

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CLIII.]

SEPTEMBER, 1818.

[Vol. XIII.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Some Account of Doctors Baron and Bullock, Deans of Norwich, by Mr. Edward Taylor.

SIR,

Norwich.

MR. TOMS's notice of Dr. Baron [XII. 389] will, perhaps, excite the curiosity of some of your readers to know more of him, and especially to see the Epitaph to which Gillingwater, the Lowestoft historian refers. Baron was Rector of the Saxlinghams, in Norfolk, succeeded to the Deanery of Norwich in 1733, and was the same year made D. D. by the Archbishop of Canterbury, being then Archdeacon of Norfolk, which he resigned not long after. He died at his Rectory-house of Saxlingham, July 11, 1739, and is buried in that church. On the south side of the altar is a neat mural marble monument, with the following inscription, written by the Dean :

Cujus ossa hic sita sunt,
Si rerum novarum curiosus, scire desideras,
Quisquis ades spectator,
Saxo nihil, vicinis dubia respondentibus,
Me forte mei certiores habes indicem :
Fui JOHANNES BARON, Clericus,
Hujus ecclesie quondam Rector,
Ecclesie Cathedralis Norvici tandem DE-
CANUS,
Qui
Exuvijs hic depositis, ne Vermibus deficerent pabula,
Animus in Creatoris manus transmissi;
Reducem,
Sæcula expectantem meliora.
Si fortunæ dotes in primis quæsitis, quæ-
ras; eas vix esse nostras
Existima,
DEO tamen daute, me fuisse intelligas,
Quosque per ingenium, per malevolis
licuit,
Doctrinâ, opibus, famâ, loco, sic satis,
Cum hoc mihi potissimum in votis
fuerit,
Ut declinatâ invidiâ, otio fruere honesto primorum extremus,
Si vitæ jam exactæ rationem quæras;
frustra quæris in presentia
Cum neque respondere probè sciam Ipse,
Nec curat populus omnino, aut curat ni-
mium,

In alium diem differenda est cognitio,
Quando omnium judici DEO rationem sum
redditurus;

Tu, quoque,

Interea, Tu candide spectator,
Hunc hominem considerans, teipsum re-
spice,

Tu Judex æquissime, Pater optime,
Servum de multis malis malè admissis do-
lentem, *absolve,*

Filijque immerentis, et supplicis
Miserere mei.

Natus 31 Octobris } Anno Salutis } 1677
Obijt undecimo Julij } 1739

Dr. Baron was succeeded in the Deauery of Norwich by Dr. Bullock, who was of a very liberal turn of mind, as appears from a volume of sermons, which he published under the following title: "The Reasoning of Christ and his Apostles in their Defence of Christianity considered, in seven Sermons, preached at Hackney, 1724." I believe your readers will be pleased with a few passages from the first of these discourses. Its title is "Divine Revelations how proved." The text, "Hereby know we the spirit of truth from the spirit of error." After explaining the terms, and shewing the meaning of the apostle in the verses whence the text is taken, he proceeds to "some observations which may serve as rules to us, whereby we may distinguish between *the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*"

"I observe, that the apostle supposes the use of our natural reason, necessary to distinguish a revelation coming from God, from that which does not. The rule prescribed by him for the trial of spirits, whether they be of God or not, is this, that we compare their doctrines with the notions and apprehensions we have of God. This plainly supposes that we ought to have some just and true apprehensions of the Divine nature, before we can be qualified (according to this rule) to judge of a revelation coming from him. How then are these apprehensions of God to be acquired? Not by revelation, it is plain:

because they are pre-requisite to the trial of revelations. The existence of God, and in a good measure his attributes and perfections, must be understood by us, before we can expect him to reveal himself to us, before we can judge whether the doctrine revealed be worthy of him. In this case, therefore, natural reason must be our guide, and what *that* teaches, upon impartial inquiry, must be depended upon.

“There cannot be a worse reflection cast upon religion, than to represent it, not as founded in reason, but built upon the ruins of it. It was plainly the opinion of the first teachers of Christianity, that their doctrine had a just foundation in reason, that *it contained nothing inconsistent with it*, but that the whole Christian scheme was agreeable thereto. Therefore we find them often appealing to the reason of mankind in justification of it.

“Since, therefore, the use of natural reason is necessary truly to distinguish a revelation coming from God, from that which does not, we may observe,

“That any doctrine which contradicts the evident dictates or deductions of reason, *ought not to be received as coming from God*; but to be rejected as proceeding from a *spirit of error*. There are certainly some things necessary to be received and depended upon as true, before any such thing as a revelation can be admitted. As for instance, that there is a God, and that he is a Being of never-failing truth. Till I am satisfied of these, I have no room to look for, or depend upon a revelation from him. And the only course I can take, antecedently to revelation, to come at the knowledge of these, is to consult my reason; and all the certainty I can have about them, must be such as my reason is able to furnish me with. If, therefore, I cannot depend upon the evidence of reason, I cannot depend upon the truth of these two propositions, nor consequently upon the truth of revelation, which *necessarily* presupposes the truth of them.

“It is plain, therefore, that to question the evidence of reason, is to render revelation equally questionable; and to receive any thing as a revelation coming from God, which contradicts the evidence of reason, is

to undermine the very foundation of revelation itself, and to leave that groundless, upon which we build the truth of the doctrine revealed. Should we admit any thing as a revelation coming from God, which contradicts the evident dictates of our reason, we sacrifice one revelation, that which God gave us with our very beings, to make way for another which is inconsistent with it. It is in effect admitting, that the very best gift which God has given us, is of no *real* use and service to us, no not even in discerning which doctrines come from God and which do not. For if I cannot depend upon the plainest dictates of reason, how can I be assured that *any* doctrine is a revelation come from God? If I receive it without consulting my reason, then, for ought I know, it may be an imposture, and I am every way as liable to embrace an error as the truth. But if I embrace it upon the trial and conviction of my reason, then, it is plain, I admit the principles of reason are to be depended upon; which, if I do, I cannot consistently admit any thing as true, which contradicts it.”

Such were Déan Bullock's sentiments. You will probably think them worthy to be inserted in the Repository. If so, they are much at your service.

EDWARD TAYLOR.

SIR, *Islington, Aug. 3, 1818.*

IN the Number of the Antijacobin Review, for July, which has just appeared, and at the commencement of an article, entitled *Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Landaff, &c.*, occurs the following singular declaration respecting the Athanasian Creed, which will amuse the more intelligent and judicious readers of your Miscellany. “The Athanasian Creed contains the most clear and admirable compendium of the controverted points connected with the doctrine of the Trinity. It gives us the decision of the Catholic Church on each of these points; and whatever be the private opinion of the clergyman, as long as it continues in the Book of Common Prayer, and is sanctioned by public authority, it is his duty to obey the authority to which he has sworn obedience! Bishop Watson, of course, wished its removal

from the Liturgy, and great division of opinion has ever existed respecting it; but we shall regret the day when the long-threatened storm of innovation commences with the expunging of this Creed. The Athanasian Creed will never fall alone! New doctrines will creep in, and many well-tryed institutions will perish in that convulsive change of opinion, which must agitate the nation before this and other changes could be accomplished. The Athanasian Creed, though not the corner-stone of the arch, is, as it were, a row of bricks in the outer wall of our house; its removal is attended with danger to the whole fabric!"

I shall say nothing of the clearness of a Creed, in which no rational idea can attach to the words of which it is composed, nor of the condition of a minister of the gospel, who is obliged to read publicly what in private is the object of his reprobation, nor of the structure of a fabric, where the striking off an incumbering row of bricks in the outer wall, fails not to insure its destruction. I will, by way of contrast, introduce a paragraph from the works of the amiable and conscientious Dr. John Jebb: the reader shall be left to form his own judgment.

"Come forward, Athanasius, let us peruse thy impious and abominable Creed! let us expose to the indignation of all mankind, that intolerant spirit which induced thee to indite it, (if indeed thou didst indite it,) and if we cannot prevail with our countrymen to rise as one man, with a determined resolution for ever to abolish such a reproach to human nature, at least we will indulge ourselves in the miserable consolation of lamenting, that a summary of faith so monstrously absurd, so contradictory to reason and to itself, so destructive of charity and peace, so dishonourable to our ideas of the Almighty, so opposite to the doctrine and example of the meek and lowly Jesus, could ever find a place in a Christian form of worship, could ever be countenanced by a Protestant prelate, could ever be established by an English Act of Parliament, and thus be permitted to transmit its pestilential virus into the maxims and morals of each succeeding generation."

The learned and pious Lardner, speaking of the Athanasian Creed in

a practical point of view, has these memorable expressions: "This and other like Creeds are inserted in almost all the Established Articles and Liturgies in Christendom. But is not this teaching uncharitableness by authority? And if any join in such offices of religion, whilst they believe not the Creeds which they recite, or are supposed to recite, they are made to pass sentence of condemnation upon themselves. How great then is the privilege to be at liberty to choose our religion, and that way of worship which, upon a serious consideration, and after careful and impartial examination, we think to be reasonable, scriptural and edifying!"

And Doddridge, with his usual good sense and liberality, has these reflections on the subject:—

"How early did the spirit of bigotry and imposition begin to work in the Christian Church, that fatal humour of imposing a yoke on the neck of Christ's disciples, by making indifferent things necessary! An unmanly and antichristian disposition, which has almost ever since been rending the Church to pieces, and clamourously throwing the blame on those who have been desirous, on principles truly evangelical, to stand fast in the liberty with which their divine Master hath made them free. How foolish and how mischievous the error of making terms of communion which Christ has never made; and how presumptuous the arrogance of invading his throne, to pronounce from thence damnatory sentences on those who will not, who dare not submit to our uncommissioned and usurped authority! Prudent undoubtedly was the part which the Antiochian Christians acted in sending messengers (Acts xv. 1—11), to the apostles for their determination. And it will be our prudence, now we can no longer in person consult those ambassadors of Christ, to make their writings the man of our counsel, and the standard both of our faith and worship; appealing to the tribunal of Christ, our Master and Judge, from those uncharitable censures, which we may sometimes incur even from his faithful, though mistaken servants, for retaining the simplicity of that religion which these authorized interpreters of his will taught." JOHN EVANS.

P. S. The vicar of a parish in Wales once told me, that he had for years left off reading the Athanasian Creed, and that not one of the parishioners had complained of the omission, except his clerk Philip, who, when tipsy, was sure to mention it! This orthodox son of the church had, it seems, a zeal on the occasion, the ardour of which rose or fell like quicksilver in the barometer, being the exact measurement of his inebriety. An absurd and uncharitable Creed, always a burden to the enlightened and virtuous conscience, and sometimes the idol of a besotted profligacy, is most assuredly no recommendation to any religious establishment upon earth. Let the Bench of Bishops remedy the crying evil, which hath been denounced by a Tillotson, a Watson and a Jebb, actuated as they were by the hallowed motive of advancing the glory of the one only true and living God, and of subserving the present and eternal welfare of mankind.

Dr. Jones on the Deification of Jesus Christ at Rome, and the Conduct of Josephus, with regard to the Authors of that Doctrine.

THE following passage is taken from Tertullian, Apolog. C. vi. see Lardner, VII. p. 243: "Tiberius, in whose reign the Christian name appeared in the world, having received from Palestine, in Syria, an account of the works which revealed and verified the divinity of Jesus, proposed him to the senate, with the privilege of his own vote in favour of his deification. The senate, because he had refused that honour, rejected the proposal. Cæsar remained of the same opinion, and threatened to punish the accusers of the Christians."

If it were allowed that Tiberius had received from Pilate, in Palestine, an authentic account of Jesus, is it likely that the emperor, who was known to have been indolent, dilatory, and indifferent even to the affairs of his own empire, should be hence induced to honour, as a God, one whom in the person of his representative he had crucified as a slave and a malefactor? If this be very improbable, it follows, that Tertullian has asserted what is not true, or has not asserted the whole truth respecting it.

The Heathens, who believed that

there were many gods, and that those gods often appear among men, as soon as they became convinced of the miracles of Jesus, concluded that he was a God. His enemies the more readily embraced this notion, as it enabled them to account for his miracles without embracing his gospel. Tiberius, therefore, as soon as he became assured of the divine works done by our Lord, must have drawn the same conclusion. But how did he become acquainted with those works?

It has been answered, "from the acts of Pilate." This governor well knew that his sovereign would soon hear of the works and condemnation of Jesus. In common prudence, therefore, he would not neglect to transmit an authentic narrative of events, in which the name and power of Cæsar were deeply involved. It was, besides, his imperious duty to do this, and at his peril he would not omit it. These acts existed in the archives of Rome; and Justin Martyr, addressing the then emperor and senate, confidently appeals to them as existing there in his days. If this answer be not satisfactory, every doubt must be removed by Josephus, whose history supplies the astonishing fact, that the gospel, as the philosophy of Moses and the prophets, was preached in Rome, made known to all and received by multitudes even before the death of Tiberius. But if this emperor proposed the deification of Jesus, he must have been prompted to do so by some pretended friends of Jesus. And here I am led to another passage. In one of the dialogues of Plutarch, it is asserted, that "Thaumas, an Egyptian pilot, lately come from Egypt, brought with him a report, heard at the Palodes, that the great Pan was dead." "This report," adds Plutarch, "spread throughout Rome, so that Tiberius sent for Thaumas, and asked of him who this Pan might be: and he made other inquiries respecting him. But the philologers, who were very numerous about the emperor, represented this Pan as the son of Mercury and Penelope." See Lardner, VII. p. 247.

The Pharisees would willingly believe that Jesus had Beelzebub dwelling in him. The Egyptians might think him to be Osiris; and this accounts for the extraordinary fact stated

by Hadrian, namely, that the bishops of Christ worshiped Osiris. The people of Lystra would easily take him, as they did Paul, for Jupiter come down among them: and we here see that the magicians, in the court of Tiberius, supposed him to be Pan, the son of Mercury and Penelope. Eusebius, indeed, affects to suppose, that by the great Pan was meant not our Lord, but one of the demons destroyed by him. He must, I presume, have known better; but though contending for the divinity of Jesus he was ashamed to make him one of the most despicable of the heathen gods. Lardner objects to this story in Plutarch having any reference to Christ, as being all over heathenish. But might we not expect the truth to be mixed with Heathenism when related by Heathens? If it had been recorded in the archives of Lystra, and not in the Acts of the Apostles, that Jupiter and Mercury had appeared in the form of men, and healed a cripple in that city, and Eusebius had recorded it on that authority, as referring to Paul and Barnabas, it is evident that Lardner would have disbelieved it, and said that the story was altogether heathenish and unworthy of credit.

The miracles which our Lord performed, the reality of which was universally believed in Judea and other countries, disposed the minds of men to receive *false miracles*. The impostors, who, in Rome and in the provinces, practised the arts of magic, availed themselves of this disposition; and endeavouring, from the real works of Jesus, to attach credit to their own impostures, affected to use and extol his name, while they were enemies to him and to his gospel. The Samaritan Simon, Barjesus, the sons of Sceva, all mentioned in the book of the Acts, are examples of this kind; and it is reasonable to suppose, that the magicians around Tiberius acted on the same principle. They pronounced him to be Pan, the son of Mercury and Penelope. The character of this god may be seen in one of the dialogues of Lucian; and the monster, as he is there described, shews, that the deceivers, above-mentioned, regarded the blessed Jesus with bitter malice and derision. Tiberius, though a fatalist, was extremely superstitious, and always surrounded by a herd of magicians. The

wicked Jew, whom Josephus holds forth as a teacher of the gospel in Rome, was probably in the number of these impostors: for he was in league with the priests of Isis, who effected the destruction of Fulvia, the wife of Saturninus, an intimate friend of the emperor; and these priests no doubt constituted in part the magicians and astrologers, mentioned by Plutarch, under the name of philologers. This last author expressly declares, that the emperor consulted them on this occasion, and that they gave it as their opinion, that the person inquired after, was one of the Pagan gods. Now, as it was their opinion that Jesus was a God, or, in other words, that before he was put to death he was inhabited by a god, and as they gave this opinion to the emperor, is it not probable that they also advised him to procure his deification from the senate? And as, moreover, Tiberius was exceedingly devoted to such men, is it not farther reasonable to suppose, that he did, from their advice and under their influence, what he would not have done from his own temper or from the acts of Pilate? Tertullian and Eusebius were well acquainted with these circumstances; but being ashamed of the base advisers of the emperor, they threw a veil over their interference: but, at the same time, wishing to avail themselves of the fact, they left it by the omission destitute of its proper evidence.

Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, addressed to the emperor and senate, has the following passage, which has occasioned great perplexity to modern critics: "Simon, a Samaritan, from the village of Gitton, in the reign of Claudius, by means of demons working in him, is, in your royal city, deemed a god, and is honoured as such by a statue from you: which statue had been raised by the river Tiber, between the two bridges, having upon it this inscription, in Latin, 'Simoni Deo Sancto,'" p. 38. ed. Thirl. Simon was a shameless and profligate impostor: and it is a fact, that wherever he went he pretended to be a god. His language to his followers, as appears from the *Recognition*, ascribed to Clemens, was, "I can be adored as a god, and have divine honours bestowed upon me, so that men shall make me a statue and worship me as a god." To his im-

pious pretensions, in this respect, we have the most authentic testimony; since we read in the Acts, that in Samaria he astonished the people by his magical artifices, and professed to be the great power of God. Nor can it be well doubted, but that he assumed this title in opposition to Jesus, who is called *the Son of God*. It cannot appear improbable that he held the same profession in Rome, where he exercised the same wicked arts. Nor is it less probable that the enemies of the gospel should avail themselves of his pretensions, in order to ridicule or defeat the claims of Jesus, and thus honour him with a statue. Nevertheless, Middleton, a fine writer, but a superficial inquirer, thus remarks, in regard to the above passage: "It is manifest, beyond all reasonable doubt, that Justin was led here into a gross blunder, by his usual want of judgment, and his ignorance of Roman affairs, and his preconceived notions of fabulous stories, which passed current about this Simon amongst the first Christians; for the statue and inscription to which he appeals, were not dedicated to his countryman Simon Magus, of whose deification there is not the least hint in any Roman writer, but to a Sabine deity of ancient worship in Rome, and of similar name, *Semoni Sanco*, frequently mentioned by the old writers, as the inscription itself, dug up about two centuries ago from the ruins of that very place which Justin describes, has clearly demonstrated."

The true state of the case was the following: Among those idols which superstition had created in Rome, there was one dedicated to *Semo Sanco*, the Sabine deity above-mentioned. Simon, during his residence in that city, becoming acquainted with that idol, pretended, from the similarity of that name to his own, that he was the divinity meant by it. This similarity was a lucky coincidence; and his artifice in claiming a name so like his own, is well illustrated by what he pretended concerning the prostitute whom he led about with him. She was called *Helen*, and from this circumstance he gave it out, that she was the wife of Menelaus, whose conjugal infidelity had occasioned the Trojan war. Of Simon's pretensions no proof was necessary with the enemies of the gospel: for the deep-rooted

malice which the Romans cherished towards the Jews in general, and towards Jesus and his disciples in particular, induced them to favour and support any impostor, who partook of their malice and hatred. They, therefore, suffered a new statue, or the old one, to be erected with the inscription, not as before, of *Semoni Sanco*, but *Simoni Deo Sancto*. The Roman Senate, base as they were become, had reason to feel shame in conferring a statue on a man who was at once a stranger, a vagabond and an impostor, and that from mere malice towards Jesus and his followers. When, therefore, their purpose was answered, and the name of Simon had passed away, they naturally wished to bury this infamous act in oblivion, by restoring the statue to the original divinity, with the inscription of *Semoni Sanco*. The statue thus restored was found, as Middleton observes, in the common ruins; and the charge of blunders, with which he seeks to crush poor Justin Martyr, recoils with double weight upon himself.

Some years after the claims of Jesus and of Simon had been discussed at Rome, Josephus was brought an illustrious captive to that city. He witnessed the reproaches thrown upon Jesus and his faithful followers, and he thought it his duty to meet them, by a full and explicit testimony, in his Antiquities. "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 a teacher of men, who with delight embraced the things that are true," &c. Now what are *the truths* to which Josephus here alludes, and what the falsehoods, the charge of which being opposed to them, he had in view to repel? Let this writer be his own interpreter. After his testimony to Jesus, he subjoins an account of the wicked Jew and his associates, who professed to teach the philosophy of Moses, or as we call it, the gospel. It was not consistent with his views, as an historian, to give a detailed account of the doctrines which they taught respecting Christ. It was not at that time necessary; for it was then notorious, that they were in the number of those who inculcated that he was a god, and, as such, not born like other men. He, therefore, contents himself with holding them forth as

impostors, wicked in every respect. But that his aim might not be overlooked, he sets out with saying, that Jesus was a *man*: and, as it were, to apologize for many sincere believers in him among the Gentiles, who, from his wonderful works, might think him above human, he adds, "If, indeed, he might be called a man." After relating the extraordinary events which concerned Jesus, he adverts to the Samaritan impostor, whom, as the antagonist of Jesus, the Roman Senate had honoured with a statue. "Nor did the Samaritans escape disturbance. For they were stirred up by a man, who made no scruple of telling falsehoods, and who, influenced by the desire of popularity, imposed on the multitude by various artifices." Ant. Jud. L. xviii. C. iii. Sect. iv. It is singular, that Josephus should place his account of Jesus at the head of transactions which happened at Rome; and still more so does it appear, that he should relate, in the same connexion, events that took place in Samaria. His reason is now obvious; and his testimony for Jesus is equally genuine with that which he bears against Simon. They point each to the other, as the productions of the same hand; and it must appear marvellous, that a paragraph respecting Christ, which has been deemed spurious for want of connexion, should be found to be the corner-stone of the whole context.

In his testimony to Jesus, Josephus has excluded the notion of his supernatural birth, as not belonging to his history: and that he might point out the base origin of it, he subjoins the wonderful transaction that gave it birth. But this shall be the subject of a subsequent paper.

JOHN JONES.

Ratcliff Highway,
Aug. 3, 1818.

SIR,
I FEEL great pleasure in forwarding, for insertion, the following anecdote of Sir William Garrow, copied from the Monthly Magazine of last May. It forms a striking contrast with the instance of malignant bigotry recorded in the Repository of July, p. 443; and is the more interesting when we consider that Sir William, when Attorney-General, was never remarkable for his attachment to the

cause of freedom. But "*Libertas quæ sera tamen respexit inertem.*"

J. W. F.

In a trial at the late Leicester assizes, an attempt was made to invalidate the testimony of a respectable witness, by some impertinent and insulting questions put to him by one of the counsel relative to his religious faith,—which Mr. Baron Garrow said he was not obliged to answer; and he added, "I should not, however, have prevented him from giving an answer if he had chosen, because the answer might have vindicated him from the imputation which the question conveyed. But, whatever might have been his answer, whether he declared himself to be a believer in every part of the Holy Scriptures or not, I should, in my address to the jury, have said, that his belief or disbelief in these matters should not impeach his testimony. He might be equally disposed to tell the truth whatever were his religious opinions."—Such language is calculated to increase the number of true Christians.

SIR, *Liverpool, Nov. 15, 1817.*

THE lamented death of the Right Hon. John Philpot Curran, recorded in your Obituary, [XII. 625, 626,] reminded me of the following extracts which I made some time ago, from a collection of his Speeches, the 4th edit. 8vo. 1815. The additional interest they derive from the reflection that now they are amongst the monuments of departed genius, joined to that which their intrinsic excellence claims, will perhaps render them worthy a place in the pages of the Repository—a work that, I trust, will ever be ready to offer its tribute of willing admiration to talents, which like those of Curran's were always employed in the service of liberty. The speeches from which these extracts are made, were printed from short-hand notes taken during their delivery, and never received the finishing touches of their author's hand; but with all their imperfections they furnish highly favourable specimens of his commanding eloquence. It will soon be discovered that this eloquence is completely *Irish*:—which, whilst it disclaims the formality of the schools, and by the gaudiness of its ornaments continually offends against the refinement of an

elegant taste, is yet nearly allied to the eloquence of nature, and seldom fails to arouse the strongest feelings of the human heart. The following account of Mr. Curran's eloquence, which is itself no bad specimen of the faculty it describes, will form a suitable preface to the extracts :

"In the cross examination of a witness, he (Mr. C.,) is unequalled. The most intricate web that fraud, malice or corruption ever wove against the life, fortune or character of an individual, he can unravel. Let truth and falsehood be ever so ingeniously dovetailed into each other, he separates them with facility. He surveys his ground like a skilful general, marks every avenue of approach, knows when to attack, when to yield; instantly seizes the first inconsistency of testimony, pursues his advantage with dexterity and caution, till at last he completely involves perjury in the confusion of its contradictions. And while the bribed and suborned witness is writhing in the agony of detected falsehood, he wrings from him the truth, and snatches the devoted victim from the altar. It is when in a case of this kind he speaks to a jury, that he appears as if designed by Providence to be the refuge of the unfortunate, the protector of the oppressed. In the course of his eloquence the classic treasures of profane antiquity are exhausted. He draws fresh supplies from the sacred fountain of living water. The records of Holy Writ afford him the sublimest allusions. It is then he stirs every principle that agitates the heart or sways the conscience, carries his auditory whither he pleases, ascends from man to the Deity, and again almost seems to call down fire from heaven; while they who listen, filled with a sense of inward greatness, feel the high nobility of their nature, in beholding a being of the same species gifted with such transcendent qualities, and wrapt in wonder and delight have a momentary belief, that to admire the talents, is to participate in the genius of the orator."

Pref. p. 10. B. G.

1. *A Detail of a single Fact, often more impressive than a general Description.*

If, for instance, you wished to convey to the mind of an English matron,

the horrors of that direful period, when in defiance of the remonstrance of the ever-to-be-lamented Abercrombie, our people were surrendered to the licentious brutality of the soldiery, by the authority of the state; you would vainly endeavour to give her a general picture of lust and rapine and murder and conflagration. Instead of exhibiting the picture of a whole province, select a single object, and even in that single object, do not release the imagination of your hearer from its task, by giving more than an outline. Take a cottage, place the affrighted mother of her orphan daughters at the door, the paleness of death upon her face, and more than its agonies in her heart, her aching eye, her anxious ear, struggling through the mists of the closing day to catch the approaches of desolation and dishonour. The ruffian gang arrives; the feast of plunder begins; the cup of madness kindles in its circulation; the wandering glances of the ravisher become concentrated upon the shrinking and devoted victim. You need not dilate, you need not expatiate; the unpolluted mother to whom you tell the story of horror, beseeches you not to proceed; she presses her child to her heart, she drowns it in her tears; her fancy catches more than an angel's tongue can describe; at a single view she takes in the whole miserable succession of force, of profanation, of despair, of death.

2. *A Slave cannot breathe in England.*

The spirit of British law makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil; it proclaims even to the stranger and sojourner the moment he sets his foot on British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom, an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery; the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the God sink together in the dust, his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his

chains that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of *universal emancipation*.

3. *Irish Hospitality.*

An Irishman's hospitality is not the running account of posted and ledgered courtesies, as in other countries; it springs like all his qualities, his faults, his virtues—directly from the heart. The heart of an Irishman is by nature bold, and he confides; it is tender, and he loves; it is generous, and he gives; it is social, and he is hospitable.

4. *Scotland.*

A nation cast between the spiritless acquiescence of submissive poverty, and the sturdy credulity of pampered wealth; cool and ardent, adventurous and persevering; winging her eagle flight against the blaze of every science, with an eye that never winks, and a wing that never tires; crowned with the spoils of every art, and decked with the wreath of every muse, from the deep and scrutinizing researches of her *Hume*, to the sweet and simple, but not less sublime and pathetic morality of her *Burns*.

5. *Force of Public Opinion.*

Though a certain class of delinquents may be screened from punishment, they cannot be protected from hatred and derision. The great tribunal of reputation will pass its inexorable sentence upon their crimes, their follies and their incompetency; they will sink themselves under the consciousness of their own situation; they will feel the operation of an acid so neutralizing the malignity of their natures, as to make them at least harmless, if it cannot make them innocent.

If you are obliged to arraign the acts of those in high station, approach them not in malice, nor favour, nor fear. Remember that it is the condition of guilt to tremble, and of honesty to be bold; remember that your false fear can only give them false courage;—that while you nobly avow the cause of truth, you will find her shield your impenetrable protection, and that no attack can either be hazardous, or inefficient, if it be just and resolute. If *Nathan* had not fortified himself in the boldness and directness of his charge,

he might have been hanged for the malice of his parable.

6. *Bigotry.*

Analyze the bigot's object, and we see, he takes nothing from religion but a flimsy pretext in the profanation of its name. He professes the correction of error and the propagation of truth; but when he has gained the victory, what are the terms he proposes for himself? Power and profit. What terms does he make for religion? Profession and conformity. What is that profession? The mere utterance of the lips—the utterance of sounds which after a pulsation or two upon the air are just as visible and lasting as they are audible. What is the conformity? Is it the forgiveness of injuries, the payment of debts, or the practice of charity? No such things. It is the performance of some bodily gesture. It is going to some place of worship. It is to stand, or to kneel, or to bow; but it is not a conformity that has anything to do with the heart, the judgment, or the conduct. All these things bigotry meddles not with, but leaves them to religion herself to perform. Bigotry only adds one more, and that a very odious one, to the number of those human stains, which it is the business of true religion not to burn out with the bigot's fire, but to expunge and wash away with the Christian's tears. Such invariably in all countries and ages have been the motives of the bigot's conflicts, such the use of his victories;—not the propagation of opinion, but the engrossment of power and plunder.

7. *The Revolution.*

The glorious æra of the revolution shewed that if man descends, it is not in his own proper motion; that it is with labour and with pain, and that he can continue to sink only until by the force and pressure of the descent, the spring of his immortal faculties acquires that recuperative energy and effort that hurries him as many miles aloft,—he sinks but to rise again. It is in that period that the state seeks for shelter in the destruction of the press,—then that the tyrant prepares for an attack upon the people by destroying the liberty of the press,—by taking away that shield of wisdom and virtue behind which the people are

invulnerable; in whose pure and polished convex, ere the lifted blow has fallen, the tyrant beholds his own image and is turned into stone:—it is at those periods that the honest man dares not speak, because truth is too dreadful to be told; it is then, humanity has no ears, because humanity has no tongue. It is then the proud man scorns to speak, but like a physician baffled by the wayward excesses of his dying patient, retires indignantly from the bed of an unhappy wretch, whose ear is too fastidious to bear the sound of wholesome advice, whose palate is too debauched to bear the salutary bitter of the medicine that might redeem him; and therefore leaves him to the felonious piety of the slaves, that talk to him of life and strip him before he is cold.

8. *Irish Informers.*

I speak not now of the public proclamation for informers, with a promise of secrecy and of extravagant reward; I speak not of the fate of those horrid wretches who have been so often transferred from the (*witness*) table to the dock, and from the dock to the pillory; I speak of what your own eyes have seen, day after day during the course of this commission, from the box where you are now sitting; the number of horrid miscreants who avowed upon their oaths, that they had come from the very seat of government,—from the Castle, where they had been worked upon by the fear of death and the hope of compensation, to give evidence against their fellows,—(*each a proof*) that the mild and wholesome councils of this government are holden over those catacombs of living death, where the wretch that is buried a man, lies until his heart has time to fester and dissolve, and is then dug up a witness!

Is this fancy, or is it fact? Have you not seen him after his resurrection from that tomb,—after having been dug out of the region of death and corruption, make his appearance upon the table, the living image of life and death, and the sovereign arbiter of both? Have you not marked, when he entered, how the stormy wave of the multitude retired at his approach? Have you not marked how the human heart bowed to the supremacy of his power, in the undissembled homage

of deferential horror? How his glance, like the lightning from heaven, seemed to rive the body of the accused, and mark it for the grave, while his voice warned the devoted wretch of woe and death;—a death which no innocence can escape, no art elude, no force resist? There was an antidote—a juror's oath; but even that adamantine chain that bound the integrity of man to the throne of eternal justice, is solved and melted in the breath that issues from the informer's mouth; conscience wings from her moorings, and the appalled and affrighted juror consults his own safety in the surrender of the victim:—

Et quæ sibi quisque timebat
Unius in miseri exitium conversa tulere.

9. *From Mr. C.'s Defence of Finerty, charged with a Libel for having published an exposure of the unjust conduct of the Irish Government in their treatment of Mr. Orr, who had been executed as a Conspirator. The circumstances of this treatment will be learnt from the Extract.*

But, gentlemen, in order to bring the charge of insolence and vulgarity to the test, let me ask you whether you know of any language which could have adequately described the idea of mercy denied, where it ought to have been granted; or of any phrase vigorous enough to convey the indignation which an honest man would have felt on such a subject? Let me beg of you for a moment to suppose that any of you had been the writer of this very severe expostulation with the Viceroy, and that you had been the witness of the whole progress of that never-to-be-forgotten catastrophe. Let me suppose that you had known the charge on which Mr. Orr had been apprehended, the charge of abjuring that bigotry which had torn and disgraced his country, of pledging himself to restore the people of his country to their place in the Constitution, and of binding himself never to be the betrayer of his fellow-labourer in that enterprize;—that you had seen him upon that charge taken from his industry and confined in a gaol; that through the slow and lingering progress of twelve tedious months you had seen him confined in a dungeon, shut out from the common use of air and of

his own limbs; that day after day you had marked the unhappy captive, cheered by no sound but the cries of his family or the clinking of chains; that you had seen him at last brought to trial; that you had seen the vile and perjured informer deposing against his life; that you had seen the drunken and worn-out jury give in a verdict of death; that you had seen the same jury, when returning sobriety had brought back their conscience, prostrate themselves before the humanity of the bench, and pray that the mercy of the crown might save their character from the reproach of an involuntary crime, their conscience from the torture of eternal self-condemnation, and their souls from the indelible stain of innocent blood: let me suppose that you had seen the respite given, and the contrite and honest recommendation transmitted to that seat where mercy was presumed to dwell; that new and before unheard of crimes are discovered against the informers; that the royal mercy seems to relent, and that a new respite is sent to the prisoner; that time is taken, as the learned counsel for the crown has expressed it, to see whether mercy could be extended or not!—that after that period of lingering deliberation passed, a third respite is transmitted; that the unhappy captive himself feels the cheering hope of being restored to a family he had adored, to a character he had never stained, and to a country that he had ever loved; that you had seen his wife and children upon their knees giving those tears to gratitude which their locked and frozen hearts could not give to anguish and despair, and imploring the blessings of eternal Providence on his head, who had spared the father and restored him to his children; that you had seen the olive branch sent into his little ark, but no sign that the waters had subsided. “Alas! nor wife, nor children more shall be behold, nor friends nor sacred home.” No seraph mercy unbars the door of his dungeon and leads him forth to light and life, but the minister of death hurries him to the scene of suffering and of shame; where, unmoved by the hostile array of artillery and armed men, collected together to secure, or to insult, or to disturb him, he dies with a solemn declaration of his innocence, and utters his last breath in a

prayer for his country. Let me now ask you, if any of you had addressed the public ear upon so foul and monstrous a subject, in what language would you have conveyed the feelings of horror and indignation? Would you have stooped to the meanness of qualified complaint? Would you have been mean enough—but I entreat your forgiveness, I do not think meanly of you; had I thought so meanly of you I could not have suffered my mind to commune with you as it has done ***. If I do not, therefore, grossly err in my opinion of you, you could use no language on a subject like this, that must not lag behind the rapidity of your feelings, and that would not disgrace those feelings if it attempted to describe them.

Gentlemen, I am not unconscious that the counsel for the crown seemed to address you with a confidence of a very different kind; he seemed to expect from you a kind and respectful sympathy with the feelings of the Castle and the griefs of chided authority. — Perhaps he may know you better than I do; if he does, he has spoken to you as he ought; he has been right in telling you that if the reprobation of this writer be weak, it is because his genius could not make it stronger; he has been right in telling you, that his language has not been braided and festooned as elegantly as it might; that he has not pinched the miserable plaits of his phraseology, nor placed his patches and feathers with the correctness of millinery, which became so exalted a personage. If you agree with him,—if you think that the man who ventures, at the hazard of his own life, to rescue from the deep the drowning honour of his country, must not presume upon the guilty familiarity of plucking it up by the locks;—I have no more to say: do a courteous thing. Upright and honest jurors! find a civil and obliging verdict against the printer. And when you have done so, march through the ranks of your fellow-citizens to your own homes, and bear their looks as you pass along; retire to the bosom of your families and your children, and when you are presiding over the morality of the parental board, tell those infants who are to be the future men of Ireland the history of this day. Form their young minds by your pre-

cepts, and confirm those precepts by your example; teach them how discreetly allegiance may be perjured on the table, or loyalty forsworn in the jury-box; and when you have done so, tell them the story of *Orr*; tell them of his captivity, of his children, of his crime, of his hopes, of his disappointments, of his courage and of his death; and when you find your little hearers hanging from your lips, when you see their eyes overflow with sympathy and sorrow, and their young hearts bursting with the pangs of anticipated orphanage, tell them that you had the boldness and the justice to stigmatize the monster—who had dared to publish the transaction!

SIR, Bridport, Aug. 8, 1818.

BEING well acquainted with the character of the Rev. L. Way, who was educated for a barrister, but is now, what is usually termed, an evangelical clergyman of the Established Church of England, my attention has been particularly directed to his letters from the Continent, which have lately appeared in the *Jewish Expositor*. No man has taken up the cause of the dispersed and degraded children of Israel, with more ardent and persevering zeal than himself. He has been for some time travelling in various parts of Europe, with a view to promote the object of the London Society established for the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, and to this he readily devotes a considerable part of an affluent income. That he is influenced in his undertaking by the most pious and benevolent motives, cannot be doubted by those who best know his disposition and character; while intelligent and considerate men have, I believe, no expectation of his success in making many sincere converts to his religious system, from among a people set apart by Jehovah, for preserving the knowledge and worship of himself, the one only living and true God.

Much has been lately said of the change of sentiments which has gradually been effected in the minds of the ministers of Geneva, formerly the chief seat of Calvinistic theology. From Mr. L. Way's letters it appears, that a spirit of free inquiry prevails in various other parts of the Continent, leading to results which he deeply

laments. The Lutherans he states in one place to have renounced the doctrine of *consubstantiation*, and in another, of *justification by faith*. The great body of the Calvinists have given up some of the peculiar tenets of their founder, especially *predestination*. A considerable number of Jews in Germany and Poland admit Jesus Christ to be a *true prophet*, though not the promised Messiah. When he states the generality of professed Christian ministers in Berlin, to be Deists and Socinians, due allowance must be made for his religious system, which leads many who embrace it to represent those who deny the proper deity of Jesus Christ, though strenuous advocates for the *divinity* of his mission, to be no otherwise than Deists.

To shew the correctness of the above observations, I shall make a few quotations from Mr. L. Way's Letters.

From Berlin, the capital of Prussia, he writes, Oct. 4, 1817:

"There is a great difference in Germany as to party and opinion. There are a few staunch Lutherans who hold consubstantiation, and a few Calvinists who hold predestination, and will hold it. But the mass of the clergy, (as the spiritual part allow,) are Deists, Socinians, or any thing but evangelical Christians, and the thinking part of the community are strongly infected still with the infidelity of Voltaire, and the philosophy of Kant, Wolfe and others of the German school."—*Jewish Expos.* for April 1818, p. 155.

"The character and condition of the remnant of Israel resident in the capital of Prussia, exhibit an appearance altogether dissimilar from that of any other place perhaps on the face of the earth. The rabbinical opinions and systems have almost disappeared, and the commercial body is composed of men of more education and liberality of sentiment, than the ordinary class of trading Israelites. The origin of these distinctions is doubtless to be traced to the character and writings of Moses Mendelshom, who passed his life at Berlin, and rose by dint of industry and the exercise of no ordinary capacity to a degree of literary fame and personal distinction, which no Jew perhaps has attained since the times of Abrahimel and Maimon. He is honoured by his Jewish brethren as a Reformer, but a Christian would see more of

Voltaire than of Luther in that part of his character. His works are much read by the Jews in Germany, but from the extracts I have seen, he is not the man to lead them from Moses to Christ; as he does not seem to recognize the divine legation of the former, we know from the best authority, he cannot believe in the latter. His followers go a step farther: they very generally acknowledge that Christ was a *prophet*, and even *greater* than Moses, but they suppose both to have been competent to discover and lay down the rules of moral obligation, and even to exercise faith and love, and worship God acceptably, by the force of their *natural* powers."

"The philosophical spirit they have imbibed from the reasoning and principles of Mendelshom, has led the greater part of the Berlin Jews to reject the use of the Talmud, and a considerable party has been formed under the denomination of Reformed Jews." "I have heard since I left Berlin, that attempts are making to extend the principles and practices of this body, and that deputies have been sent to Paris, Geneva and other places. For the truth of this I cannot vouch, but nothing is more probable than that Satan, the great master of the synagogue 'who say they are Jews and are not but do lie,' should be ready to forward any work and set up any service, that may keep this people in legal bondage, or draw off their minds from the simplicity of Christ. He will doubtless allow his character as a *prophet*,* if by so doing he can reduce him to a level with Mahomet or even Moses, and to obviate the consequences of his reception as a sacrifice, priest and king in Zion; but we know none of his devices shall prosper." Jewish Expos. for April 1818, p. 156.

In the same number is a Letter from the Rev. R. Cox, written from Berlin,

* This does not appear altogether consistent with the *cunning* usually ascribed to this wily old serpent, by the believer in his personal existence and influence. If Satan, Mr. L. Way's "great master of the synagogue" of the Reformed Jews, permit them to believe Jesus Christ to be a true prophet, he will find it very difficult, I should conceive, with all his artful devices, to prevent them from embracing Christianity as a religion of divine origin. T. H.

who says, "Not a few of the Reformed Jews profess their belief in Christ as a *true prophet*, though they inconsistently decline hailing him as the promised Messiah." P. 159.

I shall make but one extract more from Mr. L. Way's Letters. He writes from Mozyr on the Prypetz River in Russian Poland, March 26th, 1818: "From Smolensko to Titomir and so on, the Catholic, the Greek and the Lutheran churches, are to be found within a stone's throw of each other; and as far as I have been able to collect the sentiments of their respective members and ministers, they live together rather like the philosophical sects at Athens, than like bodies or communities of Christendom, and indifference prevails, perhaps as much as toleration. It is impossible not to remark the *degeneracy* of the *Lutherans*. The principles of Deism and false philosophy have overshadowed the morning star of the Reformation in the great doctrine of *justification by faith*, once called among them, *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*."—Jewish Expos. for July 1818, p. 278.

Had an Unitarian Christian given the account contained in these letters, of the defection of the great body of Protestants on the Continent of Europe from the standard of reputed orthodoxy, it might have been ascribed to misrepresentation of facts, from the bias of his own mind; it might have been said, we easily believe on slight evidence what we wish to be true. This, however, is not the case with the Rev. L. Way; his prepossessions are all in favour of those religious sentiments, which, in the course of his travels, he sees with grief to be *generally exploded*, and which honest truth obliges him to acknowledge, though in strains of pathetic lamentation. That many among the *thinking* part of the community on the Continent, are really infected with the *principles of infidelity*, is probably true; and to the genuine friend of Christianity, a subject of deep regret. This, indeed, may easily be accounted for, from the *corrupt systems of religion* which have generally prevailed. Having been taught from their earliest youth to consider one or other of these as constituting the gospel of Christ, they reject the latter, on account of the evident inconsistency with reason and

the divine perfections which characterizes the former. The evil, however, I trust, is but temporary, and that infidelity itself, under the direction of a wise and beneficent Providence, will be made eventually productive of good, like storms and tempests in the natural world. Infidelity will contribute to overturn superstition, priestcraft, or dominion over conscience, and every species of corrupt doctrine, and thus clear the way for the prevalence of Christianity in its native purity and simplicity.

That this will be really the case, when the causes now in operation produce their decided effects, may, I think, be relied on with unshaken confidence. The prospect now presented to the friend of religious inquiry and pure Christianity, is pleasing and animating.

A new æra appears to be about to commence, favourable to the knowledge, virtue and happiness of mankind. A spirit of investigation is gone forth, which, like Ithuriel's spear, will detect and expose what is false and erroneous. The prevalence of schools on the improved modes of education, will teach the young and rising generation both to read and think, and the British and Foreign Bible Society will furnish them with the Scriptures to peruse in their respective languages. Though the versions circulated are not as *perfect* as they might and ought to be, the obstruction to truth arising from hence, will be, in my opinion, of trifling injury, in comparison with the *good* which will be done by the universal spread of the records of divine revelation, even in their present state.* Let men be taught to form their religious systems, from the *sense* rather than the *sound* of words and phrases, from the *general strain* of the sacred writers, instead of from *single* and *detached* passages, and from explaining the more *difficult*, by those which are

* Upon this principle, I conscientiously and heartily co-operate with the friends and supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society. I consider this institution, not only as forming a new bond of union among Christians of different denominations, but as likely also, in due time, to connect, in friendly intercourse, the most distant nations of the habitable globe.

clear and obvious, and we need be under no apprehension respecting the *final* prevalence of pure, rational Christianity. In the mean time, it is the duty of its friends and advocates to contribute what they are able, by their exertions in their several spheres, to promote the cause, in their view, of God, truth, righteousness and human happiness, and more especially to recommend it to others, by the attractions of Christian dispositions, of pious and benevolent examples, of sober, holy and unblameable lives.

T. HOWE.

Macclesfield,

August 19, 1818.

SIR,

IT was with no small degree of surprise, and even pain, that a letter was noticed in the Repository, for the last month, [p. 422,] purporting to be from the late venerable Mr. Lindsey to Dr. Harris, containing some reflections upon a highly respectable character, and distinguished minister of the Dissenting church, the late Mr. Lowthion, (for so he always wrote his name, not *Lothian*,) of Newcastle; which, the writer of this is persuaded, were not the deliberate sentiments of the reputed amiable and respectable author, but only the feeling of the moment, occasioned, probably, by misinformation, the communication of which to the public is, therefore, much to be regretted. It is insinuated, that Mr. Lowthion was friendly to Popery, that he "aped" the obsolete rites of the Established Church, that he was desirous of "introducing an organ" into the place of worship of which he was the minister, and to use "a stated form of prayer." That some of these charges were utterly unfounded, the writer of this can positively affirm, from his own personal knowledge, and others, such (he is inclined to think) as will reflect no dishonour upon the late Mr. Lowthion, in the opinion of every candid and liberal-minded person, but the contrary. He as heartily disapproved of the doctrines and principles of Popery, as any man could do, consistently with the sacred rights of conscience and universal toleration, of which he was always the firm and declared advocate; at a time, too, when it was much more the fashion to entertain a jealousy of the designs of Popery, than

it has been since: but on which side propriety and consistency lay, your Correspondent pretends not to decide. What endeavours were used, or whether any, to introduce an organ, he does not know; fifty years being too distant a period for him to recollect particulars, nor has he had much connexion with that congregation for near forty years. But he can positively state, that neither "an organ," nor "a stated form of prayer," was introduced in Mr. Lowthion's time. But if they had, where would have been the unpardonable transgression? With regard to the former, was it not rather a proof of his superior sagacity, strength of mind and freedom from prejudice, openly to propose the introduction of it, if he were persuaded, (which no doubt he was,) that the use of it was not only innocuous, but might be rendered conducive to good, by enlivening devotion, regardless of the censures of the illiberal and prejudiced; on whose conduct, in that respect, more enlarged sentiments, and increased light and knowledge, have since pronounced their sentence of approval?

That Mr. Lowthion used forms of prayer of his own composition occasionally, is not denied; but his usual mode of conducting the devotional service in his congregation, was by free prayer, in which he eminently excelled: and the writer of this recollects, with lively pleasure, the animating fervour with which he directed the thoughts and hearts of his auditors, to the pious contemplation of their Maker. But, however these things might be, with what consistency can the late Mr. Lindsey be brought forward as disapproving of stated forms of prayer among Dissenters, when he himself made use of them, from the very instant of his commencing his ministry among them, till the conclusion of it? It may also be asked, what connexion there is between the rite of confirmation, as practised in the Church of England, and the use of organs, or stated forms of prayer, among Dissenters?

In what has been said, nothing can be more remote from the intention of the writer, than to cast any imputation on the character of that distinguished confessor of the truth, the late Mr. Lindsey, whose uncommon dis-

interestedness in relinquishing the "ease and emoluments of an opulent, dignified and dignifying great National Church," (his own words,) from conscientious motives, deserves to be held in lasting and respectful remembrance. But he disapproves exceedingly of the indiscretion of his friends, in bringing before the public, without proper selection or curtailment, Mr. Lindsey's confidential communications to his friends, which never could have been intended to meet the public eye, and of which, he is confident, it would have deeply wounded Mr. Lindsey's feelings, could he have imagined that such an use would have been made. What human character (and it is with great pleasure admitted, that Mr. Lindsey's was as perfect as most), could undergo such an ordeal, without, in some degree, suffering from it?

He is also of opinion, that the communicator of Mr. Lindsey's letter was wanting in delicacy to the memory of the late Mr. Lowthion, in giving his name and place of abode at length, without any reserve, or endeavour at concealment: some kind of veil, however flimsy or transparent, would have appeared respectful.

Your giving the foregoing insertion in the *Monthly Repository*, the first convenient opportunity, will greatly oblige a warm friend of that publication,

L. P.

SIR,
IN the XXVIth Volume of the *Evangelical Magazine*, [p. 59.] appears a posthumous letter, written more than twenty-seven years ago, to one, signing himself Mancuniensis, from the late Dr. Simpson, Theological Tutor of the Hoxton Academy, who then resided at Bolton, in Lancashire.

A few remarks on the following extracts are submitted to your consideration, whether they be sufficiently interesting for insertion in the *Repository*.

"A Mr. J., from N., called upon me last week, with a design to collect some money among our people, towards defraying the expenses that attended the building of a chapel somewhere in Wales. I sent him to Mr. — and his people. Mr. — supposing him to be one of his frater-

nity, exclaimed against the heretics, as he called us, the encroachments we made, and the speed of our heresy, especially in and about W—— (Wigan?) He told Mr. J. that he himself and other three were going to preach at W—— in rotation, that they would knock Calvinism on the head, &c. &c. There is vaunting for you." "What are these uncircumcised infidels, that they should think to defy the armies of the living God? Can they, with all the embattled hosts of hell, stop the progress of him who flies upon the wings of the winds? Knock Calvinism on the head! Stop the progress of heresy, as they call the gospel! Fine story indeed! Let them try whether they can arrest the sun in his course, hush the roaring winds and calm the raging sea.

"But do you, my friend, pour into the sides of their floating vessel, a whole volley of red hot forty-pounders, and blow it into millions of atoms, that they may have the mortification to find their efforts vain, and carry the doleful tidings to Diabolus, their prince; that instead of a triumph among the hosts of darkness, the prince may have reason to order all the apartments of hell to be hung in mourning for their shameful defeat."

The preceding, Sir, are a few of the most striking passages, in a letter addressed, probably, to Mancuniensis himself, who then, it seems, was a minister of what they called the gospel at W——, and who imagines, that in this epistle, and particularly, perhaps, in such extracts, the friends of Dr. S. will recognize "the vigorous conception and the soul of fire," which characterized the man.

But may not other features be also discerned, if not the antichristian assumption of being always in the right, that of being never in the wrong? From the nature of the scintillations too, or rather volcanic or explosive imagery, the profane might insinuate or fancy the presumed fire of the soul to have had its origin, not in that gracious light and heat which proceed from the Sun of Righteousness, or from the Father of Mercy, but from the lake which burneth with brimstone and fire.

But, allowing Dr. S. all the credit of genius and good intention, whether after the lapse of more than twenty-

seven years, it became Mancuniensis to rake up old, uncertain stories, founded on the credulity and ardour of youth, and perhaps misrepresented by the artful, may be left for him and his friends to determine. Should he himself have suffered from *unfounded calumny, scandal and slander*, he might be expected to have more sympathy and charity for others. If he be not only a preacher of the gospel, but a professor of theology and an inquirer after sacred truth, it may deserve his diligent consideration, whether the spread of insinuations, to the disadvantage of any particular sentiments, or for the purpose of depreciating them, by stating the imprudence, it should seem, the guileless, unsuspecting imprudence of their too sanguine advocates, be a fair, candid, righteous or Christian mode of recommending his own cause; whether Mr. Simpson advised Mr. J., of N., to conceal from Mr. ——, that he was not of the same religious persuasion, with the last mentioned person, does not appear; whether Mr. J. be yet living to own, that after permitting the delusion of supposing him not to be a Trinitarian, he boasted of the feat, and gave his own statement of a private confidential conversation, seems equally uncertain. How far, after such conduct, he was entitled to the credit of giving a correct and faithful account of what was entrusted to him from a misconception of his views, which he countenanced, is a question yet to be decided.

The friends of the person to whom Mr. J. was sent by Mr. S., may be best able to bear testimony, whether it be like him to brand those as heretics, who differ from him in opinion, or whether, with the apostle Paul, (Acts xxiv. 14, 1 Cor. xi. 19,) he has not always represented heresy, which is the result of inquiry, to be rather creditable than otherwise.

If in an hour of youthful arrogance he used the elegant phrase of "knocking Calvinism on the head," (though it may be questioned, whether it do not rather savour of tale-bearing, dissembled zeal in a disappointed applicant,) there may still be fully as much vaunting manifested in affirming, that this Calvinism is the doctrine of the gospel, as there is certainly more bigotry in concluding, that they who

attempt to shew the contrary are the subjects of Diabolus, and will behold hell in mourning for their supposed impotent and unsuccessful endeavours. What is this but the intolerance of Popery without its magnificence and power? Whether Calvinism do not bear some other marks of Antichrist, or if not, how far those who profess it agree with him, from whom they have derived their name, or in any great numbers with one another, it may be their part to consider or declare. But whilst they style themselves, or are styled, Antimonians, high or low, strict or moderate Calvinists, Evangelical Christians, &c., and find it difficult to unite in many sentiments of apparent or supposed moment, their encroachments, whatever they may be, in such scattered and discordant bodies, cannot well be regarded as very alarming. Their house is divided against itself, and they may do better to look at home, than with the wizard wand of defaming detraction, to raise a mist of groundless prejudices, from the supposed errors of individuals, against arguments which it is not so easy for them to confute. For though they may, by this unworthy craft, by these mean artifices, still longer maintain the empire of what by many is deemed superstition; though they may thus add to the genuine doctrines of the gospel; they may providentially still preach what they cannot deny, and thus like pioneers prepare the way for that purer and better system, which, according to the Unitarian faith, is alone sanctioned by the Holy Scriptures. If this faith be rather eclectic than differential, it may not require all that ardour of overflowing zeal, which seems necessary for the spread of what it supposes to be mysterious and unscriptural peculiarities. But though there may not be one article of this faith, which even the friends to the Evangelical Magazine do not allow, whatever additions they may make, it may be justly questioned, whether any of them would subscribe a mite towards the support of such general, uncontroverted and incontestible principles. How far then, after soliciting for assistance in their exertions, which they have often obtained from the generosity and candour of those, whom they miscall Socinians, it is

handsome or right for them to report and spread the private, confidential, misrepresented conversation of the unsuspecting, credulous, deceived, imprudent or sanguine, as if it were an argument in their favour, is another problem proposed for their solution.

Liberal and candid minds would pass over the probably exaggerated errors of it might be, injudicious, too ardent and zealous advocates, to attend to the arguments for their cause. How that cause was defended at Wigan, more than twenty-seven years ago, whether with temper, candour, ability, or with what other essentials of a Christian spirit, may better be learned from the Letters to the inhabitants of that town, on the great subjects of theological controversy, than by anonymous or other communications, containing epistles or statements of deceased persons, respecting transactions or conversations, it may be of confidential, too sanguine, though deluded and misstated imprudence, which have long ago been effaced from the memory, which could only be the errors of too ardent and zealous youth, and which are not, therefore, either evidences or arguments for or against the sentiments in question. J. H.

Dukinfield,

June 10th, 1818.

SIR,

IT is somewhere said by Boswell, that Dr. Johnson had once intended to devote a portion of his time to an inquiry into the amount of fiction formerly existing, and yet made use of as common stock in works of imagination. This, or a similar undertaking, has lately engaged the attention of Mr. Dunlop. Give me leave to point out another region in which fiction has not been less exuberant, and in which its Protean qualities are yet, in one form or another, receiving the daily homage of every Christian denomination.

The Church of Rome has, at various periods, been compelled to yield the ground she previously occupied, to the progress of the Reformation. But, perhaps, in no instance has she quitted the contest, without leaving behind her as much of her torn mantle as would envelope the limbs of those antagonists by whom she became subdued. It would be no uninteresting subject for your pages to ascer-

tain how the shreds, the fringe, and the tatters of this mantle have been preserved, and carefully sewed into the "solemn stole" of almost every religious institution. The arrogance of the priesthood; the implicit confidence of the laity; the prescribed pale of salvation; the dogmata of belief; absolution for offences, and passports to salvation, are all found as satellites, affording their lesser influences to every planetary church in the reformed hemisphere of Christendom. Is it the weakness of humanity, the indolence of habit, or the feeble progress of knowledge, that inclines all to be desirous of some staff to lean upon, when the crook of St. Peter is wrested from their support?

If it be not too severe to identify the history of sacred fiction, and that of church establishments together, I beg your indulgence whilst I just mention a few instances, by which the above remarks will be corroborated. And should any of your Correspondents favour your readers with a history of religious fiction, the hints for such an undertaking now suggested, are capable of considerable addition, as well as great amplification.

Our national church, the achievement of so much effort, and the boast of many centuries, will be found, like her Metropolitan Temple, a very exact copy of her great prototype, St. Peter's at Rome. Her supreme head, her legislative authority, articles of faith, (even the Athanasian!) punishment of heterodoxy, and hierarchical jurisdiction, varying the shadowy effect a little, leave the lineaments of her great parent entire. Add to this the politico-religious fiction of the indispensable union of church and state, the equally convenient one of interpreting Scripture by the Prayer-Book, as by "law set forth," and the domination of the civil over every higher authority is complete.

The *Unitas Fratrum* boast their uninterrupted ordination from the apostolic times, and the visible guidance of their affairs, by the second person of the Trinity. The key of Paradise is appended to the observance of their ritual, and happiness here and hereafter secured, by living and dying in the close connexion of the society. The Methodist finds his security in being

"bought with a price;" the Calvinist erects his pentagonal tower, immovably fixed upon five points, by which he, like those of old, endeavours to reach unto heaven.

What shall we say to the impugners of infant baptism? Is not immersion with them the "Cretan ditany," able to staunch, like the wound of Eneas, every issue by which life ebbs away? Indeed, Mr. Editor, your pages hardly yet dry from the impression of this subject, but too readily evince how closely the alloy of an external coating, sticks to the pure ingot of superior intelligence.

Should those discoveries which Newton predicted, ever be realized, when he anticipated greater improvements in the moral world, than had then taken place in the natural, with what fading insignificance the distinctions of party will melt away! Amongst some of the probable advantages that will then be disclosed, the following suggestions may, perhaps, be included. That had it not been for the Passover, we should never have known the Eucharist: had there been no feasting at the conclusion of the Jewish sacrifices, we should not have had those in the primitive church denominated love-feasts: had there been no circumcision, no witness to the deed, no designation of the child by a name perpetuated in the tribe; "*They said unto her, there is none of thy kindred that is named with this name:*" had there been no "passing through fire to Moloch," no dedication of children to the protection of a favourite idol, no "baptism for the dead;" is it not equally presumptive, that no injunctions would have been recorded respecting the baptism of Christian proselytes? Names would never have been considered otherwise than as appropriate appellations, as they were in Homer's time:

— "Say what the name you bore
Imposed by parents in the natal hour;
For from the natal hour, distinctive names
One common right, the great and lowly
claims."

Perhaps, the "vantage ground" of our present information will hereafter become more fully manifested, and it will appear that Christianity blooms the best in the meridian of knowledge; that the church has the accumulating

certainty of the past, the evidence of testimony, and the assurance of historical facts, for its present security; that in consequence of this ripeness in years, the phraseology of its infancy may now be found extremely inadequate, if not quite obsolete. The terms faith, justification, sanctification, redemption, &c., will then descend to that oblivion to which the ten thousand volumes of controversy they have occasioned, are already gone.

It may then, perhaps, be apparent, that the fountain of our inestimable religion was as strictly Judean as

“Siloa’s brook that flow’d
Fast by the oracle of God :”

and that the Christian Church was swathed in Judean bandages: it was afterwards papped and nursed by the Gnostic and Platonic philosophy administered to it by the mistaken officiousness of the fathers: the fair promise of its youth was blighted now by internal disorder, and now by external opposition: its manhood was disguised, and its strength crippled by that foster-mother, the mother of harlotry and fiction, who reared her throne on the seven hills of the eternal city: destined for immortality, the enchanted net-work that enveloped its limbs is burst asunder. We now view its “lineaments divine,” and contemplate its stature emancipated from the thralldom of ignorance and bigotry. Henceforth, our song may be that of the Psalmist, “Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in.”

W. H.

SIR,

July 17, 1818.

ONE of your early volumes contains the character of Henry VIIIth. as given by Sir Walter Raleigh, in the Preface to his History. He says, and offers proof for the assertion, that “if all the pictures and patterns of a merciless prince were lost in the world, they might all again be painted to the life, out of the story of this king.” [Mon. Repos. VII. 40.] Such was our first *Defender of the faith, and so forth.*

There is a story, very likely to be true, so far as his (Henry’s) own conduct is concerned, but which I do

not remember to have seen, except in the work from whence I now quote it, “The Memoirs of Sir James Melvil,” a favourite courtier of Mary, Queen of Scots, first published from his MSS. in 1683. He passed through England, from France, in his way to Scotland, when “Queen Elizabeth was lately come to the crown;” and “at Newcastle, he fell in company with an Englishman, who was one of the gentlemen of the Queen’s bed-chamber; a man well skilled in the mathematics, necromancy, astrology, and was also a good geographer, who had been sent by the Council of England to the borders, to draw a map of such lands as lie between England and Scotland.” Sir J. Melvil adds,

“The Englishman and I by the way entered into great familiarity, so that he shewed me sundry secrets of the country and of the court. Among other things he told me, that King Henry VIII. had, in his life-time, been so curious as to inquire at men called diviners or necromancers, what should become of his son, King Edward VI. and of his two daughters, Mary and Elizabeth: that answer was made unto him again, that Edward should die, having few days and no succession; and that his two daughters should the one succeed the other: that Mary, his eldest daughter, should marry a Spaniard, and that way bring in many strangers to England; which would occasion great strife and altercation: that Elizabeth should reign after her, who should marry either a Scottishman or a Frenchman. Whereupon the king caused to give poison to both his daughters; but because this had not the effect he desired, (for they, having suspected poison, had taken remedies,) he caused to proclaim them both bastards.”

It is then stated, that Queen Mary, “to be revenged upon her father, caused secretly, in the night, to take up her father’s bones and burn them.” Sir J. Melvil adds, “This the honest gentleman affirmed to be truth, though not known to many. He was a man of great gravity, about fifty years of age. When he came to London he shewed me great kindness, and made me a present of some books.” *Memoirs*, Ed. 2, *Edinburgh*, 1735, pp. 55, 56.

Should any of your readers have met with any other authority for this story, or any remarks upon it, they will, I dare say, send them for your insertion.

HISTORICUS.

Washfield, near Tiverton,

June 6, 1818.

SIR,

I HAVE been much gratified by observing, in the last Number of your excellent Work, [p. 304,] a suggestion by your Correspondent, who styles himself "A Friend to the most Critical Examination, and most free Discussion of the Doctrines of Christianity." I sincerely hope, that the judicious advice he has given will meet the approbation, and obtain the contribution of many of our ministerial friends towards those small societies who are unable to support a regular minister.

Having, for the last fourteen months, undertaken the conducting of the services in the Unitarian Chapel at Tiverton, opened in April 1817, [XII. 309,] and being engaged in an agricultural occupation, which necessarily requires a very considerable part of my time and attention during the week; I have, therefore, had but little leisure to transcribe many sermons, and have consequently been obliged chiefly to read from a printed copy.

The observation your Correspondent states, as being "too often made," namely, "we may as well stay at home and read a printed sermon, as go to hear one read in public," has struck me very forcibly, from my having more than once heard, that similar remarks have been made by persons who have occasionally attended the public worship at our chapel. I, however, shall name a still stronger motive for wishing a plan of the kind to be accomplished. During the last winter half-year, I regularly delivered a Lord's day evening lecture, in addition to the two services of the day, and on these occasions, (with the exception, I believe, of three evenings, when I was unable to do so,) I read written manuscripts, compiled and transcribed by myself, and I invariably perceived, that I could command more attention from my hearers, and deliver them more both to their satisfaction as well as my own, than from

a printed copy. These lectures were principally confined to an explanation and vindication of those views of the gospel, which are maintained by the worshiper of the one God, even the Father alone; and by way of exciting more interest and attention amongst those who frequented them, I constantly, at the close of the service, made known the subject proposed for the following lecture, and I had reason to be assured that, on several occasions, some attended again from a desire to hear the subject given notice of, discussed; and, I believe, I may with truth add, that a few went away less confident of the truth of their former opinions, and with their prejudices against our principles removed.

I purpose, should my life and health be preserved, and no more able person can be obtained, to undertake the evening lectures again the ensuing winter, to commence at Michaelmas; if, therefore, any of our ministerial friends should feel disposed to assist me by the loan of some manuscript sermons, *written in long hand*, they will be most thankfully received, and shall be carefully returned to them. I beg to add, that I shall be glad to receive them as soon as convenient, in order that I may arrange and circulate a list of the subjects prior to their commencement. I also beg to state, that I have, for some time past, at the request of the society, administered the Lord's Supper at stated periods, from the Form of Dr. Priestley for Unitarian societies; I name this, should any of your readers, who may be similarly engaged with myself, entertain any scruples at doing it, to shew them a very humble precedent for aiding in overcoming their objections thereto, as it is certainly most desirable that it should be done in every congregation, however small.

Had I not already exceeded the length I at first proposed these observations should extend, I should feel disposed to add some remarks on the most excellent plan of your Correspondent, W. Whitfield, [p. 305,] for a list of the Unitarian places of worship, which could not but be useful and interesting to every sincere friend to our good cause.

M. L. YEATES.

THE question of population and production, has been brought before the public in a powerful manner by Mr. Malthus, to whose work, "The Principles of Population and Production investigated, by George Purves, LL.D." is an answer. But let it be understood where they agree, and how far the two great authors differ. On Mr. Malthus's two ratios, Dr. Purves replies, that the ratio of subsistence is purely fanciful, and in this there can be no ratio of increase. A field may be made, in a few years, to yield as much as it can do at any future time. In a newly occupied country, instead of the increase of subsistence being as 1, 2, 3, 4, it may, by extending cultivation, be made to increase in any ratio, as 1, 10, 100, &c. Of the increase of subsistence, therefore, there can be no ratio; but what is fundamental in the two systems, as they oppose each other is this: Mr. Malthus holds that population will always rise to the level of subsistence, and Dr. Purves holds, that subsistence will always rise to the level of population, *as long as the earth can be made to yield additional subsistence*, or until the earth be cultivated to its maximum.

Dr. Purves contends, that no individual, or class of individuals, will raise more corn than they can dispose of to advantage; that demand, therefore, regulates cultivation, that demand is created by population, and that this is the reason why more subsistence is not raised, in countries which are very imperfectly cultivated. He does not deny that population *may* become excessive, but he contends that this can never be the case, as long as more subsistence could be raised, than is, in fact, raised. According to Mr. Malthus, subsistence increases population; according to Dr. Purves, population increases subsistence, the earth being given as the supplier of subsistence by cultivation. Mr. Malthus holds, that Europe is too populous, though it is not sufficiently cultivated; Dr. Purves, that it is not sufficiently populous, otherwise it would be better cultivated. Mr. Malthus contends, that an increased population diminishes employment and wages; Dr. Purves, that an increased population increases employment and wages.

Were we disposed to throw Dr. Purves's book into propositions, for the sake of brevity, which he does not do, we should say that he attempts to prove the following:

1. That countries, the least peopled, according to their extent and capability, the characters of the inhabitants being similar, are uniformly the poorest, the least employed, and have the fewest accommodations.

2. That the wealth and accommodation of the inhabitants of every country, have ever increased with the increase of its people; and that this will ever be the case, until the earth is cultivated to its maximum.

3. That at present no extensive country exists, which is cultivated up to its maximum or near it.

4. That in every country where the population has declined, the people, instead of becoming richer and better fed, have become poorer and worse fed.

"When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war"—and we must say that Mr. Malthus and Dr. Purves are equally powerful, equally prepared to examine this question to the bottom. And it will be examined. Political œconomy is undoubtedly the last-born of all the sciences, it is not a century old. But as it is the most important, and almost the only important science, (embracing all the interests of human nature,) it will now be examined with ten-fold zeal. Mr. Malthus has led the way, and presently the ablest men in the country will enter the lists. Dr. Purves is one of these, for it is evident to us, that Mr. Gray and Dr. Purves are the same author; indeed the volume before us is a mere application of the principles of "Gray's Happiness of States." Who is Mr. Gray? No other, we believe, than Dr. Purves.

This book may be safely recommend to every reader of Malthus. Malthus seems to teach that all the vice and misery which is in the world, or ever has been in the world, since the commencement of authentic history, has arisen from the principle of population. Dr. Purves is of a quite opposite opinion; holding, that vice and misery most abound in thinly peopled countries. Holland is the most populous state in Europe. Russia is the least populous. Dr. Purves says, Hol-

land is the most virtuous and happy state in Europe, Russia one of the most miserable. And he contends, that this will ever hold good, until the earth is cultivated to its maximum. All this seems to be countenanced by facts, and Dr. Purves is the pupil of facts. He does not deny that the maximum of the cultivation of the earth may come; what then is to be done? This he leaves, not wishing to run into hypothesis, but to confine himself to facts.

The Christian religion seems to allow the choice of marriage, but it enjoins industry, care, sobriety and every effort for the support of a family. These must never be separated. Every man ought to consider, that if he is permitted to marry, he is not permitted to be idle. The question is, if all were to be thus virtuous, would the issue be still greater misery? Yes, says Mr. Malthus—No, says Dr. Purves, at least not until the earth is cultivated to its maximum. And we believe and hope that this is true. Undoubtedly those who live a life of virtuous celibacy are as respectable as the most exemplary amongst the married. Nature seems to give no privilege without a balancing trial. But nature can exhibit no spectacle more horrible, than a married man or woman not careful about a provision for a family. Sloth, intemperance, vanity, in married life, are most dreadful crimes.

As to the question of cultivating the earth, that may be brought to its maximum now without much emigration. A market is only wanted to spread cultivation every where. No matter whether this be foreign or domestic. Navigation is uniting all countries. America and England join, they are only divided by a distance of a fortnight's sail. Presently the time of the passage will be still less. Every thing points out this as not only possible, but certain. They say at Carlisle, that the landing of King William was not known there, till the lapse of a month after the event! Consider that the communication between London and Carlisle is now effected in forty-three hours. Population has done this. He who would understand, must read Malthus and Purves.

Mr. Malthus says, that in animal nature, (if we leave man out of the

case,) his principle is universally true, as all animals increase faster than subsistence. Dr. Purves answers, that the law of universal nature is, that one animal subsists upon another, and this law admitted, it is a contradiction in terms to say that animals increase faster than subsistence, because their increase is to each other the increase of subsistence. This answer is certainly complete, and if Mr. Malthus could not see this, it may be hoped that he is equally blind, as to many of the other parts of his gloomy and horrible system.

The great question is, can any degree of comfort and morality be made to unite in the system of nature, as far as man is concerned? Mr. Malthus's system renders this impossible; Dr. Purves' system affirms its possibility, until the earth is cultivated to its maximum. Not till then can it be necessary for man to destroy or devour man, for want of necessary subsistence, nor on the other hand to deny the rite of marriage, without the existence of which Mr. Malthus affirms that life would at best be "a dreary blank."

Of all subjects, let it be repeated, this is the most important, and Dr. Purves seems to be the only man yet qualified to discuss this subject with Mr. Malthus; he is, therefore, again recommended to the attention of the reader.

It is evident, that the system of Mr. Malthus makes marriage a crime, and the greatest of crimes, as, according to him, it is necessarily connected with starvation, misery and murder. It is improper to introduce religion unnecessarily into this subject; but if there be revealed religion, forbidding murder, and if marriage leads directly to murder, why is that religion silent on this head? Moses was married, and did not prohibit it. The Christian religion originated in one of the most populous regions of the earth at that time, for Judea contained three or four millions of inhabitants, though it now does not contain three thousand, according to Volney, and yet marriage is permitted by this religion.

The fair conclusion is, that Mr. Malthus is either wiser or more humane than either Moses or Jesus Christ, or that, if he be less wise and less humane, his system is erroneous,

Whatever weight there be in this consideration, to those who think that revealed religion has any evidence, it must have *some* weight.

A. R.

SIR, *Swakeleys, July 17, 1818.*
I KNOW not whether I ought to feel surprised at the reception which my well-meant, however questionable, project of a comprehensive, because fully scriptural form and place of worship [p. 122,] seems to have received from the Unitarian public. An assurance of our own absolute infallibility, and a disposition to anathematize in some degree or other all who differ from us in opinion, are perhaps infirmities of which many more theologians are guilty than conscious. Assuredly, let the image fall from Jupiter, and what model so pure or perfect as that we placed last in our own dear little inch-wide sacristy? The Trinitarian not content with his mysterious modification of an incomprehensible Being, must proceed to counting each on his fingers, and then call upon the whole world at the peril of their immortal part, to fall down and worship before the idol, which his licentious imagination has set up, arrayed in all its fantastic and unaccredited lineaments. The Unitarian in a too kindred spirit, hesitates not to cry out as well as fasten idolatry on the man who understands the term "Lord" as applied to Christ by an apostle in any other sense than that which he has been pleased to attach to it, in correspondence with his most deliberate and conscientious convictions. All this is human nature, I admit, but is it, let me ask, genuine Christian philosophy? Or if in our own closets, it be both, is it so every where or any where else? And even there, for my part, I am not ashamed to avow—honest haply in my own eyes, wrong most certainly in every pair beside, is a sentiment, an impression, worth a thousand times all the best dogmatism of the most conscientious bigotry. But let the merit of an erring conviction, and exclusive rectitude of judgment be what they may, must they be always acted up to and followed out to their every legitimate consequence? Must every man construe his Bible precisely as I do, before I can consent

to kneel down with him under the same roof? To myself, at least, must every sanctuary but one be a house of Rimmon? Then, beyond all doubt, instead of there being at no very remote period of time one house of prayer for all the nations, must Christian temples be ever as multitudinous as Christian sects, and while only one Jerusalem should long ere this have existed on the globe, shall not every little precinct of each land teem for aye with its Gerizims? O sad, shameful prospect, for the Christian world! Was it for a consummation like this, that "the Logos came unto his own," saluted us as brethren, proclaimed himself our only Master, taught us to believe in a common Saviour, and enjoined us to adore a common Father and a common God!!! And that a happier vision has never yet, for ages past, not been realized, may not more of us than may be willing to criminate ourselves, have been verily most guilty? The precepts of the Son of God on this single point of worship are scarcely to be tortured by ingenuity into matters of "doubtful disputation." The good mode of an apostle's worship is a simple matter of fact that must be accessible alike to every reader of his Bible. But now, if a believer in *this* doctrine is to determine in spite of them how they could not have worshiped, and a believer in *that* is to conjecture how they could not but have uniformly worshiped—if to some palpable practice as an actual occurrence, *one* interpreter of the sacred oracle is to oppose his construction, and to an unimpeachably authenticated system, *another*, his inference—if here a corollary is to be added because it is become necessary to *my* faith, and there a doctrine to be questioned because it is opposed to *your* reason—farewell, doubtless all hope of unanimity, all approximation to concord. Yet, oh! amidst the interminable Aceldama of controversy, shall never then one little basis peer big enough to rear upon it any but a sectarian temple to Jehovah? Alas! alas! must not the understanding be less at fault than the heart, when scarcely two disciples at their Master's feet alone can meet together in a sanctuary dedicated to concord as well as truth? Shall Athanasius daily con-

gregate his motley thousands and tens of thousands to the unhallowed tinkling of an unscriptural phraseology, and Christ still importune in vain that more than two or three should be gathered together in his name to worship the Father in spirit and in truth, lest haply here and there a louder hosannah than to some Pharisee may seem meet, should mingle with the unanimous diapason of the hallelujah? Shall I be for ever scandalized at my better-informed or more erring brother's homage to the Son, because I cannot haply join with him in an occasional petition to that intercessor at God's right-hand, who is able, according to my creed, no less than his own, to save to the uttermost all who come unto the Father through him? Nay, let the Trinitarian, content to confine his antibiblical, however orthodox, aspirations to his private oratory, so far only concur with me as to worship God in the spirit, through his Son our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall I feel the profanation of his presence, because aware that he cannot recognize in the "one Lord" of us both a mere man, or though he cannot forbear conscientiously even to explain away his admitted inferiority to the Father? Let us differ as men, but pray together as Christians. And with our Bibles in our hands, and a spirit of evangelical unity at our hearts, would it be so impracticable to devise a form of prayer, which, while it offended none but those with whom the language of that book was not as oracular as its contents, should comprehend all who did not prefer hypothesis to narrative, the inferences of their own prurient imaginations to the *ipse dixit* of an apostle, and the established usage of the primeval church, as evidenced by its only authentic documents in the day of its heavenly Founder and his contemporary missionaries? Surely so noble an experiment were worth at least the hazard of a failure; and to secure its probable success, what more were necessary than to confide its execution to men who were not so bigoted to their own construction of any part of the sacred record, as unnecessarily to preclude that of any other "Bible only" Christian—who for a grand purpose would be well pleased for once to merge the

didactic sectary in the fellow-disciple, and (so but Christ were preached not "in pretence" but honestly, not in the words which man's wisdom or foolishness might teach, but in those which the Holy Spirit has taught), to study for a season truth at the lips of charity, and seek future unanimity in the bosom of present variety of opinion? Could, indeed, a strictly scriptural church long want a strictly scriptural liturgy? But in the mean time take only that of the established sect in this country, and divest it of its *traditional* deformities—and why should conscience so peremptorily require of any worshiper of the Most Highest in and through Christ Jesus, that he tolerate at his elbow no other creed than the last he made his own, though that creed no less than his own religiously abjures every vocabulary save that of the Bible, and introduces nothing but what can equally plead *totidem verbis*, the *litera scripta* of some portion of that book in its apology? Why, for instance, must not he who had only the name of Christ "called upon himself," endure to hear as honest an inquirer as himself into the meaning of every scriptural phrase, "invoke that name" with the protomartyr, pray to it with Paul, or even apostrophize it with Thomas? Could two *such* men love as brethren, only with a middle wall of partition between their devotions? Forsooth, might not two such men become all the better in point of faith, for having become all the better in point of charity? Might not either listen till he learnt, and learn till he obeyed? Who knows how soon idolatry might to the one assume the form of subordinate homage, or blasphemy, to the other, put on the semblance of a purer Theism? Who shall say that a congregation formed upon this Catholic plan might not one day chance to be of one mind, and that mind the mind of Christ? Halcyon hour! at the thought of thee how much does a Procrustean spirit lose of its least questionable charm; how almost does a rigid conscientiousness itself abate of its most hallowed dignity!

But would such a place of worship be Unitarian? 'Pon honour, I know not, and to be candid with my querist, care not. I will go a step farther, and

venture to guess that it would be neither Trinitarian, nor Arian, nor Socinian. Well, and what then? The first question with your Correspondent, whatever it may be with any of your readers, is, would it be a place of worship in which the Christ might haply be found "in the midst," and his apostles, could they again appear on earth, pour forth their prayer and praise in all but vernacular language: the second, which he now repeats, what patronage might be looked for from the "Bible only" Unitarian?

J. T. CLARKE.

SIR,

Sept. 12, 1818.

IN your last Number, page 489, a Correspondent, (R. L. C.) has adverted to a note of mine in the translation of the Racovian Catechism, (p. 7,) with the view of introducing an inquiry concerning Mr. Farmer's belief as to the existence and personality of the Devil. In that note it was by no means my intention to place Mr. Simpson's Essay, and Mr. Farmer's two works, there referred to, on the same footing, or to intimate that they went the same length, in the discussion of the subject in connexion with which they are named. The note relates to the existence of the Devil, and to the powers usually ascribed to him; and Mr. Simpson's Essay is referred to as comprising an able discussion of both these points. But Mr. Farmer's publications were meant to be recommended to the reader's notice, as exhibiting an able elucidation of the question, chiefly or solely as it related to the second point. This distinction has not certainly been marked as it ought to have been.

It is, I apprehend, no difficult matter to ascertain how far Mr. Farmer, in the two publications mentioned in the note, meant to commit, or actually has committed himself on these questions. In neither of those treatises has he explicitly avowed his disbelief of the existence and personality of the Devil. On the contrary, whenever his subject led him to mention the name, he always introduces it in precisely the same way as the firmest believer in his personal existence would do; never in a single instance, as far as I can recollect, accompanying it with any doubt or suspicion of his being the mere creation of the fancy. He appears to me,

therefore, to have left this part of the question untouched, and to have confined himself to the task of proving, that the Devil is not invested with the powers which are commonly ascribed to him, that he is not able to work miracles, and can exert no influence over the human mind and conduct.

There is certainly a difficulty in conceiving how Mr. Farmer, writing as he has done on this subject, or how any of his readers who admitted the force of his observations, could believe in the existence and personality of the Devil—because thus stripped of his essential attributes, he would necessarily, one would suppose, cease to be, at least in their estimation. The impression made by Mr. Farmer's writings upon his contemporaries, was precisely of this kind. He was generally considered as having relinquished all belief in the Devil, and several jokes passed current in consequence, in connexion with his name.

One of Mr. Farmer's opponents, on the ground, I conceive, of this impression, rather than from any direct evidence, has charged him with this anti-diabolic faith; and this charge drew from Mr. Farmer the most explicit declaration in reference to his belief, which he has perhaps any where committed to the press, and which I shall here transcribe, in compliance with the wish of your Correspondent. The passage occurs in his "Letters to the Rev. Dr. Worthington," published in 1778. "I cannot conclude this letter," remarks Mr. Farmer, p. 81, "without observing farther, that from the principle here contended for, viz. 'that possessions were referred to human spirits,' it cannot be inferred that I deny the existence of fallen angels, much less that I deny the existence of human souls in a state of separation from the body. You are pleased to tell the world 'that I have made short work with the Devil and his angels, and have done more than all the exorcists put together ever pretended to; that I have laid the Devil and all other evil spirits, banished them out of the world, and in a manner destroyed their very existence.' There may be much wit, but indeed, Sir, there is no truth in this language. I have never denied, nor could I, without great absurdity, take upon me to deny, the

existence of evil spirits originally of a rank superior to mankind. And as we are ignorant of the laws of the spiritual world, it would be great presumption to take upon us to determine the sphere of their operation. That they have no dominion over the natural world, which is governed by fixed and invariable laws, is a truth attested in the amplest manner by reason, by revelation, and by our own experience. But the question is, whether possessions are referred to fallen angels or to human spirits. To say they are referred to the latter, is by no means to banish the former out of the world. I do not remember that Mede, or Sykes, or Lardner, were ever charged with, or even suspected of what you impute to me, and what you might, upon the same grounds, have imputed to them."

THOMAS REES.

SIR, Norwich, Sept. 6. 1818.

I AM one of those who, though believing in the doctrine of final restitution, admit it only on the ground of inference derived from those views of the nature of the gospel and of the character of God, which are contained in the Scriptures. That the doctrine is expressly and designedly inculcated in any one passage of the Old or New Testament, does not appear to me ever to have been satisfactorily made out. Nevertheless, it seems to be capable of very strong proof from induction, and by your leave I will briefly state a few of the considerations from which I think it may be fairly deduced.

1. The word gospel signifies glad tidings, good news. I suppose it will be allowed that the language of Scripture is employed for better purposes than to deceive or mislead; and though when figurative language is used, we are to beware of a literal interpretation, yet where the language is plain and literal, where the expression is such as to convey only one idea, one sentiment, and which cannot possibly be construed into a metaphor, it is right to understand it agreeably to its common accepted signification. Now, if Christianity be a message of good news, strictly and properly so called, is it possible that it can at the same time be the bearer of intelligence, which throws all its good tidings com-

pletely into the shade? If it had been the medium of communicating to mankind the eternal condemnation of the great mass to everlasting, irremediable woe, *would it, could it* have been characterized as the *gospel*?

2. In the New Testament Christ is uniformly represented in the character of a conqueror, as conqueror over death and the grave, vice and error, pain and sorrow. Satan, the adversary of all that is good, is described as baffled, overthrown, completely subdued. Christ leads captivity captive, subjects all things to himself, and resigns up the kingdom to God the Father, who becomes all in all. This is not an incidental nor an accidental representation of Christianity, but it enters into the very spirit and intention of the gospel. Now, if the majority of mankind are to be everlastingly miserable, (which must be the case if the wicked are to undergo everlasting punishment, for I fear the most benevolent mind will be obliged to rank the greater part of mankind in this class,) if the great mass of human beings are to be subject to eternal misery, how is this to be reconciled with the Scripture account of Christ's kingdom? If sin and pain and sorrow are to have an everlasting existence, and to number among their victims the far larger part of mankind, then Satan, the power of evil, is the conqueror, and not the Captain of our salvation: Christ is the subdued combatant, Christ the baffled warrior, Christ the beaten antagonist. The whole order is reversed, the whole scene is changed, the dominion of evil is confirmed, the reign of misery is established, the empire of sin is extended and perpetuated. But this belies the authority of Scripture: this is repugnant not merely to the letter, but to the whole character of the gospel. This notion, therefore, I must reject; and rejecting this, I must admit that death *will* be destroyed, that sin *will* be overthrown, that vice *will* be subdued, that misery *will* have an end. This appears to me to be the direct and necessary consequence of the nature and character of the Christian revelation.

3. The character of God, the description which is given of his goodness and mercy throughout both Testaments, warrants the conclusion

that all things will issue well, that all human beings will eventually be happy. The language of metaphor seems to be almost exhausted by the sacred writers, to convey to our minds the most beautiful and touching images of the Divine goodness. He is our Father, He is love itself. He *delighteth* to do us good; He preserves us as the apple of his eye; He is a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy, a refuge from the storm, and a shadow from the heat. For what purpose now is all this language used? In mockery and in sport? Impossible—it must be meant to convey to our minds the truths of which it is plainly and forcibly descriptive. If other notions of God had been designed, why had not other terms been used? Why adopt the strongest possible language the other way? But no one denies, it may be said, that God is infinitely good and infinitely merciful; not in words it is true. In the face of the Scriptures no man can be fool enough to say literally and directly that God is cruel, that God is unjust, that God is tyrannical; but yet men have not been afraid of attributing *conduct* to God which is cruel, which is unjust, which is tyrannical. Words are, or ought to be, the signs of ideas. In any transaction between man and man, if language were used by one party in a sense not understood by the other, or in a sense different from that in common use, and so were the means of deceiving him, it would be regarded as an act of treachery and fraud.

I am told of such a man, that he is a kind, indulgent, affectionate parent; of course I expect to discover in his behaviour clear indications of his kindness and affection; but I witness in his actions the reverse of all this; I see him exercising towards his children the greatest rigour and cruelty. Am I then to be imposed upon by mere words? No, words will weigh nothing with me against facts; my judgment is decided not by what has been said, but by what is done; and though the language of flattery may still be addressed to him, though he may still be called a kind and affectionate parent, I set him down in my own mind as a monster, and a disgrace to the nature which he bears. Now apply this reasoning to the cha-

acter of God. He is described in Scripture not only as the best, but as the mercifullest of Beings, as the lover of souls, as one to whom judgment is a strange work, as a tender parent giving good things to his children who ask him for them, as mourning over the absence of his disobedient and wandering child, and then, when he sees him coming towards him weeping and penitent, eager to receive him back to his love; and yet, notwithstanding all this, some men would persuade us that for the errors of this short life, the great mass of mankind are to be doomed to excruciating, uninterrupted, everlasting torments. Incredible, impossible! Every particle of reason within us becomes vocal and exclaims against it; every feeling of the heart rises up in indignation, and cries out, it cannot be, for then God would be cruel, for then God would be unjust. It is therefore false. God is faithful and cannot deny himself. In this way it is that I deduce the great and important doctrine of the final salvation or restitution of all mankind. Whatever previous sufferings the sinner may undergo, however long and dreadfully severe they may be, still if the Scripture account of Christ's kingdom and of the character of God be correct, if language be not employed to deceive us, the time will come when these sufferings shall have an end, and one magnificent scene of virtue and of happiness be unfolded to our view.

But how, it may be asked, does this conclusion accord with the state of things as actually existing before our eyes? Here are pains and evils and sufferings, here justice does not always triumph, nor truth always succeed. Often does piety mourn in secret and virtue bleed in public. Why then do you not conclude from this appointment of Providence, that God is not infinitely good and merciful? For this plain, obvious reason—that here we see only a part, and but a very small part of the field of Providence. If we could see the whole, the whole we should pronounce to be good; the end would justify the means, temporary evil would be absorbed in eternal good. The eye which now sees through a glass darkly, cleansed of its earthly film, and with its powers of vision strengthened and enlarged to

look through the universe of God, would then be able to trace the order and harmony of the whole, would perceive light bursting forth from the midst of darkness, and form and beauty springing out of chaos, and truth rising up from the ashes of error, and ignorance giving way to knowledge, and sorrow brightening into joy. The use of those evils that now seem to sully and overcloud the works of God will *then* be perceived, and his wisdom and his goodness shine forth gloriously and resplendently, like the noon-day sun after struggling with the mists and clouds of the morning. But in the other case, *i. e.* in the case of everlasting punishment, the *end* is misery, the *result* is bad—it is a cloud which will never be dispersed, a night upon which no morning will ever dawn. According to this notion, punishment is not used as an instrument, as a means, as a step to something higher and better, but is itself the conclusion and the consummation, “the be all and the end all.” The two cases, therefore, are not parallel, or rather they are directly the reverse. The actions of God are to be judged of not singly and apart from one another, because they are all mutually dependent and closely linked together from the first to the last. There is not one loose or independent link, but every one is connected with the rest throughout the vast and mighty chain; and if this mighty chain could be extended out before us, we should see it going on from good to better, and better still in endless progression. It is the language of reason, it is the dictate of philosophy, it is the creed of piety, that the pains and evils of this life are not ordained for their own sakes, but are ministerial to better things, subordinate to higher purposes. “Our present afflictions will work out for us a far more exceeding, even an eternal weight of glory;”—this is the reason of their *ordination* and *this* is their *justification*. The conduct of God in their appointment, so far from furnishing any evidence against the doctrine of the final happiness of all men, does by analogy establish and confirm it. It furnishes at the same time both a proof and an illustration.

The sufferings of this world are tributary to future and greater good. Viewed by themselves they are an

evil, viewed in their consequences and they are a blessing. They will be absorbed in the happiness which they create;—analogous to this is the ordination of future punishment. It is appointed with a view to the correction of evil and to the production of final good. This, as in the other case, is the reason of its appointment and the ground of its justification. Future punishment is not in itself a distinct, separate line of divine operations, but is only a link in the endless chain of causes and effects, acting in subordination to nobler ends and tending to everlasting happiness. Glorious, delightful consummation! Heart-swelling, soul-cheering, blessed anticipation! When all evil shall be destroyed, when pain shall cease, when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even his Father, having put all things under his feet, and subdued all things to himself, when the shouts of victory over death and the grave shall be echoed by every mouth from one end of heaven to the other, when every soul shall bend before the throne of the Majesty on high, and “God shall be all in all.”

THOMAS MADGE.

SIR, *Bristol, Sept. 6, 1818.*

IN your Repository for last month, [p. 489,] Mr. Joseph Lamb observes, in answer to an inquiry of Brevis, [XIII. 32,] concerning the author of “Stonehouse’s work on Universal Restitution,” that he was “not ‘the Rev. Sir James Stonehouse, Bart., the friend of the late Mr. Hervey.’” I believe this is correct. The following I have extracted from a pamphlet, entitled “Pre-existence of Souls and Universal Restitution, considered as Scripture Doctrines, extracted from the Minutes and Correspondence of Burnham Society, in the County of Somerset,” and it is at your disposal.

G. S. BROMHEAD.

“Universal Restitution, considered as a Scripture doctrine, was first debated between the years 1729 and 1735, by a society of twelve young collegians of Oxford, emphatically called the Holy Club. John Wesley was tutor, and, of course, president of this society; and he, with his brother Charles, a Mr. Morgan, and one or

two others, supported the merit of works. George Whitfield and James Hervey, (author of the Meditations,) adopted the Calvinistic side of the question; Messrs. Delamotte, Hall, Hutchins and Ingram trimmed and became Moravians. The Rev. George Stonehouse, of Hungerford Park, (afterward Sir George Stonehouse, of East Brent, in the county of Somerset, Baronet,) had been labouring to reconcile the different opinions of his fellow-collegians, till he stood alone in support of his favourite tenet, viz. that Universal Restitution was a Scripture doctrine; and as the arguments he used with his different opponents had ever prevailed, they severally promised, that if he would collect his thoughts together in a discourse upon that subject, it should receive a candid answer.

“He married, in 1739, a daughter of Sir John Crisp, Bart., a niece and heiress of Sir Nicholas Crisp, Bart., with whom he had an elegant seat at Darnford, near Blenheim, in Oxfordshire, which he left to go on his travels, with the sole view of consulting the Syriac copies of the New Testament, in the different libraries of Europe, under the idea that our Lord delivered his discourses in Syriac, and not in Greek. He was on his travels twenty years, twelve of which he spent in Germany, chiefly with Count Zinzendorf. During his peregrination, he became such a proficient in the Syriac tongue, that he wrote a very copious grammar of that language; and was so indefatigable in his scriptural studies, that he was able immediately, and without hesitation, to translate any passage in the Bible into thirteen different languages.

“He published his ‘Universal Restitution a Scripture Doctrine,’ in 1761. Although this book surprised the learned world, it was never answered. On a visit from Mr. Wesley, Mr. Stonehouse said, ‘Ah, John, there are only you and I living out of us * all.’ W. ‘Better you had died

* “This alluded to a Society who sat down to a sumptuous dinner at Oxford, on a gaudy day, which, by way of self-denial, was, at the motion of Mr. Wesley, left untouched by the whole company, and sent to the prisoners in the Castle.”

too, George, before you had written your book.’ S. ‘I expected you had eaten up my book at a mouthful, John; but neither you nor any of the rest, though you all engaged to do it, have answered a single paragraph of it.’ W. ‘You must not think your book unanswerable on that account. I am able to answer it, but it would take up so much of my time, that I could not answer it to God.’ This declaration so stung the author, as to put him upon writing *Universal Restitution Vindicated*: printed by S. Farley, Bristol, 1773.

“Sir George Stonehouse, Bart., died 5th December, 1793, and was buried at East Brent, Somerset, where he had purchased an estate of seven hundred pounds per annum, and resided upon it the last twenty years of his life.*

“Some time before he died, he presented the copy-right of all his works to the president of Burnham Society, with a view to being printed in an uniform edition, under his own inspection, as his last thoughts; undertaking to correct, with his own hands, all those proofs which contained any Greek, Hebrew or Syriac elucidations. The following were the works proposed to be printed by subscription, containing about 1200 pages:

“1. Universal Restitution a Scripture Doctrine, 468 pages, 5s. 1761.

“2. Universal Restitution farther Defended, 148 pages, 2s. 1768.

“3. Universal Restitution Vindicated against the Calvinists, 176 pages, 2s. 1773.

“4. † Evangelical History Defended, in answer to Farmer's Inquiry, 1s. 3d.

“5. Apostolical Conceptions of God, in a Series of Letters, 180 pages, 1786.

“6. A Second Part to the last Tract, 160 pages, 1787.

“7. Various Miscellaneous Manu-

* “Mr. Stonehouse was presented to the Vicarage of Islington, in 1738, and resigned it 1741; the reason of which we find in the History of Canonbury, p. 51.” [This would be a suitable extract for the Monthly Repository, which we beg leave to suggest to any of our readers who may have the opportunity of furnishing it. Ed.]

† The 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th, I have in my possession. G. S. B.

scripts, explanatory of the chief Controverted Points.

"Sir George Stonehouse, Bart., was a son of Francis Stonehouse, Esq., and grandson to Sir George Stonehouse, of Hungerford Park, Bart., who died 24th February, 1737."

It appears from a note in the Burnham Society correspondence, that the Rev. Sir James Stonehouse, Bart., M. D., (noticed by Brevis,) enjoyed his title from after the death of Sir George Stonehouse, of East Brent, he having died without male issue.

In this note there is a copious genealogy of the family.

On Mr. Belsham's Censure of Mr. Robinson.

(Continued from p. 441.)

Sir, August 2, 1818.

THOUGH Mr. Belsham's words, referred to at the end of my last letter, were not misquoted by me, yet, I confess, they were misconceived and misinterpreted. "In vain did I seek for a single individual, who being the child of baptized parents," &c. I understood the word baptized as being synonymous with Christian or believing, and in reference to that sense of it, I had been perusing Mr. R.'s History: a great oversight unquestionably, and which, as it is entitled to blame, so it requires an apology; though, I trust, it will not be inferred, that I did not know the different senses of the words. The truth is, I read Mr. Belsham's words at a time when my mind was fully and very seriously occupied with other subjects; and, indeed, to those subjects I am now obliged to return. I must, therefore, beg your permission to let me defer sending the further observations, which I had been preparing on Mr. R.'s History, till a future opportunity. In the mean time, I ask leave to submit to you the following few thoughts connected with the preceding observations, and not inapplicable to what may hereafter follow. Mr. B., I perceive, pretty uniformly follows Mr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism; and Mr. Wall's statement of the point referred to above shall be fairly and distinctly examined, when I am more at leisure. You will, therefore, please, Sir, to consider what now immedi-

ately follows, as a sort of postscript to the preceding letter, or rather, perhaps, as an interloquium between that letter and the other which I propose to send.

It may, probably, then, have been the wish of your Correspondent, Mr. Belsham, when looking for *any opposition* to the early and prevailing practice of Infant Baptism, to have met with disputes pro and con, after the manner of modern controversies, and these, perhaps, lying in very ancient manuscripts. Mr. Robinson, it is true, makes no such appeals. Manuscripts, indeed, going into those matters, of the age, at least, when those disputes were, I apprehend, first afloat, must have been more ancient probably than any known manuscript, Hebrew, Greek or Latin, even of the Old or New Testament. Nor shall I inquire what light may be thrown on this subject in ancient manuscripts that are known to exist, de Baptizandis, de Baptismis Parvulorum, de Hæreticis Rebaptizandis, the many fragmenta, pro et con, de Anabaptistis, contra Cainistas, contra Manichæos, contra Pelagium, and the like: though, perhaps, before we assert too much, it would not be unreasonable to suppose we have made a little search. If we make no search, we must be content with what positive proofs can be produced, on one side or on the other, from printed books. Such proofs, ample enough for the purpose of induction, exhibited in ancient writings, and in primitive practice, are, in my humble opinion, produced, as I may hope has appeared in a former letter, by Mr. Robinson.

To say nothing at present of the apostolical writings, as we have had occasion to allude to writings nearly, if not quite, equal to them in point of antiquity, it may not be improper to produce from them such passages as throw any light on this subject: and as these works are in print, as well as in manuscript, the amount of the evidence to be derived from them is accessible to all.

To leave then, for the present, Mr. R., the first of these writings alluded to, is known by the name of the "Catholic Epistle of St. Barnabas," said to be the companion of St. Paul. The earliest and some of the most

important writings (so deemed at least by many) of Christian antiquity, have been but of late discovery. This ascribed to St. Barnabas was first brought to light by Hugo Menardus, a monk, in the middle of the sixteenth century, and, being recovered out of the dust and rubbish of an old library in a monastery, was not printed till 1645, at Paris. Since then it has been published, and, in England, in different forms. There are but two passages in this Epistle which speak directly of baptism; but they are to our purpose, I think, both as to subject and mode. "Blessed are those," says he, "who having hoped in the cross, have descended into the water." * And, again: "We descend into the water full of sins and filth, and ascend bearing fruit," &c. † It is unnecessary to notice what he says of baptism in a spiritual way: and, that though he uses the word *sprinkling* elsewhere, yet it is for a purpose very different from baptism. That very passage which would, and, I think, has been so injudiciously huddled into this controversy, may be taken as adding considerable weight and force to the argument founded on the other two passages, and I should reckon it trifling to introduce it here.

The next writing is, "The Shepherd of Hermas," who also is said to have been contemporary with St. Paul. This was a long time only to be seen in Latin manuscripts, from which various editions in Latin were afterwards printed. Cotelerius first published it, in 1672, among the *Patres Apostolici*, with various insertions in Greek, collected from the Greek Fathers. Dr. Fell published it at Oxford, in 1724, without the Greek insertions: and there are other editions. Now there are, in this singular work, several places where Infant Baptism would naturally and almost of necessity have been mentioned, had it been practised at the time these visions were written; as, where the circumstances of his family, and particularly

of his sons, are so pointedly commented on, and in the vision that he has about the church, (under the similitude of a tower founded on waters,) and the persons that composed it, together with the discriminating reasons for receiving some persons and rejecting others. Not the most distant allusion is made to an infant or babe: he speaks of some "who have heard the word, desiring to be baptized in the name of the Lord," &c. : * and when, in illustrating his figures, he alludes to baptism, he adopts language which implies immersion of the whole body, and which, of necessity, excludes babes and infants: "That seal is water into which men, obnoxious to death, descend; but ascend, set apart to life," † &c. which of necessity excludes infants. The figurative part of the vision, relating to baptism, is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, and so quoted by him as to comprehend the import of the whole passage. †

The next writings among the Apostolical Fathers, are the two Epistles to the Corinthians, of St. Clement, (Romanus,) said also to be the Clement mentioned by St. Paul. The original Greek manuscript had been sleeping for many centuries in a library at Alexandria, and was first brought to light, and published by Patricius Junius, in 1633. There have been many editions published since, illustrated by the notes of learned men of different countries; and they appeared in Cotelerius's more splendid edition of the *Patres Apostolici*, at Paris, in 1672. In the first Epistle there is no notice taken of baptism, either infant or adult. In the second an allusion is once made to it in these words: "But the Scripture also says in Ezekiel, 'that if Noah and Job and Daniel should rise up, they shall not deliver their children in captivity.' But if such just men cannot by their righteousness deliver their

* *Ii sunt, qui verbum audierunt, volentes baptizari in nomine Domini. Lib. i. Vis. iii. Sect. vii.*

† *Illud autem sigillum est aqua, in quam homines descendunt morti obligati; ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Lib. iii. Sim. ix. 16. He had been saying just before, "Antequam enim accipiat hominum nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est."*

‡ *Strom. ii. post init. vi. ante medium.*

* Μακαριοι, οι, επι του σταυρου ελπι-
σαστες, κατεβησαν εις το υδωρ.

† Ημεις μεν καταβαινομεν εις το υδωρ
γεροντες αμαρτιων, και ρυπου, και ανα-
βαινομεν καρποφοροντες, &c. Sect. x.
xi.

children, with what confidence shall we, unless we keep our baptism pure and undefiled, enter into the kingdom of God?" * Where we may see the contrast does not lie between *their* children and *our* children, or the *baptism* of our children; but between their children and our entering, by keeping our baptism, into the kingdom of God.

Next follow the *shorter* epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, being more generally reckoned the *genuine* ones. These were first published in Greek, by Isaac Vossius, from a Greek manuscript, in the Florentine Library. Ignatius was said to be the very child whom Christ took into his arms, when instructing his disciples in humility: and though Chrysostom denies this, yet it is pretty generally allowed, on his authority, that he was contemporary with the apostles. The only passage that occurs in the epistle to the Smyrnæans on Baptism, throws no light on the mode or the subject: "Without the bishop it is lawful neither to baptize nor to celebrate a love-feast." The epistle to Polycarp throws light on the subject: "Let your baptism remain as arms, † (*with which the body is covered*); your faith as a helmet; your love as a spear; your patience as a panoply (*πανοπλια*). The whole passage is clearly an allusion to the words of St. Paul: "Put on the whole armour of God;" each adopting the language of one rousing and encouraging Christian soldiers, not lisping or whistling to bleating babes: as the writer had been saying just before, "Please him under whom you fight, from whom also ye receive your pay."

This is all I can collect on Baptism from the ancient Greek Apostolical Fathers, as they are called: every thing on this subject is in agreement with what is said in the Four Gospels,

* Ezek. xiv. 14, 20: The passage is quoted according to the reading in the Epistle. — ου δυνανται ταις αυτων δικαιοσυναις ρυσασθαι τα τεκνα αυτων, ημεις εαν μη τηρησωμεν το βαπτισμα αγιον και αμιαντον, ποια πεποιθησει ειστελευσομεθα εις το βασιλειον τβ Θεσ; Sect. vi.

† Το βαπτισμα υμων μενετω ως οπλα, &c. Sect. vi.

the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles. I could never find in either of the latter any thing about Infant Baptism; and in the former there is not a syllable on the subject: all speak clearly on the immersion of adults, but, in my humble opinion, not a syllable about the baptism of babes.

I am aware, however, that some suppose, that these latter (of the Greek Apostolical Fathers) are not the genuine productions of the persons to whom they are ascribed. Certain, however, it is, that these writings, ascribed to the Apostolical Fathers, were found in very ancient manuscripts: some of them are referred to and quoted by the other ancient Greek Fathers; and they have been edited by persons conversant in old writings.

It is, however, not my business nor my inclination to maintain nor to deny, at least now, that they are the genuine works of those persons whose names they bear. I formed, and long since gave, in part, my opinion on this subject, and I see no reason materially to alter my opinion.

But further, I must beg leave to add, that the consideration of their authenticity does not affect the present question. If the writings are genuine, we have undoubted testimonies to real facts; if they are forged, * we possess studied resemblances of them. Composed by whomsoever, and at whatever period, they may have been, they were intended to bear the stamp of the period, the character of the persons, to whom they relate; and of this we possess striking proof. Thus we meet with (particularly in Ignatius and Polycarp) repeated opposition to the *Docetæ*, who maintained that Christ *did not come in*

* Eusebius speaks of "the Catholic Epistle of St. Barnabas, as written by an uncertain author." It is at least presumed, by those who doubt its being a genuine writing of Barnabas, to have been of the second century. "The Shepherd of Hermas" and Epistle of Barnabas are both rejected by Tertullian as uncanonical: but even this rejection of them by *Tertullian*, supposes they were very ancient writings. On the genuineness of these writings, and of those of the others called *Apostolical Fathers*, and the doctrines contained in them, see some thoughts in *An Inquiry on the*

flesh, and that he suffered only in appearance. In the epistle of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, we find the word *Χριστιανος* frequently used, (the followers of Christ were first called Christians at Antioch,) the same order of bishops, presbyters and deacons, and the same offices assigned to them, (though some little variation is pleaded for by Tertullian, in cases of necessity,) and in like manner the allusions made to baptism exactly correspond to what is said of it in the apostolical writings, and, subsequently, in Tertullian and Justin Martyr.

Thus much concerning the writings of the earliest Greek Fathers, the *Patres Apostolici* so called. Tertullian, Mr. B. is kind enough to inform us, was the earliest of the Latin Fathers. Now it has always appeared to me, and I made the search and comparison more than thirty years ago, that Tertullian's account of baptism is in exact correspondence with that in the apostolical writings and in the Apostolical Fathers: and from the following quotations and particulars, let your readers judge. For the sake of brevity I shall not reckon it necessary always to quote the Latin.

“Happy sacrament of our water, (thus he begins his treatise,) by which being washed from our sins, *we* are received into eternal life.” I have said in a former letter, that Tertullian spake not merely in his own person, but also in that of the Catholic Church at Carthage; meaning thereby, not that he gave the open, avowed sanction of that Church, subscribed in testimony to it, but that he speaks throughout in the first person plural, as delivering the acknowledged sentiments and practices (which amounts to the same thing) of the Catholic Church of his time. And the Catholic Church, with whom Tertullian was then in communion, consisted of numerous congregations; and where he speaks of the practice of the Church, he must mean the Catholic Church; for heretics he did not at the time allow to have “the one bap-

tism,” or to be a Christian Church at all. He goes on: “But we little fish,” he says, fancifully enough, speaking of men baptized by immersion, “according to our fish, Jesus Christ, are born in water; nor are we saved otherwise than by remaining in water. That here, because (he speaks of those denying water baptism) a man let down in water, and dipped, amidst a few words, rises not much or nothing clearer, the obtaining eternal life should therefore be reckoned incredible.” “Is it not to be wondered at, that death should be washed away in a bath, or by bathing?” “Are we dipped or dyed in those very waters which then were in the beginning?” Tertullian uses the word dipped and dyed as synonymous; for it is by being dipped that things are dyed: and the word washing, when applied by him to baptism, always implies being covered or immersed in water. “Therefore there is no difference,” says he, “whether we are washed in the sea or a lake, in a river or fountain or conduit; nor is there any difference between those whom John dipped in Jordan, and those whom Peter dipped in the Tiber.” Tertullian appears, however, to have thought immersion essential to the ceremony; for he adds, “although a *resemblance* to the simple act is necessary, that as in the circumstance of filth we are defiled by sins, we may be washed in water.” Speaking of the *priests* of Isis or Mithras, he says, “in *their* washings or bathings,” &c. (for it was bathings he means, it being by immersion of these priests that the ceremony was performed,) “*but* waters being brought about, they every where expiate by *sprinkling* towns or villages, houses, temples, and whole cities.” Where observe the difference or opposition between *sprinkling* and *bathing*; and he observes the same distinction in another place; where speaking of those who, objecting to baptism said, that the apostles were not baptized, he adds; “others, plainly with sufficient violence to the passage, object, that the apostles had what supplied the place of baptism, when, in the little ship they were covered, being *sprinkled* with the waves; and that Peter, walking through the sea, was sufficiently immersed. But, I think it is one thing to be sprinkled or inter-

Nature of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, Second Edition, printed for Johnson, St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1792, Appendix, p. 361.

cepted by the violence of the sea, another to be dipped in the way of religious discipline." Speaking of the baptismal form, he says, "the law of dipping is imposed, and the form prescribed:" "Go," said he, "teach the nations, dipping them into the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost." Where, by the bye, though we read of a law for baptism, we read not a syllable of Mr. B.'s apostolical tradition by the Apostolical Fathers, nor is it once mentioned. "On the Apollinary and Eleusinian games they are also dipped;" and they pretend that they do it for "regeneration, and to escape the punishment of their perjuries." Speaking of washing, he says, "a man is thereby restored to the image of God;" afterwards he adds, "by faith sealed in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit," and elsewhere, "with the confession of all their past sins." After they came out of the water, in Tertullian's time, they were rubbed over with oil, (the common practice after bathing,) which would have been trifling after a few drops of water merely sprinkled in a child's face. After many fanciful observations, before expressed, he adds, "Christ is never without water, therefore he was dipped in water." He invariably connects baptism with believing, confessing sins, &c.: "therefore all who *thenceforth* believed were baptized; then also Paul, when he believed, was baptized," &c. Thus much and more, all referring to the immersion of adults. Every word, every allusion, every metaphor and figure, (and he uses several figures,) correspond to this idea: *man*, often repeated, *full*, *perfect man*,* is the subject; nor does he once allude to Infant Baptism, till the words soon to be quoted are introduced. Infant Baptism is afterwards mentioned, and seriously opposed by Tertullian; and contrary to what Mr. B. supposes, from the whole tenor of this treatise, I repeat it, he delivers the sentiments and practice of the Catholic Church; and thus for several pages he had been describing baptism,

* Ita restituitur homo Deo ad similitudinem ejus, qui retro ad imaginem Dei fuerat. Imago in effigie, similitudo in eternitate censetur.

and it appears by the whole account that the rite was performed by immersion at an adult age; and when he gives advice to others, who were not of his Church, the Church of Quintilla, it is decidedly against every form of baptism, till after the candidates were properly instructed and prepared. He had, a few lines back, been speaking of the officers who were the proper and regular administrators of baptism, and he admits, that in cases of danger a laic might administer it, least he should be guilty of a *man's* destruction; but that, in all cases, it would be better to delay, than to hurry on baptism.

Then follow the words quoted by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Belsham; the former has, I think, unnecessarily introduced several lines which do not relate to Infant Baptism. These I shall omit.

"Every request is able to deceive and to be deceived. Therefore, according to each person's condition and disposition, and age also, the delay of baptism is more useful, but particularly in the case of little ones. What necessity is there that sponsors (*susceptors* or *guardians*) should be brought into danger? They themselves may be incapacitated by death from fulfilling their engagements, or may be deceived by the intervention of a bad disposition. The Lord, indeed, says, 'Be unwilling to *forbid* them to *come unto me*.' Let them *come*, therefore, when they are grown up; let them come when they are taught; when they are instructed for what purpose they come. What need is there that an innocent age should hurry to the remission of sins? We act more cautiously in secular affairs, than to intrust divine substance, to one to whom we do not intrust temporal. Let them know how to ask for salvation, that you may seem (*by entering into the import of the command*) to give to him that asketh."

I beg leave to add a remark or two on these words. They relate, then, to a question put by Quintilla, a member of a church of heretics, (as the primitive Christians were in the habit, often bitterly, impudently, ignorantly, of calling one another,) who were numerous, (*plerosq. rapuit*, says Tertullian,) to a member of the Catho-

lic Church, that was also numerous. This member, Tertullian, a lawyer and an elder, speaking agreeably to the opinion and practice of the Catholic Church, answers the question, which relates to the baptism of little ones or infants. Mr. Robinson has shewn, that there is nothing to be proved as to the precise age from the word little one or infant, for that both in the early and middle ages it was synonymous with minor. He gives his reason for believing these children here were about seven years of age. He observes, "that such children could ask; and so they answer the character proposed by the Quintillianists." But be these matters as they may, (and I intend to illustrate this point hereafter by a passage from Gregory of Nazianzum,) it is certain, from Tertullian's referring to Christ's words, "*Suffer little children to come unto me,*" and from his interpretation of it, "*Be unwilling to forbid them to come unto me:*" it is certain, I think, from the *turn* of the phrases, and the *import* of the whole passage, that they were not babes at the breast or in the arms. Nor did Christ baptize the little children brought to him. He baptized none, but merely laid his hands on them and blessed them, and from the innocence of children taught his disciples a lesson. As to the sponsors here mentioned, they were not, as now, the peculiar and exclusive character of god-fathers or god-mothers, but a legal character, as Mr. R. has shewn, of susceptor or guardian: and it is clear, that from considerations of the character of the sponsor, of the children, and from the custom of the Catholic Church, as exhibited throughout this treatise, that Tertullian's opinion was, that *such infants* should not be baptized (by immersion) till after they were instructed into Christianity. The baptism (still less the mere sprinkling) of new-born babes does not once come into view; and so I do not perceive how that can be forced into an argument at all, in reference at least to Tertullian.

I see Mr. Belsham, on the above passage, (which is in part quoted by him,) after the words, "what occasion (or necessity) is there," adds, (*except in case of necessity, si non tam necesse,*) and that his quotation is

made (after Mr. Wall) from Rigaltii Edit. Tertull. Now, at first sight, it should seem, that these are not the words of Tertullian. He had, indeed, referred to expediency or necessity, in the case of adults, who had committed crimes, by whom, therefore, as repentance was required of them, so was remission of sins to be expected. But in the case of infants, he asks, "What need is there that their innocent age should hurry to the remission of sins?" It was not, therefore, to be expected, I think, that in that connexion, (though in after-times it was so introduced,) particularly after he had used the word *necessity* immediately before, that he should have introduced it again here. Rigaltii, Edit. Lut. 1684, (the only copy I have,) has it not; nor is it in Rigaltius's own quotation of this passage, as introduced in the Oxford Edit. of Cyril's Works, 1684, p. 159. On what authority Mr. W. introduces this passage, (for it is of some use in this controversy,) I may, perhaps, not having Mr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism at hand, probably, as opportunity offers, inquire.

This little tour of observations has been made, Sir, to shew how this question affected my mind many years ago, independently of Mr. R.'s History, or any other writings than those alluded to, wishing to ascertain their bearing on this question; and my conviction was, and on going over the same ground still is, that so far as the apostolical writings, the writings so called of the Apostolic Fathers, and of Tertullian, go, there is no foundation for baptizing any but instructed persons, and consequently that for the sprinkling or baptizing new-born babes, there can be none.

Other particulars, belonging to this place, will, with your permission, follow in due order; in the course of which, if I should admit that Mr. R. has made a trip in interpreting one or two passages of Tertullian's dubious, African Latin, I am afraid I shall be obliged to observe, that Mr. B. has made a fall, and one of much more consequence in this controversy; and that his interpretation of two or three words from Justin Martyr is not quite correct.

D.

*Portsmouth,**September 2, 1818.*

SIR,

I HAVE great satisfaction in assuring your Correspondent Mr. Lamb, [p. 489,] that the Rev. Charles Toogood is still living, an ornament to his profession, a zealous friend to your valuable Repository, and an admirer and encourager of your excellent Miscellany, "The Christian Reformer." Not having it in his power to extend the circulation and sale of the Repository, agreeably to the wish expressed by you at the close of the last Volume, and being very desirous of encouraging and supporting it, he gave me, when I left him about a fortnight since, ten pounds to send to you, to be applied to this purpose. I remit them to you by a friend.*

Mr. Lamb speaks of Mr. Toogood as Rector of Ashill: he was only Curate. He never has been a beneficed clergyman, because he never could subscribe.

RUSSELL SCOTT.

The late Professor Porson.

[In the Minutes of Evidence of the Third Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, on Education of the Lower Orders, is the following account of the early studies of the late Professor Porson, in the examination of the Rev. Joseph Goodall, D. D. Provost of Eton College, p. 77. The outlines of the life of this celebrated scholar are given in our IIIrd. Volume, pp. 573, 574, and in the same Volume, pp. 533—539, is a Literary Memoir of him, drawn up by our lamented friend, Mr. Dewhurst. Ed.]

ARE you acquainted with what happened to the late Professor Porson, to prevent his election to King's?—I beg leave to say, that every account that I have read about him, in relation to this circumstance, is incorrect. When he came to the school, he was placed rather higher, by the reputation of his abilities, than, perhaps, he ought to have been, in con-

* We think it right to acknowledge the receipt of this contribution, and to present our thanks to Mr. Toogood, and also to Mr. Scott. Ed.

sequence of his actual attainments; and I can only say, that many of the statements in the Life of Porson are not founded in truth. With respect to Prosody, he knew but little; and as to Greek, he had made but comparatively little progress when he came to our school. The very ingenious and learned Editor of one account of him, has been misinformed in most particulars, and many of the incidents which he relates, I can venture, from my own knowledge, to assert, are distorted or exaggerated. Even Porson's compositions, at an early period, though eminently correct, fell far short of excellence; still we all looked up to him, in consequence of his great abilities and variety of information, though much of that information was confined to the knowledge of his school-fellows, and could not easily fall under the notice of his instructors. He always undervalued school exercises, and generally wrote his exercises fair at once, without study. I should be sorry to detract from the merit of an individual whom I loved, esteemed and admired; but I speak of him when he had only given the promise of his future excellence; and in point of school exercises, think that he was very inferior to more than one of his contemporaries; I would name the present Marquis of Wellesley, as infinitely superior to him in composition.

Did he write the same beautiful hand as he did afterwards?—He did; nor was there any doubt of his general scholarship.

Then did he make great progress during the time he was at Eton or after he left?—He was advanced as far as he could be with propriety, but there were certainly some there who would not have been afraid to challenge Porson as a school-boy, though they would have shunned all idea of competition with him at Cambridge. The first book that Porson ever studied, as he often told me, was Chambers's Encyclopedia; he read the whole of that dictionary through, and in a great degree made himself master of the algebraic part of that work, entirely by the force of his understanding.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Systematic Education, &c.*

(Continued from p. 521.)

THE Mathematical and Philosophical part of the work fell naturally to our lamented friend Mr. Joyce, whose multiplied labours in this walk, had before entitled him to the grateful acknowledgments of the rising generation. After a few observations on the importance and utility of mathematical science in general, as an exercise of the faculties of the mind, as well as for its various useful applications, he proceeds to the History and Principles of Arithmetic, gives a short review of the principal school books, Vyse, Hutton, Molyneux, Bonycastle, and his own, the particular recommendation of which is, that it contains a greater variety of examples tending to afford much useful information applicable to the advancing stages of life, and that it applies logarithms with great advantage to the calculating of annuities, reversions, &c. The larger works of Malcolm and Mair are also deservedly praised.

Algebra is in like manner historically traced, its general principles explained, and the practical treatises of Bonycastle and Bridge recommended; after either of which the student is directed to Maclaurin, Simpson, Euler, &c., then to the mathematical repositories of Dodson and Leybourn, and to the works of Clairaut, D'Alembert, Landen, Waring, &c., and the *Scriptores Logarithmici*. We were surprised at the unfavourable mention of Mr. Friend's Algebra, which gives a clear idea of negative quantities, or makes the change of the sign in multiplication at all intelligible; and whatever may become of his proposed change in the mode of notation, (and we admit the difficulty of effecting a change in these respects even for the better,) we should be very glad to see a practical elementary book, with a sufficient number of examples, constructed upon his principles.

Geometry is traced from the Egyptians to modern times, and its universal application pointed out. The several editions of Euclid are reviewed, from Barrow to Playfair, as are also the compendiums of Simpson, Payne, Cowley, &c., and the extensive plan of Professor Leslie, only in part executed, which is considered as proper to be made rather a second than a first book by those who are studying without the aid of a preceptor. Handsome mention is made of the treatises of Reynard and Keith, and the chapter concludes with some judicious remarks on the best mode of studying geometry.

Trigonometry is traced from Hipparchus to the completion of the Logarithmic Tables: and the distinction is noted between the ancient mode of resolving trigonometrical questions by chords, and the modern one by sines, &c. The advantages respectively possessed by the geometrical and algebraic modes of investigation are pointed out; the three cases, which include all the varieties that can happen, stated; and the modes of solution, by geometrical construction, arithmetical computation, and extension upon the scale, are described. The practical treatises are those of Martin, Ashworth, Simson and Simpson, Vince, Woodhouse, Bridge, Bonycastle, Keith, &c.; in Spherical Trigonometry, Kelly, and the late excellent George Walker's *Doctrine of the Sphere*, “ which has at no time been appreciated as it deserves.” The Logarithmic Tables of Hutton and Taylor are recommended, and the *Tables Portatives* of Callet, stereotyped by Didot. Some remarks conclude the chapter on the centesimal computation of the French, which, though it would, no doubt, facilitate calculation, would render useless all existing trigonometrical and astronomical works, as well as all the valuable mathematical instruments.

Conic Sections, after being traced from Apollonius, are recommended to be studied in the works of Simson, Hamilton, T. Newton or Vince. It

is to be lamented that Mr. George Walker had not encouragement to complete his treatise on this subject.

On Fluxions, the Author recommends to beginners, Rowe or Vince; and to proficients, Simpson and MacLaurin.

Then follows some account of the principal writers on the Doctrine of Chances, Annuities, Insurance, &c.; a history of Navigation, with a critique upon the principal works, of which those of Robertson, Mackay, and Mendoza de Rios, are particularly recommended.

A few observations on Mensuration, Surveying, Levelling and Dialling, with references to the treatises of Hutton, Bonnycastle, Leslie, Crocker, Davis, Ferguson, &c. conclude the volume.

The second volume commences with Natural Philosophy, beginning as usual with Mechanics, the theory of which is so necessary to the right understanding of so large a portion of the other departments. After an historical sketch, the Author briefly treats of Attraction, the Centre of Gravity, the Mechanical Powers, &c., referring to Keill, Wood, Parkinson and Hamilton. Next come Hydrostatics, of which also we have the history, from Hiero's Crown to the Improved Steam Engine; then come the Specific Gravity and Density of Bodies in general, and the *quaquaversum* Pressure of Fluids; with references to Cotes, Vince and Parkinson; Pneumatics, or the Statics of Elastic Fluids, with the principles of the air pump, hydraulics and hydrodynamics, or the conveyance of fluids, and their application as a moving force, with references to Clare, Smeaton, Gregory and Atwood (Prony, Guglielmini and Venturi).

On Optics, (for the history of which he refers to Priestley on Light and Colours, which is characterized as one of that Author's most interesting works,) the writer briefly treats of light, refraction, (in general, and the production of colour by the different refrangibility of its component parts,) reflection, the eye, and the several optical instruments; with references to Stack, Wood, Harris, and especially Smith, and to Baker, Adams, and his own little work on the Microscope.

On Electricity he again refers to Priestley for the history, and then passes on to the distinction between electrics and non-electrics, the electrical machine, electrical attraction and repulsion, the Leyden phial and the shock, &c., referring to his own Dialogues, to Adams, Cuthbertson, and especially Singer, whose early death was a great loss to practical science. His work is excellent also as an introduction to Galvinism, or rather Voltaism, which, in the hands of Sir Humphrey Davy, has achieved such important and interesting discoveries; for which see his own work, and the Articles in Rees's Cyclopædia. This chapter concludes with a short account of Magnetism, with reference to Cavallo and Haüy.

The chapter on Astronomy (which would more naturally have followed Optics, which have so much illustrated its phenomena, as Electricity would better have introduced Chemistry, the principles of which its voltaic modification has so much unfolded), is somewhat more full than the rest, as the sublimity and importance of the subject required. After, as before, a brief history of the science, from the Chaldeans to Piazzi and Olbers, a general view is given of the face of the heavens, the division of the stars into constellations, &c., with Herschel's Theory of the Construction of the Universe; of the solar systems, according to the three great schemes of Ptolemy, Tycho Brahe, and Copernicus; of the several constituent members of it, with Herschel's idea of the sun as itself an opaque habitable sphere, surrounded by a luminous external matter; of the distances and periods of the planets which revolve round him, together with their respective peculiarities, and the secondary planets connected with several of them; the phases of the moon, the phenomena of eclipses, and of the tides. The books referred to are Bonnycastle, Ferguson, Ol. Gregory and Robison; the larger works of Newton and David Gregory, and Vince, Lalande and Laplace.

The article of Natural Philosophy concludes with some important general observations connected with the whole subject: on the advantage of a course of study of this kind being ac-

accompanied by experiments; on the practicability of introducing experimental philosophy into schools, at least those of a higher order; on the general elementary works of Joyce, Gregory, Haüy, Webster; the more scientific treatises of Enfield, Cavallo and Vince; and the still larger ones of Gravesande, Desaguliers, Young and Playfair.

The article of Chemistry displays its great importance to the arts and manufactures; treats in order of simple and of compound substances; of chemical apparatus, with a neat list of experiments illustrative of the principal discoveries; and gives at some detail the more remarkable discoveries of Sir H. Davy, by means of his powerful galvanic battery. Of the elementary works on Chemistry, so numerous that it is difficult to make a selection, are particularized the Dialogues of Joyce, the Conversations of Mrs. Marcet, and Parkes's Catechism, for beginners; Dr. Henry's Elements of Chemical Science, the Systems of Thomson and Murray, and Chaptal's Chemistry applied to the Arts; to which might well have been added, Messrs. Aikin's Dictionary of Chemistry and Mineralogy applied to Arts and Manufactures, a most admirable and useful work.

Next comes the extensive and most interesting department of Natural History. In the mineral kingdom, after a general view of the systems of Cronstedt, De Lisle, Brochant, Haüy and Brongniart, we have a more particular account of that of Werner, as given by Professor Jameson in his System of Mineralogy, and of Mr. Aikin's Manual, the work last published, and particularly adapted to persons entering on the science. In the conclusion a short account is given of the Plutonian and Neptunian Theories as maintained, the former by Hutton, Playfair and Sir James Hall, the latter by Werner, Saussure and Kirwan; and reference is made to the "admirable Comparative View of the Two Theories, by Dr. Murray," and to Mr. Bakewell's Introduction to Geology. We believe that these theories, and the zeal which has been shewn for them, have arisen from confined views of particular districts, and that the more extensive the re-

searches of scientific mineralogists become, the more they will be convinced that the phænomena of various districts will not receive a satisfactory solution from either of them: and we have often occasion to recollect the observation of a venerable friend long ago deceased, (the late Dr. Rotheram, of Newcastle,) who, when the conversation after dinner turned one day on Whitehurst's book, then just published, pointing to a fly upon an orange, said, "That fly has been working a long time upon that orange; and if she has got her trunk half-way through the acrid oil contained in the cells on its surface, she has got deeper in proportion than all the mines on the surface of the earth. But suppose she has got into the insipid fungus which lies underneath, still she will be able to give us little information on the nature of an orange. As little, I believe, does our author know of the 'original formation and structure of the earth.'"

Next follows a pretty sketch of Botany, taken from Nicholson's Encyclopædia; and reference is made to the works of Mrs. Wakefield and Rousseau, Sir James Smith, Wildenow and Persoon, and to the writings of Linnæus and Jussieu.

In Zoology, the survey begins with a short account of the division of Aristotle, into viviparous and oviparous animals; of Ray, according to the different structure of the heart and lungs; and of Linnæus, who chiefly adopts the system of Ray with regard to quadrupeds and birds. The Author then gives a more detailed and extensive survey of the Linnæan distribution of the animal world, to which we must refer, and concludes by recommending the Essays of Dr. Skrimshire, as a popular and instructive work, the Elements of Natural History, published at Edinburgh, Dr. Shaw's General Zoology and Zoological Lectures, the Zoography of Mr. Wood, the works of Edwards and Latham; (we are rather surprised at the total omission of Bewick, whose admirable works have, perhaps, contributed more than any other to the universal acquaintance of our youth with the zoology of their native country,) and above all of Pennant, Buffon and Linnæus.

We should now have proceeded to the Philosophy of Man, his mind and its exercise, his duties and relations, his frame and structure, and his final expectations. In this part of the work Dr. Carpenter has the principal share; assisted, however, by Mr. Joyce on Political Economy, and by Mr. Shepherd on the Evidences of Christianity. But this is so important a part of the work, and so particularly adapted to afford interest to the readers of the Monthly Repository, that we must make it a separate article.

V. F.

(To be concluded in the next Number.)

ART. II.—*The Researches in the East; or, an Important Account of the Ten Tribes of Israel, &c. &c.* By the Rev. M. Sailman. 8vo. Pp. 154. 5s. 6d. 1818.

MR. SAILMAN is the author of the pamphlet on the London Society for converting the Jews, reviewed Vol. XII., pp. 684, 685, and the success of that publication has emboldened him to appear again in print. He describes himself in the title-page, which, Hebrew and English together, makes a full page, as "Hebrew Lecturer, Portsea;" an office which we do not understand, but which we presume Mr. Sailman considers as an authority for taking the title of *Reverend*. In the former pamphlet he contented himself with the designation of "Teacher of Hebrew, Southampton."

The present work is in whole, or in part (for it is so confused that we cannot speak more definitely), a translation from the Hebrew of *Rabbi David Raphael Sodo*: of whom the translator tells us only, that "he was led by his ancestors to believe that he himself was a descendant from the tribe of Naphtali," that his father, a man of letters, "was employed in an embassy in the East," and that the son, then 18 years of age, attended him, and that he took the opportunity of inquiring after the Ten Tribes, minuting down the fruits of his researches, though the manuscript "was not intended by him for publication." The last-mentioned fact is the only proof furnished by Mr. Sailman of *Rabbi David Raphael Sodo's* good sense.

The misnamed "*Researches*" are,

in fact, a jumble of history and fable, and little else than the common-place book extracts of a compiler without learning and judgment.

The fate of the Ten Tribes is one of the points not cleared up by history. Hence, imagination has on this topic free scope. Some writers have placed this lost portion of the House of Israel in the East Indies, and some in North America. Modern Jews, who are distinguished at once by credulity and unbelief, are disposed to receive the fable of Benjamin of Tudela, (copied by our author, pp. 32—34,) respecting the river *Sabbatyon*, "which derived its name from its ceasing to flow on Saturday," on the banks of which marvellous stream, unknown to profane geography, "great numbers of Jews dwell." This sacred stream may be safely placed in the neighbourhood of the country, where the aforesaid traveller, "who has not amused his reader" (according to Mr. Sailman's manuscript,) "with accounts of miraculous proceedings," (p. 2,) found a tower built by Balaam, (p. 4,) Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace, (p. 14,) Ezekiel's tomb, (p. 17,) and "the original of his prophecies, written by his own hand," (p. 16). Even sober Jews of the present day believe that the scattered Tribes "are still in the East:" but if, as they acknowledge, (p. 123,) "the families and tribes are not distinguished," but are, on the contrary, confounded with the various Asiatic nations, how is their looked-for restoration possible? Difficulties attend every hypothesis; but the more probable opinion is, that remains of all the twelve tribes returned to the Holy Land with Ezra: on the dedication of the second temple "a sin-offering" was made "for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel" (Ezra, vi. 17). Paul, in his speech before Agrippa, describes the *twelve* tribes as then existing in Judea (Acts xxvi. 7); and the General Epistle of James is addressed, (i. 1,) "to the *twelve* tribes which are scattered abroad."

Our Rabbi gives a succession of names of supposed Jewish rulers in the East, who are dignified with the title of *Heads or Princes of the Captivity*. One of these, *Ananus*, is represented as belonging to the *seventh*

or eighth century. We shall copy the account here given of him, and also of a contemporary personage whom our readers will recognize as Mr. Moore's "Veiled Prophet:"—

"This Rabbi was a man of parts, but could not be admitted to the number of excellent, because his doctrine was suspected of some *blemish*, which suspicion was well-grounded, for he put himself at the head of the *Sadducees*, which sect was believed to have been buried in the ruins of *Jerusalem*. They recovered strength, and under the conduct of this famous leader, became formidable to their enemies. Some critics consider this *Ananus* as the father of the *Caraites*, rather than the restorer of *Saduceism*: but we have shewn that the *Caraites* could not claim him for their founder, because they were of a more ancient standing.

"In the reign of this prince appeared the much spoken of impostor, *Hakem*, surnamed *Burca* or *Mask*. He taught that God took a human shape, by assuming the person of *Adam*, for which reason he commanded the angels to worship him; that he afterwards appeared in the persons of the prophets and great men that lived from time to time; that, at last, he descended upon *Aboulem*, prince of *Corrazan*, one of the generals of his time, whom *Almanser* had murdered in his chamber, for fear of his revolting and robbing him of the Caliphship. From thence, the divinity came and made his abode in him. Giving out that he was God, with so foolish an opinion he deceived numbers of Christians and Idolaters, whom he caused to wear a white habit, to distinguish them from *Aly's* followers, who were black. Having lost an eye in battle, he wore a gold mask on his face to conceal its deformity; but his disciples maintained that he did it with the same design as *Moses*, that he might not dazzle men's eyes with the majesty of his countenance. He had the art, every night, to produce a luminous body like the moon from the bottom of a well, which diffused its light to several miles distance. Lastly, as he was skilful in the art of war, he went into the field at the head of an army. But *Mohadi* pursuing him by one of his generals, he retired into a fortress that was almost inaccessible: finding himself besieged, he poisoned all his associates and burnt them, and afterwards threw himself into a great tub of *aqua fortis*, presuming that it would be believed that he was returned to heaven, because his body could not be found: but a woman who had hid herself, to avoid death, gave up the place, discovered the secret, and in the *aqua fortis* they found the impostor's hairs consumed. *Abulpharages* calls this impostor *Almokannius*.

He says that he cast himself into a funeral pile, that totally consumed him, and that having promised his disciples to appear again, that sect, instead of being undeceived by his death, persevered in their error, and expected him a long time." Pp. 80—83.

Another deceiver is brought forward in connexion with the city of *Aleppo*:

"It was this city that produced the famous impostor, *Zabathai Tzevi*, who deluded this nation in the seventeenth century, pretending to be the Messiah. His father was but a poulterer at *Aleppo*, but yet he had the ambition and rashness to go about persuading the people that he was the Redeemer of *Israel*, promised by the prophet, and expected for so many ages. He learnt, by times, all that was necessary to be known, to act so great a part. Scarce was he come from school but he set up as a teacher; he preached in the fields in the sight of the *Turks*, who laughed at him, whilst his disciples admired him. At twenty-four years of age, he married a young Jewess, whom he divorced without knowing her, and took another, with whom he also lived in abstinence. It cannot be conjectured what was the use of these marriages repeated without consummation, unless it was to amuse silly people with the love of chastity.

"He fell upon the study of prophecies, which greatly overturned his head by his applying them to himself. He imagined he was to ascend above the heights of the clouds, as *Isaiah* had foretold: and whether his head was perfectly crazed, or that he thought he had sufficient authority to impose upon his disciples, he asked them one day whether they had not seen him carried in the air; and he upbraided those with blindness that had not seen him. The wiser sort easily perceived what the man would come to, who so boldly boasted that he worked miracles, and profaned the name of God. He was cited to appear before the heads of the synagogue at *Smyrna*, where he then was, and was condemned as a blasphemer; but because nobody would execute the sentence, supposing him to be crazy, they only banished him.

"He went to *Thessalonica*, a city full of Jews, which he thought a proper stage to act his part, but he was expelled from thence, as well as from *Athens*, and several other places of *Greece*, which obliged him to retire to *Alexandria*, where he got greater reputation. He married a third time, to a lewd wench, whom her Jewish parents had left in *Poland*, under the conduct of a Christian lord. He gave out that the spirit of the father, departed from his body, had passed from *Asia* into *Poland*, to fetch his daughter, and convey her stark-naked into his house. *Tzevi* married

her after she had run through *Germany* and *Italy*, and he had sufficient authority to have her respected as the queen of the empire he was to conquer. This woman's brother, who was a tobacconist at *Frankfort*, left his shop to find out his brother-in-law, with the hopes of sharing the dignities of the crown, but he returned after he had been cheated like the rest. *Tzevi*, who traversed the world, met with a Jew of reputation at *Gaza*, called *Nathan Levi*, or *Benjamin*, to whom he communicated his design. The conjunction was the more favourable, as it was construed from some passages of Scripture, that the time for the coming of the Messiah was near at hand. *Levi* embarked in his design, and set up for the prophet *Elias*, who was to be the Messiah's forerunner. He assembled the Jews at *Jerusalem*, and abolished the fast that was there celebrated in *June* or *Ab*, because sorrow was not suitable to the feast of the Messiah: he declared *Tzevi* to be the person expected. Part of the nation were misled, and they flattered themselves with the hopes of seeing *Jerusalem* delivered by a man, who specified the month of September for the period decreed for the conquest and ruin of the Grand Seignior. Wise men, instead of being imposed upon, were aware that this insurrection would be the cause of their destruction; wherefore they opposed this new Messiah and *anathematized* him. He was obliged to quit *Jerusalem* and return to *Smyrna*, and from thence to *Constantinople*, where he hoped to gain followers; but twenty-five Rabbins had prevented him by letters to their *Smyrna* brethren, signifying that he was an atheist, and that the man who would rid him from them would do as acceptable a work to God, as if he had won many souls. He parted from *Constantinople* to return to *Smyrna*, where his presence was necessary: he knew that four ambassadors, sent by *Levi*, were to wait upon him there, and acknowledge him for the Messiah. This embassy imposed upon the people, and even on part of the doctors, because *Levi* who sent it, was an eminent man among them. All the multitude, deceived by his humility, and his diligence to wash himself every morning, and to be the first at synagogue, and especially by his pathetic sermons, owned him for a king, and every one brought him presents, that he might be able to support his dignity. *Levi* did not forget himself; he persuaded all that were willing to hear him, that *Tzevi* was the prince of the nation; that the *Ottoman* empire was to fall under his government; that they were only to wait nine months, for which time he was to be concealed, and cause great afflictions to the people, but that afterwards he should appear with glory, mounted upon a lion, conducting the people to their country, and

that a stately temple, wherein they should make continual sacrifice, should at the same time descend from heaven.

“The *Smyrna* doctors met to consult a second time about an affair which daily grew more important. The more judicious of them did not find the character of the Messiah in *Tzevi*, nor those of *Elias* in the person of the forerunner; for which reason they condemned him to death: but as their party was not the most numerous, they were forced to yield to the multitude. *Tzevi* summoned the people to the synagogue, celebrated a new feast, profaned the name of God several times, changed some words of the liturgy: they acknowledged his authority, and thought they saw something divine in his person.

“A third decree of death pronounced by the Rabbins, did not daunt him, as knowing nobody durst execute it. His friend had gained the *Cadi* of *Smyrna*, upon whom he waited in his palace, and obtained his protection. The people published that fire proceeded from *Tzevi's* mouth, when he spoke to the *Cadi*; that a pillar of fire had frightened the *Turkish* governor, which had obliged him to send him away instead of putting him to death. They brought him back in triumph, singing these words of the *Psalms*, *The right hand of the Lord is exalted*. Nothing was wanting but a throne for this new king; wherefore he caused one to be erected for him, and another for his royal consort, and he spoke from thence to his subjects. He drew up a new form of faith, which every body was obliged to receive, as coming from the hand of the Messiah. They artfully applied the prophecies of the Old Testament to this impostor, and shewed them accomplished in his person. A famous Jew, called *La Peigne*, continuing to oppose his empire, he sent to, and demanded of the synagogue to punish him: upon their refusal, he went himself at the head of five hundred men, and *La Peigne* avoided death only by a hasty flight. His own daughter, meaning *Tzevi's*, rose against him, and staggered her father's faith. Many others who had been incredulous, ran along with the stream, or honestly believed they were mistaken.

“When he saw himself exalted to so high a pitch of power, he ordered the name of the *Ottoman* emperor to be erased from the prayers, to substitute his own; and before he undertook the conquest of his empire, he divided the dignities and employs of it amongst his favourites. He called himself the *king of the kings of Israel*, and *Joseph Tzevi*, his brother, the *king of the kings of Judah*. At last he departed for *Constantinople* in a little vessel, whilst most of the Jews made their march by land. The passage lasted thirty-nine days, in which time the *Grand Seig-*

rior was advertised of his coming, and ordered the *Vizier* to arrest him prisoner, and give him a sound *bastinado*, which was executed.

“ This adventure did not dishearten the Jews; they called to mind *Levi's* prediction, that the *Messiah* was to be concealed nine months, during which time the nation should suffer greatly. They took this for the accomplishment of the oracle, and this misfortune confirmed them in their prejudice, instead of undeceiving them. The criminal answered upon his examination, that he had taken the title of king, whether he would or no, and to secure himself from the violence of the Jews, who had forced him to it. This answer obliged the *Vizier Azem*, who was going to the siege of *Candia*, to treat him gently, and to shut him up in the *Dardanelles*. This was a new miracle; the Jews maintained the *Grand Seignior* had not power to put their king to death, since he had not done it. They flocked from all parts to the *Dardanelles*; they won the governor by presents; they made larger to the *Messiah*; who, puffed up with the honours that were paid him even in his prison, commanded all the nation to celebrate the feast of his birth, dispatched ambassadors to all parts to proclaim him the *Messiah*, and to publish the miracles he had wrought and still performed. Lastly, he gave plenary indulgences to all that came and offered their devotions at his mother's tomb.

“ But yet he was not without his enemies. *Nehemiah Cohen*, a *Polish Jew*, came to maintain to him in prison the vanity of his pretensions, and turned *Musulman*, that he might the better ruin him by revealing the whole intrigue to the *Caimacan*. The *Mufti* was provoked, because favour was shewn to a man who disgraced the *Mahometan religion*, in calling himself the *Messiah*. The *Grand Seignior*, at the request of his principal officers, sent for the impostor to *Adrianople*, and ordered a sword to be run into him, to try whether he was invulnerable. This order put *Sabathai Tzevi* into a consternation, who chose rather to turn *Musulman* at the solicitation of the emperor's physician, who had given him an example, and his wife did the same. Nevertheless the people will never be in the wrong. They were not entirely undeceived.

“ This article is somewhat long; and it is not amiss to learn from these circumstances, how far an impostor may carry his impudence, and the people their credulity. For even to the present day are many found, in some parts of *Poland* and *Russia*, who yet believe that this impostor was more than an ordinary man. He lived to a very advanced age, and was attended at his funeral by some score thousands from *Poland* and *Russia*.”—Pp. 106—115.

Rabbi David Raphael gives the following description of a Jewish ceremony, of which he was an eye-witness; it suggests painful reflections on the melancholy religious condition of the Jews:—

“ Being at the synagogue at *Seda*, some time in the early part of the month of *Nissan*, as I was looked upon as a public character, I received an invitation from the *ab beth din*, the prime and chief elder, to attend at the *Assepha*, general meeting, to take place the night following, which honour I was unwilling to forego, particularly as I could form no idea in my mind as to the purport of the meeting so early in the month. We met at the house of the *ab beth din*, an hour and a quarter before midnight, from which place we proceeded in regular order, attended by all the men of consequence and learning, and boys intended for religious purposes, above the age of thirteen, accompanied with *cymbals, trumpets, timbrels, harps, organs*, and various instruments of music, from the *ab beth din's* house, to about two-thirds of an hour's walk from the gates of the city, chaunting the hundred and twenty-sixth psalm, and other psalms of thanksgiving, during the procession to the above distance: but after tarrying there about two-thirds of an hour, they return back again at a slow pace, appeared much dejected, sounding the hundred and thirty-seventh psalm, and some parts of *Jeremiah's* lamentations, in a doleful tone. After seeing the chief elder to his house, they all separate for their respective places.

“ Upon my inquiring from one of the learned the cause of this singular mode of worship, I discovered that they have a tradition handed to them from centuries past, that they are to expect the coming of the *Messiah* to take place precisely at midnight, and which is firmly believed by them, as it is well known that the redemption from *Egypt* was also precisely at midnight. Consequently, the month of *Nissan* having been once productive of the great event, they expect the same in every *Nissan*. They therefore prepare as above-mentioned, to meet the promised *Messiah*: but after tarrying some time after midnight to no effect, they return back in the mournful manner above described. The same tradition is (according to report) entertained by all the different tribes, in all their various settlements in the East.”—Pp. 124, 125.

We have now extracted the only passages of this pamphlet that could interest the reader. The translator proposes to publish a work of his own on “*The Stability and Constancy of the Jewish Nation*.” Before he begins to write, we would recommend it

to him to study Watts's Logic, and before he prints, to submit his manuscript to the revision of some English scholar.

ART. III.—*Unitarianism the only Religion that can become Universal. A Discourse, delivered on Sunday Evening, April 19, 1818, in the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, Liverpool, with Notes and an Appendix.* By George Harris. 8vo. Pp. 96. Liverpool, Robinson and Sons; London, Hunter and Eaton.

THIS is an explicit assertion and animated defence of Unitarianism from Zech. xiv. 9. "The religious system" (Mr. Harris contends) "that can alone become universal, must be distinguished, in the 1st place, by its simplicity; 2ndly, by its rationality; * and 3rdly, by its agreement with the Scriptures of truth." He then shews with much ability and with a constant reference to the New Testament, that these characters belong to the Unitarian, but are wanting in the Trinitarian system.

The sermon was composed in answer to the pamphlet, entitled "Unitarianism Weighed and Found Wanting, in a Series of Letters, addressed to the Rev. George Harris, and occasioned by his Evening Lectures, in Renshaw-Street Chapel, by Robert Philip," and is printed in compliance with the wishes of the Preacher's congregation. We rejoice in these local controversies, being persuaded, that they afford the best means of the exposure of error and the establishment of truth.

Mr. Harris explains in his Preface, (p. vi.) that he confines the title *Unitarian* "to that part of the Anti-trinitarian body, who believe in the proper Unity of God, and the humanity of Jesus Christ." This narrowing of the meaning of the term is not, we think, philologically or historically correct; nor is it in our judgment consistent with good policy, if it be with charity. The preacher must have overleaped his own restrictions, when he says in the Sermon, (p. 46,) "there are at this moment in Great Britain, above three hundred congregations of Unitarians."

We observe a few *hard* expressions in this pamphlet; e. g. p. 15, the de-

* Reasonableness is a better English word, and is, we believe, less grating to the ears of Trinitarians.

scription of the *orthodox* belief of the Fall, as "the transgression of God's precept in *eating of one apple*," and, p. 63, "the *howlings* of ignorance and fanaticism:" but we point them out, not for the sake of detracting from the merit of an useful publication, but in the hope that they may pass under the author's revision on a future occasion.

ART. IV.—*Letter of Advice to a Young American, on the Course of Studies it might be most advantageous for him to pursue.* By William Godwin. 8vo. Pp. 16. Godwin & Co. 1818.

WE insert this pamphlet in our Review Catalogue, because we think it may be very useful to young students. On a few points, we might dispute Mr. Godwin's taste, as where he prescribes that Don Quixote be read "with a *deep feeling* of its contents," and "high *veneration* for and *strong sympathy* with its hero," (p. 6,) but upon the whole, we cordially concur in his "Advice." One short extract will surprise such as are acquainted with the author only through his *Political Justice* or his *Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft*:

"It is my opinion, that the imagination is to be cultivated in education, more than the dry accumulation of science and natural facts. The noblest part of man is his moral nature; and I hold morality principally to depend, agreeably to the admirable maxim of Jesus, upon our putting ourselves in the place of another, feeling his feelings and apprehending his desires; in a word, doing to others, as we would wish, were we they, to be done unto."—P. 4.

ART. V.—*Unitarianism Unassailable; and the Believer in the "One God and Father," who is "The Saviour of all Men," vindicated from the Charge of Blasphemy.* 12mo. Pp. 36. Hunter. 6d. 1818.

THIS little tract is in answer to one entitled "Unitarianism Untenable," reprinted from the *New Evangelical Magazine*. It is drawn up by an able hand, and contains, in a small compass, a complete answer to the principal Trinitarian and Calvinistic arguments, and a satisfactory explanation of the Scriptures usually alleged against the Unitarians. We recommend it to the conductors of our Book Societies, as worthy of a place in their lists of tracts for distribution.

ART. VI.—*More Work for Dr. Hawker, in Reply to his Misrepresentations of the Gospel, &c. &c.* By the Rev. Thomas Smith, of St. John's College, Cambridge, &c. 8vo. Pp. 22. Sherwood. 1818.

WE smile involuntarily at the schisms in the Church of England, which has no less than thirty-nine Articles of Faith, "for the avoiding of the diversities of opinions, and the stablishing of consent touching true religion." These schisms are daily multiplying and becoming wider. There is not only the evangelical and the moral party, but also different evangelical parties who pursue each other with the genuine *odium theologicum*. Dr. Hawker, for instance, is accused of antinomianism by the Rev. Thomas Smith, who at the same time intimates that the Lord Bishop of Landaff is quite as far from the gospel on the other side. The Plymouth Doctor has declared against offering Christ to sinners, whereupon the present writer confronts him with a list of gospel ministers in the church, who "offer Christ to the vilest of the vile, and God blesses their labours:" this list is very dutifully headed with the name of "The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London." Emboldened by the presence of such a host, the Rev. Thomas Smith charges the popular Doctor with quibbling, with feigned humility and real pride, and with ignorance and "dreadful delusion" and opposition to the design of the gospel; and gives him a broad hint that it would be well for him to look after his own soul. At the same time, both this untitled possessor of "Holy Orders," and the Doctor lay claim to the spirit of God, and would perhaps unite in pitying or condemning such as do not enjoy the leadings of this supernatural guide to all truth!

ART. VII.—*The True Interests of Religion Considered: A Sermon preached before the Annual Assembly of General Baptists, at the Chapel in Worship Street, May 12, 1818.* By David Eaton. 8vo. Pp. 40. 1s. 6d. Eaton and Hunter.

MR. EATON divides his sermon into a description of religion and a statement and recommendation of its interests. In the former part,

he naturally expounds the creed of his own denomination, the *General Baptists*, who call themselves *Baptists* because they immerse believers in water on a profession of faith, which they hold to be the only baptism, and who take the prænomens of *General*, because they maintain the salvability of all mankind in opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of the redemption only of the elect. The preacher here animadverts on the arguments of Mr. Towgood and Mr. Belsham in behalf of infant-baptism, and makes some sensible and shrewd remarks on the weight of tradition and the authority of the Fathers, whose testimony he appreciates rather with a layman's boldness, than with the proverbial caution of a controversial divine. In the latter part, he well defines what are not and what are "the true interests of religion," and zealously exhorts his brethren to uphold their own interests (would to heaven that the interests of all religious communions admitted of such exhortations only!) by enlightening the mind, making the Holy Scriptures the sole spiritual authority, encouraging honest inquiry and free discussion, and exhibiting a conduct consistent with Christian principles.

ART. VIII.—*The Reasonableness of Protestantism: a Sermon preached to the Congregation of Protestant Dissenters, Harlow, Dec. 25, 1817.* By Thomas Finch. 8vo. Pp. 36. 1s. 6d. Sherwood & Co.

WE find from this Sermon, that Mr. Finch, whose narrative of his ejection from a congregation of Calvinists at Lynn, for reputed heresy, and of his reception by a new society, gathered together on purpose to uphold religious liberty, is taken notice of Vol. VI. pp. 679, 680,* has become the minister of the Baptist Church, at Harlow, in Essex. The Sermon before us was preached in celebration of the Tri-Centenary of the Reformation, and in principle and spirit is truly *Protestant*.

* In Vol. VII., p. 58, is an account of the opening of the new chapel at Lynn, by the Rev. J. Evans. The congregation received assistance from the Unitarian public in defraying the expenses of the building.

OBITUARY.

July 23, aged 25, at *Montauban*, in France, whither he went in the beginning of the year, by the advice of his medical attendants, the Rev. BENJAMIN GOODIER, of Hollinwood, near Manchester, and lately of the Unitarian Academy at Hackney. He had a constitutional tendency to a pulmonary complaint, which took a decided character before he left the Academy, owing, it is supposed, to the severity of his application to his studies. Great hopes were, however, entertained of his recovery, and especially of late, and after his visit to France. It pleased Providence, however, to disappoint the fond wishes and earnest prayers of his friends, and by his premature death to exhibit another lesson of the vanity of all human expectations. But such a death following such a life ought to excite nobler sentiments than regret and sorrow. Mr. Goodier was an eminent Christian: few have there been so young in years and so ripe in character. His excellencies of head and heart and life won their reward even in this life, for they procured him a succession of friends, whose kindness and generosity were not less admirable than were the virtues of him on whom they were bestowed. He is gone before his benefactors and friends to that world where goodness finds its proper home. [*Further particulars hereafter.*]

July 26, 1818, at *Stratford*, Essex, Mr. EDWARD MAGUIRE, who was born April 7, 1751. During his religious profession his sentiments sustained several alterations, as the light of divine truth beamed upon his mind. Upon his first becoming serious he attended the Methodist Connexion, but afterwards became a zealous Calvinistic Baptist; in these sentiments he continued a few years, when reading Elliot's Circular Letter to the Baptists his faith began to waver, and after a serious examination of the Scriptures, he was compelled to relinquish the doctrine of the Trinity for the more pure and simple doctrine of the Divine Unity. He now made a stand for some years, his sentiments being nearly those of an Arian. With such views he became acquainted with Mr. Vidler, who, by his powerful arguments and his appeals to Scripture, together with the writings of Priestley, Lindsey and others, let in such a flood of light and truth upon his mind, that he was forced to give up the whole of what is called the orthodox system. His views of Christianity being now firmly established on Unitarian principles, his chief endeavour was to live a life conformable to the precepts of the gospel; in the mean-time he lost no oppor-

tunity of improving his mind by reading the Scriptures, or attending to such other helps as came within his reach.

His illness was long and painful. From the autumn of 1815, he was confined (with few exceptions) to a sick-bed: during his protracted sufferings his mind was perfectly calm and serene. He frequently passed whole nights in dwelling upon the joyful prospect of immortality. He retained his faculties to the last and gently fell asleep in Jesus.

Aug. 2, aged 71, Mrs. RUPERTIA HILL, of *Fore Street*, well known for her benevolence to the poor, and for her contributions to the support of several religious and charitable institutions. On Tuesday, the day preceding the funeral, her body lay in state, at her dwelling-house, and a Religious Tract (No. 48) was given to all the visitors. On Wednesday morning (Aug. 12) her corpse was removed in a hearse and six, followed by six coaches with the usual attendants, to the Countess of Huntingdon's College, Cheshunt, where a vault had been previously prepared outside the chapel. On its arrival at Cheshunt the corpse was preceded by the Tutors and Students, and followed by the Rev. Messrs. Kemp, Vasey, Gore, Macdonald, J. Hyatt, Wood and Stodhart; by her executors, Messrs. R. Butcher, E. Kemble, T. Hughes, and B. W. Scott and other friends. The chapel being full, and a considerable number of persons outside, the burial service was read from the rostrum near one of the windows, by the Rev. Mr. Kemp, of Swansea, to the end of the lesson; the Rev. Mr. Stodhart then gave out a hymn, after which the Rev. Mr. Gore delivered a short oration, which was followed by another hymn given out by the Rev. Mr. Wood; after which the body was removed to the vault, over which Mr. Kemp read the remainder of the service.

The following are the principal of Mrs. H.'s legacies:

Cheshunt College	£1000
Lady Huntingdon's Connexion	1000
London Society (Jews' Schools)	1000
To 30 poor Ministers, Indep.	600
To 30 Do. Baptists	600
To 30 Do. Wesleyan	600
Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb	200
Do. for the Blind	200
London Missionary Society	100
Moravian Do.	100
Baptist Do.	100
Provident Fund, Lady H.'s	100
Travelling Do. Do.	100

Homerton Academy - - - - - 100
Orphan School - - - - - 50

Besides a number of private legacies to ministers, and to the widows and orphans of ministers deceased. *Evan. Mag.*

August 20, at *St. Ives*, Huntingdonshire, aged 36 years, ELIZABETH, the wife of Thomas Escolme FISHER, of that place, Solicitor. She was a lineal descendant of two ancient and highly respectable families. Her ancestor, George Underwood, of Kensington, Barrister at Law, (whose father was an alderman of London,) married Joyce, the daughter of Sir Robert Jocelyn, of Hide Hall, in Hertfordshire, Knight, an ancestor of whom, Sir Gilbert Jocelyn, Knight, accompanied William I. in his Conquest of England. The family of Jocelyn was raised to the Peerage in 1730.

Mrs. Fisher possessed a mild and affectionate disposition, which rendered her an amiable and endearing wife, a tender mother, a sincere friend. She bore a long and painful illness with great fortitude and resignation to the Divine Will, and exchanged time for eternity without a struggle or a sigh. She died with a firm conviction of the truth of the Divine Unity: to which conviction the conversation of Mr. Richard Wright and the late Mr. Winder, while on visits to Mr. Fisher, did not a little contribute.

A Sketch of the Character of Abraham Shackleton, of Ballitore.

“E'en he, whose soul now melts in mournful lays,
Shall shortly want the gen'rous tear he pays.”

Survivors owe a debt to departed worth, to make some record of the virtues of those who have finished their terrestrial course with honour; and, avoiding the fulsome-ness of indiscriminate panegyric, to erect at once a memorial dictated by friendship, and to hold out an example of good qualities for the imitation of others.

My acquaintance, and consequent intimate friendship with my highly esteemed friend, did not commence very early in our lives.

—“In the summer of his life I knew him,
And called him friend; for in our hearts
did dwell
Some kindred likings and some kindred
scorns:
The tyrant's state, the pontiff's pomp and
pride,
The hireling's meanness, the debasing tricks
Of avarice, the sycophantic airs
Of dangles after wealth: ah! subjects fit
Of generous scorn. Together we did hail
The star of freedom rising on a world

Of slavery-goaded men—
Snapping their fetters off, enlarged and
free.”

In the arduous profession of a schoolmaster, Abraham Shackleton was anxious to discharge the important trust with the most strict integrity. He loved his scholars with a strong parental affection, and in an especial manner identified himself with their interests. In the honest enthusiasm of his disposition, he was desirous to be in habits of close intimacy with them, hoping by kindness to gain on their hearts; and feeling strongly, as was his accustomed manner in all things, the errors of too great severity towards youth, he perhaps fell into the opposite extreme, and by relaxing the bands of discipline, left under too little restraint the youthful passions, which require a firm, though gentle hand to restrain, till reason have established its rule. The motive was amiable, although the effects were not successful, either in a pecuniary point of view to himself, by the falling away of his school, which, however, with a generous indifference, he disregarded; or as respected the scholars, who, being left too much to themselves before they had acquired habits of self-restraint, were in danger of deviating from that narrow road, which conducts to the heights of virtue. But to be in extremes was the error of this worthy man. How happy, if he had blended the peculiar kindness of his manner towards youth, with enforcing the salutary restraints necessary for their government!

He was strictly educated in the society of the people called Quakers, was for many years an esteemed and active member among them, and had attained to the rank of an elder. He assumed the right of private judgment, and gradually developed some sentiments in opposition to theirs, especially on the subject of the Scriptures, which he treated as other writings of a mixed nature. He more than doubted of some of the historical parts, particularly of the assertions that God commanded the Jews to destroy the Canaanites, with circumstances of peculiar cruelty and atrocity. For many of the poetical parts, as highly congenial with his own ardent imagination, he retained great admiration, and more especially cherished the sublime morality as taught by Jesus Christ; concerning whom he rejected the Trinitarian hypothesis, without appearing fully to have made up his mind as to the doctrines usually called Unitarian. His opinions were his own, and not borrowed. His religion being very much founded on feeling, he was accustomed to speak of Christ in a mysterious manner; and being a firm believer in the peculiar Quaker doctrine of an immediate revelation to each individual, he combined it in an allegorical manner under the figure

of Christ as a principle, without defining his opinion of Christ as a person.

In process of time he diverged farther from his parent society, spoke against many of their observances as leading into formality, and finally declined the attendance of their meetings. He fearlessly avowed his opinions, according to his characteristic intrepidity; and, daring to inquire, was too honest not to follow the result of his inquiries. For these reasons the society recorded their disownment of him in 1801; and from that time he lived separate from all societies.

At that period free inquiry was more generally practised: latterly it has become unfashionable. Most have shrunk back from the consequences, and have attempted "to unthink their thoughts." The results have been a want of energy, and an attempt to suppress originality of thinking in themselves and others. Knowledge in Ireland has ceased to be progressive; and, both in politics and religion, which generally share with each other, the search after truth has fallen off. The consequent torpor has not been productive of improvement; and the human mind, for a season, has retrograded into apathy and a degrading selfishness. But freedom of inquiry, it is hoped, may yet burst through the intervening clouds, and renovation dispel the mists arising from the present dread of innovation.

Philanthropy was a peculiar trait in his character. He entered warmly into the question of the slave trade, and for a time refrained from the use of sugar and other West Indian produce, that he might not participate in the guilt of the iniquitous trafficking in slaves. Latterly, conceiving that wars were frequently encouraged by taxes drawn from it, he abstained from the use of tea, sugar, wine, and other commodities brought over sea, and also from spirituous liquors, from his dislike of the frequent abuse of them. In all these he afforded proofs of the benevolence of his dispositions and the kindness of his heart.

He was of an active turn, and delighted in exertions both of body and mind. His pen was almost always employed. A few years ago he published a volume of poetry, which did not meet with much encouragement; and his prose writings were numerous. Some he occasionally gave to periodical publications, and great numbers of essays, on various subjects, remain among the mass of his papers. He possessed a fine genius, and cultivated a taste for classical literature. The activity of his disposition was farther exemplified by his entering warmly into the pursuit of botany at a late period of his life.

His unsuspecting disposition laid him open frequently to imposition, and his friendship, on some occasions, was greatly

abused. It must be allowed, that he sometimes wanted discrimination, in admitting to his intimate friendship those who were unworthy of it. The warmth of his heart also led him to lavish praise often without just discrimination.

In 1798, when Ballitore was for a few days in the possession of the insurgents, and after its re-occupation by the army, he zealously and fearlessly exerted himself, with considerable risque, with the leaders of both, to repress their mutual excesses, and where he could not prevent, to afford succour to the suffering. When threatened by the insurgents, and a blunderbuss was held to his breast, he resolutely refused the smallest appearance of joining with them, and openly protected a sick soldier, and the wives of some soldiers and officers. On the change of circumstances, he equally afforded protection to the insurgents. His conduct, on this trying occasion, extorted approbation from both sides, even from some who were ready, after the manner of the times, to construe his liberality towards the people into a crime.

An account of his death in the papers gives the following just description of him. "He was a man endowed with uncommon versatility of talent, which, with enthusiastic ardour, was always devoted to the forwarding of some project or principle, calculated in his view to promote the welfare or happiness of mankind. Even those who occasionally dissented from him in opinion, felt themselves irresistibly impelled to pay homage to his virtuous intentions." *

Yet he had much obloquy to encounter.

* His character was well delineated in the Dublin Evening Post, by the pen of a near relative. "His life of activity and temperance was blessed with health, scarcely interrupted, till about two months before his death. Not only his own family and neighbourhood, but a wide extended circle, will long feel the loss of a man, whose heart was warmed with the sincerest benevolence, who loved his fellow-creatures, and all creation, and who wanted only to be known, to gain universal love. His talents, which were of the highest order, and embraced a great variety, were accompanied with a simplicity which enhanced their value. He loved to communicate knowledge to others, and had conducted the boarding-school established by his grandfather for many years with much credit. Seldom in one person have been combined so many talents and virtues. He possessed a transparency of character, through which were seen the motives of his actions and sentiments, some of which might deviate from the common tract of opinion, but all sprung from a pure and honest heart."

His separation from the society in which he was educated, exposed him to the vindictive censure of a sect, conspicuous for their hostility to those who have separated from them; and his generous, unsuspecting disposition, sometimes leading him to extremes, laid him open to the sneers of the selfish, who, measuring others by themselves, were unable to appreciate his virtues. Such have more pleasure in carping at the eccentricities of genius, than in imitating the example of good qualities. According to a maxim attributed to Confucius, "the perfection of man consists not in never falling, but in being able to rise again."

He was a friend to civil and religious liberty; and having exercised the important right of choosing his own religious opinions, he was willing to concede a like right to others. He was pre-eminently distinguished for the warmth of his affections, and the sincerity of his friendship, and for a freedom from selfish motives, which induced him to follow where the dictates of apprehended duty led him, regardless of consequences, or of the losses he might sustain by such conduct. He preferred the doing right, abstracted from all consideration of gaining the applause, or avoiding the censure of men; and, possessing a genuine, unaffected modesty, he abstained from obtrusive argumentation, and that war of words, which seldom leads to profitable results. Placability and the forgiveness of injuries were distinguishing traits in our worthy friend's character.

About two months before his death, he felt the approach of disease, but for a time he cherished hopes of his recovery. During the latter part, his sufferings were severe; but he maintained a peaceful serenity. He looked forward to his death without dismay, as might have been expected from a man, whose religious opinions were the very opposite of gloomy. "God is love," was his favourite maxim; and under this consoling influence, a death-bed was divested of the terrors, with which it is often viewed by the victims of vice or of superstition. After his death a large collection of water was found in his chest.

He was born 8th of 12th month, 1752, and died 2d of 8th month, 1818. Virtue, in a very eminent degree, had "filled the space between."

JOHN HANCOCK.

Lisburn, 20th of 8th month, 1818.

Rev. W. Richards.

WE regret that we have to announce the death of a valuable correspondent and

esteemed friend, in the 69th year of his age, the Rev. WILLIAM RICHARDS, of *Lynn*. He was a man of sterling integrity and of true Christian worth. The General Baptist denomination has lost in him one of its most zealous advocates and brightest ornaments. He might have lived without reproach (except on the ground of heresy) in the days of the Puritans: like them he lived apart from the world, and like them he was a religious enemy of ecclesiastical usurpation and civil tyranny. [*Further particulars hereafter.*]

Funeral of the Rev. Mr. Ham.

[WE sometimes state our opinion freely of the enormous and mischievous errors of Popery, but we are at all times pleased to acknowledge and record the virtues of Roman Catholics, and have great satisfaction in copying the following paragraph from the *Weekly Freeman's Journal*, Dublin, August 8th. ED.]

This gentleman had been for many years parish priest of Coolock, Clontarf, &c., and lived at the sheds of Clontarf. His pious conduct and amiable manners had so endeared him to his parishioners, that, perhaps, the death of any individual never produced such universal and sympathetic sorrow and regret in that district as his did. His funeral shewed the esteem in which he was held. About a thousand respectable farmers and inhabitants in the neighbourhood, assembled at an early hour on Monday morning, and when the body, in a superbly mounted coffin, was about to be placed in the hearse, they unanimously proclaimed their intention of carrying the remains of their lamented pastor to the place of interment, (Mulhuddart,) a distance from Clontarf of no less than nine miles. It was really an affecting sight to behold the procession: the numerous persons who had assembled for the above purpose walked, and alternately carried the body, every man uncovered, after which followed the hearse and a string of carriages and cars, extending full a mile in length. The procession moved in this order from Clontarf to this city, through Summer Hill, Great Britain Street, Capel Street, King Street, Stoneybatter, and on to the grave, amid the most solemn and respectful feeling that we have ever witnessed. This is perhaps the strongest proof that religion, virtue and amiability of manners will, even in these times of depravity, meet and receive the just appreciation which they deserve.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Right of the Jews to English Charities.

SIR,

I TAKE the liberty of handing you, for the Monthly Repository, a Report of the late Case on the subject of Religious Disabilities, as peculiarly relating to the Jews. The discussion must be interesting to all, but especially to Unitarians, as involving in principle (though now pushed somewhat farther into its naked deformity), the positions maintained in the Wolverhampton Case, and attempting in the same manner to set up, by means of the Court of Chancery, a barrier to the progress which liberality and an enlightened policy have made in discarding religious persecution, whether positive or negative.

Every one will be glad to see Sir S. Romilly in his true station, the friend of civil and religious liberty, the enemy and exposé of the arts of bigotry and intolerance.

The report of the first day's argument is little more than a copy of the Newspaper reports; the remainder I am answerable for. Whatever may be the result, the Jews have acted wisely in bringing the question fairly and openly into discussion, and if they fail, they will have the opportunity of appealing, I have no doubt successfully, to the legislature.

VIGIL.

Lincoln's Inn, July 31, 1818.

In the Matter of the Bedford Charity.

Sir Samuel Romilly opened this case, observing, that he felt its particular importance, not only to the individuals who now petitioned, or to the trustees of the Charity now in question, but to all the charitable institutions of Great Britain; for if the order of the trustees of this particular charity was to be confirmed, it would introduce a novelty into the administration of public charities hitherto unknown or unthought of. One of the petitioners was Mr. Joseph Lyon, who complained of his daughter, Sheba Lyon, being excluded from the benefits of the Charity, merely because he was a member of the Jewish persuasion: the persons who joined in the petition were Joseph Cohen, Isaac Levy and others, rulers of certain synagogues in London. King Edward the VIth, on the petition of the mayor and corporation of Bedford, did grant them a free Grammar School in that town, with one master and one usher, which, "in his gracious attention," he ordered to continue for ever. In the 8th of Elizabeth an agreement was made between a Sir Wm. Harper and the

mayor, &c., by which the estates and a house of the former were conveyed to the latter for the support of this school. In the 4th of Geo. III. an act for the better management of this Charity was passed, but that act was repealed by one in the 36th year of his Majesty, which declared that the lord-lieutenant of the county, the representatives in parliament for the town and county, the mayor, corporation and eighteen inhabitants, should be constituted trustees of the Charity, with power to fill up vacancies in case of deaths, and that the Directors should, from and after the passing of this act, assume the name of the master, governor and trustees of the Bedford Charity. It further provided, that the sum of £800 should be annually distributed as portions to forty poor maidens, and that the trustees of the Charity were to meet every three months to distribute the quarterly proportion of that sum, giving at the same time three weeks' previous notice of their intention so to do. While the founder made this will, it was to be observed, he made no restriction so far as regarded religious opinions, and no exclusion was certainly made of any person on that account. In addition to this, there were £700 to be annually expended for boys as apprentice fees, and for girls to encourage them to be good servant maids, the boys to have £20 each, as apprentice fees, and the girls were to have somewhat less. The money given to the forty poor maidens was to be paid them on condition of their marrying within two calendar months after receiving it; and that to the boys was, that in two calendar months after they were paid it, they should be bound as apprentices. The daughter of the petitioner was within the limits of age pointed out by the act of the king, and prior to Michaelmas 1816, she applied to the governor and trustees, but she was refused admission as a candidate for the fee, in consequence of her father belonging to the Jewish persuasion. Since that also, they had made a rule that no children, the descendants of Jewish parents, should be allowed to partake of the benefits of the Charity. Now, the petitioner was most astonished at such a resolution, for his son, Lemuel Lyon, was in the school, and had got the apprentice fee, and his daughter, Elizabeth Lyon, had had the same advantage. The facts of the petition were corroborated by Michael Joseph, who had formerly two sons in the hospital. There were a number of other instances which he (Sir S.) might mention, but he thought it unnecessary. The elders of the Jewish

Synagogues in London, than whom there was not a more respectable class of men in the world, had taken up the cause, judging it of the highest importance, not only as related to this case, but as a general question. They had done well in taking it up, as an important question would be thereby solemnly decided, for it should be remembered, that this Act of the 36th George III. gave the Lord Chancellor the full power of deciding the case. There was also another branch of the Charity he must allude to, viz. the alms-houses, and in that instance it was ordered by the founder, that the poor old men and women should attend some place of religious instruction on Sundays. Now it was, in his opinion, very difficult to shew how this could exclude Jews; for, were their synagogues not to be held places of religious worship? To profess some religious principles was necessary, but the deed did not say, that because a man belonged to this or that class of religious professors, he was disqualified from being an inmate. A certificate of conduct was required, and a reward given to those who excelled in good conduct; but then that certificate was merely relative to the discharge of moral duties, and had no reference whatever to religious duties, nor the forms of religious worship. On what principle the managers of the Charity had chosen to deviate from their former practice, and adopt a system so illiberal, he was at a loss to know. In this country, thank God, every man had the liberty of worshiping his Creator according to the dictates of conscience, none daring to make him afraid. And was he to be told, that because the Jewish nation adhered to the faith and worship of their ancestors, a system of worship venerable from its origin and antiquity, the members of that persuasion were to be excluded from public charities? The doctrine was monstrous, it was disgusting to hear it in this enlightened age. Whether Jew or Christian, every man had a right to approach the Deity as he thought proper, and no man ought, no man should be the victim of oppression or obloquy on that account. The trustees complained of the increase of Jews and foreigners in that town. If they were afraid of the funds of the Charity being enjoyed by such persons, let them apply to the legislature for an extension of the time which it is necessary for a householder to live in the town, before he claims the right of applying for the Charity; but let them not by their own means establish an intolerant system which liberal, rational minds must be disgusted with.

Mr. Bell followed on the same side, and was at a loss to know what he could say on the subject, as he was quite astonished to hear it brought forward. No case, that

he knew, was to be found in the law books to correspond with this. *Lord Hardwicke* had indeed held, that this court could not protect a school solely for the education of Jewish children in that faith, but that did not apply here. Intolerance had been justly branded with the reproach of every liberal mind, and it was monstrous to say, that relief was not to be afforded to one who differed from us in religious opinions. The highest authority known by Christians had taught the contrary, and in one of his sublimest and most admirable parables, had proved that religious differences should not operate at all on the mind.

The Solicitor-General wished merely to remind *Mr. Bell*, that the warden and masters of New College were visitors of the school, and of course the question now was, had they a right to visit this Charity, and see how it was applied, and what were the regulations they had made? This was the point.

The Lord Chancellor.—Suppose the visitors order the children to be taught the New Testament; how are we to do in that case with Jewish children?

Mr. Bell thought that would be a matter left solely to conscience. He did not see why a Jew might not read the New Testament as well as a Christian, though the former did not view it in the same sacred light as the latter did. A Jew might read the Greek Testament with as much regard to conscience as *Sir William Jones*, or any similar person, might read the sacred books, however absurd in his opinion, of a heathen nation. As to the provision in the will of the founder, which required the candidates for the bounty to give their christian name and surnames, he did not conceive that at all militated against the Jews; for if it did, then, on the very same principle, might Anabaptists be excluded who did not baptize till they were adults. Besides, to bind a man, and deprive him of public charitable benefits, was absurd, for what would be thought, for example, of persons being excluded from such advantages, because they did not go the whole length of *St. Athanasius's Creed*? That creed was not adhered to by even some of the Bench of Bishops, who wished several of its objectionable clauses to be expunged. The exclusion of Jews from Christian charities would be setting an example of intolerance, which had not been practised by the former, for it would be recollected, that *Mr. Goldsmidt* had given a very large sum of money to the Jews' Hospital, a charity, the benefits of which were not confined to that nation, but extended to a very large number of Christians.

The Lord Chancellor wished to know whether the inhabitants of the town of Bedford, belonging to the Jewish persua-

sion, and paying scot and lot, had ever been appointed, or ever voted for, the trustees of the Charity? Whether any Jews had ever been educated either in the grammar or writing school? Whether any had been admitted into the hospital or bound out apprentices? And whether old men or women of that persuasion had ever been admitted into the alms-houses?

The matter stood over for the purpose of making the inquiries necessary to answer these questions, and the parties were desired to furnish the Lord Chancellor with copies of the letters patent, acts of parliament, &c., so that the question might come on again on the ensuing Monday, his Lordship observing, that it was one of infinite importance, and ought to be settled at once.

Monday, 7th August, 1818.

The Solicitor-General, on the part of the trustees, appeared to oppose the petition; he observed, that since this interesting case had been before his Lordship, the inquiries directed had been made, and, he was happy to say, were answered in so satisfactory a manner, as to leave no doubt on a single point. The petition prayed, that his Lordship would declare all the poor inhabitants of Bedford, whether Jews or Christians, entitled to the benefit of the Charity. It became material, therefore, to inquire the origin and progress of the institution. By letters patent, dated 15th Edward VI. a school was founded for the education of poor children in the town of Bedford; and New College, Oxford, was appointed visitor or regulator. It was most important to look to the period when this Charity was established; the court must endeavour to discover the intent of the founder: he contended, that if this question had arisen in the reign of Edward or Elizabeth, the court would not have hesitated to refuse Jews the benefit of it, and whatever indulgence the enlightened policy of later times had extended to that nation, he was yet to learn that any legal toleration had been given them. He had, however, no wish to agitate that question; he had only to shew that, by the law, as it stood at the time of the foundation, and as it now stands, Jews were no objects of it.

In the reign of Elizabeth, Sir William Harper endowed this Charity, and extended its objects. It was hardly necessary to observe, that at this time Jews, and indeed all infidels, were then considered by law to be alien enemies. In Calvin's case, Lord Coke lays down the proposition broadly, that Jews were *perpetui inimici*, that they could take nothing within the realm, for all infidels are enemies, "and the law supposes not their conversion being a remote possibility." He (the

Solicitor-General) only mentioned this to shew how the law was considered to stand at that time, and he contended, that the Act of Parliament, which afterwards regulated this Charity, had not altered the case. It was an historical fact, that the Jews, in the reign of Edward I., left this country, and did not return till they were allowed to do so under the Commonwealth; they, therefore, could not be contemplated by this Charity. Christianity too had been decided repeatedly to be part of the law of the land, and it had been expressly settled that there could not be a Charity for direct benefit of persons professing any other religion. The case of *Da Costa and De Pas* had determined this; and can it be allowed that the same object should be effected indirectly? Let us hope that the fullest toleration will always be given to Jews and every one else in the exercise of their religion; but it was a very different question, whether such persons were to claim, as their right, a direct benefit from a Christian foundation. In the 4th and 33d George III. acts were passed for regulating this Charity; by the last, trustees were appointed—and the qualification of a trustee was, that he should be a member of the corporation, or have filled the office of churchwarden or overseer; it was perfectly clear from this, that no Jew could have been contemplated. In fact, no Jew had ever been a trustee, nor till about thirty years ago, had a Jew ever even resided in Bedford—about that time Mr. Lyon came there, who has, it appears, been permitted to vote in the choice of trustees.

The Solicitor General then went over the provisions of the Act, at some length, contending that all of them contemplated a Charity for the benefit of Christians only. New College, Oxford, was to have the management and regulation of it; and can it be supposed that such a body should have the direction of an establishment in which the Jewish religion was patronized? There are exhibitions provided for pupils removing to the University, and could it be supposed that any Jew was contemplated, when it was well known that no one of their faith could, with a clear conscience, resort there? He was anxious to avoid all discussion of the rights to toleration or any other privilege of the Jews, by the law as it now stood; the only question is, whether they can claim the benefit of a Christian Charity, founded at the period this was.

No Jew boys could attend this school without introducing confusion and irregularity: there had been two, and on that occasion many exceptions were obliged to be made in their favour as to the duties of the school. The next purpose of the Charity was to distribute portions to poor

maidens, claimants for which were required to send their Christian and surnames to the churchwarden. It was said by Sir Samuel Romilly, that these words did not point to any religious distinction. He could not but say that he thought that one could not but see from this, perhaps accidental, phrase, the interest of the trust—the persons in the alms-houses are bound to go to some place of worship every *Sunday*: can it be said that Jews would comply with this? Then, with respect to apprentices, two sons of Jews have been so bound, but then it was irregularly done; they were bound to their Jew fathers, they could not perform any regular apprenticeship, for their faith would prevent their doing the duty of their situation as a Christian master would require it to be done; they would not work on Saturdays. At the end of apprenticeship the parties are entitled, on production of a certificate of the minister and churchwarden, to an exhibition. The kind of persons who are to make this certificate, shews again clearly the intention; the minister cannot be supposed to have any superintendence over Jews.

With respect to the clause, requiring attendance on public worship, Mr. Bell had said, this does not necessarily mean Christian worship, but certainly it meant some worship on *Sunday*, not Saturday. He knew too of no law that tolerated Jew worship, to bring it within the legal description of public worship. If the argument was good, too, it must be carried still farther; a Mahometan might claim this Charity. If the argument was worth any thing it would go this length. The law said expressly there can be no direct Charity for the benefit of Jews. This had been expressly decided, and how then can a Jew claim the benefit of a Christian Charity? When this Charity was founded, by law no Jew could take the benefit of it; and though they have, by the increasing liberality of the times, been tolerated in the exercise of their religion, there had been nothing to alter their rights, certainly nothing to alter the intention of the founder, which must be construed as the law then stood.

The Solicitor-General then adverted to the affidavits filed. The affidavit of the petitioner, Mr. Joseph, stated, that he settled in Bedford thirty one years ago—that there had been no Jew there before in the memory of man—that he had a large family who had had the benefit of this Charity—that he had voted in the choice of trustees—that two of his children had received apprentice fees—that these were apprenticed to himself—that two of his daughters had received the portion—that there are now three or four Jew families in Bedford.

The affidavit of Dr. Brereton, the master, stated the regulations of the school;

one was, that prayers were to be read twice a-day—boys absenting themselves from prayer, without sufficient reason, were to be punished—that the boys should read the Greek Testament. Can the Jews (observed the Solicitor-General) read this book which they discard? How can they claim the privilege of this Charity, when there are parts of it absolutely inconsistent with their faith; and can they select parts of it? It is all one system, there is one primary object and intent of the founder; and is Judaism consistent with it? If it is inconsistent with any one part, it sufficiently shews the intention of the whole establishment. The affidavit farther stated, that the two Jew boys, who had been there, never got far in learning—that their father requested the master to dispense with their attendance on Saturday, which he consented to—and that they were allowed to sit while the Christian children were at prayers.

The master of the other school stated, that the Jew children there were required to read only the Old Testament; the Christian children being taught to read the Scriptures and the Church Catechism.

With respect to the practice which has thus been, as it were, established since Mr. Joseph came, the Solicitor-General observed, that it must be lamented that it was ever allowed, because it had given rise to this prayer for a general declaration by the Chancellor of their rights, and which would not only extend to this, but many other charities. He said it was not his wish to interfere with any civil privileges the Jews might have acquired in other respects; he could only observe, that no legislative enactment had given them, but he did not meddle with that. It was sufficient for his purpose to observe, that they could have no legal title to the benefit of such a Charity which they now claim as their right. After again disclaiming all wish to interfere with the free exercise of Jewish worship, the learned Counsel concluded with contending, that it was contrary to the spirit of the constitution of this country to encourage persons professing a religion at variance with Christianity. No one could maintain, that in the reigns of Edward or Elizabeth, Jews could have claimed the benefit of this Charity; and what had altered their situation?

Mr. Phillimore, on the same side, contended, that the whole question was, what was the intent of the founder, and that this must be construed with reference to the state of the law at the date of the letters patent, that the admission of Jews would interfere with the regulations of the school; while the Christian boys were on their knees at prayers, the Jew boys must be allowed to sit—what an example of

insubordination was this? While the Christian boys were attending service on Sundays, the Jew boys would be at play!

The masters were required to be Clergymen of the Church; what a mockery to say to such a master that he must admit Jews, who are to sit while the others are at prayers! A Synagogue was not a place of public worship; within the meaning of the Act it was a place of private worship.

Mr. Shadwell, on the same side, observed, that the Court was now called upon not to determine what ought to be but what was the nature of this Charity, not to make law but to declare it. The Charity was originally founded by letters patent of Edward VI. to which he should call the Court's attention. In these the King, who described himself as *the supreme head of the Church*, founded the school for the cultivation of grammatical learning and good morals; and what were the morals which such a king so describing himself intended to promote? It was well known that King Edward was more firmly attached to the religion of the Church than almost any other of our sovereigns, and could he mean any thing but the spread of that religion?

He did not mean to say that the other object of the King, the promotion of grammatical learning, was inconsistent with the Jewish religion; for he was aware that St. Paul himself, before his conversion, was well versed in the learning of the age, that in his Epistles he even quoted Menander and Euripides. He knew too, that the Jews, down to the time of the Ptolemies, translated the Scriptures into the Greek language; he did not, therefore, mean to take so narrow a ground, as to contend that the Jewish religion was inconsistent with the spread of literature; but as to good morals, it was important to consider what it was that this King *must* have meant.

He contended that Jews were alien enemies, though born in this country. It might be true that modern liberality had softened this, but we were to look what was law when this Charity was established. Calvin's case had been cited, in which it was decided by the twelve judges and the Chancellor, in the reign of James I., that infidels are by law alien enemies, *perpetui inimici*. It was not decorous, perhaps, to mention the reason given by Lord Coke, but so the law was settled. In Coke upon Littleton, title, Dower, the same opinion was expressed; the Jews were considered, it was clear, as a people *sui generis*, altogether under the power of the Crown, which could do what it pleased with their liberties and properties. It was not even necessary, as in case of other aliens, that an office should be formed. The Crown could seize their property at any time. When the

Jew Naturalization Bill was argued in Parliament, in 1753, a great doubt was entertained whether Jews were natural-born subjects, and it was most ably argued by Mr. Fazakerly that they were not. Sir R. Raymond had, he was aware, some years before given a contrary opinion, but he contended that he was wrong in that opinion.

When Jews were tried, the jury used to be *medietatis linguæ*.

Mr. Shadwell then reviewed the Act of George III. regulating the Charity, arguing, that it did not mean to alter its nature in any respect.

The trustees were, generally speaking, to be members of the corporation; now the Corporation Act prevented Jews from belonging to such a body. Blackstone certainly considered that Act as applying not only to sectarians, but also to infidels and Jews, and no one understood better the true and liberal spirit of toleration of the laws of this country.

All notices are under the Act to be given in the parish church; and could it be meant to benefit persons who never went there, and could not, therefore, receive the notice? One of the trusts, which every trustee took an oath to execute was, to maintain the statue of Sir William Harper in repair. Now could a Jew do this? If any thing was prohibited by the Jewish law, it was to set up a graven image of any sort. When it could be shewn that a Jew might keep up a graven image, he was willing to give up the matter.

Good manners and morals were to be supported; now Jewish good manners must be different from Christian good manners. Would the Jews think that good manners were inculcated where nothing of their religion was taught? Could Christians be satisfied without teaching their faith? If Jews and Christians were indiscriminately admitted into the trusteeship, there must spring up an irreconcilable difference of opinion on these points. As Christians they could not teach Judaism, as Jews they could not teach Christianity.

The portions were to be given to persons sending in their *Christian* and surname. When it could be shewn that any Jew ever bore a Christian name, he would give up the argument. This provision, if there were this alone, told in glowing terms, in letters written with a sun-beam, that the persons to take the benefit were to be Christians.

There were to be certificates by the minister of the parish of the good morals of *the persons applying* for the exhibitions; what morals could a minister of the Church think he could certify, but those which were built upon the Christian faith? Could a man in his situation certify a person to be of good morals who placed his faith,

his hope of salvation, upon other grounds than those which, by the law of the land, by the oaths and engagements which he necessarily enters into, such a minister must regard as the rule of faith which he is to inculcate?

The Act enumerates non-attendance at public worship on a Sunday, as an instance of bad behaviour. Mr. Shadwell contended, that this shewed that it intended attendance to be good behaviour, and that it thus pointed out what it meant when it required a certificate of good behaviour from the minister; and how could the minister certify this, in the case of Jews, who keep the Sabbath on another day?

New College, Oxford, was authorized to make the rules and regulations of the schools; one was that prayers should be read twice-a-day: could this be done with any effect if Jewish children were admitted?

Something had been said of persecution. He and his clients denied the charge. They regarded the Jews as a peculiar people, in whose direction the hand of Providence had always been especially manifested; and no persons, endowed with any religious feeling, could wish to persecute a people still marked out in so peculiar a manner, a perpetual miracle before the eyes of the world.

The Lord Chancellor made some objection to the form of the petition. He did not see how the Court could recognize the rulers of the London Synagogues as petitioners, who had no immediate interest in the Charity. Some discussion took place on this point, after which Sir Samuel Romilly proceeded to reply.

Sir Samuel Romilly.—My Lord, the petition presented by my clients is one in itself of the highest importance, but it has become still more so from the manner in which it has been argued. The petitioners did not put themselves forward on this occasion, until a child had been rejected by the trustees, for no other reason than its religious faith; and they then took up the question from a motive which, as men and religious characters, did them the highest honour. My Lord, the arguments on the other side have been numerous and ingeniously put. I shall notice all that appear to me important, as briefly as I can. It was contended, that this is a new and unheard of claim set up by the Jews; whereas, it now turns out that for more than thirty years they have been undisturbed partakers in the Charity. It is, to be sure, most triumphantly stated, that no Jew has ever been a trustee. Very well, we admit it; but why not? Because they have not been in a situation to entitle them to it—they have been always in low circumstances—they have been objects of

the Charity, and it is expressly provided, that no such person shall be eligible as a trustee.

Mr. Shadwell, my Lord, has supposed it impossible to find a minister of the Church of England, who would certify the good morals of a Jew; but it unfortunately happens, that that which Mr. Shadwell supposes to be impossible has actually taken place: it does appear there was a minister to be found, notwithstanding Mr. Shadwell's doubt on the subject, to the honour of human nature, which he had disparaged; it does appear, there was a minister in Bedford of sufficient liberality to think that a person who performed the honest practical duties of all religions, those of acting justly, loving mercy, doing good to his fellow-creatures, and walking humbly with his God, was entitled to a certificate of good morals. I have no doubt he will be equally mistaken with regard to apprentices, and that some Christian master might be found who would go so far as to receive a Jew into his service.

We therefore shew, that so far as regards the practice of this Charity, Jews have actually enjoyed the benefit of it, till most unfortunately some opinion was taken, which gave rise to the present steps on the part of the trustees. There are now but three Jew families in Bedford; and though Mr. Phillimore has pressed very strongly the *obsta principis*, and drawn a frightful picture of the lamentable consequences that would ensue from the preponderance which he has imagined possible to be obtained by the Jews, so as actually to turn the Christians out, the plain truth is, that there once were seven families, and now there are only three.

This case will, my Lord, if the doctrine of the gentlemen on the other side is correct, and sanctioned by the authority of this Court, establish a new epoch in the history of religious disabilities. It will strike at the root of the liberties, the properties of large bodies of individuals, without at the same time having any authority to support it. I deny that what the gentlemen have stated ever was the law of the land. They have, indeed, asserted that it is a decided point, that no Charity for the benefit of Jews can be supported; but what case, what dictum even will they produce in which such a proposition can be found? It is true that the case of *Da Costa* and *De Pas* settled that no institution for the purpose of propagating and teaching the Jewish law could be supported; but what has that to do with the present case? Can it possibly be said that an hospital founded by Jews, for the benefit of Jews, could not be supported by this Court? Hard, indeed, would be their situation, if neither from their brethren nor Christians they could

receive any assistance!—Mr. Shadwell says Jews are still aliens, alien enemies, and can hold no lands; I must again totally deny this. The practice has always, at any rate, been totally different. Did any person ever object to a title because the estate once belonged to a Jew?—These objections are easily taken. If a title has passed through the hands of a crown debtor, a stand is soon made; but did ever any one hear of the objection that a Jew had been the former owner?

It is very well known that the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench is now residing in a house he bought of a Jew—I mean his estate at Roehampton, which he purchased of a Jew, Mr. Goldsmidt. Surely he would not have so done if he had thought a Jew was incapable of holding lands!

What is the meaning of the 14th Geo. II. which makes Jews merely residing seven years in the colonies natural subjects?—The legislature must have been in a great mistake when it passed this act, if the law is as they state it. Well, then, my Lord, what is at last the ground-work, the authority on which all this monstrous superstructure is to be built? It is a dictum of my Lord Coke. I am sorry the gentlemen on the other side should have thought it necessary to revive a stain upon the memory of so great a man, (for a great man he undoubtedly was, though he committed many and great faults,) by calling the Court's attention to such a disgraceful passage. They felt, I am sure, that they were insulting his memory, and had too much respect for it to read the whole passage, as I shall think it my duty to do, (however I may regret the necessity,) because, when such a proposition is made, it is exceedingly important to see the foundation on which it rests.

The whole passage is this, "All Infidels are by law *perpetui inimici*, for between them, as with the devils, whose subjects they be, and the Christian there is perpetual hostility," &c.

But ought it not to be added, that this passage has never scarcely been mentioned by any judge in any court, without the strongest reprobation? In the case of *Ormichund v. Barker*, 1 Atkins, 23, the main reliance was upon the passage, but it was scouted by all the judges who sat on that occasion. Lord Chief Justice Willes particularly remarks, "this notion though advanced by so great a man is contrary to religion, common sense and common humanity; and I think the devils themselves to whom he has delivered them, could not have suggested any thing worse." "Lord Coke is a very great lawyer, but our Saviour and St. Peter are in this respect much better authorities than a person pos-

sessed with such narrow notions." It was, as he observed, a little, mean, narrow notion, to say that no man is *dignus fide* but a Christian.

In the same opinion the other judges concurred, and such has been the invariable course of the courts. As Lord Chief Justice Lee observed in that case, "One rule can never vary, the eternal rule of natural justice."

My Lord, I do not shrink from the dilemma in which the gentlemen have concluded I am placed, namely, that it would follow from my argument, that Mahometans would be entitled to the benefit of this charity: unquestionably they would—I mean, I desire to be understood as going that length; I can see no reason why a Mahometan or the professor of any other religion should be excluded, and I leave it to the gentlemen to point out one if they can.

The gentlemen have contended, that if they could shew any branch of the Charity to be inconsistent with the Jewish worship or doctrine, they have established this proposition, that its professors must be entirely excluded; I confess I cannot admit this. The Charity is for all the poor inhabitants of the town; there are various objects of it requiring different qualifications, and if they can shew that Jews are necessarily deprived of the benefit of one part, surely in fair reasoning this would decide nothing as to the rest. There are various branches of the Charity requiring different classes of, and qualifications from, the respective objects; but how can the fact of a person being in a situation that rendered one branch applicable to him, make him necessarily unfit for the rest?

Let us look to the great extent to which the arguments of the gentlemen would go. If Edward, that most religious of kings, as Mr. Shadwell observes, in founding a charity for preventing the evils to which human nature is subject, is to be considered as contemplating persons only of his own religious opinions, why should this interpretation be given in one case more than another? He founded Saint Thomas's Hospital—is no one but a Christian to be admitted there? On the same principle of exclusion, why should a Jew with a fractured skull or a shattered arm be allowed to come into that hospital? The founder, it ought to be said, could not mean it; the sufferer is a Jew, let him be turned out: such is the consequence of the profound arguments of my learned friends, arguments which I confess I can hear only with astonishment and disgust.

It is true, Jews were not tolerated at the time of the foundation of this Charity, but can the counsel mean to pursue their reasoning and extend it, as they ought to do,

to all persons in that situation? From the way the gentlemen have argued this case, one may suspect that they would have no objection to follow up their reasoning; and certainly it appears to me, that the exclusion, if to be made at all, must extend to all sects, to all but members of the established church. How can a Quaker, for instance, have the benefit of the Charity upon their principles?

My Lord, the gentlemen have dwelt upon the old legal disabilities of the Jews, and have built their argument for exclusion from civil rights upon the opinions and practices of barbarous times, which are to be dignified with the authority of law. The Jews were certainly expelled this country by a violent act of arbitrary power, totally repugnant to every principle of justice, and the whole transaction deserves only to be buried in silence and oblivion, as a disgrace to the country. Libelled and traduced by the calumnies and inventions of bigoted monks, and loaded with imputations of fancied crimes, they were given up as it were to the fury of a deluded populace, their lives and properties were invaded by the hand of rapacious and arbitrary power; but is such a transaction to be held up as the law of the country? Are the Jews to labour under disabilities long ago discarded from the minds of every one, and scouted in every court of justice? Under the auspices of Oliver Cromwell, fortunately a body of industrious and useful citizens was restored to the country, and the Jews have ever since been protected in the exercise of their religion, and in practice, at least, continued in the full enjoyment of civil rights.

If the argument, that the Jews can have no benefit from institutions created during their persecution, be good, how can a Jew have the benefit of the Poor Laws? The Statute of Elizabeth, by the same reasoning, must be held never to have contemplated Jews. In general, to be sure, they have not the benefit of the Poor Laws, for they, much to their credit, generally support their own poor; but while Jews are actually obliged to fill the office of churchwarden and overseer, (and perhaps it will astonish the gentlemen to hear that they do fill such offices,) while they are obliged to bear all the burdens, who is to say that they are to be deprived of the benefit of these institutions of the country?

I contend, that when the Jews were restored to the privileges of subjects under Oliver Cromwell, they became entitled to the benefit of all institutions except such as are necessarily confined to the established religion.

If, however, your Lordship is only to look at the civil condition of the Jews in its lowest state, and to say that as there is no legislative alteration, the prejudices and

bigotry of barbarous and unenlightened times are to form the present rule of decision, then they must be a proscribed people; they must continue to be subject to all the old legal disabilities; the barbarous notions of the dark ages must be maintained; and the Jews must remain, as Mr. Shadwell observes, a perpetual miracle, the perpetual subjects of Christian persecution.

With regard to the statue, Mr. Shadwell in particular has made many observations, through all of which I cannot and do not think it necessary to follow him; he has shewn now (as he has before this done) that he understands the Christian religion, but I cannot think it is quite clear, he understands the Jewish equally well. Upon his construction of the second commandment, not only no Jew, but no Christian could be a trustee; he will hardly contend it is not equally forbidden to one as to the other to set up a graven image for worship: but who is required to fall down and worship Sir William Harper?—What is there in the Jewish faith which prevents the repair of his monument?

With regard, too, to the Test and Corporation Acts, I must think Mr. Shadwell's argument equally inapplicable: he quotes Sir William Blackstone on the subject, and bestows great praises, not undeserved in many respects, to be sure, though I cannot but think he might have chosen a more fortunate instance of the qualities he commends than a passage in which he praises the Test and Corporation Acts. But this argument, if good for any thing, excludes all Christian sects as well as Jews.

If Jews cannot be trustees, because they cannot be members of the corporation, will not this apply equally to all Dissenters?

With regard to the attendance on public worship, I think the phrase used was expressly intended to give the most enlarged privilege; no exclusive words are used. There is no mention of church, of any thing that can confine the benefit of the charity. The intent seems to be merely to require the sober, regular compliance with the religious duties and services, whatever they might be, of the claimant.

It did not, most likely, ever occur to the founder, that Jews might want the benefit of the Charity, and therefore it is not to be wondered that the worship required should be confined to the Sunday; but even with this, a Jew might literally comply. It is not true that the synagogue is not open on a Sunday, it is open every day, and it would not be difficult for a Jew to perform that part of the duty if it was thought proper to require it. Surely it is putting at any rate a very forced construction, to say that these words are to exclude Jews by requiring the performance of an act, which is not at all necessarily incompatible with their habits or worship.

As to the words "*Christian name*," of which so much use has been made, I ask in the first place, what is a Christian name? Does it mean the baptismal name? Then no Anabaptist could have the benefit of the charity: but no one that looks at the clause can doubt the object was merely to have the proper description by which the person was to be known, that is to say, both his names; and *Christian* is the term by which we usually designate the *prænomen*, or first name, in contradistinction to the second, or surname.

With regard to the regulations, if we are to discuss the literal meaning of every expression, you will find it repeatedly said in many passages, that all poor children of Bedford shall be taught. If we are to argue upon words, I say these are stronger than all the obscure, and by-the-by inferences which have been drawn.

The question is of great importance, of immense magnitude indeed, when we regard the principles on which gentlemen have argued it, principles which, say what they will in disclaimer of persecution, amount to this, that the Jews are to continue, as they were in dark and barbarous ages, a proscribed, persecuted people, aliens and enemies by birth, incapable of property and civil rights, in defiance of all the progress which a liberal and enlightened policy has been making, and I trust and hope will continue to make, in discarding such narrow, bigoted notions from the breast of every honest and generous friend of mankind.

My Lord, I leave the case with the most perfect confidence to your decision, satisfied that you will give it the most dispassionate consideration, and that you will reinstate these petitioners in those privileges from which it has so unfortunately been attempted to exclude them.

The Lord Chancellor deferred his judgment, stating the case to be one which he felt to be of the highest importance, and that he would name an early day for its decision.

[We hope to be able, with the assistance of our valuable legal Correspondent, to present our readers with a full and correct report of the Chancellor's judgment in this case, so interesting to the friends of religious liberty. Ed.]

Manchester College, York.

THE thirty-second annual meeting of Trustees of Manchester College, York, was held in Cross-Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Friday, the 7th August, 1818.

Abraham Crompton, Esq. of Lune Villa, near Lancaster, Vice-president, in the Chair.

The proceedings of the Committee since the last annual meeting were read over,

approved and confirmed, and the treasurer's accounts were laid before the meeting, duly audited by Samuel Kay and Edward Baxter, Esquires, and were approved of and passed.

The annual subscriptions discontinued during the last year, from deaths and other causes, were found to amount to 30*l.* 3*s.*; and the new annual subscriptions to 52*l.* 8*s.* The total amount of annual subscriptions for the year amount to 713*l.* 7*s.*, being an increase of 22*l.* 3*s.* on the preceding year.

The benefactions of the year amount to 254*l.* 2*s.*; the congregational collections to 104*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.*; the rents of the Manchester buildings to 288*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.*; exhibitions to students from various funds to 221*l.*; and dividends on stock and interest of money to 285*l.* 5*s.*; making the total receipts of the year 1804*l.* 7*s.* 1*d.*

A sum equal to the amount of the benefactions of the year was ordered to be invested in the Permanent Fund, and the sum of 288*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.* was appropriated to discharge the remainder of the debt on the York Buildings. This appropriation will be immediately carried into effect, and the trustees will henceforth possess that property free from incumbrance, the liberality of the public having enabled the trustees to provide the whole of the purchase-money, and for the expense of the necessary alterations, in the course of the last seven years.

The ordinary charges of the year have been 1334*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.*, which, with the appropriations to the Permanent Fund, and to the York Building Fund, make together 1888*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.* The balance remaining in the treasurer's hands, towards the ensuing year, is 78*l.* 15*s.* 3½*d.*

The thanks of the meeting were unanimously voted to the President, Vice-presidents, Visitor, Treasurer, Secretaries, Committee, Deputy Treasurers and Auditors, for their services during the last year. Joseph Strutt, Esq. of Darley Abbey, near Derby, was re-elected President; James Touchet, Esq. of Manchester, Peter Martineau, Esq. of St. Alban's, Daniel Gaskell, Esq. of Lupsett, near Wakefield, and Abraham Crompton, Esq. of Lune Villa, near Lancaster, were re-elected Vice-presidents. Mr. George William Wood was re-elected Treasurer, and Mr. T. H. Robinson, and the Rev. J. G. Robberds Secretaries.

The committee of last year were re-appointed, with the exception of Mr. John Touchet, the Rev. Joseph Ashton, and Mr. James M'Connell, rendered ineligible by non-attendance; and Mr. James Touchet, Jun., Mr. Thomas Potter, and Mr. Benjamin Heywood, were chosen to supply their places.

The only change made in the deputy treasurers, was occasioned by the resigna-

tion of Thomas William Tottie, Esq. of Leeds; Mr. George Oates, of Leeds, has been requested to act as his successor.

There were thirteen divinity students in the college during last session on the foundation, and two at their own charge, making fifteen in the whole; two of these, Mr. Samuel Wood and Mr. John Haslam, have now finished their studies, and finally quitted the college, as Protestant Dissenting Ministers. The number of lay-students was fourteen. The trustees have hitherto thought it prudent to limit the number of regular foundation students to twelve, not considering their funds as adequate to the permanent support of more. They have, however, been induced, by the present call for ministers, and the great respectability of the applications laid before them this year, on behalf of several of the candidates, to admit for the ensuing session, four additional students as supernumeraries, and the divinity students on the foundation will consequently be sixteen. They trust this measure will be approved of, and they rely with confidence on the exertions of their friends throughout the country, to enable them to make the necessary provision for the increased charge on the establishment, which this addition will occasion.

The prizes given by the president, and by Robert Philips, Esq. for the encouragement of extempore speaking, and of the study of the mathematics, are again offered for the ensuing session, and a new prize of five pounds is offered by an anonymous friend for the best composition in Greek Prose, and another of five guineas by Archibald Kenrick, Esq. of West Bromwich, for the best English Essay on the influence of the Reformation in England.

When the business of the day was concluded, and the chairman had quitted the chair, it was taken by Daniel Gaskell, Esq. and the thanks of the meeting were unanimously given to A. Crompton, Esq. for the favour of his attendance, and for his services in the chair.

The trustees and friends of the Institution afterwards dined together as usual, at the Bridgewater Arms, Manchester, to celebrate the thirty-second anniversary of the foundation of the College,—Daniel Gaskell, Esq., of Lupsett, near Wakefield, one of the Vice-presidents, in the chair. About seventy gentlemen assembled, and the evening was spent in a cheerful and pleasant manner.

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

N. B. Mr. John James Tayler, formerly of Manchester College, York, Bachelor of Arts of the University of Glasgow, has

been this day appointed Assistant Classical Tutor in Manchester College, York.

Manchester, Sept. 21, 1818.

The Rev. Mr. Wells.

[Extract from a Letter from Stourbridge, dated Sunday evening, September 13, 1818.]

HAVING been this morning at a meeting, house in Stourbridge, of which the late Mr. Carpenter was minister, and having heard a Mr. Wells from North America, whose discourse excited peculiar interest; I send you a short account of some circumstances respecting this gentleman, and his present journey.

He is a native of England, and was formerly minister of a dissenting congregation at Bromsgrove in Worcestershire: but feeling some repugnance at the spirit of party and violence, which was shewn against the Dissenters, in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, after the disgraceful riots of 1791, about the year 1793, he retired to the United States in North America; where he has since resided. But feeling the attachment to his native land return upon him, he ventured to revisit it, though at the advanced age of 75 years.

His sermon, this morning, seemed to be in coincidence with the feelings and sentiments that would naturally arise from the circumstances of his visit and age. His text was, "One generation passeth away and another cometh." In treating of which, he took a most interesting view of human vicissitudes and mortality. I will not pretend, from memory, to communicate a general epitome of the discourse; but two or three observations so exactly suited his age and visit, that I wish I could communicate them in his own words. They were somewhat to the following purpose:

"When a person far advanced in life, looks over his native district, he finds a strong illustration of my text. The companions of his youth, the acquaintance of maturer years, are almost all departed; and a new race is filling their places. I find many of the buildings standing, but the builders themselves are fallen! The farms are still cultivated, but where are the former proprietors and occupiers?"

He made some very just observations, on the power and goodness of God, as exemplified in the creation and support of the many millions of creatures which inhabit the earth; which, though they are continually dying off, are still succeeded by others: so that existence, though not to the same individuals, is still kept up, and benevolently supported.

The aged appearance of this venerable visitor, and his preaching in a *black velvet*

cap, excited some curiosity; and his discourse being full of good sense, and remarkably suited to the circumstances of his case and age, excited great attention.

Union of the Seceders in Ireland.

(From the *Newry Telegraph*.)

WE are happy to learn that the division which has so long existed in that respectable religious body, the Seceders of Ireland, is now at length terminated, and the distinctive epithets of *Burgher* and *Antiburgher*, in this country, are now no more. At a meeting of the two Synods, in Cookstown, the coalescence was finally settled; and after the dissolution of the respective Synods, they constituted themselves into one body, under the name of the "Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name of Seceders."

Fellowship Funds.

THESE useful institutions are becoming more numerous and effective. Our limits will not allow us to state at large the proceedings of any of them, but we shall always be glad to report concisely their establishment and progress. There are now lying before us the annual reports of two of them, viz. those of Exeter and Birmingham.

EXETER.

The annual meeting of the Exeter Fund Fellowship Society was held, Sunday Evening, August 16, the Rev. James Manning, President, in the Chair. After a short devotional service, the Rev. W. Hincks read the Report, which was highly gratifying. The number of members is 185. The income of the year has been 45*l.* 2*s.* It is recommended in the Report that the business of the Society be transacted, not by a Committee, but by quarterly general meetings, agreeably to the suggestion of the late Dr. Thomson, in pp. 301, 302, of our present volume: the design of the proposed alteration is to promote true Christian fellowship. A wish is expressed for intercourse with neighbouring Fellowship Funds. The number of collectors was enlarged from 12 to 18; among whom we are pleased to observe 10 ladies. The meeting concluded with singing a hymn.

BIRMINGHAM.

The annual meeting of the New Meeting Christian Fellowship Fund, was held July 5; the number of members is 236. The sum of 54*l.* 14*s.* was subscribed last year. An admirable report was read from the Committee, which is given entire in the *Christian Reformer* of the present month,

pp. 426—428. The following passage is a deserved and eloquent tribute of gratitude and respect to the memory of Dr. John Thomson, to whom these Funds owe their existence:

"Your Committee, and, doubtless, many of yourselves, have often reflected with gratitude and admiration upon the piety and zeal of a gentleman eminently gifted in intellectual as well as moral endowments, who first recommended the institution of Fellowship Funds among Unitarians, and in conformity with whose suggestions our Association professes to be framed. It has pleased Divine Providence to remove him, in the prime of life, from this transitory and imperfect state. That most awful event will not fail to suggest many solemn lessons. To each of us it gives this warning, 'Arise and be doing;' for none of us can have a more reasonable prospect of a lengthened life than our late able and active friend. We know however that, ere death put a sudden stop to his useful and honourable labours, his attachment to the cause of truth and goodness had been abundantly blest by the rapid and almost simultaneous formation of many Societies formed upon the plan which he had pointed out. Through their united operation, the benefits of his generous and enlightened piety will long continue to be felt. By him the root was planted, and already, when scarcely two years have elapsed, the firm and flourishing trunk has sent forth its branches from sea to sea: many in all quarters of our island meet, to hold sweet converse together beneath its pleasant shade; and it presents, to the eye of faith, the certain and ennobling prospect of being rich in everlasting fruit. What, brethren, could afford a more animating call upon every one of us to avail ourselves, before it is too late, of the means which in our several stations we all enjoy of aiding the progress of Christian truth and practice, and thus contributing to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men?"

Unitarian Congregation, Alnwick.

WE trust we shall be excused for calling the attention of our readers, and especially such of them as have the management of the Fellowship Funds, to the case of this congregation, stated in our last Number, p. 530, with so powerful a recommendation as that of the Rev. W. Turner, of Newcastle. In addition to that gentleman, we are desired to name Mr. David Eaton, Bookseller, 187 High Holborn, as a receiver of subscriptions, on account of the Alnwick Chapel.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;
OR,
The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

A RETURN to peace, the state for which rational beings are formed, and which it is a main object of the gospel to produce, changes greatly the appearance of the political world. The mind of the politician is relieved from the disgusting occurrences occasioned by war; but at the same time, the evils that it has produced will engage greatly his attention. It must necessarily have introduced a great change in the moral system; and they who have been engaged in the havoc of war, cannot easily bring themselves to the useful occupations of peace. Each country has its peculiar difficulties to encounter, and in our own, one of a very alarming nature has presented itself, which may require all the skill and prudence of the legislature to get the better of.

It is now many years since the pernicious system was introduced by Mr. Pitt, of substituting a paper for a metallic currency. This was done by prohibiting a banking company from paying its own notes in specie, and making those notes the current payment for all other notes of the different banking companies in the kingdom. The consequence was, that gold disappeared, silver was raised in nominal value, and tokens were issued by the bank to represent the silver coinage of the country. The plan was very simple; the bank originally issued notes, promising to pay on demand the sum in sterling money, mentioned in the note, and at the origin of this company, from the natural fear of having a run upon it, care was taken to insure a supply of cash by a small premium to persons to produce it on due notice.

On a sudden appeared the fatal order in council, under the auspices of Mr. Pitt, and of course not without due representation from and consultation with the bank, that it should no longer be answerable as usual for its notes; and instead of paying the holder of a note of a hundred pounds on demand, all that it would do was to break this note for him, and to give him in exchange other notes, with the same promise to pay on demand the smaller sums, which together made up the original note tendered for payment.

The natural result of this measure was a prodigious rise in the nominal value of bank stock, and a very great increase in its half-yearly dividends to its proprietors. In fact, the latter was a necessary consequence of the former, provided the country was satisfied with the new arrangement. The bank was now enabled to extend its discounts almost without limit, and the whole commercial world lay at its mercy.

It might be presumed, that the bank had nothing to do but to coin bank paper upon any purpose in which money was wanted; but it is said that this was never done, and a note was never issued but in exchange for the paper of a merchant, whose credit was established, or upon other deemed good security.

Thus, if a merchant stood in need of ten thousand pounds for a present payment, and had good bills of two months' date, these were presented to the bank, which advanced the ten thousand pounds, on receiving bills, which at the end of that time brought home to the bank ten thousand pounds in its bills, and also the amount of interest for the sum advanced for that time. Thus in every six months was a return made to the bank of notes above those advanced, which being divided among the proprietors, paid off their dividends in whole or in part, or, being withheld, made a fund for new advances. This, of course, was a very gainful traffic. Besides this, it advanced to government its bills, for which it received in return exchequer bills, carrying an interest; and, besides, it had in circulation an immense quantity of notes, on which, not being obliged to keep gold in reserve to answer the demand, the gain was very great both as capital, for which no interest was paid, and also as a gainful capital by the destruction of many of these notes by fire or other accidents.

It is no wonder then, that the gains of the bank were greater, probably, than those ever made by a similar institution. Its concerns became more and more implicated with those of government, which at last was in the situation of an heir borrowing money of his steward. It is ready to pay in cash the moment its demands on government are settled, but when that time will come remains very problematical.

Such a change in the affairs of a country could not be without some necessary results. A government may do what it pleases in its own realm, but its laws do not bind other countries; and it was soon found that a bank pound was very different from a sterling pound, or to use the vulgar language of the times, the guinea was raised in value. This was a misnomer; the guinea was not altered, but the things given in exchange for it were altered; and when a pound note and six shillings was the usual value of a guinea, it was only saying that the bank note did not stand, as it did before, for twenty twenty-one parts of a guinea, but for a much less sum. Hence naturally arose a change in the value of all commodities,

particularly those received from a foreigner, to whom it is a matter of indifference by what name the current coin goes, whether in twenty-shilling notes or guineas, as he makes his bargain on the return to be made to him in some commodity of the country for what he sent to it: and if his commodity is valued in bank paper, he must have as much of it as will answer the demand for the commodity, which he deems an equivalent to it; and consequently the consumer of the foreign commodity must pay more of this fictitious bank paper, than he was accustomed to do of the real bank paper, or that paper which faithfully performed its promise.

But the great change in the price of commodities was not the only consequence of Mr. Pitt's measure. The circulation of paper money being greatly extended, it became in common use with the lower classes, who were little qualified to distinguish between a real and a forged note. And hence forgeries of this fictitious paper became numerous, far beyond any former example, or any thing that Mr. Pitt could have expected: for, if he could have foreseen the number of executions for forgery that have since taken place, the number of transportations, the number of trials, the mode of the processes at law, rash as he was, he might have been appalled at a measure so dreadful in its consequences.

A general alarm on this subject pervades the country. The evil is universally felt, and humanity shudders at it. Supposing we were to allow, which we are very far from doing, that death is the due punishment for forgery; still, when it is seen that it produces no abatement in the crime, but on the contrary, occasions a very extraordinary mode of procedure in the prosecutors themselves, the expediency of this punishment may be justly called in question. How much more sensibly affected, then, must those persons be, who deem the punishment of death to be too great for the crime! A system has been adopted, that the mercy of the crown should not be extended to those who are convicted of forgery: but the number of persons who may be brought into this predicament is so great, that the prosecutor himself interferes, and exhorts his culprits to plead guilty to the minor offence, that they may avoid the greater punishment: that they would subject themselves to transportation, instead of terrifying their countrymen by an execution. In the last sessions at the Old Bailey many availed themselves of this supposed lenity in the prosecutor: but one woman could not be brought to this plea of minor guilt, and after a trial for the higher crime was acquitted. This instance leads to suspicions, that fear for their lives may induce innocent persons to subscribe to this plea of guilty of the minor offence, and expiate in a foreign clime their imaginary guilt.

Another circumstance presses on the mind with respect to the persons thus charged with guilt. It rests with the prosecutor to select from the number of the tried, those whom he may deem proper for execution, and leave the others for transportation. But here his discrimination may not be correct, and on comparing notes with each other, some of the transported persons may really be far guiltier than those left for execution: and as it is now the custom that the severity of the law is to be exercised upon all found guilty of the higher crime, a manifest degree of partiality may be exercised. For, supposing all that now consent to plead guilty of the minor offence were to be tried for the higher offence, and on being found guilty their cases were represented to the Prince, the guiltiest only would be left for execution, and the rest would suffer the punishment for the minor offence. It should seem that the case of these unhappy people ought rather to be left to the Prince than to the Bank solicitor.

The papers mention a case, which requires an examination into the mode of procedure, with respect to the guilt even of the accused. It has been thought sufficient that the inspector of the Bank should pronounce on the forgery: but it may be asked, is his judgment in this respect to be so implicitly relied on? Has the Bank never pronounced a note to be forged, which really was not so? The papers state that a note has been stamped with forgery, but the possessor of it has denied the fact, and got a good note from the Bank in return for it.

The proprietors of the Bank themselves sympathize with the public on the number of prosecutions for this offence. At their last meeting it was brought forward, and the desire of some change in the system was manifested. A committee has also been appointed by government to examine into the means of rendering forgery more difficult, and a difficult task it has undertaken. For as long as the number of small notes continues as great as it is at present, the temptation and the facility of passing forged ones are so great, that little is to be expected from any thing in the execution of them to prevent the crime. One way of diminishing the number of prosecutions is obvious; and that is, by removing from circulation all notes under ten pounds: but the objections to this measure seem, in the present state of things, to be almost insurmountable.

The question will, most probably, come early before the legislature. Humanity is interested in the discussions; it is impossible to go on much longer on the present system. Let it be recollected, that human life is too valuable to be sacrificed to the interest of a company, and with this thought in view, it may not be impos-

sible to devise some scheme, which shall not be so much at variance with our feelings. The legislators will naturally look to those countries where forgery is, and where it is not, a capital crime: and if it is found that it is less frequent where the punishment is not capital, surely it will be worth while to try the experiment in our own, and there is little doubt that the advantage to the country will be on the side of the milder punishment.

We regret to notice the confusion that has arisen in the North, from disputes between the manufacturers and their employers. Attempts have been made to connect it with some political disputes, but it seems to be merely a question of wages. In such a case there must necessarily be much difficulty, but one point is certain, that combination either by masters or men is unjustifiable; and force used to prevent workmen from using their labour as they please, calls for force to resist it. Strange that the term force should be so often used in a country professing to be guided by the principles of the gospel.

Another child has been given for a very short space of time to the Bourbon family. It lived long enough, however, for a bishop to administer to it, what is called the rite of baptism or christening, and thus to entitle it to what is called Christian burial. What farther benefit was conferred on the child we leave to the advocates of infant-baptism, to determine, being satisfied in our own minds, that whether the rite be performed by a bishop or by an Unitarian minister, according to the ritual lately drawn up for this purpose, Christianity has nothing to do with it. The child was deposited in solemn pomp in the tomb of its ancestors, and the high-sounding titles with which it was decorated mark only the vanity of human grandeur.

Baden has obtained a representative constitution, and thus set an example to the other states of Germany. This is a great step gained in that vast empire, and is the forerunner of other improvements. With respect to religious liberty the inhabitants of Baden are on a better footing than those of this country. Every inhabitant enjoys undisturbed freedom of conscience, and equal protection with respect to his religious worship: but this, which is a great point, and with which the Christian may be well contented, does not come up to the liberty which the true Christian would grant to every man; for he would not permit his religion to be made the ground for a civil distinction. In Baden, however, civil privileges are granted equally to the three great sects that prevail in the duchy: for by one article it is declared, that the political rights of the three Christian religions are equal. We know of only one Christian religion, and one Christian church, even that which

worships the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and acknowledges our Saviour to be its Head. By the three Christian religions are meant the three sects—the Popish, the Lutheran, and the Calvinist: and though the members of our faith are excluded from enjoying the political rights allowed to these sects, we rejoice that the Sectarians can permit each other to participate in them. To be a representative, a person must be a member of one of these sects; we do not perceive, however, any test by which they are to be distinguished. On admission to the diet, they merely take an oath of fidelity to the sovereign, and of acting for the advantage of the country, without respect to orders or classes. The nature of the liberty of the press is not decided; this is to be regulated by the diet, but probably it will be very extensive, as the article of book-making, reviews and journals, is of some consequence in a trading point of view, and may, if it is unshackled by the restraints of neighbouring powers, increase considerably the exports of this small duchy. The production of this constitution before the meeting of the Holy Alliance is very fortunate, as, if any regulations were intended by the royal personages to check the rising spirit of inquiry and general liberty, there will be at least some obstacles to their introduction into one part of Germany.

As the time approaches for the mighty masters of mankind to deliberate on the future state of Europe, which most probably will turn out very different from their decisions, their subjects are every where forming plans for them. The removal of the armies from France, and the future condition of the Spanish colonies, are great points in these discussions. On the former they may act as they please: happily the latter is not within their power. They may, should they think proper, decide that Ferdinand is the legitimate sovereign of Spanish America, and that his claim is to be supported by the *ultima ratio regum*, the power of the sword: but happily, a great body of waters is between them and the parties who think that they also have an interest in these questions, that they have been misgoverned for a sufficient length of time, and that the meaning of the term legitimate is to be derived as well from the first author who made use of it, as from later commentators. Livy tells us, that by it is to be understood the choice of the people; and there is little reason to imagine that the inhabitants of the Spanish colonies will choose to exchange their independence for the dominion of a Bourbon, and particularly a Spanish Bourbon. The reports from America still give very varying accounts; but Buenos Ayres and Chili seem to be clearly emancipated from despotism and the terrors of the Inquisition.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, in Defence of the Unitarian Faith. 12mo. 6s.

The Remonstrance of a Unitarian, addressed to the Bishop of St. David's. By Captain James Gifford, R. N. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

An Elucidation of the Unity of God, deduced from Scripture and Reason, addressed to Christians of all Denominations. By (the late) James Gifford. Fifth edition, enlarged, to which is subjoined, A Letter from the Author to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. Third edition, with Additions. 8vo. 5s.

The Morality of the New Testament, from the 4to. edition of 1765, in Nos. VII. VIII and IX. of the Philosophical Library. Vol. II. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

A Vindication of Unitarianism; in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. By James Yates, M. A. Second Edition. 8s.

The Juvenile Tourist. By John Evans, A. M. Fourth Edition. Maps, &c. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Juvenile Pieces, designed for the Youth of both Sexes. By John Evans, A. M. Sixth Edition. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

A Treatise on the Being and Attributes of God; with an Appendix on the Immateriality of the Soul. By William Bruce, D. D. 8vo. 8s.

A Letter to Sir S. Romilly, M. P. from H. Brougham, Esq., M. P. on the Abuse of Charitable Funds, with an Appendix of Evidence. 4s.

Half-a-Dozen Odd Thoughts on a National Liturgy. 1s.

Narrative of the Mission at Otaheite and

other Islands in the South Seas, commenced by the London Missionary Society, in the year 1797, with a Map and Geographical Description. Published by Order of the Directors. 2s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Life and Character of Mrs. Mary Savage, eldest daughter of the Rev. Philip Henry. By J. B. Williams. With a Preface by the Rev. W. Jay. 3s.

Harvest; a Poem, in Two Parts: with other Poetical Pieces. By Charlotte Caroline Richardson. Demy 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Cambridge Prize Poems: being a complete Collection of English Poems, which have obtained the Chancellor's Gold Medal in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 5s.

A Catalogue of American Books, on sale at Souter's, St. Paul's Church-Yard, with their Prices. 1s.

An Irrefragable Solution of that hitherto dark Scripture Enigma, the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, thoroughly rendering both Tables consistent, and demonstrably and incontestably proving Joseph to have been his proper, his natural Parent. By John Gorton. 1s.

The History of the Jews, from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the present Time. By Hannah Adams, of Boston, America. 12s.

Inquiries respecting the Punishment of Death for Forgery and other Crimes without Violence. By Basil Montagu, Esq. 2s. 6d.

An Inquiry into some of the most curious and interesting Subjects of History, Antiquity and Science. By Thomas Moir, Member of the College of Justice, Edinburgh. 12mo. 4s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Rev. W. Turner; W. H.; L.; Dr. John Walker; Mrs. Mary Hughes; F.; U. C.; Brevis; and D. W.

ERRATA.

- Page 496, column 1, line 29 from bottom, for *favourable*, read *favoured*.
 Page 497, column 2, line 2 from bottom, for *a hundred*, read *a hundred years*.
 Page 498, first paragraph, last sentence, leave out the marks of quotation.
 Page 517, line 33, column 2, for *in* read *to*.
 Page 518, line 18, column 1, should have been printed as a poetical quotation as well as the next. So also *Note* in column 1, page 519.
 Page 520, line 15 from bottom of column 1, for *Fermor* read *Fermoy*.
 Page 520, line 4 of column 2, for *Greg's* read *Grey's*.