

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CXCIV.]

FEBRUARY, 1822.

[Vol. XVII.]

Mr. Cogan's Examination of Mr. Hume's Objection to the Argument for the Being of God.

SIR,

ONE of the most plausible objections to the arguments for the being of a God is that which is suggested by Mr. Hume, namely, that we have no experience in the origin of worlds, and therefore cannot safely conclude, because ships, cities, &c. are made by human art, that the universe must have had an intelligent Author. This objection I propose to consider.

The universe exhibits in innumerable instances an adaptation of means to ends, or what, for the sake of brevity, I shall sometimes call contrivance, not meaning thereby to assume the matter in dispute. And this adaptation of means to ends seems to be as truly prospective as any thing which we call contrivance in the works of art. The eye appears to have been as manifestly formed for seeing, as the telescope for assisting the vision of the eye. The universe, then, is justly comprehended in the general description of works which indicate a fitness of means to ends; and if I may not, in the case of the universe, call this fitness intentional, I must maintain that it is strictly *analogous* to the effects of intention in the works of art. As far as relates to the *appearance* of design, the works of art have no advantage over the works of nature. The question, then, is, why I should not apply to the latter the reasoning which I apply without hesitation, and, as it seems, without error to the former. Is it not reasonable to maintain, as a universal truth, that such an adaptation of means to ends as was never known to be fortuitous must be referred to an intelligent Author? But I have had no experience in the origin of worlds. This is true; nor is this experience needed. I have seen, in cases innumerable, the connexion between intellect in a designing cause, and the marks of contrivance in the works which intellect has effected; and unless the human mind must be denied the privilege of reasoning from the

VOL. XVII. K

clearest analogies, I may safely infer that this connexion must be universal. Contrivance is contrivance, wherever it be found; and the connexion between cause and effect is not more certain than the connexion between an effect which indicates contrivance, and an intelligent or designing cause. We gain our knowledge of both these connexions in precisely the same manner, or rather they are virtually the same, the latter being only a specific modification of the former. But Mr. Hume says, that all that we can pretend to know concerning the connexion of cause and effect is constant *conjunction*. That conjunction is all that we *perceive* is true; and a more harmless truth was never made known to the world. For until some disciple of Mr. Hume shall assign a better reason for constant *conjunction* than that the things thus *conjoined* are necessarily *connected*, the human mind will go on to reason from effect to cause, as it did before Mr. Hume's discovery saw the light. Could Mr. Hume's observation *disjoin* what we see to be *conjoined*, it would do something; but the fact remains exactly as it was, and where we see that an effect is, there we cannot help concluding that a cause has been. And this is sufficient for all purposes of reasoning. And if any one shall choose to believe that cause and effect are always conjoined but never connected; for example, that, though a ball, when struck by a cricket-bat, is invariably put in motion, yet, for any necessity that operates, it might invariably remain at rest; he may, indeed, enjoy the satisfaction of not thinking with the vulgar, but assuredly he will not have the credit of thinking with the wise. But Mr. Hume farther observes, that "all reasoning from the relation of causes and effects is founded on a certain instinct of our nature, and may be fallacious and deceitful." If this proposition is intended merely to intimate a possibility that the reasoning in question may be fal-

lacious, it amounts to no more than this, that this reasoning does not rise to absolute or mathematical demonstration. But if it is intended to imply that all reasoning from the relation of causes and effects probably is fallacious, it may be satisfactorily replied, that it does not follow because a thing possibly *may be*, that, therefore, it probably *is*. Moreover, if the observation were to be thus interpreted, it would imply, that the contrary conclusions to those which mankind have hitherto drawn from the relation of cause and effect would be more likely to be just; an extravagance to which no sober-minded man can assent for a moment. In innumerable instances we rest with as much confidence upon reasonings drawn from this source as upon the evidence of the senses or upon mathematical proof. And this, however it comes to pass, we cannot help doing. But to spend another moment upon Mr. Hume's proposition: were the reasoning from the relation of causes and effects founded upon instinct, this, I conceive, would be a presumption that it would *not* be fallacious. It is, however, founded on no such thing. It is founded on experience, on which Mr. Hume can place sufficient dependence when it suits his purpose. And the same experience which has taught us to believe that every effect must have a cause, has also taught us to look for a designing cause where there is an indication of contrivance in the effect. And hence we infer thus much with sufficient certainty, that if the universe is an effect at all, it must be referred to an intelligent cause. But, it seems, our experience does not reach far enough to justify the conclusion, that the universe, because it exhibits an adaptation of means to ends, must have had an intelligent Author. We want the only experience which the case demands, an experience in the origin of worlds. Were this principle carried to its full extent, it would follow, that when I see a work of art, which is altogether new to me, I must not confidently conclude that it had a maker. I know, indeed, that men exist, and though *all reasoning from the relation of causes and effects may be fallacious*, I think I know that the human intellect is adequate to the production of those effects which we call the works of art. But as my experi-

ence cannot reach to a novel case, unless I may venture to call in the axiom, that similar effects must be referred to similar causes, I must draw my conclusion with diffidence and hesitation. But, as Mr. Hume observes, I have *no* experience of the origin of worlds. And if I had, what would be its precise value? "All reasoning from the relation of causes and effects may be fallacious and deceitful." But the argument from experience, which Mr. Hume says is wanting, would rest upon the presumption, that similar effects proceed from similar causes, in which presumption Mr. Hume ought to have maintained that *in all cases* there may be no force. Indeed, if all reasoning from the relation of causes and effects may be fallacious and deceitful, were a world constructed before my eyes, the possibility of doubt, as to its origin, would not be precluded! In opposition, however, to these extravagancies of scepticism, I maintain that experience affords a *sufficiently* certain ground of reasoning, and I farther maintain, that the experience which we have had of the connexion between contrivance and a contriver, abundantly justifies the conclusion, that the universe must have had a designing cause. To reject this conclusion is to set aside, without necessity,* one of the strong-

* I said *without necessity*, because no difficulty attending the hypothesis of Theism can possibly be greater than the difficulty of conceiving that such an adaptation of means to ends, as is *equivalent to contrivance*, should exist without the operation of intelligence. Indeed, no ideas are more closely associated in the human mind than those of *contrivance* and a *contriver*. In contemplating the works of art, as connected with intelligence, we not only recognize the general relation of cause and effect, but are, moreover, led to acknowledge that the work effected corresponds to an archetype in the mind of the artist. And hence we seem satisfactorily to infer, that every thing which indicates contrivance answers to a certain model which previously existed in the mind of some intelligent agent. And shall the works of nature, with all their various and exquisite adaptation of means to ends, be regarded as answering to no model, as corresponding to no archetype? There is one point of difference, it is true, between the works of nature and the works of art, which is,

est associations of the human mind, and to reason upon a principle, if a principle it can be called, which would subvert the foundation of all reasoning. If similar effects are not to be referred to similar causes, all ratiocination is at an end. It is in vain to urge that there is a difference between the works of nature and the works of art. As far as respects the adaptation of means to ends, and on this alone the argument rests, there is no difference, except that this adaptation, in the former, is far more curious and exquisite than in the latter. Were any one still to say that the experience of which I have been speaking is no certain guide in a case to which it does not itself extend, I should think it sufficient to reply, that it is the only guide which we have, and that it is absurd to relinquish this guide in order to wander in a field of vain conjecture, without a ray of probability to direct us. One thing we know, which is, that intellect can adjust means to ends, and produce effects which indicate contrivance; but that any thing else can produce these effects, we not only do *not* know, but have not even the slightest reason to believe. But men sometimes argue as if it were the perfection of human wisdom to follow the weaker probability instead of the stronger, or to set probability altogether at defiance, because it falls short of strict and mathematical demonstration.*

that the latter are put together by the application of mechanical powers, whereas the former are many of them evidently produced by the action of certain laws, which are called the laws of nature. But this circumstance of difference by no means counterbalances the circumstances of resemblance, and, therefore, does not avail to set aside the analogy. And what are the laws of nature but a certain mode of operation? Does the law in any case design and anticipate the effect? It may not be altogether foreign to the argument to observe farther, that the laws of nature, together with all real existences, must be, in themselves considered, the objects of knowledge. And yet from the hypothesis of the Atheist, it will follow that no being exists by whom these laws are understood.

* If any one should say that probability is not a reasonable ground of confidence, I should only desire him to carry this

From the view which has been now taken of Mr. Hume's objection to the being of a God, it appears that the reasoning which ascribes the universe to an intelligent Author, rests upon precisely the same foundation as that which attributes what is denominated an effect to that which is denominated a cause. Contrivance is the thing to be accounted for, and that reasoning, founded on experience, which has led us to conceive that every effect must have a cause, has led us to demand an intelligent cause for every effect which indicates such an adaptation of means to ends, as could not, in our apprehension, be the result of chance or accident. And against this reasoning I do not see what can be urged, except that it does not amount to such a demonstration as would exclude all possibility of doubt. If the argument does not amount to the highest probability, I do not know what probability is. And Mr. Hume's reasonings only shew that this probability is not absolute and incontrovertible proof. That this may appear more clearly, I will deduce from Mr. Hume's observations the only conclusions which would be formidable to the hypothesis of Theism, and leave the reader to judge whether these conclusions are legitimate. Between cause and effect we perceive only *conjunction*; therefore the probability is, that cause and effect are not *connected*! All our reasonings from the relation of causes and effects may be fallacious; therefore the probability is, that they *are* fallacious! We have no experience in the origin of worlds; therefore it is *probable* that the universe, which shews throughout an adaptation of means to ends, is *not* the work of an intelligent Author!

principle as far as it will go, and to act upon it. I need not point out what consequences would follow. But shall that evidence, upon which mankind do not scruple to act in ordinary concerns, be considered as unsatisfactory only in concerns of the highest importance? The practice of demanding absolute demonstration where it is not to be had, and where it is not needed, has done much mischief. It has given rise to an unreasonable scepticism on the one hand, and to an absurd appeal to common sense on the other.

If these are just conclusions, Mr. Hume's reasonings carry with them more weight than has been hitherto attributed to them. But, in spite of Mr. Hume's subtleties, mankind will continue to reason with confidence from the relation of cause and effect. They will also assume to themselves the privilege of generalizing their ideas, and from similarity in different effects will infer similarity in their causes. And unless it shall be shewn by some solid argument, that an organized universe is *not* an effect, they will think that they cannot err in ascribing it to an intelligent though invisible Cause.

But it may, perhaps, be said, that we may as well rest in a self-existent universe as ascend beyond it to a self-existent God. Were the universe a mass of matter, without any indication of design, it might, for any thing that I am able to allege, be self-existent. But the marks of design, which it every where exhibits, stamps upon it the character of an effect which could be produced only by a designing cause. Between a harmonized universe and the idea of self-existence there is a repugnance, a repugnance founded on the experience which we have had of the connexion between contrivance and a contriver, between effects which indicate an adaptation of means to ends, and an intelligent agent by whom this adaptation was devised. But between the notion of intelligence and self-existence there is no repugnance, and, for any thing that either experience or reason suggests to the contrary, intellect may exist uncreated. Something uncreated there must be; but as analogy forbids us to suppose that this something is an organized system, which seems to testify the operation of an intelligent contriver; it consequently leads us to conclude that this something is that incomprehensible Being whom we call God. I will conclude with the sentiment of the poet, in which even an Atheist will not refuse to join,

And if a God there is, that God how great!

E. COGAN.

Exeter,

January 8, 1822.

SIR,
THERE is no text more commonly appealed to as a declaration of

the strict unity of God than our Lord's answer to the Scribe, respecting the first commandment of all, Mark xii. 29, *Κυριος ὁ Θεος ἡμῶν Κυριος ἓς ἐστι*, yet the opinions of learned men by no means agree as to the just translation of these important words, and I must confess myself not quite satisfied with any comments I have been able to consult. I am, therefore, induced to offer, with diffidence, to your readers the observations which have occurred to me upon it. The rendering of our authorized Version is, "The Lord our God is one Lord." The Improved Version, after Vitringa, Dr. Campbell and others, translates thus: "The Lord is our God: the Lord is one." A difference, the discussion of which has chiefly occupied commentators on the passage, yet it may, perhaps, be a question of still greater interest, and which involves in it the other, what is the most suitable translation of the word *ἓς* in this connexion. Our Lord answers the Scribe in a quotation from Deut. vi. 4, and in relating the discourse, the Evangelist Mark, according to the general custom of the New-Testament writers, employs the exact words of the Alexandrian Greek Version, which may be considered as having been, from its universal use, in a manner, an authorized version of their Scriptures, among all the Jews who spoke the Greek language at that period. The precise words spoken by Jesus himself, we cannot know: it is not unlikely they were taken from a Targum, somewhat resembling the later Chaldee one, which we now possess; but however this may be, Mark has done what is commonly done amongst us in translating religious books, he has copied the texts of Scripture in the translation generally known and valued by his readers.

As our best chance for obtaining satisfaction respecting the real meaning of the words under our consideration, we will revert to the original Hebrew of Deuteronomy, of which they are the translation—יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד; where the substantive verb being omitted, it must be determined by the sense whether the words make one clause or two, which seems to me to depend entirely on the question, whether אחד, *one*, is immediately connected with יהוה or אלהים: as

both the Common Translation and that of the Improved Version equally connect it with *Jehovah*, of which name the Greek *Κυριος*, is the representative, they are both almost equally objectionable. *Jehovah*, the proper and peculiar name of the God of Israel, being an appellative, and from its nature denoting *one* object, would not have the attribute of singleness ascribed to it, which supposes the possibility of its including more than one. It would be just as rational to say, "George our king is one George," as if any one could need to be informed of his unity. The only supposition on which the language of the Common Translation or Improved Version could be justified is, that it was intended directly to contradict the doctrine of the Trinity, which will be embraced neither by its advocates nor by those who believe it to have been first devised in a later age. There is no other passage of Scripture in which unity is predicated of the name *Jehovah*, except Zech. xiv. 9, in which I conceive the translation to be incorrect.

Dr. Geddes has, I think, translated the words of Moses more successfully than his predecessors—"The Lord, the Lord only is our God;" where, though for the sake of clearness and conciseness, the *one* is changed into the adverb *only*, the quality of *unity* belongs to the word God, which is equally applicable to false as to the true God. The meaning is, "Jehovah is our God, Jehovah is the only God." The Hebrew Lexicons, to which I have access, do not indeed give to the word *אחור*, the sense of *only* or *alone*; but there can be little doubt of its allowableness, as it is but a different application of the same idea, which is often expressed by the same word, not only in the kindred languages but in many others, besides which there occur to me some instances in justification of it. Job xxiii. 13: *והוא באחור*, "But he is the only one," i. e. the Supreme God (vide Dathe in loc.); or, perhaps, "though he be alone, who can hinder him?" Song of Solomon vi. 9: "This my dove, my most excellent is *alone*," *אחור*, unrivalled in beauty—above all the queen's concubines and virgins spoken of in the preceding verse. "She is the *only one* (*אחור*) of her mother, the most beloved of her parent." (Dathe in loc.) Ezech. vii. 5: "There

is an evil, an *only* evil," *אחור*. In Zech. xiv. 9, our Common Version is,

The Lord shall be king over all the earth,

In that day there shall be *one* Lord, and his name *one*.

But as the intention plainly is to prophesy of the authority of *Jehovah* being acknowledged, and his name adored, to the exclusion of other gods, it will certainly be a great improvement to render *אחור* as in the above examples:

And Jehovah shall be king over all the earth;

In that day shall Jehovah be *alone*:

i. e. as king or God.

And his name shall be the only one: sc. which shall be revered and honoured.

If it be allowed, as I think it must, that the translation I have adopted is justifiable from the original words, we shall not, I apprehend, find much difficulty with the ancient versions. I believe they all meant to convey the same sense. The Targum of Onkelos and the Samaritan Version are liable to exactly the same remarks as the original. The other translations insert the substantive verb at the end, from which it has been inferred, that they took the whole to be one clause. The Latin *unus*, the Greek *εἷς*, (vide Schleusner in verb.) and the Syr. *ܐܝܢ*, may all signify "only" or "one alone." "The Lord our God, the Lord is the one, or the only," sc. God, is a just translation of the Greek words, and that this was our Lord's meaning may appear, probable, from the echoing reply of the Scribe, "Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God; and there is no other but he." The argument also drawn from the words, for the exclusive love of *Jehovah*, is plainly directed against the worship of many gods.

On the whole, there is a material difference between the propositions, "There is one God," and "God is one." The former is opposed to the opinions and practices of Pagans, and is a simple and important truth—the latter must appear a mere truism, unless in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, which all who disbelieve it hold to have arisen much too late to be directly contradicted in Scripture; but, as in the text under our consid-

ration, "the Lord" is the representative of the proper name *Jehovah*, which was never used but of the true God, and which is as much an appellation as Moses, Isaiah or Jesus; the *unity of the Lord* is still more obviously a self-evident proposition, and the design must have been to assert that he is the *only God*, in opposition to the claims of all other pretended deities, and is, therefore, entitled to the whole of the religious affections of all his creatures—to express which sense we must render the words, "The Lord our God, the Lord is the only God;" or, if we please, in two clauses: "The Lord is our God; the Lord is the only God."

W. HINCKS.

Clapton,
Jan. 19, 1822.

SIR,
I OBSERVED, very lately, that Mr. Lindsey, in one of his valuable publications, had adopted, from a modern historian, what appears to me to have been an erroneous, though common opinion, respecting William III. Under this impression he represents that prince as favourable to *religious* liberty, more justly described as the *civil* right of all, publicly to profess their religious opinions, however differing from the conclusions of the learned and the inquiring, or from the creeds taught by the "priest and the nurse" to that unreflecting multitude, the great and small vulgar.

I refer to Mr. Lindsey's "Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine," published in 1783. At p. 303, my eminently candid friend, "still pleased to praise" whenever he could praise conscientiously, repeats Mr. Emlyn's sentiment, that "King William was not willing to be made a persecutor," though "this great prince suffered himself to be prevailed upon to pass an act" against Unitarians. This was the Act of 1698, professing "the effectual suppression of blasphemy and profaneness," but really designing to forbid the publication of their opinions, to all who should impugn, however seriously, the Divine authority of the Scriptures, or deny that they contained the doctrine of a Trinity. Mr. Lindsey sustains his opinion "that the king yielded to pass this Act with reluctance, and through the necessity of the times, from the

following fact," for which he thus quotes "Smollett's History of England, Vol. XIII. p. 319:"

"The Scottish Commissioners who came up to make a tender of their crown (anno 1689) to King William, (and who were, the Earl of Argyle for the Lords, Sir James Montgomery for the Knights, and Sir John Dalrymple for the Boroughs,) being introduced to their Majesties at Whitehall, presented first a preparatory Letter from the Estates, then the Instrument of Government, with a paper containing a recital of the grievances of the nation, and an Address desiring his Majesty to convert the Convention into a Parliament. The King having graciously promised to concur with them in all just measures for the interest of the kingdom, the coronation-oath was tendered to their Majesties by the Earl Argyle. As it contained a clause, importing, that *they should root out heresy*, the King declared, that he did not mean by these words, that he should be under an obligation to *act as a persecutor*. The Commissioners replying, that such was not the *meaning* or import of the oath, he desired *them*, and others present, to *bear witness to the exception he had made*."

Mr. Lindsey is confirmed in the opinion of King William's liberality by *Burnet's* remark, (O. T. 1689, *Fol.* II. 24,) that "when the King and Queen took the oaths, the King explained one word in the oath, by which he was bound to *repress heresies*, that he did not by this bind himself to persecute any for their conscience." There remains, however, a higher authority on this subject, published in 1697, eight years before *Burnet* wrote, and in a work compiled expressly in honour of the king.

The small volume to which I refer, is called in the head lines, "The Royal Almanack," and thus entitled, "Fasti Gulielmi Tertii; or, an Account of the most memorable Actions transacted during his Majesty's Life, both before and since his Accession to the Crown: with the Days, Months and Years wherein the same hapned." Under the date of May 11, 1689, there is an account of the introduction of the Commissioners from the Scottish Convention to the King and Queen, at the Banqueting-house, Whitehall. The King informs the Commissioners, that when he projected the expedition into England, he "had a particular regard and consideration for Scotland."

Probably, according to a recent instance of royal abundance, he had a *Dutch*, an *English*, a *Scottish*, if not an *Irish* heart. Then, after detailing the ceremony of tendering the coronation oath, as described by Smollett, the *Almanack* thus proceeds:

“But when the Earl came to this part of the said oath, ‘And we shall be careful to root out all heretics and enemies of the true worship of God, that shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God, of the aforesaid crimes, out of our lands and empire of Scotland,’ the King declared that he did not mean by these words that he was under any obligation to become a persecutor. To which the Commissioners, being authorized by the States of Scotland, made answer, that neither the meaning of the oath, or the law of Scotland, did import it, since by the said law no man was to be persecuted for his private opinion, and that even obstinate and convicted heretics were only to be denounced rebels or out-lawed, whereby their moveable estates were confiscated. Whereupon the King declared again, that he took the oath in that sense, and called for witnesses, the Commissioners and others present.”

In a “Preface to the third edition” of his *Pastoral Care*, written (1713) in his 70th year, *Burnet* remarks that “the breaches on a man’s liberty or goods, are as really persecution, as that which strikes at his person. They may be, in some instances, more uneasy; as a single death is not so formidable, as to be forced to live under great necessities, perhaps with a numerous family.” He adds, that, “if we judge of this matter by our Saviour’s rule, of doing to others what we would have others do to us, our consciences would soon decide the question; if we will but honestly ask ourselves how we would have those of another religion deal with us, if we were living in countries where we must depart from the legal establishment, if we do truly follow the dictates of our conscience.”

I beg leave to recommend these *last thoughts* of one who had witnessed so much pretended liberality and real injustice, to any of your readers, if one can yet be found among them, who would leave to the magistrate a cure of souls, or who can contemplate such wrongs as those *legally and judicially* inflicted on the *Carle* family, without blushing for the ignorance or the

hypocrisy, the *heads or the hearts*, of our *State-Christians*. Yet, according to King William’s definition of persecution, which forms a fine illustration, by contrast, of an Apostle’s “royal law, according to the Scripture,” though he engaged, by the solemnity of an oath, to denounce, as rebels, all whom the *Kirk* should declare to be heretics; to expatriate them by an outlawry, and to beggar them, with their families, by a confiscation; yet, after inflicting these sufferings, he was not to “become a persecutor” unless he had persecuted a man “for his private opinion.” Such a folly, whatever a *crowned head* might expect to accomplish, an *Inquisitor*, I am persuaded, never attempted; convinced, however reluctantly, that the wary possessor of a *private* opinion might fearlessly defy him to “take vengeance on the mind.”

Beheld on the homely page of the mere annalist, and not as adorned by an historian’s flattering pencil, William III. was little more than a soldier of fortune, till he received, from a grateful nation, the crown of England, a munificent reward for having driven away his justly despised and deserted father-in-law. A passage of an earlier date in “the Royal Almanack,” discovers, that, like other soldiers, he could employ the argument of force in other places besides the field of battle, and that he had landed in England sufficiently prepared to “become a persecutor.” At the same time it is mortifying to see, in the author of the *Pastoral Care*, a *political* priest, or rather an *avant-courier* of military outrage; while the extraordinary scene, as I had occasion to remark in another place, exhibits the distressing dilemma of an established clergy placed between a *royal authority*, to which they had vowed obedience, and the *law of the sword* which answered their just plea of conscience with the old conclusive argument *væ victis*. “The Royal Almanack,” after relating, “Nov. 8, 1688,” that “the Prince of Orange made a very splendid entry into Exeter with his army,” thus displays (p. 254) the “little triumphs” which immediately succeeded:

“Nov. 9, 1688, Dr. Burnet was sent to the Cathedral of Exeter to order the priest and vicars not to pray for the pretended Prince of Wales; and the same day his Highness went to the said Cath-

dral, and was present at the singing *Te Deum*, after which his declaration was publicly read to the people; but I must observe that the ministers rushed out of the Church by a very surprising piece of policy."

Thus "the hero William" opened the campaign of 1688, by routing "the priest and vicars" of the cathedral of Exeter, "white, black and grey, with all their trumpery," the Bishop and the Dean having fled, as "the hireling fleeth," the day before. Yet whatever might be the judgment of a priest, a prince and a soldier, here was surely a gross instance of persecution, according to the common opinions and feelings of mankind, and such a man as *Burnet* appears poorly employed on such a mission. He well knew that James, though now trembling on a precarious throne, was still as legally king as any of his predecessors; and that all "priests and vicars," including himself, yet owed him, according to their most solemn engagements, an unreserved obedience, as Supreme Head of the Church of England; and were bound "to pray, according to the Liturgy, that God would be the defender and keeper of King James, and give him victory over all his enemies." He knew too, that these "priests and vicars" were under peremptory orders to pray for the Prince of Wales, without being allowed to interpose a question as to his legitimacy.

The *legitimacy* of James III. has, indeed, long ceased to be a question with any impartial inquirer; yet it should be allowed to *Burnet*, that he implicitly believed the *revolution* tales which he has collected in his History. I observe, also, in a "Memorial to the Princess Sophia," printed in 1815, from his MS. in 1703, that he expresses the same confidence in the now exploded political fable. Thus having related the imprisonment of the seven Bishops, he adds, (p. 57,) "The Queen in the mean time was, as was pretended, delivered of a son at St. James's, the Princess Ann being sent industriously out of the way, to bathe. We had, I remember, a song upon it at the time, that

The Bishops were sent to the Tow'r,

The Princess went down to the bath,
And the Queen she cried out in an hour."

Such then was my excellent friend's "great prince," and Dr. Watts's "man of wondrous soul;" or, rather, the grateful Nonconformist poet's auspicious *numen*; or, at least, "the Monarch" that could "be shewn

Under no shape but angels' or his own,

Gabriel, or William, on the British throne;"

a *bathos*, which reminds me of

—— "Dalhousie, the great God of War,

Lieutenant-Colonel to the Earl of Marr."

It might almost be suspected, that our *orthodox* Protestant grandsires were disposed to restore the *hero-worship* of Paganism, in honour of any king who would persecute only *Papists* and *heretical* Nonconformists. Thus they appear to have been "lost in wonder, love and praise," whenever they contemplated the condescension of a *Dutch* Stadtholder, in accepting a *British* crown. Their descendants, under the tuition of passing events, and the advantages of a more liberal *political* education, have learned to distinguish between the real merits of the man, and the national advantages acquired, though by no means cheaply, from the successful enterprise of the petty prince and valiant soldier, in whom the ambition would be easily excited, to possess the splendid regalities and to wield the military energies of a powerful kingdom. And, indeed, whatever *constitutional* policy may dictate towards the living, it is no part of *historical* justice to the dead, to incur the charge of folly, brought even by a courtly poet, against those who

—— "drop the man in their account,
And vote the mantle into Majesty."

Mr. Lindsey, in the passage which produced these observations, has referred to Mr. Emlyn's *Works* (II. 374). There, in *Remarks* on "The four London Ministers," authors of "The Doctrine of the blessed Trinity stated and defended," they are reminded that "King William was not willing to be made a persecutor, though the Dissenters lay hard at him, in their address by Dr. Bates, to stop the press, anno 1697." It is probably to this attempt, which *Calamy*, I perceive, in his additions to

Baister, has not ventured to notice, that *Mr. Elwall* refers in his "Declaration against all the Kings and temporal Powers under Heaven." I quote his third edition, 1734, pp. 16, 17. He is there addressing Geo. II., whom he had challenged "out into James's Park," to settle the question of Christian freedom from civil controul, not bringing his "ugly carnal sword" but "pure spiritual weapons." To his "royal friend," his "Lord and King in all temporal things," *Elwall* says:

"Thy great predecessor King *William*, the glorious *William*, when the priests here, joined by some Dissenters too, solicited him to persecute the Socinians, a people that began to see a few of those monstrous doctrines of trinity, transubstantiation, absolute election and reprobation, infinite satisfaction, imputed righteousness, making the Most High God, the holy One of *Israel*, to be a plurality of persons, and making God to have a couple of equals (and some more such jargon as above); but his generous soul, that had breathed in a freer air, gave them this truly Christian and courageous answer, *That he would not do the priests' drudgery.*"

Unfortunately for these fine speeches, attributed to King William with "simplicity and godly sincerity," by a triumvirate of exemplary Christian confessors, before whom too many "names of awe and distance here" will, at least, hereafter "rank with common men;" a plain tale is sufficient to put them down. We read, "Feb. 17, 1698," of "an address of the Commons" to the King "for suppressing all pernicious books and pamphlets containing doctrines against the Holy Trinity, and other fundamental articles of faith, and for punishing the authors and publishers." We next learn the conduct of this prince who "was not willing to be made a persecutor," or to "do the priests' drudgery." After a week's consideration, "Feb. 24, a proclamation was issued accordingly;" then follows, "An Act for the more effectually suppressing Blasphemy and Profaneness," inflicting on all Unitarians, as well as Unbelievers, who were not content to enjoy their "private opinion," the penalties of imprisonment and confiscation. (*Chron. Hist.* I. 291, 292.)

That *William III.* had not always "suffered himself to be prevailed

upon," but could, on other occasions, freely exercise his prerogative, by objecting to comply with addresses, or to pass bills presented by the Parliament, sufficiently appears from various transactions of his reign. In 1692, he refused the royal assent to a "Bill for frequent Parliaments;" in 1693, to "a Place-Bill;" and in 1694, to "a Bill for free and impartial Proceedings in Parliament;" facts which justify Mrs. Macaulay's remark, in her *Letters*, on "the History of England," (1779, p. 144,) "that the enlarging civil liberty was not the errand for which William undertook so hazardous and expensive an enterprise as the invasion of England."

Nor, among the royal refusals, can it be easily forgotten that King William, "not willing to be made a persecutor," determined to suppress the inquiries urged by the justly indignant Scottish Parliament, respecting the barbarous massacre of Glencoe. *Burnet* acknowledges, (O. T. II. 156,) that "the King seemed too remiss in inquiring into it;" and, (*ibid.* 162,) that "the libellers" (as the exposers of "wickedness in high places" are generally described by courtiers of various moral temperament, from *Burnet* down to *Londonderry*) were "furnished with some colours in aspersing the King, as if he must have been willing to suffer it to be executed, since he seemed so unwilling to let it be punished."

Some of your readers can look back, not without pensively-pleasing recollections, to a period, when "the glorious and immortal memory of King William" was annually celebrated by the most enlightened friends of liberty and of human kind. Should those readers, or any others be prepared and inclined to shew that I have ill-appreciated the King's character, and especially that he deserved the commendation of such men as *Emlyn*, *Elwall* and *Lindsey*, I shall thank them for an opportunity of correcting my judgment, on a question of some importance in the British History.

J. T. RUTT.

February 2.

P. S. Since I concluded this letter I have observed, in "The History of King William III.," 1702, (p. 240,) the following confirmation of *Burnet's*

outrage on the consciences of his clerical brethren at Exeter: "1688, Nov. 9. The first thing his Highness did, was to go and pay his grateful acknowledgment to Almighty God, and to cause *Te Deum* to be sung in the Cathedral Church for his safe arrival. After the Collects were ended, Dr. Burnet began to read his Highness's declaration, at which the ministers of the church, there present, were so surprised that they immediately left their seats and went out; however, the Doctor continued reading, and the declaration being ended, he said, *God save the Prince of Orange*, to which the major part of the congregation answered, Amen."

P. 1. "The Nonconformist" has well chosen, in the *Italian Reformation*, a subject unaccountably overlooked, so far as I have observed, by our ecclesiastical historians. I had occasion to make this remark in Vol. X. of Priestley's Works, where, at p. 290, some of your readers may find a note on the subject.

I there quoted the complaint of Cornaro, "on a sober life," in 1549, that *l'opinion Lutherana* was one of *tre mali costumi* which then prevailed in Italy. The other two were *l'adulazione*, *et la cerimonia*, and *la crapula* (intemperance). This, Cornaro attacked, in his *Discorsi della Vita Sobria*, the English translation of which is a very common book. As to the other two, the noble Venetian fondly predicted, (for he says, *son certo*,) that some great genius, *qualche gentile spirito*, would soon appear, to oppose and drive them from society, *levarle dal mondo*.

Alas, for the credit of *Italian* prophecy, a third century is wearing away while we wait the advent of *qualche gentile spirito*. Still *l'opinion Lutherana* proceeds; nor (judging from the *Styles* very lately displayed at Brighton, according to the Morning Chronicle,) does *l'adulazione* retrograde.

In the note to which I have referred, I also mentioned an Italian Testament, printed in 1551, at Lyons, as translated from the *Greek*; a mode then, I apprehend, peculiar to the *Reformers*, for whose use, in Italy, it was no doubt designed. I also referred to Clarke's *Persecutions*, 1651, (pp. 231—241,) for an account of martyrs in Italy, from 1546 to 1560. A *Papist*,

whom he quotes, says their execution "resembled the slaughter of calves and sheep."

P. 3, col. 2. "John Valdesius or Valdesso," of whom, I think, there is some account in one of your early volumes. Walton, in his "Life of Herbert," on the authority of Mr. Farrer, who translated the "One Hundred and Ten Considerations," describes "John Valdesso" as "a Spaniard," who "had followed Charles V., as a cavalier, all the time of his long and dangerous wars." At length he resigned his appointments to the Emperor, saying, "there ought to be a vacancy of time between fighting and dying." If this account, which I have also seen in some writer quite as early as Walton, be correct, he was not merely "a civilian" and "private secretary" to the Emperor. Yet Sandius, I observe, who claims Valdesso as an Anti-trinitarian, gives no hint of his military character. Young, I see, in his *Centaur*, (Letter II., on Pleasure,) refers to the story, with some variations, thus addressing a gay assembly: "'Ye fine men of rank and parts, a common soldier, (your contempt no doubt,) shall reproach you.' One of them, requesting dismissal from Charles V., gave this reason for it: *Inter vitæ negotia, extremumque diem oportet aliquod temporis intercedere*. Much more *inter vitæ voluptates*, and our last hour;" as if fighting, were much more rational and praiseworthy than "dancing, into death."

P. 6. Dr. Morell's valuable remarks on a highly important subject, remind me of an anonymous publication, so early as 1648, which has been long known as the production of Sir William Petty. It is a pamphlet of four sheets in small quarto, entitled, "The Advice of *W. P.* to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, for the advancement of some particular Parts of Learning." I had once the curiosity to examine it at the British Museum.

After proposing "that proper persons be employed to collect from books all real and experimental learning contained in them, in order to facilitate the way to farther improvements," the author recommends "that there be instituted *Ergastula Literaria*, (literary workhouses,) where children may be taught as well to do some

thing towards their living, as to read and write," and "that all children of above seven years old may be presented to this kind of education, none being to be excluded by reason of the poverty and inability of their parents, for hereby it hath come to pass, that many are now holding the plough, which might have been made fit to steer the state."

The author proceeds to recommend that "such poor children be employed in works, whereby they may earn their living, equal to their strength and understanding. And if they cannot get their whole living, and their parents can contribute nothing at all to make it up," that they "stay somewhat the longer in the workhouse." He further recommends, "that they use such exercises, whether in work or for recreation, as tend to the health, agility and strength of their bodies;—that they be taught to read by much more compendious means than are in common use, which is a thing certainly very easy and feasible;"—and "that the elements of arithmetic and geometry be by all studied, being not only of great and frequent use in all human affairs, but also sure guides and helps to reason, and especial remedies for a volatile and unsteady mind."—*Advice*, pp. 3—5.

Such, at the age of 25, without the benefit of an example, and with scarcely a coadjutor, was the anticipation of improvements, reserved for a distant generation, but now contemplated by this almost universal genius. In Ward's *Gresham Professors*, p. 223, the *Advice* is mentioned as the earliest of the author's publications. I cannot help remarking how highly honoured was Mr. Hartlib, by the confidence of such a triumvirate, as *Boyle*, *Milton* and *Petty*!

P. 20. I thank Mr. H. Taylor for his information. Since I mentioned Dr. John Taylor's pamphlet, I have found "A Letter to the Society of Protestant Dissenters at the Octagon in Liverpool. London, 1766." This pamphlet contains an introductory letter inviting to an examination of the subject of baptism. This is followed by a letter from "A Pædobaptist," with a reply, both which had appeared, October, 1765, in the *General Evening Post*, the first letter being occasioned, by an advertisement in that

paper, from Dr. Gill, in which he asserts that "the Pædobaptists are ever restless and uneasy, endeavouring to maintain and support, if possible, their *unscriptural practice* of infant-baptism; though it is no other than a pillar of Popery."

Then follows (p. 26) the "Copy of a Letter published in the *Whitehall Evening Post*, Sept. 17, 1747, with Notes by the Author." This is a severe charge of inconsistency against the *Dissenting gentleman* (Mr. Towgood) for his zealous defence of *Infant-Baptism*, compared with his assertion of Christ's sole authority, in reply to Mr. White. The *Dissenting gentleman* is loudly called upon to explain himself. One of your correspondents can, perhaps, say who was the anonymous Letter-writer, and whether Mr. Towgood ever replied.

P. 50, col. 1. "The confounding of Wollaston with Woolston" was once very common. Mr. Clarke, in his Preface to "The Religion of Nature," 1750, attributes the mistake not only to "the similitude of names," but to the circumstance of both those writers having been members of the same college in Cambridge.

Ibid. col. 2. *Voltaire's* last moments were not so described nearer the time of his death in 1778. *Condorcet*, in his Life, annexed to Vol. C. of his Works, (1792, p. 164,) says, not indeed much to the credit of Voltaire's sincerity, "L'Abbé *Gau-thier* confessa *Voltaire*, et reçut de lui une profession de foi par laquelle il déclarait qu'il mourait dans la religion Catholique où était né." An earlier account, probably the earliest in English, (*An. Reg.* 1778, XXI. 4,) makes Voltaire reply to the question on the divinity of Christ: "Ah! M. le Curé, if I pass that article to you, you will demand if I do not also believe in the Holy Ghost, and so go on, until you finish by the Bull *Unigenitus*."

P. 52, col. 2. The late King's "bad education." In Lord Melcombe's *Diary*, (ed. 3, 1785, p. 171,) the Princess Dowager, in October 1752, says of her son Prince George, "that he was very honest, but she wished that he was a little more forward and less childish, at his age," (just past 14,) and "that she hoped his preceptors would improve him," adding, in answer to

the courtier's further inquiries, that "she really did not well know what they taught him; but, to speak freely, she was afraid not much; that they were in the country, and followed their diversions, and not much else that she could discover."

P 52, col. 2. "The Bishop of Peterborough, Mr. Stone and Mr. Scott." The Princess (*Diary*, 172) says, "that Stone was a sensible man, and capable of instructing in things, as well as in books—that Scott, in her opinion, was a very proper preceptor; but that for the good Bishop, he might be, and she supposed he was, a mighty learned man, but he did not seem to her very proper to convey knowledge to children; he had not that clearness which she thought necessary; she did not well comprehend him herself, his thoughts seemed to be too many for his words."

This Bishop of Peterborough was Dr. John Thomas, who had first sojourned at Lincoln, and was, in 1761, translated to Salisbury:

"Another and another still succeeds,
And the last *See* more welcome than
the former."

This Prelate has been exalted, apparently with great justice, to "a bad eminence," by *Wakefield*, in his *Memoirs*, I. 15, 16. He is there represented (from his treatment of my friend's father) as an "episcopal tantalizer," who made a "common practice of exercising the credulity and insulting the feelings of his inferior clergy."

Remarks on our Lord's Question to Peter, "Simon, Son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" John xxi. 15.

SIR, January 2, 1822.

THESE words are capable of three interpretations. (1.) Lovest thou *me* more than thou lovest *these things*,—thy nets, thy boats and thy fishing employment? (2.) Lovest thou *me* more than thou lovest *thy fellow-disciples*? (3.) Lovest thou me more than *these* love me? Is *thy* affection for me stronger and more ardent than that of Thomas and Nathanael, John and James, and those two other disciples (ver. 2) who have accompanied thee in this fishing expedition?

The first of these interpretations,—*"lovest thou me more than thou lovest thy nets, thy boats and thy fishing employment?"*—has been adopted by Whitby and Pearce, and certainly has the claim of ingenuity to recommend it. Peter was by occupation a fisherman; and, judging from many little circumstances which are incidentally mentioned in the Gospels, was fond of his employment, and took a pleasure in it unconnected with any prospect of emolument. It was, therefore, reasonable, as well as natural, that Christ should endeavour to obtain from his own lips a confession that he was not less attached to the cause of the gospel than to his worldly occupation. Hence it has been thought, that, in the question, "Lovest thou me more than these?" our Lord had a reference to the instruments of Peter's trade; which are supposed to have been upon the spot where Jesus and his disciples were assembled at the time when this interesting dialogue commenced. But there is a delicacy and reserve in the Apostle's answer, which was altogether unnecessary on the supposition that the question related merely to his worldly occupation: for, though he promptly and unhesitatingly replies, "Yea, Lord!" the answer is afterwards so qualified as to exclude all idea of comparison between his love to *Christ* and *other objects*. It is also worthy of remark, that, in his subsequent answers, he repeats, without any material variation, what he had said in his first reply; cautiously avoiding that comparison, whatever it might be, which it was the design of our Lord's question to draw from him: "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee." As if he had said, "I am unwilling, after the severe trial which my fidelity and attachment have lately undergone, and the imperfect manner in which my love towards thee has been displayed, to make any further professions; but, notwithstanding my three-fold denial of thee, at which thou hast manifestly hinted by thrice repeating this embarrassing question, I can affirm, with sincerity and confidence, that my love towards thee still remains unshaken." Now, had Peter attributed to our Lord's question the meaning assigned to it by the advocates of the above interpretation, it appears

to me that he could have had no difficulty whatever in returning a positive and distinct answer, and in expressly declaring that he loved his Lord more than his employment as a fisherman, or any other worldly occupation. On this account I feel a considerable degree of reluctance in adopting this interpretation; and this reluctance is greatly increased by the circumstance of Peter and his companions having quitted their vessel some time before our Lord began the conversation, and likewise of their having probably left their fishing tackle behind them when they came on shore.

The second interpretation—"Lovest thou *me* more than thou lovest thy fellow-disciples?"—is not liable to these difficulties. Jesus had just finished his repast with his disciples, and had begun a short but interesting conversation, by turning to Peter, and putting to him, in an abrupt and unexpected manner, the question which has given rise to these remarks. The Apostle instantly perceived the drift of this question, and was aware of the embarrassing situation in which it placed him. His reply, therefore, was more guarded and deliberate than usual. Jesus had said, on a former occasion, when he called his Apostles together and commissioned them to preach in his name, "He that loveth father or mother *more than me*, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter *more than me*, is not worthy of me." (Matt. x. 37.) The time had now arrived, when the necessity of acting up to the spirit of this injunction was more imperative and binding than ever. But, instead of devoting himself exclusively to the support of his Master's cause, Peter was discovered among his old associates, pursuing his employment as a fisherman, and apparently forgetful of his duty as an apostle of Jesus Christ. With a view, therefore, as it would seem, to ascertain his comparative attachment to Jesus and his fishing companions, our Lord puts to him the question, "Lovest thou *me* more than *these*?" "Yea, Lord," replies Peter, "thou knowest that I love thee." Then says Jesus, "Feed my lambs." "Let not thy love for *others* exclude *me* from a place in thy affections; but love *me* through *my* disciples; and be assured, that when *their* interests are most

effectually promoted, *mine* will be in least danger of being forgotten." Such appears to be the true interpretation of this confessedly difficult passage; and the grammatical construction of the clause, as it stands in the original, seems to me to require this interpretation: *Αγαπᾷς με πλεον τῶτων*; The personal pronoun *συ* is only implied in the termination of the verb: the emphasis, therefore, rests correctly and properly upon the word *με*. "Lovest thou *me* more than *these*?"

On this account I feel strongly inclined to suspect that Doddridge and others are not justified in adopting the third interpretation,—"*Lovest thou me more than these love me?*" "The nominative of the personal pronoun," says Matthiæ, (§ 465,) "is usually omitted with the personal termination of verbs, except where there is an emphasis, e. g. in an opposition, that is expressed or understood." It follows, therefore, that, where such opposition exists, the insertion of the pronoun is essential; as in the following instance: "*All these* have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God; but *she* (*αὕτη*) of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had." (Luke xxi. 4.) In this and other similar cases the opposition is marked by the insertion of the pronoun; and its absence in our Lord's question to Peter affords strong presumptive evidence against the correctness of Doddridge's interpretation.

Others have objected to this interpretation on different grounds, alleging that it was impossible for Peter to say whether his own love to Christ or that of his fellow-disciples was the stronger. He could have had no difficulty, it may be said, in affirming, that he was more attached to the cause of Jesus than to his employment as a fisherman, if he had understood the question proposed to him, as Whitby and Pearce have understood it: and he could easily have ascertained the comparative extent of his affection for Christ and his fellow-disciples, though he might be unwilling, on many accounts, to declare it in express terms in their presence. But he could not possibly have determined by any test but that of experience, whether his love to Jesus was stronger than that of Thomas or Nathanael, James or John. There appears to me, however,

I confess, no particular force in this objection. Peter, it should be recollected, had made a boast on a former occasion, that, whatever others might do, nothing should induce *him* to deny or betray his Master. "Although *all* should be offended," says he, (Mark xiv. 29,) "yet will not *I*:" thus placing his own attachment to Christ on higher grounds than that of his fellow-disciples. In this view our Lord's question to Peter might have had some allusion to his former professions of attachment, and might thus have been intended to convey an indirect rebuke grounded on his late fickleness and miscarriage.

Of the above interpretations, the first and third have been most generally adopted. The second appears to me to be the only one which suits both the context and the grammatical construction of the passage. Different minds, however, will of course be differently affected by them; and it is possible that many arguments in favour of the first and third interpretations may have been overlooked by me in the course of the preceding remarks. If any of your learned readers, Sir, are in possession of such arguments, by stating them in some future Number of the Monthly Repository they will oblige your occasional correspondent,

O. P. Q.

SIR,

AT the conclusion of the Book of Psalms in the Septuagint is the following: "This Psalm was written by David, when he fought with Goliath, and is out of the number: 'I was the least among my brethren, the youngest in the house of my father. I fed my father's sheep. My hand made the pipe, and my fingers formed the viol. And who told it to my Lord? He is the Lord, he heareth. He sent his messenger, and took me from my father's sheep, and anointed me with the oil of his anointing. My brethren were fair and great, yet the Lord did not take pleasure in them. I went out to meet the Philistine, and he cursed me by his idols. But I, having seized his sword from him, cut off his head, and took away reproach from the sons of Israel.'" How is it that this has not been put in the Apocrypha? Does the following account of the additions in the Apocrypha to

the Books of Daniel and Esther seem probable? In the Hebrew copies of those books we find, that under the Persian monarchy, the king could not revoke a decree which he had once signed. This seemed very strange to the inhabitants of Alexandria, living under a very different government, and very ignorant of the ancient Persian customs. Some of them, therefore, boldly wrote another account of the circumstances of Daniel's being thrown into the lion's den, in order to evade the difficulty. This appears to me to furnish a very strong internal proof, that the Books of Daniel and Esther were written during the continuance of the Persian monarchy, as otherwise this very remarkable custom would probably not have been mentioned in them. It strengthens this argument to observe, that Josephus in his history of Esther, and Racine in his play, have both committed the error of making the king revoke his decree, which shews the high probability that an historian who has given a correct history of these transactions, must have lived while the custom was still in existence, that is, before the destruction of the Persian empire. This is of importance, because, as the Book of Daniel certainly contains prophecies of events long after the destruction of the Persian empire; if it were written before that time, the divine authority of its prophecies, from which the truth of the Jewish and Christian revelations may very easily be deduced, is an undeniable consequence in the opinion of

T. C. H.

SIR,

January 12, 1822.

AS you have inserted an account of a conference of the Emperor Alexander with three Quakers, Vol. XVI. p. 701, I send you what I take to be an equally authentic narrative of a less formal conference between Peter the Great, the founder of the Russian Empire, and two respectable members of that Society, in the words of one of them. If you think fit to accept it, your readers will see that this ancestor of Alexander was so far from affecting to adopt the peaceable principles of the Friends, that he inquired of what use they could be in any kingdom, seeing they would not bear arms and fight? Yet this conference seems

to have induced the Czar to attend the Friends' Meeting, at Gracechurch Street, with his suite and interpreter, the next Sunday morning. And while he was at Deptford, afterwards, acquiring a practical knowledge of ship-building, he occasionally attended their meeting at that place, and behaved not only with great propriety, but with the condescension of a truly great man, by changing seats, or standing up to accommodate others. His conduct also towards the Quakers in so promptly ordering his soldiers out of their Meeting-house at Frederickstadt, going himself to their meeting, and acting as an interpreter to his attendants, who did not understand the language of the preacher, was to give an impressive, practical lesson of toleration, and almost of religious liberty, which many monarchs have yet to learn, or want the virtue or the wisdom to act upon. There seems, indeed, to have been in his intercourse with the Friends, an entire consonance between his actions and his professions, which is more than I can say of Alexander's.

His I confess rather remind me of the saying of Napoleon, who was personally acquainted with him, and a shrewd discerner of the real character of others, (whatever might be the defects of his own,) when he described Alexander, as "*delightful in conversation, but as false and treacherous as a Greek*," alluding, I suppose, not to the modern Greeks, but to the well-known line in Virgil—

— "timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."
F.

"At this time," (1697,) says Thomas Story, (Journal of his Life, fol. Vol. I. p. 123,) "Peter the Great, Czar of Muscovy, being in London incog., and Gilbert Mollyson (Robert Barclay's wife's brother) having heard that a kinsman of his was in the Czar's service, and being desirous to increase the knowledge of the truth, requested me to go with him in quest of his kinsman to the Czar's residence, a large house at the bottom of York Buildings, in order to present him with some of Robert Barclay's Apologies in Latin, hoping they might fall under the Czar's notice. When we came to the place, Gilbert inquired of the porter after his cousin.

"Being invited up stairs, we observed two tall men walking in a large room, and being directed to the Czar's interpreter, he told us, that such a person had been in the Czar's service, but was dead.

"In the mean time, the Czar and Prince Menzicoff, his general, came to us, and upon the Czar saying something to his interpreter which we did not understand; he asked us, as we had our hats on, 'Why do you not pay respect to great persons when you are in their presence?' I answered, (says Thomas Story,) 'So we do when we are fully sensible of it, especially to kings and princes; for, though we decline all vain and empty shows of respect and duty, and flattering titles, whereby they are generally deceived by insincere and designing men; yet we yield all due and sincere respect to such, and all in authority under them, by ready obedience to all their lawful commands. But when, at any time, any of them, either through tyranny or ignorance, or ill counsel, happen to command any thing contrary to our duty to the Almighty, or his Son, Christ our Lord, then we offer our prayers to God, and humble addresses unto such rulers, that their understandings may be opened, and their minds changed towards us.'

"The Czar made no reply to this, but talked with his interpreter again, who then asked, 'Of what use can you be in any kingdom or government, seeing you will not bear arms and fight?'

"To this I replied, 'That many of us had borne arms in times past; but when it pleased God to reveal in our hearts the life and power of Jesus Christ, his Son, our Lord, whose commandment is love, we were then reconciled unto God, one unto another, unto our enemies, and unto all men. Yet we are of use in any kingdom or government. For the principle of our religion forbids idleness and incites to industry; as it is written, 'They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks.' And we being concerned in all manner of husbandry, as likewise in manufactories and merchandizing, with the blessing of heaven upon our labours, do not want, but rather abound.

"And though we are prohibited

arms, and fighting in person, as inconsistent (we think) with the rules of the gospel of Christ, yet we can, and do by his example, readily and cheerfully pay unto every government where we happen to be subject, such sums and assessments as are required of us, by the respective laws under which we live. For when a general tax was laid by the Roman Czar upon his extensive empire, and the time of payment came, the Lord Jesus Christ, whose kingdom is not of this world, demanded of Peter,—‘Of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? Of their own children, or of strangers?’ Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money; that take, and give unto them (the tribute-gatherers) for me and thee:’ thus working a miracle to pay a tax, where it was not strictly due. We, by so great an example, do freely pay our taxes to Cæsar, who, of right, hath the direction and application of them, to the various ends of government, to peace or to war, as it pleaseth him, or as need may be, according to the constitution or laws of his kingdom; and in which we, as subjects, *have no direction or share*. For it is Cæsar’s part to rule in justice and in truth; but ours to be subject, and mind our own business, and not to meddle with his.’

“After this I said to the interpreter, that we understood there was a person of great dignity and distinction in that place, a stranger very inspectious into the state of affairs and things in general; and might be also inquisitive into the state of religion; and we, lest that great prince should be misinformed concerning us and our religion, had brought him some books dedicated to the sovereign of our own country; by which he might please to see a full account of our principles. We then produced two of the Apologies in Latin.

“The Czar then talked again with the interpreter, who asked us, ‘Were not these books writ by a Jesuit? It is said there are Jesuits among you.’ To which Gilbert Mollison replied,

‘That is a calumny, and proves the necessity of our endeavours in that respect at this time. We have no Jesuits among us. Our religion and theirs differ very widely.

“‘This book was writ by a near relation of mine who was not a Jesuit, but sincerely of those principles asserted and maintained in the book, as our whole community is.’

“Then the Czar and interpreter talked together again; after which, the latter offered us some gold for the books; but I told them, they were a present to that great prince; all we desired was, that they might be acceptable; and that in case any of our Friends should come into his country and preach those principles, and meet with opposition, and be persecuted by any officers or persons in power under him for the same, he would please to afford them protection and relief. Then they talked together again, the interpreter kept the books, and the Czar and Prince Menzicoff retired into the room from whence they came.

“The interpreter afterwards told us, the Czar did not understand the Latin tongue, but only his own language and high Dutch. This was about the beginning of the week, and the next first day (Sunday) the Czar, the prince, and a great company of his other attendants, came in the morning to our meeting in Grace-church Street, all in English habits, like English gentlemen, and the same interpreter with him. I happened to be there in the [preachers’] gallery, and the first I knew was Prince Menzicoff. Robert Haddock had begun to preach a little before they came in, upon the subject of Naaman, the captain-general of the host of the Assyrians, going to the prophet for cure of his leprosy; who directing him to dip himself seven times in the river Jordan, the general, despising the means, was about to return without a cure, till being persuaded, by his own servant, to make a trial of the means prescribed, he found the end accomplished by happy experience.

“‘The nations of this world,’ said the preacher, ‘being defiled and dis-tempered, as with a leprosy of sin and uncleanness, no cure or help could be found until the Almighty, in his infinite goodness, sent his Son Jesus

Christ into the world to die for man, as a propitiation for sin; through whom also he hath sent forth his divine light, spirit and grace upon all mankind, in order for the completing of that cure; which nothing less can do, and to which all mankind are directed by the servants of Christ; and as many as have believed, and made trial of this excellent means, have found the blessed effects thereof; they have been healed, cured and cleansed.'

"'Now,' said he, 'if thou wert the greatest king, emperor or potentate upon earth, thou art not too great to make use of the means offered by the Almighty for thy healing and restoration, if ever thou expect to enter his kingdom, into which no unclean thing can come.'

"The Czar and his interpreter were often whispering together, though Robert Haddock knew nothing of his being in the meeting; and thus he staid very sociably, till observing the people crowd up before him to gaze, (which he could not endure,) he retired on a sudden, along with his company, before the meeting was quite over. Some people in the streets had seen him as he came, and, discovering who he was, crowded after him to see him more perfectly.

"After this he went incognito to Deptford, to improve himself in the art of ship-building, and there wrought at it with his own hands. Gilbert Mollyson and I acquainting some Friends how we happened to see him, and had given him some books, and that he understood High Dutch, William Penn, George Whitehead and some other Friends went to Deptford, and waited on him privately, and presented him with more of the same books in that language, which he accepted; and, afterwards, was sometimes at our meeting there, behaving as a private person, and very social; changing seats, standing or sitting as occasion might be, to accommodate others as well as himself.

"When this great prince had, in a good degree, furnished himself with useful knowledge in natural things, necessary for the civilizing and improving the barbarous people of his kingdom and nation, he returned thither, accomplished with experience in

many particulars, to the great advancement thereof in general.

"In the year 1712, the Czar of Muscovy, being in the city of Frederickstadt, with 5000 soldiers to assist the Danes against the Swedes, after he had quartered his men, inquired of one of the Burgomasters, whether there were any of the people called Quakers there. The officer told him there were a few. The Czar asked him if they had a meeting in the place. The officer told him they had. Then the Czar bid the officer let the Friends know that if they would appoint their meeting that forenoon, being first day, he would be at it. The officer replied, that there were thirty of his soldiers in the meeting place, so that there could not be any meeting in it.

"When the Czar heard this, he was angry that they had put soldiers there, and sent an order by one of his own captains, that they should all be put out forthwith, and that notice should be given to the Friends by the captain, that if they would appoint the meeting, he would come to it; and accordingly the officer gave notice to Jacob Hagen, then at Frederickstadt, and Philip Defair, a public Friend [or minister] who lived there; and not only ordered the soldiers out of the room, but made them take away all that they had brought thither. And the place being made ready, they had their meeting at the second hour afternoon; to which the Czar came, and brought with him Prince Menzicoff, of Muscovy, the General Dolgoruchez, and several others of his dukes, generals, and secretaries of state, and other great men. A great crowd following, he ordered the door to be shut, as soon as a competent number were in to sit comfortably, and many more came to the windows and all about.

"After some time of silence, Philip Defair preached the doctrine of truth among them, and all sat very quiet, but especially the Czar; who sat very gravely all the time of silence, and all the others, being awed by his example and presence, did so likewise. But the Muscovite lords and generals not understanding the language, and the Czar himself understanding it pretty well, interpreted to them what was declared, with much gravity and seri-

ousness ; commending what he heard, saying, that whoever could live according to that doctrine would be happy. A Friend, after this, presenting him with Robert Barclay's Catechism and Apology in High Dutch, he said he would have them translated and printed in his own language."

SIR,

IF I have, as your correspondent John Bunce asserts, (XVI. 713,) been guilty of an "uncharitable imputation of want of charity," in the case of Dr. Marsh and Co., I am sincerely sorry for it: and gladly should I acknowledge my error could I find, on an attentive re-consideration of the subject, any reasons for so doing. In John Bunce's letter I see, indeed, a very brisk retort on the Evangelical party, which, as I provoked it, I suppose it behoves me to bear patiently. At the same time, as I am neither Evangelical nor High Church, but a lover of conscientious honesty wherever I can meet with it, I hope not to be considered a friend to orthodox faith or practice any farther than as *this* appears in connexion with ingenuousness, and *that* with charity. Nor do I presume to attack the High Church party upon other ground than that of *disingenuousness*, in retaining and upholding a system of faith, by which it yet refuses to abide: and of *illiberality* in hunting out of the Church men whose greater conformity of belief gives them a superior claim to be considered as its real members.

But it is to the expression of "Protestant spirit," as applied to them, that John Bunce chiefly objects. I do not know what ideas the word "Protestant" may suggest to his mind. Sure I am that though to me it brings many cheering and delightful images, I cannot connect the past history of those who have borne it with any extended views of religious toleration. I regard its chief and peculiar gift to have been the Holy Scriptures; and its great boon to man, the substitution of the words of our Lord and his followers, for the traditions of a church. Now it does seem to me very clear, that if in the English Church there be any agency at work to counteract this blessed effect of Protestantism, it is that of the High Church party.

They dare not call in our Bibles and substitute the Prayer-Book for them; but they take infinite and unwearied pains to prove that it is dangerous to trust the Bible alone. "A Bible," says one of these worthies, "given away by a Papist will be productive of Popery; the Socinian will make his Bible speak Socinianism; while the Calvinist, the Baptist and the Quaker, will teach the opinions peculiar to their sects. Supply these men with Bibles, (*I speak as a true Churchman*,) and you will supply them with arms against yourself." * "What God has joined together," says Dr. Wordsworth, speaking of the circulation of Church tracts with the Bible, "let not man put asunder." "For though," says Dr. Marsh, "without the Bible, the Liturgy has no support, yet, without the Liturgy, men are left in *doubt*, whether the principles of *our* faith should be embraced by them or not. Without the Liturgy, they want a guide, to lead them to the Established Church. Without the Liturgy, the Bible may be made to lead them into doctrine and discipline most discordant with our own." †

In a better and, with leave from John Bunce, in a more "Protestant spirit," exclaims Dealtry, (an Evangelical Churchman,) "And this is common sense and reason and charity and sound Churchmanship! Eternal God! hast thou provided thy blessed Word 'to be a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path'? Hast thou indeed enjoined it upon us all, as a sacred duty, to search the Scriptures; to read them by day; to meditate upon them by night; to teach them diligently to our children; to talk of them when we sit in the house, when we lie down and when we rise up; to receive them with all reverence, as the record of truth, as the guide to everlasting life? And shall creatures like us attempt to impede the free course of thy mercy, and to defeat thy providential designs? Shall we interpose

* Country Clergyman's Address to Lord Teignmouth.

† National Religion the Foundation of National Education, a Sermon preached in St. Paul's, June 13, 1811. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S.

to arrest the pure stream of heavenly light, till they can be rendered more fit for their purpose by the miserable contrivances of human ingenuity? 'Keep back thy servants from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over us, *then* shall we be upright and innocent from the great transgression.' Cordially as I love the Church of England, and in this country I am persuaded that the existence of true religion is involved in her existence, I cannot admit that any system should be supported by the suppression of the Scriptures." Again he says, "I know of no commentary on the Scriptures, or on any other book, of which it can truly be said that it is given 'by inspiration of God.' Away, then, with these profane and vain babblings, which would elevate the traditions and comments of men to the rank of heaven's blessed and lively oracles! Other writings are valuable, but these are above all value: others may be wise, but these flow from the Fountain of Wisdom: others may be useful, but these are given for the conversion of the world." *

This is not the language and sentiments of one individual in a party. If John Bunce has made any inquiries at all on the subject, he must be aware that in the passages I have quoted I have given the sentiments of both sides fairly; and I leave it to your readers to decide whether my expression, explained as I have explained it, is not justified. I am sorry to say, instances have come to my own knowledge, in which poor curates have been restrained by the high hand of ecclesiastical power, and that in the most tyrannical manner, from attending Bible-meetings; and have read most awakening sermons, addressed to country congregations, by affrighted High Church ministers, on the appearance of a little cloud "no bigger than a man's hand," indicative of the approach of that fearful thing a Bible Society. Yet, now, it proves that all this affection for the Church is not an affection for her doctrines, but for that spirit of non-inquiry in which Priests and Popery have flourished.

* Dealtry's Vindication of the Bible Society, pp. 31, 133.

If Dr. Marsh has really departed from the faith of the Church of England, as expressed in her Articles; if he has adopted larger and more liberal views, we cannot but lament that he should thus uphold her with all her sins upon her head, and discourage the free circulation of that volume, to which we must hope he himself owes his revulsion from Calvinism. But really it is too much to believe in the existence of liberal views of toleration, where we see a mode of proceeding so very opposite to the gospel spirit.

I wish I were convinced that the High Church party are satisfied with themselves about their past concessions to Unitarian Dissenters. Joining the Evangelical in *nothing else*, it is not very likely they will unite with them against a sect to which, in a few points of doctrine, they approach a degree nearer than their Calvinistic brethren; but that they have a warm and hearty desire to extend the right hand of fellowship to Unitarians, I do not believe.

If the continual insinuations of their organ, "The Quarterly Review," mean any thing, they seem to say that Unitarians have not been sufficiently grateful for the kind condescension already shewn them; and that there is no danger of their receiving more favours speedily. I do not, however, wish to add to the list of suspicions which, I fear, your correspondent will already deem "uncharitable" enough. With regard to politics, my own experience is decidedly of an opposite nature to his. The Evangelical clergy have, with *very few exceptions*, appeared to me to be strikingly devoid of *interest*, even in politics; and to leave the battle to be fought by High Church Tories and the Whigs and Reformers. *Submissive* they undoubtedly are; but this is from a feeling of reverence (which John Bunce, no doubt, will agree with me in thinking superstitious in this case) for the words of St. Paul, which they admit very literally. But I will not take up your time with discussions which are not as profitable as could be wished.

Q.

SIR,

I AM a Unitarian, but not without doubt and difficulty; consequently, very desirous of seeing all the agreea-

ble views of Unitarianism settled on a solid base. I cannot but wish that Mr. Belsham's *Optimism* were as sound as it is pleasing; and Dr. Southwood Smith's speculations as true as they are amiable. But when great men kill themselves, (in a very vulgar manner too,) and the former gentleman will moralize from the pulpit on the occasion, and virtually tell us, it is all for the best, just as it should be, and just as Providence designed it to be; however profound such observations, I cannot but suspect there is unsoundness about them somewhere; and though philosophy cannot answer him, I am perverse enough to think such views and sentiments not quite *scriptural*, and therefore no better than they should be. There is, I am aware, no gordian knot in the moral world which Mr. B. cannot, with great ease, untie in the cool speculations of his Necessarian philosophy: and whether a man dies by his own hand, by that of the executioner, or quietly in the domestic bed, he does, I suppose, through the glass of that philosophy, look on with the same moral complacency and satisfaction. For my own part, Mr. Editor, (and many others, I believe, share my weakness here,) I cannot avoid, in regard to certain moral phenomena in the world, thinking and feeling with the vulgar; and I fear I shall never be sufficiently enlightened to imagine that, on the subject of moral agency and moral evil, a subtile metaphysical argument is to be set against common sense, moral consciousness, general consent of mankind, and plain and powerful assertions of Holy Writ. These four voices seem to be in opposition to a good deal advanced by Dr. S. Smith in his "Illustrations of the Divine Government:" a book of so amiable a spirit and delightful sentiments, that I regret there should seem to lie any objection to its grateful argument and consolatory conclusion. My attention was drawn to his book a second time by the circumstance of meeting with a Review of it in the Tenth Vol. (New Series) of the Eclectic Review; and I beg permission, Mr. Editor, to ask Dr. Smith (by the pages of your Repository) if he has seen that article? To my own judgment it is, Sir, a very powerful and impressive piece of writing, containing strong objections to

the propositions and reasonings advanced by Dr. S.; calculated to make every thinking mind serious, and to induce the ingenuous Unitarian to pause on his creed, and feel diffident of its strength and correctness. I believe the Eclectic has made but an indifferent figure in former Numbers of your excellent Miscellany, and has given itself a notorious celebrity for deficiency of candour and liberality towards us: I have still the same confidence in your own superior temper, to admit the observations I send you on a very important subject; and it would be a great relief to myself to see a satisfactory reply to them from some one or other of your intelligent readers. Dr. Smith observes: "The misery produced by sin is designed to answer the same benevolent purpose in the moral world, which the pain occasioned by hunger accomplishes in the animal." The Reviewer observes upon this: "The reader will remark the evasion of the subject in this sentence. Let it be granted that the misery consequent upon sin is a purely beneficent infliction upon the subject of it; the question is not what good the *misery* does him, but what good the *sin* does him. He is made miserable, it seems, that he may become good; but, is he made wicked that he may be made miserable, that he may become good?" On the following definition of punishment by Dr. Smith;—"Punishment is the infliction of pain, in consequence of the neglect or violation of duty, with a view to correct the evil;" the Reviewer remarks,— "Granting both the justness and the appositeness of this definition, the hypothesis proposed to us as alone worthy of a reasonable credence, is this (as we have before expressed it): *Men are made wicked, that they may be punished, that they may become good.* Now, let the reader observe, that that evil which terminates in its own ultimate correction or destruction, adds nothing to the well-being of the universe; but, to the whole extent of it, is *simple evil*. Nor does it make any difference if we choose to call the former portion of this evil, *cause*, and the latter, *consequence*; the former, sin; and the latter, punishment. Dr. Smith asserts, that he who chooses simple evil for its own sake, and rests in it

as an end, is a malevolent being. But evil that only cures itself, is simple evil. Here, then, again we perceive, that to support the doctrine of a *beneficent causation of evil*, it must be believed that sin will produce, to the subject of it, a positive additional advantage beyond what could result from an uninterrupted course of virtue. A little reflection will convince any one, that if evil does not produce a *higher good*, it is *pure evil*; and to choose pure evil, we are told, is the property of a malevolent being. But if it be said that evil produces a higher good, it must do so either to the subject of it, (that is, the sinner will be the better for his sin,) or it must procure this higher good to other creatures; but this is a supposition which, we imagine, the favourers of this final restitution could by no means allow, for there would then inevitably follow the ideas of *partiality*, of the subordination of individual interests and of the Divine sovereignty. Indeed, it would be impossible, after such an admission, to resist even Calvinism itself." In pages 553 and 554 of the Review, there is some reasoning (on the acknowledged principles of human nature) that might seem almost unanswerable. I hope you will authorize me to present it to the serious consideration of your readers. Towards the close of the article the Reviewer observes:—"We must briefly remark upon that part of Dr. Smith's volume, in which he adduces and discusses the evidence of Scripture upon the subject in hand. He employs many pages to very little purpose, as we think, in a critical examination of the terms *aion*, *aionios*, *apollumi*, *olethros*, *thanatos*, and *kolasis*. No peculiar obscurity appears to attach to any one of these words. The power of language is by no means solely or chiefly derived from the individual signification of words. The intention of a writer or speaker is primarily ascertained on the ground of the CONVENTIONAL sense of words taken in combination. The *conventional* sense of certain phrases and modes of expression, is, of course, more determinate than that of individual words: if it were not so, as all words have more or less extent of meaning, thought could never be communicated. If we must ever be retrograding from the obvious *conven-*

tional intention of a sentence, to the power of the words of which it consists, language will be deprived of its faculty to convey any determinate proposition; it is resolved into an enigmatical mass, in which all meanings may float, indifferently and at large. Now, this is the very treatment to which the language of the Bible is every day subjected by theorists."—"God, in speaking to men by man, as his instrument, must unquestionably be understood as submitting his message to the established usages of human communication. On this principle it is affirmed, that the Divine veracity and our correlative responsibility, are involved in the rule, that the opinion or intention which we should not fail to attribute to a profane writer, using such or such expressions, are, without reference to the nature of the doctrine therein implied, to be received as the opinion or intention of the inspired writer who does employ them. In proportion to the infinite moment of revealed truth, is the importance of adhering to the principle, that inspired persons spoke and wrote under the presumption that they should be heard and read as other men are heard and read; so that when they employ those uncompounded forms of speech, which are ordinarily understood to convey an absolute sense, they also shall be allowed to intend an absolute sense," &c. &c.

I fear trespassing on your pages, Mr. Editor, and, therefore, cannot do justice to the Reviewer's reasoning. I should be happy to have your permission to present to your readers more of what appears to myself a very formidable argument on the interpretation of Scripture phraseology.

Bearing in mind the almost unquestionable *conventional* meaning of the terms used by our Lord, and his knowledge of the circumstances of his hearers, can we make the supposition that Jesus would use the language he did use in speaking of the future destinies of men, knowing the truth of the doctrine of Universal Restoration? The Reviewer justly remarks, p. 558, "The passages of the gospel, whose apparent sense it is attempted to invalidate, should be perused under the supposition that our Lord, who is surely free from the imputation of a sinister design, ut-

tered the threatenings recorded by the Evangelists, with the intention to suggest or to favour the doctrine of Universal Restoration; at least, if that doctrine be true, it could never be his design to generate in the minds of his hearers an idea, not only absolutely false, but, as is pretended, highly injurious to the Divine character, and quite destructive of all the sanctions of morality," &c.

Dr. Smith and others speak in unqualified terms of the *impartiality* of God's providence to the children of men: permit me, Mr. Editor, in concluding this paper, to ask Dr. S., how the frightful disparity of men in the most important point, *moral character* and the means of its improvement, is reconciled with any definite sense of the term *impartial*? Dr. Smith has also, in his delightful views of Providence, and his illustrations of its wisdom and benevolence, boldly asserted, that, with respect to the moral world, every man is placed in circumstances, adjusted with infinite nicety to his natural powers and propensities. Where is the proof of this in fact? And if true, in fact, why does the moral world exhibit its present motley aspect; why all its discordancy, its folly, its madness, its vices, its crimes? Whence all the unfortunate results of birth, parentage and education? Why thousands and tens of thousands unhappy consequences of concomitant circumstances, if the Deity has always good in view, and his providence with unerring wisdom has adapted every circumstance in the moral world to produce good? This *may* be true in the final issue of things, and our present ignorance and limited views prevent us knowing it; but I submit to Dr. S., do present facts and appearances bear out a proposition so perfectly satisfactory? Much would many minds, besides my own, be relieved, Sir, by a clear proof of it. It appears to myself, Sir, that when we travel an inch out of the record, that is, when we stir a step from Scripture tuition and guidance in our reasoning on the ways of God, we are at once in a labyrinth, with endless error and perplexity before us: and it might seem a beautiful character of the wisdom and excellence of Scripture, that it comprises precisely what human nature appears to want in the present

state; namely, objects of faith and hope; motives to vigilance and exertion; clear precepts and positive commands; promises, for present comfort, of future rest and recompence.

QUERO.

ITALIAN REFORMATION.

The Nonconformist.

No. XXIII.

(Continued from p. 6.)

Although some progress was made in the work of Reformation in the South of Italy, yet the success of the cause, if it be measured by the number and celebrity of the converts, was much greater in the northern states. The territories of Venice, in particular, became, at an early period, honourably distinguished by the attention that was excited in them to the religious inquiries and controversies of the age. It appears, from a letter written to Luther by Frobenius, a printer at Basle, which is dated in February, 1519, that, even previously to this period, the writings of that Reformer had been conveyed in considerable numbers to Italy, where they had been extensively dispersed, and read with avidity and approbation.* In the following year was issued the first Bull of Leo the Tenth against Luther and his writings, which was sent to the Senate of Venice, with instructions to have it proclaimed in that city. The Senate were, however, in no haste to render themselves a party in the quarrel. They thought it prudent, nevertheless, to make a show of compliance, and immediately a strict search was instituted by the ecclesiastical authorities, after the publications of Luther in the houses of the booksellers: but, with the exception of a single imperfect copy of one of his works, which was seized, they found that all that had been imported had

* Gerdes, Specimen Italiæ Reformatæ, pp. 4, 5. Calvus bibliopola Papiensis, vir eruditissimus, et musis sacer, bonam libellorum partem in Italiam deportavit, per omnes civitates sparsurus. Neque enim tam sectatur lucrum, quam cupit renascenti pietati suppetias ferre, et quatenus potest, prodesse. Is promisit ab omnibus eruditis in Italia viris Epigrammata se missurum in tui laudem scripta, usque adeo tibi favet, Christique negotio, quod tanta constantia, tam viriliter tamque dextrè geris.

been disposed of.* This proceeding did not, however, suppress the spirit of inquiry which had been excited,

* The circumstance is thus related by Bernardus Shenkius, a German monk, residing at the time at Venice, in a letter to George Spalatinus, the Secretary of Frederick, Elector of Saxony, dated the 19th September, 1520: *Legi quæ de domino Martino Luther petiisti, et certè bona fama viri diù apud nos fuit; dicunt autem: Caveat sibi à Pontifice. Ante duos menses decem libri de suis appor- tati, et statim venditi fuerant, antequam novissem. In principio verò hujus mensis supervenit mandatum Papæ, et domini Patriarchæ Veneti, inhibens libros, quos dominus Patriarcha apud librarios inves- tigando unicum imperfectum invenit, et abstulit. Ego habere desideravi, sed præ timore librarius non vult adducere.—Gerdes, ubi supra, p. 7.*

Notwithstanding this show of vigour, the publication of the Bull was post- poned; and, indeed, it seems doubtful whether the first Bull was ever published at Venice. In the year following (1521) the publication of a Bull took place, but this was probably the second Bull, which was issued on the 6th January, in that year. The reluctance of the Senate to give their sanction to this instrument, which ex- communicated Luther, and all who pos- sessed his books, or favoured his opi- nions, is evident from the manner in which they caused it to be made public in their city; for they would not suffer it to be read until after the people had been confessed, and nearly the whole of the congregation had quitted the church. The circumstance is thus related by Shen- kius, in a letter to Spalatinus, dated the 5th April, 1521: *Unum dolens dico, quoniam Patriarcha Venetiarum secunda feria Paschæ, jussu Papæ, ab omnibus prædicatoribus, fecit excommunicari Ma- gistrum Martinum Luther, et omnes ha- bentes libros suos, quoscunque et fau- tores ipsius cujuscunque gradus et status, cum magna totius Germaniæ divisione, tanquam consentientis. In hoc tamen Domini Veneti prudenter egerunt, quod noluerunt hoc publicari, nisi postquam populus fuerat confessus, dimisso nempe cœtu, aut maxima ejus parte.—Gerdes, ubi supra, p. 7; Seckendorf, Hist. Lu- ther, Lib. i. pp. 115, 116.* A copy of the second Bull against Luther, printed by the authority of the Papal Government at Rome, in 1546, is now before me. There is a singular error of the press in the date of this instrument, *vigesimo* TERTIO being inserted for *vigesimo* PRIMO. Leo the Tenth was succeeded by Adrian,

but apparently served rather to extend and strengthen it. In 1524, Cardinal Campejus, who attended the Diet of Nuremburg that year as the Pope's Nuncio, bitterly complained, not only in respect to Germany, that it had embraced the doctrine of Luther, but also of Italy, because, even at that period, the writings of Luther were generally read at Venice. And he seems to have considered the case of the Italians as even more hopeless than that of the Germans: for such, he remarks, was the genius of the Ger- mans, that whilst they readily received novel opinions, they as readily aban- doned them; but that what the Ita- lians had once embraced they steadily retained.* That the Cardinal's la- mentations were not without good grounds, may be collected from some documents relating to this period; from which it appears that numerous converts had been gained over to the cause of the Reformation in the Vene- tian States. Luther was apprised so early as the year 1528 of the existence of these Italian Reformers; and, in 1542, he received a communication from them, in a letter which was writ- ten by Balthasar Alterius, at that time Secretary to the English legation at Venice, "in the name of the brethren," as they are styled, "of Venice, Vin- cenza and Trevigio."† Melancthon,

in 1522. The date of the Pontificate is right, being the eighth year, "*anno octavo.*" Leo was made Pope in 1513.

* Bock, Hist. Antitrin. II. p. 396; Ger- des, ubi supra, p. 8. Germanos eo esse ingenio, ut nova cupide accipiant, sed et facile deponant; Italos pertinaciter in- hærere semel acceptis.

† Seckendorf, L. iii. § xcvii. pp. 401, et seqq.; Gerdes, pp. 61, et seqq. From this letter it appears that the friends of the Reformation in the Venetian States were at this time very narrowly watched, and that some of them had already been driven into exile.—Proscribuntur, the writer states, multi, quorum aliqui in Cenobates (forte Genabates) secessisse dicuntur, quidam Basileam, et in Helve- tias, alii in finitimas regiones, plurimi capiuntur, ut perpetuo tandem carcere contabescant: nullus tamen est qui eri- piat innocentem, qui judicium faciat pau- peri et orphano, qui patrocinetur gloriæ Christi. Omnes in unum conspirarunt, ut opprimant Dominum et Unctum ejus, nullibi autem magis sævit aut prævalet

in 1538, addressed a letter to the Senate of Venice, from which it has been inferred, though probably without suf-

hæc calamitas, quam hîc, ubi totus viget Antichristus.

In consequence of the danger and the sufferings to which they were thus exposed, these Reformers supplicate Luther to intercede for them with the German Protestant princes, in order to induce them to take up their cause and prevail on the Senate to allow them the free exercise of their religion, while they abstained from political offences :

Nam, cum tanta passi fueritis, ob eam duntaxat causam, ut nomen Christi ad nos usque perveniret, non est credendum, quod cum agnoverimus illum, et sequamur, in medio pene cursu deseramus à vobis, quorum voce ad id vehementer incitati sumus, et ad hunc usque diem mirificè impellimur. Id autem est, quantum huc usque à Spiritu Christi colligere potuimus, et fortasse vobis quoque non displicebit, ut, quamprimum fieri poterit at Serenissimos Germaniæ Principes, qui ex nostra sunt parte, et eorum bonus est numerus, auspice Christo, sicut à multis accepimus, hanc rem totam deferatis, eosque per Christum rogetis, ut litteras commendatitias ad Senatum Venetiarum pro nobis conscribant, rogando monendoque ut sese temperent ab ea decernendi licentia, atque judicandi libidine, quam ministris Papæ tam inconsulto concessere ac quotidie sævius impertiuntur in pusillos Christi sub prætextu fidei et religionis impiè cruciandos, sed, permittant quemlibet ritu suo vivere, dum tamen seditio, et publicæ quietis perturbatio caveatur, eamque rem ad generale concilium, quod ajunt, in promptu esse, licet nunquam futurum esse arbitremur, omnino referant, interim neminem cogi aut trahi ad fidem sinant.

In the course of this letter, the learned and pious writer took occasion, in the spirit of charity, to lament the disunion and the angry disputes which had been excited among the Protestant Reformers in Germany and other places on the subject of the Lord's Supper, and to recommend to his correspondent to put an end to such dissensions. He learnt, however, from Luther's answer, that his benevolent wish, on this head, was not likely to be soon accomplished. The notice of the subject seems to have roused all the angry feelings of the Saxon Reformer against his opponents in this controversy ; for he particularly cautions the Italians against the "pestilent errors" of Bullenger, Bucer and others, whom he stigmatizes as false prophets, who, at the instigation of

sufficient reason, that the members of that venerable body were not unfriendly to the cause of the Reformation. In this epistle, the writer gives a brief exposition of the principal doctrines which were professed by himself, and the other German Reformers : but he subjoins to this statement an admonition to the Senators against the tenets of Servetus, warning them not to permit such heresies to be promulgated in their territories.*

There is extant a curious document which, if it be, as it purports, the genuine production of a sincere Catholic, may serve to shew, on the authority of its adversaries, the extent and strength of the feeling which existed in the North of Italy in favour of the Reformation. This professes to be a letter addressed by Gerardus Busdragius, a suffragan Bishop in the diocese of Padua, to Cardinal Pisano. The writer expresses his serious apprehensions that the whole of Italy would be shortly infested with what he calls "the plague of Lutheranism;" the inquisitors finding themselves, it seems, unequal to the task of staying the ravages of the malignant disease which was threatening the very existence of the Papal authority. This let-

Satan, were knowingly fighting against the truth. This language was afterwards severely censured by Melancthon. Besides the references above noted, see De Porta, *Hist. Reform. Eccles. Ræticarum*, Tom. I. Pt. ii. p. 10.

* It has been doubted whether Melancthon did actually address such a letter to the Venetian Senate, it appearing unlikely that he should write in such terms and upon such a subject to a body known to be attached to the interests of the See of Rome ; and it has been conjectured that the report might have arisen from his having addressed a letter "to some Venetians devoted to the study of the gospel." *Ad Venetos quosdam Evangelii studiosos.* But Bock saw the original edition of the letter referred to in the library of the University of Königsberg. It was printed at Nuremberg, in 1539, by Jerom Formschneider, and is intitled *Epistola Philippi Melancthonis ad Senatum Venetum. Oratio publice habita Wittenbergæ in promotione Doctoris Juris. De scripto Jure et Dignitate Veterum Interpretum Juris.* Bock, *ut supra*, II. pp. 397, 398. De Porta, *Hist. Reform. Eccles. Ræticarum*, Tom. I. Lib. ii. p. 63.

ter is dated the 15th December, 1558, and the writer asserts, upon information which he had been at considerable pains to collect, that, antecedently to that time, nearly eight hundred persons, tainted with this contagious malady, had fled from Italy on account of their religious opinions; "among whom," he writes, "are to be reckoned some men of distinguished learning and sagacity."

He next complains that those who yet remained in the country pursued the same measures as their predecessors, in promulgating their sentiments, by their discourses and the distribution of books. "These men," he observes, "sadly harass our inquisitors: for they clandestinely penetrate the whole of Italy, sometimes in person, and sometimes by their emissaries, who disperse their books and sermons, and infect more in one day than we are able, with all our inquisitions and pains, to cure in a year." The zealous bishop, if such he were, then recommends that, on account of their proved inefficacy, they should thenceforth abstain from the cruel proceedings of the Inquisition, by which, he states, that within a period of forty years, or since the beginning of the Reformation, more than one hundred thousand persons had been put to death, without effecting any thing towards healing the disorder which they were designed to extirpate. He advises that a new expedient should be tried, in order, if possible, to prevent the whole country from being contaminated. He proposes that the Pope should interdict all intercourse whatever between Italy and Germany, so that no person from one country should be allowed to visit the other; "in order," he writes, "that our Catholics may not know what our enemies say, or, if they should be made acquainted with it, that they should not at once adopt their opinions." As, however, obvious obstacles suggested themselves, which would render the execution of this plan impracticable, he expresses himself obliged to conclude that it was extremely difficult, if not wholly impossible, to preserve Italy. He reproves the Venetians for crippling the powers of the Inquisition in their states; complains of Poland because it favoured Lutheranism; blames the Pope because he would not acknowledge Fer-

dinand Emperor, and expresses his wish that his Holiness would not further persecute the Lutherans with his thunders, but would extend to them the same toleration as he granted to the Greeks, and by this means promote the peace and augment the treasures of the Church. Bock, who has given the preceding account of this singular epistle, justly observes, that it wears more of the appearance of a piece of satire, than of grave advice. It is, indeed, by some, and not without probability, attributed to Vergerius, who was one of the earliest of the agents sent by the Pope into Germany to oppose the proceedings of Luther, but who afterwards gave up his bishopric, and joined the Reformers.*

Although the states of Venice contained so great a number of persons who had become converts to the doctrines of the Reformation, it does not appear that here, any more than in Naples, separate societies had been formed for religious worship.† The vigilance of the agents of the Inquisition, notwithstanding the restraints which were imposed upon their proceedings by the Venetian Senate, rendered it, no doubt, impossible for the Reformers to take so decisive and public a step. The society which is stated to have met at Vincenza, and to which the origin of Socinianism is commonly ascribed, is probably not to be considered an exception to this remark. Mosheim, indeed, and with him some other writers, doubt whether this much-famed society had any real existence; but the reasons they assign for their scepticism are in the extreme weak and inconclusive.‡ Very little is known of the constitution of this association. From the title of college, which is so generally applied to it, the presumption is, that it was founded merely for conversation, or, for the

* Bock, ut supra, II. pp. 399, et seqq., Gerdes, Lib. cit. p. 9.

† Alterius, in the letter to Luther, above referred to, expressly intimates that they had no separate churches. His words are:—*Ubi nullas publice habemus, sed quilibet sibi ipsi est Ecclesia, pro cujusque arbitrio atque libidine, &c.*

‡ The English reader will find these reasons stated and discussed in the Historical Introduction to Rees's *Racovian Catechism*, pp. xxi. &c. *Note.*

discussion of literary and religious topics. The period assigned for its dispersion is the year 1546: and it is worthy of observation, that on the first of May, in that very year, the Pope addressed a Bull to the Senate of Venice, directing them to suppress the Lutheran heresy at Vincenza.* There can be no question but that it was this Papal mandate which occasioned the breaking up of the Protestant society at that place. There belonged to it at this period, James de Chiar, Julius Trevisanus, and Francis de Ruego, who were seized by the inquisitors; the first died in prison, and the other two were put to death at Venice:—Lælius Socinus, Niccola Paruta, Valentine Gentilis, Darius Socinus, Francis Niger, and John Paul Alciatus, who all escaped, and obtained an asylum among the Reformers on the other side of the Alps.†

The Senate of Venice, by permitting the Pope's Bull to be acted upon with such promptness and sanguinary violence, departed, for the first time, from that cautious and lenient policy which it had usually observed towards the favourers of the Reformation in the countries under its jurisdiction. Whatever might have been the reasons of its conduct in this instance, they did not at once cease to operate: for the measures to which it now assented proved to be the forerunners of others upon a still larger scale, which ultimately effected the ruin of the cause of the Reformers in these states. The Pope, finding that the Reformed doctrines were gaining over proselytes in great numbers throughout Italy, issued strict orders to the officers of the Inquisition to use the utmost vigilance to detect and seize the heretics, and to suppress their books. These orders obtained the ready adoption and the active co-operation of the several governments into which they were sent. The Senate of Venice, on this occasion, evinced its zeal for the interests of the holy see, by re-enacting a decree which it had passed against heretics in the year 1521, probably on the

publication of the Bull against Luther, but which it had allowed to remain a dead letter upon its statute-books.

In consequence of the severity with which it was now carried into execution, Balthasar Alterius again interested himself for the persecuted Protestants, and, with the view of obtaining some mitigation of the edict which had been passed against them, wrote on their behalf to the Duke of Saxony, and the other leaders of the Reformation in Germany, and went himself with the same view into Switzerland to intercede with the Swiss Governments to take up their cause. His benevolent exertions failed of their object, and only served to incense against himself the power which he had aimed to soften: for on his return he was ordered either to rejoin the Church of Rome or quit the states, and he immediately chose the latter alternative.*

Besides the territories of Venice, the principles of the Reformation obtained a favourable reception in other states in the north of Italy. The celebrated Paginus, writing to Pope Clement VII., in January, 1525, states, that many of the citizens of Florence were infected by the Lutheran heresy; and he is careful to add, that he had laboured among them not without benefit to many souls.†

There were, also, several Protestants at Modena in 1542 and 1545, who attracted the notice of the See of Rome; and at Milan, so late as the year 1536, Pope Paul III. complains, in a letter to Moronus, bishop of Modena, that there were many heresies condemned by the Church, openly professed. The same Pope, writing to Cardinal Mantuanus in 1545, states, that he had been informed that there were at Mantua some of the clergy and others who not only doubted but denied the doctrines of the Roman Church, whom he exhorts him to take the proper methods to punish or reclaim. At Bologna, also, there were many converts to the Protestant cause; and, it is stated, that in their number they reckoned one individual of such influence and authority, that

* Gerdes, ut supra, pp. 71, et seqq. This writer has given the Bull at length.

† Rees's *Racovian Catechism*. Historical Introduction, pp. xx. &c.; with the authorities referred to in the Note,

* De Porta, ut supra, Tom. I. Lib. ii. pp. 31, et seqq.

† Gerdes, pp. 9, 10.

he offered to furnish six thousand men, should it be found necessary to oppose, by force of arms, the measures of the court of Rome.*

Whether at Ferrara, any proselytes were gained, does not decidedly appear. But in that government the cause of the Italian Reformers derived great support from the friendship and influence of the Princess Renata, the daughter of Louis XII. of France, who was married to the Duke of Ferrara and Modena. Her palace was the resort of those who were favourable to the Reformation: and under her roof those of them who in other states were persecuted for their opinions, frequently obtained a ready and a safe asylum.†

Whilst the spirit of the Reformation was spreading through the other states of Italy, it was found impossible to prevent its manifesting itself in the Pope's territories, and at the very threshold of the church of St. Peter's. For it appears, that even here, particularly in the town of Faenza, some men were zealous and intrepid enough to preach against the Roman power.‡

The little republic of Lucca is entitled to particular notice, in connexion with the history of the Italian Reformation. It has been already observed, that Peter Martyr, after quitting Naples, obtained the situation of prior of the monastery of St. Fridianus, at Lucca. After entering on this preferment, he established a kind of collegiate institution for the education of young persons, in which Paul Lacinus taught Latin; Celsus Martinengus, Greek; and Imanuel Tremellius,

Hebrew; whilst Martyr himself attended to the department of theology, and delivered lectures on the Epistles of Paul. By the measures which he now pursued, he soon imbued his companions and fellow-labourers with the principles of the Reformation, and gained over other converts from among the persons who were admitted to attend his lectures. In the number of these proselytes was the celebrated Jerome Zanchius, at that time a monk, but who was afterwards Professor of Divinity in the university of Strasburg. Some idea of the success with which Martyr laboured may be formed from the fact, that within one year after he gave up his cowl, and went into voluntary exile, not less than eighteen of his associates at the monastery, quitted the place and joined the Reformers in Switzerland and Germany. Martyr finding it no longer safe to remain in Italy, went to Zurich, in company with Bernard Ochini, in 1542. He was followed by Celsus Martinengus, who was afterwards pastor of the Italian church at Geneva, by Imanuel Tremellius, Jerome Zanchius, and others.*

This sketch of the Italian Reformation must not be concluded without some notice of the churches which were formed in the Rhætian Alps. It seems, that so early as the year 1523, the attention of the court of Rome was drawn to the progress of heretical opinions in the valley of Tellina, in this district. The efforts that were then made to suppress the rising spirit of religious inquiry, proved vain and ineffectual; and, in a short time, the population of those parts which were included in the Swiss government of the Grisons, became converts to the doctrines of Zwinglius. The Italian being the language in common use, the exiles from Italy were naturally induced to resort hither, and great numbers of them chose this district for their permanent residence. From the Italian churches of this state, others were afterwards formed at Zurich and Geneva, which had to boast, among their ministers and members, of numerous individuals of distinguished learning and talents, and of noble and

* Gerdes, pp. 59, 71, 84.

† Idem. p. 23.

‡ Les mœurs dépravées de l'Ordre Ecclésiastique et de la Cour de Rome persuadèrent à bien des personnes, que tous les maux, qu'on éprouvoit, étoient en exécution des jugemens de Dieu, qui venoient venger les grands abus, qui se commettoient journellement. On embrassoit en conséquence la Réforme, dans les maisons, et divers villes, particulièrement à Faenza, quoique Terre du Pape, on y prêchoit contre l'Eglise Romaine; de manière que de jour en jour, le nombre des Luthériens, qui se faisoient nommer Évangélistes, s'augmentoit. Giannone Hist. Civ. de Naples, apud Gerdes, p. 22.

* Adam in Vita Petri Martyris, pp. 38, 34; Gerdes, p. 80.

illustrious rank, who had been forced, by the terrors of the Inquisition, to bid adieu to their native Italy.*

The preceding statement contains a brief abstract of the history of the Reformation in Italy, as far, at least, as respects the first manifestations of open hostility to the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Church. The subsequent ecclesiastical history of that country would supply many additional facts of an interesting kind, which cannot now be noticed, but which might be used as materials for a work that is yet a desideratum in this branch of literature—an Italian Protestant Martyrology.

In tracing the means by which the work of reformation was carried on in Italy, it is evident that a great part of its success is to be attributed to the labours of churchmen, who, like Peter Martyr, employed themselves in explaining the Scriptures, and instilling into the minds of their hearers the principles of the German or the Swiss Reformers. But the most extensive effects in this way were produced by the general circulation of the writings of these eminent men, which were translated into the Italian language, and read with great avidity.† Ano-

ther circumstance to which important consequences are deservedly attached, was the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongue. In 1530, Antonio Bruccioli printed, at Venice, an Italian version of the New Testament; and he followed up his design, by a translation of the Old Testament, which was published in 1540. These translations are erroneously classed, by Le Long and Father Simon, among the Catholic versions; but they were instantly disowned by the Roman Church, and placed in the catalogue of prohibited books.*

Exclusively of those who appear to have acted in concert, or as associated bodies, there were many individuals of distinguished eminence who sided with the friends of the Reformation in Italy, and became exiles on account of their religion. In the number of these, we may here just mention the names of Olympia Fulvia Morata, a native of Mantua; Cœlius Secundus Curio, born of a noble family in Piedmont; Minus Celsus, a native of Sienna; and George Blandrata, a physician of Piedmont, afterwards the opponent and persecutor of Francis David, in Transylvania.

It may be remarked, in respect to the Italian Reformers in general, that most of those who were in circumstances to emigrate, and were fortunate enough to escape the agents of the Inquisition, transported themselves, in the first instance, to Switzerland, and obtained settlements in the Grisons, at Geneva, and in some of the other states. Some of them were readily admitted into the Swiss churches, whose opinions they had embraced, and to whose discipline they did not object to conform.

In the course of time, as has already been observed, churches were formed of their own body, to which ministers were appointed from among their exiled countrymen. Some of the more learned of the ecclesiastics were appointed to professorships in the Swiss

* De Porta, ut supra, Tom. I. Pt. ii. Cap. i. ii.; Gerdes, p. 86.

† One of the earliest of the works that were translated was Melancthon's "*Loci Communes*," which was printed at Venice about the year 1529, under the following title: "*I Principi della Theologia, di Ippofilo de Terra Nigra*." Afterwards appeared, without the author's name, Luther's explanation of the Lord's Prayer, and his Catechism, which latter, not being suspected to be an heretical work, was greatly esteemed by the Catholics. About the same period, Bucer published an Italian edition of his Commentary on the Psalms, under the feigned name of Aretius Felinus. Calvin's Catechism was also printed in Italian, without his name; and, in 1557, his Institutes were translated into Italian by Paschali, and dedicated to Galeazzo Caraccioli. In 1526, Bucer translated Luther's "*Postillas*" from the German into Latin, for the use of the Italian Reformers. Having taken some liberties with his original in omitting and altering some passages relating to the doctrine of Consubstantiation, he drew upon himself the severe displeasure of Luther, who styled his preface sacrilege,

and his notes poisonous glosses—*venenatorum glossematum*. Bucer, in consequence of this complaint, afterwards printed the altered passages in their original state, in a separate book, in which he inserted Luther's letters of remonstrance. See De Porta, ut supra, Tom. I. Pt. ii. p. 8.

* Gerdes, pp. 14 and 56.

and German Universities, and others were invited to fill similar stations in England; whilst some who went beyond the Swiss and German Reformers in their secession from the doctrines of the Church of Rome, found it necessary to emigrate to Poland and Transylvania, where they became instrumental in promoting the cause of Unitarianism.

The history of the Reformation in Italy presents one fact which is worthy of particular observation. It is not a little singular, that in this country so large a proportion of the more distinguished of those who seceded from the Roman Church should, at so early a period, have been carried to so great a length in calling in question and in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. It seems to be generally admitted, that those who formed the society at Vincenza, including in their number Lælius Socinus, were Antitrinitarians; and it may be inferred, that their opinions were pretty general among the Italian Reformers, from the suspicion of Unitarian heresy which appears to have attached to almost every person of learning and distinction who quitted Italy on account of his religious sentiments. This suspicion was, indeed, in many cases, wholly unfounded. It is extremely doubtful, whether Valdesso, one of the first Reformers in Italy, dissented from the popular faith on the doctrine of the Trinity. In his "Divine Considerations," there is certainly nothing to impeach the orthodoxy of his creed on this head. Coelius Secundus Curio has also been charged with holding Antitrinitarian sentiments, but without the shadow of evidence. Bernard Ochini has likewise been misrepresented in relation to this point. He has commonly been enumerated among the members of the society at Vincenza. But it does not seem likely that he could ever have belonged to it, and it is certain that he was not a member in 1546, when it was dispersed, as he had quitted Italy four years previously to that period. It appears, moreover, evident, that he was at this time a Trinitarian, and had no difficulty in uniting with the Trinitarian churches, both in Switzerland and in England. Towards the close of his life, however, he changed his sentiments, and became an Unitarian. But

making every allowance for these misrepresentations, which were generally the work of the enemies of the parties, who wished to heap upon them all the odium they could; and a deeper stain, they well knew, they could not at that time throw upon them, than that which the very imputation of Unitarianism conveyed; there is abundant evidence to shew, that a very large number of persons gave up their Trinitarian creed before they quitted Italy. This circumstance affords a good proof, that they prosecuted their theological inquiries with a manly freedom and fearless intrepidity of mind, and with a becoming anxiety to follow the truth wherever it might be found, and whithersoever it might conduct them.

R. S.

Erratum.—The reader is requested to correct the reference to Mosheim in note *, col. 2, p. 5: it should be to Vol. III. p. 387.

Kendal,

Feb. 14, 1822.

SIR,

I HAVE the satisfaction to announce to the Unitarian public, the establishment of a Fellowship Fund in the religious society with which I am connected. Upon the regulations for managing the institution, and the objects to which it is to be devoted, it is unnecessary to enlarge, as they are conformable to the well-known plan originally suggested by the late Doctor Thomson, and coincide with those which have been so frequently detailed in your pages. The great end we have in view, is to join with our brethren in aiding the progress of the truth as it is in Jesus, and we hope, that we shall strengthen *our own* hands by contributing to strengthen *theirs*, in this great and good cause.

It gives me additional pleasure to state further, that at the time when this establishment took place, it was unanimously resolved to have an annual collection, the amount of which should be alternately given to the College at York and to the London Unitarian Fund. The collection for this year will be appropriated to the use of the latter. In following up both these plans, I have no doubt we shall soon be joined by the whole of our society, when they see that the pecuniary exertions are *individually* below the notice of those whose means

are the most limited, but *collectively* efficient and available to such valuable purposes.

I am induced to mention another subject of importance to a few neighbouring congregations, in the hope that the information we want may be supplied by some of your correspondents. The last Lord Wharton left, by will, a number of Bibles to certain Dissenting societies, (of which ours was one,) to be distributed, at the discretion of the ministers, among the young. For a considerable time this was done in conformity to the conditions stated in the bequest, but about thirty years ago the distribution was transferred to the clergy of the Establishment, without any reason assigned, or any known authority for such a deviation from the will of his Lordship. This statement was made to the commissioners sent by Parliament to inquire into the abuses of Charities, but they knew nothing of the subject, and did not seem to consider it as within the scope of their powers. If inserted in your miscellany, it may possibly meet the eye of one better informed; and should this be case, any explanation of the business, through the medium of the Repository, will be acceptable to many of its readers in this part of the kingdom.

JOHN HARRISON.

SIR,

*Manchester,
Feb. 13, 1822.*

IT is with considerable diffidence that I intrude upon the notice of the readers of the Monthly Repository; but being convinced that the subject to which I wish to draw their attention, is one which, if it were more universally considered, would be productive of much good, I have been thus induced to act, no less influenced by a principle of duty, than a desire to promote the interests of Unitarianism. A few months ago, a religious society was formed by several ardent friends to the cause of pure and uncorrupted Christianity in this town, for the purpose of promoting a spirit of free inquiry, by the liberal discussion of the leading doctrines of Christianity. The meetings are held once every week, and the discussions carried on in a candid and impartial manner, under the superintendence of a conductor who officiates as chairman

for the evening. There are a few short rules prepared for the government of the society, which are subscribed by the members, each of whom is allowed to introduce his friends. From amongst the gentlemen constituting the society, a number of persons are chosen to act as conductors, whose duty it is, in rotation, to deliver a short discourse on some religious subject, of which a week's previous notice has been given, so that every person may, in the interval, acquaint himself with the subject, and come prepared to give his opinion. The meetings are opened by singing and prayer, and concluded, after the debate, with a short prayer. By these means are the great and leading doctrines of Christianity brought before their view, and become not only more thoroughly understood, but more deeply impressed upon the mind. Some are, thereby, led to inquire into the truth of those doctrines which they have, perhaps, adopted without inquiry, and professed to believe without understanding. Its members are led into a more minute examination of the evidence upon which their belief is founded; and that must naturally tend to a better acquaintance with the Scriptures, and to the elucidation of many parts of those writings which had before appeared to them "hard to be understood;" thus, too, are they better prepared "to give to every one that asketh of them, a reason of the hope that is in them." It also promotes an interest in that most pure religion which too many of the world are inclined to think they sufficiently estimate by an attendance at a place of public worship one day out of seven, and by now and then contributing towards the accomplishment of some desirable object of support of a charitable institution. It tends to the instruction and improvement of each individual, by all imparting their own information and knowledge for the benefit of the community. And, lastly, it excites a degree of fellowship and brotherly-kindness amongst the members, and knits them more closely together in the support of that doctrine which they profess: an object, I fear, more to be wished than realized in the congregations of Unitarian Christians. It is to me a matter of regret, that they do not "exhibit the

pleasing picture" held out in the example of our great Master and his immediate followers, in cordially uniting both rich and poor in the labours of love, and in offices of Christian charity.

These, indeed, do not appear to me all the advantages which may be derived from societies of this description; for if every Unitarian congregation in the empire were to form themselves into similar societies, they would not only derive the benefits before pointed out, but they would thereby most effectually promote a more extensive knowledge of the doctrines of Unitarianism: a religion which, however it may have met with the censure of many well-meaning, but mistaken Christians, only requires to be known, in order that it may be duly estimated. Such societies, if properly encouraged by the Unitarians themselves and their ministers, would not long be in existence without exciting the attention of the world; and that attention once excited, would lead to inquiry as to our doctrines. Inquiry is all we wish, is all we ask for: we do not urge, we do not desire any one to profess our faith unless perfectly convinced of its truth. Belief without conviction is a blind faith which can produce no good effects. The wish of the Unitarians is, that the gospel (and that alone) may be the standard of every man's faith; feeling convinced as they do, that the more the Scriptures are searched, the more their religion will flourish. Societies of this nature, though at first they may not appear of much consequence, yet they are calculated to produce many important advantages to the community at large. But even admitting for a moment, that there is no probability of their ever attaining such importance, yet ought they to be encouraged for the good they must naturally produce amongst their members. Many institutions which, at their commencement, appeared under more unfavourable auspices, are now flourishing in vigour, and why may we not indulge the hope that these, like others, may increase and flourish, if they are adapted to answer any good end?

Should your opinion coincide with mine, that such institutions are worthy of public attention, you will much

oblige me by the insertion of these few observations in the next Number of the Monthly Repository.

P. ECKERSLEY.

SIR,

IN my last letter (p. 24) I endeavoured to remove Mr. Belsham's objection to the authenticity of the Mosaic history. I next attempt to prove that it is not chargeable with the vulgar errors which this writer imputes to it. In justice to himself and to Moses, Mr. B. has specified these errors. To deal in vague charges, dictated by a love of paradox, by an affectation of novelty, or a regard to popular prejudice, is not the character of this intrepid inquirer. Reason and conviction alone guide his enlightened mind; and though he may occasionally fall into error, and to err is human, the diffusion of moral and religious knowledge, the substitution of genuine in the room of spurious views on the subject of revelation, are the sole object of his animating toil. And what man is there who can boast of more ardent zeal, of greater talents, of more abundant success in the same honourable field?

Moses, according to Mr. Belsham; regarded the firmament as a solid arch, but the sacred writer, it is certain, held no such opinion; in proof of this I copy a note from *Essenus*, a little publication which Mr. B. seems not to have perused:

"The original of expanse is *regua*, a word that signifies mere space or extension. The terms by which the firmament is expressed in Greek and Latin, and in many modern tongues, exhibit a remarkable instance of the influence of philosophical opinion on language. Early in the second century, an Egyptian philosopher taught, that the firmament or heavens consisted of solid orbs, each star being supposed to be fixed in a solid, transparent sphere, like crystal. This notion was doubtless not new: it prevailed in Egypt ages before, though from Ptolemy, who, with some additions and modifications, no doubt first systematically taught it, it went by the name of the Ptolemaic system. It is from the prevalence of this opinion, that *σφαῖρα* in Greek, and *firmamentum* in Latin, came to be applied to the

heavens, though these nouns imply something firm and solid. Hence, too, the epithets χαλκοβατης, κραταιος, are used by Homer and other poets, to characterize the heavens. Moses, on the other hand, has employed a term which denotes mere expansion or extension; and this circumstance shews, either that he was untainted with the vain theories of the Egyptians, or, which is more probable, that he lived in an age antecedent to them. The seventy translators thought it wiser to follow the Egyptians than their Lawgiver in this respect. They wrote their translation in Egypt, and, in conformity to the prejudices of that people, used σερῶμα, which signifies a solid mass. This warrants us in concluding, that the system, which in after days was taught by Ptolemy, prevailed in Egypt before the authors of the Septuagint."

Mr. Belsham further imputes to Moses the puerile notion that a reservoir of water exists in the heavens, supported by the firmament as a solid arch, and that from this celestial reservoir are dispensed the rain and the dew. The Jewish Lawgiver well understood, as appears from his own words, that rain and dew are caused by evaporation from the ground. "Before this," says he, "no plant of the field existed; no herb of the field grew: for the Lord God caused no showers to descend, but thick vapours issued from the ground, and drenched the whole surface of the earth."

The verse on which Mr. Belsham's misconception is founded, is thus rendered in Essenus: "And God said, Let there be an expanse amidst the fluids, that it may separate one fluid from another; and God made the expanse and separated the fluids below the expanse from the fluids above the expanse, and so it was done." To this the following note is subjoined by the translator:

"The term fluid comprehends water and air, and Moses uses *meim* with the same latitude. This appears indisputable from the two following facts: the divine historian has not mentioned the air by any appropriate name; and if it be not included in *meim*, he has not mentioned it at all, which is incredible." The same writer represents the fluids signified by *meim*,

as producing birds as well as fishes. "And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life; and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." This is the Common Version, and strictly conformable to the original. The meaning then is, Let the waters bring forth the fishes and let the air bring forth the fowl. That the water, indeed, produced the birds, as well as the fishes, is thus asserted in 2 Esdras vi. 47: "Upon the fifth day thou saidst unto the seventh part, where the waters were gathered, that it should bring forth living creatures, fowls and fishes."

When we read, then, that God separated the fluids below the expanse from the fluids above in the expanse, we are to understand the waters below the expanse on the surface of the earth, and the air in the expanse above the surface of the earth. Thus Moses, by a fair interpretation of his own language, is rescued from the vulgar notion, if a notion so vulgar ever could prevail, that waters exist above the firmament, similar to those below it.

The philosophers of Greece, and probably those of Egypt and Chaldea before them, were uniformly of opinion, that air and water were distinct elements, utterly incommunicable with each other. Moses, on the contrary, whom Mr. B. supposes not to have been exempt from the grossest errors, thought these elements so analogous, that he comprehends them under the same general term; and I leave it to the reader to determine whose notion is most conformable to the discoveries of modern philosophy.

"It is evident," adds Mr. B., p. 21, "that this writer believed that light might exist in the absence of the sun, as it appears to do in the morning and evening twilight, when the sun is below the horizon, or in a cloudy day, when he is invisible; and of course he believed that the principal use of the sun was not to create, but to increase the day-light." I wonder that a writer so sagacious as Mr. Belsham did not suspect that he was doing great injustice to the character of Moses; as he ascribes to him errors, from which all descriptions of men, the ignorant as well as the wise, appear ever to have been exempt, far so uniformly in the

approach of the sun connected with the light of day and his departure with night, that every person capable of reflection from the beginning of time to the present hour, must have associated them in his mind as cause and effect; and to suppose that Moses did not form the same association, is to suppose him a child or an idiot, when he composed his narrative.

It is reasonable to conclude, that creation, as the effect of Omnipotence, was a simple, undivided act, and the words of Moses favour the conclusion. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This statement, be it observed, represents the works of God, the sun and the light, the moon and the stars, the land, the sea, the air, together with all animated nature as now in being; but it is too summary for an author who wished to divide creation "into steps and stages, and to enable the slow eye of human imagination to accompany the motions of Omnipotence." This renders a detail necessary, and all that follows, from the first verse to the end of the chapter, is but a detail. In perusing this detail, indeed, the reader is apt to impose on himself, by regarding those as acts of creation, which are but the developement of things already created. The narrative, however, is altogether anthropomorphitcal, and has no more reality than the motion of a body which, though really at rest, appears to change its position merely because the eye which beholds it is itself in motion. In this very chapter occurs an example which renders my assertion obvious and conclusive. Moses represents man as made in the image of God; and though Adam and Eve were already created, we meet in the sequel with two successive accounts which, detached from the preceding history, would imply that they were not yet in being, but which are, in reality, intended to be fuller and more adequate details of their creation.

Now, when Moses, after stating the general proposition that God created the heavens and the earth, enters on the detail: he begins with the last and lowest step, thus conforming to a figure which is called *Agateronproteron*, and which frequently occurs in ancient writers. By this inversion of

his ideas, he separates the light from the sun, its primary source; depending on the good sense of his readers for comprehending their necessary connexion, and the occasion of their being thus detached and inverted in the narrative. It may, however, be observed, that as Moses began his detail with the light, so, after going through the round of inanimate creation, he ends with the sun; thus leading the imagination to recognize their connexion, and to join them as cause and effect, like the two extremes of a circle, coalescing in one common point. This process appears to me to have been dictated by the most exalted wisdom; and surely it must be deemed extremely incongruous to consider the Jewish lawgiver, (as Mr. B. does consider him,) as having delivered the sublimest truths of natural religion, with a simplicity and majesty unrivalled amidst the productions of the human mind, and at the same breath to charge him with vulgar errors, which, if true, sink him below the level of common sense.

Whoever is acquainted with ancient compositions, must be aware, that to understand them in many parts it is necessary to know the circumstances of their respective authors; and to investigate the opinions and practices to which they allude and on which they are grounded, is the principal object of enlightened criticism. It is not easy to find a passage more illustrative of the truth of this assertion, than the following words of Moses: "And he made the stars." From this Mr. B. takes occasion to say, that "the stars he (Moses) regarded as ornamental spangles, the formation and collocation of which was hardly worthy of his notice." I wonder, that as Mr. B. makes Moses to suppose that the firmament was a solid arch, supporting the waters above, he did not proceed a step farther, and make him suppose them to be *icicles* hanging from the lowest surface of the celestial reservoir; the waters escaping being liable, from their great elevation, to freeze and to reflect the lustre of the sun which still shines on them, though set with regard to us. This would make the system palmed on the historian of creation uniform and brilliant; and though, from its brit-

teness, it might be brought to the ground by the sling of some Goliath, Mr. B. might hope, with the aid of his learned anonymous friend, to restore the splendid arch, by only following a few steps farther the smooth and airy plan of castle-builders. The stars in ancient times were thought to be gods. This was not the opinion of the ignorant only, but of the gravest philosophers; of Plato, of Aristotle and Cicero, &c., and the same notion doubtless prevailed since the origin of idolatry antecedently to the days of Moses. As these aerial gods, like nightly sentinels, go round the globe, and have their eye on every part of it, it was natural to conclude, that they influenced the destinies of its inhabitants. Hence the doctrine of astrology, a doctrine which enabled the selfish and cunning to bind in iron chains the souls and bodies of a great portion of mankind, from the earliest ages almost to the present. Moses, by a few words, dissolves this pernicious system, and blows it into air as with a potent spell. "And he made the stars;" as if he had said, "The stars are not gods, but the works of God; they are not made for our use, nor do they influence our happiness; and though they are well calculated to enlarge our ideas of the great Creator, they ought not to be themselves objects of our dread or reverence."

BEN DAVID.

*Cursory Remarks on the Island
Borneo, &c.*

(Concluded from p. 16.)

BEFORE a missionary entered their country, it would be necessary to get acquainted with one of the chiefs, and if he followed the example of St. Paul, to "become all things to all men," he would, perhaps, see it proper, or, at least, expedient, to go through the ceremony of fraternization with such chief. This ceremony being curious, I shall here describe it. The chief with his followers being assembled on the day appointed, a young cock chicken is killed at sun rising, and roasted while some rice is being boiled, by fuel of a peculiar kind of scented wood, during which, an old man (selected to act the priest on the

occasion) keeps chaunting a string of sentences in a language which he does not understand; probably, an invocation borrowed from Hindoo ceremonies. About 11 o'clock in the forenoon, the chief and his adopted brother are placed side by side, at the upper part of an elliptic circle, formed by the attendants. The aforesaid old man brings the victuals, and places it before the parties, and also two glasses, containing palm wine: he then takes a small dagger, and lifts up the skin of the right shoulder of one of the parties, takes thence a large drop of blood, and puts into the glass destined for the other, and also takes a drop of blood similarly from the other, and puts into the other glass, which they immediately drink off, amidst the huzzas of the attendants; the victuals are then eaten by the new-made brothers from off the same dish, and a keep-sake, such as a ring or tiger's tooth, or such like, is exchanged as a token, as also their daggers. The attendants then retire to their own houses to feast, and the chief thenceforth must be considered and treated in every respect as a brother, and he will not fail to act the part of one in every respect.

The conduct of the Arab missionaries who propagated Mahometanism in the Malayan Archipelago, should be held in view by the Christian messenger. They did not profess to be solely teachers of a new religion, but merchants and traders who took the native surplus produce from off their hands, and brought in return, conveniences and elegant articles much more valuable, at least in their estimation, while the increase in their comforts or gratifications, taught the natives to view them rather in the light of benefactors, than innovators or monopolists. Their principal obligation, however, viz., the extension of Islamism, was never lost sight of; and the result was, what any rational person would have anticipated from such prudent conduct, rapid and extensive conversion; and it was not till they acquired political power, and began to employ it for the purpose of enforcing the compulsory tenets of their religion, that conversion was suspended. The Aborigines are at this time in a very favourable state for the recep-

tion of genuine Christianity and consequent civilization. They are become sensible of the disadvantages of ignorance of letters and ciphers, and are anxious for their acquirement. A chief, with whom I became acquainted, anxiously wished to be able to put his ideas on paper; and though rather past the middle age of life, he acquired the art of writing very quickly. I of course taught him the Roman characters, with the exception of those which I considered unnecessary, viz., the C, and the X;* giving the broad or Teutonic pronunciation to the others, which, it may be remarked, agrees much better with all the Oriental languages, than the softened pronunciation adopted by the English. I never mentioned religion to him, except by inquiring what his ideas were on the subject; but his curiosity soon impelled him to seek information on the subject from me; and I gratified it, by telling him what we believe according to Unitarian tenets; and after sketching to him the history and contents of the Divine word, I took occasion to contrast the religion which represented God as love, and as a loving Father over all his works, with that of the ceremonious, bigoted, intolerant and bloody Mussulmen; and with the ignorance of his countrymen, which made them fit to be the prey of any delusion which might be introduced amongst them. I however acquainted him, that the greatest number of those people professing Christianity, held only a corrupted sort of it, being so corrupted by the remains of a flood of ignorance and anarchy, which overspread the world during the infancy of its establishment: the chief of which was a tenet relative to the One God and his chosen Messenger, and gifts dispensed by him, similar to that of the Hindoos, from whom, indeed, it appeared to have been taken by superstitious men, who had professed Christianity without examining its real nature and design. His unprejudiced mind acknowledged the truth as soon as it was stated, and anxiously

inquired how it could be introduced into his country. Probably, had the British Government kept a footing in the country, I should have endeavoured to follow up the impression which had been made, but I could not, under the then existing circumstances, spare time from the ship I was building, to attend properly to it. Seeing I could not come to his country as he wished, he proposed to abandon his lands and villages, and bring his people, to the number of near 2000 persons, to where I was; and there break up the surrounding forest, settle, and conform to my directions in all respects. The adjacent country did, indeed, offer abundance of room, being a fertile plain for 15 miles round, with a noble river and safe harbour; and no inhabitants besides the few people I had with me, who were native Javanese convicts. I was necessitated to dissuade him from the execution of this design, until it should be seen whether the British government would re-occupy the settlement, which I was then holding for them, and did continue to hold about 18 months after their departure. The Dutch government, in the neighbouring settlement, however, became jealous of the good understanding subsisting between the natives and me; and being fearful besides, that the British government would re-occupy so advantageous a situation, in a very few days after my launching the ship, sent about 500 troops with armed vessels, and took forcible possession of the place, without being able to assign any reason for such conduct; against which, therefore, I protested; and soon after left the place, and came away with all the people I had with me, leaving the country to the Dutch as I found it, viz., void of inhabitants. My friend, the chieftain, had returned to his country with the intention of bringing his two sons from thence, for the purpose of sending them to England with me; but the monsoon setting in earlier than usually happened, compelled me to sail from thence without them. The total population of Borneo does not, probably, exceed three millions of souls, and when it is known, that the island is one of the most healthy within the tropics, that it is in fact much more temperate

* Neither the V nor F is pronounced in their language; P being substituted for the latter.

than many countries situated in higher latitudes (which, by the way, is easily accounted for from local causes not necessary now to state); when it is known that the fertility of its soil is such that, with even very moderate cultivation, twenty millions would be far from sufficient population; when, further, it is taken into consideration that it abounds with many of the most valuable metallic and mineral productions, twenty millions more would find more than sufficient employment, in their extraction from the earth; and that, if cultivation and domestic industry were carried to the height in which they are in the neighbouring provinces of the Chinese empire, one hundred millions would enjoy a comfortable existence.* I say, when all the foregoing facts, as I may call them, are brought to view, it would, I should think, be rather difficult for some of Mr. Malthus's most rational admirers to prove his assertion, or rather leading principle, that in all countries population presses hard against the means of subsistence, (except they explain it to mean the actual, not pos-

* I have been to China and been much on shore, and have been very intimately conversant with the Chinese, who are found in the Archipelago, and I am enabled to contradict Mr. Malthus's assertion most completely as to their poor habits of living, and all the other doctrines he builds, as usual, on false premises. They are, on the contrary, the most luxurious people of Eastern Asia, and, at the same time, the hardest workers; and the poorer class of them who come from China, as labourers in the mines, are bent on saving every mite for the purpose of returning as soon as they have amassed a small sum; yet even these people will think themselves starved if they cannot live as well as Europeans; and three of them will consume as much provisions, and of a more nutritive sort, than any five of the natives, and also perform their work in rather a superior proportion. This conduct forms but an indifferent support to the assertion, that they are habituated to starvation. During a stay of several months at Canton, and going on shore every day, I saw but one child exposed, and as it was in the river, it is uncertain whether it had not fallen out of some of the floating houses.

sible means, which would amount to as much information as that two and two make four,) and human institutions, such as despotism, anarchy and slavery in politics, and bigotry, intolerance, superstition and ignorance in religion, are but as a feather in the scale compared with the misery resulting from the laws of nature, that is, the laws of God.

J. C. R.

P. S. Islands of Bally and Lomboch.
The first separated from the east end of Java, by a narrow strait; and the latter separated from the east of Bally by another strait: both these straits, with that which divides Lomboch from Lumbawa, the next island to the eastward, are much used by the European and American ships, as also those from Hindostan, bound to China during the N. W. monsoon, and by those returning from thence during the S. E. monsoon. After the triumph of Islamism over Hinduism in Java, its relics found an asylum in those two islands, where they have held out against the Mussulman power to this day; but they, however, tolerate Mahometanism and its professors under their government. The two islands are well cultivated and very populous, and the inhabitants more civilized than any other people of the Archipelago, except the Javanese; and were the five princes, who hold the government of those islands, to be united amongst themselves, no other native government would be able to withstand their power, for even singly they make themselves respected by their neighbours. I touched there on the last voyage, and being invited to see the Rajah in his capital, happened at the same time to have an opportunity of seeing the two widows of a deceased nobleman burn themselves, for and with him, agreeable to the Hindoo customs; but the mode was rather different, as the detail will shew. At a hill, some distance outside the town, in a place appropriated to those purposes, three covered platforms were erected at about forty yards apart, and in a line with each other, and fronting the east, having a furnace about twelve feet long by eight broad in front, walled to about eight or nine

feet high, and having a raised gangway of about ten paces, leading to it from the covered sheds (behind) aforementioned. Those furnaces were filled three or four feet deep with dry faggots, and when fully lighted, some Bramins brought out the corpse from the centre shed, and, proceeding to the side of the furnace, threw it in. About half an hour after this, the woman, who was in the shed to the left, (where she had been previously brought in a covered chair, highly decorated, and carried by people dressed in white, &c.,) came forth, attended by some Bramins very gaily drest, and having a small tame bird, of the dove kind, perched on her head. She then walked leisurely forward to the edge of the furnace, gradually inclined herself forwards, and made a sudden spring forwards and headlong into the fire; when the bird flew away, and the persons who surrounded the furnace instantly threw in great quantities of dry leaves, &c. so as to raise the flame to a great height. In about another half hour, the other woman made her appearance from the shed to the right, and walked forward on the gangway in the same manner, but evidently afraid and unwillingly, and when she came to the brink of the furnace, she hesitated some minutes, till the Bramins threatening to throw her in, (which would have obliterated the merit of her sacrifice,) she called up resolution, and plunged into the fire as the other did. The spectators, who were extremely numerous, including the Royal family, princes, women, children, &c., behaved with considerable order and decency, rather serious than otherwise: after the fire was burnt out they told us the bones would be collected and buried by the Bramins in one grave as usual, and as appeared to have been done all round on former occasions. These detestable sacrifices to ignorance are rather common, and we were informed, that but a little previous to our arrival, one of the Rajahs

of Bally had died, and that thirty of his wives were burnt at his burning, several of whom were thrown into the fire. It may be observed, that at the man's death all his wives are separately interrogated, whether they will be burned and go to paradise with him or live as slaves. If they choose the former, as they generally do, they are not allowed to retract afterwards; if they do, they are thrust through with a dagger, or thrown into the fire, which robs them of the merit of their suffering. These people, though following the Hindoo customs, are far from being bigoted to them, and the Mussulmen, who have been conquered by them, or become converts from their Hinduism, enjoy full toleration under their government.

These islands lie in the tract between Atlantic-America, Europe, Hindostan and China; and ships going thither during the N. W. monsoon, or returning thence during the S. E. monsoon, usually stop at one of these two islands to fill up their water, and procure refreshments, which, in consequence of the numerous population and consequently improved state of cultivation, are both cheap and abundant. Missionaries established on these islands would be much more comfortable than at many other stations where they now are, and if preachers of genuine Christianity, their success would be great, and by occupying themselves in teaching the knowledge of letters and useful arts, and, at the same time, carrying merchandise, as Christians should do, they would defray their expenses, and furnish themselves with increased means of doing good. The mode in which the Quakers carry on trade is, I think, a good model of such dealings as I here suggest, always observing that mercantile views should be reckoned subordinate to the main object of extending Christianity both by precept and example.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Letters of Mary Lepel, Lady Hervey, with a Memoir and Illustrative Notes.* 8vo. pp. 344. Murray. 1821.

TO whatever cause it be owing, whether to public spirit, to a sense of family-honour or to a love of gain, the descendants of persons distinguished in the last century, are industriously bringing to light manuscripts which explain the characters and events of that interesting period. The historian of England, from the Revolution downwards, will, therefore, possess ample materials for his undertaking; but it may be justly doubted, whether his knowledge of the secrets of the Court and of great families, will contribute to the dignity of his sketches. In history, as well as other provinces of art and literature, a certain degree of obscurity is necessary to sublimity.

MARY LEPEL was the daughter of a military officer, and maid of honour to Queen Caroline, then Princess of Wales. She was early celebrated for her wit and beauty, which recommended her to John Lord Hervey, son of the Earl of Bristol, whose wife she became in 1720. Lord Hervey was the foremost beau of his age, a courtier, small poet and parliamentary orator. He is unfortunately made immortal by some witty, but malignant, verses of Pope's, which he is said to have wantonly provoked; but appears in a better, though fainter light to posterity, as the friend of Dr. Conyers Middleton.

Lady Hervey was a woman of eminent accomplishments. Her Letters are not always, however, in the best taste. She *affects* Latin quotations, and takes upon her too much of a political character. For an Englishwoman she has an undue liking for the literature and manners of France. She wants too, that sense of religion, without which, the female character is always glaringly and offensively imperfect; for though she is politically of the Established Church, she shews

herself at heart a free-thinker. But, with all these drawbacks, we feel interested in her epistolary productions, and are persuaded, that if the present volume do not prove a popular book, its merits will, at least, save it from oblivion. The Letters were written at a late period of Lady Hervey's life, and chiefly after her husband's death, which may account for their exhibiting little of that vivacity and grace which fascinated the most eminent contemporaries of her youth: they are, nevertheless, far from dull, and sometimes spirited; the fair writer's criticisms on books, and her judgments on mankind, are generally characterized by sound sense; and some facts are related by her which will assist the biographer, if not the historian.

The person to whom the Letters are addressed, was the Rev. Edmund Morris, who had been tutor to her sons, and who, at the time the correspondence begins, was settled down, as a country clergyman, in Hampshire. He was of the low church party, and looked up to Bishop Hoadly as a patron.

The Editor of this work is unknown. His "Memoir" is very scanty; his "Notes" are for the most part judicious and useful. Were they less tinged with Toryism they would, in our judgment, lose nothing of their value.

It does not appear, whether the Letters are published by the family of Mr. Morris, or that of Lady Hervey, whose grandson is the present Earl of Bristol.

The Correspondence begins at a stormy period of our history, the year 1742. At that time, less practical liberty was, we apprehend, enjoyed, than at the present moment. What letter-writer now thinks of saying to a correspondent, "Do not, for the future, use the *formality of signing* your letters: you may possibly have occasion to write such news as may be *better unsigned*?" (P. 15.)

A remark of the Editor's (p. 16)

upon Lady Hervey's picture of the times, that there is little new under the sun, will frequently occur to the reader of this volume. The date of 1822, would suit the following extract as well as that of 1744, when it was penned :

"I find by your letters both to my son and me, that you are in a *patriot* fright, which, on this occasion, is synonymous to a panic fright on any other. I wish you were here ; you would make a trio in the pathetic, political performance I hear every noon, which I sometimes hiss and sometimes parody—*what should be great I turn to farce* : if I did not, the tragedy would be too deep to hear repeated every day. I hope things are better than my tragedians represent them, and have one reason to hope it ; which is, that above five-and-twenty years ago I heard the same dreadful prophecies from the same dreadful prophets, and was advised to sell immediately out of the stocks, for there would come a sponge in less than a year. That year and four-and-twenty more are passed without the sponge, therefore, *dum spiro sperabo* : my reason, my experience and my spirits, (which latter, I thank God, are not English,) all concur in enabling me to do so. Had I cried for my country as long as Lord Bristol has been telling me I ought to do so, I should not by this time have had an eye left to cry with ; and now I have two, and a mouth to laugh, which I am resolved to make use of as long as I can. I don't know whether this is philosophy or madness ; but, if it be the latter, I may say, with Torresmond, '*There is a pleasure in being mad, which none but mad folks know* ;' and if any wisely endeavour to cure me of it, I shall say with the Argive lunatic, '*Pol, me occidistis, non servastis*.' When I remind Lord Bristol how long it is since he bespoke my tears for my *ruined country*, he shakes his head, and says, 'Ay, Madam ! but it is nearer and nearer, and must happen at last :' therefore, according to his method, one should begin to weep for one's children as soon as they are born ; for they must die at last, and every day brings them nearer to it. Let his Lordship be a disciple of Heraclitus if he will ; I prefer Democritus, and should be glad to have you of the same sect. *Ride si sapis !*" pp. 80—82.

The period comprised between the accession of Charles I. and that of Geo. III., was "the reign of pamphlets." For the last half century, political warfare has been chiefly carried

on by means of newspapers. These Letters shew the interest taken in the writer's day, in the former species of ephemeral literature. She mentions, and with becoming disapprobation, (p. 19,) a political parody of the Te Deum, of which, she says, that the wit does not compensate the impiety.

Several heterodox divines and (*proh pudor !*) bishops are brought forward in this volume. Lady Hervey praises or blames them according to their individual merits : her Editor, who is probably a clergyman, takes uniform offence at the name of an unsound churchman. The story of Dr. Thomas Rundle is well-known. In 1733, Lord Chancellor Talbot recommended him for the see of Gloucester ; but the heads of the English Church resisted the appointment, and Rundle "was obliged to content himself with the lucrative bishopric of Derry, in Ireland." Rundle is described, by Lady Hervey, as the greatest flatterer and greatest talker she ever knew. (P. 51.) Her ladyship speaks with great respect of Bishop Hoadly : not so, her Editor, who complains of Queen Caroline's being somewhat of a latitudinarian, and using her influence to raise prelates of suspicious orthodoxy to the bench. Of Hoadly, he says, in this connexion,

"His Lordship was almost a Dissenter, or, at least, what would now-a-days be called a very *liberal* Christian. When some Free-thinking writers were mentioned before Archbishop Secker as being Christians, 'Yes,' said he, in allusion to the principles of the Bishop, and the title of the books printed for Winchester School, 'Yes, Christians *secundum usum Winton !*' And yet we find that the orthodox Archbishop himself has not escaped similar and even worse imputations. I have read somewhere that Secker was an *Atheist !*"—P. 94, Note.

Dr. Conyers Middleton has been before mentioned as the friend of Lord Hervey. To this nobleman he dedicated his great work, the *Life of Cicero*. He was on terms of friendship with Lady Hervey, who appears to have embraced his principal opinions. The Letters shew an incessant interest, and even anxiety, with regard to his various controversial publications. This displeases the Editor, who will not allow Middleton to

have been a sincere Christian (p. 145, note): it might mend his charity if he would condescend to read this writer's eloquent letter to Mr. Venn, on "evangelical" defamation. (Works, 8vo. I. 421, &c.) With very censurable neglect, to say the least, this anonymous critic quotes a passage from one of Middleton's "private letters," in order to disgrace him, without referring to any publication, or in any other manner authenticating the quotation. Supposing it to be genuine, it does reflect discredit upon Middleton, but how many other dignified clergymen have there been, and are there, at whose Christian integrity it virtually glances! The Editor's remark is as follows:

"Lady Hervey would probably not have thought so highly of him if she had known that he had subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles *politically*, merely to obtain the living of Hascombe, although he was in affluent circumstances, which ought to have put him above such deplorable meanness. His avowal, too, of this act in one of his private letters is almost as shameless as the act itself: 'Though there are many things in the Church which I wholly dislike, yet, while I am content to acquiesce in the *ill*, I should be glad to taste a little of the good, and to have some amends for the *ugly assent and consent*, which no man of sense can approve.' *The spirit of a philosopher*, forsooth!"—P. 60, 61, Note.

Mr. Morris appears, from one of the Letters, to have recommended to his distinguished correspondent, one of the works of Dr. James Foster. She replies, that she has not so great an opinion of him as Mr. Morris expresses; and adds, most unwarrantably, "I believe he is a man of *parts*, but, with all his Presbyterian sanctity, as much a man of the world as any one." (Pp. 151, 152.) Never was character more mistaken, for if there were any two features of "modest Foster's" character more striking than any others, they were his freedom from all professional and sectarian affectation, and his disinterestedness. But a Dissenting minister is, we apprehend, always regarded by persons in high life, as a person to be either suspected or pitied. The orthodox Editor says, "his works are now nearly forgotten:"—this is somewhat too

much, for we apprehend, that, with the exception of the Calvinistic party, the clergy have not yet left off preaching Foster. His Sermons, we say fearlessly, are entitled to a permanent place in that class of English literature; and will, we predict, keep it, notwithstanding his having been "a Dissenting minister."

Lady Hervey's own religion was of a very doubtful kind. She explains it thus: "I will think as I can, *believe as I must*, do as little hurt and as much good as I am able, and *take my chance* for the consequences." (P. 57.) On this subject, she writes from Paris, Jan. 5, 1751, a characteristic anecdote:

"I was, a few days ago, agreeably entertained by meeting, at a third place, a very deep, acute, determined Deist, who undertook me and a very sensible, cautious Abbé; after arguing, twisting and turning about our several arguments very cleverly, and shewing what he called our different, but continued inconsistencies, he very dexterously turned us upon one another; ridiculed both our tenets; and ended by saying, my antagonist the Abbé was determined to believe more than he could; and that I was ready to give up as much as I dared. I wish you had been there to have heard it all, and to have assisted me; for I own I sometimes wanted it. Altogether, it was very agreeable and very entertaining, as there was warmth enough on all sides to keep up a spirit, and not heat enough to produce any ill-humour."—P. 184.

The uncertainty of Lady Hervey's mind upon religion, left her a frequent prey to apprehension and melancholy. She grows sad as she grows old. In 1748, she writes, "There is nothing wanting to my present happiness but the thoughts of its continuance; but the knowing how short its duration will be, is" (the italics are copied) "*the cruel something that corrodes and leavens all the rest.*" (P. 135.) In 1767,—"*I find a life after sixty is but a burthensome affair, &c. All one can do is to suffer life; to enjoy it is impossible. This is a bad prospect,*" &c. (P. 327.) Again,—"*There is a cruel difference between youth and age,*" &c. (P. 328.) And in her *last* letter, dated June 22, 1768, (she died the 2d of September following,) she speaks miserably concerning death,

and profanely (though in borrowed language) of an hereafter:

“What you seem most to apprehend is not a subject of horror to me. I think about it as I do about death; 'tis not *that* I fear, but 'tis the way to it; 'tis the struggles, the last convulsions that I dread; for when once they are over, I don't question but to rise to a new and better life. Dr. Garth, I remember, used to say, '*I vow to God, Madam, I take this to be hell, purgatory at least; we shall certainly be better off in any other world.*' I think I am of his opinion.”—Pp. 330, 331.

Like the greater part of the fashionable world, this lady had no conception of religion but as an instrument of human policy, legitimated by parliamentary or royal authority. She expresses in one place her approbation of the Reformation conducted by that Christian Reformer Henry the Eighth, but at the same time her great doubts of the right of Luther and Calvin to go so far as they did in opposition to ecclesiastical usage! Here she had forgotten her preceptor, Dr. Middleton.

The fanatical admiration of Frederic the Great (as he is styled by courtesy), King of Prussia, which has been exposed in our IXth Volume, p. 548, infected Lady Hervey, who ridiculously describes the heartless monarch as “something in the great scale of beings between man and a deity!” (P. 235.)

We meet occasionally with lively descriptions of Lady Hervey's French acquaintances; the picture of Fontenelle in the letter from Paris, before referred to, of Jan. 5, 1751, is very pleasing:

“I dine sometimes with a set of *beaux esprits*, among which old Fontenelle presides. He has no mark of age but wrinkles and a degree of deafness; but when, by sitting near him, you make him hear you, he never fails to understand you, and always answers with that liveliness, and a sort of prettiness peculiar to himself. He often repeats and applies his own and other people's poetry very agreeably; but only occasionally, as it is proper and applicable to the subject. He has still a great deal of gallantry in his turn and in his discourse. He is ninety-two, and has the cheerfulness, liveliness, and even the taste and appetite of twenty-two.”—P. 183.

VOL. XVII.

P

Lady Hervey lifts up the veil which Earl Waldegrave forebore to remove, and shews us the nature of royal pastimes. Her introductory remark is not on a courtly theme; but from “horned cattle” she presently ascends to the family of Frederic Prince of Wales, at Leicester House:

“I hear the distemper among the cattle breaks out in many new places. The town is sickly; and nothing seems prosperous but gaming and gamesters. 'Tis really prodigious to see how deep the ladies play; but in spite of all these irregularities, the Prince's family is an example of innocent and cheerful amusements. All this last summer they played abroad; and now, in the winter, in a large room, they divert themselves at base-ball, a play all who are or have been school-boys are well acquainted with. The ladies, as well as gentlemen, join in this amusement; and the latter return the compliment in the evening, by playing for an hour at the old and innocent game of push-pin, at which *they* chiefly excel, (if they are not flattered,) who ought in every thing to precede. This innocence and excellence must needs give great joy, as well as great hopes, to all real lovers of their country and posterity.”—Pp. 139, 140.

This extract was written, Nov. 14, 1748. On the 1st of the next February, she returns to the Prince of Wales, whom she denominates *Sosia*: “As for the *Sosia*, I agree with you, and firmly believe the *prologue* and *epilogue* are both his own; at least they are (as Lord Paulet, when he was Lord Hinton, once told him, on being asked his opinion of some of his poetical performances) worthy of his Royal Highness.” P. 147. It is not a part of the court religion to praise princes long dead, especially princes that were never perfected by becoming kings, and therefore the Editor gives us, in a note on this passage, (pp. 147, 148,) the following scarcely decorous intelligence and half-disloyal reflection:

“Why Frederic Prince of Wales is here called *Sosia*, I do not see; but the rest of the allusion is to the play of *Cato*, performed on Wednesday the 4th of January, at Leicester House, by his Royal Highness' children, and some other boys; a copy of the cast of characters may, perhaps, amuse the reader.
Cato, Master Nugent.

Portius, Prince George (George III.).
 Juba, Prince Edward, Duke of York.
 Sempronius, Master Evelyn.
 Lucius, Master Montague.
 Decius, Lord Milsington.
 Syphax, Master North.
 Marcus, Master Madden.
 Marcia, Princess Augusta (Duchess
 of Brunswick).
 Lucia, Princess Elizabeth.

"The Prologue, spoken by Prince George, and Epilogue, by Princess Augusta and Prince Edward, were but indifferent compositions, particularly the latter; which may indeed have been written by the Prince himself. As a specimen I shall copy the concluding lines:

"*Prince Edward.*

"In England born, my inclination,
 Like yours, is wedded to this nation:
 And future times, I hope, will see
 Me, General in reality.
 Indeed, I wish to serve this land;
 It is my father's strict command:
 And none he ever gave shall be
 More cheerfully obey'd by me."

"And all this mummary and doggrel was intended less to amuse the children, than to vex their grandfather, and make the father popular in his opposition to the King."—Pp. 147, 148.

We cannot make any further use of this interesting volume; interesting to all readers, but especially to those in the circles of fashion and power, whom it admonishes, in effect, to take care what letters they write, lest on the turn of the next century their great grand-children should shew the public of that age, by their secret correspondence, what are their real opinions of personages, whom, as in duty bound and as interest prompts, they now praise and extol in the high places.

ART. II.—*A Plea for the Nazarenes: in a Letter to the British Reviewer.* By Servetus. 8vo. pp. 208. Bristol, printed and sold by Manchee; sold in London by R. Hunter and by John Robinson. 1821.

THE *British Review*, a quarterly journal, in the hands of the soi-disant Evangelical churchmen, has exceeded the usual bounds of the odium theologicum, in its attacks upon the Unitarians. One of its philippics has drawn upon it the animadversions of the writer before us, to whose mas-

terly pen we are indebted for the valuable work, so largely reviewed in a former volume (XIV. 431 and 500), entitled, "*An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition on behalf of the Unitarian Faith.*" *Servetus* discusses and refutes the arguments, exposes the unwarrantable assumptions, chastises the bigotry and repels the calumnies of the anonymous Reviewer. This fanatical Trinitarian preaches up a new crusade against the infidel Unitarians, and calls upon all believers of every orthodox denomination to unite under the tri-une standard. The Unitarian is emphatically "*The Enemy.*" What can the reverend * Reviewer mean? Already the orthodox are united in refusing the name of *Christian* to a sect of which Lardner was the ornament and the champion. They cannot go further in abusive and scandalous language. Nothing would seem to remain for the zeal of true believers to accomplish, but some measure of personal violence or secular injury. This, however, is not yet avowed, and is not likely, we humbly think, to be carried into effect. But we leave the author of the mysterious project to the lash of *Servetus*, who retorts upon him the charge of heresy, and proves, again and again, that his doctrine is as anti-evangelical as his temper.

The anonymous accuser draws up his indictment in the spirit, and almost in the language, of that enlightened statesman, Haman (*Esther* iii. 8, 9): in behalf of the sect who are not to be suffered, because they are "*diverse from all people,*" *Servetus* thus pleads:

"The assumption that Unitarians worship a different God from that worshiped by the general church is (I might say unjust to the general church, but I will say, if you please) unjust to the Unitarians. They who acknowledge the Father to be the sole, self-existent being, the root of Deity and the fountain of love, worship, with the Unitarian, the Father as properly and supremely God. They who worship a sole, eternal, infinite and indivisible being, assuming towards his creatures the offices or relations of Father, Son and Spirit, worship, with the Unitarian, a common God: but it must be owned that we do *not* worship the

* It is reported that the writer is a clergyman.

Popish God: that we do not worship the God of the Athanasian Evangelians: that we have not a common object of worship with the *Anthropomorphite Trinitarians*, who, denying that the Father of Israel is their Saviour, and the Most High God their Redeemer, bow the knee to the HUMANITY of GOD in the person of his CRUCIFIED SON."—P. 27.

Servetus examines some of the Reviewer's criticisms on former Unitarian writers, and hesitates not to avow his dissent from some of their arguments and conclusions.

"In another place you seize hold on what you regard as a concession of Mr. Yates, fatal to the Unitarian cause: that 'he is unable to form a very decided opinion on the meaning of the phrase 'calling on the name of the Lord:'" Acts ix. 14—21; 1 Cor. i. 2. I do not wonder at your seizing this advantage: I only wonder that it should have been given you: and I must again remind you that your bringing forward the opinion of an individual proves nothing, unless you can prove that the general body of Unitarians hold the same: but so far from being able to prove this, you must in the present instance be fully aware of the contrary. Mr. Yates, and not the Unitarians, is responsible for the doubt and the difficulty. Wakefield, a competent scholar, I presume, thought the proper rendering of the words was 'being called by the name of the Lord,' or 'taking his name upon them.' What, then, is to be done? We must step out of the 'single text,' and take our stand on the broad analogy of Scripture. We there find that the apostles 'bowed the knees to the FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It happens, however, that there can be no doubt, and that there is no difficulty. The phrase is neither more nor less than a Hebraism (for, strange to say, though you and Bishop Horsley imagine that the apostles were inspired to write modern idioms for the express use of the English nation, they actually employed the language of their age and country); the calling on the name, or calling a name upon them, implies no more than the being enrolled as the followers of him by whose name they are called.

"I dissent, as much as you can do, from the supposition of Mr. Yates, that this passage is purposely left as a trial of our humility; for if idiomatical usage did not authorise the construction of 'calling his name upon them,' or 'being named by his name,' still it would not follow that, because praying in Christ's name and being baptized into Christ's name, they were said to call on Christ's name,

therefore they invoked Christ as himself the object of prayer. The word *ἐπικαλεσθαι* is the same that occurs in the passage of Acts, 'I appeal unto Cæsar:' Acts xxiv. 11. It has, therefore, no necessary and inseparable connexion with religious invocation."—Pp. 72—74.

"The next charge is more serious: you really appear, for once, to be in the right, in so far as *the individual* is concerned. Mr. Worsley, as well as Mr. Yates, must 'bear his own burthen.' I have not the book before me, and I cannot, therefore, tell whether you have garbled the extracts or stated them fairly: but his allusion to the *Magi*, which you, of course, hold up to your readers as a specimen of the way in which Unitarians treat *Scripture*, is probably connected with a doubt whether this much-canvassed narrative *be* Scripture or no. But your chief charge respects the name of the LORD OF HOSTS. That political preachers have perverted this title, to consecrate the unhallowed ambition of statesmen delighting in war, is a fact that requires no proof: but it seems strange that Mr. Worsley should both have countenanced this false interpretation by regarding it as the sense of the Hebrew nation, and that he should have overlooked the occurrence of the name in passages of unequivocal inspiration. By describing the writer, with mock gravity of information, as 'no Deist, but a minister of a Dissenting congregation, who dedicates his work to the Unitarian Fund,' you wish to convey the impression that the identity of the Hebrew title *Lord of Hosts* with that of the *God of Battles* of the northern nations, is the familiar and approved construction of Unitarians. Your malice shall be disappointed. I shall simply refer the reader to a Sermon, entitled '*The name Lord of Hosts explained and improved, by JOSHUA TOULMIN, D. D.*' It is there expounded as implying dominion over *the hosts of heaven*, 'the moon and the stars which he had made:' thus involving at once a reproof and refutation of the Gentile worship of the planetary idols. I mention the definition, because though 'smelling blasphemy afar off,' in Mr. Worsley's mistaken irreverence for the term, I suspect you lie under the same mistake as to its import. The blunder was originally *Voltaire's*.* You will not be able to make much of this discovery. Mr. Worsley is in orthodox company."—Pp. 81—83.

Charges of various kinds are pre-

* "Dictionnaire Philosophique, *Guerre*, p. 108."

ferred by the Reviewer against the Unitarians; one extract will shew how well-prepared Servetus is to meet them.

“ Our preaching is *political*. This reproach does really exceed all that I could have conceived of the *powers of face*. You happen to light on a sermon of a political cast by Mr. Madge, of Norwich, (a young minister singularly distinguished by the spiritual fervour of his general pulpit eloquence,) and you observe, ‘ This is what we must look for from Unitarians. When we find controversy substituted for religion, [Paul’s disputing at Athens was, it seems, no religion,] we may naturally expect *faction* for politics.’ Meaning by faction, as appears from the rest of your quotation, a disapprobation of what are called *Holy Alliances*. Perhaps, Sir, you will inform me what occasion of political preaching has ever been let slip by the ministers of your schism? What address or petition to the King or the National Council has ever been agitated without

Your pulpit, drum ecclesiastic,

Being beat with fist instead of a stick?

Is it not a fact as palpable as ‘ the sun is visible at noon-day,’ that you have absolutely thinned your churches, and disgusted both the rich and the poor of your congregations, who, when ‘ *hungering after the bread of life*,’ have been dieted on the froth of your whipt loyalty and the cream of your time-serving adulation? ‘ *The hustings of Westminster*,’ indeed! Do you know how many fathers of families have stayed at home, and read *Secker* or *Paley* to their children, that they might escape the Sibylline furor of your party spirit, sucked from the leaves of the *Courier* newspaper? The hypocrisy of your charge is only equalled by its diverting simplicity. You have no dislike to political preaching in itself; but the politics must be of your own dictation. It consists with the duties of a preacher to palliate and uphold the art and mystery of governing by a systematic violation of the laws of the constitution, or to brand Dissenters (whom, though you court them with a fawning show of liberality to serve a purpose of persecution, you yet both fear and hate) as turbulent schismatics and sowers of sedition; but he must not say a word of those great cardinal maxims of civil and religious freedom, which speak unto us from the ashes of English martyrs, or the ‘ gory bed’ of patriots who died for liberty. The former is to inculcate the ‘ *fearing God and honouring the King* ;’ the latter is to preach *faction*.

“ The secret is, that the preachers of

your school have adopted with approbation as an axiom the inference of *Rousseau*, which so many other infidels have echoed, and which, perhaps, has been, and still is, a principal cause of their being infidels,—that ‘ *the spirit of the gospel is favourable to tyrants, and that true Christians are formed for slaves*.’ How utterly repugnant such a notion is to the genius of that religion of which the earliest promulgators were distinguished by their ‘ *boldness*,’ is satisfactorily shewn by *Dr. Leechman*, in his Discourse on ‘ *the Excellency of the spirit of Christianity*.’ As a *Presbyterian* he had, indeed, some fond notions of liberty, incompatible with the notions of a true Episcopalian; and his alleging it to be a mistake that God, by the propitiation through Christ, was rendered merciful and placable when he was otherwise before, for that ‘ *it is so far from being the cause of the divine mercy that it is the effect of it*,’ will not recommend his authority to you in other matters; but, as he comes within the pale of your ‘ *general church*,’ which differs on these ‘ *all-important points*,’ and is yet a true church, though the Nazareans, so differing, stand convicted of being a false church, I shall press on your consideration an extract from the above discourse: ‘ *Whenever this superiority to the fear of man and the fear of temporal evils and dangers flows from the principles of the gospel, it is accompanied with a noble freedom and independence of soul that can never dwell with mean and slavish principles*.’ ”—Pp. 85—90.

The Reviewer has provoked inquiry into the character and merits of Bishop Horsley.

“ It may seem extraordinary that you, Sir, who seldom speak of the actual church without a hint at slumbering prelacy, or at ‘ *spiritual wickedness in high places*,’ should bestow such pompous eulogies on the high-church bishop, the great Goliath of Gath, Dr. Horsley. I can easily perceive why you do this. He is held up (partly from error, partly policy) as the champion of the Church of England. Any defence of *any* Trinity was thought to call for gratitude. But the Athanasianism of the Bishop is directly opposed to the Oxford decree, as it is to the private opinions of the regular church, which fluctuate between this decree and the ‘ *Scripture doctrine*’ of Samuel Clarke. Again, Dr. Horsley’s damnable dogma, that ‘ *the moral good of Unitarians is sin*,’ stands contradicted by all the sound divines of the Establishment, living or dead; by all, in short, (and they are still many,) who hold with the Apostle John,

that 'he who DOETH righteousness is righteous.' This creed-and-article theologian combats, therefore, under false colours: he is, in fact, your proper leader. You are fighting your own cause, while contending under his shield; and, at the same time, you gain credit for your fealty to the church.

"After being introduced to the *real* learning and rational piety of the old church-divines; (whose doctrinal creed neither constituted their whole of religion, nor narrowed the expansiveness of their Christian affection)—after witnessing their profound and practical knowledge of the human heart—their milk of human kindness—their zeal for things pertaining to salvation, not for strifes of words and oppositions of science—their language and their thoughts alike tinged with the study of their Bibles,—we seem dropping from 'the pure empyrean' to a region of fen and fog, when we light on this supercilious Doctor of school-divinity (*'tout hérissé de Grec, tout bouffi d'arrogance'*); this proud, secular, intolerant, and intermeddling priest; this minion of a court and theologian of a college.

"Every thing in Bishop Horsley is bigoted and pedantic: he is no less wanting in comprehension of mind than in enlargement of heart. His proficiency in the mathematics is unquestioned; but, generally speaking, his knowledge, compounded of academical erudition and ecclesiastical theology, with a strong infusion of the reveries of the schoolmen and the abstractions of *Platonism*, was of that kind 'which puffeth up,' rather than that which is made available to the elucidation of truth. His posthumous work on the *Psalms* is a continued burlesque on the sacred oracles."—Pp. 91—95.

We are tempted to give a specimen of Servetus's critical acumen.

"I shall add only one more example of your docility to the 'simple teachings of Scripture,' which is furnished me by the established version and orthodox interpretation of 1 Tim. vi. 15—'Until the appearing of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords: who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting.'

"Though you are 'children of light,' Sir, you are, at the same time, 'wise in your generation.' You have the sagacity to see that BY THIS SINGLE TEXT MUST

STAND OR FALL THE ATHANASIAN TRINITY; for if the Father be intended by the blessed and only Potentate, and if the Father alone hath immortality, then Jesus, the Son of God, is not God supreme. Disregarding, therefore, the exclusion of THE FATHER from blessedness, supremacy and immortality, which must follow if Christ be the agent (and it must be confessed the Father is that person of the Trinity whom, as you could most easily dispense with, you treat with least ceremony); and finding that Christ having, in Revelations, the *title* of the Word of God, which dwelled in him, has also the *title* of the King of kings and Lord of lords, whose ambassador and representative he was (though he is, *therefore*, no more the Supreme Being than the faithful servant, on whom he promises to 'write the name of HIS God,' would *therefore* be God); seeing and reasoning thus, you do not read the words as even in their present position they would be most naturally read, 'which he, who is the blessed and only Potentate, will shew;' but you make *who* refer to *Jesus Christ*, who is thus identified at once with the 'only Potentate;' and though, in Revelations, he describes himself as he 'that liveth and *was dead*,' is declared 'alone to have immortality;' and though John proclaims him to the disciples as having been 'seen with their eyes,'* as the medium of the word of life, is asserted 'never to have been seen, and to be incapable of being seen by any man;' and yet he is to appear, or to *shew* his own *appearing*, and 'all eyes shall see him.' Of all these contradictions the Scripture is guiltless.

"—*μέχρι της επιφανειας του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου ην καιροι ιδιοις δειξει ο μακαριος και μονος δυναστης, ο Βασιλευς των βασιλευντων και Κυριος των κυριευντων, ο μονος εχων αθανασιαν, φως οικων απροσιτον, ον ειδεν ουδεις ανθρωπων, ουδε ειδειν δυναται ο τιμη και κρατος αιωνιον.*

"Now it will be seen, by the most

* "John i. 18, Jesus tells the Jews, 'Ye have not seen his shape:' v. 37, it was the 'glory of the Lord,' or a symbol of his local presence, which the Israelites saw: Ex. xvi. 7, and thus we must explain the elders 'seeing the God of Israel:' Ex. xxiv. 10. When Jesus says, 'He who hath seen me hath seen the Father,' (a text strangely urged in proof of his deity, by those who affirm that he was God *the Son*), he explains his own allusion by the works which the Father did through him.—John xiv. 9, 10, 5; as also xv. 24."

superficial scholar, that in this passage there is no mention of *he who* at all; for, though the article frequently expresses this pronoun, it is here simply an article; and, in order to use it as a pronoun, the translators are obliged to disjoin it from the noun to which it is prefixed, and to supply the verb *is*, in order to complete the sense. The translation would run literally thus:—

“Till the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, in his own times, THE BLESSED AND ONLY POTENTATE WILL SHEW; the King of kings and Lord of lords, alone having immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom none of men hath beheld, nor is able to behold; to whom be honour and power everlasting.

“What, Sir, are we to think of all this? And with what grave modesty or consistency do you and your party stand forward to accuse us of setting Scripture on the rack, and forcing it to give a testimony! What becomes of your boast of pressing us home with Bible-truths, and hooking us on a text? Remember, Sir, ‘it is dreadful when men take the gospel of God *into their own hands*, and *modify* and mitigate it ACCORDING TO THEIR FANCIES.’—*British Review*, p. 209.”—Pp. 130—133.

Servetus concludes his letter with the following spirited passage, relating to one of the common-places of orthodox invective:

“I reserve for the last what you appear to think the grand demonstration of our being a false church: namely, the alleged frigidity of our spirit of proselytism, and the confined scale of our missionary operations. And here again you forget our dwindled and dwindling numbers, and our utter insignificance and obscurity as a religious society. But, Sir, may I be allowed to question the purity of that disinterested zeal for the souls of men, which you blazon in miraculous pulpit-narratives and Bible-society orations; and, ‘creeping into houses, make captive easy women,’ whom you flatter by comparing with the *Marys* and the *Magdalenes* that followed the steps of Jesus? You act, Sir, upon Heathens, upon gross and half-intellectual savages, who embrace *your* faith, and who accept, as the bread from heaven, the Calvinistic gospel. But your brethren have, properly, an instinctive horror both of a *Jew* and a *Mahometan*. It is only equalled by their horror of a *Unitarian*. The very mention of the latter, in connexion with a *Mahometan*, is thought of sufficient point to save a page of reasoning;

and this with your party is, at least, something. You seem equally ignorant with the lowest of the vulgar, that the imposture of the Koran is ingrafted on the Mosaic and Christian Scriptures. The *Hindoo*, who worships a shapeless stone as his household deity, is the constant object of your almost weeping concern. The dupe of the false prophet, who notwithstanding, abhors an idol, and who maintains ‘there is no other god but God,’ is shunned as if he were a wild beast, rather than one of those whom the common Father of all ‘has made of one blood to dwell on the face of the whole earth.’ Though at one time you reproach us with our apathy in the work of proselytism, at another you make merry with our zeal. The fact is, we do not please you in selecting our subjects. The desire to convert the Mahometans, which our people have sometimes manifested, is called ‘having a warm side towards them.’ The insinuation will serve just as well for the *Trinitarian* promoters of missions to the *triad-worshipping* HINDOOS. The same indifference appears in your treatment of moral Atheists and philosophical Deists. Here, again, you seem to shrink back with a ‘conscious hollowness’ of cause, and appear not at all solicitous to ‘snatch them as brands from the burning.’ Your motive for this coldness is, in part, your aversion for whatever presumes or enforces the *reasonableness of Christianity*. You are sensible that the intelligent sceptic will not yield up his reason to that which contradicts reason. Believing that the contradiction to human reason is the great evidence of supernatural truth, you make no attempt to produce conviction by reasoning; but, when pressed by infidel arguments, reply by uttering the damnable clauses of your creed, and ‘thanking God that you are not as other men are.’ The hardness of your creed, and the terrific medium through which you contemplate God, have their natural effect in familiarizing to your imagination a cool, and perhaps self-complacent, estimate of the numbers sealed to perdition.

“But, Sir, if we cannot boast so much of our missionary miracles abroad, we have not ‘buried our single talent’ at home. We may at least say, though without the boasting of the *godly*, that, in this our native land, we have sown the seeds of that ‘righteousness which alone exalteth a nation.’ Many of our countrymen, through our preaching of the gospel in its ‘simplicity,’ have been brought to the knowledge of a ‘God’ who is ‘love,’ and to the practical obedience of the gospel which he gave.

by his Son. We have paramount calls and claims upon our sympathies and our resources. We have to assist those who, by studying the Scripture for themselves, have submitted their educational prejudices to the testimony of Christ, that the Father is 'the only true God.' We have to assist female teachers, deprived of their scholars, and masters of charity-schools, who on some detected point of private heterodoxy, are turned from the house that sheltered themselves and their infants, in the darkness of midnight, and 'amid the pelting of the pitiless storm.' We have seen the vision of those who cry, earnestly, 'Come and help us,' from places where the believers in the One God and Father are cursed in the name of the Lord. We may at least say, that we have stood between the REPUTED HERETIC and his HOLY OPPRESSOR; that, through our intervention, the 'prey has been rescued from the teeth of the spoiler;' that, through our instrumentality, under the blessing of Him who 'prospereth the work of the hands,' 'the sparrow hath found a house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O LORD OF HOSTS! MY KING and MY GOD!" —Pp. 177—181.

The British Review is, we apprehend, very little known amongst Unitarians: for their sake an answer was not necessary: but when it is considered, that the charge which is not answered is commonly pronounced unanswerable, and that there is a large class of readers who are easily imposed upon, by the specious misrepresentations and oracular decisions of Reviewers, Servetus's defence of his brethren must be allowed to be reasonable, and to entitle him to the thanks of "the sect every where spoken against" and every where prevailing.

ART. III.—*Reflections upon the History of the Creation in the Book of Genesis: a Discourse, delivered at Warrington, August 19, 1821: and published at the Request of the Ministers, and of the Congregation.* By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street, Strand. 8vo. pp. 36. Hunter.

THIS is not one of those sermons that are forgotten as soon as published. The pages of the Monthly Repository shew that it has excited

a lively interest amongst theologians, and the controversy which it has occasioned must be allowed to be of considerable importance. Mr. Belsham states his opinions with his usual clearness, and maintains them with his usual ability. The question to which the sermon has given rise will therefore be argued with this advantage, that the preacher has not left the possibility of a doubt concerning what he himself intends.

Mr. Belsham takes for his text Gen. i. 1, and states in the introduction to his discourse his acquiescence in the conjecture of some learned men, that this book is a compilation of ancient documents. These, he thinks, may be traced to at least three different writers; for this he assigns the following reasons:

"First, that there are many passages, and some whole chapters, in which the word *God* (in the original *Elohim*) is constantly used to denote the Supreme Being, and no other title is applied to the Divine Majesty. Secondly, in other passages the word *Lord* (in the original *Jehovah*) only is used, and the appellation *God* is excluded; excepting that in a few instances it is joined with the other, and the Divine Being is called *Jehovah-Elohim*, the *Lord God*. Thirdly, there are other passages, and even whole chapters, from which the words, both *God* and *Lord*, and every other title expressive of the Supreme Being, are altogether excluded, which must have been intentional, if it were not the effect of ignorance; because, in the greater part of the books of the Old Testament, and even in the other portions of the book of Genesis itself, the words *God* or *Lord*, occur in almost every sentence."—P. 3.

It is probable, according to Mr. Belsham, that some of the documents existed previously to the age of Moses; amongst which he reckons those chapters and sections in which the title *God* is applied to the Supreme Being, and where the word *Jehovah* does not occur. He refers for proof to Exod. vi. 6.

After these introductory critical remarks, Mr. Belsham proceeds to state those great and important moral truths to which the writer of the narrative of the creation bears his solemn testimony, viz. that there is a God, the Creator, the Former, the Sovereign Proprietor and Lord of the heavens,

the earth, the seas, and of all their productions and inhabitants: that God possesses almighty power, unerring wisdom, and unbounded goodness: and, finally, that there is no other God but ONE; one Creator, one Preserver, one Universal Benefactor, one Being, possessed of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, one sole object of all religious homage and adoration.

These truths Mr. Belsham thinks the writer did not deliver by immediate inspiration, because his narrative "contains many great philosophical errors:" on the other hand, he cannot allow that he attained to the knowledge of so pure and perfect a system of theology, by the exercise of his own intellectual powers: the only remaining hypothesis is that he derived his beautiful theism from an anterior revelation, preserved by tradition.

The second part of the Sermon is a detail of the account of the creation, and a specification of the mistakes into which Mr. Belsham supposes the writer to have been led by an erroneous philosophy. His system of philosophy, says the preacher, is that which arises from the observation of the most obvious appearances of the universe, and which existed before science began. He believed that light might exist in the absence of the sun, as it appears to do in the morning and evening twilight. He regarded the firmament as a solid arch, which separated the waters above from the waters below. He conceived of the sun and moon as lamps fixed in the solid firmament for the convenience and comfort of the inhabitants of the earth, and of the stars as mere ornamental spangles. In these and other particulars, Mr. Belsham regards the writer's account as directly and palpably inconsistent with what is now demonstrated to be the true theory of the universe; and he pronounces the attempts to reconcile the Mosaical cosmogony to philosophical truth to be unsatisfactory and useless, and even injurious to the cause of revealed religion. This conclusion sets aside the inspiration of the narrative, but inspiration is not claimed by the writer, nor does the divine legation of Moses, as a prophet or lawgiver, depend upon the supposition. At the same time, the preacher is forward to express his

unqualified admiration of some passages of the history. Referring to its assertion of the infinite power of God, he says,

"And this great truth it does not express in explicit language, but in a manner peculiarly emphatic and sublime: by representing the most extraordinary effects as produced instantaneously by a divine command. God said, 'Let there be light, and there was light: let there be a firmament, and there was a firmament.' Thus asserting and illustrating the infinite facility and the absolute instantaneity of the Divine operation. There is no lapse of time, however momentary, between the volition and the effect: God wills and it is done. Not that will and power are one and the same thing in the Supreme Being, as some have erroneously asserted; but they are co-ordinate, co-existent, there is no interval, not an instant between volition and effect. This is a representation of Divine Omnipotence so original and magnificent, that it never occurred to any Heathen writer: and it is for this reason selected by the most judicious and the most celebrated of all the ancient critics, as a grand and unparalleled example of the true sublime."—Pp. 9, 10.

Of the account of the creation of man, he remarks,

"But thus much we may at least affirm, without fear of contradiction, that nothing can be more rational, more probable, or more dignified, than this account of the creation of the human species. There is nothing low or ludicrous in the narrative. The human pair are created at once, both at the same time, male and female, at the fiat of the Almighty: they are made sovereigns of the new-created world: and are inducted into their high office with all things ready prepared for their accommodation, with a grant of the whole vegetable creation for their food, and of dominion over the various tribes of animals for their convenience and use. The whole transaction is dignified and sublime, and in all respects worthy of the character and attributes of the great Former and Parent of mankind."—P. 25.

As this interesting discourse is at this moment a subject of discussion between our correspondents, we have confined ourselves to such an analysis of its contents as may put the reader in possession of Mr. Belsham's opinions; and we shall observe only that considerable latitude has been

always granted to divines in the interpretation of the Pentateuch, that some modern "orthodox" names might be cited to countenance some of the boldest positions of the sermon, and that the interpretation of the history of the creation as allegorical, an interpretation adopted to evade philosophical difficulties, has the sanction of some of the most eminent Fathers.

ART. IV.—*Objections to the Doctrine of the Trinity, stated in a Discourse delivered at Poole, on Wednesday, June 27, 1821, before a Society of Unitarian Christians, established in the South of England, for promoting the genuine Knowledge of the Scriptures and the Practice of Virtue, by the Distribution of Books.* By Thomas Rees, LL. D., F. S. A. 12mo. pp. 48. Longman and Co.

DR. T. REES applies the solemn exhortation of his text, Isaiah xl. 25, to the believers in the doctrine of the Trinity, and after stating this doctrine in the words of the authorized formularies of the Church of England, proceeds to substantiate the following objections to it: 1. It multiplies the number of deities, and consequently of the objects of divine worship. 2. It derogates from the perfection and dignity of the divine attributes and character. 3. It introduces confusion and perplexity into divine worship. 4. It is repugnant to the Scriptures, and introduces the utmost confusion of ideas into the account given in the sacred oracles of the history of Jesus Christ and of the plan of human salvation under the Gospel dispensation. Having ably urged these objections, and shewn that they are fatal to the doctrine in question, the preacher examines the plea for this and other irrational dogmas that they are mysteries, and exposes its futility. Some pertinent notes are added. One of these consists of representations of Trinitarianism by Trinitarians, in a series of extracts, supplied by our correspondent Benevolus, XVI. 637 and 715, on which Dr. T. Rees remarks,

"In the preceding extracts the idea which most shocks the pious mind is that of the death of God, which some of them expressly inculcate; and it is deeply to be lamented that such a notion should

be incorporated with the language of our country by a Lexicographer whose work is generally regarded as the standard of correctness and good taste. In Johnson's Dictionary we find the word DEICIDE, compounded of two Latin terms which never were placed in so unholy a conjunction by the Pagans, to whom the Latin language was native. I shall transcribe the article; but it can need no comment.—DEICIDE, (from *Deus* and *Cædo*, Lat.,) The murder of God! the act of killing God! It is only used in speaking of the death of our blessed Saviour.

"Explaining how perfection suffered pain,
Almighty languish'd, and Eternal died;
How by her patient victor Death was slain,
And Earth profan'd, yet blessed with Deicide.

"PRIOR."

ART. V.—*An Address to Protestant Dissenters, commending the Practice of Sitting while Singing the Praises of God in Public Worship.* 2nd ed. 12mo. Hunter. 1821.

THIS tract was first published in 1807, occasioned by a publication entitled, "An Appeal to Serious Dissenters of every Denomination, concerning the present irreverent Posture of Sitting while Singing the Praises of God in Public Worship, &c.; by A Layman;" and this second edition appeared in 1817, but is now republished with an additional Preface, which consists of gossip relating to Dr. Collyer, and his clerk, and certain other personages. Notwithstanding this unpromising introduction, we have found some sound sense in the address. The author is a sturdy Non-conformist, and sets himself against new-fangled practices by which Dissenters imitate Methodists, who themselves imitate the Church of England. The question that he discusses is confessedly one of mere expediency, and if the custom of standing in prayer (which appears to us to be the most decent and reverent posture in a public assembly) be retained, there can be no doubt, that to exact the same posture in singing also would be to many worshipers inconvenient, and to some, whom we need not particularize, distressing.

CRITICAL NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

ART. I.—*Additions to the 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. 1821.

THE "Historical Memoirs" have been already brought before the reader (XV. 48—51). This continuation consists of additional matter, and of a proposed new arrangement of the whole work, by which it may be read in chronological order.

Prefixed to the present volumes is a chapter of upwards of 50 pages, entitled "The Author's Works and some of his Reminiscences." Here the writer may incur with the censorious, the charge of egotism, but so amiable is his vanity, that we should rejoice to hear that his "Reminiscences" were continued and enlarged. Amongst them we find the following candid remark upon the celebrated *Code Napoleon*:

"The writer apprehends that the five codes of law, compiled under the eye of Buonaparte, though in some respects justly objectionable, will always be honourable to his memory. He himself thought so favourably of them, as to express to a friend of the writer a wish, that he might descend to posterity with these in his hands."—P. xix.

Referring to a tract in his *Horæ Biblicæ*, entitled, "Historical Account of the Controversy respecting 1 John v. 7," he says,

"The arguments against the authenticity of the verse are very strong; but the admission of it into the Confession of Faith presented by the Catholic bishops to Hunnerie, (Hunneric?) the Vandal King, is an argument of weight in its favour. The statement of these by the writer, was allowed by Mr. Porson, the late learned adversary of the verse, to be very strong, and he promised the writer to reply to them."—P. xxxvi.

Reasoning on the decree of the Council of Constance relating to the nullity of safe-conducts granted to heretics, Mr. Butler puts the following case:

"If a person should now publish,

within any part of the united empire of Great Britain and Ireland, a work against the Trinity, and make some place beyond the seas, his residence; and his Majesty should grant him a safe-conduct to any part of his cis-marine dominions, both in going and returning, would this safe-conduct protect the offender against the process of any of his Majesty's civil or spiritual courts?"—III. 103.

This hypothetical reasoning affords but a poor apology for the truce-breakers of Constance; and the case proceeds upon the supposition, which we are astonished that so eminent a lawyer as Mr. Butler should have indulged, that impugning the Trinity is still a punishable offence in law.

He quotes from the "*Commentaire du Chevalier Folard sur Polybe*," published in 1727, the following remarkable prediction of the French Revolution:

"A conspiracy is actually forming in Europe, by means at once so subtle and efficacious, that I am sorry not to have come into the world thirty years later, to witness its result. It must be confessed that the sovereigns of Europe wear very bad spectacles. The proofs of it are mathematical, if such proofs ever were, of a conspiracy."—III. p. 111, Note.

Of the Act of Toleration, Mr. Butler says,

"If we reflect on all the circumstances under which this act was passed, we must admit that the general cause of civil liberty gained by it considerably: if we view it without reference to these, we shall be more scandalized by the niggardliness than edified by the liberality of the boon which the Protestant Dissenters then received from the new government."—IV. 223.

He quotes, from Dalrymple, a curious document, from which it appears, that King William obtained a report of the numerical strength of the three denominations of Church-of-Englandmen, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics, in England, in order to found upon it some measure of union. It is stated in this that the number of Freeholders was 2,599,786, of whom the Nonconformists were 108,676, and the "Papists" 13,856. The following is

a part of this report, which, though probably not at all accurate, is of some importance :

“ An account of the province of Canterbury. In the taking of these accounts we find these things observable :

“ 1. That many left the church upon the late indulgence who before did frequent it.

“ 2. The sending for these inquiries hath caused many to frequent the church.

“ 3. That they are Walloons chiefly that make up the number of Dissenters in Canterbury, Sandwich and Dover.

“ 4. That the Presbyterians are divided, some of them come sometime to church, therefore such are not wholly Dissenters upon the third inquiry.

“ 5. A considerable part of Dissenters are not of any sect whatsoever.

“ 6. Of those that come to church very many do not receive the Sacrament.

“ 7. At Ashford and at other places we find a new sort of heretics, after the name of Muggleton, a London taylor, in number thirty.

“ 8. The rest of the Dissenters are Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Quakers, about equal numbers, only two or three called Self-willers professedly.

9. The heads and preachers of the several factions, are such as had a great share in the late Rebellion.”—IV. 254, 255.

Two sections of chapter lxxviii. are devoted to the Socinians and the Unitarians, between whom Mr. Butler makes the just distinction. These are meagre, but edifying, from the candid spirit which they breathe. The historical sketch prefixed by Dr. T. Rees to his translation of the Racovian Catechism is quoted as an authority.

The Section on Deists is very brief. Atheists are brought in at the conclusion. Amongst these is placed Toland, of whom the writer says, (IV. 366,) he “ would have disgraced any creed.” This censure is much too strong, and appears to us to savour of bigotry. Toland, we know, though he wrote against Spinoza, used a mystical Pantheistical jargon, but he solemnly disavowed the imputation of atheism, and was, we are inclined to believe, rather a sceptic than a positive Deist. Lord Molesworth’s constant and generous friendship for him is of more weight in favour of his character than all the traditionary scandal that can be put into the other scale. With

all his indiscretions, it must be conceded to the memory of Toland, that he was a zealous, active and consistent friend to the constitutional liberties of England.

The author has evident pleasure in relating the liberality of the British nation towards the French emigrants, whom the Revolution drove into England. Amidst other benefactors to these exiles, he names in the following anecdote the late Lord Chancellor, Earl Rosslyn :

“ It was mentioned at his Lordship’s table, that the Chancellor of France was distressed, by not being able to procure the discount of a bill which he had brought from France. ‘ The Chancellor of England,’ said Lord Rosslyn, ‘ is the only person to whom the Chancellor of France should apply to discount his bills.’ The money was immediately sent ; and, while the seals remained in his hands, he annually sent a sum of equal amount to the Chancellor of France.”—IV. 374.

Mr. Butler has taken little notice of Dr. Milner’s late outrageous attack upon him. [Mon. Repos. XVI. 119.] He has, however, sufficiently vindicated himself by quoting from the varying pages of the different works of his calumniator, and by translating an “ Apologetical Epistle of Dr. Poynter, vicar apostolic for the southern district, to his eminence Cardinal Litta,” which occasioned a reprimand to be given to Dr. Milner from Rome ; followed, so lately as April, 1820, by a brief from His Holiness, in which “ he complains of the turbulence and violence of Dr. Milner’s conduct, and orders the sacred congregation to make this known to him ; to exhort him to reform, and to threaten him with removal from his vicariat, if he do not.” IV. 469, Appendix. This public reproof must put the *Catholicity* of the haughty Vicar Apostolic of the midland district to a severe test.

ART. II.—*Dissertation, exhibiting a General View of the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy, since the Revival of Letters in Europe.* By David Stewart, Esq., F. R. S. S., London and Edin., &c. &c. [Prefixed to

Vol. V. of Supplement to *Encyclopædia Britannica*. 4to.]

WE put down this title not to attempt any review or analysis of the instructive and amusing essay which Mr. Stewart has given to the world, or even to make extracts from it, but merely to introduce two letters that passed between Locke and Newton, here inserted in a note, and, we believe, now printed for the first time. Having introduced a passage of Lord Shaftesbury's, crying out against the tendency of Mr. Locke's philosophical speculations, Mr. Stewart says,

"Sir Isaac Newton himself, an intimate friend of Locke's, appears, from a letter of his which I have read in his own hand-writing, to have felt precisely in the same manner with the author of the *Characteristics*. Such, at least, were his first impressions; although he afterwards requested, with a humility and candour worthy of himself, the forgiveness of Locke for this injustice done to his character. 'I beg your pardon' (says he) 'for representing that you struck at the root of morality in a principle you laid down in your book of ideas, and designed to pursue in another book; and that I took you for a Hobbist.' In the same letter Newton alludes to certain unfounded suspicions which he had been led to entertain of the propriety of Locke's conduct in some of their private concerns; adding, with an ingenuous and almost infantine simplicity, 'I was so much affected with this, that when one told me you was sickly and would not live, I answered, 'twere better if you were dead. I desire you to forgive me this uncharitableness.' The letter is subscribed, *your most humble and most unfortunate servant, Is. Newton.*"

"The rough draught of Mr. Locke's reply to these afflicting acknowledgments was kindly communicated to me by a friend some years ago. It is written with the magnanimity of a philosopher, and with the good-humoured forbearance of a man of the world; and it breathes throughout so tender and so unaffected a veneration for the good as well as great qualities of the excellent person to whom it is addressed, as demonstrates at once the conscious integrity of the writer, and

the superiority of his mind to the irritation of little passions. I know of nothing from Locke's pen which does more honour to his temper and character; and I introduce it with peculiar satisfaction, in connexion with those strictures which truth has extorted from me on that part of his system which to the moralist stands most in need of explanation and apology.

MR. LOCKE TO MR. NEWTON.

"SIR, Oates, 5th October, 93.

"I have been ever since I first knew you so kindly and sincerely your friend, and thought you so much mine, that I could not have believed what you tell me of yourself, had I had it from any body else. And though I cannot but be mightily troubled that you should have had so many wrong and unjust thoughts of me, yet, next to the return of good offices, such as from a sincere good will I have ever done you, I receive your acknowledgment of the contrary as the kindest thing you could have done me, since it gives me hopes I have not lost a friend I so much valued. After what your letter expresses, I shall not need to say any thing to justify myself to you: I shall always think your own reflection on my carriage both to you and all mankind will sufficiently do that. Instead of that, give me leave to assure you, that I am more ready to forgive you than you can be to desire it; and I do it so freely and fully that I wish for nothing more than the opportunity to convince you that I truly love and esteem you: and that I have still the same good will for you as if nothing of this had happened. To confirm this to you more fully, I should be glad to meet you any where, and the rather, because the conclusion of your letter makes me apprehend it would not be wholly useless to you. I shall always be ready to serve you to my utmost, in any way you shall like, and shall only need your commands or permission to do it.

"My book is going to press for a second edition; and though I can answer for the design with which I write it, yet, since you have so opportunely given me notice of what you have said of it, I should take it as a favour if you would point out to me the places that gave occasion to that censure, that, by explaining myself better, I may avoid being mistaken by others, or unwillingly doing the least prejudice to truth or virtue. I am sure you are so much a friend to both, that, were you none to me, I could expect this from you. But I can-

"It is dated at the Bull in Shoreditch, London, September, 1693; and is addressed, For John Locke, Esq., at Sir Fra. Masham's, Bart., at Oates, in Essex."

not doubt but you would do a great deal more than this for my sake, who, after all, have all the concern of a friend for you, wish you extremely well, and am, without compliment, &c. &c.

“(For the preservation of this precious memorial of Mr. Locke, the public is indebted to the descendants of his friend and relation the Lord Chancellor King,

to whom his papers and library were bequeathed. The original is still in the possession of the present representative of that noble family; for whose flattering permission to enrich my Dissertation with the above extracts, I feel the more grateful, as I have not the honour of being personally known to his Lordship.)”
—Pp. 31, 32.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Unitarian Christian's Apology for Seceding from the Communion and Worship of Trinitarian Churches. A Discourse of which the Substance was delivered at Lewin's-Mead Chapel, Bristol, January 6, 1822. By S. C. Fripp, B. A. Late of Queen's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Prayers for the Use of Families and Individuals: including a Prayer adapted to each Discourse, in 3 vols. of Sermons, by the same Author: and also Forms suited to Particular Occasions. By the Rev. Edmund Butcher. 8vo. 8s.

The Book of Genesis and the Mosaical History of the Creation, vindicated from Unitarian Misrepresentation; in a Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's, and in Reply to a recent Discourse of Mr. Thomas Belsham. By John Garbett, M. A., Curate of St. Bartholomew's, Birmingham. 1s. 6d.

Letters to Count Toreno, on the proposed Penal Code, delivered in by the Legislation Committee of the Spanish Cortes, April 25, 1821. Written at the Count's Request, by Jeremy Bentham, Esq. 5s.

Remarks on Unitarianism, addressed to the Inhabitants of the Staffordshire Potteries. 8vo. 6d.

Franklin's Memoirs, Vols. V. and VI., 8vo.: comprising his Posthumous Writings, now first published from the Originals. By his Grandson, Wm. Temple Franklin, Esq. (The Memoirs complete in 3 vols. 4to., or in 6 vols. 8vo. £3. 12s.)

The Works of the late Right Hon. Edmund Burke, containing Speeches in Westminster Hall, on the Impeachment of Mr. Hastings. With an Introduction, addressed to Lord Viscount Milton. By the Bishop of Rochester. Vol. VII. 4to. £2. 2s. (An 8vo. Edition is in the Press, forming the XIIIth and XIVth Vols. The 12 vols. 8vo. £6.)

A Description of the Shetland Islands, comprising an Account of their Geology,

Scenery, Antiquities and Superstitions. By Samuel Hibbert, M. D. M. F. S. E. 4to. Maps and Plates. £3. 3s.

A History of the Island of Madagascar, from the Time of its Discovery to the present Period. By Samuel Copland. 8vo. Map. 10s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Court of King James the First. By Lucy Aikin. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait. £1. 4s.

The History of Brazil. By Robert Southey, Esq., LL.D., Poet Laureate. 3 vols. 4to. Map. £7. 15s.

History of Cultivated Vegetables, comprising their Botanical, Medicinal, Edible and Chymical Qualities, Natural History, and Relations to Art, Science and Commerce. By Henry Phillips. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. £1. 11s. 6d.

Letters of Junius, with Preliminary Dissertations and Copious Notes. By Atticus Secundus. Pocket volume. Seven Portraits. 6s.

The Principles and Doctrine of Assurances, Annuities on Lives, and Contingent Reversions, stated and explained. By Wm. Morgan, Esq., F. R. S., Actuary of the Equitable Life Insurance Office. 8vo. 12s.

Archæologia Græca; or, The Antiquities of Greece. By John Potter, D. D., late Archbishop of Canterbury. To which is added, an Appendix, containing a Concise History of the Grecian States, and a Short Account of the Lives and Writings of the most celebrated Greek Authors. By J. Dunbar, F. R. S. E., and Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 6s.

A Harmonical Grammar of the Principal Ancient and Modern Languages. By F. Nolan. 2 vols. £1. 5s.

A Second Journey into the Interior of South Africa; undertaken at the Request of the London Missionary Society. By the Rev. John Campbell. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 1s. Royal, £1. 10s. Twelve Coloured Prints and Map.

Suggestions on Clerical Elocution. By John Lettice, D.D., Prebendary of Chichester. 3s. 6d.

A Synoptical Review of the Religious Systems and Opinions of the Philosophers of the Ancient World. For the Use of the Junior Students in the Universities. By a Graduate of the University of Oxford. 4to. 4s.

Practical Reflections on the Ordination Services for Deacons and Priests, in the United Church of England and Ireland: for the Use of Candidates for Orders. To which are added, Appropriate Prayers. By John Brewster, M.A., Rector of Egglecliffe, and Vicar of Greatham, in the County of Durham. 8vo. 8s.

A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, confirmed by References to the Text of Holy Scripture, compared with the Liturgy, Articles and Homilies of the Church of England; and illustrated by Extracts from the Chief of those Works which received the Sanction of Public Authority from the Time of the Reformation to the final Revision of the Established Formularies. By E. J. Burrow, D.D. F.R. and L.S. 3 vols. 12mo. 18s.

An Introduction to the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By the Rev. T. H. Yorke, Vicar of Bishop's Middleham, Durham, and Rector of St. Cuthbert's, York. 4s.

An Essay on the Connection between the Jewish and Christian Dispensation. By Wm. Trollope, B.A., of Pembroke College, Cambridge. 2s.

A Letter to the Parishioners of St. Sepulchre, Northampton, respecting the Fraud which has been committed in a Testimonial to the Bishop of the Diocese; and proving that the Guilt does not attach to the Writer of this Letter. By Moses Marcus, Curate of St. Sepulchre. 1s. 6d.

A Letter to the Rev. T. T. Biddulph, Minister of St. James's, Bristol, occasioned by his Cursory Remarks on a Pamphlet, entitled "Missionary Excitement and Hindoo Demoralization." By John Bowen. 3s. 6d.

The Wrongs of the Clergy of the Diocese of Peterborough stated and illustrated. By T. S. Grimshaw, M.A., Rector of Burton, Northamptonshire. 2s.

Plain Reasons why Political Power should not be granted to Papists. By Samuel Wix, A.M. F.R. and A.S. 1s.

A Letter to C. A. Moysey, D.D., Archdeacon of Bath, on the Subject of an Attack made by him upon the Catholics in a Charge, &c., June 21, 1821. By the Rev. Peter Baynes. (Catholic Priest.) 2nd ed. 1s. 6d.

A Letter to the Rev. Peter Baynes, in Reply, &c.

Remarks on the Rev. Thomas Tysan's Attack on Protestantism and Bible Societies. By Jacob Stanley. 2s.

Popery Indefensible; being Strictures on the Rev. Thomas Tysan's Observations. By the Same. 1s.

A Recapitulation of some of the Leading Principles contained in a Treatise on Human Motives. By John Penrose, A.M. 2s. 6d.

Ninth Occasional Report of the Society for the Suppression of Vice. Gratis.

A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool, on the Present Contest between the Greeks and the Turks. 1s.

The Signs of the Times; indicating that the Shaking of the Nations has already begun, which is to precede the Fall of the Mystical Babylon and of the Turkish Empire, &c. By Benjamin Johnson. 8vo. 3s.

An Attempt to define some of the first Principles of Political Economy. By Thomas Smith. 8vo. 7s.

Address to the Land-Owners of the United Empire. By C. C. Western, Esq., M.P. 2s.

An Investigation of the Doctrine of Water Baptism, containing Strictures on the Form of the Established Church and Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary. By T. L. P. 2s.

The First Principles of Christian Baptism, deduced from the New Testament, with a View to lessen Differences. By Thomas Eisdell, of Enfield.

The Life of the Rev. J. W. Fletcher, late Vicar of Madely. By Robert Cox, A.M., Perpetual Curate of St. Leonard's, Bridgnorth. 5s.

The Life of Wm. Hey, Esq., F.R.S., Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, &c. By John Pearson, F.R.S. F.L.S. M.R.I. 8vo. Portrait. 18s.

Irak and Adah, a Tale of the Flood; and other Poems. Together with Specimens of a New Translation of the Psalms. By Thomas Dale, of Bene't College, Cambridge. 8vo. 9s.

Constance, a Tale. By Isabel Hill, Author of "The Poet's Child." 7s.

Poems. By I. F. Rattenbury; consisting of Edgar and Ellis, a Legendary Tale of the 16th Century, a Versification of the First Book of Fingal, and several Minor Poems. 8vo. 8s.

The Carnival of Death. A Poem in Two Cantos. Dedicated to the Peace Societies. By Thomas Bailey. 8vo. 4s.

Hymns for Sunday Schools. By James Edmeston, Author of Sacred Lyrics. 6d.

The Martyr of Antioch; a Tragic

Drama. By the Rev. H. H. Milman,
Professor of Poetry in the University of
Oxford. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Sermons.

Objections to the Doctrines of the
Trinity, stated in a Discourse delivered
at Poole, on Wednesday, June 27, 1821,
before the Southern Unitarian Society.
By Thomas Rees, LL.D. F. S. A. 12mo.
1s.

A Critical Examination of the Re-
markable Prediction concerning the Mes-
siah, contained in Isaiah ix. 6 : being a
Sermon delivered on Christmas Day,
1821, at the Upper Meeting House, New-
bury. By John Kitcat. 8vo.

The Christian Ministry—preached in
the Parish Church of St. Leonard, Shore-

ditch. By Thomas Mortimer, M. A.
Sunday Afternoon Lecturer. 1s.

The Vanity of the Earthly Hopes of
Man—preached in George Street Chapel,
Glasgow, on Lord's-day Evening, Decem-
ber 9th, on occasion of the Death of Mr.
William Friend Durant, of Poole, Dor-
setshire, Student in the University of
Glasgow. By Ralph Wardlaw, D. D.
1s. 6d.

The Office and Duties of the Christian
Minister: delivered in the Cathedral
Church of Chester, upon Sunday, Decem-
ber 23, 1821, at an Ordination of the
Right Rev. George Henry Law, Lord
Bishop of that Diocese. By Lawrence
Gardner, D. D. F. A. S., Canon Residen-
tiary of Lichfield, and Rector of St.
Philip's, Birmingham. 2s.

POETRY.

EPITAPH ON ——— BUCKLAND,
*Professor of Mineralogy and Geology, at
the University of Oxford.*

[From a Correspondent, who sends it, we
presume, as a copy, but without saying
whence it is taken.]

I.

Mourn, Ammonites, mourn o'er his fu-
neral urn,
Whose neck ye must grace no more,
Gneiss, Granite and Slate, he settled
your date,
And his ye must now deplore.
Weep, caverns, weep, with filtering drip,
Your recesses he'll cease to explore,
For mineral veins and organic remains
No stratum again will he bore.

II.

Oh! his wit shone like crystal! his
knowledge profound
From gravel to granite descended;
No trap could deceive him, no slip could
confound,
Nor specimens true or pretended;
He knew the birth-rock of each pebble
so round,
And how far its tour had extended.

III.

His eloquence roll'd like the deluge re-
tiring,
Which Mastodon carcasses floated;
To a subject obscure he gave charms so
inspiring,
Young and old on Geology doated;
He stood forth like an out-lier, his hear-
ers admiring
In pencil each anecdote noted.

IV.

Where shall we our great Professor inter,
That in peace may rest his bones?
If we hew him a rocky sepulchre
He'll rise and break the stones,
And examine each stratum that lies
around,
For he's quite in his element under-
ground.

V.

If with mattock and spade his body we
lay
In the common alluvial soil,
He'll start up and snatch those tools
away
Of his own Geological toil!
In a stratum so young the Professor dis-
dains
That embedded should be his organic
remains.

VI.

Then exposed to the drip of some case-
hard'ning spring
His carcase let stalactite cover,
And to Oxford the petrified sage let us
bring
When he is incrustated all over,
There, 'mid mammoths and crocodiles,
high on a shelf,
Let him stand as a monument raised to
himself.

THE LAMENT OF THE LAST DRUID.

[From Parry's Welsh Melodies, Vol. II:
the words by Mrs. Hemans.]

I.

The harp is hush'd on Mona's shore,
And mute the voice of mystic lore,

And the deep woods lie low !
 Where were the *Dark Isle's* * vengeful
 gods,
 When thus their shrines and dread
 abodes
 Received the insulting foe ?
 Who shall recal the Druid seers,
 They that could lift the veil of years ?
 The home is silent 'midst the slain,
 And *I alone on earth remain*,
 On the wild winds to pour one strain,
 A dirge for *Mona's* woe !

II.

The stars on *Mona's* rocks look down,
 And far *Eryri's* † mountain-crown,
 And ocean's glitt'ring wave ;
 But those, who track'd, with gifted eyes,
 Their burning pathway through the skies,
 Lie slumbering in the grave !
 There, too, shall rest the lore sublime,
 The secrets of primæval Time ;
 For *Mona's* guardian Powers are fled,
 Her oaks have bow'd their crested head :
 Take me, ye dwellings of the dead,
 Homes of the wise and the brave !

TO A FRIEND.

(From the *Literary Gazette*.)

Brother in soul ! O who can break the
 bond,
 That twines thine image with my hopes
 and fears ?
 It is not fancy's ardour, wildly fond,
 Nor transient intercourse, that thee
 endears ;—
 But thoughts, pursuits and feelings, that
 respond
 In tried reality ; and checquered years
 Of prov'd regard ; with Faith, that looks
 beyond
 Vain Reason's prospect through this
 vale of tears.
 Eternity shall crown our perfect love ;—
 Life is too short for friendship such as
 ours :
 Ah ! still together may we onward rove
 Through the brief scenes of time's few,
 fleeting hours,
 Until, together gently loos'd from this,
 Soar our freed spirits to a world of bliss !

STANZAS

Written during a Marine Excursion in
 August, 1821,

By T. MOORE, Esq.

See how beneath the moon-beam's smile
 Yon little billow heaves its breast ;

* Anglesea, or *Mona*, from its thick
 wood of oak was anciently called the
Dark Island.

† *Eryri*—the Snowdon mountains.

And foams and sparkles for awhile,
 And murmuring there subsides to rest.
 Thus man, the sport of bliss and care,
 Rises on Time's eventful sea ;
 And having swell'd a moment there,
 Thus melts into Eternity.

PARAPHRASE ON PSALM cxxxvii.

I.

The daughter of Babel shall sit in the
 dust—
 Her splendours of triumph be sadden'd
 with tears,
 She shall mourn o'er the rampart, no
 longer her trust,
 The blood of her race shall atone her
 arrears,
 For she pour'd upon Zion the vials of
 woe,
 And she scoff'd at her sons in the land of
 the foe.

II.

We sat by the streams on the willowy
 brink,
 We gaz'd on our harps as they silent
 hung near,
 We thought upon Zion—'twas painful to
 think,
 We heard the proud harlot—'twas
 madness to hear ;
 Come, sing, said the scorner, a song of
 your mirth,
 The song which ye sang in the land of
 your birth.

III.

Ye desolate scenes, yet as beauteous as
 dear,
 Ye glories, the light of our harp and
 our song,
 Who can revel in mirth while shedding
 a tear ?
 Who can smile at remembrance of
 ruin and wrong ?
 Or shall we sing of Zion—the city laid
 low,
 In the days of our grief, in the land of
 our foe ?

IV.

We'll think upon Zion—but not as she
 is—
 Her increase of glories which yet are
 to be :
 We'll sing of the Lord—her restorer of
 bliss ;
 We'll praise her avenger—how blessed
 is he !
 Who will give unto Babel the cup which
 she gave—
 The shrieks of the childless, the groans
 of the slave.

Chichester, Jan. 26, 1822.

F. S.

OBITUARY.

1821. Dec. 30, at *Fryston Hall*, near *Ferrybridge*, Yorkshire, aged 49, the Rev. T. LUCAS. He was seated with his family at breakfast, apparently in excellent health, when he suddenly dropped from his chair and expired without a groan or a sigh. He had discharged, for many years, the duties of domestic chaplain to Mrs. Milnes, and was formerly minister of a Presbyterian Chapel, at Morley, near Leeds.

1822. Jan. 18, in *Bedford Place*, after a long and most painful illness, Mrs. HEYWOOD, wife of Mr. Sergeant Heywood.

—, 31st, at *Nottingham*, in the 30th year of his age, the Rev. HENRY TURNER, one of the ministers of the congregation assembling in the High-Pavement Chapel in that town. Of the private sorrows awakened by this early removal of a son, a brother and a husband, it is enough for those to speak, who, in the sacred retirement of a mourning home, can soothe each other by remembering how deservedly the purity of his mind, the integrity of his principles, the sweetness of his temper, and the tenderness of his heart, secured their highest esteem and warmest love. Nor is it necessary, in the page which will be read by those who knew him as their friend and former fellow-student, to repeat, what their own hearts have already told them, of his claims upon *their* lasting and affectionate remembrance. A subject more properly belonging to the public remains in his character as a Christian pastor. It may truly be said of him, that “he had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.” He had completely that first and great recommendation of a religious instructor, a deep feeling, as well as a firm conviction, of religious truths. He could not understand why the best and noblest gift of God to man, should not enter into our highest enjoyments, and consecrate our sweetest affections. He beheld in religion an inmate sent down from heaven to gladden our homes, to mingle a gentle and cheerful wisdom with our social converse, and to speak continually to our friendships the promise of immortality. He believed that the purest union

of hearts and mind could be perfect only among those who “have taken sweet counsel together, and walked to the house of God in company.” He thought it natural, that “they who fear the Lord should speak often one to another” of the subjects included in their noblest knowledge, and connected with their most valuable hopes. Consistently with these views of religion, the whole temper of his mind was deeply devotional; and while this temper infused a truly evangelical spirit into his public services, it proved itself, in his manners, conversation and whole character, to be entirely removed from all affected or unseasonable gravity. His presence was never any restraint upon cheerfulness; yet it was always felt to be the presence of a religious man. With a gentle, but effectual firmness, he never failed to withhold the approbation of his countenance, at the first step beyond “the limits of becoming mirth.” Nor was he restrained by any unchristian awe of talents, or learning, or eloquence, from more directly and forcibly opposing a sophistical argument, or rebuking a sceptical sneer. The constant union of steady principle with amiable manners, peculiarly fitted him to be the companion and friend, as well as the public instructor; and, happily, he had every encouragement, both in his own dispositions and those of his congregation, to make the social circle, and still more the fireside, auxiliary to the pulpit. He was truly the pastor of his flock. They were to him a sacred and beloved trust. They were all, both rich and poor, those to whom he was, by every means in his power, to prove himself a friend and brother—“a helper of their joy”—a soother and comforter of their sorrow—a strengthener of their hope—and a faithful guardian of their true and everlasting interests. It will be inferred, and it will be most justly inferred, that he took an earnest and active part in all their benevolent plans and useful institutions; and how valuable his assistance, how kind his care had been felt, was seen in the anxiety manifested during his illness, and in the tears which were shed at his grave, by the companions and objects of his labours. Whatever, indeed, could be done by a grateful and affectionate flock to shew their value for their pastor, has been done in their kindness to himself while living, and their unfeigned sympathy with his mourning

family. They who know what that kindness was, and how delicate and respectful have been the attentions prompted by that sympathy, cannot but feel that, even in this world, it is no mean reward of a faithful minister, to live so beloved and to die so lamented.

J. G. R.

Feb. 24, at his house in *Stratton Street*, at the age of 87, THOMAS COURTTS, Esq. the banker, who, in the course of a long life of active exertion, had amassed immense wealth. He was familiar and respected in the highest circles of society, and has left numbers to lament him who were benefitted by his charities, which were habitual and eminently generous. His family consisted of daughters, for whom he formed the most honourable alliances: one is Lady Burdett, (the wife of Sir Francis,) another, Countess of Guildford, and the third, Marchioness of Bute, who is now in Italy, on account of her health.

Supplementary Obituary.

THE Rev. John Charlesworth, M.A. whose death is recorded, XVI. 735, is entitled to further notice, and we request some correspondent to favour us with a memoir of him. His name appears in

the list of the Petitioning Clergy in 1772, communicated by V. M. H., XVI. 15. His principles, as from this circumstance might be expected, were very liberal, and on his occasional visits to the metropolis, he was accustomed to unite in worship with the Unitarians. For the sake, we doubt not, of greater usefulness, he continued his connexion with the Church of England and with its associations, and amongst the rest, the Bartlett's Buildings' Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. He published and most freely dispersed valuable tracts and practical sermons: of some of the latter an account is given, VII. 643. We believe he reprinted, for gratuitous distribution, Bishop Lowth's admirable Visitation Sermon. His charity was ever ardent and active, flowing from pure Christian principles and a kind heart. He was connected with the Royal Humane Society, some of whose papers he was accustomed to carry in his pocket, in order to give away as warnings against fatal accidents, or as directions as to the conduct to be observed on their occurrence. In proof of his Catholic spirit, it may be added, that he was accustomed for several years to make occasional presents of books out of his library to Dr. Williams's Library in Red-Cross Street.

REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS.

Address from the Friends in Ireland to George the Fourth, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

May it please the King!

It having been the will of the Almighty to remove, by death, thy royal father, and to permit thee to ascend the throne of this realm; we, thy dutiful and faithful subjects in Ireland, of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, desire thus to approach thee; and, bearing in remembrance the long and eventful reign of thy revered father, the recollection of whose many virtues is precious to us, we gratefully acknowledge the kind disposition he evinced toward us as a society; holding, as we do, some religious sentiments different from his other subjects, thus exhibiting his feeling for conscientious scruples, and evincing thereby his own religious consideration and acknowledgment of the power of Him,

whose right it is to rule in the hearts of the children of men.

We feel bound by the ties of duty and gratitude to fidelity and attachment to thy government. We are also bound by the stronger ties of the Christian principles, which teach us submission to those in authority, and first to the King as supreme.

We look back with satisfaction to those advances in the cause of humanity, and towards the amelioration of the state of mankind, which took place in the reign of our late King; during which an act was passed, abolishing that great evil, the African Slave-Trade. And thy royal father encouraged, by his example, the zeal and efforts of his subjects in promoting the diffusion of education, and the general dissemination of the Holy Scriptures: from this the good effects have extended to neighbouring nations, and even to those that are remote.

We offer thee our respectful congratu-

lations, on thy accession to the British throne; and, with feelings of gratitude to Him who ruleth in the kingdoms of men, for that state of peace in which the sceptre of this great kingdom has been delivered into thy hands. We pray that He may cause this blessing to continue. May He influence thy heart to seek his divine counsel in all thy steps: and grant thee his holy aid to perform the various great and important duties of thy high station; so that being enabled to rule in righteousness, thou mayest, in the end, exchange thy earthly crown for an incorruptible crown of glory.

Signed at the Yearly Meeting of the aforesaid Society, held in Dublin, the 6th day of the 5th Month, in the year of our Lord 1820.

JOHN CONRAN, Clerk.

[Transmitted by Earl Talbot, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to Viscount Sidmouth, and by him presented to the King.]

Address of the Friends in Ireland to the King, 20th 8 Mo. 1821.

To George the Fourth, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging.

May it please the King!

Thy dutiful and loyal subjects, the Society of Friends in Ireland, commonly called Quakers, at their last Yearly Meeting held in this city, anticipating thy visit to this country, authorized us to address thee on their behalf on this memorable occasion. We should not do justice to our feelings did we not assure the King that our Society participates in the general joy caused by his presence. Although religiously restrained from demonstrating those feelings by public marks of

rejoicing, nevertheless we respectfully offer to the King a sincere and cordial welcome, and congratulate him upon his safe arrival upon our shores. We desire that thy visit may not only tend to thy own satisfaction and the joy of thy people, but that an event so auspicious may promote the improvement of Ireland and of her inhabitants, and thus render an important and lasting advantage to the empire. We wish to avail ourselves of the present occasion to renew the declaration of our love and our allegiance to thee our King under thy illustrious House. We, as a religious Society, have received many privileges; we are therefore bound, both by duty and by gratitude, to fidelity to thy Royal Person and Government. We are thankful to the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe, that peace generally prevails; we pray that this blessing may continue, and spread wider and wider; and we desire for thee, O King, that thou mayest be enabled, under the influence of that grace which visits the hearts of all men, to live in righteousness, and be an instrument in the Divine hand to promote that state wherein all nations may join in the holy anthem, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill to all men."

To the Society of Friends.

It is highly satisfactory to me to receive your congratulations on my arrival in this part of my kingdom, and your assurance of attachment to my Person and Government.

The loyalty of your principles and your regular and peaceable conduct entitle you to my good opinion and esteem. You may rely upon my constant protection, and upon the continuance of those privileges which you now so justly possess.

INTELLIGENCE.

Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society.

On Wednesday, July 25, 1821, the Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Tract Society for Warwickshire, and the neighbouring counties, was held at Leicester. In the morning the sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Wallace, of Chesterfield. The text was Ex. xx. 24: "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." The discourse was replete with ingenious and

sound criticism. The preacher explained, in a very rational and satisfactory manner, many passages in the New Testament, which are usually brought to prove the omnipresence of Christ. It was the unanimous request of all present, that the sermon should be published, a request which we yet hope will be complied with. In the evening, the Rev. J. H. Bransby, of Dudley, preached from 1 Tim. ii. 5: "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man

Christ Jesus." The preacher ably demonstrated the absurdity of the commonly-received opinion of two natures in Christ, shewing this to be merely the device of orthodox theologians to extricate themselves from the difficulties of their system. The sermon concluded with seasonable practical remarks. The services of the day were very acceptable to an attentive and respectable audience. The ministers and a numerous party of friends dined together. Some additional subscribers were obtained, and the day was spent with much cordiality and pleasure.

*Religious Manœuvres at Kingsley,
Cheshire.*

SIR,

Chester,
Jan. 31, 1822.

THE following account is drawn up by Mr. Astbury, the late minister of the late Unitarian Chapel at Kingsley, near Kelsal, in the County of Chester. Mr. Astbury is a pious and sensible man. He has for many years been sincerely attached to the opinions of the Unitarians, which he has endeavoured to promote in his humble sphere, with much personal inconvenience, and with a very trifling emolument. Being unused to composition, he has requested me to revise his account of a disgraceful transaction, which he denominates religious swindling, at Kingsley. I have made only a few verbal alterations.

W. BAKEWELL.

I have gone to Kingsley, as minister, for 25 years, out of which time I have been 16 years stated minister. I was chosen by the trustees, and the united voice of the people. Since then the trustees are dead, and things have remained in a varied state. On the 9th of Sept. 1821, a sermon was delivered on the death of the Queen; at which time, a man came into the chapel in disguise, pretending to be a home missionary of liberal sentiments, and delivered papers to the same effect, and requested liberty to preach, which I granted. As he said that he was going to stop awhile in the country, he wished to preach at night, which I refused. He left the country awhile, and returned, and got into the favour of the High Church party, who applied to me for him to preach during the winter. They said, as the distance was seven miles from my house, and I was in years, his preaching in my chapel would be an act of kindness to me. I, however, refused to give up my pulpit to him; but gave him liberty to preach

every other Sunday. Some time after he came to me, and said, that the people had agreed that I must resign, but that I was welcome to the small salary. I told him that I would not comply with this. On the 30th Dec. at two o'clock, when Mr. Jones, this self-named home missionary, was preaching, he gave out that there would be service twice during that week, and that there would be a meeting on Saturday to appoint new trustees. I opposed these meetings, and locked up the chapel. On the 5th of January, 1822, I, in company with a few friends, went to the chapel, and found that the door was broken open, and the lock stolen away. I locked the door again, but it was again broken open, and we left the chapel open. On the 6th of this month I preached in it again, but the rabble on the outside made a great disturbance. On the 13th I preached again, from Acts xxiv. 14—16. Two attorneys came, and several others, who paid great attention. When the service was over, we agreed to meet on the Friday following at Frodsham, at the attorney's office. I attended with some friends. I asked them there to state what they had against me, which I had repeatedly done before; but they only replied, that the congregation was reduced. I asked them, whether it would be creditable to their town to dismiss an old minister without a fault. They answered, that it would not. They asked me to state some conditions on which I would resign. I brought forward an account of 60*l.* and upwards, which I had collected from our friends for the rebuilding of the chapel; and I stated that I had an undoubted right to have this money back towards building another chapel at our own place, in the township of Delamere. They did not deny my right, but could not comply by reason of the present distresses; but they stated, that they would allow me 2*l.* per annum for my life, and 15*l.* towards building another chapel, out of the money in my hands, which belongs to the Unitarian chapel at Kingsley. They declared, that if I would not comply they would actually pull down the chapel. Our friends at Kingsley unitedly urged me to agree to the conditions; and I signed my resignation. There are a few sincere friends at Kingsley who were borne down by the above-mentioned party. We are informed, that at some distant time, they intend to sell the chapel to raise money for erecting a chapel of ease. I preach at my own house every fortnight, and am better attended than I was at Kingsley; and there is a prospect of raising a congregation. We had it in contemplation

to build a chapel in the parish of Delamere, before we were driven from Kingsley, if we could receive a little assistance. There are three promising young men in the neighbourhood, who have preached for us, and whose active services encourage the hope of much usefulness. I called on the Rev. Mr. Lyons in the spring of last year, and stated our case. He wished me to draw up proposals for the building of a chapel at Delamere. Delamere is one of the most improved places in Cheshire. We conceive that a chapel would be of singular use, and that we might obtain a good Sunday-school. As the materials for building are close at hand, as wages are low, as we have 15*l.* in hand, and as the land would be given, the expense would not exceed 60*l.* We submit this statement to the consideration of the public, if you think it proper to insert it in the Monthly Repository or Christian Reformer, hoping that we may receive aid from some of our Unitarian brethren, and from some of the Fellowship Funds.

I remain,

Your persecuted and humble servant,
EDWARD ASTBURY.

Delamere, Jan. 31, 1822.

Members
of my
Congregation. } WILLIAM GARNER.
GEORGE FERMAH.

Unitarian Petitions on the Marriage Law.

THE COMMITTEE of the UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION have reminded the different congregations in connexion with the Society, that it is desirable to be prepared with petitions to both Houses of Parliament on the subject of the Marriage Law as early as possible in the present Session. They state that the petitions may either be sent to the Secretary, Mr. Edgar Taylor, for presentation, or put into the hands of any Member of Parliament whose support a congregation can obtain. Forms of the petition may be obtained of the Association, on application to the Secretary. They are nearly the same as those adopted in the last Session of Parliament, and proceed upon the principle of the Bill, drawn up by Mr. Richmond, and adopted by the Association, and heretofore presented to the House of Commons by Mr. W. Smith. The present state of the Marriage Law is explained, Mon. Repos. XIV. 174—178. The Bill referred to will be found in the same volume, p. 383. And the proceedings in Parliament upon the question are reported, XIV. 383—386, and 446, and XVI. 498, 499.

Ecclesiastical Preferments.

Rev. C. J. BLOMFIELD, D. D., (Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate,) to be Archdeacon of Colchester.

Rev. T. W. BLOMBERG, M. A., to be Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's Cathedral, *vice* Dr. Samuel Ryder Weston, deceased.

Rev. G. HOLCOMBE, D. D., to be a Prebendary of Westminster, *vice* Blomberg.

Hon. and Rev. J. E. BOSCAWEN, M. A., to be Canon or Prebendary of Canterbury, *vice* Holcombe.

The King has been pleased to grant to the Rev. J. H. MONK, B. D. and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, the Deanery of Peterborough, void by the Death of the Rev. Dr. T. Kipling.

A List of the Committee of Deputies appointed to protect the Civil Rights of the three Denominations of Protestant Dissenters, for the Year 1822.

William Smith, Esq., M. P., Chairman, Philpot Lane; Joseph Gutteridge, Esq., Deputy Chairman, Camberwell; James Collins, Esq., Treasurer, Spital Square; John Christie, Esq., Hackney Wick; Samuel Favell, Esq., Camberwell; Benjamin Shaw, Esq., London Bridge-foot; Henry Waymouth, Esq., Wandsworth Common; Joseph Stonard, Esq., Stamford Hill; William Titford, Esq., West Street, Walworth; John Bentley, Esq., Highbury; John T. Rutt, Esq., Clapton; Robert Wainewright, Esq., Gray's Inn Square; Robert Winter, Esq., Bedford Row; B. P. Witts, Esq., Friday Street; Thomas Wood, Esq., Little St. Thomas Apostle, Queen Street; William Freme, Esq., Catherine Court, Tower Hill; George Hammond, Esq., Whitechapel; William Marston, Esq., East Street, Red Lion Square; Joseph Benwell, Esq., Battersea; William Esdaile, Esq., Clapham Common; William Hale, Esq., Homerton; John Addington, Esq., Spital Square; William Burls, Esq., Lothbury; Thomas Stiff, Esq., New Street, Covent Garden.

Bigotry in a Public Company.—A vacancy was recently declared in the office of clerk to the MERCHANT TAYLORS' COMPANY, one of the most opulent of the chartered Companies of the city of London. A great number of gentlemen in the profession of the law, some of them of the highest respectability, started as candidates. To reduce their number, in order to make an election more easy,

various expedients were adopted; amongst others a test or subscription of assent and consent to the doctrine and worship of the Church of England. On hearing this, one of the candidates, at whom, perhaps, on account of his interest, this precaution was pointed, instantly withdrew, and addressed a letter "To the Master, Warden and Court of Assistants of the Worshipful Company," a copy of which is now before us in print, and which speaks such a noble feeling of honour and Christian integrity, that we cannot refrain from making an extract:

"I have been made acquainted with a Resolution, which, although not officially promulgated, is yet universally understood to have been recently adopted by your Court, excluding from the existing competition for the office of your clerk and solicitor, all persons who in their religious professions are not members of the Church of England.

"It would not become me, under present circumstances, to inquire what connexion there can possibly exist between particular modes of Christian faith, and the professional duties of the office referred to; much less does it belong to me to question the propriety of such a rule of election. It is sufficient for me to know that such an exclusive qualification is insisted on, and that my conscientious persuasion disqualifies me from continuing a candidate. I am very averse from any thing which might be deemed an ostentatious or unnecessary profession of my religious tenets; but I consider it due to truth and consistency of character, to avow, on the present occasion, that those which I profess, derived from my ancestors and confirmed by personal conviction, place me beyond the pale of qualification. And I feel assured that I should not be considered by others, any more than by myself, a deserving object of your choice, if I could hesitate one moment, in taking the determination I have now come to.

"The reception I experienced on my canvas, induces me to flatter myself, that, but for this peculiar exclusion, I should have been justified in entertaining the most confident expectation of success; and I trust I may be permitted to say, without the imputation of offence, it is no small consolation to me to find that I am excluded from being a *Candidate*, not rejected at the *Election*; and that my exclusion is produced, not by personal objection, but by the mere difference of religious persuasion, acknowledged to be equally conscientious in each party.

Although disappointed in an object of

professional ambition to which he had a fair claim, the writer appears to us to derive more honour from this manly and Christian avowal than he could have derived from any office whatever.

It has been questioned whether the Company had a legal right to adopt their resolution; but allowing this, we may be permitted to say, that it was not liberal to the Dissenters who are on the Court and in the Company, it was not considerate towards the candidates, and it is surely unworthy of a public body in the metropolis in this era of light and liberty. If the object be more than an election-manceuvre, if it be intended to shut out Dissenters altogether, the Court must go yet farther, and decree that any of their officers becoming Dissenters shall be *ipso facto* excluded. Are they prepared for this act of persecution?—While the door to public employment is thus closed against Dissenters, the Dissenters themselves have for the last half century been opening trusts and emoluments, of which they had the disposal, to Churchmen; and the consequence has been in certain hospitals and charities that we could name, that the members of the Establishment have by degrees obtained the ascendancy, and wholly excluded the Dissenters. Thus have this latter class of persons been doubly injured. Let them, then, take the matter into consideration, and henceforth act, not indeed with illiberality, (for even by way of retaliation that is always bad,) but with a due care of the interests of their own denomination and of the claims of their posterity upon institutions founded or endowed, with a view to their benefit or influence, by benefactors who either were of their own persuasion, or considered that their charities would be best administered by such as were.

Cambridge, Jan. 4.—R. WOODHOUSE, Esq. M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Caius College, and Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, was yesterday unanimously elected Plumian Professor of Experimental Philosophy, in the room of the late Archdeacon Vince. The Rev. J. LONSDALE, M.A., Tutor of King's College, is elected Christian Advocate, in the room of the Rev. T. Rennell. The Rev. C. BENSON, M.A., Fellow of Magdalene College, is continued Hulsean Lecturer for the present year. The Hulsean Prize for the year 1821 was, on Monday last, adjudged to W. TROLLOPE, B.A., of Pembroke Hall: subject, "The expedients to which the Gentile philosophers resorted, in opposing the progress of the Gospel, described and applied in illustration

of the truth of the Christian religion." The subject of the Hulsean Prize Dissertation, for the present year, is, "The argument for the genuineness of the sacred volume as generally received by Christians."

Vaccination.—The Report of the National Vaccine Establishment is just published, signed by Sir Henry Hallford, and other eminent medical men. The subscribers say, that the result of another year's experience is "an increase of their confidence in the benefits of it." They rejoice that the practice of vaccine inoculation is growing. Many cases have been reported to them of small-pox in patients previously vaccinated; but, they add, "the disorder has always run a safe course, being uniformly exempt from the secondary fever, in which the patient dies most commonly when he dies of small-pox." They express their unqualified reprobation of the conduct of those medical practitioners, who, knowing well that vaccination scarcely occasions the slightest indisposition, that it spreads no contagion, that in a very large proportion of cases it affords an entire security against small-pox, and in almost every instance is a protection against danger from that disease, are yet hardy enough to persevere in recommending the insertion of a poison, of which they cannot pretend to anticipate either the measure or the issue." In conclusion, they report that the number of persons who have died of small-pox this year within the bills of mortality, is only 508, not more than two-thirds of the number who fell a sacrifice to that disease the year before.

Eton.—A Library for the first hundred Eton boys has been established at that College. His Majesty has expressed his approbation of this, and presented a superb copy of the Delphin and Variorum Classics to the institution.

The Rev. T. C. HOLLAND will resign the charge of the Unitarian congregation at Edinburgh in a few months. He announces to us his intention of undertaking the pastoral care of some congregation in South Britain. A vacancy will, of course, be created at Edinburgh.

Mr. WORDSWORTH has two new poetical works in the press. The first that will appear is entitled "Memorials of a Tour on the Continent," and the other "Ecclesiastical Sketches," in 3 Parts. Part 1. From the Introduction of Christianity into Britain to the Consummation of the Papal Dominion. Part 2. To the close of the Troubles in the Reign of

Charles I. Part 3. From the Restoration to the Present Times.

In compliance with the request of the friends of the deceased, *the Sermons* of the late Rev. CALEB EVANS, will be sent to the press as soon as it can be ascertained what number of copies may be wanted. To this small Volume (price five shillings) will be prefixed a *Portrait*, and the *Memoir* of Dr. Southwood Smith, inserted in our last number (pp. 55—60). An Appendix will contain the Deceased's "Week's Ramble into the Highlands of Scotland."

Mr. OVERTON has in the press an Inquiry into the Truth and Use of the Book of Enoch, as it respects his prophecies, visions, and account of fallen angels, such Book being at length found in the Ethiopic Canon, and put into English by Dr. Laurence.

The new PARLIAMENT has been chiefly occupied with the consideration of Agricultural Distress. Various and contradictory opinions have been hazarded by our legislators on the subject. Some attribute the difficulties of the farmers to the bounty of Providence, or, as the Marquis of Londonderry says, "the causes of nature," and represent plenty as the great curse of the country: this is surely quite a new doctrine, and, if true, requires a great part of the Bible and of our Prayer-Books to be remodelled. Others say, agreeably to the opinions of our fathers and of almost all mankind in all ages, that the pressure of taxation is the evil under which the nation groans; while the ministers and their partisans and some independent men who are theorists, seem to hold that taxation is a blessing! A Committee is appointed to discuss the matter and report upon it, but he must know little of the constitution of Parliament who expects much from a Committee of the House of Commons, where the Prime Minister has a secure majority.

It is our intention to take notice from time to time of such Parliamentary proceedings as bear upon the great question of religious liberty and ecclesiastical reform: and in this connexion, we have to record a curious motion of Mr. HUME's, the indefatigable friend of reform, by means of economy and retrenchment; it is, for a *Return of Half-Pay Officers in the Church*. How many and whom this return will include, we know not; but we suspect that it will comprehend more ecclesiastics than are dreamed of, and rumour says that there will be found in the list a certain bishop! On the motion being made, Mr. CALDWELL

asked, What would be the answer if these half-pay clergymen were called upon to serve again?

FOREIGN.

Memorial of Mr. Locke.—We find the following in the New Monthly Magazine for January, "Histor. Reg." p. 20. It is not stated where the intelligence is picked up; probably from some French Journal. We confess that we regard the story with suspicion.

"*Montpellier.*—A workman employed in removing the foundation of an old house near this city, found a glass bottle hermetically sealed; it was found to contain, in an excellent state of preservation, the following Latin inscription on vellum:—

"Mortalis! In thesauros incidisti! Hic in Christo FIDES, rebus in humanis MODUS patent. Ampulla nec vacua, nec vilis, quæ animo hilaritatem, corpori salutem, affert. Ex hac imbibere, et haustum, vino vel Falerno vel Chio, gratiorem hauries. Scripsit Johannes Locke, Anglus, A. D. 1675.

The following is a translation:

"Mortal! Thou hast found a treasure! Here are placed before you FAITH in Christ and MODERATION in things terrestrial. The bottle is neither empty nor of little worth, which affords cheerfulness to the mind and health to the body. Quaff of this, and thou shalt imbibe what is more precious than the juice of Falernum or Chios. So wrote John Locke, Englishman, in the year of our Lord, 1675."

The news from abroad is not characterized by variety. The UNITED STATES of America are rapidly reducing their debt, and at the same time increasing the means of national defence and improving their civil institutions. A proclamation has been addressed to the citizens of the United States by the Greek Senate at Kalamata, claiming their sympathy and aid as freemen on behalf of a people struggling for liberty against barbarous and sanguinary oppressors. The cause of the GREEKS is in abeyance. The greater part of the Morea and of the islands seems to be in their possession. Their capital, the seat of their senate and government, is Kalamata (just named) in Messenia. Here they have established a printing-office, from which the Acts of the Senate and the Bulletins of the armies are regularly issued, and from which also proceeds a new Journal, called *The Hellenic Trumpet*, edited by Theoclitos, a learned ecclesiastic. Their leaders judge rightly, that a free press is a formidable

weapon against imposture and tyranny. The tragical end of the Persian prince, Mahomet Ali Mirza, a powerful enemy of the Turks, who was found dead in his tent, is said to have damped (though we trust but for a moment) the enthusiasm of the Greeks. The negotiations between TURKEY and RUSSIA are not as yet brought to a conclusion. Some students at Constantinople, training up as teachers of Islamism, lately made a stir on occasion of the banishment of one of their Professors for alleged seditious expressions, which recalled the government to moderation: a proof that even here, under the throne of ignorance, there is felt the impulse of that popular feeling which agitates the rest of Europe.—The leaden sceptre of AUSTRIA presses upon the heart of beautiful Italy. The despot knows his enemies by instinct rather than wisdom, and we hear of the suppression of schools in Lombardy.—SPAIN and PORTUGAL are consolidating their free governments: the Priesthood in these lands of promise are declining daily in numbers and influence. A cloud is over FRANCE, portending, as some think, an explosion at no distant period. Superstition has shewn itself in a disgusting form in the conversion of the two daughters and the niece of Mr. Loveday, an English gentleman, to Popery: the actors in this gloomy farce were a Parisian school-mistress, certain priests and prelates, and, it is said, a prince of the blood in a mask. The event will, we trust, operate as a warning to our countrymen who send their children to France for education, some of whom have not scrupled to place their daughters for that purpose in religious houses. The new Royalist Ministry have succeeded in carrying through the Chambers a law with regard to the press, of a more despotic character than any measure brought forward in Europe for the last half-century. The discussions amongst the Deputies were exceedingly stormy: a considerable body of the patriots withdrew before the passing of the law, that they might not seem by their presence to give the colour of legislation to so fatal a violation of the Charter of Liberties. By this law it is a crime to question "the Divinity of Christ:" the French are not theologians, and the phrase may loosely mean the denial of the Christian religion; but the ambiguous wording of the law may be strained by bigots to the oppression of the liberal Protestants. How well was the present reigning family in France described by their late Rival, as having, in their exile and their experience during the Revolution, "learned nothing and forgotten nothing"!