

THE Monthly Repository

No. 1. JANUARY, 1820. Vol. XV.

An Account of the Life and Writings of RAMMOHUN ROY, a learned Brahmin, and of the New Sect in India, of which he is the Founder.

[We have already introduced the Hindoo Reformer to our readers, XIII. 299 and 512, and XIV. 561—569. We now lay before them a further account of this interesting man, translated from a French pamphlet, lately sent to us from Paris, by the Abbé Gregoire, formerly Bishop of Blois. This pamphlet has been since inserted in the *Chronique Religieuse*. The biographical part of the article is a communication to the Abbé from Bengal, drawn up in French by M. d'Acosta, an Asiatic well versed in the languages, history and antiquities of India, and the present Editor of *The Times*, at Calcutta: the concluding remarks upon Rammohun Roy's system and writings are by the Abbé himself. Our translation is literal, which we premise, as a matter of justice to ourselves, should any of the statements appear questionable. We have reason to believe that the *Monthly Repository* is read in India, and we, therefore, take this opportunity of requesting communications from our readers in that part of the world on this subject, or any other within the province of our work. Ed.]

RAMMOHUN ROY BANOUDJIA is the son of Ram Hant Roy, and the grandson of Roy Bry Binad. The latter resided at Mourshedabad; he filled some important offices under the Moguls, but was ill-used by those despots towards the end of his life, which circumstance led his son, Ram Hant Roy, to take up his abode in the district of Bordouan, where he rented land of the English government. Rammohun Roy was born in Bordouan about the year 1780. He there beneath his father's roof received the elements of education, and also acquired the Persian language; he was afterwards sent to Patna to learn the Arabic, and lastly to Calcutta to obtain knowledge of the Sanscrit. His masters at Patna gave him Arabic translations of some of the writings of Aristotle and of Euclid to study. Pro-

bably the nature of those works, and the intimacy which he formed at an early age with Mahometans whom he seems to have esteemed, contributed both to shake his faith in the Brahminical religion, and to lead him to the design and the means of examining other religious systems. It is not credible that his masters intended to give such latitude to his mind; for although there are in India many intelligent and well-informed Mahometans, yet there is not one of them who, with respect to religion, is otherwise than intolerant. At nineteen or twenty years of age, Rammohun Roy was not a believer in any one of the three religions which came under his observation; that is to say, the Mahometan, the Christian, or the Hindoo. At that time he knew very little of the English tongue, and that little he had taught himself. The awe with which his father inspired him prevented the open acknowledgment of his scepticism; but from some indirect reproaches which he received, he imagines that he had fallen under his suspicion; the father, however, was too sincerely a Hindoo to conceive the extent or the cause of his son's incredulity, and he undoubtedly attributed the young man's apparent irregularities merely to the thoughtlessness of youth. We may here remark, that the education which he gave to his son was, for the country in which he lived, of a very superior kind. Brought up himself in the midst of a Mussulman court, he was inclined to give the young man those qualifications that would recommend him to the ancient conquerors of India, rather than to the more recent, in whose language even he did not have him instructed: the Sanscrit, which he caused him to learn, could be intended only to support his Brahminical rank.

Ram Hant Roy died about the year 1804 or 1805, after having divided his property, two years before this period, among his three sons, in order to prevent all disputes on the subject. The eldest son died shortly after. Rammohun Roy then became the elder, and in

a short time the only survivor. From this period, he appears to have conceived his plans of reform; he thought it expedient to quit Bordouan, where he had resided but little, and removed to Mourshedabad; he there published, in Persian, with an Arabic preface, a work, entitled *Against the Idolatry of all Religions*. No one undertook to refute this book; but the host of enemies which it raised up against the author, among the Mahometans and Hindoos, obliged him to retire to Calcutta in the year 1814. This step points out the limit of British influence in India; for though all the places hitherto inhabited by him were equally under the authority of the English government, they were not equally influenced by English manners. At Calcutta, Rammohun Roy applied himself more seriously to the study of the English tongue, both by reading and conversation. He learnt a little Latin of an English schoolmaster, named Pritchard; and a German, of the name of Makay, a man of a philosophic turn of mind, instructed him in the mathematics. He purchased a garden, with a house constructed in the European mode, in the Circular-Road, at the eastern extremity of the town.

Rammohun Roy found means to recommend his religious opinions to a dozen of his countrymen, all distinguished for their rank and opulence; and with their aid he has founded a sect, which may comprise a thousand disciples. To conciliate the Europeans, he has not only given the appellation *Unitarian* to this sect, but likewise declares, that his morality is no other than that of the gospel. The members of the sect unite every Sunday at the dwelling of Rammohun Roy, where they eat, drink, and sing hymns in Sanscrit and Bengalee to the honour of the only true God. Rammohun Roy is the most respectable individual amongst them; the only one, perhaps, who is really so: the rest are little known, with the exception of one named Kamo, a man of great wealth, and excessively fond of spirituous liquors. We may easily imagine, that the Hindoos, from their attachment to the Vedas, earnestly set themselves against innovation: Rammohun Roy has been attacked in various ways; but his intelligence, his firmness, his knowledge, joined to the affluence he enjoys,

have prevented his losing caste, a species of excommunication, that his countrymen would gladly have subjected him to; which would be a dreadful punishment, since it would deprive him of the society even of his wife and his only son. To the causes enumerated for his exemption from this punishment, we should add the entertainment he gives daily (actuated by prudence, equal to his ardour for reform) to a certain number of Brahmins, who are thereby led to take a personal interest in the defence of him; for if they had once eaten at his table, they would be all involved in the excommunication deserved by him. This proves how impotent, under certain circumstances, those institutions become which are not founded on nature and reason; and how their contrivances may be turned against themselves. If this be true respecting the Hindoo system, which of all the ancient institutions has preserved most of its primitive harshness, how much more is it applicable to all the others!

Whatever be the abstract merit of Rammohun Roy, there is, probably, throughout India no Brahmin who is less a Brahmin and less a Hindoo than he; and thousands of dupes who have suffered the loss of their caste have been less offenders against the peculiarities of their religion than he.

Rammohun Roy, considering that youth is the period most adapted to the reception of novelties, either good or bad, has established a school at his own expense, where fifty children are taught Sanscrit, English and Geography. How slender soever these attempts at reform may appear, they will, probably, more or less rapidly attain their object; aided as they are by European influence, and, above all, by the art of printing. It is against the division of his countrymen into castes that Rammohun Roy's correcting hand is turned, and in that the strength of his judgment is evinced. The distinction of castes may be regarded as the cement of the polytheism and the other errors prevalent in India: let that distinction disappear, and all the Hindoo superstitions will crumble beneath the touch of human reason. It is the division into castes, carried to a frightful excess, which consolidates the Hindoo system, by incorporating it with the daily habits of domestic life.

In fact, European institutions themselves are not altogether exempt from the influence of this vicious principle: legitimacy, taken as an absolute rule; hereditary nobility, and the privileges of the first-born, are the same thing; or rather, are remnants of it, which cannot without difficulty be destroyed.

Rammohun Roy, adapting his measures to the place and the times in which he lives, as well as the sort of men he is attempting to enlighten, does not oppose the institution of castes by abstract reasonings, (for they would be useless,) but by the authority of the Vedant, which he is careful not to bring into disrepute, and of which he professes to be but the commentator. The discretion which regulates his conduct prevents any action revolting to the prejudices of his fellow-sectaries, or capable of affording an excuse for his exclusion. He has, nevertheless, risen above many littlenesses: he scruples not to seat himself with an European who is eating; sometimes he even invites Europeans to his house, and treats them according to their own taste. Far, however, from wishing to lose his Brahminical dignity, it is upon *that* he founds his enterprise; asserting that it is his duty, as a Brahmin, to instruct his countrymen in the sense and in the real commands of their sacred books. His efforts are directed towards the destruction of that prejudice which prevents the different castes from eating together. He considers that this amelioration is the most essential, and will effect every other, even the *political* amelioration of his country—and this is an object to which he is not indifferent. Every six months he publishes a little tract, in Bengalee and in English, developing his system of theism; and he is always ready to answer the pamphlets published at Calcutta or Madras in opposition to him. He takes pleasure in this controversy; but although far from deficient in philosophy, or in knowledge, he distinguishes himself more by his logical mode of reasoning than by his general views. He appears to feel the advantage which it gives him with the Methodists, some of whom are endeavouring to convert him. He seems to have prepared himself for his polemical career from the logic of the Arabians, which he regards as superior to every other; he asserts likewise, that he has found nothing in

European books equal to the scholastic philosophy of the Hindoos.

We may easily imagine that a man who has raised himself so much above the level of his countrymen by his intellectual attainments, cannot exactly resemble them in his conduct. He not only refrains from their superstitious practices, (which is not saying much in his favour, since he might do so from various causes not highly laudable,) but, what is much more important, all his conversation, his actions and manners evince a powerful sentiment of individual dignity; whilst, in general, meanness and feebleness of mind are characteristic of the Hindoo. Influenced, like those around him, with the spirit of order, economy and knowledge of the value of money, acquired by their mercantile education, Rammohun Roy does not view the augmentation of property as the most important object: his fortune consists of the wealth he received from his ancestors: he does not give his mind to any kind of commercial speculation. He would consider that mode of life beneath his station and the duties of a Brahmin. He derives no pecuniary advantage from his works; and, in all probability, desirous as he may be of power and distinction, he would not accept of the Government any place that should be merely lucrative; to *solicit* one of any description he would not condescend. It is not likely, however, that the Government will make trial of his inclination: it would not suit the policy of the present masters of his country to give encouragement to a subject whose soul is so lofty, and whose ingenuous conversation often shews, in a strain half serious and half jesting, all that he wishes to be able to do for his country. He cultivates a friendly connexion with many Europeans, distinguished by their rank or their merit; he appears not to seek connexions of any other kind. Within the last year or two he has been less in society than formerly.

Rammohun Roy, as has already been shewn, is not yet forty years old; he is tall and robust; his regular features and habitually grave countenance assume a most pleasing appearance when he is animated. He appears to have a slight disposition to melancholy. The whole of his conversation and manners shew, at first sight, that he is

above mediocrity. He frequently talks of going into Europe, but apparently considers it desirable first to mollify so far the prejudices of his countrymen, that he may not by that voyage, which is regarded as unlawful, expose himself to excommunication. It is very doubtful whether he will succeed in this attempt; the hope, however, which he cherishes, is a decided proof of the character of his mind. It may here be remarked, that almost every man who has done more in this world than come into life, exist a time, and die, has proposed to himself some object of this nature; not chimerical, yet distant and difficult of attainment, which may continually impel him to exertion, support him through his arduous career with the ennobling conviction of not living in vain, and invigorate him, and charm away the pain of occasional disappointments, with the certainty of leaving at least some worthy object of pursuit for a future generation.

It is singular that this philosophic Indian, who, as has been shewn in this little sketch, has enlarged views respecting the amelioration of the men of his country, has not the least idea of improving the females; of whom he avoids even the mention. We must suppose that this sort of prejudice, inspired by the Shasters, though general amongst the Hindoos, has been perpetuated in so enlightened a mind only by the circumstances of Rammohun Roy's domestic life: it is known that every member of his family verifies the proverb, by opposing with the greatest vehemence all his projects of reform. None of them, not even his wife, would accompany him to Calcutta; in consequence of which, he rarely visits them in Bordouan, where they reside. They have disputed with him even the superintendence of the education of his nephews; and his fanatical mother shews as much ardour in her incessant opposition to him, as he displays in his attempts to destroy the idolatry of the Hindoos.

Calcutta, Nov. 8, 1818.

Amongst the works sent over from Bengal is an English translation, printed in December 1818, of a conference, originally written in *Bungla*, against the custom of burning widows alive on the funeral pile of their husbands. In the countries in which that detestable

usage obtains, an extensive circulation has been given to this little anonymous tract, whose author is undoubtedly Rammohun Roy. His name is in the title-page of the other writings about to be mentioned, published in Bengalee and Hindoostanee, and then in English: in all of them his object is to combat the polytheism of his countrymen from their sacred books; to convince them of the unity of God, and to detach them from idolatry, and from the prejudices of the castes.

The first of these is entitled "Translation of the Ishopanishad, one of the Chapters of the Yajur Veda; which proves the Unity and Incomprehensibility of God, &c. By Rammohun Roy. 8vo. Calcutta. 1816." There is a long and well-written preface to this tract. The author puts under requisition the sacred books which contain the doctrines, the history, and the literature of the Hindoos, the *Veds*, and all the writings of the most celebrated authors, the *Puranas*, the *Tantras*, and the *Shasters*; and, by a great variety of quotations, proves that they have all admitted the unity of God. Some of these works, indeed, appear to contradict themselves, by speaking of many gods and goddesses; but this is reconciled by their declaring frequently that homage paid to material beings is allowable only for persons incapable of elevating their minds to the idea of a supreme, invisible Being; that this mode of worship, gross as it is, may form a bridle to vicious desires, but that idolatry should be despised by all whose understanding is more cultivated.

Many well-informed Brahmins are convinced of the absurdity of polytheism; but its rites and festivals being a source of wealth to them, a means of turning the credulity, the weakness and the patience of the Hindoos to their own profit, they desire not to put an end to superstition; on the contrary, they encourage it, and keep the people from the knowledge of the truth. Their adherents also feel satisfaction in the idea that the divine nature dwells in living men, whom they transform into gods; yet that they resemble other men in their birth, outward appearance and passions. This false notion, pleasing to the senses, is destructive of the principles of morality. A Hindoo who makes or purchases an

idol, fails not, to consecrate it, by ceremonies, by means of which he believes it becomes animated with the pretended god which it represents, and that a supernatural power is conferred on this vain image. If it be of the masculine sex, he marries it to another of the feminine gender, with all the magnificence of nuptial ceremonies. From that moment the idol is considered the arbiter of his destiny; he pays his adorations to it; offers it food morning and evening; if the weather be hot, refreshes it by the use of a fan; if cold, he places it at night in a comfortable bed.

Some Europeans of little information on the subject, Rammohun Roy says, have propagated the opinion, that the idols of the Hindoos were but symbolical beings, employed to lead the soul to the contemplation of the Divine attributes. The details just given prove the erroneousness of this opinion. It has, nevertheless, been adopted by many of the Hindoos who, beginning to feel the absurdity of their worship, are eager to escape the ridicule and shame attached to it, by means of this subterfuge. This circumstance, says the Reformer, gives strength to my hope of seeing them one day abjure their superstitions to embrace the worship of the one God, as prescribed by the *Vedas*, and taught by common sense.

About the middle of the last century, the religion of the Hindoos deteriorated, especially in Bengal, so that on some essential points they differ from the natives of Behar, Tirhoot and Benares; and have estranged themselves from their ancient worship, to adopt an idolatry denominated the religion of the *Tuttras*, in opposition to that of the *Vedas*. This idolatry, chiefly of modern date, is more revolting than that of the Greeks and Romans, since it is not only childish and impure like theirs, but still more inimical to the principles of virtue: for the mythology of the Hindoos offers to their imitation the most infamous sensuality, ingratitude, cunning and treachery; all which is the work of the Brahmins, interested in encouraging vices which to them are a fruitful source of gain.

It is to be expected that Rammohun Roy should be an object of hatred to these men; and certainly nothing but

the high repute in which he is held by the public for his wealth, talents and acquirements, could shield him from their malice and persecution. Only two tracts in defence of idolatry have been published against him: the first was contained in the *Journal of Madras*, and was answered by Rammohun Roy; the second is an *Apology for the present System of Hindoo Worship*, by a Brahmin of Calcutta, who sees nothing incredible in his 330 millions of gods and goddesses, the principal of whom are Seva, Vishmes, Kabi, Ganesha, the Sun, the Moon, the Elements. Our author put out an answer in English, entitled *A Second Defence of the Monotheism of the Veds*. 8vo. Calcutta, 1817.

In this work he presents a new series of unanswerable arguments to the Brahmins, whose hypocrisy, baseness and folly he exposes; dwelling, amongst other subjects, on the separation of castes, and the actions by which persons are subject to lose caste. He proves that that institution had no place in the ancient system of theology, and that it is a subsequent invention. At the head of this institution is the caste of the Brahmins, who have raised themselves to the highest possible dignity by investing their birth and quality with fantastic splendour; representing themselves as gods upon earth; the Brahmins are in India what the members of an oligarchy and the feudal lords are in Europe, but still worse, and that is saying a great deal. They have broken the ties of social life, not only by the separations formed by the castes, but by isolating, as it were, the members of the same family from each other: a Hindoo who affects great rigidity cannot share his dinner with his brother whom he is visiting; and if the brother touch any of the provisions of his guest, the latter must instantly throw away what remains, and even destroy the utensils* in which it was contained.

The Hindoo religion allows of taking another or several more wives during the life of the first, in such cases as the drunkenness, extravagance, incurable disease, sterility, &c. of the wife; but with respect to this right, such

* See a *Second Defence of the Monotheistical System*, pp. 41, 42.

licence has been given, that a private person sometimes marries thirty or forty wives, merely to satisfy his brutal desires.*

Ideas of morality are still further debased by the superstition which attaches more value to vain observances than to the precepts of the law of nature: thus, according to the doctrine of the Brahmins, loss of *caste*, with all its privileges, is incurred by the infringement of certain ceremonies, but not by murder, theft nor perjury. For these crimes there are easy means of expiation, most of which are a source of wealth to the Brahmins. The mere difference of the material, the form and the efficacy of chaplets, and the manner of using them, is a boundless science, which would of itself furnish a large library.

He who pronounces the word *Doorga*, a name of the goddess *Cali* or *Parvati*, the wife of *Siva*, is justified, although he be living in adultery; he who exclaims, even involuntarily, *Salutation to Hari*, and he who does but look at the Ganges, though thinking of some other object, are delivered from their guilt. We may fairly institute a comparison between these privileges and the doctrine of Indulgences propagated in France by certain publications and missionaries.

The Veds, or sacred books, containing the religion of the Hindoos, are extremely voluminous, and the subjects of which they treat often obscured by a confused manner and metaphorical style; the great Byas, according to our author, made a sort of harmony and abstract of these books upwards of two thousand years ago. This abstract, entitled the *Vedant*, the authority of which is scarcely inferior to that of the Vedas, contains all the proof of the unity of God; but as the Brahmins reserve to themselves the explanation of it, Rammohun Roy has translated it into Hindoostanee and Bengalee, and gratuitously distributed the translation among his countrymen. And, in order to convince his European friends that the superstitious practices which deform the Hindoo worship are a departure from its primitive institutions, he last year published in En-

* See a Second Defence of the Monotheistical System, pp. 44, et seq. and p. 55.

glish an *Abridgment of the Vedant*.* The sum of his arguments is, that *God is an unknown Being*, that he is *the true Being, the Creator, the Preserver, and the Destroyer of the universe*.†

In the translation of the *Ishopanishad*, among the quotations from the sacred books of the Hindoos, we find the passage, *I am what he is*,‡ similar to the text of Scripture: *ego sum qui sum: je suis celui qui est*. It is well known that in India there have been preserved to the present time a vast number of traditions, facts, maxims and customs, to be found in our Holy Scriptures. William Jones has given examples of them; Burder has made them the subject of a work in 2 vols. 8vo.;§ and Ward has lately entered into an extensive and curious investigation of these coincidences.||

All the writings of Rammohun, which have been sent over by M. d'Acosta, are in English. Life is so short, time so precious, and every thing relating to religion so worthy of attention, that, whilst lamenting the want of leisure to translate those works into French, we shall, perhaps, be happy enough to inspire some learned and zealous Christian with a resolution to execute that desirable project. Let us return to Rammohun Roy. The success he has already had leads us to hope for still greater: nor are we without ground for hope, since we find that his perseverance is unabated, and that he has announced the speedy publication of other works of a similar tendency to the former. The moderation with which he repels the attacks on his writings, the force of his arguments, and his profound knowledge of the sacred books of the Hindoos, are proofs of his fitness for the work he has undertaken; and the pecuniary sacrifices he has made, shew a disinterestedness which cannot be admired and encouraged too warmly.

* See Translation of an Abridgment of the Vedant, &c. 8vo. Calcutta, 1818.

† Ib. p. 21.

‡ See Translation of the Is. Honanis, p. 7.

§ See Oriental Customs, &c. by Sam. Burder, 8vo. London, 1802.

|| See Account of the Writings, Religion and Manners of the Hindoos, &c. by W. Ward, in 4to. Serampore, 1811. 4 Vols.

The division of the Hindoos into castes has hitherto appeared the greatest obstacle to their conversion to Christianity. That obstacle is not insurmountable; the same may be said of the absurd doctrine of polytheism, which cannot continue to be maintained by a civilized people. If once the Hindoos can be convinced that there is but one God, and that they are all children of the same Father, who is no respecter of persons, then the fall of Brahminical prejudices and of idolatry, will prepare the way for the triumph of the gospel.

[We cannot find a fitter place than this for the insertion of a short account of Rammohun Roy, taken from p. 106 of a "Journal of a Route across India, through Egypt to England, in the years 1817 and 1818. By Lieut-Col. Fitzclarence." 4to. 1819.

"There has never been, to my knowledge, an instance of any Hindoo of condition or caste being converted to our faith. The only conversion of any kind, if it can be called so, that has come within my observation, was that of a high-caste Brahmin, of one of the first families in the country, who is not only perfectly master of the Sanscrit, but has gained a thorough acquaintance with the English language and literature, and has openly declared that the Brahminical religion is in its purity a pure Deism, and not the gross polytheism into which it has degenerated. I became well acquainted with him, and admire his talents and acquirements. His eloquence in our language is very great, and I am told he is still more admirable in Arabic and Persian. It is remarkable, that he has studied and thoroughly understands the politics of Europe, but more particularly those of England; and the last time I was in his company, he argued forcibly against a standing army in a free country, and quoted all the arguments brought forward by the Members of the Opposition. I think that he is in many respects a most extraordinary person. In the first place, he is a religious reformer, who has amongst a people more bigoted than those of Europe in the middle ages, dared to think for himself. His learning is most extensive, as he is not only conversant with the best books in English, Arabic, Sanscrit, Bengalee and Hindoostanee, but has even studied rhetoric in Arabic and

English, and quotes Locke and Bacon on all occasions. From the view he thus takes of the religions, manners and customs of so many nations, and from his having observed the number of different modes of addressing and worshiping the Supreme Being, he naturally turned to his own faith with an unprejudiced mind, found it perverted with the religion of the Vedas to a gross idolatry, and was not afraid, though aware of the consequences, to publish to the world in Bengalee and English his feelings and opinions on the subject; of course, he was fully prepared to meet the host of interested enemies who, from sordid motives, wished to keep the lower classes in a state of the darkest ignorance. I have understood that his family have quitted him—that he has been declared to have lost caste—and is for the present, as all religious reformers must be for a time, a mark to be scoffed at. To a man of his sentiments and rank this loss of caste must be particularly painful, but at Calcutta he associates with the English: he is, however, cut off from all familiar and domestic intercourse; indeed, from all communication of any kind with his relations and former friends. His name is Rammohun Roy. He is particularly handsome, not of a very dark complexion, of a fine person, and most courtly manners. He professes to have no objection to eat and live as we do, but refrains from it, in order not to expose himself to the imputation of having changed his religion for the good things of this world. He will sit at table with us while the meat is on it, which no other Brahmin will do. He continues his native dress, but keeps a carriage, being a man of some property. He is very desirous to visit England and enter one of our universities, where I shall be most anxious to see him, and to learn his ideas of our country, its manners and customs."]

SIR,
H A V I N G repeatedly heard intelligent persons express an opinion, that the question concerning Liberty and Necessity involves difficulties from which the human mind cannot easily extricate itself, I conceived that it might not be useless to shew, that as a philosophical question it is as simple as need be, and admits a most clear

and certain solution. The controversy has been embarrassed by the use of the term *motive*, which is not *essential* to it, and which being capable of different interpretations has left room for misapprehension and subterfuge.

The proposition of the Necessitarian is precisely this, that every volition or determination of the mind is the necessary result of the state of the mind at the time when the determination is formed.* Of the truth of this proposition, in regard to myself, I am conscious; and presuming that the general constitution of all human minds is the same, I suspect that, were the question closely urged, the consciousness of every other man would coincide in this respect with my own. And were it not for certain consequences, which are supposed to follow the admission of this doctrine, I am persuaded that no human being would have been found to doubt its truth.

But in opposition to this statement the advocate of Liberty maintains, that there is in the human mind a self-determining power, to which, as their proper cause, all the volitions or determinations of the mind are to be referred.

What, then, is the operation of this self-determining power? By the very definition, it is not governed in its exercise by the state or disposition of the mind. Does it, then, itself determine the state of mind in which a certain volition shall be formed? Then, as no mental act can be performed except in some certain state of mind, it may be asked, How came the mind to be in that state in which the self-deter-

* Though I have avoided the use of the term *motive*, I do not mean to intimate, that motives have nothing to do with volition. By *motive*, indeed, the Necessitarian means not only the inducement which is presented to the mind, but the mental disposition in which a given volition is formed. But to use the term in its ordinary acceptation, it may be remarked, that every state of mind in which a volition takes place, results partly from a former state, and partly from the influence of certain motives or considerations which are suggested to the mind. And no truth in the whole circle of intellectual inquiry seems more self-evident than this, that from a definite state of mind, nothing but a definite volition can proceed.

mining power was called upon to act? Did this power of its sovereign pleasure decree this state of the mind also, and before this a former state, and so on to the *first moment of conscious existence*, always acting in a certain state of mind, and always determining that state? But in reality, the determining the state of the mind, in which a given volition shall take place, would not differ from determining the volition itself. In a given state of mind, then, does it determine the volition? If so, can it determine in opposition to the state of the mind *at the time* when the volition is formed? If not, it can do nothing that is worth contending for. If it can, whenever this case is realized the *will* inclines one way, and the *mind* another. But as the will in its exercise cannot, even in imagination, be distinguished from *the mind in the act of willing*, the mind wills against itself, or wills and does not will the same thing, at the same time. That this reasoning may not be confronted by *classical* authority, I just remark, that Homer's well-known *oxymoron*, *εὐωκεῖντι γὰρ θυμῶν*, stands at an immeasurable distance from the case which is here supposed.

But let this self-determining power be examined a little more closely. And as it is stated to be the faculty of the mind which determines the volitions, and, therefore, the actions of men, it is reasonable to ask, whether it possesses the properties of judgment, reflection and other qualities which have always been supposed to have some influence upon the determinations of the will? If so, it is no longer a faculty of the mind, but the mind itself; and when we are told that it is the efficient cause of volition, all that is meant is, that our volitions are the volitions of the mind. If it does not possess these properties, it is nothing but the simple power of volition, which, as it will not submit to be governed by the state or habit of the mind, but insists upon the privilege of determining itself, is not distinguishable from blind caprice, or what we usually term *chance*.

Shall it be said that the *mind* determines its volitions *by means* of a self-determining power, which is inherent in it, and essential to it? Can the mind, then, form either of two opposite volitions at the same time, and in

the same frame and disposition? If not, it does not possess a self-determining power, and every thing is conceded which the Necessitarian contends for. If, when the mind is said to possess a self-determining power, it were meant that the volitions of the mind originate in itself, and are not forced upon it by extraneous compulsion nothing would be said but what is true, and nothing but what the Necessitarian admits and maintains. But this will not serve the cause for which this power has been devised. In order to set aside the position of the Necessitarian, this faculty must be supposed to be altogether independent of the feelings and dispositions of the mind, and must, in the strictest sense, determine itself, and govern its own decisions. The advocate of Liberty may say, that this is not what he means, but he will hear in reply, that if he does not mean this, he means nothing. But if the mind can form either of two opposite volitions at the same time, then the true and proper cause of definite volitions is the abstract *power of willing*; a fit principle, in good truth, to which the government of life should be committed.

Will the advocate of Liberty lay down his proposition in terms to the following effect: that though the state of the mind has a certain influence upon the self-determining power, yet that it does not, strictly speaking, *cause* the volition, which is the *free* act of the power for which he contends? What, then, is the nature of the influence supposed? Does it in any way effect that the volition should be what it is? If so, all that the Necessitarian will be solicitous to maintain is granted. If not, we must look somewhere else, that is, to the self-determining power, for the reason why one volition takes place rather than another: that is, a power which bears the same relation to all imaginable volitions, contains in itself the sole cause of every definite and specific volition. And on this faculty depends the moral agency of man! But does the self-determining power, in fact, obey the influence which the mind exerts upon it? Why, then, does it obey it? Because it chooses. Does it, then, reflect and judge, and thus determine on the propriety of yielding this obedience? No such thing. Reflection and judgment are

properties not of a self-determining power, but of intellect and reason. They are not attributes of the will, but of the mind.

But what, after all, can we understand by a *self-determining* power, considered as the efficient cause of volition? It is an incontrovertible truth, that the act of volition implies a certain inclination or disposition of the mind. Does, then, the self-determining power cause this disposition, or is it acted upon and governed by it? If the latter, it is not a *self-determining* power, and the controversy is at an end. If it be said to determine this disposition, the question arises, whether it must be considered as acting independently of *every mental feeling*? If so, it is a manifest nonentity, since a volition cannot take place except in *some* state and disposition of the mind. If it does not act independently of mental feeling, it will again be asked, does it determine that state of feeling in which it acts? To what conclusion this question would lead, it must be needless to remark.

But let the advocate of Liberty plead for himself in the language of that able metaphysician, Dr. Clarke: "The true, proper, immediate, *physical efficient cause* of action," says he, "is the power of self-motion in men, which exerts itself *freely*, in consequence of the last judgment of the understanding." If this power *always* obeys the last judgment of the understanding, the Necessitarian will ask no more. But can this power, at the very time when it exerts itself *freely*, in consequence of the last judgment of the understanding, determine without any inducement whatever to set this last judgment at defiance, and to act in direct opposition to it? This Dr. Clarke would not have affirmed. If it cannot, what is gained by maintaining, with an appearance at least of contradiction, that it exerts itself *freely*, in consequence of this judgment? If it can, then it is in very deed a power of *self-motion*, a power which, without *any reason*, can act against the very reason in consequence of which it acts.*

* Dr. Clarke is disposed to consider the last judgment of the understanding as the same with the *act of volition*.

In a word, if definite volitions have not their causes in definite states of mind, they can be attributed to no cause distinct from the mere power of willing. But to say that the mere faculty of the will, or what would here be the same thing, the self-determining power, is the sole cause of specific volitions, does not in reality differ from saying that a definite volition is the cause of itself. The self-determining power, in itself considered, is equally indifferent to all volitions; but by a determinate *act*, it is supposed to cause a specific volition; but this *act* is the volition itself, nor can even for a moment be conceived of as distinct from it. The self-determining power, in other words, wills *this* or *that*, because it wills it; that is, the only reason for the volition is the volition itself.

Were it necessary to reason any farther against this same self-determining power, this independent faculty, which will submit to no controul, and acknowledge no principle of action but the imperious maxim *sit pro ratione voluntas*, it might be objected in the first place, that its existence is a mere assumption; secondly, that the assumption is unnecessary, as the phenomena of volition are satisfactorily accounted for without it; thirdly, that the assumption is unwarrantable, as we are acquainted with nothing in the whole compass of nature which bears any analogy to such a faculty; and

Then, as in this case the power of self-motion has nothing to do with volition, but only acts in consequence of the determination of the *will* or the *understanding*, it may be dismissed from the controversy, as having no relation to the matter in dispute. "But," says he, "if the *act of volition* be distinguished from the *last judgment of the understanding*, then the *act of volition*, or rather the *beginning of action*, consequent upon the last judgment of the understanding, is not *determined* or *caused* by that last judgment as the *physical efficient*, but only as the *moral motive*." If the last judgment of the understanding *causes* the volition, that is sufficient. By what name its operation shall be called, the Necessitarian will not be very anxious to determine. For what avails the distinction between the *physical efficient*, and the *moral motive*, if the volition in given circumstances could not be different from what it is?

fourthly, that the supposed operation of this faculty contradicts *the only notions which mankind have ever formed of the connexion between cause and effect*. We are, indeed, ignorant of the operation of what we term causes, but this ignorance does not diminish the force of the objection. For a definite effect, we, in fact, look for a definite cause; and every variation in the effect is *always* supposed to imply a proportionable variation in the cause. Let it, then, be remembered, that the subject of controversy is not the cause of volition in general, but of definite and specific volitions. Now a self-determining power, if it means any thing, must mean a power which, at the same time and in the same circumstances, can form either of two different or opposite volitions. But to refer a definite volition to the act of such a faculty, is, *according to the only idea which we have of causation*, to say that a specific volition can be formed without a cause. The *sic volo* of the self-determining power will not be a satisfactory answer to the question, how it came to be the *pleasure* of the will to determine as it did. The prevalence of one inclination at the very moment when it was possible by the hypothesis that another inclination should have prevailed, requires a definite cause as much as any effect in nature; or rather the supposition involves an impossibility, unless mankind have been thus far mistaken in requiring a definite cause for a definite effect. And if they have been herein mistaken, they may also have been mistaken in requiring *any cause at all* for that which they have denominated an effect; since the same reasoning which has led them to the notion of a cause, has led them to conceive of it as a *definite energy*, from which a *definite result* proceeds. To deny, then, that a definite cause is necessary to a definite effect, or what is the same thing, to deny that a difference in the effect implies a difference in the cause, is to call in question the very existence of a cause. The term, indeed, may be retained, but the only idea which we have of the thing is gone. And when the advocate of Liberty imagines a power which can at the same time cause either of two different volitions, he deceives himself by a mere abuse of language. A self-determining power, then, is not only gratuitously

assumed, but involves another assumption, which sets at defiance what have hitherto been thought the most certain conclusions of the human mind.

I will now say one word respecting the moral consequences which are supposed to follow from the doctrine of Necessity. The most formidable of these is, that it annihilates the accountability of man, and renders him an unfit subject of reward and punishment. I shall consider the difficulty as pressing entirely on the side of punishment, and shall observe, that as, according to the Necessitarian system, punishment can operate on the *state of the mind*, it may with the greatest propriety be applied. But if man had within him such a *capricious principle* as a self-determining power, the application of punishment would be improper, *because it would be useless*. What, indeed, has been called *vindictive punishment*, the doctrine of Necessity does exclude; but this, instead of being an objection to the doctrine, is one of its recommendations. Vindictive punishment, it is true, cannot be defended upon any system; but upon the principles of the Necessitarian it is *manifestly and palpably* absurd.

It will easily be perceived that I have not written for those who are altogether strangers to the controversy, nor for those who thoroughly understand the subject; but, as I intimated above, for those who have conceived that it cannot be thoroughly understood. And if the light in which it has now been placed shall render it more intelligible to any who have hitherto thought it obscure and intricate, my end will be answered.

E. COGAN.

P. S. I am aware that I have written much more than was necessary; but the supposed difficulty of the subject seemed to require that it should be treated somewhat at length. Otherwise the argument (like most other arguments) lies in a small compass. The Necessitarian maintains, that every volition necessarily results from the state of mind in which the volition takes place. His opponent, to set aside this proposition, contends for a self-determining power as the efficient cause of volition. Here a simple question presents itself. Can the mind, *will* this or that *without* a certain feeling, or disposition that prompts the volition?

Fact, to which even a self-determining power must bow, will answer, Certainly not. *Consequently* it cannot will *against* the state or disposition in which it is at any given time. And here, were impartial reason to decide, the controversy must end.

Sir,

I AM no infrequent reader of the English Divines of the Latitudinarian school, of whom Tillotson may be considered as the head, and I profess myself an admirer of the author last named, whom Dr. Lardner somewhere justly quotes, under the epithets of "a good man and a great preacher." But I confess there are passages in his works, and incidents in his life, which grieve me; and would puzzle me if I did not know the sad influence of dignities, possessed or expected, in political churches, upon the soundest understandings and best hearts. No lover of liberty can recollect, without a sigh, that he and Burnet tampered with the conscience of the martyred Russell, in order to bewilder him into a dying confession of the abominable doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance.* His "rare piece of Hobbism" is already explained on your pages, (Vol. III. p. 148,) but as he repented of that pulpit indiscretion, it ought not to be severely urged against his memory. There is a still worse instance of his yielding to the iniquity of the times, which I cannot forbear to point out. I do so, I am sure, with no wish to hurt his excellent name, but merely to shew in what manner the licentiousness of a court may infect the pulpit, even when most worthily filled, and how offensive to posterity, if not to contemporaries, are all accommodations of righteous principles to corrupt political maxims.

Tillotson's Sermon CXCVI (8vo. edition of his Works, Vol. X. p. 267) is on "Our Saviour's Ascension," preached on Ascension-day, which happened to be on the 29th of May, the church festival in celebration of Charles II. and his Restoration. After reading his

* In extenuation of Tillotson's conduct it should be remembered that he hoped, by extorting a political confession from Lord Russell that should be agreeable to the Court, to save his life. Ed.

text, the solemn and sublime passage, Acts i. 9—11, the Doctor began: "There are two occasions of this day accidentally met together, which bear some resemblance to one another; the ascension of our blessed SAVIOUR into heaven, and his exaltation in his kingdom, being 'crowned with glory and honour, and set on the right hand of the Majesty on high:' and the restoration of our sovereign to his just rights, and royal state and dignity here upon earth, by a miraculous providence of GOD, and as it were by a kind of resurrection from the dead"! He proceeds, "The first of these being of a more spiritual and excellent nature, shall be the subject of my present discourse, not forgetting the other in the application of it." He then treats the subject of the ascension with his usual ability, seriousness and dexterity in the Scriptures, and comes at length to the application, in the conclusion of which he says, first, "Let us heartily thank GOD for the whole dispensation of our salvation by the incarnation and doctrine, by the holy life and meritorious death of our blessed SAVIOUR;" and secondly, "And let us likewise bless GOD for the wonderful restoration of his majesty to the government of these kingdoms, who, under CHRIST, is the great defender of our faith and religion; and let us pay that duty and obedience, which becomes us, to a prince whom GOD hath so miraculously preserved and restored; and pour out our most fervent prayers to GOD, that he would long preserve him, and protect his person from all dangers, who is the great security of our religion, and the life of all our hopes, and as truly as any prince ever was to any people, THE LIGHT OF OUR EYES AND THE BREATH OF OUR NOSTRILS; and that GOD would make him 'wise as an angel of GOD, to go in and out before this great people;' and grant to him, and all the people of this land, 'to know in this our day the things that belong to our peace, before they be hid from our eyes.'"

In a note upon this passage it is said, "Preached towards the conclusion of the reign of King Charles II." This is meant to remind the reader, that it was penned when the Protestants and Whigs were desirous of the life of that monarch, on account of the imminent danger of a Popish succes-

sor. But allowing this apology its full weight, what justification can be framed for such adulation from such a man as Tillotson to any prince, and much more to such a prince as Charles II., who sold his country to France, spilled the best blood which was in it, turned his palaces into stews, and as to religion lived a hypocrite and died a dishonest Catholic? Can any thing worse be found in the sermons of the Gaudens, the Allestrees, the Sheldons, the Parkers and the Souths of that age of ecclesiastical profligacy and corruption?

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Exeter;

December 8, 1819.

SIR,

MY late highly-valued friend, the Rev. Joseph Bretland, of this city, having nominated me his sole executor, in trust, an honour which, though unworthy of, I cannot sufficiently appreciate, I am become, in consequence thereof, possessed of his manuscripts. It is my intention, should life and ability be granted me, with the assistance of my much-respected friend, the Rev. Thomas Jervis, to make a selection from Mr. Bretland's sermons, for the purpose of publishing two volumes; and I hope they may be ready for delivery in a few months hence.

It is probably unnecessary for me to say any thing in commendation of these Discourses, as every person who knew the author is well aware that nothing but what is of sterling value, and highly adapted to promote the cause of virtue and religion, could proceed from his pen. This is one of the objects which I have in view in publishing, and the other is to hand down to posterity the name of one who, from the extreme diffidence with which he was ever accustomed to estimate his own attainments in science, has been, comparatively, but little known in the world.

The confidence placed in me by my late venerable friend may, by some at least, be thought to require a panegyric on his talents and virtues; but this has been done already by two writers better qualified than myself, and whose opinions must have more weight; and I have the happiness to expect an extended memoir from the Rev. Mr. Mardon, of Glasgow.

It is true my knowledge of Mr. Bretland is not of a recent date,

having enjoyed the advantage of being placed under his tuition when I was very young, and from that time to the period of his death, no interruption has taken place in our friendly intercourse. Towards the latter part of his life, when any little attentions of mine were rendered more useful, I can with pleasure reflect they were always afforded him with readiness, and, I believe, they failed not to add to the comfort of his declining years. The gradual decay of corporeal and mental strength, of which I was a witness, would have been more painfully felt by me had it not been accompanied with a view of the entire devotedness he manifested of himself to the will of Providence, which enabled him to bear his increasing infirmities with perfect composure, and even with a cheerfulness which was apparent in his countenance long after he breathed his last.

W. B. KENNAWAY.

SIR, December 18, 1819.

I HAVE read with great interest the controversy which has taken place in the late Numbers of the Repository respecting Divine Influences. I wish, through the medium of your pages, to request from Dr. Carpenter and H. T. some explanation of their statements. Will Dr. C., or any other of your Correspondents, favour me with the meaning of the following expressions:

“God does by his *immediate* influence or agency, *not* supernatural, *nor* miraculous, *yet immediate*, afford supplies of strength,” &c. (P. 618.) I wish to have the difference explained between *supernatural* and *immediate* agency, as I have always supposed them synonymous terms.

On a very attentive perusal of Dr. C.’s letter, I am led to the conclusion that the doctrine he has stated is at variance with Unitarian principles. Dr. C. will much oblige me, by presenting the texts on which he founds his view of divine influence.

May I also ask H. T. to support his positions by Scripture proofs? I acknowledge his reasoning is just, but without the concurrence of the Bible, he will “open the door to every sort of delusion.” (P. 478.)

Will he tell me the difference between “God, in the exercise of his providence,” leading a Heathen “to the knowledge of the gospel of Jesus,”

and “by his own immediate operation inspiring him with the knowledge of his truth”?

An insertion of this, as soon as convenient, may lead to profitable discussion, and will much oblige,

AN ENQUIRER.

SIR,

I HAVE read with no less pleasure than satisfaction, Dr. Carpenter’s excellent Lecture on Divine Influence, and really am at a loss to know how the view he takes of this subject can be controverted by any believer in revelation. I am desirous of seeing a sermon said to have been written by Dr. Priestley on this doctrine; will any of your readers say where it may be met with?

Z. Z.

AT a time when *that* Christianity, which is called “the law of the land,” is identified with persecution, the following eloquent extract from a sermon by Mr. Coquerel, minister of the Walloon Church at Amsterdam, may, perhaps, be read with interest.

“It can be no illusion; whatever is really wrong is foolish and short-sighted; and of all the errors that have disgraced mankind, intolerance is the most dangerous—perhaps the most guilty,—but assuredly the most absurd. What! convince a man by violence—persuade him by main force! The stupidity which would impose a creed, can only be exceeded by the malignity which would punish its rejection. Transfer to another your powers of mind and body—lend him your emotions and your thoughts—infuse into him your understanding—and then begin the work of conversion. My conviction of truth is an internal, inalienable possession which I cannot convey to another. I may unbosom that conviction, trace its progress, and endeavour to lead men to its conclusions, but they are as free to reject as I to adopt my system, and having no right to believe them insincere, I must bear with their incredulity—but dare not punish it. To insist on their believing as I believe, is to order them to receive no impressions but what I receive—to require, that what satisfies me shall satisfy them—that their intellect shall be a servile copy of mine—in a word, that they shall sacrifice to

my pride and passions the sublime faculties they (like me) have received from 'the Father of lights.' Yet intolerance has been called a necessary evil. How necessary? Is not every man to answer for the talents he has received, and to be judged according to the advantages he has possessed? Will you take its consequences for its justification? Short and shameful are its triumphs. It receives no involuntary tributes, for it is a tyrant that is abandoned as soon as he hides his head. Would *you* be gratified with false and hollow homages, and will you dare insist on their being offered to *God*? Intolerance makes no real proselytes. Her most obedient slaves are hypocrites and liars. Would you have such to honour the triumphs of the religion of Jesus? Mistaken men! Study his spirit, and you will find that you are the worst of apostates. And you would invite others to follow the steps of him you call your Master, by trampling on his holy laws? The gospel will neither have slaves nor tyrants for its advocates. It is founded on the spirit of liberty. Freely as we have received from it the blessings of freedom, freely and generously we are bound to give. Let our candour, our charity, be the first proof of our faith. It is better—it is mightier than the strong arm of power."

J. B.

—
York,

December 9, 1819.

SIR,

IT gave me great pleasure to see Mr. Channing's excellent discourse, preached at Baltimore on the 5th of May last, reprinted at Liverpool, and as I think it may be interesting to some of your readers to know the circumstances out of which it took its rise, I shall transcribe the following particulars from my friend Dr. H., of Dorchester, with which he favoured me a few weeks ago:

"Of the progress of religion, of freedom of inquiry, and of literature, I could give you interesting details, but they would fill a volume rather than a letter. Some particulars you will glean from the publications that accompany this. Among them the sermon of Mr. Channing, I know will attract your first attention, because his name and fame are already familiar to you: but it is necessary to give you a

brief history of the occasion on which the sermon was delivered. It was preached at Baltimore, the capital of Maryland, and, next to New York, the largest commercial town in the United States. Some of the most respectable and opulent inhabitants of that place, went from New England, and carried with them an attachment to *Congregationalism*, or Independent church-government; whereas all the churches there are either Presbyterian or Episcopalian, and of course highly Calvinistic and Trinitarian in their creed. Several of the ministers of our vicinity, in their journeyings to visit Washington City, and see Congress in its sessions, stopt at Baltimore. The New England inhabitants wished to hear them preach; but the Presbyterians would not, and the Episcopalians could not, invite them into their pulpits. This led the Congregationalists to unite in erecting a place of worship for themselves, and they have built a most magnificent one. They then sent to our university for a preacher, and obtained Mr. Sparks, one of the tutors, a gentleman of superior talents. At his ordination Mr. Channing's Sermon was delivered. It has passed through two large editions in Baltimore, (eight hundred copies of the first, it has been said, were taken up on the day of its publication,) and two editions have been printed in Boston. It is eagerly read, and the impression which it has made, and is making, is very great."

"On Mr. Channing's return from Baltimore, he was urged to preach at New York, not by the clergymen of the city, for their pulpits are not open to such as he, but by distinguished individuals, who obtained for him the Medical Hall: and on the following week two meetings were held of considerable numbers, to take measures for collecting a society and erecting a house for public worship, and an invitation has been forwarded to us for a preacher; in consequence of which Mr. Ware, one of the most esteemed Boston ministers, has gone on to New York to preach, and to assist them in the furtherance of their enlightened purposes."

I have since heard that the sensation occasioned by Mr. Channing's Sermon, has raised up a powerful opponent in support of the orthodox system in Professor Stuart, of the Andover The-

ological Seminary, who addressed to Mr. C. a series of controversial letters, which passed almost immediately through two editions. "Mr. Stuart," my friend says, "is one of the most learned, able and powerful supporters of what is deemed high orthodoxy." These letters are very ably reviewed in an interesting publication, entitled "The Christian Disciple," published at Boston every two months, by Wells and Lilly. My friend adds, "probably there will be more publications in this controversy; indeed we are promised, perhaps I should say threatened, with a vindication of doctrinal points, in answer to Mr. C., by another Andover professor." Dr. H. regrets the personal asperities that too much mingle with this controversy, but hopes and trusts that, "like the storms and tempests that sometimes visit the American region, it may have a salutary tendency, and, dispelling dark and noxious vapours, may leave the atmosphere more pure, and let in the light of heaven through a clearer medium." "We," he says, "may see this light but partially diffused, yet, with good old Simeon, we may depart in peace, encouraged by the assurance that it shall not only shed more of its glories in our own lands, but also enlighten the Gentiles who now sit in darkness, and ultimately spread joy through the whole earth."

In these sentiments, Mr. Editor, I am certain you will participate, and if you think the facts to which they relate may be unknown to many of your readers, you will, by inserting them in the Repository, greatly oblige

CATH. CAPPE.

SIR,
JOSEPHUS has given a brief but important account of the manner in which the Apostle James was put to death. It is to this effect, A. J. Lib. xx. C. 8. § 1: "The younger Ananus, who was made chief priest, was haughty in his behaviour and exceedingly daring. He moreover ranked with the Sadducees, who surpassed all the Jews in the cruelty of their judicial sentences. Ananus being thus disposed, summons a council of the judges, and bringing before it the brother of Jesus, called Christ, whose name was James, with some others, he accuses them of transgressing the

law, and delivered them up to be stoned. But those in the city most distinguished for their probity and accurate knowledge of the laws were grievously offended at this measure."

The ground of the accusation brought against James was assuredly his belief in Jesus as the Messiah. Stephen maintained the same opinion. And they said, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God," Acts vi. 11. We may be assured also that the other persons who suffered with James, suffered for the same reason. Moreover, since the enemies of James insisted that he transgressed the law in holding forth Jesus as the Saviour, we are to infer that the men whom Josephus represents as most distinguished by their probity and accurate knowledge of the law, and who were grievously offended at his death, had the same views of Jesus with the apostle. These were such men as Gamaliel and the priests who became obedient to the faith, Acts vi. 7.

From this passage we may gather, that, in the dispute between the apostles and their adversaries, the terms *Gospel* and *Christianity* were not employed. The sole question between the parties was, which of them rightly understood the laws of Moses. The believers in embracing the gospel, so far from professing a new or exclusive religion, professed only a more adequate and refined knowledge of the Mosaic law. The writings of Josephus, in an eminent degree, illustrate this fact. In his immortal work against Apion he has given, under the title of the law, a beautiful delineation of the gospel; and he asserts that, in his time, there was not a place, nor scarcely a family in the whole civilized world where it was not received.

Lardner and some other sagacious critics reject this passage of Josephus as a forgery, and one reason for the rejection is, that it gives an account of the death of James different from that which, through Eusebius, (H. E. Lib. ii. C. 23,) we have received from Hegesippus. But the two narratives are perfectly consistent with each other, only that the Jewish historian, in his brevity, has omitted the particulars related by the other. Josephus does not say, as Lardner represents him saying, that Ananus had James and

his brethren stoned, but that he delivered them up to be stoned: and this sentence, consistently with the spirit of it, might be executed either by *pelting* him with stones, or *throwing him over a precipice*. Those who were charged with the execution of the sentence chose the latter: they conveyed him to the battlement of the temple, and threw him thence, finishing him on the ground with a club. According to Hegesippus, James was murdered not only in the temple, but on the passover, when multitudes of Jews and Gentiles were assembled in Jerusalem; and so highly revered was the apostle for wisdom and piety, that Ananus and his party could not dare to execute the sentence passed upon him without suborning the Sicarii, who had come to the feast for that purpose. These particulars we have from Josephus:

“This murder (namely that of Jonathan) having continued unpunished, the Sicarii afterwards ascending in great multitudes to the feast with weapons, which, as before, they concealed, on mingling with the crowds slew, some their enemies, others whom they were suborned to murder; which they did not only in other parts of the city, but some even in the temple: for even in that sacred place they had the audacity to massacre: nor did they think that they were committing impiety. But I am of opinion that on this account God, who hates impiety, has demolished our city, and, regarding the temple as no longer a pure habitation for himself, brought upon us the Romans, and exposed it and the city to purifying fire, and ourselves, with our wives and children, that we might learn virtue from our calamities.” A. J. Lib. xx. C. 7. § 5.

Origen, who thoroughly understood the writings of Josephus, properly concluded, that the persons here said to be massacred in the Temple were James and his brethren; James, the leading one among them, being specified by name in the succeeding chapter. Accordingly Origen says, that, according to Josephus, “These things befel the Jews in vindication of James, called the Just, who was the brother of Jesus, called the Christ: forasmuch as they killed him who was a most righteous man.” See *Lardner*, Vol. VII. p. 121. *Lardner* broadly asserts that

this passage is not extant in the writings of Josephus, and the assertion illustrates the weight that ought to be ascribed to his opinion, that the passage concerning James is not genuine. The first authors of the Miraculous Conception represented the brothers and sisters of Jesus as children of Joseph by a *former* wife: and as our Lord was not the son of Joseph, James could not in reality be his brother. But Josephus calls him the brother of Christ, and by that means intends to set aside as false the story of his miraculous birth. Origen understood this intention, and hence adds, with the view of setting it aside, “This James is the same whom Paul, that genuine disciple of Jesus, says he had seen, and calls the Lord’s brother, not so much for the sake of consanguinity as their common education and agreement in manners and doctrine.” This single circumstance proves that the author of the paragraph concerning James was an *Unitarian* believer in Christ, such as the Nazarenes or Ebionites were, and not a forger, who, in a future age, sought to fasten the divinity of Christ on the belief of mankind.

There is one circumstance farther, worthy of notice in the account given by Hegesippus. The enemies of James are represented as putting to him the apparently absurd question, *Τίς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; Which is the door of Jesus? Now, in Hebrew the term Jesus means *salvation*. And the meaning of the adverse question, no doubt, was, “Which is the door of salvation?” James must have understood it so: but availing himself of the double meaning of *yw*, he answers, “Jesus is the door,” alluding to our Lord’s own words, “I am the door.” This reply amounted to “blasphemous words against Moses and against God” in the eyes of his enemies: and hence the charge brought against him, that he transgressed the law of Moses. Josephus brings forward the testimony of those “who were distinguished by their probity and accurate knowledge of the laws,” that he was not guilty of any transgression: and as the opinion that he was *not* guilty, must be interpreted by the sense in which he was said to be guilty; and he was said to be guilty of transgressing the law, only because he believed and taught Jesus to be the door of salvation, it follows,

that the persons, with Josephus in the number, grievously offended at his death, did look on Jesus in the same light, or in other words, that they were believers in Christ.

JOHN JONES.

SIR,

January 7, 1820.

I AM not ashamed to profess myself one of those "Bible only" Christians, who while they recognize, in the utmost possible latitude of the terms, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as the one and only true God," cannot go so far as to deny the honourable name of Unitarian to many a fellow Biblist who would refuse to subscribe assent to a tenet *so unscripturally* EXPRESSED, as that of "the simple humanity" of the Saviour of the world. Shall I be accused of more than venial effrontery by the great majority of my brethren, if I follow up the avowal by even presuming to doubt the expediency, nay, the propriety of laying so unnecessary a stumbling block, as it now appears to me to be, in the way, at the very threshold, of that great desideratum to the Protestant community, "the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"? The dogma of the Trinity, (itself scarcely more reprehensibly, because not more *unscripturally* expressed,) has evidently seen its better days, and as the phraseology of the Sacred Records regains its due estimation in the Christian world, will more and more lose ground. Now, what more cogent or effective argument has ever been urged against this doctrine by its opponents, than that it usurps a name which neither Jesus nor Paul knew, and which no disciple, at their feet alone, can ever justifiably adopt? Why then ourselves imitate so justly-deprecated a precedent of deviation from the language of a common oracle? Decipitne Exemplar, &c.? Surely, on the contrary, of all other men, it most behoves us, whose peculiar boast it deservedly is, that we require no phrase or term in which to express any article of our creed, but what has fallen from the lips of the great Author and Finisher of our faith, or of his immediate missionaries, to be punctiliously scrupulous about travelling out of the Sacred Records in any confession of our faith, or any exposition of our tenets. As we wish to bring back the religion of Christ, let us prove our un-

VOL. XV.

D

impeachable title to so proud a distinction. Such Shiboleths as unscriptural compendiums of belief offer no equivalent for the reproach of inconsistency. The unity of the church of Christ cannot be contemplated as possible till they shall have been unanimously abandoned. With their abandonment, the principal obstacle to a consummation so devoutly to be wished, would be removed. In the glorious enterprise, what church so fit to lead the way, never turning to the right hand or the left, as that which would build, not chiefly, but only, on Christ as its corner stone?

J. T. CLARKE.

SIR,

I AM the wife of a professor of music, and the attraction of that delightful art brings to my house many people of superior station and abilities, with whose company I am much pleased. Among these I have often heard Mr. L. talked of as a surgeon of extraordinary merit and abilities; but I will confess to you, Mr. Editor, that I have been the cause of my husband's not employing that gentleman professionally, because I understood he was a Materialist. Now, Sir, this Mr. L. has lately published a book on the natural history of man, which has excited so strong a feeling of hostility against him, that he has been obliged to recall the publication, or he was threatened with the loss of all his public situations as Surgeon to Bedlam and St. Bartholomew's, and Lecturer to the College of Surgeons. I mentioned this yesterday to a physician who is a great friend of ours, and of whose judgment I have a high opinion, but who, to my great surprise, reprobated the whole business in very strong terms, and said it was founded on the most ignorant bigotry and groundless prejudice, and that it ought to be quite indifferent to the public whether any man was a Materialist or not. I said it appeared to me of great importance whether we had souls or not, and that I freely confessed I could not like any body who denied the existence of that noble part of my nature. "Your dislike would be reasonable, Madam," said the doctor, "if the denial had any influence on the nature of things, and in all cases, before we entertain dislike of an individual for his opinions, we

ought to prove that his thoughts have power to alter the nature of the subject in question. In the present instance such an idea is manifestly absurd, and the question itself is so very abstract and difficult, that very few persons are fit to give an opinion about the matter; and of those who do, their positiveness will be found in a very direct proportion with their degree of ignorance." I begged him to give me some slight notion of the nature of those difficulties, as the question appeared to me simple and easy enough. "This, Madam," said he, "is almost impossible in a short conversation, but, however, I may just hint that any one who assumes a right to decide the question, ought to begin with shewing the difference between the nature of the attraction of the particles of matter in a case of chemical affinity, a piece of zinc suspended in a solution of acetate of lead for instance, and that attraction which exists between the particles of matter in a seed, and the soil in which it is inserted. If he should succeed in this, he must proceed to the still more difficult task of tracing the cause of the distinction between the attractions in the former cases, and those exercised in the production of animal existence; which is so far from having ever been done, that we are entirely ignorant of the manner in which these operations of nature are performed. No Materialist is bold enough to say he can trace these various attractions; but he says a regular analogy may be observed from the most passive and inert matter, up to the most active and complicated; that with the first appearance of any thing like brain and nerves in an object, there is a glimpse of sensation, and that as the organization of these material organs improves, there is an equal rate of advance in the powers of feeling and intellect, till you arrive at their utmost terrestrial perfection in man; that whatever is the cause of feeling and intelligence in man, is exactly the same in nature, although differing in degree with that in all other sentient beings on this globe, and that it is no more necessary to suppose the addition of another principle, than it is to imagine the existence of a *spirit* of elasticity in the springs, or a *spirit* to move the wheels of a watch. Now this is all quite true, and the brains and nerves

of man may possibly contain within themselves, essentially, the properties of intelligence and sensation, as a piece of steel does of elasticity, but till we know how the cause produces the effect, which is probably beyond the reach of the human faculties, we can never be competent to decide positively on the matter.

"The Immaterialist, on the other hand, starts with the position, that there is a manifest contrast between mind and matter, and that to talk of a material intellect is as absurd as it would be to speak of a thought as being square, or an argument as being triangular. That the mind of man, glancing in an instant from pole to pole, from the earliest records of history to the present moment; darting with a rapidity, greater far than that of light, from the sun to the utmost planet, and thence into the regions of infinite space, can never be justly considered as a mere quality of the dull, heavy clod of earth which, for a moment, it is made to inhabit. That we have even a consciousness that we ourselves are something distinct from our bodies, and that when a man's limbs are mutilated, his sense of integrity is no more affected than by a change of his clothes. But all this is evidently mere assertion, and assuming as granted the very subject of dispute; and the Immaterialist is just as incapable of proving that the mind of man is something separate from his body, as his adversary is of the reverse. If the Immaterialist denies a soul to brutes, he gets involved in an inextricable maze of contradiction, which he in vain attempts to get out of by saying that God is himself to them a soul; because that is a mere sophism,—words without meaning,—an assumption without the least proof. There is still another theory on this subject perhaps more profound, more logical, and more consistent than either of the others, viz. that which supposes the non-existence of matter. The Spiritualist asks, what is matter? You say, every object in nature which comes within the cognizance of the senses; any thing that is hard, soft, rough, smooth, coloured, plain, odorous, heavy, and so on—the table, chair, picture or statue in this room for instance. The Spiritualist answers, that you have only described your own sensations, and can, in the nature of

things, do nothing more; for you can never go beyond the impression made on your senses, and say what that is which produces them. He will tell you that an impression on a bodily sense is no proof of a material cause. Look in that mirror, you will see the table, chair, picture and statue expressed to your eye with the same accuracy and distinctness as the objects themselves, and yet they are mere phantasms, the reality of which only exists in the mind of the sentient being. Our other senses do not afford such plain examples, obvious to any understanding, but their case is precisely similar, and the whole world is nothing but a phantasmagoria, and sentient beings the only real things in it. Now pray, my dear Madam, can you think that your surgeon is the less estimable for having directed his attention to these high subjects; and, do you still think that the evidence for any one of these theories is so conclusive as to stamp with contempt or infamy him who inclines to a contrary? You will say, perhaps, that the Christian religion has long ago decided the question, and established the fact of our having immortal souls. The Christian religion, Madam, has, if you please, established the fact of a future state of existence, in which we are to be rewarded or punished for our moral conduct in this world; but all sound and rational divines have long agreed that the inspired writers had no authority to reveal any thing beyond the great truths of religion. It was the absurd doctrine of what is called the plenary inspiration which induced the inquisitors of Rome to imprison Galileo for proving that the earth was not immovable. There is, perhaps, hardly an individual in England, however ignorant or intolerant, not even one of the governors of Bedlam or St. Bartholomew's, who would now attempt to screen those inquisitors from contempt and abhorrence; but they should be told that their own conduct is precisely similar, that they are actuated by the very same spirit and motives, and that it is just as probable that St. Paul might have wrong notions of the animal economy, as King David of the movements of the heavenly bodies. Unfortunately, such behaviour in public bodies towards a man of science, stamps a character on a whole

age and nation, and this it is which renders it a duty on every man of public spirit or enlightened patriotism, to enter his protest against conduct so mean and disgraceful."

I have only to add, Mr. Editor, that as the Doctor's discourse has had the effect of entirely changing my opinion on the subject, I have written it to you, in order, if you please, to communicate it to your readers.

S. W.

I WAS solicited some time since, by more than one of your readers, and, I believe, subscribers, to send you some remarks on Mr. Belsham's Censure of Mr. Robinson's History of Baptism. I was unwilling at first to engage, partly because I had paid my respects already to that gentleman's memory, and partly because I had a place in reserve, in which I meant, at the proper time, to say something more concerning him. At length, however, I complied, for which I have been justly condemned by some friends, and I have condemned myself, as I was engaged in business at the time from which nothing ought to have diverted me, and as I could not engage in such remarks without going into detail. My motives, as I have explained them, were rather general than particular. I had no personal dislikes nor private seekings, and I was as little influenced by the love of controversy, or a desire of obtruding myself on the notice of your Correspondents. I sent, as you know, no signature, nor did I intend at first to be known as the writer. I have reason, on many accounts, to be sorry for dwelling on the subject so long, and the more so, if my aim to do justice to Mr. Robinson has at any time obtruded on more valuable communications.

That some of your subscribers may wish the subject to be discontinued, I can very readily believe, and, to speak freely, I was myself before-hand with their wishes. What I said on sending my last communication I have in part forgotten: but I had determined on my return to town to trouble you no more, as well because I was aware that what I had already offered could not interest many of your readers, as because I thought what I had yet in reserve could not (in the way I proposed to treat it) be offered with pro-

priety to your work. It was, therefore, my wish and intention to drop the subject for the present, to finish the remarks at my leisure, and, in my own time and way, to submit them to the public.

It is natural, Sir, that you should wish to begin the new year with new subjects, and that your Correspondents should look for them. At the same time, as the case now stands, I am obliged to leave off in the midst of my argument, or rather at the precise point, where, I conceive, its principal strength lies. The communication now in your hands, with what I proposed still to add, went to shew, that Mr. Robinson's translations, with the exception of typographical errors, * is, in the main, right, and as "to recriminate is just," that Mr. Belsham's is grammatically and essentially wrong; and that several other matters, advanced by that gentleman, relating to Tertullian, both in your Repository and his own publication, is incorrect, either directly or by implication. It was, further, intended to examine Mr. Belsham's Greek translations, and quotations from Dr. Wall, by the language of the New Testament, and of the first Greek Fathers. I have already alluded to these matters, and gone over the ground in my own mind, and by a course of honest inquiry. Now, Sir, it would not be agreeable to my feelings to leave Mr. Robinson under misconceptions and misrepresentations, and I should reckon it dishonourable to have made insinuations which I cannot substantiate. Something, therefore, is still left for future discussion.

But, perhaps, Sir, it was kind in some of your Correspondents, for the present, to put the check-string on my aberrations: and certain of my friends, wish they had done it sooner, for they knew I was seriously engaged, and had brought myself into great responsibility. As the matter now stands, I

* That the errata and omissions in Mr. Robinson's quotations from Tertullian are merely typographical, his translation proves; Mr. Belsham's translation is itself wrong, as is all that he says, or would imply, with respect to Tertullian, as well in reference to the *subject* and *mode* of baptism, as to the *time* and *place*. It is not historically true, according to *truly primitive faith and practice*.

shall dismiss the subject from my thoughts, and not resume it till I have finished my proper business. I beg leave to add, that my observations on Mr. Robinson's History will extend no further than Tertullian is concerned; for there the charge was brought; and that an examination of Mr. Belsham's Greek authorities, though arising out of the subject, will be a work of supererogation. These, with a few previous questions, are the points, (and I shall keep to them,) which I propose to consider somewhat at large, and critically, as leisure and opportunity are offered, which cannot be till my present engagements are fulfilled.

Personal religion (that is, what arises from real feeling and conscientious conviction, producing a corresponding practice) is not subject to man's estimate; it is as little within his reach, as it ought to be beyond his controul, and, whether a man *conscientiously* believes, in what concerns a ceremony, that it may be practised with a few drops of water, or should be practised with much water; and whether he holds it should be administered to babes, or only on adults, or, if he conscientiously sets all water, and all ceremonies aside; in either case a truly conscientious man is equally religious. But points, as they are made the matter of theological controversy, like other literary subjects, may be properly estimated, and brought under the laws of criticism. On these principles no opposition could have been intended, nor can hereafter be, against personal religion, and in any course of future inquiry that I may enter on, I may, perhaps, think it my duty to move as independent of Mr. Robinson as Mr. Belsham.

In the mean time, I re-affirm, that Mr. B. has himself mistranslated and misrepresented Tertullian, as my papers suppressed would have more fully shewn. I wish certain of your readers to be informed, that the remarks contained in them, together with the preceding Letters, I propose to submit to their consideration, in a more public and correct form, when I am at leisure, which, however, is not likely to be for a considerable time to come.

G. D.

P. S. As, I perceive, your Correspondent pays great deference to the authorities of Dr. Wall and Dr. Priest-

ley on the points which are the subject of these Letters, it is proposed, on a proper occasion, to examine the value of their authorities.

Newport, Isle of Wight,
December 16, 1819.

SIR,

AS a member of one of those unfortunate Societies which have fallen under the formidable lash of Mr. Belsham's censure, [XIV. 657,] permit me to state a few circumstances which may at least serve to palliate, if they do not justify our conduct.

The London Unitarian Society, it appears, "was first formed by a few individuals, who, assuming as a principle that the simple humanity of Jesus Christ is a doctrine of the highest importance, and believing that every deviation from it tends to still greater errors, and that these deviations have, in fact, proved the primary source of the grossest corruptions of the Christian doctrine, conceived that they could not render a better service to the interests of pure and practical Christianity, than by instituting a society, the direct and avowed object of which should be the public profession and promulgation of this fundamental truth."

Not so, the Southern Unitarian Society: this Society was formed by persons, some of whom held that our Saviour, before his birth, existed in a state of great glory and happiness; others, that he was by nature, in all respects, like his brethren; though they all believed in his subordination to the Father and complete dependence upon him. They all acknowledged the absolute unity and unrivalled supremacy of Jehovah, the almighty, all-wise, and all-gracious Creator and Preserver of all things, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. To teach this great doctrine was the object which the formation of the Society had in view: its members were far from adopting the contracted notion, that in order to associate for this purpose it was necessary that a complete similarity should exist on minor points of opinion.

In order to bear their united testimony to the unity of God, they no more conceived it necessary that they should think alike as to the age of Christ, than as to his stature and complexion. Where, then, is the justice, as far at least as we are concerned, of

the charge "that the unforeseen and unexpected junction of the Arians has, in some measure, disturbed the harmony of the Society, as they have been continually pushing to alter the preamble, and in some cases, among the affiliated societies, with too much success; having actually subverted the original object of the Society, the profession of the simple humanity of Christ"?

But, Sir, we have great examples to plead in excuse of our "modern Latitudinarian principles." At the first annual meeting of the Southern Society, held at Portsmouth in 1812, the secretary informed the committee that he had obtained the consent of the Rev. Thomas Belsham to preach at the next anniversary; it was subsequently resolved, after thanking Mr. Belsham for his obliging compliance with the request that had been made to him, "That he be informed that this Society is associated *only* in the doctrine of the Divine Unity." Now, Sir, I have not Mr. Belsham's sermon before me; "but I fear that, instead of the good old original practice of preaching the truth as it is in Jesus," he adopted, "the modern principle of the reformed societies," which is, "not to give offence to their new friends," and that something else was "substituted in the room of a plain, energetic declaration of the absolute unity of God and the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, as the great and fundamental articles of the Christian faith;" for I find in the record of proceedings at the meeting for business, held immediately after the morning service, the following resolutions:

"That it be entered as a minute on the journal of the Society, and printed with the list of subscribers, that by calling ourselves Unitarians, we mean only to avow our belief in the simple unity of God."

"That the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Belsham, *for the candid manner in which he received the information of the Society's character and design, as well as listened to their request of adopting his discourse.*"

Mr. Belsham, who had become a member of the Society, is stated to have been present when the above resolutions were passed, and it does not appear that any objection was made to them. Several of our succeeding preachers, like Mr. Belsham, adapted

their discourses to the character and design of the Society, and among the rest, the gentleman who preached at its last anniversary: he, it is true, warned his hearers "not to be ashamed of Christ and his words"—"a duty certainly in these times of no very difficult performance;" but he was far from resting in this general exhortation; he defined the leading articles of Christian faith to consist in a belief of the unity of God, the placability of the Divine character, and the remedial nature of future punishment: these fundamental doctrines he earnestly exhorted his hearers openly to avow and maintain; though, like some of his predecessors, adapting his discourse to the character and design of the Society, he forbore to insist on any peculiar opinion as to the person of Christ.

In conclusion, Sir, allow me to express a hope, that the respected gentleman so frequently alluded to, will see the propriety of abstaining in future from so severely censuring those who have only followed the line of conduct which he himself assisted to mark out.

VECTIS.

Norwich,

December 14, 1819.

SIR,
MUCH as I admire and applaud the spirit which pervades the letter of your Liverpool Correspondent T., [XIV. 672,] I am not so much aware, as he seems to be, of the absolute necessity of a *General Unitarian Association*. It appears to me that the exertions of the Unitarians have been, though slowly, yet gradually and powerfully directed as a body towards the accomplishment of those ends which, as Christians, they are bound to promote. They are bound to make known their sentiments and opinions, to attack unscriptural creeds and idolatrous worship, to wage unceasing war with error, bigotry and superstition, and never to relax till these be no more. This they are associated for the purpose of effecting, by their London Unitarian Book Society, which, in the course of thirty years, has lived to see in existence and in action a numerous and thriving progeny—by the unwearied and valuable labours of their Missionaries, and by the various objects which the Unitarian Fund pursues with equal zeal and prudence. They are bound to watch over and protect (as

far as they can) the civil rights which they enjoy, and to obtain an extension of them. This they do by the Association for that purpose. They are bound to provide a place at which education may be given to those persons who desire to become public instructors; and this they do by supporting the College at York. They are also bound to afford assistance to the wants of their brethren, and this they do by their Fellowship Funds.

All these Societies and Associations have arisen, because the want of them has become manifest, but what other objects your Correspondent has in view besides these, is not, I think, very apparent. He has referred to the state of the Chapels at Stafford, Stone, and Newcastle-under-Line, in proof of the necessity of such an Association, but surely these cases come immediately within the province of the Unitarian Fund, which has successfully interposed to rescue some of our old Presbyterian Churches from entire decay, and if its funds had been sufficiently ample, would, probably, have used the same exertions in behalf of these places. In counties where there are no Unitarians, of course no Associations can exist, but in those in which they are at all numerous, Associations of one kind or other have sprung up, and these, I conceive, may be rendered quite adequate to the necessary exertions of their respective districts. Each of these Associations has a secretary, whose name is generally announced every year in the Repository, and to whom, of course, the London Societies apply whenever necessary. The following list will shew how much has already been effected, and how much still remains to be done in various parts of the kingdom. It is, probably, not a complete one, but it may serve as an attempt or a beginning of a more perfect one:

*London.—Unitarian Book Society.
 Unitarian Fund.*

Association for Protecting the Civil Rights of Unitarians.

Western Unitarian Society, including Somerset, Gloucester, Devonshire, Dorsetshire, Wiltshire.

Southern Unitarian Society, including Hampshire and Sussex.

Northern Unitarian Society, including Derby, Nottingham, Leicester, and the South of Yorkshire.

Warwickshire Unitarian Society,

including Warwick, Leicester, Stafford, Nottingham and Worcestershire.

North Eastern Unitarian Society, including Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire, Isle of Ely, and part of Norfolk.

Eastern Unitarian Society, including part of Norfolk, Suffolk, and part of Essex.

Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association.

West Riding of York Unitarian Tract Society.

Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Association.

Gainsborough Association.

Scotch Unitarian Christian Association.

South Wales Unitarian Society.

Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association.

Southern Unitarian Fund.

Manchester Quarterly Meeting of Ministers.

Midland and Northern Meeting of Unitarian Ministers.

Welsh Unitarian Ministers' Quarterly Meeting.

Assembly of Ministers in Devon and Cornwall.

Dudley Double Lecture.

Somersetshire and Dorsetshire Association of Ministers.

Rossendale and Rochdale Association of Unitarian Brethren.

This list comprises twenty-four distinct Societies, of which the objects are various, but they all have one common principle and effect, that of bringing different churches into fellowship. They are all both able and willing to promote the various objects which, as a body, we ought to have in view. The counties which are not embraced by any of these Associations, are Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire, Shropshire, Rutland, Hereford, Northampton, Huntingdon, Bedford, Hertford, Bucks, Oxford, Berks and Surrey.

Then in addition to these District Associations, there appear to have been Fellowship Funds formed in London, (Parliament Court,) Southwark, (Dr. T. Rees's,) Hackney, (Gravel Pit,) Manchester, Birmingham, (Old and New Meetings,) Swansea, Exeter, Lewes, Newport, Warwick, Southwark, Kidderminster, Sheffield, Leicester, Brighton, Tenterden, Norwich, Palgrave, Yeovil, Lynn, Sidmouth, Glou-

cester, Liverpool, Hull, Framlingham, Warrington and York.

Now, comparing this list (in which I hope there are several omissions) with the number of Unitarian congregations, it appears to me, that it is to its extension, our efforts ought to be chiefly directed. Here is abundant scope for more to be done. The means are easy and attainable — the utility obvious, the success certain. Every society can do according to its ability — much to whom much is given, and little to whom little. If universal, all our institutions and all the objects embraced by them might be easily, effectually and liberally supported, and supported in the best possible way; not by the exertions of a few opulent individuals, but by the collective strength of the whole body.

The formation of a General Association would necessarily bring with it a fresh pecuniary call upon Unitarians. Now, the multiplication of societies, unless their utility be most apparent, is an evil. If they be too numerous, they necessarily starve each other. But in the Fellowship Funds the sum required from each person is so small, that they cannot decline or decay if once established. No man thinks it worth his while to give up a subscription of a penny-a-week. They are at present only in their infancy, and yet we see that for the erection of one place of worship they have furnished £79, (see Repos. Wrapper for Nov.) the whole of which is raised without inconvenience to any one, and without the deduction of a shilling for travelling expenses, or the irksomeness of repeated and often unavailing personal solicitations.

EDWARD TAYLOR.

Bristol,

January 7, 1820.

SIR,
INCOMPETENT as I may be to perform the task in a manner satisfactory to myself or to others, I am desirous of making some remarks upon the subject of the Divine Influence, in reference to the communication of your Correspondent L. J. J., inserted in your Number for November (XIV. 675). I feel it, indeed, to be a duty to enter a protest at least against that cold scepticism, which must tend to chill the warmth of pious affections, to weaken the power of virtuous emotions, and to make religion itself little else than an altar without an offering.

If the arguments employed by your Correspondent to get rid of "the petitionary part of devotion" be examined into, they will be found to have very little solidity, and I cannot but regret that the comfort and support of many pious, but, perhaps, not well-informed Christians, should be in any respect endangered by the promulgation of opinions which I deem so contrary to reason and Scripture.

The great error which your Correspondent appears to me guilty of, is, his taking it upon himself to settle and limit the powers and modes of the operations of the Deity. Admitting the premises he has laid down to be correct, his reasoning is fair, but believing them, as I do, to be false, I cannot attach the slightest importance to his conclusions.

After stating that all the phenomena of the universe depend upon certain laws fixed by the Supreme Being, he adds, "These laws, however, excepting in miraculous times, seem to act uniformly, regularly, and without any interruption, even from any interference, direction or controul, of their great Former himself:" and in reply to a remark of your Correspondent H. T., (XIV. 477,) that there is nothing irrational in praying for spiritual guidance, or that God would exercise his providence in placing in our way the means of improvement, and adapting our principles to our trials, L. J. J. observes, "I confess it appears to me very irrational, and the more so, as 'God has actually revealed his will to us in a supernatural manner,' that he should now 'so order his providence,' that is, interrupt the action of his own laws, 'that this holy will may be understood by us.'"

So ignorant as we are, and must in this state of existence be content to remain, of the manner in which God has ordered the laws of nature, or chosen to accomplish the designs of his providence, it is presumptuous to assert that any end may not be produced without a departure from, or an interruption in those fixed laws. And what is there irrational in the supposition, that our prayers may be some of the means appointed by himself to bring about particular ends?

For reasons which we cannot doubt are the wisest and the best, the Deity has not permitted us to penetrate the

veil that conceals the workings of his providence. We know not the influences which he calls into action in the production of events, and it is not allowed us to conjecture to what extent he regards the supplications of his creatures. But this ignorance should be a check to our presumption only, and not to our humble hope that our prayers may find acceptance in his sight. I should pursue this point farther, but it has been so ably treated in the chapter on "The Parental Character of the Deity," in Dr. Cogan's Theological Disquisition on Christianity, that I cannot do better than refer your readers to that work. The whole of L. J. J.'s arguments will be found there fully anticipated, and most satisfactorily answered.

I cannot well imagine how a person who peruses the New Testament, with a sincere desire to discover truth, and who believes in the Christian religion, can feel the doubt implied in L. J. J.'s question respecting prayer, "if it be a duty enjoined upon us in the New Testament," &c. There are, in my opinion, few duties more clearly defined and commanded than that of prayer, and the arguments which may be employed to prove that it was only enjoined upon those of the apostolic age, will equally prove that all the other duties and obligations of Christianity were confined to its earliest professors.

To a believer in the authenticity of the New Testament, I should think that the first part of the sixth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, would be quite convincing of the duty of prayer in its petitionary, as well as in its other forms. Christ has there given a model for prayer. Though in a preceding verse he says to his disciples, "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him," so far from discouraging them from presenting petitions to their Father, he instructs them to pray even for *temporal* blessings, "Give us this day our daily bread:" and because Christ has not informed us in what manner or degree our prayers will be answered, it is no reason why we should be induced by any speculations of our own upon the mode in which God may please to act, to omit the performance of a duty so clearly defined.

But not only to the instructions of

our Lord can we appeal in favour of prayer, we have his example also in the most direct and decisive manner. Upon the eve of the most important event of his history, when we cannot but suppose that he saw the horrors of a violent and ignominious death to be apparently inevitable, and while he acknowledges that his "soul is exceeding sorrowful," still does he open his heart to his heavenly Father, and entreat that his afflictions may be averted: "Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." With these memorable words before us, coming from such an authority, and uttered at such a moment, how insignificant do the doubts, the suspicions and the speculations of the sceptic appear! Here we have an example how we may pray, and how we ought to feel when we pray. Though our Lord knew that the hour of the sufferings he had predicted was drawing near; though he knew that submission to death would be required of him, we find him expressing the wish that the cup might pass from him, but accompanying the wish with the most submissive acquiescence in the wisdom of all the appointments of his Father. Can we desire a stronger encouragement to pray than this? In the moment of mental anguish, when all worldly succours appear to fail us, we have the example of Christ to breathe our wishes in the ear of our heavenly Father, and with unlimited confidence in the wisdom and goodness of him who knows what is fit for us better than we do, to pray for what we, in our ignorance, may think best for us.

In the chapter of St. Luke, (the xi.) where Christ gives the Lord's prayer as a model for praying to his disciples, who requested one, we find a further encouragement to the petitionary part of devotion in a parable. Though the language in this, as well as in other parables, is highly metaphorical, I cannot but consider the spirit of it as affording very strong evidence, in favour of the propriety of petitions to the throne of mercy.

It is supposed by some that our requests in prayer should be confined to what are called spiritual blessings, as wisdom, virtue, &c. To me, however, it appears that all the arguments which support this opinion, may be extended

also to petitions for those temporal blessings which are innocent in themselves, and which we believe to be good for us. Our Lord prayed for deliverance from the sorrows which awaited him, and instructed his disciples to pray for the supply of their "daily bread." It does not follow that we must be dissatisfied or discontented, because our prayers are not answered. It is the duty of a Christian, whenever he pours out before his heavenly Father the humble desires of his heart, to acknowledge his ignorance of what is best for him, and to hope for an answer to his supplications, only so far as they may be conducive to his real interest, and agreeable to the dispensations of unerring wisdom and unlimited goodness. With these views and feelings, whether we pray for spiritual assistance, or for those temporal blessings in which the welfare of ourselves and of those who are dear to us is intimately involved, our addresses cannot be injurious to ourselves, or unacceptable to that Being who is constantly watching over us, and who has graciously permitted us to look up to him with the reverential affection of children to a kind Father.

Whatever we may consider the *efficacy* of prayer to be, it is not necessary for us to suppose that we can *inform* the Deity of what is proper for us, or that any alteration will be made in his plans in consequence of our prayers. We are ignorant of all his plans, and of the methods by which he brings them about: it is enough for us to know that he has commanded us to pray to him for the blessings which we think will be conducive to our real interest, while, with perfect resignation, we leave to his wisdom the degree and mode in which they are to be granted.

Some have supposed that the efficacy of prayer is confined solely to *ourselves*, and that it is of no use farther than as it acts upon our minds, and renders us more diligent in the discharge of our duties. To meditate upon the perfections of the Deity, to contemplate the stupendous effects of his boundless power, to mark the harmonious operations of his wisdom, and to dwell upon the benevolence which shines forth through all his works, must refine, expand and elevate the mind: but, it is while viewing him under the character of a Parent, while

acknowledging our dependence upon him for every thing we enjoy, and imploring for ourselves and others a continuance of his mercies, that the feelings and affections of our hearts are most awakened to love, and confidence, and holy joy. Such, I believe to be the constitution of the human mind, that without the belief that our petitions *might* (in what manner we know not) have *some* effect in procuring for us the blessings we supplicate, our devotions would soon be chilled, and their influence on our hearts soon destroyed. It is not necessary to know in what manner God will attend to our petitions, in order to be convinced that he *will* hear them, and that he *may* answer them. If we suppose that the act of acknowledging our dependence upon God, and imploring the bestowment of his blessings has the effect of rendering our minds more fitted for receiving what we ask, and thus disposes our heavenly Father to grant our requests, all for which I contend, is admitted. L. J. J. is ready to allow that the expression of our wishes, for good dispositions, has a tendency to strengthen and confirm them, and that this effect actually takes place, but he discourages all attempts to procure them in this pious manner, by adding, that they may "be obtained by means much more simple and direct than that of supplication."

I am also much inclined to believe, that the gratitude which we ought to feel for the many mercies and blessings we are constantly experiencing, would have its fervency much diminished if we viewed the favours of Providence as bestowed upon us merely according to the original, fixed and immutable laws of nature. The philosopher may fancy that he can force his mind to this continued effort of gratitude, but to keep alive the feeling in the hearts of most, a sense of the more immediate and personal regard of the Deity, and that constant intercourse with him which a belief in his ever-watchful providence creates, will be necessary.

It appears to me, that your Correspondent, from the fear of leading to superstition, has gone to the other extreme—an extreme, perhaps, not the less dangerous of the two. He seems to think that prayer cannot be answered **excepting** by some immediate, visible interference of Providence, some ob-

vious suspension of the usual laws by which he governs the universe, which, I presume, he means by "supernatural." If the remarks of T. F. and the excellent letter of H. T. upon this subject, inserted in your Number for August, (XIV. 476—479,) together with the interesting lecture of my friend Dr. Carpenter, upon the Divine Influence, in your Numbers for September and October, (XIV. 545—550 and 617—622,) are not satisfactory to L. J. J., I shall despair of giving any explanation that would be more so. I see no difficulty in the supposition that the Deity may execute any of his plans,—that he may bestow upon us blessings, of either a temporal or spiritual nature, without any miraculous interference.

L. J. J. demands the proof that God answers the prayers of his creatures. It is equally incumbent upon him to prove that the Deity does *not* sometimes answer the prayers that are offered to him in sincerity and uprightness of heart. Though we see that events often happen contrary to our wishes and our prayers, yet we often observe, that they turn out beyond our most sanguine desires and expectations, and it by no means follows, because we cannot precisely say how far our petitions have been attended to, that they have been altogether neglected. It is apparently the design of the Deity, although he has commanded us to pray to him, that we are never to feel certain of the answer to our prayers. Were we conscious in praying for spiritual blessings that they were conceded to our request, the knowledge might slacken our exertions in the attainment of moral excellence, and lead us to depend more upon the assistance of heaven than upon our own endeavours.

Though I believe that we have the example of Christ and his apostles, and the authority of every Christian community, from their time to the present day, to pray for temporal blessings, yet I agree with your Correspondent T. F. (XIV. 476,) in thinking that the propriety of prayer for spiritual blessings rests upon even a more solid basis. In praying for wisdom and virtue, for religious knowledge, religious feelings and religious conduct, we cannot err. For the attainment of these we are placed in the world, and we know that our future state will be

greatly affected by the progress we make in them: what, therefore, can be more proper, or more natural than to entreat the blessing of heaven upon exertions which our own frailty, and the temptations to which we are constantly exposed, are too apt to render weak and inefficient?

I am unwilling to dismiss this subject without remarking, that it is the duty of all Christians to observe much discretion in offering objections to those opinions of their brethren which tend to afford consolation under affliction, support in the hour of temptation, and encouragement in the often arduous path of duty. Truth, it will be said, can do no harm: but injudicious attempts to discover truth may be productive of a great deal of harm. Indeed, there are many truths that Providence chooses to withhold from our comprehension, and in the present limited state of our faculties, it is very probable that the knowledge of them would be injurious to us. There is a medium between enthusiasm and scepticism, and in our desire to avoid one extreme, let us not fall into the other. It is very easy to raise objections: there is no system in ethics, no creed in religion, to which some may not be offered: but we ought to be very cautious in destroying a good system, unless we are prepared to substitute a better. To object to the use of supplicatory prayer, because we cannot comprehend how the Deity can answer our prayers without some miraculous interposition, or some deviation from his all-wise purposes, appears to me much the same as opposing the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead, because we cannot understand how God can re-organize the decomposed parts of the animal frame, or how the intellectual principle can exist in a state distinct from the body. The ways of Providence are past our finding out: we must be *patient* and *humble* while on earth: in another state of existence, a great source of satisfaction may arise from an intelligible view of the plans and designs of the Almighty. But while we remain in the present scene of trial, exposed to pain and sorrow, to temptation and sin, let us not be deprived of that anchor of our souls,—that high privilege of rational and accountable beings, the liberty of pouring out our hearts to God; and

petitioning his consolation and support, his mercy and kindness, his assistance and direction, under all the difficulties, distresses and frailties we are subject to. In the dubious moments of mental uncertainty, when the path of virtue is but dimly recognised, or, when the wavering will, beset by temptations, hesitates between the impulses of inclination and the pointings of duty, let us not be denied the encouraging permission of supplicating from our heavenly Father, that guidance which his frail and erring children so much require. And when anxiously watching the bed of sickness, while the messenger of death appears hovering over the form of one to whom our hearts are united by the tenderest sympathies of nature;—or, when unable to avail ourselves of any more earthly aids, we gaze upon the seemingly fast-closing eyes of him whose life is dear to his friends and important to the world;—in moments like these, oh! let us not be refused the sweet consolation of praying with earnestness,—but with perfect resignation to the whole of our Father's will, that the threatened affliction may be averted.

The advantages of this communion with our heavenly Father must be apparent. It leads us to a closer intercourse with him than we can enjoy, if we merely contemplate him as a Being who governs the world by certain fixed unvarying rules, who (according to L. J. J.) “preserves or destroys his creatures agreeably to the general laws of the universe.” We need not fear falling into superstitious opinions, if we entertain those sentiments of God which the Scriptures teach; that his rational creatures are objects of his peculiar care, that he will hear and accept their prayers, and that they are to feel towards him the gratitude and reverence, the love and veneration, the confidence in his protection, guidance and direction, which the relation of “our Father in heaven” supposes and demands. We shall then be led to have God always before us; in moments of joy to raise our grateful thoughts to him; in temptation to supplicate his assistance, in pain to pray for relief from him; to implore from his benevolence health in sickness, consolation in sorrow, hope in despondence, and comfort and support under all the trials we may meet with.

Happy but, I trust, not unattainable is the state of that man's mind, whose pious and well-regulated feelings enable him with sincerity to say,

In every joy that crowns my days,
In every pain I bear,
My heart shall find delight in praise,
Or seek relief in prayer.

And surely we cannot err in imitating the example of our blessed Lord. If he prayed for release from suffering and sorrow, it cannot be wrong for us, his imperfect followers, if we feel equal resignation to the Divine will, to pray also for the mercies of our heavenly Father.

These remarks have extended much beyond what I intended: the subject, however, is an important one, and, I trust, I shall be excused. I wished to advert to some other points, but I must not trespass any longer upon your valuable pages, or on the patience of your readers.

J. B. ESTLIN.

SIR,

I WAS very glad to see in your last Number, [XIV. 744—750,] that the subject on which I had taken the liberty of addressing you, had called forth the able pen of Dr. Lant Carpenter. In the greater part of what he has advanced I most cordially agree with him: but I beg leave to submit to his consideration, and that of the Western Societies, formed on the plan of the Society at London, a few remarks on the alteration which he proposes to be made in the articles of their societies. Previous, however, to this, let me call your attention to what I stated in my last letter; namely, that several Unitarians at Cambridge quitted the Society formed in London for the distribution of books, on other grounds besides those stated by Mr. Belsham in his letter to you on this subject. [XIV. 657—660.]

I have now before me the words of the Preamble, declaring the fundamental principle of the Society, in which it is stated *we* all agree. By which is evidently implied or intended to be implied, that all the subscribers to this Society should agree to its fundamental principle. I will not detain you with any remarks on the first part, relating to the Supreme Being, though its language, in my opinion, is reprehensible: but I come to that relative

to the character of Christ, which did not agree, as I have stated in my former letter, with the views we then at Cambridge entertained of it; and on reviewing this article my opinion remains unshaken.

The words of the article imposed upon the subscribers are as follow: "Jesus Christ was the most eminent of those messengers, which he (God) employed to reveal his will to mankind; possessing extraordinary powers similar to those received by other prophets, but in a much higher degree." Hence the Messiah is ranked among the messengers, and distinguished from them only by superiority of powers; and these powers are similar to those enjoyed by the other prophets. Now superiority of similar power being thus declared to be the distinguishing character of our Saviour, it follows that he himself was inferior to some of his disciples: for he has declared, that they should do even greater works than he did; and that this prophecy was accomplished is evident to any one that reads attentively the Acts of the Apostles.

Among the messengers above referred to, no one was, according to the words of our Saviour, greater than John the Baptist, yet we do not find one miracle to have been recorded by him, and hence we are at a loss to determine what was meant by the extraordinary powers possessed by the prophets; and besides, the least in the kingdom of God is declared to be even superior to John the Baptist. Thus our Saviour is the most eminent of the messengers; but as the least in the kingdom of God is declared to be greater than the greatest of them, except him, it does not appear from the account given of our Saviour, in this article of the Society, that many of the disciples may not be greater than their Master.

Again, our Saviour in his beautiful parable speaks of messengers, sent by the master of the vineyard to the farmers of it, but without effect; and at last he sent his own son, saying, although they have not regarded my messengers, they will surely reverence my son. From which passage it appears to me evident, that a strong line of distinction is drawn between our Saviour and the messengers that appeared before him; and that his powers,

so far from being similar to theirs, were of a quite different nature. Indeed it appears so from the language used by them: the prophets in addressing the people say, "thus saith the Lord;" but our Saviour speaks from himself, as a son invested with the authority of his father.

In the customary language of the world we perceive a distinction in terms, according to the dignity of character supported by persons in office. Thus he, who is charged with an important mission from one sovereign to another, is called an ambassador; the ordinary people who carry dispatches to him are called messengers; and ambassadors themselves differ in rank, and are sometimes designated by inferior titles, as envoys, &c. Now, it may be said, that all these, being in fact employed on a message from the sovereign, may be called messengers; yet surely there would be great impropriety of language in saying, the messenger from England made his entry into Paris on such a day, and had an audience from his most Christian Majesty, by whom he was very graciously received. The same impropriety appears to be in the test of the Unitarian Book Society. The term messenger is improperly chosen, and is derogatory to the character of our Saviour; and I cannot persuade myself, that it would have been used, but from the fears in the persons who framed the test, that, if they used the terms of dignity, so frequently applied by the apostles to our Saviour, they should countenance the errors of those who have overstrained those terms, and given to him a character which he was the farthest in the world from assuming. Thus by avoiding one, they have fallen into the opposite extreme.

In saying this, however, I may perhaps be supposed to countenance the opinions of those Unitarians who believe our Saviour to have existed in a superior state, or, in other words, to have been a pre-existing being. But when I left the sect established by law, which I did from an examination of the Holy Scriptures, and without any regard to the opinions or traditions of men, I left it on the conviction, that our Saviour was a man like to ourselves, sin only excepted, but distinguished from all who went before or will follow after him, in being the ap-

pointed man under God for the salvation of mankind; that through him God bestows eternal life on his disciples; that we are bound to reverence him as our Saviour; and that all the titles we bestow on the messengers or prophets who preceded him, fall far short of the dignity of his character, and of the glory justly assigned to him for his active obedience to the will of his and their heavenly Father and God, and his submission to the most disgraceful death for our benefit. The prophets came with a message from God, and from the earliest records they unite in foretelling the humiliation and glory of him who should bruise the serpent's head. In that glory none of the prophets or messengers can participate with him, and when we look to the writings of the Apostles, and observe the exalted terms in which they speak of our Saviour, I cannot but think, that they would entertain a very mean opinion of the Christianity of those persons who should speak of our Saviour only as a messenger, and keep out of sight the more appropriate parts of his character. In fact, the term so often applied to him in Scripture, Our Saviour, carries with it enough to shew the impropriety of the test laid down by the Unitarian Book Society. At any rate this was the opinion of us at Cambridge, and the experience I have since had serves only to convince me, that that opinion was well founded.

Indeed, it appears to me, that the language used by the Unitarian Book Society, is calculated to produce, and has produced very pernicious effects. It has a tendency to lead persons away from the spirituality of our holy religion. It has been my fate to hear sermons and prayers, in neither of which has been the least allusion to our Saviour; and they might have been addressed to, and received by a Deistical as well as a Christian audience. And this puts me in mind of the only sermon I ever heard from a celebrated preacher, Mr. Rowland Hill, which, with very slight exceptions, might be termed a truly evangelical discourse. In it he made a remark, on which he laid a becoming stress, and which, whenever a fit opportunity occurs, I endeavour to enforce on the minds of all who get into the pulpit; namely, that a discourse without the

Saviour in it may be very beautiful, very philosophical, very moral; but still it wants the grand essential to make it suitable to a Christian audience. In fact, he said, that the mind of the preacher might be known from his discourse, and that he could not be duly impressed with the grand truths of Christianity, unless he made them appear in striking colours in every address delivered from the pulpit.

I cannot, by any means, approve of the reasons alleged by Mr. Belsham, for retaining the term "idolatrous" in the articles of the Unitarian Book Society; for the obstinate adherence to that term appears to me to swerve very far from what is recommended to us by our Saviour, the wisdom of the serpent and the innocence of the dove. What a striking contrast may be perceived in the conduct of the framers of the articles of the Unitarian Book Society, and that of the apostle Paul at Athens, whose admirable speech before the Areiopagus is so strangely travestied in the Bible now in general use. The apostle's spirit was roused in that city, wholly given to idolatry; but he does not use the term idolatrous, nor does he utter an expression which would convey contempt of his audience. His speech is a masterpiece of eloquence, and points out to us most forcibly the mode of conduct to be used towards those who are of a different opinion from ourselves.

The framers of the articles of the Unitarian Book Society appear to me to have imbibed a portion of that spirit which dictated the articles of the sect established by law in the southern part of this island. I can easily conceive, that both parties were convinced in their own mind, that what they drew up was founded on the Scriptures, and, therefore, essential to the faith of every Christian. But the hand of man appears in both, and in the vain endeavour to clothe their sentiments in a formulary that every Christian might safely subscribe, they have met with the success which such an attempt deserves. We must leave the Scriptures to speak for themselves, and when we travel out of the record, we shall certainly fall into error.

I might now proceed to discuss the formulary given to us by Dr. Lant Carpenter, but as I have trespassed so long on your patience, I will beg leave

to reserve my observations upon it till another opportunity.

W. FRIEND.

SIR, *London, Dec. 6, 1819.*

AFTER the audacious attempt of Mr. Carlile to bring the Christian religion into discredit, it was to be expected that its ministers would reprobate such conduct, and bear their most decided testimony against Infidelity. The sermon of Mr. Fox, entitled, *The Duties of Christians towards Deists*, [Mon. Repos. XIV. 701,] forms an exception, for he palliates Unbelief, and dwells on the imperfections as well as certain vices of professed Christians, with an unmitigated severity.

Mr. Fox begins with assuring us, "I am no sceptic as to the essentials of Christianity." But why should scepticism, in any form or degree, attach to the professors of Christianity? Essentials and non-essentials differ not in their truth, but in their importance. To be a sceptic, therefore, as to non-essentials, is to be in a measure an Unbeliever, and surely this ought not to be the case with *the faithful minister* of the New Testament. To say the best, it has an odd appearance, and will probably account for many positions by which the performance is characterised. The author, however, adds, "Its truth is my trust; its evidences are to my mind most convincing; its moral loveliness charms my heart; to its holy precepts I would yield unreserved submission; in the removal of its corruptions and the extension of its influence I would exert all my powers and spend all my days, and its promises I regard as a sure foundation for the immortal hopes of man." After this admirable declaration, Mr. Fox, in the next page, dwelling on the moral evidence of Christianity, reminds the reader that it is not *mathematical* or demonstrative; therefore, the Deist may be right and the Christian wrong; and upon this representation he seems to expatiate with ill-timed amplification. Where is the necessity of throwing out the idea that "the prophecies" may be no more than lucky guesses, that CHRIST may have entertained "the fancy" of being the Messiah, that the apostles might turn out "a clan of ignorant deceivers," and that their system, "so framed and so pro-

pagated," might nevertheless become the admiration of the wisest, the delight of the virtuous, the refuge of the afflicted, the source of knowledge, holiness, and joy to the world! This, indeed, he supposes, to be "barely possible;" but why make the supposition at all? A concession of this kind, the Deist, he may rest assured, will turn to no good account. And it is unavailingly counteracted by the author avowing his own belief on such evidence and by declaring that the rejection of such evidence "incarcerates us in the dark dungeon of eternal scepticism."

Mr. Fox then proceeds in the same style of special pleading: "Christians, draw not too hastily the inference that, if the conclusiveness of these and other proofs be not seen, it can only be attributed to the mental perception being dimmed by the effluvia of a corrupted heart. He to whose sight alone the heart is open, who knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are dust, can alone be qualified to pronounce such a condemnation, and to him much may be visible which you cannot perceive, productive of an effect so undesirable, without inculpating the individual. Nay, you may imagine various pleas which in the judgment of charity ought to be admitted for the claims of an *avowed* and ACTIVE Deist, not to be ranked in sincerity and rectitude materially below an honest and active Christian"!

The preacher then institutes a kind of mathematical process to exculpate the individual in his predilection for Infidelity; but though we may grant that some minds are unhappily inclined to scepticism, yet, generally speaking, there is no reason to question the truth of our Saviour's solemn asseveration: "This is the condemnation that light is come into the world, but men love darkness rather than light—because *their deeds are evil*"! Jesus Christ makes no exception, and his ministers need not affect a greater delicacy on the subject. But I shall not enter any further into an analysis of this singular discourse, which has, we understand, drawn forth profusely the thanks of the Deist, whilst it has given offence to some of the best friends of Christianity. There was no need of handing over weapons to the

enemy. There was still less need of exposing and blazoning forth the differences subsisting betwixt the advocates of revealed religion. The enlightened and consistent Unitarian, who, at such a time, would wish to repel the charge that his creed has any alliance to Infidelity, ought to have avoided even *the appearance of evil*. The duties of Christians towards Deists are, most assuredly, not to seek out every possible excuse for their unbelief, but to expostulate with them on their unreasonableness in rejecting that plenitude of moral evidence of which alone religious subjects are susceptible; on their perverseness in identifying the corruptions and abuses of Christianity with the Christianity of the New Testament, in opposition to all that has been advanced to the contrary; and on the danger incurred by reviling a religion whose origin is divine. This is our bounden duty; and more than this ought not to have been done. We disclaim, as to Deists, the aid of the civil power, and leave them to the mercies of that God who alone has the disposal of the world to come.

Before I conclude, it is only justice to the author to remark, that the *Sermon* is well written, and many of its passages in strict accordance with the spirit of Christianity.—But I would caution a minister of the gospel against saying any thing which may promote rather than check the prevalence of Infidelity. Unitarians owe nothing to Mr. Carlile; he has, in the eyes of thousands, done them an injury which will not be easily retrieved. The reputedly orthodox will, in this point, believe the Infidel, though they yield him credence in nothing else. CHRISTIANS have an awful task to sustain in not betraying, either by principle or by practice, the religion they profess to an inveterate and outrageous enemy. And, with the author of this discourse, I am most firmly persuaded, that, "when the reign of ANTICHRIST is over, all hostility will be disarmed, and *the genuine gospel*, rising from the ruins of corruption, like the fabled phoenix in renewed youth from the funeral pile, shall spread its wings for a glorious flight, and urge its resistless course around the globe."

AN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN.

SIR, January 8, 1820.

TRUTH being of much more consequence to society than fame to an individual, I shall at all times feel grateful for a candid statement of any errors I may be led into, and I am willing to make due allowance for partiality in every case of personal feeling. With this sentiment I must express my thanks to your Correspondent for his detail (XIV. 750) of the Medical Dispute on the Origin of Vitality; at the same time, I trust it will appear in the sequel, that he has greatly magnified the inaccuracies of my statement, which, on his own shewing, are entirely local, and do not at all affect the subject in discussion. It is true, he has in part shifted the scene of the drama; but the performers in it remain the same, the plot is the same, and the *dénoûement*, if I may so speak, continues the same also. Upon a close inspection, I find that the mistakes which are so greatly multiplied for the purpose of effect, and which, at first sight, have a very formidable appearance, really resolve themselves into a single one; and it is this: that the Lectures, which I stated to have been delivered at Bartholomew Hospital, were, in truth, pronounced at the Surgeons' College in Lincoln's Inn Fields; a circumstance that I certainly might have recollected, and for the inadvertency I here apologize. Your readers, then, will change the locality of the public performances, although not of the controversy, and read thus: That two medical professors, who are surgeons to Bartholomew Hospital, each having pupils and followers as ardently attached to their masters and to their dogmas as any in the schools of the ancient philosophers, in the course of their public lectures at Surgeons' College, have maintained what they consider opposite theories on the doctrine of life, and have brought to the discussion as large a portion of the spleen as can be reasonably desired. Now, I would ask, is it at all likely that the young men, who were auditors of the lectures, and in a measure idolize the professors, should not take a lively interest in the discussion of the jarring opinions? This, therefore, is a sufficient reason why the disputes should run higher at the Hospital I have mentioned than at any other.

How your Correspondent could fall into so strange a mistake as to assert that, "during the last winter, no controversy was afloat amongst the medical professors and students at Bartholomew Hospital" upon the subject in dispute, is to me unaccountable, having a personal knowledge of the contrary. A word or two here as to dates. Mr. Abernethy's Lectures, to which I referred, were published in 1817, and it is the first in the series that furnished the principal ground of my animadversion, in the severity of which I do not feel inclined to make any abatement. The first course delivered by Mr. Lawrence, and upon which his colleague animadverted, were not, I believe, published; but his second course were so, and did not make their appearance until last winter. As these contained the obnoxious doctrines, the discussion was revived, and involved, at the same time, some theological inquiries. It was here the tenderness existed that occasioned the suppression of the book. The unwarrantable conduct of certain governors in attempting to put down metaphysical opinions by the infliction of civil pains and penalties, your Correspondent refers to another institution. My informant, whose authority I have no reason to question, speaks of it relatively to Bartholomew Hospital. I know not which is right; perhaps it may be true of both. Before I quit the subject of these lectures, I would just observe, that the enormous price at which they were published was a sufficient bar to their extensive circulation.

Since I wrote my former article, I have taken up the Monthly Review for last September, and there find the view I have taken of the subject fully corroborated. In a review of Mr. Abernethy's "Physiological Lectures," the writer says, "It is naturally to be expected that a lecturer under (his) circumstances, should be disposed to look with peculiar respect on the character and acquirements of Mr. Hunter, and to regard them with the eye rather of an advocate than of an impartial spectator: but while we allow considerable latitude to these feelings, and should be much disinclined to question them, if restrained within moderate limits, it is impossible not to

lament over that perversion of sentiment which leads Mr. Hunter's admirers to deem it a necessary tribute to his fame to attack, with other weapons than those of argument, every one who is induced to maintain opinions or hypotheses contrary to those of their master." "Mr. Abernethy's additions, (to Mr. Hunter's opinions,) as far as we learn their nature from this volume, are much more liable to animadversion than the tenets of his master; yet he betrays extreme impatience and irritability because they have been disputed, and even condescends to repel the attack by an appeal to prejudices, and by something that, we are concerned to say, borders at least on abuse." After noticing a want of charity towards Mr. Hunter's opponents, the Reviewer goes on to observe, "He speaks of them with a feeling of rancour that is seldom manifested in the writings of modern physiologists. They are invidiously designated as 'a party,' entitled 'modern sceptics,' and tauntingly styled 'writers by profession;' their morals and good sense are questioned, and they are assimilated to a description of persons whom we are taught to avoid, as maintaining principles at once dangerous and absurd."

Upon the merits of the controversy itself, I must still refrain from pronouncing any opinion, but should be glad to see the question discussed with temper and ability in your well-conducted work. Whatever be the immediate cause of life, whether it be the result of organization, as Mr. Lawrence contends, or the consequence of an electric fluid, according to Mr. Abernethy, it is a fair topic for inquiry, without quarreling, and there can be no just reason why either party should set down the other for fools or knaves. To consign our adversaries over to the prejudices of mankind, by calling them "professed sceptics,"—"persons in disguise,"—or "writers by profession, who have words at will to make the worse appear the better argument," is not a very legitimate mode of treating a philosophical question. The inconvenience of appealing to the passions, particularly when excited by theological prejudices, has already been felt by one medical professor, and may, in his turn, perchance, one day fall to the lot of the other.

As I would wish to regulate my own conduct by the rules that I prescribe to others, I hope that in the foregoing observations I have not indulged in any uncalled-for severity. To wound the feelings of any person unnecessarily, is far from my intention; but when I take up a book and find the author resorting to other means than argument to support his opinions, I cannot help thinking him an unworthy advocate. And I must add, that if the use of reproachful language, and of disingenuous arts in controversy, be not the ready way for a writer to "disgrace" himself, I do not know what is. With these sentiments, unwilling to trespass farther upon your columns, I commit myself to the judgment of your readers.

W. W.

*Essex-House,**January 17, 1820.*

SIR,
HAVING in my former letter [XIV. 657] only stated facts which I know to be incontrovertible, I shall now, in reply to my friend Dr. Carpenter, [XIV. 744,] whose abilities, zeal and exertions in promoting the great cause of Christian truth I hold in the highest estimation, only offer explanations where it appears to me that my expressions have been misunderstood, or my intentions misconceived; and I will do it with all possible brevity, even at the hazard of appearing abrupt.

1. I trust that my friend does not mean to insinuate, by the distinction which he makes in his eighth remark between the London and the Western Societies, that I have been guilty of the rudeness of animadverting upon the proceedings of a Society of which I am not a member, and to which I have never subscribed a shilling. I flatter myself that he knows me too well to suspect that I am capable of so flagrant a breach of propriety and decorum. My friend, I doubt not, well knows that I was, if I may presume to say it without being charged with over-weening vanity, one of the first members of the Western Unitarian Society, and a subscriber for life; and it was under this character that I gave an opinion of their late proceedings, and knowing that the principle and object of the two Societies were originally the same, namely, to spread the doctrine of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, I

I expressed my great satisfaction in the result of the late discussion.

2. What is an Unitarian? Answer, 1. One who believes in the simple humanity of Jesus Christ. 2. One who believes in his simple pre-existence. 3. One who believes that the Logos which animated the body of Christ was the Maker of the world, but not the object of worship. 4. One who believes that, being the Maker of the world, he is the object of worship. 5. One who, whatever be his opinion concerning the person of Christ, worships the Father only. 6. All Anti-trinitarians. 7. All who profess their belief in the unity of God, whether they do or do not believe that in the unity of the Divine essence there are three subsistences or persons, and whether they are Realists, like Waterland and Sherlock, who denounce Nominalists as heretics, or Nominalists, like Wallis and South, who accuse their Realist brethren of blasphemy and nonsense. 8. I have lately seen another definition of an Unitarian, viz. one who believes that "this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This, if not the most perspicuous, is, at least, the most Catholic definition of Unitarianism that ever was given: for in its ample range it includes not only the holy apostolic Roman Church, and all the various denominations of Protestants which secede from it, but it also comprehends the Greek, the Nestorian and the Syriac churches in the East, and likewise the Copts and the Abyssinians in Africa; all of whom would be ready to subscribe this simple creed, and to form one grand Unitarian Society throughout the world.

3. Of these various definitions I have myself selected the first; and being a plain man, who write to be understood in all my publications, I invariably adhere to that definition, so that no person can read what I have published without knowing precisely the sense in which the word is used.

My reason for making this selection is, *historically*, because I believe the term was first applied to the Polish Unitarians who denied the pre-existence of Christ, and *etymologically*, because I conceive that, in strict propriety, the term can only be applied to the two first definitions; for whoever

ascribes the formation of the world to Jesus Christ, deifies him, for he attributes to him a work appropriate to God, and infringes the great doctrine of the Divine Unity. Finally, I adopt this sense of the term upon the *authority* of Dr. Lardner, the great reviver of genuine Unitarianism in modern times, and my two venerated friends Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Priestley, the ablest and the most celebrated luminaries of the Unitarian Church. And here I trust I shall not be arraigned of presumption and arrogance in claiming these eminent confessors as my particular friends, even though *no kind notice was taken of me in their wills*. While living, they constantly communicated with me upon every theological topic without reserve, and dying, they bequeathed a legacy more precious than rubies: the bright example of a disinterested love of truth, and of firmness, fortitude and perseverance in the profession of it, in the face of opposition, calumny and reproach, and under the loss of all things. These venerable men uniformly used the word Unitarian in the sense which I have adopted from them: and if this use of it is censurable, I am very willing to take my share of the reproach.

I have too much regard for the rights of others to presume to censure any for using the term with greater latitude than myself. I only lament that it is used in so many senses as to occasion great ambiguity of language, and that to such a degree that, in reading what is published by many who call themselves Unitarians, I declare that I am utterly at a loss to understand their meaning.

4. I regret to differ from my worthy friend concerning the importance of the doctrine of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, which to me appears an article of primary importance, and one upon which the greatest stress is deservedly laid by those who desire to see Christianity restored to its primitive purity. My reason is this: Errors concerning the person of Christ were among the first which were introduced into the church even in the apostolic age, and were zealously opposed by the apostles themselves, and particularly by Paul and John. And upon this primary error, as the chief foundation, almost all, and certainly all the principal corruptions of the Christian

doctrine, have been erected. Take away, therefore, this fundamental error, and the whole edifice falls of course. Nor must any known and acknowledged error be spared, how trifling soever it may appear. Error is prolific: and one produces another, till in the end a monster is brought forth which threatens to overturn Christianity itself. What error appears more innocent or trivial than that of the simple pre-existence of Christ? But if it be once admitted that our Lord is something more than man, some work must be provided for him which a mere man cannot perform. This lets in the doctrine of atonement, and that brings after it some other erroneous notion, and so on ad infinitum. But state at once that Jesus is a man in all respects like to his brethren, a mere human being selected from the rest of mankind to introduce a new dispensation, and invested with the powers necessary for that purpose, and the huge fabric of error and superstition vanishes at once like an enchanted castle touched by the magician's wand, and nothing remains but the plain, simple, uncorrupted gospel, divested of all mystery, worthy of all acceptation, which will make men wise to salvation.

I do therefore think not only that it is justifiable, but that it is wise and right, for those who entertain these just and important views of Christianity, to associate for the express purpose of prominently holding forth the unspeakably important fact of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, and of supporting this truth by calm and candid discussion. Nor do I see any reason while they are proceeding in this course, allowing to every one his right of private judgment, and casting no reflections upon the motives of those who differ from them, why they are to be upbraided as deficient in candour, liberality and charity. And least of all do I see how they can be justified in sacrificing their main principle, the great object of their union, for the sake of admitting into their society those who, whatever other excellent qualities they may possess, and however desirable it might be to associate with them for other objects, professedly deny the very principle upon which this Society is formed. They would despise us for the concession.

What could be more motley or more ridiculous than an Unitarian society formed upon the principle of the eighth definition? No, no. The original Unitarian societies pursue a grand and definite object by definite and laudable means. And if any who do not think as they do, but who, as lovers of truth and of freedom of discussion, think fit to give us their names upon that ground only, we accept their liberality with gratitude: but if we thought that such persons entered the Society with an insidious design, and only paid us, like Judas, to betray our Master; if it was their intention to bribe us to abandon our principle, and to throw down that pillar of our faith in which we place our glory, we will reject their offer with indignation, and rather say, with the apostle, Thy money perish with thee. But we believe better things. We are sure that our friendly associates do not desire us to act so base a part. They support us as lovers of fair and free inquiry. And we will continue our course as heralds of the pure gospel of Christ, the doctrine of his simple humanity being the chief corner-stone.

5. The word "idolatrour" in our preamble is indeed a strong and an offensive expression. But must it not be true in the estimation of all Unitarians of the first class, that they who worship Jesus Christ are idolaters in the very same sense as those who worship the Virgin Mary? Do not the most zealous and learned Trinitarians themselves acknowledge that if the Unitarian doctrine is true, their worship is idolatrour? And do they not express themselves upon this subject in much stronger language than Unitarians have ever used? And is that to be regarded as an epithet of reproach which is nothing more than a solemn warning to the parties concerned to consider their conduct, and how they will answer for themselves to Him whose first command it is, Thou shalt have no other God beside me? Are we to abstain from such faithful warnings through fear of offending the delicacy of the parties concerned? At the same time it should always be understood, that there is an infinite difference between Christian idolatry and Heathen idolatry; the first having been sometimes practised from unavoidable ignorance by the most virtuous of mankind,

but the last almost invariably leading to the practice of the grossest vices.

6. The London Unitarian Society has, I believe, been uniformly careful in circulating only those publications which recommend the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, except in the case adverted to by Dr. Carpenter, of Archdeacon Blackburne's Works. These had been published at great expense and great loss by his son, Mr. F. Blackburne. And out of compliment to Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, the work was placed for a year or two on the Society's catalogue, and nearly a hundred copies were sold; but it was then withdrawn, as being incompatible with the Society's design.

T. BELSHAM.

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

No. CCCLV.

The Eleventh Commandment.

Archbishop Usher, of learned and pious memory, being wrecked on a desolate part of the Irish coast, applied to a clergyman for relief; and stated, without mentioning his name or rank, his own sacred profession. The clergyman rudely questioned it, and told him peevishly that *he doubted whether he knew the number of the commandments. Indeed, I do,* replied the Archbishop mildly, *there are eleven. Eleven!* said the clergyman, *tell me the eleventh, and I will assist you. Obey the eleventh,* said the Archbishop, *and you certainly will:* "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another."

No. CCCLVI.

Result of Kennicott's Labours.

When the King asked Dr. Kennicott, on the completion of his great work, what was the result of all his labours, the Doctor told his Majesty, that, of the immense number of various readings which had been collected from manuscripts, there was not one which affected the truth of any Scripture fact, or the certainty of any doctrine of faith or moral duty.

Gentleman's Mag. Vol. XII. (N. S.) p. 323.

No. CCCLVII.

Free-speaking Sect of the "Seits."

A sect in Persia, which descends from Mahomet, and is held in esteem and veneration. A *Seit* considers himself privileged to *tell the truth to the King* at all times. He is at liberty to enter any house, and his host is obliged to give him the best reception, and even to offer him presents. The lowest Persian, as a *Seit*, can have immediate access to a minister whenever he pleases, and seats himself at his table, particularly if the latter be himself a *Seit*.

Kotzebue's (Capt.) "Narrative of a Journey into Persia, in 1817." 8vo. p. 226.

No. CCCLVIII.

An accommodating Divine.

The earliest document which remains of these proceedings (in Hen. VIIIth's divorce) is a letter of Secretary Pace to the King, in which he informs him, that he had treated with *Dr. Wakefield* of the divorce, and that the Doctor was ready to resolve the question, *either in the negative or affirmative, just as the King thought proper, and in such a manner as all the divines in England should not be able to make any reply.* This letter is dated in 1526, and, to Wakefield's eternal infamy, is still extant. (Le Grand, tom. 3, p. 1.)

Life of Card. Pole, I. 42.

No. CCCLIX.

Licensed Spies.

The following curious copy of a license to a spy is copied from a book published in the beginning of the present century, entitled "Mæmoires of JOHN KER, of Kersland." We wish to know if similar licenses are now issued?—

ANNE R.

Whereas we are fully sensible of the fidelity and loyalty of JOHN KER, of Kersland, Esq., and of the services he hath performed to us and our Government. We therefore grant him our Royal Leave and License to keep company and associate himself with such as are disaffected to us and our Government, in such way or manner as he shall judge most for our service. Given under our Royal Hand, at our Castle of Windsor, the 7th of July, 1707, and of our reign the sixth year.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Sermons on Various Subjects.* By James Lindsay, D.D. 8vo. pp, 504. Hunter. 1818.

EVERY one that is acquainted with Dr. Lindsay would expect to find in his Sermons the proofs of superior intellect and of warm-heartedness; and no one that reads this volume with such an expectation will be disappointed. The Sermons are the dictates of a masculine understanding, and the effusions of a benevolent and generous heart. They are published at the request and at the charge of his congregation meeting in Monkwell Street, in token of the mutual affection between the pastor and his flock, after a connexion of five-and-thirty years' duration. What reward could be more valuable to a pious and conscientious Christian minister than this voluntary testimony of approbation, esteem and gratitude! In the Preface, Dr. Lindsay thus states his experience in his honourable and useful profession:

“ It has been sometimes brought as a general charge against Dissenting ministers, that, being dependent upon the voluntary contributions of their hearers, they are under the necessity of humouring prejudices, and concealing truth, and compromising conscience. That there are among us, as well as elsewhere, creeping time-servers, who seek favour at the expense of principle, may be very true. But this I can say from experience, that, in the end, firmness and consistency will secure more esteem, even from those to whom we refuse to yield, than the sycophancy of those despicable characters, who become all things to all men for the sake of popularity or of filthy lucre.”—Pp. vii. viii.

The following are the titles of the Sermons:—I. On the Spirit of a Man compared with the Spirit of the Beast in its Qualities and Probable Destination. II. On the Unequal Distribution of present Good and Evil, as furnishing a strong Presumption in Favour of Future Retribution. III. On the Superiority of Religion over Infidelity. IV. On the Superior Assurance and

Comfort, which Christianity gives to the Heart in the Prospect of Death. V. On the Inseparable Connection between the Habits of the Present and the Happiness of the Future Life. VI. On the Death of a Father. VII. On the Death of a Child. VIII. On Maternal Affection, as the most appropriate Image of Divine Benevolence. IX. Against Excessive Grief. X. On the Connection between Purity of Heart and seeing God. XI. On Tender-Heartedness. XII. Integrity the best Guide both in Religious Inquiries and in Moral Conduct. XIII. Paul and Peter at Antioch. XIV. The same Subject continued. XV. On the Character of the Beloved Disciple. XVI. Paul before Felix. XVII. A Caution against Fanaticism. XVIII. The Gospel Revealed to Babes. XIX. On the Means of Religious Probation, with a particular Reference to the Circumstances of the Young.

In so large a collection of Sermons, there must be inequalities; but there are (to use a favourite term of the Author's) *distinctive* qualities in all, which cannot fail to recommend them to every reader who can appreciate strong sense and sound argument, and whose habits qualify him to admire Christian liberality and a generous attachment to the best interests of mankind. Here are no metaphysics, no minute defences of a peculiar creed, and but little textual criticism. The preacher's constant aim is to set forth general views of the Christian religion, and to apply the great truths of the gospel to the heart, in order that by means of the affections they may duly influence the life. A glow of kind feeling is every where felt. There is a sort of generous and noble passion in the discourses whenever they relate to the condition of the poor, and to the sacred cause of civil and religious liberty. For hypocrisy, craft, intolerance and oppression, the preacher makes no allowance. His religion is altogether a system of benevolence, and all his fellow-creatures are his brethren.

The plans of the Sermons are generally inartificial, even to carelessness; the reader must sometimes look back to keep the preacher's design present to his mind. Figurative language is sparingly used; and the figures adopted bespeak less imagination than feeling. The style has few faults and many excellencies; it is easy, flowing and sonorous: the parts of sentences rise naturally one upon another, and the close is usually pleasing to the ear; the composition thus combining the two important qualities of strength and sweetness.

The second Sermon in the volume appears to us entitled to the first place in point of merit. The argument is maintained in a masterly manner, and there is no falling off (which we think we perceive in some of the other discourses) in the strength and spirit with which the subject is discussed. From the animation that pervades the whole discourse, we infer that this is the preacher's favourite topic. He founds the argument, from the inequality of present good and evil to future retribution, on the parable of Dives and Lazarus, taking nearly the same view of these allegorical characters as is represented in Massillon's celebrated sermon upon the same subject. He considers the rich man as a mere voluptuary, and the beggar as a mere sufferer. The difference of moral character strengthens the argument, but is not essential to it. The Author's powers are unusually exerted to combat the two objections, that inequality of outward condition does not imply inequality of happiness, and that the most wretched have, all things considered, a preponderance of enjoyment. Upon the whole, we think he succeeds; though his pictures of human misery are traced with a bold and rapid pencil, and he makes, perhaps, too little allowance for the power of habit in accommodating the human being to his condition. With much abatement of the actual wretchedness which is here supposed, the argument is still solid and incontrovertible.

In sketching the character of the Sadducees, the Jewish Epicureans, whom our Lord intended to reprove in the parable, the Author thus exposes the want of motive to virtue, which there is in any scheme of infidelity:

“ Their system was, to enjoy the passing hour by indulging freely in every luxury, bodily and mental, which their circumstances could afford, without any regard to a future account. Had their infidelity been well grounded, the wisdom of this system would have been incontrovertible. The only restraint which a man, acting upon their principle, should impose upon himself, is that of a prudent attention to health and reputation; for, to pay the least respect to moral duties, independently of immediate advantage, would be the height of inconsistency. Where pleasure is the sole end of living, (as to those who are convinced that their pleasure and their existence must end together, it ought undoubtedly to be,) morality is matter of mere convenience and duty, a word without a meaning. They may admit virtue as an auxiliary; they cannot consider it as a principal. It may be employed to promote or to secure enjoyment; but should never be suffered to interfere with it, where there is a competition. In ordinary cases, indeed, it may be advantageous, and consequently expedient, even upon this plan, to abstain from ‘ the great transgression.’”—Pp. 31, 32.

And again,

“ It has indeed been argued by some, that the feelings of pleasure and pain, which by the constitution of our minds are inseparable from virtue and vice, form of themselves a retribution, sufficient both for the purposes of society, and for the vindication of Providence in the unequal distribution of good and evil. It is not intended to undervalue these feelings as they are an inherent part of our moral frame. But we must insist, that their influence both in supporting and rewarding virtue, depends chiefly, if not solely, upon that reference, which nature and reason uniformly give them to a future account. Take away the belief of this, and what do you leave? You reply, The dictates of conscience. What then are these dictates, considered as a recompense to the righteous? Some undefined admiration of moral beauty, some transient feelings of self-satisfaction, than which, when unconnected with the anticipation of a future judgment, nothing can be more fallacious and nugatory! And what are they as a punishment to the wicked? Merely a few vain remonstrances, which they ought to regard no more than the croaking of a raven. Are such feelings an adequate encouragement to suffering virtue, or such remonstrances an adequate infliction of divine justice upon easy, voluptuous and domineering vice?”—Pp. 58, 59.

The design of the whole of this able sermon, and the best manner of the preacher will be seen in the following passage :

“ Let us put the case of a man living within the gripe of upstart power, holding his tenement and his means of support from one of those profligates, unhappily too numerous, who stick at no crime to gratify their pride and sensuality—compared with whom the rich man in the parable is an angel of light. His poor dependent fears God and hates wickedness. He will not become the instrument of oppression; he will not sacrifice his daughter to a tyrant's lust; he will not contribute by his vote to send a wretch into the council of the nation, who would sell his country, as Judas did his Master, for thirty pieces of silver; nay, perhaps, he can but ill conceal his honest indignation, when he hears him praised by unprincipled selfishness. In his rectitude he finds his ruin. A debt which he cannot pay, or a vexatious suit which he cannot support, sends himself to a jail, and exposes his innocent and destitute family to hazards and sufferings, from the very contemplation of which the heart recoils.

“ Here is an instance of a good man suffering, from the violence of the wicked, for the sake of righteousness. Is it only a fictitious case to uphold an inference which fact would not bear out? Or is it one of a few solitary examples which are not to be heeded in a general estimate? Read the history of the world. Mark those little tyrants, so numerous in every country, who are for ever grinding the faces of the industrious poor, by exactions and oppressions, for which the law has no remedy. See the statesman and the lawyer, too often plundering under the pretence of defending; and O! that it could not be said, Behold even the minister of religion, employing the name of God to bind slavery and degradation about the necks of his offspring. Honest simplicity and unprotected goodness become, in a thousand ways, the prey of artifice and malignity; and when we think of the numberless oppressors and deceivers of this description, in all parts of the earth, who seem to exist and to feed upon human misery, especially where despotism is established, it is impossible for a heart of sensibility to dwell, without horror, upon this single source of human wretchedness. And is it within the compass of credibility, that these evils, which have no compensation here, shall receive none hereafter? Can it be true, that for these cruelties the man of violence has nothing to fear; that for

these sufferings the man of righteousness has nothing to hope; that the oppressor and the oppressed, the tiger and his victim, are to lie down quietly together, and rise no more for ever? Then virtue is indeed a phantom, and religion a dream. Then even the monster who hates virtue upon principle, because it is the living reproach of his own character; who dreads patriotism, because it opposes a barrier to his ambition; who abhors honest piety, because it will not give its sanction to his usurpations and enormities; who organizes violence upon an extensive scale, and tramples upon the good that resist it, with the same indifference as he does upon the worm under his feet; who makes havoc his pastime, and rises to empire over the bodies of millions, and upon the awful ruins of justice and humanity—then may even this man repose upon his pillow in security and peace. He may occasionally have some fears for his personal safety, perhaps some remorse for his most flagrant atrocities. But the worst that can happen is death. And can this be the final result of a moral government, conducted by infinite wisdom and benignity? Upon such a scheme, what source of consolation is left to injured innocence and suffering worth? And who upon such terms would bear the proud man's scorn, with all the buffetings that patient merit of the unworthy takes, when he might either improve his state by dexterous villainy, or leave it by a voluntary death? A supposition involving such consequences must appear absurd and incredible. It were, indeed, more easy to believe that there is no God, than to believe that he governs the world upon such a plan.”—Pp. 62—66.

The fourth Sermon is a re-publication. It was preached and printed many years ago, on occasion of the death of Dr. Towers. Dr. Lindsay has consulted no less the gratification of his readers than his own reputation, by preserving it in this collection. The text is 1 Cor. xv. 53—57, and in the following passage the subject is well stated and divided; we quote it the rather because it is one of the few instances in which the preacher follows the old and, in our judgment, *most useful* plan of announcing distinctly and numerically the division of a discourse :

“ What I propose in addressing you from these words is, to point out the ground of peculiar thankfulness to God, which both the common and enlightened Christian has above all other men in an-

anticipating the approach, and conquering the fear of death.

“To take from this anticipation the horror with which it is naturally accompanied, and to render the thinking mind tranquil in the prospect of dissolution, two things appear to be absolutely necessary; first, that we should possess the assurance of immortality, to relieve the imagination from that dread of falling back into nothing, which is of all sentiments the most melancholy and the most revolting to the heart; and, secondly, that with this assurance of life, we should be assured also of mercy to forgive our sins, and to inspire us with confidence towards God, that we may thus be delivered from the fear of punishment, which is natural to a frail and guilty creature.”—Pp. 95, 96.

There is the eloquence of ardent feeling in the passage which we now extract, containing an exposure of the consequences of Infidelity and a remonstrance with the Unbeliever:

“The doctrines of this philosophy, which despises equally the probabilities of reason and the truths of revelation, are indeed beyond description dreadful. They bring death to the soul here, by threatening it with death hereafter. They extinguish all the rising energies of the mind, and all the tenderest sympathies of the heart. If I can believe these doctrines, then must I believe, that the first and strongest of all desires, the desire of living, has been given for no other purpose than, that the thought of its final disappointment may destroy the relish of its present gratification. Then must I believe, that the human soul, which, in this state, can but just expand its germ, and put forth its blossoms, shall never realize its flattering promises of a harvest to come. Then must I believe, that all the best affections of nature obtain a sweet, but temporary and precarious indulgence, in the intercourses of friendship, and the endearments of domestic life, only that the idea of everlasting separation may come home upon the soul in more tremendous horror. What is there—in the name of wisdom, what is there in the short and interrupted enjoyments of humanity, that could compensate for the anxiety and pain which such ideas must occasion to the thoughtful, especially in those hours of sorrow, when all other consolations are unavailing, if not aided by the consolations of religion? For myself, I had rather dream—if it were nothing but dreaming—I had rather dream a thousand and a thousand times the dream of immortality, than wake once to the reality, supposing it to be one, which would draw a terrific gloom

over all those prospects that mitigate the evils and enhance the joys of man. But a reality it cannot be, if there is a just and merciful God, who rules the universe, and has given to us the word of life.

“Infidel, cease! Tread not with daring step and cruel purpose, that hallowed ground, which upholds, and upholds well, whatever reason or affection values most. Respect, at least, the sensibilities of a wounded spirit, and leave to the mourner in Zion, O! leave him that faith, which alone can reconcile him to the death of others, which alone can fortify his courage in the prospect of his own, which alone can fill his heart with peace and joy in believing.”—Pp. 112—114.

We cannot quote all that we strongly approve or even admire, but we recommend to the reader Sermon V., and particularly the conclusion (pp. 146—150), in which the preacher makes use of the precariousness of reason as a motive to instant moral and spiritual diligence, and contends that the loss of reason, *whatever may be the consequences*, is not a forfeiture of previous character.

Sermon VI. “On the Death of a Father” is truly pathetic, and the Introduction is remarkably striking.

The VIIIth Sermon will, by the majority of readers, be perhaps best remembered; though a critical eye may, we think, discover some irregularity in its plan. Perverse, however, would be the criticism that should render the heart insensible to the preacher's delightful descriptions of maternal affection. In the more argumentative part of the Sermon, he considers this “wonderful affection, as indicating, in the most striking manner, the unbounded wisdom and benignity of Providence.”

“If we had but this one evidence, it would be sufficient to convince a reflecting mind, that a paternal care is exercised in the government of the world, and that the tender mercies of God are over all his works. Take away the strong instinctive feelings of a mother, and what becomes of the living creation? Nay, even if it were not taken away, but left, like other affections, dependent upon time and culture; liable to be damped by little disgusts, or to be overcome by the love of ease, and the dread of care and labour, what would become of infant life? Is it not then an irresistible evidence of wise and gracious design, that in the œconomy of animated nature, that affection alone should be unconquerable,

to which she is indebted for her preservation, and without which she must soon be extinct? The care of life devolves immediately upon the mother, who is to the child, as soon as it is born, in God's stead, to save and cherish its helplessness. If she were left to infer this duty from reasoning, like too many of our other duties, it would be forgotten and neglected. Has not Providence then, in guarding against this neglect, by the irresistible impulse of maternal tenderness, given to man a beautiful image of that incessant care, with which it is watching over the safety and happiness of all its creatures?

“But whilst man, in common with other animals, owes to this instinctive feeling, the preservation, growth, and vigour of his body, he owes to it, what is still more important, the commencement of those moral affections, which constitute, in their progressive development, the strength and the glory of his moral and social life. It is in the bosom of a mother, that these affections are generated. Accustomed to look to that bosom for nourishment, protection and pleasure, it raises thence its infant smiles; it catches answering smiles of complacency and joy: its heart begins to dilate with instinctive gladness; its sensations of delight are gradually modified into those of fondness and gratitude; and as it continues to mark the love of a mother, it learns from her the art of loving. Happy when she possesses the invaluable capacity of training with skill this nascent feeling. For, in loving her, the child is easily brought to love whatever she loves, and thus to lay the early foundation of filial and fraternal affection. Yet more, in imbibing sentiments of gratitude towards his parents on earth, he imbibes by degrees the more elevated sentiment of gratitude and love to the great Parent of the universe. Here then is the commencement of that simple, but admirable process, by which animal life is preserved and moral life acquired. Here is the first link of that chain, which encompasses the social world; to whose magic power we are indebted for all the virtues, and all the enjoyments of social life; nay, which reaches from earth to heaven, and unites us with the source of love in the Divine mind. All originates in the mysterious workings of a mother's heart. And can we ever cease to admire the wisdom and benignity of God in rendering this principle of nature so ardent, so patient, so unconquerable? Or shall we be guilty of the monstrous crime of counteracting this all-gracious ordination?—If ever we would learn piety to our Maker, we must begin with cherish-

ing piety to our mother. The Romans had one word for both. The feeling is nearly the same, differing only in its application, and in the perfection of its object.”—Pp. 215—218.

We extract a fine passage from Sermon X., on what some of our fellow-Christians term *Christian experience*; but we cannot forbear to point out, by italics, a grammatical error in the concluding clause, a relative without an antecedent, by which the effect is diminished:

“It is because men lose, in the progress of a sensual life, all relish for the higher attainments of intellect, and the more refined pleasures of a pious and good heart, that they are neither qualified nor disposed to see God. The sun may beautify the face of nature; the planets may roll in majestic order through the immensity of space; spring may spread her blossoms; summer may ripen her fruits; autumn may call to the banquet; the senses are regaled; but in the heart that is not purified by religious sentiments, there is no perception of spiritual beauty; no movement of spiritual delight; no reference to that hand which is scattering around the means of enjoyment, and the incentives to praise. But let the heart be touched with that ethereal spark, which is elicited by the word of God, and the promises of his Son; let sinful affections be removed, and the influence of a devout spirit be cherished; let intellect and reflection become the handmaids of piety; then we shall see God in all that is great and beautiful in creation, and feel him in all that is cheerful and happy in our own minds. The understanding thus employed, experiences a sensible enlargement of its own powers and the heart thus moved, draws nearer in its desires and affections, to that fountain of love, from which its joys proceed, and in which they will finally centre.

“I am aware that men, who have never been accustomed to those secret musings of the mind, which rise through ‘things that are seen and temporal, to things that are not seen and eternal,’ are very apt to consider all this as the reverie of an enthusiastic fancy. But, if this were the time, it would be easy to shew, that such views, such feelings, such pleasures, are derived from the most rational exercise of our best powers, and that they are perfectly consistent with that sobriety of mind which Christianity recommends. They are congenial to a pure heart: revolting to those hearts only, which are debased by worldly wisdom; perverted by pride and avarice;

or chilled by that wretched philosophy, which, despising at once the feelings of nature and the dictates of reason, sees nothing but matter in man, and nothing beyond matter in the movements of the universe. Let those who love such philosophy profess and enjoy it. Give me the philosophy of Christ, which teaches me to purify the heart and elevate its affections, by raising its desires and aspirations to the fountain of moral perfection—that philosophy, which makes me feel the value of my own existence, by the conviction that there exists also a wise and gracious Father, to whom I am indebted for it, and for all that it possesses of excellence or of enjoyment. Give me the philosophy, which, in bringing me acquainted with my weakness and my wants, directs me, for moral strength and religious consolation, to that fountain, whose waters invigorate, whilst they refresh the heart: that word of life, which Jesus revealed to the weary and the heavy laden; that word, which in speaking peace to the broken heart, prepares it for the reception of divine truth, and renders it eventually the seat of holy desires and pious sentiments; whilst these desires and these sentiments, by a reciprocal tendency, dispose and enable it more and more to converse with the Father of spirits; to see him in his works; to hear him in his word; and to feel his goodness, in all that soothes and gladdens, and ennobles *his rational nature*.”—Pp. 263—266.

Sermon XI. “On Tender-heartedness,” and Sermon XII. “On Integrity,” are valuable discussions of particular moral questions, and shew that the preacher does not excel alone on the more general subjects of Christian feeling and duty.

The four following Sermons are on historical subjects. The XIIIth and XIVth on the dispute between Paul and Peter at Antioch, are (especially the former) beyond our praise, and may be confidently recommended as models. The analysis of Peter's character and the parallel between his character and Paul's, considered as developing the moral of history, are complete. There is a singular instance of lapse of memory in the preacher, p. 329, where Peter is said to have “wounded *his kinsman*.” The blunder may have been occasioned by a confused recollection of the place, John xviii. 26, in which mention is made of the kinsman of Malchus, “whose ear Peter cut off.”

How lamentably true is the following description of “evil times”!

“The cry of heresy or sedition is raised. The base desert from selfishness, and the timid from fear. A few only, who disdain to sacrifice their convictions to the clamour of the moment, continue firm; and their firmness incurs the charge of affectation or of obstinacy.”—P. 338.

Dr. Lindsay boldly renounces the belief of the perpetual inspiration of the apostles, and exposes some weaknesses and imperfections in the character of Paul. We cannot agree with him in the statement that follows:

“But the most exceptionable, because the most deliberate and personal display of resentment he records himself, in the case of Alexander the coppersmith, against whom, on account of some private injury, he employs a form of execration that ill accords with the meekness and charity of the gospel.”—P. 363.

A reference to the passage relating to Alexander, 2 Tim. iv. 14, 15, will shew that the apostle's resentment was not “on account of some *private injury*,” but on account of opposition, and probably base and hypocritical opposition, to his ministry; *he hath greatly withstood our words*.—In the supposed “form of execration,” there is, besides, nothing more than an appeal of the apostle's from his calumniator to the Supreme Judge, q. d. “He traduces me and represents himself as the true servant of God; *the Lord reward him according to his works*.”—To which it must be added, that the Alexandrine and other MSS. of authority read in this place not ἀποδῶνη but ἀποδώσει, which Griesbach marks as probably the true reading: hence Archbishop Newcome renders the phrase, “the Lord will reward him.”

We assent entirely to the preacher's general argument upon the character of Paul, notwithstanding our objection to this passage, which other critics would censure as exhibiting an *heretical taint*. Dr. Lindsay will not suspect that we mean to impeach his *orthodoxy*.

The Sermon (XV.) “On the Character of the Beloved Disciple” suggests some counsels, particularly interesting to the young, on the subject of friendship. There is great truth in the maxim, (Dr. Lindsay's flowing style does not allow us to quote from

him many maxims,) "We may esteem the man whom we cannot love, but, we cannot love long the man whom we do not esteem." P. 382.

"Paul before Felix" (Ser. XVI.) is a bold and animated discourse. Recent events give an interest to the following short paragraph, which at another time we might have passed over:

"The leading men at Jerusalem followed a practice, which, unhappily for the interests of truth and virtue, has in all times been too common and too successful. They first excited the multitude to be guilty of outrages, against those daring innovators, who were introducing new doctrines, and then imputed their own crime to the very men against whom it had been committed."—P. 395.

The preacher is (if we may be pardoned the phrase) *quite at home* in the character of Paul.

"Paul's religion was not of this courtly stamp. We know indeed from his own pen, and from his history by the pen of another, that in his general manners, he was courteous, in the right sense of the word, becoming all things to all men, wherever he could be pliant without sacrificing truth. He did not affect that rudeness of address, which is sometimes the offspring of pride, and sometimes the substitute of honesty. But whenever he was called upon by his office as an apostle, to defend or to enforce the great truths of religion, there was no fear of man before his eyes. He then spoke with that plainness, and that manly decision, which the consciousness of his acting for God and virtue, and that alone, can inspire; and he was ready to go both to prison and to death, rather than compromise his integrity, by concealing the doctrine which he was commissioned to publish, or sparing the wickedness which he was bound to expose. Compare this firmness of courage, this consistency of character, with the pitiful sycophancy, the impious compliances of those who fashion a religion that knows no respect of persons, to the taste of those, who hate the light because their deeds are evil. Compare Paul with those gospel ministers, who sell themselves to the support of any opinions, and the defence of any practices, that are known to be most agreeable to men in authority;—compare his conduct before Felix, with the despicable meanness of such time-serving preachers as these, and say which you had rather be, the apostle in bonds, or these with all the wealth and all the worldly consideration, which the mitre, or even the tiara can give them."—Pp. 400—402.

According to our Author, Paul was not, in the modern sense of the term, an *orthodox* and *evangelical* preacher:

"But if, as some contend, men are to be justified or condemned by another rule than that of their personal acts; if they are to be tried, without any reference to their works; then where was the sense of reasoning upon righteousness and temperance to Felix? Why did not the apostle exhort him to believe and be saved, without urging him upon points, which he could not but know, would be very unpleasant? Had he followed this course, he would have been heard by the Roman governor without any of that perturbation, which his discourse occasioned; and we should probably have been informed, that he had become, both with him and Drusilla, a favourite preacher. But instead of this, he holds up the faith of Christ, as inseparably connected with a virtuous life, and makes the judge tremble in the apprehension, that he himself would be judged for the profligacy of his public and private character, and for all those transgressions of justice and temperance, of which his own conscience, roused by this appeal, could not fail to remind him."—Pp. 410, 411.

We find some good remarks in Sermon XVII. "On Fanaticism;" but we think that it is defective in definition of terms, and that the texture of the argument is loose. To the caution (p. 432) against running from the extreme of fanaticism into that of indifference, we subscribe most cordially.

In the XVIIIth Sermon, "The Gospel revealed to Babes," the preacher presents us with his system of Christian theology; would to heaven that the Church had always contented herself with so simple and scriptural a creed!

"When the gospel speaks of God, for instance, it is not to discuss the mysterious nature of an existence, to the comprehension of which our faculties are utterly inadequate; but to exhibit his perfections and his moral government in such a light, as may cheer the soul under the consciousness of frailty, and prove an encouragement to all the feelings of devout gratitude, humble confidence, and holy joy. It is to remove the terrors of superstition, and to make us acquainted with the Most High, as a father, benefactor and friend. It is to open a new way of communication with him, not through costly sacrifices, offered by men like ourselves, but through that one Mediator of the New Covenant, who by his own death rendered all other mediation

unnecessary. In one word, when the gospel speaks of God, it is to shew us, that the essence of his nature is love, and the object of his government, the happiness of his rational creatures; which happiness is to be pursued and acquired by ourselves, in the course of a pious and good life, and to be perfected hereafter in a state of progressive knowledge and confirmed virtue.

“Here is nothing abstruse, unless when it is made so by the perverse subtlety of disputatious polemics; and yet when we regard what is thus revealed, as having the undoubted stamp of a divine authority, it does more to satisfy the understanding, to purify the morals, and to console the hearts of rational beings, than all the treasures of Greek and Roman philosophy.”—Pp. 442, 443.

For some time, we have been conscious of having transgressed our bounds, but we cannot refrain from the quotation of another passage from this Sermon, on the corruption of the gospel:

“Thus it is that the enemies of the gospel are furnished with arguments against its truth; and that the very men, who profit by it as an instrument of ambition, laugh at the simplicity of those who believe it. They have reason to laugh: for it would be simplicity indeed to believe, that the motley and incoherent thing, which such men consider as Christianity, could ever have proceeded from the God of order and the prince of peace—a thing which instigates one nation to pray and fight against another, both of them boasting of the name of Christian; a thing which teaches us to curse instead of blessing; or, if that be too much for an open avowal, to disguise a curse in the form of a blessing, the better to impose upon our own conscience. This is the disgrace of Christianity, but not Christianity itself, and this it is that retards its influence in humanizing the heart, and producing the fruits of righteousness and peace. It is made a kingdom of this world, contrary to the express declaration and intention of its author. It is embraced in this view by the wise and the prudent: whilst those who receive it as babes, who love it for its simplicity, who seek it from no weapon of carnal warfare, but find in it the spirit of power, the spirit of wisdom, and of a sound mind, are borne down by the maxims of worldly wisdom, and regarded as very silly, at least, if not something worse. But in the midst of all this contempt and discouragement, the Christian is consoled by the assurance, that better views are even now beginning to prevail,

and that the evils of this ill-assorted mixture of religious with political institutions, which are already beginning to be felt and understood, will eventually find a remedy in a more enlightened state of public opinion.”—Pp. 449—451.

One sentence of the Sermon (p. 454) would have been better omitted; it bears two senses, and in one sense, though it forms a *truism*, raises an involuntary smile: *The number of babes is daily increasing.*

We close this volume as we part with a friend, pleased that we have met and hoping to meet again.

ART. II.—*A Plain Statement and Scriptural Defence of the Leading Doctrines of Unitarianism; to which are added, Remarks on the Canonical Authority of the Books of the New Testament, and a Candid Review of the Text of the Improved Version, in a Letter to a Friend.* By Robert Wallace, Minister of a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters in Chesterfield. Chesterfield: printed and sold by T. Woodhead: sold, in London, by Longman and Co., and by Sherwood and Co. 1819. 8vo. Pp. 128.

THE author of this pamphlet would have better consulted the accommodation of his readers, had he distributed the matter of it into four or five letters. In his *statement, defence, remarks, and review*, we meet, however, with that information, good sense and candour which may well compensate for some disadvantages of arrangement.

After a short epistolary introduction, he represents *the peculiar doctrines of Unitarians*, and describes the several classes of Christians who are known under that denomination. We shall not stop to examine the historical or theological accuracy of every part of his catalogue: it is in the main correct; and the Unitarianism of Mr. Wallace himself evidently consists in a belief “in the sole, entire, and incommunicable divinity of God,” and in the simple, unreserved humanity of Jesus Christ.

We have next a compendium of the *scriptural proof that there is only one God*. Having adduced, for this position, texts the clearness and strength of which would seem to be resistless, the writer adds:

“Passages like these admit properly but of one interpretation; and yet the ingenuity of criticism has invented other senses as remote as possible from their natural and obvious meaning. ‘Every text which affirms the Divine Unity,’ says the Rev. R. Wardlaw, a writer of orthodox celebrity, ‘must be interpreted as meaning that God is *one* indeed—but *one according to the peculiar modification of unity which belongs to Deity;*’ and hence he infers, in consistency with this favourite principle of interpretation, that ‘every text which affirms the unity of God, involves an affirmation of the Trinity.’ It is in vain that the Unitarian adduces his proofs by hundreds and thousands. His adversary, with this happy principle of interpretation at hand, can instantly disarm them of all their force, however numerous and explicit; for, by this grand secret of the polemical art, he is enabled to assign a variety of new senses to the term unity, and instead of regarding the Deity as strictly and numerically one, he may regard him as one in three, or any indefinite number of persons.”—Pp. 13, 14.

Mr. W. proceeds to prove from Scripture *the sole Deity of the Father, the inferiority and subordination of the Son, and his simple humanity.* On the same authority he shews, that *the Holy Spirit is not an intelligent being distinct from God the Father.* In the illustration of these points our author is concise, but perspicuous and forcible. Of the practical importance of viewing Jesus of Nazareth “as a MAN approved of GOD,” he seems to be fully sensible. The following observations on this subject (p. 26, Note) are extremely just; and the same reference to a valuable criticism of Dr. S. Johnson’s, had been made by Mr. Bransby: *

“In reflecting on the orthodox system concerning the divine nature of Christ, I have often been struck,” declares Mr. W., “with the language of Johnson respecting ‘the plan of Paradise Lost,’ and which will apply at least with equal force to the subject before us. Had Jesus been possessed of such a nature, his life, as it appears to me, ‘would have comprised neither human actions nor human manners. We should have found no transactions in which *we* could be engaged; beheld no condition in which *we* could, by any effort of imagination, have

placed ourselves; and should, therefore, have had little natural curiosity or sympathy.’”

The second general division of Mr. W.’s letter treats of *the grounds of difference between the canon and text adopted by the editors of the Improved Version and those of the authorized translation.*

To the “commonly urged” accusation “against Unitarians that they have not the same reverence for the Bible which is found among other denominations of Christians; and that they alter passages which do not accord with their own views, so as to make them convey a sense entirely foreign from that of the original authors,” he thus replies:

“No denomination of Christians, I will venture to affirm, has done more, in proportion to its numbers, to establish the genuineness of the books of Scripture, and shield them from the attacks of Infidels, than Unitarians. Let the appeal be made to facts, and where will you find a person, among the ranks of orthodoxy, who has laboured to confirm the truth of the Christian religion with as much assiduity and success as Lardner?”—P. 41.

As to “the genuineness of the books of the New Testament,” the writer before us expresses himself with that discriminating judgment which is the effect of thought, inquiry and knowledge. He thinks, that in the case of every one of these books the question of its genuineness “demands a separate investigation.” And, as the issue of such an examination, he receives all the historical books of the N. T., the thirteen epistles almost universally ascribed to Paul, the first of those which are attributed to John, and the first of the two of which Peter is said to be the author. “For various and weighty reasons,” however, he cannot, “with the same confidence, affirm, that Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews;” while he deems it “highly probable” that the epistle commonly ascribed to James is genuine, “because it appears to have been known to Clemens Romanus and Hermas, two of the earliest apostolical fathers, and because it is found in the canon of the first Syriac New Testament, which is decidedly the most ancient version of the Christian Scriptures.” With Lardner and many

* See his Discourse on *Love to Christ*, delivered, at Coventry, in January 1811, p. 39.

others, Mr. W. thinks that "the Epistle of Jude and the Apocalypse ought not to be regarded as of sufficient authority to establish by themselves any point of doctrine." He then states the testimony on which he frames these sentiments, and in the compass of a few pages affords much useful information.

While he disclaims "any intention to involve the editors of the 'Improved Version' in the consequences which may result" from his statement of his own views of the genuineness of certain books of the New Covenant, he aims, nevertheless, at establishing that principle of separate investigation which they and he acknowledge in common. His defence of their candour and moderation does him much credit:

"They have broached," he observes, "no new opinions on the subject of the canon: they have stood forward as the advocates of no peculiar system: their references are all clear and satisfactory, and their authorities of the most respectable kind: their conclusions are neither hasty nor unfounded; and, though they have ventured to express doubts on some particular points, they have not removed a single book from the New Testament, or stated a single fact which is not confirmed by the most ample and unexceptionable testimony."—P. 61.

The intelligent writer advances to a topic of great importance, though little understood, the *text of the New Testament*. This part of his letter he introduces in a manner richly meriting attention:

"The doctrines of Unitarianism are few and simple; nor, we may be bold to say, are they so far deficient in scriptural authority as to require any additional aid from interpolations. That 'there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus,' (1 Tim. ii. 5,) are plain and obvious declarations of the New Testament; and these declarations, as you have already seen, constitute the fundamental articles of the Unitarian's creed. From various causes, however, the common version of the New Testament is clogged with many additions, which it is the object of the Unitarian to remove."—Pp. 62, 63.

From the succinct account given by Mr. W. of the critical editions of the Christian Scriptures we shall copy a few sentences, which record a fact

truly honourable to the memory of one biblical scholar and to the character of another:

"Wetstein was an Antitrinitarian, and Michaëlis has, on this account, attempted to fix upon him the charge of partiality in judging of passages supposed to relate to the divinity of Christ. But Bishop Marsh has, with much candour and good sense, repelled the ungenerous insinuation; proving that the decisions of Wetstein respecting such passages have been abundantly confirmed by the researches of later critics."—P. 68.

Of Griesbach's labours in this field our author speaks in the highest terms, and enumerates "some of the principal points of difference" in *his text* (2nd Ed.), and in that of the I. V. The passages brought forward by Mr. W. are, Matt. xxiii. 14; John i. 14—18, xix. 4, xx. 8; Rom. iii. 25; 1 Cor. x. 9, xv. 47. Each of these he very carefully examines, and decides upon most of them with his characteristic judgment. As to Rom. iii. 25, we would follow Dr. Carpenter and this writer in reading the clause, "through faith," parenthetically. An amended punctuation is a fair and often an effectual method of ascertaining the real sense of Scripture.

Mr. W. goes on to state five texts "from which Trinitarianism derives its main support," but of which it is, nevertheless, deprived by "impartial criticism." The reader will compare Griesbach's editions of the G. T. with the R. T. in Acts xx. 28; Eph. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John iii. 16, v. 7, 8. Our author adds:

"The majority of learned orthodox writers have acknowledged the corrupt state of the received text, and given a verbal sanction to the amended text of Griesbach; or at least to the principles upon which it is founded. But the time, I apprehend, is far distant when these principles, which are deemed so admirable in theory, will be applied, under the sanction of episcopal authority, to the formation of a purer text than the one now in common use.—'The Athenians know what is right; but the Lacedæmonians practise it.'"—P. 85.

If, however, we may regard Sir James Bland Burges as speaking the sentiments of the fashionable world, perhaps of the very highest orders of society, we must take for granted that, in the opinion of those who could give

efficiency to the measure, there are not wanting reasons in favour of a new translation of the Holy Scriptures. Biblical learning, it is true, does not seem to be the baronet's most honourable distinction: he confounds together translation and interpretation, the adjustment of the text and the disclosure of the sense of the sacred writers: he commends, too, what we presume, no man of solid erudition and judgment can commend, the labours of Mr. John Bellamy. From such objectors and such critics the R. V. has nothing to apprehend. A judicious revision of it is all that we desire: great as are its merits, it is the translation of a text confessedly incorrect; nor can the phraseology of the sixteenth, or even of the beginning of the seventeenth be always intelligible to persons living in the nineteenth century. These, we think, are sufficiently powerful arguments, without the aid of merely theological considerations, for such a revision as we have intimated; and these, we should hope, might approve themselves even to Mr. Todd, whom, like Sir J. Bland Burges, we hail chiefly in the primrose path of literature.

The author of the "Plain Statement," &c. and our readers, will pardon us for this digression, if they so esteem it.—We return with pleasure to Mr. Wallace. His remarks on the two narratives of the miraculous birth of Jesus, at the beginning of the respective gospels of Matthew and Luke, we have perused with much approbation: it is a very ingenious conjecture that certain parts of these introductory chapters are borrowed from Exod. i. 22, ii. 15, iv. 19; and from 1 Sam. i. 3, 24, ii. 26, iii. 19. (Pp. 91, 92.) But as to all or most of the passages which the editors of the I. V. have printed in italics, we believe that Critical Justice rather calls for their being included within brackets. We take the liberty of referring to Rule xix. p. 353, in Archbishop Newcome's Hist. View, &c. This course we should pursue in regard to the much agitated passage in Josephus, were it our lot to carry a new edition of that historian through the press.

No part of Mr. W.'s pamphlet reflects more honour on him than that in which he animadverts on a late "Inquiry into the Integrity of the

Greek Vulgate," &c. To these strictures he is naturally led by his notice of John vii. 53, viii. 11. Nothing can be more complete than his defence of the editors of the I. V., and his victory over Mr. Nolan, whose calumny of Eusebius of Cæsarea our author skilfully exposes, and the unsoundness of whose critical system he clearly illustrates. Rendering him our sincere thanks for his services in the cause of truth, and expressing our satisfaction that he is so well qualified to fulfil his office as a Christian minister, we entreat his leave to employ the short remainder of this article in making a few observations on Mr. Nolan.

This gentleman seems ambitious that his *Inquiry*, &c. should be looked upon as supplementary to Dr. Kennicott's *Inquiry into the State of the Hebrew Text*, &c. Very slender is the probability of its gaining the same exalted reputation, or even of its surviving the present age. Between the execution of the two performances, in point of style and method, of testimony and reasoning, there subsists a striking difference; nor less obvious is the contrast in the objects of them; Dr. K. endeavouring (with much success) to restore, but Mr. N. to perpetuate, a corrupted text.

A more hasty, indigested and confused production than his *Inquiry*, &c. has seldom been presented to the world: its language is obscure and involved, its arrangement disorderly; it abounds in needless and innumerable repetitions, and is characterised by those theological prepossessions which utterly disqualify a man for being an able biblical scholar. They are pointless weapons with which Mr. N. attacks the memories of "the illustrious dead," Eusebius and Origen: it would appear that, in the conviction of some men, false accusation is essential to the support of the orthodox belief and to the overthrow of heresy.

From Mr. Nolan's cloudy pages we select one specimen of his good faith and candour, or perhaps of his felicity as a translator. He ventures to charge Eusebius with having suppressed John vii. 53, viii. 11; and on what foundation is this charge erected? Why, truly, the historian "wanted neither the power nor the will" thus to mutilate the Scriptures. Not the will, because he was an Arian, or some-

thing like one: not the *power*, because the emperor Constantine gave him a commission to order to be written, "by able scribes," fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures, [των θειων δηλαδη γραφων] ὡν μαλιστα την τ' επισκευην και την χρησην τῷ της εκκλησιας λογω αναγκαιων ειναι γνωσκεις. Who, except Mr. Nolan, can perceive in the last clause any thing about a discretion to deal with these books *ad libitum*? To whom besides is it not

clear that these concluding words express the emperor's and Eusebius's high opinion of *the Sacred Scriptures*, and this without the least reserve? Either the author of the *Inquiry*, &c. could not construe, or he has purposely misrepresented the language before us. On either supposition, where is his competency for the task he has undertaken?

N.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

[Under this head we propose to insert brief remarks on, or extracts from, new books, which are entitled to some attention from us, but which we are not able to bring under *Review*.]

- I. *Historical Memoirs respecting the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics, from the Reformation to the present Time.* By Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn. 2 vols. 8vo Murray. 1819.

Mr. Butler is an indefatigable author. Every one wonders that he can spare time from his learned and laborious profession for the compilation of books on subjects not relating to it; but he himself explains this, in a motto from the celebrated French lawyer, D'Aguesseau, *Le changement d'étude est toujours un délassement pour moi*; and we may add, that however valuable Mr. Butler's works are, they are chiefly compilations, and are hastily made. We say not this to disparage them, for they are extremely useful, and manifest great extent of knowledge and true Christian liberality of heart.

The present publication is a sort of apology for the British Roman Catholics, and the author has succeeded at least in shewing that their persecutors have been commonly in the wrong. No one can read it, we imagine, without surrendering his prejudices, and admitting that whatever be the truth or error of the Roman Catholic creed, it opposes no barrier to their full enjoyment of the civil and political rights of Britons.

Mr. Butler gives an interesting and, we doubt not, an accurate account of the present state of the Roman Catholics in this country, as also of their literary history and theological contro-

versies from the Reformation to the present times. He points out some admirable writers of their communion, especially in the earlier part of this period; but even his flattering review of his sect exhibits upon the whole a great dearth of talents. His partiality leads him to claim *Shakspeare* as a Roman Catholic, but he proceeds in this case upon mere negative evidence. The wording of the poet's Will appears to us to be decisive proof on the other side.

But we take notice of the Memoirs chiefly for the sake of a few passages which we wish to extract.

Conversation of Mr. Fox's on Religious Liberty.

"Mr. Fox's principles of civil and religious liberty are known to have been of the most enlarged kind.—On one occasion, he desired the writer of these pages to attend him, to confer with him, as he condescended to say, on Catholic Emancipation. He asked the writer, 'what he thought was the best ground on which it could be advocated.' The writer suggested it was—that 'it is both unjust and detrimental to the state to deprive any portion of its subjects of their civil rights, on account of their religious principles, if these are not inconsistent with moral or civil duty.' 'No, Sir!' Mr. Fox said, with great animation: 'that is not the best ground.—The best ground, and the only ground to be defended in all parts is, that *action*, not *principle*, is the object of law and legislation. With a person's principles no government has a right to interfere.'—'Am I then to understand,' said the person with whom he was conversing, and who wished to bring the matter at once to issue, by supposing an extreme case—'that, in 1713, when the houses of Brunswick and Stuart were equally balanced, if a person published a book, in which he

attempted to prove that the house of Hanover unlawfully possessed the throne, and that all who obeyed them were morally criminal, he ought not to be punished by law?" "Government," said Mr. Fox, "should answer the book, but should not set its officers upon its author." "No," he continued with great animation, and rising from his seat; "the more I think of it the more I am convinced of the truth of my position;—*action*, not *principle*, is the true object of government." In his excellent speech for the repeal of the Test, Mr. Fox adopted this principle in its fullest extent; and enforced and illustrated it with an admirable union of argument and eloquence."—II. pp. 205—207.

Dr. Geddes and his Translation of the Old Testament.

"The subject leads to the mention of the version of the historical books of the Old Testament, by the late Reverend Alexander Geddes, LL. D. Dr. Geddes was a priest of the Catholic Church, and, for several years, served a Catholic mission in Scotland. Incurring the displeasure of his bishop, he removed to London, and at first said mass in private families. After some time, he altogether abstained from the exercises of his sacred functions, and dedicated himself to a new translation of the Scriptures, under the patronage of Lord Petre, the grandfather of the present lord. His lordship furnished the Doctor with a complete biblical library, and promised to allow him, during the time in which he should be engaged in his biblical undertaking, an annuity of one hundred pounds. Double the amount of this sum, his lordship, whilst he lived, most regularly paid the Doctor. The first volume of the Translation appeared in 1792; the second, and last, in 1797. They were accompanied by Notes under the text; and by a volume of Critical Observations. In these he absolutely denied the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the sacred writings, expressed himself very slightly on several opinions universally received and respected by the church; and generally adopted the German scheme of rationalizing the narrative of the Old Testament.

"The frequent levity of his expressions was certainly very repugnant, not only to the rules of religion, but to good sense. This fault he carried in a still greater degree into his conversation: it gave general offence, but, those who knew him, whilst they blamed and lamented his aberrations, did justice to his learning, to his friendly heart and guileless simplicity. Most unjustly has he been termed an infidel. He professed himself a Trinitarian, a believer in the

resurrection, in the divine origin, and divine mission of Christ; in support of which he published a small tract. He also professed to believe all the leading and unadulterated tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. From her, however scanty his creed might be, he did not so far recede as was generally thought. The estrangement of his brethren from him was most painful to his feelings. The writer has more than once witnessed his lamenting this circumstance, with great agitation, and even with bitter tears.

"The general opinion respecting his version appears to be settled. It is admitted to contain many happy renderings; many just emendations of the text; and many profound and ingenious observations on its sense; and to discover a profound knowledge of the Hebrew language. But the propriety of the greater part, both of his emendations and interpretations, has been questioned; the too frequent levity of them we have already noticed. Another considerable defect in his version is, its total want of uniformity of style; in this respect it yields to the Vulgate, in which, although it was evidently executed by different hands, the *vultus et color idem*, are, throughout, admirably preserved. No translation of the sacred volumes, not even that of Houbigant, possesses this excellence in an equal degree. In every page of the version of Doctor Geddes there is some breach of this uniformity; the style, moreover, is justly reproached with incessant inversion, a mode of writing equally contrary to the Hebraic and the Greek idioms.

"He completed and published his translation of the historical books; and, when he died, he was preparing a pocket edition of the Psalms. He had sold the copy to Johnson the bookseller; and the work was printed off to the middle of the cxviiith Psalm.

"Lord Petre, his original patron, bequeathed to him an annuity of one hundred pounds during his life. With the hereditary munificence of his family, his lordship's son, soon after the decease of his father, signified to the Doctor, in the most polite and friendly manner, his intention to continue his father's patronage of the work; and to allow him an additional annuity of one hundred pounds. The Doctor did not long survive his noble patron. Lord Petre died in July 1801. The Doctor died in the following February. He was buried, by his own desire, in the churchyard at Paddington. The funeral was numerously and honourably attended. Few could boast of warmer, or of more respectable friends; for, no one ever called in question his learning, or the benevolence of his disposition. Lord

Petre extended his kindness to the Doctor's memory. Immediately after his death, his lordship desired the writer of these pages to examine his papers. At his request, the late Doctor Disney, a particular friend of the deceased, was associated with him in the task. This was the more proper, as a report had been widely circulated that the Catholics had caused his papers to be destroyed. Doctor Disney, and the present writer, made as complete a search among them as their avocations permitted. To their great surprise, although they found several literary manuscripts, they did not, with the exception of a rough version of the last Psalm, find a single scrap of paper that related to his biblical pursuits. This was signified to Lord Petre, with a recommendation, that further searches and further inquiries should be made by some person possessed of greater leisure. These were made; but they were equally unsuccessful. All this was the more surprising, as, from the Doctor's declarations to his friends, and from other circumstances, there was great reason to suppose that he had made considerable progress in the continuation of his work; or, at least, had collected ample materials for it. Probably, in the view of his approaching dissolution, he had committed them to the flames. On the receipt of this report, it was thought proper, that the public should be made acquainted with the result of the investigation, by a preface to the Doctor's translation of the Psalms. Such a preface was accordingly written. It was signed by Doctor Disney, and by the present writer; and prefixed to that work.

“A learned and interesting life of the Doctor has been written by Mr. Mason Good. It has been mentioned, that the Doctor was, by his own desire, buried at Paddington.—It was by his own desire also, that the following inscription was written on the stone raised at the head of his grave:

“Reverend Alexander Geddes, LL. D.
Translator of the Historical Books
of the Old Testament,
Died, February 26th, 1802,
Aged 65.

Christian is my name, and Catholic my surname.

I grant, that you are a Christian, as well as I;

And embrace you as my fellow-disciple in Jesus:

And, if you are not a disciple in Jesus,
Still I would embrace you, as my fellow-man.

Requiescat in Pace.

Extracted from his works.

This stone was erected by his friend, Lord Petre, in 1804.”—II. pp. 298—303.

Anecdote of Dr. S. Clarke and Dr. Hawarden.

“In his work, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, he propounded his system with great clearness, and supported it with considerable strength and subtilty of argument. He met a powerful opponent in Doctor Hawarden. By the desire of Queen Caroline, the consort of George the Second, a conference was held by them in the presence of her majesty; of Mrs. Middleton, a Catholic lady, much in the confidence of the queen; and of the celebrated Doctor Courayer.

“When they met, Doctor Clarke, at some length, in very guarded terms, and with great apparent perspicuity, exposed his system. After he had finished, a pause of some length ensued. Doctor Hawarden then said, that ‘he had listened with the greatest attention to what had been said by Doctor Clarke;’ that ‘he believed, he apprehended rightly the whole of his system;—that the only reply which he should make to it was, asking a single question; that, if the question were thought to contain any ambiguity, he wished it to be cleared of this before any answer to it was returned; but desired, that when the answer should be given it should be expressed either by the affirmative or negative monosyllable.’ To this proposition Dr. Clarke assented. ‘Then,’ said Doctor Hawarden, ‘I ask;—Can God the Father annihilate the Son, and the Holy Ghost?—answer me yes, or no.’ Doctor Clarke continued for some time in deep thought, and then said,—‘It was a question which he had never considered.’—Here the conference ended.

“A searching question it certainly was; and the reader will readily perceive its bearings. If Doctor Clarke answered, ‘yes,’ he admitted the Son and the Holy Ghost to be mere creatures. If he answered, ‘no,’ he admitted them to be absolute Gods. The writer of these pages has frequently heard the conference thus related, particularly by the late Mr. Alban Butler, and by Mr. Winstanley, the professor of philosophy at the English College at Douay.”—II. pp. 309, 310.

Instance of Dr. Thomas Hussey, the Catholic Bishop of Waterford's Eloquence.

“His eloquence in the pulpit was really great; but it rather subdued than satisfied reason. The writer of these pages was present at a sermon which he preached, on the small number of the elect. Copying Massillon, he asked, ‘Whether if the arch of heaven were

to open, and the Son of Man, bursting from the mercy in which he is now enveloped, should stand in that chapel, and judge his hearers, it were quite certain that three, or even two;—nay, trembling for myself, as well as for you! is it quite certain that even one of us!”—exclaimed the Doctor, in a voice of thunder, ‘will he be saved?’ During the whole of this apostrophe, the audience was agonized. At the ultimate interrogation there was a general shriek, and some fell on the ground. This was the greatest triumph of eloquence that the writer has ever chanced to witness; but, as he has before observed, it rather subdued than satisfied.”—II. p. 318.

II. *The Life of William Lord Russell; with some Account of the Times in which he lived.* By Lord John Russell. 2 volumes. 8vo. Longman and Co. 1819.

III. *Some Account of the Life of Rachael Wriothesley Lady Russell, by the Editor of Madame Du Deffand's Letters, followed by a Series of Letters from Lady Russell to her Husband, &c.* 8vo. Longman and Co. 1819.

These are valuable works. Lord Russell was a pure patriot, and an ever-to-be-honoured martyr to English liberty; and Lady Russell was a woman of eminent wisdom, of enlightened piety, and of unparalleled conjugal devotion. The study of these high characters would have a happy influence upon our youth, who are in danger of being perverted from the

true English character by Scottish Toryism in the shape of novels, by French and Italian dissoluteness in the bewitching form of poetical tales, and by German sentimental metaphysics in the guise of sonnets and other metrical effusions.

Lord John Russell might have been pardoned for displaying more enthusiasm than we find in the life of his illustrious ancestor. His work is somewhat tame. Every where, however, it breathes the spirit of constitutional freedom. Little of novelty has been gleaned on the history of Russell from the Bedford and Devonshire papers. The biographer is most entitled to praise for his arguments in refutation of the charge against Russell and Sydney of receiving money from France. The Protestant Dissenter will be gratified to see the connexion which the interests of his denomination have always had, by Lord John Russell's shewing, with the liberties of England.

The Life of Lady Russell is a fine piece of biography. The writer appears from the Dedication to be a female, who is in the decline of life. We know not her name; but there are not many female names which could be attached, with any plausibility, to such a composition. Lady Russell's Letters will disappoint those that expect to see a superior mind affecting stateliness and pomp: but no one can read them without pleasure who delights in beholding a noble character in the undress of domestic life..

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Hallamshire. The History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield, in the County of York. By Joseph Hunter (of Bath). Folio. £4. 4s.

An Historical Map of Palestine. One very large sheet. £1. 8s., on Canvass with Roller, £1. 15s.

Memoirs of the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, and his Sons Richard and Henry, illustrated by Original Letters and other Family Papers. By Oliver Cromwell, Esq., a Descendant of the Family. 4to. £3. 3s. (6 Portraits.)

The Fulfilment of Prophecy further illustrated by the Signs of the Times: or, an Attempt to ascertain the probable Issues of the recent Restoration of the Old Dynasties; of the Revival of Popery; and of the present Mental Ferment in Europe: as likewise how far Great Bri-

tain is likely to share in the Calamities by which Divine Providence will accomplish the final Overthrow of the Kingdoms of the Roman Monarchy. By J. Bicheno, M. A. 6s. 6d.

A Defence of the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, in Answer to Mr. T. C. Holland, with Remarks on the Personality of the Holy Ghost. By Edward Law, A. M., Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester. 4s.

A Dissertation upon the Traditional Knowledge of a promised Redeemer, which subsisted before the Advent of our Saviour. By C. J. Blomfield, B. D.

A Critical Examination of those Parts of Mr. Bentham's "Church of Englandism," which relate to the Sacraments and the Church Catechism. By H. J. Rose, A. B. 8vo. 5s.

A Syriac and English Grammar, principally adapted to the New Testament. By Thomas Yeates, late of the University of Oxford. 7s. 6d.

A Letter to the Bishop of St. David's, occasioned by his Lordship's Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of a pamphlet entitled, "Reflexions concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England, and the Church of Rome being holden," &c. By Samuel Wix, A. M. F. R. S. 3s.

The Fulfilment of the Revelation of St. John displayed, from the Commencement of the Prophecy, A. D. 96, to the Battle of Waterloo, A. D. 1815. By J. J. Holmes, M. A. 8vo. 12s.

On the late Prosecution of Mr. Carlile.

The Deist, the Christian, the Unitarian: a Sermon, at Bath, Nov. 28. By Joseph Hunter. 12mo. 1s.

The Duties of Christians towards Deists: a Sermon, preached at the Unitarian Chapel, Parliament Court, Artillery Lane, Bishopsgate Street, on Sunday, Oct. 24, 1819, on occasion of the recent Prosecution of Mr. Carlile, for the Republication of Paine's Age of Reason. By W. J. Fox. Second edition. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Four Letters to the Rev. W. J. Fox,

occasioned by his Sermon on The Duties of Christians towards Deists; and by his Remarks on the Prosecution of Mr. Carlile. By An Inquirer. 1s. 6d.

The Christianity of the New Testament Impregnable and Imperishable: an Address occasioned by the Trial of Mr. R. Carlile. By John Evans, LL.D. 8vo. 1s.

A Letter to the Attorney-General on the Inexpediency, Sinfulness and Inefficacy of all Prosecutions for Blasphemy and Irreligion. By Samuel Roberts, Sheffield. 8vo.

Moral Thoughts on the Necessity of the Bill for preventing Blasphemous Publications. Dedicated to Mrs. Fry.

On the Nature and Tendency of Blasphemous Opinions. By E. W. Stillingfleet, B. D. 8vo. 3s.

Blasphemy not to be suppressed or refuted but by the Truth as it is in Jesus. By Thomas Mulock, Esq., late of Magdalen Hall, Oxford. 1s. 6d.

Alarming Crisis; Important Anti-Deistical Publication. The Athanasian Creed, with Variorum Notes.

Modern Infidelity Portrayed. A Sermon, at Artillery Street Meeting-House, Bishopsgate Street, Nov. 14, 1819. By T. S. Brittan. 8vo.

POETRY.

HYMN.

Where'er the foot of man hath trod,
He feels the presence of a God:
Around, above, beneath,—where'er
His thought can reach, a God is there.
In midnight darkness he can see
The spirit of the Deity:
In midnight solitude, his ear
The noiseless voice of God can hear.
Around His throne no lightnings play,
No thunder marks His awful way:
He walks in silence thro' the air,
And He is here! and every where.
God is all eye, all ear:—the soul
That animates this wondrous whole:
The ray that lights our senses dim,
Is a reflection caught from Him.
God is our origin and end,
From Him we came, to Him we tend;
What an exalted strife to be
Deserving such a destiny! A.

HYMN.

Infinite greatness of God.
Could I mount on Seraph's wing
To Thy throne of heavenly light:
Could I like archangels bring,
Holiest offerings, pure and bright:
Could I songs of Cherubs sing,
Veil'd before Thy dazzling sight:—
I might lift my eye to Thee,
Thought-absorbing Deity.

I am but a child of day—
Shadow of mortality!
Born—as 'twere but yesterday,
And to-morrow doom'd to die;
Like a dream I pass away.
Source of being! how shall I
Seek Thy high and holy throne,
Great, unutterable One? A.

HYMN.

FROM LOPE DE VEGA.
(*Creacion del Mundo.*)

Divine eternal Lord! before whose face
I worship, while the everlasting choirs
Of saints and angels chaunt their rapturous hymns.
Holy and Mighty! Infinite! Immense!
Whom not alone the lips of Seraphs sing
'Midst the blest radiance of thy heav'nly love,
But all Thy creatures—every element,
In eloquent language fills the world with praise.
The flame soars upwards towards Thy glorious throne,
Bright-beaming in thy presence;—and the air
In its sweet silence Thee adores, or breathes
Thy name in echoes, and the morning song
Of woodland music;—while the noble sea
Heaves its high breast, thundering Thy greatness forth;

And rills and rivers, as they roll along
 Send their united chorus up to heaven
 In thousand voices.—Earth is full of
 Thee.
 A tongue is heard in ev'ry trembling
 leaf;
 A hymn is utter'd by each smiling flower.
 O let me join the general harmony,
 And bring my humble offering in the
 train
 Of these Thy marvellous works. A.

HYMN.

The offerings to Thy throne which rise,
 Of mingled praise and prayer;
 Are but a worthless sacrifice
 Unless the heart is there.
 Upon Thy all-discerning ear
 Let no vain words intrude:
 No tribute—but the vow sincere;—
 The tribute of the good.
 My offerings will indeed be blest,
 If sanctified by Thee;
 If Thy pure spirit touch my heart
 With its own purity.
 O may that spirit warm my heart
 To piety and love;
 And to life's lowly vale impart
 Some rays from heaven above. A.

W A R.
 Lightning and earthquake, flood and
 pestilence
 Are visitations of high Providence,
 Brief ills appended to prevailing good;
 But War, dread curse! from human rage
 proceeds,
 And in its train combines all guilty
 deeds
 With horrors dire of rapine, fire, and
 blood.
 Authors of War, whose lust for conquest
 burns,
 Or vengeance fierce that reason's plead-
 ing spurns,
 And champions hired to work its hideous
 woes,
 Than deadly blasts and tempests greater
 evils,
 Just is your title, Nature's murdering
 foes,
 Though steeples celebrate your bloody
 revels.
 The mangled victims on the drenched
 ground
 Send up to heaven a dreadful murmuring
 sound.

R. F.

Kidderminster, Oct. 21, 1819.

OBITUARY.

AGAIN has Death visited our palaces. We have the painful task, this month, of recording the decease of His Royal Highness, the Duke of KENT, who expired at Sidmouth, after an illness which but lately assumed a threatening appearance, on Sunday the 23rd instant. This event has produced a deep impression on the People, of whom the departed Prince ever gloried in representing himself as one. Our public charities have lost in him a Benefactor and Patron. His name is in the mouths of all the children in the Schools for the Poor of all Denominations, which, after the example of His Royal Father, he took a manifest pride in encouraging. He was also the warm friend of religious liberty; and the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Dissenter and the Jew could always reckon, in their schemes for the security of their freedom or the extension of their privileges, upon his countenance, and upon his vote as a peer of the realm.

The Duke's usefulness was much impeded, and we fear his happiness diminished, by the embarrassed state of his affairs, of which a painful exposure was lately made. Having read the official statement, we are of opinion that His Royal Highness was scarcely blameable, and that he was treated through successive administrations with a neglect and a

rigour which would not have been shewn to any other subject; to none, at least, not out of favour with the Court.

EDWARD, Duke of KENT and STRATHERN, fourth son of George III. was born on the 2nd of November, 1767. At 18 years of age, he was sent to Germany, and resided successively at Luneburgh and Hanover, until he had almost completed his 20th year. He then passed two years at Geneva. His next removal was to Gibraltar, with his regiment. He was afterwards in North America and the West Indies, and again at Gibraltar, of which he was appointed Governor. His bravery as a soldier has been much extolled; but he was a rigid disciplinarian, and on that account unpopular in the army.

His Royal Highness married at Coburg, May 29, 1818, her Serene Highness VICTORIA MARIA LOUISA, youngest daughter of the late reigning prince of Saxe Coburg, widow of his late Serene Highness the Prince of Leiningen, and sister of his Royal Highness, Leopold, Prince of Saxe Coburg, the surviving husband of the lamented Princess Charlotte. The only issue of this marriage was a daughter, named ALEXANDRINA VICTORIA, who was born at Kensington Palace, May 24, 1819.

1819. December 4, at *Woolwich*, Mr. JOHN RAILTON, in the 49th year of his age, leaving a wife and eight children to lament the loss of him. A fortnight before the termination of his valuable life he was in good health, and, with the sprightliness of disposition natural to him, enjoyed the pleasures of social intercourse with his affectionate family. So true it is, that in the midst of life we are in death; that, when in our full strength and all the vigour of our powers, and surrounded by earthly enjoyments, we are liable to be cut down like a flower. Possessing a sound understanding, he had by steady and persevering exertions attained respectability. For more than twenty years his religious principles had been firmly established. He was fully convinced of the truth of the Unitarian doctrine, and a fearless professor of it. Though he knew of no other Unitarians in *Woolwich*, feeling the value of what he believed, he was anxious for the establishment of an Unitarian place of worship there; and above a year before his death was instrumental, in connexion with the Unitarian Fund Committee, in procuring a small chapel for Unitarian worship, in which he assisted in conducting the service when a minister could not be obtained. The opening of this place of worship excited much opposition among the reputed orthodox, many of whom loaded the Unitarians with the bitterest reproaches. This led him sometimes to say, "Thanks be to God! we live in a country where they have not the supreme command, otherwise we might fall victims to their vindictive and intolerant spirit." His leisure time was principally employed in reading the Scriptures and other religious books, and in instructing his family, whom he endeavoured to lead to habits of piety, integrity, sobriety and prudence. In this course he looked to God for the enjoyments of this life and of the life to come. He gave pleasing proofs that the religion of Jesus affected his heart and influenced his mind; that he regarded it as the only safeguard of man. Had he been spared, there is reason to believe his usefulness as a Christian would have increased. The unity and infinite benevolence of God were to him a rich source of consolation: he said, they preserved him from perplexity in religious worship, and from the dread of futurity. The gospel he regarded as the most invaluable of the Divine gifts. With such views, and influenced by such principles, we may cherish the hope that he was habitually prepared to meet his God. In society he shewed frankness of manner, liberality of sentiment, and undeviating integrity. Dignified without pride, and cheerful without levity, in his intercourse with the

world, he did not lose sight of the character he had to support, and the duties he had to fulfil as a Christian. He would discuss subjects with entire freedom, without any tincture of acrimony. Those who shared his friendship saw that his religion was no less that of the heart than of the head. Among his other pursuits he had studied the English constitution, and none could more warmly admire its excellence. He abhorred tyranny of every kind, arbitrary sway, and the extravagances of democratic fanaticism. His loss will be long severely felt, and his memory long cherished with affection by his mourning widow and offspring. They will never forget the lessons he taught them both by precept and example. His warning was short: in his last moments he discovered no terror, and almost imperceptibly breathed his last. On Saturday, December 11th, his remains were deposited in the silent tomb.

Woolwich.

T. R.

Dec. 6, DAVID JENNINGS, Esq., of *Fenchurch Street* and of *Hawkherst*, in the county of *Kent*, grandson of Dr. Jennings, a respectable Dissenting minister, and grand-nephew of Dr. Lardner. Mr. Jennings was Chairman of the Land and Assessed Taxes for the City of London, and was a Special Commissioner under the late Property Tax. He was an active supporter of the principal Dissenting Institutions; and on account of his zeal and his dexterity in managing public business, was usually put into the chair at committees. He published in 1792, "*Hawkherst; a Sketch of its History and Antiquities.*" 4to. He put up a monument to Dr. Lardner in *Hawkherst Church*, for the inscription on which, see *Mon. Repos.* III. 364. In the same Volume, p. 487, is a record, less honourable to Mr. Jennings's name, of his attempt to prevent Dr. Kippis, from being the biographer of Lardner.

1820. Jan. 10, in the 56th year of her age, Mrs. EGELSOME, of *Golden Place, Oxford Road, Manchester*. It will be difficult, in endeavouring to embalm the memory of this most excellent woman, to use terms at once appropriate and equal to her merits, without incurring the charge of partiality from those who were strangers to her worth. It has fallen to the lot of few to experience the fluctuations of fortune, and the sorrows of domestic privation which she sustained, and to none who, under every reverse and check of hope, could have continued the unabated exertion, the renewed efforts, which her resolution evinced.

She was the great granddaughter of Robert Dukinfield, Esq., the father of

the Baronet of that name, and once famous as a Colonel in the Protector's army. Her grandfather and her uncle, the late Rev. W. Buckley, of Dukinfield, sustained, with unvarying credit and respectability, the important duties of the ministry, for more than half a century, at Dukinfield Chapel. (The grandfather succeeded the celebrated Mr. Angier, of this place, and the uncle, with the intervention of some who remained but a short time with the congregation, succeeded his father.) Conscious that her own character ought not to depreciate the credit of being so respectably allied, she sustained with dignity, she combated with unabated efforts, the obstacles which accumulated disappointments presented. Though often plunged in deep distress, her mind remained firm, and her conduct displayed inflexible perseverance.

She was the mother of a numerous family, and once had reason to look forward, through commercial prosperity, to an ample provision for them all. In this expectation her hopes were frustrated, and about the same time her eldest child, a most amiable and accomplished daughter, fell a victim to that tyrant

“ Whose shaft flew thrice, and thrice her peace was slain,”

in the gloomy succession of after bereavements.

Her second daughter and her eldest son became then the objects of her renewed solicitude. The boy was apprenticed to a liberal profession, and the daughter's education directed to qualify her for the instruction of others. Scarcely were her fine talents sufficiently matured, and a seminary reared, in which they began to display themselves to no common advantage, before disease began to threaten their total extinction. Previous, however, to these fears becoming realized, the son of her hopes, one whom she had destined to take his younger brothers by the hand, returned sick from his master's employment, and, to the inexpressible regret of all who knew him, sunk prematurely to the grave. The loss of a child, and sometimes of many children, becomes the lot of most parents to endure; but to lose one designed to

sustain the double character of a brother and a parent to the younger branches of the family, was a stroke of overwhelming bitterness. Such was the case of this afflicted mother: and her recovered firmness under this trial had scarcely erected itself before the death of her accomplished second child sapped the foundation of it for ever. On the evening of the funeral of this beloved daughter, she declared, prophetic of her own dissolution, that the then assembled friends would soon be called together again to pay her remains the sad respect they had that day bestowed upon her daughter.

Six children survive her; the eldest of whom, the present Miss Egelsome, well qualified for her arduous undertaking, will place herself at the head of that seminary which has heretofore been so ably conducted by her sister, herself, and her revered and beloved mother. The child of one so tried cannot be said to be inexperienced; the witness of so much talent and virtue cannot be unprepared for the duties now devolving upon herself.

The limits of the present notice preclude any development of character except what the events already mentioned point out. If this task was faithfully executed it would furnish materials equally interesting and important. From her the most affluent might derive salutary distrust in their greatest prosperity, and the most indigent, lessons of economy and forethought in their narrowest circumstances. Perhaps one trait of her character ought not to be omitted, and it is this—*she never neglected herself*. Always neat in her appearance, and of the most unassuming and retired demeanour, the correctness of her language, and the propriety of her manners, never sunk below that of the gentlewoman. She seldom uttered a murmur, or ventured a complaint. Her attendance upon public worship was exemplary—her devotion ardent and enlightened. Her Christianity was the gold that had sustained the heat of the furnace—her robe that which had been dyed in much tribulation.

W. H.

Jan. 26, at his house in Rutland Place, Mr. JOHN PEARSON, aged 46.

REGISTER OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Report on the Criminal Laws.

REPORT.—The Select Committee appointed to consider of so much of the Criminal Laws as relates to capital punishment in felonies, and to report their observations and opinion of the same, from time to time, to the House; and to whom the several petitions on

the subject were referred, have, pursuant to the orders of the House, considered the matters to them referred, and have agreed upon the following Report:

Your Committee, in execution of the trust delegated to them by the House, have endeavoured strictly to confine

themselves within the limits prescribed to them by the terms of their appointment. In some cases they have laid down restrictions for themselves, which the letter of the resolution of the House did not impose. They have abstained from all consideration of those capital felonies which may be said to be of a political nature, being directed against the authority of Government and the general peace of society. To the nature and efficacy of the secondary punishments of transportation and imprisonment, they have directed no part of their inquiries, because another committee had been appointed to investigate them, and because no part of the facts or arguments to be stated in this report will be found to depend either on the present state of these secondary punishments, or on the degree of improvement of which they may be found capable. With many extensive and important parts of the criminal law—such, for example, as that which regulates the trial of offenders—they are entirely satisfied; and they should not have suggested any changes in these departments, even if they had been within the appointed province of this committee. On other parts of the subject—as, for example, in the definition and arrangement of crimes—they have recommended a consolidation of the laws respecting only one class of offences, and have presumed only to express a general opinion of the utility of the like consolidation in some other cases. They wish expressly to disclaim all doubt of the right of the Legislature to inflict the punishment of death wherever that punishment, and that alone, seems capable of protecting the community from enormous and atrocious crimes. The object of the Committee has been to ascertain, as far as the nature of the case admitted by evidence, whether, in the present state of the sentiments of the people of England, capital punishment in most cases of offences unattended with violence, be a necessary, or even the most effectual security against the prevalence of crimes.

1. In the first place they endeavoured to collect official accounts of the state of crimes, and the administration of criminal law throughout the kingdom, from the earliest period to which authentic information reaches. The annual returns of commitments, convictions, and executions, first procured by addresses from this House, and since required by statute, go no farther back than 1805. Accounts, though not perfectly satisfactory, of the same particulars from London and Middlesex, from 1749 to the present time, have been already laid before Parliament, which, with an official summary of the returns of England and Wales from 1805,

will be inserted in the appendix of this report.

A full and authentic account of convictions and executions for London and Middlesex, from 1699 to 1804, obtained for the latter part of that time from the clerk of arraigns at the Old Bailey, and for the former part from the officers of the city of London, is inserted in the appendix. The Corporation of the city of London have shewn on this occasion a liberality and public spirit worthy of acknowledgment; and it is to be hoped that they will continue their researches as far back as their records extend, and thus complete returns probably unparalleled in the history of criminal law.

The deputy clerk of assize for the home circuit has laid before your Committee a return of commitments, convictions, and executions on that circuit, which comprehends the counties of Herts, Essex, Kent, Sussex and Surrey, from 1689 to 1718, from 1755 to 1784, and from 1784 to 1814. The returns of the intermediate period, from 1718 to 1755, he will doubtless furnish very soon. From this important return it appears that, for the first 30 years which followed the Revolution, the average proportion of convictions to executions was 38 to 20; that from 1755 to 1784, it was 46 to 13; and that from 1784 to 1814, it was 74 to 19. It is worthy of remark, that the whole number of convictions for murder on the home circuit, in the first period, was 123; that the executions for the same period were 87; that in the second, the convictions for the same offence were 67, and the executions 57; and that in the third, the convictions were 54, and the executions 44. If the increase of the population, during a prosperous period of 130 years, be taken into the account, and if we bear in mind that within that time a considerable city has grown up on the southern bank of the Thames, we shall be disposed to consider it as no exaggeration to affirm, that in this district (not one of the most favourably situated in this respect) murder has abated in the remarkable proportion of 3, if not 4, to 1.

In the thirty years from 1755 to 1784, the whole convictions for murder in London and Middlesex were 71; and in the thirty years from 1784 to 1814 they were 66. In the years 1815, 1816 and 1817, the whole convictions for murder in London were 9, while in the three preceding years they were 14. Most of the other returns relate to too short a period, or too narrow a district, to afford materials for safe conclusion with respect to the comparative frequency of crimes at different periods.

In general, however, it appears that

murders, and other crimes of violence and cruelty, have either diminished or not increased; and that the deplorable increase of criminals is not of such a nature as to indicate any diminution in the humanity of the people. The practice of immediately publishing the circumstances of every atrocious crime, and of circulating in various forms an account of every stage of the proceedings which relate to it, is far more prevalent in England than in any other country, and in our times than in any former age. It is on the whole of great utility, not only as a controul on courts of judicature, but also as a means of rendering it extremely difficult for odious criminals to escape. In this country no atrocious crimes remain secret; with these advantages, however, it cannot be denied, that by publishing the circumstances of all crimes, our modern practice tends to make our age and nation appear more criminal than, in comparison with others, it really is.

2. In considering the subject of our penal laws, your Committee will first lay before the House their observations on that part which is the least likely to give rise to difference of opinion. That many statutes denouncing capital punishments might be safely and wisely repealed, has long been a prevalent opinion. It is sanctioned by the authority of two successive Committees of this House, composed of the most eminent men of their age, and in some measure by the authority of the House itself, which passed several bills on the recommendation of their Committees. As a general position, the propriety of repealing such statutes seems scarcely to have been disputed; respecting the number and choice of them, different sentiments must always be expected. Your Committee have not attempted a complete enumeration, which much time and considerable deliberation would be required to accomplish. They selected some capital felonies, for the continuance of which they cannot anticipate any serious argument, and which seem to them to serve no purpose but that of incumbering and discrediting the statute-book. Various considerations have combined to guide their choice: sometimes mere levity and hurry have raised an insignificant offence, or an almost indifferent act, into a capital crime; in other acts, the evil has been manifestly and, indeed, avowedly temporary, though it unfortunately produced a permanent law. Where the punishment of death was evidently unnecessary at the time of its original establishment, and where, if it was originally justified by a temporary danger, or excused by a temporary fear, it has long been acknowledged

to be altogether disproportioned to the offence, your Committee conceive themselves warranted in confidently recommending its abolition. But they have also adverted to another consideration: if, in addition to the intrinsic evidence of unwarrantable severity in a law, which arises from the comparison of the act forbidden with the punishment threatened, they find also that the law has scarcely ever been executed since its first enactment, or if it has fallen into disuse as the nation became more humane and generally enlightened, your Committee consider themselves as authorized to recommend its repeal, by long experience, and by the deliberate judgment of the whole nation. In the application of this latter principle, they have been materially aided by the documents which have been mentioned. Where a penal law has not been carried into effect in Middlesex for more than a century, in the counties round London for sixty years, and in the extensive district which forms the Western Circuit for fifty, it may be safely concluded that the general opinion has pronounced it to be unfit or unnecessary to continue in force. The Committee are aware that there are cases in which it may be said, that the dread of the punishment has prevented the perpetration of the crime, and where, therefore, the law appears to be inefficacious only because it has completely accomplished its purpose. Whatever speciousness may belong to this reasoning in the case of conspicuous crimes, and punishments generally present to the minds of men, it never can be plausibly applied to rare and obscure offences, to penal enactments, of which it requires a more than ordinary degree of professional accuracy habitually to recollect the existence. Your Committee have endeavoured to avoid all cases which seem to them to be on this ground disputable. From general caution, and a desire to avoid even the appearance of precipitation, they have postponed cases, which seem to them liable to as little doubt as some of those to which they are about to advert.

It has sometimes been said, that the abolition of penal laws which have fallen into disuse is of little advantage to the community. Your Committee consider this opinion as an error. They forbear to enlarge on the striking remark of Lord Bacon, that all such laws weaken and disarm the other parts of the criminal system. The frequent occurrence of the unexecuted threat of death in a criminal code tends to rob that punishment of all its terrors, and to enervate the general authority of the government and the laws. The multiplication of this threat in the laws of England has brought on them,

and on the nation, a character of harshness and cruelty, which evidence of a mild administration of them will not entirely remove. Repeal silences the objection. Reasoning, founded on lenient exercises of authority, whatever its force may be, is not calculated to efface a general and deep impression. The removal of disused laws is a preliminary operation, which greatly facilitates a just estimate, and (where it is necessary) an effectual reform of those laws which are to remain in activity. Were capital punishments reduced to the comparatively small number of cases in which they are often inflicted, it would become a much simpler operation to form a right judgment of their propriety or necessity. Another consideration of still greater moment presents itself on this part of the subject: penal laws are sometimes called into activity after long disuse, and in cases where their very existence may be unknown to the best-informed part of the community, malicious prosecutors set them in motion; a mistaken administration of the law may apply them to purposes for which they were not intended,

and which they are calculated more to defeat than to promote; such seems to have been the case of the person who, in the year 1814, at the Assizes for Essex, was capitally convicted of the offence of cutting down trees, and who, in spite of earnest applications for mercy from the prosecutor, the committing magistrate, and the whole neighbourhood, was executed, apparently because he was believed engaged in other offences, for none of which, however, he had been convicted or tried.

This case is not quoted as furnishing any charge against the humanity of the judge or of the advisers of the crown: they certainly acted according to the dictates of their judgment; but it is a case where the effect of punishment is sufficiently shewn by the evidence to be the reverse of exemplary; and it is hard to say whether the general disuse of the capital punishment in this offence, or the single instance in which it has been carried into effect, suggests the strongest reasons for its abolition.

(To be continued.)

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

THE *British Critic* is, we are glad to see, devoting itself to the Unitarian controversy. In spite of its misstatements and vauntings and reproaches, it will do good by leading some of its readers to the pure sources of truth. The Number for December contains a Review of an Answer to Captain Gifford's admirable *Remonstrance to the Bishop of St. David's*, (see *Mon. Repos.* XIII. 638—640,) by Mr. John Garbett, curate of Cardington, in the county of Bedford. The Critic decries the Captain's pamphlet which, by his own confession, he has never read, and equally cries up the Curate's: but there are some deductions from his praise of Mr. Garbett, whom he considers not quite sound in the "Athanasian Creed," and whom he gently rebukes for not speaking "with greater confidence of the genuineness of 1 John v. 7—after the powerful testimonies in its favour which have been lately produced." What can the writer mean? What new attempt is there to revive the credit of the exploded passage?

Law of Church Singing.—In a cause lately tried in the Court of Arches, Sir J. NICHOL referred to a case in which

an action was brought by the minister against the churchwarden; and the charge in the citation was "for obstructing and prohibiting, by his own pretended power and authority, and for declaring openly his intention still further to obstruct and prohibit, the singing and chaunting of the charity children of the parish." Here the churchwarden supposed that he had a right to direct when the children should sing and when they should not. The minister had directed the organ to play in certain parts of the service, and the children to chaunt at the same time: the churchwarden directed the contrary, and the organist obliged him in preference to the minister. The Court said, "that the right of directing Divine service was with the minister, and, for the churchwarden to interrupt or defeat it, was an offence and an innovation of the clergyman's rights, to be proceeded against by articles."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Dissenters' Marriages.—Petitions numerously signed, have been sent by the Protestant Dissenters at Newcastle, to Earl Grey and Sir M. W. Ridley, to present to each House of Parliament, praying that the Dissenters in England and Wales may celebrate matrimony in their own

places of worship by their own ministers, as is allowed to the Episcopalians and other sects in Scotland, to the Roman Catholics and other Dissenters in Ireland, and to the Jews and Quakers in this country.—*Carlisle Journal*.

Anglo-Greek University.—*Oxford, Nov. 5.* In a full Convocation, on Thursday the 28th of last month, the University Seal was affixed to a dutiful and loyal address to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, on the present state of the country. The Prince Regent, having appointed the Earl of Guildford, K. G. C., formerly student of Christ Church, to be Chancellor of the University in the Ionian Islands, it was in the same Convocation resolved to confer upon his Lordship the degree of Doctor in Civil Law by diploma. With the same view it was also resolved to present to the Library of the Ionian University all such books, printed at the Clarendon Press, as are likely to be useful to the general design of the Institution.

Hulsean Lecture.—The Rev. JOHN HULSE, of Elworth Hall, in the county of Chester, formerly a member of St. John's College, Cambridge, among other bequests for the promotion of religion and learning, instituted a lectureship in Divinity, to which he annexed a considerable salary, arising out of estates in Middlewich, Sandbach and Clive. The duty of the Lecturer is to preach and publish twenty sermons, chiefly on the truth and excellence of Revelation. The Rev. CHRISTOPHER BENSON, of Trinity College, has been chosen Lecturer for the present year.

PROFESSORS' CHAIRS, EDINBURGH.—Mr. Professor Leslie has succeeded Professor Playfair in the Professorship of Natural Philosophy at Edinburgh. Dr. Chalmers was a candidate for the vacant chair, but withdrew his pretensions. The vacancy in the Mathematical Professorship, made by Professor Leslie's election, was very warmly contested. The candidates were Mr. Wallace, Dr. Haldane, Mr. Babbage, of Cambridge, and Mr. Thomas White, of Dumfries. The two last, however, were not proposed by any member of the Town Council, and the contest lay between Mr. Wallace and Dr. Haldane, of whom the former was the successful competitor, having eighteen votes, while the latter had only ten. Four members were absent, and one who was present was neuter.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. TUESDAY,
DECEMBER 21.

Debate on the Libel Bill.

LORD EBRINGTON.—The state of morals in this country was not such as to call for such a measure as the present. It was not, he trusted, necessary for him to guard himself by expressing the abhorrence which he felt at the principles of *blasphemy* which were propagated. He admitted that some persons did circulate such principles, but he believed that their number was far less than it was represented from the other side of the House. (Hear, hear, hear.) Let them look to their Bible Societies; let them look to the various societies for the propagation of the gospel, societies patronized, not by the rich and the great alone, but by all classes above the very paupers (hear, hear); let them look at the new churches and chapels building in every part of the country; let them look at the immense increase of meeting-houses. Many clergymen in the Church were heard to complain that the people did not think the devotion of our own Church sufficient for them. He was sincerely attached to the Church, and did not wish to encourage Methodism; but he could appeal to the increase of Methodism as proof that blasphemy was not generally prevalent. (Hear, hear.) But even admitting the evil to exist to a far greater degree than it really did, surely it was incumbent upon those who brought in the present measures, to shew that the existing laws were not sufficient for that evil, (hear,) before they called upon the House to pass other laws. Since 1810, only one individual had been prosecuted for blasphemy, as appeared from the return upon their table. The conviction and punishment of that individual could not be supposed to encourage blasphemy. The severity of his punishment might be thought sufficient without severer laws.

Mr. W. SMITH.—He hoped he should be excused for saying a few words here upon the kind of defence set up on his trial by Mr. *Carlile*—a defence in which proceedings in that House were alluded to, and his name, as the mover of a bill on which Mr. *Carlile* rested his defence, had been mentioned. He knew nothing of Mr. *Carlile*, and almost of the whole of his defence he was ignorant. But if he had rested his defence on the bill which he had the honour and very great satisfaction to carry through that House, no defence was ever more void of foundation. He had had a conversation with the most respectable and venerable person who was at the head of the Church,

and to whom he could appeal if he were in that House, before the bill was proposed, and they had agreed that the common law respecting *blasphemy* was not to be touched by it. He would not now touch the law of blasphemy, nor would he enter into the question whether blasphemy might not better be left to its own fate. He was sure of the concurrence of an honourable and learned gentleman on the other side, in the opinion that Christianity needed not the support of the civil power. He was perfectly satisfied that it would occasion no danger to our religion if every statute for its defence were done away, or had never existed in this country. Every government undoubtedly had the right to protect the religion which it established. But when Protestants contended against Catholics, they stood, precisely on the same foundation in Catholic countries as those who opposed the constituted authorities and the established laws respecting religion.

The Marquis of TAVISTOCK said, that the honourable and learned gentleman had this night, in a tone very different from that of his honourable and learned colleague on a former evening, brought forward a charge against those who contributed to the relief of Mr. Hone. He had hoped that, after what had passed in that House from time to time respecting the prosecution of that individual, it would not have been necessary for him to say one word upon the subject. He had thought it had been clearly understood, that whatever might be the opinion with respect to the conduct of government in that prosecution, there could be but one feeling of disgust with respect to the parodies. (Hear.) One of the honourable and learned gentlemen opposite had said, that it was owing to those who expressed their disapprobation of the prosecution of Mr. Hone, that blasphemy and sedition had gone unpunished. He (the Marquis of Tavistock) must request the indulgence of the House while he stated shortly what the motives of his conduct had been. Having seen others not only not prosecuted, but loaded with honours and pensions, after having published parodies of a similar nature, (loud cheers from the opposition,) only that they were in favour of the Government (hear, hear); and having seen, in the case of Mr. Hone, that if the parodies had not been against his Majesty's Government, we should not probably have ever heard of them; having seen three prosecutions carried on by the Attorney-General, and having observed that Mr. Hone, after the acquittal on the last of them, had given a promise—a promise which he had since

kept—that he would not republish the parodies, he (the Marquis of Tavistock) thought it proper to mark his conduct of those proceedings, and his admiration of the abilities of Mr. Hone in conducting his defence against all the power and talents which had been arrayed against him. (Hear, hear.) He must beg to recall to the recollection of the honourable and learned gentleman [the Solicitor-General] the sentiments of his former, but perhaps less prudent days, and ask him whether a man might not entertain such sentiments in his breast, and yet feel the utmost abhorrence of blasphemy and sedition. (Loud cheers, which were continued for some seconds.)

Mr. SCARLETT.—Then came the case of Mr. Hone. One prosecution was for a parody on the Litany, another for a parody on the Catechism, and a third for a parody on the Athanasian Creed. When he was brought up, the information was read at great length, and every count but the last charged him with an intent to revile the Liturgy. He (Mr. Scarlett) thought that Mr. Hone would be acquitted, and he said so to Mr. Justice Richardson, who was then one of the counsel for the prosecution. His reason for so thinking, and he then stated it, was, that so many distinguished persons, bishops, deans and ministers of state, in all times and ages, had published parodies, that he did not believe that a jury could, on their oaths, conscientiously find a man guilty of blasphemy for doing what they had done before him. As he had foretold, Mr. Hone was acquitted. The second prosecution was for a parody on the Catechism: this was something worse: but Mr. Hone had produced in his defence a similar catechism, written by Dr. Arbuthnot, in the reign of Queen Anne, but which, by mistake, he had attributed to Mr. Wilkes. It was in fact written by Dr. Arbuthnot, in favour of the Government of that day, and was thought to be a very useful composition. Mr. Hone was again acquitted. As to the third parody, on the Athanasian Creed, he (Mr. Scarlett) had no sooner read the record than he asserted that he had no doubt of an acquittal. Indeed, a parody did not necessarily infer an intention to revile the thing parodied. How many parodies, for instance, had been published on Pope's Letter of Eloisa to Abelard? It was well known that Mr. Porson was very fond of a parody on that poem; but who would impute to him, or to the poem, any wish to revile the poetical character of Mr. Pope? He was one of those who thought that these compositions ought not to be applauded. He did not think the present an irreligious age:

if not so devout as former ages, it however paid the greatest attention to the outward forms and decorums of religion; and perhaps it was for this very reason that parodies, which appeared so innocent to our forefathers, were so shocking and offensive in our eyes. (Hear, hear.) But a jury to whom it was put as Mr. Hone put it, whether they could think he had a design of reviling or degrading the Christian religion, by doing that which bishops and ministers of state had done before him, or whether they thought that his object was purely political, could not in their conscience convict him of the former offence; and as to the latter, the Attorney-General, though certainly not deficient in courage, had not ventured to appeal to the jury for a political verdict. (Hear.)

Mr. R. MARTIN supported the bill, on the ground that it was necessary, by more severe enactments, to check the streams of sedition and blasphemy which had inundated the land.

Mr. BANKES believed that abuses of the press existed to such a degree as required the interference of Parliament. It had been urged by one honourable gentleman (Mr. Bennet) that he (Mr. Bankes), in expressing a doubt regarding the policy of extending education on the plan at present pursued, had opposed the spread of morality and religion. No man, he was convinced, could suspect him of such a design, and he thought it beneath him to answer such an insinuation. A man must in the House stand on his general character and habitual conduct, and if that did not protect him from such a charge, it would be vain to disclaim it in words. He had never declared education an evil. He had merely expressed a doubt on the policy and expediency, in the present condition of society, of carrying the system of educating the poor to the extent recommended by some of his friends, and with the rapidity with which the well-meant zeal of those who encouraged it, pressed it forward. His reasoning was the following:—We put the people in a new situation by this general diffusion of education, and we are not perhaps aware of the effects to which this change may lead. This new condition which is created may lead to evils which additional restrictions on the press may be required to correct, as with the capacity of reading, facilities are afforded for spreading mischievous as well as moral and religious principles. If he was asked generally, whether education was a good, he should be a savage to deny it; but if interrogated further, whether he thought it should be spread so extensively and so rapidly as was the

wish of many benevolent persons whom he highly valued, he would beg leave to express a doubt; but because he did so, he ought not to be pointed out as a marked man, and accused of opposing the diffusion of morality and religion. During the progress of teaching, we could see what books were put into the hands of the young, but we could not regulate their subsequent studies, or determine the kind of food which their minds should receive.

MONDAY, DEC. 27.

Newspaper Stamp Duties Bill.

LORD SIDMOUTH.—The bills which had already become laws had, as he had already observed, produced the best effects. With regard to the measure under consideration, whatever tended to affect the press, even in the way of regulation, was a subject which called for great attention and caution. This their lordships would find had been observed in proposing this measure. What the danger to be guarded against was, their lordships would see from the preamble of the bill, which stated, that pamphlets and printed papers containing observations on public events and occurrences, tending to excite hatred and contempt of the government and constitution of these realms as by law established, and also vilifying our holy religion, had lately been published in great numbers, and at very small prices; and that it was expedient that the same should be restrained. The means by which it was proposed to effect this object he should now shortly explain. The first provision made all pamphlets and other publications not exceeding two sheets, published within intervals of twenty-six days, and at a price not exceeding sixpence, exclusive of the duty, liable to the same duty as newspapers. Religious tracts and books of instruction were, along with some other publications, excepted from the operation of the bill. The circulation of blasphemous and seditious libels, which had, during the last few years, the last few months, and even the last few weeks, been pushed into every hamlet and cottage in the kingdom, rendered some measure of this kind indispensable. The next provision to which he wished to call their lordships' attention was that by which any person printing a newspaper, or other political publication, is required to give a bond to the extent of 300*l.* in the capital, and 200*l.* in the country, with sureties to the same amount. This clause was introduced for the purpose of securing the payment of any fine which might, on conviction, be

imposed by the sentence of a court. Another provision which he should notice was one which extended to pamphlets and other publications held to be newspapers, the enactment originally introduced by his noble and learned friend, by which printers are obliged to send to the Stamp-Office a copy of each paper they published. The necessity of this regulation was obvious. It had been made a reproach to his Majesty's ministers that they had not prosecuted the libels which were in circulation; but their lordships were now aware that the prosecution of the author was hopeless, and the discovery of the printer, and sometimes the prosecution of the first publisher, were things extremely difficult, from their obscurity, and because they were not venders. For instance, CARLILE had four or five prosecutions instituted against him because he was the vender of libels; whereas SHERWIN, the original publisher, taking care to avoid selling except to persons who, he knew, would not enforce the law against him, escaped. The effect of this provision would, therefore, be, to identify the printer and original publisher; and, if a blasphemous libel appeared, to facilitate the prosecution of those who put it forth. The printer or publisher was, therefore, required to subscribe his name to the copy delivered to the Stamp-Office. He knew that measures of this kind would be objected to by those who had all along contended that no regulation was necessary. He was aware that some persons were of opinion that the danger against which it had been the study of his Majesty's ministers to provide, was greatly overrated, and that the constitution of this country stood on a basis so firm, that it was impossible to shake the allegiance of the people. But it had been well observed by Lord BACON, that a man should not try how much poison his constitution would bear.

The Earl of HARROWBY perfectly agreed with the noble Duke, that the majorities by which the measures had been supported were not confined to the two Houses of Parliament, but that they comprehended all the sound, which he believed to be the major, part of the community. Where were the public meetings which had been held to petition or to remonstrate against them? There had been one in London, one in Westminster; but where was the rest of the country? The general silence was expressive, and offered a satisfactory proof that the people at large felt as he had stated. *Dum tacent, clamant.* Attempts had been made to procure general meetings for the purpose of petitioning, but the attempts had failed. The call made

in various places had been followed by no response. If this was owing to an acquiescence in the late proceedings of Parliament, he augured well for the future tranquillity of the country. *If, on the other hand, those proceedings were regarded as actually subversive of their rights, and the people, notwithstanding this opinion, continued silent, it afforded, indeed, an awful warning:* it shewed that the abuse of the press and of public meetings had inspired so general a disgust, that the country was willing to sacrifice their advantages rather than tolerate their mischievous effects.

HOUSE OF LORDS, WEDNESDAY, DEC. 29.

Newspaper Stamp Duties Bill.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH supported the bill, which imposed no restraint on fair discussion, but was directed against a pauper press, from which the greatest mischief was to be apprehended. That press did not dare to tell the truth, because those who managed it wrote solely for profit. It therefore did not attempt to direct, but constantly followed the varying opinion of the ever-changing mob, studying to flatter their prejudices and minister to their passions. The cheapness of these publications rendered it impossible to undersell them; and as they had already produced so much mischief, the evil must necessarily be greatly increased before they could be written down. From the period of HONE'S acquittal to the conviction of CARLILE, the press, from which these mischievous publications issued, had gone on without any controul, or any apprehension of punishment. He was aware that an important question here arose, namely, whether the lower orders ought to be deprived of a political press; but into that he did not further enter than to express his opinion against their political reading, which he thought could be of no use to them. The country could derive no benefit from philosophers from the loom, or statesmen from spinning-jennies. Besides, the kind of reading which publications, such as had lately been so widely circulated, afforded, tended to destroy the hopes of that moral improvement which it was of the greatest importance to promote among the lower orders of the people.

LITERARY.

A manuscript of undoubted authenticity has just reached this country, which is calculated to excite an extraordinary degree of interest. It is already in the hands of a translator, and will be published both in English and in the original

French, in the course of the ensuing month. It is entitled "Documents Historiques et Reflexions sur le Gouvernement de la Hollande. Par Louis Bonaparte, Ex-Roi de Hollande."

This work contains every event relating to the political or financial situation of Holland, from the commencement of the reign of Louis until the close of his government; sketches of the invasion of Italy and expedition in Egypt, in both of which the author was present; relations of most of the important events in Spain, and his refusal of the crown of that kingdom on the renunciation of Charles IV. to Ferdinand his son, and the formal cession of the latter to Napoleon; copies of the letters of Charles and Ferdinand, relating to the conspiracy of the latter against his father; the hitherto secret motives of the marriage of the author with the daughter of the Empress Josephine, and their subsequent mutual agreement to a separation; the events which occurred on the separation of the Emperor Napoleon and the Empress Josephine; the various princesses afterwards proposed to Napoleon, and the reason of his selecting the daughter of the Emperor of Austria; numerous characteristic and highly interesting letters from Napoleon to the author, exposing his views, situation and purposes; an indisputable genealogical history of the family of Buonaparte, extracted from various histories of Italy and other public documents, all of which prove, beyond doubt, the illustrious rank they held in Italy, even in the 12th century, and it is somewhat singular, that 600 years ago Androlius Buonaparte was Grand Podesta, or Governor of Parma, where is now the wife of Napoleon as Grand Duchess! An important letter from the Duc de Cadore, explaining the intentions of the Emperor relating to Holland, the various united propositions of France and Russia to accommodate with England, and a variety of Anecdotes of the Author, of Napoleon, and of his family.

Although this work may contain many events already known to the public in a general way, yet coming from the hand of one who was on a throne, and who had an immediate share in all that occurred, joined to his universally acknowledged probity and good faith, form together an unanswerable motive for giving it the preference over any other modern publication; and it is assuredly next in point of interest to a work from the pen of Napoleon himself. It is already inquired after with eagerness upon the Continent; in Holland there is not a gentleman who will not be desirous of possessing it, as it contains an accurate statement of the political and financial

situation of his country during a momentous period; and as it is written with the utmost candour, and is totally exempt from any expressions which might offend the most partial Bourbonist, it will find a wide circulation in France, where the Author, being known to be somewhat opposed to the maxims of his brother's government, will likewise be read with equal avidity by the most determined Ultras.

The CHURCH UNION Society of St. David's offers a premium of £50. for the best Essay on the Necessity of a Church Establishment in a Christian Country, for the Preservation of Christianity among the People of all Ranks and Denominations, &c.

The "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," which shewed such jealousy of BISHOP WATSON, during his life, has admitted his *Apology for the Bible* into its list of books, and published a cheap edition, at 1s. 6d. or 15s. the dozen.

Early in the coming year, 1820, will be presented to the public, The Chronicles of Ulla'd, commencing from the earliest point of time marked; the traditional portion of which is the work of Eolus, Prince of the Gael of Scot, of Ib-er, who ruled in Gael-Ag 1400 years before Christ.

On the 1st of February will be published, W. Baynes and Son's Catalogue of Old Books, for 1820, Part I. Comprising a very valuable and extensive collection of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History, both English and Foreign, Dictionaries, Lexicons and Grammars, in various languages, and the best Greek and Latin Classics.

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

"IN the Chamber of Deputies the Abbé GREGOIRE has been excluded by a large majority, as is alleged, on account of his share in the fate of Louis XVI. The ostensible reason was of a technical kind, relating to some irregularity in his election; but the real feelings of the Deputies, and their personal dislike of the individual, were avowed with no little vehemence and tumult on the occasion. And yet M. Gregoire had no part whatever in the death of that monarch. He proposed, it is true, the abolition of royalty; and, on various occasions, used very unmeasured and unwarrantable language, because he used the language of the day. But he was not present in the

Assembly when the king was tried and condemned. He was then on a mission at a considerable distance. He wrote a letter, indeed, to the President, expressing his clear opinion of the king's guilt, but yet condemning him not to *die*, but to *live*. He was decidedly adverse to inflicting upon him the punishment of death. It is worth inquiring how it has happened that, under these circumstances, and with so many around him, stained by still deeper shades of criminality, M. Gregoire should have become so generally obnoxious as to be rejected with indignation, and almost with abhorrence, from the Chamber of Deputies. To us the fact appears not difficult of explanation. In the first place, Gregoire stood forward singly in defence of Christianity, when proscribed by the almost unanimous voice of his revolutionary associates. His zeal in this hated cause roused the contempt and hatred of many even of his own political party.—In the next place, he had been an active, and we may say leading, member of the Society of *Les Amis des Noirs*; and, even during the iron reign of Buonaparte, he ceased not to lift his voice with courage and energy against the Slave Trade, and against that frightful system of colonial bondage which Buonaparte sought to restore in St. Domingo. He stood long single in this cause also. He became, therefore, the mark for all the arrows of detraction and calumny which the *ex-colons*, (a most powerful and numerous body,) the slave traders of Havre, Bourdeaux and Nantz, and all their adherents could direct against him.—But more than all this, since the restoration of Louis XVIII. he has exerted himself with extraordinary ability, perseverance and effect, in opening the eyes of his countrymen to the dangers likely to arise from the re-establishment of the Jesuits, and from the insidious pretensions of the Court of Rome to interfere in the affairs of the Gallican Church. He has become, therefore, on this account, particularly obnoxious to the bigoted adherents of the Papacy, and, above all, to that active, insinuating, restless and unprincipled body the Jesuits, who have spared no pains to blacken his character, and to confirm and increase the prejudices that had been excited against him on other grounds. Had he left the slave traders and Jesuits in peace, we believe that M. Gregoire might have very quietly taken his seat as a legislator. But the friends of the Pope's power and pretensions, and the friends also of Slavery and the Slave Trade, dreaded the presence of so powerful and so fearless an antagonist in the Chamber

of Deputies. The periodical work which expresses his sentiments on religious and ecclesiastical subjects had already done so much to defeat the machinations of the Court of Rome and its satellites the Jesuits, and to prevent the revival in France of the more gross corruptions of Popery, and had so boldly asserted the right of all the members of the Catholic Church to the use of the Holy Scriptures, that the utmost alarm and consternation were naturally enough created by his election, and the utmost efforts were therefore made to nullify it. Those efforts, as might be expected, have proved successful. Whether the decision to which they have led be right, we will not presume to determine. Thus much, however, we feel ourselves bound in common justice and charity to say, in behalf of one who, whatever may have been his errors, has, on many grounds, deserved well of his fellow-men, but who seems at present to be abandoned by all the world.*—(*Christian Observer*, December, 1819.)

ITALY.—ROME.

M. P' *Abbé* CANCELLIERI, known throughout Europe as one of the most learned men living, author of *Memoirs of St. Medieus*, *Description of the Papal Chapels*, &c., published in 1817, a *Catalogue of Works from the Propaganda Press* at Rome, which is under his direction, and he has promised the public a *History of the celebrated Propaganda Congregation*. His advanced age and his great weakness, it is said, increase the impatience of the literati of Italy, for its appearance.

M. ALEXANDER MANZONI, grandson of the celebrated Beccaria, has lately published in Italian, *Observations upon Catholic Morality*, (8vo. 297 pp.) in which he combats various assertions scattered in "The History of the Italian Republics of the middle age."

* "The periodical work to which we have alluded above, is entitled 'La Chronique Religieuse,' and may be had of Trentell and Wurtz, 30, Soho Square. It deserves the particular attention of the Christian world at the present moment, being, perhaps, the first public attempt, since the days of Erasmus, by members of the Roman Catholic Church, to expose the errors and corruptions of their own body. The conductors of this work appear to be themselves Jansenists in principle."