

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CXCVII.]

MAY, 1822.

[Vol. XVII.]

The Introductory Chapters to Luke's Gospel Spurious: their Chronology inconsistent with Truth and with itself.

SIR,

April 27, 1822.

ALLOW me to say, through the channel of your Repository, that I think Dr. Lant Carpenter is mistaken when he imagines that, "independently of the Introduction to St. Matthew, there is no chronological difficulty whatever in the Introduction to St. Luke's Gospel." (See Mon. Repos. XVI. 360.)

Let us take his own statement, according to which the 15th year of Tiberius commenced August 19th, in the year of Rome 781; and place the baptism of Jesus, as he does, in the following January or February, in the year 782 of Rome. Connecting these premises with what he reads in Luke iii. 23, the Doctor ascribes the birth of Jesus to the year 751. But I think the words of the text do not justify him in placing it earlier than 752.

According to the common translation, with which Wakefield and the Improved Version agree, this text informs us that Jesus at his baptism "began to be about thirty years of age."* Now, the words "about

thirty" cannot be fairly explained to mean any thing else than that he was nearer to thirty than he was to twenty-nine or to thirty-one. He must, therefore, have been more than twenty-nine and a half, and less than thirty and a half; that is, he must have been baptized some time within the twelve months that intervened between these two limits of his age. (See Whiston's Harmony, p. 8, No. vi. edit. 1702, 4to.) But Luke informs us not only that our Lord's age, at his baptism, was within these limits, but that it *began* to be so. He could not, therefore, have passed through the first half of the limited year: for if he had, he would have been ending instead of beginning those twelve months. Consequently he must have been baptized before he had completed his thirtieth year. And therefore if, with Dr. Carpenter, his baptism be placed in 782, his birth must be placed in 752.

Now, in what is commonly called the first chapter of Luke, the conception of John the Baptist is dated six months before the conception, and consequently fifteen months before the birth, of Jesus. (See verses 26 and 36.) And if this birth were on the 25th of December, in the year of Rome 752, the conception of the

* "Jesus was about thirty years of age, beginning so to be. *Ἀρχομενος* fixes the senses of *ὥσπερ* to the beginning of the thirtieth year." (Newcome's Harmony of the Gospels, fol., Dublin, 1778, Note upon Luke iii. 23, page 5 of his Notes.) In his translation of the New Testament, 8vo., Dublin, 1796, he gives a different explanation. Lightfoot says, the Evangelist "intimateth to us that Jesus, when he was baptized, was but entering on his thirtieth year." "The word *Ἀρχομενος*, *beginning to be*, denieth his being thirty compleat; for if he were full thirty, then he *began* not to be so. By the phrase, therefore, is to be understood that he was now nine and twenty years of age compleat, and just entering upon his thirtieth." (See his Harmony of the New Testament, p. 8, [208, errata,] and Harmony of the Four Evangelists, p. 455.) Scaliger critically examines the words, and contends that they mean, "Christum

ad baptismum accessisse trigesimo anno completo, et trigesimo uno ineunte," and, according to custom, is very angry with those who understand them otherwise. (See his Canones Isagogici, Lib. iii. p. 306, at the end of his edition of Euseb. Thesaur. Temp. 1658; also De Emend. Temp. p. 255, ed. 1583, or p. 549, ed. 1629.) Campbell has a good note on the passage in his Translation of the Gospels. Among other sound and sensible observations, he says, that "some critics have justly remarked that there is an incongruity" between *Ἀρχομενος* and *ὥσπερ*, "the one a definite, the other an indefinite term, which confounds the meaning, and leaves the reader entirely at a loss."

Baptist could not have been earlier than three months before the expiration of the year 751. But the pretended Luke places it (ch. i. ver. 5, &c.) "in the days of Herod the king of Judea," who, according to Dr. C., died in March, 750, a year and nine months at least before the expiration of 751. Here, then, we meet with *some* chronological difficulty. The biography of the baby swaddled in a manger—if a few incoherent and incongruous scraps, every one of which seems to whisper as we pass it, "I only am escaped alone to tell thee,"* can be called biography—contradicts, by a year and a half at least, the chronology of the Christian moralist whose name he has usurped, whose miracles he has caricatured, and whose morality and truth he has abandoned.

This is just what we should expect. Fiction is regardless of facts and of dates, of sobriety and moderation, because its object is to strike us dumb like Zacharias, and to make us "marvel all" (ch. i. 20, 63); and therefore it sets before us "one born out of due time," the offspring of a phantom, ushered into the world with dreams, and wandering stars, and wise men from the East, worshiping with gold and frankincense and myrrh, with shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night, with hosts of quiring angels, and with all the machinery of romance; petrifies us with an account of murders not only so extensive and so savage, that they far "out-herod Herod," but so wild, so frantic and so useless withal, that no man could ever have ordered such deeds of folly as well as horror, but a raving maniac, whose orders would never have been obeyed;† soothes and softens us again by extricating the chief object of our solicitude from his perilous situation, not by the aid of God's providence, ordinary or extra-

ordinary,—that would not have been sufficiently surprising,—but by the sudden appearance of the angel who presides over dreams; at whose command the child flees into Egypt; by whose information it afterwards learns (what never could have been known in Egypt without) the death of Herod, and by whose voice it is "called out of Egypt" again, to fulfil a prophecy which was never uttered, and which, without *a call*, could never have been fulfilled. The little hero of the tale then becomes a miracle of rabbinical learning at twelve years of age; and then,

—————"meeting
A vast vacuity; all unawares,
Fluttering his pennons vain, plumb down
he drops
Ten thousand fathom deep"

into a yawning chasm, where he is lost,—shall I say for 17 years? That would imply that the son of wonder whom we lose at twelve, were the son of Joseph who is baptized at 29. No: where he remains "a thing forbid," one "for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever," one never heard of more. For the Son of man whom we read of in the gospel was not a phantom, nor the son of a phantom, but an ordinary man, superior to the rest of mankind, not in nature, but in virtue only; who became the son of God, not by supernatural generation, but by moral conduct and by obedience, an obedience unparalleled, an obedience which no temptation could seduce, no provocation disturb, no fear of disgrace could stagger, no painful suffering subdue. For this, God was pleased to set his seal upon him, (Acts ii. 22; Rom. i. 4; Philipp. ii. 8, 9; Heb. ii. 9, xii. 2,) in order that he might give to all men power to become the sons of God even as Jesus was the son of God, that thus they might have life through his name; (John i. 12, xiii. 15, xx. 31; Rom. viii. 14; Philipp. ii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 21, &c.;) and for this purpose, that all men might believe, *practically* believe, this truth; and for this purpose alone the evangelists have described, not the birth, life, parentage and education, but the ministry, the conduct, the character of their holy Master, and have told us, not how he was conceived in the womb, but how he went about doing good. (Acts x. 34—39.) For

* Job. i. 15—17, 19. The church in its wisdom has selected this chapter for the evening lesson on St. Luke's day.

† "Infanticidium quod mirum est tacitum a Josepho." . . . "Sed quod paulo ante dixi mirum est tam *belluina* crudelitatis exemplum a Josepho præteritum esse, qui tanta diligentia reliqua sævitiae Herodianæ facinora persequitur." Scalig. Animadvers. in Euseb. Thesaur. Temp. p. 176.

this, and for this alone, they have faithfully and without exaggeration, for our conviction, recorded the miracles that convinced themselves ; miracles, not like the wonders of profane history, nor of fable, no, nor of counterfeit evangelists ; not miracles of astonishment but of instruction ; miracles neither extravagant, nor unworthy, nor unwanted, but distinguished from all others by their propriety, by their being worthy of him who alone worketh miracles, by their being wrought to declare his will, upon occasions where man from his ignorance or superstition has become blind to it, or from his wickedness wilfully disregards it ; occasions which have occurred much more rarely than is commonly supposed, even by those who allow no miracles but what they find, or fancy, in the Scriptures : * miracles, lastly, which are neither dumb (like all others, dumb as to morals at least) nor intended to strike *us* dumb with stupid admiration, but miracles which speak—which speak a language understood by all, and which every where proclaim, and call upon *us* to proclaim, that God would “have mercy and not sacrifice.”

What then saith the Scripture ? Cast out the phantom and its son, for the son of the phantom shall not be heir with the son of God.

But let us return to our chronology. Dr. Carpenter seems to think that he gets rid of the difficulty above-stated, by “*supposing*” that Jesus at his baptism, in 782, “was not yet thirty-one years of age, which,” says he, “St. Luke’s words (iii. 23) appear clearly to imply.” To me these words are so far from appearing clearly to imply this, that they appear clearly to imply the contrary, and to assert, in the way I have explained above, that Jesus at the time of his baptism, was not yet thirty years of age. The

Doctor, however, concluding that he completed his thirty-first year before the expiration of 782, places his birth in 751.

Still, even if he were born before the end of 751, the difficulty, though diminished, does not vanish. Even upon that *supposition*, if we adhere to the commonly-received date of 25th December, for the birth of Jesus, John’s conception could not have taken place till six months after Herod’s death ; and not till three months after, if we adopt the earlier date of Joseph Scaliger, * Lightfoot, †

* “Quare natalis Christi competeret circiter finem Septembris diebus σκηνοπηγίας.” So says Scaliger in his notes upon some Greek fragments at the end of the last edition of his work “De Emendatione Temporum,” p. 59, Colon. Allobr. 1629, fol. But in his prolegomena to the same edition, p. xxii., speaking of the year of Christ’s birth, he calls it “annus Julianus 43, in cuius xxv Decembris natus fuerit Dominus.” In the body of the same work (Book vi. p. 551) he says, “Christus natus anno periodi Julianæ 4711 *in fine*, aut 4712 *in principio*.” And again, (p. 545,) “De anno autem ita censuerunt veteres, et recte: Christum natum anno xxviii Actiaco. Hoc est natalem Christi circa ultimos menses anni Juliani conferunt a cuius anni Juliani Augusto inivit vicesimus octavus annus Actiacus.” And in his edition of Eusebius’s Chronicle, or Thesaurus Temporum, Amst. 1658, fol. p. 306, mid. he says, “Natalis Domini inciderit circiter Octobrem ineuntem, plus, minus.” Here is considerable fluctuation of opinion. Probably, *September* was the month in which he finally acquiesced, as the edition of his book De Emendatione, to which the Greek fragments are annexed, was a posthumous publication, and as he speaks of the fragments as throwing light upon some of the darkest parts of Scripture chronology.

† Lightfoot’s Harmony of the New Testament, Sect. vi. on second chapter of Luke, Vol. I. p. 4, [204, errata] ; *ibid.* Sect. ix. p. 8, [208,] and p. 10 [210] ; also Sect. viii. of the Prolegomena to his Harmony of the Four Evangelists, Vol. I. p. 390, and Harmony itself on Luke ii. 7, p. 427 ; and again, pp. 452, 477, 455, [487]. See also his Heb. and Talmud. Exercit. on Matt. ii. 1, Vol. II. pp. 106, 107, and on Matt. iii. 16, Vol. II. p. 128.

* Ye who reverence the Scriptures, who value their solid, sterling worth, and prefer their virgin modesty and native charms, to the leer of invitation, the loose and wanton attire, the tinselled glare and gaudy paint (1 Pet. iii. 3) with which *established* or fanatic fashions have disguised and tricked them to their interest or their fancy,—remember, “all that glisters is not gold.”

Lardner,* Dr. Jebb† and others,‡ who think that Jesus was born in the month of September.

* Lardner's Credib. Part. I. Vol. II. pp. 796, 798, 800, edit. 8vo. 1741; or Kippis's edition of his Works, 1788, Vol. I. pp. 352, 353.

† See Harmony of the Gospels in his Works, Vol. I. p. 135, line 32, edition 1787.

‡ Erasmus Schmidius, in his Versio Nov. Test. cum Notis et Animadvers. Norimb. 1658, fol., in a note upon John iii. 30, noticing the silly conceit of those who suppose this passage to be an allusion to Jesus being born at the winter solstice, from which the days increase in length, and John the Baptist at the summer solstice, from which the days decrease, says, "Quod commentum, hoc unicum refellit quod nec Christus in Decembri, sed sub finem Septembris, nec Joannes Baptista in Junio natus fuerit, sed sub finem Martii."

Fabricius, in his Bibliographia Antiquaria, p. 480, edit. Schaffhausen, Hamb. 1760, 4to., having observed that Joan. Frid. Mayer published a dissertation at Gryphiswald, 1701, "De eo quod quilibet anni mensis gloriam nati servatoris ambiciose sibi asserat," gives a table of every month in the year, under each of which (July excepted) he has arranged the names of those who place the birth in that month. For July he seems to have known of nobody who declared. The most numerous and respectable names are found under December and September. Under the last-mentioned month, besides Lightfoot and Schmidius, he places a tract, entitled "Christ's Birth mis-timed, by R. S.," which was re-published in the Phoenix, a revival of scarce and valuable pieces, Lond. 1707, 8vo. pp. 114, &c., and to which I find a reply was made in another tract, entitled "Christ's Birth not mis-timed, in Answer to R. S.," Lond. 1649. (See the Bodleian Catalogue, Vol. I. p. 276, col. 2, edit. 1738, fol.) Under the same month also, he places Josephus Medus in Crenii fascie. Tom. X. p. 254, seq.; Jo. Harduinus in Antirrhethico; D. Aug. Quirinus Rivinus libro de vera Ætate Servatoris nostri, eique assentient Christianus Gerberus libro de Ceremoniis Ecclesiasticis, pp. 132 and 149.

With regard to Mede, it is true that in the tenth volume of Crenius's Opusculorum Fasciculi, Rotterod. 1700, 12mo., the 44th tract is Dissertationum Ecclesiasticarum Triga—1. De Sanctitate relativa. 2. De Veneratione Sacra. 3. De

To meet this still remaining part of the difficulty, Dr. C. adds, that "Luke's

Sortitione et Alea: quibus accedunt Fragmenta sacra, a Josepho Medo Anglo, S. T. B. scripta; and that in p. 254, as cited by Fabricius, we find among the Fragmenta, which consist of detached notes on various parts of Scripture, "Christus natus est mense Septembri circa festum tabernaculorum, Johan. i. 14, ἐσκηνώσεν, &c. Zac. xiv. 16—19. Festum hoc neglectum fuerat a tempore Joshuæ usque ad egressum e captivitate. Nehem. viii. 17, (quod malo omine notare potuit Christum natum non agnoscendum isti populo ante reductionem e longa captivitate,) sic fors verum tempus nativitatis usque ad conversionem Judæorum."

But this Triga of Dissertations is not to be found in the posthumous edition of Mede's Works, published by Dr. Worthington, Lond. 1670, fol., in which, however, Mede says, (p. 703,) "Our Lord was baptized *unno Olympiadio* 805 *in-eunte*, about the feast of Expiation, in the seventh month *Tisri*, six months after John began to baptize, and in that year, natural and political, which began in the 15th of Tiberius towards ending, but was the 16th when he was baptized. For I suppose John began to preach and baptize in the first month *Nisan*, (when summer was before him, and not when the winter was to enter,) in the 15th year of Tiberius, which ended August following."

Here we have the authority of the authentic edition of Mede's Works for his placing our Lord's baptism in September. And, as Scaliger observes, (see p. 174, col. 2, No. 2016 of his edition of Euseb. Thesaur. Tempor. Amst. 1658, in Animadversionibus, and p. 305 of his Canones Isagog. annexed to the same work; also Fabricii Bibliograph. Antiquar. edit. 1760, p. 463, de Festo Epiphaniæ, and p. 480,) the whole of the Eastern Church, and the greater part of the early Christians, held that Jesus was baptized on his birth-day: "Idque persuasum habebant ex testimonio Lucae, quod perspicuum est quum dicat quo tempore Christus baptizatus fuit eodem inivisse trigesimum annum suum" (Luc. iii. 23). This, Mede could not be ignorant of. But whether he adopted the opinion of these early Christians, and coupled the baptism with the birth-day, is not to be ascertained from the genuine edition of his works, in which he only says, cautiously, (and, perhaps, with the fear of being thought to differ from the Establishment before his eyes,) p. 266, 'Give me leave to

Introduction renders it necessary to place our Lord's birth before the mid-

relate, not mine own, nor as my own, but the opinion of the most learned chronologers; the sum and conclusion whereof is, that the birth of our Saviour was in September, at the time of the feast of Tabernacles, and not in December, as the memory thereof is now celebrated. And then he gives at some length, and better and more strongly stated than I recollect to have seen it elsewhere, the reason upon which these chronologers ground their conclusion.

Calvisius (Chronol. p. 424, col. 2, edit. Francof. 1685, fol.) places the birth "circa initium mensis Octobris, finito Festo Tabernaculorum;" Mr. Arthur Bedford, at the feast of Tabernacles, Sunday, October 7th, and Whiston on the 25th of the same month. The latter has a curious note to shew that if the ancient Christians intended to point out the 25th of December as the exact day of the nativity, they were certainly mistaken therein: but he rather relies upon "an uncommon observation which he had from a very great man," [qu. if Dr. Clarke or Sir Isaac Newton?] that the Christian holidays were not meant to declare that the particular event occurred on that particular day; but that whenever any day was polluted by the licentious and idolatrous rites of the Heathens, the Christians endeavoured to sanctify that day by affixing some solemnity of their own to it. Thus they fixed on the 25th of December for the birth of Jesus, without knowing on what day it happened, merely because the Heathens celebrated their *Saturnalia* at that time. (See his Harmony, pp. 161—163.) Probably the reader will think this remark more ingenious than just, at least, such a practice, if it ever prevailed, would be as likely to corrupt Christianity as to purify Paganism.

Archbishop Newcome, taking the mean between the two extremes of the middle of August and the middle of November laid down by Lardner, (Vol. I. p. 353 of his Works, edit. 1788, 8vo. or p. 799, Vol. II. Part I. edit. 1741, 8vo.,) places the birth of Jesus on the 1st of October; and supposes that he was baptized in the same month. (See his Harmony, p. 2, top, and p. 5 bottom, Notes, 1778, fol.) He also says, "Probably John began to preach when he was 30 years of age. See Numb. iv. 3, 47, that is, about six months before Jesus's baptism." (Ibid. p. 5, middle.)

Le Clerc seems to think the month of our Lord's birth quite uncertain. "No-

dle of 751." Necessary! For what? No reason is assigned, no authority quoted, no probability mentioned for so placing it, or for supposing it to have happened so early in the year. The necessity for placing it thus early seems to be no other than this, that, unless it be so placed, the chronological difficulty cannot be got rid of, so as to reconcile the fictitious Luke with the true. But if this be a sufficient necessity, it will authorize us to get rid of the chronological difficulty in the Introduction to Matthew's Gospel, in the same way. We have only to suppose that Jesus at his baptism in 782 was not yet 35 years of age, and we must then place his birth in 747 (in which year, Dec. 25, Bp. Pearce places it); and if we say that Matthew's Introduction renders it necessary to place it before the last six days of that year, we shall reconcile at once the pseudo-Matthew (ii. 16) with the genuine Luke (iii. 1 and 23); the chronological difficulty will vanish, and all will go smoothly on without disturbing the day established for the nativity. The wise men might arrive at Jerusalem in 749, in proper time for Herod to be "troubled and all Jerusalem with him;" he might call a council of "all the chief priests and scribes of the people;" might privily inquire of the star-gazers diligently," or exactly, "what time the star appeared;" they might follow their leader, the eastern luminary, to Bethlehem, "till it came and stood over where the young child was," and saved them the necessity of "searching for it diligently;" might offer their precious treasures and their still more precious worship; might be "warned in a dream" (the star it seems, a mere outward-bound convoy, had nothing more to do with them) "not to return to Herod," who, when he saw that he was "mocked, might be exceeding wroth," and might issue the mandate for his "*belluina crudelitas*" in time

lim negare," says he, "aut affirmare natum esse Christum hoc aut illo mense anni Juliani 41: quia res minime constat. Hoc unum constare posse mihi videtur, natum eum esse hoc anno, quamquam ignotus est mensis." Dissert. the first, annexed to his Harmony of the Gospels, p. 508, col. 1, edit. Amstel. 1699, fol.

to have it executed on the 25th of December, 749, when the dreaded infant would be just ripe and ready (barring dreams) to be murdered when he was exactly "two years old," with "all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, under" that age. And thus Herod might shew the Jews how silly a thing it was for them to suppose that the "Scripture cannot be broken" (John x. 35); might reply to his father, (John viii. 44,) that though the Son of God could never "dash his foot against a stone, (Matt. iv. 6, Luke iv. 11,) that was no proof that a man could not cut his throat, and might congratulate himself on having done more than all the gates of Hell can do (Matt xvi. 18)—conquered the kingdom of heaven, frustrated all its plans some thirty years before the time appointed for their maturity, and secured his seat upon the throne for as many years more as he had sat on it already (no small time); though he was now so worn out with age and disease, and the anxious, corroding cares, disappointments and vexations of a wicked and a miserable reign, that he died about three months afterwards, in March, 750. The dreams would not stand at all in the way of this, for neither the Jews, nor Herod, nor, as I think, his father, though he passes for "a *deep* one," would know any thing about them, or their success.

But the chronological difficulty that occurs in the introductory chapters to Luke, independently of those prefixed to Matthew, has not yet been considered in its full extent. Hitherto it has only been extended to the conception of John the Baptist; but it appears to me to reach even the birth of Jesus himself: for the same note of time first taken up by the pseudo-Luke, as a date in order to point out in what king's days the angel appeared to Zacharias, seems to be studiously continued and carried on by him till he arrives at the birth of Jesus.

Elizabeth is stated to have conceived "in the days" wherein the Lord looked on her, (i. 25,) that is, immediately after the appearance of the angel. After "those days," that is, those days of Herod which followed immediately after, she conceived, and hid herself five months (ver. 24). It

is not barely said, "afterwards." The Greek is not *μετεπειτα*, *μετα ταυτα*, or *υστερον*, but the very words used before are used again: *ταυτας τας ημερας* is coupled with *μετα*, as if for the express purpose of informing the reader, that the days of her concealment were the same days identified before, the days of Herod, who is thus pointed out to be still living at the expiration of the five months. The very same mark of time is carefully repeated for the purpose of carrying on the reign of Herod, in the 39th verse. "In those days," in Herod's days, Mary arose and went on a visit to her cousin. And lastly, in ch. ii. 1, it is said, that "in those days," i. e., in the days of Herod, were accomplished the days that Mary should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son (ii. 6, 7). In this last place, the pronoun in the Greek is different from that used in verses 24 and 39; being the one usually employed when reference is made to a more remote antecedent, and seems here intended to carry the reader back to the days first mentioned in ch. i. 5, "the days of Herod the king of Judea."

Dr. Paley also understands the phrase "those days," as intended to fix the birth of Jesus to the reign of Herod; for he says, that "St Matthew, and St. Luke also himself, relates that Jesus was born in the time of Herod." (Evidences, Vol. II. p. 187, 2nd ed. 1794, 8vo.)

It is probable too, that the spurious chapters which have usurped the name of Matthew, and those which have usurped that of Luke, were written by the same author. And if so, this furnishes an additional reason for supposing that the one account, as well as the other, was meant to place the birth of Jesus in the days of Herod.

The chronology, therefore, of the parasitical fungus which passes for the first two chapters, cannot be reconciled with that of the third chapter of Luke, if the commonly-received month and day of the nativity be adopted, unless Herod were living on the 25th of Dec., 752. But, according to Dr. Carpenter, he died in March, 750.

Such is the difficulty that results from the date which the *first* chapter of the spurious Introduction to Luke requires us to assign to the birth of Jesus, when compared with that which

is assigned to it by Luke himself. But this is not all.

In the second verse of the *second* chapter of this foul excrescence, we have a much greater chronological difficulty. Here the pretended Luke errs on the opposite side. He had before placed the birth of Jesus nearly three years too soon. He now places it more than ten years too late. If Jesus was born in the days of Herod, he must have been about 33 at least, at the time of his baptism. But if he was not born till the days of the taxing, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, he could not have been more than about 20 when he was baptized. This last is a much more formidable difficulty in chronology than any that occurs in the spurious chapters prefixed to Matthew's Gospel. Lardner accordingly discusses the taxing of Cyrenius at greater length than he does the fifteenth of Tiberius. Dr. Carpenter "after repeatedly considering his arguments with a perfect willingness to receive his opinion," is dissatisfied with what he has said on the latter difficulty. But his "double toil and trouble" bestowed on the former seems scarcely to have satisfied Lardner himself, for he concludes it in these words: "If I have not been so happy as to remove every difficulty attending this text, yet I hope the reader will allow at least, that I have not concealed or dissembled any."

Like Dr. C., I too have repeatedly considered Lardner's arguments, long ago, with the same disposition, and with no better success. I have more recently attended to those of Mr. Benson.* The result has been to increase my convictions that none of those silly stories about the infancy of Jesus which are ascribed to Matthew and to Luke, were ever seen or heard of by those evangelists.

The pretended Luke, like the pretended Matthew, not only contradicts the genuine Luke, but he contradicts himself also. Whoever this counterfeit was, he was no evangelist. Whatever he was, he was no chronologer. When viewed in reference to chronology, the childish tales of wonder pre-

fixed to the rational and moral treatise of the beloved physician, present nothing to the eye but a mass of confusion. In every other point of view they are more like the fictitious legends of Popery than like the genuine Gospel of Luke.

CHRONOS.

P. S. A good review of Mr. Benson's book could not fail to be acceptable and interesting to the readers of the Repository. It is the work of an ingenious and sensible young man, with a mind possessed of native and acquired abilities, and stored with a very creditable share of learning. Unfortunately, he straps a millstone about his neck before he plunges into the deep. That which is puerile, perplexed and contradictory, that whose genuineness has always been disputed by Christians ever since it was known, (the rubbish that constitutes the spurious chapters,) he takes for granted as the undoubted Gospel of the evangelists, and then labours by compression and extension, and all sorts of distortion and screwing, to bring what is simple in itself (viz. Luke iii. 1—23), whose genuineness no Christian ever disputed, into consistency with a chaos which is inconsistent with itself. He struggles hard; but the load with which he has encumbered himself, drags him to the bottom in spite of all his "anxious" (p. 213) efforts. It always has been so; and always will be so. A man may as well try to serve God and Mammon, as to reconcile the legitimate with the illegitimate evangelists. He who would give a true and consistent account, must hold to the one and despise the other. There is no other way under heaven, given among men, whereby he can succeed.

Mr. Benson concludes, from his inquiries, that Jesus was born in April or May, 4709 of the Julian period, (749 of Rome,) about two years before Herod's death (pp. 116, 117); that John the Baptist entered on his ministry in May, 4739, Jul. per. [779 Rom.] (p. 220); * that Jesus was

* This is said upon the supposition that Tiberius reigned two or three years during the life of Augustus, and that Luke reckoned those to be years of Tiberius, and not of Augustus, of whom he

* "The Chronology of our Saviour's Life," Cambridge, 1819, 8vo.

baptized in the following November ; * and that after preaching about two years and a half, he was crucified at the third Passover in his ministry, in the consulship of the Gemini, in the year 4742, J. P. [782, R.] (pp. 293 and 336).

This date for the crucifixion, which places it in the 15th year of Tiberius, reckoned from the death of Augustus, Mr. Benson tells us, "has the peculiar advantage of corresponding with the most ancient and uniform tradition which exists upon the subject in the church" (p. 293). In page 214 he does not speak quite so confidently. There he only says, that "the Christian fathers from the earliest times, and *almost* with one consent declare" for it. Samuel Basnage, in his *Annales Politico-Ecclesiastici*, Rotterod. 1706, fol., holds the balance more evenly. In Vol I. p. 245, he states that "*bene multi*" and "*complures*" were for this date: but in p. 247 he adds, that "*alii bene multi de non minorum gentium grege*" were against it; and among the latter he ranks Irenæus, a more ancient name than any that Mr. Benson has produced in favour of the date. But even

takes no notice (iii. 1): "which hypothesis, for I can call it no better," (says Mr. Bowyer, *Conject. N. T.* note in p. xxiv. of Pref., ed. 1782, 4to.) "Sir Isaac Newton did not intend to follow, as appears p. 165" of his *Observat. on Daniel*. One would think no person, who allowed himself a moment's reflection, could be so absurd as to follow it. While Augustus was living, no man would have dared to date in this way. No *share* of power that he could have conferred on Tiberius, nothing less than his own complete abdication, could have made it safe to use such a mode of reckoning. And after Augustus was dead, to date in this way, without expressly stating that the person who used it began the reign of Tiberius before the death of his predecessor, would have caused such confusion as would have rendered all dating useless, unless this mode of it had been so constantly practised and established as to prevent all ambiguity; which was so far from being the case, that not a single instance of it can be produced.

* At which time he would have been a year and a half older than the Evangelist Luke says he was at his baptism. (Ch. iii. 23.)

Basnage, who himself argues at length and with ability against this date, overstates the evidence in favour of it. In fact, the opinion was neither ancient nor uniform, nor were there many who asserted it. Mr. Benson enumerates eight writers who are supposed to have declared for it. Basnage has added a ninth. And where do we find a tenth? Nay, even of the nine, some, as Basnage observes, have been erroneously reckoned among the maintainers of this date. Then the antiquity of the works in which it is found has been much over-rated. They abound with interpolations. The particular passages are very suspicious; some of them scarcely intelligible, others quite vague and inexplicit, and others again so ambiguous, that it is not easy to say in what spirit they are written, whether in jest or in earnest. But, setting aside these drawbacks, what right has the voice of nine individuals to be considered as the uniform tradition of the church? Were it uncontradicted, it would be of no great weight in the scale.

But in the present case it is not only contradicted by the writers mentioned by Basnage, but by the united voice of the Christian Church in all ages, the voice which has always connected the crucifixion with the year 33 of the vulgar æra, and with the pascal limit of the 1st of April; than which no voice was ever more steady, more uniform, or more invariable.

That Jesus was crucified in this year is not a mere traditionary rumour that has floated loose and unconnected down the stream of time: it is a thread closely interwoven with, and running through the whole web of the Christian history: it is a position that has not only always been believed, but that has been uniformly *acted upon*, from the crucifixion to the present hour, by all associated bodies and communities of Christians in all parts of the world. All Christian Churches, whether Jewish or Gentile, Greek or Roman, Eastern or Western, Catholic or Protestant, Established or Non-established, have always maintained that the day of the crucifixion was to be regulated by the dominical letter that stands opposite to the year 33, in their tables, and the paschal full moon for that year by the

limit of the 1st of April. They have all agreed in carrying on and in registering, in one uninterrupted series, from year to year, the same succession of numbers for their solar and their lunar cycles, and for the corresponding years of the Christian æra. No disputes which have occasionally occurred about the proper time of celebrating their Easter; no supposed defect in the original Jewish and Christian lunar cycle, which Epiphanius and others after him have called a vicious cycle; no anticipation of the full moons, or of the æquinox, arising from a computation of the length of the month, or the year, not perfectly accurate; no correction of these inaccuracies by any alteration in the table of paschal limits, or by what is called the alteration of the stile; none of these things, nor any thing else, has ever disturbed the regularity of the succession, has ever broken a link in the chain, or ever prevailed upon any body of Christians (whatever a few individuals may have done) to deviate into any other year, or any other limit, either before or after in the succession, for the year of the crucifixion, than those I have mentioned.

I do not say that this year has always been called the year 33, or that the 1st of April has always been considered as the precise day of the limit: but I say, that however different the denominations of the year may have been, they have all referred to the same year of real, absolute, physical time; and that however the limit may have varied a day or two, the reference has always been to the same spot or place in the cycle, the ground or *site*, if I may so call it, on which the 1st of April stands in the original table of paschal limits, and to no other of the whole nineteen.

The early Christians might explain, and did explain, differently what Luke has said about the age of Jesus at his baptism. Some understood him as saying that Jesus had only begun, others that he had completed his thirtieth year, and others again contended that a greater latitude was included in the word "*about*." These, though they agreed in the year of the crucifixion, would all call it a different year of Christ. But the difference of time, as to the crucifixion, would be nomi-

nal only, not real. As to the birth, it would be real. Indeed, it was the year of the birth that was always disputed; the year of the crucifixion never. They disputed about the former because they could never reconcile the spurious chronology, which makes Jesus to be born in the reign of Herod, with the gospel chronology, which makes him only begin to be thirty years of age some time after John had begun to baptize, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar. And for this reason many of the early Christians, that they might avoid all ambiguity, all dispute and controversy, and give offence to nobody, chose to date their years of Christ, not from his birth, but from his crucifixion; about which there was no contest nor uncertainty.

Since the time of the Emperor Justinian and of Dionysius Exiguus, all Christian churches have invariably considered the year 33 as the year, and the 3d of April as the day of the crucifixion; because the table of Dominical letters, or solar cycle, points out that day, and not the 1st of April, for a Friday. Before this, the Roman Christians connected the crucifixion with a particular year of their æra taken from the building of their city, and whatever it was, invariably adhered to it: the Greek Christians, as invariably adhered to some particular year of their Olympiads; and the Jewish Christians to some year of their Jewish æra. And all these years, however differently denominated, pointed to the same real, absolute time. And that year was, in the sixth century, when the vulgar Christian æra was introduced, called the year 33, and has been so called by all Christian churches ever since. This year of the crucifixion was the hinge and pivot upon which the whole æra turned. For, as to the birth of Jesus, it was never pretended that the first year of this æra precisely and exactly corresponded with that: on the contrary, it was maintained that he was really born *four* years before the commencement of the vulgar æra; the first year of which was only the nominal, not the real year of his birth.

This was the last bungling result of many vain attempts to distort the chronology of the gospel, so as to make Jesus contemporary with Herod.

Not all the disturbing force of the hierarchy could ever succeed completely to its wishes : but it succeeded so far as to give us an erroneous instead of a true æra for the birth of Christ. It also disturbed some chronological dates more fanciful and of less importance. Before Herod was raised from the dead, to do a deed without a name, *such* a deed as none but a downright, absolute madman could ever think of doing, and none but one theologically mad could ever really believe to be done by any man in his senses, chronologers, who are very fond of round numbers, and almost as zealous for *correspondences* as a Swedenborgian, had by their calculations, assisted by imagination, made the world to be exactly 4000 years old at the birth of Jesus. But when Herod commanded Jesus to be born four years earlier, (a mere trifle, compared with what the pseudo-Matthew has ascribed to him !) the chronologers, obedient to the mandate, made the world to be exactly 4000 years old at the *new* birth, and 4004 at the old. And that this new birth might not claim any nearer approach to Roman antiquity, but keep itself at a proper distance from the birth of the immortal city, the Romans, whose consular calendar would not easily admit of extending the duration of their republic, were kindly accommodated with four years in addition to the duration of their regal state, when there was as full and as free scope for invention as any chronologer could desire. And thus the 240 years which Sir Isaac Newton had the presumption to think were a vast deal too long for seven kings to reign in succession, were extended to 244. But the Jews, who were always a stiff-necked people, and always resisted the Holy Ghost, would have nothing to do, either with the new ἀκροβυστία, or even with the old superfluity of these uncircumcised Heathens, no portion of which they contended was sanctioned by their records, or could be freed from the suspicion of uncleanness even by the Heathens themselves. Accordingly, they would not superintend the printing of a Hebrew Bible for the Christians unless they were allowed to cut off 240 years from the Christian æra for the date of it; which any one may see exemplified

in the rabbinical dates annexed to Robert Stephens's, to Plantin's, and to most of the early-printed Hebrew Bibles.

The true year of the crucifixion, then, has been faithfully preserved by the Christian church in all ages. In every mode of computing time, the memory of it has been carefully handed down from year to year, and from cycle to cycle, in the way described. The year of the vulgar æra in which it happened is also regularly marked in the margins of our Gospels to this day. To this year the adherence has been invariable ever since the æra was adopted. To corresponding years in other æras the adherence was equally invariable, as long as those æras were in use. When they fell into disuse, the correspondence between the years of those æras and our own was lost. It has, therefore, now become a question of some difficulty among us, in what year of the Jews, the Greeks, or the Romans, though not in what year of our own æra, the crucifixion happened. There is also, from some cause or other, a difficulty in settling the precise day of it, so as to be free from all objection. Basnage says rightly, (Vol. I. p. 246, col. 1,) no day can be the true day, unless it be a Friday, and also the day of the full moon. I add, unless it stand on the *site* of the 1st of April in the original table of paschal limits; which table has been carefully preserved in all the service-books of the church ever since it was a church. And I further add, that no year can be the true year of the crucifixion, unless it correspond to the year 33 of our present vulgar æra.

Mr. Benson, therefore, cannot be right in placing the crucifixion in the year 4742 of the Julian period, which, ever since that period was invented by Joseph Scaliger, has been considered as coinciding with the year 29 of the vulgar æra, whose paschal limit, in the original table, is the 15th of April; but which Mr. B. (pp. 326.—328) would allow any one that chooses it, to consider as the 18th of March, a day antecedent to the vernal æquinox, a thing unheard of, or even as the 25th of March, between which and the year 29 there is no correspondence whatever.

Newcastle-under-Lyme,
March 18, 1822.

SIR,

THE inclosed document relative to the transactions of the Philadelphia Unitarian Society, having lately come into my possession, I send it to you for insertion, if you think proper, in the Repository. As the subject of Lay-Preaching has lately been brought before the public in your pages, it may be interesting to some of your readers to be presented with a practical proof of its efficacy when conducted with sincerity and seriousness. I also inclose you an extract of a letter received a few days ago from Philadelphia.

P. B.

Transactions of the Philadelphia Unitarian Society.

Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the members, pewholders and contributors of the first Society of Unitarian Christians in the city of Philadelphia, held in the church, agreeably to previous notice, after morning service, on the 9th April, 1820.

Mr. John Vaughan was called to the chair, and

Mr. William Turner was appointed Secretary.

The Chairman read the following letter from Mr. Ralph Eddowes, dated 25th March, 1820.

To the Committee of Order of the Unitarian Society.

RESPECTED FRIENDS & ASSOCIATES,

I now find myself under the necessity of deciding upon a measure which I have for some time past had in contemplation,—that of retiring from the situation I hold as officiating minister to our Society. When I agreed to conduct the service alternately with Mr. Taylor, I had many doubts whether my powers of body and mind would admit of such continued exertion; and I now find the duty becoming too great a burden upon both, increased by a consciousness how very deficient I have been, at best, in the qualifications necessary for an office of such a serious and important nature. However, that no immediate inconvenience may arise from an alteration or interruption of the present course, I propose (if God permit) to continue it for six months longer; by that time I shall have entered upon my seventieth year, when the natural faculties, whatever they may have been, cannot be otherwise than on the decline; and it would be doing injustice

to the Society and myself to persist in attempting what must be unacceptable to them in proportion as it discovered increasing incapacity in me. Still, if remaining strength should allow, and it should be in any respect desirable, I would not decline the delivery, now and then, of an occasional discourse, but I feel it indispensably necessary, both to my health and the ease of my mind, to be at perfect liberty from any positive or permanent engagement.

As I presume this communication will be entered on your minutes, I wish to avail myself of the opportunity to leave on record, among the archives of that church which I have been an humble instrument in founding, my thankfulness to the Divine Providence, that I have been thus led to a more diligent inquiry into the grounds of the Christian revelation—my firm and deliberate conviction of its general truth—and more particularly of *those views* of it to which the great and fundamental doctrine of the DIVINE UNITY, either directly or collaterally, leads; associating reason with faith, and laying a broad foundation for hope, and love, and joy: on *them* I confidently rely for consolation through the short remainder of my days, and for support in the hour of death. Nor do I doubt that, in God's good time, they will dispel every mist of error, and restore the religion of the gospel to its primitive purity. With earnest wishes and fervent prayers for the peace and prosperity of the society,

I remain,

Their and your affectionate friend and servant in Christ,

(Signed) RA. EDDOWES.

Whereupon, on the motion of Mr. William Hulings, seconded by Mr. James Taylor,

It was unanimously Resolved,

That we learn, with unfeigned regret, that notice has been given by Mr. Eddowes of his intention to retire from the public services of the church at the expiration of six months from the 25th day of March last.

That, much as we lament the loss we shall sustain, the reasons assigned by him for discontinuing his labours among us, particularly as regards the state of his health, render it our duty to acquiesce in an event, to which we cannot help looking forward with solicitude and concern.

That we entertain a high sense of the very able and acceptable manner in which Mr. Eddowes has conducted the public services, and of the truly Christian example by which he has practically illustrated the great duties of our holy religion: and

that we feel the weight of a large debt of gratitude for his disinterested and gratuitous ministrations among us during a period of nearly 13 years.

That, under the influence of these sentiments, we offer him our most respectful and sincere thanks, accompanied by our warmest wishes for his present welfare and future happiness.

That a copy of these Resolutions, attested by the Chairman and Secretary, be presented to Mr. Eddowes, and that Mr. William Hulings and Mr. Guy Bryan be a committee for that purpose.

True extract from the minutes.

(Signed) JOHN VAUGHAN,
Chairman.

WM. TURNER, Secretary.

In his reply, Mr. E. expressed his deep sense of the kindness of the Society in passing these Resolutions, and his obligations for the politeness of the gentlemen who presented them; but that, being as little expected as merited, he had been prepared to find his only reward in the consciousness of having discharged the duty, however imperfectly, to the best of his ability.

—
Extract of a Letter from Philadelphia.

“Dr. M—— has retired from his ministerial office at New York, having been chosen President of Carlisle College, Pennsylvania. In his farewell Sermon to his flock, he took occasion to pour forth a torrent of the most bitter invectives against the Unitarians, imprecating curses upon, and consigning them to damnation, although he said that their doctrine was *too* coarse and abominable for hell itself. The Sermon being printed, came under review by Mr. Walsh, who publishes a daily paper in Philadelphia. He, though a Catholic, in an article headed *Intolerance*, warmly reprobated this unchristian and illiberal conduct of the Doctor's, and very handsomely did justice to the character of Unitarians as a body, mentioning an individual among them as the foremost in every plan of public benevolence and utility. The Sermon has been remarked upon by one of the New York Unitarian congregation, and Mr. Taylor has taken the occasion to defend the cause before a numerous audience at our regular evening service, so that we seem in a way more than ever to attract the public notice. Indeed, the Presbyterian clergy do all they can to help us; they cannot refrain from venting their spleen in sermons and publications. Dr. ——, formerly of New York, but now of Princeton College, sore from the castigation

given him by Mr. Sparkes, in his little periodical publication, has been attacking us in a style of asperity worse (some say) than Dr. M. himself.

“There is a strong movement among the Catholics about the choice of a priest for St. Mary's—the clergy on one side and the people on the other contending for the right of appointment. Some personal violence has been used, and both parties are resorting to the law for the confirmation of their claims. These things seem to portend a revolution in favour of religious liberty, in the end no less successful than that which has given us the full enjoyment of our civil rights.”

Ross,
April 10, 1822.

SIR,
I SEND you a few remarks on the supposed death of Moses. In Deut. xxxiv. 5, it is said, “So Moses the servant of the Lord *died*,” &c.: Dr. Geddes observes on this passage, (see Crit. Remarks, p. 473,) that “not only many Jews, but some good Christian fathers, think that he died not, but was *snatched* up to heaven alive.” This, however, he says, “is not the common opinion of modern commentators;” himself amongst the rest, I should think from his manner of stating this opinion, and asking the question, who wrote the account of the *death* of Moses and of his *burial*? “It is clear, however,” he adds, “that it must have been written after, and some considerable time after Moses, from this expression, *unto this day no man knoweth aught of his sepulchre*.” Now, from the proneness of the Israelitish nation to idolatry, of which Moses has given us many instances, it might be concluded, that this concealment of his death, if it indeed took place, and the place of his burial, was intended to prevent the Jews from deifying their great legislator, after the manner of the Heathen nations. And this might have been the case, had they known of his being translated alive to heaven, in their *then* circumstances.

Now the Scriptures of the New Testament have revealed this mystery to us Christians. The gospel, I say, informs us that Moses, as well as Elijah, was translated from earth to heaven without undergoing the law of our nature. Indeed, the historian infers as much when he informs us,

that "his eye was not dim, nor was his natural force," or vigour, "abated;" although of the age of 120 years. Ver. 7th. *Three* of the evangelists have given an account of the transfiguration of Jesus; or a sensible display of the glories of the future state, in the persons of Moses, Elijah and Jesus. There is little difference in their several relations, only Luke positively calls them *men*; which would not have applied to Moses, had he been *dead*; neither can it be asserted, that he was *risen* from the dead, without contradicting the express testimony of Scripture, that *Jesus* was the first-fruits of them that slept. Here, then, we have the testimony of *three* evangelists that *Moses died not*; but was *translated*, like Enoch and Elijah, to the heavenly state. And this satisfactorily accounts, why his sepulchre was not to be found. This is called a *vision* by the sacred writers, but it was also a real transaction, as St. Peter affirms, from what they both *saw* and *heard* in the Holy Mount. (See 2 Epist. Peter i. 16—18.) It is rather singular, that neither John in his Gospel or Epistles, nor James, who were eye and ear witnesses with Peter, should make any allusion to this transaction of the transfiguration; but we have sufficient evidence of the historical fact.

PHILALETHES.

P. S. At p. 216, Vol. VI. of Theol. Repos., I beg to correct a passage relating to the *Prince Michael*, who is there represented as the leader or great prince of the children of Israel, to restore them to their country, &c., as foretold by Daniel. (See x. 13—21 and xii. 1.) It does not necessarily follow that this temporal prince was to spring from the stem of Jesse, as is supposed in the paper referred to; I rather think now, he may be of Gentile race, as Cyrus was, who was the great deliverer of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity. And should the war between Russia and Turkey take place, as in all probability it will, we shall soon discover to *whom* this high destiny belongs.

SIR,

HAVING been engaged for some time in making collections for a History of the Life and Times of

Daniel De Foe, with a view to publication, you will oblige me by allowing your work to be the medium for requesting communications from any of your correspondents for the furtherance of the design, and the same will be thankfully accepted, addressed to me either at Lufton, near Yeovil, in Somersetshire; or at No. 34, Ely Place, Holborn, in London.

WALTER WILSON.

The Unitarian Mourner comforted.

LETTER IV.

To Mrs. ——— on the Death of her Daughter, aged 20.

Sept. 28, 1819.

MY DEAR MADAM,

I ADOPT this method of addressing you, in the hope of being able to express my sentiments on the subject of the recent painful visitation of Divine Providence, more fully and with better effect than can be done in conversation. If it be any solace of your grief to know that others feel with you, I beg to assure you, for my own part, that I have been deeply affected by your loss, and that the other members of our society with whom I have conversed on the subject, sincerely sympathize with you.

But happily it is not in the sympathy of our friends alone that we can find consolation in seasons of distress. With no better support than earthly friends can afford, the heart would sink under its burthen of grief. You will allow me to attempt the fulfilment of what I conceive to be the most important part of the office of the Christian friend and the Christian minister, by directing your thoughts, as well as I am able, to those everlasting sources of consolation which the sacred volume unfolds. I doubt not it will be often before you,—for every other book is poor and meagre in comparison with these living oracles. Let me particularly recommend to your attention the following passages, as affording interesting subjects for meditation, under the loss of friends, and more especially the loss of children: 2 Sam. xii. 15—23; 2 Kings iv. 8—37; 1 Kings xvii. 8—24; Job i. 18—22; Ezekiel xxiv. 15, 16; Luke vii. 11—16, viii. 41, 42, 49—56.

Your eyes will, perhaps, be dimmed with tears, when you read of the

happy lot of the widow of Zarephthah, the Shunemmite, and the wife of Jairus, who had their beloved offspring restored to their longing arms, just as the gates of death appeared to have closed upon them for ever, and contrast their lot with yours. But your grief will be greatly moderated when you recollect that these events are recorded instances of the power of God to raise the dead to life again. And, upon further reflection, you will find that what seemed at first sight to be calculated to aggravate your sufferings, is in fact adapted not only to soothe them, but to change the voice of wailing into songs of thanksgiving and joy. Happy were these favoured mothers, although they were doomed shortly to part company again, and their intercourse with their children, thus snatched from the grave, might be interrupted by distance, or embittered by vice. But far happier will virtuous parents one day become, when rising from the slumbers of death, they shall run to embrace those whom God hath given them, and be re-united in eternal friendship. No selfishness shall cool the ardour of their attachment, no sorrows shall cloud their intercourse, no follies and imperfections shall call for the voice of admonition. Whatever in this world has given pleasure, shall be heightened and perfected; whatever has caused momentary pain, shall be eternally banished. Allow me to remind you that the hope of a resurrection is the main pillar of Christianity, "for this is the word of faith" preached by the apostles, "that if thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that *God hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved." This great truth the Unitarian doctrine places in the clearest point of view. While other systems disguise the fact of his death, and perplex the evidence of his resurrection, by representing him as God who cannot die, and as rising by his own inherent power and immortality from the grave, the Unitarian believes him to have been precisely what the apostle's argument to the Corinthians supposes him to have been—simply a man. If he were any thing more, his resurrection could be no proof of the possibility and pledge of the certainty of ours. "For since by *man* came death,

by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead." Whatever therefore others may tell you of the barrenness of this doctrine, you will, I trust, find it fruitful in the richest sources of consolation. You view the Saviour of the world in the most interesting light possible, as tempted in all points like his brethren, yet without sin; as having, not figuratively, or nominally suffered, but as having really undergone all the piercing griefs of this state of trial, and set us an example at once of feeling them acutely and bearing them manfully. And when you meditate on the character and perfections of God, your thoughts of him will be full of consolation and joy. You do not consider him as having required of you a sinless obedience which he made you incapable of yielding him, or as making you the subject of his everlasting, implacable wrath for the guilt of another which you had no part in incurring; but as *love*, infinite and essential *love*, revealing itself in the works of nature, but more fully in the dispensation of grace, the *free gift* of pardon and eternal life, to every sincerely repentant offender.

It is my earnest hope, that while you and Mr. H. meditate on these things in the "multitude of your" troubled "thoughts within you," the "consolations of God" will still "delight your souls."

Had you this morning consigned to an untimely grave a froward, ungrateful, or vicious child, I might have been at a loss to know in what language of consolation to address you. But to the parents of an amiable, pious and dutiful daughter, a thousand pleasing topics for reflection will readily occur. To have been the authors of her birth, instead of being thought of with pain and shame, is a subject of pride and congratulation. A thousand instances of dutiful attachment to her earthly parents, and of reverential love to her heavenly Father, will rush into your minds in your hours of retirement and meditation. And even the last sad scene of suffering which brought her an early victim to grace the triumphs of death,—when it is recollected that disease and approaching dissolution seemed as it were to *unlock* the treasures of the pious heart, which modesty had kept concealed, and to convince her sorrowing relatives how well

the sufferer was fitted, through the mercy of God, for that immortality to which she was hastening—will be contemplated with a species of tranquil satisfaction. Not to mourn under such circumstances would be unnatural and unchristian. But you will weep, I trust, "as though you wept not." *Time* heals our wounds, however deep and painful they may be; even the *face of nature* to a contemplative mind appears to forbid us to indulge in immoderate grief; the fields dressed in the gay attire of spring, or smiling with abundant harvests, inspire our hearts with joy and thankfulness. The blue arch of heaven, decked with stars all bright, serene and tranquil, silently persuade the troubled breast to a similar composure. But, above all, religion is calculated to give us "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

With sentiments of respect and friendship for yourself and Mr. H., believe me to be,

Dear Madam,

Yours, truly,

G. K.

P.S. I have inclosed an excellent Sermon of Mr. Little's, entitled, *Death and a Future Life*; and a beautiful letter, by Lady J. Fergusson, on the *Death of her Son*.

SIR,

April 3, 1822.

A GOOD deal has lately been said on the supposed coincidence of opinion among some of the original leaders of the *Quakers*, and that maintained by Unitarian Christians. The subject lately formed a part of a conversation at which an intelligent lady of the former persuasion was present, and who was requested to peruse "*Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken*." A copy, as published by the "*Unitarian Society*," was presented to her for that purpose, which was afterwards returned, accompanied by the following letter, which I have permission to send for insertion in the *Monthly Repository*, and shall be glad to see satisfactorily answered. The subject is rather an important one, both as respects fair and candid dealing, the

cause of Christian Truth, and the reputation of William Penn, as its consistent advocate.

AN ADVOCATE FOR TRUTH.

DEAR FRIEND,

In compliance with thy request we have attentively read Wm. Penn's "*Sandy Foundation Shaken*;" nevertheless, it has not shaken the foundation of that truth for which Wm. Penn was both an able and a faithful advocate. Whatever constructions individuals may have put upon that pamphlet, entirely opposite to Wm. Penn's views and intentions, his subsequent declaration of his principles, and his public vindication of them in a work entitled, "*Innocency with her Open Face*," removes from him every possible imputation of holding Unitarian doctrine.

In Clarkson's *Life of Wm. Penn*, Vol. I. p. 36, there is a full account of the circumstances which caused this pamphlet to be written, the substance of which is this: two persons of the Presbyterian congregation in Spitalfields, went one day to the Meeting-house of the Quakers, merely to learn what their religious doctrines were. It happened that they were converted there. This news being carried to Thomas Vincent, their pastor, it so stirred him up, that he not only used his influence to prevent the converts from attending there again, but he decried the doctrines of the Quakers as damnable. This slander caused William Penn and George Whitehead, an eminent minister among the Quakers, to demand an opportunity to defend themselves publicly. This, with a good deal of demur, was granted, and the Presbyterian Meeting-house fixed upon for the purpose. When the time came, the Quakers presented themselves at the door, but Vincent, to secure a majority, had filled a great part of the Meeting-house with his own hearers, so that there was but little room for them. Penn and Whitehead, however, with a few others of the Society, pushed their way in; they had scarcely done this, when they heard proclaimed aloud "that the Quakers held damnable doctrines." Immediately George Whitehead shewed himself, and began to explain aloud what the principles of the Society really were; but Vincent interrupted him, contending that it would be a better way of proceeding for himself to examine the Quakers as to their own creed. Vincent, having carried his point, began by asking the Quakers whether they owned one Godhead subsisting in three distinct and separate persons. Penn and Whitehead both asserted that

this, delivered as it was by Vincent, was no "scriptural doctrine."

Clarkson, after going more at large into the subject, adds, "it will not be necessary to detail the arguments brought forward in this controversy, in which nothing was settled;" but he describes the great intemperance betrayed by several of the Presbyterians, so that it was impossible to obtain a hearing. This then was the cause for William Penn's writing the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," which gave offence, from its being entirely misunderstood, as his "Innocency with her Open Face" will amply testify.

And now suffer me to make some remarks upon the Unitarian preface to the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," wherein there are (excuse me for saying so) two instances of an entire want of candour in the author. He mentions the commitment of William Penn to the Tower, by Lord Arlington, the then Secretary of State. Can we then suppose him ignorant of the letter which William Penn addressed to Lord Arlington, wherein he says, "truly were I as *criminal* as my adversaries have been pleased to represent me, it might become me to bear my present sufferings without the least resentment of injustice done, and to esteem a vindication of my cause an aggravation of my guilt; but since it is so notorious that common fame hath maliciously belied me, and that from invincible testimonies, I stand not guilty of what my adversaries would have so peremptorily fastened on me, *confessing that eternal deity of Christ*"? Certainly no man will assert this is *Unitarian doctrine*, the "eternal deity of Christ."

And now let me transcribe one of these "invincible testimonies," which William Penn speaks of. They are not isolated passages to be hunted for through his works, but are to be found every where, where he speaks upon the subject; indeed one characteristic stamps both his life and writings, that of being led and guided by the *spirit* of Christ. But let his letter to John Collynes, dated 1673, speak for itself.

"I will tell thee my faith in this matter: I do heartily believe that Jesus Christ is the only true and everlasting God, by whom all things were made that are in the heavens above, or the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, that he is omnipotent, omniscient, therefore God; this I confess by me in two books printed a little before the 'Sandy Foundation Shaken,' viz. 'Guide Mistaken' (p. 28) and 'Truth Exalted,' (pp. 14, 15,) also at large in my 'Innocency with her Open Face.' I think I have

dealt very honestly with thee; I am sure to the satisfaction of my own conscience, and it is not my fault if it be not to the better information of thine."

The other passage in the Unitarian preface is the following: "During this close imprisonment, the loud and general clamours against him reached Penn's eyes or ears, and induced him to write a small tract, which he called an *Apology for the former, not with an intention of recanting any of those doctrines* which he had so recently professed to lay down on the immovable basis of Scripture and right reason, but to clear himself from aspersions cast upon him for writing the 'Sandy Foundation Shaken.'" Yet, in this very Apology, which the Unitarian author considers as no recantation of the *doctrine* which he ascribes to the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," are to be found these unequivocal expressions: "I am constrained, for the sake of the simple-hearted, to publish to the world of our faith in God, Christ and the Holy Spirit: We do believe in one holy God Almighty, who is an eternal spirit, the creator of all things, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only Son and express image of his substance, who took upon him flesh, and was in the world; and in life, doctrine, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension and mediation, perfectly did and does continue to do the will of God, to whose holy life, power, mediation and blood, *we only ascribe our sanctification, justification and perfect salvation*. And we believe in one Holy Spirit that proceeds from the Father and the Son, as the life and virtue of both the Father and the Son, a measure of which is given to all to profit with; and he that has *one* has *all*, for these *three are one*, who is the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, God over all, blessed for ever. Amen."

Now if this be not a recantation, does it not clearly prove to every candid lover of truth, that William Penn's "Sandy Foundation Shaken" was totally misconstrued and wrested from its genuine meaning? But if, on the other hand, the editor's preface is to be regarded as truth, wherein he says, he is "not acquainted with a more manly and able vindication, in that peculiarly fanatical age, of the pure Unitarian doctrine than the 'Sandy Foundation Shaken,'" then it necessarily follows, that the apology is a recantation, or disavowal of his former sentiments, it being in direct opposition to the principles which constitute Unitarianism.

Let any unprejudiced mind read the following vindication of himself, in "Innocency with her Open Face," and then

declare if there be any ambiguity in his expressions: "How much I have been made an instance must needs be too notorious to any that holds the least intelligence with common fame, that scarce ever book took more pains to make the proverb good by proving himself a liar, than in my concern, who have been most egregiously slandered, reviled and defamed, by pulpit, press and talk, terming me a blasphemer, Socinian, *denying the divinity of Christ*, the Saviour, and what not, and all this about my late answer to a disputation with some Presbyterians, but how *unjustly*, it is the business of this short Apology to shew."

Now I think it must be allowed that the publication of the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," by Unitarians, without taking the least notice of William Penn's vindication, or of his open and unequivocal avowal of a doctrine totally opposite, or of his declaration of the injustice in terming him a *Socinian*, and a denier of the divinity of Christ, is at once disingenuous and unjust, and a departure from that principle which teaches us "to do as we would be done by."

We are averse to discussions of this nature, from a belief that they do not generally promote vital religion; yet in entering into this subject, we trust we have not been influenced by any unchristian disposition, but with unfeigned good-will towards thyself; and most sincerely do we wish that in this important point, as in every other, thou mayest be guided by the spirit of truth into all truth.

On Congregational Schools, and Considerations to what extent the Minds of the Labouring Classes may be advantageously cultivated.

SIR, March 27, 1822.

WHEN a religious society united formerly in a contribution for educating that class of their community who might otherwise have remained wholly untaught, the distinct and specific objects were unquestionably to instruct the boys in reading and writing, with a slight knowledge of numbers, and the education of the girls was confined to needle-work and reading; and when their funds enabled them to do so, the benefit to the children was increased by gifts of clothing, and occasionally a dinner was provided for them.

The same necessity for these schools cannot now be deemed so immediate as they were before the general establishment of the national schools,

which, admitting all denominations of the poor to the above advantages, adds that of greater promptitude and a more lively attention, (perhaps from the emulation induced by numbers learning together, than can be well attained among a smaller number, even where the same plan is adopted,) as is generally observed by those who compare the National with the Congregational Schools.

If, then, the Congregational Schools have no further object than the simply instructing children in reading, writing, arithmetic and needle-work, it becomes a question why the societies incur the expense of these establishments, when there are others at least equally efficacious of comparatively no expense.

Female education having most occupied my attention, I shall confine my observations particularly to the degree of instruction which girls now receive in these schools. I learn that the object in view is to make good house-servants of them. On visiting their school-rooms, with this impression, I find that sitting at needle-work occupies most of their time, and that in knowledge they attain as much as just enables them to read mechanically a chapter in the Bible, and some of them add to this a little of writing and arithmetic. The girls also scour and clean their school-room, &c., and thus acquire a little more activity than they otherwise would; yet, perhaps, not sufficient to compensate for the sedentary mode in which they spend the rest of their time during the most important period of their lives, as relates to health and habitual activity. The funds are frequently insufficient to maintain the establishment without considerable aid from the work done in it, and in consequence it is often observable that more vigilance is exerted in getting work completed to be sent home, after being entrusted only to a few who are qualified for the nicety it may require, than care in instructing those who require immediate superintendence. By degrees, perhaps, a good knowledge of shirt-making is attained; and at fourteen, a girl whose last six or seven years have been devoted to the purpose, quits the school able to execute plain work promptly and neatly, but without having been taught, what would most likely

be particularly required of her, a neat mode of repairing linen and making her own clothes. She may be able to read her Bible; but unless she has met with instruction from some other source than her school, she will seldom do so, because her mind has been so little cultivated; and she may possibly have the comfort of being able to communicate with her friends, by having been taught to write. But in what respect does she possess any advantage which the girls from the National Schools do not equally possess? And if not any, why should the societies contribute so much, and perhaps, also, have given their time and attention to their little establishment?

If it is replied, that these schools were founded before the National Schools were thought of, and that, having subsisted so long, it would be a matter of regret to relinquish the old custom; or if it is considered that the class of children who go to them rank rather higher in society than those who attend the larger establishments, and are therefore conveniently separated; or if it be observed that the care of these schools link in the most agreeable way the members of the society together, giving to the rich a common interest, and making rich and poor feel as one family when they assemble for public worship; or that they are desirous of keeping in their society those whom they can influence and guide to the adoption of such views as these individual societies believe to be the truth; then every motive which induces us to keep up these establishments, (except the simple one of continuing them because they are of long standing,) might stimulate us to a desire of greater moral good and usefulness in the mode of conducting them.

It seems that the qualities and powers of mind most desirable for the well-being of the labouring classes, including house-servants, are those of a quick perception, present attention, with ready memory and discrimination. For the cultivation of these powers of the mind, it appears desirable that their time should be so *fully occupied* as not to admit of passive insensibility, nor of trifling and careless habits.

It is next to be considered how, during the six or seven years which they spend under the care of these

societies, their time could be sufficiently occupied to call out and keep in exercise these qualities. It must, doubtless, be according to the circumstances under which their still earlier education began; for if this earlier period was passed in the listlessness of neglected helplessness, (owing to the necessary avocations of the parent,) or under the injudicious controul of those who rather needed guidance than possessed the means of guiding, the faculties of the mind would be necessarily much slower in their developement than under more favourable circumstances, especially as the temper would also require more regulation to prevent its impeding the progress of the mind. But why consider what pursuits would best befit them, when the difficulty is solved by the motives given for keeping up these establishments? The children are thought to rank somewhat higher in life than those of the other schools. If so, give them, then, more knowledge; let them have more to raise them above mere objects of sense; and if you wish to retain them hereafter in your congregations, if you wish them to have with yourselves the same hopes, the same religious views, teach them the reason of the faith that is in them; and if you would have them join with you in your worship here, that they may partake of blessings hereafter, then teach them, also, every moral and religious duty, inquire respecting them at their homes, teach them the law of kindness among each other, and every where lead them to submit their wills to the will of their heavenly Father. Let the concern be to cultivate every social and religious duty in sincerity: and then, whether they have attained *much knowledge*, or *little knowledge*, so as they have in the cultivation of their minds acquired habits of industry—every apparent object in the Congregational Schools will be obtained, and it appears there will be reason to hope such education will help to fit them for the purposes of life to which it may please the great Father of all to destine them.

W.

Belief of the Patriarchs and Israelites in a Future State.

(Continued from p. 144.)

WHETHER the history of *Job* be a real or a fictitious one, the moral philosophy to be derived from it is the same: some parts are evidently figurative or dramatic. We may have heard in Christian pulpits portions introduced from this book, as indicative of the writer or the hero's disbelief of a future state. "There is hope of a tree—but man goeth down to the grave, and where is he?" But this is "wresting the Scriptures," and not explaining them; it is quoting imperfectly, or by halves, without regard to the connexion; and, therefore, such arguments are built only on the sand. "Man," says Job, "lieth down and riseth not again, till the heavens be no more;" *till then* "they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep. If a man die, shall he live again?" No, certainly, not in this world; but what follows? "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come!" But there are other passages still more explicit, without alluding to that controverted text, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Job had, upon the whole, comfortable views of the Divine providence and government, which convinced him that "the righteous should hold on his way, and he that had clean hands should wax stronger and stronger;" and induced him to cry out, in the midst of his sufferings, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him!" This text alone is in itself "an host."

Solomon, though not a prophet, was endowed with extraordinary natural powers; and, in his bright and golden days, was furnished with the most copious stores of religious wisdom. In his beautiful personification of this divine quality, *Prov. viii.* &c., he says, "Whoso findeth me, findeth life." In ch. xxiii., denouncing those that "remove the ancient land-marks, and enter the fields of the fatherless," he observes, "Their Redeemer is mighty, he shall plead their cause with thee:" and in ch. xiv. 32, "The righteous hath hope in his death!" In the book of *Ecclesiastes*, generally supposed to have been written by him, and of which it bears the strongest internal testimony, he is more precise

and emphatic: "If thou seest oppression and violent perversion of judgment, marvel not; for He that is higher than the highest regardeth it, and there be higher than they. Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, &c., but forget not that for all these things" (if misapplied and abused) "God will bring thee into judgment." And he sums up the whole in these remarkable words: "For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil."

But, in this view of the Old-Testament writers, *David* appears with a peculiar lustre. Thus, in a serene and silent midnight sky, though every star shines with a distinct flame, yet some emit a more vivid brightness, and irresistibly attract the eye of the beholder: hence the pious hymns of the royal poet will remain among the chief standards of a rational and sublime devotion to the end of time. "To the poet," says a modern lecturer,*—"To the poet ever remain the lovely forms of animate and inanimate nature; all that is interesting to humanity, to sympathy, to imagination. While there is a star in heaven, it shall speak to the poet's eye of another and a better world. In poetry is to be found a reservoir of the holier feelings of our nature. It is as a robe of light, spread over the face of things, and investing them with super-human splendour. There is in poetry a sort of *intrinsic revelation*, leading man to consider this existence as the wreck of other systems, or the germ of a future being!" But the Psalmist of Israel was a *prophet* as well as a poet and a philosopher; hence he became eminently qualified for the most profound researches into the history of Providence, the works and ways of the Almighty; for magnifying his name and celebrating his praises; and in this delightful work, when loosed from the bondage of iniquity, and rejoicing in a sense of the Divine favour and acceptance, he pours out his soul before him in the most ecstatic transports, and calls upon universal nature to unite with him in the great design. But the powers of language are exhausted before him in the prosecution

* Mr. Campbell, at the Royal Institution.

of the mighty theme! Yet what he can do, he will endeavour to perform; he will transfer, in immortal strains, from the table of his heart, to succeeding generations, the praises of the Most High; and call upon "all flesh to bless his holy name for ever and ever."

Mr. Addison observes, that the passages in Psalm xvi., relating to the Messiah, "had a present and personal sense, as well as a future and prophetic one:" for though David himself "fell on sleep and saw corruption," yet he could not consider this event as final and irreversible, for he immediately adds, "Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore;" therefore "his flesh did rest in hope." And if all this should be referred to the *Messiah* alone, it would be strange, indeed, if the Psalmist, who had such clear views of the Messiah's being raised to an immortal life, should nevertheless conclude, that this great future Prophet and Restorer, "the hope and consolation of Israel," so long waited for, should himself prove only a single and solitary instance of the Divine power and goodness in this respect; and all the people of God besides, from the beginning to the end of time, should lie down for ever in the land of silence and forgetfulness! The ideas are so absurd and incongruous, that they will not bear a moment's discussion; especially when in other psalms he is as precise and determinate on this point as words can well admit of. "Depart from evil and do good, and dwell for evermore.—Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth I can desire besides thee! My flesh and my heart shall fail, but thou art the strength of my heart and my portion for ever.—Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me!—Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints!—I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness!"

Thus it appears, as it should seem, that there are sufficient evidences in the Old Testament to prove, to the satisfaction of any reasonable inquirer, that the ancient fathers of the primi-

tive church, and their successors, believed in and expected a future state; and if the comparative silence on this important subject in the Jewish Scriptures be objected, it may be replied, (besides observing, by the way, that we are to find our religion, and not to make it,) that we are not to reject any doctrine or opinion, reasonable in itself, and honourable to the Supreme Being, on account of a comparative, or even an absolute silence in the sacred writings. We know *little* from the Bible of the state, the numbers and the orders of angels; yet who can doubt of their existence, and of their important services in the creation? A scale of beings above us, supposing the use of our faculties, being almost an intuitive proposition; as a scale below us is a matter of fact and experience. We know *nothing*, from this source, of the plurality of worlds; but every Tyro in modern philosophy can almost demonstrate the fact. And who will say, it is not as reasonable that there should be a future state, as that there should be superior orders of intelligent beings, or a plurality of worlds in the regions of immeasurable space? Doubtless, there were sceptics in the primitive churches, as well as in our Saviour's time, "who said there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit;" and who, with the rebellious Israelites, in the days of the prophet Malachi, said, "It is in vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinance, and walked mournfully before him?" But, in such evil times, "They that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name; and they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels, and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not."

But the New Testament places this subject in the most convincing point of view, so that "he may run that readeth." Our Saviour, alluding to the prophecies concerning himself, refers the unbelieving Jews to their own Scriptures, in which also they pro-

fessed to find “*eternal life* ;” and he does not deny the inference: on the contrary, concerning a resurrection, he observes to the Sadducees, that Moses himself “*shewed it at the bush, in calling the Lord the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob* ; for he is not the God of the (finally) dead, but of the living, for all live to him.” These passages need no comment: and in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the writer, enumerating the triumphs of faith in the ancient world, represents the Old-Testament saints as looking through the present transitory scene, “*for a better country, that is, a heavenly* ;” and he emphatically declares, that the only faith which can please God is that which leads not only to a belief in his existence, but also in his character and government, as “*a rewarder of those that diligently seek him* ; and he insists that the primitive believers possessed this divine principle; that they “*all died in faith* ;” not, indeed, having received the promises, but seeing them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, confessing themselves to be strangers and pilgrims on the earth.”

The notion which we have here endeavoured to disprove, hath called forth the animadversions of many eminent divines. Mr. *Robinson*, in his *Notes on Claude*, (ed. 1779, p. 132,) says, “*The present times have scarcely produced a more absurd and dangerous error than that of Bishop Warburton* ; who affirms, that ‘*the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make a part of, the Mosaic dispensation.*’” After citing some of the texts above-named, and making a few remarks, not very creditable to the sincerity of the learned prelate, he gives some extracts from eminent foreign writers, in favour of the contrary opinion; namely, “*That the patriarchal religion included the doctrine of a future state: that the Mosaic economy included the patriarchal religion: that the apostles preached ‘what was written in the law and the prophets,’ and was believed by the bulk of the Jewish people (Acts xxiv. 14, 15): that the promise of the Messiah alone included all spiritual blessings, and that the Israelites understood it so:*

that God made the Old-Testament saints fellow-heirs with the New-Testament believers, and that it is senseless and wicked to set the two dispensations at variance. *Jesus Christ*, far superior to all human glory, was known and celebrated long before he came into the world. His magnificence is of all ages. The foundations of his religion were laid with those of the world; and though not born till four thousand years from the creation, yet his history begins with that of the world. He was first preached in Paradise, the subject was continued down to Moses, and revealed still more frequently and more clearly during the reign of the law and the prophets. Behold, before his birth, the titles of his grandeur! *Jesus*, above all *Jesus* crucified, throws the brightest light upon the Old Testament. Without him the law would be a sealed book; and Judaism a confused heap of precepts and ceremonies, piled up without meaning. On the contrary, how beautiful is the history of the people of God, and all their worship, when the cross is the key! It is *one whole*, the different parts of which relate to the same end. It is a long allegory of Divine wisdom. It is an edifice which God himself hath founded and insensibly raised, with a design of placing upon the top the cross of his Son!”

Let us not, therefore, represent the God of grace, “*the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*,” as in opposition to the God of nature, or to “*the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob* ;” for these “*are not three Gods, but one God*,”—one in name, one in nature, one in person, one in power and glory! Who, though he varies his dispensations to his rational offspring, according to their different situations and circumstances, talents and capacities, which are ordered “*after the counsel of his own will* ;” is himself “*without variableness or shadow of turning* ;” Who “*hateth nothing which he hath made* ;” nor expects “*to reap where he hath not sown, or to gather where he hath not strewed* ;” with whom is “*no respect of persons*,” but who “*judgeth according to every man’s work* ;” and who, with regard to the leading and essential principles of all true religion, “*hath never left himself without wit-*

ness;" but, in different degrees, "enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world."

AN OCCASIONAL READER.

Kiddermminster,
April 12, 1822.

SIR,

ALTHOUGH I entertain a very high respect for Mr. Belsham's learning, judgment and integrity, and greatly esteem the rich and glowing sentiments concerning the unity and glorious perfections of the Divine Majesty which appear in a sermon he has lately published; [see Mon. Repos. XVII. 111, &c.] yet I cannot concur with him in some of the ideas he has advanced respecting the contents of the first chapter of the book of Genesis, commonly called the Mosaic account of the creation. He considers the narrative to be philosophically wrong, or inconsistent with the system of nature, as demonstrated by modern philosophy; and I cannot but regret that such a decided opinion has proceeded from a person of his merited theological and literary eminence. If the contents of this chapter be thus erroneous, they certainly could not have been communicated by divine inspiration to Adam, or any of his posterity, and transmitted from that sacred origin to Moses; nor could they have been imparted by the Creator immediately to him or any other writer. And as it must be utterly impossible that any human being could know what transactions occurred before the human race had existence, without being favoured with such inspiration, the whole narrative can be nothing else than the effusion of man's imagination, which might have been conveyed from one generation to another as a tradition of the primitive age; and which may now be admired for its high antiquity, and regarded as a curiosity for the singular information it gives of the false philosophical opinions of that early period of the world, but cannot be venerated as a part of divine revelation, for which it has been generally esteemed both by Jews and Christians. My design is not to consider the question whether or not there be discordances in the former chapters of this book, tending to prove

that it is a compilation of different documents; nor to offer any remarks on the variations in the Divine name, adduced as evidences against the prophet Moses' being the author of the whole book of Genesis, as the need of them is superseded by the ingenious observations of Ben David, and the quotations he has made from Essenus, which appeared in a late Repository [pp. 24—26, 95—98]. My object is to state the view I entertain of the first chapter of this book, as containing natural philosophy consistent with the discoveries of modern ages, in the hope it may contribute to convince some of your readers of its correctness, and help to confirm the belief of its having proceeded from the infinite Fountain of wisdom and truth.

An attention to this chapter, with a desire, I own, to retain it as a valuable and important part of the Holy Scriptures, has led me to believe that it is a mistaken sentiment, though commonly conceived, that the process represented to have been the employment of six days, includes the primitive creation of the world, which appears to have been prior to their commencement. In the first sentence of the chapter we read, *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth*, or the luminaries of the etherial space, usually termed the firmament, (but in a sense different from the etymology of this word,) and this terraqueous globe. Understanding the word *beginning* to mean anterior to the measured time of this world, the sentence appears to be a proem to what succeeds, and entirely distinct from it, declaring all the existing worlds in the universe to be the product of God's almighty power in a former period, without stating the mode in which the creative energy was exerted, or the duration of the process; which, for aught we know, may have comprehended millions of such spaces of time as we denominate ages. If what is contained in this declarative introduction were included in the narrative of six days, then the natural order would have been to begin with a particular representation of the heavens, or heavenly luminaries, as having been first mentioned, and as claiming priority in the account for their stupendous grandeur; whereas it begins with the

original state of the earth, and no further notice is taken of these luminaries until the fourth day is described, and not, I conceive, as being then created, but as having their regular functions assigned to them relative to the earth. It seems that at the commencement of this process the earth was a dark, chaotic mass, completely covered with water, and encompassed with air. *The breath of God*, a form of expression denoting an abundant treasure of air, *brooded upon the face of the water*. This incumbent air must have been a comparatively dense fluid, and perfectly still, before the properties of elasticity and expansion were given to it, to counteract the earth's gravitating power, which must have been coeval with its existence; and before the laws of humidity and motion were superadded, for accomplishing the uses designed by Unlimited Intelligence.

The first employment of the Divine wisdom and power was causing light upon the earth: *God said, Let there be light, and there was light*. It is not conceivable that the Creator spoke this or any other sentence to himself, or uttered such words to any lifeless substance which he had previously made; but this is obviously a most sublime mode of declaring the production of light by almighty energy, as the instantaneous effect of the Divine volition. That this might have been caused without the sun's beams, as Mr. Friend suggests, [Mon. Repos. XVI. 647,] cannot be denied, but it is not probable that such was the light here intended. So great an abundance of the electric fluid and of hydrogen might have been evolved from the world, as would have served for irradiating its surface for all the duration that the six days comprise; but this could not strictly have constituted the day. *God saw the light that it was good, and separated the light from the darkness; and he called the light day, and the darkness he called night*. It was, therefore, by the rays of the sun that the Almighty caused the earth to be enlightened, and heated for exhalation, or extended the solar light through the etherial region of ninety-five millions of miles. Thus he commanded the exercise of that power, which he afterwards established as a great law of nature, which

illuminates our world, and is essential to its being a fit dwelling-place for living creatures.

The second day's work is thus described: *Let there be an expanse amidst the waters, which may divide the water from the water*. This has been supposed to imply that the writer was so egregiously deluded as to conceive the heavenly canopy, to which was applied the term *firmament*, from the Latin translation of the Greek word *σφαιρωμα*, in the Septuagint, to be a solid, bespangled arch or vault, sustaining a reservoir of water for supplying rain to the earth; but such an irrational conceit was, I imagine, as distant from the mind of Moses, as it is from the astronomy of the present age. The Divine enactment, denoted by the words, *Let there be an expanse*, seems to have been the spreading upwards the vast volume of air which lay brooding on the face of the water, so as to form an elastic, expanded atmosphere as now existing, and which God called *heaven*, which must mean the lower heaven. This expanse is said to be amidst the waters, and such is the reality; for, besides the visible aqueous vapours that compose the floating clouds, the atmosphere holds, as a component part, a vast quantum of liquid in gaseous solution, its particles being extremely attenuated by the chemical union of caloric; which is rendered evident in dry, sultry weather by a metallic surface, reduced to a temperature below that of the atmosphere, when the surrounding air will, by parting with a portion of its caloric to restore an equilibrium in the metal, release the liquid, which will appear in a state of condensation. And if so small a quantity of air is found to have contained so much moisture, what a vast abundance of volatilized water may be supposed to occupy the immense circumference of the atmosphere, encompassing the globe to the height of many leagues, and which gives to the clear sky its beautiful azure aspect. If all this rarified vapour were to be condensed by Omnipotence, and united with the oceans of the earth, there would then be water enough to drown the whole world, for it would bring the earth back to its primeval state, before the copious evaporations reduced the terraqueous waters, and

charged the atmosphere—as a single drop which God created could never have been annihilated except by his own power. The great utility of this economy of nature is as obvious as its existence is apparent. Without such a vast solution of water combined with the air, there could not be those reflections and refractions of the solar rays which are of the utmost importance to vision. And if the atmosphere were to be divested of its humidity, or of a large proportion of what it now contains, it would not only be defective for the sight of objects at any distance not exposed to the direct beams of the sun, but it would be unsuitable on account of its aridity for the functions of animal life as at present constituted. Thus, then, on the second day were instituted, by Infinite Wisdom, some at least of the curious and wonderful principles on which the science of optics depends, and the pneumatic laws enacted that are necessary for rendering the atmosphere subservient to the purposes of light, which are necessary also for exciting and controlling the occasional agitations of the air, or the winds, and which are essential to the support and preservation of the vegetable and animal productions which the all-wise Creator designed.

The third day's account presents the disposal of the waters that remained on the face of the earth after the atmosphere had been sufficiently replenished with moisture, and determining what portions of the world should be the dry land. *Let the waters below the expanse be gathered together in one place, and let the dry land appear. And let the earth bring forth grass, &c.* It may be properly supposed, that on this day there was not merely a separation of the land and water, which of itself would have left the latter a stagnant mass, except as it might be disturbed by gales of wind, but that the ocean was saturated with salt for securing it from putrefaction, and its regular motions begun; and that the land was made fit for the uses intended, those occult principles ordained which guide chemical affinities and combinations in the formation of secondary rocks, crystallizations and minerals; fertility given to the soil of the earth; and the laws of vegetation established, which direct

the various selections of proper mucilage, and all the astonishing chemical transmutations that compose vegetable substances in their indescribable variety.

The narrative given of the fourth day relates to the celestial ordinances, and the institution of the periodical seasons; and this, in general estimation, is attended with as great, if not greater, difficulty than any other part of this sacred history. As the statement is commonly received, it appears to represent all the celestial luminaries as having been created in one day, while as many as five days were employed in creating the earth and adjusting its appendages. This being so highly improbable, has caused the whole narration to be discredited as a fiction of human device, and repugnant to enlightened reason. But if the idea before expressed be just, concerning the first verse, that *God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning*, or that this original creation of worlds is to be understood as having been antecedent to the commencement of the six days, then this account of the fourth day can have no such meaning as has been commonly supposed; but, on the contrary, it declares what is agreeable to facts and perfectly right. The Common Version begins the narrative of the fourth day with—*God said, Let there be lights in the firmament*, which imports that the celestial luminaries were first brought into existence on this fourth day; but the Hebrew words have a signification that obviates this opinion which reason and science pronounce to be erroneous, *יהי מארת ברקיע השמים*. *Let the lights in the expanse of the heavens be*, and the Greek Version in the Septuagint will admit of the same rendering, *Γενηθητωσαν φωστρες εν τω στερωματι τῶ ορανοῦ εἰς φευσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. So translated, the passage will read, consistently with probability, *Let the lights*, so called because they had been shining to the earth during the three preceding days, *in the expanse of the heavens, be to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and season, and times and years*: evidently meaning, that the luminaries before created were then permanently appointed to these uses. The remaining verses, which describe this fourth day, have the appearance of a paren-

thesis, declaring particularly what were the luminaries which the Most High had made, and the respective uses assigned to them in the great machinery of the universe. Even upon the hypothesis that the Jewish prophet intended here to speak respecting the original creation of these lights in the heavens, the importance of the subject would sufficiently account for such a recurrence to it by a repetition of the assertion, no less true than grand, that the hosts of heaven were all the work of the one infinite and everlasting Being. But as he does not here employ the verb *בָּרָא*, as in the first verse, which signifies bringing into existence, but another word, which means to prepare, on which there will be occasion to insist further under another passage, there is good reason to conclude that to speak of their creation was not his design, but only of their allotted functions with respect to the earth. Ver. 16: *God prepared, or adapted, two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night, and the stars also.* That is, the sun to regulate the day, and the moon, and also the stars, to regulate the night, by causing their rays, whether primary or reflected, to reach the earth, which could no more have been without being caused by the Divine power, than these luminaries could have created themselves. The word, in ver. 17, which is translated *set*,—*God set them in the firmament of heaven*,—seems, according to this version, to import that these shining bodies were studded in a concave solidity, or at least that they were then first placed in their respective stations; but this is not its true signification. This verb, *נָתַן*, means *gave* or *appointed*, and being thus read, it is in full accordance with the foregoing remarks concerning their prior creation. *And God gave, or appointed, them in the expanse of the heavens*, signifying that he decreed what offices they should perform to the earth, which is supported by the prophecy of Jeremiah, xxxi. 35, where the same Hebrew verb is used, and properly construed—*Thus saith Jehovah, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night.* And the same sentiment is expressed by the Psalmist, though he

employs another word, Psalm lxxiv. 16, *Thou hast prepared the light and the sun.* It has been already observed, that the light of the sun was brought to the earth on the first of the six days, and motion must have been then given to it to produce the alternations of morning and evening, or of day and night, which the Creator was pleased to ordain, apparently for measuring the periods of his own proceedings, to become the subjects of future record, that the generations of men may know who hath done all these things; but on the fourth day he permanently established the great laws of nature, by the operation of which the transmission of light from the sun is continued, and the lunations are governed which cause the solar rays to be reflected on the earth at stated times, and occasion the ebbing and flowing of the tides of the ocean. By the appointments of this day also the diurnal rotations of the earth were perpetuated for continuing the changes of day and night; and its annual revolutions for producing the alternate seasons of the year, and marking the progress of time, which could not have been the order of nature if the world had remained stationary as when it was first commanded into existence, or if the Divine power had not superadded to the creation of the earth the cardinal laws of nature, which impel its daily motion and annual course.

The fifth day's work was the formation of sentient creatures; fishes to occupy the waters; and the feathered race to fly in the atmosphere, called the expanse of heaven. Anterior to the foregoing adjustments and preparations there was not a spark of animal life connected with this rolling planet; not a single rational inhabitant to survey and admire the beauteous works of God; not a quadruped trod the ground, not a bird winged the air, nor a fish finned the water; not even a reptile nor an insect existed in either province of nature; but all that had been hitherto created was unperceptive, inanimate matter, and but for the vivifying energy of that Being who is alone eternal and self-existent, the world must have remained in lifeless silence for ever. Ver. 20: *And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the*

earth in the open expanse of heaven. It is observable in the Scriptures, that the term heaven has several distinct significations, which are worthy of being noticed. These are three: the highest or *third heaven*, which is the celestial abode of the Almighty, or where his glory is more immediately manifested; 1 Kings xxii. 19; Job xxii. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 3: called also *heaven of heavens*, 1 Kings viii. 27. The second heaven, which is the magnificent region of the planetary orbits and of the fixed stars, which are called *the host of heaven*, and *the ordinances of heaven*, Deut. xvii. 3; Jer. xxxiii. 25. And the lower heaven, in which are clouds, rain, dew, snow and winds; Dan. vii. 2; Gen. vii. 11, xxvii. 28; Isaiah lv. 10; Dan. vii. 13; and in which the fowls fly as their proper element. A due attention to these distinctions is needful for understanding the several uses of the term in this chapter, as in the 1st, 14th, 15th and 17th verses, it means the second heaven, or all the luminaries which it contains; and in the 8th, 20th and 30th, it signifies the lower heaven, or, as it is translated in the last of these verses, *the air*, with all that appertains to it as a necessary appurtenance of the earth.

The atmosphere and waters having been supplied with suitable tenants, it remained on the sixth day to provide appropriate animals to inhabit the dry land. Ver. 24: *And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, and cattle after their kind, &c.* Whether the divers sorts of creatures were produced for these different departments of nature, the water, the air, and the land, by the transformation of materials previously existing, or by being immediately created, which the Hebrew suggests to have been the case with some, they minister to the glory of the Supreme Being, whose plastic might instantly produced what his incomprehensibly intelligent and benevolent will designed. Their production in such innumerable genuses and tribes, all so admirably framed in their anatomy, so aptly compacted in their forms, exquisitely organized in their systems, and endowed with senses, instincts and sagacities so accurately adapted to their various stations; fitted for securing their safety and supplying

their wants, and suited to the enjoyment of the life they received; together with the enactment of the laws of their respective natures for perpetuating the existence of each species of these sensitive beings through all successive ages—most strikingly evince the infinite skill, beneficence and power of their great Creator. And last of all were mankind brought into existence in the Divine image, *male and female created he them*, in whose formation were combined the most curious organic constructions and wonderful contrivances belonging to those animals which had been before produced. And, in addition to the excellencies of their corporeal frames, they were endued with intellectual faculties, that not only qualified for all beneficial temporal purposes, but were also susceptible of high improvement; such as capacitate the human race, in every age, for contemplating and adoring the perfections of their glorious Maker, for reflecting on their peculiar moral obligations, cherishing a consciousness of responsibility, and anticipating immortal life. Invested with these mental powers, were the first parents of mankind distinguished for a most decided pre-eminence over all other animated natures, in dignity, adaptation for usefulness and capability of happiness, and constituted the glories of God's terrestrial creation.

The whole of this account of rendering our world a proper abode for living creatures, and especially for the human race, unquestionably written in that early period when knowledge had made but small advances towards the comparative maturity of the present age, is so consistent with the appearances of nature, so analogous to principles which the understanding and experience of cultivated ages have demonstrated and confirmed, and so far superior to every representation of the origin of nature given in remote times by unassisted reason, or philosophical science in the mere light of nature, that I conceive there cannot be a more rational conclusion than that it was the result of a divine communication to a favoured prophet. This belief, too, is so much in harmony with the divine legation of Moses, with the sanctity of the Jewish dispensation, and with the heavenly authenticity of the Christian revela-

tion, that it is, in my view, highly desirable it should have a firmly-established credence in the minds of all the adherents to Christianity. If we conclude the Mosaic narrative, or what is commonly esteemed such, to be incompatible with the system of nature as elucidated by science, must not that confidence in the truth of its theology be greatly enfeebled, which a belief in its historical accuracy will at least tend to strengthen and confirm? And viewing this account as false in its detail, how are we to regard the language of the Decalogue given to the Hebrew nation, as proceeding from the Supreme Potentate, wherein his resting from his six days' work is assigned as a reason for the sanctity of the seventh, which was appointed to be the Sabbath? Exod. xx. 11: *For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is, &c.* If the representation in the first chapter of Genesis, concerning the divine transactions during six days be fictitious, which it certainly must be, if not correct in its philosophical statements, then the declaration here evidently alluding to it, and not merely implying its verity, but positively adopting it as sacred truth, must also be of the same spurious character. On the contrary, if, as Moses asserts, Exod. xx. 1, *God spake all these words*, then the relation given of the six days and their occurrences, must be a description of certain facts and realities, which cannot be disbelieved without the authenticity of the whole Levitical economy being rendered disputable, and the credibility of the gospel revelation being seriously affected and impaired. But it may be alleged, as a supposed refutation of the theory which I am attempting to support, that in this passage of the Decalogue, as it stands recorded in Exodus, Jehovah is said to have *made* the heavens and the earth in six days. It is to be again remarked, that though *made* is the word used in the English Version, yet the Hebrew verb, so translated in this and various other instances, is not, as in Gen. i. 1, *אֵלֵּם*, which means to create in the strictest sense, or to bring from nothing; but *עָשָׂה*, as in the 16th verse, which signifies to make in the sense of fashion-

ing or preparing. Thus, in this book of Moses, Gen. vi. 14, *Make thee an ark of Gopher wood*; and ch. xxxv. 3, *I will make there an altar unto God*, the same verb is used, and obviously in the sense of making fit or fashioning; as the materials already existed which were to be fashioned into new forms, or prepared for the specified purposes. The word having this signification in the Decalogue makes it confirmatory of what has been advanced respecting the six days, and the employment of the Divine wisdom and power in these first divisions of time. *In six days Jehovah prepared, or adjusted, the heavens and the earth.* This Hebrew verb appears also in Gen. i. 31, and repeatedly in the beginning of the second chapter, and in the 3d verse both of these words are used, and so as to shew their distinct significations: *He rested from all the works which he had created and prepared.* They appear likewise in the prophecy of Isaiah with the same meanings; ch. xlv. 18: *Thus saith Jehovah, who created the heavens, God himself, who formed the earth and prepared it.* And Jeremiah, using the latter word, says, ch. x. 12, *He hath prepared the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and stretched out the heaven by his discretion.*

Moses does not, indeed, declare that he received the knowledge which his account conveys immediately from God, nor to whom it was originally imparted; but this silence cannot be justly considered as sufficient to invalidate its divine authenticity. If the narrative contain what may be fairly deemed internal evidence of divine inspiration, this is equivalent to any assertion to that effect, if not of greater validity, especially when corroborated by other sacred documents. With such testimony, which is not wanting if the foregoing observations be well-founded, it is perceived as the pole-star of revelation, not only elevating the intellectual views with regard to the wisdom, goodness and power of the one eternal Deity, as employed in the creation of the universal system with its countless worlds, and in the excellent adjustment and preparation of our own for the uses intended; but it further prepares the

attentive mind for rightly receiving those irrefragable proofs of the Divine benevolence to his human offspring, which not only nature proclaims, but the Scriptures largely describe; and for regarding their allusions to it as just sanctions to its holy verity and worth. Besides the several instances in the Psalms of evident reference to this introduction of the sacred writings, the prophets allude to its descriptions; and their sublime celebrations of the attributes of God, as displayed in his works, tend to attest that the Mosaic account was the source of their information, and to certify that it was believed by them to contain an unquestionably true statement of the origin of nature. The same valid sanction is given to the truth of this primitive record by the various indirect allusions to its contents by our Saviour and his apostles, for it is not credible that they would have referred to it in a manner that would be liable to be understood as implying their persuasion of the reality of its representations, if they had viewed the narrative as being in any respect fabulous. Thus, then, unless I am much mistaken, the first chapter of Genesis briefly, but truly and faithfully, portrays the institution of those principles and laws which originated in unerring wisdom and unbounded benevolence, and are invested with never-failing efficacy to perform the goodwill of God; and every season of the year, yea every revolving day, bears a

renewed and ample testimony to their being the well-adapted means of his superintending and bountiful providence, which upholdeth nature in pristine vigour, and giveth life and breath, and all things conducive to the general welfare and happiness of his creatures.
RICHARD FRY.

SIR,
I HAVE been much gratified by a perusal of the Sketch of Eichhorn's "Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament," given in the last volume of the Monthly Repository, and cannot help thinking that it would contribute to gratify the curiosity of many of your readers, if the same gentleman to whom we are indebted for that sketch, or any other person who possesses a competent knowledge of the German language, would furnish a translation of the 426th Section, which contains an outline of the author's theory respecting the origin of the Book of Genesis, and a statement of the reasons by which he has been guided in assigning the different portions of that Book to the documents from which he supposes them to have been respectively taken.

If my own acquaintance with the German had been more intimate than it is, so as to have given me confidence in making such a translation, I should have been glad to have supplied what I am now under the necessity of asking as a favour.

R. W.

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.

(Concluded from p. 164.)

Year of Admission.	Name.	Remarks.
1779, d.	Thomas Hawkes, Penn Benjamin. — Shattock, m.	a manufacturer at Birmingham.
1780,	Nicholas Thos. Heinekin, m. — Noon, m. d. Mordaunt Crachcrode, m.	Ware—Brentford—Gainsborough—Bradford in Yorkshire. Lambrook. no very distant relation of the celebrated Prebendary of Westminster, who assisted to support him at the Academy; died on the road as he was going to preach a lecture.

List of Students educated at Mr. Coward's Academy, Daventry. 285

Year of Admission.	Name.	Remarks.
1780,	Eliezer Cogan, m.	Cirencester; removed to Ware to assist in a school; afterwards opened a school himself at Enfield; removed to Cheshunt; became minister of a congregation settled at Walthamstow: one of the most learned of the Dissenting Ministers of his day; his merits gradually became very conspicuous; and his school very prosperous; half-brother to the celebrated Dr. Thomas Cogan, one of the founders of the Humane Society, author of Travels on the Rhine, and of various Treatises on Metaphysics, Ethics and Theology.
	Ebenezer Beasley, m.	Uxbridge; where he keeps a very respectable school.
	John Wainewright, Esq.	solicitor, Furnival's Inn.
	d. John Rodick,	took orders, and held a living near Wellingborough.
	Charles Frederick Bond,	took orders, and held a living in Essex.
At the end of the Session, in June 1781, Mr. ROBINS resigned the office of Principal and Theological Tutor, on account of the loss of his voice, and was succeeded in September following by the Rev. THOMAS BELSHAM, under whose superintendence the following pupils entered the Academy.		
1781,	Samuel Pett, M. D.	settled first at Plymouth, and afterwards at Clapton, where he practises with a very high degree of reputation and success.
1782,	Roger Ward, m.	Kidderminster, as master of Mr. Pearsall's school; preaches at Bromsgrove.
	d. John Graham, Esq.	died young.
	Reader Wainewright, Esq.	London; barrister at law.
	Jeremiah Olive, Esq.	London; wine merchant; Bank Director.
	John Merrick, m.	Stamford; became a tutor in the family of Benjamin Vaughan, Esq., M. P., whose sister he afterwards married, and settled at Hallowell, in the State of Maine, in North America.
1783,	Isaac Cook, m.	Narborough.
	William Allard, m.	Rotherham—Bury, Lancashire.
	John Holland, m.	Bolton.
	d. John Jenkins,	drowned in his passage to the East Indies.
	Thomas Smith,	of Yorkshire; staid only three months.
	d. Edmund Butcher, m.	London, Leather Lane—Sidmouth.
	Robert Kell, m.	Wareham—Nottingham—Birmingham.
	Benjamin Kingsbury, m.	Warwick; left the ministry and went into trade.
	John Corrie, m., F. R. S.	removed to Hackney College; became Classical Tutor; removed to Birmingham, and opened a respectable institution for young gentlemen; elected minister of the Old Meeting, which, to the great regret of the congregation, he was soon compelled to resign, on account of ill health.
	d. William Hawker, Esq.	a youth from the Warrington Academy; who died in May, 1784, before the close of the Session.
	Richard Chapman, Esq.	merchant, London.
	Josiah Cottin, Esq.	a colonel in the army.
	d. Joseph Shrimpton, Esq.	London.
	John Davis, m.	seceder from Caermarthen—Collumpton.
1784, d.	John Yerbury, Esq.	Shire Hampton, near Bristol.
	Thomas Reynell, m.	Crediton; left the ministry and entered into business.
	Thomas Davis, m.	soon left the ministry and was called to the bar.
	d. George Hodgkins, m.	from Caermarthen Academy—Stoke Newington.
	Thomas Johnston, m.	Wakefield.
	James Scott, m.	Cradley—Stourbridge.

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

Year of Admission.	Name.	Remarks.
1784,	John Kentish, m.	removed to Hackney College—Plymouth Dock—Hackney; colleague with Mr. Belsham at the Gravel Pit—St. Thomas's, Southwark—New Meeting, Birmingham, lately under Dr. Priestley; a most flourishing society.
	d. John Fletcher, m.	Chosen to Plymouth Dock; died of an apoplexy soon after he had finished his studies, and before he reached his destination.
	William Peard Jillard,	quitted the ministry; carried on a brewery at Old Down, near Bath.
	Thomas Smith, Esq.	of Easton Grey, near Tetbury.
	Ibbetson Fenton, Esq.	
	Christopher Mitchelson,	of Berwick-upon-Tweed; obliged to desist from his studies on account of ill health.
1785,	— Goothridge, Esq.	Hitchin, Herts.
	William Shepherd, m.	removed to Hackney College—Gateacre—Lancashire; highly distinguished as an eloquent leader of the popular party at Liverpool.
	Theophilus Harris, m.	America.
	— Gardner, m.	
	Thomas Moore, m.	Dartmouth—Kingswood—London.
	Thomas Sanderson, Esq.	Chowbent.
	d. John Evans,	from Hoxton; died before he finished his studies.
	George Lee, m.	from Hoxton—Belper—Hull.
1786, d.	John Edwards, m.	from Hoxton—Warwick—Gateacre—Birmingham New Meeting—London: a lecturer (at the Old Jewry) one season; drowned in bathing near Wareham.
	d. George Wiche, m.	from Hoxton—Monton, near Manchester; went to America, and died of yellow fever.
	d. Thomas Patterson, m.	from Hoxton—Daventry—Ashby de la Zouch.
	d. Daniel Wright, Esq.	Bristol.
	John Kettle, Esq.	Birmingham.
	Thomas Keay, Esq.	Whitchurch.
	Israel Worsley, m.	Dunkirk, escaped with difficulty—Lincoln—Plymouth.
	Samuel Palmer, m.	son of the Rev. J. S. Palmer of Hackney; keeps a flourishing school at Chigwell.
	John Williams, m.	Uffcombe—Norton—Halifax—Mansfield; a student first at Caermarthen, afterwards at Hoxton, then at Daventry; keeps a respectable school at Mansfield.
	Jonathan Eade, Esq.	
	John Finch Simpson, Esq.	Launde Abbey, Leicestershire.
	John Willett, m.	
	John Norris, m.	
	d. George Moore,	left the Academy before he had finished his studies.
	William Morgan, m.	
	Oliver Bernard Galvez Jacinto Procopio Pollock, Esq.	of New Orleans.
	Malachi Blake, M. D.	Taunton.
	Joseph Bond, Esq.	banker, London.
	d. John Humphreys, Esq.	died at Northumberland in North America.
1787,	Benjamin Davis, m.	Chowbent; settled with a large and flourishing congregation of well-informed Unitarians.
	William Priestley,	second son of Dr. Priestley, America.
	Samuel Heineken, Esq.	
	Thomas Kinder, Esq.	Stoke Newington.
	William Busk, Esq.	London.
	Hans Busk, Esq.	London.
	Thomas Warwick, m., M.D.	Rotherham—Manchester.
	William Stevenson, m.	Classical Tutor at Manchester; private secretary to Lord Lauderdale.

Year of Admission.	Names.	Remarks.
1787,	John Tingcomb, m.	Plymouth—Newport—Isle of Wight—Bridge-water.
	d. David Jardine, m.	Bath; highly respected; died of an apoplexy before he was thirty.
	d. T. Porter, m.	highly acceptable; settled at Plymouth Dock; wrote an able defence of Unitarianism against Dr. Hawker; suddenly deserted the ministry, and emigrated to America.

N. B. Messrs. Jardine and Porter left the Academy at Homerton to finish their studies at Daventry.

1788,	Samuel Rickards, Esq.	London.
	William Field, m.	from Homerton—Warwick.
	John Warren, Esq.	London.
	Daniel Lister, Esq.	Hackney.
	John Reid, M. D.	Grenville Street, London.
	Lockhart Johnstone, Esq.	Worcester.
	Sparrow Stovin, Esq.	
	d. R. Raymond, Esq.	
	Edward Barron, Esq.	Norwich.
	Arthur Aikin, Esq.	Shrewsbury—York; left the ministry, and is now the very ingenious and scientific Secretary to the Society of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce.
	— Oakden, Esq.	Daventry.

In June 1789, the Rev. THOMAS BELSHAM resigned his situation as Tutor, on account of the change which had taken place in his theological sentiments: and the Academy was soon afterwards removed to Northampton, and placed under the care of the Rev. John Horsey.

N. B. The account of the Academy under Dr. ASHWORTH, to the year 1766, is compiled chiefly from a paper communicated to me by the late Rev. JOHN COLE, of Wolverhampton. The remainder is taken from my own memorandums and recollections. Mr. COLE's account was compared and corrected by Dr. ASHWORTH's ledger.

T. B.

SIR,

April 7, 1822.

AS your learned correspondent, Mr. Cogan, has been kind enough to notice (p. 210) the inquiries which I lately made, through the medium of the Monthly Repository, (p. 76,) respecting the construction and interpretation of John xxi. 15, I beg leave, through the same medium, to state how far his observations appear to me to affect the interpretation in favour of which I have decided. "If," says he, "the sense were, 'Lovest thou *me* more than these?' the Greek ought to have been, *αγαπᾷς ἐμε πλεῖον τῶν*." This remark, it will be observed, applies to two out of the three interpretations which have been given of this passage: "Lovest thou *me* more than thou lovest *these things*?" viz., the instruments employed in thy trade as a fisherman; and, "Lovest thou *me* more than thou lovest *these*

thy fellow-disciples?" Of course, therefore, it reflects upon the accuracy of Whitby, Pearce, Campbell, and all commentators who have adopted or admitted the possibility of either of these interpretations. But I am far from being convinced that *με* is never used in cases of opposition by the writers of the New Testament. That a comparison or a contrast is more strongly marked by *ἐμου*, *ἐμοι* and *ἐμε*, than by *μου*, *μοι* and *με*, I am well aware; but that the authors of the New Testament have uniformly attended to this distinction is by no means evident. Take the following passages as examples: "*He that cometh after me* is mightier than *I*:" *ισχυροτερος μου*. Matt. iii. 11; see also Mark i. 7. "*My Father* is greater than *I*:" *μειζων μου*. John xiv. 28. "Why callest thou *me* (*με*) good? *None* is good *but one*, that is *God*." Matt. xix. 17; see also Mark x. 18,

and Luke xviii. 19. "If ye had known *me*, ($\mu\epsilon$,) ye should have known *my Father*." John xiv. 7. "He that loveth *me*, ($\mu\epsilon$,) shall be loved of *my Father*." Ver. 21. "As the Father hath loved *me*, ($\mu\epsilon$,) so have I loved *you*." John xv. 9. "Ye have not chosen *me*, ($\mu\epsilon$,) but I have chosen *you*." Ver. 16.

"But," says your correspondent, "suppose the sense to be, 'Lovest thou me more than *these* love me?' the Greek is correct." Whatever the drift of our Lord's question may have been, it was far from my intention to deny the correctness of the Greek; for though the passage is now wrapt up in obscurity and ambiguity, owing to the imperfection of written language, it was no doubt painfully intelligible to the apostle when first uttered, and accompanied with a tone and gesture calculated to give it the intended effect. I merely observed that it was *usual*, when there was a strong opposition, to mark that opposition by inserting the pronoun; and gave this as a reason, not for denying the possibility, but for questioning the probability of the correctness of Doddridge's interpretation. I will now venture to add, that, if this had been the sense intended, the other apostles who were present, justly anxious to remove the imputation of being less zealous and sincere than Peter in their attachment to Jesus, would have been unanimous in endeavouring to free themselves from the consequences involved in such a comparison. When Christ said, during the last Supper, in the presence of the twelve, "Verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me," they "began *every one of them* to say unto him, Lord, is it I?" evidently with a view of eliciting some remark which would lead to their exculpation: and it appears to me highly reasonable to conclude, that a similar effort would have been made in the case supposed, to place their attachment to Jesus above the possibility of suspicion. But, as it is possible that I may still labour under some misconception respecting the passage which it has been the object of this and my former communication to illustrate, I shall still feel obliged to Mr. Cogan or any other reader of the Mon. Repos., who

will be kind enough to offer some further remarks upon the subject.

O. P. Q.

SIR,
THE communication of your correspondent T. F. B., in your last Number, (p. 211,) brought forcibly to my mind an observation which I had made to a friend not a week ago, which was, that the Unitarians, while they have endeavoured to shew the absurdity of the popular doctrine of the atonement, have not sufficiently urged upon the public the true interpretation of the phraseology on which it is founded. This interpretation will, I conceive, be found in the Sermons of the late Mr. Kenrick. This able and excellent man has satisfactorily shewn, "that the death or blood of Christ has no efficacy in removing moral guilt, but that, whenever it is spoken of as procuring the forgiveness of sin, it relates entirely to restoration to a sanctified or privileged state, which in the language of both the Old and New Testament on many occasions is expressed by the forgiveness of sins." Sermon XIV. Vol. I.

Thirty years ago I was led to doubt whether the death of Christ and the forgiveness of sin (in the usual sense of this expression) were ever associated in the minds of the apostles, and Mr. K.'s Sermons have convinced me that my doubts were not groundless. To many, I am aware this declaration will appear strange, and will seem to indicate a wish to dispose of a plain Scripture doctrine by any expedient. Against strong prejudices it is not easy to reason with effect; I would, however, just suggest to such persons the advantages which attend the above-stated hypothesis. In the first place, it is founded upon a *truly scriptural interpretation* of Scripture phraseology. In the second place, it gives a view of the consequences of the death of Christ which is conformable *to fact*. In the third place, it is free from the difficulties which encumber every scheme of the atonement which the advocates of this doctrine have hitherto been able to devise.

While I have my pen in my hand, I will make a remark or two upon an observation which I met with the other day in the Quarterly Review, and which

the Reviewer considers as very admirable and important; namely, that God is revealed to us not as he is *absolutely* and in himself, but as he is *relatively* to us who are his creatures. I am not deep in these mysteries; but I presume that the observation is intended to intimate, that we must not reason from the Divine attributes as made known to us in Scripture, to the measures of the Divine administration. If such be its object, it might as well have been spared. For, in the first place, it is altogether gratuitous. In the next place, God cannot be imagined to possess absolutely any attributes which stand opposed to those which he possesses in relation to his creatures. And, consequently, if we know what God is in relation to mankind, we can reason with the same certainty and confidence respecting the measures of his government, as if we thoroughly understood what he is absolutely and in himself. If, for instance, we are assured that God is infinitely or (as the Reviewer would say) *perfectly* good in relation to man, we know just as well what to expect at his hands, as if goodness were proved to constitute his moral nature and essence. In a word, unless revelation be intended to mislead and deceive, God can be nothing absolutely which will not allow him to be, in his dealings towards his creatures, what he has declared himself to be.

E. COGAN.

May 1, 1822.

Contributions to Scriptural Criticism—
— *quodcunque potest.*

LEV. xxvi. 34, 43. [2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.] “Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths.” This language is sometimes interwoven with modern thanksgivings for ~~days~~ of sacred rest. In such an adaptation of it, however, there can be no propriety. The phrase expresses a curse, and not a blessing: it signifies, that the ground was to lie fallow through long years of captivity and desolation; and in these circumstances the ordinances of religion, the weekly sabbaths, could scarcely, if at all, be celebrated.

Psalm i. 3. * “— whatsoever he

doeth shall prosper.” I adopt the rendering proposed, in MS., by a scholar of considerable taste and learning,* and read, “it shall bring to maturity whatsoever it beareth.” *Merrick*, in his Notes on the Psalms, endeavours to justify the received translation of this clause, and to shew, by means of quotations from Greek and Roman authors, that there is nothing unusual in appropriating to the *subject* of a comparison expressions which had been employed just before in the comparison itself. The fact, which he takes so much pains to establish, is readily admitted. Yet from this admission it does not, of necessity, follow either that the words before us contain an example of the practice, or that *all* his citations are pertinent. In the fourth and fifth verses the respective situations of the righteous man and of *the ungodly*, are placed in contrast with each other, under *similitudes*, borrowed from natural objects: nor does it appear reasonable to believe, that within so short a compass a transition would suddenly be made to a different figure of poetry. The annotator is not happy in his reference to Virgil, *Æn.* IV. 300, &c.:

“Sævit inops animi, totamque incensa
per urbem
Bacchatur; qualis commotis excita
sacris
Thyas, ubi audito stimulant trieterica
Baccho
Orgia, nocturnusque vocat clamore
Cithæron.”

Here we have a comparison, and nothing more; the verb *bacchatur* being now used in a general, not in its primary and specific, sense.†

Psalm ii. 7. “— *this day* have I begotten thee:” upon which clause Bengel‡ has the following observation: “*æternitas nunquam vocabulo hodie significatur; quare, ego hodie genui te dicitur hoc sensu, hodie, definii, declaravi, te esse natum meum.*” His remark conducts us to the just rendering and sense of Luke xxiii.

* The late Rev. Henry Moore.

† I am aware that Merrick's view of the lines is countenanced by *Servius*: but I prefer the comment of *Heyne*, “*Bacchatur, summa cum vi dictum pro discursitat.*” See, too, *Æn.* VI. 78.

‡ Gnomon, &c., in Acts xiii. 33.

43.* It may be added, that Heb. xiii. 8, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," has been very improperly brought forward as a proof of the generally-received doctrine of our Lord's eternity: such language is never used throughout the Scriptures in relation to Him who is really "from everlasting to everlasting," and "who," in the strictest and highest signification, "only hath immortality."

John xviii. 34. "*Jesus answered him, Sayest thou,*" &c. Matthew, Mark and Luke agree in relating that Jesus, when he was brought before the Roman governor, *answered not a word*: John, on the contrary, informs us that our Saviour was not altogether silent on the occasion: he even records the inquiries and replies that passed between them. How is the variation to be explained?

Pilate had *two* interviews with Jesus. Now, Matthew, Mark and Luke speak *only* of the former of these interviews, which was *public*, and in the presence of the Jewish rulers; whereas John limits himself to the latter interview, which was *private*, and *within* the judgment-hall. When the chief priests and elders of the people had bound our Lord, they delivered him to Pilate: and *then*, on his being accused by these men, he answered nothing. This scene happened *without* the Prætorium, which, as John tells us, (xviii. 28,) the Jews would not enter, lest they should be defiled, and prevented from eating the approaching passover.† The governor, nevertheless, for a reason that will hereafter be assigned, went into the judgment-hall again, and called Jesus thither. Here they were alone: and here they engaged together in conversation.

John often coincides with the other Evangelists undesignedly, and thus confirms their narratives. We collect, for example, from what he says in the 28th down to the 33d verse of this chapter, that something like a public examination of our Saviour was insti-

tuted by Pilate: but the fact is implied rather than declared in his history; while he represents at large the dialogue between the governor and his prisoner in private.

The deportment of Jesus Christ, in his present as in every situation, was marked by consummate wisdom and propriety, by meekness united with fortitude, by dignity yet gentleness of soul. When his calumniators stood together with him before Pilate, he answered nothing: he was conscious of his innocence;* he knew their falsehood and their malice, and was perfectly sensible that it became them to produce credible witnesses against him, but that this was beyond their power. With such persons he could not, and would not, enter into any altercation, in the presence of the governor. On the other hand, when he was admitted to a private audience with Pilate, an audience too sought for by the judge himself; the respect which he always shewed and inculcated for the office of the civil magistrate would not suffer him to be silent; the less so, as the purpose which the Roman procurator now had in view, evidently was to ascertain, if possible, the nature of the accusation, the ground on which it rested, and the pretensions of the individual accused. Jesus, accordingly, unfolded his claims with his characteristic firmness and wisdom. By this conduct he strengthened the favourable impression which had already been left on Pilate's mind. The difficulty, therefore, that has occurred to some individuals † in respect of this part of the gospel history, is only apparent. Indeed, Paul, when, in one of his letters to Timothy, ‡ he refers to our Saviour's confession at the bar of Pilate, attests the truth of John's account: nor did the early Christians or their adversaries, those who were most capable of deciding on the point, and particularly interested in the decision, see any dissonance, certainly no fatal dissonance, in the narratives of the last scenes of the life of Jesus.

Acts i. 26. "—— they gave

* Bishop Law's *Considerations*, &c. App. Obj. xiv.; and see 1 Sam. xv. 27, 28.

† Le Clerc's *Harmony*, [English,] &c., in loc; Carpenter's *Geog.* &c. (3d ed.) 49; and Secker's *Sermons*, Vol. IV. No. ix.

* Origen, cont. Cels. L. i.

† Evanson's *Dissonance*, &c. 2d ed. 286.

‡ 1 Tim. vi. 13.

forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." The meaning is, that he was added to them, and made the twelfth: nor can I doubt of his having been duly elected to that office. What was the business of an apostle? What his essential qualification? He was to proclaim and testify that Jesus, who died, had risen from the grave: and he was to do this on his personal knowledge of the fact, on his individual acquaintance with the identity of his Master. "Of these men," says Peter, (21, 22,) "who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." The event proved that Matthias was rightly constituted an apostle. It is true, he was not literally appointed one by our Saviour: but neither can it be shewn, that such an appointment was indispensable. Not more valid is the objection, that we hear nothing afterwards of Matthias; since the same assertion may be made concerning most of the apostles.

In the number of *the twelve*, Paul, assuredly, was not comprehended. He himself distinguishes between their situation and his own, 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7, 8, where it is evident, that by *the twelve* we are to understand *the collected body* of the apostles; though, at the time referred to, a vacancy existed by the death of Judas of *Kerioth*.*

Acts iii. 16, "— his *name*, through faith in his *name*, hath made this man strong." No judicious and candid reader will suppose that any thing like a *charm* is here intended. We are not to take the word *name* literally. In the phraseology of the Scriptures, the *name* is sometimes equivalent to the *person*: sometimes, as in this verse, it denotes *authority*. From the Old (for it is a perfect Hebraism) it

was transferred, naturally enough, into the New Testament. To speak of the *name* of a being, or of any class of beings, is not simply to use a form of expression. On the principles of sound criticism, it will appear, that there is no real difficulty, and still less any mystery, in the term. They who have doubts concerning its sense, either separately or in combination, may be referred to Glassii Philolog. Sacr. p. 100, ed Dath, to Hammond on 1 Cor. i. 2, and to Schleusner, in verb.*

1 Cor. xv. 24, "— when he shall have delivered up the kingdom," &c. *Alexander*† explains the clause in the following manner: "then cometh the end, when Christ shall deliver the kingdom, which hath so long been possessed by others, to God, even the Father." To me, I own, there seems an incongruity in supposing that the phrase *the kingdom*, which elsewhere in the New Testament means the kingdom of Christ, has here another and unusual signification, and that the word *kingdom* in ver. 24, and the word *reign* in the 25th, refer to two distinct and even opposite empires. The whole passage is evidently a description of the mediatorial power of the Saviour.

Heb. ii. 16, "— he taketh not hold of [helpeth not] angels," &c. See the marginal reading in the Eng. Bib. I consider this passage as a decisive proof that the mission of Jesus Christ, and all the benefits ensuing from it, are limited to the human race, to the rational inhabitants of this part of God's creation. With what propriety then has Dr. Paley‡ said, "Great and inestimably beneficial effects may accrue from the mission of Christ, and especially from his death, which do not belong to Christianity as a *revelation*"?

N.

* The divisions, however, in that valuable Lexicon are too numerous and refined: the explanation of *ονομα*, No. 6, fits properly under the preceding number.

† Paraphrase, &c., in loc.

‡ Evidences of Christianity, &c. P. ii. Ch. ii., note.

* For the nature of Paul's appointment to the apostleship, see Gal. i. 1, Rom. i. 1, 5; and a curious note in Mosheim de Rebus Christianis ante Constant., Sæcul. I. § 6.

SIR,

Birmingham,
May 2, 1822.

IN consequence of the friendly and gratifying suggestions of your correspondent *Proselytus*, (p. 151,) I have given directions to Mr. David Eaton, (187, High Holborn, London,) for a new edition of the "*Sequel*" to my "*Vindication of Unitarianism*." It will therefore be ready for publication in a few months, at as low a price as can be afforded without loss; and I shall be obliged if any Book Societies, who wish to furnish themselves with copies, will send notice of their intention either to myself or to Mr. Eaton.

I embrace this opportunity of adding a few lines in consequence of the remarks which have lately appeared in your valuable work, upon my views of the passages which, in the common version of the New Testament, represent Christians as "*calling upon the name of Jesus Christ*." Servetus, as quoted p. 106, thinks that the phrase presents no difficulty whatever. Nevertheless, it is not clear what his own view of the construction of it is: for he gives no less than five different translations; 1st. "*being called by the name of the Lord*:" 2dly. "*taking his name upon them*:" 3dly. "*calling on his name*:" 4thly. "*calling his name upon them*:" 5thly. "*being named by his name*." Before I can admit that any one of these is a correct translation of the phrase, I must see sufficient evidence of it. That the expression had the meaning now commonly attributed to it by Unitarians, has been repeatedly asserted, but, as I think, never proved. Your author cites the authority of Wakefield. I ask, *Where are Wakefield's PROOFS?* Wakefield evidently supposed *επικαλουμας* to be in the middle voice; Hammond, who deduces from it the same general sense, asserts that it is in the *passive*. See his Note on 1 Cor. i. 2. This, as it appears to me, is a most material difference, but scarcely regarded by those who have written on the subject. The use of *επικαλεσαμενος*, in Acts xxii. 16, seems to indicate, that in the disputed passages the verb is in the *middle* voice.

Upon this subject I beg leave still to express my *doubts*; and, as the inquiry may probably be interesting

to others of your readers besides myself, I shall be obliged to any of your correspondents who will produce whatever evidence he may think either favourable to the translation commonly given by Unitarians, or in any way illustrative of the construction and meaning of the phrase, deriving his remarks either from grammatical analogy, or from the actual use of this and similar phrases in Greek authors.

I have seen no reason hitherto to retract the supposition, which many have ridiculed, that this may, perhaps, be reckoned among "the difficulties left in revelation for the purpose of inculcating humility and candour." To the observations of the British Reviewer and Servetus upon this point, I beg to oppose the following remarks of the able and learned Translators of the Bible, in their Preface to the Reader:

"Though 'whatsoever things are necessary, are manifest,' as St. Chrysostom saith, and as St. Augustine, 'In those things that are plainly set down in the Scriptures, all such matters are found that concern faith, hope and charity;' yet, for all that, it cannot be dissembled, that partly to exercise and whet our wits, partly to wean the curious from loathing of them for their every where plainness, partly also to stir up our devotion to crave the assistance of God's spirit by prayer; and, lastly, that we might be forward to seek aid of our brethren by conference, and never scorn those who be not in all respects so complete as they should be, being to seek in many things ourselves, it hath pleased God, in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched, that the Scriptures are plain,) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseech us than confidence, and, if we will resolve, to resolve upon modesty."

JAMES YATES.

Norfolk,

May 10, 1822.

SIR,

YOUR Chichester correspondent, who signs himself Non Con, (pp. 22—24,) desires to be informed, how Unitarians can acquit themselves

of duplicity when, in disseminating our common version of the Bible, they pretend that they circulate the Scriptures "without note or comment." "DUPPLICITY" is a strong term, Sir, and when I call to mind the conduct of one with whose name, I will venture to say, the charge of "duplicity" was never for an instant coupled; one who, excellent in many ways, was perhaps *most* conspicuous in abhorrence of every thing like deceit; (need I name the late venerated Dr. Lindsay?) I cannot suppress a rising emotion of keen regret at the rashness of the judgment which would affix the stigma of "duplicity" on those who tread where he has trod, and fearlessly avowing in all companies, and on every proper occasion, the grounds of the difference between themselves and their Trinitarian brethren, esteem it their duty to join them in the circulation of a version of the Scriptures, imperfect it is true, and liable to many objections, but fully competent, according to the confession of the most eminent among Unitarian writers, to lead the diligent inquirer to the knowledge of the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. Instead of "duplicity," your correspondent will have no objection, I trust, to read "forgetfulness;" for if a Unitarian has been betrayed into a momentary assent to the notion that he is employed in circulating the Scriptures entirely without note or comment, he will, I should think, be glad to correct himself the first opportunity, and let his orthodox friends know that such is not his deliberate opinion. Having made this point clear, he will next be led to inquire, whether he is therefore bound to withhold his support from the Bible Society. And here, I should think, a difficulty will occur. If our inquirer be a zealous Christian, he must feel a longing desire to dispense the word of life as far as lies in his power. Looking abroad, he sees but two versions of the Scriptures which he can disseminate in his own country. These are the received text and the Improved Version. To both of these, probably, he sees objections. He thinks there may be interpolations in the first; he suspects there may be suppressions, or alterations, which have nearly the effect of suppressions, in the last.

He thinks it highly probable that the latter may have corrected some erroneous passages, but he dislikes the strained and unnatural phraseology of some of its texts. They appear to him to act as a "note and comment" upon the sacred penman, rather than to flow easily from the nature of the subject. Encompassed with difficulties, he finds no better refuge than in the belief that the Scriptures, however varied in the hands of different translators, are yet "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," and therefore, in the assurance that all who *will*, may be by them "made wise unto salvation," he embraces every opportunity for promoting their circulation among his fellow-creatures; believing, that were he to wait till he had secured a translation in which there should not be an *unsuspected* chapter, verse or word, he might tarry till the day were far spent indeed.

To advert for a moment to the letter of your former correspondent, "A Berean:" it strikes me that both himself and the writer of the letter in your last Number, would do real service to the cause of truth, if at public meetings of the kind described, they would take occasion to declare their dissent from the opinions expressed on controverted points, and endeavour to impress on the minds of those with whom they associate, the duty and policy of keeping these subjects out of sight on such occasions. I am far from surprised that Trinitarians who certainly *began* upon this plan, have now learned free language. No objection, as far as I have heard, has ever been made to it. Unitarians have silently withdrawn from these meetings; but have they ever taken occasion publicly to testify the reasons of their dissent? These reasons may have been stated in print; but Unitarian books are not very saleable among Trinitarians, and I should be glad to feel assured that those Unitarians who are connected with the Bible Society, were taking the better course of calm and immediate remonstrance whenever the original rules of that Society appear to them infringed. If such be not their conduct, no wonder that the most active party considers itself as free from the obligation to respect the private and unexpressed opinions of

the few, very few individuals of our sect who ever appeared among them.

Allow me, in conclusion, to express my hopes, that your Non Con correspondent is not quite decided in his opinion respecting the impropriety of uniting Dissenters and Churchmen in the good work of sending abroad the word of life. Many sterling principles, much rectitude of heart, may be lost and frittered away in those circles of dissipation where the Dissenter is daily shamed or invited into alliances which conscience forbids. But I feel infinitely less suspicious of the human heart where it is under a religious influence, and can hardly believe conformity to establishments is the necessary result of an awakened attention to the duty of disseminating the Scriptures. It is fair, in general, to conclude that the Christian who is serious on one point is not careless and *conscienceless* on any; he *may*, doubtless, deceive us and himself too; but "to his own master he standeth or falleth." Meanwhile, though we are forbidden to do "evil that good may come," it is no where said that we are to abstain from doing visible good because there is the possibility that evil may ensue. Non Con carries his dislike to establishments far indeed if he will not allow Churchmen and Dissenters to join together in giving a Bible.

Q.

—
Leeds,
May 7, 1822.

SIR,
YOUR publication for January last has just been put into my hands, and Dr. Morell's letter on Mr. Owen's System of Education (pp. 6—8) pointed out to my notice. Without entering into any discussion on the doctrine of hereditary depravity in the human species, or any speculations upon divine revelation, I cheerfully communicate, through the medium of your Repository, the substance of what particularly struck me in that branch of Mr. Owen's Establishment, which is employed in the education of the children; and perhaps I cannot do this in a better manner than by making extracts from the letters which I transmitted from Lanark to Leeds, when the scenes were fresh in my sight. It will be recollected that these observations were made in 1819,

From a conversation I had with Mr. Owen in Leeds, some few weeks since, he gave me to understand that a great improvement has taken place in the minds, learning and general deportment of the children since my visit in 1819.

Being deputed, along with Mr. Oastler and Mr. Baines, by the Guardians of the Poor of the township of Leeds, to visit the Establishment in New Lanark, we arrived there in the evening of the 28th of August, 1819. On the next morning

"The three years' old children's school was our first object; and a more pleasing sight to the philanthropist is not to be seen from Johnny Groat's House to the Land's End. An innocent glow of health, pleasure and unabated childish freedom mantled on their pretty countenances: this melting sight gave me a pleasure which amply repaid the toils of the journey.

"We then went into the upper school—a school, for cleanliness, utility and neatness, I should not suppose surpassed in the kingdom. This was Sunday; they were just commencing, which was by singing a psalm, then the master went to prayer, and afterwards read a chapter. The girls and boys, being placed on the opposite sides of the room, then read in the New Testament; a boy read three verses, then a girl three, then a different boy other three, then a girl, &c. alternately. In another part of the room a person was hearing the boys and girls the Assembly's Catechism. Old Lanark is improving in morals, as any child who is willing to walk down from the Old Town to the New may have instruction gratis."

* * * *
* * * *

Next morning,

"After calling upon Mr. Owen at Braxfield-House, we walked down to the village, and entered the small children's play-ground. God bless their little faces, I see them now; there were some bowling hoops, some drumming on two sticks, all engaged in some infantine amusement or other; not a tear, not a wrangle—innocent peace ran through the group. As soon as they saw us, curtsies and bows teemed about us. Mr. Owen seemed here to be among his own imaginary improved state of society.

You know that his creed supposes that all human beings are the creatures of circumstances; hence he contends, that if he had a colony of infants, by suppressing all erroneous reasoning and conclusions upon all subjects, and by substituting *truth*, which is, that of being taught to make no conclusion but what is thoroughly understood, he could make man to set at naught the things upon which he now places the most value, and unite in a community of interests that would have the effect of producing brotherly love and unity throughout the world. Nay, he carries this idea so far, that he supposes the highest ranks in society will find it the greatest source of recreation to visit the establishments of their neighbours, and perform a few hours' labour at something that will pay for their entertainment. These results, and many others, which I have not time to mention, Mr. O. will have that he can bring about in society, by means of children. Then, is it to be wondered at, that his character assumes the highest traits of benevolent and overflowing pleasure, when he mixes among these germs of future men and women?

"From the play-ground we entered a large room for the purpose of play and amusement when the weather will not permit them to be out of doors. Here the most unrestrained liberty is given for noise or amusement. On each side of this room are schools for this class, which runs from two years old to six. Some are taken to the upper school at four, having attained the learning necessary for their advancement.

"From these schools we went up into the large room for dancing, marching, &c., when soon the shrill fife echoed up the broad staircase. Six boys, in Highland plaids and caps, entered, playing a quick march until all the boys and girls (for girls march here) entered the room: they were followed by other six fifiers; the whole as they entered formed a square. After this, the word of command was given, right face, left face, &c. They then passed in review, marching round the room in slow and quick time. After marching, the boys and girls destined to sing, at the word of command, ran in a kind of dance, and formed two

lines in the centre of the square. They then sang, 'When first this humble roof I knew,' accompanied by a clarionet; then 'The Banks of Aberfeldy;' then 'The Banks and Braes of bonny Doon;' then 'Auld Lang Syne.' There were fifty singers. After this, they then again formed a square; and the word of command was given for the dancers, who immediately came into the centre as the singers had done. Two or three dances were then given in a style which would not have disgraced some of our assemblies. After dancing they marched again once or twice: six fifiers then led them down stairs, the other six remained playing, and all kept beating time until the whole deployed out of the room. These interesting beings were all barefoot, but gracefulness was in their steps.

* * * *

"Next we entered the large school on the same floor, capable of holding 400 writers and accompters. There is a pulpit at one end, and it is neatly galleried, and will hold a congregation of 1200. There were boys and girls from four to twelve years old busily employed in reading, writing and accounts, plain sewing, marking, &c. The greatest regularity and decorum prevailed. Heard children of four years old read well in the Testament; others of five read, and that well, historical pieces from various authors. The writers and accompters industrious; the writing a good style. The ladies who were with us, said the sewing and marking was very good. We next went and stood in a gallery in the room where the singers, &c. had been, and saw below us a professional man from Edinburgh, teaching four barefooted girls and four boys the different steps, bows and curtsies and dancing. It was delightful to see the gracefulness and ease with which these rustic sons and daughters of the working classes made the obeisant compliment, or tripped on the light fantastic toe. They have two violin players, who are also professional men.

* * * *

"After tea we went down to the village, and found the large school-room (which is capable of holding 1200 persons) about two-thirds full: it was concert night. Concert night!

concert! what, for the amusement of the labourers in a cotton factory! Yes; it was truly concert night, and they are blessed with one once a week. How drivelling dost thou look, world in which I have been accustomed to live, when placed in comparison with this community! Here, the labourer of two shillings per week can go to concert every week, and the fastidious souls of a town like Leeds, wallowing in unenjoyed wealth, can scarcely raise one, once in half a year. But here too they are taught music, and, of consequence, enjoy the captivating sweets of sound. The band was military, although they have violins, and consisted of two horns, one trumpet, three bassoons, one serpent, five clarionets, flutes and fifes. * * *

“Whilst standing in the buildings appropriated for the schools and amusements, with the magical sight before me, (for at this place almost all is wonderful and astonishing,) and contemplating the enormous expense which must have been incurred to provide these buildings, teachers and every other thing to move this comparatively vast machine, produced from the fluctuating sources of manufacture,—my ideas were enchanted with anticipation in the prospect of that pleasure and profit which might be produced from the combined powers of a number of villages united in a community of interests. Who can say with how little labour their wants might be supplied; and who can tell the happiness which would accrue from the want of temptation to covetousness, and all the other deadly evils attendant upon man suffering from want? The temptation to do evil would be removed, and brotherly love be the bond of union. No one with half the senses of a man, but what can see this, in walking through the precincts of New Lanark. There is not a nobleman in England that is giving so much comfort to so many human beings as Mr. Owen is, and the very proudest of them would be astonished and confounded were they to spend one evening in this place.”

In the education of the children, the thing that is most remarkable, is the general spirit of kindness and affection which is shewn towards them. In this they appear like one

well-regulated family united together by ties of the closest affection. We heard no quarrels from the youngest to the eldest, and so strongly impressed are they with the conviction that their interest and duty are the same, and that to be happy themselves it is necessary to make those happy by whom they are surrounded; that they had no strife but in offices of kindness. With such dispositions, and with their young minds well stored with useful knowledge, it appeared to us that if it should be their destiny to go out to service or to be apprenticed, the families in which they were fixed would find them an acquisition instead of a burthen; and we could not avoid the expression of a wish, that the orphan children in our workhouses had the same advantage of moral and religious instruction, and the same prospect of being happy themselves and useful to the families in which they may be placed.

On the return of the deputation to Leeds, the committee of the Leeds Workhouse entered fully into the desires of the delegates upon this subject, and a new code of regulations was adopted for the management of the children, which, I am happy to say, has already proved of essential service to these sons and daughters of poverty; which code I subjoin to these remarks.

JOHN CAWOOD.

Education and Employment of the Children.

1. That the boys and girls be kept in a state of separation from the adult part of the inhabitants of the House.

2. That a separate room be devoted solely to the girls, and fitted up for their school-room and sitting-room.

3. Every day in the week (Sunday excepted) the girls shall be employed in learning to read and write, from half-past eight o'clock in the morning till twelve o'clock at noon, under the superintendence and instruction of a proper master; that from twelve to half-past one they shall have dinner, with the remaining time for recreation. And that from half-past one to six o'clock, they shall be employed in knitting, sewing, &c., under the superintendence and instruction of a

suitable mistress. And that, in order to accustom them to domestic service, two of the senior girls, in rotation, shall be kept in the kitchen for one month at a time, and be then employed in such work as the mistress of the house shall direct.

4. The boys shall be employed in the card-room from eight o'clock in the morning until twelve at noon; that, from twelve to half-past one, they shall have their dinners, with the remaining time for recreation; and from half-past one until six in the evening, they shall be instructed (in a room solely appropriated for that purpose) in reading and writing by the school-master.

5. In these arrangements the greatest frugality should be united to the most persevering endeavours, to render these orphan children useful members of society. This cannot be more effectually accomplished than by removing from their observation every thing that is likely to give them bad habits, and placing before them every thing which is calculated to inspire them with good ones. These recommendations duly followed, will in time make these children of poverty rather sought after as apprentices in the town, than despised and considered a tax; and instead of rising into manhood and relying upon a parish all the days of their future life for a portion of their support, they will feel an ambition and a capacity to maintain themselves.

Mr. Cooper on the Disposition of the Negroes to embrace Christianity.

LETTER II.

Newcastle-under-Lyme,

May 10, 1822.

SIR,

AT the close of my last communication, (pp. 217—219,) I stated that the slaves on Mr. Hibbert's estate were allowed half-a-day in a fortnight, out of crop,* for the sole purpose of attending on me. I now proceed to explain the manner in which that time was spent.

It was the original intention to build

a place of worship large enough to accommodate all the slaves belonging to the property; but this design was abandoned, on its being found that the overseer could permit us to employ the boiling-house (the house in which the cane juice is boiled into syrup) during that part of the year in which alone we had any opportunity of meeting for religious purposes. This edifice answered our purpose sufficiently well, as long as the undertaking was regarded simply in the light of an experiment: but had it been determined to render it permanent, a more convenient place would have been found necessary.

The Negroes usually quit the field, for dinner, about one o'clock, to which they never return till the end of two hours; but it was understood, between the overseer and myself, that on the days on which they should have liberty to attend me in the boiling-house, they should not retire till nearly two, so that the estate might be put to as little inconvenience as possible. This being the case, they were never ready for me before four, and sometimes not even till five in the afternoon; a circumstance which, however, I never regretted, not deeming it necessary, or even desirable, to detain them above two hours at a time. But had they been disposed to submit to a little extra exertion, they most certainly might, notwithstanding this, have been with me by three, or very soon after; but they had no idea of devoting the smallest portion of their own time to the work of spiritual improvement. So far, indeed, from this, it was found to be a matter of some little difficulty to secure their attendance, even in their master's time. And, before the attempt was made, some individuals, well acquainted with the Negro character, appeared to be very apprehensive that it would be found necessary to employ coercive measures with them in this as well as in other cases: yet the inhuman and unchristian idea of driving the poor creatures to a place of worship by force, could not be endured for a moment. It was, therefore, determined, without hesitation, not to resort to it, but to meet them on the following terms; which, it will be perceived, reduced the business, in a great measure, to a matter of their own free choice.

* That is, the Jamaica harvest, which commonly commences in Hanover early in December, or about the first week in January, and ends some time in May.

As our sabbaths, as we sometimes termed them, came round, they were informed by the overseer that they were at liberty to spend the afternoon with me in the boiling-house, if they felt disposed to do so; but, if otherwise, they must return to the field and work their usual hours. Immediately, therefore, on seeing what the nature of our plan was, they agreed to throw down their hoes and prepare for me. Not, I believe, that they felt any particular anxiety respecting matters of religion; but because they knew, full well, that in paying a little attention to these things, they should be exposed to far less bodily labour than would fall to their share, were they to remain in the field under the scorching rays of a tropical sun. In this manner my sable audience was collected; and, I doubt not, that it might have been kept up, on similar principles, for any length of time, had such a measure been deemed desirable. It is true, that on most, if not on every occasion, a few individuals were found guilty of absenting themselves, who ought to have attended. Yet this evil never existed to any very great extent; and, most probably, it would never have been heard of at all, had we adhered with perfect strictness to the plan on which we professed to act; but we were fearful of pressing the matter too far, and particularly anxious to leave as much to the will of the Negroes as the nature of the case could be imagined to admit of. Yet I now acknowledge, on looking back upon the business, that I think we should have done better had we been more particular in putting the laws in force against those individuals by whom they were too frequently violated. At the same time, I must distinctly maintain, that our experience abundantly proved the possibility of raising and keeping up a congregation amongst the slaves without the aid of the lash. And this we always regarded as a point of some importance, because it seems clearly to remove a common and a very plausible objection to the moral reformation of these degraded, unhappy people; viz. that nothing short of means which all object to, would ever be found sufficiently efficacious to induce them to attend, with proper punctuality, the lectures of a religious instructor. The experiment, it was

affirmed, had been tried on the south side of the island by a clergyman of the Church of England, but without producing the desired effect; the Negroes withdrawing their attendance after the first few meetings, although the hours of instruction were taken from those of labour. But it does not appear that any efficient measures were employed to secure their attendance on the gratuitous labours of this benevolent individual, and, therefore, their conduct towards him was nothing more than might have been expected. I believe the Georgia Negroes would never have attended me in the manner they did, had it not been for the alternative which was placed before them. They are all excessively fond of novelty, but totally destitute of perseverance where they are not urged on by "fear and force," and consequently nothing regular can be expected from them, for any length of time, when compliance depends *entirely* on their own will. The fact is, they are mere babes in understanding, quite ignorant of the importance of knowledge to a rational being, and seem, without any exception, to take it for certain, that the whole of Christianity is comprised in the ceremony of baptism.

After this it will, perhaps, be asked, what good could a mere preacher expect to result from his exertions amongst such a people as the negroe-slaves? To which I reply, not so much as he would naturally wish, and most probably promise himself; yet, under proper patronage, he would be able to accomplish something. But as things now are, nothing is achieved.*

* I allude to the condition of the slaves on sugar estates in general. On the properties of several gentlemen, endeavours have long been, and are still, making for the religious improvement of the slaves, but, I am fearful, with but trifling success. The Moravian brethren, whom scarcely any difficulties can discourage, still continue to sow the seed in hope, on the sterile soil of Jamaica. And I was informed by one of their missionaries, who has spent many years in the West Indies, that one of their settlements in this island is now in a flourishing condition. The brethren have long been tried in Jamaica, and they seem to have gained the respect of all parties.

My plan was, when I met them in the boiling-house, to read a short portion of Scripture, and to make such remarks upon it, as appeared to me to be calculated to strike the minds and suit the circumstances of my hearers. And they generally listened with apparent attention, during the whole of the discourse. The service always commenced and concluded with prayer. We had no singing; that being a part of worship we could not engage in for want of singing abilities. A few white people would frequently take a seat with the rest, and I have sometimes flattered myself that our meeting together was not wholly in vain. The Negroes always dressed themselves for the occasion: not in finery, but in decent, clean apparel. This, however, I am aware, many of them would not have done had I not insisted upon it in the most particular manner. To say the least, their bodies were refreshed, and it was pleasing to see them drawn off from the toils of the day, and join in the worship of the common Parent of our race. But such is the difficulty of getting the crop off a sugar estate in Jamaica, that it is found to be impossible to allow them *any* opportunities of this kind during six months in the year, without putting the whole concern to very great inconvenience. The question is, whether the good which might be obtained would be equal to the expense and hazard of the undertaking. I think not, unless the people could have the afternoon *in* as well as *out* of crop: in other words, unless the crop could be made to give way to religion, and not religion to the crop. Besides, it cannot, surely, be expected that any Christian minister would consent to consume his time amongst a people to whom he should have not more than twelve opportunities of preaching in a year. He would, no doubt, at times find a few other occasions of usefulness; such as burying the dead, visiting the sick, and holding conversations with the Negroes in private, and in endeavouring to instruct the young. To the latter class I devoted a considerable portion of my time during a part of the period I passed in Jamaica; and I should never have relaxed my exertions with the young, had I not clearly perceived that my plans of proceeding went directly to sap the

foundations of the existing order of things. I taught the children to *read*, and treated them in all respects like rational beings; whereas the government under which they are doomed to live and move, contemplates them in the light of *mere* animals. I think I may assert, without fear of contradiction, that to hold a people in slavery, it is necessary to keep them in ignorance. The Negroes feel, but they do not see their chains, and therefore it is that they are contented to drag them. Let them once be enabled to read for themselves the sublime truth, that "*God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth,*" and is it conceivable that, with such views of human nature, they should be contented to regard themselves as the lawful property of the whites?

But I am treading on tender ground, and will, therefore, drop the subject for the present.

T. COOPER.

Springfield, Clarke County, Ohio,
Feb. 20, 1822.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I MAKE no apology for addressing you from this remote part of the world, because I know that any letter, the subject of which is connected with the religious improvements of the human mind, will not be considered by you as unworthy of notice or perusal.

After a variety of changes and trials I may, perhaps, consider myself as permanently settled, if any settlement may be called permanent in this uncertain and precarious tenure of existence. I have, therefore, considered it my duty to pay some attention to what was passing about me, in and among the various religious sects which prevail in this improving State of the Union; and whenever I take a view of the deplorable ignorance which pervades every class of professing Christians in this country, I take shame to myself for the little value I set upon my former great privileges in connexion with what I believe the most enlightened societies of professing Christians upon earth. Sir, these privileges, to be duly appreciated, must *be lost, at least for a time*; for I do believe that the great mass of the Unitarian public do not sufficiently estimate the real, the *ines-*

timable value of just notions of the benign attributes of the Deity, of religion without superstition, of devotion without enthusiasm. We may hear, Sir, and we may read of the gross darkness that covers some parts of the earth, and of the mental blindness and silly extravagancies of which many are accused who profess the Christian name; but I am much afraid these representations, in general, make but little permanent impression upon the public mind. To be *fully felt*, they must be witnessed. I know that Bible Societies and Missionary Societies have been the *fashion* for some years past in the religious world; but, alas! in the present almost universal depravity of Christian principles, there is so much to *unlearn*, that it should almost seem a certain portion of mental superiority was necessary to shake off the fetters of prejudice, and discover the plain, unobtrusive truths of the gospel amongst the rubbish and rust that envelope them. The principal religious sects in this State are the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Christian Brethren or *New Lights*, and the Baptists. There are also Shakers, Dunkers, Universalists, Seceders, *Rational Brethren*, Covenanters, Antiburghers, Swedenborgians, Moravians, Dutch Lutherans, and two sects of Seceders both from the Methodists and Baptists. The Presbyterians, as in the Eastern States, are highly orthodox and intolerant; happily in this State they are not numerous. The Episcopalians are still fewer in number, but much more liberal in their sentiments, which I believe is also the case throughout the Union. The Methodists are very numerous, and appear to be increasing very fast, notwithstanding the great secessions from them, chiefly on account of their arbitrary church government, which, like the tyranny of the Presbyterian Synods, ill accords with the spirit of republicanism. The Christian Brethren, or *New Lights*, who are very numerous in this part of the State and also in Kentucky and Indiana, are exhibiting to the world a curious exhibition of a liberal creed, which appears to have *no influence* upon its believers or defenders, united with gross enthusiasm and blind superstition. Their tenets are Arian: they have open communion, and reject most

of the offensive dogmas of Calvinism; yet, for want of a regular, well-educated ministry, they are most deplorably ignorant, and guilty of all manner of extravagancies at their frequent meetings, particularly their camp-meetings, when they vie with the Methodists in noise and rant and jerk and gesticulations. At their meetings there are many speakers in succession—seldom any text taken. Women frequently take the lead, particularly in *washing feet*, which is frequent among them without any decency of demeanour. They arose, 20 years since, in Kentucky, among the Baptists. *Benedict's History of the American Baptist Churches*, gives a particular account of their origin. They *pay* no ministers, therefore have but few men of talent amongst them. A Mr. Stone is the only writer I have heard of amongst them; he has lately published a very smart defence of their tenets, in reply to the attacks of the Methodists. I intend, at some future time, to draw up a more detailed account of these people, either for your Reformer or your Repository. The Baptists are numerous in Ohio, but do not appear increasing; their ministers in general, except a few at the principal towns, are extremely illiterate. The Shakers have a very great establishment or commonwealth at Union Town in this State: I do not now recollect what Dr. Evans says of them, but they have many join them from political rather than religious motives, who want a good home. The economy of their whole establishment is admirably conducted, and they are of great service to this part of the country. They are only 40 miles from hence: I intend soon to pay them a visit to know the particulars of their management, &c. The Swedenborgians are extremely active and zealous in propagating their tenets here, and boast of very great success; Cincinnati may be considered their headquarters. The *Rational Brethren* are quite a new sect, at Middleton in this State. They neither sing nor pray at their meetings; in fact they are Deists, and are endeavouring to establish a commonwealth like the Shakers, only they reject not sexual intercourse. Amongst all sects there is such a lack of good practical preachers, that the ignorance and enthusiasm of the hearers is not

much to be wondered at ; I know of no place in the *whole western country* where there is any academy for the instruction of persons destined for the ministry, among any sect ; and the supply of ministers from the Eastern States is very precarious, as few congregations think of supporting a minister ; even the Baptist ministers all preach gratuitously, except in a very few principal towns.

And now, Sir, I would wish to say a few words upon what will take your attention most, for I am afraid I have already tired you, viz., the probability of Unitarianism making any progress in these extended regions. The chief and almost only ground I have for hope in this respect, is the very general willingness there is amongst *all sects* to read whatever books you may put in their hands. This may be accounted for thus : 1. Almost or quite all Americans are taught to read, and almost all are without books of any kind to read. A book is a novelty : although I brought but one box of books with me, here it was wondered at as a thing incredible, and universally understood that I meant to sell books, as such a number was thought quite unnecessary for one person. Whenever an American enters your house, if he sees a book, he takes it up and begins to read aloud, and that without any shame, let him read ever so badly. I have several times been accosted, by strangers, when I have been seen with a book, with "holloa ! what book is that?" I have endeavoured to take advantage of this trait in the character of a true *West countryman*, and circulated what books I had that were likely to be the means of doing good. I had but few theological books, and those have been circulated until they are quite worn out. I have received a most kind letter from Mr. Belsham, and since then I received also a small parcel of books and manuscripts he sent me. I am very much gratified to hear that the London Unitarian Book Society have voted me a supply. I hope so to distribute them as to answer the intention of the donors by promoting the cause of genuine, uncorrupted Christianity. I know not of one professed Unitarian in this State who is a *native of it*, though, undoubtedly, there are

many such, although not known to each other. An English gentleman, lately settled at Cincinnati, a Mr. Rands, and Mr. W. D. Jones, formerly from South Wales, will zealously co-operate in any plan to make known Unitarian sentiments. The latter gentleman lives near Hamilton in this State, about 80 miles from hence. He has, at his own cost, erected a building for Unitarian worship, and been the means of converting a young man of considerable talent, a Mr. Kidwell, who was a preacher amongst the Universalists, to Unitarianism. He now preaches regularly at their new chapel ; they have about 20 regular hearers. This, Sir, is the first attempt at Unitarian preaching in the *State of Ohio*. Mr. Jones has written to me for a supply of Unitarian books, as he is very sanguine of effecting much good in his neighbourhood. I have no personal knowledge of him ; but hearing a most excellent character of him, I wrote to him and have had several letters from him, which bespeak him a man of sound mind, and a good Christian. He has printed and circulated (at his own expense) 500 copies of Dr. Priestley's "Candid Appeal." I hope ere long to be able to go and see him. He has procured me several subscribers to the "Unitarian Miscellany," published at Baltimore, as I had forwarded him several Numbers for perusal. No doubt, Sir, you have seen or heard of that *respectable publication* which commenced with the last year ; it is the *Monthly Repository* of the United States, and has already a very wide circulation and is doing incalculable good. We had not the means before of knowing any thing that was going forward in the Eastern States amongst religious communities. I have lately had a letter from the respectable Secretary Mr. Coppleton, in consequence, he says, of seeing *my name in the Monthly Repository*, on what occasion I *know not*, wishing me to do what I can for the circulation of the work. I should consider it a great acquisition indeed if I could now and then get a Volume of my old friend the *Repository*. It would recall to my mind so many pleasing recollections, and invigorate my poor exertions in the cause of that excellent work. Mr. Bakewell of Pittsburgh

has succeeded in establishing a Unitarian place of worship at that place. This gentleman's name is not unknown to English Unitarians.—I need not give you any information of the success of the *good cause* in the *Eastern States*; no doubt you are better acquainted with it than I am; from thence the communication is so direct with England, that you can get their news and their publications with greater facility and less expense than we can here. The Allegany Mountains are greater obstacles than the Atlantic Ocean to a free intercourse.

The "Unitarian Miscellany" announces the intention of Mr. Wright to come over as a Unitarian Missionary to the United States, if he is encouraged thereto by the next general Fund Meeting in London. Upon this subject, Sir, I would say a few words, not as presuming to give advice upon the subject of his coming over, but concerning the *best means of travelling*, and the most likely route to ensure him candid hearers and opportunities of preaching. I take it for granted that he will not confine his labours to the Eastern States, where Unitarianism may be considered as *established*, but come out into the woods of the *great Western wilderness*, and preach the simple, yet grand truths of the Christian religion where they were never before heard of. To do this he must travel on horseback; his friends at Washington or Baltimore will know how to equip him. His expenses will average about one dollar and a half per day. He will find the *court-houses* at all *county-towns* open to him, and the news of a *strange preacher*, in a very little time, bring him a numerous audience. If he comes into the West, I should like to be informed of it in time, and I would undertake to escort him through the greatest part of this State, say 200 or 300 miles (we do'nt think much of distance here). Mr. Jones says, he would undertake to travel with him across Indiana, either into Kentucky or the Illinois, as he should think fit. The present governor of the State of Kentucky is a Unitarian, and will, no doubt, be anxious to give any assistance; and he would meet with a cordial reception at the English settlement in the Illinois, as there are seve-

ral zealous Unitarians there. The latter end of August would be the best season to begin travelling on horseback; the great heats then begin to abate, the *roads are good* and there is more leisure amongst agriculturists; add to which, the weather is generally settled and fine for September and the two following months. If he should come by the way of Pittsburgh, I could meet him in the north-east part of this State, say at Steubenville, Zanesville, or any other given point. I am the more anxious on this account because I well know how wearisome it is to ride alone through the interminable woods, and, to a stranger, how difficult, very often, to hit the right tracts or know where and how to ford a river aright. A strange doctrine, by a *strange* preacher from a strange country, will no doubt excite much attention; but, above all things, Sir, I recommend the distribution of cheap tracts. They leave a memorial of a preacher and his sentiments. They form a resting-point and defence for those who seem inclined to farther inquiry; for timid characters, who are afraid to encounter the anathemas of the orthodox while they "halt between two opinions," often want such books to encourage their new-formed hopes and to refer their opponents to, in answer either to argument or obloquy. We are situated only 40 miles from Columbus, the capital of this State, a town improving very fast; I could very much wish Mr. W. was to be preaching there when the legislature was sitting; the sessions generally commence in November. We have many English families settled directly around us, chiefly from Yorkshire. We have established an inquiring or debating society, which has brought upon us the reproach of many of the preachers about here. It has excited much attention, and when the Unitarian books arrive, I mean to establish a gratuitous circulating library, which I think will be better than giving them away, as I can then see they are taken care of, and I know I shall have plenty of readers, as many are anxious for their arrival. I shall forward about one-half of them to Mr. Jones, for his books also are all worn out; and he is very anxious for a supply. I hope another winter to

have Unitarian worship at my own house, as I am about to build a much larger one than I now occupy, or else at a new school-house which is now erecting in our township. I am so little used now to take my pen in hand that I almost, you will perceive, forget the use of it, which I hope will excuse the inaccuracy of this long epistle. Nothing can give me greater satisfaction while I live, than being any way instrumental in *clearing or opening a new road* (to use an American expression) for the advance of religious truth. The "blind guides" here, who lead astray the human mind from reason and Scripture and truth, are so deplorably ignorant, even of the doctrines they pretend to preach, that I have often heard the peculiar doctrines of Calvin and Wesley and Arius, all preached in the same silly rhapsody called a sermon. Oh! my dear Sir, how inestimable are the privileges of Britons in a religious sense! I bless God you are not unmindful of those

who perish for lack of knowledge, and great, I trust, will be your reward. Next to the success of religious truth, I take pleasure in hearing from any of my old Unitarian friends. Last Spring I sent a large packet of letters and papers, by private hand, all under cover, to Mr. Ludlow; I am afraid they never arrived, as I have heard of the death of the young man who took them out. I should be very thankful for some Unitarian sermons by Mr. Wright if he comes; but I believe the Book Society never published many. May the blessing of Almighty God rest upon your labours, and may love and harmony unite your various societies for the promotion of gospel truth, and the *present and future well-being* of your fellow-men in every class and every clime, prays

yours in the Christian Faith,
most respectfully,

W. AMPHLETT.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Christ Crucified. An Essay, in Three Parts. By Richard Wright, Unitarian Missionary. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

The Inquirer. (To be continued Quarterly.) No. I. 8vo. 4s.

Memoirs and Select Remains of an Only Son. By the Rev. T. Durant. 2 vols. 10s. 6d.

Report of the Committee for Managing a Fund raised by some Friends for the purpose of Promoting African Instruction; with an Account of a Visit to the Gambia and Sierra Leone. 8vo.

Illustrations, Historical and Critical, of the Life of Lorenzo de Medici, called the Magnificent. With an Appendix of Original and other Documents. By William Roscoe, Esq. 8vo. 14s.

Institutes of Theology; or, a Concise System of Divinity. With a Reference under each Article to principal Authors. By Alexander Ranken, D.D., one of the Ministers of Glasgow. 8vo. 14s.

A Vindication of the Supreme Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—so far as that Doctrine is impugned in Mr. Kitcat's Sermon on Christmas-Day. By Samuel Slocock, Rector of Waring.

A newly-invented Table of the Genea-

logy of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke; also the difference of their Accounts explained, Objections answered, &c. By Robert Berkley Greene, of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 2s.

A Selection from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, in Testimony of the Divinity of Christ, with Illustrations from the Four Evangelists, and Remarks by the Author. 2s.

The Influence of the Atonement, an Essay. By Joseph Bate. 1s. 6d.

The History and Chronicles of Scotland; written in Latin by Hector Boece, and Translated into the Scottish Language, by John Bellenden, at the command of King James V. 2 vols. 4to. Fac-Similes and Memoirs. £5. 5s.

Historical Account of the Origin, Progress and Present State of St. Thomas's Hospital, Southwark. By Benjamin Golding, M.D., one of the Physicians to the Royal West London Infirmary.

Travels along the Mediterranean and Parts adjacent, in the years 1816, 1817, 1818, in Company of the Earl of Belmore. By Robert Richardson, M.D.

Miscellaneous Notices relative to China, and our Commercial Intercourse with

that Country, including a few Translations from the Chinese Language. By Sir Geo. Thomas Staunton, Bart., LL.D. and F. R. S. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Works of John Home, Esq., Author of "Douglas," a Tragedy, now first collected, with an Account of his Life and Writings. By Henry Mackenzie, Esq., F. R. S. E. 3 vols. 8vo. Portrait. Maps and Plates. £1. 11s. 6d.

Hints towards the Right Improvement of the Present Crisis. By Joseph Jones, M. A. 8vo. 5s.

Curia Oxoniensis; or Observations on the Statutes which relate to the Vice-Chancellor's Court, and the Power of Searching Houses; with some Cursory Remarks on the Procuratorial Office, in the University of Oxford. 2s. 6d.

An Inquiry into the Elective Franchise of the Citizens of London, and the general Rights of the Livery; with Copious Notes, referring to the Saxon Laws, the earliest Writers on the Common Law, and ancient Charters, Manuscripts and Records. Addressed to the Citizens. By Henry Schultes, Gent. 3s. 6d.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, and the other Visiting Justices of the Lunatic Asylum for the County of Lancaster, on the still peculiarly wretched lot of the Pauper Lunatic, &c. By Paul Slade Knight, M. D., Superintendent. 1s.

The Literary History of Galloway, from the earliest Period to the present Time. With an Appendix, containing, with other Illustrations, Notices of the Civil History of Galloway till the end of the Thirteenth Century. By the Rev. Thomas Murray. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Journal of an Expedition 1,400 Miles up the Orinoco, and 300 up the Arauca: with an Account of the Country, the Manners of the People, Military Operations, &c. Illustrated by Seven Plates. By J. H. Robinson, late Surgeon in the Patriotic Army. 8vo. 15s.

Christian Researches in the Mediterranean from 1815 to 1820, in furtherance of the Objects of the Church Missionary Society. By W. Jowett, M. A., one of the Society's Representatives. 8vo. Maps. 10s.

Anti-Scepticism; or, an Inquiry into the Nature and Philosophy of Language as connected with the Sacred Scriptures. By the Author of "The Philosophy of Elocution." 5s.

The Miscellaneous Tracts of the late W. Withering, M. D. To which is prefixed, a Memoir of his Life, Character and Writings. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 7s.

Views of Nature in the Universal Constitution thereof, viz. Spiritual, Subtile

and Material Existences. By John Purdie. 8vo. 7s.

A Narrative of the Rise and Progress of Emigration, from the counties of Lanark and Renfrew to the New Settlements in Upper Canada. By Robert Lamond, Secretary and Agent. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Uriel, a Poetical Address to the Right Hon. Lord Byron, written on the Continent: with Notes.

An Original Set of Psalm and Hymn Tunes, with a Funeral Ode adapted for Public Worship. By D. E. Ford. 3s. 6d.

The French Protestant; a Tale, by the Author of the Vicar of Iver. 12mo. 3s.

The Protestant Beadsman; or, A Series of Biographical Notices and Hymns, commemorating the Saints and Martyrs whose Holidays are kept by the Church of England. To which is appended, a brief Review of the Scriptural and Traditional Accounts of the Holy Angels. 6s.

Observations on the Influence of Manners upon the Health of the Human Race, more particularly as it regards Females in the Higher and Middle Classes of Society. By R. Palin, M. D., of Newport, Salop. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Essay on "The Influence of a Moral Life on our Judgment in Matters of Faith," to which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and Church Union, in the Diocese of St. David's, adjudged its Premium for 1821. By Samuel Charles Wilks, A. M. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Prayers intended as a Supplement to the Collects of the Church of England. By J. C. Nicolson, M. A., late of St. John's College, Cambridge. 12mo. 3s.

The Principle of the English Poor-Laws illustrated and defended by an Historical View of Indigence in Civil Society; with Observations and Suggestions for their improved Administration. By Frederic Page, Esq., one of his Majesty's Deputy Lieutenants for the County of Berks. 4s.

A Letter to his Grace the Lord Primate of Ireland, on the Manner in which Christianity was taught by our Saviour and his Apostles. By George Miller, D. D., M. R. I. A. 8vo. 2s.

An Inquiry whether the Disturbances in Ireland have originated in Tithes, or can be suppressed by a Commutation of them. By S. N. 2s. 6d.

Sermons.

A Statement and Illustration of the Principles of Unitarian Christianity, and the Influence of Knowledge on the Character and Happiness of Man: Two Sermons delivered January 20, 1822, at the Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Port-

Glasgow, near Greenock. By George Harris. 8vo. 3s.

Lectures on the Reciprocal Obligations of Life; or, a Practical Exposition of Domestic, Ecclesiastical, Patriotic and Mercantile Duties. By John Morison, Minister of Trevor Chapel, Brompton. 12mo. 7s.

Lectures on the Offices of the Church of England, from the Commentary of Peter Waldo, Esq. By E. Berens, A. M. 12mo. 4s.

On the Public Means of Grace, the Fasts and Festivals of the Church, &c. By the late Right Rev. Theodore Dehon, D. D., Rector of St. Michael's, Charleston, and Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of South Carolina. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

Single.

The Truth of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, proved upon the Principle of Human Testimony, considered as a Branch of Moral Evidence. By Benjamin Mardon, M. A., Minister of Union Chapel, Glasgow. 12mo.

The Wrath of Cain: a Boyle Lecture, delivered in the Church of St. Martin in the Fields, February 7, 1822. By William Harness, A. M. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Christian Servant: preached on the Death of Thomas Solder, a faithful Servant to Mrs. Newell, of Colchester, at St. Peter's Church, January 24, 1822. By W. Burgess. 2nd edition. 6d.

The Office of Deacons; preached at an Association of Ministers and Churches, at Haberdashers' Hall, March 7, 1822. By Robert Winter, D. D. 2s.

The Conversion of the Jews to the Faith of Christ, the True Medium of the Conversion of the Gentile World: preached before the London Society for Converting Jews, April 18, 1822, at St. Paul's, Covent Garden. By G. S. Faber, B. D., Rector of Long Newton. 1s.

Remarks on Universal Education and the Principles of Mr. Brougham's Bill, as affecting the Established Church; preached at St. Lawrence's, Reading, January 8, 1822. By E. A. Howman, Prebendary of Salisbury. 1s. 6d.

Preached at the Spital, on Easter Tuesday, 1822, before the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, the Sheriffs, &c. By Charles Goddard, D. D., Rector of St. James's, Garlick Hythe, &c. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Unitarianism a Perversion of the Gospel of Christ. By the Rev. A. Bishop. 9d.

OBITUARY.

1821. Nov. 19, on his journey to Bangalore, whither he was proceeding for the benefit of his health, Sir SAMUEL TOLLER, Knight, Advocate-General of Madras.

1822. Mar. 9, in *Sion Place*, Bath, aged 66, CALEB HILLIER PARRY, M.D. F.R.S., &c. He received his classical and general education at the celebrated academy of Warrington, and his medical and philosophical instructions in the schools of Edinburgh and London. At an early age he married Miss Rigby, of Norwich, whose brother, Dr. Rigby, has lately terminated an honourable and distinguished professional life. Dr. C. H. Parry, about 40 years ago, commenced his medical life at Bath, from which period, during the first dawning effulgence of his extraordinary powers, and the shining meridian of his matured knowledge, he gradually advanced his character as a great practical physician and medical philosopher, till the fiat of the Almighty destroyed his useful and active powers, by a sudden attack of palsy in the year 1816. The effects of this attack were so complete and universal, as to annihilate his faculties and his usefulness. After this era of Dr. Parry's life, we must look to

what *he had done*, not to what his physical disease disabled him from the power of perfecting.

Dr. Parry's first professional public effort was in a communication addressed to the Medical Society of London, on the nature and pathological history of certain, commonly called, nervous affections of the head, for which he recommended compression of the carotid arteries, on a principle which subsequent observations on these diseases have confirmed and extended. Subsequently to this, in the year 1797, he published a treatise on a disease called *Angina Pectoris*, the leading and essentially important part of which was first communicated to him by his old and distinguished friend Dr. Jenner, though it received additional demonstration from his own observations. Dr. Parry's next public work was one that evinced his general knowledge as a natural historian and physiologist, termed "A Treatise on Wool." Afterwards, Dr. Parry, surrounded by incessant occupations, published "Observations on the Pulse," and on a fact not before known, viz., the formation of new arterial branches in quadrupeds, when the parent and principal trunks had been obliterated by ligature, contrary to what

had been observed to take place in man under similar circumstances ; this *entirely original fact*, though not yet confirmed, has not been controverted by succeeding experimentalists. Dr. Parry also gave to the world a 'Treatise on Hydrophobia and Tetanus, in which the histories of these generally fatal diseases are most ably traced from observation.

But the greatest and most characteristic work of this eminent philosopher and physician, is "The Elements of Pathology," published in 1816. This exhibits a great system of original and unexampled depth of observation, accuracy of conclusion and abundance of fact and illustration ; it may truly be considered as an almost unparalleled example of great originality and capacity.

The accounts already inserted of Dr. Parry's general genius, demonstrated on a subject not strictly within the pale of professional attention, is enough to prove the extent and versatility of his talents. To those who enjoyed his society this evidence would be superfluous. At the meetings of that useful and enlightened body, the Bath and West-of-England Agricultural Society, his reasonings, remarks and communications were in the highest degree instructive, enlightening and entertaining. To his efforts, the high estimation which this Society possesses is not in a small degree referable, and especially to the joint energy and exertions of his most able and excellent brother-in-law, Sir Benjamin Hobhouse, Bart., lately president of this Institution.

Of the various and general talent and knowledge of Dr. Parry, some proofs have already been afforded in these remarks. They are, however, too few to allow of amply expatiating on his general traits, and the limits of this article would not well admit of much more ; still we may add, that his astonishing grasp of conception on every subject which he considered, amply fulfilled the phrase, "*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*" He was alike superior in the graver and lighter exercises of the mind ; his ratiocinations, though luxuriant and abundant, seemed never to be the result of effort or labour ; and his moral, conjugal and parental feelings were exemplary. In a continued series of bodily suffering, his Christian resignation was perfect.

Dr. Parry has left two sons : the first, Dr. C. H. Parry, of Bath ; the other, the distinguished commander of the late Northern expedition.—*Gent. Mag.*

March 16, aged 75, Mr. JOSEPH WITHINGTON, of *Chowbent, Lancashire*, formerly an extensive nail manufacturer, but latterly retired from business. Having

long since embraced those views of the Divine Being and those religious principles which are generally denominated Unitarian, he continued, to the end of life, a zealous advocate for the same. About two years ago, a paralytic stroke deprived him of the use of one side ; he, however, bore this severe affliction without complaining, and with that submission which becomes a Christian when he bows to his Father's will.

B. R. D.

April 12, in *Portland Place*, in his 77th year, after a gradual decay, and a short illness occasioned by an accidental fall, Sir NATHANIEL CONANT, Knt. He was born at *Hastingleigh, in Kent*, of which place his father, the Rev. John Conant, (of *Pembroke Hall, Oxford, M. A., 1730*), was Rector from 1734, and Vicar of *Elmstead* from 1736, till his death, April 9, 1779. He was great-grandson of the celebrated Dr. John Conant, Regius Professor of Divinity, and head of *Exeter College, Oxford*, in 1649 ; afterwards Archdeacon of *Norwich*, and Vicar of *All Saints, Northampton*, near which place he possessed considerable property, part of which is still in the family. He was an eminent divine, and a distinguished author of Sermons, of which several volumes were published, and many others, with a Life of him by his son, the Rev. John Conant, of *Merton College, Oxford, B. and D. C. L., 1683*, remain in the possession of his descendants. Some interesting anecdotes of him may be seen in *Chalmers's "Biographical Dictionary ;"* and an elegant testimonial to the remarkably early learning of the famous Linguist, Dr. William Wotton, in the "*Literary Anecdotes*," Vol. IV. p. 255. He died in 1693, aged 86.

Sir Nathaniel was brought up at *Canterbury School*, and intended for business, which, however, he early relinquished, and, in 1781, was placed in the *Commission of the Peace for Middlesex*. He was the first who suggested the idea of the new establishment of the Police in 1792, and was very instrumental in forwarding the design. He was thereupon appointed one of the Magistrates at *Marlborough-Street Office*, where he continued till 1813, when he became Chief Magistrate of *Bow Street*, and received the honour of knighthood, and that situation he resigned in 1820, on account of the declining state of his health.

He married Sarah, eldest daughter of John Whiston, of *Fleet Street*, bookseller, and grand-daughter of William Whiston, the celebrated scholar and mathematician.

By her (who died Dec. 3, 1811) he had four children, now living; and he was buried with her, on Friday, April 19, in Finchley Church, Middlesex.—*Gent. Mag.*

April 14, in the 95th year of his age, Mr. JOHN VALENTINE, of *Chowbent, Lancashire*. He was the youngest son of the Rev. Peter Valentine, who formerly preached at Wharton, in the neighbourhood of Chowbent, but resided at the latter place, and taught a school there. Under his father's tuition he acquired a considerable portion of classical literature. He was, also, well acquainted with history, particularly ecclesiastical history, and with most of the controversial writers of the last age, on moral and religious subjects. Although he was educated in the principles of religion taught in the Assembly's Catechism, yet, on arriving at years of maturity, he began to inquire into the truth of them; and the result was the adoption of Unitarian views and sentiments. These he professed for upwards of sixty years of his life; and in them he found that consolation which supported and comforted him under many severe domestic afflictions, and in the prospect of his own dissolution. During his last illness, which was neither very long nor uncommonly severe, and which did not appear to affect his mental faculties, for they continued almost unimpaired to the last moment of his life, he frequently spoke of death, according to the scriptural representation of it, as a *sleep*, and as a *rest* from the cares of this life; that death is as welcome to the Christian at the end of his warfare, as rest is to the labourer after his day of toil. Mr. V. was a member of the Unitarian congregation of Dissenters at Chowbent, about 60 years, and, during this long period of time, was rarely absent from his place of worship, constantly attending twice a day, and in the evening conducting a devotional service in his own family. This practice he adhered to until about the last year of his life, when increasing bodily feebleness prevented his attending more than once in the day, and unfavourable weather confined him altogether at home. It was much to his advantage and happiness, (for he always spoke of it as such,) whilst a young man, to enjoy the friendship of the late Mr. John Mort, whose memory is still cherished here by many, although he has now been dead upwards of thirty years. Mr. Mort, very early in life, became an Arian, and shortly after this a Unitarian. And it was chiefly owing to the encouragement he gave to free inquiry, in his own example, and by the distribution and circulation of books, that Unitarianism

early planted itself here; and Mr. Mort had the pleasure of seeing nearly the whole of the congregation (at that time upwards of a thousand persons) with which he was connected, avowed Unitarians, some time before his death, which happened in the 86th year of his age. It was principally owing to this connexion and intimacy, that Mr. V. attributed the change in his religious sentiments; a change which lengthened years approved and sanctioned. And, in the faith and hope inspired by these sentiments, he went rejoicing to his *rest*.

Chowbent.

B. R. D.

(From the *Gent. Mag.*)

April 17, at *Claydon*, in the county of Suffolk, the Rev. CHARLES MEIN HAYNES, LL.B. This worthy divine was born at Elmset, in the same county, in 1739, and was the fourth son of the Rev. Hopton Haynes, A.M., the rector of that parish, who was a son of Hopton Haynes, Esq. Assay Master of the Mint, and principal Tally Writer of the Exchequer—a strenuous advocate for Socinianism, and the author of a tract relating to the prerogatives of his office, and of several publications on religious subjects; and an elder brother of Dr. Samuel Haynes, * canon of Windsor, the learned editor of “*A Collection of State Papers*,” transcribed from the Cecil MSS., at Hatfield House, 1740, fol.

Mr. Haynes received the rudiments of his education at the grammar-school of Dedham, in Essex, and from thence removed to Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he proceeded to the degree of LL.B. in 1765. In the year following, he was presented by Thomas Pelham Holles, Duke of Newcastle, to the Vicarage of Damerham, in the county of Wilts, as an accommodation to the celebrated preacher, Dr. Samuel Ogden, and in exchange for the Rectory of Stansfeld, in the county of Suffolk, which had been promised Mr. Haynes by the Lord Chancellor, and which was then vacant by the decease of his father. This living he held at his death; and it is a circumstance worthy of remark, that, during the fifty-six years of his incumbency, the Crown presented four several times to the Rectory of Stansfeld, while two Dukes of Newcastle passed away without presenting to Damerham.

As a minister of the Established Church, Mr. Haynes was firmly attached to her doctrine and discipline; and for many years officiated as a curate in his native

* For brief Memoirs of both these persons, see Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, II. 140, 141.

county. A scrupulous obedience to the Divine commands, and the keeping a conscience void of offence towards God and man, were the rules that regulated his life. His religion was without bigotry, and his piety without enthusiasm. As his sentiments were distinguished by candour, freedom and liberality, he was a firm and decided advocate for the exercise of private judgment in matters of religion, and on points of doubtful disputation.* Of a humane and benevolent disposition, he performed, without ostentation, many generous and charitable actions (particularly to the family with which he resided) that would have dignified a more ample fortune.

In his intercourse with others, his manners were mild and humble, friendly and unassuming; yet his humility was without meanness, and his friendship without dissimulation: these qualities, therefore, ensured him the respect and esteem of his acquaintance. Naturally of a shy and timid disposition, the tenor

* In corroboration of these remarks on his character, I have extracted from "The Monthly Repository of Theology," &c. II. 336, the following conversation which passed between Mr. Haynes and the Rev. Samuel Say Toms, of Framlingham, as detailed by the latter gentleman.—"Some years since," says Mr. Toms, "visiting at a friend's house near to Witnesham, Mr. Haynes's present residence, I met the old gentleman, and entering into conversation, I mentioned that I had often heard my mother speak of a clergyman of his name at Elmset: he replied, 'He was my father;' and of Mr. Hopton Haynes; 'Yes, he was my grandfather;' and said, his writings were very differently thought of now from what they were at their first publication, and some years after. They are now in high repute with many, as giving a just and rational interpretation of the Scripture doctrine concerning Jesus Christ. There were warm contenders on both sides of the question. It became every one to examine and think for himself, and speak and act from conviction; but some were of opinion, that religion was a plain, simple thing, and that it was of more importance to insist on it practically, than to enter upon the minutiae of controversy. 'He hath shewn thee, O man, what is good, and what,' &c. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' &c. 'The grace of God, which bringeth salvation, had appeared unto all men, teaching,' &c. On these things hang all the law and the prophets, and those persons think they best preach Christ, who lay the main stress on them."

of his life was retired: he mingled but little in promiscuous company, excepting at particular periods, when he was the life and soul of the party in which he joined.

The powers of his memory were great, and in the highest degree retentive; and whatever had pleased or interested him, either in the perusal of books or the remarks and observations of others, he made his own entirely, and could bring forth his stores, as occasion offered, with the greatest effect. In history and geography, his knowledge was extensive, and his recollection of names, dates and places, truly surprising. The writer of this brief Memoir, who revered his character, and who has been often gratified in his society, heard him, when at the advanced age of seventy-six, repeat, without hesitation, the regular succession of our English Monarchs, with the precise year and month of their accession to the throne, as well as the day and year of their decease; and, what is more surprising, this stretch of memory was followed by a similar recital of the Roman Emperors.

He possessed a strong vein of pleasantry, and a considerable share of humour; and to a pun was by no means an enemy. In all parties, where the company accorded with his taste and inclination, his conversation was animated and amusing; teeming with repartee, and pointed with wit; enriched by anecdote, and enlivened by story. His recitations of passages from various authors, whether serious or humorous, were given on such occasions with great taste and spirit; and will be long remembered by those who have ever had the pleasure of hearing him. Many pleasing anecdotes respecting him are in the recollection of his friends, to whom his attractive qualities had long endeared him, and whom he had entertained with as many good puns as had ever emanated from the most celebrated wits of the day.

Mr. Haynes departed this life April the 17th, in the 83rd year of his age, in the full enjoyment of his faculties, and of a tolerable share of health, even to the last.

At his particular request, his remains were conveyed to Elmset, his native village, and interred in the churchyard of that parish, under a tree which he had specified; having always strongly decried the indecency of interment in churches, wisely observing, that "the Church was intended for the living, and its yard for the dead."

Mr. Haynes was a bachelor; and his niece, Charlotte Catherine Anne, the sole daughter and heiress of his elder brother, Samuel Haynes, Esq., was married, Ja-

January the 14th, 1783, to John William Egerton, the present Earl of Bridgewater.

Ipswich.

F.

May 6, in his house, Hill Street, Berkeley Square, in the 68th year of his age, the Honourable and Most Reverend WILLIAM STUART, archbishop of Armagh, and Lord Primate of all Ireland. His Grace was the fifth and youngest and last surviving son of John Earl of Bute. He was translated from the See of St. David's to the Primacy of Ireland, in December, 1800.

— 6, in *Rutland Square, Dublin*, at a quarter past eight o'clock, his Grace the Right Hon. and Hon. CHARLES BRODRICK, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Cashel, Primate of Munster and Lord Bishop of Emlly. His Grace was translated to the Archepiscopacy in 1801. He was consecrated Bishop of Clonfert in 1795, and Bishop of Kilmore in the succeeding year. His Grace was brother to Lord Viscount Middleton, was a commissioner of the Board of Education, a treasurer to the Board of First-Fruits, and a vice-president of the Society for discountenancing Vice.

— 12, ISABELLA, the wife of the Rev. B. MARDON, of Glasgow, aged 25, about two days after the birth of a daughter.

— 13, at *Northwood Rectory*, the Rev. THOMAS DALTON, D. D., Rector of Carisbrook and Northwood, in the Isle of Wight, and Harting in Sussex, aged 88. He was one of the petitioning clergy, and one of the earliest members of the Unitarian Society. [We hope to be able to give further particulars hereafter.]

— 13, at *Milton House, near Peterborough*, after a protracted illness, in her 75th year, the Countess FITZWILLIAM. Her Ladyship was Charlotte Ponsonby, youngest daughter of William, second Earl of Besborough, by Caroline Cavendish, eldest daughter of William, third Duke of Devonshire.

Lately, at his Parsonage, after a lingering illness, the Very Rev. THOMAS KIPLING, D.D., Dean of Peterborough, Rector of Holme, and Vicar of Holme, in Spalding Moor, Yorkshire. He was of St. John's College, Cambridge; B. A. 1768, M. A. 1771, B. D. 1779, D.D. 1784, and was elected Deputy Regius Professor of Divinity.

His works are :

"The elementary Parts of Dr. Smith's Complete System of Optics," 1778, 4to. ;

"Codex Theodori Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Evangelia et Apostolorum Acta completens, Quadratis Literis Græco-Latinis," 1793, 2 vols. folio ; "The Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistic," 1802, 8vo. This pamphlet having been remarked on by a writer under the signature of Academicus, drew forth a defence by a friend to Dr. Kipling, supposed to be the Dr. himself. "Certain Accusations brought lately by the Irish Papists, against British and Irish Protestants, examined," 1809, 8vo. Dr. Kipling preached the Boyle's Lectures in 1792, but never printed the course.

The Gentleman's Magazine, from which we extract this article, has the following paragraph relating to a part of Dr. Kipling's life which has not been thought equally unblameable by all: "This learned divine, in 1793, rendered himself obnoxious to a refractory party in the University, by accepting the office of promoter or prosecutor in the case of Mr. Friend, Fellow of Jesus College, against whom it was deemed necessary to proceed judicially for his attack upon the Established Church. The expulsion of that gentleman for his offence and contumacy, brought upon the deputy professor a shower of abuse from the zealots for innovation, at the head of whom was Dr. Edwards, who took occasion, when the Codex of Beza came out, to assail both the preface and the editor with a virulence which amounted to personal hostility. Dr. Kipling was charged with ignorance and want of fidelity, but though it cannot be denied that the edition is inferior to the magnitude of the undertaking, still no candid person will justify the scurrility of the Socinian critic. As a reward for his labours and some consolation for the mortifications which he had experienced in the discharge of his public duty, Dr. Kipling was made Dean of Peterborough."

Additions and Corrections.

The Rev. EDMUND BUTCHER.

(See p. 247.)

The Rev. EDMUND BUTCHER was born 28th of April, 1757, at Colchester, in Essex. The family was originally of Feering in that county, of which, about the year 1667, John Butcher was rector, and whose mother suffered extremely during the siege of Colchester by the Parliamentary army. The father of the subject of this short memoir, was a house-carpenter and builder. Unsuccessful in some of his speculations, he was unable to afford his son *Edmund* those advantages in early life which he wished to have given him. He was a man of ta-

lent; a skilful draftsman, whose plans and designs were executed with special accuracy. The kindness of Dr. Stanton, the Dissenting minister at Colchester, supplied the son with the instruction requisite at this period, and the progress of the young pupil shewed that the kindness was not ill bestowed. A little poem of several books, entitled the *Brutæis*, in heroic verse, upon the fabled report of the peopling of Britain by the Trojans, ornamented with drawings of pen and ink, remains among his papers, a proof of his poetical turn, of his art of designing, and of his persevering industry. He was at this time not more than 14 years of age, capable only of reading and writing, which renders the work an extraordinary performance. I well recollect his producing one day after dinner, this ludicrous specimen of early talent, diverting himself and the company with his *epic* flights and *pictorial* representation of the hosts contending with an ensanguined fury!

Soon after, he went to London, and was apprenticed to a linen-draper. During this period he was seldom idle, even at his leisure hours, his pen being employed on various subjects, for the newspapers and periodical works of the day. Whatever profits accrued were transmitted to his father, mother, and only sister, who composed the whole of the family. For the kindness of his *parents* he always entertained the deepest gratitude, and their coming into the possession of a small estate left by their ancestor, the Rev. John Butcher, already mentioned, which rendered their latter days comfortable, must have yielded him no small satisfaction.

During his residence in London he attended Salters' Hall, and became acquainted with the late excellent Rev. Hugh Worthington, who, discerning his talents, led his views to the ministry. He furnished him with preparatory instruction—when he went to Daventry Academy, conducted by his much-esteemed friend the Rev. Thomas Belsham. Here he laid a foundation for his future reputation and usefulness. He had to acquire the rudiments of a classical education, whilst he assiduously attended to the higher branches of learning. No further proof is necessary of the ardent zeal with which he prosecuted his studies for the ministry, a profession towards which his earliest wishes were directed.

His first settlement was at *Sowerby*, in Yorkshire, with a congregation who much esteemed him, and regretted his removal from amongst them to a more extended sphere of usefulness in the metropolis. He occasionally preached at *Monkwell Street*, and at *Carter Lane*,

Doctors' Commons: but he settled at *Leather Lane*, Holborn, where he was ordained March 19, 1789, by Messrs. Tayler, Kippis, Belsham, Gillibrand, Worthington, Lindsey and Jacomb. He, in 1790, married a respectable widow lady, Mrs. *Elizabeth Lowe*, who, with a son and daughter, survive him. And it is at their request that I draw up this imperfect tribute of respect to his memory.

In addition to his stated labours at *Leather Lane*, he united with the Rev. Hugh Worthington, with myself, and other ministers, in carrying on a *Wednesday Evening Lecture* at Salters' Hall, which was for several winters most respectably attended. He also not long after bestowed much attention on a *Family Bible*, in conjunction with Mr. Worthington; a work on an original plan, and of considerable utility. He also edited the latter volumes of *The Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, in which he inserted, throughout a series of numbers, *The Temple of Faith*, an interesting ebullition of his imagination, and no unacceptable present to the rising generation.

He succeeded the venerable Mr. *Thomas Pope*, at *Leather Lane*. Here he continued for many years, and the interest being low, he revived the congregation. Though the weakness of his voice prevented his attaining much popularity, yet his sterling sense and piety always ensured him a number of respectable hearers, more particularly that *class* in the religious world whom it is a credit to please! Here I became acquainted with him in 1792, soon after my residence in London, and our friendship was unabated to the last period of his life! We passed many pleasant hours together, preached often for each other, and when he quitted the metropolis I paid him a visit in the country, as well as corresponded with him till within a few weeks of his decease.

His health becoming very precarious, he was obliged to leave London, and withdrew to *Sidbury Vale*, near *Sidmouth*, in *Devonshire*. His complaint being an affection of the lungs, he soon found relief. Indeed, his constitution was invigorated by his retreat into the country. Providence thus raised him up, as it were, from the dead! Many years were allotted him of enjoyment and usefulness; for in 1798 he was chosen pastor of the congregation assembling at the *Old Meeting-House* in *Sidmouth*. He served his *little flock* with cheerfulness and fidelity. He formed around him a small band of friends who knew his worth and studied his happiness. He and his family were objects of regard to all who had the pleasure of knowing them. Many of the first

visitors at Sidmouth availed themselves of his ministerial labours. Some members of a wealthy and very respectable *Jewish* family occasionally attended him, and on their departure made him a pecuniary present in return for his instructions.

Within the last few years he was afflicted with a kind of paralytic stroke, which produced great debility; but he continued preaching once a day till lately, when he altogether gave up the ministry. He, about a twelvemonth ago, visited his only son, Mr. Edmund Butcher, residing at Bristol, where he abode for several months. Hence, though under much weakness, he wrote me more than once with his accustomed cheerfulness and resignation to the will of God! In November, 1821, he removed to Bath, with the hope of gaining some relief; but soon after, walking across the room, he fell down and dislocated his hip. This confining him to his bed, increased his debility, which terminated in his placid dissolution. He expired, without a sigh or groan, early on the morning of April 14, 1822, in the 65th year of his age.

His beloved widow writes thus on the Sunday after his interment: "Blessed spirit! this was to have been the day we were to have consigned him to the tomb; but the sudden transition from severe cold to heat made it improper to retain him longer than *Friday*, and we wished the last beautiful impression of his fine countenance to remain upon our minds. Never was there a more angelic countenance; it seemed to say, 'I am happy!' The prospect was all delightful to him beyond the grave; he only shrunk when he thought of *the struggle*, but, blessed be God, that was all done away in seemingly nothing of pain or anxiety, but a sweet forgetfulness!" He wished to die on *the Sabbath*, and his wish was gratified.

He was buried in a most sequestered and rural spot at *Lyncomb*, in the vicinity of Bath, a portion of ground set apart by the generosity of Henry Edward Howse, Esq., about four years ago, for the interment of *Unitarian* Dissenters. He was followed to the grave by his own affectionate family; and the service was performed by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, with an impressive solemnity. Here, "early in the morning," the precious deposit was laid till *the resurrection of the just*! His funeral sermon was preached at Sidmouth, to a crowded and weeping audience, by his esteemed successor, the Rev. Mr. Yeates, from Psalm xxxvii. 37: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace!"

And, as a singular coincidence, I from *the same passage*, at Worship Street, paid a similar tribute of respect to his beloved memory; the conclusion of which forms the greatest part of this communication for the Repository. His friends, the Rev. Joseph Cornish, of Collyton, and the Rev. John Hughes, of Honiton, delivered sermons on the occasion, as well as other ministers in the West of England. His *grateful little flock* at Sidmouth are about to raise a tablet to his memory.

His character is best ascertained from his writings. Besides his pleasing *Picture of Sidmouth*, and his entertaining *Tour through various Parts of England*, [Mon. Repos. I. 357,] he published *three volumes of Sermons for the Use of Families*, [Mon. Repos. I. 544 and XV. 163,] exceeded by none in the English language for plainness and simplicity. There is a rich vein of devotion and benevolence that runs through the whole of them. The last volume has a prefatory account of his adoption of *Humanitarianism*, without the least censure of those who differed from him. Indeed, with his usual liberality, he concludes: "The liberty in religious matters which I claim for myself, I most cheerfully and unreservedly allow to all other followers of Christ. Let all uncharitable thoughts and measures be for ever abandoned. Let each be fully persuaded in his own mind. May the spirit of Jesus animate all his disciples, and the *peace of God, which passeth all understanding*, will fill us with comfort now, and fit us for glory hereafter! With these sentiments, I remain the friend and wellwisher of every sincere and virtuous inquirer after truth."

His last publication was a *volume of Prayers for the Use of Families and Individuals*, adapted for each Discourse in his three volumes of Sermons, and Forms suited to particular occasions. The work is well executed and of inestimable utility. The close of the Prayer for *Saturday Evening* is a fair specimen of the rest:—"To thine all-protecting Providence we once more commit ourselves and all that are near and dear to us! The *day* is *thine*, and, blessed be thy name, the *night* is *thine* also! Thy sacred eyes never slumber nor sleep—no fatigue ever wearies thine attention—no darkness hides from thy notice—no danger too great for thy power to withstand—no maze too perplexed for thy wisdom to unravel—no blessing too rich for thy goodness to bestow! *Guardian* as well as *Creator of the universe*! take us into thy holy care; preserve us during the watches of the *night*; and if it shall

please thee to raise us again in the morning, may refreshing sleep have recruited our bodies, and may our minds with fresh vigour rise to the duties and enjoyments of a *new day*, a new *Sabbath*! Prepare us, O God! for the approach of that solemn morning, when *all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God*, when the last slumbers of mortality shall close, the last night of probation terminate, and the endless day of immortality begin! Grant, heavenly Father, that, through thy abounding grace in the gospel, we may then *enter into the joy of our Lord!*"

He had a pleasing talent for *Sacred Poetry*. Some of his *Hymns* are far above mediocrity. The following specimen may be deemed among his happiest effusions. I have long used it at the Lord's Supper on the commencement of the year:—

"Stand still, refulgent orb of day!"

A Jewish hero cries;
So shall at last an angel say,
And tear it from the skies!

A flame intenser than the sun
Shall melt his golden urn;
Time's empty glass no more shall run,
Nor human years return!

Then, with immortal splendour bright,
That *glorious orb* shall rise,
Which through eternity shall light
The new-created skies!

Thou sun of nature, roll along,
And bear our years away;
The sooner shall we join the song
Of *everlasting day*!

In matters of religion, his characteristics were—*good sense, great modesty and a truly Christian liberality*. He had not a spark of bigotry in his composition. He loved good men of all denominations, and rejoiced in the anticipation of meeting them in heaven!

As to his private character, our *deceased Brother* was exemplary in all the relative duties of civil and social life. He was a kind husband, an affectionate father and a faithful friend. His *widow and children* bless his memory! Never did a person relish more truly the pleasures of domestic life—never was an individual more happy in the bosom of his family. A proof of the truth of this statement is afforded by the recital of a few lines sent me from his own pen many years ago, for insertion in a periodical miscellany.

Ask me to choose my happiest lot,
I chose *exactly* what I got!
Ask me what I wish for more—
A *little* to relieve the poor;
A life well spent, since life is given,
And long or short—as pleases Heaven!

This is the true spirit of Christian contentment.

He has left behind him for publication, a *Fourth Volume of Sermons*; and it is his widow's intention to add a small volume, with a portrait, of *Poems and Letters*, which, from their intrinsic merit, cannot fail of meeting with due encouragement. For some time past, such were his corporeal infirmities, that his pen was his constant and almost only amusement. His *daughter*, in one of her excellent letters to the writer of this article, describing the latter days of her deceased parent, says, that even when confined to his bed, he would dictate small *poetical* effusions, indicative of the truly devout and pious state of his mind! To the very last, few individuals possessed more of the spirit, and none shared more largely in the consolations of *Christianity*. The fruits of his pen were of no ordinary cast—and whilst they have been admired by his contemporaries, will be duly estimated by posterity.

J. EVANS.

Islington, May 14, 1822.

BENJAMIN HAWES, Esq.

(The brief notice of this gentleman's death, p. 188, is incorrect: we now insert a more authentic account, the publication of which has been delayed by accident.)

1822. Jan. 10. Suddenly, aged 79, being struck with a fit while on his usual walk, three miles distant from Worthing, Benjamin Hawes, Esq. Mr. Hawes was a native of Islington. He was the youngest of three brothers, of whom Mr. James Hawes, the eldest, died in 1789, the other,—the philanthropic and much-lamented Dr. William Hawes,—died in 1808, and was the founder of that admirable charity, the Royal Humane Society.

Mr. Hawes was for many years a respectable indigo merchant in Thames Street; and having, by great skill in business, with unremitted industry and unsullied integrity, acquired an ample fortune, he relinquished trade, and passed his latter years at Worthing, where his loss will be felt in an extraordinary degree, even by many who did not know him to be their benefactor. The great distinctive feature of his mind was an ardent and conscientious desire to relieve the distresses of his fellow-creatures, without taking to himself the merit of his good works. Having retired from the busy scene of life, he lived very abstemiously, and his constant study was not only to communicate good to all around him, but, if possible, to conceal the hand which thus diffused blessings.

In his own immediate neighbourhood, his charity, which often amounted to munificence, could not always escape the detection of gratitude; but, wherever it was practicable, his benefactions were anonymous; he seemed even ingenious in devising means of “doing good by stealth;” and he literally “blushed to find it fame.” In many instances he even made considerable *transfers of stock* to meritorious individuals whom he saw struggling with adversity; and who were never informed of the source from which their timely accession of property was derived. With the same shrinking modesty, he became an anonymous contributor to many public institutions for the alleviation of pain and suffering, the instruction of the ignorant, or the reformation of the depraved. Naturally attached, for 48 years together, to an institution founded by his brother, and congenial with his own generous sensibility, his liberal annual donation to the Royal Humane Society was nevertheless contributed under the mere designation of “A Life Governor in 1774.”

But the great object which interested his philanthropic feelings through life was the *abolition of the Slave Trade*. To promote this measure of enlightened humanity, he in many different ways contributed large sums anonymously. Nay, so indignant was he, on the close of the late war, at the treaties which tolerated that abominable traffic, that in a letter which he had sketched to Mr. Wilberforce (whether he ever sent it we know not) he offered to sacrifice *several thousands a-year*, if that sum could ensure the adoption of means to compel all the European powers to put an end to the Slave Trade entirely. Even in this princely conception, however, ostentation had no part; for he stipulated for the absolute concealment of his name, and only identified himself in the letter as the individual who, between 1780 and 1790, had inclosed to the then Treasurer in Lombard Street, five Exchequer Bills, and about 1810 had sent an India Bond directed to the Secretary of the African Institution.

Mr. Hawes was habitually an early riser, usually quitting his bed, in winter as well as summer, at four o'clock, or earlier. One of his great delights was to observe the rising sun. He considered exercise in the open air to be essentially conducive to health; and, by a prudent arrangement of his time, even when engaged in an extensive business, he generally contrived to walk on an average about twenty miles a-day; and this practice he continued at Worthing

till the afternoon which terminated his mortal existence.

Though he sedulously avoided company, he well knew what was going on in the busy world. His dress was always neat, but so plain that it might be mistaken for that of a Quaker; and, in fact, though not one of the Society of Friends, he occasionally attended their meetings. His religious faith was that of a Protestant Dissenter. Having diligently made the Holy Scriptures his habitual study, he was from principle and conviction a firm believer in the great and important doctrines inculcated by the inspired writers.

It is needless to say, that this model of true Christian charity acted under the impulse of the strongest religious feeling; but it was a feeling so destitute of all prejudice, that he embraced in the large circle of his beneficence his fellow-creatures of every religious persuasion, as well as of every species of affliction; and the records of testamentary bounty afford few parallels to the following list of benefactions, which are to be made to various societies after the death of a near and dear relation, a daughter of his eldest brother, who had constantly contributed to his health and comfort.

3½ per cent. Stock.

Royal Humane Society . . .	£1000
Refuge for the Destitute . . .	1000
Foreigners in Distress . . .	1000
Philanthropic Society . . .	1000
St. Luke's Hospital . . .	1000
Magdalen Hospital . . .	1000
——— Asylum . . .	1000
Indigent Blind . . .	1000
Society for the Relief of Prisoners for small Debts . . .	1000
Jews' Poor, Mile End . . .	1000
City of London Truss Society . .	1000
General Penitentiary . . .	1000
London Hibernian Society . .	1000
London Hospital, Whitechapel .	1000
The Missionary Society . . .	1000
British and Foreign Bible Society	1000
Religious Tract Society . . .	1000
Quakers' Poor House . . .	1000
Methodist Preachers . . .	1000
Presbyterian Ditto . . .	1000
Baptist Ditto . . .	1000
Independent Ditto . . .	1000
Roman Catholic Ditto . . .	1000
Quakers' Ditto . . .	1000

Mr. Hawes had no children; but he had numerous relations, among whom he distributed the bulk of his ample property, with strict attention to their just claims on his notice; nor is there one of them who has not reason to remember him with gratitude.

INTELLIGENCE.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

THE Half-Yearly Meeting of this Association was held at Taunton, on Tuesday, April 9th. The Rev. Mr. Bowen, of Ilminster, delivered a discourse from John xvii. 5, on the analogy between Natural and Revealed Religion.

In the evening, the Rev. W. Hincks, of Exeter, preached from 1 John iv. 1, with particular reference to the doctrine of immediate Divine Influence.

Ten new members were added to the Association, and nearly thirty of its friends dined together at the Bell Inn.

The Rev. William Wilson, of Crewkerne, is engaged to preach at the next Meeting, which will be held at Yeovil, in October.

G. B. W.

Quarterly Meeting of Unitarian Ministers in South Wales.

THE Quarterly Meeting of Unitarian Ministers in South Wales was held at Blaen-y-gwrach, on Thursday last. There was service at the Meeting-House on the preceding evening, when Mr. E. Lewis, a student in his last year at the Caermarthen College, introduced, and Messrs. J. Jones, of Bridgend, and J. Thomas, of Pant-y-de-faid, preached; the former from Acts ii. 36; the latter from Eph. i. 7. On Thursday morning, Mr. J. Griffiths, of Llandy-fan, conducted the introductory part of the service; and J. James, of Gelli-onnen, preached from 1 Tim. iv. 8; and Mr. D. Davies, of Neath, in English, from John ix. 3. After concluding the service with a prayer, an open conference took place, Mr. W. Williams, minister at the place, in the Chair. The subjects discussed were, Reason and Zeal in Matters of Religion; what they are, and how far useful. There were present about ten preachers, and the audience, though not very numerous, was respectable and attentive, and consisted of men of very different and opposite sentiments. The friends of Unitarianism seemed to be much pleased with what they had heard, and its opponents were perhaps in an equal degree dissatisfied; some of whom, the writer has been informed, expressed (though not publicly in the Meeting) their disapprobation, if not in the mildest, yet in very significant terms.

The summer's Quarterly Meeting is united with the Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Society, which is to be held at

Swansea on the 27th of June next, and at which Mr. J. Thomas, of Pant-y-de-faid, is to preach the Welsh sermon. The ministers are to meet at Gelli-onnen on the 26th, where Mr. Thomas Evans, of Aberdâr, is to preach at eleven o'clock.
J. JAMES.

April 13, 1822.

Opening of Unitarian Place of Worship in the Borough.

OWING to the shutting up of the chapel in St. Thomas's, in the Borough of Southwark, and the removal of Dr. THOMAS REES's congregation to Stamford Street, Blackfriars, the remaining members of the late Mr. Brown's congregation at Horselydown, who chiefly reside at a distance, which renders their worshipping at Stamford Street inconvenient, and sometimes impracticable, have, in conjunction with a few other zealous individuals, engaged a large and commodious room for Unitarian worship, in *White Horse Court, High Street, Borough*. This was opened on Sunday, April 14, when a sermon was preached in the morning by Mr. DAVID EATON, from Psalm xcvi. 6, to a congregation of about 130 persons, and another in the evening, by the Rev. S. W. BROWNE, A. B., the minister of Monkwell Street, from John xiii. 7—9, to a very crowded audience. Mr. Browne has generously offered his gratuitous services to the congregation for three months on the Sunday evening. In this service the Essex-Street Liturgy is used, fifty copies of which have been presented to the Society by Mr. AGAR, through the kind offices of the Rev. T. BELSHAM. —As the individuals who have opened this chapel are, for the most part, in humble circumstances, they respectfully solicit the aid of their Unitarian brethren, and of the various Fellowship Funds, in discharging the necessary expenses. They have consulted rigid prudence in the whole of their expenditure, and they conscientiously believe, that, with the Divine blessing, on which they rely, much good will result to the cause of Christian truth and piety from their humble undertaking. Any further particulars may be learned of Mr. W. Wood, Treasurer, 63, *High Street, Borough*.

Eastern Unitarian Society.

THE Yearly Meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Society will be held at Diss, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 26th and

27th of June, when the new chapel will be opened. The Rev. Robert Aspland is expected to preach.

EDWARD TAYLOR,
Secretary.

The Annual Meeting of the *Southern Unitarian Society* will be held at Newport, Isle of Wight, on Wednesday July 24, 1822, when the Rev. J. B. Bristowe, of Ringwood, is expected to preach before the Society. Service to begin at twelve o'clock.

THOS. COOKE, Jun.
Secretary.

Managers of the Society for the Relief of the Necessitous Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, deceased, for the year 1822.

Ebenezer Maitland, Esq., Clapham Common, *Treasurer*, William Ashlin, Esq., Belton Street, Long acre; the Rev. Joseph Barrett, Mecklenburgh Square; Joseph Bradley, Esq., Clapham Common; Joseph Bunnell, Esq., Southampton Row, Bloomsbury; the Rev. John Clayton, Sen., Shore Place, Hackney; William Burls, Esq., Lothbury; James Collins, Esq., Spital Square; John Danford, Esq., Aldgate; James Esdaile, Esq., Bunhill Row; James Gibson, Esq., Lime Street, Fenchurch Street; the Rev. Thomas Griffin, Mile End Green; Joseph Gutteridge, Esq., Camberwell; William Gillman, Esq., Bank Buildings, Cornhill; George Hammond, Esq., Whitechapel; Samuel Jackson, Esq., Hackney; William Marston, Esq., East-Street, Red Lion Square; John Towill Rutt, Esq., Clapton; John Rogers, Esq., Swithin's Lane; Thomas Rogers, Esq., Clapham; Josiah Roberts, Esq., Terrace, Camberwell; Robert Sangster, Esq., Denmark Hill, ditto; Thomas Saville, Esq., Clapton; Benjamin Shaw, Esq., London Bridge Foot; James Smith, Esq., Hamper Mill, Watford, Herts.; Thomas Stiff, Esq., New Street, Covent Garden; William Titford, Esq., Walworth; and Thomas Wilson, Esq., Highbury Place, Islington.

LAW REPORT.

*Court of Chancery, Lincoln's Inn,
March 23.*

Lawrence's Lectures on Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man.

LAWRENCE v. SMITH.

Mr. Wetherell on Thursday moved to

dissolve the injunction which had been granted in this case, to restrain the defendant from printing, publishing and disposing of a book under the above title. He stated, that Mr. Lawrence was a professor of surgery, and lecturer to the Royal College of Surgeons: the defendant was a respectable bookseller in the Strand. The injunction was granted on the ground of piracy. The Lectures in contention were delivered by the plaintiff, at the College of Surgeons, and he afterwards printed them; the defendant had put them together, and published them in one volume, and this was the piracy complained of. What he (the learned counsel) had to contend for was, that the plaintiff had no copyright in the work, for it was a publication denying Christianity and revelation, which was contrary to public policy and morality. He would not have his Lordship take it on his *ipse dixit* that they were so, but those Lectures had undergone criticism by persons in the habit of performing that duty; they were reprobated by the writers of the *Edinburgh Medical Review*, the *Quarterly Review*, by the Lecturer on Christianity in the University of Oxford, and by the Rev. Mr. Whitfield, of Bath, as being irreligious, and of such a tendency that public policy ought not to tolerate them. The object of the publication was to send out to the world the doctrine, that when man dies, his soul dies with him; denying the immortality of the soul. He would admit that the Lectures were most ably and eloquently written, which only tended to give the poison they contained greater influence over weak minds. It was impossible that he could express his opinion of the mischievous tendency of the Lectures better than it was expressed in the *Edinburgh Medical Review*—that they could not believe that the plaintiff would have attempted to have brought his pupils into a state of total darkness; for what was the doctrine of the plaintiff?—that a man had no more soul than an oyster, or any other fish or insect. The learned counsel then quoted several passages from the Lectures, to prove, that the death of the soul was announced to them in as strong terms as it could be pronounced; it was no accidental doubt that was expressed in them, but it was a positive assertion, and read at the Royal College of Surgeons. He not only denied that the race of man sprang from Adam and Eve, but went so far as to say there was no truth in the deluge. Having called his Lordship's attention to the passages, it would be for him to decide whether the plaintiff could have a copyright in such a work,

to send its poison out to the world. It was scarcely necessary for him to allude to the place in which the Lectures were delivered—it was a place licensed by royal charter; but he would contend, if such Lectures were allowed to be delivered there, that the charter would be as bad as the plaintiff's copyright: he, however, understood that the plaintiff was no longer Lecturer there. He had nothing, certainly, to do with the place where the Lectures were delivered; but he would deal with him in his character of an author, and he would dilate on the poison disseminating from him as a lecturer to a school, the pupils of which were afterwards to become practitioners of surgery. Looking at it as the work of an author, it did not require criticism to shew its evil tendency, for it was as clear as the sun at noon. The learned counsel was proceeding with his argument, when he was interrupted by

The *Lord Chancellor*, who stated that he should stop there for the present, as he was obliged to attend elsewhere.

Mr. *Wetherell* this day resumed his argument. He had but little further to add to what he had said on Thursday. The article in *The Quarterly Review* called the work in question an open avowal of the doctrine of Materialism. It was also reprobated for the pernicious tendency of its principles by *The Edinburgh Medical Review*, which said that it was calculated to lead the minds of his pupils into darkness worse than the darkness of the valley of death; and by the vicar of Kensington, who was the Christian Lecturer in Cambridge. The book, he contended, had the same object as the doctrine of the French Imperialists, namely, to establish the belief that death was an eternal sleep, and that, therefore, we were not hereafter to be accountable for our actions in this life. The learned counsel concluded, with expressing his regret that such great learning, taste and talent, as this work evinced, should be combined with such dangerous principles; which, being calculated to subvert the doctrines of our religion, deprived the work of all claim to protection on the score of copyright; he therefore submitted that the injunction ought to be dissolved.

Mr. Rose followed on the same side, and referred to Dr. Priestley's case, where it was determined that, although a work might contain much valuable information, yet if it was directed against the institutions of the country, the law would afford it no support. He also referred to the case of Mr. Southey's book, and the work of Lord Byron the other day, in which

the Court, to use the language of the poet, refused to "set its seal on Cain," and sent him forth a wanderer through the world. The pernicious principles contained in these Lectures were not the native growth of this country, but were sought for in the doctrines of foreign professors, and imported here from the German and French schools. The learned counsel then read a passage from the Dedication, which he said was the first passage complained of: the second was in page 98, where the learned professor said, that the Mosaic account of the origin of mankind, as contained in the book of Genesis, did not make it quite clear that all the world had been peopled by the descendants of Adam and Eve; and treated the account of the circumstances of the deluge as a zoological impossibility. Mr. Lawrence (Mr. Rose continued) had subtilely condensed into one passage all the venom contained in a whole chapter of Gibbon. He then read an extract from page 422, in which Professor Lawrence contended, from the peculiar organization of the brain, that it was the seat of the sentient principle, which necessarily depended upon it for existence, and that the annihilation of the one must inevitably involve the annihilation of the other. He also read other passages, in which it was stated that many writers had doubted the inspiration of the scriptural writers: and containing other observations, the tendency of which, the learned counsel argued, was subversive of our faith; and they were the more dangerous, from the author's scholarlike command of language, and his scientific manner of treating his subject; which, acting upon undisciplined minds, was calculated to subdue and bring them under its controul, and thereby work the greater mischief.

Mr. *Shadwell*, on behalf of the plaintiff, supported the injunction. He was obliged to his friend, Mr. Wetherell, for the manner in which he laid the question before the Court. He had condemned the work on the ground of its professing the doctrine of Materialism. The doctrine of Materialism was two-fold. One species of Materialism limited the existence of man to this world only. That was a doctrine which he (Mr. Shadwell) would be the last person in existence to say one word in defence of. But there was another species of Materialism, which says, that the sentient principle of man depends upon the organic structure of the body, and therefore cannot have a separate existence; but does not deny that both may exist hereafter, when the resurrection of the body takes place. That was perfectly

consistent, Mr. Shadwell contended, with the doctrine of the Christian religion, as laid down in the Holy Scriptures; while, on the contrary, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as a distinct and independent principle, was quite foreign from our church. There was not a single passage in Scripture recognizing the existence of the soul in the intermediate period from the death of the body to its resurrection; while there were many which went to confirm the belief in the total suspension of the sentient principle during that interval. The words of the Apostles' Creed, "to judge the quick and the dead," implied this notion, as did those of the Nicene Creed, "both the living and the dead;" they, however, left it doubtful; but the Creed of Athanasius left it wholly unambiguous, for it said, "at whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works." Mr. Shadwell then quoted several passages from the New Testament in support of his position. In the first book of Josephus' Antiquities, he alludes to the story of Abraham sacrificing his son Isaac, and saying that "the soul of the son would hover round the father and protect him;" from which it appeared that he believed in the immortality of the soul; but St. Paul, in his Epistles, shewed that he was wrong. Our Saviour was described as having risen "in body;" and the bodies of the saints who had been dead to have appeared to many in the Holy City. In the 15th chapter of Corinthians, St. Paul, talking of our Saviour being seen of 500 of the brethren at once, says, "of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep;" and again, "of them which are fallen asleep." From which one must infer a state of non-existence before their resurrection. The resurrection of the dead is talked of, but there is not a single passage in revelation mentioning a distinct spirit, independent of the body; and, indeed, the Book of Genesis applies the term "soul" to the brutes and fishes. In our English translations that term is not used; the passage is, "And God said, let the waters bring forth the moving creature that hath life, &c.;" but in the original Hebrew the word is *nephesh*; and in the Septuagint *psuche*, each of which signifies *soul*; and it was therefore impossible to make out that the soul was separate from the living principle: so that it was perfectly consistent with Scripture to say that the sentient principle of man cannot be separated from his body: nor did that deny the doctrine of his accountability hereafter, when the resurrection of the body took place. Mr. Shadwell, after refer-

ring to the second volume of Locke, where he held it to be impossible for human reason to discover these points without the assistance of the inspired writings, spoke of the wisdom of our church in laying down no doctrine which might not be simply reconciled with what was stated in Scripture, excluding all metaphysical positions; and therefore nowhere setting forth that the soul was immortal, or had a separate existence from the body. There might be some passages found, which would seem to *imply* its existence in the intermediate period, between the death of the natural body, and its resurrection; but there was not one which *asserted* it. The learned counsel then quoted passages from the works of several eminent divines in support of his argument. Bishop Law said that no man could quote passages from Scripture to prove that the soul existed unconnected with the body. Mr. Taylor asserted, that all natural arguments to prove the existence of the soul separate from the body were vain: experience shewed the contrary; and as to the faculties of a dying man retaining their vigour to the latest moment of life, when the body was nearly powerless, it was only because the brain was the last part of the system which was attacked by death. Bishop Butler had endeavoured to give metaphysical reasons for a separate existence of the soul, from the strength of a dying man's faculties when his body had nearly failed; but Mr. Pitt declared that that doctrine of the learned Bishop raised more difficulties than it solved. Dr. Bayly's doctrine went still further than that of Mr. Lawrence; for the latter confined himself to the formation of man as a zoological creature. Archdeacon Blackburne said that the New Testament always spoke of the interval between death and the resurrection as a state of sleep. He (Mr. Shadwell) did not believe it was so: but St. Paul, in alluding to it, constantly used the word "slept." It would be useless to waste the time of the Court in quoting passages from Drs. Watson and Warburton's works. He had done sufficient to shew that great and eminent men in the church had entertained, if not avowed, the doctrine which had been denominated the poison of the present work. It was a work containing 600 pages, on physiological and scientific subjects; the readers of which were more likely to have their attention attracted by its learning and science, than by an abstract point of doctrine contained in an insulated passage. It was not like a work of a light nature, easily read, and therefore extensively circulated, like the one which came before his Lordship the other day: he

thought the present question materially affected the liberty of the press. It was by the liberty of the press that this country had grown great : he did not speak of it in its licentious sense. This gentleman had not spoken of Scripture with disrespect. He had certainly said that some persons had entertained doubts of the inspiration of its writers ; but he himself spoke in terms of the highest eulogy of the New Testament. He called it "a religion of peace and love, as unfolded by the apostles." He qualified his denial of those doctrines which he controverted by saying that, "physiologically speaking," it was impossible to believe them, calling them, at the same time, sublime doctrines, and admitting that they had existed in all places and in all ages, and therefore depended not on his inferences. He talked of Paschal, who was the best friend of Christianity, as "the profound, fervent, and pious Paschal." In short, if there were any exceptionable passages in the book, there were others which contained their antidote, and the whole work should be taken together. He (Mr. Shadwell) would rather drop down lifeless upon the ground, than attempt for a moment to uphold the doctrine of Materialism, as tending to overturn belief in a future state. But the principles in the book before the Court were quite consistent with the notion of existence in a future world ; and a valuable work of this kind ought not to be condemned, and the author to lose the price of his labour, because there might happen to be a passage or two in it which might as well have been omitted.

Mr. Wilbraham followed on the same side with Mr. Shadwell, and said that the defendant had no claim to the favour of the Court, who had taken to himself the fruits and profits of the plaintiff's labour without any moral right whatever to the work ; but merely because he thought there were a few passages in it which disentitled it to the protection of the law. The learned gent. then contended that the doctrine contained in the Lectures was perfectly reconcileable with Christianity ; and argued from a passage in the burial service, in addition to what Mr. Shadwell had cited, that a mutual existence of the soul and body was the result after death. In the sentence "the dead shall be raised," &c., the words in the Greek were *oi nekroi*, and not *ten nekren* in the neuter. Dr. Butler had said that that doctrine depended on revelation only, and not on natural principles. Mr. Lawrence's Materialism was confined to this life, and contained no principle contrary to the immortality of the soul here-

after, when the resurrection took place ; and it was countenanced by Scripture. With respect to his doctrine of mankind having descended from different parents, that opinion was strengthened, not only by the different complexions of nations, but also by the difference in their features, the formation of their bones, and the substantive parts of the body : and he only said that "the Mosaic account did not make it clear," &c. And as to saying that many doubted the inspiration of the scriptural writings, he was surely entitled to say what were the opinions of others ; but that was not stating that they were his own. On the contrary, he spoke of their simple grandeur, and said that "they were not inferior to the uninspired writings of the East," from which the inference was, that he looked upon them as inspired. The Mosaic account of the deluge, the collection of two of every description of animal on the earth, he stated to be a zoological impossibility ; but he did not deny the fact, that it took place miraculously. With respect to a passage in Mr. Wetherell's speech, in which he stated that Mr. Lawrence was no longer Lecturer to the College of Surgeons, he should state that he laid down the office of his own accord, in consequence of his increased practice ; and the members of the College had expressed their regret at his so doing. These Lectures were delivered in 1816 and 1817 : in 1819 he delivered other Lectures, but in the interval these had been published. The College of Surgeons, therefore, had not only heard them delivered, but had them in print before 1819, and what was their opinion of them ? (Mr. Wilbraham here read an affidavit of Mr. Lawrence, by which it appeared that he had received the thanks of the College of Surgeons for his luminous Lectures delivered in 1816, 1817, 1818 and 1819.) The learned counsel then resumed his argument, and insisted that the author of our planetary system might as well be condemned for impugning the passage in Scripture which ascribed motion to the sun, and affirmed that it stood still on one day ; as Professor Lawrence's Lectures, because they asserted the zoological impossibility of one or two facts stated in Scripture. He concluded by expressing his hope that his Lordship would continue the injunction.

The Lord Chancellor.—Mr. Wetherell, I shall hear you in reply on Tuesday : you will lose nothing by the delay, for I shall have an opportunity of reading the book in the mean time.

(To be continued.)

MR. MILLS has prepared a work on *Irish Tithes and Temporals*, which Mr. Cobbett says (*Register*, Vol. 42, p. 250) he hopes the public is soon to have in their possession. It presents a picture, he adds, which, if it could but be once seen by every man in the kingdom, would cause the immediate, the instant abolition of the *monstrous original*, the equal of which has never been seen before in any country under the sun.

PROFESSOR CHENEVIERE, of Geneva, has in the press a French *Translation of Marsh's Michaelis*, with many additional notes. Scriptural criticism has been so much neglected among the French and Swiss Protestants, that the publication of a version of this admirable work becomes an important fact; and it is doubly so at a moment when *authority* pretends to decide all subjects of doubt, and refuses to the judgment and to the conviction their honest exercise. The Professor will attack the supposed errors of the English Prelate, and give, we have reason to believe, a high tone of liberal feeling to the volumes.

Letter from Lord Byron to Mr. Murray, the Bookseller, on his "Cain."

(From the Newspapers.)

Pisa, February 8, 1822.

DEAR SIR,

ATTACKS upon me were to be expected; but I perceive one upon *you* in the papers, which I confess I did not expect. How, or in what manner, *you* can be considered responsible for what I publish, I am at a loss to conceive. If "*Cain*" be "*blasphemous*," *Paradise Lost* is blasphemous; and the words of the Oxford gentleman, "*Evil, be thou my good*," are from that very poem, from the mouth of Satan; and is there any thing more in that of Lucifer in the *Mystery*? *Cain* is nothing more than a drama, not a piece of argument. If Lucifer and Cain speak as the first murderer and the first rebel may be supposed to speak, surely all the rest of the personages talk also according to their characters; and the stronger passions have ever been permitted to the drama. I have even avoided introducing the Deity, as in Scripture (though Milton does, and not very wisely either); but have adopted his angel, as sent to Cain, instead, on purpose to avoid shocking any feelings on the subject, by falling short of what all uninspired men must fall short in, viz. giving an adequate no-

tion of the effect of the presence of Jehovah. The old *Mysteries* introduced him liberally enough, and all this is avoided in the new one.

The attempt to *bully you*, because they think it will not succeed with me, seems to me as atrocious an attempt as ever disgraced the times. What! when Gibbon's, Hume's, Priestley's and Drummond's publishers have been allowed to rest in peace for seventy years, are *you* to be singled out for a work of *fiction*, not of history or argument? There must be something at the bottom of this—some private enemy of your own: it is otherwise incredible.

I can only say, "*Me—me adsum qui feci*," that any proceedings directed against you, I beg may be transferred to me, who am willing, and *ought* to endure them all; that if you have lost money by the publication, I will refund any, or all, of the copyright; that I desire you will say, that both *you* and Mr. Gifford remonstrated against the publication, as also Mr. Hobhouse; that *I* alone occasioned it, and I alone am the person who either legally or otherwise should bear the burden. If they prosecute, I will come to England; that is, if by meeting it in my own person, I can save yours. Let me know—you sha'nt suffer for me, if I can help it. Make any use of this letter which you please.

Yours ever,

BYRON.

Slave Trade.

It is distressing to learn that the nefarious commerce in human beings is still largely carried on. The profits of the abominable traffic are so great, that it is not likely to be finally crushed, until all the civilized states shall engage by treaty to employ an adequate naval force on the African coasts, for the protection of humanity. England has, to the honour of her government, done much in this philanthropic work; the United States of America, more. The latter country has employed armed vessels on the shores of Africa for the suppression of the *piracy* (as it is now regarded) of making and transporting slaves. Many wretched cargoes have been seized by the American navy, and the poor negroes carried to the United States' colony, set on foot in Africa for their civilization. A committee of the Senate was appointed some time ago for the suppression of the *Slave Trade*, and they have made a report in which they recommend the continuance of the exertions already made, with some improvements as to the construction of the vessels employed and their comple-

ment of seamen, and to urge the necessity of a treaty with the maritime powers of Europe for allowing the reciprocal right of search, under certain modifications, with a view to prevent the fraudulent exercise of the accursed traffic. The committee allege that the horrid trade has been chiefly carried on of late under the French flag, though they seem willing to allow that Frenchmen may not be privy to the guilt. There are, no doubt, in all countries wretches whom the lust of gold will draw into any crimes however monstrous. All the world exclaims against the characters of such monsters; but will they not abound of necessity, while bloodshedding under the name of war is accounted honourable, and robbery on the high seas justifiable?

Tithes chargeable with Poor's Rates.

At the last Norfolk Quarter Sessions, held at Norwich, on Wednesday the 17th of April, the Court came to a most important decision on the Poor Laws, on an appeal by the Rev. Dr. Bulwer, Rector of Cawston, against the Poor Rates for that parish. The Doctor had been rated at 550*l.* for his tithes, against which he appealed, upon the ground that it exceeded a fourth of the assessment upon the titheable property in the parish, which he contended was the proportion, at which tithes should be assessed to the Poor Rate. The Court dismissed the appeal, being unanimously of opinion, that there was no rule in law for affixing a proportional assessment on tithes compared with land, and that the only principle was, to assess all real property according to the productive *value* or *profit* which it yielded. This determination is important, as it recognizes a principle, the general application of which, at the present time, will necessarily be attended with the most serious results, both to the farmer and the clergy; upon the latter of whom the chief burden of the poor will now, as in former times, be thrown. According to this principle it is evident that, at present prices, the assessment upon land ought to be merely nominal, and that the *tithes* should be assessed to their *full amount*, it being notorious that no profit whatever is now afforded from land in general, and that which the landlord receives in the name of *rent*, is, in fact, a payment out of the farmer's capital; while *tithes*, being taken clear of taxes and all other expenses attending the raising of the crop, are nearly *all profit*. This decision has, we understand, excited a great sensation in Norfolk, and the farmers, in many places, have already insisted upon a reduction

of their assessments, and upon rating the parsons to the full amount of their tithes, as well *where they are compounded for* as when taken in kind. Let the farmers generally adopt this plan, and they will not only obtain *immediate* and *considerable relief*, but, in a few months, they will see the clergy as clamorous for Reform as the most devoted radical; for nothing short of Reform, any alteration in the law being wholly out of the question, can now prevent the tithes from *being wholly swallowed up in Poor Rates*. The above principle was acknowledged, in its full extent, a short time since in the Court of King's Bench: Mr. Justice Holroyd having expressly declared, that rate on land is, in effect, a rate on the *profits* on land; for, where there are no profits, there is no *beneficial occupation*.

PARLIAMENTARY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 30.

Admission of Catholic Peers to the House of Lords.

MR. CANNING brought forward his motion for allowing Catholic Peers to sit in the Upper House. His speech was eloquent and impressive; but the less interesting as it proceeded on narrow grounds of policy rather than enlarged principles of freedom. The principal antagonist of the measure was Mr. PEEL, who vindicated the intolerant side of the question with great gravity, little reason and not more bigotry than his argument absolutely required. The motion in favour of the Catholic Peers was carried by a majority of *four*. The Bill thus brought in, was read a second time, May 10th, when another division took place, the majority in behalf of the measure being now increased to twelve. On the third reading, May 17th, the Bill was allowed to pass the Commons without a division. It will now go to the House of Lords, where its reception will depend upon the temper of the Court. We fear that it will be thrown out.

Various petitions have been presented to both Houses by the Unitarians throughout the country, praying for relief from the Marriage Service, as far as it implies Trinitarian worship. One counter petition was presented to the House of Commons, May 17th, by Sir WM. LEMON, from several *Clergymen* in the neighbourhood of *Bodmin*, in Cornwall, "praying that no alteration might be made in the Marriage Act in favour of Unitarian Dissenters." Sir William had previously presented an Unitarian petition from Falmouth.