religion of Jesus as the religion of Moses, improved and spiritualized; he is the historian of its progress and the apologist of its votaries among the Jews and Gentiles. He was, therefore, a disciple of Jesus as well as of Moses; and the testimony which he bears of the former, is in perfect unison with his faith and with his writings. Here he says that Jesus was the Christ, and that he appeared to his disciples the third day, alive, after his crucifixion. This explains his meaning, when in his work against Apion he asserts, that God has given a mighty proof of a future state; nor can any one reasonably doubt, that by this mighty proof Josephus means the resurrection of Christ. For he mentions this under circumstances peculiarly characteristic of the gospel. From the New Testament it appears evident that, though the doctrine of a future state might be suggested to the Jews by their prophets, no proof, much less a *mighty proof* of this animating doctrine, was given by God but the resurrection of his Son. This resurrection is justly characterized by Josephus as a mighty proof, because, while it was attended with a mighty display of the Divine power, it afforded the most circumstantial and unequivocal evidence of

its truth. The resurrection of Christ is explicitly held forth by the apostles as a proof, as a pledge from God, of the resurrection of all mankind: and the consequence was, that the doctrine spread throughout the world, so that at the time in which Josephus published his works, there was scarcely a place among the Gentiles where his gospel had not been embraced.

And to its extraordinary prevalence Josephus thus bears his testimony: "And as God pervades the world, so his law has at length pervaded all mankind." This is true of the gospel, and of the gospel only. Josephus, therefore, must, by the law of God, have meant the gospel, which indeed was the last and most perfect law of God to mankind. The future state held forth in the gospel, has for its foundation, not the supposed immortality of the human soul, but the resurrection of Christ; and is to commence not in its separation from the body by death, but in the resurrection of the body, after the example of Christ, at some future period.

This is the notion of a life to come, which the Gentile converts received from the mouths of the apostles, and for which multitudes among them cheerfully submitted to a cruel death. The account which Josephus gives of this interesting fact, precisely accords with the inference he thus draws from the evangelical records: "The reward of those," says he, "who conform to our laws, is not silver or gold or a crown of olive, or some such honour: but each one believes, having in himself the testimony of his conscience, (i. e. entertaining a firm and conscientious conviction,) that as our Lawgiver foretold, and God has afforded a mighty proof, if they keep our laws, and when necessary cheerfully die for them, God appointed them to live again, and after a period to receive a better life." *Against Apion*, II. Sec. xxx.

Our Lord and his apostles unquestionably understood the prophets as predicting a future state. In which way was this prediction made? There are, doubtless, expressions in Moses and the prophets which, when considered metaphorically, may be taken as intimations of a future life: but do such intimations warrant the assertion that they taught and pre-

dicted it? I think not. How then are we to account for the confidence with which our Lord and his apostles appeal to the Jewish Scriptures, as containing the doctrine of a life to come? The inspired penmen assuredly foretold the death and resurrection of the Messiah; they, therefore, foretold the proof, the pledge of a new life; and when that proof was substantiated, that pledge was redeemed, they might be said to have foretold the event itself.

Accordingly we do not read of a future state being foretold by Moses and the prophets, till their writings were illustrated by the death and resurrection of Jesus. The words of Josephus are in unison with this notion. When, in his work against Apion, he writes, that God has given a mighty proof of a new and better existence, he premises that Moses foretold it: and when in the disputed paragraph he asserts, that Jesus again appeared the third day alive, he adds, that the divine prophets predicted his re-appearance. If this reasoning be just, all the objections to the genuineness of this passage fall like a dead weight to the ground. The trumpet of opposition, which so loudly sounded against it throughout Europe, is at once hushed in eternal silence. The Hebrew believers, or as they are generally called the Ebionites, rejected the miraculous birth and divinity of Jesus. Josephus, in principle, was one of these Ebionites, and he gives his testimony respecting Christ, in such a manner as to shew, that these doctrines did not originate with him and his apostles. He asserts that he was a *man*, and hints at the falsehood of his divinity and supernatural birth, by holding forth Jesus and his immediate followers as men incapable of teaching any doctrine that was not founded in truth. The clause, "if he might be called a man," means only that he was an extraordinary man: and it has been observed, that he uses stronger terms of Moses, whom he represents as raised above human by his divine legation. Had this paragraph been really a forgery, the notion that Jesus was a divine being and supernaturally born, would have been boldly and broadly asserted in it; and it appears truly surprising that the exclusion of these notions did

not lead learned men to discover the truth; namely, that the passage was not a forgery, because it contained sentiments contrary to those who are supposed to have forged it.

The objections which have been made to the genuineness of this paragraph, I shall state and refute in a future paper; in the mean time, I only observe, that the passage being found authentic, is in many respects highly important. It unites the opposite qualities of brevity and fulness. In a few sentences, Josephus has brought together the leading articles of faith contained in the four gospels, and asserts them to be true. Jesus was a wise man, and the author of wonderful works. This same Jesus is the Christ. The rulers condemned, and Pilate sacrificed him. Nevertheless, his followers still adhered to him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; the prophets having foretold this, and a thousand other things respecting him. In the midst of his sufferings and disgrace, he draws to himself many Jews and many of the Gentiles: to those he taught the truth; and the men who saw his works, heard his words, and recorded them in the memoirs of his public life, were such as took pleasure only in the truth. These great facts, thus explicitly attested by the Jewish historian, are the chief points on which the apostles insisted in preaching the gospel; and they form the peculiar and essential doctrines of Christianity.

JOHN JONES.

SIR,

May 4, 1818.

THE wish I expressed [p. 39], that the observance of the institution appointed to commemorate the death of the founder of our religion, should form a continued part of the public service, has been misunderstood.

My expression was, "much do I wish the *state of public opinion* would allow," &c.; meaning, that the observance of the rite should extend so very widely, that no inconvenience could be felt, if it formed one continued part of the public service. This explanation, I trust, satisfactorily removes all objections that have been urged against my wish.

With your permission, I would

submit a remark to two of your Correspondents, in the Repository for this month, upon the subject of the Lord's Supper.

N. N., p. 241, has this observation, "By comparing what he (the apostle Paul) *has received*, with Luke's gospel, it will be found that it was *from the history of the ministry of Jesus, written by Luke*, his fellow-traveller, *he had received it*." Is the apostle Paul or N. N. the most competent authority to decide from what source the information was derived? The apostle's declaration is, "For I have *received from the Lord* that which I delivered also unto you."

To your Correspondent W. H., p. 255, I take the liberty to offer a paraphrase of the apostle's language, which appears to me more consistent with the whole account of this institution, than he has adopted.

1 Cor. xi. 20: "When, therefore, ye come together into one place, it is not to eat the *Lord's Supper*;" i. e. when you assemble together as a Christian Church, in your usual place of worship, you do not distinguish a simple religious rite, commemorative of the death of Christ, appointed to be observed by Christian societies, from an ordinary meal, taken in your separate houses, to satisfy your hunger. This is an abuse of a Christian ordinance, and deserves my reproof. To shew the propriety of this rebuke, the apostle recapitulates the institution of this rite, which was not introduced by Christ till after the Supper was ended; ver. 23—26. Then, ver. 27, "Whoever shall partake of the bread and wine unworthily;" i. e. "in a manner unsuitable to the nature and design of the institution, by confounding the Lord's Supper with a common meal, or an idol feast," is guilty of profaning the commemoration of the death of Christ.

I take the further liberty to question, if misapprehension on the part of those to whom a communication of a fact is made, invalidates the testimony of the person making such communication? This argument appears to be assumed by W. H. at the close of the first paragraph of his letter.

Should he pursue, as he intimates, his inquiry, I recommend these remarks to his candid attention.

T. G.

### Jeremy Bentham on the danger of Penal Laws in Matters of Religion.

[Translated from *Traité de Legislation*, Vol. III. Chap. xviii.]

EVERY article of faith is necessarily hurtful, as soon as the legislator puts in activity penal and coercive motives to favour its adoption. The persons whom it is wished to influence, may be considered as forming three classes: those who are already of the same opinion with the legislator; those who reject this opinion; and those who neither adopt nor reject it.

For the conformists, the coercive law is unnecessary; for the non-conformists, it is equally useless, because it cannot fulfil its object.

When a man has formed his opinion, is it in the power of penalties to make him change it? The very question is an insult to good sense. Penalties will rather produce a contrary effect. They will serve rather to confirm an opinion than to shake it; partly because to employ constraint is a tacit avowal that arguments are wanting, and partly because the having recourse to violent measures, produces an aversion to the opinions which it is wished in this manner to sustain. All that can be obtained by penalties is, to engage, not a *belief*, but a *declaration* of belief.

Those who from a conviction, or a sense of honour, refuse this declaration, submit to the greatest of evils, to persecution. For, what is called persecution, is an evil which is not compensated by any advantage; it is an unmixed evil; and this administered by the hand of the magistrate, is precisely the same in nature, though much greater in degree, than if it came by that of an ordinary malefactor. Those who, less firm and less generous, give way to menaces, and to the immediate danger which presses them, escape by a false declaration; but this momentary pain avoided, is converted, if they have any scruples, into the pains of conscience, and into the pains of contempt on the part of society, which will accuse of baseness these hypocritical retractions. In this state of things, what is the consequence? One part of the people, for the sake of self-complacency, accustoms itself to despising the opinions of the other



part; subtle distinctions are invented between innocent and criminal falsehoods; privileged lies are established, because they serve as a safeguard against tyranny; customary perjuries and false signatures are considered as simple forms. But, in the midst of these subtleties, the respect for truth becomes impaired; the limits of good and evil are confounded; and a train of less pardonable falsehoods introduce themselves under favour of the first: the tribunal of opinion is divided; the judges which compose it, no longer follow the same law; they no longer know with precision, what degree of dissimulation they ought to condemn, and what other degree to excuse; the suffrages become divided and contradictory, and the moral sanction having no uniform regulator, is enfeebled and depraved. Thus the legislator who requires declarations of faith, becomes the corrupter of the nation; he sacrifices virtue to religion, although religion herself is of no value any further than she is the auxiliary of virtue.

The third class to be examined, is that of those persons who, at the establishment of the penal law, have not as yet formed any opinion either on the one side or the other. With respect to those, it is probable that the law may influence the formation of their opinion: seeing the dangers of the one part, and the safety of the other, it is natural that they should contemplate the arguments for a condemned opinion, with a degree of fear and aversion, which they do not feel for the arguments of the favoured opinion.

Arguments which we wish to find true, make a much more lively impression than those we wish to find false; and thus a man comes to believe, or rather not to disbelieve; not to reject a proposition which he would not have adopted, if his inclinations had been left free. In the last case, the evil, though not so great as in the two first, does not cease to be an evil. It may happen, but it does not always happen, that the judgment gives way entirely to the affections; and even when this is the case, that is to say, when the persuasion has every possible degree of strength, still, if fear enters at all into the motives of this persuasion, the mind is never perfectly tranquil.

That which a man believes to-day, he is afraid he may not believe to-morrow: a clear moral truth can never be shaken, but the belief of a doctrine is more or less unsteady: from this arises that inquietude with respect to those who attack it. Examination and discussion are dreaded, because it is felt that there is no solid ground on which to rest. Nothing must be removed in an edifice which is not firmly fixed: the understanding becomes enfeebled; the mind seeks for complete repose, only in a state of blind credulity; it seeks out all errors which have some affinity with its own; it fears to explain itself clearly on the possible and the impossible, and wishes to confound their boundaries; it loves every thing which supports sophistry, which shackles the human intellect, —every thing which persuades it that it is impossible to reason with entire certainty; it acquires a disposition, an unhappy dexterity, to reject evidence, to give force to half proofs, to listen but to one party, to subtilize against reason: in a word, in this system it is necessary to put a bandage on the eyes, not to be injured by the light of day.

Thus every penal means employed to augment the influence of religion, tends indirectly to lessen that respect for truth and for public opinion, which forms so essential a part of morals. All the enlightened friends of religion, at the present day, are of this opinion; but how few states are there which have acted on this principle? Persecutions have ceased to be violent; but silent persecutions, civil penalties, threatening laws, a precarious toleration, still exist. Humiliating situation for classes of men who owe their tranquillity only to a tacit indulgence, a continual pardon! \* \* \* \*

I have explained myself elsewhere on the utility of religion, but I cannot omit to observe here, that in our days she has acquired a salutary tendency to disengage herself from futile and pernicious dogmas, and again to make approaches towards sound morals and sound policy. Irreligion, on the contrary, (I am unwilling to pronounce the word Atheism,) has manifested herself in our days, under the most hideous forms of absurdity, immorality and persecution. This experience is sufficient to shew all good minds in

what way they ought to direct their efforts; but if the government acts too openly to favour this salutary direction, it will fail of its end. It is the liberty of examination which has corrected the errors of the dark ages, and reconducted religion towards its true object; it is the liberty of examination which will complete its purification, and will conciliate it with public utility.

SIR,

May 4, 1818.

**H**AVING attributed to Mr. Tucker, [p. 253,] the inimitable author of "The Light of Nature pursued," the sentiment that Jesus Christ was by nature and constitution as weak and prone to evil as any other human being, you seem to call upon me to point out the part of his work where he has expressed such an opinion. This is very equitable on your part. What he says on that subject, occurs in that division of his work, entitled, "Christian Scheme." Some, he says, have, to do honour to the Saviour, contended that his soul was by nature more pure than those of other men; but he thinks, that the more honourable supposition is, that he was by nature less perfect than the rest of Adam's race; for that that supposition appears to him to magnify the glory of both God and the Saviour, in his victory over all temptation. And he concludes by observing that he was a descendant of Adam, and his soul, naturally, no better than ours.

There is surely nothing in this sentiment dishonourable to Mr. Tucker; for he is most virtuous, who resisteth the most trying temptations. Where the religious principle has nothing to struggle against, its triumph must be less. It is surely more meritorious for a poor man to be honest, than a rich man;—for a man who loves wine, to be sober, than a man who hates it; and so of all the other virtues. If Jesus was by constitution timid, his triumph over himself in submitting to suffering and death, was by that circumstance made more remarkable, and the strength of the religious principle more signally illustrated.

Morals, the most interesting of all subjects, seem generally to be treated in the most superficial manner. Mr. Tucker is on these subjects, the most judicious of all writers. In general,

the act is considered without the circumstances, the crime without the temptation; and I have never yet met with a writer on eternal torments, who did not write as if himself were without either part or lot in the matter. Now this surprises me. For if there be eternal torments, why not for me? Am I so good as to be in no danger, from a Being who can inflict such punishment? I may not have committed murder, nor adultery, nor perhaps direct theft. But change my circumstances:—place me in the situation of those who have been thus guilty;—then, and not until then, if I avoid them, am I better than these!

A man in easy circumstances, with all the wants of nature supplied, thinks himself very good, and thanks God that he is not as other men are! He ought to be thankful that he is happy,—not that he is good; for his trial is not yet come, and perhaps never may come! He who prayed for neither riches nor poverty, was wise; and all wise men put up the same prayer. But it is not answered,—poverty comes, and with it its ten thousand trials! There are in all our churches, honoured men, who have never met a severe trial of virtue:—let them yet be humble! Let the perfect man, pure from the fiercest trials, thunder condemnation on his fellows:—let him find consolation in eternal torments;—but who is he?

I have never met with any thing so exquisitely fine as the expostulation with David, which God is made to speak by Nathan. God says, "Have not I given thee two kingdoms, and many wives into thy bosom, and if thou had asked it, I would have given thee yet more?" and then is introduced his adultery and murder!! Who can read this, and not tremble that he is a man! Who does not pray that his trials were over, and that he ceased to be in the land of temptation?

HOMO.

SIR,

May 15, 1818.

**W**ILL you permit an old Correspondent of the Theological Repository, [Vols. IV., V., VI.,] to address a few thoughts in your very useful and entertaining Miscellany, on a subject the most awful and interesting imaginable, especially as we see the day approaching? There may

be nothing *new* in the following observations; and they are thrown out for the sake of some more able hand to consider particularly the texts I have alluded to, relating to this subject, and prove if any of them or others militate against the supposition of the *first* resurrection taking place in the same manner as our Saviour's, which was the first-fruits of them that sleep. I repeat, after the same *manner*, as the affairs of the world were not interrupted by it at the time, nor was either his resurrection or ascension *known* or *seen* by any in the world, but by his disciples only.

The great consolation of the Christians in those days of vengeance, and with which St. Paul exhorts them to *comfort one another*, is, the connexion these judgments have with the resurrection of the just, and the change of the righteous living at the coming of our Lord from heaven (and not before); by which they will escape all these judgments, and stand before the Son of Man, in *that day*, emphatically so called; as also the day of his appearing, as distinct from the general resurrection and *final* judgment at the *last* day. Our Saviour calls it the resurrection of the just, Luke xiv. 14; St. John, the *first* resurrection, Rev. xx. 5, 6; and St. Paul, the resurrection of those that are Christ's at his *coming*, 1 Cor. xv. 23. These three authorities appear to me to point at *two* periods of time; a first and second resurrection, most distinctly and literally; the first, at our Lord's second coming, the other at the *end* of Christ's reign, which St. Paul speaks of, when death, the *last* enemy, is to be destroyed, and of course, there will be no subjects to be raised, but those only who have previously died, and been left in the grave till the last or general judgment.

I conceive that the *first* resurrection may take place without any interruption of the affairs of this world; I mean only as far as our Saviour's resurrection and ascension did, and as relates to the kingdom of God upon earth. This great event will be accomplished *after* the *first* resurrection takes place, as the spread of Christianity did after our *Lord's* resurrection and ascension: see Luke xvii. 24—36, inclusive. There will be, undoubtedly,

great changes, great judgments, great glory and great happiness, till death shall be swallowed up in victory. But the *immortality* of the righteous will be a distinct happiness. All these things, St. Paul informs us, are to take place at the *last trump*; and they are every where in Scripture spoken of as coming on the world suddenly and unexpectedly. St. Paul in his 1 Cor. xv., in the close of his argument on this head, which is highly deserving our regard, tells us, that he explains to us a mystery, when he informs us, that "the dead shall be raised, and the living changed at the *last trump*; for the trumpet," says he, "shall sound." Now, the words "last trump," and "the trumpet shall sound," are evidently metaphorical. In the emblematical language of prophecy, the sound of the trumpet always signifies some very great change in human affairs, which would be followed by such events as are the main objects of the prophecy. Thus St. John tells us, Rev. x., in the words of the arch-angel, whom he beheld in the vision, coming down from heaven, "that in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall *begin* to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished." Is not *this* the mystery which St. Paul unfolds to us in 1 Cor. xv. (see Evanson's Sermon on the Resurrection); and also in 1 Thess. iv. 14, and following verses, to chap. v. 11? Observe particularly the 4th, 9th and 10th verses of chap. v., and the 16th verse of chap. iv. as applicable to the *escape* of the righteous, when the Saviour comes to inflict the threatened vengeance on his enemies. See also Luke xxi. 34—36. The apostle Paul assures us, that the trumpet of the seventh angel shall at length sound; the great changes predicted by it, assuredly take place; (one of which, I conceive, will be the restoration to life of the virtuous dead, and the sudden change of the virtuous living, to immortal happiness,) and lead to the great and final revolution of all the kingdoms of the earth, and the conversion of the Jews to Christianity; when the kingdoms of *this* world will become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ. The apostle calls it the *last trump*, because the glorious kingdom of God will then immediately



appear; in which, God has foretold by his prophet Isaiah, "that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Coincident with these awful events may be that *descent* mentioned in Zech. xiv. 4, of the Saviour on the Mount of Olives, from which he also ascended, and *who is to come in like manner*, Acts i. 11. Here no date is fixed. But in Daniel, the angel tells him, "that he shall stand in his lot at the end of the days." Of what days, we may ask? I apprehend he means at the end of the 1335 days or years; for *blessed* and *holy* is he that shall see those days. However that may be, and it does not become any man to be presumptuous on a subject like this, Paul, Daniel and John, agree that all these great changes will take place at the sounding of the *seventh* angel, or *last* trump, and *at the end of the days*. See also Dan. xii. 2, 3. All these great events are closely connected, and almost cast into shade the awful calamities with which they are to be accompanied, at the *appearing* of the Son of Man in his kingdom.

I have one observation to make before I close this subject. The angel informed Daniel, that "*many* (not *all*) that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt." This seems to be adverse to the opinion I am contending for, a partial and not a general resurrection. But it does not necessarily follow that the same period of time is intended. The angel may only suggest that there will be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust, as St. Paul has affirmed; and, as I think, from the foregoing passages stated, to take place at two separate periods of time: the first, of *those that are Christ's at his coming*: the latter, or general resurrection, at the end of his reign; when he shall have put all enemies under his feet. The *last* enemy that shall be destroyed is *death*. Now observe, that *this* enemy is not destroyed at his coming, but at the end of his reign; which St. Paul and St. John say, will finish with the general resurrection.

I have thrown these hasty thoughts together, in the hope that some of your Correspondents may take up this truly awful and very interesting sub-

ject; and I shall, with great pleasure, attend to any remarks they may favour me with.

PHILALETHES.

P. S. Every lover of biblical criticism must admire the exactly literal version of Dr. Alexander on Philip. ii. 5—11, in your Monthly Repository [XII. 614—617]. But as the dwarf can sometimes see farther than the giant, when mounted on his shoulders, I would prefer the word *slave* to *servant*, as heightening the contrast, and as it alludes to the *crucifixion*, which was the common death of the Roman *slaves*, and the most *ignominious* punishment, as well as cruel, that could be inflicted.

Paddington,

April 3, 1818.

SIR,

IN pursuance of the example of some of your former Correspondents, I have to communicate to your readers the copy of a Protest against the Marriage Ceremony, as administered by law; the ceremony took place on Thursday, April 2, and the parties (as you will see by the names subscribed) were Mr. J. Dillon, of Paddington, and Miss M. Woolley, of Plaistow, in Essex. The making marriage a *religious* instead of a *civil* act, and compelling every man, whatever may be his opinions and belief, to conform to the same rite, as administered by a priest in the same church, is a disgrace to a civilized age and country, so much so indeed, that it only requires to be honestly and manfully opposed, to be entirely got rid of. Let, Sir, every Dissenter, and particularly every Unitarian, but bear his public testimony against this grievous imposition, and its interested and ignorant supporters will not dare to defend a practice so absurd in itself, so inconsistent with the enlightenment of the age, and so serious and important in its moral consequences. Hoping to see your Magazine the record of *many* such stands against priestly imposition, and trusting, from the visible advantage derivable from a frequent repetition of the subject, to your speedy insertion of these observations, and the accompanying documents, I remain,

DELTA.

" To Mr. ———, commonly called the  
Rev. Mr. ———.

" The undersigned, being *Unitarian Dissenters*, present to you the following *Protest* against the Marriage Ceremony, to which, according to the law of the land, they are compelled to subscribe. They disclaim all intention of acting disrespectfully either to the legislature, or to its civil officer before whom they stand. They lament that they are placed in a situation so unnatural, as that even forbearance to what they consider as *established error*, would be a formal recantation of opinions which they received on conviction, and which they will only renounce on similar grounds.

" Against the *Marriage Ceremony*, they can but most solemnly protest ;

" *Because* it makes marriage a religious instead of a civil act ;

" *Because*, as Christians and Protestant Dissenters, it is impossible we can allow of the interference of any human institution, with matters which concern our faith and consciences ;

" *Because*, as knowing nothing of a priesthood in Christianity, the submission to a ceremony performed by a person 'in holy orders, or pretended holy orders,' is painful and humiliating to our feelings ;

" *Because*, as servants of Jesus, we worship the one living and true God, his God and our God, his Father and our Father ; and disbelieve and abominate the doctrine of the Trinity, in whose name the Marriage Ceremony is performed.

" (Signed)

" JOHN DILLON,

" MARY WOOLLEY,

" Members of the Church of God, meeting in the Crescent, Jewin Street, known by the name of Free-thinking Christians."

April 2, 1818.

Clapham,

SIR,

March 23, 1818.

I CONCEIVE it affords a fair trial of the scripturality of any doctrines, to observe whether those who believe simply as they are taught, and speak simply as they mean, are led by receiving them into scriptural or unscriptural ways of thinking and speaking. As many of your readers may not be accustomed to peruse the

Missionary accounts that are published, they may not be aware how striking an occasion they present of applying this trial to the question of the Trinity. It may not be useless to prove this by a few instances, which are a fair sample of a host of others.

In the Christian Observer for February, in this year, an interesting account is given of a visit paid by a man named Anund Messech, to some Christian converts in the neighbourhood of Delhi. He found in their hands a copy of a gospel, and on pointing out to one of them the name of Jesus, asked him, " Who is that ?" " That is God ;" replied the Hindoo. Would this have been an apostle's answer ? Again, in the Missionary Register for the same month, we read a letter from a Calmuc prince, addressed to the President of the Russian Bible Society. It begins in this way :— " On the 19th of the first Tiger month I received with great pleasure the letter you wrote me, together with two copies of the History of the Merciful God Jesus Christ, translated into our Mougolian language. You desire me to read in this book. In obedience to this command, I have not only myself read the word and doctrines of the Almerciful God Jesus Christ, but have given one of the copies to our Lama, who reads it with the priests."

Once again, among the same pages is given a letter from Pomare, King of Tahiti, or Otaheite, accompanying his household gods, which he has sent over to Europe, as he beautifully says, " that they may be either burnt with fire, as is thought proper, or that the people of Europe may satisfy their curiosity, and know Tahiti's foolish gods." Here, indeed, is cause not only for blessing God and glorying in our Master, but also for heartily commending our brethren, and embracing them with Christian love, who have done such great good. But is it not startling to read in Pomare's letter, twice repeated, such expressions as these : " When this body of mine shall be dissolved in death, may the Three-one save me !" " The Three-one, he it is that can make the love of sin to cease" ?

Surely we may say, this appears to be a setting forth of strange gods, and is too much like reclaiming men from

one idolatry to plunge them into another. In the mean time, it may shew the call that there is on those who hold the old Christian truth, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," to be active, *not only at home but abroad*, lest Christianity should be misrepresented all over the world. May God grant that there may soon be missionaries of this description, that it may appear, under his blessing, that the simple and genuine gospel is mightier than any corruption of it.

HOPEFUL.

*Palgrave,*

SIR, February 6, 1818.

**P**RESUMING that the Author of the "Survey," in your last Number, [pp. 77—80,] is correct in what he states, I am very sorry to find that the Attorney-General should, on the late trials, have distinctly stated that Unitarians are still amenable to the common law for transgressions against established doctrines. The worthy writer points out an obvious method, as he thinks, by which we may avoid every evil, but I am not quite sure that his plan will give us sufficient latitude. It is hardly enough for us to preach our opinions unless we may contrast them with those of our opponents, and thus discover the relative deformity. But supposing we could do so, still being jealous of any encroachment on religious liberty, I beg to ask your legal Correspondents, whether or not this be not a new doctrine, "that we are amenable to the common law"? I am aware that Christianity is considered as part of the common law, though, unless it can stand without this prop, perhaps some may think it not worth preserving. But I was not aware that any *particular form* of Christianity, to use the words of a *Church Dignitary*, was so established by common law, as to make those who differed from that established doctrine sinners against the law. In fact, was not your able Correspondent, who sent you an account of indictable offences not many months since, correct in shewing that, upon all informations thus laid, the judges uniformly made a difference between impugning the evidences of Christianity, and the questioning of the validity of those

doctrines, on which wise men have differed? This was the impression your worthy Correspondent's paper made on my mind; but how is this statement reconcilable with the Attorney-General's opinion? And if things, after all, are so, that we are amenable, should we not apply for farther protection; for it signifies but little whether I spend my time in prison, from sinning against common law, or from transgressing the enactments of a positive penal statute?

J. F.

SIR,

March 11, 1818.

**I**N reading the critique on Mr. Fox's sermon, delivered before the Unitarian Fund Society, 28th March, 1817, [p. 137,] I was struck with what I conceived to be a great impropriety; and as my only wish is to be guided by *reason and truth*, I shall feel greatly obliged to any of your Correspondents to relieve my mind from the perplexity I labour under in consequence. The critique informs me, that Trinitarians, as such, are not idolaters, because their worship is the result of "an honest compliance with the dictates of an erring judgment." Until now, Mr. Editor, I had thought that the worshiping of any object, other than the great Creator of all things, was idolatry, although, at the same time, I did not think the sin of idolatry was of equal magnitude in all. For instance, the Roman Catholic maintains the efficacy of saint-worship, the Heathen nations the efficacy of worshiping the sun, moon, fire, wood, stone, &c. &c.; but as this worship results from ignorance more or less according to the degree of light and knowledge which they might, or might not have, so I thought would be their sin before the Almighty. But if these people worship, according to the Reviewer, "with an honest compliance with the dictates of an erring judgment," they are not idolaters. What then is idolatry?

Again: "Mr. Fox," says the Reviewer, "seems to maintain Mr. Lindsey's opinion, that 'Trinitarian worship is Christian idolatry.'" Now, Mr. Editor, I am not very well acquainted with ancient mythology, but I am told they had gods many and lords many; neither am I sufficiently acquainted with modern or Christian



mythology; but this I do know, that they too have gods many, and yet I am informed by the respectable Reviewer of Mr. Fox's sermon, that as they worship "with an honest compliance with the dictates of an erring judgment," they are not idolaters. If even the more polished of the heathen world had many gods, and differed one from another as to the particular god or image of their worship, and were considered idolaters, how, in the name of common sense, can we reject "Mr. Lindsey's opinion, that 'Trinitarian worship is Christian idolatry'?" Have not the Trinitarians gods many? I well remember to have heard from the Tabernacle pulpit, (for, for many years I was a Tabernacle man,) addresses in the same prayer, to God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, and these compounded, making another god. If this gross worship had not been, again and again, obtruded upon my understanding, no doubt I should have kept my seat there to this day; (for I bear witness to their sincerity and piety,) but I thought this worship (first) a great impropriety,—then a perversion of reason,—then contrary to Scripture,—then idolatry, though without sin, because my worship was in "honest compliance with the dictates of an erring judgment;" nevertheless I have thought, and continue to think, I was an idolater, and a "Christian idolater" too, though not wilfully. I hope some one of your learned Correspondents will take this subject up, and inform your readers (especially the class to which I belong) what idolatry is,—distinguishing between Jewish, Heathen and Christian idolatry. In giving the above in your valuable Miscellany, you will greatly oblige a new subscriber.

A. Z.

*Plymouth,*

*March 28, 1818.*

SIR,

**A**LTHOUGH it is our lot, as a sect, to be much spoken against, and we may expect from every quarter, both direct and indirect blows from the parties which divide the Christian church, yet we have no occasion to apprehend offence where none was intended, nor to imagine that every advocate of orthodoxy means a fling at us when he says

something ill-natured of a different party. The feelings of Unitarians are those of men, alive to every touch, and liable, therefore, to be unnecessarily awakened by the inuendos of the orthodox champions.

I am inclined to think this has been the case in a recent instance; and, lest the alarm which has been raised by a friend, warm in the interests of truth, should spread in the Unitarian circle, I must beg to rectify what I conceive a mistake, as to the opinion that is entertained by an eminent Scotch divine, of the actual state of the Unitarian church.

I refer, Sir, to a declaration made by Dr. Chalmers, in the Introduction to his very celebrated Astronomical Sermons; the passage is as follows: "This was the sole attribute of his theology, (a firm belief in revelation,) which I had in my eye when I presumed to eulogize it. I do not think that, amid the distraction and the engrossment of his other pursuits, he has at all times succeeded in his interpretation of the book, else he would never in my apprehension, have abetted the leading doctrine of a sect or a system, which has now nearly dwindled away from public observation."

Now it has been thought that the Doctor here alludes to Unitarianism; but this I apprehend is a mistake. I learn from a very intelligent gentleman, whose usual residence is at Glasgow, that the opinion generally prevailing in the circles of that city is, that he refers to the Millenarian hypothesis, or the reign of Christ for a thousand years upon the earth. His language is doubtful, and I do not think we are warranted to apply it to the case of Unitarianism. Whether Sir Isaac Newton was a Millenarian or not, I have not been able to discover either by my own researches or by those of an industrious friend. His tutor, Dr. Barrow, avowed this notion; it was very generally prevalent at the time Sir Isaac lived; and the sweet influences of Christianity appear to have laid fast hold of his enlarged and philosophic mind; it is, therefore, highly probable that a notion so accordant with the moral and benevolent sensibilities of man would be acceptable to him. Churchmen and Dissenters equally patronizing the opinion, he might become its advocate.

with more safety than he could be the advocate of other theological opinions openly: on this point the cry of heresy would not be raised against him. And, that he was not better known as a believer in the proper unity of God, was owing, perhaps, to some dread of such a charge. Perhaps some of your readers may discover in his works the distinct traces which have led Dr. C. to regard him as the abettor of a leading doctrine now generally fallen into disrepute.

Dr. Chalmers cannot be so totally unacquainted with the world in which he is living, as to believe that Unitarianism is now dwindling away. He has seen a proof of the contrary in the very city in which he resides; and in other towns of the northern kingdom are manifestations of the falsehood of the position; and whatever opinion we may entertain of the solidity of the Doctor's apprehension, that other worlds and other systems may be interested in the awful catastrophe of the sacrifice of a God upon the little hill of Calvary, by that pitiful, that despicable race of bipeds, called Jews, we really believe Dr. Chalmers knows better than to insinuate "that Unitarianism has nearly dwindled away from public observation."

I am, Sir, proud of the honourable rank in which Unitarian professors now stand, and confident of the greater honour that yet awaits the Unitarian profession, yours in sincere congratulation,

I. W.

SIR, Jan. 12, 1818.  
**A**MONGST the desiderata on the part of free inquiry, may I be permitted, through the medium of your widely-circulated little volume, to report one, in my opinion, of no little consequence, viz. a bookseller of liberal and fearless principle at the West end of the town. I should be happy to be contradicted by any of that respectable profession residing in that particular quarter: but at present I most reluctantly, but as confidently presume myself authorized, from some experience, to say, that the fear of Reverends and Very Reverends and Right Reverends, before their eyes, forbids one and all of them from even suffering to be advertised as only sold at their shops, any publication which

these great Dons in Divinity might object to, as too determinedly heterodox. It is not long ago that a "venerable" of this sacred order had very nearly proceeded to excommunicate, in form, a right and very loyal and Church-going member of the fraternity, for having in his window a little book, good-humouredly enough surely, entitled, "The Common Prayer Book of the Sect of the Thirty-nine Articles (still whimsically enough styling itself *the* Church of England) made Scriptural," &c.; and a friend of mine, only the other day, upon proposing, for sale under his roof, to another, a page or two, as inoffensively too, entitled, "Addenda to Gastrel's Christian Institutes, or a Sequel to 'Bible Precepts,' for the edification of 'Bible only Schools,'" was at once replied to, that he did not dare to sell the sheet in question, because he published for the Bishop of ——. For brevity's sake I make no comment.

#### A GRADUATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

P. S. May I avail myself of the opportunity to remark, that in compliance with the request in your present Number, I have added the name of a friend to your list of subscribers.

Gainsborough,  
 May 8, 1818.

SIR,  
**Y**OUR volumes will hereafter be looked into as a record of facts and events, out of which the historian and biographer of Unitarian Dissenters may extract the most important materials. In this view, I think a short sketch of the history of the buildings and congregations connected with us in various parts of the country, is a *desideratum*. I communicate the following account of the "old Presbyterian, or Independent meeting-house" at Gainsborough, with a hope, if it be acceptable, that short communications of a like nature from other places may be excited.

The present meeting-house, situated in Ratten Row, (in modern times, Beaumont Street,) has been erected more than 100 years. It has little appearance of a place of worship externally; but it is neatly fitted up within, and will contain upwards of 200 persons. We have no accurate account of its origin; but Mr. Ambrose

Rudsdell was minister here in A. D. 1707, and continued so till 1750, when it is supposed he resigned and retired; he died in the neighbourhood, April 8, 1754. By the register of christenings in his time, and from some other circumstances, it appears that the congregation must have been very numerous, and highly respectable. Some important legacies were left by different individuals belonging to the congregation, for charitable purposes, and for the maintenance of a *Presbyterian or Independent* minister in that place. By this cautious wording, it seems that the donors were aware of the change of constitution which the Presbyterian congregations in England were undergoing, and provided against being misunderstood.

Mr. Jeremiah Gill succeeded, in 1750, and remained pastor until his death, which happened in 1796. This gentleman was one of the contributors to the *Theological Repository*, edited by Dr. Priestley. (See *Mon. Repos.* XII. 601.)

Mr. Jacob Brettel, who had been for some time a fellow-labourer with Mr. Gill, succeeded him as pastor of the congregation, and continued in that office fourteen years. He died March 19, 1810, aged 48 years, and is buried by the side of his predecessor, in the church-yard of Gainsborough; as was also Mr. Rudsdell. Over each of these ministers, whose remains are separated by only a few yards of ground, a handsome, but plain monument is erected. Thus it appears, that for considerably longer than a century, this congregation had but three ministers.

Mr. N. T. Heineken was elected the successor of Mr. Brettel, and was pastor from 1810 to Midsummer, 1817, at which time he removed, to take the charge of a congregation at Bradford, in Yorkshire, not without the warmest esteem of those among whom he had laboured with much acceptance and usefulness for near seven years.

The choice of the congregation next fell upon your present Correspondent,

R. LITTLE.

P. S. An anecdote respecting Mr. A. Rudsdell, the first of my predecessors whose name is recorded, may be found in the interesting *Life of Mr. Wm. Hutton*, of Birmingham.

And it may be worth mentioning, that a grandson of his is at this day the senior member of our congregation.

SIR, *Clapham, May 10, 1818.*

I DOUBT not but most of your readers have perused with singular pleasure, the letter from a native Unitarian Christian at Madras, lately edited by Mr. Belsham. (See *Christian Reformer*, IV. pp. 1—10.) It is, indeed, a just occasion for joy and thanksgiving; and we are also obliged to the editor for his interesting remarks upon it. But, I must confess, I felt a damp on my pleasure, when I found that a person of so much influence was not about to second, but to discourage the petition of the Indian Unitarians, for a European teacher; and as I feel deeply interested in the subject, I beg leave to propose a few arguments in favour of our acceding to that petition. Mr. Belsham observes, that "it is not within the purview of the society to send out Missionaries; and, *that for his own part, he did not see that they could be of any use.*" He thinks that Roberts, the writer of the letter, and a few younger assistants whom he might select, would make better preachers than Europeans. Now as to the Unitarian Society, the sending Missionaries is evidently not one of its functions; but the inutility of Missionaries is not so manifest. There is no doubt, that native teachers have their own advantages; and if the question were as to the relative magnitude of those advantages, in comparison with those of Europeans, it might not be easy to decide. But the question is, whether European Missionaries might not greatly promote and assist the endeavours of the natives? Now, I think, a few considerations may convince us that they might, and would.

I will argue, first, from the attention and respectability which a European teacher, especially a scholar and a gentleman, would procure for the cause. As the Master said, "A prophet has no honour in his own country." A native teacher of a foreign religion labours under all the odium of an apostate from his own: a terrible prejudice to encounter, but from which the foreigner is free. All



accounts from India shew, that the Englishman is very highly thought of by the natives; and how great are his advantages, when contrasted with the disabilities of natives, of the lower castes, which seems to be the description of these our brethren! How can we expect that the Bramins will deign to be taught by these abject and profane persons? How much does one wish, that such inquiring Bramins as those whom Mr. B. mentions, should have their attention called to the *existence* of Unitarian, European Christians! To gain respectful attention to Christianity, is more than half to win the day. A gentleman, who lately published a work entitled, "Sketches of India," asserts, that he was a witness to the reading and teaching of a Baptist Missionary, for several weeks, during a great religious fair, before an attentive audience of above 8000 persons, including many Bramins. One cannot but suppose, that it was the European who commanded so much attention.

I would argue, secondly, from the superior intelligence and information, which a well-instructed Missionary must possess over a native Hindoo, on subjects connected with Christianity. He has read the originals of the Scripture; he knows at large the history of the church and the world; he has seen the ends of controversies, and the tendencies of opinions; he has a philosophical expansion of views, and a Christian superiority to superstition, to which the native Christian can seldom have attained. An infant church, in such a land as Hindostan, seems to need such a guide. But what is a stronger argument, our Indian friends feel *themselves* their need of such a helper. Probably, indeed, with the gospels in their hands, they may discern and embrace the essence of our simple religion; but then they need some person of authority, to assure them, when this is attained, that they *have the one thing needful*, to set them at rest that they are Christians.

A third source of argument, is the importance of opening a channel of communication. This our Indian brother craves, in order, as he says, "that we may hold up to them the true light, and encourage and raise their spirits in their duty." I humbly hope that

this letter of William Roberts, which is so plainly the call of Jesus to feed his flock, will not be disregarded by us. Such an opportunity may never be given again; a finer never opened before the eyes of Christian philanthropists. I have been considering usefulness abroad; but I must add, that undertakings of this kind leave a rich reward at home: they call religious feeling into animated and delightful action, and promote the general sympathy and love of Christians to one another; and as to Unitarianism, I believe, that under the Divine blessing, they would be to it as the bread of life.

T. F. B.

*Loughborough,*

SIR,

May 9, 1818.

I WAS examining lately a coin of Constantine, surnamed the Great, and had occasion to turn to the life of the Emperor, as given by Lempriere, in his Classical Dictionary; it is there related, that "Constantine was learned, and preached, as well as composed, many sermons, one of which remains."

Constantine, it seems, was a preacher, and employed in the propagation of the doctrines of the gospel, not only the keen logic of the sword, but also the weapons of the ecclesiastic, the tongue and the pen. The use of force was sufficiently consistent with the Emperor's general conduct, but the office of Christian minister accorded not with his character; and the illustration and enforcement of the mild, merciful and benign system of Christianity, came with a bad grace from him who took away the life of his own son by means of poison.

When we call to mind that the first Christian Emperor employed his pen in defence of the religion of Jesus, we are inclined to wonder that his productions should have been consigned to oblivion: but when we recollect that this same writer of sermons murdered his own son Crispus,\* it is no longer difficult to account for the forgetfulness in which his discourses seem to have been buried.

If any of the readers of the Repository would favour us with some account of the subject, style, &c. of

---

\* See the articles Crispus and Constantinus, in Lempriere's Classical Dictionary.

the remaining sermon of Constantine, it would gratify, not only the writer of this article, but I should think many of our Unitarian friends. The Royal Discourse of the Emperor is certainly a Christian antiquity, and some information concerning it, to say the least, could not fail of tending to the gratification of the theological antiquary.

W. P.

SIR,

May 6, 1818.

**H**AVING long been, and still remaining in great doubts concerning the disputes between materialists and immaterialists, permit me to put the following questions to both parties, the answers to which may, perhaps, in some degree serve to discover on which side the truth lies.

1. Do we know any thing of matter except its qualities, such as extension, colour, hardness? &c.

2. Do we know any thing of mind except its qualities, such as the power of perceiving, thinking? &c.

If both these questions be answered, as I imagine they must be, in the negative, I proceed to ask the immaterialist—Can you prove, that the qualities of mind are incompatible with those of matter? And of the materialist I inquire, Can you shew that the qualities of mind necessarily result from any combination of those of matter, or are necessarily connected with them? If all these questions be, as it seems to me they must be, answered in the negative, it will then follow, that we have not yet at least sufficient data to establish the truth of either hypothesis.

T. C. H.

Kidderminster,

May 16, 1818.

SIR,  
**T**HE letter, of which you now receive a copy, was written by a young gentleman to his relative in Kidderminster; if you do not object, I should be happy to see it inserted in your valuable Repository.

H.

Rome, Good Friday,

MY DEAR SIR, Mar. 20, 1818.

**T**HOUGH separated from home by a distance of 1300 miles, I cannot cease to think with frequent and affectionate regard upon the friends I have left behind. If the same sentiments are

common also to them, it will not be unacceptable to hear occasionally by letter from one whom circumstances have removed so far from them.

After a stay of five weeks at Paris, we turned our faces southward, and passing another five weeks, with great satisfaction, between Lyons, Turin, Bologna and Florence, we arrived here just in time to witness all the ceremonies and solemnities of Christmas.

Though the duration of Rome has been so considerable as to have dignified it with the title of the eternal city, the propriety of such an epithet is called into question at every step, by the marks of ruin, desolation and decay. Much as I was prepared to enjoy my visit to these hallowed precincts, at once the scene of so many early associations, and the theme of my maturer studies, it was some days before I could view with complacency the shattered columns of its temples or smile amidst the vestiges of departed greatness. It is too humiliating to see the *Forum Romanum*, the theatre of their ancient glory, degraded by the modern Romans into a common cattle market, and the intervals between its dilapidated walls now made the seat of beggary in its most revolting form. That feeling, however, has now subsided, the scenes are become familiar to me, and the mere locality of the Forum, once fully ascertained, is enough to carry back my imagination to the days of old, and to make the heroes of antiquity pass in review before me.

The quarter of the Forum is crowded with remains. At one end is the commanding eminence of the capitol, which hath a modern edifice upon the old foundations. Immediately at the foot of it is the arch of *Septimus Severus*, with the remains of two colonades of temples, and one insulated column in honour of one of the late emperors. At the opposite end is the Arch of Titus, in honour of the overthrow of Jerusalem; on the right hand you have the massive remains of the Imperial Palace, and on the opposite a chain of shattered temples, magnificent even in their fall.

You have no sooner left the Forum than, at the head of the *Via Sacra*, you are confronted with the Arch of Constantine, a very striking and imposing

edifice. It is, however, a monument of the decline of the arts and of good taste, as its only good bas reliefs are borrowed from the Arch of Titus, without any considerations of propriety or truth, whereas its own reliefs are the most paltry things imaginable, both in the style and execution. The *Colosseo*, however, or Amphitheatre, is infinitely the grandest specimen of all antiquity. It is an oval, and might have still been very perfect, had not the Pope been so entirely destitute of taste as to have made a quarry of it for the building of his palace. Not far from it commences *Via Appia*, which communicated with *Capua*, and went for many many miles in a direct line. It is lined for some distance with the fragments of the ancient sepulchres; that of *Scipio* was discovered under ground, only forty years ago, with the *Sarcophagi*, inscriptions, names, &c.; whereas, that of *Metella*, the wife of Crassus, upon the same road, has never ceased to challenge the admiration of posterity.

The most perfect, however, of all the memorials of ancient Rome is the Rotunda of the Pantheon, which remains little impaired either internally or externally, though very different in its decorations now from the time of its erection. The aqueducts are surprising works, and are seen extending for miles in many directions across the dreary plains of the Campagna. But it is inconsistent with the brevity of epistolary correspondence to enumerate all the various monuments of antiquity. It is true, that the identity and character of some are but imperfectly defined and ascertained, and that others are the works of the very worst times of Rome. Still, however, there is enough to interest the classical traveller, in the certainty of the more material points, and in the speculative probability of others of minor merit.

The boast of the modern town is the justly celebrated Cathedral of St. Peter. Its extension has, perhaps, too much the appearance of a palace, but the beauty, comfort, cleanliness and sublimity of its entrance baffle every power of description. Its immense dimensions, its exquisite marbles, its costly and magnificent Mosaics, its splendid monuments and its union of so many chaste and elegant decora-

tions, endear it to every lover of propriety and taste. The Vatican attached to it is the repository of the finest museums of statuary and paintings in the world; though every palace here commands the attention of the traveller, by some specimens of the perfection of the arts. The streets are generally narrow, and oftentimes very offensive. We have a suite of rooms looking into the *Palace d'Espagne*, the most open and pleasing part of the whole town.

But as we are now in the metropolis of Catholic Europe, we avail ourselves of every opportunity to attend the ceremonies of papal worship. On Christmas day we saw the Pope attend the sacrament, at the Church of *St. Maria Maggiore*. He was conveyed up the centre aisle or nave, between two files of military, in a chair of state, with fans of five ostrich feathers on each side of him, and with all the pomp and pageantry of Eastern magnificence. He seemed, indeed, to share a divided worship with the Deity; and though the Catholics in general are very earnest in their devotions, not a soul on that occasion, either ecclesiastic or layman, seemed interested in the service, except the aged Pope himself, who appeared under the influence of a very fervent and unaffected piety. Indeed, he is a most excellent old man, and every circumstance of his life seems calculated to adorn the gospel of his Master. He is much beloved both by natives and foreigners. Another day we were summoned to the Church of St. Sylvester, where a virgin was about to take the veil. She appeared at the altar in a bridal dress, with her father and mother, and after a public profession of her faith and wishes, she was conveyed by the officiating cardinal, to the Convent attached to the church, and presently re-appeared at a grated window behind the altar in the same attire. The abbess and other sisters were in attendance, who, in the presence of a numerous congregation, cut off her hair, stripped her of her finery, and equipped her in all the dismal characteristics of her order. Thus did we see this deluded girl, at an age of not more than twenty-two, consign herself to voluntary and perpetual confinement.

*Monday Night.* There are many



similar establishments at Rome, and almost every day is marked with some solemnity of more than pagan superstition. In St. Peter's, crowds of worshipers are seen every hour kissing the foot, and rubbing their heads under the sole of the apostle. At another church, hundreds of penitents are seen crawling on their knees up the very steps by which our Lord ascended to the judgment hall. At a third, the identical cradle of our Saviour is exhibited. At a fourth, a relic of the manger and remains of the very cross, large enough to fill an ordinary wagon, as if God had multiplied the fragments to animate the piety of the faithful. To me, I must own, it is very painful to see the understandings of my fellow-creatures so perverted, and to find them exchanging the influence of a pure, genuine, inward religion, for the ostentatious, but unimproving homage of ritual observances. I would *pity*, however, but not condemn, and would feel the valued superiority of our own institutions, both in religion and politics, so enhanced by my experience, that I may be more patient, under seeming difficulties, and more grateful for real advantages.

The Easter ceremonies are now over, and wonderfully solemn and imposing they have been. To see high mass at St. Peter's, the noblest Cathedral in the world, to see the head of Catholic Europe, prostrate at the altar of his God, to see him humbling himself to the dust, discarding all his greatness, beating on his breast, and saying, with the emphatic humility of the Publican, *God be merciful to me a sinner*, is indeed a more striking solemnity than my imagination could ever have conceived. To see the same father of the church, in the balcony of St. Peter's, bestowing his patriarchal look upon the thousands in the area below, to hear him invoking the blessing of heaven on the prostrate multitudes beneath him, is indeed so awful and impressive in its effect, that it might soften the most obdurate, and blend the discordant principles of the hearers, in one common sentiment of piety and love.

It has been my extraordinary good luck, too, to see the dome of St. Peter's illuminated, which, till this

year, has been only exhibited on St. Peter's day in June.

Last week but one we took a trip to Tivoli, the ancient Tibur: the scenery about it is absolutely beautiful, though on a very small scale. The cascades are lovely—the ruins graceful—the evergreens singularly rich and beautiful, and the whole effect so engaging, that I had almost betrayed myself into the poet's wish of old:

Tibur Argeo positum colono,  
Sit meæ sedes utinam senectæ, &c.

[*Hor. L. ii. Od. vi.*]

till the thought of distant home and friends, renewed the recollection of a more substantial residence.

I spent rather more than a month at Naples. It is a very fine town and finely situated. Its neighbourhood abounds in classical interest, and solicits your attention on every side. *Cumæ*, *Baiæ*, *Misenus*, the *Lucrine* and *Averne* Lakes, the *Circæan Promontory*, *Pæstum*, &c., are all easily accessible from it. It is, however, a villanous place; there seems, indeed, throughout Italy, to be a sort of scale of roguery increasing as you go south. Thus at Turin you complain a little, but the natives transfer all the abuse to the Florentines, they in like manner to the Romans, and they to the Neapolitans as the very *Ne plus ultra* of rascality, and the very outcasts of society. Travelling, too, though dangerous in many parts of the Roman States, is worse in the Neapolitan, and we have frequently gone, attended for a day together, with some armed men on horseback at every stage.

St. Januarius, as the patron saint there, has in many cases superseded Christianity; there is a statue of him near the bottom of Vesuvius, with one hand pointing to the smoke. On every alarm of an eruption, the inhabitants betake themselves to his protection; but as the Saint seldom interferes, except to support the honour of his own natal day, he not unfrequently has had his face pelted, and his back scourged by the irritated and impatient multitude. I climbed with a large party up to the very crater, and a very amusing and singular adventure it was.

Far, however, the most interesting excursion from Naples is to Pompeii, a town which lay 1700 years buried

under a shower of cinders from Vesuvius, and which is now, since the excavation, so perfect, that you walk through the very streets, enter the very houses, read the very advertisements on the walls, and take your seats in the very same theatre that Cicero and Virgil frequented, in the days of Roman greatness. The limit of our travels was Pæstum, about 70 miles south of Naples. We went from Salerno by sea, about 30 miles; and afterwards by sea to Amalfi, the loveliest sail I suppose in Europe.

But as I have nearly exhausted all my materials and time and paper, I must haste to a conclusion. The post for England starts to-morrow morning. We intend to follow a part of the way on Wednesday. Our route is to go by Bologna, Venice, Milan, &c., staying a few days at each place. Adieu. M. C.

*Extract of a Letter from a Gentleman in Rome, received by his Friends in Edinburgh.*

(See p. 338.)

**I** HAVE lately been much interested by a controversy carried on at Geneva, between the clergymen there and a Mr. Drummond, assisted by Madame Krudner, the great German enthusiast and prophetess. These two, during some little residence they made in Switzerland, had observed the great departure of the clergy and the people from the good old doctrines of John Calvin, and formed a scheme for bringing back the lost sheep to the adoration of the holy Trinity. Their attempt was as bold as it was fruitless. They began by assembling around them all the most ignorant part of the rabble; and when they thought themselves sufficiently strong, wrote a letter to the Consistory, which is a matchless piece of impertinence and folly. I need only mention the few first words, in order to give you an idea of the whole. It addresses the whole church as "blasphemers of the name of Jesus." Can any thing be imagined more arrogant than this? Christian meekness and humility are certainly not very remarkable in it. But the effect of the letter was very different from what its authors expected. The lady was sent out of the town, under the conduct of gens

d'armes, and I have been told, that every canton and country which she reached, afraid of a person so active in stirring up rebellions, had adopted the same measure, and the poor woman was not allowed to rest till she reached Frankfort.

Mr. Drummond was told that his absence would be acceptable, and that if he did not quickly take himself off, he might run a risk of sharing the fortunes of his fair coadjutor. Meanwhile, the people of Geneva were a little troubled; for although the ferment was removed, yet it left some dregs behind it that were not so easily cleared out. Three clergymen, imbued with the principles of these people, convened their brethren, and laid the matter under discussion, in consequence of which, it was necessary to come to some decision. I am glad, however, to tell you, that the judgment of the council does honour to their liberality. It was decreed, that faith in the doctrine of the Trinity, or any other doctrine of any church, was unnecessary, and forms no part of the government of the Church of Geneva; but that a belief in the truth of the holy Scriptures, and a careful study of their contents, with a conformation of the conduct to their dictates, was all that was required of clergymen. Thus you see that true religion, unfettered by the interests of men, or prejudices of education, has at length found a situation in which it may flourish without impediment. Geneva has most gloriously finished the work which she began so happily, and her second reformation *will* be allowed by all to be as great as her first. \*

SIR,

March 7, 1818.

**A**MONG the number of benevolently disposed persons, there are those who consider it praise-worthy to settle a part of the worldly goods, with which they are endowed, for the use of charitable or religious institutions. I have met with individuals who are able, and, I trust, some

\* The above account is very interesting from the information which it conveys concerning the spread of a purer religious system; it does, however, afford too much ground to lament the union of civil authority with any body of ecclesiastics. B.M.

of them inclined to assist in promoting the spread of those religious sentiments, which you and I consider nearly approaching Christian truth, by this means, and who were ignorant of the clogs and restrictions which the laws of their country have imposed upon them, in the exercise of their power over their property, for this purpose. Doubtless there are many that come under this description, who read your valuable publication. By inserting the following extracts from a statute passed in the 9th of Geo. II. (the 36th chap.) you will put these good souls on their guard, and, perhaps, prevent the occurrence of a circumstance which would be unpleasant to yourself, were it to reach your ears, and would be injurious to our glorious cause.

By the above statute it is first enacted, "That from the 24th June, 1736, no manors, lands, tenements, rents, advowsons or other hereditaments, corporeal or incorporeal, whatsoever, nor any sum or sums of money, goods, chattels, stocks in the public funds, securities for money or any other personal estate whatsoever, to be laid out or disposed of in the purchase of any lands, tenements or hereditaments, shall be given, granted, alienated, limited, released, transferred, assigned or appointed, or any ways conveyed or settled, to or upon any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, or otherwise, for any estate or interest whatsoever, or any ways charged or encumbered by any person or persons whatsoever, in trust or for the benefit of any charitable uses whatsoever; *unless* such gift, conveyance, appointment or settlement of any such lands, tenements or hereditaments, sum or sums of money or personal estate, (other than stocks in the public funds) *be made by deed, indented, sealed and delivered, in the presence of two or more witnesses, twelve calendar months at least before the death of such donor or grantor,* (including the days of execution and death,) and beenrolled in his Majesty's High Court of Chancery, within six calendar months next after the execution thereof; *and unless such stocks be transferred in the public books, usually kept for the transfer of stocks, six calendar months at least before the death of such grantor or donor,* (in-

cluding the days of transfer and death,) *and unless the same be made to take effect in possession for the charitable use intended, immediately from the making thereof, and be without any power of revocation, reservation, trust, condition, limitation, clause or agreement whatsoever, for the benefit of the donor or grantor, or of any person or persons claiming under him.*"

By the third section of the act, "all gifts or transfers made in any other manner or form than is directed by this statute," are declared to be "void."

"All gifts or transfers for valuable consideration actually paid, and *bonâ fide* made," are excepted.

It is almost needless to add, that it is provided, "That the act shall not extend to gifts or transfers to either of the two Universities, or any of the colleges or houses of learning within either of the said Universities, or to or in trust for the Colleges of Eton, Winchester or Westminster, for the better support and maintenance of the scholars only upon the foundations of the same colleges." This is a matter of course.

#### HÆRESIARCHUS.

##### *Spirit of the Clergy.*

"Would it be right to involve the numerous adherents of the Church of England in the censure which may justly be attached to—what—some individuals have practised in its support?"—Mon. Repos. XI. 152.

SIR, March 31, 1818.

**A**CCIDENTALLY reverting, a short time ago, to a former volume of your Repository, [X. 576,] I was much struck with the tendency of some reflections closing a Review, which had not previously fallen under my notice, of the present Bishop of London's primary charge to his clergy. I feel anxious to notice the subject as an act of but just exculpation of a numerous portion of individuals in the Establishment, the very contrary spirit of whose conduct and opinions utterly exonerate them from all implication in the views, there (and in as far as they *may* have any real existence deservedly) reprobated by your Reviewer in the article in question.

That there may be some individuals (few, however, it is to be hoped) in



the Church, influenced by the feelings, and entertaining the views that article describes, cannot, perhaps, be questioned, however it must be regretted, as a fact; nor do I apprehend that there is the sect of Christians at this day to be found, within whose pale there are not some intemperate individuals, and may not ever be, it is presumed, without implicating the character or involving in the censure *they* may deserve, the rest of the body.

The persons, however, to whom the reflections alluded to refer, by *no means* form any preponderating proportion of the collective mass of the Established Clergy. And could any public occasion call forth their feelings in an aggregate expression of it, I would boldly venture to predict, that the description of individuals to whom your Reviewer's allusions apply, would be found to constitute a very insignificant minority, in point of numerical strength, however supported by *some* powerful names.

It may not be known, perhaps, to the generality of those who form the usual class of the readers of this Repository, that the very existence of this party in the Church, is a subject of real regret to its more pacifically disposed members; men whom I may safely undertake to describe as conscientious ministers, spending their lives in the silent and unobtrusive discharge of their pastoral duties, amidst the affections, and cheered by the attachment of their parochial flocks, and with too serious a sense of the awful responsibility of their own charge, to allow them to exhaust their precious moments in unedifying and vexatious contests with their dissentient "fellow-labourers in the Lord," to whom, too, they are cordially disposed to give credit (whenever *their* lives are in unison with their professions), for similarly conscientious and zealous integrity.

Believe me, Sir, the characters for whom I am contending, regret that any of their brethren should even *wish* to stand forth as the champions for a renewal of any exploded powers of ecclesiastical supremacy; they regret any attempts to gain an extension of the discipline of their church, beyond what is necessary for its own government, or for any that is not strictly consistent with a due regard

to the rights of religious liberty.\* In conclusion I will only add, what I am convinced, and have ample opportunities of knowing, to be the fact, that a highly respectable portion of the members of the Church, both in talent and in influence, and of its most zealous and consistent supporters, both in its ecclesiastical and in its lay ranks, are as adverse as the warmest advocates for Christian liberty *out of* it can be, to the principles and practice of intolerance and bigotry under any form, or in any shape they can assume—men steadily actuated by motives, free from all *party* views or personal policies and connexions, of preserving "*unity in the bond of peace*," as the basis on which the security and support, the interest and prosperity of every just cause, and of every righteous undertaking must ultimately depend.

V. M. H.

P. S. I am rather inclined to think that your Reviewer's idea, [p. 578,] that the Established Clergy have "*lost their influence, and that they have long ceased to lead*," is not exactly borne out by the existing facts. Their own *experience* certainly and decidedly proves the reverse, as in all cases, unexceptionably, where the principles advocated in the foregoing letter are acted upon, they find an harmonious concurrence in their views, and an affectionate attachment to their persons, which can only be impaired or extinguished by their own imprudence. Nor is this remark of your Reviewer even consistent with his own position in another article, [p. 580,] where he expresses an inclination *almost to envy* them "*the umple means which they possess of gaining the affections of mankind by moderation and catholicism*," which is, in fact, all

---

\* The casual instances which do unfortunately occur, (and seldom occur, I believe, without meeting their merited exposure and punishment,) of petulant and persecuting bigotry, are invariably a subject of grief to the *pacific* members of the Church; and *they*, as I have stated, form no mean portion of that class to which the writer in your Journal, whom Mr. Belsham has so aptly as well as facetiously called your "*Christian Politician*," has thought proper to attach the generalizing appellation of "*the Latitudinarians*."

I contend for; and may I be permitted to indulge the hope, that long may *such* instruments retain their *power* to rescue, and *such* instruments be wisely *used* to secure and perpetuate this natural attachment?

SIR, March 30, 1818.

**I** ACKNOWLEDGE myself incompetent to wield the pen of controversy against the scientific skill of Mr. Belsham, and therefore, without entering the list as his antagonist, I only desire him to establish his right to the ground which he has taken in defence of "Infant Baptism," so called. Indirect proof is certainly as satisfactory as direct; but the question is, has such proof been advanced in support of the fact, that "Infant Baptism was the uniform, universal and undisputed practice of the church from the apostolic age down to the fifth century"? Mr. B. claims this ground; but surely he ought to make himself master of it by fair conquest, before he sets up his banners.

I have perused Mr. B.'s "uniform, universal, uncontradicted testimony of Christian Antiquity," but to my short-sighted capacity there is such a gulph between the apostolic age and practice, and Tertullian the first *father*, that I am ready to add another *un* to Mr. B.'s statement, and say, *unconnected* with apostolic precept: that hundred years forms such a chasm, that Mr. B.'s reasoning is not sufficient to *build a bridge across, and land faith safely on the distant shore*.

"Deny Infant Baptism," says Mr. B., "and we do not say you deny the obligation of a precept formally expressed in holy writ, but you deny that upon which the authority of holy writ itself is founded, you subvert the credibility of the Christian Scriptures." This is a grand charge against Baptists and Antibaptists, which, I trust, will be met and refuted by some of your Correspondents. The language of a humble "Plea" is now transposed into a *peal* of thundering attack. For myself, I ask for Mr. B.'s *why* and *wherefore*; suppose the advanced proof of "Infant Baptism" is the evidence of those persons who are also the evidence for the credibility of the Christian Scriptures, is it necessary for me to believe their comments and practice of apostolic authority, because

I believe their testimony to facts? Mr. B. may say the practice of "Infant Baptism" is a fact; but the point is, whether their testimony supports the fact of "Infant Baptism" being an apostolic appointment, or is simply evidence to the existence of a fact founded on an erroneous comment of scriptural expressions. In the citation from Tertullian, pages 14 and 15 of the "Plea," there is no allusion to apostolic command; the chief part which relates to the point is the language of Christ, "Suffer the little children," &c. Neither in the whole book of Tertullian is such allusion made, although reference is clear to the passage, "Give to him that asketh of thee," &c. Here Tertullian grounds his argument, (ever for allowing little children to come *when grown up*,) on a passage which has nothing to do with the subject; it is simply Tertullian's *comment*, and that *erroneous*. Mr. B. seems to discover some intimation of it, or allusion to "Infant Baptism" in the former passage; see pages 81, 82: but how can a passage favour "*an apostolic institution*," when the same apostles rebuked those who brought the little children to Christ? Mr. B. considers the incidental testimony of Tertullian, as tending to establish his point; but surely, if he mentions his *disapprobation* incidentally, we should infer, that had he treated the subject "*professedly*," he would have *plainly opposed it*. What Mr. B. says respecting his not appealing to authority, and pleading the example of other sects, is what ought not to be expected under these circumstances; and unless we suppose that the first writer, by whom "Infant Baptism" is mentioned, (and who, observe, *disapproved of it*,) was a solitary dissentient, or the only one who disapproved of the practice, it appears to me a reasonable supposition, that he would have made such appeals, had he written expressly or "*professedly*" on the subject. But, in short, Tertullian's testimony has no allusion to the baptism of *babies*, as may be seen by reference to the connexion from which Mr. B.'s extract is taken; it refers solely to infants or *minors*, who had obtained sponsors or guardians, who are able to *ask* for baptism, and to *come* to be baptized. As well might the language of David be adduced to support original sin:

"They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies," and applied to *babies*, as the language and testimony of Tertullian.

Allowing it to be "*impossible*" that Irenæus "could be ignorant of the injunctions and the practice of the apostles concerning baptism," it does not follow that baby-baptism is right, or that Irenæus countenances the practice. Shall we explain the words of the tutor by the scholar's, or the disciple's by the instructor's? When John used the terms, "*fathers*," "*young men*," "*children*," and "*little children*," or Peter, "*new-born babes*," can we suppose they meant what those terms literally mean? Why are not Irenæus's terms of similar import? Why do not they mean the same description of characters, and not persons of different ages? "*By regeneration*," says Mr. B., "*baptism is unquestionably to be understood, that being the only regeneration of which infants are capable.*" This may be Mr. B.'s *unquestionable* opinion, and yet not mine; it is grounded on a mere begging the point in question, namely, that Irenæus is talking of *babies*, instead of converts to Christianity. I may as well say, that regeneration denotes a change from Heathenism to Christianity; but babies are not capable of such a change, and, therefore, Irenæus's *infantes* are not our *little babies*.

Stumbling then at the very threshold of *saintly* ground, I wish these blocks to be removed, or I cannot tread another step with safety and satisfaction. In vain I rub my eyes, without some farther assistance, to see that it follows "by obvious and necessary deduction, that the baptism of the infant (I mean baby) descendants of baptized persons, was authorized and instituted by the apostles themselves."

Mr. B. endeavours to clear the rite from what he conceives erroneous views. "Baptism is not intended to wash away the stains of original sin," says Mr. B., page 87. While Origen, the second witness, to support the "*Plea*," speaking of *original sin*, says, "For this also it was that the church had a tradition or order from the apostles to give baptism even to infants." "Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins; or when have they sinned? . . . . It is because, by the sacrament of bap-

tism, the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." Now, Sir, I am so blind as not to be able to discern the necessity of *believing* Origen, when he says, the church had a tradition to give baptism, and of *rejecting* his testimony, when he declares *the purpose* for which such tradition or order was given.

Mr. B. may ask, how came it to pass that such a practice should prevail *universally* in the church, if it were not authorized by apostolic warrant? I frankly own that I do not know that it was *universal*. I do not know whence arose the custom of *kissing the babies after baptism* in the African churches, unless it were from the apostle's declaration, "Salute the brethren with a holy kiss;" nor can I tell how the practice of baptizing them before kissing, in the laver of regeneration, to wash away the pollution of their birth, crept into use, unless by a strange comment on the apostle's expression, "else were your children *unclean*." I can say I was not so conscientiously delicate as Tidus, for I kissed my baby at three hours of age without baptism; and notwithstanding Mr. Belsham's kind endeavours to persuade me, with others, to act so as not to recollect the time when our children *were not believers in Christ*, mine still remains in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity, according to father Origen's testimony.

Mr. B. fails, *I think*, in his first testimony, and therefore "the uniform, universal, undisputed practice," remains to be established, and then its connexion with the apostolic command.

#### AN UNLETTERED RUSTIC.

Sandonbury,  
April 25, 1818.

SIR,  
THE controversy upon the subject of Infant Baptism, does not appear to me to be conducted on right principles, by either the advocates or the opponents of that rite.

I lay it down as a simple, immutable principle, adapted to the understandings of all men, rich and poor, that no rite or ceremony is obligatory upon Christians in general like ourselves, unless it stands upon a *clear, positive command* to observe it through all ages, accompanied with the particulars of the time when it is to be practised,



and of the *persons*, and succession of persons, who are to administer it.

Upon this solid ground stands the memorial of the passover. The time when it was to be taken, how long it was to continue, by whom it was to be observed, the particular manner of its observance, and its perpetuity, are all clearly and indisputably laid down by God himself. Here then is no subject for dispute or even for doubt; and when Infant Baptism, or any other Baptism, or the ceremony of the Lord's Supper, can be made to appear to rest upon the same foundations, then, but not till then, I think, will they be obligatory upon the disciples of Jesus.

As to infant or adult baptism, let me ask, where is to be found the positive command to practise it? Who is specifically appointed to administer it? In what manner is it to be performed, by dipping or by sprinkling? And at what age or period of life?

It signifies nothing to say, that "Infant Baptism was the uniform, universal practice of the Church from the apostolic age down to the fifth century." Because, in the first place, there must always be some *doubt* respecting the *accuracy* of this kind of knowledge, even in the minds of the most learned men; and, in the second place, the *practice* of the church is no authority for the conduct of Christians. Nothing less than a *positive command* from God, with all the particulars of time and persons, can be sufficient to create an authority which ought to be binding upon the followers of our divine Master. The *practice* of the church can be no just rule for me; it may be an unauthorized practice, an early corruption, a practice which would have been more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Respecting the authority of the apostles to baptize, (excepting Paul,) they were directly commanded by Jesus himself. But observe how delicate was the mind of the apostle Paul on this subject: "I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanus. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Here we see this noble servant of God thanking his Maker that he had not proceeded any farther in this business, because he

discovered upon reflection that he had not received any positive, direct command to baptize at all; and happy would it be for the purity of Christianity, if some modern teachers of religion would imbibe a little of the same species of delicacy which influenced that truly excellent preacher of the gospel. If, then, Paul had no authority to baptize, who can he so presumptuous as to claim any, in our times, unless he can produce a positive command directed to him for that express purpose? I shall rely upon your impartiality for the insertion of the above remarks in your Repository.

G. F.

SIR,

May 28, 1818.

I APPREHEND there are no distinct declarations in the New Testament from which we can decide, whether it was the practice of the apostles to baptize the children of believers that were born after they had professed the Christian faith. All the arguments of the Baptists and the Pædobaptists are taken from the history of the church in the succeeding ages; and I confess I have not yet met with any which carried us up near enough to the original source, to afford satisfaction to my mind upon this subject of, indeed, secondary importance. In this want of direct evidence, we can only have recourse to inference; and not unfrequently this kind of evidence is of a character little short of direct. I should be pleased to have the opinion of those who are advocates for Infant Baptism, and, indeed, of those who are advocates for any Baptism at all, upon the passage of Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 14: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband, *else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*" When a man or his wife had been converted to the Christian faith, there appears to have been a doubt at Corinth, whether it was the duty of this convert to forsake his or her unbelieving partner; and, to decide the question, they applied to their acknowledged oracle. His answer is contained in the tenth and following verses. To be unclean and to be holy are terms of Jewish law, referring to the custom of the Israelites, to sanctify their persons and their vessels for a sacred use; which

was done by washing or sprinkling. These terms were adopted by Christian professors to express the relative states of believers and unbelievers; the outward act of Christian profession being baptism. The observation which follows, respecting the children, seems to imply that the children of a believer are already holy or privileged persons: can there then have been occasion for baptism, to bring them into a state in which they already were, in consequence of the act of the parent? Had they been holy by the act of baptism, the apostle would have ascribed their sanctification to that rite, but he does not; for it is in consideration of one parent being a believer and a baptized person, that he declares them to be holy: hence, I should infer, that baptism was not employed at all with the children of believers.

I. W.

SIR, *Halifax, May 7, 1818.*  
**M**R. JOHNS has undertaken to vindicate the Manchester and neighbouring ministers from the charge of *duplicity*, in styling themselves *Presbyterians*, [p. 281,] and I should think no reflecting person can imagine that a respectable body of men are capable of *wilful* deception. Still I am inclined to believe, that a good deal of mischief is done by adhering to a term, which, to say the least, is unmeaning and totally misapplied. What must an indifferent person suppose on reading "The *Presbyterian* ministers will dine with the friends of the Lancashire and Cheshire *Unitarian* Book Society," but that, on some account, a distinction was intended? I am not aware that the term is continued in any other district, and am of opinion, that an adherence to it is not only improper, but has a tendency to disunite the friends to Unitarianism, which has an abundance of opprobrious epithets from its enemies, without being obliged to complain of internal divisions.

A CONSTANT READER.

*Liverpool,*  
 SIR, *May 11, 1818.*  
**P**ERHAPS your Correspondent Mr. Johns, who has undertaken to advocate the cause of the Manchester *Presbyterians*, [p. 281,] will inform

your readers why they prefer that title to one more suitable in every way to their opinions. I should think as *individuals* they have no objection to be thought *Unitarians*, and the reason remains to be stated of their preference *collectively*, to a term which undoubtedly they would not continue but on the most satisfactory grounds.

AN UNITARIAN.

*Hammersmith,*

SIR,

*May 17, 1818.*

**I** WISH to express my thanks to J. T. R. and Mr. Bransby for the gratification they have afforded me, by their communications of and respecting the elegant and expressive epigram, "Ad Somnum," and various translations of it, inserted pp. 95, 277.

To any of your readers who are musical, (and to the gentlemen above-named I am particularly desirous of mentioning the circumstance,) it may not be an unwelcome addition to the information already imparted respecting it, to state that one of these translations, if I remember rightly, the third, "Though Death's strong likeness in thy form we trace," &c.

has been set to music with great felicity by that eminent composer Danby.

I am indebted to the obliging attentions of Mr. Bartleman for my knowledge of this exquisitely sweet glee; which, from its words, its music, and that gentleman's incomparable performance of the bass line of it, could not fail of being powerfully, and no less agreeably impressed on my recollection.

JAMES SILVER.

SIR,

*May 6, 1818.*

**I** WAS, till very lately, prevented, by various occupations, and some of them far less agreeable, from reading Mr. Yates's pieces in controversy with Mr. Wardlaw, with any thing like the attention they justly deserve.

There are, however, two passages upon which the liberal-minded author of those pieces will, I am persuaded, allow me to solicit farther information. In the *Vindication*, p. 16, he says, "Whether the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures be a doctrine of the Christian religion, is one of the questions upon which Unitarians are divided in opinion."

Of this statement I am inclined to doubt the accuracy. I can, indeed, hardly suppose it possible for a person to examine the Scriptures so fully as to embrace the Unitarian faith, in defiance of long-established creeds and recommended formularies, received by the great majority of Christians, without observing that no such plenary inspiration is claimed by the sacred writers, or consistent with several of their declarations; not to add the conduct of Divine Providence in suffering the Scriptures to come down to these later ages, under the disadvantages common to all ancient writings; though counteracted by the high regard early paid to those invaluable records, and the jealousy of rival sects, among whom they formed a common authority.

The other passage to which I refer is in the *Sequel*, p. 17, where Mr. Yates says, "Of the language and sentiments of Dr. Priestley, contained in the passages, which Mr. Wardlaw has quoted, I strongly disapprove; and I have no doubt, that my sentiments are those of the great mass of Unitarians."

Not having access to Mr. Wardlaw's publication, I can only conjecture, as to the passages here censured, I need not say, on the part of Mr. Yates, with the highest respect to Dr. Priestley's memory, and from a motive which he would have been among the first to approve. As many of your readers may be in a situation like myself, the able *Vindicator* may probably be disposed to satisfy an inquiry, which I can assure him is prompted by a better motive than curiosity.

R. L. C.

SIR,

March 20, 1818.

**I** OBSERVE in the *New Annual Register* for 1785, [VI. 276,] the notice of a work, entitled *The Restoration of all Things*, "by Mr. Brown, late Missionary in Georgia." It is described as "an ingenious and liberal essay, and worthy of attentive perusal." This author describes, as the end of the Divine dispensations, "the entire extirpation of evil, disorder and misery; and the restoration of peace, perfection and felicity, through all the regions of the Divine dominions." Some of your readers may, perhaps,

know and communicate farther information respecting the author and his work.

BREVIS.

SIR,

June 15, 1818.

**H**AD your Correspondent *Obscurus*, [p. 331,] taken the trouble to read with attention the note at the foot of Griesbach's page, he would have seen that Professor Birch expressly retracts the reference which he had made to the Vatican manuscript, and, consequently, that the Editors of the Improved Version are not under an error, when they assert with Griesbach, that in the celebrated passage, Acts xx. 28, "the received text reads *God* upon the authority of no manuscript of note or value."

B.

P. S. *Obscurus* very oddly refers to the note above alluded to, as "stating Birch's grounds for his asserting the Vatican reading to be Θεσ," whereas it really states his reasons for retracting his assertion. Let the reader judge from the words of the note itself: viz. Sed in præfatione ad Varias Lectiones ad textum Apocalypses collectas, p. xxxix. Birchius, "Cum schedas meas, inquit, collationem hujus codicis (B) complectentes iterum intentè examinarem, nihil de lectione ἐκκλησίαν τὸ Θεσ, nec alia lectione hoc loco adnotatum invenio, ita ut pro certo pronunciare non ausim, quid in codice nostro scriptum reperiat. Vix tamen dubitare licet, si hic (hæc?) in codice nostro obtinuisset varietas lectionis, hanc intentionem meam fugisse, cum locum hunc notabilem in omnibus codd. qui mihi obvenierint, præ ceteris examinandum sumpserim. Cuinam vero, an typographo, an mihi, culpa sit tribuenda quod Vat. 1209, (i. e. B.) hoc loco irrepperit, omnino me latet: sed delendum esse ex supra dictis apparet."

What *Obscurus* means by stating that Birch's note is unnecessary, "because if we will get the manuscript itself examined, as he has done, they will be able to state the fact positively from their own knowledge," is too obscure for me to comprehend. As however we have got the manuscript examined by Professor Birch, and as he has not discovered this peculiar



reading, I for one shall be content, upon *his authority*, to believe that the word *God* is not to be found in this text, in the Vatican manuscript. Had the word been there, it is hardly possible, that the Professor should have overlooked it, or neglected to have noted so important a variation.

—  
*The Nonconformist.*  
No. V.

*Faustus Socinus and Francis David.*

**T**HE deliberations of this society, so far as they have been directed to the elucidation of the history and to the development of the principles and character of sects and individuals that, since the æra of the Reformation, have stood forward as the advocates of free inquiry and liberty of conscience, in respect to religious faith and worship, have hitherto been restricted to this country. It is now intended to travel into other climes, and to select for the subject of the present essay, *Faustus Socinus*—a man, whose sacrifices to the dictates of his conscience, whose splendid talents, and whose numerous and valuable writings on theological topics, give him a just claim to respectful consideration.

In his views of Christian doctrine, Socinus departed far more widely from the assumed orthodox standard of the Church of Rome, than most of the anti-trinitarian Reformers of his time. But he was not able to divest himself altogether of the influence of a system which had, through so many centuries, been strengthening its hold on the associations and feelings of mankind. Of this we have a decisive proof in his sentiments concerning the high authority of Christ in his mediatorial kingdom, and the lawfulness and propriety, if not the indispensable obligation, thence arising, for invoking him in prayer. In other respects also he appears to have been tainted by the spirit of the church from which he had separated. He was too little disposed to allow for the peculiar impressions, or for the ignorance and mistakes of those persons who failed to see things in the same light as himself, and to admit, in every particular, the correctness and truth of his opinions. His language, both in stating his own sentiments, and in combating

those of his opponents, is, on this account, frequently marked by a tone of arrogance and superciliousness, which but ill accords with the mild, candid and forbearing temper of the genuine Christian.

These defects might, however, be attributed, in a great measure, to the fervour of his zeal, to the natural warmth and vivacity of his feelings, and to the spirit of the age. Had, therefore, nothing more appeared to detract from his high merits, and to cast a shade over the lustre of his virtues, than the maintenance of an opinion scarcely to be reconciled with the other parts of his religious creed, and the ebullitions of anger and contempt which are occasionally observed in his controversial writings, his character might, perhaps, be safely left to the impartial judgment of posterity.

But the reputation of Socinus has come down to the present times, stained by an imputation of a deeper dye, which his warmest admirers and his ablest advocates have not been able wholly to efface. It has been charged against him, that he acted the part of a persecutor; and while himself spurning human authority in the formation, and in the avowal and promulgation of his religious opinions, appealed, with gross inconsistency, to the civil magistrate, to restrain by the iron arm of power, from using the same freedom, and standing on the same natural right, a man not less distinguished than himself by his talents and integrity, who happened to disagree with him on one solitary point of theological speculation. The immediate purpose of the present essay is to investigate the grounds of this heavy accusation, by instituting an inquiry into the circumstances of the persecution of Francis David, in Transylvania, upon which it wholly rests.

It must be premised that this inquiry is attended with many difficulties, which may prevent the formation of a strictly correct judgment on the nature of the transaction, and on the conduct of the parties whose characters are implicated in it. Very few of the writings, wherein the circumstances were professedly detailed, are now accessible, at least in this country: and those that may be consulted, whether composed by friends or ene-

mies, are evidently tinged by a feeling of partiality; and leave room for doubt and hesitation as to the degree in which their representations may be depended upon for their fidelity and truth.

The leading facts of this case are comprised in the following particulars. George Blandrata, a physician, high in favour at court, in Transylvania, and Francis David, an eminent divine and the superintendant of the Unitarian churches of that country, disagreed in opinion on the subject of the invocation of Christ; Blandrata maintaining, and David denying, its propriety and obligation as a religious duty. Blandrata, failing to bring over David to his sentiments, invited Faustus Socinus, then residing in Switzerland, to come into Transylvania to assist him in this work. Socinus accordingly arrived, was lodged in David's house, and for upwards of four months engaged with his host in the discussion of this topic. David remained after all unconvinced, and persisted in the public assertion of his opinion. He was, in consequence, arrested by orders from the prince. A general synod was convoked for the consideration and settlement of the controversy. Before this tribunal David was arraigned on a charge of blasphemy, was pronounced guilty, and committed to close imprisonment, which shortly terminated in his death.\*

After the lapse of fifteen years, Socinus published the arguments which had been drawn up by David and himself in the progress of their disputations, and prefixed to the work a vindication of himself against the accusations and, as he styles them, the calumnies, which had been circulated to his prejudice, in consequence of the part he was thought to have taken in the persecution of his opponent.† It would lengthen this paper too much to enumerate the whole of these, and

detail the replies of Socinus. It must suffice to state generally the principal charges, and to subjoin a brief examination of the evidence by which they are supported.

The charges usually preferred against Socinus in this affair are,

First, that he instigated the proceedings against David.

Secondly, that by an abuse of confidence and of hospitality, he furnished the materials on which the prosecution was founded.

And thirdly, that he assisted personally in the arrangement and direction of it.

I. No attempt has ever been made, as far as now appears, to substantiate the first charge by evidence. It seems to rest solely on a vague and general assertion, that Socinus kindled the great fire which at this time broke out in Transylvania, by which is supposed to have been intended the calamities that befel Francis David. But as the work in which this declaration is made,\* was written by a person who pretended to be accurately informed concerning the whole of the transaction, and in a spirit of bitter hostility against Socinus, it might reasonably be thought, that he would most readily and certainly have stated his proofs, had he been in possession of any to substantiate his allegations. His silence in this respect is fatal to his testimony, and may be considered as a demonstration of the falsehood of the charge.

This charge is, moreover, sufficiently invalidated by the statement which the enemies of Socinus have themselves given of the origin of the rupture between Blandrata and David, and of the unrelenting hostility with which the former acted towards the latter in all the subsequent transactions. They tell us, that Blandrata committed a gross immoral offence, which David felt it his duty to mark with his reprobation, by abstaining from all further friendly intercourse with him: that Blandrata took high umbrage at this; determined upon severe retaliation,—and, in fact, made his theological difference with him the plea and the instrument for the gratification of his personal resentment. It appears perfectly evident,

\* *Bod. Historia Unitariorum in Transylvania*, pp. 82, et seq. *Lugd.* 1781. Rees's Historical Introduction to the Racovian Catechism, pp. xlv. et seq. London, 1818.

† “*De Jesu Christi Invocatione Disputatio*,” &c. 8vo. *Racoviæ*, 1595 et 1626. *Socini Opera*, Tom. II. pp. 709 et seq. Toulmin's Life of Socinus, pp. 82 et seq. London, 1777.

\* *Bod. ubi supra*, pp. 102 et seq.

that in his invitation of Socinus to Transylvania, and in the arrangements made for his residence in David's house, there was, on the part of Blandrata, much more of private malice, than of religious zeal, or a pious regard to the honour of Christ. There is, indeed, scarcely room to doubt, but that Blandrata was pursuing through the whole business a dark and deep-laid scheme for the overthrow and destruction of David. The truth, therefore, seems to be, that the charge of instigating the prosecution against Francis David, must be transferred from Socinus, against whom it ought never to have been preferred, to Blandrata, whose conduct clearly proves him to have been the main director of all the proceedings. In addition to the presumptive evidence of this, furnished by the facts of the case, the following testimony may be taken from the pen of Blandrata himself. After Socinus had reported to him the unsuccessful termination of his disputations with David, Blandrata writes to him:—"Tell Francis that thus far I have not declared myself his enemy to the prince, but henceforth he may regard me as such."\* A few days subsequently were issued to the Senate of Coloswar, the orders of the prince for the deposition and arrest of the superintendent.

II. It is charged further against Socinus, that he furnished the materials for the prosecution, and this too, by a breach of confidence and hospitality.

There is not the slightest ground for the latter part of this accusation; it is therefore unnecessary to dwell upon it here.

Agreeably to the original arrangement, made with the concurrence of David himself, Socinus transmitted to Blandrata, from time to time, the written arguments which were drawn up in the course of the disputations. And had these documents been employed as the ground-work of the charges to be exhibited against David before the Synod, no blame could have attached to Socinus for making the communications. But Blandrata did not at all avail himself of these papers. He was by no means satisfied with the manner in which Socinus had managed the

controversy. He did not think that he had met the objections of his opponent in the way that he ought to have done, and maintained the obligation of invoking Christ, on the highest and best ground. On this account he was unwilling to give publicity to his arguments. The main charge actually preferred against David at his trial was, that on the first Sunday after the termination of his conferences with Socinus, he had publicly declared, in preaching to the people, "that Christ ought not to be invoked in prayer; and that those who prayed to him, sinned as much as if they prayed to the Virgin Mary, or Peter or Paul or any other dead saints." It is not pretended that this accusation was made by Socinus; nor is there any evidence of his being among the auditors of David when the words are alleged to have been uttered. The officer of the court, when he read the charge, expressly stated, that the information had been communicated to the prince, by the brethren, the disciples and associates of David, who were then present among his accusers, that is to say, by other ministers of Coloswar, who had on this occasion joined themselves to Blandrata. There is, therefore, no evidence to criminate Socinus on the second charge of having furnished the materials for the prosecution of David.

III. It is alleged in the next place, that Socinus lent his personal assistance, in the arrangement and direction of the prosecution.

Socinus admits that it was at one time his intention to have been present at the Synod convened for the settlement of this controversy, having received the commands of the prince to attend. He also states that he had, in consequence of this, drawn up his answers to David's arguments, with the view of having them ready to produce, in case the assembly should wish to be made acquainted with them. It is, however, to be observed, that Socinus seems to have thought that the business of the Synod would be to discuss, as theologians, the controversy which had been agitated between David and himself, and not, as afterwards proved to be its design, to sit in judgment on the worthy superintendent, for the promulgation of alleged blasphemies against God and

\* *Ibid. ubi supra*, p. 110.



Christ. It ought not, therefore, to be suspected that he prepared this document with the view of involving his opponent in any heavier calamity than a removal from his ministerial charge, in order to disable him from the farther dissemination of his opinions.

The first Synod convoked for the consideration of this business, met at Thorfa, on the 25d of April, 1579. And it is stated in one account, that a week previously to this, Socinus had arrived at that city, in company with Blandrata and others, for the purpose of arranging the proceedings.\* But to this statement Socinus opposes his distinct and unqualified denial, alleging that, had there been no other cause of his absence, he was disabled from undertaking the journey by severe bodily indisposition.

Owing to the formidable aspect assumed by the nobility, who were friendly to David, this Synod was dissolved before it had proceeded to business. Another was convened to meet at *Alba Julia* or Weissenburgh, on the 1st of June then next ensuing. But before this time, Socinus, alarmed by his disorder, and not improbably displeased with Blandrata's behaviour towards himself, in respect to his management of the controversy with David, quitted Transylvania, and retired to Poland. It is, therefore, manifest that Socinus did not assist personally in the conduct of the prosecution.

Having now dismissed what may be called the direct charges preferred against Socinus, it may be proper to take some notice of an accusation which has been brought against him in a different form. It is observed, † that "Blandrata had enough interest and influence with the Prince of Transylvania, to hinder the imprisonment of David, if he had pleased; and that Socinus could easily have brought Blandrata to temper and mildness."

There can be no doubt of Blandrata's

influence with the prince. That influence procured the imprisonment of David, and could as effectually have been exerted to hinder it. But Blandrata willed otherwise.

From what has already been advanced, it may easily be seen how little it was in Socinus's power to have brought Blandrata "to temper and mildness." With the feelings which prompted his conduct, it is not at all likely that he would have listened to any overtures from Socinus on David's behalf. He used Socinus, as far as suited his purpose, to promote his ulterior object, but he would have turned a deaf ear to all his solicitations and remonstrances had he attempted to divert him from his pursuit, or to deliver the victim which he now held in his fangs. Blandrata was too intent on the destruction of his adversary, to consent even to the slightest alleviation of the sufferings he was then enduring from his confinement. When, after the dissolution of the Synod of Thorfa, some ministers of Blandrata's own party interceded for a relaxation in his imprisonment, his answer was, "Believe me, I will lose all I possess rather than David should be liberated: I will forfeit my life rather than he should escape."\* Where was the influence that could have brought such a spirit "to temper and mildness"?

Socinus concludes his reply to the accusation and calumnies that had been published against him, with the following solemn asseveration, which there is no adequate reason to disbelieve, and with which this essay shall be closed:—"I neither consented to any more severe measure against Francis, nor knew of any other design of Blandrata and the brethren in this transaction, nor ever said that I knew of any, than that Blandrata himself would take care that the prince should command Francis to be suspended from his ministerial office, until a general Synod should, as had been agreed upon, put an end to this controversy concerning the invocation of Christ. To this I call God to witness." †

R. S.

\* This statement has been given in the Historical Introduction to the Racovian Catechism, p. liv. It ought to have been accompanied by Socinus's denial of its truth. *Socini Opera*, Tom. II. p. 710.

† *Reland's Four Treatises on the Doctrine, &c. of the Mahometans*, p. 234. *Toulmin's Socinus*, p. 88.

\* *Ibid. ubi supra*, p. 113.

† *Socini Opera*, Tom. II. p. 712.

SIR, York, June 7, 1818.  
**T**HE inquiry in the last Number of the Repository, [p. 326,] of your unknown Correspondent, respecting the peculiar opinions which have, it appears, been denominated *Cappism*, has explained to me the principal cause why the "Critical Dissertations," of which it devolved upon me, in the year 1802, to become the Editor, should hitherto have excited so little general attention.

Ushered into the world wholly unpatronized, and when the able pen of the author could no longer be employed in their farther illustration or defence; containing some deductions from the careful, sober, unwearied study of the sacred volume for the long-protracted period of half a century, which had unavoidably led to results that, however important, had not previously been anticipated, it was not wonderful that their novelty should excite a prejudice in their disfavour; nor, perhaps, wholly unprecedented that the fortunate expedient should be adopted of designating them by a term, which should imply the total absence of just reasoning and legitimate argument, and thus impede, if not prevent their more general diffusion, without subjecting the objectors to the more arduous labour of a sober and regular reply. The mind of your new Correspondent, Mr. Editor, appears to be cast in a different mould, and it is my earnest wish, a wish which I express with the greater confidence, under the full persuasion that it would also have been that of the justly revered Author himself, (who had no higher object in this world than the faithful development of important truth,) that he will attentively read these calumniated "Dissertations," and judge for himself. They were published for the late Mr. Johnson, St. Paul's Church-yard, and may now be had of his successor, Mr. Hunter.

CATHARINE CAPPE.

SIR, June 2, 1818.  
**I**T is with some reluctance that the writer of the following observations submits them to the readers of the Repository, and an apology is perhaps due to them for the present

attempt, an attempt it may be thought by some to keep alive a dispute, which indeed, has hitherto, so far as appears in the Repository, been carried on with skirmishes only, and the small shot of the opponents, though evidently men capable of much higher evolutions, but which the friends of each party may think has been already carried, if not too far, at least far enough. The dispute relates to baptism.

In the course of this contest some contemptuous censures were passed on Mr. Robinson's *History of Baptism* [p. 241]. Your *Christian Surveyor of the Political World*, indeed, recommended it, as containing "a full refutation of all that Mr. Belsham had advanced on Infant Baptism and Babesprinkling" [p. 223]. Mr. B., on the other hand, expressed his concern in a concise, royal way, which he expected, perhaps, some readers would take for answer, "that such a book should have been written by such a man." In a strain of similar compliment the *Christian Surveyor* might have expressed his wish, that such a person as Mr. B. would give such an answer to it as the book requires, though it appears, from what has lately fallen from his pen, that at present he is ill-qualified for such an undertaking; and that, with whatever *avidity* he began to read this work at its first appearance, that *avidity* must have cooled very soon.

"I found much curious information," says Mr. B., "about fonts and baptisteries." There are certainly some curious engravings of baptisteries, as any body may see without reading the work, as that of St. Sophia at Constantinople, of the Lateran at Rome, of the Catholic and Arian baptisteries at Ravenna, and of others. The *description* of them actually *does throw*, what it seems this gentleman was so anxious to obtain, "*much new light on the subject of baptism*," and a *perusal* of it will shew, that he need not have been disappointed. It became necessary for the writer to shew, that the situation of those splendid baptisteries, over or near rivers, the form and magnitude of the lavacra or baths, with steps going down into them, the paintings, and other emblematic decorations in

them, the officers and administrators employed, the subjects or catechumens, the various ceremonies and ordinals used—that all *elucidated* the writer's view of the subject; that when the practice of baptizing in rivers began to cease, every fact and circumstance relative to the ancient baptisteries and fonts, proved that baptism was performed by immersion, and given to instructed persons. This is all done historically, with respect both to the Greek and Roman churches, and the several dissidents; often very minutely, as it were to a hair's breath, and yet not unnecessarily so; on the writer's principles it became expedient. Now to most people's eyes I repeat, much new historical light was thereby thrown on the subject of baptism, more, I suspect, than might be agreeable to some persons, or than their eyes could well bear. But can any one who has *perused* the work complain of want of historical argument? Much nearer to the truth is what is said by your Christian Surveyor, who, to his remark on Mr. Robinson's History, referred to above, adds, "there is more learning in it, and a better description of the manners and customs of the early Christians, than perhaps in any other ecclesiastical writer;" and with respect to *historical argument* on the subject of baptism, this is certainly more amply true.

Mr. B. says, he "found in Mr. Robinson's History much harsh censure of the celebrated bishop of Hippo." To all which the author says of St. Augustine I do not fully assent. He says, (Hist of Bapt. p. 203,) "Augustine understood neither Greek nor Hebrew, though he expounded both the Old and New Testament," in which, perhaps, he is not quite correct. Hebrew, probably, Augustine did not understand: Jerome, who lived but a few years before him, was perhaps the only person of his time, not a Jew, who understood much of Hebrew. Greek, probably, Augustine did understand. His most famous book *De Civitate Dei*, shews much acquaintance with the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and the later Platonists; from whose writings, though he does not make quotations in Greek, yet he is very frequent in explaining Greek

terms that occur in them: his remarks on the Septuagint, though very fanciful and absurd, imply he had some knowledge of the Greek. Erasmus, too, who published an edition of Augustine's book, just mentioned, speaking of his intention of publishing his other works, says, *Græca restituissemus*.

It is no uncommon thing for critics to speak of their brother critics, as not understanding Greek, because one may differ from the other in his translation of a Greek word. Thus Le Clerc charges Cotelierius, the Editor of the *Patres Apostolici*, with not understanding Greek, from his not translating *κεφαλαιῶδες*, as Le Clerc thought it ought to have been translated. And when Augustine translates words on which the whole controversies about Baptism, the Trinity and Original Sin turn, so differently from what Robinson thought to be the truth, we are not to be surprised that the latter should say, Augustine did not understand Greek; besides that, it is the uniform testimony of the bishop of Hippo's biographers, "Il est sûr qu'il n'étoit pas fort habile dans les langues."

But it was not for deficiency in talent or learning, nor for excess in his amours, and leading others into criminal practices, that Robinson's censure was so peculiarly sharp against Augustine; nor was it merely for his treachery to one mistress, and his taking another, when he had even *put his name on the Catechumen list, and was preparing for baptism*; but it was principally for the violence of his passions, *after he had been baptized, and after he had obtained the Episcopate of Africa*, as manifested by his conduct towards Arians, Pelagians, Manicheans and Donatists; in short, towards all orders of Dissenters, who ventured to think for themselves, called indeed heretics by him, but who were the most virtuous men of the times. It was for the bitterspirit introduced into *his code of church law*, that enslaved his own country, enslaved enough before, and which extended its influence even far beyond Africa; "for it was Augustine," to borrow Robinson's words, "who transferred Carthage to Rome; and it was the bishop of Rome, who, in after ages, brought the Carthaginian



code of church law into the west, and they were kings, his coadjutors, who made them laws of their separate states. These general notions may suffice for African orthodoxy, instead of an unpleasant detail of miserable particulars, which some modern Christians would behold with indignation, and all with a degree of disgust. In brief," continues Robinson, "Augustine did in the church what Juba had formerly done in the state: both called in the Romans to assist them to enslave their country; and the Romans, in both cases, made slaves of them all. The first was a tragedy acted in the name of pagan deities: the last was performed in the name of a Triune God. It is the only difference."—*History of Baptism*.

Men so sincerely attached to civil and religious liberty as Mr. R. was, and who so thoroughly understood its principles, must naturally then, feel abhorrence of such systems as those of Augustine, and may be expected to speak indignantly against the authors of them. He had not formed his ideas of the bishop of Hippo out of his own brain, but from facts fully authenticated, from writers of the best authority, and, indeed, even from the abundant testimony of Augustine himself: for his epistles are written in a character which cannot be mistaken. He continued violent for orthodoxy to the last, and wrote his book *De Trinitate*, as he tells us himself, when an old man. If, as his *Meditations* and *Retractions* exhibit him, he became a sincere penitent for some grosser immoralities, so much the better for him; but that was no atonement to his country or to the world for his slavish, cruel code of church laws. Bigots, who embody their grovelling ideas of the Supreme Being, and their own passions, into a system, seldom properly repent of intolerance. The old chancellor of France, in the very act of setting his seal to the *Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, went out of the world chanting, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." Let it be granted, then, that Robinson's account of Augustine and the African church, is sometimes coarse, and his censures sharp; but let it at the same time be recollected, he had to grapple with a coarse subject; African man-

ners, African perversions of Christianity, African bishops and African intolerance; that he was engaging a sharp persecutor. "Who (to borrow Robinson's words) can help being offended at the sight? And who can be grieved at seeing the Vandals come forward, and subvert all the labours of Augustine's life?" And allow me to add, that Mr. B. wasted his candour in supposing that Mr. R., had his life been spared, would probably have retracted his opinion of Augustine. His love of liberty was too well settled; his abhorrence of oppression could not have changed: and we accordingly find in his posthumous work, (his *Ecclesiastical Researches*, p. 102,) the same, or rather much sharper, censure given to Augustine. Winding up the account on Augustine's death, he vents his indignation against him in the fullest force.

"From this bitter and bloody fanatic of Africa," says Robinson, "proceeded 232 pamphlets, an innumerable multitude of epistles, expositions of the Gospels, and Psalters, besides sermons, or homilies; and by this man's writings did Luther, Oecolampadius, and other Reformers, expound Scripture, and frame an ecclesiastical constitution to lead Europe into purity of faith and manners; as if Punic faith and African manners, execrable at Rome, when Rome was Pagan, were fit for ages enlightened by philosophy and religion. Instead of improving by all the great men that have lived in the last thousand years, should the world continue to be the disciples of Austin and his spiritual sense of Scripture? He understood the ten commandments in a spiritual sense; and 'Thou shalt not kill,' signified, thou shalt not kill an orthodox believer. The command did not protect the life of a heretic. This man and his maxims blasted the character of Christianity, and excited in the minds of many of the most learned and liberal of mankind, just suspicions of the religion of Jesus; for the Christianity that Austin taught was the curse and scourge of the empire. If Jesus employed him, as he affirmed, to teach occult grace and penal sanctions, for not believing without, and even against evidence, the shame retreats from the obedient disciple, Austin, and revolves

to his master, Jesus! But far, far from every heart, be such a thought! It is impossible to defend both Jesus and Austin, and justice requires the sacrifice of the latter."

When it was suggested to the writer of the above observations, that, from his known respect for the talents and worth of Mr. R., it became him to take some notice of Mr. B.'s remarks, he, at first, for private reasons, declined it. Afterwards he altered his opinion, though not till it was too late to offer his thoughts for insertion in the last month's Repository; and how far you may now think them likely to be acceptable to your readers, is left to your own judgment.

I certainly did not wish to exceed one letter; but I perceive I must crave your readers' indulgence to another paper. For I have not as yet even touched those points which principally drew my attention, and which I think very derogatory to the real character of Mr. R.'s History. It is many years since I read it, and I am obliged to Mr. B. for drawing my attention to it again. I, on the first reading, thought it, though not a perfect, yet an extraordinary performance, and, after a period during which I have not been inattentive to subjects connected with such works, think so still. In the perusal of it, I have experienced much and increased pleasure, intermixed, I own, with some concern connected with Mr. B.'s remarks, in which, though I will not say I perceive proof that he has not read the book, I discover very evident signs of what must equally affect me.

In the subsequent paper, I propose to contrast Mr. R.'s positive elucidations and testimonies with Mr. B.'s very anxious, though unfortunate inquiries, "In vain did I," "In vain did I," "In vain did I," &c. &c. and to make an observation or two on Mr. R.'s references to ancient authorities.

D,

Clapton,

June 22, 1818.

SIR,  
I REQUEST, through the medium of the Repository, to remind the subscribers to Dr. Priestley's Works, that the Fifth Volume, (containing the *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*), has been ready for de-

livery at Mr. Eaton's since the end of last month. The Sixth Volume, now in the press, will include the larger part of the Four Volumes of the *History of Early Opinions*. From the attention required, especially to the correctness of the Greek notes, which are very numerous in that *History*, the volume cannot be ready for delivery before September.

I am sorry to understand that a number of the subscribers have not yet applied for the volumes already published. If those who cannot conveniently send for them to Mr. Eaton's, will write to me, saying how they wish to have them forwarded, I will immediately observe their directions. I must request them, at the same time, to order payment for the volumes at some place in London.

Lest any who have not subscribed, should be desirous of possessing this edition, I beg leave to add, that, of the two hundred and fifty copies, to which it is now limited, only thirty remain unappropriated. It would be peculiarly gratifying to me, and best accord with my design in undertaking the edition, should these remaining copies be mostly disposed of in public libraries, especially in those of Unitarian congregations.

I take this opportunity of repeating my solicitations, for whatever assistance towards the correctness and elucidation of Dr. Priestley's Works and his Biography, any friends to this undertaking can supply. The Life and Correspondence, for which the first volume is reserved, would have been in greater forwardness, had I not waited for some communications, which I have still reason to expect, and also been occupied, much more than I had apprehended, in editing the volumes already published.

J. T. RUTTE.

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

No. CCCXXXII.

Extract from a Will proved at Doctors Commons in 1813.

In the name of the most holy and adorable Trinity, of the Father who created us, of the Son who redeemed us, of the Holy Ghost who sanctified

us. I recommend my soul to God, here and every where present, to the most holy and immaculate Virgin, Mother of God, to my holy patrons, the holy Virgin Mary, St. Joseph, St. Agnes, St. Rose, and all the saints in paradise, to my guardian angel and to all the angels and archangels in heaven: I firmly believe all that God has revealed, all that Jesus Christ and the apostles have taught, and all that our faith, the holy Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church sets forth, in the Communion of which I wish to live and die. I submit, with all my heart, to the holy will of God, to the time and cause of my death; and I unite the sacrifice of my life, as Jesus Christ voluntarily did his, to satisfy the justice of his Father, for my sins, and those of all men. I beseech him to suffer me to die like him in one faith, in the mystery of the redemption, a firm believer in his merits, a sincere penitent for my sins, and that the last

breath of my life may be an act of his pure love. I desire that my body may be kept three days after my death, in whatever country I may die, and that I may be buried as the meanest person, and that a hundred masses may be said immediately after my death, but no service. In returning thanks for the means which God has given me to gain my livelihood during eighteen years, I wish that his goodness may revert upon the beloved members of Christ; to this end, I give five Louis to twelve poor, old and infirm men and women indiscriminately, and who are known to persons who can attest their distress; and desire that this small sum be given to each poor person at half-a-crown a week: I require from each of them, every day, a prayer to the holy Virgin, during the time these alms shall last, and a communion of their devotion for the repose of my soul.

T. H.

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*Philip. ii. 5—11.*

SIR,

May 15, 1818.

I SHALL not follow your Correspondent C. A. E. through his reply, [pp. 191—193,] but there is one part of it which demands an answer. He asks, "What has the heresy of the *Phantomists* to do here? What possible connexion has it with the argument, to be told in the midst of exhortations to have the same mind as was in Jesus, that he was in corporeal structure, physically and properly a man? What possible relation has the being found in structure as a man, with efficacy of example?" These are very pertinent questions, and closely connected with the subject at issue. My ingenious adversary seems to consider the heretics here alluded to, as a visionary sect unworthy the notice of the apostle. This is a material error. The Gnostics consisted of the leading men among the Jews, who, being at heart enemies to the gospel, and unable to check it by

argument or violence, sought to undermine it by wild and impious falsehoods. The leading articles of their creed were, that God was an evil, imperfect Being; that Christ being in nature divine, did not really die and rise again as the pledge of the resurrection of mankind; that there is therefore no future state, and, consequently, no obligation on the part of his followers to abstain from vice and practise virtue; they, moreover, maintained that Christ did not come from the Father, but acted independently of him; and that, so far from designing to rescue men from their sins, his object was to destroy the works of the Creator, and thus to give his favourite followers full liberty to indulge in sin. This is the true character of the Gnostic teachers: their object was to make the gospel the instrument of effects diametrically opposite to those which it produced in the hands of the apostles. They differed from each other, or as occasion might require from themselves, in some minor



points: but the object of them all was uniformly the same, namely, to render the doctrine of Jesus of no effect, by blending it with falsehoods. This is what John calls Antichrist; and so active and numerous were the teachers and supporters of this system, that they followed the apostles in their labours, and with considerable success introduced it into the several churches in spite of all their efforts.

Now, in chap. iii. ver. 17, of this very Epistle, commences an illustration of this statement: "Brethren, be ye imitators of Him, whom I also imitate, and observe those who walk conformably to him, as ye have a pattern in us. For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is the destruction of others, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, whose mind is on earthly things."

So congenial was the system of the impostors to the corrupt propensities of men, that many in the church at Philippi seem to have embraced it, and followed the example of its unworthy teachers. In reference to their success in this respect, Paul calls on the converts to join him in imitating Christ, and to take the apostles for a pattern in so doing. The same wicked men were enemies of the cross of Christ, because they denied his crucifixion, pretending to honour him by holding forth the sacrament, not as a memorial of his death, but of his divinity. To their pretence to extol him as a God, in this festival, the apostle refers, when he says, that the God whom they really worshiped was their belly. The sum and substance of the Gnostic system was this: "Christ is a God; he neither died nor rose again in reality: there is therefore no resurrection of the dead, no life to come, in which the virtuous shall be rewarded and the guilty punished, and his true disciples, instead of being restrained from sinning, have a privilege to sin with impunity:" hence they are said to fix their mind on earthly things, and to glory in their shame, or, as Jude truly says of them, "they turned the free gospel of God into lasciviousness." They appear to have argued against the second

coming of our Divine Master to raise the dead, from the nature of the human body, and this argument was the circumstance which called forth the following animating declaration of the apostle: "For our citizenship is in heaven, whence we expect our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our humble body, so as to become in form like his glorious body, according to that energy by which he is able to subject all things unto himself."

The apostle having thus set aside the pernicious tenets of the impostors, concludes, "Wherefore, my brethren, beloved and greatly desired, my joy and crown, thus stand firmly in the Lord, my beloved . . . . and henceforth brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are venerable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are benevolent, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." These sentiments are exceedingly beautiful in themselves, but their beauty and propriety must appear greatly increased when it is considered, that they are levelled against men who laboured to entail on the church at Philippi, principles and practices that were in direct opposition to them. And to enforce them more pointedly on the attention of the converts, he adds, "The things which ye have both learned and received and heard and seen *in me*, do;" that is, in me, and not those which ye see in those false teachers who have introduced themselves among you.

I will now advert to the disputed passage—"Who being in a form of God,—divested himself of it," &c. This form cannot mean his miraculous power, because he never divested himself of that power. It cannot mean the glory which, in the eyes of the world, he might have acquired by a selfish use of it, because he never was possessed of such glory. The term Θεός, God, it is well known implies *immortality*, as opposed to what is mortal. It also implies *light*, it being derived from a word in Hebrew and Arabic, which signifies *to shine*. To this import of the term, John seemingly alludes, when he says, that God is *light*; and James, when he desig-

nates Jehovah as the *Father of lights*. The phrase then, "being in a form of God," naturally denotes, the "being in a splendid, immortal form." The form thus meant, I contend, is the transfiguration; "And he was changed before them, and his face shone as the sun, and his garments became white as the light." I have said that this representation encouraged in the disciples who witnessed it, the vain hope that Jesus would continue immortal on the earth, as they expected the Messiah to do. "Then Peter said, Master, it is good for us to be here, let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah." The purport of which request was, that Moses and Elijah, by continuing with Jesus, might be the means of recommending him to the Jewish rulers, and thus superseding the painful tragedy of his crucifixion. The transfiguration was certainly intended to be a symbol of the glorious form which Jesus was to assume after his resurrection; and the scene, when properly understood, held forth to the disciples the hope that they also would undergo a similar change in a glorified state. Now it is observable that the expression "being in a form of God," or, "being in a glorious form," bears a striking resemblance to the clause "so as to be like in form to his own glorious body," used in chap. iii. ver. 21; and this last is unquestionably the antitype of the transfiguration. The symbolical form which denotes immortality beyond the grave, Jesus, however, did not retain; but in obedience to the will of God, he assumed the form of a slave, having suffered on the cross the death of a slave. The apostle having asserted, that Jesus humbled himself to death, and was proved to be a man, effectually set aside the artifice of the impostors, who pretended that he did not actually suffer, as being a man only in appearance. But he did more: by referring to the transfiguration, he undermined the very foundation of their system, which was, that Christ did not come from God, but acted with power independent of him, and even in opposition to him. What could so forcibly bear down this impious and artful position, as the referring his readers to a scene where it was declared by

a voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him"?

The sanctions of a future state claim the simple humanity of Christ, as essential to their validity, since the gospel affords adequate motives to repentance and moral improvement, only so far as it holds forth our Saviour's resurrection as a pledge of the resurrection of mankind; but this consideration supposes that he possessed the same frame and nature with the rest of the human race, which the deceivers denied, merely because it enabled them speciously to undermine his doctrine. Their argument, as I have already said, was, Christ is a God; he did not suffer nor rise from the grave, nor will he come again to raise the dead: we are, therefore, under no obligation to follow his example, nor to deny ourselves any pleasure. The apostle refutes the premises, and enforces on his readers an opposite conclusion: "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in mine absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." In pressing upon the converts this inference, Paul uses an expression which referred them to the parable of the vineyard, Matt. xx. where Jesus represents the reception of the Gentiles into equal privileges with the Jews. This was, no doubt, a source of discontent to the latter, in all the churches; and even the well-disposed among them might be apt to say, "these last have worked but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us who have borne the burthen and heat of the day." The clause which Paul adds, "for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure," must appear rather as an encumbrance of his argument, unless we discover that it is founded on the answer which the householder makes to the complainant, "Friend, I do thee no wrong, didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take what is thine and depart, now it is my will to give unto this last even as unto thee." It is in reference to those who thus murmured that the apostle subjoins, "do all things without murmuring."

I now take my leave of this passage. Enough, I hope, has been said to justify the interpretation which Dr. Alexander has given of it in his excellent paper.

I cheerfully acknowledge the merits of your Correspondent C. A. E. His critical talents and the direction of them to the Scriptures are highly creditable to his heart and head: and your readers cannot but be pleased to see the fruits of them occasionally inserted in the Repository.

JOHN JONES.

SIR, Clapham, May 25, 1818.

**M**AY I ask a place among your Biblical Criticisms for a suggestion regarding the passage which occurs in 1 Cor. x. 9: "Neither let us try the Anointed as some of them also tried"? This passage is confessedly rather difficult, and various interpretations have been proposed. One is, that we should read "the Lord," instead of "the Anointed," which would certainly completely disembarass us, if the authority of this reading were unexceptionable. But this is far from being the case, and most of the greatest critics, including even Griesbach himself, while they allow a probability to this reading, yet decidedly prefer the common one. There appears to be a mis-statement in the note of the Improved Version at this place, which would lead one to suppose that Griesbach preferred reading "the Lord;" how this arose I cannot say, but the true state of the case will be decided by reference to the second edition of Griesbach's Testament. This interpretation, therefore, though by no means to be forgotten, as there is good evidence in its favour, is certainly not satisfactory. That again which would supply the word "God," or some other, at the end, after the verb "tried," instead of referring that verb to the preceding object, seems barely tolerable, especially when we regard the force of the Greek construction. Another would consider the term Anointed as applicable to both Christ and Moses: but in answer it may be urged, that in the whole Bible there is no instance of this title having the latter application. We are reduced then to a dilemma; we

must either rest our whole cause on the authority of the reading "the Lord," or allow the pre-existence of Jesus, unless some other interpretation can be offered.

By this consideration I am induced to propose another explanation, which appears to me less objectionable than either of the others, supposing that we retain the common reading. It is simply this: I suppose that the apostle considered the Israelites as trying Christ, when they tried those miraculous manifestations which God gave them as types of him. I think it is needless to prove that the word "tried," in such a passage as this, means, put to proof or trial by disbelief and dissatisfaction: and by the account of the transaction referred to, which is given in Numbers xxi. it appears that the offence of the Israelites was, that they put to such a trial the provision which God had made to supply them with bread and water. Now it must be allowed, that it would not be very obvious to us to consider this as trying Christ, because the connexion is not obvious between Christ and this bread and water. But we must consider not only that our Lord declares that he was the truth and substance of that bread which came down from heaven, but what is much more pertinent, that Paul in a closely preceding verse asserts, that the Rock which supplied the Israelites in the desert *was Christ*; meaning, as is generally understood, that it prefigured or represented Christ. Now we see from this, that the apostle in applying the events in the wilderness to the circumstances of the Christians, which is his drift throughout the passage, was considering certain things in that old dispensation, as representing Christ in the new; or to use his words, as *being Christ spiritually*. May we not suppose, then, that when he says "they tried Christ," he meant it spiritually, that is, by distrusting and rejecting those emblems which spiritually were Christ? To me this appears not at all improbable; but wishing to submit it to the judgment of your readers, to some of whom, perhaps, the idea may not be new, I venture to beg a column of your Repository.

RES ECTI.



## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Considerations sur la Divinité de Jesus-Christ, adressées à Messieurs les Etudiants de l'Auditoire de Théologie de l'Eglise de Genève.* Par Henri-Louis Empaytar. Genevois. Ff. 63. 1816.

A YOUNG Minister, who has been educated at Geneva, is the author of these Considerations. His object in addressing his “ dear colleagues ” is, to warn them of the dangerous heresies of their professors and pastors, and bring them back to the faith of Calvin. The pamphlet contains nothing new in argument, exhibits no proofs of uncommon talent, and is written in the same detestable spirit which dragged the unhappy Servetus to a stake, erected by the Protestant patriarch of the author's native city. An English reader, acquainted with the state of the Trinitarian controversy, will be surprised at the author's ignorance, and shocked at his presumption. He calls himself a Protestant; but he is so, evidently by accident, as he might have been a Catholic or a Mahometan. Forgetting the two first principles of the Reformation, that the Bible only is the foundation of revealed religion, and that every man possesses the right of private judgment accountable only to God,—he cites “ the venerable Company of Pastors ” before the tribunal of human authority. Instead of asking, “ What say the original Scriptures ? ” he quotes a number of disputed and even exploded translations, takes it for granted that the truth of the divinity of the Saviour “ can no longer be doubtful, after eighteen centuries of evangelical preaching and belief ; ” and having convicted the pastors, not only of doubting, but of disbelieving the doctrine, notwithstanding their learning, which he allows to be extensive, and their character which he declares to be estimable, he condemns them as “ innovators,” “ Socinians,” “ unbelievers,” and “ impious blasphemers ; ” says, that according to “ the frightful sect of the impious Socinus,” the doctrine of the gospel is only “ a shameful mixture of impiety, impudence and

folly ; ” that “ Christianity is only a new species of idolatry ; ” that “ the death of Christ is without object ; ” and invites Socinians “ to complete their blasphemy by confounding the Saviour with other impostors, who have attempted to deceive the world.” Such is the spirit of this Protestant divine ! Such the manner in which he proposes to convince and persuade the victims of error, and win souls to Christ ! Yet this same writer speaks of those who have not learnt “ to measure the depth and the breadth of the wound which ignorance has made in their souls ; ” he “ trusts that his Considerations will be read in the same spirit which has dictated them,” and “ he dares call God to witness that his heart has been accessible to no other feelings, but those of love and zeal, for truth, for the welfare of his country, and for the glory and edification of the Genevan Church.”

We are aware that the grand precept of antiquity, *know thyself*, is of extremely difficult application: but the above passages betray an ignorance of self, almost too great to be accounted for on common principles. We have, therefore, sought a solution in the personal history of the author, and we learn from good authority, that, though at present he is preaching at Geneva to a small *Dissenting* congregation, under the surveillance of the police, at the time of writing this pamphlet, he was travelling as a friend and assistant of Madame Kru-dener, a prophetess of the Continent.

It is not then the superior respectability of the author, nor the intrinsic worth of his *Considerations*, which leads us to submit them to the notice of our readers ; but because they prove that the great controversy of England begins to excite attention on the Continent, and especially because they cast additional light on the state of the Church at Geneva: a church which, by the general suffrage of Protestant Europe, has received the venerable appellation of “ Mother of the Reformation,” a title which, we confidently trust, events will justify and confirm in this instance.

The writer divides his work into six parts, in which he proposes to answer the following questions: 1. Is the reproach well-founded which is brought against "the Venerable Company of the Pastors" at Geneva, that of no longer believing in the divinity of Jesus Christ? 2. Is this doctrine agreeable to the spirit of the holy Scriptures? 3. What was the belief of the Genevan Church on this subject, at the commencement of the eighteenth century? 4. At the æra of the Reformation, were not all Christian communions agreed on this point? 5. Is it indifferent, whether we embrace the affirmative or the negative on this question? 6. What steps ought the students to take, to unite in the establishment of sound doctrine in their church? Of these parts the two first only concern us, and we shall dismiss the second, by observing that the argument is conducted entirely after the manner of *Jones*; that is to say, an attribute or title which is *assumed* to be incommunicable, is ascribed in the Old Testament to Jehovah: the same attribute or title is ascribed to Jesus Christ in the New Testament; *ergo*, Jesus Christ is Jehovah; an *ergo*, which equally proves the deity of several other persons, and by thus proving too much, proves nothing.

Under the first head the author is more conclusive, because he give us *facts* instead of reasonings.

"It is painful to me (says he) to be unable to answer this question, in a manner which would vindicate the honour and the faith of a clergy so estimable in many other respects, and so distinguished by its luminous and extensive acquaintance with science and letters; but here *facts* oppose themselves to the wishes of my heart, and would accuse me of incorrectness and partiality, were I to attribute a doctrine to our pastors, which the *greater* part of them no longer profess, and which we shall not find in any of the depositaries of religious public instruction.

"In order to know the doctrine of any church, it is necessary to consult its catechism, its liturgy, the treatises of its theological professors, the version of the Bible which it adopts, the sermons of its pastors, and the theses publicly maintained by the candidates for the sacred ministry, under the direction of their tutors.

"Now, if we examine these divers monuments of religious belief, we shall acquire the afflicting certainty, that the

Company of our Pastors no longer professes the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ. We shall find in these monuments, either an *absolute silence* upon this truth, or opinions which are formally opposed."

The writer then proceeds to examine in order, 1. *The Catechism*; which, as many of our readers know, guards an *absolute silence*. The pastors have discontinued since 1780, "the ancient and praise-worthy custom" of teaching the Catechism of Calvin. 2. The private courses of religious instruction, which the pastors are in the habit of giving, in which they either maintain an *absolute silence*, or what is worse, "they expose, as objects of free opinion, the sentiments of Trinitarians and Arians, leaving to their pupils the *choice* of one or the other." 3. *The Liturgy*, where again the author finds an *absolute silence*, and charges the pastors with the apostolical crime of "only pointing out Jesus Christ by the titles of Son of God, Saviour, Redeemer, Master, King, Legislator." As an addition to their guilt they have suppressed, in their edition of the Bible of 1805, an orthodox Confession of Faith, which had formerly been printed with the Scriptures. 4. *Absolute silence* is farther maintained in the instructions given by the theological professors to the students. 5. *Silence almost absolute* in the sermons of the pastors. Two of the pastors have preached each a single discourse in support of the doctrine. But, "with the exception of these two rays of light, in one hundred and ninety-seven sermons, preached (and published) by our pastors in the course of more than half a century, there is not one in which can be found a profession of faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ."

But this is not all. The pastors have not been content with *absolute silence*, but have dared at times to teach a doctrine formally opposed to that of the deity of Christ. 1. "Their Catechism represents the Saviour simply as the *sent* of God, the first-born of all creatures, to whom we owe sentiments, not of adoration, but of respect." 2. "In their new translation of the Bible, published in 1805, many of the passages, relative to the divinity of Christ, have been altered, and present a sense altogether different from that which is found in the

previous translations, and in the Bibles of the other Reformed Churches." Several of these passages are quoted, the most important of which is, Acts xx. 28, where the translators have followed the text of Griesbach. Our author, however, has nothing to do with Griesbach, or with sacred criticism. The version is different from that of Calvin, (which he tells us he has carefully examined,) and, therefore, ought to be condemned. 3. Since the middle of the last century the pastors have been openly denounced to Christian Europe as Arians or Socinians, by d'Alembert, by Rousseau and by Voltaire, the latter of whom asserted, in a letter to the Marquis de Villevieille, in 1768, "that there were not twenty persons in Geneva who did not abjure Calvin as much as the Pope." "This manner of generalizing the accusation (says the author) is an atrocious calumny—but unjust as it is, it imposed on the members of the Company the obligation of completely dissipating the suspicions which were cast upon the integrity of their faith, by a frank and loyal disavowal of the errors imputed to them. Unhappily, far from taking this wise step, they resolved the problem against themselves, and established by a solemn and authentic fact, what till then had rested on conjecture."

"The too celebrated thesis, which M. Jean Lecointe maintained, in 1777, under the presidency of M. Jacob Vernet, pastor and professor of theology, revealed to Arians, Socinians and unbelievers, that they had accomplices and adepts in the bosom of the Company of Pastors. An aspirant to the sacred ministry, under the direction of his master, in presence of the ministers of the holy gospel, *dared* to proclaim, 'that we should cautiously abstain from attributing to the person of Jesus Christ, however excellent, an equality with God the Father, to whom he was inferior by nature, and subject by will and by obedience:' 'he *dared* to reject the expression consecrated since the birth of Christianity, 'God the Son': he *dared* to maintain that we ought not to render the same degree of honour to the Son as to the Father. Is this the language of an Arian or Socinian? It is useless to decide on a mere shade of difference. It is sufficient for me to know that it is the language of one who does not regard Jesus Christ as very God and very man at the same time: it is therefore the language of an innovator, against whom the Venerable Com-

pany ought to have protested—against whom they have not protested. They are, therefore, considered as avowing and ratifying, by their silence, an error supported by one of their members. And we are the more authorized to regard the opinion of M. Vernet, as the opinion of the Company, as since that period, amidst the great number of theses which have been maintained by the students, not even one has been consecrated to avenge the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ against the continually-increasing *blasphemies of the impious*."

"I conclude then with heartfelt sorrow, (en gemissant) and without permitting myself any personal application, and I say, that the reproach brought against the Venerable Company of Pastors, of no longer professing the Divinity of Christ, is unhappily, but too well founded."

Thus far our author. We conclude from the same premises with lively joy and sincere thankfulness, that, amid the political convulsions which have shaken the Continent to its foundations, and astonished, as well as affrighted the civilized world; amid the contest of blind superstition and fanatical incredulity, falsely styled philosophy—the simplicity of divine truth has been accompanied with power, has been making, if not a rapid, at least a certain progress. We hail the dawn of light, as an earnest of the perfect day, which it will eventually introduce. We confidently hope that the word of truth, recommended by the learning and piety and Christian graces of the "Venerable Company of Pastors" at Geneva, and aided by the Divine blessing, will, ere long, *mightily prevail and be glorified*. To such a hope, changed into an earnest supplication to Him, without whom a *Paul may plant, and an Apollos water* in vain, we are persuaded that all our pious readers will add their cordial *Amen*.

B. G.

ART. II.—*Christianity and present Politics how far reconcileable: in a Letter to the Right Honourable W. Wilberforce*. By the Rev. H. Bathurst. 8vo. pp. 84. Ridgway. 1818.

MR. BATHURST is son to the venerable Bishop of Norwich, and in the spirit of this truly Christian prelate, remonstrates with Mr. Wilberforce on his parliamentary po-



litical conduct, which he shews to be grossly inconsistent with the law of evangelical truth and charity. We recommend the pamphlet to general perusal, as believing, with Mr. Bathurst, "that neither religion nor government are ever in half the danger from those who openly, with unblushing wickedness assail their foundations, as from those who, affecting a courtesy and affection for them, violate in practice and application, the plainest precepts of both."

ART. III.—*An Answer to a Sermon preached, by the Rev. Charles Simmon, M. A., of King's College, Cambridge, at the Church of St. Catharine Cree, Leadenhall Street,*

*December 31, 1817, relative to a Question between Jews and Christians.* By Benjamin Abrahams, an Israelite. 8vo. pp. 22. Wilson, Royal Exchange. 1518.

**B**ENJAMIN ABRAHAMs makes some shrewd remarks upon the "Evangelical" preacher's sermon, plainly shewing that the popular system of Christianity is at all points opposed to the law of Moses; that the very exhibition of Trinitarianism is a triumph to the Jews; and that the great body of that people are fixed in their faith and customs, not wishing to convert others, and incapable of conversion, except by means which are not yet apparent.

## POETRY.

### ISLE OF WIGHT.

"See all my works," exulting Nature cried,  
"Sublime and lovely spread on ev'ry side!  
Here ocean heaves his calm majestic breast,  
On the lone shore the rippling billows rest.  
Rocks piled on rocks in wildest grandeur rise,  
Whose dizzy summits prop th' incumbent skies.  
There the rich pasture clothes the swelling down,  
And golden harvests the luxuriance crown.  
There shall the raptur'd eye the vale explore,  
Rich, soft and blooming, plenty's fruitful store.  
There mountains, waving woods, and streams expand,  
And beauty glows beneath my lavish hand!  
What can I more?—blest thought! it shall be mine  
In one small spot these graces to combine."  
She said; and radiant smiling with delight,  
Wav'd her light wand, and rose the Isle of Wight.  
  
Sweet Isle! 'tis not alone thy bloomy vales,  
The rich, luxuriant landscape that I mourn;  
Oh! though to these I never may return,  
Nor feel again thy health bestowing gales  
Saline and buoyant,—nor the whitening sails  
Watch with strain'd eye approach their distant bourn,

Nor gaze upon thy cliffs in air upborne,  
Wild, grand, romantic, till all conscious being fails;  
Yet 'tis not these that prompt the ready tear,  
'Tis not for these, how lov'd soe'er, I sigh!  
The memory of those hours to friendship dear,  
When faith and love beam'd bright from Ella's eye;  
When virtue, taste, and feeling ever nigh,  
'Mid Nature's fairest works confess'd their proper sphere.

Yes, they are fair! the shades of Priory  
Are soft and lovely as Idalian bow'rs;  
And mingled odours of unnumber'd flow'rs  
Load the delicious air! O it is luxury  
Indeed, and soothing to the dazzled eye,  
T' exchange the sparkling sands and foamy show'rs  
At once for shade, and pass the fervid hours  
'Neath hanging woods, fresh breezes murmuring by.

And thus, amid the world's meridian blaze  
Does the tir'd spirit pant for calm repose,  
Sated with splendour. O 'twere sweet to close  
In fresh'ning shade our renovated days!  
These tranquil scenes a purer joy impart,  
Those charm awhile the eye—these satisfy the heart.

E. M.

Sydenham, May 22, 1818.

## TIME AND ETERNITY.

*Suggested by an extraordinary Flood in the River Stour, April 27, 1818.*

The torrent rushes with impetuous force,  
Defying obstacles to stem its course ;  
Urg'd on by nature to the briny wave,  
In ocean's depth to find a destin'd grave.  
Thus flows Time's current, that no wishes  
stay,  
Bearing with speed all mortal life away ;  
Ne'er to return the rapid moments roll,  
And sink in that abyss which has no  
shoal.

But when the driving flood of Time is  
past,  
And Death's awaken'd by the trumpet's  
blast,  
Duration's stream an endless course shall  
run,  
And life restored be ever but begun.

R. F.

*Kidderminster, May 16, 1818.*

## SONNET.

O Thou, our lives' Protector! doth the  
Spring  
Come forth in beauty, from the chill  
cold tomb  
Of winter; bursting into buds and  
bloom,  
Cheering the sense, the heart inspiriting  
With promise of the future? Mortals sing  
Thy praise for *this*: and shall their  
tongues be dumb  
As hope chaunts forth the song of  
Springs to come,  
Of fadeless flowers, and buds unperish-  
ing?

O Thou, our lives' Protector! rolling on  
Season to season tells the mighty tale,  
That Thou thy deathless work hast but  
begun,  
That thy resistless purpose shall not  
fail  
Till MAN, escap'd from darkness and de-  
cay,  
Drinks the bright beams of everlasting  
day.

T.

## SONNET.

Supreme Creator! is that holy flame  
Of inexhausted love still burning bright?  
And will it burn for ever? Shall that  
light,  
When other suns are set, shine out the  
same!  
"FOR EVER," Father! yes—thy saints pro-  
claim  
Its sacred fire unquench'd, unquenchable;  
Oh! that thine earthly sons content would  
dwell  
In its pure light, nor seek a meaner fame.  
But we are erring-wanderers, and our  
hearts  
Restless so long, would restless still re-  
main:  
They scorn that peace which thought of  
Thee imparts,  
And bend them back to toil and strife  
again.  
Oh! rather from my grasp all blessings  
wrest,  
Than give me joy on earth by Thee un-  
blest.

T.

## OBITUARY.

1818. May 3, at *Leicester*, aged 79,  
Mrs. ANN SHIPLEY. In her character were  
united a peculiar sweetness of temper and  
simplicity of manners, with the most sin-  
cere and unaffected piety. She was in-  
terred in the burial ground of the Pres-  
byterian congregation, of which society  
she had been a member for more than 50  
years.

— 17, at *Sutton*, near *Prescot*, Mr.  
TARBUCK, greatly respected and sincerely  
lamented. His death was accelerated by  
disappointment and anxiety. Philanthro-  
pic and generous to an excess, Mr. T. had  
long enjoyed the gratitude and veneration  
of his poor neighbours. He could not hear  
unmoved, the plaintive voice of misery.  
Objects of real distress, uninfluenced by

sectarian considerations, he relieved to the  
utmost of his power, and with promptitude  
and cheerfulness. In hard times, when  
his poor neighbours groaned under the  
twofold burden of scarcity of work and  
high markets, he vended a portion of the  
products of his estate at a reduced price ;  
and liberally patronized plans, that piety  
dictated and sympathy approved.

May his orphaned offspring emulate  
these graces of their unfortunate father :  
and, soothed by the respect paid to the  
memory of so generous a friend of the poor,  
may they be induced to unite piety and  
benevolence in their dispositions, and to  
display prudence and generosity in their  
conduct!

W. T. P.

May 18, of a typhus fever, after an illness of ten days, aged 36, Dr. JOHN THOMSON, of Leeds, late of Halifax. His best eulogy will be found in the sentiments of deep and heartfelt regret which the sudden stroke has excited in the breasts of those who knew him. Warmly beloved by his friends, highly respected by the generous brethren of a liberal profession, universally esteemed, he is now universally lamented. Seldom has the hand of death blighted fairer prospects or inflicted a severer wound. In Dr. Thomson, a powerful, enlightened and active mind was united with a kind and benevolent heart. He had the will as well as the ability to be, and to do good. His talents were great, and he used them as the instruments of his virtues. As a physician, though but lately settled here, he was already rising into eminence; and if unwearied diligence in collecting the materials of medical knowledge, combined with great skill in the application of them, could have ensured success, he must have succeeded. To the practical duties of his profession his attention was unwearied, and his patients will bear witness to that unaffected kindness of manner which always made his advice doubly acceptable; which led them to believe that he took a personal rather than a professional interest in their welfare—that he was their friend as well as their physician. And such, indeed,

was the case; he considered his fellow-men as friends and brethren, and valued his christian even more than his medical profession. It was the first wish of his heart to do good himself, and to teach others to do good in every possible way; and deeming the moral still more dangerous than the natural maladies of man, he was proportionably anxious to minister to them also. As a firm believer in the divine mission of Christ, he considered it a sacred duty to lend all the aid that he could in diffusing the knowledge of the gospel. A diligent and conscientious inquiry had led him to the peculiar views of religious truth which he entertained, and he therefore exerted himself with zeal in their diffusion; but his zeal was according to knowledge, and consequently without bigotry. For many of those who differed from him most widely, he always felt and expressed the highest regard, and where he dissented honestly on points of faith, could still unite with heart and hand, sincerely and cordially in the spirit of charity. As a physician and a friend, a fellow-citizen and a fellow-christian, he will be long and deeply regretted. May the sorrow excited by his sudden and premature death, lead to the earnest emulation of his good example!—"It is the end of all men, and the living should lay it to heart."—*Leeds Mercury*.

## REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS.

### *Further Address of the Society for promoting the Enlargement and Building of Churches and Chapels.*

[See pp. 212—214.]

THE extraordinary unanimity with which a bill, grounded upon the recommendation from the throne, for the building of churches and chapels, has just passed into a law, sufficiently attests the existence and magnitude of the evil which led to the formation of this society, and recognizes the duty of all to exert themselves for its remedy. It only remains, therefore, for the committee, now that the provisions of the act are ascertained, to point out the present and peculiar uses of this society; and to vindicate its high claims to the patronage of the public, by a slight reference to the extent of that work, which, notwithstanding the bounty of the legislature, is still left to the piety of individuals.

For this purpose it will be proper shortly to state the limits within which the operations of the act are confined, and the amount of claims which exist within these limits.

The parliamentary grant, it appears,

can in no case go in aid of any parish, the population of which is short of 4000 persons, however large its deficiency of church-room may be; or of any parish, however numerous its population, in which there is accommodation for one-fourth of such population, unless there be 1000 persons resident more than four miles from the church, or the parish contribute in a satisfactory proportion to the charge of building a new church or chapel. At the same time it is shewn, from official returns, that there are, in twenty-two dioceses only, not fewer than two hundred and fifty parishes, which, containing in the whole about three millions of souls, without church-room for one seventh of such population, leave, in places within the regulations of the act, upwards of two millions and a half actually shut out from the means of attending upon the services of the National Church.

But it is in the multitude of parishes (beyond those entitled to share in the million of public money), in which parliamentary documents exhibit a deplorable deficiency of church-room, and an almost equal need of pecuniary help, that the



necessity for the supplemental labours of this society is most firmly laid. And it is in promoting the enlargement of the building, and the increase of accommodation in existing churches—a department altogether out of the contemplation of the parliamentary vote, and in which moderate aids may be productive of the largest returns, that the peculiar usefulness of the society will be most strongly felt.

It is manifest, therefore, that a wide field is open for the exertions of the society; and most gladly do they enter upon

it, with the grateful declaration that they are now ready to receive applications, and appropriate their funds agreeably to the regulations of their constitution, already before the public, in the firm confidence, that as the society has been happily instituted with the patronage of the wise and good of all orders in church and state, so it will be supported with a zeal and liberality proportioned to the importance of its object, and commensurate with the numerous calls which will be made upon its funds.—*June.*

## INTELLIGENCE.

### FOREIGN.

#### ST. DOMINGO.—DEATH OF PETION.

*Port au Prince, April 1.*—Yesterday the remains of the president Petion received a sumptuous and splendid funeral. The corpse was laid in state two days; and, to the moment of being consigned to the vault, the features did not exhibit any visible change. Every one who chose went to see it, and the scenes which occurred were such as are seldom witnessed on the demise of men in power! In the different quarters of the galleries of the palace, were men, women and children, some on their knees, others standing, who, after taking a last sight of the body, were imploring heaven for his soul. They were all bedewed in tears, and, on retiring from the palace, filled the air with their cries and lamentations; not, perhaps, one dry eye quitted that place out of the myriads which visited it; but at the funeral the stoutest heart must have melted—the procession had nearly a mile to go to church, and to return to the place of interment, which was in a vault under the Tree of Liberty, opposite the palace; the troops, of which there were a great many in town, were formed in two lines from the palace to the church. The body was on an open bier, dressed in state-clothes, and laid on a car made in imitation of that used for our late Lord Nelson; it was drawn by six horses, covered with black silk velvet, ornamented with white tassels, feathers, &c.

It is a curious circumstance that he died voluntarily, which, indeed, was suspected by some about him from the beginning of his sickness, (which only lasted eight days) from his constantly refusing all kinds of medicine and nourishment, and even water; or if he did take any thing, it was at the pressing solicitations of those who surrounded him, but he spat it out again; and he preserved to the last that calmness and serenity of mind for which he was so remarkable through life—expiring without a groan or a struggle. His body has been

opened, and found as sound as that of any man; no indications of any disorder whatever; and the physicians do not hesitate in declaring that he died of inanition! What may have been the cause is yet a mystery. He had frequently been heard to say that he wished himself dead; for that, with all his study to render the people happy and prosperous, some were still dissatisfied, and made his life a torment. Time will, perhaps, reveal the cause; in the meanwhile, his loss is to be lamented; for, I repeat it, there are few such men as he was, more particularly in acts of charity and benevolence.

His death threw all the merchants into the greatest consternation, as there is computed to be in the Republic 6,000,000 worth of British property alone, including the shipping. The judicious measures which were immediately adopted, tended, in some degree, to calm our fears: all the military were turned out, and have been kept at their posts to this day. An embargo was placed on the shipping, and no one suffered to leave the town till pretty late on Sunday; and the appointment of the new president (Boyer) has been unanimous; nor to this moment have I heard of any chief having expressed a wish for the situation. The president will be proclaimed this day, and in two or three he will proceed to examine the frontiers, lest Christophe, on hearing of the death of Petion, might advance, in the hopes of profiting by the event. Some of the troops which attended yesterday, were marched off after the solemnity, for the frontiers; in fact, every precaution that prudence can dictate for private tranquillity, and external security, appears to have been adopted.

### DOMESTIC.—RELIGIOUS.

#### *Nottingham and Derby Association.*

THE third quarterly meeting of the associated Unitarian ministers of the counties of Nottingham, Derby, and the South of Yorkshire, was held at Stanington, near

Sheffield, on Good Friday, March 20, 1818. The Rev. H. H. Piper, of Norton, performed the devotional services, and a sermon was preached by the Rev. Jacob Brettell, of Rotherham, on the character and object of Christian zeal. In the course of his address, the preacher gave an animated description of the evils which had resulted from a zeal for particular speculative points of faith, united with a bigoted and intolerant spirit, and shewed that men, under the pretext of zeal and attachment to the Christian religion, had been persecutors and tyrants,—had become, instead of the ministers of peace to the children of men, the very bane and pest of society; in short, had, in their frenzy, played such tricks in face of high heaven as made the angels weep. He did not fail, in opposition to this repelling and disgusting picture, to set forth the advantages of a zeal enlightened and tempered with liberality of spirit, maintaining at the same time, that the zeal of the present day, amongst professing Christians in general, was, in a vast majority of instances, totally misplaced; that it was generally called forth in support of circumstantials, or, to adopt a comparison from one of the fine arts, much more care was displayed in preventing a single fold of the drapery of an admired piece of sculpture from falling into decay, than in keeping the symmetry and beauty of the figure itself, perfect and unamutilated.

The service was well attended, and the company afterwards dined together at the Little Matlock Inn, (situated in a most romantic spot, on the edge of the High Moors,) to the number of fifty, amongst whom were the following ministers:—the Rev. Dr. Philipps, of Sheffield, H. H. Piper, of Norton, R. W. Wallace, of Chesterfield, J. Brettell, of Rotherham, Richard Astley, of Halifax, P. Wright, of Sheffield, and Messrs. Charles Wallace and Wm. Worsley, students of the Manchester College, York. In the course of the afternoon several spirited addresses were delivered to the meeting, which broke up about six o'clock in the evening.

The next meeting (the annual one to be held at Derby, in June, intervening) is to be held at Chesterfield, September 17, 1818. The Rev. H. H. Piper is appointed to preach, and the Rev. John Williams to conduct the devotions of the day.

P. W.

*Sheffield, April 11, 1818.*

#### *Dudley Double Lecture.*

On Whit-Tuesday, May 12, was the anniversary of the Double Lecture at Dudley. The Rev. J. Kentish, of Birmingham, conducted the devotional service, and two very interesting discourses were delivered, the

VOL. XIII.

former by the Rev. T. Davis, of Oldbury, from Philip. iii. 8: "Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord:" and the latter by the Rev. Richard Fry, of Kidderminster, from Acts xx. 24: "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." Fifteen ministers were present, and the congregation was numerous. The Rev. Thomas Bower, of Walsall, and the Rev. Thomas Warren, of Stourbridge, were appointed to preach at the next Lecture.

J. H. B.

#### *General Baptist Assembly.*

THE Old General Baptists held their annual Assembly, on Tuesday, May 12th, at the Meeting-house, Worship-street, London. Some of the elders and representatives of the churches met, as usual, for business about two hours before the public service, which commenced at eleven o'clock.

Mr. Evans, of Islington, read the Scriptures and gave out the hymns; Mr. S. Kingsford of Canterbury offered the prayer, and Mr. David Eaton, of London, preached the sermon. The discourse was founded on 1 Tim. ii. 4: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." In the course of his sermon the preacher, after alluding to the name by which the body is designated, attempted a brief refutation of the argument recently advanced by Mr. Belsham, in his *Plea for Infant Baptism*. Whether the refutation be or be not complete must be left to the judgment of those who may read the sermon, which is now before the public.

Soon after the close of the public service, the business recommenced. The letters from the different churches were read, and some of them contained very gratifying information respecting the state of those churches, and the means used for the dissemination of what they regard as pure and saving truth; while one in particular evinced that the favourite dogma of the denomination—the right and duty of individual judgment, was not so clearly understood and duly appreciated as it ought to be. The Assembly, however, manifested a becoming candour on learning that, in two of the churches, the following up of the principle of free inquiry to what individuals deemed its legitimate consequence, had led them to reject some of those means of strengthening religious feeling and practice, in the observance of which all denominations are agreed. We allude to public prayer and singing, and pulpit

3 F

preaching. The only sentiment which the Assembly could consistently avow on receiving this intelligence was, that every individual had a right to act agreeably to his own conviction; and this sentiment was boldly avowed, without being contradicted. A wish was, nevertheless, expressed, that a rejection of any of the forms hitherto observed as means of promoting piety and diffusing christian knowledge might not be followed, by at least an apparent want of that charity which thinketh no evil, and by a superciliousness and dogmatism more disgusting than had ever been evinced by those who have been marked out as being either fools or knaves for not thinking and acting in a similar manner.

At the close of the business the ministers and their friends, together with several gentlemen not belonging to the Assembly, withdrew to the White Hart Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, to dinner.

After the cloth was removed, the chairman, the preacher for the day, gave several pertinent toasts, which called up a number of gentlemen to address the meeting.

In the midst of considerable variety of opinion the greatest harmony prevailed, and the company broke up at an early hour, apparently satisfied with what they had witnessed and participated in during the day.

E. D.

#### *Yeovil Fellowship Fund.*

SIR,

As it may be useful to record in your valuable Repository every fact tending to illustrate the growing zeal of Unitarian Christians, I with pleasure inform you, that, after a discourse on the subject of religious zeal, and the proper modes of expressing it, delivered by the Rev. S. Fawcett, a meeting was held in the chapel for the purpose of forming a Fellowship Fund, at which meeting the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, and signed by upwards of sixty subscribers, (of which a large proportion consisted of young persons,) by whom I am directed to transmit a copy of the resolutions.

H. MEAD, Secretary.

At a meeting of persons friendly to the establishment of a Christian Fellowship Fund, held in the Unitarian chapel, Yeovil, on Sunday the 17th May, 1818, Edmund Batten, Esq. in the chair, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1. That a society be formed, called the Yeovil Christian Fellowship Fund Society.

2. That its objects shall be to present occasional contributions to Unitarian chapels about to be erected or repaired, to Unitarian academies for the education of ministers, and to promote generally the diffusion of Unitarian truth.

3. That the fund be supplied by weekly subscriptions of one penny and upwards; those who subscribe more than a penny per week, to pay quarterly.

4. That an annual general meeting shall be held the first Sunday in June, in each year, at which time, a president, treasurer, secretary, committee and collectors shall be chosen.

5. That the committee shall consist of the president and treasurer for the time being, and seven other persons, to be chosen by each subscriber present at the annual meeting, giving in a list of names, from which list a majority shall be selected.

6. That the committee shall meet on the first Sunday in every month, at three in the afternoon, in the chapel; and that their meetings shall be open to every subscriber, but that the right of voting be confined to the committee.

7. That the expense necessary to furnish a Sunday school with books, shall be defrayed out of this fund; but that no sum excepting this, shall be paid out of the fund during the first year.

8. That in case of emergency the secretary shall be empowered to call a special meeting of the committee.

9. That the Rev. Dr. Smith be requested to accept the office of president.

10. That the Rev. S. Fawcett be requested to fill the office of treasurer.

11. That Mr. Mead be requested to perform the office of secretary.

12. That the following subscribers be requested to act as a committee till the annual meeting in 1819, viz. Messrs. Carter, Erith, Tett, Fitchett, Lee, Ensor and Stephens, Sen., any three of whom, with the president or treasurer, shall be sufficient to act, and in case of necessity, the president to have a casting vote.

13. That Messrs. Mead and Stephens, Sen., be requested to act as collectors for the first year.

14. That these resolutions be inserted in the Monthly Repository and Christian Reformer.

(Signed)

EDMUND BATTEN, Chairman.  
Yeovil, May 19, 1818.

#### *Lynn Fellowship Fund.*

SIR,

FOLLOWING the commendable example of many of our Unitarian brethren in various parts of the country, we have commenced a Fellowship Fund in this town, and the prospect before us is very promising. This fund embraces the general objects of such institutions, and is regulated by rules adapted to local circumstances.

We have a conference once a fortnight. This improving and unifying meeting is



remarkably well attended. It is open to all religious denominations, and full liberty is given to every person to express his opinion. The ladies are invited to communicate their sentiments in writing to the moderator of the meeting, for the purpose of being publicly read, and from this interesting quarter, at all our conferences we have had great assistance and equal gratification. Many persons attend upon these occasions who are not of our society. Indeed, most of the subjects which have come under serious and impartial attention in our past conferences, were proposed by a truly liberal and pious Wesleyan preacher. May others follow his example, and then we should soon perceive, agreeably to the sentiments of a female friend at our last meeting, that "the animosity which too frequently subsists between professing Christians of different sects, would be greatly lessened; and if they would charitably consider each other's views, the difference between them would oft-times be found trifling, and when great, the knowledge that each was actuated by the same love of truth and piety, would bind them together in the indissoluble bands of brotherly love."

B. TRELEAVEN.

Lynn, June 10, 1818.

*Manchester College, York.*

THE Thirty-second Annual Meeting of the Trustees of Manchester College, York, will be held at Cross Street Chapel Rooms, in Manchester, on Friday the 7th of August. The Trustees and their friends will dine together, as usual, after the meeting, at the Bridgewater Arms.

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

The following sums have been received on account of the College since the last Report. [P. 339.]

*Congregational Collections.*

Bath—Rev. Joseph Hunter,	£19	16	6
Chester—Rev. W. J. Bakewell	14	8	6
Mansfield—Rev. John Williams	10	0	0
Chesterfield—Rev. R. Wallace	11	12	6

*Benefactions.*

A Friend to the Unitarian cause, by the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved 5 0 0  
Εὐελπις, by the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, one half to be bestowed as a prize to the student, who, in Greek prose, produces the best composition, on such subject connected with Moral Philosophy, or the early history of Christianity,

(intended to be repeated annually)	10	0	0
Joseph Liddell, Esq. Moor Park, near Carlisle, by the Rev. William Turner, Newcastle	50	0	0
<i>New Annual Subscriptions.</i>			
Richard Meade, Esq. Taunton	2	2	0
Mr. Sudworth, Chester	1	1	0
Mr. John Buddle, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	1	0
Mr. John Hill, ditto	1	1	0
Mr. George Hill, ditto	1	1	0
Mr. Wm. Robson, ditto	1	1	0
Mr. R. H. Lacey, Chichester	0	10	6
Rev. George Case, Shrewsbury	1	1	0

£129 16 0

GEO. WM. WOOD, Treasurer.

Manchester, June 17, 1818.

*Subscriptions to the Unitarian Chapel at Neath.*

SIR,

I BEG the favour of your inserting in your Repository the subjoined list of subscriptions, at Bristol, towards the liquidation of the debt on the Unitarian Chapel at Neath, now reduced to about £160. It is hoped that, when other cases of a more pressing nature do not present themselves, the liberality of the public will effect a still farther reduction of it. In compliance with the wishes of the society, I avail myself of this opportunity to return our united and warmest thanks to all those friends of the cause, who have, in various ways, kindly contributed to our assistance. And I beg leave to make my particular acknowledgments to gentlemen of the Lewin's Mead Society, for voluntary and very friendly personal aid, afforded me in promoting my object, to which they and their friends contributed with a liberality and cheerfulness, which evinced warmth of zeal, and cordiality of good wishes.

The spirit of inquiry, excited by the secession of Dr. Stock, and the Sunday evening lectures, &c. conducted by Mr. Rowe and Dr. Carpenter, have been the means of removing much prejudice, and of adding to the strength of the highly respectable interest at Bristol. May they go on and prosper.

D. DAVIS.

April 17, 1818.

Rev. John Rowe	1	1	0
Rev. Dr. Carpenter, 2d subscription	1	1	0
Thomas Hodgetts	5	5	0
Michael Castle	5	5	0
Arthur Palmer, jun. Park Row	5	5	0
Richard Bright	5	5	0
Jacob Wilcox Ricketts	5	5	0
Thomas Castle	2	2	0
Hinton Castle	2	2	0

Harley and Lang	-	-	2	2	0
Joseph Davy	-	-	2	2	0
Adrian Moens	-	-	1	1	0
Brooke Smith	-	-	1	1	0
J. K. Huberfield	-	-	1	1	0
Joseph Edye	-	-	1	1	0
Jacob Ricketts	-	-	1	0	0
Henry Ricketts	-	-	2	2	0
Joseph Hall	-	-	1	1	0
Samuel Hall	-	-	1	1	0
Thomas Morgan	-	-	1	1	0
Mrs. Foot	-	-	1	1	0
John Maningford	-	-	1	0	0
G. F. Bromhead	-	-	1	1	0
Robert Syle	-	-	1	1	0
Joseph Hunt, of Exeter, 2d sub-	-	-	1	0	0
scription	-	-	1	0	0
Ephraim Bastable	-	-	1	1	0
Francis Allen	-	-	1	1	0
Thomas Andrewes	-	-	1	0	0
Levi Ames	-	-	5	5	0
Robert Bruce	-	-	1	1	0
Mrs. Pierce	-	-	1	1	0
Joseph Maurice	-	-	1	1	0
William Inman	-	-	1	1	0
Thomas Rankin	-	-	1	1	0
John Ames	-	-	1	1	6
James Johnson	-	-	0	10	6
William Browne	-	-	0	10	6
Henry Reynell	-	-	0	10	6
Edmund Butcher	-	-	0	10	6
James Cox, of Exeter	-	-	1	0	0
John Yerbury	-	-	5	5	0
Frederick Savery	-	-	3	3	0
John Shute	-	-	1	1	0
John Wright	-	-	2	2	0
Mrs. Hart	-	-	1	1	0
Frederick Norton	-	-	1	0	0
Thomas Williams	-	-	1	1	0
Richard Vigor	-	-	1	0	0
Miss Hilles	-	-	1	1	0
Miss Eveleigh	-	-	1	1	0
James Lambert	-	-	1	1	0
John Woodward	-	-	1	1	0
Samuel Bryant	-	-	0	10	6
			£90	10	0

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*Persecution of the French Protestants.*

[From the Times.]

Private Correspondence.

Bordeaux, June 17, 1818.

WE are now very much occupied with an incident which interests the whole of the reformed church of France. One of the deacons of our church has just been condemned to pay a fine by the Tribunal of Police, for not having decorated the front of his house with the usual hangings, during the procession of the host on *Corpus Christi* day. This prosecution appears to us a manifest violation of the 5th article of the Charter; but what appears more surprising still are the arguments employed

by the public ministry (the law-officers of the crown) who demanded the condemnation. They rested these arguments on a regulation of 1757, which they cited at the audience as their authority, and which you will observe renewed the rigour of the persecutions against the Protestants, the exile of their pastors, interdiction of their assemblies, the annulling of their marriages, the declaration of bastardy on their infants, &c. What must we think, in the age in which we live, of seeing such atrocities dug up from their grave? No attempt is made, it is true, to bring them again into exercise at the present moment, and the *attempt could not succeed though made*; but it might be expected that shame would restrain them from recalling those barbarous decrees, especially as by so doing they violate existing laws, and aim a direct blow at rights consecrated by the Charter.

Article 5 of the Charter is thus expressed:—"Every man professes his religion with equal freedom, and obtains for his worship the same protection." It is evident that, if the Protestants can be compelled to put out hangings, then to bend the knee, &c., acts prohibited by their conscience, there is no longer any toleration in religion, and by degrees we may expect the revival of former abuses. Attempts of the same kind appear to have been made in the whole of the South. We know of energetic representations made, addressed to the government by divers consistories, and we think it necessary to display zeal and firmness in the delicate circumstances in which we are, with regard to the concordat. The concordat presented to the Chambers, but not discussed, threatens us with a revival of *all the laws of the church*, and you are not ignorant what the *ultra-montane* party mean by these expressions. I know that some of the provisions of this Charter may be amended, but is it not deplorable, that the idea of proposing them should have been entertained? If we shew weakness or indifference, can we tell how far our supineness or want of energy may be abused in the discussions of the approaching session of the Chambers, to extort from them concessions which may endanger our liberty of conscience?

A peculiar system of management appears to be adopted by those who move in these affairs. They appear to act in concert, as the same attempts have been made in different places. The condemned have demanded signed copies of their sentences; they have not received them, and probably never will. This mode of proceeding appears a tacit confession on the part of the authorities that their decisions are not founded on law. It is to be remarked likewise, that though several Protestants re-

sisted a compliance with the ceremony above-mentioned, only one (a Swiss pastry-cook) was prosecuted, on a belief, probably, that he was without support: on the other hand, the Jews have been persecuted in great numbers."

SIR HUMPHRY DAVY is gone to the Continent. Sir Humphry's first object is to assist the miners of Flanders and Germany in using his safety lamps for the preservation of their lives; and his second object to go to Naples for the purpose of applying a chemical process to the unrolling the Herculaneum MSS.—His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, we understand, honoured Sir H. Davy with an audience before his departure, and was graciously pleased to encourage his undertaking, and afford to it his patronage. His Royal Highness, we believe, has never lost sight of these interesting remains, and it is sincerely to be hoped that his enlightened views and exalted patronage, bringing into activity the resources of British science, will at length unfold to the literary world these hidden treasures of Greek and Roman learning.—*Morn. Chron.*

#### NOTICES.

THE annual meeting of the Unitarian Tract Society established in Birmingham for Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties, will take place at Wolverhampton, on Tuesday, July 28. The Rev. John Kenrick, M. A. classical tutor at the Man-

chester College, York, has engaged to preach on the occasion.

THE annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Society will be held at Ilminster, on Wednesday the 8th July next, the Rev. Dr. Smith to preach on the occasion.

THE annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society will be held at Brighton, on Wednesday, July 22. The Rev. John Fullagar, of Palgrave, is expected to preach. THOMAS COOKE, Jun., Secretary.

#### LITERARY.

In the press, the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland: with Translations into the Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French and German languages. This work will be comprised in one quarto volume, uniform to a Polyglott Bible, also in one quarto volume, now publishing by Mr. Bagster, of Paternoster-row; by whom the names of subscribers will be received: and it is hoped that this publication will make the Common Prayer still more acceptable to the scholar and the student, and ensure the approbation and encouragement of the clergy and friends of the Established Church. A Common Prayer, in each of the above languages, in a beautiful pocket volume, will be published at the same time.

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

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

THE dissolution of parliament presents the United Kingdom under an aspect, of which foreigners can have no idea, but by an actual visit to the country. The usual incidents from a large concourse of people in one place, though not embittered by animosity or a riotous spirit, when swelled out by a French imagination, afford matter for exclamation against us, as if we were freed from every restraint of good manners and civilized life. Instances indeed will occur, when the passions of men are afloat, of individuals acting in a base manner against their opponents: yet these are very rare, and in general the elections have been carried on with as much decorum as could be expected in the present very imperfect and very improper manner of taking the votes. Westminster has been the place most noted for outrage; but the electors of Westminster are not to bear all the blame, as probably the refuse of the metropolis were collected

about its hustings, and some censure may fall on the police for not having attended more to its duty.

The last parliament was dissolved in a very abrupt manner by the Prince Regent in person. On his ascending the throne a message was sent for the Commons, who attended with their Speaker at their head: and he in presenting some bills addressed the throne with the usual expressions of loyalty and notices of the proceedings of their body. The prince then addressed both houses: at the conclusion of which the parliament was declared to be dissolved. In consequence, the House of Commons ceased to exist; there was no Speaker, and they were only private individuals. Several of them went back however with the late Speaker to St Stephen's chapel, who took the seat that had been appropriated to him, and was going to read the speech from the throne, as would have been proper, if there had been a



House of Commons; but on its being mentioned that they were all there without authority, the gentlemen dispersed, and the speech cannot be entered on the minutes of the late representative body.

This departure from the usual custom has excited much animadversion. Such an occurrence has not taken place since the time of Charles the First, who in a very ungracious manner dismissed once his parliament, and was afterwards in open war with his Commons. Since that time the custom has been for the King to address the two houses on one day, and dissolve the parliament by proclamation on the next. According to that mode, the Speaker, on returning to the House of Commons, brought with him the speech from the throne, which was read to it, and entered upon the minutes, and then the house separated. Its proceedings being thus completed, they all, on the understanding that the parliament would be dissolved on the next day, went to their respective homes to give an account to their constituents of their conduct, and prepare themselves for the new elections.

An improvement took place this time in the issuing of the writs, on which there used occasionally to be much improper conduct, by the writs being forwarded or delayed for some places, according as it might suit the purposes of some favoured candidate. Upon this occasion all the writs were first signed and sealed, and then sent all together to the post office. Thus every place received its writ without favour or affection in the time that its distance from the metropolis required: and the elections for cities and boroughs being limited by the time of the receipt of the writs, the elections were nearly at the same time throughout the kingdom. The elections for counties necessarily varied, from their dependence on the county courts.

The last act of the last parliament was the alien bill, which occasioned a variety of difficulties in its passage through the Houses. Its object evidently is to unite our government with those of the continent, to keep under surveillance those persons of various kingdoms, who may be considered as obnoxious to their respective heads. It is liable to very great abuses, as individuals may be exposed to private malice, covering itself under some public pretext; and the administration may be made party to deeds which they would be the first to abhor. It was found in the course of the proceedings on this bill, that it militated with a law of Scotland antecedent to the Union, which occasioned a new modification of it after it had gone through most of the forms. This required a new bill, which was carried through the houses with what might almost be styled

indecent dispatch: for such a dispatch is to be allowed only, when injury to the kingdom might be expected to arise in the delay. But as the bill itself is in the minds of a great number of persons by no means necessary, or rather is alien to our constitution, any particular hurry in favouring its progress can scarcely be allowable. However so it was. It received the royal sanction, and aliens are now completely at the mercy of the ministers.

Sir Francis Burdett introduced his measure for the reform of parliament. The basis of it is the extension of the right of suffrage, and the shortening of the duration of parliaments. The opinion of the house was decisive upon his plan, for he had no one to support him but his colleague in the representation of Westminster, who seconded his motion. In the debates the idea of universal suffrage was treated with great contempt, and strange insinuations were thrown out against the shortening of the duration of parliaments. The speakers on this occasion seemed to have forgotten, that for about three hundred years no one parliament existed for a year, and there were frequent instances of more than one parliament holden within the year. The present system of septennial parliaments took its rise only at the accession of the present reigning family to the throne: and if circumstances at its origin might justify the extension of the duration of the existing parliament, experience has shewn, that its continuance has been injurious to the liberties of the country. In fact, the House of Commons has since that time been gradually estranging itself more and more from the people: and it could not be otherwise, for the members elected for so long a time form a species of petite noblesse, and not being accountable till a remote day to their constituents, they are inclined to act more as the masters of than the attorneys, according to the old language, for their constituents.

On the extension of the right of suffrage one would think that there could be only one opinion. For it was never in the contemplation of any one, that the House of Commons should be in its present state. Time, the great innovator, has introduced its usual changes in the state of cities, towns and boroughs, reducing in a considerable degree the population of some places, and in others annihilating it altogether. In granting to a place the right or privilege of sending representatives to parliament, it was not on account of stones, or bricks, or trees, that might have been on that place, but in consequence of the people that inhabited it: and when the people disappeared, it was natural that the representation should cease. But this did not suit the views of

the proprietor of the place: as by retaining the privilege he could nominate two members to parliament, and thus make himself equal in consequence to a county, and his borough became the foundation of increasing consequence to himself. To remedy this evident abuse ought to be the first object of the representative body, for a set of men are thus introduced into the House of Commons to vote away the public money, from which they take care to secure no small advantage to themselves. The grievance is now seen in its full extent; it is perfectly well understood; and if it should be permitted to continue, it is evidently a misnomer to speak of the House of Commons as a true representative of the people. It is a representative of a very small body of the people; and in this small body the proportion of individuals commanding votes, is such, that they materially interfere with the rights of the crown, the peerage, and the people. The question will be brought up again in the ensuing parliament, in which it will be seen how far the interest of the borough-holders is superior to the general sentiment.

A cause has been tried in the courts of law of great importance to the public. It will be recollected, that a person having a forged note in his possession, which he had taken in the way of trade, was by the bank brought before a magistrate, and, on his refusal to surrender it, committed to prison. He has brought his action for false imprisonment, and obtained considerable damages: the judge having reprobated in strong colours the conduct used towards him upon this occasion. This will be a salutary lesson to the bank, whose proceedings with respect to forged notes should be watched with a careful eye. The liberty of the subject must not be sacrificed to the interests, whatever they may be, of a commercial body.

France is likely to open a scene of some importance to the religious world. The old laws respecting Protestants are well known, but they slept during the time of the republic and the late emperor; and it was supposed that they were completely abrogated by the Charter. A disposition has manifested itself of reviving them, and subjecting Protestants to ancient restraints. The sectaries of the Romish persuasion have a grand festival every year under the name of *Fête de Dieu*, festival of God, on which day the cross, the mass, the images of the mother of God, and the saints, are paraded through the streets in solemn procession. In fact, it is a heathenish rite to all intents and purposes; and the zealous sectarians declare their approbation of it, not only by walking in it, but in adorning their houses in every manner

possible according to their circumstances, to testify their adherence to the cause, which is popular in their countries. To such a procession, it is evident that Protestants cannot give their countenance, and where they live they have contented themselves with staying within their houses, which of course displayed none of those marks brought forward by their neighbours. A deacon of one of the Protestant churches was in this situation, and he was brought before the courts for the offence of not decorating his house, and fined accordingly. This has produced a great sensation, and if it is allowed in this manner to attack the Protestants, there cannot be a doubt that the conquering party will pursue their triumphs, and the toleration allowed by the Charter will exist only in name. How far our court will interfere, time will shew; but the societies in England, which were on the alert on the former attacks against the Protestants in the South of France, will not, we are persuaded, sleep on this occasion. They may do much good both by open remonstrance and by the assistance they may be enabled to render to the persecuted.

The later intelligence from the Spanish colonies is much more favourable to the cause of independence than that which preceded it. But we must wait some time for a clear detail of the transactions from the Spanish Main to the river Orinoco. There is every reason to believe that the royal cause is very much broken, and in a short time its flag will disappear from that region. If, however, the success of independence is doubtful in that quarter, to the south of America the prospect is more cheering, and the banks of La Plata seem to be entirely removed from all danger from the mother country. A report has been spread, that Monte Video, which is at present a bone of contention between Spain and Portugal, is to be put under the English flag, till affairs in that quarter are better settled; but it may be very much doubted whether such an interference on our part can be attended with any beneficial consequences. The holy alliance finds some difficulty in the arrangement of these matters, and the natives will trouble themselves little with the result of their conferences. A few years more will shew the flags of various independent American States floating on the Atlantic, and Spain may then look to its own resources at home, and having banished bigotry and the inquisition, may become much happier from the produce of its own soil and its own industry than from the gold and jewels extorted from its distant subjects, so long kept back under the grievous weight of ignorance and superstition.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley, LL. D. F. R. S. Vol. V.

Historical Memoirs of the Church of France, in the reigns of Louis the XIVth, XVth, XVIth and the French Revolution. By Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn. 8vo. 14s.

The Sacred and Indefeasible Rights of the Clergy Examined, Recognised and Vindicated. The Origin, Moral Obligation and Policy of the Law of Tythes inquired into; with a Plan for relieving the People from the Burdens imposed upon them by the Church, without serious Injury and Inconvenience. 3s.

Victory over the World, through Faith in Jesus, the Son of God. A Sermon at the Unitarian Chapel, Artillery Lane, London, Wednesday, May 13, 1818, before the Unitarian Fund Society. By N. Philipps, D. D. 12mo.

Unitarianism the only Religion that can become Universal. A Discourse, on Sunday Evening, April 19, 1818, in the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, Liverpool. With Notes and an Appendix. By George Harris. 8vo.

The True Interests of Religion Considered. A Sermon before the Annual Assembly of General Baptists at the Chapel in Worship Street, May 12, 1818. By David Eaton. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Two Discourses: 1. On the Fitness and Propriety of the Gospel Dispensation being introduced through the medium of the Man Christ Jesus. 2. On the Foundation, Nature and Proper Expressions of Love to the Lord Jesus Christ. Preached at the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of Scottish Unitarian Christians, at Glasgow, April 26, 1818. By William Turner. 12mo.

An Essay on the Attributes of Satan; viz. the Nature and Extent of his Power, his Subtlety, his Malignity, his Ubiquity and his Misery. 2s.

A Description of Greenland. By Hans Egede, who was for twenty-five years a Missionary in that country. A new edition, with an Historical Introduction, and a Life of the Author, map and engravings. 12s.

The Polemical Contest betwixt the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, and the Rev. Thomas Scott, Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks, on the subject of Calvinism. Referred to his Honour the Worshipful Christian Common Sense, Esq. 5s.

Church-of-Englandism and its Catechism Examined: preceded by Strictures on the exclusionary System as pursued in the National Society's Schools; interspersed with Parallel Views of the English and Scotch Established and Non-Established Churches; and concluding with Remedies proposed for Abuses indicated; and an Examination of the Parliamentary System of Church Reform lately pursued, and still pursuing; including the proposed New Churches. By Jeremy Bentham, Esq. Bench of Lincoln's Inn, and late of Queen's College, Oxford, M. A. 20s.

Sermons on the Nature, Offices and Character of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. T. Bowdler, A. M. 8vo. 14s. boards.

The Philosophical Library; being a Curious Collection of the most Rare and Valuable Manuscript and Printed Works, both ancient and modern, which treat of Moral, Metaphysical, Theological, Historical and Philosophical Inquiries after Truth. Vol. I. By Josephus Tela. 8vo. 15s. 6d.

Don't Despair: a Tale. By Wm. Beck. Dedicated to the British and Foreign School Society. 1s. 6d.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Mr. Herbert; W. H.; F. K.; P. G—e; T.; E.; Mr. Yeates; W. P.; A Constant Reader; J. D. B. C.; J. T. C.; Free Thinking Christian; M. H.; Philalethes; and An Unitarian at Heart.

We have also received Mr. Holden's Memoir of the late Rev. Caleb Fleming, and the Letter and Extract from Chester.

The Communication from Edinburgh was printed before the second letter came to hand.

K.'s paper cannot be found, and we believe was never delivered to the publishers.

The Editor hopes to be able henceforward to resume the various preparations for the Monthly Repository, which he has been lately constrained to neglect.