

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CXC.V.]

MARCH, 1822.

[Vol. XVII.]

THE NONCONFORMIST. No. XXIV.

*On some of the existing Disabilities and Inconveniences which attach to
Dissent from the Church of England.*

IF we may credit the dotting eulogists of the "best constituted church in the world," she has never shrunk from the fullest investigation of her tenets, and has constantly been distinguished by the most unparalleled forbearance towards those who dissent from her doctrines and discipline. But without resorting to other sources of history, the records of our statute-book, which cannot be gainsayed by a church founded on Acts of Parliament, disclose her character in a somewhat less consistent and amiable point of view. The secret motives in which her separation from the Church of Rome originated, when compared with those which gave rise to Protestantism in other countries, were not peculiarly laudable for their purity, whether we trace them to the caprice and infidelity, or to the grasping avarice, of a sensual and arbitrary tyrant. How far the first public act of her separate existence displayed an enlightened preference to truth and simplicity in doctrine, or the most charitable spirit towards her opponents, is recorded in the statute passed in the 31st year of Henry's reign, "for abolishing of Diversity of Opinions in certain Articles concerning Christian Religion," by which, transubstantiation, the denial of the cup to the laity, private masses, auricular confession, and others of the most scandalous corruptions of Christianity, were consecrated as leading articles or doctrines of "the whole Church and Congregation of England," and the extreme penalty of death was denounced against all oppugners of the edict. *

* This statute was passed immediately after the Act for dissolving the greater Monasteries. The following is an abstract of its preamble:

Where the King's most excellent Majesty is, by God's law, supreme head, im-

The cool and unhesitating arrogance, with which the omniscience and infal-

mediately under him, of this whole Church and Congregation of England, intending the conservation of the same church and congregation in a true, sincere and uniform doctrine of Christ's religion; calling also to his blessed and most gracious remembrance, as well the great and quiet assurance, prosperous increase and other innumerable commodities which have ever insued concord and unities in opinions, as also the manifold perils, dangers and inconveniences which have heretofore, in many places and regions, grown, sprung and arisen of the diversities of minds and opinions, especially of matters of Christian religion; and therefore desiring, that such an unity should be charitably established in all things concerning the same, as might chiefly be to the honour of Almighty God, and, consequently, redound to the Commonwealth, had caused his Parliament, and also a synod and convocation of the Archbishops, &c. to be assembled.

The articles proposed for their consideration were six, relating to transubstantiation, communion in both kinds, celibacy of the priests, voluntary profession of celibacy, private masses and auricular confession. The King's most Royal Majesty, most prudently pondering and considering, that, by occasion of variable and sundry opinions and judgments of the said articles, great discord and variance had arisen, as well amongst the clergy of his realm, as amongst a great number of the vulgar people, his loving subjects of the same, and being in a full hope and trust, that a full and perfect resolution of the said articles should make a perfect concord and unity generally amongst all his loving and obedient subjects, of his most excellent goodness, not only commanded that the said articles should deliberately and advisedly, by his said Archbishops, &c., be debated, and their opinions to be understood, but also most graciously vouchsafed, in his own princely person, to descend unto his High Court of Parliament and counsel, and there, like a prince

liberty denied to the long acknowledged Vicar of Christ, are by this parliamentary Bull attributed to the new usurper of supremacy in the Christian church, cannot fail to excite a smile in modern days; and this notable statute remains a standing index of the height to which the tide of intolerant presumption had mounted, even after the waters of the great flood of Papal pretension had partially receded, and the everlasting hills of truth and Christian science had begun to re-appear. It is not competent to the partisans of that undefined and fluctuating abstraction, called the Church of England, to urge that the Roman Catholic religion was still the ruling religion of the country: the separate existence and moral reputation of their church must be dated from the period when she cast off her allegiance to the Court of Rome, but deliberately retained all the prominent points of the Catholic doctrines and ritual, in opposition to the arguments of more en-

of most high prudence and no less learning, opened and declared many things of high learning and great knowledge, touching the said articles.

With such princely help it was finally resolved as to the first article.

“That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ’s mighty word, (it being spoken by the priest,) is present, really under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and that, after the consecration, there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, nor any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man.”

The other articles received a resolution equally favourable to the good old practices and notions, and thus far his Majesty’s faithful Parliament may be tolerated in lauding his “godly studie, paine and travell;” but his godly enterprise was not thus to be accomplished: and it was, therefore, ordained, that if any persons by word, writing, imprinting, cyphering, or in any otherwise, did publish, preach, teach, say, affirm, declare, dispute, argue, or hold any opinion to the contrary, they and their aiders, comforters, counsellors, consentors and abettors therein, should be adjudged heretics, and should suffer death, by way of burning, without any abjuration, clergy, or sanctuary.

lightened Protestants in this and foreign countries.

The Church of England has, however, reluctantly * lowered her pretensions, both in theory and in practice. The statute-book has recognized the right not only of thinking, (which no law could ever controul,) but also of professing religious opinions inconsistent with those established as the national creed; and some of her most illustrious members have signalized themselves by the most enlightened principles of religious liberty: yet there are several civil inconveniences and disabilities to which Nonconformity still exposes its professors, the continuance of which can be justified by no reasonings in favour of the utility of civil establishments of religion, which must and ought to fall to the ground, if they can only stand by paralyzing the bonds of civil union, and erecting invidious distinctions between subjects equally attached to the constitution and well-being of their country.

It is well known, that, out of the phalanx of statutes behind which the Church of England was entrenched, before the Revolution in 1688, the Acts, commonly called the Corporation and Test Acts, are, at the present day, the most extensive infringements of the civil rights of Protestant Dissenters.

I shall not attempt imperfectly to echo the general arguments which have been so unanswerably urged for

* I say *reluctantly*, because every concession to the consciences of others has been opposed by a host of those of her members who have sustained her highest offices, or have put themselves forward as her only true champions. There never was an æra in her history in which the heads of the Church generally admitted the possibility of extending toleration without risking her existence. The majority are, indeed, satisfied when once the tolerant decree is passed; but a more consistent minority still indulge fond retrospections towards the golden days of proscription and penalty. These ecclesiastical curs will snarl over and gnaw the bare bones of intolerance, until they are wrested from their gripe by animals of a more generous breed. Their miserable feast is, I trust, for their own sakes, swiftly verging towards its final close.

the repeal of these falsely-imagined bulwarks of the Church, and which were very early put upon record in a Protest, by several noble Lords, against the rejection of a clause for taking Dissenters out of their operation, in the first session after the Revolution. *

* The following are the principal heads of this interesting document, extracted from a collection of the Lords' Protests, Vol. I. pp. 121—123.

"1st. Because it gives great part of the Protestant freemen of England reason to complain of inequality and hard usage, when they are excluded from public employments by a law, and also, because it deprives the King and kingdom of divers men fit and capable to serve the public in several stations, and that for a mere scruple of conscience, which can by no means render them suspected, much less disaffected, to the government.

"2dly. Because his Majesty, as the common and indulgent father of his people, having expressed an earnest desire of liberty for tender consciences to his Protestant subjects; and my Lords the Bishops having, divers of them, on several occasions professed an inclination, and owned the reasonableness of such a Christian temper; we apprehend it will raise suspicions in men's minds of something different from the case of religion or the public, or a design to heal our breaches, when they find that, by confining secular employments to ecclesiastical conformity, those are shut out from civil affairs whose doctrine and worship may be tolerated by authority of Parliament, there being a Bill before us by order of the House to that purpose; especially when, without this exclusive rigour, the Church is secured in all her privileges and preferments, nobody being hereby let into them who is not strictly conformable.

"4thly. Because it turns the edge of a law (we know not by what fate) upon Protestants and friends to the government, which was intended against Papists, to exclude them from places of trust, as men avowedly dangerous to our religion and government; and thus the taking the sacrament, which was enjoined only as a means to discover Papists, is now made a distinguishing duty amongst Protestants, to weaken the whole by casting off a part of them.

"5thly. Because mysteries of religion and divine worship are of divine original, and of a nature so wholly distant from the secular affairs of public society, that they cannot be applied to those ends; and therefore, the Church, by the law of the

But amongst the opponents of the more recent applications of the Dis-

gospel, as well as common prudence, ought to take care not to offend either tender consciences within itself, or give offence to those without, by mixing their sacred mysteries with secular interests.

"6thly. Because we cannot see how it can consist with the law of God, common equity, or the right of any free-born subject, that any one be punished without a crime: if it be a crime not to take the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England, every one ought to be punished for it, which nobody affirms; if it be no crime, those who are capable and judged fit for employments by the King, ought not to be punished with a law of exclusion, for not doing that which it is no crime to forbear: if it be urged still, as an effectual test to discover and keep out Papists, the taking the sacrament in those Protestant congregations where they are members and known, will be at least as effectual to that purpose."

I subjoin an extract from Mr. Beaufoy's long and able speech upon his application for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1787, as reported in Dodsley's Annual Register for that year, p. 116.

"The former act, which passed in the year 1672, at a moment when the first minister of state and the presumptive heir to the crown were professed Papists, and the king himself generally believed to be one in secret, bears the express title of "An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from *Popish Recusants*." The minister, Lord Clifford, who was a Catholic, attempted to persuade the Dissenters to oppose the bill, as subjecting them to penalties, who confessedly were not in any respect the objects of the law. The Dissenters, on the contrary, through the mouth of Alderman Love, member for the city, declared, that in a time of public danger, when delay might be fatal, they would not impede the progress of a bill which was thought essential to the safety of the kingdom, but would trust to the good faith, the justice and humanity of Parliament, that a bill for the relief of the Dissenters should afterwards be passed. The Lords and Commons admitted, without hesitation, the equity of the claim, and accordingly passed a bill soon after for their relief; but its success was defeated by the sudden prorogation of Parliament. A second bill was brought in, in the year 1680, and passed both Houses; but while it lay ready for the Royal assent, King Charles the Second, who was much exasperated with the

seenters for relief from the sacramental Test, it has been a favourite topic of argument, that the acts annually passed for indemnifying persons who have not qualified for office according to law, give the Dissenters a substantial practical protection against the penalties and disabilities incurred by non-compliance with the Test, and render their petitions for relief factious and unreasonable.* Without examining the consistency of this view of the subject with the supposed necessity of the Test, it may deserve some little inquiry, how far the argument is in itself founded upon fact; in other words, how far a professed Nonconformist, who scruples the Test as a qualification for civil offices, is protected by the present practice of passing annual Indemnity Bills. The inquiry will derive some interest from the circumstance, that there are understood to be at the present time individuals personally and materially affected in the determination of the question.

It will be necessary shortly to state the tenor of the original enactments, in order to bring the subject more clearly into view.

The Corporation Act (13 Charles II. Stat. 2, c. 1 †) is intituled, "An

Dissenters for refusing to support the Catholics, prevailed upon the clerk to steal the bill. With respect to the Corporation Act, which passed in the year 1661, when the kingdom was still agitated with the effects of those storms that had so lately overwhelmed it, it was allowed to have had the sectaries of that day, who had borne a conspicuous part in the preceding troubles, for its object. But the Dissenters of the present day were not responsible for them, and were as well affected and peaceable subjects as those of any other description."

* Mr. Pitt concluded his speech against Mr. Beaufoy's motion in 1787, with declaring, "that the discretionary power wisely lodged and liberally exercised every year in Bills of Indemnity, left the Dissenters no reasonable ground of complaint." Mr. Canning and others have since echoed the same declaration, and the Dissenters themselves appear to have felt the force of the reproof.

† The Acts of the 13th of Charles II. are formally stated to have been enacted "to the high pleasure of Almighty God, and to the weal public of the realm;"

Act for the well-governing and regulating of Corporations,"—to the end that the succession in corporations might be most probably perpetuated in the hands of persons well-affected to his Majesty and the established government: (such are the words of the preamble :) it enacts, that no person should be placed, elected or chosen in or to any the offices or places aforesaid, (viz. mayors, aldermen, recorders, bailiffs, town-clerks, common-councilmen and others bearing any office of magistracy, or places, or trusts, or other employment * relating to or concerning the government of cities, corporations, boroughs, cinque-ports and port towns,) that should not have, within one year next before such election or choice, taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the rites of the Church of England; and in default thereof, every such placing, election and choice, is declared to be void.

The Test Act (25 Charles II. c. 2) is intituled, "An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants," † and enacted that all persons that should be admitted into any office, civil or military, or should have command or place of trust, from or under his Majesty, &c., should, at specified times and places, take the oaths prescribed by the statute, and should also receive the sacrament according to the Church of England,

and include, besides the law as to Corporations, Acts for a free and voluntary present to his Majesty, for providing necessary carriages for his Majesty in his royal progress, and against the unlawful coursing of deer, &c. &c.

* It was even once contended, that common freemen ought to take the Test, but decided otherwise in the case of the Borough of Christchurch. 2 Strange, 828.

† The grand source of danger, against which this statute was directed, is impressed upon its forehead. It would be a climax of injustice, as whimsical as it would be detestable, if, as it has been whispered, the present government, in consenting to the emancipation of the Catholics, should leave Protestant Dissenters under the ban of a law which originated in the dread entertained by Protestants in general of the return of Popish ascendancy.

within three months after his or their admittance in or receiving their authority and employment, in some public church upon some Lord's day, immediately after divine service and sermon, and should deliver a certificate of so receiving it, under the hands of the minister and churchwarden, and should then make proof of the truth thereof, by two credible witnesses, at the least, upon oath, and that all persons neglecting or refusing, should be *ipso facto* adjudged incapable and disabled in law, to all intents and purposes, to have, occupy and enjoy the said office or employment, or any profit or advantage appertaining, &c. The 5th section declares, that, upon being convicted of executing any office after a neglect or *refusal* to comply with the Act, the offender is to forfeit 500*l.* to the informer, and is, moreover, disabled to sue in any court of law or equity, to be guardian of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or to be capable of a legacy or gift, or of holding any office whatever. The offices of constables, overseers, churchwardens, surveyors of the highways, or "any like inferior civil offices," are left open to the ambition of Nonconformists, who are also tolerated in exercising the functions of a gamekeeper, or like private offices.

The first statute I have met with, which bears any close resemblance to the modern Indemnity Act, is the statute 1 William and Mary, Sess. 1, c. 8, by which the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, previously existing, were abrogated, and the oath of abjuration directed. The 14th section recites, that since the 11th Dec., 1688, the abrogated oaths could not be taken by any person elected to corporation offices, by reason whereof his election was void by the act of 13 Charles II., and indemnifies him upon taking the new oath within a limited time. The 15th section contains a like provision for officers incapacitated by neglect of the requisitions of the Test Act.

But in this statute we do not find any symptom of a disposition to relax these laws, out of deference to the scruples of Dissenters; on the contrary, it is upon record, that clauses proposed in favour of Protestant Nonconformists were rejected. See Lords' Protests, Vol. I. pp. 120, 121.

The Toleration Act, which was passed in the same session, in making a sweeping repeal of the laws passed for repressing Papists and Popish recusants, so far as they affected Protestant Dissenters, expressly excepts the Test Act, and also the statute of 30th Charles II., for disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament; with the requisitions of which latter statute, however, Protestant Dissenters had never any difficulty in complying. It is rather singular that the Corporation Act was not also the subject of express exception, but I presume it was not considered to come precisely within the description of an act against Popish recusants.

There is no other statute in this reign which answers to the modern annual Indemnity Act. There is, indeed, an Act of a similar description, (11 and 12 Wm. III. c. 17,) intended to protect the officers of government against the penalties incurred by a neglect to subscribe the Protestant Association, which, having originated in a voluntary engagement to protect the person of the Sovereign, had been legalized and continued as an additional Test until the accession of Queen Anne, when all laws relative to the Association were annulled.

It would seem, from the case of the King *v.* Haines, which occurred in the 7th year of King William III., and is reported in Skinner, p. 583, that the Corporation Act was occasionally made the instrument of private malice and revenge, even against regular Conformists. The reporter says, that this prosecution against an alderman of Worcester, appeared upon the trial to be a warm prosecution, fomented by a person in *the highest civil station*, upon a private pique, the defendant having omitted to take the sacrament three days after the time prescribed by the Act, but, upon notice, he received the sacrament, and intended to take the oaths (he being a person in all points conformable, and who communicated frequently every year, and had taken the oaths several times) at the next sessions, which were accidentally adjourned. The defendant was acquitted for want of sufficient evidence of the charge of *having acted* after the time limited.

The statute 1 Anne (Sess. 2, c. 17) appears to have reference to such

cases as that just noticed, for it recapacitates those who had neglected to take the oath of abjuration, &c., through ignorance or mistake, or by not duly holding the courts when the same ought to have been holden, or for some other such like reasons.

We need hardly expect to find in Queen Anne's days any legislative provision relaxing the obligation to take the Test. On the contrary, the High Church party, after several unsuccessful struggles, obtained the celebrated Act against occasional Conformity, and disgraced the closing session of this reign by the infamous Schism Bill, which, by the death of the Queen, was fortunately prevented from acquiring the character of an essential bulwark of the Church.

In the Act passed at the commencement of the reign of George the First, (Stat. 2, c. 13,) for confirming the oaths of allegiance, supremacy and abjuration, it was enacted, that all persons who, by virtue of any law then in being, are or would be obliged to receive the Sacrament, &c., on any occasion whatsoever, should continue obliged, under the penalties required by any former Act; and the 23rd section declares, that all persons who should comply with the Tests, within a time limited, should be indemnified against all penalties and incapacities incurred by any former neglect or omission.

The reign of this monarch was, upon the whole, decidedly favourable to the full enjoyment, by the Protestant Dissenters, of all the rights of good subjects, the consequence, not only of the personal feelings of the sovereign, but of the critical circumstances of the state: yet the Act 5 George I. c. 4, which repealed the Schism Bill and the provisions of the statute 10 Anne, c. 2, against occasional Conformity, merely restored Dissenters to their former footing, giving, indeed, an indirect sanction to the practice of occasional Conformity, by substituting, in place of the repealed enactments, a mere prohibition to public officers from attending Nonconformist worship with their official state.

The act passed in the same session for modifying the Corporation Act, cannot be viewed as a boon to the Dissenters, it having been evidently

passed to avoid the extensive public inconveniences which had resulted from its original operation. By this statute, (5 George I., c. 6,) intituled, "An Act for quieting an establishing Corporations," the then existing members of corporations were confirmed in their offices, notwithstanding their omission to take the Sacrament, and were indemnified against penalties; and after enacting, that none of their acts, or the acts not then avoided of former members of corporations, should be questioned, the Act proceeds in the following words: "nor shall any person or persons who shall be hereafter placed, elected or chosen in or to any the offices aforesaid, be removed by the Corporation, or otherwise prosecuted for or by reason of such omission; nor shall any incapacity, disability, forfeiture or penalty, be incurred by reason of the same, unless such person be so removed, or such prosecution be commenced within six months after such person's being placed or elected into his respective office, as aforesaid; and that, in case of a prosecution, the same be carried on without wilful delay."

We now come to the reign of George the Second, in which the practice of annual Indemnity Acts took its rise. An Act was passed in the second year after his accession, for quieting the minds of his Majesty's subjects, and preventing the inconveniences that might otherwise happen to divers persons who ought to have qualified, according to *the Test Act*, but who had, through the shortness of the time allowed for that purpose, or some accident, omitted so to do. In its enacting clause, it appears to be framed on the model of that passed in the former reign, and specifies the 1st of August as the period of indulgence.

The statute 9 Geo. II. C. 26, may be considered the first of the series of Acts which, with very few exceptions, have been passed annually since that period, and under which professed Nonconformists have been generally regarded as receiving a protection equal in effect to a repeal of *the Test Act*. Upon looking at the preamble, however, we find that the persons intended to be benefited were those who, through ignorance of the law, absence, the shortness of the time allowed for

that purpose, or some *unavoidable accident*, omitted to qualify; and the enacting clause is introduced by the words, "For preventing the inconveniences that might otherwise happen by reason of *such* omissions." It goes a step further than the previous Acts, in extending to *penalties*, &c. not only incurred, but also *to be incurred* by reason of any *former neglect*; but it contemplates and provides for no *future omissions*, or their attendant penalties.

The Indemnity Act of the 16th year of George the Second, (cap. 30, sec. 3,) reciting, that by *the Test Act* persons admitted into office should receive the Sacrament within three months, enlarges the time to six months, but expressly reiterates the penalties of the act against any longer neglect.

I have not been able to trace any material variation in the form of these Acts down to the Union, as they are not generally reprinted in the Statutes at large, but there is no reason to believe that any words have been introduced to countenance an intentional omission to qualify, which might, perhaps, not unfairly be presumed against a professed Nonconformist. And it is remarkable, that in the Act of Indemnity passed with reference to Ireland, in the session after the Union, its objects are described as persons *well affected* to his Majesty's government, and to the United Church of England and Ireland, who had, through ignorance of the law, neglected, or been by sickness or other unavoidable causes, prevented from qualifying.*

The most modern Act of Indemnity, printed at length in the Statutes at large, is that of the 42 Geo. III. c. 23, with which the subsequent acts are stated to correspond. It extends to omissions to qualify under the Corporation Act, which the acts in George 2nd's reign do not appear to have done. In its preamble, it refers the

omissions intended to be protected against, to "ignorance of the law, absence or some unavoidable accident;" and then proceeds to enact, for preventing inconveniences from *such* omissions, that all persons who at or before the passing of the Act had omitted to receive the sacrament, &c., within such time, &c. as is required by law, and who, after accepting any office, &c., but before passing the Act, had received the sacrament, &c., or who before the 25th December, 1802, should receive the same, should be indemnified and discharged from all penalties and incapacities incurred or to be incurred by reason of any neglect or omission previous to the passing of the Act, and should be fully recapacitated, &c., and should be adjudged to have qualified themselves; and that all elections and qualifications of, and acts by, such persons, should be of the same validity as if they had duly qualified according to law. But the 2nd section provides, that the Indemnity should not extend to persons against whom final judgment had been obtained for any penalty incurred by neglecting to qualify. The 5th section provides, that the Act shall not restore or entitle any person to any office, &c., already actually avoided, by judgment of any of his Majesty's Courts of Record, or already legally filled up and enjoyed by any other person.

It is observable, that, instead of the 1st of August, according to the earlier acts, the period of indemnity was enlarged to the 25th of December, in the acts passed in 1798 and the following years up to the year 1807; and it is a remarkable circumstance, that in each of the sessions of the two Parliaments which met in that year, an Act of Indemnity was passed, the first giving time until the 25th day of December, and the second prolonging it until the 25th of March. These alterations, combined with the present practice of convening Parliament early in the year, have been generally regarded as not merely circumscribing the operations of the informer within very narrow limits, but as effecting a complete suspension of all prosecutions under the Test laws.

Upon this review of the Corporation and Test Acts, and the statutes

* It is understood that the Test and Corporation Acts have no present operation against Protestant Dissenters in Ireland. The Act of Enfranchisement must be an interesting document, and should have been introduced, if I had been able to procure a sight of it.

which have modified their operation, it must be evident that Nonconformists of all descriptions are out of the purview and intent of the latter, which are professedly passed to obviate inconveniences arising from accident or inadvertence, and not such as result from a deliberate and conscientious opposition to the law. I do not, therefore, think, that a judge could be severely reflected upon for illiberality, who should manifest a decided leaning to confine the relief afforded by the Indemnity Acts to those against whom no overt acts of dissent could be proved upon which to raise a fair presumption, that the omission to take the Test proceeded from principle, and not from ignorance or accident. Were a more liberal construction established, it is evident that Roman Catholics, as well as Protestant Dissenters, might take shelter under these Acts, and that they are entitled to do so is the published opinion of their learned and liberal advocate Mr. Butler; * adopted, perhaps rather hastily, from the current notion of their beneficial operation as to other Nonconformists.

2. But, assuming that the general terms used in the enacting clause of the Indemnity Act would not be restrained by the recital of its purpose and intention, and that consistent Nonconformists may be considered as included, it would seem that the protection afforded by these successive Acts, either to the inadvertent omission or to the determined repudiation of the Test, is by no means complete: for, suppose an individual to have accepted office five months before the passing of the annual Act, and to have omitted to qualify according to the *Test Act*, he is not an object of the Indemnity proposed, for as yet he has been guilty of no omission which makes him liable to a prosecution; but, in the space of a month, proceedings may be instituted against him, and in the ordinary course of law, final judgment may be obtained for the pecuniary penalty before the recurrence of a new bill, which will not, in such case, relieve him from any portion of the enormous load of incapacity, denounced by the

Test Act, amounting as we have seen to a kind of civil outlawry.

3. Neither is it to be overlooked, that the protection granted by these Acts, however complete, rests upon the presumption of their being regularly passed; for if, in consequence of some extraordinary emergency affecting the usual routine of parliamentary business, or under the temporary influence of some besotted hue and cry against all dissenters from the Church Establishment, the Act should not be passed at all, or be restricted in its extent, Dissenters, who had unwarily accepted office upon the faith of its recurrence, would be affected with all the consequences of an *ex post facto* law, and have no alternative between swallowing the Test or braving the utmost penalties of the Act imposing it.

4. The foregoing observations apply more particularly to the Test Act; for, with respect to offices included under the provisions of the Corporation Act, it is obvious to remark, that the sacramental qualification ought to precede the election to office, otherwise the election is declared absolutely void; and the Act of 5 Geo. I. c. 6, is only a statute of limitation, founded on the political inconvenience of allowing a latent disqualification to vitiate official acts; * it merely gives a retrospective validity to the election, provided the person shall not be removed within six months; and as the annual Indemnity Act does not re-capacitate the party, unless he receive the Sacrament before the office have been actually avoided by judgment, or legally filled up, it is plain that during half a year after entering upon office, the consistent Dissenter is exposed to removal or prosecution, which nothing but Conformity can avert. But this is not all: for

5. The candidate for a corporation office is liable to be questioned at the time of election as to his previous compliance with the Sacramental Test, and upon his confessing or not denying his omission in that respect, or (as it seems) *without any reference* to him, notice of his noncompliance will

* See Butler's Notes on Coke, Litt. IV. 391 (a).

* See King v. Corporation of Bedford, 1 East, 79.

have the effect of nullifying all votes subsequently given for him, and enabling the presiding officer to declare a rival candidate with a minority of votes to be duly elected: thus putting it into the power of any intriguing electioneer to rob the majority of their franchise, and thrust upon them an individual obnoxious in the highest degree.

This was exemplified in the case of the King *v.* Parry and Phillips, 1811, reported 14 East, 549, where informations, in the nature of a quo warranto, were exhibited against the defendants as Common-councilmen of Haverfordwest. It appeared that their votes more than trebled the numbers of votes for the candidates whose election was sought to be established, and would have been established but that the Mayor refused to admit them into office, and the defendants, in the mean time, removed their disabilities, by complying with the terms of the Indemnity Act. See also the case of the King *v.* Hawkins, 10 East, 211, in which the candidate, having the majority of legal, but a minority of actual, votes, had been declared duly elected, and was considered as legally filling the office; and the case of King *v.* Bridge, 1 Maule, and Selwyn, 76, which decides that a candidate cannot gain his election by a minority of votes given *before notice of the disqualification of his opponent*.

The existing notion, therefore, that the Corporation and Test Acts are in their actual operation a mere dead letter, is far from being founded in truth; and should the fashion of forming associations for enforcing the penal laws be extended to the laws against Nonconformity, there are many openings through which the astuteness of a legal secretary may pounce upon the luckless Dissenter, who may have trusted to common opinion for that protection which the laws, strictly construed, do not and were never intended to secure.

It has been suggested, that the Judges would, in deference to the general impression as to the intent and operation of these Acts of Indemnity, delay the trial or judgment in any proceeding which might be instituted under the Test Laws, so as to give the defendant the benefit of the next Indemnity Act; but this expect-

tation appears to me wholly unjustifiable; * and I, for one, would deprecate such an unprincipled interference with the course of the law on the part of any court of justice, the more especially as I feel convinced, that if those judicial characters who have, at various periods, signalized themselves by their enlarged views on the subject of religious liberty, had, by giving full scope to these barbarous enactments, exposed them to the eye of the public in all their naked deformity, they would have rendered a more essential and permanent service to that great cause, than any departure from the spirit of the statute book, in deference to the general spirit of the times could possibly effect. In this point of view, even the decision in Allen Evans's case † affords matter of doubtful tri-

* The case of *Rex v. Brown*, 29 Geo. III., reported in a Note to 3 Term Reports, p. 574, will, perhaps, be thought conclusive upon this point. A rule for an information, in the nature of a quo warranto, against the defendants as Common-councilmen of York, for not having received the Sacrament, was obtained within six months after their election, and Erskine shewed cause against the rule, urging, that if the court thought the granting of these informations discretionary, no case could occur where that discretion might be more properly exercised; for the necessity of the statute in question had been long since done away, and the defendants had been elected without their knowledge, and in their absence, and by their affidavits state, unequivocally, that they are members of the Church of England. Lord Kenyon said, "I think we are bound to grant this information. The law has said that the magistracy of the country shall be in the hands of those who profess the religion of the Church of England. This law has been revised and softened down since the accession of the House of Hanover; but we are now called upon to pare away the provisions of it still more than the Legislature have yet thought fit to do."

† See 2 Burn's Eccl. Law. Tit. Dissenters; 3 Brown's Parl. Cases, 476.

It seems the question ultimately decided in that celebrated case was very early agitated in the cases of the Mayor, &c. of Guildford *v.* Clerk, (2 William and Mary,) 2 Ventris, 247, and the King *v.* Jarwood, (6 William III.,) reported in Skinner, 574, 4 Modern, 270. The latter was upon an information against the

umph to the Dissenting cause, for a contrary result would have brought Dissenters before Parliament with an unquestionable grievance, and they might probably have been long ago released from that bed of Procrustes, upon which it was attempted to stretch them, not by exonerating them from all legal eligibility to offices which, though burdensome, every good citizen will wish to share; but by erasing from our Code every impious enactment which presumes to interpose between man and his Maker, or to connect criminality and civil incapacity with a conscientious desire to preserve an unsullied loyalty, an untainted allegiance to the King of kings.

Before I close this subject I would offer a remark upon the strange notion

defendant, as Sheriff of Norwich, for refusing to be sworn into office. S. Eyres, Justice, argued for the defendant, (and his opinion was said to be that of Lord Keeper Somers,) that the exclusion from office was a punishment of itself, and, therefore the party should not be fined: but G. Eyres, Justice, and Holt, Chief-Justice, said, the intent of the Corporation Act was not to exempt any man from serving the King, or to give ease or favour to Dissenters, but rather to *draw them to a reconciliation with the Church, as a way to render them capable of offices in the government*: this was the design of the Act; and if the plea in that case was good, a man should be excused for not serving the King, which is one offence, for (by) not receiving the Sacrament within the year, which is another offence. In the same case, Holt, Chief-Justice, remarked, that the design of the Corporation and Test Acts was the same, the one to exclude Dissenters, and the other to exclude Papists; and it never had been thought that if a man would not qualify himself, it was an excuse under the Test Act; that there never was any distinction between Protestant and other Dissenters, till after the Toleration Act; and that it had been for thirty years the opinion of men learned in the profession, that the Corporation Act did not exempt Dissenters, and they had always submitted to fines in London and Norwich also. But the reasoning of the two latter Judges, or, at least, their judgment, proceeded upon the circumstance of the Toleration Act being not specially pleaded in bar, it being at that time regarded as a private Act, though since declared a public Act by Stat. 19 George III. c. 44.

which appears to be widely prevalent amongst the Dissenters of the present day, that our cause will be best promoted by a silent acquiescence in things as they are, until, by means of a series of amicable discussions, which some few leading individuals may have an opportunity of carrying on with the minister of the day, they have succeeded in convincing him, by our apparent insensibility and indifference as to the removal of our disabilities, that the right moment is arrived for our complete enfranchisement without risk to the sacred but puny twin-sister of the state. I readily admit that Dissenters would be ill-advised to make their appeal to the Legislature and the public in the language of violence or of marked disrespect to the institutions of their country, many of which, how essentially bad soever in theory, are yet by the general liberality of the public mind rendered comparatively innoxious in practice; nor would I be disposed to take my stand upon the high but disputable ground of abstract right as separated from expediency. But I would ask those silent negociators, who, whilst they are horrified at the indiscreet downrightness of Dr. Priestley in the year 1790, would in some sort *realize* his most appalling metaphor, by depositing explosive materials, *grain by grain*, under the edifice of intolerance, and reckon upon enlisting my Lord Liverpool as one of their corps of sappers and miners: I would ask them, I say, What is the experience upon which they ground the delusive notion, that the clear and manly cause of religious liberty will be most subserved by a patient waiting until the hearts of kings and senators are melted by the edifying spectacle? The history of the Test Act appears to read them a very different lesson, for it was upon private assurances of a speedy repeal as to the Dissenters that they concurred in its enactment; nor will the late statute for the relief of Antitrinitarians be regarded as an instance in favour of this quiet policy, whilst we have the Lord Chancellor's declaration sounding in our ears, that the Legislature, in passing that statute, had no idea of establishing a general principle of forbearance towards Antitrinitarians, but merely to repeal, or rather to mitigate, some of

the penalties denounced against them by the law as being considered a *little too severe*. It is by full, free and reiterated discussion alone, that the friends of the Dissenting interest, I would rather say of the general interests of truth and liberty, (apart from these the *Dissenting interest* shews paltry and base,) can hope finally to eradicate that dissocial, antichristian system under which the Saviour has been so often mocked with the purple robe of worldly dominion, and conscience has been made tributary to Cæsar's treasury. It is said, however, that preliminary discussion will expose our weakness, and lay open our assailable points to the attack of the enemy; but with reference to the Corporation and Test laws, are we not also concealing from our friends the precise situation of danger in which they stand, if, relying upon fancied indemnity, they should aspire to serve the public in civil offices? There are not many, it is to be hoped, who are perfectly contented to enjoy their birth-right, as it were, by stealth; and if amongst us there be any individual who has enough of the spirit of a Hampden publicly to hurl defiance against these degrading laws, or of another Curtius boldly to leap into the gulf of civil incapacity and penalties which they denounce, his glorious aim is to be answered, not by concealment, but by a full disclosure of the risk and danger he encounters, and by a fearless challenge to the supporters of these favourite laws to display their excellence in their amiable operation. In short, ours is not a petty question of duties and drawbacks, or of agricultural or commercial preferences, upon which we must necessarily approach the bar of the Legislature through the audience-chamber of the First Lord of the Treasury: we boldly but temperately ask, Is it fitting that large classes of the community should remain under the proscription of statutes which were not originally levelled against them, and which were enacted under the pressure of a political exigency long since passed away? If we are still denounced as unfit to be invested with civil trust and honour, let us be content to dignify our private stations by consistency in profession and unwavering integrity in practice; but if bigotry and intolerance receive a pub-

lic defeat, and our just claims be conceded, we shall have "our charter and freehold of rejoicing to us and our heirs," and our triumph will consist not so much in the advancement of our personal and sectarian interests, as in rescuing our great and beloved country from the taunts of other nations, far behind her in religious knowledge, but whose renovated codes are happily free from the abomination of imposing a theological shibboleth at the threshold of the council-chamber or the custom-house.

It was my intention to have brought into discussion the inconveniences to which Nonconformists are subjected by the present state of the law with respect to the registration of the births of their children; inconveniences which, like the grievance of the Marriage Law, are the result of that incongruous union which subsists between functions purely civil and those of an ecclesiastical nature; but I must be brief. It is well known that Dissenters have made provision against the loss, destruction or negligent keeping of their congregational registers, by a Register at Dr. Williams's Library, the great utility of which cannot be disputed, and ought to be still more generally known. But as this register is unsupported by any legal sanction, the evidence supplied from it is not in a legal point of view of the highest and most conclusive kind, and a recent instance occurred at the Rolls' Court in which the Register was not admitted. See I Jacob and Walker's Reports, p. 483. It is understood that the evidence has since been accepted; but the legal difficulty unquestionably remains, and may prove a fruitful source of vexatious and expensive delay whenever it is urged. It is passing strange, that in a case of such general concernment, and which by no means presses exclusively upon Dissenters, (for the children of Dissenters sometimes swell the ranks of Conformity,) the Legislature should suffer the squeamish scruples of a few of the Church clergy to stand in the way of reformation. If the object were to make the clergy the collectors of a tax for some just and necessary war, how few of them would express any distaste for the office, or that part of it in particular which would bring them into collision with the self-ex-

communicated Dissenter! This is not an uncharitable prognostication, but is grounded upon fact and experience.

By the statute 6 and 7 William III., duties were imposed upon marriages, births and burials, for carrying on the war against France with vigour; and by the 24th section, persons in holy orders, deans, parsons, &c., were, for better levying those duties, directed within their respective parishes, and to take an exact and true account, and keep a register in writing of all persons married, buried, christened *or born*, under a penalty of £100.

By another Act, passed in the following year, (7 and 8 William III. c. 35,) after reciting that divers children, who were born within this kingdom, were not christened according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and many were christened in private houses, nor were the parents of such children obliged to give notice to their respective ministers, of the births of such children, for want whereof an exact register of all persons born was not kept, and many persons chargeable with the duties escaped payment: for remedy thereof it was enacted, that the parents of every child which should be born during the continuance of the Acts should, within five days after such birth, give notice to the rector, vicar, curate or clerk of the parish, of the day of the birth of such child, under penalty of 40s., the which rector, &c., was required to take an exact and true account, and keep a distinct register of all persons so born and not christened, for a fee of 6d., under a penalty of 40s.

It is wonderful that a regulation of so much political utility should be made dependant upon the continuance of a paltry tax; but, at any rate, we possess in these expired Acts that all-important ally, a *precedent*, in attempting, at some convenient opportunity, to impose on the clergy the duty of registering the births of all children within their parishes, without distinction of sect, or at least to press upon them the alternative of performing efficiently the office of public registrars, or of relinquishing it altogether. It is matter of notoriety, that the Act, passed a few years ago, relative to parochial registers, was rendered very imperfect in its operation through the intolerant scruples of some of the

clergy, there being, in fact, no provision for recording the date of the natural birth, which is therefore left to other evidence, or to vague presumption as to the length of the interval between the birth and baptism. The objections of the clergy on this point are the more unreasonable, as it has been solemnly decided that, according to the canons of their own Church, lay-baptism is as valid as any sprinkling by consecrated fingers.

If this union of the Church and State, of ecclesiastical and civil functions, is like the union of the ivy with the oak, to blast or check all wholesome improvement in the latter, the more liberal adherents of the Church must admit that the treaty of alliance needs some revision, and that the complaints of their Dissenting fellow-subjects are not, to this extent at least, either selfish, frivolous or vexatious.

R. D.

SIR,

IN adverting to the inquiry, so pointedly yet modestly proposed in a former Number, *whether the ancient Patriarchs and Israelites believed in a future state*, it may be observed, first, that the Christian Church in general hath been on the affirmative side of the question; and though this is not an absolute proof of the fact, yet, in a case which involves no palpable absurdity or contradiction, where it is impossible to prove a negative, and which admits at least of many plausible reasons in its behalf, general consent will operate as a considerable argument in its favour, since it is found, that, in similar circumstances, wise and reflecting men in all ages have thought nearly alike upon all great and important subjects. If, therefore, under the light of nature alone, such persons, reasoning from the best ideas they could form of the Divine perfections and character, from the present state of man, his fears and his hopes, his desires of continued existence, and his anticipations of futurity; principles which are not confined to the learned and acute, but are to be found, in different degrees, in the lowest and most degraded forms of human society, and which will bid defiance to all the opponents of natural religion, whether sceptics or ultra-believers, to the end of time: if from

these principles, they arrived at considerable degrees of moral certainty in this important point, for "God and nature," says Mr. Baxter, "do nothing in vain," it must surely appear strange, if the leading members of the primitive church of God, with the additional aid of particular revelations and the occasional evidence of miracles, should deem these supernatural interpositions as only intended to promote a length of days in the earthly Canaan, and smooth their path through the present imperfect state, and leave them finally in the darkness and silence of the grave. They could at least reason as well upon general principles as Cicero or Seneca, Plato or Epictetus, and *the certainty* of higher states of existence and of superior beings, of which they had absolute demonstration, would naturally elevate their desires and expectations towards them. But let us briefly attend to the outlines of their history.

When the great Protoplast was introduced into Paradise, as, on the one hand, he could lay no claim to immortality, so, on the other, he could entertain no rational fear of dissolution, while he maintained his allegiance and integrity, and had continual access to "the tree of life," as a pledge or symbol of the Divine favour, and of his continued existence and happiness: for, being made perfect in his kind, and favoured with frequent communications from above, he could not avoid forming the most enlarged, the most unlimited expectations from the Divine bounty. To what end, would he naturally exclaim in the solemn season of devout meditation,—to what end hath the Almighty called me from nothing into being, and placed me in this fair and well-furnished world? To what end hath he endowed me with such astonishing powers and capacities, and rendered me superior to the numerous tribes of animals with which I am surrounded? Wherefore hath he made me capable of contemplating himself, of adoring his perfections, and of attaining to still higher and higher degrees of conformity to his moral image and likeness? Is it that, after a few revolutions of the seasons, I should lie down in the dust and return to my primitive non-existence? Impossible! Infinitely self-

sufficient to his own happiness, he hath created me for happiness also; and though as yet I have had no particular revelation of the number of my days, I will trust in his infinite goodness and his infinite power, and entertain, with gratitude and joy, the full, the delightful, the inestimable persuasion, that, while I continue to walk in the paths which he hath prescribed, I shall continue to be a partaker, in my measure and degree, of his favour and of his immortality.

But when Adam fell, these glorious prospects were obscured; they were *obscured*, but not obliterated or destroyed. In strict *law*, indeed, he was utterly lost; and in him, consequently, all his supposed posterity; (the latter not *morally*, but naturally;) he was judicially consigned over to death, not, as some suppose, to eternal torments, which are not mentioned in *the record*, but to *death*, which was the penalty annexed to the transgression: but now mercy intervenes, the sentence is suspended, a mysterious promise of a restoration to himself and his race is promulgated, and the first sinner, from a state of darkness and doubt bordering on absolute despair, is immediately raised to a state of exalted hope and confidence in God. In these circumstances, during the long course of his earthly pilgrimage, and probably favoured with further Divine communications of which we have no account, his hopes would naturally improve, and his prospects brighten. These sentiments would infallibly be transmitted to his posterity, and continually receiving fresh accession and increase; for, "it is natural to suppose, that God having once spoken to man, mankind would retain and repeat with great punctuality what had been said, and listen after more." *

In the time of *Seth* we read, that "men began to call upon the name of the Lord." Then commenced the external distinction between the world and the Church. The heads of pious families led the way, and "commanded their children and their households after them:" nor is it too much to suppose, that they met together at stated times, for public worship and

* Robinson's Notes on Claude, Pref.

instruction, probably at the new moons and on the sabbath-day, which some have thought, as a day of rest, was instituted in Paradise. We find, soon after, that "*Enoch* was translated without seeing death;" and *Jude* informs us, that he "prophesied" and preached to the people. Whether the sacred writer here refers to a genuine document or to an apocryphal writing, the book itself existed long before Christianity, and the quotation proves that *Enoch*, or the author of the book, (which is all one in this case,) believed "in the unity of God, and his natural and moral perfections, the essential difference of moral good and evil, and a day of future, impartial retribution." "Behold the Lord cometh with his holy myriads." * *Noah*, likewise, "was a preacher of righteousness while the ark was preparing." In the frequent supernatural revelations with which *Abraham* was favoured, (called, in Scripture language, which is never to be taken literally, "talking with God, and seeing God,") among other tokens and assurances of the Divine regard, it was announced, that "all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him." *Melchisedeck* "was a priest of the Most High God," which, in the primitive sense, conveys an idea of every thing excellent and sublime, awful and alluring! "How charming, upon a primitive mountain, beneath the shade of a venerable grove, the voice of a Melchisedeck, the father, the friend and priest of his people, publishing good tidings of salvation; and then, with holy hands, calling upon the name of the Lord, the everlasting God!" †

Although "the law came by Moses," both the moral and the ceremonial, enforced by additional divine sanctions; yet, in reality, Moses preached and taught something beyond the law: he taught the essential goodness and placability of the Deity, ascertained by the symbol of sacrifices, and the promise of a mediator and restorer, like unto himself. Prophets and seers, in succeeding ages of the church, were all "preachers of

righteousness," in opposition to the errors and superstitions of the surrounding nations, and to the false prophets, the blind leaders and visionary enthusiasts of their own land; the pastors that "destroyed and scattered the sheep," instead of nourishing and sustaining them.

After the Mosaic law was committed to writing, it became the standard of sound doctrine. In the course of time, synagogues were erected; and "in the days of our Saviour, public preaching was universal; synagogues were multiplied; there were thirteen at Tiberias, and at Jerusalem, they say, four hundred; including, perhaps, the *proseuchas*, or small places for private prayer. We have only short memoirs, analyses or abridgments of the primitive sermons, which were, doubtless, delivered more at large; but what is recorded is sufficient to prove, that they taught the primitive truths of natural and of the then revealed religion, which included the necessity of repentance, of devotion and conformity to God, and the doctrine of a future Redeemer and Restorer." *

Now supposing that there is no record in the *Pentateuch* sufficiently explicit to prove, that the doctrine of a future state constituted a part of the public instructions of the patriarchs, or of the law of Moses, as it was proclaimed amidst the lightnings and thunders of Sinai; yet, is not the probability on the other side of the question? Were not the mysterious promises to Adam and to the father of the faithful, to Moses and to the succeeding prophets, indicative, to *their* minds, at least, of something greater and better than mere earthly power and dominion, prosperity and glory? What were pardon of sin, conformity to God, and a sense of his favour, if *the effects* of them were to terminate with the present state, and be finally lost in the land of darkness and forgetfulness? What did the sacred historian intend by his favourite phrase, that the primitive saints "were gathered to their fathers"? Did he mean only, that their ashes should be mingled together? Was this the *ultimate* hope

* Robinson's Notes on Claude, Pref.

† *Ibid.*

* Robinson's Notes on Claude, Pref.

and expectation of an inspired prophet; of one who had such superior manifestations of the Divine power and presence, as to have it recorded concerning him, that, in a celestial colloquy, he “saw God face to face, and conversed with him, as a man talketh with his friend”? When dying Jacob said to his beloved son Joseph, “Behold, I die; but God shall surely be with you, and bring you again to the land of your fathers;” was this *all* that was intended? In the history of the Patriarchs we read, that, for the most part, they were divested of their earthly frames with little bodily suffering, and in a state of mind comparatively tranquil and serene; but could this have possibly been the case if *eternal annihilation* had been before them; if they had no prospect of a future recompence, but, in the language of the sceptic, were “about to take a leap in the dark”? Life is, indeed, a great blessing in proportion to its length and utility; man, considered merely as a rational animal, has enjoyments and privileges far above the brutes; virtue gives much in hand, and much in reversion, in the benefits we can procure for ourselves, for our descendants and for posterity; but still, the blank of death without the prospect of futurity draws a veil over all our comforts, and must have chilled the devotion even of an Abraham or a Noah, a Moses or a Methuselah.

Moreover, the translations of Enoch and Elijah, in conjunction with the successive visions and revelations from Moses to Malachi, would combine to produce in their order, fresh arguments in behalf of a future state; and the former operate as a striking and indubitable *proof* of the reality of such a state; a sensible encouragement to their faith and hope, at least in the minds of considering persons, who would be zealous on all proper occasions to promote the influence of this grand and important principle; for, by an easy inference and analogy, independent of abstract reasoning, they would be led to conclude, that if among the leading and distinguished characters of the ancient world, some, without controversy, were highly worthy of a future existence, and *two*, as they had reason to believe, so signally favoured as to be actually intro-

duced into it “without seeing death,” it was highly unreasonable to suppose, that the great mass of mankind should be overlooked; man being, by his very nature, *accountable*, and the individuals of his race, however differing from one another in external advantages, in spiritual attainments and moral qualities, in talents and capacity, yet from this very circumstance, as well as many others, partaking of a *sameness* or similarity which renders them amenable to the tribunal of their Maker, who is not to be regarded only in the awful sublimities of his nature, his infinite power, wisdom and knowledge, but in unison with his inimitable excellencies and perfections, his justice, mercy and goodness, as the moral governor and final judge of his rational offspring.

Nor are the Jewish Scriptures so silent upon this subject as some suppose. Besides the passages above referred to, numerous texts might be cited in favour of this opinion; but a few for the present may suffice.

After the fall, Adam and his posterity were placed (says Matt. Henry) “in a second state of probation, upon new terms;” and the sum and substance of the new primitive law was comprised in the blessing and the curse set before Cain, in these memorable words: “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.” The succeeding Patriarchs lived under the influence of these divine sanctions. “Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generation;” and Abraham “was called the friend of God.” In the record of his death, the peculiar expression first occurs, “he was gathered to his people,” a phrase which seems to imply, at least, as before hinted, a deliverance from absolute death, and a safe conduct under the Divine keeping. Isaac, in blessing Jacob, implores for him “the blessing of Abraham, to him and to his offspring.” Jacob, in his last interview with his children in the land of Egypt, though in the prophetic spirit he chiefly foretells temporal blessings and events, yet does not confine himself to these, but breaks out in the midst into a holy ejaculation,—“I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord.” Moses, in his divine song, recited before

the elders of Israel, characterizes the Deity as "the Rock, whose work is perfect, whose ways are judgment, as a God of truth, and without iniquity, as the Father that had bought them, made them and established them." And had all these sentiments no reference to futurity?

When Moses died, it is said "the Lord buried him, and no man knew of his sepulchre:" this, to a believing Israelite, must have conveyed a peculiar and encouraging idea. As we proceed, we meet with numerous allusions and references to something greater and better than mere earthly felicity. In the *prophecies*, the Deity is represented as loving his people "with an everlasting love," far exceeding the love of parents to their infant offspring! A kingdom is described, where "the work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever;" and Daniel saw a vision, similar to that of John, where "the Ancient of Days did sit, the judgment was set, and the books were opened;" and he prophesied, that hereafter "some shall arise to everlasting life, and some to shame and lasting contempt; and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever"!

(To be continued.)

Account of the Establishment of Presbyterianism in Manchester.

No. III.

(For Nos. I. and II., see Vol. XVI. pp. 387 and 528.)

SIR,

I NOW send you further extracts from the Register of the Presbyterian Classis, which I am sorry I could not prepare sooner.

"The 14th Meeting at Manchester, January 12^o, 1647.

"6. Mr. Constantine desired from the Classis to warne Mr. Briggs to come to the Classis the next Meeting, 2d Feb. 1647.

"The 15th Meeting at Manchester, February 2^o, 1647."

The greatest part of the minutes of this Meeting relate to the quarrel be-

tween Mr. Benson and the Elders, at Chollerton. See the 13th Meeting; concerning which the following is the decision of the Classis:

"James Chorlton acknowledged that he had wronged Mr. Benson, and that he was sorry for it. This he was ordered to do by the Classis.

"The 17th Meeting at Manchester, March 8^o, 1647.

"4. Henry Gregory and Richard Rogers (Elder at Flixton) brought in a charge against Mr. Woolmer, minister there, for clandestine marriages.

"Mr. Woolmer to be summoned to the next Meeting. The said H. Gregory and R. Rogers to have warrant for witnessses.

"5. Summons to be given to James Chorlton, Elder at Chollerton, to shew cause why he doth not act as an Elder.

"6. John Barlow, Elder at Chorlton, desired to give notice to Mr. Clayton, minister of Didsbury, to shew cause at the next Meeting, why he proceedeth not to election of Elders.

"The 18th Meeting at Manchester, April 5^o, 1648.

"4. Mr. Angier desired to joyne with Mr. Clayton to move the Elders elect at Didsbury to come and undertake the worke, and to return answer thereof at the next Meeting.

"8. James Chorlton being called to shew cause why he doth not execute his office of Elder, alledged, that they have never sitten as an Eldership, that he is unfit, desires to be freed from his office. The businesse differ'd till the next Classis, till Mr. Benson be acquainted therewith.

"10. Mr. Constantine being desired to shew cause, why the government is not settled with them, answered, That the Classis gave liberty to deferr it. Mr. Angier and Mr. Harison are desired to take cognizance of the causes, and represent them.

"The 19th Meeting at Manchester, May 3^o, 1648.

"16. Ouldham Congregation desire that they might not be pressed to set up the government at present, because of some obstructions, (though they be willinge and desireouse of it,) but they hope those obstructions will shortly be removed; and they have tyme given till the next Classe, to see if those obstructions be then removed.

"The 20th Meeting at Manchester, June 14th, 1648.

"3. It was ordered that the businesse concerninge the Congregation of Ouldham shall be called upon the next Classe.

"4. Mr. Anthonie Allen desired Or-

duation, brought certificate of his abilities and good life and conversation, hee sheweth a request and desire from manie of the people at Oulton in Lincolneshire, that hee might bee their minister, it is enjoyned unto him to bringe a certificate to the next Classis that the saide place is without a minister, and that he hath the consent of the patron.

“A letter is to be written to the members of the congregation at Oulton to give them notice what is requested of us by Mr. Allen, and to desire of them satisfaction that no other minister hath right unto, or is in the place; and that Mr. Allen hath the consent of the Patron.

“6. Mr. Walton came to the Classis and shewed his dismissal from the congregation of Horwich, and a dismissal from the congregation of Boulton, and Samuel Tayler (one of the Members at Blakeley) witnesseth hee had the assent and desire of the people at Blakeley to be their Minister; it was ordered, more of the congregation should come to the next Classis to give satisfaction thereof.

“The 21st Meeting at Manchester, July 12^o, 1648.

“2. Mr. Walton manifested the desire of the congregation at Blakely to have him to bee their Minister, by a further testimonie of Josephe Costerdine, Lawrence Walworke, Thomas Clough, John Travis and William Cheetham, who affirmed they were sent by the Congregation there to testifie there assent as aforesaid.

“3. It is thought fitt, that Mr. Walton proceede according to ordinance of Parliament to make a preparatory Sermon, and so to proceede to election of Elders in his the said congregation with what convenient speede hee cann.

“4. The businesse that concerneth Ouldham is continued, and ordered to be called upon the next Classis.

“7. Mr. Angier, Mr. Clayton and William Boothe are still desired to deale with those elected Elders at Didsburie to accept there office before the next Classis.”

Two or three similar minutes of former Meetings relative to the appointment of Elders at Didsbury, have not been transcribed.

“8. Mr. Hollinworth gave account of Mr. Harrison's and his journey to Preston by the appointment of the Classis, viz.,

“First, that there was an appearance from each Classis.

“Secondly, that all those that appeared did agree that they may acte provincially, and appointe tyme, and place and delegates for the provinciall assem-

blie upon the late ordinance of Parliament.

“Thirdly, that the first provinciall meetinge to bee the eight of August next, in the Church at Preston, and Mr. Ambrose to preach the same day at ten of the clocke.

“Fourthly, that three Ministers and six ruleing Elders shall be delegated to the provinciall assemblie from everie Classis, and have letters of credence from the moderator of the said Classis under his hand.

“10. It was this day agreed in the Classis, that every Minister in this Classis should in there several congregations give notice of the Provinciall Assemblie, August the eight, and shall instructe there people touchinge the nature, use and benefitt thereof. And desire there congregations jointly and earnestly to pray to the Lord for his blessinge upon that meetinge the next nationall Fast-day.

“The 22d Meeting at Manchester, August 1^o, 1648.

“4. Delegates appointed by the first Classis within the province of the Countie of Lancaster, for the Provinciall Assemblie at Preston, the eight of August, 1648.

“5. Ministers,—Mr. John Angier, Mr. John Harrison, Mr Richard Hollinworth.

“Elders,—Peter Egerton, Robert Hyde, Richard Haworth, Esqrs.; Robert Ashton, Peter Sergeant, Edward Johnson, Gents., Ruleinge Elders.

“6. The unwillingenes of those chosen Elders for Didsburie to undergoe there office, was certified by a note under there hands, delivered in by William Boothe.

“7. Certaine things were reade and approved to bee propounded to the Provinciall Assemblie, and submitted thereunto by the Delegates assigned by this Classis, and the moderator is to subscribe the same.

“The 23d Meetinge at Manchester, September 5^o, 1648.

“5. It was reported from the Provinciall Meetinge at Preston, that exception was taken, for that all the Elders delegated from this Classis did not appeare. It was for there excuse declared, that they were of the Committee for this countie; and that the necessitie of the affaires of the countie would not, in regarde of the present dangers, permit there then appearinge at that tyme.

“9. Samuel Pendleton chosen an Elder for Blakely Chappell came to be examined, was examined and approved for his knowledge.

“The 24th Meetinge at Manchester, September 29^o, 1648.

“4. There was a petition brought in and attest by foure men from Ouldham

against the validitie of the election of Elders at Ouldham.

“The hearinge of the businesse was defered till the next Classis.

“5. In the meanetyme twoe Ministers are desired to meete and heare the differences among the Members of the congregation, and compose the differences amongst them, and give account what they doe therein the next Classis.

“Mr. Angier and Mr. Harrison are desired to be the Minsters.

“10. Ordered publicke notice bee given in the Parish Church of Prestwich, that Mr. Furnesse haveinge a call to Bury, desireth dismission from the Classis from Prestwich, they are to come in to shew cause to the contrarie, if they have cause.

“The 25th Meetinge at Manchester, the 7th October, 1648.

“2. There came some of the congregation of Rostourne, and declared that they were desireouse to have Mr. Martindale to be there Minister at Rostourne aforesaid, and hee with them desired Ordination from this Classis; they tendered a certificate to manifest his call to that place under the hands of above 268 of the said congregation. Hee delivered in a certificate of his age, that hee was 25 years of age; and hee brought likewise a certificate that hee had taken the nationall covenant. Hee was admitted to examination to the end the Classis might receive satisfaction of his fitnes for the Ministrie, and so might certifie the same to the Comittee above, to the end his civill right may be cleared to Rostorne aforesaid; hee was approved so far as he was proceeded with in his examination.

“6 Mr. Anthonie Allen came to the Classis, and brought a presentation from the patron at Oulton, and satisfied the Classis of the vacancie of the place at Oulton; hee is admitted to examination, and approved so farr as hee was proceeded with in examination.

“7. Mr. Joseph Kellett came out of Nottinghamshire to desire ordination; hee brought certificate of his call to Hauton, neare Newarke, affirmed he was Batchloure in Arts, brought testimonie of his good life and conversation and fittnes for the Ministrie, was admitted to examination, and approved soe far as was proceeded with in his examination.

“8. Mr. Thomas Fowler came out of the countie of Derby,” &c. same as last minute, *mutatis mutandis*.

“The question given to Mr. Kellett,—An sint distincti ordines Presbiteron. Affirm.

“The question given to Mr. Fowler,—An Presbiteri sint ejusdem ordinis. Affirm.

“The question given to Mr. Martindale,—An liceat mere privato in ecclesia constituta publice concionare. Neg.

“The question given to Mr. Allen,—An gratia salutifera possit amitti. Neg.

“9. Those of the congregation of Ouldham that had petitioned against the election of Elders at Ouldham, were appointed to bring in there exceptions, if they have any more than are in there petition, the next Classis.

“10. There is noe cause shewed by anie of the congregation of Prestwich to hinder Mr. Furness his dismission from that place.

“11. This day there was a petition preferred to this Classis from manie of the parishioners of Prestwich, takeing notice of Mr. Furnesse intention to remove from thence; and desireing no Minister may be placed there without the consent of the major part of the parishioners.

“It was agreed to give them answeare, that the Classis hath taken there petition into consideration, and will give them due and meete satisfaction accordinge to there desire.

“The 26th Meetinge at Manchester, the 21^o November, 1648.

“2. There appeared divers of the parishioners of Rostorne delivered a writinge unto which there names were subscribed, and by such as were there present attested, and subscribed by a publicke notarie, as they said, who was present and attested it, wherein they objected against Mr. Martindale's ordination.

“3. It was resolved not to proceede to ordaine the said Mr. Martindale to Rostorne, till the tyle he had to the place was cleared.

“4. Mr. Anthonie Allen, Mr. Joseph Kellett, Mr. Thomas Fowler, did all bringe in there thesis, and disputed, and were approved, and resolved to proceede to ordayne them.

“The 27th Meetinge at Manchester, 19th December, 1648.

“4. The parishioners of Ouldham were appointed to produce witnesses to prove there exceptions against the election of Elders at Ouldham the next Classis.”

N.B. A similar minute is registered under the next *Meetinge*.

“The 28th Meetinge at Manchester, 6th Januarie, 1648.

“6. Evann Clarke, by generall consent of the Classis, is appointed, pro tempore, for their Register. And Mr. Hollinworth entreated to overlooke and to have an eye upon him.

“Mr. Birch, schoolmaster, at Prestwich, is by the Elders thereof to be appointed to appeare at the next Classical

Meetinge at Manchester, for baptiseinge children, and for makeinge clandestine marriages.

"The 29th Meetinge at Manchester, February 13, 1648.

"None of the Elders of Flixton appeared"

This minute is entered in the Register of several former Meetings.

"2. There appeared severall other Eldershipps to the number appointed for a Classe.

"3. The generalitie of the people of Newton did appeare before this Classe, and there did declare their willingnes to have Mr. John Walker to bee there Minister.

"4. Mr. John Walker appointed to preach the next Classicall Meetinge, at Manchester, being the 13th of March next.

"5. Mr. Dury hath bene examined in Logicke, Phisicks, Ethicks, Metaphisicks, Greeke and Hebrue.

"8. Mr. Birch, schoolmaster, at Prestwich is once more to be advertised by the Elders there, to appeare before this Classe for baptiseinge children privately without order, and to appeare upon Tuesday the 13th of March next.

"9. It is ordered, that the Elders elected for Ouldham come in the next Classe to bee examined in point of knowledge, and that the said Elders elected have notice of it publickely in the said congregation.

"The 30th Meetinge at Manchester, March 13th, 1648.

"2. This Classe have rendred thanks to Mr. John Walker for his paines in preacheinge before the said Classe.

"4. Agreed that the exhortation from the Provinciaall Assemblie be reade in everie congregation within this Classis the next Lord's Day, beinge the 18th of March instant.

"7. A warrant to bee drawne up to bringe in the witnesses to testifie what they can against Mr. Birch, schoolmaster, at Prestwich, for private baptizeinge of children, and makeinge clandestine marriages.

"8. Agreed that there bee a solemn day of humiliation to be kept at Manchester, upon the grounds and reasons in a petition presented to us by some of the well-affected in Manchester.

"At the first Classe within the province of the Countie of Lancaster, April 10th, 1649.

"A copie of a warrant for Mr. Birch, schoolmaster, at Prestwich.

"Forasmuch as Mr. Birch, schoolemaister, at Prestwich, beinge not approved by this Classe for the exerciseinge

of anie part of the Ministeriall function within these bounds, hath bene heretofore admonished for baptizeinge of children, and hath contemned their order; whose offence herein is further aggravated by his baptiseing in private contrarie to the directorie, and hath been proved before them by oath; and haveinge alsoe bene divers tymes sumoned to appeare before this Classe, has refused to make due appeareance, these are therefore publickly to give notice to your congregation at Prestwich, that the said Mr. Birch is prohibited by this Classe to baptize anie children either publickly or privately, or to exercise anie other parte of the Ministeriall function. And these are further to give notice to the said Mr. Birch, to appeare before this Classe at their next Meetinge at Manchester, the 8th day of May, or otherwise they must proceede to the further censure of him for his severall contempts, and makeinge clandestine marriages, whereof there are complaints made unto us."

Your readers will perceiv that the change of the date of the year in the Register is made in April.

In my selections from the Register, though many items, by no means devoid of interest, have been necessarily omitted, to the best of my judgment I have given the preference to those which appeared most generally interesting. Perhaps I may be thought to give too much rather than too little; or more probably in this, as in almost every thing else, different tastes will decide differently. I shall be guided by any *hint* which you, Mr. Editor, may deem necessary.

My next communication I intend to contain the Resolutions of the "Provinciaall Synod at Preston," being in number forty-three.

W. J.

P. S. Allow me in a few words to correct an error, probably of the press, in Dr. Carpenter's Examination of Magee's Charges. In a note in the 5th page, Dr. C. ascribes what he is pleased to designate "An able Letter on the Atonement," to G. of Manchester. It ought to be J. of Manchester, the latter of the initials subscribed above.

Evesham,

January 15, 1822.

SIR,
THE insertion of three harmless letters from the Illinois, in the

Number for October, 1820, Vol. XV. pp. 606—609, has been made the pretext for a very heavy charge against the Monthly Repository. It is preferred by a Constant Reader and Occasional Contributor to the Christian Observer, in the Number for November, 1821, Vol. XX. p. 690, under the signature of T. P. His letter is without date, but says, "were the month to pass away without bringing to my door its Number of the Christian Observer, I should feel as though that month had lost a day of sunshine." He adds, "It happened, *not long since*, that my favourite pamphlet found its way to me in company with a number of the Monthly Repository. I am *no reader* of the latter production; but my bookseller observing in it some private letters, from a family to which *I am related*, now residing in the Illinois State, North America, sent it for my perusal."

T. P. describes himself, moreover, as "residing in a small town at a great distance from the metropolis." He is of opinion the said letters should not have been published without the permission of *the writers*. Adding, "This liberty, however, if not justifiable, loses its fainter hue of enormity, when compared with the attacks on *public opinion*, for which the Monthly Repository is *so justly celebrated*." As he is "*no reader*" of this work, though his censure is intended to convey no slight hue of enormity, it seems as if T. P. judged it not from examination, but *from report*. He should have been more careful to avoid even the appearance of "defamation and detraction," against which the Society of Friends, of which I suppose he is a member, give salutary cautions, and profess to bear a religious testimony. He should also have considered, that an attack "on public opinion," may be sometimes not only innocent, but useful and commendable. The writers of the New Testament attacked it boldly and with great effect, as faithful witnesses and servants of their Lord and Master.

T. P. does not think he is "wholly ignorant of the channel through which those letters found their way to publication," or of "*one of the motives for printing them*;" viz. "to catch the little, quiet, undisputing brother-

hood, called Quakers—in the comprehensive fraternal embrace" of the Unitarians. This, he thinks, has of late "been a favourite design with them. And as those letters from the Illinois were written in the style and language" of the Quakers, he says, "it would seem to the *undiscerning public* to corroborate this claim to association."

Yet I think the public are not so blind as this attack of T. P. supposes, for not one word do those letters contain respecting Unitarians, or *any of their distinguishing doctrines*. "This error, however," adds he, "can only operate on minds totally unacquainted with the opinions, *feelings* and *worship of the Quakers*." It should, therefore, seem, if his object was to correct the error into which the style of his relatives had led your readers, that he should have addressed you on the subject, not the Editor of the Christian Observer. His next sentence may, however, explain why he did not, though he fancies you have fewer readers among Friends than the latter work, and being otherwise curious, I shall give it entire. He says, "As this people have found their happiness *materially guarded*, by avoiding, as much as possible, all disputes on theological questions, I am not going to drag them into the arena of controversy. But I cannot *apprehend any danger*, from throwing into the pages of the Christian Observer (for no periodical work *is so much read*, or so well received by them) a passage I have lately met with, which I think explains *their feelings on certain points of difficulty*, in a manner that places them at an immense distance from *the hardy Unitarian*;" a character as little alarmed at controversy, as any he could have mentioned, because it is not apt to build on the sand of human invention, but "on that foundation which cannot be moved."

The document T. P. quotes for the above purpose, is not from Penn's "Sandy Foundation Shaken," or any other approved work of the early Friends, but from "Dr. Waterland's controversy with Dr. Clarke," as cited "in a letter from Edward Nares to Francis Stone," two entire strangers to me. This quotation informs us,

"The first Christians easily believed that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in whose name they were baptized, and whom they worshiped, were equally divine; without troubling themselves about the manner of it, or the reconciling it with the belief in one God." It is much easier to make these assertions than to prove them.

If, as Archdeacon Blackburne observes, we read the supposed baptismal form, Matt. xxviii. 19, as follows, "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations (baptizing them) into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" there is not a single tittle altered in the text of the Evangelist, save in the pointing; and yet a very material alteration of the sense of the passage obtained, which makes the two Evangelists [Matthew and Luke] perfectly consistent with each other. For as the passage stands above, explained by the parenthesis, the command to baptize refers to no particular form at all, and leaves us to suppose, what was certainly the truth of the matter, that the apostles being already well acquainted with the form used in the baptism of Jesus, it was quite superfluous to enjoin it here.

St. John tells us expressly, chap. iv. 2, that the disciples of Jesus made and baptized other disciples to their Master, and these not a few. This is a sufficient proof without any other, that the apostles of Christ were well versed in the form of baptism prescribed by our Saviour; upon which account the repetition of it in this solemn manner, is one of the last things one would look for in this particular passage.

The Archdeacon, I need hardly add, was of opinion that the words in question contain "no baptismal form at all." Works, I. xxvi. Appendix B. Barclay, in his Quakerism confirmed, says, "That the apostles used the words Father, Son and Holy Ghost, when they baptized, cannot be proved; far less used they the word Trinity, which was not invented [till] long after the apostles' days." Works, III. 139. And, accordingly, he is entirely silent on that doctrine in his "Apology for the true Christian Divinity," which he of course thought might well do without it. The Quakers have always

held that the above text has no relation whatever to water baptism.

Dr. Waterland, as quoted by T. P., adds, "Probably these plain, honest Christians believed every person to be God, and yet but one God." This is oddly enough called "the artless simplicity of the primitive Christians," of which, however, the New Testament, the only, or at least the most authentic record of their faith, affords not even the slightest evidence. "It seems they troubled not their heads with any nice speculations about the modus of it, till prying and pretending men came to start difficulties, and raise scruples and make disturbances; and then," adds the Doctor, "it was necessary to guard," not the purity and simplicity of the apostolic faith, as expressed in Scripture, but "the faith of the church," in new notions which required new terms "against such cavils and impertinencies as began to threaten it."

How did the church act in this difficulty, as T. P. confesses *it still is*, to reconcile the doctrine of the Divine Unity, with that which he holds the common doctrine of the Trinity? His oracle, Dr. Waterland, says, "Philosophy and metaphysics were called in to its assistance, but not till heretics had shewn the way, and made it in a manner necessary for the Catholics to encounter them with their own weapons."

This is, in other words, to say the Catholics adopted heretical language. I confess there is too much truth in this, whether they or others first set so bad an example. "Some new terms and particular applications came in by this means, that such as had a mind to corrupt or destroy the faith" aforesaid, "might be defeated in their purposes; but after the heretics had invidiously represented the Catholics as asserting a division," by the new terms they had adopted in speaking of the one true God, instead of those used by the sacred writers, and by their Lord and Master, "it was high time," says the Doctor, "for the Catholics to resent the injury, and deny," not disprove, "the charge." He adds, "There was no occasion for mentioning of three hypostases, till such as Praxeas, Noetus and Sabellius, had pretended to make one hypostasis

an article of faith," which he calls very properly "their prime position." "The *ὁμοῦσιον* itself," he says, "might have been spared, at least out of the creeds, had not a fraudulent abuse of *good words* brought matters to that pass, that *the Catholic faith* was in danger of being lost, even under *Catholic language*."

Such is the substance of T. P.'s quotation, of which he says, "The point I aim at is this—to refer the reader to the *simple view* of the *full and supreme* divinity of the Father, *the Son*, and *the Holy Ghost*, ascribed by Dr. Waterland to the apostles and the primitive Christians; for precisely the same view is taken of this *high doctrine* by the Quakers in the present day; a view, which is greatly confirmed by their *almost* exclusive use of the Sacred Scriptures as the fountain of their doctrines."

If T. P. has done the Quakers justice, I must say that on this point the Unitarians have greatly the advantage of them, for the Scriptures are not merely "almost," but the sole fountain of their doctrines. Freely admitting T. P.'s right to profess his own faith in any words he may choose for himself, or adopt from any writer, ancient or modern, I must demur to his competency to speak in such positive terms of the faith of the Quakers, even "in the present day;" amongst whom, perhaps, I have had as large an acquaintance as himself, and at least equal, if not better opportunities of knowing their sentiments, and how very generally the most strict amongst them of every class, *even when closely pressed*, refuse to admit in any sense whatever, any distinction of persons in the Deity. I have also read many of the writings of their best and most approved authors, none of whom, so far as I know, ever professed to hold that doctrine. William Penn said, very truly, in his *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, for writing and publishing which, being a notable attack on "public opinion," he was persecuted by his enemies, but applauded by his friends the Quakers, with remarkable unanimity, that "the Scriptures undeniably prove that ONE is God, and God only is that only ONE; therefore he cannot be divided into or subsist," says he, "in an holy THREE,

or THREE distinct and separate holy ones."

In pointing out "the absurdities that unavoidably follow the comparison of—the vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction, being dependent upon the second person of the Trinity," he even describes "Jesus Christ as *a finite and impotent creature*," without reference to the unscriptural notion of two natures, and his God and Father as "*the infinite and omnipotent Creator*." I am aware that some of their approved authors have sometimes used mystical language on the subject, as nearly approaching the present standard of reputed orthodoxy, as Sabellians have long ago employed, but I know of only one writer amongst them who has gone so far as T. P., and that is the author, whom I much esteem, of a work published in 1813, by Wm. Phillips, London, and entitled "Remarks suggested by the Perusal of a 'Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, by William Penn; with a Modern Sketch of Reputed Orthodoxy,' &c., by Thomas Prichard."

The Portraiture is reviewed in your journal for 1812 (VII. 523). The remarks on it have, I believe, not come under your notice. The greater part of the pamphlet consists of a republication of another tract of Penn's, which was more to the Editor's taste than the Portraiture, the readers of which he describes as "introduced to this amiable writer, *only through the medium of Unitarian quotation*." Whereas, it must be confessed, the other tract is rather strongly tinged with Sabellianism, but with nothing like "the common doctrine of the Trinity," without which he considered the Quakers as consigned "to the invidious condition of the bat in the fable, neither bird nor beast, with all its pernicious consequences." Yet he tells his readers, that Penn's *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, or the above Portraiture, "professes to attack *all* that is of *mere human authority and invention* in the tenets that relate to the Trinity, imputed righteousness, and the satisfaction and atonement made by Christ." The author considered the whole as founded on the sand, and tells us he "endeavoured *a total enervation* of those cardinal points, and chief doctrines so firmly believed,

and continually imposed for articles of Christian faith."

T. P. concludes his letter to the Editor of the Christian Observer by saying, "So strong is my desire to detach the Quakers from that identity with the Unitarians, under which some mistaken minds regard them, that I may perhaps feel rather gratified than hurt at any consequences that may result from the general diffusion of this knowledge, that their tenets are at an irreconcilable variance. T. P." The Editors, in a courteous P. S., say "T. P. will find a letter in our Vol. for 1819, p. 582, signed Samuel Fennel, containing a similar complaint against the Monthly Repository, and a defence of the Society of Friends from the charge of Socinianism."

In this letter S. F. does, indeed, repeat his totally groundless charge against you. [XIV. 400.] As to his defence of Friends, he has indeed shewn, that the Quakers had not wholly discarded the term Trinity. Directly after his quotation, abruptly ending with an "&c.," Penn adds, "But they are very tender of quitting Scripture terms and phrases for Schoolmen's, such as *distinct and separate persons*, and subsistences, &c. are, from whence people are apt to entertain *gross ideas and notions* of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

I would willingly remove T. P.'s painful but groundless apprehension, that it is a favourite design with the Unitarians to identify "their tenets" with those of the Quakers, farther than they actually approximate. They can have no motive to do this. He does not seem to be aware, that from the time of Sabellius, those who "say nothing of three hypostases [or persons] but keep to one," in expressing their belief in God, have always been considered by the reputedly orthodox, as nearly allied to the Unitarians, notwithstanding their occasional use, like the Quakers, of obscure, ambiguous or semi-orthodox language.

He has, I own, completely absolved himself from the imputation, but before he again asserts "that the Quakers have precisely the same view of this high doctrine" as himself, I recommend him to make farther inquiry, lest he should mistakenly represent them as forsaking generally or collectively, the authentic testimony of

scriptural revelation on this point of primary importance, and teaching, in its stead, for doctrine, the inventions of men.

THOMAS FOSTER.

SIR,
I HAVE several times endeavoured to procure from the booksellers, Yates's "Sequel" to his "Vindication of Unitarianism:" but the answer is uniformly the same—*out of print*. Now, Sir, as the theological critic in the British Quarterly Review, with a meanness of dissimulation which, I suppose, he would excuse by the convenient subterfuge of inherent moral incapacity, has sunk upon his readers the existence of this tract, although incidentally he betrays his knowledge of it, and as the great advocate of tritheism and vicarious righteousness himself, Dr. Wardlaw continues with unabashed ostentation to re-advertise in the Newspapers his "Unitarianism incapable of Vindication," may I ask why the "Sequel" is not reprinted? If the able author himself be unwilling to risk the expense, (though I should have thought the sale of the first edition a guarantee for the success of the undertaking,) why is not this tract, which so calmly and rationally exposes the hollow blustering pretensions of the orthodox school, reprinted and liberally re-advertised at the expense of the society?

Let me take this opportunity of suggesting also the expediency of re-printing in a separate tract, and at a cheap rate, the excellent and learned Dr. Lardner's "Posthumous Discourses on the Trinity," which appear to state the respective grounds of the Trinitarian, Arian and Unitarian doctrine, with a plainness, comprehension and acumen, calculated to make a strong, popular impression, and, at the same time, to remove much of the prejudice existing against the simplicity of the ancient faith in minds pre-occupied by college theology; and to awaken serious doubts whether "the things which they have learned" be in reality "sound doctrine." This little publication is further needed as a set-off against the affectedly impartial, but really dogmatic and bigoted, not to say insidious, statement of Dean Tucker; entitled a "Brief and Dispassionate View of the Difficulties

attending the Trinitarian, Arian and Socinian Systems," to which it forms no less striking a contrast in force, than in fairness of reasoning.

PROSELYTUS.

SIR,

Feb. 15, 1822.

IN the last Volume of the Repository, p. 354, your ingenious and learned correspondent, Dr. Jones, animadverted upon my having said that "the New Testament disciples of Jesus were not ashamed or afraid to own 'that worthy name by which they were called.'" He conceives me chargeable with "a total inattention to the fact." He has not made it evident what "fact" he adverts to; but we cannot be mistaken if we understand him as referring to one, or more probably to both, of the statements which immediately follow: "that all the Jewish converts considered Christianity and Judaism as the self-same religion;" and "that the name *Christians* was given the disciples by their enemies as a term of reproach: and that, for this reason, the apostles and the converts made by them declined the use of it."

Neither of these assertions can I regard as "beyond controversy;" and I do seriously think that strong objections lie against them both. Nor do I perceive that Dr. Jones has replied to the remarks which I proposed upon his sentiment, (I comply with his wish in not calling it *hypothesis*,) that Philo and Josephus were Christians. (*Script. Test.* I. 449, 450.) Till those remarks are distinctly met, I do not feel myself called upon to embark anew in the dispute. My only object at present is to say, that Dr. Jones has misapprehended the point of my reference. Perhaps I did not express myself with due explicitness: but the citation of James ii. 7, I had supposed would have prevented any misconception. By the "worthy name" I did not mean exclusively the appellation *Christian*, as my respected friend takes it; but the name *Jesus*, or the official designation *Christ*, as well as the term *Christian*: and to that name or designation the allusion was principally intended. My argument was, that had Philo and Josephus, and the persons whom they speak of as having embraced Judaism, been really Christians, there would not have been the

deep silence which reigns through the writings of the former, upon the name and history of JESUS the CHRIST, nor would the alleged Heathen converts have avoided the being distinguished as *disciples of Jesus*, or *Christians*. It is, indeed, not improbable that the appellation *Christian* was first applied to the followers of Jesus by their opponents; and that, according to a prevalent association of idea with Latin adjectives in *anus* denoting party, the new term might have a discreditable appearance. But it is worthy of observation, that this term was invented and brought into use with reference to the first *Gentile* church, and at the time when the right of Gentiles to the blessings and privileges of the gospel, without being subjected to circumcision or any other Judaical observance, was established by apostolical authority. Thus there was, *primâ facie*, some reason why converts from Heathenism to the religion of Jesus should have been the more eminently called Christians. If the name had an unfriendly origin, it would soon, according to the common principles of human nature, cease to convey an unwelcome association, and would be accepted and gloried in as a badge of honour. About eighteen years after, we find the apostle Peter writing thus: "If any one of you suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf." 1 Peter iv. 16.

It can scarcely be necessary for me to add, that the argument is not nullified by the passage which has been sometimes called the testimony of Josephus to Christ; for it appears to me very satisfactorily shewn by Lardner and others, that the passage is spurious.

March 9.

Unavoidable hindrances prevented my finishing this letter in time for the last month. I proceed to Dr. Jones's critical and doctrinal remarks on Phil. ii. 6—8, in pp. 535, &c. of your last volume.

(1.) He asserts "that $\iota\sigma\alpha\ \Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ is a parallelism with $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and is but a varied expression of the same idea." This appears to me to be imputing to the apostle an absolute tautology. If the two terms are synonymous, each of them may be put = *a*; then the apostle will be made to say,

"Being α , he deemed it not a thing to be grasped at to be α ."

(2.) On the meaning $\tau\epsilon\alpha\ \Theta\epsilon\omega$, it would be unreasonable to ask you to reprint the reasons and the authorities from Greek writers, especially the Septuagint, which are adduced in the Script. Test. (II. 385—402, 414, 415) to support the interpretation of the phrase which the evidence of the case appears to me to warrant. Those who are sufficiently interested in the question to take the trouble of the examination, will, perhaps, do me the favour to weigh my arguments before they reject my interpretation.

(3.) To Dr. J.'s mode of supplying the ellipsis which he supposes the passage to require, I feel no objection: nor does it militate against the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, except upon the assumption of what we most earnestly protest against, that, in holding that doctrine, we suppose that the death of Jesus was the death of Jehovah. That doctrine attributes to the Lord and Redeemer of mankind, not only THE DIVINE NATURE with all its essential perfections, but also the human nature with all its proper qualities.

(4.) I must likewise protest against Dr. J.'s seeming to impute to me the opinion "that God has any form, or that form and nature have here the same meaning." To which assumption he adds, "In this confusion, gross and palpable as it is, is founded the interpretation put upon this passage by the orthodox divines." What I had said concerning the use of $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$ in this passage was to this purport: that the word "can be understood of the Divine Being only in the way of an imperfect analogy. As the visible and tangible figure of a sensible object is, in ordinary cases, the chief property, and frequently the only one, by which we know the object and distinguish it from others; so, that part of what may be known of God, (Rom. i. 19,) that which distinguishes him from all other objects of our mental apprehension, may thus, allusively and analogically, be called the form of God. Therefore, dropping the figure, the notion is evidently that of specific difference, or essential and distinguishing properties. It might, I conceive, be unexceptionably ex-

pressed by the phrase, "The characteristics of God."

(5.) Of a passage of Josephus, adduced as an instance of this analogical sense of $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$, my respected friend affirms, "This is said in reference to the Greeks, who represented their gods under material images; and the object of the writer is to set aside that superstitious practice. His words are to this effect: 'God is not in the least visible in form; it is, therefore, most absurd to represent him under forms that are visible.'"

The passage in question is a part of a long and interesting recital, in the style of just panegyric, of the religion, laws and manners of the Jews. The paragraph from which a small part only, for the sake of brevity, was cited in the Script. Test., is as follows: "God, the all-perfect and blessed, possesses all things, himself sufficient to himself and to all other beings, the beginning and the midst, and the end of all. He, though displayed by his works and his kindnesses, and more manifest than any other being whatever, yet, as to his nature [literally form] and greatness, is the most remote from our view. All material substance, even the most valuable, compared to his image, is worthless: and all art is incompetent to the conception of an imitation. We can neither conceive, nor is it lawful to imagine, any thing as a resemblance to him. We see his works; the light, the heaven, the earth, the sun and moon, the waters, the generations of animals, and the productions of vegetation. These hath God made, not with hands, not with labours, not needing any assistants; but, by the mere act of his will determining these good things, they instantly came into existence, good according to his design. Him we all ought to follow, and serve by the practice of virtue; for this is the holiest manner of serving God." The reader will judge, whether it is the more probable that Josephus here uses $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$ in the sense of those who formed corporal ideas of the Supreme Being, or to denote the characteristic and spiritual properties (the metaphysical form) of that Infinite Nature. Other and not contemptible evidence for this sense, may be seen in Elsner, (*Obs. in N. T.* II. 241,) and it is un-

questionable that the Greek fathers, who were likely to understand their native language, took *μορφή*, as here used by the apostle, to signify *φύσις* and *ουσία*. "As the form of a servant," says Chrysostom, "signifies no other than real and perfect man, so the form of God signifies no other than God." See *Suiceri Thesaur.* II. 377, 378. If there be any propriety in explaining the phraseology of the New Testament by the use of terms among the followers of Aristotle, "it is unquestionable," says the learned and pious Sir Richard Ellys, (*Fortuita Sacra*, p. 189,) "that with them *μορφή* was used to signify *το ειναι τινος*, that which constitutes the essence of a subject. I venture, therefore, still to think that Schleusner, in giving this interpretation, had a little more reason on his side than that "he might as well have said that *white* may mean *black*."

"The form of a slave," says my learned friend, "means the death of a slave." That the apostle, in using the expression *form of a servant* or *slave*, had no reference at all to "the death of the cross" which he so soon after mentions, I by no means affirm: but that this was the single circumstance comprised in the allusion, does not appear probable. The frequent use of *δουλος* in the New Testament, in various moral significations, suggests a more extensive application of the ideas of servitude to the circumstances of the Lord Jesus. See John xiii. 16, xv. 20, and the numerous passages in which the apostles and Christians in general are called servants of God, or of Christ; while, on the other hand, wicked men are represented as the servants or slaves of sin. In the whole view of the case, there appears to me most evidence that our Lord's "taking the form of a servant" denotes his submission, in his assumed human nature, to "the characteristics of that servitude and dishonour which sin has inflicted upon our nature, and upon all our circumstances in the present state; that which is called in Scripture (*ἡ δουλεία της φθορας*) 'the bondage, servitude, or slavery of corruption.'" (*Script. Test.* II. 410.)

Dr. Jones is equally confident that "a form of God can only mean a divine or splendid form:" and he has

no hesitation in regarding the expression as an allusion to the transfiguration of Jesus, on the mountain, where "he assumed an appearance bright as the sun, and was seen to converse with Moses and Elias;" and that, from this magnificent appearance, Peter eagerly conceived the hope of Christ's evading his predicted sufferings and death. The Doctor has depicted the scene with great ingenuity and pathos. On the opinion, I beg leave to remark:

1. That the allusion supposed rests only upon conjectural grounds.

2. That, had it been intended by Paul, it is reasonable to think that he would have made his allusion more definite, as Peter did in referring to the very transaction: 2 Pet. i. 18.

3. That the tense of *ὑπαρχων* does not well agree with the supposition of reference to a single past fact, while it properly comports with the idea of a state or habit. Had the former been the object of reference, the proper form of the participle would have been *ὑπαρξας*.

4. That, if the allusion were admitted, a believer in the proper Deity of the Saviour might reasonably contend that the "form of God" most naturally and justly expresses some manifestation, by the symbol of a visible brightness exceeding that of the most magnificent objects in nature, and probably similar to the representations made to Moses and others of the prophets, of that Divine Nature and Perfection which he believes, on other and independent grounds, that the Scriptures ascribe to Christ.

(6.) Dr. Jones, whose soul is filled with the enthusiasm imbibed from his familiarity with Grecian poetry and eloquence, declares his "unspeakable pleasure" in disclosing to the world his discovery that this passage of the Epistle to the Philippians contains allusions to Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue. I must, however, confess that my duller powers of perception cannot see clearly the evidence of this discovery. The resemblances appear to me to be faint and precarious. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, much closer coincidences of both thought and expression often occur to men of reading, in authors of widely different ages and nations, and of whom it is certain that neither could have received

the hint from the other. I am well aware of the "obscurity" which, as Mr. Locke remarks, has been "unavoidably brought upon the writings of men who have lived in remote ages and different countries,"—"wherein the speakers and writers had very different notions, tempers, customs, ornaments, and figures of speech, every one of which influenced the signification of their words then, though to us now they are lost and unknown,"—so that "it would become us to be charitable one to another, in our interpretation or misunderstanding of ancient writings." (*Ess. Hum. Und.* Book III. ch. ix. § 10, 22.) I do not therefore take upon me absolutely to contradict the supposition of an infamous concealed meaning in this celebrated little poem; but I own that it appears to me altogether improbable, and that I am disposed to regard the revolting imputation upon the philosopher and the unfortunate ruler of Atarneus, as a calumny. The charge of impiety, brought by an obscure person against Aristotle, appears to have referred solely to his having been in the habit of singing this hymn, in honour of the memory of his murdered friend, patron and relative, though it was deemed a Pæan, and, consequently, was considered as an affront to Apollo: very unreasonably, for a Pæan was *et hominum et deorum laudes*, and was not restricted to its primary application. Athenæus, however, maintains that it is not a Pæan, but a Scolion. In no part of this little production is Hermias said, or so far as I can perceive implied, to be "invested with a form splendid as the sun;" and *μορφή* is applied, not to him, but to Virtue. The supposed parallelism of *ἀρπαγμός* and *θηραμα* is not very close, and is at least too weak a circumstance on which to build the belief of an allusion: for more striking coincidences are often to be found, where no design of reference could have existed. As for the honour which the poet sings as conferred by the Muses upon the patron of letters and victim of Persian treachery, the idea is so common to the classic poets that I cannot see any propriety in taking it as the correlative of the apostle's doctrine of the exaltation of Jesus. The enumeration of persons or things

"in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth," is, I conceive, nothing more than a Jewish idiomatical expression to denote the whole created universe. The same phraseology, with an unimportant variation, occurs in Rev. v. 3, 13; where surely no one will dream of an allusion to the Heathen gods, dæmons and heroes. We are, therefore, under no necessity of accepting Dr. Jones's alternative, either that the apostle is treading in the steps of Aristotle, or that his language "might be deemed the rant of a mystagogue."

But, to form a proper judgment upon Dr. Jones's opinion, it is necessary to have the whole hymn in view. Your learned readers are probably well acquainted with this beautiful little poem. Those who are not, will find it in Stobæus, in Athenæus, in Diogenes Laertius, in the first volume of Brunck's Anthology, and in other collections. For the sake of readers who have not the opportunity of consulting any of those authorities; and as the poem is very short, I subjoin a literal translation.

"Virtue, thou object of severe labour to our mortal race, fairest (*θηραμα*) acquisition in life! For thy (*μορφή*) beauty, O virgin, even to die, or to undergo glowing, unwearied toils, is in Greece an envied destiny. Such immortal fruit thou castest into the mind, nobler than riches or ancestors, or gentle sleep. For thy sake, Hercules the child of Jove, and the sons of Leda, bore their many toils, eagerly pursuing (*αγρευοντες*, *hunting*, *chasing*, which accounts for the use of *θηραμα*) thine excellence. From desire of thee, Achilles and Ajax went to the abodes of the dead. For the sake of thy friendly (*μορφή*) form, the favourite of Atarneus widowed the rays of the sun: thus, for his deeds, renowned in song. And the Muses, daughters of Memory, will advance him to immortality, as they celebrate the glory of Jove, the guardian of the hospitable, and [celebrate] the recompence of constant friendship."

[“Widowed the rays of the sun.” I follow Brunck, Buhle, and Schweighæuser in reading *ἀυγάς*. Dr. Jones prefers the genitive singular *ἀυγᾶς*, as was given by the older editors. But this requires a harsh ellipsis, and

would convey the idea that Hermeias committed suicide, instead of the fact that he was most perfidiously betrayed and cruelly put to death. The former reading not only gives a more regular and natural construction, but it also preserves the consistency of the imagery. To be dear to Apollo and the Muses was a common classical compliment: and in conformity with it, the murdered protector of science and its votaries is described as, by his untimely and disastrous death, causing "the rays," the offspring, "of the sun," to mourn as widows for him; while the Muses, the children of Memory, do their part to perpetuate his honour. *Xηρω* properly signifies, *to reduce to the condition of widowhood.*]

I now submit it to the judgment of candid and competent scholars, whether the interpretation of Phil. ii. 6—8, proposed in the *Scripture Testimony*, has been overthrown by the learned, ingenious and able, but I humbly think untenable, animadversions of Dr. Jones. A single observation more you will indulge me briefly to make.

(7.) The Doctor, in his conclusion, says, "The above passage is justly regarded as one of the strongest in favour of this doctrine;" that is, the doctrine of a divine nature in the person of the Christ: and he represents it as "that fortress which he [Paul] is said to have erected in support of the orthodox faith." Now, I beg leave to rejoin that I have by no means represented this passage as supplying the strongest, or one of the strongest, arguments in favour of the doctrine which appears to me to be contained in the Scriptures. It appears to me to recognize that doctrine in a very sufficient and decided manner; but I should not hold it forth as ranking among the most cogent of detached evidences. Indeed the great strength of the proof in favour of that sentiment lies, to my apprehension, in the variety, frequency and constancy of the modes by which it is involved, implied and incidentally assumed, as well as directly asserted in the great and only rule of faith. It seems to me to be rather an idle inquiry whether this argument or that, in a given case, is separately the strongest. The question for a rational man is whether the arguments, whatever may be their

insulated form, are constructed of solid materials, and whether their total amount be sufficient to establish the proposition.

J. P. SMITH.

Clapton,

February 10, 1822.

SIR,
THE learned author of "The Scripture Testimony" will, I hope, excuse me if I hazard a remark on the representations in his letter (p. 37). *Benevolus*, to whom, so far as I know, I am an entire stranger, must, I think, have received more satisfaction, could it have been shewn that his "citations" would not merely be "painful and offensive" to a guarded polemic like Dr. Owen, (p. 38,) or to a modern liberal scholar, such as my justly-respected acquaintance, in whose hands a *Trinity*, as Burke profligately said of courtly vice, may at length become almost harmless, "by losing all its grossness;" but that those "citations" had pained and offended the contemporaries and in other respects the admirers of the writers and preachers from whom *Benevolus* made his selections.

A Protestant would not be contented to represent *Transubstantiation* as described by such a Roman Catholic as the late Dr. Geddes. Thus my friend Mr. Belsham had, I conceive, a clear right to turn from the qualified language of cautious disputants, and to assume, as "the orthodox doctrine," the popular representations; among which appears prominent "the incarceration of the Creator of the world, in the body of a helpless, puling infant." Proceeding downwards from the pious *father*, whose marvellous faith produced the exclamation, *credo quia impossibile est*, we find "the infant-deity" (which, according to Watts, the *reason*, but, as I should say, the *religion* of Locke could not bear) adored for ages by the people, as a *mystery*, without such worship appearing to have excited any censure from their more learned instructors, whether *Papal* or *Protestant*, who would, indeed, have hazarded their own reputation for orthodoxy, had they ventured to teach the people that their *mystery* was an *absurdity*, and especially to be rejected as "painful and offensive to a very high degree."

The author of "the Scripture Testimony" has very justly characterized some of Dr. Watts's Hymns, with which, indeed, there is reason to believe, no one was, at length, less satisfied than the pious poet himself. Yet those hymns, connected with their repeated republication for general use, even down to the present day, form a host in support of Mr. Belsham's representation of "the orthodox doctrine." Nor should it be forgotten that the *Psalms*, a later composition of the pious author, and containing, comparatively, few passages offensive to any Christian, were, as is well known, slowly admitted to a competition with the *Hymns*, which in some *orthodox* congregations still maintain their ascendancy.

But the principal, though a very large use of those pious compositions, has not been, I apprehend, in public worship. With a most laudable design of worthily occupying intervals of leisure, and forming a devout Christian temper, the Hymn-book of Watts, always republished in an *uncastigated* form, has been recommended, as a daily *manual*, to children and servants, in the most unqualified terms. At least, the exemplary Christians by whom I had the unspeakable happiness of being led into life, and who were by no means *ultra-orthodox*, never directed me to pass over a page or even a line in the whole volume, as containing "language" calculated to "wound a thinking and pious mind," or in the least opposed to the language of the *Assembly's Catechism*, in which, like other infants, I had been taught to dogmatize on the nature of Deity, the supposed complex person of the Saviour, and the Divine decrees. No; I was left, with the thousands of my contemporaries, by parents little inclined to neglect the highest interests of their children, either to hymn an "infant of days" as

—— "the mighty God
Come to be suckled and ador'd;"

or escaping this Christianized Paganism, only worthy to be compared with "the old Heathens' song

Of great Diana and of Jove,"
to say in the words of truth and soberness,

"Jesus, we bless thy Father's name;
Thy God and ours are both the same."

In consistency with this method of early *orthodox* institution, when about 10 years of age, in a school-exercise for turning English into Latin, which has escaped the accidents of half a century, I was taught, with my class-fellows, in the manner of Lord Bacon's *Christian Paradoxes*, to regard these among the "unparalleled opposites" in the person of the Saviour:

"The eternal God once an infant
of an hour old;

"The immense God, once a child
of a span long."

My schoolmaster was a highly popular Calvinistic preacher, who riveted the attention of crowded congregations, as I have often witnessed. To his manners were attributed some innocent eccentricities, but his *orthodoxy* was never questioned.

Such, then, are the authorities which occur to me, and they may be easily multiplied, for believing that Mr. Belsham has been inaccurately charged "with misrepresenting and stigmatizing the orthodox doctrine." My friend's language is, as he designed it, highly disgusting. The disgust, however, is chargeable on a system, by which, according to the general understanding of its professors, whatever may be the guarded representations of its more learned advocates, that language is authorized, and not on those who, regarding such a system as a misrepresentation of Christianity, will, if they are conscientious and consistent, seize every fair occasion to develop and to expose it. Such, I am persuaded, will be the conduct of the learned author of "the Scripture Testimony," should he ever discover that the faith for which he ably contends, is not "the faith once delivered to the saints."

I scarcely need to add, that disapprobation of any system, and even contempt for some representations which it appears to authorize, are both perfectly consistent with a high respect for the virtues and talents of those by whom that system is maintained. Protestants, amidst all their differences, have agreed to assail, with unsparing ridicule, the *breaden deity* of the Romish Church. Yet they justly

eulogize her *Pascals* and *Fenelons*, “of whom the world was not worthy,” though, by precept and example, they instructed the multitude devoutly to “eat their God,” or, in more plausible language, to “receive their Maker.”

J. T. RUTT.

SIR,

February, 1822.

THE Monthly Repository is now become a respectable and valuable publication; and it owes its reputation, in a great degree, to the attention, assiduity and impartiality that have been exercised on your part, as its principal conductor. It is of little or no consequence what my opinion may be of the peculiar doctrines which it inclines to favour. These are fit subjects of fair and candid examination; and as long as every writer or reader is left at liberty to form his own judgment of their truth and importance, the inquiry and discussion, which are not only allowed but invited and encouraged, cannot fail, upon the whole, and in the final issue, to be highly advantageous. Although, after mature reflection and long experience, I have not thought that controversial preaching on subjects of mere speculation, indirectly and remotely connected with practice, is calculated to do much good, and I have had occasion to observe, in the course of many years, that it has irritated the passions more than it has enlightened the understanding; yet subjects of this kind, discussed with judgment and candour, form an useful part of our periodical publications. With this view I am anxious to promote the more general diffusion of the Monthly Repository, as it is at present conducted; which, with regard to the importance and utility of its disquisitions, and the liberal plan that is adopted and pursued by those who have the principal direction of it, seems to me to be daily improving, and to merit public patronage and encouragement.

After these preliminary remarks, the view in which I now wish to regard the Monthly Repository is that of a correct and impartial detail of historical facts, relating to Protestant Dissenters. Persons of this description, notwithstanding the disadvan-

tages under which they still labour, and of which they may justly complain, as members of the civil community, constitute a numerous and respectable class of his Majesty's loyal subjects, in various parts of the British empire. In making this assertion, I fear no contradiction from any who are acquainted with the population of the country. I am ready to allow, that they, as well as persons of every other description, have had, and may still have, their prejudices and errors; but I am happy to find, as far as my observation has extended, that liberality of sentiment and just notions of religious liberty are cherished and promoted among them, however they may differ from one another, and from others of their fellow-subjects, with respect to theology or politics, in a greater degree than those who knew them some years ago had reason to expect. I wish there were no limitations to this general remark. The excepted cases, however, are few in number, and, from mistake or malignity, exaggerated in aggravation. To the former cause, with total exclusion of the latter, I ascribe a paragraph, which I was surprised to find in a letter of the late Mr. Howe, of Bridport, published in your last number (pp. 28, 29). Dr. Toulmin is reported to have received a letter from London, informing him that, in order to obstruct and defeat a proposed application of the Catholics for a repeal of the Test laws, the Dissenters, of several classes, wished to waive their petition for redress of this grievance, lest the Catholics should succeed in their endeavours to obtain emancipation. Less enlightened as the Dissenters then were on the subject of religious liberty than they are now, I will venture to affirm, that this report was founded on mistake or misrepresentation. Dr. T., whom I well knew, was too honest and liberal to fabricate such a tale; but he was an industrious collector of anecdotes, and too ready to receive and record as facts, unauthenticated reports, which his correspondent, depending, perhaps, on a newspaper of the day, transmitted to him, as the intelligence of the passing moment. It is possible, indeed, that some few unenlightened Dissenters might be hostile to the

liberty of the Catholics, and express a wish that they might not succeed; and this circumstance might pass from one to another with aggravation, in the gossip of the day, till at length a considerable number of Dissenters were set in array against the Catholics. The fact itself is very improbable; for it must be well known, that the interference of the Dissenters for or against them would be of little avail. My much-esteemed friend, Dr. T., was credulous, and, with regard to some other circumstances, not always very correct. But he never erred intentionally and wilfully. Mr. Howe, indeed, was much less excusable; for he seems to intimate, that the distributors of his Majesty's bounty to the Protestant Dissenting Ministers, then called the *regium donum*, but since, from an alteration in the mode of its communication, denominated the *Parliamentary Grant*, were in the secret; and that they moved the springs of government in opposition to the Catholics. In this insinuation there is a degree of illiberality which does no honour to the memory of a man whom I esteemed, and with whom I was always on terms of intimate acquaintance. He knew where to have applied, if he had thought proper, for more correct information. Over this censurable part of his conduct I wish to throw a veil; and I regret that the letter to which I refer found its way into the Repository. I am much misinformed if those persons to whom he directed his correspondent for information could have gratified his curiosity; and if they were not as totally ignorant of the fact as the two country correspondents. I have sufficient reason for believing, that no intercourse on political measures, private or public, subsisted between the persons above calumniated and any members of his Majesty's administration, for the last fifty years. I have been assured, on an authority which I have no reason to question, that they have, on other occasions, asserted and maintained their independence. Ministers of state may easily find more pliant materials on which to exert their influence than the minds of persons who derived no benefit from any money which they received or imparted, besides the pleasure of relieving indigent

merit; and this they considered as an ample recompence for their trouble in the transaction of this business. But it has been the fate of these men, nor is their case singular, to be most calumniated by those to whom they have been most communicative.

I take the liberty of mentioning these particulars in order to render the collectors of anecdotes more cautious, in their record and detail of supposed facts, founded on conjecture and presumption, without a tittle of authentic evidence to support them; and to prevent their imposing, under the sanction of your valuable Repository, on the credulity of any of your readers.

What is the number or what is the rank of Dissenters that are now adverse to Catholic emancipation, I cannot undertake to pronounce; but I am happy to say, that in my connexion there are very few, if any, of this description; and as for others, I can only wish that they were more enlightened and more liberal.

It has been said, without sufficient evidence, that if the Catholics succeed in their application, they would be hostile to Protestant Dissenters. However this may be, it furnishes no reason why we should not wish them success, and thus by our greater liberality triumph over their more contracted and selfish principles. At all events, I beg leave to suggest my own opinion, that the case of Protestant Dissenters and that of Catholics are perfectly distinct; and whatever may be our secret or declared wishes in their favour, the repeal of the Test laws, as a subject of parliamentary consideration, should be separately argued, as they respectively affect the Catholics and the Protestant Dissenters; nor should we blend our case with theirs, lest we should injure instead of aiding and supporting one another. The time cannot be far distant when both must succeed, and those disgraceful laws be expunged from the Statute-Book of the British empire.

AN OLD DISSENTER.

Rotherham,
Feb. 5, 1822.

SIR,
IN the kind notice of the Country Minister, you have inserted in the Repository for last Month, (p. 47,

I am particularly obliged to you for the observation, expressing your opinion that the poem does not contain "the history of any individual," since I am informed it has given offence to some who have erroneously considered it as a history of myself.

Amongst these a report has reached me, that I have been condemned by some gentlemen connected with the York College, for a supposed reflection upon the impartiality and justice of the able and excellent superintendants of that important and valuable institution: and I am not sure whether others, less candid, have not attributed to me a design of thus attempting to injure it in the estimation of the public. Had such, however, been my design, the unworthy attempt could only have injured myself; for whilst the York College continues to send forth so respectable and useful a succession of ministers as those who have already, for many years, proceeded from it, and who now hold some of the most respectable situations, nothing that its enemies (if such there be) may insidiously throw out against its character, can injure it in the opinion of so enlightened a body of Christians as the Unitarian Dissenters of this kingdom. It would, therefore, have argued a want of common sense and prudence in me to have so openly attacked its character, and thus exposed myself to censure, especially as I myself was an *élève* of the institution, lived for five years under its fostering shade, and owe to it, in a great measure, whatever little talent I may possess. When young and fatherless, the York College was to me a *nursing mother*: how then can any one suppose me so destitute of common gratitude as to aim an unnatural blow at the reputation of my *Alma Mater*? It has, however, been supposed, and I, therefore, deem it a duty which I owe to my own character, as well as to that of the institution, thus publicly to acknowledge my obligations to it, and to express my high opinion both of the talents and virtues of the gentlemen connected with it, either as superintendants or tutors, whilst I, at the same time, most positively disavow the intention so unjustly imputed to me.

In addition to this disavowal, I beg

leave to add a few words in explanation of my object, in the passage which has unfortunately been misunderstood. In that passage, as in the rest of the poem, I wished to describe the feelings of a young man of sanguine temperament and acute sensibility, with little perseverance or industry, and deeming it natural for such a youth, when disappointed at College in the hopes which his ardent mind had conceived, to imagine that the prizes which his ambition prompted him to covet, but which neither his attainments nor exertions enabled him to gain, were partially and unjustly distributed, I represented him as entertaining

————— "some mistrust
Of those who dealt the prize," &c.

without reference to the sentiments of any particular person, or the character of any particular institution. That I had no intention whatever to throw the least blame on the conduct of the gentlemen engaged as tutors in the York College, (who were always kinder to me than I deserved, and who, I am persuaded, are guided by the best of motives in their behaviour to the students under their care,) will be evident to the candid reader from the following lines, containing Alfred's reflections on his departure from college, upon the manner in which he had spent his time there, and his inattention to the good advice which had been addressed to him by his tutors:

"Now, too, for when from aught below'd
we part,
A thousand fond regrets will swell the
heart,
Remembrance sigh'd o'er hours too idly
past
In trifling studies; and yet fled too fast:
O'er wilful faults, and careless, proud
neglect
(Of those whose wisdom most deserv'd re-
spect,
The mild preceptors, who, in language
kind,
Reprov'd his faults," &c.

Before I conclude this communication, permit me, Mr. Editor, to make one general observation naturally suggested by it; that it is a very unfair mode of criticism which identifies the author with the hero of his work, and refers every sentiment that may occur in it to the actual feelings of his own

especially when that author writes in verse, since a poet is not confined to the beaten track of common life, or compelled to tread only in the footsteps of his own experience.

J. BRETTELL.

The Unitarian Mourner comforted.

LETTER III.*

To Mrs. ——— on the Death of her Father.

Sept. 28, 1820.

MY DEAR MADAM,
WHEN I visited ——— two months ago, for the purpose of paying my public tribute of sincere respect to the memory of your excellent father, it was a source of great satisfaction to me in the discharge of what was in other respects a painful duty, to be assured from their own mouths that I had administered some consolation to his weeping family.

But, alas! the Christian comforter has performed but half his office when he has attempted to soothe the first moments of anguish. There are tears which having been brushed away with that magnanimous resolution which springs elastic under the immediate pressure of affliction, return to their wonted channels, and there are losses of which we are rendered more deeply sensible by reflection. And now that you are deprived of the services of a regular preacher which I know you highly appreciate, I greatly fear your minds may be too much occupied on the darker parts of the providential event of which you have become the subjects.

It is a very allowable, and I am persuaded you will find it a very consolatory employment of the thoughts, to compare your own condition with that of others, *your* sources of comfort under sorrow with *theirs*. The result will, I am persuaded, be a grateful conviction that, as Christians and Unitarians, you are possessed of unspeakably greater privileges than any of the sons or daughters of the large family of affliction throughout the world.

Direct your thoughts first to the uninspired Heathen philosopher, with-

out any certain rule of duty or assured promise of reward or punishment hereafter, excluding the Deity in his thoughts from all concern in the direction of the affairs of the universe, and regarding *pleasure* as the great object of human life, or proudly maintaining in spite of the smarting experience of every hour of life, that there is no evil in pain, and therefore despising all those considerations which might sustain the heart under its burthens. Next look at the Heathen vulgar, having no superior beings to look up to but such as are weak, passionate and wicked like themselves, by whom rewards or punishments in this and in that future imaginary world, which their poets describe, are distributed as caprice or revenge may dictate, with little regard to moral excellence or guilt; with no compassionate Saviour, instructor and comforter to whom to apply; no almighty, merciful and gracious Father, into whose bosom to pour forth the heart's secret sorrows.

Look at the disciple of Mahomet, panting after an unhallowed heaven of sensual pleasure above, as a recompence for the sufferings and mortifications of the present life, and ascribing the whole circle of human events to resistless, all-governing fate, *which hears no prayers and exercises no compassion*.

Look at the Indian widow, indignantly flinging away life as a worthless faded flower, when it can no longer be enjoyed in the society of the lord of her affections, and wasting, in an uncalled-for sacrifice, that fortitude which, better directed, might have insured her a martyr's crown.

Contemplate the loud and extravagant grief which was indulged in, even by the chosen people of God of old, which called forth the rebuke of our Saviour, and you will be convinced that within the *fold of Christ alone*, narrow and confined as are its present boundaries, the fountain of life, the well-spring of everlasting consolation is to be found.

But how can we sufficiently lament, that many of the followers of the great Shepherd have been content to drink the waters of life mixed up with the most pernicious ingredients, and have even attempted to disturb the serenity and clearness of the sacred, inexhaustible fountain itself! Observe the Ca-

* We regret that we could not bring this article into the last Number as we promised, p. 20, and that we can now insert only one letter. Eo.

tholic, instead of pouring forth his soul in the hour of sorrow, as Jesus did, to the *Father*, the God of all consolation and joy, and to him alone, dividing his homage and petitions with scrupulous exactness in error amongst a host of departed saints. By what costly and painful methods is his God to be appeased! *What anguish does he feel for the departed soul of his friend, if no holy man have been present to carry his spirit's expiring prayer to the gates of heaven, and anoint his dying limbs with holy oil!* Look at the zealous member of the Church of England: what trembling anxiety does he feel that his innocent expiring infant should be *baptized*, and his pious parent *receive the sacrament*; and with what lively sorrow is his bosom agitated if these have been unavoidably omitted! Visit the Calvinist after the death of his son, or friend or relative, who, though pure and godlike in his manner of life, had not exhibited that triumphant faith in the atoning sacrifice (by which alone an angry Deity is to be appeased) which, his system teaches, must characterize one of the elect. What avail the angel-smile on the countenance of his child, or the saintly, matron graces of *her* who gave him birth, or a long-continued course of benevolent and virtuous deeds in *him*, whom, but for this stain, he would have been proud to call his father—if either have not the witness that he is in the number of those whom God has arbitrarily chosen to be exclusive objects of his everlasting favour? When the child of affliction, weighed down by the burthens of life, and weary of the heartless commerce of the world, with reverence asks to see the face of the Christian's God, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; he is shewn a Deity, pavilioned in *eternal* darkness, dressed in *everlasting* frowns, the flames of whose wrath are only to be quenched in blood, who punishes the innocent for the guilty, smiles on a few, and looks with a countenance of terror on a universe!

It cannot be doubted that the Great Spirit who dwells in the heart of the untutored Heathen and the Christian, Jew and Greek, orthodox and heretic, does in all so over-rule the influence of their mistaken views, as greatly to

abate their painful and pernicious efficacy. But how different, my dear Madam, the sentiments which my esteemed friend and your lamented father was accustomed to cherish as the light and joy of his existence! Upon *his* views of the gospel, how encouraging the character of our common Heavenly Father! How simple and rational the preparation for death and eternity—a life of piety and benevolence in obedience to the commands of Christ! How readily may *our* fears be quieted, and *our* hearts be soothed, under the *sudden* departure of those who were dear to us! With what cheerful confidence may we commend their spirits to him who knew and allowed for all the infirmities of their nature; was ever ready to forgive their offences upon repentance, and will assuredly reward whatever was good in their characters!

I doubt not your thoughts and those of the other members of your family, are still chiefly occupied by the melancholy event which has befallen you. But while you dwell on the *past* and the *present*, allow me to remind you that the boundless, heart-cheering and all-glorious future lies no less open to your meditations. Carry your thoughts forwards, my young friends, to the period, though it should be many ages distant, when that heart in which you discerned so much moral worth, and which so tenderly interested itself in the welfare of each and all of you, shall rejoice in beholding you all again, greatly improved in knowledge and virtue, and blessing his paternal hand for having laid the foundation of a structure, which shall advance in lustre and beauty throughout the ages of eternity. View him no longer oppressed with languor and emaciated with sickness; his devotions no longer interrupted by disease and pain; or checked by any earthly imperfection, magnifying that name in which was his and his children's confidence below, in everlasting songs of adoration and thankfulness.

With best wishes for the happiness and improvement of every member of your family, &c. believe me,

Dear Madam,

Yours,

with sincere esteem and respect,

A List of STUDENTS educated at the ACADEMY at DAVENTRY under the Patronage of Mr. COWARD'S Trustees, and under the successive superintendence of the Rev. CALEB ASHWORTH, D. D., the Rev. THOMAS ROBINS, and the Rev. THOMAS BELSHAM. Communicated by Mr. BELSHAM.

The following Students removed from Northampton to Daventry, November 9, 1752.:

Year of Admission.	Name.	Remarks.
Dead.	Joseph Brown, minister,	settled at Wolverhampton—Coventry—London.
	d. H. Cutler,	died at Daventry. A German.
	d. William Blake, m.	settled at Crewkerne.
	d. Joseph Gellibrand, m.	Tottenham—Edmonton.
	d. Henry More, m.	Modbury—Leskiard. Author of a volume of Poems and of Criticisms in the Commentaries and Essays.
	d. William Boulton, m.	Dublin, retired to Hackney.
	d. William Jackson, m.	Freeby, Coventry.
1750,	d. Samuel Mercer, m.	Chowbent.
	d. Nathaniel White, m.	Hinkley—Leeds—London, Old Jewry.
	d. Radcliffe Scholefield, m.	Whitehaven—Birmingham.
	d. Thomas Robins, m.	Stretton-under-Foss—West Bromwich—Daventry, as successor to Dr. Ashworth, 1775; obliged to resign on account of the loss of his voice, 1781; carried on the business of bookseller and druggist at Daventry till his death, 1810.

To these were added, in 1753, upon the dissolution of the Academy at Kendal,

d. — Rotheram, m.	Kendal.
d. — Smithson, m.	Nottingham.
d. — Threlkeld, m.	Longdon—America.
d. — Whitehead, m.	Box Lane, near Berkhamstead, Herts.

The following entered under Dr. Ashworth.

1751,	d. Henry Holland, m.	Prescot, Ormskirk.
	d. Matthew Rolleston, M. D.	
	d. John Alexander, m.	Longdon, author of a Commentary on I Cor. xv.; found dead in his bed at Birmingham, A. D. 1765.
	d. Joseph Priestley, LL.D. F. R. S., &c. &c. m.	Needham-market — Namptwich — Warrington, tutor; Leeds—Calne; a librarian to Lord Lansdown—Birmingham; driven away by the Riots, 1791; Hackney, Gravel-Pit; emigrated to America, 1794; died at Northumberland, 1804: the celebrated author of many excellent works in Philosophy and Theology.
1752,	Thomas Tayler, m.	Daventry, Assistant Tutor—chaplain to Mrs. Abney, at Stoke Newington—one of Coward's Trustees, Carter Lane; the senior student now living, 1822.
	d. Thomas How, m.	Flower and Weedon—Walpole—Yarmouth.
	d. Henry Prockter, m.	Whitney—Stamford—Whitchurch—Evesham.
	d. John Robotham, m.	Freeby—Cambridge—Congleton.
	d. S. Smith,	Trade.
	d. — Buxton,	Trade.
1753,	d. — Jowell, m.	Trade.
	d. — Hodgson, m.	Namptwich.
	d. — Mather, m.	Stamford; conformed.
	d. Francis Webb, m.	Honiton—London, Pinners' Hall; quitted the ministry for a civil employment; secretary of Legation at the Peace of Amiens; died 1815, aged 80.
	d. Beesly, m.	Tewkesbury.

164 *List of Students educated at Mr. Coward's Academy, Daventry.*

Year of Admission.	Name.	Remarks.
1753,	d. P. Doddridge, d. Bunyon, m.	Solicitor at Tewkesbury.
1754,	d. John Cole, m. d. Henry Taylor, m. d. John Willding, m.	Wolverhampton—Narborough. Croydon; quitted the ministry. Congleton—Derby—Prescot.
1755,	d. Nathaniel Lea, m. d. John Reynell, m. d. Richard Amner, m. d. Samuel Brabrooke, m.	West Bromwich. Plymouth. Yarmouth—Hampstead—Cosely. Flower—St. Helen's—West Bromwich, as a schoolmaster—East Bergholt.
	d. Thomas Astley, m.	removed to Warrington Academy—Preston— Chesterfield.
	d. Nathaniel Cooper, m.	
	d. Joseph Howe — Maclane, Esq.	
1756,	d. Thomas Bruckshaw, m. Michael Underhill, m. d. Noah Hill, m.	Loughborough—Nottingham. Boston. succeeded Mr. Taylor as Assistant Tutor— London, Old Gravel Lane; one of Coward's Trustees.
	John Hall, m.	Stannington—Rotterdam.
	d. William Buckley, m. Peter Le Grand, Esq.	Atherston—Dukenfield.
	d. — Rogers, m.	
	d. — Hodge,	a son of Dr. Hodge, was a student about this time, and died before he had finished his course.
1757,	d. Samuel Worsley, m. d. — Bostock d. Thomas Somerset, m. Francis Panting, m. d. — Threlkeld, m.	Cheshunt. Okeham,—St. Ives. Rochdale; celebrated for an almost miraculous memory. See Dr. Barnes's Funeral Sermon for him.
	Dr. Cooper, M. D. Thomas Colley	
1758,	d. Ottiwell Heginbotham, m. d. Samuel Palmer, m.	Sudbury; a man of very superior talents; died young. London, Weigh-House — Hackney; one of Coward's Trustees; well known as the author of the Nonconformists' Memorial, and of many tracts in defence of Noncon- formity.
	d. William Enfield, m. LL.D.	Liverpool—Warrington, as minister and tutor in the Belles Lettres—Norwich; an elegant writer; he published some volumes of ser- mons, a System of Natural Philosophy; and joined with Dr. Aikin in the first volume of his General Biographical Dictionary.
1759,	d. John Boulton, m. d. William Whitaker, m. d. William Stuck, m. d. Richard Wright, m. d. William Bull, m.	Newmarket—Congleton. Leeds, Call-Lane; died young. Dorking. Atherstone.
	d. John Atchinson, m.	Newport, Pagnel; where he opened a small seminary for students for the ministry under the patronage of John Thornton, Esq. Gorton, gave up preaching and retired to Lei- cester.
	d. — Goodford, Esq.	
	d. Thomas Blackmore, Esq.	Briggins, Herts.
	d. Samuel Crompton, Esq.	Clapham.
1760,	d. John Ashworth,	son of Dr. A., grazier; kept the Wheat Sheaf at Daventry.

(To be continued.)

Edinburgh,
Dec. 11, 1821.

SIR,

IN reading Southey's Life of Wesley, I was much struck with the following incident: "Wesley confessed to William Law, that he felt greatly dejected, because he saw so little fruit from his labours. 'My dear friend,' replied Law, 'you reverse matters from their proper order. You are to follow the divine light wherever it leads you, in all your conduct. It is God alone that gives the blessing. I pray you always mind your own work, and go on with cheerfulness; and God, you may depend upon it, will take care of his. Besides, Sir, I perceive you would fain convert the world; but you must wait God's own time. Nay, if after all, he is pleased to use you only as a hewer of wood or a drawer of water, you should submit, yea, you should be thankful to him that he has honoured you so far.'" These appear to me very just and excellent remarks, and particularly applicable to the situation of Unitarian Ministers, and those who, being convinced of the truth of Unitarian sentiments, are desirous to diffuse them. Such persons are apt to be dejected and discouraged, from seeing the little progress which their opinions appear to be making, and the slight effect which their own efforts to propagate them seem to produce. Let them not, however, be discouraged. God's own time for the diffusion of the truth will come. It is the duty of all, following the divine light, to examine the Scriptures for themselves, and to use every method in their power to diffuse the opinions which they think agree with the real sense of revelation. Let them in this way endeavour to follow the divine direction, and they may with confidence trust, that God will give that success to their efforts which will be most for the benefit of mankind. And whether they succeed in diffusing their sentiments in this world or not, they may depend upon it that the Father of truth and sincerity approves of their conduct, and will finally reward them.

T. C. H.

March, 1822.

SIR,

I beg leave to inform your correspondent Quero, (pp. 83—86,) that I have seen the articles in the Eclectic Review, on the "Illustrations of the Divine Government." I agree with him that some parts of this critique are ably written, but others appear to me to be exceedingly obscure. Though I have read some of the passages in it several times with great attention, I am yet quite unable to understand them. The charge of obscurity, however, by no means attaches to all that is said in this paper. There is in particular one capital principle very clearly and distinctly stated, which your correspondent does not notice, but which in fact goes to the foundation of the subject. It is contained in the following passages of the Review:

"The argument *à priori* in favour of the doctrine of Universal Restoration, is not only specious but satisfactory, if the one thing which requires to be proved is taken for granted — — — ; if it be allowed that evil is a branch of the Divine contrivance for the production of a higher ultimate good to the creature; that it is but the *temporary name* of a particular class of the dispensations of Sovereign Beneficence; if, in a word, the foremost and favourite dogma of infidelity be conceded, that all things are as God makes them. But with the proof of this most essential point, Dr. Smith no where troubles his readers. Perhaps he never surmised that it could be called in question: or he might perceive that, unless he could place it beyond a doubt, it would give an absolutely gratuitous and nugatory character to his subsequent reasonings."

And again,

"It may be admitted that there is a plausibleness in the hypothesis to which we have already alluded, and which includes the whole of the argument adduced in support of Final Restitution: namely, that evil, moral as well as natural, is but a means in the great machinery of the universe, essential to the higher good of the creature. — — — We question if there is a proposition more indispensable to the existence of true religion, considered as a habit of the mind, than this, that evil is ESSENTIALLY and ULTIMATELY EVIL."

This is going to the very bottom of the subject: the consideration of this single point does "indeed include the whole of the argument adduced in support of the doctrine of Final Restitution." I am content that the matter should depend upon this issue. It

is very true that in the former editions of the Divine Government, I did not enter into any proof of this most essential point. I do confess that in the simplicity of my heart, I did not "surmise it could be called in question." In the nineteenth century, in England, in this age and country of religion and philosophy, I was addressing Christians, and I did not suppose that any one would deny the position, that, under the administration of a God of infinite power, of unerring wisdom, and of perfect goodness, evil is the means of producing good.

Since, however, this position is denied, and since it is distinctly admitted by the opponents of the doctrine of Universal Restoration, that this doctrine must follow of course, if that position can be established, I have now entered into the proof of it. In the new edition of the Divine Government, which will be published probably as soon as this article appears, I have stated that proof at length.

Believing too, as I most sincerely and firmly believe, that, taken in its whole extent, this is a subject with which the virtue and happiness of mankind are more intimately connected than with any other whatever, I have also entered into a more comprehensive and careful investigation of the origin, the nature and the tendency of evil in general. I have considered separately and in detail the several classes of evil, namely, natural and moral evil, and the evils which have hitherto been found inseparable from the social state, namely, poverty, dependence and servitude. "I have endeavoured to shew why these evils exist in the creation of a Being of almighty power, of infinite wisdom, and of perfect goodness. I have endeavoured to lead the mind to the calm and serious consideration of principles which seem adequate to divest it of doubt, where doubt must be unhappiness, and to conduct it to a conclusion which, if once embraced from conviction, must secure it from misery."

I have also read with great attention the work of Dr. Jonathan Edwards, entitled "The Salvation of all Men strictly examined," which is, perhaps, the ablest production on that side which has ever appeared. Every thing of importance, however, which

he advances, and which had not been previously considered in the Illustrations, may be arranged under these two inquiries :

1. Whether punishment, under the Divine administration, be invariably corrective. 2. Whether it be consistent with the Divine justice to inflict an endless punishment.

Every argument that can be considered important, which he adduces under these heads, some of which he states with great acuteness and ability, and which deserve very serious consideration, I have examined and answered with all the care in my power.

I must add, that further consideration has induced me to give up some passages of Scripture which were formerly adduced as express testimonies in favour of the doctrine, that all mankind will ultimately be restored to a state of purity and happiness.

I may notice in conclusion, that under the evils of the social state some considerations are suggested which may assist the mind in determining the very important inquiry, whether the law of population, as stated by Mr. Malthus, be or be not consistent with the Divine benevolence. I had entered with some minuteness into this thorny question of population, but considering that this discussion might divert the mind too much from the main argument of the work, I resolved to omit the greater part of what I had prepared for the press. I have, therefore, contented myself with stating what appears to me to be the real state of the question as it now stands between Mr. Malthus and his opponents; and with suggesting what I think sufficient to lead the mind to the just conclusion respecting the degree in which this question, however it be settled, can influence our conceptions of the Divine benevolence.

There are some other topics in Dr. Edwards's work which I could have wished to discuss, but as they are not essential to the argument, I have omitted them, lest my work should grow to too great a bulk. The same reason has prevented me from noticing any other part of the articles in the Eclectic Review than that which I have mentioned. This is the only *essential* point which, it appears to me, they

have brought into discussion, and on which there is any thing to be advanced which has not been already advanced. But there are several other topics of great interest and importance which I have always thought it would be very desirable to notice, and which I have always intended to request your permission, Mr. Editor, to discuss in your liberal and impartial Repository. But more than two years have passed away since that resolution was formed, and my time has been so little at my own command that I have not been able to accomplish my purpose. However, if you think that this is a proper subject for discussion in the Repository, and if no other person will undertake the task, (though I sincerely hope some of your able and less occupied correspondents will undertake it,) I will endeavour to do so: and if Quero do not find any thing in what is now added to the Illustrations to remove his doubts, I shall be happy to do all in my power to assist him in solving them, if he will state them with precision.

SOUTHWOOD SMITH.

SIR, *Cork, January, 1822.*

YOUR correspondent, who subscribes himself [XVI. 727—729] "No Presbyterian," replies with some degree of warmth to a charge of misrepresentation, absolutely imaginary; a charge which I never meant to bring against him, or any others of my English Dissenting brethren. With respect to the circumstance of which he complained, I did not feel interested in it, and, consequently, meant not to make any allusion to it. It was the paper in your valuable Repository, signed John M'Cready, [XVI. 473—475,] which called forth my explanation of the peculiar circumstances of the ministers and congregations to whom he alluded, and my representation of what Presbyterianism now is, in a great part of Ireland, by which I wished to give information, which might be pleasing to my highly respected English friends; information which I deemed justice required. For Presbyterianism, as described in the Encyclopedia Perthensis, or as denounced by that most amiable, pious and eminent labourer in the gospel vineyard, the late Dr. Toulmin, with

whom, I am proud to say, I was personally and intimately acquainted; for such Presbyterianism, which claimed authority from the Holy Ghost, which imposed creeds of human invention, and which abetted spiritual tyranny, nursed and nurtured in the very spirit and principles of religious liberty as I have been, I never could plead. Yet even in that age of dark superstition, Presbyterianism was, in many respects, an enlightened form of Christianity. Presbyterianism allowed no other head of the Christian church, than Christ, and called no man master upon earth. It was founded on the precept, "one is your master, even Christ, and ye are brethren." It did, indeed, acknowledge different offices, and consequently different officers, in the church of Christ, which existed in the days of the apostles; such as teachers, presbyters or elders, and deacons, administrators of its secular concerns.

It must, however, be added, that Presbyterianism did insist upon faith in doctrines, which, to me, appear to be corruptions of the pure gospel of Christ. But let it likewise be remembered that this was not peculiar to that system, but, unfortunately, prevailed in all Christian churches, and even in spiritual republics, styling themselves Independent. Yet, with all its faults and defects, it was productive of various utilities; its form of worship was plain and simple; it disavowed temporal authority in religious concerns. I beg leave to quote its character as drawn by the translator of the Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745, by the Chevalier de Johnstone: "Wherever the Presbyterian system has been established—in Scotland, in the north of Ireland, in Holland, Germany and Switzerland, or in the wilds of North America, it has uniformly been accompanied by a marked elevation of character. The great body of the people identify themselves with Presbytery; the humblest individual feels himself something under it, and raised in his own eyes; and no virtue can exist without such respect; the grand foundation on which the structure of society rests, becomes thus firm and solid. The complete establishment of Presbytery produced such effects, that the Scotch, who, in one

century, were the most unprincipled and desperate marauders, were, in the next, examples of sobriety and peace. It is not meant to defend the intolerance with which the Presbyterians, as well as other sects, were chargeable. Peace be to their errors! The austerity too of the Presbyterians may seem to throw an unnecessary gloom over human life, and it cannot be denied, that they formerly carried their hatred of pleasure to an unwarrantable excess; but the open profligacy of their opponents, the keen struggle they had so long maintained, and their almost unparalleled sufferings, could hardly fail to throw them into the extreme of self-denial. To these times, succeeded others of a different complexion, in which nature asserted her dominion over the Presbyterians; and their austerity has long ceased to pass the bounds of propriety."

At present, as it exists in a great part of this country, Presbyterianism is to be considered, not as implying belief in any particular controverted opinions, but rather as a religious association of various and (as to faith and worship) Independent Christian Societies, represented in annual Synods by their Elders and Ministers, and thus forming, as I mentioned in my former communication, tribunals for the preservation of temporal funds and property; for the settlement of such differences as may unhappily arise between pastors and their congregations, and for examining into the characters and qualifications, not the religious opinions, of candidates for the ministerial office. No creed is imposed; no authority is assumed over conscience, no absolute power of decision, but simply the Christian right and duty of exhorting, of admonishing, of warning. The greater part, I believe I may say *all*, of the ministers of the Synods of Munster and Antrim, and many of the ministers of the far more numerous Synod of Ulster, hold the doctrine of the pure unity of God, and pay religious adoration to the Father only. This Presbyterianism (as I have already stated) claims no command over religious opinions or religious worship; to what claims, therefore, "No Presbyterian" refers, when he expresses his conviction, "that as ignorance and bigotry

shall give way to the farther advances of knowledge, reflection and intelligence, the Presbyterian *claims* will recede more and more," I know not. And as it does not arrogate power derived from the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery; nor attempt to infringe, in any respect, the rights of conscience, but, as I conceive, is productive of many salutary effects, I cannot join in the wish, that the very name of Presbyterianism should be banished from the earth.

SENIOR.

SIR,
MR. HALL of Leicester, in the last edition of his "Apology for the Liberty of the Press," has very properly omitted some acrimonious passages concerning Dr. Horsley, of which he has given notice to the reader in his Advertisement, and one reason he assigns for the omission of these passages is, that they were scarcely consistent with the "REVERENCE DUE TO DEPARTED GENIUS." Now with whatever feelings we contemplate what is called Genius, that of REVERENCE surely ought not to be one of them. I REVERENCE only moral excellence. In all the writings of the early Christians, I find no REVERENCE attached to Genius, living or departed. The Author of the Christian dispensation expresses NO REVERENCE for men of Genius. If Christians were to become like little children, they were not permitted to value themselves or others as men of Genius. Indeed, this term Genius, as it is now used, inspires nothing but disgust. Now every peevish and flippant witling is a man of Genius, and may think himself, for aught I know, entitled to REVERENCE! If Dr. Horsley in the privacy of his own heart, sacrificed either passion or interest to a sense of duty, I will not deny him REVERENCE, and he will have his reward.

But Mr. Hall, in his REVERENCE FOR DEPARTED GENIUS, has omitted in this edition of his tract his elaborate eulogium on Dr. Priestley, without giving to the reader the slightest intimation of such omission. Perhaps Dr. Priestley, when departed, was not to be regarded as a man of Genius, though whilst living, he received the

homage of Mr. Hall! or, perhaps, Mr. Hall offers up the manes of Dr. Priestley, to the feelings of orthodox associates! But enough of conjecture, Mr. Hall alone knows his own motives of action. However, there are those who regard Dr. Priestley not only as a man of Genius, but as a man of the most solid claims to REVERENCE. Priestley, by nature or habit, or both, was a man of restless activity; but he uniformly directed that activity to what seemed to him the public good, seeking neither emolument nor honour from men. His youth, devoted to labour and spent in the habit of chastity, temperance, and every virtue, was a faultless example to all, and a striking contrast to that of some men who have been called men of Genius. He knew how to bear poverty without murmuring, and disappointment without fretfulness. He justified the will of his aunt, which deprived him of expectations she had excited. His attainments were various and extensive, yet such was his true Christian humility, that when his reputation as a discoverer in physics was higher than that of any man in Europe, he urged men to the pursuit of natural philosophy, alleging that the pursuit demanded nothing more than COMMON POWERS OF MIND. So far was he from demanding REVERENCE DUE TO GENIUS. When philosophy was in fashion, and he, as one of its great masters, was in fashion, he wrote on religion, to the injury of his reputation, only because he believed it still more important to mankind than any of the pursuits of philosophy. His writings in philosophy, history, theology, criticism, and metaphysics, remain monuments of a vigorous, varied and extensive Genius. But leaving his writings out of the case, he was one of the most laborious clergymen who ever lived. His preaching, catechising, and other ministerial labours, would have been beyond the ability of any other man. Some men have called him the head of a sect. If he were, no one who ever sustained that character, is worthy to be compared with him. The Luthers, Calvins, Knoxes and Cranmers, for comprehension of mind, acuteness of distinction, depth of research and varied attainments were all mere children to Priestley. I

confess I read his writings against the Trinity without interest; because writings for or against an impossibility, if they display all the acuteness of Scotus himself, are of little value. If there were a fault in the mental character of Priestley, I should be inclined to think it was too *conclusive*, as he seems to me to be confident sometimes on subjects which hardly admit of positive decision. But one should hesitate, perhaps, here; the fault may be in one's own mind.

He wrote his life when he was in the zenith of his reputation, and disdains not then to tell us, where he preached in his youth, and with what acceptance his SERMONS were received by an unlettered audience. He was, in short, a perfect pattern of Christian simplicity, and such an union of talents and attainments, with so much sanctity of character, I believe never before existed. And shall we regard this "DEPARTD GENIUS" without REVERENCE?

If Mr. Hall have ceased to praise Priestley, there is little to be lamented in this silence, when we perceive how liberal he is of his praise to his orthodox associates living or dead. This Tract contains very little "satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parùm," and the statesman and moralist will find in it nothing to direct their conduct. And as to eloquence, (of which Mr. Hall has an ample share,) I fear it is seldom subservient to the promotion of religion. The effect of eloquence is to rouse men to some sudden act. To give a vote, or to fight a battle, men may be roused by eloquence. But religion is no sudden impulse. The Christian warfare is constant, persevering, and ends only with life. Eloquence can do nothing here. Who that is bent upon the discharge of Christian duty, does not find in the simple but classic page of William Law, more efficacious persuasion than in all the eloquent declamation (rich and varied as it is) of Jeremy Taylor? Mr. Hall is eloquent; he is, perhaps, a man of Genius; but if he be a good man, is on that account only entitled to REVERENCE: sanctity of character, and that alone, is above all Greek, above all Roman praise.

REVIEW.

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

- ART. I.—*An Inquiry into the Probability and Rationality of Mr. Hunter's Theory of Life, &c.* By John Abernethy, F. R. S., &c. 1814.
- ART. II.—*An Introduction to Comparative Anatomy and Physiology, &c.* By William Lawrence, F.R.S. 1816.
- ART. III.—*Physiological Lectures, &c.* By John Abernethy, F. R. S. 1817.
- ART. IV.—*Lectures on Physiology, Zoology and the Natural History of Man, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons.* By William Lawrence, F. R. S. 1819.
- ART. V.—*Sketches on the Philosophy of Life.* By Sir T. C. Morgan. 1819.
- ART. VI.—*Remarks on Scepticism, being an Answer to the Views of Bichat, Sir T. C. Morgan, and Mr. Lawrence.* By the Rev. Thomas Rennell, A. M., Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. 1819.
- ART. VII.—*Cursory Observations upon the Lectures, &c.* By one of the People called Christians. 1819.
- ART. VIII.—*A Letter to the Rev. Thomas Rennell.* From a Graduate in Medicine. 1819.
- ART. IX.—*A Letter on the Reputed Immateriality of the Human Soul: with Strictures on the Rev. T. Rennell's late Publication.* 1821. Hunter. 3s.
- ART. X.—*An Inquiry into the Opinions, Ancient and Modern, concerning Life and Organization.* By John Barclay, M. D. Edinburgh. 1822. 12s.

[A correspondent having sent the following paper in the form of a Review, the Editor publishes it in that form, though without pledging himself to every opinion expressed in it.]

WE have been almost deterred by the long array of belligerents in this controversy, from entering the field and attempting a Review of their respective merits; but the subject being one of peculiar interest, and having

been treated by most of our contemporaries with disgraceful bigotry, we shall attempt a general retrospect of the publications we have enumerated, bespeaking the indulgence of our readers on account of our necessarily restricted limits.

The inquiry into the principle of life and organization is intrinsically one of philosophical curiosity, and peculiarly so to Unitarians, who, perhaps, in their general sectarian character, may be denominated Materialists. On this particular question our own individual opinions are unsettled, and perhaps at variance with the theory of Materialism; but at the same time we cannot stand timidly by and witness the scandalous opinions imputed to the Materialists, as consequences of their doctrine, and repeated in a geometrical progressive ratio with the solemnity and repetition of denial: for what, in the year A. D. 1821, could exceed the following sentence in Mr. Rennell's (the Christian Advocate's) *Remarks on Scepticism*: “Atheism and Materialism go hand in hand”? We offer this “Christian Advocate” his choice of the two horns of the dilemma—ignorance or impudence.

This controversy has also become more interesting from the recent suppression of Mr. Lawrence's works, which appears to have become necessary from the clamour of bigotry in fits, and the imminent danger of his gown and temporalities—the Professorship of Anatomy and Surgery to the Royal College of Surgeons, &c. The “HOLY ALLIANCE” (in the name of the Holy Trinity) and their connexions, it is well known, are great epicures in books, and seem to have given Mr. Lawrence a place in the revived *Ind. Expurg. Anglicanus*: such is the spirit of these literary incendiaries.

The theory of life was, undoubtedly, at an earlier period of philosophical and religious knowledge, an object of more anxious importance than at present, since the possibility and probability of a future state were deeply implicated in the research, while the

Heathen philosopher had no aid from the light of revelation. Accordingly, we find it a favourite speculation of the Oriental philosophers, and of the "Wise Men" of Greece and Rome. Indeed it is probable, that the doctrine of Immateriality owed its early origin to the natural and proud desire of a future state, so inherent in man, and was the only theory on which, with their limited physical and metaphysical knowledge, they could found its belief. To enumerate or examine the several opinions of the Heathen philosophers on immortality and causation, is inconsistent with our limits; and we will take the liberty of referring our readers to a very interesting work on that subject, by Mr. Scott, Aberdeen Professor of Moral Philosophy. The philosophical inquirer also is familiar with the "intellectual system" of the learned and laborious Cudworth, who, in his refutation of Atheism, has amply explored the labyrinths of ancient metaphysics. Neither shall we here enter into the controversies concerning the belief of the ancients in a future state, or the singular silence of the Old Testament on the subject. Both have occupied a distinguished rank in British literature, and engaged the learning and research of many celebrated names. Suffice it to observe, *in processu*, with respect to the hope and theories of the Heathens, that the faint and anxious expectation indulged by some few, and the bold denial of all possibility of futurity by others, constitute an unanswerable argument for the necessity or rather for the utility of revelation: and as to the question of the Jewish Scriptures, which engaged the pens of Warburton and Middleton, the very fact of the controversy is a plain proof that the doctrine of a future state and the immateriality of the human mind was not revealed; or, at all events, most imperfectly, and could not have been a principal object of the old covenant: and, indeed, the existence of the sect of the Sadducees would of itself have afforded a strong proof. It was reserved for the glorious distinction of Christianity to bring "life and immortality to light," and Christ became "the first-fruits of them which slept." It was this glorious and invaluable privilege which Paul preached to the men of Athens, that

"stumbling-block" to the Greeks. This was his defence before Felix: "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers; and have hope towards God that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust; and herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence towards God and men." So also before King Agrippa: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, for which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

Now to every reflecting and critical reader of the New Testament, it is notorious that the very few particulars communicated as to a future state, indeed it may almost be asserted, that the bare promise and the title to it, constitute the whole revelation. On some future occasion we shall enlarge on this interesting topic. The scantiness of the divine communication has been often lamented, even by Christians themselves, and, we believe, is a cause of great anxiety with many very pious believers; but this limited knowledge appears to us perfectly consistent with the economy of the Divine government, and the silence of the sacred writers on this subject, a very remarkable testimony of their integrity. We shall, however, at present, only observe, that these metaphysical obliquities, now under censure, are in themselves a fair proof how little the limited power of the human mind can comprehend on such a subject; and, consequently, that unless man was differently endowed than by his present constitution, such particulars could not be the objects of revelation, because he could not have comprehended them. Our future existence, calculated for immortal duration, can be conceived by no analogical knowledge of our present mortal senses; for if man's understanding could comprehend the secrets and powers of Divine Omnipotency, it would of necessity be equal to it: sufficient that we are assured of our mental identity; and as to the mode of our resuming *that*, what could the knowledge of it add to the sense or influence of our moral responsibility, or to our grateful anticipation of future happiness? We

are ignorant whether there be not passions in the human mind which, in this world, remain dormant and undiscovered, for want of objects to excite them; and with respect to the *manner* of our resurrection, we are described as the “workmanship of the Creator;” and all Deists have conceded, that the Creator who first made us could *re-make* us after dissolution. The sculptor can mould his plaister into various shapes, can again confound it into a general mass, and again fashion them from the same; shall we deny the same power to the Great Sculptor of nature? Lord Herbert, in his celebrated Dialogues, p. 169, has the following admission: “His restoring the dead to life seems miraculous, because it is rare and unusual; though yet, if we consider things aright, the birth of a child would be the greater wonder: it not being so strange, that any which once was, should be again, as that which never was, should be at all.” Mr. Paine, also, in the 2nd part of his *Age of Reason*, makes the same confession, expressing his hope and expectation of futurity. We, as Christians, are no more bound to explain *how* this hope will be realized than the sceptic is. If God raise the dead, whether they have the same bodies they had formerly, or whether some other particles of matter be in the composition of them, or whether they will not have something added to counteract their former mortality, does he not do what he promised? The question is certainly a very *immaterial* one; and Alexander, in his Paraphrase on Corinthians, very pertinently remarks, that it is not the most interesting that can be imagined, since it may be reduced to this point—Whether our houses from heaven, as the apostle calls them, will be entirely new, both for matter and form, or fitted up in part out of the old materials. Nor do we consider that this physiological or metaphysical controversy at all involves the question of an intermediate state; and we were, some months since, greatly surprised to hear the horror expressed by a venerable and learned ornament of the Dissenting Church, on the accidental introduction, by Mr. Belsham, of his (Mr. Belsham’s) disbelief of an intermediate state preceding a day of general judgment. On the occasion alluded

to, the “sleep of the soul,” or this temporary suspension of existence, was denounced as incompatible with any rational hope of futurity. Surely nothing could be more unphilosophical than such an inference. We well know the flattering prospect which the dying Christian sees, of an immediate junction with those friends who have gone before him to their long home; but how vulgar is the prejudice against the heterodox belief in the temporary suspension of existence between the days of death and judgment, and an interregnum perhaps ordained by the superior wisdom of the Deity! This is purely a speculative subject, and we by no means assert a confident opinion against an intermediate state; but from the consideration we have hitherto given it, we do conceive that the doctrine of Materialism is here consistent with reason and scripture, and would argue against it. We shall make use of some very remarkable arguments of Alexander, selected from pp. 46, 47.

“The time which passes between death and the resurrection may be very short. And though it should be some ages longer than we apprehend, yet to them that sleep, and are unconscious of what passes, it will appear less than a moment; and the very same instant which separates them from this mortal life, must, to their thought and apprehension, be that which unites them for ever to their Saviour and their God. I do not mention it with any considerable stress, that there seems a sort of equality, which is not displeasing to the human mind, in such a constitution as we are speaking of, where no person is distinguished from another, either to his advantage or loss, on account of a difference in the time of his birth, which is wholly arbitrary, and constitutes no part of his character or desert: but each man appearing in his own order, and receiving at the hand of Providence the materials of his future character and hope, having filled up the station assigned him either to his honour or disgrace, retires at the appointed time, and waits till a general day of retribution; to receive, in common with all who have borne any part in the concerns of human life, that sentence which his conduct has deserved, from the universal Judge and Parent. And one person has no more reason to complain, that an examination has not been made into his character and conduct before this time, than another that he was not brought into the scene sooner.”

And to examine the justice of another imputed imperfection of revelation, namely, the indefinite period of the day of judgment, we shall further quote the observations of the same ingenious commentator, from pp. 89, 90. Many "probable reasons" may be mentioned, "why the precise time of this event was left so undetermined, or rather entirely unknown."

"For as the gospel has fixed the time of judgment to the coming of Christ, and gives men no promise or expectation of a retribution before that period, to have determined this coming to any particular era, would have been attended with two manifest inconveniences. First, the more remote any ages of men were from the period foretold, they would consider themselves as so much the less interested in its approach; and, therefore, the expectation of it would have a proportionably smaller influence upon their apprehensions and practice. Secondly, the nearer the world drew to its conclusion, men would be more strongly affected, and at last thrown into the utmost confusion. The springs of human action would by degrees lose their force, the business of the world come to a stand, while all were intent upon the approaching revolution. These inconveniences are sufficiently provided against by the wisdom of heaven. For as we are cautioned to beware of false prophets, who should pretend to tell us that Christ is in this or that place, and immediately to appear; so we are warned against another abuse, proceeding from a contrary cause, namely, a presumption of its delay, by which too many would be led to set at defiance an event which they thought afar off, and long in coming. Matt. xxiv. 48. And further, the suddenness with which it will take place is intended to prevent that disorder in human affairs which the apprehension of its near but slow approach would at any time occasion.—The uncertainty of this event bears a near resemblance to the natural uncertainty of human life, and seems calculated to produce the same effect. He who tells me that I am mortal, tells me that death is near, that life is short and the days few, that I may die soon or suddenly, that I should be continually expecting the end of life, and not be surprised if it should take place to-morrow. And he is equally a true prophet, whether I die the next day or live beyond fourscore. Is not this the language of Scripture, with respect to the coming of Christ?"

These remarks may, perhaps, be thought out of place, or foreign to the

subject: they will, however, shew, that the Materialist may have a most consistent belief in revelation, and that "Materialism and Atheism" do not "go hand in hand." We considered it highly important to prove, that Christianity is *not* endangered in these disputes on the vital principle; and we shall, afterwards, shew from the orthodox wranglers themselves, how little *they* are, in fact, interested in establishing the separate existence of the soul.

The really interesting question, therefore, arises, How was this spurious doctrine foisted into the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and at what period was the simplicity of Christianity destroyed by its introduction? It was the gift of Paganism to Revelation in that early defection of the Eastern and Western churches from the simple tenets taught by our Saviour and his primitive disciples; and the doctrine of Immateriality was the axis on which the doctrines of Purgatory, Transubstantiation and the "Hypostatic Union" revolved, and without which these ecclesiastical mints could not have been worked to any pecuniary advantage. On this was founded the institution of masses and saintly shrines; and was, indeed, the soul of that funding system of priestcraft, which ultimately saddled such a grinding weight of unproductive labour on the industry of the people. In this subtle fluid was the credulity of the people steeped, and their whole faith was pinned on that crafty motto of monastic art—"Piu ci metti, piu meriti"—the more you give, the more's the merit! Dr. Priestley's able pedigree of this natural child of Heathenism is well known, and here we shall leave it; for no one, tolerably read in history, is ignorant how much more this doctrine owes its birth and existence to Plato and Eneas than to Christ or his apostles.

This controversy, both in its physiological and metaphysical relations, has been often agitated in Europe. Our limits will not, however, allow us to sketch any particular outline of the systems which have successively supplanted each other. This will be found to have been performed in a very full and able manner by Dr. Barclay, in the 3rd and 4th chapters of his volume (the last article in our

notice). The third chapter details the opinions of those who, since the revival of learning in Europe, have treated of the causes of organization, and ascribed the principal phenomena of life to organic structure. These comprise the distinguished names of Paracelsus, Fray, Darwin, Leibnitz, Priestley, Haller, Buffon, Needham, Maudslayi, Robinet, Blumenbach, Gassendi, Cuvier, Lawrence, Cabanis, Des Cartes, &c. The 4th chapter particularizes the opinions of those who suppose a living internal principle distinct from the body, and likewise the cause of organization; comprehending the celebrated names of Harvey, Willis, Hunter, Abernethy, Deleure and Grew.

To enter into any separate examination of these various theories is impossible: they compose a Babel of hypotheses; and, as Dr. Barclay remarks in his summary view, all physiological writers, both ancient and modern, seem to be agreed, that the causes of life and organization are utterly invisible, whether they pass under the name of animating principles, vital principles, indivisible atoms, spermatic powers, organic particles, organic germs, formative appetencies, formative propensities, formative forces, formative minuses, pre-existing monads, semina rerum, plastic natures, occult qualities, or certain unknown chemical affinities!

The theological part of this controversy, as connected with our own country, forms no part of the present review; and, indeed, a most impartial history of it has been compiled by Archdeacon Blackburne, in his "Historical View of the Controversy concerning an Intermediate State, and the Separate Existence of the Soul; 2nd ed., 1772."

We pass over altogether the many absurd theories which might amuse our readers, though not instruct them; and which have abounded in the last century, from the opinions of Bishop Berkley to animal magnetism, inclusive, and not forgetting the hypothesis of the celebrated modern French chemist, Delametherie, who affirms that the Deity is nothing more than a crystallization! Bishop B. pretended to disbelieve the evidence of his senses, and to doubt the existence of matter: he contended, that sensible, material

objects, as they are called, are not external to the mind, but exist in it, and are nothing more than impressions or shadows made upon it by the immediate act of the Deity. To reason with any of these visionists would be to fall to a level with them in absurdity. The pens and ink with which they wrote their paradoxes, were their refutation; as the works of those ultra-orthodox which contend against the use of reason in matters of religion, by their very arguing disprove the position. We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to the question at issue, as relating to the principle of vitality in man considered as matter and a body.

And, to arrive at a simple definition, we shall borrow the definitions of an author whose work, though on a department of Natural History of confined interest, we have lately read with great admiration of his power of abstract reasoning, and of the truly philosophical liberality with which, though an Immaterialist, he states the arguments of Materialism.*

"Particles of matter when collected together in a mass of any degree of size or compactness form a *body*. An *organic* body is a mass of matter of which the component molecules are or have been in motion on being collected together by intussusception. Such a body is said to live or to have lived. By the term *life* we would express that faculty which certain combinations of material particles possess, of existing for a certain time under a determinate form, and of drawing while in this state into their composition, and assimilating to their own nature, a part of the substances which may surround them, and of restoring the same again under various forms."

Mr. Macleay goes on to observe:

"How this faculty is acquired, what is its immediate cause, or, in other words, whether there may not be several mediate causes between it and the Primary Cause, are questions to the solution of which we are totally incompetent. It is to the organic body what the expansion of steel is to a watch, or that of steam is to the engine; but if we ask what is expansion? what is life? we can get no answer but a recital of their effects."

We have thus borrowed this clear description of man as the most con-

* *Horæ Entomologicae*: or, Essays on the Annulose Animals; by W. S. Macleay, Esq., A. M. F. L. S.

cise in its language and idea we ever met with. The distinctive character of man, and the superiority of his sentient principle to that of all organized beings, is too evident to need any illustration: nor can it, we think, be denied by any species of sceptic, that this world is particularly designed for his developement. God made man after his own image, endowed him with reason, that distinctive prerogative of our nature, and delegated to him certain limited powers. "Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

"Far as Creation's ample range extends,
The scale of sensual mental powers ascends:
Mark how it mounts to man's imperial race,
From the green myriads in the peopled grass."

We might give endless quotations, were it necessary, from sceptical writers and comparative anatomists, in proof of the vast superiority of our nature, sentient and organic, over the whole organized creation. Lord Monboddo has, indeed, endeavoured to assimilate us to baboons, with amputated tails; and Lord Kames has described the Giages (an African nation) as a species totally distinct from mankind, because they killed their own children, and robbed the nurseries of their enemies: two instances among many, that writers against Revelation have nevertheless a credulity equal, if not superior, to that of any Christian fanatic.

It is the study of our intellectual nature which we term metaphysical science; the study of our organic nature, physiology. The great physiological question at issue is, respecting the cause of the vital phenomena, whether the effect of a certain organism of the materials which compose the visible structure, or a principle totally distinct: the metaphysical question, whether the sentient principle, or faculty of thinking, can be produced out of the powers and various modifications of matter, or is a *something* superadded to matter. Hence arose, among the ancients, those subtle, scholastic questions relative to final causes, which have continued to the present times, and as long as this

world exists will afford matter for disputation. Previous to the days of Lord Bacon, the object of philosophical inquiry was directed, not to the actual state of the creation as it appears to be formed, but to the means by which it has arrived at its present state. The vast progress of science since the memorable introduction of Lord Bacon's principles of induction, has occupied the pen of Mr. Dugald Stewart in a dissertation which, for real knowledge and eloquent language, eclipses the works of all modern historians.

We have thus distinguished the opinions of metaphysicians into Materialism and Immaterialism. We have shewn the unpopularity of the former theory to arise very much from its contradiction of the popular religion of the world, both Pagan and Roman Catholic, wherever they have been "the law of the land;" and in later times, it owes much of its obnoxious character to being the basis of the celebrated system of Spinoza, and the doctrine of many of the sceptics of the last century. A refutation of Spinozism and Atheism cannot be needed in our pages. Atheism, were it cultivated as a system, might indeed merit the notice of a legislature, since every tie of society is destroyed and all the motives of virtue buried in "annihilation, the sanctuary of sin." But the works of Boyle, Bently, Cudworth, Clarke, Tucker and Paley, are barriers against the inroad of this black infidelity, and have demonstrated the material world,
"————— one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and God the soul."

The advocates of Materialism may be subdivided into two parties; viz. those who believe in the authority of revealed religion, and those who do not. The Christian Materialist usually believes in the immateriality of the Deity, but contends that the sentient, cogitative principle in man is not distinct from the body, but the result of its organization. The Deistical Materialists appear to verge closely on Spinozism, and argue, that, as the powers of perception and thought have never been found but in conjunction with a certain organized system of matter, therefore those powers usually exist in and depend on such a system. They have been nearly all unbelievers in a

future state. Surely, therefore, there needs no comparison of the superior sanctions to virtue in the gospel scheme and of the glorious superiority of that divine illumination which lights us through the dark valley of the shadow of death. Ignorance and prejudice may, and indeed do, assert, that the Christian Materialist, proceeding on the same reasoning with the Sceptical Materialist, would necessarily be subject to the same contempt of revelation and futurity, and which, if pushed to its extent, would lead to the Atheist's creed of a material Deity; but this by no means follows, and we shall give the present controversy in evidence. We strongly contend, on behalf of Christian Materialists, that, as far as revelation is concerned, their opinions make not a shadow of difference. We do not enter into the various theories of Immateriality, which, indeed, is a term for a *something* of which no one has yet given any distinct explanation. We are ourselves strongly inclined to the hypothesis of Mr. Locke, who thought there was some *unknown* principle superadded to matter to confer the faculty of thinking; but we do not wish to obtrude our own individual speculations on our readers: we only wish to inculcate Mr. Locke's liberal accompaniment, that these metaphysical riddles have no right to be obtruded as *creeds*, and that, however that faculty may exist, "it cannot be in any created being but merely by the good pleasure and bounty of the Creator." See Essay on II. Und. B. iv. Ch. 3.

But to exhibit the same evident truism from these metaphysical alarmists themselves, we will quote the following accidental and simple slip of the pen in the very first page of the Quarterly Review, and after which its scurrility requires no other antidote:—"It can scarcely be necessary to remind our readers, in limine, that the nature of the living principle is among the subjects which are manifestly beyond the reach of human investigation. The effects and the properties of life are indeed obvious to our senses through the whole range of organized creation; but on what they depend, and how they are produced, never has been discovered, and probably never will"! And again, p. 20: "Immateriality does not necessarily imply immor-

ality: they are not convertible terms." So also Mr. Rennell, in his Remarks, p. 113: "The principle of volition, because it is *immaterial*, is not, therefore, of necessity, *immortal*." These admissions, however, were necessary, since they knew that any argument used to prove the necessary self-existence of the soul, went to prove its *pre-existence*—an absurdity too great for even them to undertake, skilled as they are in maintaining paradoxes. Now, if immateriality be *not* necessarily immortal, common sense must perceive that it cannot be a requisite or material part of the creed of a Christian; or at all events, that it is equally subject with matter to decay and perish; since, by their confession, immateriality may have a beginning and an end, and yet man attain immortality. Where, then, is the object of dispute, or where any preference of the two opinions? And even had there not been this luckless admission, who would be the *sceptic*;—the Immaterialist, who reckoned on futurity as the necessary result of an imperishable vital principle; or the Unitarian Christian Materialist, who placed his hope in the power and benevolence of his Creator, and on the fact of one Man, Christ Jesus, having actually risen from the dead? We think St. Paul has answered this: "If Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins, and those also who are fallen asleep in Jesus are perished."—"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." Did St. Paul believe in futurity on any other trust than that of the resurrection of our Saviour? Did he believe in an intermediate state of the soul, previous to the resurrection of the body? And how many sublime passages in his writings are destroyed by the supposition of an intermediate state!

The Christian Materialist founds his hope on the immediate power of the Deity; the Immaterialist, on the subordinate agency of a supposititious vital principle; yet the latter denounces the former as a sceptic! Mr. Macleay, to whose candour we have before appealed, has stated our own opinions on this head with great force. "The necessary immortality of the human soul is a dogma as much in opposition to the idea of Divine Omnipotence, as its necessary mortality. Without the

assurances of revelation, the immortality of the soul could never have been ascertained; nay, perhaps might have been reasonably doubted.”—P. 479.

We fear we have entered too fully into the general question to admit of any quotations from the different works, the particular subject of our review. Of Mr. Lawrence's volumes, we cannot sufficiently express our praise of the scientific knowledge and love of truth which everflows every page; and it is lamentable that the deadly poison of bigotry should have been employed against the works of an author, which bid fair to redeem our character in Comparative Anatomy and Physiology. The lectures on the natural history of man are of course more interesting to the general reader. Mr. Rennell may term the following sentence Atheism, from p. 30 of the two Introductory Lectures, but we do not: “From the modifications of structure, and its constant relation to the wants, habits and powers of animals, there arises the strongest evidence of final purposes, and therefore the strongest proof of an INTELLIGENT FIRST CAUSE.” We shall not, however, reflect on the understanding of our readers by further quoting numerous sentences on “that Exalted Power and Wisdom, in testimony of which all nature cries aloud,” (to use the words of Mr. Lawrence, p. 52 of his Physiology,) and repeated in language too fervid, pious and eloquent to admit a doubt of his sincerity. He has no where, in matter, that we can discover, impugned the truth of revelation: and whatever may be his opinions, (and they are certainly of comparative insignificance to the subject of his works,) we are sure Mr. Lawrence has too much common sense to believe that Christianity can be disposed of in a parenthesis. We certainly can discover a detestation of priestcraft, which, whatever may be the policy or propriety of disseminating it through the medium of his Lectures, does honour to him in an age where talent and political prostitution are such saleable commodities in the market of corruption. But we do confess we are somewhat puzzled to discover the relevancy of a note on the Game Laws, which Mr. Lawrence introduces as an alternative to the subject; unless, indeed, it had been a short biographical notice

of some of those unfortunate young gentlemen who are occasionally introduced to his anatomical inquisition by steel traps, spring guns, and the sentences of Mr. Justice Best. Mr. Lawrence also occasionally volunteers a remark on the comparative anatomy of the American and English governments; and we shrewdly suspect that this effluvia of civil liberty has offended the olfactory nerves of the Quarterly Review and its patrons. We conceive these zealous Immaterialists are just as much interested for religion as the faculty of a northern metropolis, who so memorably opposed the election of Leslie to their mathematical chair on the ground of his Materialism, and have since preferred a candidate for the lectureship of Moral Philosophy, reputed to have made a cock-pit of his drawing-room, parodies on the words of Scripture, and a living by the editorship of Blackwood's Magazine. Such is the physical reward of “plastic natures,” and of those who uphold the policy of the “social” system, in thinning his Majesty's redundant population at Tyburn Gate! “RELIGION—POLITICS—there's a couple of topics for you, no more like one another than oil and vinegar; and yet, these two, beaten together by a state cook, make sauce for the whole nation.”*

Of the part which Mr. Abernethy has written and acted, we cannot give unqualified approbation, highly as we estimate his strong and original talent, and the obligations due to him for his advancement of surgical science. But as a philosopher, he should have supported Mr. Lawrence in maintaining the independence of the chair, however he might have differed from him in opinion. We give Mr. Abernethy credit for sincere motives in a wish to secure, as he conceived, the religious principles of the students; but we think he ought rather to have shewn the insignificance of the dispute as far as concerned religion, on that beautiful sentiment of the pious and philosophical Bonnet, so often quoted by Dr. Priestley and others: “*Si quelqu'un démontreroit jamais que l'âme est matérielle, loin de s'en enlarmier, il faudroit admirer la puissance qui auroit donné à la matière la capacité de penser.*”

* Congreve's Love for Love.

Mr. Abernethy, on the contrary, like all Immaterialists, edges in his own hypothesis, and endeavours to define that which he pronounces undiscoverable. A theory of Mr. John Hunter's is the grand specific prescribed for the prevention and cure of Mr. Lawrence's influence. He has since exhibited it in several subsequent forms—in a little anonymous tract on the Human Mind, dedicated to (by) himself; and lately in some reflections on Dr. Gall and Spurtzeim's System of Physiognomy and Phrenology. Indeed, from the assiduity with which this grand mental catholicon is published, we expect some morning to see John Hunter's name supersede on the walls and churches of the metropolis, "Dr. Eady, Dean Street, Soho." Leucippus, we remember, described the vital principle as a certain *blue* flame; and this Hunterian hypothesis of Mr. Abernethy's may be termed the *PILLULA SALUTARIA*, or blue pill of his metaphysics. Whatever effect this physiological opinion may have on his patients, most certain it is that it did not preserve the faith of Mr. Hunter himself, who was a notorious Atheist. And the Deism of Sir William Drummond, enveloped in clouds of immateriality, is a pretty practical proof how little this vaunted nostrum is a stay to infidelity.

We had intended here to have made some remarks on the scepticism imputed to the medical profession, and to have ventured some observations on the causes of it, and the most probable remedy, but we defer them to some future occasion. The immortal Hartley, Dr. Percival and Dr. Rush, have, however, been distinguished exceptions. In an ingenious work of the latter on the diseases of the mind, he classes one which he calls the "Derangement in the Principle of Faith, or the Believing Faculty," and enumerates two classes of diseased—those who believe and report every thing they hear, and those who have an inability to believe things that are supported by all the evidence that usually enforces belief: amongst these last he ranks "persons who refuse to admit human testimony in favour of the truths of the Christian religion, believing in all the events of profane history." Ch. xi.

In the commencement of this paper

we intended also to have quoted at some length from the 9th article in our notice, "The Letter on the reputed Immateriality of the Human Soul." We can now only commend it to our readers as a most impartial and intelligent review, coinciding almost entirely with our own opinions; and we have the greater pleasure in these commendations, understanding its author is a clergyman of the Establishment.

The anonymous author of the "Cursor Remarks," is an alarmist of the old school, and deals wholesale in the *odium theologicum*. And the "Graduate of Medicine" might have saved himself, the public, the paper manufacturer and printer, much trouble, by not going to press, with the candid confession that he knows nothing of the subject. The remaining volume, "Sketches of the Philosophy of Life," by Sir C. Morgan, though an imposing title, is rather a shallow performance, and exhibits depth only in verbal mystification, as will appear in the following sentence, quoted also by the Quarterly Review; a bog of mystification, in which we think scarcely a recondite German metaphysician could see his way of extrication.

"Essentially linked with the power of loco-motion, relative sensibility is distributed to the different animals in an exact proportion to the wants of their organization, being resident in a tissue, whose development is regulated in the various species, by the sphere of activity necessary to their preservation!"—P. 276.

We would now ask the "Christian Advocate of Cambridge," whether he really considers such arrant nonsense as endangering the existence of Christianity; and whether these hopeless disputes of Physiologists (past the comprehension of the "learned" themselves) can possibly influence the religious principles of the poor and unlearned, for whom Christianity *was* preached? "Certainly," says Bishop Fell, "the first propagators of our faith proceeded at another rate; they well knew, that not the *brain* but the *heart* was the proper soil of that celestial plant, and therefore did not amuse their proselytes with curious questions, but set them to the active part of their religion."

We esteem all these metaphysical cobwebs as more fit "to catch flies"

than men ;” and an attempt to ascertain a final cause of the nature of which we are profoundly ignorant, and likely to continue so.

“ — nature is but the name for an effect whose cause is God.”

We have previously stated that our opinions on the nature of the vital principle are extremely unsettled: we hold it right to confess our ignorance, and to leave these *secret things to the Lord our God*. As liberal Christians, we shall never underrate the value of our reason. God forbid that we should countenance the folly of those who love to soak in mystery and contradictions; but we do condemn that presumptuous pride which, forgetting the limitation of the human understanding, soars beyond its sphere, and that impious arrogance which, ignorant of the ends of the Deity, dares to judge of the fitness of the means he employs in the government of his creation. Intellectual pride is the Scylla of knowledge, and Infidelity its Charybdis. What innumerable errors does it originate, and how many youthful minds, ardent in the pursuit of knowledge, have been shipwrecked on its dangerous breakers! And how many delusive meteors have been mistaken for the lighthouse of *reason*!

“ At best thou’rt but a glimmering light,
Which serves not to direct our way;
But, like the moon, confounds our sight,
And only shews it is not day.”

Oxford Miscell. 1685.

We are well aware of the popular imputations against Unitarianism: we may, perhaps, sometimes, in our ardour against the corruptions and abuses of religion, have fallen into the opposite extreme; and in our anxiety to root up the dogmatism of orthodoxy, we may have planted speculative scions of our own. We do not think it necessary or liberal to animadvert on some backslidings of former years, however lamentable some of those instances may be regarded, or whatever their causes. But we repel with indignation the imputation of infidelity. The profession of the law, nay, the very bosom of the Established Church, and the annals of the mitre itself, will supply a larger comparative number of those who are known to have renounced revelation; and we need fear no misrepresentations, however wilfully de-

signed; no calumnies, however black, so long as we can triumphantly appeal to the public libraries of our country. Whence originated your most learned and laborious works on the external evidence of Christianity and on its internal proof? From the piety and disinterestedness of Unitarian Christians.

To conclude: we have thought it necessary to make these remarks, feeling that we are interested parties in the controversy, and that, with so much contumely wasted upon us, our silence might be imputed to a stricken conscience.

We are not among those who consider that natural religion affords no hope of futurity; on the contrary, we consider its evidence as introductory to the revealed assurance. Its arguments have been enforced with peculiar strength by Dr. Jortin and Dr. Price, and lately in the luminous and practical sermons of Dr. Rees. On this subject we differ from many distinguished Unitarian writers, who, we think, have done great injury to the cause of natural and revealed religion, by denying the evidence of the former, in a weak jealousy, as if they could not otherwise enhance the value of revelation. Yet these same writers have written zealously on the *analogy* of natural and revealed religion, as if all other points of resemblance do not sink into insignificance compared with the grand doctrine of a future state. And, surely, on the most important of all relations we may expect to discover some analogy. We are far from contending that the arguments from natural religion in favour of futurity, are by any means calculated for the generality of mankind; nor, indeed, can we consider them conclusive for the more enlightened and learned, since the contrary opinions of Deists, and the many pathetic lamentations of the ancient philosophers of their want of additional assurance, indisputably prove that they are not; and we also know, that much argument has been adduced against excepting human nature from the perishable fate of the whole material world. But still we cannot but place great confidence in the attributes of an all-wise, beneficent and omnipotent Being; in the moral evidence resulting from the unequal distribution of good and evil; from

the persecution and suffering of the virtuous, and the too frequent success and impunity of the vicious. These arguments, coupled with the power of the Creator, who first made us to *recreate* us, constitute, in our opinion, a very strong and rational ground for belief in a future state, independent of the evidence of Christianity; and form, also, a very important and secure ground-work for the superstructure of revelation.

These arguments, aided by the tradition of her ancestors, doubtless emboldened that heroic Jewess (whose story is so inimitably related in 2 Maccabees vii.) to encourage the immolation of her children by a foreign tyrant and her own martyrdom, rather than transgress the Mosaic law, and to cheer them in their dying agonies with that pious exhortation—"I cannot tell how ye came into my womb; for I neither gave you breath nor life, neither was it I that formed the members of every one of you; but doubtless the Creator of the world, who formed the generations of man, and found out the *beginning* of all things, will also, of his own mercy, give you breath and life again, as ye now regard not your own selves for his law's sake." This ancient and universal expectation of futurity is what the poetical author of the Cypress Grove, describes as "the voice of nature in almost all the religions of the world, that general testimony characterized in the minds of the most barbarous and savage people; for all have had some roving guesses at ages to come, and a dim, duskish light of another life, all appealing to one general judgment throne. To what else could serve so many expiations, sacrifices, prayers, solemnities and mystical ceremonies? To what such sumptuous temples and care of the dead? To what all religion, if not to shew that they expected a more excellent manner of being, after the navigation of this life did take an end?"

But we should be sorry to rest that belief solely on tradition or metaphysics: we believe it on the authority of the New Testament; and though we are not prepared to say there is a *demonstration*, yet we do solemnly think it is little short of demonstration, when we duly consider the *variety* of evidence, from the indisputably recent origin of our race; from the con-

nexion of the Jewish and Christian covenants; from the necessity of some super-human communication, (a necessity which sceptics themselves prove to exist by the folly they impute to the whole civilized world for believing revelation); from the evidence of prophecy and miracles; from the single, incomparable and inimitable personal character of our Saviour; from the unrivalled perfection of his moral code, a system of Ethics which, even if not original in all its principles, at all events embodies and concentrates every virtue which natural religion had taught the wise men of all previous ages and countries; the number and disinterestedness of the witnesses who handed down this revelation, and who, the more ignorant and bigoted they may be represented by sceptics, were, therefore, proportionably less able to invent such a system, and promulgate it with consistency and effect; from the numerous historical documents which in regular succession have transmitted these circumstances to the present times; from the peculiarly strong evidence contained in these writings, (the genuineness admitted,) for the grand miracle of the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ; from the final spread of his religion over the whole civilized world; from the effects it has already produced, and those that may be reasonably anticipated; from the remarkable accordance of its principles with those of civil liberty and the *signs of the times*; from the realization of its promises of hope and consolation to the afflicted and dying; and, lastly, in the recorded faith of most of the enlightened philosophers of all subsequent ages and countries; although too many of them, it must be admitted, have also given their assent to the most contradictory and unchristian additions.

Many men of distinguished intellect have credited revelation on single parts of this evidence: who, then, can deny Christianity with so much internal light of its own perfections; with so many miraculous, providential attestations, and with a knowledge of its *effects*? Mr. Lawrence has not inaptly quoted the authority of Socrates, that greatest of the ancient philosophers, as pointing out the surest admission into the temple of wisdom through the portal of doubt. Surely, then, on the

same principle, we may counsel the religious sceptic, with so much evidence for Christianity, to *doubt* ere he irrevocably makes up his mind against the truth of revelation. For this evidence, we affirm, constitutes a barrier of proof which, we confess, we cannot discover any means of surmounting by those who have studied its nature. We know we shall be answered, that ours is a spare faith, and that so long as Christians are not agreed as to what is Christianity, assent must be withheld from it. But would not this argument equally apply against the study of physiology itself, where we observe doctors so materially disagree? And, in the quaint language of old Richard Baxter, “All arguments be not weak which some men dare deny. Is not the high way right except every man hit it? A drunken man may go beside it, and a wise man that is not used to it may miss it, or by credulity may be turned by others out of his way; and yet the way may be right and plain too, for all that. Will you think nothing certain in philosophy, because philosophers are of so many minds? Or will you renounce all physicians because they ordinarily disagree? Or if a Londoner have a journey into the countrey, which his life lyeth on, will he not go his journey because the clocks disagree? Or will he not set on till all the clocks in London strike at once? Or will he never give any credit to a clock till then?”

But should there be those who, from ignorance of these accumulated evidences, or who, knowing them, are untrue to their understandings, deny the super-human origin of Christianity, and publicly disseminate their scepticism, we shall ever contend, that the immutable principles of religious freedom are as much their right, and may be as safely extended to their opinions, as to those of any Protestant Dissenters. Nay, many zealous Christian have contended that they ought to be encouraged to produce their objections, certain that TRUTH must emerge with renewed power and glory from the contest. PRIESTIANITY indeed may suffer, and the “alliance between Church and State” be endangered, but true Christianity will receive no wound from the assaults of

the sceptic. Those political Christians who regard churches in the light of barracks, may reasonably feel alarmed for *legitimacy*. What, however, can the cause of civil and religious liberty gain by the recent persecution of Deists, but prejudice against the doctrines of Christ in the hands of such followers? What effect can be wrought on the contemptible objects of such anti-Christian zeal, but by this odious proscription to congregate unbelievers together, where they are sure to mistake the repetition of their objections for increased number and strength? This “illiterate policy” never yet attained its end, and never will: and that such barbarism should be varnished with the colouring of religion, “what is it,” says the admirable Robinson, in his Remarks on Deism, “but the voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau?”

We here again repeat, that our opinions are not those of the Materialist, since we cannot reconcile many of the phenomena of life and sensation to that hypothesis. All that we feel sure of is, and in this it appears all agree, that God imparted to us the “breath of life.” The Pentateuch, whatever may be its authority, does not inform us *how*; nor, in our judgment, will men of science ever make such an addition to revelation. But Materialism having been the opinion of many eminent and Christian philosophers, we have often, on the possibility of its truth, examined its relation and consistency with the Christian doctrine of a future state. In those sequestered moments when the mind wanders beyond the grave, the reflections in these pages have arisen; and candour obliges us to concede an equally pious and rational hope of futurity to the Materialist as his prejudiced opponents arrogate to themselves; nor can we conceive how the mere *belief* of either party can affect their *practice*.

We have studiously avoided all reference to our *title* in the promises of the gospel. We have a humble trust that HE who gave us the blessing of this life, will continue his goodness in its renewal after death; “knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us up also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.” Would

that Christians could be brought to believe that we are candidates for, not judges of, heaven.

In the eloquent language of an anonymous review of the controversy with Dr. Priestley on Matter and Spirit—"Then farewell the obscure speculation of metaphysics. They embarrass me no more. The mere philosopher may indulge them if he pleaseth; and if he can gain any amusement or any satisfaction from them, I envy him not. He purchaseth it at a rate too dear for me; and placeth his hopes on what I should regard as the most insecure foundation. But do not think me the enemy of science because I consider it as ill applied in the investigation of a subject so much beyond its reach. Let it operate in its own sphere, and, by a patient research into those natural objects which fall more immediately under the scrutiny of the senses, enlarge the boundaries of human knowledge. I hail her progress, and wish I could add a laurel to her brow. But let her not presume to trespass on the hallowed enclosures of heaven's own immediate messenger. Her feeble taper may light the curious philosophic eye through nature's walks. But it is the full, unclouded sun of the everlasting gospel that can alone, with safety, guide the doubting mind of man through the paths of religion to the world of immortality. The dove sent from the ark of reason and philosophy, wanders over a boundless expanse, a dreary waste of unfathomable waters. Fatigued with its fruitless excursions, it returns, but brings no olive branch to me. Thanks be to the immortal Redeemer of the world, I receive this pledge of peace from a higher region. I press it to my trembling heart; and methinks it gains fresh verdure while I bedew it with the mingled tears of gratitude and penitence."

C-s.

ART. XI.—*A Reply to a Review in The Christian Guardian, January, 1822, of "An Apology for the Freedom of the Press," &c.* By Robert Hall, A.M. With the Review extracted. 8vo., 2nd ed., pp. 18. Holdsworth.

IN our acknowledgements to Correspondents on the Wrapper of the

last Number we signified our intention of inserting in our work the whole of Mr. Hall's Letter from the Leicester Chronicle; but as it has been since published in the form of a pamphlet, as above, we deem it an act of fairness to the publisher, to content ourselves with this notice of it, in the shape of a review.

The "Apology" appeared nearly thirty years ago, and excited, as it deserved, considerable attention. Since that period, Mr. Hall has, until now, abstained from politics in his writings; or rather has manifested a leaning to a very different system from that which first engaged his affections and drew out his eloquence. It was for a long time supposed that he privately disavowed and would have been glad to recall the productions of his youthful enthusiasm on behalf of freedom. If the rumour were correct, he has undergone a re-conversion and returned to his first love. On this subject, Mr. Hall is entitled to speak for himself:

"It certainly is very unusual for a writer to suppress his own publications, unless he has recanted the principles they contain. To persevere in doing so, naturally exposes him to the suspicion either that he has renounced his former opinions, or that he is afraid to avow them; but neither of these situations is mine. I have changed no principle, and I feel no fear. Why then should I act in such a manner as must render me perpetually liable to either of these imputations? For a considerable time, indeed, after loud and repeated importunities, I declined a compliance with the wishes expressed for republication, from a sincere reluctance to engage in political controversy. By one party, in the mean while, it was my fortune to be so unequivocally claimed as a convert, and by the other so assailed with reproaches as an apostate, that I was convinced by experience there was no other way of putting an end to the misrepresentations of both, but to republish the original pamphlet. Had I never written it, the same motives which made me reluctant to reprint, might probably have prevented my writing it; but since there is not a principle in it which I can conscientiously retract, and my silence has occasioned numerous misrepresentations and mistakes, the fair and manly part was doubtless to republish it. An ingenuous mind is not less ashamed of receiving praises it is conscious it has not deserved, than indignant at reproaches which are not merited."—P. 4.

The "Christian Guardian," a minor theological journal, in the hands of the *soi-disant* "Evangelical" Churchmen, took occasion from the re-publication of the "Apology," to task the author, as if he had been guilty of apostacy. This class of men have been for some years accustomed to pay excessive homage to Mr. Hall's talents, and their present chagrin is equal to their former admiration. Their "Review" of the new edition of his pamphlet manifests the affectation of dislike of politics that is invariably expressed by the religionists that would bend the Bible and yoke the conscience to those very politics that foster corruption and tend to slavery. Mr. Hall exposes very plainly this hypocrisy:

"But a minister of the gospel, it seems, is on no occasion to meddle with party politics. How exactly this maxim was adhered to at the commencement of the late war, when military banners were consecrated, and the people every where summoned to arms

'By pulpit drum ecclesiastic,
Beat with fist instead of a stick,'

must be fresh in the recollection of my readers. The men who in the garb of clergymen bustle at electioneering meetings, forsooth, are not really such, but merely assume the disguise of that holy order, since it would be uncandid to suppose they can so universally lose sight of what is befitting ministers of the gospel. The venerable bench of Bishops who sit in the House of Lords, either attend in silent pomp, without taking any part in the deliberations, or they violate the character of ministers of the gospel. We must have been grossly imposed upon by the public prints which informed us of the clergy of a whole archdeaconry or diocese, meeting to petition Parliament against the Catholic Claims, since they could never with one consent depart so far from the decorum of ministers of the gospel.

"The plain state of the case is, not that the writer is offended at my meddling with politics, but that I have meddled on the wrong side. Had the same mediocrity of talent been exerted in eulogizing the measures of ministry, his greetings would have been as loud as his invective is bitter. But it was exerted to expose public abuses, to urge the necessity of Reform, and lay open the tergiversation of the Heaven-born Minister and Sunday Duellist, who, after devoting the

day of rest to deeds of blood, has, by a strange fatality, obtained a sort of political beatification. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.*" —P. 5.

The original edition of the "Apology" contained some passages of severe crimination against Bishop Horsley, and of glowing eulogy on Drs. Price and Priestley: these, it would appear from our correspondent *Homo*, (pp. 168, 169,) are somewhat altered in the present edition: enough, however, remains to excite the disapprobation of "Evangelical" Churchmen, and accordingly the "Christian Guardian" vents its pity or its rage at this desecration of a saint, and apotheosis of sinners. Mr. Hall's reply is, upon the whole, worthy of himself: we qualify our opinion, because we wonder that with his acute discernment he should applaud or even admit the general "correctness" of Horsley's "speculative theology:"

"Another head of accusation is, that I have censured the character of Bishop Horsley, whose character, the Reviewer tells us, 'is far removed beyond my attack, while I have eulogized Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, Socinians.' To this it is sufficient to reply that Dr. Price was *not* a Socinian, but an Arian; he wrote professedly in confutation of Socinianism; and though I disapprove of his religious principles, I feel no hesitation in affirming, in spite of the frantic and unprincipled abuse of Burke, that a more ardent and enlightened friend of his country never lived, than that venerable patriarch of freedom. Such were the sentiments of the worshipful Corporation of London, who, in token of their esteem, presented him with the freedom of the City in a golden box; such was the judgment of Mr. Pitt, who long professed himself his admirer, and condescended to seek his advice on questions of finance. Dr. Priestley, it is acknowledged, was a Socinian; but it was not under that character that he was eulogized. It was as the friend of liberty, the victim of intolerance, and the author of some of the most brilliant philosophical discoveries of modern times, for which he was celebrated throughout Europe, and his name enrolled as a member of the most illustrious institutions; so that my eulogy was but a mere feeble echo of the applause which resounded from every civilized portion of the globe. And are we suddenly fallen back into the darkness and ignorance of the middle ages, during which the spell of a stupid and unfeeling

uniformity bound the nations in iron slumbers, that it has become a crime to praise a man for talents which the whole world admired, and for virtues which his enemies confessed, merely because his religious creed was erroneous? If any thing could sink orthodoxy into contempt, it would be its association with such gothic barbarity of sentiment, such reptile meanness. What renders the wretched bigotry of the Reviewer the more conspicuous is, that the eulogy in question was written almost immediately after the Birmingham Riots, that disgraceful ebullition of popular phrensy, during which a ferocious mob tracked his steps like bloodhounds, demolished his house, destroyed his library and apparatus, and, advancing from thence to the destruction of private and public buildings, filled the whole town and vicinity with terror and dismay. What sort of a *Christian Guardian* the Reviewer would have proved on that occasion, may be easily inferred from his passing over these atrocities in silence, while he discharges his malice on their unoffending victim.

The maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, admits of exceptions; and as I am vilified for censuring Bishop Horsley, whose character, it is affirmed, 'is far removed beyond my attack,' while I praised Priestley, the Socinian, justice compels me to remark (what the Reviewer probably knows well enough) that in the virtues of private life, Dr. Priestley was as much superior to his antagonist, as he was inferior in the correctness of his speculative theology."—Pp. 5—7.

The "Evangelical" conductors of the "Christian Guardian" are masters of the art of controversy, and have brought in the names of *Hone* and *Carlile* to embitter their accusations. Mr. Hall is justly indignant at this artifice. Does he not, however, display some portion of the willing prejudice that he condemns, when he attributes *blasphemy* to the publications of Mr. Hone? He himself, truly defines blasphemy, "the speaking contumeliously of God," and we are persuaded that the writer last named, would feel as much horror as Mr. Hall or any "Christian Guardian" at such an outrage upon public feeling as well as upon piety.

Let Mr. Hall expect no more compliments from clergymen and bishops and ministers of state; the following passage fixes him for life an unaccommodating, untameable Nonconformist:

"In relation to the question of ecclesiastical establishments, since I am challenged to produce any passage from Scripture which sanctions my opposition to them, I beg leave to refer him to our Lord's declaration: 'Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up.' That *national* churches, or exclusive establishments of religion by the civil magistrate, are one of these plants, will not be denied, since nothing of that kind, it is universally allowed, existed during the three first and purest ages of Christianity, and not being authorized by the *great* Head of the Church, it must, if we believe him, be rooted up. I have used the term *great* Head of the Church, by way of distinction from that *little* Head which the Church of England has invented, and on which, whether it be a beauty or a deformity in the body of Christ, the Scriptures are certainly as silent, as on Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments."—P. 9.

We have seen, in the second of our extracts, that Mr. Hall regards the memory of Mr. Pitt with no peculiar veneration; he concludes the Letter with some very bold animadversions upon the character of the celebrated minister:

"Having already trespassed on the patience of my readers, I shall close with one remark on the eulogium pronounced by the Reviewer on the character of the late Mr. Pitt. He appears to be extremely shocked with the freedom and severity of my strictures on his conduct, as implying a forgetfulness of his singular disinterestedness and his 'perfect devotion to his country.' As this has become a favourite topic with the admirers of that celebrated minister, it is necessary to remind them, that there are other vices besides the love of money, and other virtues besides that of dying poor. It may be easily admitted, that the ambition which grasps at the direction of an empire, and the pitiful passion for accumulation, were not the inmates of the same bosom. In minds of a superior order, ambition, like Aaron's rod, is quite sufficient to swallow up the whole fry of petty propensities.—Far be it from me to wish to withhold an atom of the praise justly due to him. That he devoted much time and a considerable portion of talent to the affairs of his country, is undeniable. The evils which he has brought upon us were not the production of an ordinary mind, nor the work of a day, nor done in sport; but what I con-

tend for is, that, to say nothing of his unparalleled apostacy, his devotion to his country, and, what was worse, its devotion to him, have been the source of more calamity to this nation, than any other event that has befallen it, and that the memory of Pitt will be identified in the recollection of posterity with accumulated taxes, augmented debt, extended pauperism, a debasement and prostration of the public mind, and a system of policy not only hostile to the cause of liberty at home, but prompt and eager to detect and tread out every spark of liberty in Europe; in a word, with all those images of terror and destruction which the name imports. The enthusiasm with which his character is regarded by a numerous class of his countrymen will be ascribed by a distant age, to that mysterious infatuation which, in the inscrutable counsels

of Heaven, is the usual, the destined precursor of the fall of states."—Pp. 13, 14.

Our notice of this publication is, we are aware, disproportionate to its size, but we agree with the religious public in general, that Mr. Hall is no common writer, and we cannot repress our satisfaction at seeing him once more take the foremost rank amongst the friends and advocates of ecclesiastical and political reform. We hope that this is not his last contribution to the same good cause, but that he will actively co-operate with those that are stemming the tide of corruption, which has set in so strongly under the influence of a puling sentimentalism, and of a selfish and worldly profession of sanctity.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Moral Gallantry : a Discourse, addressed to the Nobility and Gentry of Great Britain. With other Essays intimately connected with the Subject. By the late Sir George Mackenzie, of Rosehaugh, Advocate to King Charles II. and King James VII. 8vo. 5s.

Human Creeds and Confessions opposed to the Spirit and Design of Christianity : an Essay. By Alexander Galbraith, of Dalmellington, Ayrshire. 12mo.

A Memoir of Richard Roberts Jones, a Native of Aberdaron, in the County of Caernarvon, North Wales; exhibiting a remarkable Instance of a partial Power and Cultivation of Intellect. Portrait. 5s.

Memoires of His Own Times. By Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford. 2 vols. Royal 4to. Portraits and Characteristic Devices.

Elementa Linguae Græcæ; novis, plerumque, Regulis tradita; brevitæ sua Memoriae facilibus. Pars Prima. Complectens Partes Orationis Declinabiles, ad finem usque Verborum Regularium, &c. Studio Jacobi Moor, LL.D. In Academia Glasguensi Litt. Gr. Prof.—Partem Posteriolem, Notasque adjecit, G. Neilson, S. T. D. In Academia Belfastiensi, LL. Heb. et Gr. Prof. 8vo. 5s.

A Short and Plain Exposition of the Old Testament, with Reflections, for the Use of Families. By the late Rev. Job Orton. A New Edition. To which is now first prefixed a Memoir of the Author, by Andrew Kippis, D. D. &c. 6 vols. 8vo.

The History and Chronicle of Scotland. Written in Latin by Hector Boece, Canon of Aberdeen; and translated by John Bellenden, Archdeacon of Moray and Canon of Ross. 2 vols. 4to. £5. 5s.

Rauken's History of France. Vol. IX. 8vo. 9s.

France during the last Seven Years, or the Bourbons. By W. H. Ireland. 8vo. 12s.

Europe; or, a General Survey of the present Situation of the Principal Powers, with Conjectures on their Future Prospects. By a Citizen of the United States. 8vo. 12s.

Works of the late John Playfair, Esq. With a Memoir of the Author. 4 vols. 8vo. £2. 12s. 6d.

A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bristol, respecting an Additional Examination of Students in the University of Cambridge, and the different Plans proposed for that purpose. By Philo-Grantus. 2s. 6d.

Account of the Abipones, an Equestrian People, in the Interior of South America. By Martin Dobrizhoffer. 3 vols. 8vo. £1. 16s.

A Memoir of the Principal Occurrences during an Embassy from the British Government to the Court of China. By the Rev. Dr. Morrison, attached to the Embassy. 3s. 6d.

Memoirs of a Life chiefly passed in Pennsylvania, within the last Sixty Years. 8vo. 9s.

Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. W. Tennent, formerly Pastor of the Presby-

terian Church at Trutsold, New Jersey. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

Some Passages of the Life of Mr. Adam Blair, Minister of the Gospel at Cross Meikle. Post 8vo.

Memoirs of Charles Brogden Brown, Author of Wieland and other American Tales, with Selections from his Original Letters, &c. By William Dunlap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Inaugural Lecture, delivered in the Common Hall of the University of Glasgow, Nov. 6, 1821. By D. K. Sandford, A. B. Oxon, Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Universal Technological Dictionary; or, Familiar Explanations of the Terms used in all Arts and Sciences, containing Definitions drawn from Original Writers. By George Crabb, A. M. No. I. 4to. 9s. Cuts and Copper Plates. [To consist of Twelve Monthly Parts.]

The Conversational Preceptor in French and English, consisting of useful Phrases, arranged under distinct Heads, on a new and more simple Plan than any hitherto attempted. By J. L. Mabire, of Paris, Professor of Languages. To which are added, Amusing Dialogues on various Subjects of general Interest. By M. Leblanc. Neat Pocket Volume. Half-bound. 6s. 6d.

Notes on Philosophy, Morality and Education. By W. M'Kenzie. 8vo. 7s.

Illustrations and Proofs of the Principles of Population. By Francis Place. 8vo. 8s.

The Weird Wanderer of Jutland, a Tragedy. Julia Montallan, a Tale. By the Hon. and Rev. W. Herbert. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Conjectures on the Physical Causes of Earthquakes and Volcanoes. By the Rev. James Little. 8vo. 4s.

A Treatise on the Gospel Constitution, by the late Rev. William Bennet, of Chapel en le Frith. To which is prefixed, a Short Account of the Life of the Author. By N. K. Pugsley. Containing Correspondence with the Rev. R. Hall, the late Andrew Fuller, &c. 8vo. 8s.

Moral Discipline; or, Elements of Self Improvement: comprising a Familiar View of the Intellectual Powers and Moral Characteristics of Human Nature: principally adapted for Young Persons entering into active Life. By the Rev. Thomas Finch, of Harlow. 12mo. 6s.

An Appeal to Humanity in behalf of the Heathen World: particularly addressed to Snuff-takers and Tobacco-smokers in all Christian Lands. 4d.

Observations on the Rainous Tendency of the Spitalfields Act to the Silk Manufacture of London. 1s.

An Appeal to the Public, in Defence of the Spitalfields Act; with Remarks on the Causes which have led to the Miseries and Moral Deterioration of the Poor. 8vo. 1s.

Proposed Address to His Majesty, on the Present Distresses of the Country. By Philip Henry, Earl Stanhope. 1s.

A Letter on the Subjects of Economical Retrenchment and Parliamentary Reform, addressed to the Middle Ranks of the People of England. By a Gentleman Farmer. 1s. 6d.

An Answer to "The State of the Nation at the Commencement of the Year 1822," and the Declarations and Conduct of his Majesty's Ministers fairly considered. 3s.

A Letter to Mr. Scarlett on the Poor-Laws. Pointing out a Constitutional Way in which the enormous Privileges of the Clergy may be legally reduced, and the Country relieved altogether of the Poor-Rates. 3s.

A Letter to the Burgesses of Colchester, containing a Plain Statement of the Proceedings before the Benchers of the Inner Temple, upon his Application to be called to the Bar; and upon his Appeal to the Judges. By D. W. Harvey, Esq. 1s. 6d.

A Letter to Philo-Grantus. By Eubulus. Being a Sequel to a Pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on the Present System of Academic Education in the University of Cambridge." 1s. 6d.

Remarks on some Fundamental Doctrines in Political Economy; illustrated by a brief Inquiry into the Commercial State of Great Britain since the Year 1815. By John Craig, Esq., F. R. S. E., Author of "Elements of Political Science." 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A Letter to Sir Walter Scott, Bart., in Answer to the Remonstrance of Oxoniensis, on the publication of Cain, a Mystery, by Lord Byron. 3s.

Revolutionary Causes; with a brief Notice of some late Publications, and a Postscript containing Strictures on Cain, &c. An Itinerary of Provence and the Rhone, with Etchings. By John Hughes, Esq., A. M., of Oriel College, Oxford.

The Spirit of the Lakes; or, Mueruss Abbey: a Poem in Three Cantos, with Explanatory Notes from the best and most approved Authorities. By Miss Luby. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Irish Priests, the great Obstacles to every Measure intended to promote the Tranquillity, Civilization and Unanimity of Ireland.

Memoirs of the Astronomical Society of London. Vol. I. 4to. £1. 1s.

A Defence of some Passages in Dr. Coplestone's Inquiry into the Doctrines

of Necessity and Predestination. By the Rev. W. Dalby; M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. 2s. 6d.

A Letter to Daniel K. Sandford, Esq., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow, in Answer to the Strictures of the Edinburgh Review on the Open Colleges of Oxford. By a Member of a Close College. 2s. 6d.

Sermons.

Discourses on Passages selected from the Acts of the Apostles. By Henry Thomson, D. D., Penrith. 8vo.

The Resurrection of Lazarus: a Course of Sermons on the xith chap. of John:

from the French of Beausobre. By Henry Cotes, Vicar of Bedlington. 8vo. 15s.

Plain Sermons; designed chiefly for Family Reading. By T. Blackley, Curate of Rotherham. 8vo. 8s.

Sixteen Village Sermons on Certain Parts of the Christian Character. By Edward Berens, M. A. 12mo. 4s.

Lectures on Parables selected from the New Testament. By the Author of Geraldine. 8s.

The Protestant Reformation vindicated: preached at Lune-Street Chapel, Preston. By Joseph Fletcher, A. M. 1s.

OBITUARY.

1822. Jan. 18, at Ilminster, in Somersetshire, CAROLINE, only surviving daughter of the Rev. Thomas BOWEN. The fatal event is recorded here, not with the view of introducing an enumeration of her various excellencies, but for the sake of animating individuals in the bloom of life and health to prepare, by the same assiduous cultivation of their understandings and their hearts, for an early removal from the world, if such be the will of God, and of affording comfort to Christian parents, on the loss of promising children. This amiable young person was cut off in her 17th year, in the midst of pursuits, which greatly tended to the improvement of her mind, and at the period when she was repaying the fond care of her father and her mother and realizing their highest expectations. Her mild, affectionate temper, her exemplary and blameless conduct, well qualified her for the enjoyment of purer happiness than our present state of being can supply. In peace and hope she descended to the grave. On Wednesday, January 23, her remains were interred in the burial-ground belonging to the society of Unitarian Christians at Ilminster; on which occasion an appropriate address was delivered by the Rev. Samuel Fawcett, who, on the succeeding Lord's-day, preached a funeral sermon, full of tenderness and consolation, from Job xiv. 2.

Although the *promiscuous* ravages of death furnish an unequivocal proof of wise and kind design in the government of the world, yet the religious parent is called to one of the hardest trials of his faith by that appointment of Providence which takes from him a deservedly be-

loved child.* Still, the separation is temporary; the reunion will be eternal. When the principles and the spirit of Christianity have been successfully communicated to the young, this consoling belief may with reason be indulged. "The flower fadeth:" but the plant will blossom again in a more congenial soil, and bring forth fruit to immortality.

February 1, at Bristol, aged 26, MARGARET, wife of Mr. J. B. ESTLIN, surgeon of that city. By an affecting coincidence, this breach in the tenderest and most important charities of life, occurred a few hours after the event with which the readers of the Repository have been already made acquainted, and which deservedly excited so deep an interest in a more widely extended sphere of influence. (See the Obituary of the Rev. H. Turner,

* In the present instance the blow was a repetition of that which had fallen, seven years before, on the bereaved parents. Elizabeth Awbrey Bowen, died, at Walsall, in Staffordshire, on June 25, 1814, after a severe illness, which lasted for twelve months, and was sustained with perfect resignation. She, like her younger sister, was removed hence at the age of seventeen. *Clouds and darkness are round about him: Righteousness and truth are the pillars of his throne.* To mourning parents the perusal of two admirable letters, the one, from the late Rev. Job Orton to Dr. Stonhouse (Letters, &c. No. vii.), the other, from Lady Jean Fergusson to Dr. Doddridge, may with propriety be recommended. (Orton's Letters to Stedman, No. xxv.)

in the last Number, p. 121.) In both cases a large circle of relatives and near friends had to experience the same sorrows, and they shared in the same consolations. None who knew Mrs. Estlin intimately, can cease to mourn her loss. Her mild humility, her simplicity and uprightness, her steady and discriminating judgment, and her rational and influential piety, and well-disciplined affections, formed a character unusually matured, and enabled her to fill up well the relations of wife and mother, daughter, sister and friend. Religious conscientiousness formed the main-spring of her conduct and self-culture; and with this, which gave her the firmness of duty, and prepared her for its higher and more extraordinary exercises, she blended the mild graces of the female character, its thoughtful kindness, its tenderness and its gentleness; and these made her more useful and more respected, as well as more the object of heartfelt affection.—The principles which gave such stability and value to her virtues, which shed their influences on the sources of happiness and comfort, chastening without weakening, directing without interrupting them, and which made her view the world, as the Christian should view it, in its relations to another state of being, enabled her to meet death with a collected composure, a peaceful hope, a tender concern for the best interests of others, a steadfast trust and filial resignation, which could not but aid the lessons of her life, and which were alike affecting, encouraging and consolatory. One is deprived of her watchful, judicious care and guidance, who is too young to know her own calamity. She held her child as a trust; and by express act, as well as in the daily offering of the heart, devoted her to her heavenly Father. May he who shared in her pious cares, be enabled so to fulfil their mutual purposes and most earnest desires, that when the separation is finally ended, (which to her, as she said, “is but for a moment,”) she may see them fully realized.—Her religious sentiments were those of Unitarianism, which she embraced from conviction, after a serious search into the records of revelation; and she manifested an increasing satisfaction in their truth, and in their efficacy and value.

It is refreshing, in these days of excitement on the one hand, and of indifference on the other, to witness the simplicity and calm influential piety of the gospel. And while the writer of this imperfect notice, offers it as a tribute of affectionate respect to the memory of one whom he highly valued, he cherishes the hope that

it may contribute to lead others, (and especially some who might hereafter have had the benefit of her example and her friendship,) to discern what is the true excellence of the female character; and to perceive that its finest features can only be formed, by seeking but little for the applause of the world, and looking principally for the approbation of the wise and good, and even this in subordination to the approval of Him who knoweth the heart; by a judicious preparation for the constantly recurring duties of the more confined relations of life, and the thoughtful and faithful discharge of them as they present themselves;—in short, by the devotement of the heart to God and Christian obedience.

L. C.

Feb. 22. JOHN STEWART, Esq., commonly known by the appellation of “Stewart the Traveller,” or “the walking Stewart,” aged 78. [Of this gentleman’s life and singular publications we hope to be furnished with some particulars for our next Number.]

March 3rd, in the 7th year of her age, HENRIETTA SADLER, daughter of the Rev. Thomas Sadler, of Horsham. The Rev. Edwin Chapman, of Billingshurst, preached an excellent sermon on the occasion from Isa. xl. 7, *The flower fadeth!* to a very large and sympathizing congregation. She was an amiable and promising child, making rapid progress in her education, even at so early a period, and bidding fair to become a valuable member of the community. She had endeared herself to her relatives and friends by the mildness of her temper and the simplicity of her manners. Doddridge, who lost a beloved daughter at the same age and of a similar disposition, asked her, not long previous to her decease, “How is it, that every body loves you so?” She gave this immediate reply—“I do not know, except it is because I love every body!” *Of such, indeed, is the kingdom of heaven.*

Islington.

E.

March 8, at *Burton Hall, Yorkshire*, in the 83rd year of his age, the Rev. CHRISTOPHER WYVILL, the amiable, virtuous and persevering friend of civil and religious liberty. [We hope some one of our correspondents will furnish us with biographical particulars of this excellent man.]

— 11th, at *Worthing*, Mr. BENJAMIN HAWES.

INTELLIGENCE.

Christian Tract Society.

THE Anniversary of this Society was holden at the Old London Tavern, on March 6th; JAMES ESDAILE, Esq., in the Chair. The Treasurer read his report, from which it appeared that there was a balance in his hands of £52. 16s. 2d.; but the Society was stated to be indebted to its stationers and binder, £76. 10s. 0d.

The Committee's report was then read. The arrangements for a medal to be presented to the Author of the best Tract, in each year, which had been referred to the Committee, were briefly noticed; Mr. Parkes, who had generously offered the *dies* and the *medal*, being prepared to lay the medal before the Meeting. When the report was finished, Mr. Parkes laid on the table two medals, one of *Silver* and the other of *Bronze*, leaving the Society to make its election. That of *Silver* was accepted.

The appointment of a Collector, which had also been referred to the Committee, was next adverted to; Mr. Titford, whom the Committee had re-appointed, having a few months since resigned his office in consequence of his intention of going to Jamaica. A gentleman was known to the Committee who was willing to accept the office; but as the collectorship to the Unitarian Society, Unitarian Fund, and Unitarian Association was also vacant, the Committee did not recommend the Society to proceed to that gentleman's election; it being thought desirable that the *four* societies should avail themselves of the services of one Collector. The appointment was therefore again referred to the Committee, who will doubtless give the subscribers the earliest possible notice of their having found a gentleman to fill the office.

Some of the Tracts sent to Piedmont in 1820, were reported to have been translated by the pastor *Geymet*, who speaks of them in terms of high commendation. From the Moravian Tract Society at Zeist, near Utrecht, some of their publications had been received in return for a set of those of the Christian Tract Society; but as yet the Committee were not prepared to make a report of their contents. To France another set has been sent; but it was feared that the recent restrictions laid on the press in that country might operate against their circulation.

During the year the Committee have

published three *new* Tracts—"The Father's Treatment of the Lost Son on his Return," by Mr. *Wright*; and "Family Dialogues, or Sunday well spent," and "The Good Grandmother, or a Visit to my Uncle's," by Mrs. *Hughes*. Of each of these 2000 copies have been printed, and eight of the former Tracts have been reprinted; making in the whole 22,000. The total of the Tracts published by the Society from its formation was stated to be 317,000, of which 278,000 have been sent from its store.

The Society's property was reported to be as follows:

Due from Booksellers,	}			
Country Societies, &c.		£105	18	6
on sale or return - - -				
Estimated value of the	}			
Stock on hand - - -		245	16	6
In the hands of the Treasurer		52	16	2
		404	11	2
Due from the Society to	}			
Stationers, &c. - - -		76	10	0
		£328	1	2
Balance of the Society's	}			
Property - - - - -				

The Report concluded with the gratifying announcement, that the Rev. JAMES YATES, of Birmingham, had kindly consented to become the Society's *Agent* for the *Midland Counties*, and that, with his permission, the Committee had sent down 50 sets of the Tracts, as Mr. Yates anticipated a considerable increase of Subscribers. Sunday-school and Fellowship Fund Societies becoming Subscribers in the Midland or Northern counties will thus be enabled to procure the Society's Tracts at a comparatively trifling expense for carriage. Mr. Yates has engaged to receive the names of Subscribers and to forward their allotments.

The following gentlemen were elected into office for the ensuing year:

JAMES ESDAILE, Esq. *Treasurer*,
Mr. GEORGE SMALLFIELD, *Secretary*.*

* This office was accepted conditionally, Mr. S. stating that he was unable to devote to it the time which the interests of the Society required. The Committee are pledged to endeavour to find a successor.

Committee.

Rev. Dr. T. Rees, Messrs. Hart, Holt, R. Taylor, J. Bowring, Leach, Robinson, Friend, Joseph Fernie, R. Fennell and Jacob Guillonneau.

Auditors.

Messrs. C. Lean, C. Richmond and S. Bayley.

The Society afterwards dined together; Wm. FRENCH, Esq., in the chair. In the course of the evening the sentiments given by the chairman called up the following gentlemen—the Rev. R. Aspland, S. W. Browne, Dr. T. Rees, Mr. R. Taylor, &c. &c. By desire of the Subscribers, the *Silver Medal* given by Mr. Parkes, was presented by the chairman to Mr. Aspland, requesting him to convey it to Mrs. HUGHES, with expressions of the liveliest gratitude for her numerous and highly useful literary productions, and the most cordial respect of the Subscribers.

On the health of Mr. Parkes, and thanks to him for his handsome donation, being given—that gentleman rose and said, he had *two* favours to ask of the company, which he trusted they would readily grant him. The *first* was, that every Subscriber would demand his allotment of Tracts, and endeavour to find means of distributing them; the *second*, that every Subscriber present would strive to make the Society as extensively known as he possibly could and as it justly merited.

Greenock and Port-Glasgow Unitarian Chapel.

THE Subscribers to the Greenock and Port-Glasgow Unitarian Chapel are respectfully informed, that on Sunday, January 20th, 1822, the Chapel built at Port-Glasgow was opened for the worship of Almighty God. Friends were present from Greenock, Glasgow, Paisley and Renfrew. Three Sermons were delivered in the course of the day by the Rev. George Harris, of Liverpool, to deeply attentive audiences. In the afternoon, the Rev. David Rees, of the University of Glasgow, concluded the devotional services; and the Rev. David Logan delivered his acceptance of the pastoral office to the Port-Glasgow Congregation. The chapel is a very neat and commodious building, and there is a house, ultimately intended for the use of the minister of the place, under it. The whole expense will not exceed £500, which will leave but a small debt to be discharged. The buildings are secured to seven trustees, of whom the Rev. George Harris is one,

and there is a clause inserted in the deed, securing the property to the UNITARIAN FUND, should Unitarian worship be discontinued in the Chapel. Of this, however, there is little fear, as the prospect at Port-Glasgow and in its neighbourhood is very encouraging. The morning and evening sermons, delivered by Mr. Harris, are published, at the unanimous request of the congregations which heard them delivered.

Clapton, March 27, 1822.

SIR,

I BEG leave to inform the Subscribers to Dr. Priestley's Works, that Vol. XXI., which concludes the *theological* part, will be ready for delivery at my friend Mr. Eaton's, 187, High-Holborn, on Saturday, April 20th.

I have found, on a late examination, so large a number of the former volumes for which subscribers have not applied, that I cannot but request them to consider the great *pecuniary* inconvenience imposed by such neglect, upon an Editor, unavoidably occupied in the *literary* duties of an undertaking, laborious and unproductive; except of the high gratification afforded by the prospect of accomplishing a favourite, and, as he trusts, no useless project.

I am, however, indebted to many subscribers, for their prompt attention to the notices which I had deemed sufficient, and which have always appeared in your Repository, when any volume was ready for delivery. Of such subscribers, (excepting those with whom I am in correspondence,) I have only to request that they would procure Vol. XXI. from Mr. Eaton, sending at the same time their *full address*, that I may correct my list, which I have reason to fear is, as to some names and places, very inaccurate.

Subscribers who have not received the whole of the 18 Volumes, now ready for delivery, I must request *immediately* to apply by letter to Mr. Smallfield, Printer, Homerton, Middlesex, mentioning what volumes they have received, and directing where the rest, with Vol. XXI., shall be sent, adding an order for payment in London.

As the Subscribers are generally readers of your work, I trust that these requests will come under the observation and be favoured with the attention of those whom they concern. A very few copies of Dr. Priestley's Works are yet at the service of any who may wish to possess them.

J. T. RUTT.

Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund.

A REPORT of the LIVERPOOL UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP FUND has recently been published, by which it appears the following donations have been made during the year ending 31st December, 1821.

To the Unitarian Fund (London)	-	-	£10 0 0
Rochdale Chapel	-	-	10 0 0
Oldham Ditto	-	-	5 0 0
Newchurch (Rossendale) Ditto	-	-	5 0 0
Merthyr Tydvil Ditto	-	-	10 0 0
Boston Ditto	-	-	5 0 0
Knowsley Ditto	-	-	10 0 0
Padiham Ditto	-	-	15 0 0
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Ditto,	-	-	5 0 0
Gellionen Ditto	-	-	5 0 0
General Baptist Academy	-	-	5 0 0
An Aged Minister	-	-	3 0 0
Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Association	-	-	5 0 0
Total	-	-	£93 0 0

Communications (post paid) may be addressed to the Secretary, Mr. H. Taylor, Bold Street, Liverpool.

ON Thursday evening, March 21st, the Meeting-House in Sir Thomas's Buildings, Liverpool, formerly a Catholic Chapel, was opened for Unitarian worship, when a sermon was preached by the Rev. George Harris, explanatory of the doctrines maintained by Unitarian Christians. The place was crowded to excess. The Meeting-House is intended for the use of the Society formerly assembling in Great Cross Hall Street, and religious worship will be conducted there on the morning and evening of Sunday, and on Thursday night, commencing with the first Sunday in April.

NOTICES.

THE Half-Yearly Meeting of the Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association will be held at Taunton, on Tuesday the 9th of April.

G. B. W.

THE Rev. GEORGE HARRIS has accepted the unanimous invitation presented to him to become the pastor of the new Unitarian Congregation, Bolton. His connexion with the Renshaw Street Society will terminate on Sunday the 31st March; and he will enter on the duties of his situation in Bolton on Sunday, April 7th.

ON Sunday, April 7th, 1822, the Meeting-House in Moor Lane, Bolton, formerly a Calvinistic Chapel, will be opened for the worship of the One True

God, the Father. Three Sermons will be delivered, those in the morning and evening by the Rev. George Harris; and that in the afternoon by the Rev. W. J. Fox, of London. On Monday the friends and members of this new church will dine together in the Cloth Hall; and in the evening, the Rev. W. J. Fox will preach in the Meeting-House.

THE Friends of the late Rev. HENRY TURNER, of Nottingham, propose to print in 8vo. (price 12s.) a volume of his Sermons. They request the names of such as propose being subscribers may be forwarded as early as convenient.

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

WE perceive that in our last, (p. 128,) we stated prematurely that the law restraining the press had passed the two Chambers. The event thus anticipated has since taken place. The discussions in the Chamber of Peers, as well as in that of the Deputies, were very animated: the speech of Prince TALLEYRAND has been much applauded. This disastrous measure was carried in the upper chamber by only a small majority: it is now, however, the law of France, and will be so as long as the present system of government is suffered to continue.

Tumults have arisen in various parts of France, principally in places of public education; the young men being very reluctant to submit to the yoke of legitimacy.

One great source of discord is the preaching of the Missionaries, that is, priests who go about carrying the cross, preaching up the old doctrine of passive obedience, fulminating church-censures against those that took a part in or profited by the Revolution, asserting the divine right of tithes, calling back, as far as words avail, feudal times and usages, and in some cases pretending to miracles. Fanatics and impostors as they are, they are countenanced by the government, and on that account, perhaps, more than from any dislike of superstition, they are obnoxious to the people, who have on several occasions opposed their preaching so riotously, that they have been obliged to claim the protection of the military.

Certain state-prosecutions have brought out very prominently the political feeling of the French people. Alarmed by this and other demonstrations of disloyalty, the police are very active in their inquisition after heresy and blasphemy. We copy a paragraph on this subject from a paper which we do not often quote, but which we never see without amusement,

the *New* (or pretended) *Times*. So extravagant, and therefore so innoxious, is this wretched journal, that it rebukes the *Courier*, (the regular ministerial paper,) for speaking with decency of the Opposition in the Chamber of Deputies, and especially for naming BENJAMIN CONSTANT with respect. CONSTANT is the friend of LA FAYETTE, of GREGOIRE, of LANJUINAIS, and was the friend (which of itself is a testimonial that might carry him with honour through the civilized world) of the wise and virtuous ROMILLY; but he stands up for the Charter, and not merely for the family of the Bourbons, and therefore the ex-jacobin Dr. STODDART, points him out as a revolutionary monster, whom the majority of the Chamber would do well to impeach. The paragraph referred to is in the paper of March the 19th, and runs thus: "We perceive from the Paris journals that the police exerts itself with laudable diligence in the seizure of blasphemous and seditious publications. A writer named DUPUIS, several years ago wrote a book entitled, *De l'Origine de tous les Cultes*, which was intended to prove, among other things, that there never was such a person as Jesus Christ. In order to bring the substance of this impious work within the reach of the common people, an abridgment of it has been printed at Paris, which, we are happy to find, was immediately seized, and we trust that the vender, M. CHASSERIAN, will be made an example of."

PORTUGAL AND SPAIN.

A DISPOSITION to loosen the shackles of Popish authority has been for some time visible in the former country, and that disposition has been much encouraged and strengthened since the establishment of the constitutional system. The office of the *Patriarca*, or supreme Bishop of Lisbon, has been extinguished. The respect with which the regular clergy have been regarded by the people is singularly diminished, and even among the peasantry questions as to the utility of the monastic establishments, are sometimes started and answered in a spirit of bold inquiry. During the Lent just over, the Cortes applied to the Pope for a Bull to allow the people to eat flesh. His holiness refused for some time; but being given very plainly to understand that his refusal would not alter the determination of the national representatives, who were resolved to root out some of the foolish superstitions of the Portuguese, he at last consented. The Bull was received, published, and Lent has been observed without those forms to which folly and igno-

rance attached so much importance, and which fraud and cunning made availing for their sinister interests. There are many ecclesiastics in the Portuguese Cortes, but they are generally disposed to support the independence of the Lusitanian church. Ecclesiastical reform has not, however, on the whole, made such rapid progress as in Spain. No church or convent property has been hitherto confiscated. In half a century the religious orders will, however, be extinct by the non-admission of noviciates. In Spain their suppression is much more rapid; as they have been there deprived of much of their revenue, every encouragement has been given to secularization; and many convents have been already alienated where the number of Friars was small, or where a neighbouring convent existed of the same order. Of the most enlightened among the Friars in Spain, a considerable portion have been absolved from their religious vows. The Spanish Cortes have assumed a high tone in their intercourse with the Church of Rome. An annual sum was formerly paid in the shape of tribute to the Holy See. Since the Revolution that sum has been very much diminished, and the Cortes refused to allow any thing unless it were received as a *free gift*,—not claimed as a recognized right. The Jansenists are becoming stronger in Spain. To that party belonged the leading ecclesiastics of the last Cortes. One religious journal is published at Madrid, called the *Cronica Religiosa*. Its character is liberal, and its object is to destroy the Papal influence; but involved as all men are in party-politics, it does not seem to excite much interest or obtain much circulation.

The remnants of old intolerance have been but too visible in Spain during the late discussions on the Penal Code; many of whose articles breathe the most furious bigotry. The strongest assurance was given that they would not be permitted to pass; however, they were approved almost without discussion, in spite of a very general conviction of their absurdity and cruelty. "Let us make this cession (they said) to the ignorance of the clergy, as no Spaniard can be affected by it. To us, all the forms of religion are indifferent, and the common people are too sound in their faith to be exposed to the consequences of heretical pravity. The ecclesiastics will allow civil reform to move onward, if we give them enough of church tyranny as the price of their acquiescence!" Thus it is, that fancied wisdom becomes the ally of folly, and that truth itself is made the herald and the handmaid of error.