

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXII.]

AUGUST, 1823.

[Vol. XVIII.]

Rammohun Roy: Controversy between the Bramuns and Missionaries.

(From the *Baltimore "Unitarian Miscellany,"* for May 1823.)

THE attention of our readers has already been called, on several occasions, to the progress of Unitarianism in India. We have informed them of the conversion of Mr. Adam, a missionary in Calcutta, and noticed his sermon preached at the opening of a new society in that city. We have, also, repeatedly spoken of the labours of Rammohun Roy, who has made himself so conspicuous in India and Europe by his talents, learning, and zeal for religious truth.

Later information represents the cause as advancing with as much success as could be expected. Dr. Channing's Ordination Sermon at Baltimore, which has passed through a great number of editions in this country, and in England, has been reprinted in Calcutta. We have before us two letters from Rammohun Roy to a gentleman in Baltimore, the first dated Calcutta, October 17, and the other, December 9, 1822. These letters contain valuable facts, some of which will be seen in the extracts below. They are written in English, and manifest a perfect acquaintance with that language. In the first letter the writer observes,

"I have now every reason to hope, that the truths of Christianity will not be much longer kept hidden under the veil of Heathen doctrines and practices, gradually introduced among the followers of Christ, since many lovers of truth are zealously engaged in rendering the religion of Jesus clear from corruptions.

"I admire the zeal of the Missionaries sent to this country, but disapprove of the means they have adopted. In the performance of their duty, they always begin with such obscure doctrines as are calculated to excite ridicule, instead of respect, towards the religion which they wish to promulgate. The accompanying pamphlets, called *The Bramunical Magazine*, and published by a Bramun, are a proof of my assertion. The last number of

this publication has remained unanswered for twelve months.

"If a body of men attempt to upset a system of doctrines generally established in a country, and to introduce another system, they are, in my humble opinion, in duty bound to prove the truth, or, at least, the superiority of their own.

"It is, however, a great satisfaction to my conscience to find, that the doctrines inculcated by Jesus and his apostles, are quite different from those human inventions, which the Missionaries are persuaded to profess, and entirely consistent with reason, and the revelation delivered by Moses and the prophets. I am, therefore, anxious to support them, even at the risk of my own life. I rely much on the force of truth, which will, I am sure, ultimately prevail. Our number is comparatively small, but I am glad to inform you, that none of them can be justly charged with the want of zeal and prudence.

"I wish to add, in order that you may set me right, if you find me mistaken,—my view of Christianity is, that in representing all mankind as the children of one eternal Father, it enjoins them to love one another, without making any distinction of country, cast, colour, or creed; notwithstanding, they may be justified in the sight of the Creator in manifesting their respect towards each other, according to the propriety of their actions, and the reasonableness of their religious opinions and observances.

"I shall lose no time in sending you my *Final Appeal to the Christian Public*, as soon as it is printed."

In the second letter Rammohun Roy remarks,

"Although our adversaries are both numerous and zealous, as the adversaries of truth always have been, yet our prospects are by no means discouraging, if we only have the means

of following up what has already been done.

"We confidently hope that, through these various means, the period will be accelerated, when the belief in the Divine Unity, and in the mission of Christ, will universally prevail."

What the author calls his *Final Appeal*, relates to a controversy in which he has been some time engaged with the Missionaries, and which we have before noticed. He published selections from the New Testament, in which it was his object to bring together the practical parts, and avoid such as have divided Christians. For this he was censured by the Missionaries. He has defended himself in two *Appeals to the Christian Public*, written with great moderation, candour and ability. In the first, he makes it appear, by various arguments, that if any hope is ever to be entertained of converting the Hindoos to Christianity, the work must be commenced by teaching the plain, practical instructions of Jesus. In the second, he takes up some of the dogmas, which the Missionaries declared to be essential to Christianity, but which he says he has never been able to find in the Bible. The Trinity and Atonement are the two dogmas on which he chiefly insists. He affirms, that these are not taught in the Scriptures, and he draws all his arguments to confute them from the Scriptures themselves. He also explains in a very full and clear manner all the texts quoted by the Missionaries, and Trinitarians generally, in support of these doctrines.

His *Second Appeal* contains one hundred and seventy-three pages, and in it the author discovers a familiar and profound acquaintance with every part of the Scriptures, not only in their English dress, but in the original Hebrew and Greek. He criticises several passages in the original with judgment and discrimination. He is an adept in the Eastern languages. He has published works in Arabic, Persian and Bengalee; and we have never known a foreigner write the English with so accurate a use of its idiom. A volume of his works has recently been published in England.

We consider the conversion of this learned Bramun to Christianity, a remarkable event of the present age, and one of the strongest practical

arguments which could be adduced in favour of Unitarianism. He studied the Scriptures alone, and his own writings prove that he studied them with uncommon attention. He believed them on their own authority, and he now declares his willingness to support the truths they contain, "even at the risk of his own life." He has found no Trinity there; he has found "one God and one Mediator;" the Supreme Being, and his subordinate Messiah; the Creator of all things, and the Son by whom he revealed his will to the world. In short, the results to which he has come, have very little accordance with the high dogmas of orthodoxy, which make so prominent a feature in human systems of faith, but which Unitarians deem unscriptural and unprofitable. In regard to the Trinity, he says,

"Early impressions alone can induce a Christian to believe that three are one, and one is three; just as by the same means a Hindoo is made to believe that millions are one, and one is millions; and to imagine that an inanimate idol is a living substance, and capable of assuming various forms. *As I have sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the Author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy apostles, and not from a parent or tutor, I cannot help refusing my assent to any doctrine which I do not find scriptural.*"—*Second Appeal*, p. 108.

As to the general tenor of the above extracts from Rammohun Roy's letters, our readers cannot but perceive that the views they indicate are rational and just. It is perfectly clear, that before you can pretend to teach a doctrine, or any truth, to beings who can reason and think, you must bring it down to their apprehension, and shew something in it, which their minds can grasp, and on which their understanding can rest. The Missionaries seem to reverse this order of nature. They begin with mysteries; with things which they acknowledge to be unintelligible to themselves; and it is no wonder that they should end in a total failure.

The absurdity of this plan is the more manifest in such a country as Bengal, where there are natives of great talents and great learning, who spend their lives in study and research,

who are acquainted with the principles of science, who are given to examination and inquiry, who write and publish books on all the varieties of human attainment, who look for a reason in every thing, who have a national literature abounding in numerous works on theology, law, jurisprudence, politics, geography, astronomy and other sciences, and who have settled opinions on all these subjects, founded on the basis of custom, education and continued patient investigation. These are the people, whom the Missionaries would bring over to Christianity, by inculcating dogmas, which they confess are inexplicable, and not to be reasoned about!

Moreover, these same people have a religion, which they can trace back many centuries anterior to the coming of the Saviour, and which is rooted in their minds by all that is imposing in the records of their ancestry, by the countenance of popular opinion, by the force of instruction, by the authority of sacred books, by all that is venerable in a long-established priesthood, by every thing, in short, which attaches them to their customs, builds up and sustains their institutions, and stamps the features of their character. They have a formal and systematic religion, taught in books of great antiquity, in which habit and conscience equally incline them to put implicit credence. They have their Veds and their Shastrus, their Poorans and Tuntrus, and to these are appended commentaries on commentaries, which have been the result of the wisdom and study of ages. Now, whatever may be the absurdity or the defects of the system; which these contain, it cannot be doubted, that there is something in it adapted to the better principles of the human mind, something which is upheld by plausible arguments, and the appearance of consistency. On no other grounds can you account for its being maintained for so long a period of time, by a people in many respects enlightened and polished.

We infer that the errors of such a religion, under circumstances in which this is embraced, cannot be successfully combated by any other weapons, than those of plain sense and argument. To preach mysteries will only thicken the darkness; to enforce

things at which the understanding revolts, will make it cling the more closely to its mistakes. This is the dictate of common sense, and it has been the result of experience. In the above letter, from a learned native, who feels a real interest in the Christian cause, we are told that the Missionaries begin with such doctrines as to expose themselves to ridicule, instead of gaining the attention and respect of the Hindoos. And why is this? Because they talk without reason. No one was ever ridiculed, who addressed the understanding and added demonstration to his assertions. Preach truth in a plain garb, and it will be received; for no mind is below or above truth, when it is presented in its unobscured simplicity.

Rammohun Roy has become a Christian, in spite of the Missionaries, by the force of his own mind, examining the Scriptures with a determination to find and understand their meaning. He is convinced of their truth and divinity, although he has never been able to discover in them the mysterious doctrines, which for twenty years the Missionaries have been endeavouring with great industry and zeal to inculcate. Other natives would not be long in following his steps, if they could be allowed to inquire, like the honest Bereans, why these things are so, and could be favoured with a frank and ready answer. And, surely, it cannot be thought a difficult task to prove the superiority of the Christian religion over that of the Hindoos. It is no doubt difficult to prove inexplicable and contradictory propositions either to a Hindoo, or to any other rational man; but if we cannot prove the superiority of all that is valuable and commanding and true in the Christian religion over every system of idolatry, we have no reason to boast of our privileges as the disciples of one who came from God, and who had power to enlighten and save an erring world.

We know well what obstacles the amiable and enthusiastic Henry Martyn encountered on this very ground. He attempted to argue, and his was a mind of no ordinary vigour and acuteness. The purity of his soul, his disinterestedness, his piety, did not surpass the strength of his intellect and the variety of his attainments.

But he ingenuously confessed, that he argued without success ; and there is no wonder, when we know the topics on which he delighted to dwell. These were no other than the Trinity, total depravity, imputed righteousness, and the like. Was it to be expected that a Hindoo or Persian would receive such doctrines as these, which were shrouded in mystery, and which they found in no degree preferable to the superstitions of their own religion ? Had Henry Martyn preached more from the Sermon on the Mount, and less from the five points, he would not have been forced to the melancholy acknowledgment of having wasted his strength in vain.

A paragraph in Rammohun Roy's First Appeal is so appropriate in this place, that we insert it, although it has appeared in our work on a former occasion. He states that,

“ He has seen with regret, that the Missionaries have completely counteracted their own benevolent efforts, by introducing all the dogmas and mysteries taught in Christian churches, to people by no means prepared to receive them ; and that they have been so incautious and inconsiderate in their attempts to enlighten the natives of India, as to address their instructions to them in the same way as if they were reasoning with persons brought up in a Christian country, with those dogmatical notions imbibed from their infancy. The consequence has been, that the natives in general, instead of benefiting by the perusal of the Bible, copies of which they always receive gratuitously, exchange them very often for blank paper ; and use several of the dogmatical terms in their native language as a mark of slight in an irreverent manner, the mention of which is repugnant to my feelings.”

But it is time to speak of the *Bramunical Magazine*, printed at Calcutta, and mentioned in Rammohun Roy's letter. We consider this work, in many respects, one of the most curious of the present day. It contains a set controversy between the Bramuns and Missionaries on the principles of their respective religions. We believe this is the first regular written controversy which has ever been commenced for a similar purpose. Three numbers of the work only have

come to hand. It is printed in Bengalee and English on corresponding pages.

It seems that, in a periodical work established by the Missionaries at Serampore, called the *Sumachar Durpun*, an article appeared attacking different parts of the Hindoo religion. Several distinct charges were made, and the editor stated, that if a reply were sent, it should be published in the same paper. The Bramuns accordingly furnished a reply, defending their religion, but when it was forwarded for publication it was rejected. Thus disappointed, the Bramuns resolved to publish what they had written in a separate form, and in this resolution originated the Bramunical Magazine. The two first numbers are occupied in replying to the article in the *Sumachar Durpun*, and the third is devoted to the discussion of another subject.

To exhibit the mode which the Missionaries adopt in discharging their duties, and the views and feelings of the natives respecting it, we select the following passages from the introduction to the first number.

“ During the last twenty years, a body of English gentlemen, who are called Missionaries, have been publicly endeavouring in several ways to convert the Hindoos and Mussulmans of this country to Christianity. The *first* way is that of publishing and distributing among the natives various books, large and small, reviling both religions, and abusing and ridiculing the gods and saints of the former. The *second* way is that of standing in front of the doors of the natives, or in the public roads, to preach the excellence of their own religion, and the debasedness of that of others. The *third* way is, that if any natives of low origin become Christians from the desire of gain, or from any other motives, these gentlemen employ and maintain them as a necessary encouragement to others to follow their example.”

“ It is not uncommon if the English Missionaries, who are of the conquerors of this country, revile and mock at the religion of the natives.”

“ If, by the force of argument, they can prove the truth of their own religion and the falsity of that of the Hindoos, many would of course embrace their doctrines ; and in case

they fail to prove this, they should not undergo such useless trouble, nor tease Hindoos any longer by their attempt at conversion. In consideration of the small huts in which Bramuns of learning generally reside, and the simple food, such as vegetables, which they are accustomed to eat, and the poverty which obliges them to live on charity, the missionary gentlemen may not, I hope, abstain from controversy from contempt of them ; for truth and true religion do not always belong to wealth and power, high names or lofty palaces."

Whether the mode of proceeding, above described, is the best way of recommending the pure principles of Christianity, and of converting the Hindoos from their errors, will at least admit a question. To *revile*, and *mock*, and *abuse*, and *ridicule* the opinions and customs of others, especially when these are connected with religious sentiments and feelings, does not seem the readiest method of gaining attention, winning esteem, convincing of mistake, or proving by example the efficacy of any system of doctrines to promote humility, soften the temper, and amend the heart. It is not commonly found, that people become more willing hearers by being abused and vilified ; or that they are the more likely to admire and adopt the principles of him who commends himself to them by such conduct.

In regard to the Missionaries maintaining persons belonging to the lower classes of Hindoos, "who become Christians from the desire of gain," it is a matter which chiefly concerns those among us who form societies and pay the money for their support.

We will only add, in confirmation of this statement of the Bramuns, an extract from Rammohun Roy's First Appeal.

"Of the few hundred natives, who have been nominally converted to Christianity, and who have been generally of the most ignorant class, there is ground to suspect, that the greater number have been allured to change their faith by other attractions than by a conviction of the truth and reasonableness of those dogmas ; as we find nearly all of them are employed or fed by their spiritual teachers, and, in case of neglect, are apt to

manifest a rebellious spirit ; a circumstance which is well known to the compiler from several local facts, as well as from the following occurrence.

"About three years ago, the compiler, on a visit to an English gentleman, who is still residing in the vicinity of Calcutta, saw a great number of Christian converts with a petition, which they intended to present to the highest ecclesiastical authority, stating that their teachers, through false promises of advancement, had induced them to give up their ancient religion. The compiler felt indignant at their presumption, and suggested to the gentleman, as a friend, the propriety of not countenancing a set of men who, from their own declaration, seemed so unprincipled."

The article published by the Missionaries in the *Sumachar Durpun* relates to some of the peculiarities of the Hindoo theology. It is copied entire into the *Bramunical Magazine*, and consists chiefly of quotations from the *Shastrus*, and other religious books, collected with a view to point out their absurdities and inconsistencies. Much is said on both sides, which is not very intelligible to us. The discussion runs deeply into the metaphysical and superstitious notions of the Hindoos, which are but imperfectly unfolded ; and it is replete with allusions, which can be understood only by such persons as are acquainted with their writings.

One point, however, seems to be clearer than some of the others. The Missionaries quote many passages from the Hindoo books to prove what false and degrading ideas the Hindoos entertain of the Supreme Being, and of the nature of divine worship. They are charged with assigning to God various forms, and other properties peculiar to created beings, but which could not belong to a spiritual, uncreated and perfect God. Against this charge, the Bramuns defend themselves in two ways ; *first*, by quoting and explaining their own books, and proving them to have a different sense from the one fixed on them by the Missionaries ; and, *secondly*, by attempting to shew, that the Christian Scriptures ascribe the same properties to the Deity, as are found in the Veds

and Shastrus. One specimen of their reasoning on this subject is all for which we have room. To the Missionaries they say,

“ You find fault with the Poorans and Tuntras, that they have established the duty of worshiping God for the benefit of mankind, as possessing various forms, names and localities,—and that, according to this, in the first place, it appears that there are many Gods, and that they enjoy the things of the world ; that, secondly, the omnipresence of a being, possessed of names and forms, is incredible.

“ I answer, the Poorans, agreeably to the Vedant, represent God in every way as *incomprehensible and without forms*. There is, moreover, this in the Poorans, that, lest persons of feeble intellect, unable to comprehend God as not subject to the senses, and without form, should either pass their life without any religious duties whatever, or should engage in evil works,—to prevent this, they have represented God in the form of a man and other animals, and to possess all those desires with which we are conversant, whereby they may have some regard for a Supreme Being. Afterwards, by diligent endeavours they become qualified for the true knowledge of God. But over and over again, the Poorans have carefully affirmed, that they give this account of the forms of God with a view to the benefit of persons of weak minds, and that, in truth, God is without name, form, organ, or sensual enjoyment.”

After this statement, the writer quotes the following passages from some of the sacred books, which he mentions by name.

“ Weak and ignorant persons, unable to know the supreme and indivisible God, think of him as possessed of certain limitations.”

“ For the assistance of the worshipers of the Supreme Being, who is pure intellect, one, without divisibility or body, a fictitious representation is given of his form.”

“ According to the nature of his qualities, his various forms have been fictitiously given for the benefit of those worshipers who are of slow understanding.”

These are remarkable testimonies, and would seem to indicate, that with

all their false notions, the Hindoos still discover the unity and perfections of God shadowed forth amidst the rubbish of their perverted metaphysics and idolatrous practices. This is a great point gained, for whilst they can be kept to a defence of the absolute unity of God, they must in no long time be brought by their own reflections to see the inconsistency of this doctrine, with a thousand others which embarrass and degrade their system. They will yield up these indefensible parts by degrees, and, if properly instructed, they cannot but be prepared to receive the pure doctrines of Christianity.

We are not to conclude, however, that all the Hindoos have the same rational notions of the Deity, as above expressed. The great mass are still Polytheists. In a late excellent letter from Calcutta, to the Unitarian Fund Society in England, Mr. Adam observes, that “ a large majority are idolaters, but that there is a small and increasing minority of Theists.” This latter class comprises those who hold to the unity of God in the same sense as the Editors of the Bramunical Magazine.

After confuting the Missionaries, as they think, from their own books, the Bramuns take their turn in becoming the assailants. They say,

“ We humbly ask the missionary gentlemen, whether or not they call Jesus Christ, who is possessed of the human form, *the very God* ; and whether they do not consider that Jesus Christ, ‘ the very God,’ received impressions by the external organs, eyes, &c. and operated by means of the active organs, hands, &c. ? And whether or not they consider him as subject to the human passions ? Was he angry or not ? Was his mind afflicted or not ? Did he experience any suffering or pain ? Did he not eat and drink ? Did he not live a long time with his mother, brothers and relations ? Was he not born, and did he not die ?

“ If they acknowledge all this, then they cannot find fault with the Poorans, alleging that in them the names and the forms of God are established ; and according to them God must be considered as subject to the senses, and as possessing senses and organs,

and as not possessed of omnipresence on account of his having a form. Because all these errors, namely, the plurality of Gods, their sensual indulgence, and their locality, are applicable to themselves in a complete degree.

“To say that every thing, however contrary to the laws of nature, is possible with God, will equally afford a pretence to Missionaries and Hindoos in support of their respective incarnations. The aged Vyas has spoken truth in the Muhabharut; ‘O king, a person sees the faults of another, although they are like the grains of mustard seed, but although his own faults are as big as the Bel fruit, seeing them he cannot see them.’ Moreover, the Poorans say, that the names, forms, and sensual indulgence of God, which we have mentioned, are *fictitious*, and we have so spoken with a view to engage the minds of persons of weak understanding; but the missionary gentlemen say, that the account which is given in the Bible of the names, forms, and sensual indulgence of God is *real*. Therefore, the plurality of Gods, their locality and subjection to sensual indulgence, are faults to be found in a *real sense* only in the system of the missionary gentlemen.”

Here we perceive how completely the Missionaries, by preaching the dogma of the Trinity, as the essence of Christianity, contravene all the good purposes which they might accomplish by adhering to the strict unity. They render useless their own exertions; they bring disrespect on the religion itself; and actually encourage the Hindoos to retort the charge of Polytheism and idol worship as existing in *reality* only against the Christian scheme. By such a process how can it be hoped, that any attempts will be successful in diffusing the truths and blessings of Christianity?

The Bramuns complain of what they call an unfair artifice of controversy employed by the Missionaries. They quote books of no authority, and call these quotations the Hindoo faith. “Having translated these works,” say the Bramuns, “which are opposed to the Veds, which are not quoted by any respectable author, and which have never been regarded as

authority, they always represent the Hindoo religion as very base.” Instances of this practice are given.

It is now nearly two years since this controversy was begun in Calcutta, and we cannot but express surprise, that our orthodox brethren, whose intercourse with all the missionary establishments is so direct and constant, should never have favoured the public with any notice of its progress. If a Missionary goes a day’s journey from his post, and leaves ten tracts in one village, and five in another, and talks to half a dozen ignorant natives in another, every orthodox journal and paper in the country is sure to tell the tale, with all the formality of time, place and circumstance. But when a controversy is commenced on subjects of the utmost importance, between the learned men of the College at Serampore, and the no less learned natives around them, not a whisper do we hear of so remarkable an event from the sources whence, on all other occasions, we are made acquainted with the minutest details of missionary transactions in every corner of the world. We forbear to ask any questions. Let our readers judge of the merits of the case by the extracts we have made from the Bramunical Magazine.

Correspondence with the Editor relating to Rammohun Roy.

THE first of the two following letters is referred to in our Correspondence, p. 432. When we there acknowledged it, we had no idea of making any public use of it; but having since had an interview with Mr. BUCKINGHAM, the highly intelligent and patriotic Editor of the *Calcutta Journal*, who is now in England, we put it into his hands, and have received from him the following letter in reply, which will be gratifying to our readers. To render Mr. Buckingham’s communication intelligible, it is necessary to publish the letter that gave rise to it, though it contains one passage at least which we are the reluctant instruments of circulating, and which we could not have admitted into our pages if it had not been followed by Mr. Buckingham’s satisfactory confutation.

LETTER I.

Eltham, June 19, 1823.

SIR,

I have perused with interest the several papers respecting Rammohun Roy, which have occasionally appeared in the *Monthly Repository*, and being desirous to further the object of their insertion therein, am induced to trouble you with what follows.

A relation of mine, who for some years filled a high and important official situation at Calcutta, was acquainted with Rammohun Roy, and I lately read to him the preface of "*The Precepts of Jesus a [the] Guide to [Peace and] Happiness*," which bears his name as its author. My relation observed first, that it is not fact (as asserted in pages 2 and 3 of the preface), that "the knowledge of Sanscrit is indispensable to the caste and profession of a Brahmin," and said that thousands of Brahmins were altogether ignorant of it.

"The Dewan," he said, "is not," (as described in page 3), "chief native officer in the collection of the revenues, but a kind of steward to a private gentleman."

About the time when he is said to have become Dewan, i. e. in 1814 or a little earlier, my relation knew him, and says that he possessed but the merest smattering of the English language; and though he allows him to have been perhaps the most intelligent of all the natives with whom he ever conversed or had any thing to do, considers his intellect as far below the standard of a moderate European intellect, and altogether decidedly unequal to the acquirement of our language in the degree of perfection which is necessary for criticism, translation, or controversy. His age too, at the time, was beyond the period when people acquire languages with facility. And moreover, he did not appear to him to have a remarkable talent for their acquisition, but the contrary; and, considering his advantages, spoke our language much worse than he ought, or might reasonably have been expected, to do. Considering these circumstances, and how soon afterwards he is represented as the author of several learned works, it is incredible to my relation that he

was or could ever be the author of such productions: and that he should have entered into controversy with Dr. Marshman, and have converted either him or any missionary of good talent to Unitarianism or any other faith, is still more wonderful and incredible to him.

He regards the whole as either a fabrication by persons whose zeal to further their objects has carried them to the length of imposing upon the ignorance of people in this country their own productions, with the additional weight which would be due to them from the pen of a native author of them; or that if Rammohun Roy have any hand in them, he must have received assistance from Europeans, equivalent to their having written them almost entirely themselves.

As to the character of Rammohun, my relation regards him as a man who would not scruple for a sufficient bribe, to lend his name to any publication whatever.

Now, Sir, the high estimation in which I hold the talents and integrity of my relation obliges me to listen to his testimony. At the same time, I cannot in any manner satisfactorily account for the Baptist Missionary Society having acknowledged and complained of the conversion of their missionary, (Dr. Marshman, I believe; is it not?) by Rammohun Roy, on any other ground excepting that of his being really the author of the works attributed to him. For the missionary could not be deceived in this. His own jealousy as well as that of the Society of Baptists would have detected the above-mentioned imposition had it been attempted. "But who" (urges my friend) "are the persons that report these extraordinary facts, that I should yield my own experience to their testimony? Why am I to believe an incredible story upon the testimony of anonymous writers in a periodical pamphlet?"

If this testimony can be better established than it has hitherto been; if any more particular proof that Rammohun Roy is the real and not the fictitious author of the writings attributed to him; that he is of respectable character; that he really did convert the missionary; and that a missionary was in fact converted by a

native, and that native was Rammohun Roy; and, lastly, if those who report these things to the people at large in this country, can, better than has hitherto been done, satisfy such as my relation, who oppose their own experience to their report, that what they allege is true; and if you can do this or get it done, you will much oblige a constant reader, and perhaps enable him to turn such interesting facts to some useful account.

T. L.

LETTER II.

68, Baker-St. Portman-Sqr.

SIR,

Aug. 4, 1823.

I have read the letter addressed to the Editor of the Monthly Repository, signed T. L. dated from Eltham, relating to Rammohun Roy, and I have great pleasure in offering you the following brief remarks on the several points alluded to, giving you entire liberty to use my information or authority in any way that may seem to you most likely to be productive of benefit.

It certainly is *not* fact that the knowledge of Sanscrit is necessary to the *caste* of a Brahmin; because that is a distinction which he derives from his birth, and is neither dependent on knowledge nor virtue, since idiots and villains may be as pure Brahmins as the most learned or the most upright. But it is fact that a knowledge of Sanscrit is indispensable to the *profession* of a Brahmin, because all his priestly offices are performed and uttered in that tongue; and although there are thousands of Brahmins *born* that are ignorant of Sanscrit, there can be none of these in the *profession* as *officiating* Brahmins,—for they would be unable to discharge the commonest portions of their duty.

The *Dewan* is the chief native officer in the collection of the revenue, although that title is also sometimes, but not always, given to the stewards of private gentlemen—the titles for these last, being more frequently *Banian* and *Sircar*. I can scarcely imagine any one long resident in India to be so ignorant as to dispute this; for the great act of the Mogul, by which the *Dewanee*, or collection of the revenue, was granted to the Company, is as familiar to all India read-

ers, as the term *Charter* by which they hold their monopoly of that country.

I do not know what was the proficiency of Rammohun Roy in English in 1815; but I can declare that in June 1818, the month of my first arrival in Calcutta, I was introduced to Rammohun Roy, at the house of Mr. Eneas Mackintosh, (now in London,) and was surprised at the unparalleled accuracy of his language, never having before heard *any* foreigner of Asiatic birth speak so well, and esteeming his fine choice of words as worthy the imitation even of Englishmen. My first hour's conversation with him was in Arabic, that being the oriental language most familiar to me, and not knowing at first that he spoke English with ease and fluency; but accident changing our discourse to English, I was delighted and surprised at his perfection in this tongue. I know, moreover, that he is a profound scholar in Sanskrit, Bengallee-Arabic, Persian, and Hinduee, all of which he writes and speaks with facility. In English, he is competent to converse freely on the most abstruse subjects, and to argue more closely and coherently than most men that I know. His attention has also been lately turned to Hebrew and Greek, for literary purposes, and to French for colloquial intercourse. To represent a man with such acquirements at the age of thirty-five (for he cannot be much more) as deficient in intellect, must either be the work of extreme ignorance, or malice, or both. For myself, I have no hesitation in declaring that I could not name twenty Englishmen in India, whose intellectual endowments I thought even *equal* to his own, although I have come in contact with most of the distinguished men in the country. He is in short one of the wonders of the present age, and requires only to be known, to excite admiration and esteem.

It is barely possible that some of his earlier works might have been revised by an English pen; but I am convinced that if ever such revisions were made, they must have been *merely* literal. The subject was all his own. And as to his later writings, his controversies with the Missionaries of Serampore, I do not believe

that they have one word in them which is not *wholly* his own. The Missionary converted by Rammohun Roy from Trinitarianism to Unitarianism, is a Mr. Adam, and not Dr. Marshman: which Mr. Adam was originally deputed, it is understood, from the mission at Serampore, to discuss personally with Rammohun Roy the several points of difference between their creeds, and being honestly bent on the search of truth, had the frankness to confess the arguments of his opponent to be convincing. Mr. Adam accordingly separated from the Baptist Mission at Serampore, and in conjunction with Rammohun Roy, and others of the same faith, established a Unitarian Chapel and an Unitarian Press in Calcutta. The late Bishop of Calcutta, on hearing of Mr. Adam's embracing Unitarianism, applied to the Advocate-General, Mr. Spankie, to know if it would not be possible to have Mr. Adam banished for preaching this *heresy*, in a land where idolaters, widow-burners, and slayers of human sacrifices, are allowed to preach their degrading doctrines and practise their abominable rites with impunity! Mr. Spankie then replied that by the law as it applied to India, any man might be banished for any thing which the Governor-General might deem sufficient cause: but he thought the day was past when it would be safe to banish a man for his opinions on religion, and there the matter ended.

If Rammohun Roy had been the wretch which the friend of T. L. supposes, he might have had abundant opportunities of receiving rewards from the Indian Government, in the shape of offices and appointments, for his mere neutrality; but being as remarkable for his integrity as he is for his attainments, he has, during the five years that I have known him, and that too most intimately and confidentially, pursued his arduous task of endeavouring to improve his countrymen, to beat down superstition, and to hasten as much as possible those reforms in the religion and government of his native land, of which both stand in almost equal need. He has done all this, to the great detriment of his private interests, being rewarded by the coldness and jealousy of all the great functionaries of Church and State in India, and supporting

the Unitarian Chapel—the Unitarian Press—and the expense of his own publications, besides other charitable acts, out of a private fortune, of which he devotes more than one-third to acts of the purest philanthropy and benevolence.

I am ready to meet any man living and confirm verbally what I here commit to writing for your use; for nothing will delight me more than to do justice to one whom I honour and esteem as I do this excellent Indian Christian and Philosopher.

J. S. BUCKINGHAM.

SIR,

Penzance.

WITH great pleasure I have at length received Dr. Jones's long-promised Greek and English Lexicon, and I may be allowed to congratulate the lovers of sound learning on this valuable accession to their treasures, and to express my sense of the obligation we are all under to the author for his excellent and important work. It is not, however, the object of this paper to enter into any general review of the merits of this Lexicon, but only to offer a few observations on one particular part of the plan which the learned author has deemed it best to adopt. This is thus stated by himself, in the preface: "The *accents* I have entirely omitted, as defacing the native simplicity of the language, and as requiring much sacrifice of expense and labour, without bringing in return the smallest advantage to the learner." Believing as I do that there can be no reasonable doubt that the Greek accents, as now appearing in our books, represent the genuine and ancient pronunciation of the language, and knowing from experience their great utility in giving a ready clue to the sense of numberless passages, I may say, without affectation, that I felt grieved to see this author's respectable name going to increase the prejudice which many entertain against them. I have been long used, in reading Greek, to place the accent of every word where it is marked in our printed copies; and know that this practice not only does not corrupt the quantity, but favours the euphony of the language in every respect, as many of my friends have often acknowledged to

me. But not to insist on my own instance, I will quote the words of the celebrated Greek Professor Cheke, of Cambridge. He says, "I can assert, not indeed of myself, for that might seem arrogant, but of many who at this day are studious of the Greek tongue, that they have so well attained this method of pronunciation, that they can express both the true sound of the letters, *and the quantity, and the accent, with the greatest sweetness and ease.*" Such being the case, I request, Mr. Editor, that you will allow me to occupy a few of your columns in an attempt to vindicate and explain these monuments of ancient literature, which appear to me the beauty and perfection of a language which is in other respects also the most beautiful and perfect that we have known.

The syllables of words, as uttered in connected speech, receive in addition to the articulate sounds conveyed by their letters, two distinct properties or accidents, viz. *time and tone*, or in other words, *quantity and accent*. From these arise what the ancients called λογῶδες τι μέλος, a certain music of speech, which is also the foundation of all metrical composition. Every syllable occupies a longer or shorter time in being pronounced, and every syllable is pronounced in a higher or lower note on the musical scale. In a word of many syllables every one has therefore a certain tone; but at the same time, there is in every word one syllable which is pronounced with a marked elevation above all the rest, and this characteristic elevation not only distinguishes the word from others, but, being variously modified in different cases, is of the greatest use in giving the word its due significance in the sentence. Although, therefore, every syllable of a word is uttered with some tone, yet there is one which bears a more eminent tone than the rest, and this tone is called, *the tone or accent of the word*; this syllable is called *the accented syllable*: its tone is also called *acute* to distinguish it from those of the other syllables, which being lower are therefore called *grave*. This is no new doctrine. Dionysios of Halicarnassos, an eminent Greek critic of the Augustan age, explains it at length. "Every word,"

he says, "is not spoken with the same tone, (τάσις,) but one with an acute, (οξύια,) another with a grave, (βαρεῖα,) a third with both. And of those which have both tones, there are some which have the grave blended into the acute, on the same syllable, and these we call circumflexed (περισπωμέναις); and others which have each tone in separate places, by itself, preserving its own nature. And in dissyllables there is no middle space between the acute and the grave; but in polysyllables, of what sort soever, there is one syllable with the acute tone in the midst of many grave." Dionys. περὶ Συνθεσ. Sect. 11. Both these circumstances of quantity and accent are inseparable from the nature of human speech, and are therefore common to all languages. Yet all languages have not made exactly the same use of them, nor distinguished them with equal clearness. In some languages, as in English, the difference of the time or quantity of different syllables is not so considerable as in others, such as the Latin and Greek. In these tongues we well know that all the syllables were divided into long and short, and that the long one was equivalent in time to two short. Our ears are certainly not accustomed to such accuracy, and consequently the time of our syllables is undetermined and inconstant. On the contrary, the English accents are marked very strongly, the accented syllable in every word being much elevated above the others, as well as uttered more forcibly. In the languages of antiquity, we have reason to believe, the accent was not so prominent.

Now it is in the nature of the human ear, in relation to speech, to count the syllables as they pass, and to desire a recurrence, at intervals more or less regular, of syllables presenting some one certain distinction. When this recurrence of marked syllables is contrived in a manner more regular than prevails in common speech, it constitutes metre or versification. Now we find by observing different languages, that there are two characters by which the ear is pleased to distinguish the recurring syllables, time and tone. They are either long syllables, or accented syllables, or both at once. In general they appear

to possess more or less of both these distinctions combined together; yet so combined that in any given language the one or the other is found to predominate and to regulate the verse. And in this we may see exactly what the difference is between the ancient and the modern poetry. It is this: in the former the time, in the latter the tone, is the essential distinction of the recurrent syllables. In a Greek Iambic verse, for instance, the essential condition is, that long syllables shall follow short ones alternately, allowing certain exceptions. Such is the nature of the following line,

Ω τέκνα, Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή.

In this line we may observe that the even places are all occupied by long syllables: the odd places generally by short: but the fourth and fifth even places, though long, are not accented. In what is called an English Iambic verse, we shall find that it is essential that the even places be in general accented, but not that they should be long: as in this line,

And made a widow happy for a whim.

Greek verse is therefore constituted chiefly by the time, and English by the accent: but this must not be so understood, as if either the English was wholly independent of the time, or the Greek of the accent; for as we have before observed, in either language both must conspire to make harmonious verse. The English line just quoted, for want of quantity, sounds poor and meagre, as we may judge by contrasting it with one where the times are more duly observed: such as this,

All are but parts of one stupendous whole.

In like manner it is probable, though not quite so easily proved, that those Greek verses were, even by the ancients, judged most pleasing, in which a considerable proportion of the long syllables were distinguished also by the accent. At any rate, there can be no doubt that the position of the accents was not at all a matter of indifference. The following Latin line is remarked for its awkward rhythm; and this it owes to malposition of the accents, for there is no fault in the scanning.

Tali concludit impiger ictus vulnere Cæsar.

The same thing is attested by Aristotle, where speaking of the letters, he observes, “Ταῦτα διαφέρει, καὶ δασύτητι, καὶ ψιλότητι, καὶ μήκει, καὶ βραχύτητι· ἐτι δὲ καὶ οξύτητι καὶ βαρύτητι καὶ τῷ μέσῳ· περὶ ὧν καθ’ ἑκάστων ἐν τοῖς μετρικοῖς προσήκει θεωρεῖν. Poetics, cap. 20. “They differ in being either with or without aspiration, in being long or short, in being acute or grave, or between both: and to each of these things it is proper to pay attention in versification.” We see by this unquestionable authority, that the rhythm of ancient Greek verse depended both on its quantities and on its accents, though undoubtedly the former were what was most essential to its constitution.

These preliminary considerations will prepare us to understand the nature and origin of the great charge which is brought against the Greek accents, namely, that they corrupt the quantity. This case admits of a simple explanation. It depends on an abuse of terms. We have observed that in English the quantity of syllables is very imperfectly distinguished; it is a thing little regarded, and although a good ear must always be sensible of it, in some degree, yet were it not for our acquaintance with ancient literature, quantity would probably hardly have been mentioned among us. Accent alone almost engrosses our attention, both in prose and verse. Now we commonly read Latin and Greek just in the same manner as we do our own tongue, and in reality pay just as much attention to the quantity in pronouncing the one as the other. This assertion may at first be thought somewhat paradoxical, but I am sure that if the matter is duly considered, it will be found to be just. It is true that no point is more insisted upon in our schools than what is called minding the quantity. But I ask, is the point which is really insisted upon, an observance of the proper time of the syllables? Is it that care be taken to give to each long syllable twice the time that is given to a short one? By no means, nor any thing like it. Nothing can be more foreign to the ideas both of masters and scholars. In one word, the only thing that is attended to is to place the accent aright. If a poor school-boy should read *facies* instead

of *facies*, he would probably be punished as having committed a false quantity, as having lengthened a short syllable. But if the master were not a blunderer himself, he would know that it is no such thing. The quantity is equally regarded, and equally violated, whether the word be pronounced as the trembling little culprit pronounced it, or in the way which his magisterial authority has declared to be correct. The boy was certainly wrong in reading *facies*: he misplaced the accent, because the usage of the Latin tongue, as we learn from Quintilian, required that in such a case the accent should fall on the antipenultima. The place of the accent is determined by the quantity, both in Latin and Greek. To misplace the accent, in either language, is to disregard the established rules of the tongue, but is not to be confounded with corrupting or changing the quantity, with which it has no necessary connexion. Since then, neither in Greek nor Latin, are we accustomed to pay any other attention to the quantity than to place the accent where we apprehend the quantity requires it should be, we may see that the charge brought against the Greek accents, of corrupting the quantity, resolves itself into this: that the Greek accents are not placed where the quantity requires that they should be, according to the rules which we have been used to observe. This is very true, and this is the whole amount of the objection. The rules we have been used to observe are those which regulate the Latin accent: the rules which regulated the Greek accent happen to be somewhat different from these: and therefore we suppose that the Greek accents are not where the quantity requires that they should be. First we say, they corrupt the quantity: this means merely, that they are not conformed to the quantity in the way prescribed by a certain rule: this rule is that of the Latin accent: and the objection rightly stated ends in this: the rules of the Greek accent differ from those of the Latin. For example; the laws of Greek require that the accent of *Ὀλύμπος* should be on the first syllable: this gives offence: we say the quantity is corrupted; we mean the accent is misplaced: and why? because it is

not placed where it would be placed in Latin. Such then I conceive is the explanation of a mystery which has puzzled some learned men more than one would have thought possible.

We have now taken a view of the true nature of quantity and accent; we have marked the essential distinction that there exists between them, and the nature of that dependence of the one on the other which is created by the usages of different languages. We have thus been able to trace the ground of that opinion, that the Greek accents are inconsistent with the quantity: shewing that it amounts to no more than that they are inconsistent with the Latin accents. Although, however, this be the true ground of the objection, as generally felt by those that urge it, there is still a more rational form into which it can be thrown, and which it will be proper to consider. It is obvious enough that there is no reason for requiring the pronunciation of Greek to be conformed to the rules of Latin: but it has been alleged, that our present Greek accentuation is not really the genuine ancient method; and to confirm this opinion, it has been said that it is naturally inconsistent with the observance of the quantity. Each of these positions I shall now endeavour to disprove.

In the first place, I shall attempt to shew by direct evidence from antiquity, that the place of the Greek accent is the same now that it was in ancient times. In this place it may be well to take notice, that when the antiquity of our Greek accents is asserted, we are not to be understood as speaking of the little strokes by which they are expressed in writing, but of the tones themselves which are represented by them. The marks are indeed of no modern date; but as I believe that few will be inclined to quarrel with them who believe that they correctly point out the ancient pronunciation, I shall dismiss the consideration of them very briefly. It is admitted that they were not used in the time of Aristotle: their introduction, in some form, is ascribed by the ancients to Aristophanes the grammarian, who flourished about 200 years before Christ, and to whom the invention of the marks of punctuation is also attributed; but after his

time, their reception into general use is supposed to have been but very gradual. It is reasonably conjectured that they were employed not so much for the use of native Greeks, as of foreigners studying the language, in the same way as we may, at this day, see them resorted to in Italian or other foreign elementary books. If the objection to these marks is simply that they are less ancient than some of the authors in which we find them, the very same may be urged against the use of the small Greek and Roman letters, as well as the marks of aspiration and punctuation, which are at least equally modern: that is, under the notion of restoring the native simplicity of the language, we shall object to its most valuable improvements. In living tongues, it is true, the use of written accents is rarely carried beyond dictionaries and elementary books; but in dead languages we stand in need of further assistance, and ought not to quarrel with the helps that ingenious men have invented to facilitate our progress. It is not easy to assign a reason why the accents in all languages should not as regularly be written as the letters: they are certainly not less essential to speech, not less significant in their meaning, not less permanent and integral parts of every word. In some languages, as in the Latin, they are determined by rules so simple and constant, that the use of written marks is less necessary. But what are we to do without them in Greek, in which their position is as irregular and various as in our own language? If we reject the written accents, we are reduced to the inevitable alternative of adopting the Latin system, which is to act in open defiance of the unequivocal testimony of antiquity. These remarks, which relate simply to the use of the written marks, and not to the tones themselves, I will close by transcribing an extract from a letter written to Foster by an eminent and learned friend: "I am a great admirer," he says, "of that contrivance of accentuation; and look upon it as a remarkable invention, framed by the most ingenious people that ever appeared in the world, for adorning their language to the utmost degree of refinement; and for settling, as far as human wit and wisdom can

fix, a lasting standard of tone for pronouncing every word and almost every syllable of it. I am a friend to the cause, and think an advocate wanting; since that which calls itself the learned world is thoroughly inclined to blot out this ancient character from the book of learning, and had rather lose it entirely, than be at the pains of understanding it at all."

But, to return to my argument, I shall now produce some evidence from ancient authors to prove that our present Greek accents are genuine, that is, that they occupy the same places which they did in ancient days. These quotations will first prove, in general, that the Greek accentuation was in many points different from the Latin, and secondly, that it corresponded in all the particulars which can be ascertained with that which now appears in our printed copies. This being all the evidence the subject admits of, is all that can fairly be required, and indeed is sufficient, I think, to produce the most satisfactory conviction. The following passage from Quintilian proves, in general, both that the Greek accentuation differed from the Latin, and that it presented that variety which we still find in it. It also proves, in particular, that in Greek the acute and circumflex accents were often found on the last syllable, which also corresponds with our books. "*Sed accentus cum rigore quodam tum similitudine ipsâ minus suaves habemus, quia ultima syllaba nec acuta unquam excitatur, nec inflexa circumducitur, sed in gravem, vel duas graves, cadit semper. Itaque tanto est sermo Græcus Latino jucundior, ut nostri poetæ, quoties dulce esse carmen voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent.*" Lib. xii. cap. x. It is truly remarkable, that what our modern literati decry in the Greek as a barbarism, was by the ancient Roman critics and poets deemed a beautiful peculiarity of which their own language was destitute. In another place, the same writer, having observed that many Roman grammarians required that all foreign words adopted into Latin should be made conformable to the usages of that tongue, gives the following instance: "*Inde Olympo et tyranno acutam mediam syllabam de-*

derunt, quia, duabus longis sequentibus, primam brevem acui noster sermo non patitur." Lib. i. cap. v. In Latin it was not allowed to put the acute accent on the first syllables of such words as Olympus and tyrannus, because their penultima is long: but it is implied that the Greek usage did this; that is, that they were accented as we now mark them, Ὀλυμπος, τύραννος. I may observe, in passing, that there is no instance in which our written Greek accents are thought more objectionable than in such as these. In another passage, having observed that his countrymen sometimes erred in substituting a circumflex accent for a grave, especially in Greek words, he instances the word Ἀτρεΰς, which the best Latin masters he says directed to be made acute on the first, and therefore grave on the second. Plutarch, in his Lives of the Ten Orators, says that Demosthenes was censured for some peculiarities in his speech; among other things, as προπαροξύων, the word Ἀσκληπίων, i. e. pronouncing it Ἀσκληπίον, as we do now. Servius, an ancient Roman writer, remarks on that line of the Æneid, "Ubi tot Simois," &c. "Hoc nomen, Simois, integrum ad nos transiit, unde suo accentu profertur: nam si esset latinum in antepenultima haberet accentum quia secunda a fine brevis est." When therefore I find the word in our Greek books accented Σιμόεις, my good opinion of our present system is confirmed. In Apollonius Dyscolos, an old grammarian of the age of the Antonines, we find many notices of the accents: observing the custom of the Æolic dialect, he says, Αἰολεῖς ἐμοὶ βαρέως. This confirms our common Greek, which makes it oxyton. Stephanos, another old writer, remarks, "Δαυλὶς οξύνεται το Δαυλὶς, τὸ δὲ Αὔλις Αἰολικῶς βαρύνεται." Ammonius, a writer about two centuries after Christ, who was also the tutor of Origen, wrote a work entitled "Περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων." In this book we have abundant evidence that in his day Greek was accented just as we now see it. He often notices the distinction which accent makes in words otherwise alike. For instance, he says that ἀγροῖκος, προπερισπωμένως, means one who lives in the country, but that ἀγ-

ροῖκος, προπαροξύτῳως, signifies clownish in manners. This work is printed at the end of Scapula's Lexicon, and may therefore readily be examined. If it would not transgress the limits which it is proper for me to assign to this paper, I could multiply such quotations. I produce these merely as examples of the sort of evidence on which the credit of the Greek accents rests. These ancient testimonies serve only to confirm what would without them be quite sufficient evidence, the authority of all our manuscript and printed copies, and the actual usage of the living Greeks.

I consider it, therefore, as proved by the concurrence of all the evidence which antiquity furnishes on the point, that the ancient Greeks laid the accent where we now find it written, as well as that the accentual marks, though not so old as the usage which they represent, lay claim to quite sufficient antiquity to preclude all just objection on that score. The only argument which has been really influential in causing the rejection of the accents, has been the apprehension that they are inconsistent with the just observance of quantity and the rhythm of verse. I have already shewn, that the majority of those who prefer this charge are such as do not pay any real regard to quantity in any case, and that they mean something different by it from that which it properly expresses. It shall now be my business to shew that there is no real ground for it in its true sense; that there is no natural inconsistency in the Greek accents, and the proper observance of quantity. The point of difference between the Greek and Latin accentuation, which is the principal ground of objection against the former, is this: whereas the Latin rule is, that in polysyllables, if the penultima be long, the accent shall rest upon it; the Greek rule, not turning on the quantity of the penultima, but on that of the last syllable, enacts, that if the last be long, the accent shall rest on the penultima, but if the last be short, then it shall rest on the antepenultima. Hence, in such a word as ἡδῖσος, the Greek accent falls on the first syllable, while the usage of Latin would place it on the second. It is no wonder that we, who are early instructed in the

Latin rule, and never familiarized with the Greek, especially as the Latin is, in this respect, more agreeable to the English, should conceive that the Greek accent is not properly conformed to the quantity. Thus in the instance before us, we may think that the long quantity of the second syllable of ἡδίστος can hardly be preserved if the tone is elevated on the first. The ear is the only judge in this matter; but as far as reason goes, it would be impossible to shew that this particular predicament of the second syllable is more unfavourable to its quantity than any other. Moreover, as we have already shewn, that in words of this class the ancient Greeks actually did accent the first syllable, and at the same time prolong the second, that fact alone is sufficient to shew that there can be nothing in this usage contrary to natural euphony. But for the sake of argument I will wave these considerations, and illustrate the use of the Greek accents simply by reference to our native language. For this purpose I have to observe that, in many English words, we may perceive, beside the principal accent, another tone on some other syllable, which, approaching in nature to the first, may be called a secondary accent. For example, I should say there is a secondary accent on the first syllable of the word *universal*, on the third of the word *matrimony*, and on the second of the word *schoolmaster*. This, I think, gives the clue to the Greek pronunciation. In English we may observe that these secondary accents are capable of sustaining verse almost as well as the primary. Witness the line,

Parent of good,
Almighty, thine this universal frame.

In this instance there is something of long quantity to help the accent, but in the following this secondary accent, even on a short syllable, is sufficient.

Die of a rose in aromatic pain.

I allude to the first syllable of the word *aromatic*. Now, I presume that in Greek, the long syllables, especially those most essential to the rhythm, although not bearing the principal accent of the word, were yet sustained

by something like this secondary accent of ours. And if this be just, it will follow, that the principles of rhythm in the two languages are not so widely different as they might otherwise appear. It will shew, also, how foolish the question is that has been proposed, viz. whether the pronunciation of Greek is better conducted by accent or quantity? "It is a question," observes Foster, "of like kind with the following, whether in walking a man had better use his right or his left leg singly." This doctrine of the secondary tones I will now apply more particularly to the pronunciation of the several varieties of Greek words, and trust, in this way, to shew that the genuine utterance of this noble language may easily be attained by any Englishman who will bestow common pains upon it.

Take, for instance, the first line of Homer's *Iliad* :

Μῆνιν ἀειδε, Θεὰ, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.

In the second word we encounter an accent on the first syllable, followed by a long penultima. If we pronounce this word like the English, *honesty*, our ear will tell us that the just rhythm is lost. We must, therefore, seek for a model a similar English word, accented, indeed, on the first syllable, but carrying also a secondary accent on a long penultima. Let us then pronounce the word ἀεῖδε somewhat as we do the English words, *school-master*, *mán-eater*, and other compounds of this description. I do not say that these English words will serve as exact models for the Greek; they fail in respect to quantity, as English pronunciation always does, but in relation to the accent, I think they are very fair examples. Again, such a word as φιλόανθρωπος may be pronounced somewhat as our word *elongated*, taking care to utter the third syllable distinctly and firmly, and to dwell on it a proper time. Such a word as Πέλω resembles our word *headache*, when well pronounced. Such a word as πτωχός may be pronounced like our word, *undone*, or *herein*; and such a one as λαμπάδος will not be misrepresented by such as *out-witted*, *however*. These will be sufficient to serve as examples of all others. Another mode in which an idea may be

conveyed of the just pronunciation is, by throwing the syllables into new combinations, as in the following example :

Μῆ νινά εἶδεθ' ἐὰ πηληϊά δεωαχιλῆος.

If the line be read as if thus written, the accents will be pretty well expressed, without injury to the quantity. It really appears to me, that from such examples as these, a very sufficient idea may be formed of the true nature of ancient Greek pronunciation; and may enable us, if so disposed, to restore to living utterance those long-neglected marks which at present seem but as melancholy monuments of the lost graces of Grecian diction. But whether or not we deem it expedient actually to adopt them in practice, these examples may convince us that there is no manner of difficulty in supposing that they once formed the rule of pronunciation, and might again, if it were thought desirable.

But suppose it admitted, that in pursuing the plan here recommended, our English students will, after all, be often found neglecting the quantity in favour of the accent, is this so shocking? Let me beg the reader to consider whether it can take place in any greater degree than it does on the received plan. In our books we see the word *αμφοτέροις*, but our schools teach us to read it *αμφότεροις*. If the advocate for the accents is charged with lengthening the third syllable of this word, may he not with equal justice accuse his opponents of lengthening the second? And when the last syllable is long, as in *αγάπη*, how is its quantity better consulted by reading it *άγαπη*? As to the long penultima, if it were true that placing the accent upon it was of any advantage to its quantity, the Latin mode would so far be preferable; but upon the same principle the Greek would have the advantage in numberless other instances, such as *ἐκεῖ*, *αγαπᾶν*, which we read *έκει*, *άγαπαν*. So that, judging even by the standard of our own prejudices, the one system seems but little more favourable to quantity than the other. The fact is, that through the whole subject we are apt to fall into the error of thinking a syllable long when it is accented, and the contrary. But this notion is wholly un-

tenable, and not less so in respect to the Latin than the Greek, as is too evident to need proof. The Greek practice of depressing, in many cases, the long penultima is common to the English and many other modern languages, as in such words as *chemistry*, *industry*: but the Greeks were, at the same time, mindful of their quantity, which we neglect.

The advantages of retaining and observing the tones are many. To say nothing of that pleasing effect noticed by Dionysios, when he says of them, “*κλέπτει τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τοὶ κόροι*,” and which Quintilian so well contrasts with the heavy monotony of the Latins; to say nothing of this, their use is exceedingly great in determining the sense of words, between which there is no other distinction. At the end of Scapula's Lexicon is given a list of above 800 words, differing from one another only in their signification and accent. But a still greater number of such words is derived from the inflections of nouns and verbs, of which this list takes no notice, though they are, perhaps, less easy to distinguish than the others. It is useful to discriminate at a glance, *θεά*, a goddess, from *θέα*, a spectacle; but we are more likely to be at a loss between *αγορά*, a market, and *αγορᾶ*, to a market, *αγορᾶς*, of a market, and *αγορᾶς*, markets: or again, between *ποιῆσαι*, to do, *ποίησαι*, he would do, and *ποίησαι*, make for thyself. It may be said that the context will point out all these distinctions; and no doubt it is true, that with sufficient pains, the sense of a passage may generally be thus determined. And if we went on to strike out from Greek half the vowels, and reduce it to the condition of Hebrew without points, the sense might still in general be ascertained. But then the difficulty would be much greater; and what ordinary scholar is there to whom additional facility in understanding Greek would not be an acquisition? But it is said that the accents have not the authority of the original author. This is true, but not more so than that the distinction of *ε* and *η*, *ο* and *ω*, in Homer, is in the same predicament. But surely it is sufficient, in all ordinary cases, to be guided in our studies by directions, which having first been made while Greek was flourishing in purity, have

received the accumulated sanction of the learned from that day to the present. In general, what we want in reading ancient authors, is a more ready apprehension of their sense; when once suggested to our minds, its own propriety warrants it genuine. On the whole, therefore, I can by no means assent to Dr. Jones's assertion in his Preface, that the study of the accents "does not bring in return the smallest advantage to the learner." I have no hesitation in avowing my opinion, that the knowledge and practical use of the accents, will do more towards forming a correct and elegant Greek scholar, than all the acquaintance with Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, that ever was acquired; nor do I think it possible that any one can become a finished and able Greek scholar without this knowledge. A hundred proprieties and elegancies of the language will inevitably escape him.

The plan of retaining the circumflex without the acute appears to me particularly unfortunate: the economy of the circumflex depends essentially on that of the acute, and thus shorn of its kindred, it appears but as one of the "discerpta membra" of a mangled system.

Before I close, I must acknowledge that I am indebted for many of the foregoing remarks and authorities to Foster's Essay on Accent and Quantity, an excellent work, to which I with pleasure refer the reader for fuller information. In one point, I think this author not quite correct: it is when he considers English verse as essentially founded on quantity like the ancient: but I have explained my own view of this point already. Mr. Foster observes, in conclusion, that the Greek language, treated as it has been in this matter, might adopt the complaint of Philomela in the epigram:

Γλῶσσαν ἐμὴν ἐθέρισσε, καὶ ἐσβέσεν
Ἑλλάδα φωνήν.

T. F. B.

SIR,

March 23, 1823.

ABOUT two years ago there appeared in the Monthly Repository, [XVI. 88—101,] "An Inquiry respecting Private Property, and the Authority and Perpetuity of the Apostolic Institution of a Community of Goods." Having long been a great admirer and humble supporter of the

plan of Mr. Owen, of New Lanark, in so far as regards its arrangements for facilitating mutual and voluntary co-operation, I was delighted to find that the scheme was advocated on Christian principles by a gentleman so admirably qualified for the task, as the writer of the Essay above alluded to; and I fondly hoped, that, having been once started, a subject so interesting and important, in every point of view, would have undergone a thorough discussion. But although I have been hitherto disappointed in this expectation, I do not yet despair of seeing a portion of your work devoted to such a discussion, so as to lead us to some distinct conclusion as to the merits of the plan.

Ever since I turned my attention to the subject, it has appeared to me, that the enlightened body of Christians among whom your Repository circulates, are, of all others, the best qualified to appreciate the force of Mr. Owen's arguments, and to reduce his theory to practice. He has given great offence to the religious world by a proposition to which the great majority of Unitarians will have no difficulty in subscribing; namely, "that the character is formed *for* and not *by* the individual." This, you are aware, is saying no more than is maintained by the advocates of the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity. To them, therefore, it can give no offence, nor excite the slightest feeling of alarm for the stability of the Christian religion. Nor, indeed, ought our Calvinist brethren to take offence at an axiom which lies at the root of their system, and which President Edwards, one of their ablest writers, has irrefragably defended in an elaborate piece of argumentation. It must, however, be confessed that, in so doing, he has exposed to the full light of day the horrid deformity of that dogma, which dooms to eternal misery vast numbers of human beings who are precisely what their Maker determined that they should be. With this gross inconsistency we have no concern.

But I really do not see why any man, who has the good of his fellow-creatures at heart, should reject the plan of Mr. Owen, on account of any supposed error in his metaphysical notions. The practical tendency of

his doctrine accords with the general conduct of all wise parents, tutors and governors, inasmuch as all such will prefer the prevention to the correction of evil, and will studiously endeavour to place those under their authority in circumstances the most favourable to the formation of virtuous habits and dispositions; and will strive to remove, as far as possible, all temptations to vice. On this ground the Necessitarian and the Libertarian can and do daily meet. Nor will any difference arise between them as to the expediency of gaining their object by kind rather than by coercive measures, if it can be clearly proved that, whenever they have been fairly tried, the former are far more efficient than the latter. No Christian can dispute the obligation of that precept which commands us to "overcome evil with good."

Having thus endeavoured to remove a stumbling-block, which has prevented the great mass of serious Christians from advancing even to the threshold of Mr. Owen's fabric, permit me to advert to another principle of his plan, which has proved a rock of offence to men of the world. I allude to the *community of interests* which it proposes to establish among the associated members of his villages of unity and mutual co-operation. This proposal is *primâ facie* opposed to a prejudice almost indelibly imprinted on the minds of Englishmen.

"But foster'd even by Freedom, ills annoy:
That *independence* Britons prize too high,
Keeps man from man, and breaks the social tie,
The self-dependent lordlings stand alone,
All kindred claims that soften life unknown."

Although few persons of reflection would be hardy enough to deny, that it can only be by a progressive union of interests that any great advance can be made in the career of civilization; yet the generality of philanthropic writers, in their schemes for ameliorating the condition of the working classes, always assume the necessity of preserving sacred the present division of mankind into separate families, from a persuasion (no doubt)

that to break down these walls of separation would be to destroy that love of independence which is supposed to lie at the root of our dignity, and of some of our best qualities. I can readily conceive that the association of the ideas of conventual or cœnobitic life, with the austerities and absurdities of Monachism, tended, after the Reformation, to excite strong prejudices in this country against institutions having any resemblance to a state of society, in which men were bound by rigid laws not only to do many things that ran counter to their natural inclinations, but even to perform duties accordant with their tastes and dispositions. As compared with such a system of discipline, the right of disposing of one's time and property according to one's own pleasure, must have appeared far preferable, though at the sacrifice of much of the security and freedom from worldly care which belong to cœnobitic life. But besides the limitation of liberty, which is supposed to be involved in that state of society, there is a strong repugnance on the part of enterprising, skilful and careful individuals, to share the produce of their industry with the indolent and imbecile; and to overcome this feeling, the enforcement of Christian precepts has hitherto proved ineffectual, with few exceptions. Unless, therefore, the scheme of union projected by Mr. Owen can be relieved from these grand objections; that is to say, unless it can be proved to be consistent with the enjoyment both of individual liberty and of private property, I cannot indulge a sanguine expectation that it will be generally adopted by a people so tenacious of freedom, and of the fruits of their personal industry and skill, as are the inhabitants of this island.

Happily, however, it appears, (in my humble apprehension,) that these highly-cherished privileges may be not only preserved, but enlarged by the proposed change in our mode of life. For, in the first place, each society must consist of *voluntary* associates; and the parties thus associated will be competent to establish such rules for their own government, as do not interfere with the general laws of the country. A member of one of these communities would, of course, reserve the right of withdrawing from it at

pleasure, and while he remained in it, would have a voice in the election of its officers, and be himself eligible to office. This is calculated to elevate and not to depress the human character. Provision must be made for the enjoyment of privacy, as well as for social meetings; and each adult individual would consider his chambers as secure from intrusion, as a house-keeper now does his own fire-side. And, with respect to property, it is by no means an essential part of the scheme, that a member of an association should throw into a common fund whatever property he might possess on joining it. All that would be required of him, would be to bear his fair proportion of the expenditure, on the condition of participating in the aggregate produce of the common labour. Thus, supposing the expense of living, in one of these communities, to be 50*l.* per head per annum, a person possessing 10,000*l.* would be enabled to lay by the excess of his income beyond that sum, and, moreover, to augment his accumulations by his share of the profits of the society.

It appears to me that the great error of Reformers has consisted in their attempting to begin where they ought to leave off. That an entire and unreserved community of goods will eventually take place among the individuals thus associated, I have not the shadow of a doubt: but this most desirable state of things will be brought about gradually, in proportion as the wealth of the society shall increase.

And here permit me to observe, that there appear to be but two ways whereby union and love and piety can be rendered prevalent in the world—the one is by combating the selfish principle by arguments having reference to a future state; the other, by surrounding mankind with the objects of their desire, and thus removing the temptations which have hitherto proved too strong for virtue. Far be it from me to underrate the power of those motives which our holy religion affords to the practice of the most painful and self-denying duties. We know that these motives have enabled men to triumph over dangers, difficulties and sufferings the most appalling to our nature: but I do humbly conceive, that in causing the know-

ledge and the love of divine truth to cover the earth, it is probable that Providence will smooth the way to the practice of Christian morality, and that the grand improvements which have been made in the contrivances for shortening human labour, are indications of such a design. Mr. Owen has stated, and he has been at considerable pains to ascertain the fact, that the productive powers of Great Britain and Ireland at the present day are equal to the constant daily labour of 350 millions of able-bodied men; a power capable of being indefinitely increased. As society is at present constituted, this vast power is in a great measure opposed to the interests of the working classes, who constitute the great majority of the people. All that is requisite to convert this evil into a blessing, is, to associate mankind on such principles as shall give to the respective communities a common interest in the produce of labour, aided by these grand mechanical agents; and as it is clear to demonstration, that, under the proposed arrangements, the village communities could, with perfect ease, raise and manufacture more of every article of necessity, of comfort and of convenience, than would suffice to satisfy the wants of each individual, the axe would be laid at the root of those numerous vices which spring from cupidity. Poverty is not favourable to the growth of virtue; nor can we reasonably expect that the arguments urged by divines and philosophers to prove the wisdom of Providence in permitting of so great a disparity as has hitherto existed in the conditions of mankind, will ever reconcile the poor to their lot, so long as they perceive that their teachers are as keen as others in the pursuit of the good things of this life. It is not the acquisition of wealth that is reprehended; but the rendering its acquisition the final end of our efforts. Methods to acquire riches are necessarily methods of wisdom and good conduct: the dissolute rarely grow rich.

No man is more firmly convinced than I am, that all the past dispensations of Providence have been ordered in perfect wisdom and goodness, and, consequently, that the existence, or rather the wide prevalence of wretched poverty, was designed to answer a pur-

pose worthy of Infinite Benevolence: and what purpose appears more worthy than that of exciting in us first an earnest desire, and, subsequently, the most strenuous efforts to mitigate, and eventually to eradicate this prolific source of evil? Let us not deify error, but fortify our minds with the consolatory belief, that the omnipotence of truth will gain the victory over all error.

But although it is evident that, when combined in the mode proposed, men will be able to create a superabundance of wealth for all, it does not follow that they will therefore take up their rest in mere worldly enjoyments, to the neglect of their intellectual and spiritual interests. The consciousness that they possess the power at all times of satisfying their wants, will serve to correct the passion for accumulation which is now so predominant in some minds. We perceive that, together with those discoveries which, as before observed, have thus given to the present generation such unbounded means of creating wealth, a thirst for knowledge has also sprung up among us, and a disposition to confer upon all ranks the benefits of education. As the case now stands, education unfortunately serves but too often to render the subjects of it but the more sensible of their abject condition, and to generate feelings of envy and hostility towards those who enjoy advantages which they cannot hope to obtain by legitimate efforts: hence the violent desire to change political institutions, which is a strong feature of the present times. The more I reflect, the more do I perceive the wisdom of that exhortation which prescribes to Christians a due submission to the constituted authorities, be they of what character they may, except in cases where the authority of the magistrate comes in competition with the laws of God. It surely was not the design of our Saviour and of his apostles to inculcate principles of abject servility; far from it; the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of liberty: and it is destined to subvert tyranny of every kind. But the weapons of our warfare are not carnal; the victory is to be achieved by a moral force. Generally speaking, in all countries, magistrates are a terror to evil-doers, and are not disposed

to harm those who are followers of that which is good. The fact is, that if serious Christians would but combine together to do all the good to each other, which can be effected consistently with the laws as they exist, they would inevitably attain a far greater degree of wealth, and liberty, and ease, than is procurable by mere changes in political institutions. And the errors and deformities of bad laws or of misrule, would be better exposed when peaceable and industrious communities could clearly shew how those causes tended to obstruct their progress, than by the clamorous and indiscriminate censures which popular meetings are so ready to found often upon very defective information as to the real occasion of their sufferings.

But I am becoming too diffuse, and must compress my remaining observations into the narrowest possible compass.

It would be unreasonable to expect any man to change his habits of life, unless we are prepared to shew that some valuable and obvious good is attainable by the change. To the poor the gospel is preached; and it is therefore to such as groan under the cares and difficulties and privations which are attendant upon the present isolated mode of life, to those with whom the great business of life is to live, that we address ourselves with the best hopes of success.

We see such ready to transport themselves to distant foreign lands; to incur the dangers of the seas and of unhealthy climes, and even to plant themselves in the neighbourhood of savage tribes, if a hope is held out, that by such a change they will be enabled to reap the fair fruits of their industry, and escape from the burthens which in their own country press them to the earth. Now I venture boldly to affirm, that the very same amount of capital which is thus expended in seeking a new settlement, if employed at home under arrangements similar to those projected by Mr. Owen, would infallibly effect their purpose far more easily and securely than any, the most plausible scheme of emigration. Those who, like myself, have carefully studied the co-operative plan, aided by machinery, will not for a moment dispute its power to increase, in a tenfold proportion,

the produce of any given amount of labour or of capital, as at present employed. The mind should be steadily fixed on this point. It would lead me to encroach too much upon your indulgence were I to prove, by an induction of particulars, the proposition above laid down. Suffice it to say, that by combined operations, all that is now performed in society may be performed with far more celerity, economy and effect than it is at present. A community of 1000 persons could be provided for with little more trouble than is required to provide for a family. The food could be prepared in the most approved manner; the children educated on the best principles, under the eye of their parents; every rational recreation could be readily commanded, and the social qualities of all elicited and cultivated, without prejudice to domestic enjoyments. Nine-tenths of the females would be liberated from the drudgery to which they are now subjected, and would thus be enabled not only to apply the time saved to such works as would increase the wealth of the society, but to cultivate their minds, and thus to become better companions. I speak of course of the working classes: but even those in better circumstances would, under such a system, experience a great change for the better. There can, perhaps, be no better test for the excellency of any social scheme, than the effect which it is calculated to produce upon the female character: and in this point of view, that of Mr. Owen challenges the support of the fair sex.

Assuming the power of the scheme to increase the wealth and comfort of the associated parties, let us inquire what are the objections to its immediate adoption.

I have already adverted to the supposed evil of resigning that independence which operates so strongly to render us anti-social beings. I would fain flatter myself that I have shaken, if I have not overturned this formidable barrier.

But is it probable that union could be preserved among the members of a society formed upon the proposed plan?

“What can we reason but from what we know?” We know that where an object deemed valuable is in view, men

both can and do unite with great constancy to pursue it: we see this in trading companies, in literary societies, in collegiate institutions, and in navies and armies. Men scruple not for the sake of the advantages accruing from the military profession, to subject themselves, during life, to the greatest hazards and inconveniences, and to strict and often harsh discipline. But, in point of fact, we have the best proofs from history that societies constituted on principles far less rational and liberal than are now proposed, have been held together, and existed for ages: and, at this very day, there exist in America, communities bearing a strong resemblance to the proposed villages of union and mutual co-operation which have thriven and prospered, and are increasing rapidly in numbers. I allude to the Harmonists, of whom a very interesting account is given in a pamphlet published at New York, by a committee of religious persons who are endeavouring to multiply these societies.

But will men in a community of mutual and combined interests be as industrious as when employed for their individual gain?

I shall answer this question in the words of Mr. Owen.* “It has been, and still is, a received opinion among theorists in political economy, that man can provide better for himself, and more advantageously for the public, when left to his own individual exertions, opposed to, and in competition with his fellows, than when aided by any social arrangement which shall unite his interests individually and generally with society. This principle of individual interest, opposed as it is perpetually, to the public good, is considered by the most celebrated political economists to be the corner stone of the social system, and without which society could not subsist. Yet, when they shall know themselves and discover the wonderful effects which combination and unity can produce, they will acknowledge, that the present arrangement of society is the most anti-social, impolitic and irrational, that can be devised; that, under its influence, all the superior and valuable qualities of human na-

* Report to the County of Lanark, 4to. p. 28.

ture are repressed from infancy, and that the most unnatural means are used to bring out the most injurious propensities; in short, that the utmost pains are taken to make that which by nature is the most delightful compound for producing excellence and happiness, absurd, imbecile and wretched. Such is the conduct now pursued by those who are called the best and wisest of the present generation, although there is not one rational object to be gained by it. From this principle of individual interest have arisen all the divisions of mankind, the endless errors and mischiefs of class, sect, party, and of national antipathies, creating the angry and malevolent passions, and all the crimes and misery with which the human race has been hitherto afflicted. In short, if there be one closet doctrine more contrary to the truth than another, it is the notion that individual interest, as that term is now understood, is a more advantageous principle on which to found the social system, for the benefit of all, or of any, than the principle of union and mutual co-operation. The former acts like an immense weight to repress the most valuable faculties and dispositions, and to give a wrong direction to all the human powers. It is one of those magnificent errors, (if the expression may be allowed,) that when enforced in practice, brings ten thousand evils in its train. The principle on which these economists proceed, instead of adding to the wealth of nations or of individuals, is itself the sole cause of poverty; and but for its operation, wealth would long ago have ceased to be a subject of contention in any part of the world. If, it may be asked, experience has proved, that union, combination, and extensive arrangement among mankind, are a thousand times more powerful to *destroy*, than the efforts of an unconnected multitude where each acts individually for himself, would not a similar increased effect be produced by union, combination, and extensive arrangement, to *create and conserve*? Why should not the result be the same in the one case as in the other? But it is well known that a combination of men and of interests, can effect that which it would be futile to attempt and im-

possible to accomplish by individual exertions and separate interests."

In another place,* Mr. Owen, with reference to this question, observes, "Wherever the experiment has been tried, the labour of each has been exerted cheerfully. It is found that when men work together for a common interest, each performs his part more advantageously for himself and society, than when employed for others at daily wages, or than when working by the piece. When employed by the day, they feel no interest in their occupation beyond the receipt of their wages; when they work by the piece, they feel too much interest, and frequently overwork themselves, and occasion premature old age and death. When employed with others in a community of interests, both these extremes are avoided, the labour becomes temperate but effective, and may be easily regulated and superintended. Besides, the principles and practices are now quite obvious by which any inclinations, from the most indolent to the most industrious, may be given to the rising generation."

It cannot be denied that human nature requires a stimulus to excite its exertions; but unless it be maintained that no stimulus short of wretched poverty will suffice to this purpose, and such a proposition stands opposed to the most notorious facts, then it becomes possible that men may be excited by the desire of advancing in the acquisition of those objects which conduce to the embellishment and refinement of the human character, and we may set our minds quite at ease as to the danger of sinking into inactivity for want of suitable excitements, so long as any single good, real or fancied, remains to be attained, that is to say, to all eternity.

The habits of those who will compose the first associations, will have been formed by the usual motives by which men are now actuated; so long as the projected associations are surrounded by ordinary society, they will naturally be actuated by a desire to outstrip it in excellence; and when, if ever, society at large shall come to be resolved into similar communities,

* His Public Address, dated 25th July, 1817.

one establishment will serve to excite and stimulate another. As this is one of the most important questions connected with the scheme, I have been led to dwell more upon it than I should otherwise have deemed necessary: but I know that many men of very benevolent and liberal sentiments have entertained a fear, lest men associated on the plan of a community of interests should degenerate into drones. If this be probable, what a dull place must heaven be, where we at least expect to find abundant means of subsistence, angels' food!

The last objection which I shall here notice, is that which founds itself upon the doctrine of Mr. Malthus respecting population.

I have studied his celebrated Essay with a strong feeling of anxiety, and am happy to say that we have nothing to fear upon the score of an increase of numbers. It is true, he sets out with affirming that the geometrical ratio of human increase, and the arithmetical ratio of the increase of the means of subsistence, are *inevitable laws of nature*, of sufficient force to destroy the most beautiful state of society which the imagination of man can conceive. But when we advance towards the close of the Essay, we find to our joy, that the inevitable law of human increase is a power as tractable and docile as our hearts can wish. "Thus," says Mr. Malthus, "it appears that we possess a great power, capable, in a short time, of peopling a desert region, but also capable, under other circumstances, of being repressed within any, the smallest possible limits, by human energy and virtue, at the expense of a comparatively small amount of evil."

But if the ratio of human increase be thus variable at the will of man, as admitted by the very person who professes to be the most deeply learned upon the subject, we have the satisfaction to be quite certain that be the rate of increase what it may, there can be no insuperable difficulty to the production of the means of subsistence in a corresponding ratio, until the period shall arrive when the whole of the habitable earth shall have been fully peopled. We know that other animals, and the vegetable

tribe, multiply their numbers still more rapidly than man; and that an agricultural labourer can raise ten times as much as he can himself consume. We have moreover the satisfaction to know, that under the projected arrangements, with the aid of machinery, a large portion of those who are at present engaged in manufactures may be liberated and enabled if necessary, to cultivate the earth; and that the women and elder children may also assist in the lighter parts of husbandry and gardening.

Why these political economists should be so alarmed at the effect which Mr. Owen's plan is to produce on the population of the country, I cannot conceive, since by far the greater number of instances in which men have been associated on the principle of a community of interests, those persons have practised celibacy. I have no idea that any such restrictions will ever be imposed upon the union of the sexes; but well we know, that, if prudence should require so painful a sacrifice, there is nothing in that form of society to prevent its adoption.

Having thus adverted to some of the leading objections which have been raised against the scheme of Mr. Owen, I shall now slightly touch upon some of the beneficial consequences which it is calculated to ensure to mankind.

Its tendency is to fix the lowest numbers of associated individuals, at such an amount as shall be competent to raise within themselves almost every thing that is primarily necessary or desirable for the comfortable subsistence of mankind. Each of these families will compose a little state, and a nation will therefore be made of a vast number of small corporate bodies. When once the superior efficacy of combined, over individual exertion, for social purposes, comes to be understood and to be fully experienced, the principle of co-operation will be acted upon by all the communities as respects the aggregate interests of the nation, as effectually as it will be by the members of a single association; national communities will gradually melt away, and eventually all mankind become one great family.

I am aware that the sacred prophecies lead us to expect further wars and commotions before this blessed state of things shall be established upon earth; but, as Christianity itself first throve and spread in spite of political convulsions, may we not hope that arrangements destined to assuage all the fiery contentions of mankind, may grow up even while these are raging, so as to be ready to take advantage of a lucid interval to bring rulers and people to the paths of peace? If, as I firmly believe, Christianity be destined to make wars to cease throughout the world, it must be genuine, primitive, uncorrupted Christianity, real, practical Christianity, and not the sort of thing which has but too long passed under the name of that holy and powerful religion.

Individualized man, and genuine Christianity, are so separated as to be utterly incapable of union through all eternity. How highly, then, is it incumbent upon us who are anxious to restore the lost lustre of our faith, to take the lead in a scheme which is so congenial with its spirit, which indeed is but a revival of the very order of society (though under far more favourable circumstances) which was established by the first Christian church!

Yes, Sir, I do hope that the Moravian brethren will not long remain almost the only specimen among us of Christian union; but that the Unitarians will promptly, after mature consideration, exhibit to the world a still better and more illustrious display of the power of Christianity to ensure human happiness. Your missionaries will then, indeed, preach glad tidings to the poor, and carry comfort and delight wherever they go, by shewing "that godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of this life, as well as of that which is to come."

PHILADELPHUS.

P. S. I will, at some future opportunity, with your permission, point out an easy way of obtaining many of the advantages of Mr. Owen's plan, by association of persons inhabiting the metropolis, and other cities, and following their usual avocations.

SIR,

August 6, 1823.

THE public are incalculably indebted to the learning, taste, and industry of Dr. Jones, in supplying what all but merely prejudiced scholars have long regarded as a desideratum in lexicography. The meaning of Greek words, in their nice distinctive shades of signification, is in numberless instances conveyed loosely and ambiguously to the apprehension of the English student, through the interposed medium of Latin terms. This tribute of an humble individual to the author of the Greek-English Lexicon, cannot be judged foreign to the purposes of your journal, as among the striking and incontestable advantages which the dictionary in question offers, may be accounted the light which it reflects on the phraseology of the New Testament.

Dr. Jones himself would perhaps be one of the last to feel any surprise at the detection, even in this his lucid and elaborate work, of some of those *maculæ*

quas aut incuria fudit,

Aut humana parum cavit natura.

Dr. Johnson in the transcript for the first edition of his Dictionary, had overlooked the word *sea*. By a similar unaccountable oversight, Dr. Jones has passed over without the slightest notice the Greek verb for *go*: βαίνω, βαω, and βημι.

It struck me also, on a cursory comparison of the Lexicon with the Greek Plays, that one or two various senses might be added with advantage. I take the liberty of submitting them to Dr. Jones's consideration.

απαρχη, in the plural, *clippings* of hair, strewn as an offering on graves. Orestes, 16.

αφιημι, *spill* or *pour* out. Orest. 115.

αναπαλλω, *soar*. Orest. 322.

δοξα, *show* or *semblance*. Orest. 235.

ναυαγιον, (ιππικον,) *crush* or *overthrow* of a chariot in the race. Electra, 1472.

στενω, *bewail*. Orest. 77.

φυσις, *natural beauty*. Orest. 126.

It appears to me that the senses affixed to απορια, *want*, *doubt*, *perplexity*, should have the addition of

uneasiness, or restless craving of a sick person. Orest. 232.

And that the sense attached to *καταγε*, *approach*, Orestes, 148, (it should be 149,) is an oversight. If this were the meaning, the following word *προσιθ'* is mere tautology. I think the sense is *speak low*: lower your voice: *φωνην* understood.

Under *διαφθειρω*, to the senses *depraved* or *perverted*, *disordered* in mind seems wanting in addition. Orest. 297.

GELLIUS.

SIR, *Islington, Aug. 7, 1823.*

IN reading the Rev. Mr. IRVING'S impressive volume, entitled, *Oration for the Oracles of God, and an Argument for the Judgment to come*, I find that he descants very copiously upon the *eternity of hell-torments*. It is indeed, a favourite topic, pervading the work from its commencement to its conclusion. He, however, advances nothing more than the usual arguments, and deems the contrary belief, that of *universal restoration*, pregnant with mischievous consequences. He no doubt writes under the full conviction of the truth of his sentiments, and of course discharges this part of his ministry with fidelity. It is pleasing notwithstanding, to meet with his memorable conclusion, which shall be transcribed.

"Now when *reason* taketh this picture under her deliberation, I know not what confusion she feels, but surely she is distressed. She thinks it pitiful that a brief, transient space of time like *life*, should decide and determine these terrible conclusions of eternity. She could wish a taste of it, and then a chance of escaping from it. And oh! it would please her well could she indulge the fond hope of seeing *all* yet recovered and restored to happy seats. Hell cheated, the Devil himself converted, and the universal world bound in chains of love and blessedness! It seemeth more than terrible to think of wretches swimming and sweltering for ever in the deep abyss, preyed upon by outward mischiefs and distracted by inward griefs, tortured, tormented, maddened for evermore! There is a *seeming cruelty* in this quietus of

torment, in this ocean of sorrow and suffering, which shocks the faculties of *reason*, and distresses the powers of belief." (Pp. 393, 394.)

As the Christian orator is thus visited with the compunctious feelings of nature, he may be led to exercise his reason, and review the articles of his belief. And it is to be hoped that a critical and attentive perusal of the *New Testament*, will lead him to form a creed more accordant with the benevolent character of the Supreme Being, and more auspicious to the best interests of mankind. He deems what he is pleased to denominate *the Oracles of God*, the fair subject of examination, intelligible to the common reader, and calculated to lead men into a knowledge of all truth. The *Bible* is not a dead letter, mysterious and unintelligible, needing another revelation from God to make it plain and useful. The preacher thus expresses himself forcibly on the subject—

"O! I hate such ignorant prating, because it taketh the high airs of *Orthodoxy*, and would blast me as an *heretical* liar if I go to teach the people that the word of God is a well-spring of life, unto which they have but to stoop their lips in order to taste its sweet and refreshing waters and be nourished unto life eternal. But these high airs and pitiful pelting words are very trifling to me, if I could but persuade men to dismiss all this cant about the *mysteriousness* and profound darkness of the word of God, and sift their own inward selves to find out what lethargy of conception or blind of prejudice, what unwillingness of mind or full possession of worldly engagements, hath hitherto hindered them from drinking life unto their souls from the fountain of living waters. But if I go about to persuade my brethren against the truth of experience, against the very sense and meaning of revelation, against my own conviction, that they may read till their eye grows dim with age without apprehending one word, unless it should please God by methods unrevealed to conjure intelligence into the hieroglyphic page; what do I but interpose another gulf between man and his Maker, dash the full cup of spiritual sweets from his lips, and

leave him as lonely, helpless and desolate as he was before *the Lion of the tribe of Judah* did take the book of God's hidden secrets and prevail to unloose *the seals thereof?*" (Pp. 471, 472.)

This statement augurs well. This celebrated preacher and his admirers, with this rational view of the Scriptures, may sit down to a calm and deliberate examination of their contents. The *New Testament* is consistent with itself. The attributes of the Supreme Being are there never libelled; and the happiness of man is held up as the end of all the divine dispensations. From creeds and from confessions of faith, as from an empoisoned fountain, have issued the tenets most inimical to the glory of God, and subversive of the welfare of mankind. *Christ* came to *save*, not *destroy*, the human species. And should the majority of the inhabitants of the world be condemned to eternal punishment, his mission must prove a curse, and not a blessing, to the children of men. The apostolic asseveration, that where *sin hath abounded, grace shall much more abound*, is realized only by the final restoration of man to undissembled felicity.

The subject is doubtless attended with difficulty. But as in a court of justice we incline to the side of pity and compassion, so let us adopt that creed from the word of God, which wars not with the feelings implanted by heaven in our breasts. The doctrine of the *eternal torments* of the wicked is alike irreconcilable with reason and revelation. Nor has this awfully terrific dogma a salutary influence on the mind of man. *Love*, rather than *terror*, is the predominant trait of the dispensation of Jesus. The lightnings and thunderings of Sinai have given way to the small still voice of the gospel. Persuasion invites, denunciation terrifies and drives away. The former avails, whilst the latter multiplies the evils of transgression, by hardening the sinner against his Maker. Thus, agreeably to the well known lines of the poet,

Fear frightens minds, whilst *Love*, like heat,
Exhales the soul sublime to seek her native seat;

To threats the stubborn sinner oft is hard,
Wrapt in his crimes against the storm prepar'd;
But when the milder beams of *mercy* play,
He melts, and throws his cumbrous cloak away;
Lightnings and thunder proclaim the Almighty's stile—then disappear,
The stiller sound succeeds, and—God is there!

I must apologize for the length of this communication. The topic is interesting, and I should rejoice to find that the most popular preacher of his day entertained more just views of *the glorious gospel* of the *ever-blessed God—blessed*, because he is so in himself—delighting to render the work of his hands felicitous, either in this world or in the world to come. *Mr. Irving* compliments the *Universalists* with the designation of "amiable enthusiasts," adding, that he has "no hesitation to ascribe *the bias of their mind* to the very best of feelings, a desire to save the mercy and benevolence of the Almighty"—whilst he confesses that "the mercy and goodness of God, exceeding great, and greatly to be adored, is sufficient for the salvation of *all* the earth." Of these concessions let not their author be ashamed. They are dictated by the omnipotent energy of truth, and are sanctioned by the sublimated genius of Christian charity. The great and good *Dr. Isaac Watts* says, "If the blessed God should at any time, in consistence with his glorious and incomprehensible perfections, release those wretched creatures (suffering future punishment) from their acute pains and long imprisonment, I think I ought cheerfully to accept this appointment of God for the good of *millions* of my fellow-creatures, and add my joys and praises to all the songs and triumph of the heavenly world, in the day of such a divine and glorious release of these prisoners. This will, indeed, be such a new, such an astonishing and universal *jubilee*, both for evil spirits and wicked men, as must fill *heaven, earth*, and even *hell*, with joy and hallelujahs!"

J. EVANS.

An Essay on the Nature and Design of Sacrifices under the Mosaic Law, and the Influence which Jewish Ideas and Language concerning them had upon the Language of the New Testament. By the late Rev. Henry Turner.

(Concluded from p. 378.)

WE come now to the last part of our undertaking, namely, after the view that has been given of the subject of Jewish sacrifices, to account for the language of the New Testament concerning them. We do not intend—it is no part of our object in the present essay, to take a general view of the design of Christ's death, or of the arguments which are brought from a variety of sources to prove what are called orthodox views respecting it. Our intention is, on the supposition that other evidence is inconclusive, or at least not forcibly and undeniably leading to the adoption of these views, to examine what is urged in further proof of them from comparisons made in the New Testament between the death of Christ and the sacrifices and ceremonies under the Mosaic law. And we think that having first shewn that there are no indications in the original records of the Mosaic institutions, or in any of the language of holy Jewish writers respecting them by which we could discover that they were appointed with “a principal intention to prefigure the death of Christ,” we may fairly demand a proportionably stronger case to be made out, in proof of the literal sense of such expressions occurring in the New Testament; and may conclude that there is considerable previous probability in a scheme of figurative interpretation with respect to them. This, however, is a course of argument which Dr. Magee charges with artifice and sophistry. (See No. 38.) And in his second sermon (near the beginning) he protests against the use of it in the following words: “In the mode of inquiry which has usually been adopted on this subject, one prevailing error deserves to be noticed. The nature of sacrifices, as generally understood and practised antecedent to the coming of Christ, has been first examined, and from that, as a ground of explanation, the notion of Christ's

sacrifice is derived, whereas, in fact, by this all former sacrifices are to be explained, and in reference to it only, are they to be understood. From an error so fundamental,” &c.

Now, is it possible for Dr. Magee to be blind to the futility of such an argument? Is it not, in the most glaring manner, to beg the question in dispute? If the notion of Christ's sacrifice is already determined, as Dr. Magee would have it, why inquire further into the matter? But if confirmation be sought for, from the ancient sacrifices; then, let them speak for themselves, and shew us what their real and original import was.

If Dr. Magee would avoid arguing *in a circle*, he must take the course of the argument he condemns.

The question of the proper sacrifice of Christ is at issue—argued in the affirmative, by shewing that the death of Christ is compared to sacrifices under the law; we should now expect that a distinct inquiry should be made into the nature and purport of sacrifices under the law; and that it should be proved that they represented the doctrine of the satisfaction of sin by vicarious punishment, and whatever else is essential to the popular notion of the sacrifice of Christ; and this is attempted to a certain point; (indeed, the older writers would have been ashamed to confess failure in it;) but when it is found, or at least vehemently suspected to be untenable, (see Dr. Magee's first sermon, *passim*, and No. 13, 17, and especially 39,) then the advocate for modern orthodoxy turns round upon us, and tells us that it is unnecessary to inquire further into the Mosaic sacrifices, for they are compared in the New Testament to the great sacrifice of Christ, and “from this alone derive their meaning, by this alone can be explained.”

And the next time that the sacrifice of Christ is questioned, he will run the same round; shifting from one to the other, and escaping confutation by *assuming* alternately, the vicarious import of the death of Christ, and that of the Mosaic ceremonies—so that we may well adopt an expression pronounced on a somewhat different occasion, and say, that “so long as” the first of Dr. Magee's discourses on

Atonement and Sacrifice "shall be extant, the masters of the dialectic art will be at no loss for an example of the circulating syllogism."

Indeed, the older writers, in defence of the proper sacrifice of Christ, give such a view of the meanness and imperfection of its types under the Mosaic institution, as are but indifferently calculated to increase our respect for that ancient dispensation, or to bestow a greater dignity upon its ordinances. Thus Dr. Outram: "Id inter antitypum et typum interest, quod quæ revera in antitypo vis inest ea nonnisi specie tenus, aut gradu longè exiliori in typo extiterit. Enimverò quamvis typus nonnunquam rem aliquam cum antitypo suo communem habuerit, ea tamen res multo minus in typo, quam in antitypo, semper valet; quemadmodum mors earum victimarum, quibus mors Christi adumbrabatur, longè minorem apud Deum hominesque vim habuit quam quæ ad mortem Christi pertinet. Ita ut vis rei adumbrantis virtutis in adumbratâ repertæ nihil nisi symbolica quædam species, aut tam exilis gradus fuerit, ut pro umbrâ quâdam haberi posset." Lib. i. c. 18, § 2.

And Dr. Magee, speaking of the Mosaic institutions at large, has the following remarks: "Since the law itself, with its accompanying sanctions, seems to have been principally temporary; so the worship it enjoins appears to have been, for the most part, rather a public and solemn declaration of allegiance to the true God in opposition to the Gentile idolatries, than a pure and spiritual obedience in moral and religious matters, which was reserved for that more perfect system appointed to succeed in due time, when the state of mankind would permit."

This remark, though wise and philosophical, is not very consistent with the supposition of there being an inherent and universal reference to the most important of Christian doctrines in the whole system of Mosaic worship.

The whole question, then, is brought to this point; Can a method be discovered of accounting for the application in the New Testament of sacrificial language to the case of Christ, supposing that no real original correspondence was intended, and such a

method as shall leave unimpeached the credit and authority of the Christian Scriptures as the only appointed rule and standard of faith?

We think that such a method may be discovered, provided men are not perversely determined to charge the errors which are the effect of their own want of caution, and of their precipitate and headlong prejudices, upon the uncertainty and obscurity of scripture. We have little hope, however, of producing any change of opinion in such as set out with a declaration like the following: "If the death of Christ was not an atonement for sin," (i. e. in the popular sense,) "the law and the prophets, Jesus himself, his forerunner, and his apostles, all spoke a language which is to me wholly unintelligible; and which could not have more effectually deceived had it been framed for the express purpose of deception." (Wardlaw on the Socinian Controversy, p. 206.) Is not this too much like the obstinacy condemned by the prophet, where he describes the Jews as "hardening the neck that they might not hear God's word"?

Suppose the case of men born Jews, and brought up in the pious profession of the Jewish religion; attending with devout assiduity upon the temple-worship, and "in all the ordinances of the law blameless." Suppose them to have arrived at mature age, with their religious habits, sentiments and expressions fixed in the model of a ritual and ceremonial dispensation; and at that time let them be introduced to the knowledge of a more spiritual, purer system of religion; and let them become inspired apostles and writers in this new dispensation; let them have occasion to write to separate communities of believers, composed of men brought up like themselves in an attachment to the ancient institutions of Moses: what will naturally be the style of their religious writings? Surely, without the exercise of an extraordinary, and, as it seems to us a needless miracle, it will be Jewish; and where religious expressions already in frequent devout use appear in any degree applicable to new topics, they will be used in preference to others, of which no definitions are at hand, or which must be made on purpose. And it may be

said, (without irreverence,) that as Augustus Cæsar is reported to have declared that, Emperor as he was, he could not introduce a new word among the Romans; so the Author of a dispensation of revealed truth can sooner introduce a new system of religious *ideas*, than cause it to be expressed by an underived and original frame of language. And it is well it is so; for the more familiar the language, the better it is understood; and an abstract method of expressing truths relating to religion would be an uninteresting jargon, quite foreign from all practicable use or benefit.

Again, according to the supposition we have made, what impression might naturally be felt by these writers and by those to whom they wrote, which it would be necessary to provide against? Surely the following; that although the understanding fully admitted the superior excellence of the new dispensation, yet there was experienced a blank in their feelings, a loss of some of the habitual pleasures and tastes of a religious kind, to which they had been accustomed, and a consequent tendency towards apathy, and alienation of mind from religious pursuits. As this exposed believers to the temptation of going back to Judaism, and was a stumbling-block for those who remained in unbelief, it was highly important to provide against it. And it was natural to take the method of providing against it, which is employed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The design of which is well described in the following sentence: "The Christian Hebrews had been charged with the want of an altar, a priest and a sacrifice. In answer, the apostle shews that they were in want of none of these."

Let us make one further supposition. Let us suppose that the author and principal person of this new spiritual kingdom, after leading a blameless and holy life, in continual obedience to God, and pursuit of the best interests of man, was persecuted on account of his goodness, and the sublime objects he had in view, and (rather than give up those objects, and adopt the worldly and wicked schemes of the priests and people of Israel) did voluntarily submit himself to the effects of their rage, and suffer death upon the cross; after which, being

raised far above all principality and power, and no longer subject to their controul, he had power given him from heaven to send forth his apostles upon the ministry of reconciliation to the whole world; delivering from the power of death by the evidence of his resurrection, and from the power of sin by a proclamation of forgiveness for sins past, and a future righteous judgment,—can it be said to be unnatural, absurd for persons educated in the ancient religion to describe so wonderful, so glorious a series of events, by all the images that had formerly been devoted to express their most sacred, exalted and delightful conceptions? Can we wonder that Christ should be termed a sacrifice, a priest, an altar, a mercy-seat; that he should be compared to the high priest entering into the holy of holies; and that his ascending to heaven should be described as an entering within the veil, offering up himself as a sacrifice once for all, now to appear in the presence of God for us, putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself?

Thus we see that both by habit and by design it was natural for the apostles of Jesus Christ to express themselves on this animating and delightful subject with a figurativeness, such as our theory of sacrifices, under the Jewish law, requires.

Nor can we see any harm in their being suffered to follow the natural bent of their feelings and course of their expressions, in this instance. It conciliated without misleading the Jews, who were accustomed to such allusions; and it would neither mislead nor revolt those of the present day, if they duly reflected on the necessary influence of previous circumstances on the minds of the apostles. In the judgment, however, of the amiable and plausible writer lately mentioned, (Wardlaw in loc.,) "This is at once to deprive their language of *its* meaning, and the rites alluded to, of theirs. It is, besides," says he, "to charge the writers with singular folly. No idea could well be simpler, or more easily expressed, than that of a prophet's dying to confirm his testimony, or even to afford, in his own rising from the grave, the evidence and pledge of a future resurrection. Why such language as that which has been quoted should be so constantly used to

express such ideas as these, if these were indeed the ideas intended to be conveyed, is a question," says he, "which can hardly be answered, on any principle consistent with the inspiration, or even the common sense of the writers."

Here we have occasion again to complain (in behalf, not of our own system, but of the reverence and honour due to Holy Scripture) of the very rash and unseemly manner in which men are wont to express the consequence of the rejection of their own interpretations. What! must holy men be charged with singular folly and a total want of common sense, unless they can be shewn to the satisfaction of every polemic to have meant precisely what he thinks they ought to have meant!

If there be any foundation for what we have said respecting the natural and necessary habits, feelings and sentiments of the Christian apostles, it will appear that the simplicity of the doctrine they had to teach was precisely their difficulty; and that they were permitted to represent it in such a manner as might conciliate, but ought not to have misled mankind; and that so far the Almighty was pleased to provide against an objection which was sure to be taken up against Christianity, on account of that very circumstance which was, in fact, the surest proof of its divine origin, its simplicity!

But who can justly demand it of God, that he should have wrought a stupendous and perpetual miracle upon the minds of those whom he chose to the office of providing the written records of the New Testament, for the confirmation of the faith of Christendom, and have compelled them to reject the expressions and images which had a peculiar beauty, force and propriety, when addressed to the Christians of that day, merely that men in all subsequent ages might have no chance of mistaking them? Must Paul throw away his fervent, eloquent and glowing style, and write as if he were penning an act of parliament, or a conveyance of an estate, merely to save posterity the trouble of thought, criticism and reflection?

We are not to expect that we should be able to understand scripture, with-

out making due allowance for the situation and circumstances of the writers. Happily, indeed, the New Testament was, for the most part, written by plain men, whose humble rank and want of learning preserved them from the obscurity which arises from the affectation of science, and qualified them for writing works which were intended for the use of all mankind. But that they should be perfectly free from modes of expression peculiar to one country, and derived from the circumstances of their own times, was not to be expected; and if practicable, would probably have been productive of no real benefit; since it would have deprived their works of those features which furnish a powerful argument for their genuineness. We should soon find ourselves involved in the most palpable errors, if we always adopted that which appeared the most obvious and natural interpretation of every passage. The most natural interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is my body," is that which the Roman Catholic gives to them; but we are not for that reason bound to subscribe to the absurd doctrine of Transubstantiation. We must make use of common sense, and consider the general strain and purport of scripture, or we shall make both heresy and nonsense of various parts of it. It is an obvious rule in perusing any work, to interpret that which is obscure consistently with that which is plain, and where language is used which is evidently figurative, that is, borrowed from some other subject, and applied by way of illustration or ornament, to allow a greater latitude of interpretation than where the terms are simple and strictly appropriate to the subject in hand.

To enter upon a particular examination of the texts connected with this subject, would be inconsistent with the limits of this essay. One general observation may be made, which, if properly pursued, will be found to amount to full proof of the figurative intention of all such passages of the New Testament.

That these writers did not intend to represent Christ as a sacrifice in the most literal sense, appears from this; that they have applied the same language to a variety of other subjects,

which they certainly would not have done if they had conceived that Christ was a real sacrifice, and his death the great original of this religious rite. Thus St. Paul exhorts Christians to "present their bodies a living sacrifice:" St. Peter describes them as "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." We are exhorted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "to offer up the sacrifice of praise continually," "to do good and communicate, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." St. Paul says, "If I be offered up on the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice in you all." And in the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans he speaks of himself as the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

Thus it appears that the writers of the New Testament were in the habit of applying this language to a great variety of subjects, which makes it less likely that, when they applied it to the death of Jesus Christ, they meant that we should understand them literally.

And, on the other hand, although it is under this image of a sacrifice that they frequently speak of the death of Christ, it is by no means the only representation which they give of it. He is described as a good shepherd, laying down his life for his sheep. He speaks of himself as a grain of corn, which, unless it die, abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He is described as a captain, leading his followers to salvation. By a variety of images, he is described as a priest, an altar, a mercy-seat, a high-priest entering within the veil, a sacrifice.

Thus it appears that whatever comparisons are made between the death of Christ and the sacrifices, and other ceremonies of the law, are all capable of being explained in the same way as expressions having great beauty and propriety, when considered as figurative, but destitute of both, if we attempt to explain them by a literal mode of interpretation. What has now been said may, perhaps, be suffi-

cient to shew on what principle the passages in question may be explained consistently with the general sense of scripture; and so as not to contradict our established belief in the wisdom, goodness and mercifulness of God. And shall we despise the riches and long-suffering of God, as displayed in the gospel of Jesus Christ, because the means which he has adopted do not exactly accord with our preconceived opinions? The simplicity of the means employed is surely one of the greatest proofs of the divine origin of the Christian institution. The raising of one from amongst our brethren to be our prince and Saviour—the endowing him with heavenly graces and extraordinary powers, delivering him from the dominion of death, and raising him to an immortal state of glory in the heavens—is surely a more convincing proof of divine goodness, wisdom and power, than if a being of the highest order had been sent invested with authority, to proclaim the tidings of salvation.

When we consider what important things are revealed to us, what more can we desire? We are told of the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body and life eternal; the providence of God ever exercised over us for our protection; the ascension and immortality of Christ; the perpetual love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. What is there incomplete for correction and instruction in righteousness? What is there that could have a happier tendency to inspire us with the most fervent love and veneration of God, and to fill us with the most sincere gratitude towards our Lord Jesus Christ? We look to Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith—who, having overcome death, is become the author of eternal salvation to all them that believe in him. He that was dead is alive; he is present to intercede for his church, and he will come again to receive his faithful followers to himself. May we earnestly strive to prepare ourselves for his glorious appearance, that we may not be ashamed before him at his coming, but may be received unto glory and honour and praise, through the mercy of God in Christ Jesus our Lord!

August 1, 1823.

SIR,
YOUR worthy correspondent Mr. Hinton, has, in your last Number, [p. 378,] favoured your readers with a very able and ingenious paper on the "introduction of evil," in which he contends for the following propositions: "Every being not subject to moral and natural evil must be infinite." And that, "it is not in the possible power of Infinity itself, to create a being not subject to moral and natural ill." That all creatures have limited attributes, the consequence of which is, "the moral certainty of miscalculation, fallibility, and error;" and this, without going a single step farther, introduces us to what is called "moral evil." "And that imperfection or necessary evil, is the necessary inheritance of all created intelligence." Something similar is to be found in a sermon on the Existence of Evil, by the late Dr. Williams, of Rotherham. Mr. H.'s theory is ingenious and plausible: by it he not only gets rid, as he supposes, of some offensive orthodox notions, but also completely exculpates the goodness of God in the permission of vice and misery under the divine government, by proving that he "could not prevent it, that the Almighty could not do impossibilities." That God permits evil, or introduces it as an instrument of producing greater good, is, indeed, allowed to be "plausible, but by no means conclusive, and rests entirely upon that faith in the infinite wisdom and goodness of God, which those attributes are calculated to inspire." Now, Sir, it forcibly strikes me, as it may do some others of your readers, that a consequence of the greatest magnitude results from the above statements, which Mr. H. seems not to have foreseen, and for which he has not provided, viz. "If evil is the necessary inheritance of all created intelligence;" "if every being not infinite is liable to error and evil;" how can we be sure of enjoying happiness or perfection in heaven itself? For when there, we still shall be created beings, and as finite then as we are now, consequently as liable to "miscalculation, failure and error."

I for one could almost admit any theory or explanation of the origin of evil, rather than have a doubt cast

VOL. XVIII.

upon that pure, permanent and unmixed happiness promised to the righteous in the gospel.

It is not necessary to say more at present; what is advanced being sufficient, I trust, to induce your worthy correspondent, or those who think with him, to enter more fully into the discussion.

DAVID EATON.

London,

July 8, 1823.

SIR,
GRATITUDE to your correspondent, Dr. Jones, for the treats so frequently afforded to me, in common with other readers of your miscellany, makes me loth to take up the pen for the sake of animadverting on any statement put forth by so ingenious an author; but, as liberality appears to be one of the Doctor's leading virtues, I rest assured that he will not only make allowance for any difference of opinion which may exist between us, but also gladly allow of an opportunity being afforded to such of your readers as feel interested in the subject, to hear two sides, and thereby be enabled to judge better for themselves.

In agreeing with your learned correspondent on the inconsistency which appears in the present authorized translation of Gen. iv. 26, "Then men began to call on the name of the Lord," I must beg leave to dissent from two assertions made by him, first, that *such is the exact rendering of the original according to the vowel points*, and secondly, *that regard being paid to the consonants only, the true version is*, "Then men began to call themselves by the name of Jehovah." For,

In the first case, as far as regards the points, there is no word whatever in the Hebrew answering to *men*, neither is the verb *קרא* in the third person plural; and on the other hand, whilst the word *men* is not to be found in the original if read without the points, there is no word or affix answering to *themselves*; neither is the verb *קרא* in Hithpaël, or the reflective conjugation: independent of all which, I challenge the Doctor to produce a single passage in the whole Hebrew Bible where the phrase *קרא בשם יהוה* signifies *to call (another person) by the name of Jehovah*.

With due deference I would beg leave to refer Dr. Jones to his friend Mr. Bellamy's translation of the Hebrew Bible, in which, although by an oversight in the text (pardonable enough, you will say, in the stupendous undertaking of a solitary individual to translate the Bible afresh from the original) the verb הוּחַל is rendered *began*, the sense is fully proved in the corresponding note to be the same as in Levit. xxi. 9, and Ezek. xxii. 26, namely *to prophane* or *pollute*. Hence, the literal interpretation of the passage under consideration, both according to the vowel points and without them, appears to me to be, "Then he" (sc. Enos) "caused to be prophaned" (or, simply, prophaned) "in calling on the name of Jehovah;" a sense embracing the worship of idols generally, and not that of deified mortals only, as insinuated by Dr. Jones.

With regard to the Doctor's version of the opening of the sixth chapter of Genesis, he will perhaps also pardon me if I again prefer Mr. Bellamy's translation to his, where both actually differ. It will be seen that the Doctor virtually follows Mr. B. in his version of the phrase בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, although his adoption of the plural *Gods*, does not appear to be sanctioned by a single passage in the whole Bible, and notwithstanding Mr. Bellamy's text again exhibits a mistake in the fourth verse, in printing "children of God" for "children of *the* God;" but I cannot persuade myself that Dr. Jones is fortunate in his choice of the word *marauders* for מַרְאָשִׁים, which Mr. Bellamy has rendered *apostates*, and which in the LXX. is given by γηγάντες, i. e. *earth-born*. As reference only is made to gross idolatry in the preceding verses, and nothing savouring of violence or violent proceedings is intimated therein, (for the Doctor will hardly pretend that because the children of the God *admired* the daughters of Adam, *therefore* they made a violent seizure of them, a meaning by the bye which assuredly does not attach to the original תִּקְלָה,) I must own, I, for one, feel inclined to side with Mr. Bellamy, whose quotation of different passages, e. g. Micah vii. 8, and 2 Kings xxv. 11, appears conclusive as to the signification frequently given to the root לָחַץ

which is that of *deserting from*, or *apostatizing*.

Your reverend correspondent lays much stress on the propriety of rendering the word יָרַד *shall remain*, in which he is certainly backed by the translations which he quotes; but, even admitting that they and he are correct, which, from the general context and sense, may reasonably be doubted, there does not appear any necessity for the etymological conjectures in which he indulges, since a mere reference to the Hebrew root יָרַד would have sufficiently warranted his version as far as mere etymology goes. Indeed, if the reader will turn to that old standard of Hebrew literature, the *Epitome Thesauri Linguae Sanctæ Autore Sante Pagnino Lucensi*, he will find the following *sub voce* יָרַד: "*Hinc deducunt quidam illud*," Gen. vi. 3, "*Non erit detentus tanquam in vaginâ spiritus meus*;" but I venture to submit that the sense which Dr. Jones gives to this passage, namely, that the principle of life should *not remain* in man, but that his days should be shortened to one hundred and twenty years, is not authorized by the narrative. Even supposing that the account of Cain's violent death, prior to the occurrences narrated in the sixth chapter of Genesis, may not bear upon the case, surely the number of deaths detailed in regular course by Moses, in the fifth or preceding chapter of Genesis, cannot warrant that legislator's putting *as something new* into the mouth of Jehovah the words here quoted. The number of years moreover fixed by Dr. Jones for the *days of man*, appears at variance with history and experience. Thus in the very same book, in which, according to the Doctor, man's days are limited to a hundred and twenty years, we are afterwards informed that several of the patriarchs of the second order, between Noah and Abraham, lived above four hundred years, and none under one hundred and forty; and whether we consult the average rate of the life of man or the utmost extent of his duration in "our degenerate day," we shall still find ourselves either below or above the Doctor's standard; for in the former case we dare hardly reckon on more than sixty or seventy years, and in

the latter we know that within a very recent period some have lived to the age of a hundred and sixty, and upwards. Hence, Sir, I apprehend that the whole of the latter clause of the third verse of the sixth chapter of Genesis, relates to something very different from the mere duration of man's temporal life.

Ere concluding these hasty remarks, I cannot refrain from slightly advertising to what Dr. Jones has said respecting *angels*, by which he understands a race of supernatural beings or spirits, and to whom he says, the Jewish Scriptures apply the term *בני אלהים*, *sons of God*. On this and other subjects of a similar nature, it might perhaps be as well to remain silent; but the Doctor and your readers will perhaps once more pardon me if I candidly own that in the numerous passages of the Old and New Testaments which I have been able to consult respecting the *מלאכי* of the original, or the *αγγελοι* of the Septuagint and the New Testament, I cannot find one to which any idea of a spirit or supernatural character seems to be attached. It is, in fact, one of those terms which it were to be wished might be wholly exploded from our translation of the Bible, as no where bearing in the original the meaning we now assign to it, and the retention of which only serves to throw an air of romance on what is, in the strictest parlance, *the word of God*. The time, however, appears fast approaching when this and other incongruities are likely to be disposed of, when the lover of truth and the Christian may expect to find many of those stumbling-blocks removed which have long annoyed him, and when our version of the Holy Scriptures shall be purged of anomalies and inconsistencies, which although sufficiently in unison with the style of an oriental tale, it is consolatory to know are not to be found in the original Hebrew.

J. J.

SIR,
IN your Number for this month, [page 405,] I observe with pleasure, that you have again brought before the notice of your readers, the respectable society of Quakers, by

publishing their Yearly Epistle. But, Sir, when I compare it with various communications which have appeared in the Monthly Repository, respecting the doctrines of that people, I am surprised at the difference between the statements of some of your correspondents, and what now seems to be the avowed creed of the Quakers. I thought it had been hinted by some, whose acquaintance with the Friends could not be doubted, that their *real* tenets were those of Unitarianism; that many had actually confessed it, and that we were likely ere long to see them advancing in a body as the advocates of "rational religion." With such statements, how am I to reconcile the contradiction apparent in the Yearly Epistle? (which you have no doubt correctly copied). Here they come forward, publicly acknowledging their belief in the Divinity of the blessed Saviour, "who before the world was, condescended, in order to effect our redemption, to come down from heaven, and take upon himself the nature of man." The Yearly Epistle, I believe, is considered as the voice of the whole body; but, perhaps you, Mr. Editor, can give some explanation of the enigma which has puzzled, Sir, your constant reader.

A FRIEND TO THE QUAKERS.

Clapton,

July 4, 1823.

SIR,
MR. MANNING (p. 324) does not appear to have recollected that Mr. Lindsey closed his "Historical View," published in 1783, with the case of Mr. Ross; whose "declaration" as it "stands upon record in the books of the Presbytery of Stranraer," he has thus quoted:

"I, Andrew Ross, minister of the gospel in the parish of Inch, (for the exoneration of my conscience, more particularly with respect to the terms of ministerial communion enjoined by this church,) hereby declare, that I firmly adhere to the fundamental principles of the Protestant religion, namely, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith and practice; that the exercise of private judgment is the undoubted right and duty of every Christian, and of every Christian

minister, and that it is the best means of discovering the true sense of Scripture; that the Lord *Jesus Christ* is appointed the sole head and lawgiver of his church, and the *only Master in religion*. And *I also declare*, that I reject all doctrines and practices that are inconsistent with these principles, as witness my hand this third day of January, 1776.

“ANDREW ROSS.”

Mr. Lindsey has added, “to the honour of the parishioners of *Inch*, that they unanimously presented a petition, dated April 24, 1775, to the Presbytery of *Stanraer*, praying that their minister *might be allowed to continue among them upon his own terms*, and attesting his excellent, unspotted character, and faithful, laborious discharge of his duty among them.”

This petition which Mr. Lindsey has given, at length, as it “stands in the minutes of the proceedings of the Presbytery,” thus concludes:

“They think that every church should leave its members free to search the Scriptures, and not to bind them down for ever to one sense of them. In all these points they agree most cordially with their minister, and will be happy, extremely happy, to live with him upon these terms.”

Give me leave to hazard a conjecture that the “letter on subscription,” inclosed in the letter “from Dr. Benson to Mr. Towgood,” formed afterwards a part of the following publication.

“Some Letters, which passed between a Young Gentleman, designed for Holy Orders, and his Uncle, a Clergyman, concerning Conformity to the Church of England. With an Appendix, by the Editor.” 1758. This anonymous editor I have supposed to be Dr. Benson, partly from the circumstance of my having this correspondence in a volume containing other pieces by Dr. B. and which a former possessor (who was, I believe, a Dissenting minister of Marlborough, named J. Davies) has lettered “Benson’s Tracts.” In the Editor’s *Appendix*, (p. 161, *note*,) after quoting from *Whichcot*, “to profess and not believe, this is high *dissimulation*, and a horrible indignity put upon God,” he adds,

“See the very different sentiments, expressed in a Sermon, entitled, ‘A Defence of the Subscriptions required in the Church of England,’ preached before the University of Cambridge, on the Commencement Sunday, 1757. By W. S. Powell, D. D. Fellow of St. John’s College.”

The Editor professes to have received “the original letters” from “an intimate friend,” the son of the elder brother of the nephew in the correspondence, “under an engagement” to conceal “the names subscribed to the letters,” and not “to date them.” The initials of the uncle are J. M. and those of the nephew, who is called *Harry*, are H. M. There are two of the letters, the first and the concluding, from the uncle, who “a few days after he wrote his second letter, was seized with a violent disorder, which soon carried him off.” His nephew, who wrote six letters, “died within two years after him.” That this was a real correspondence, I see no reason to doubt, though it be impossible now to ascertain the date of the letters; except that they were written after 1736, when Warburton’s “Alliance between Church and State” first appeared; for the nephew (p. 94) refers to that work as the “most unnatural and monstrous, most senseless, and *bowelless* production, that ever the brain of man was delivered of.” If the notes be not by the Editor, (and he does not appear to claim them,) the letters must have been written later, for there is a note on *bowelless*, referring to the “canons of criticism,” (*Can. vi. Examp. viii.*) which did not appear till 1748.

Had I leisure, and were your pages less occupied, I would readily give some account of the arguments for Nonconformity contained in these letters. The nephew was evidently an *Unitarian*, perhaps of Dr. Clark’s school, and the uncle probably an *Hoadlean*, who had found some liberal associates, inquiring clergymen, in his neighbourhood. One of their free conversations mentioned, (p. 52,) appears to have impressed the nephew, in whom, as Johnson says on another occasion, they kindled a flame which burned but dimly in themselves.

Should Mr. Manning know any thing of this publication, he will, I dare say, obligingly inform you.

The "answer to Powell's Sermon," (p. 324,) was, I suppose, contained in the "Serious and Free Thoughts on the present State of the Church and Religion," published in 1756, according to Mr. Manning, in his Life of Mr. Towgood. I have a pamphlet dated 1772, and entitled, "A Calm and Plain Answer to the Inquiry, Why are you a Dissenter from the Church of England? By the author of the Dissenting Gentlemen's Letters to White."

Should Mr. Manning oblige your readers with any explanatory notes on the "Letters of Voltaire," I beg leave to remind him that besides what occurs at the beginning of the "Traité sur la Tolérance," all the judicial proceeding on the *Calas* family are detailed in the "Continuation des Causes Célèbres." (*Amst.* 1771.) I have only the fourth volume, which ends with the execution of *Calas* in March 1762, and the disposal of his family. This volume will be much at Mr. M.'s service.

J. T. RUTT.

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

No. CCCCVI.

Preamble to Laws of Zaleucus.

I would here call upon all moralists and legislators, and ask them if they have said any thing more noble or more useful than the exordium of the laws of Zaleucus, who flourished before Pythagoras, and who was the first magistrate of the Locrians.

"Every citizen ought to be persuaded of the existence of the Divinity. It is sufficient to observe the order and harmony of the universe, to be convinced that chance cannot have formed it. Every man ought to have command over his soul, to purify it and to remove from it all evil, persuaded that God cannot be served by the perverse, and that he is unlike wretched mortals who take delight in magnificent ceremonies and sumptuous offerings. Virtue alone, and the constant disposition to do good, can please him. We ought, then, to seek to be just in principle and in practice: by this means we shall obtain the approba-

tion of the Divinity. What leads to ignominy ought to be feared much more than what conducts to poverty. He who abandons fortune for justice, ought to be looked upon as the best citizen; but those whom their violent passions hurry on to evil, men, women, citizens, simple inhabitants, ought to be admonished to think of the gods, and often to bear in mind the severe justice they exercise against the guilty: let them have constantly before their eyes the hour of death, that fatal hour which awaits us all, that hour when the recollection of faults brings remorse, and the vain repentance of not having made all our actions subservient to equity.

"It therefore behoves all men to conduct themselves at each moment of their lives as if this moment were the last; but if an evil genius excites them to crime, let them take refuge at the foot of the altars; let them pray to heaven to remove far from them this evil genius; let them especially throw themselves into the arms of worthy people, whose counsels will bring them back to virtue by representing to them the goodness of God and his vengeance."

There is nothing in all antiquity which can be preferred to this plain but sublime passage, dictated by reason and virtue, stripped of enthusiasm, and of those gigantic figures which good sense rejects.—*Voltaire, Histoire Générale.*

No. CCCCVII.

Corruptions of Christianity the Armoury of Unbelief.

The Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his ax, (1 Samuel xiii. 20,) and unbelievers in Protestant countries are wont to resort to Rome to whet their sneers at the Christian religion. Almost any deistical book would furnish examples of this artifice. The following is from Gibbon, (*Decline and Fall*, 8vo. Vol. VIII. p. 123, note 14,) who was always pleased when he could escape from the gravity of his historical text to play the buffoon or worse in his notes.—"Gregory, the Roman, supposes that the Lombards adored a she-goat, which they were accustomed to sacrifice to the gods of their fathers. *I know but of one religion in which the God and the victim are the same.*"

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Sermons, selected from the Papers of the late Rev. Henry Turner: and published at the request of the younger Members of the Church of Unitarian Christians, in the High Pavement, Nottingham. To which are added, a few occasional Addresses.* Newcastle: Printed by T. and J. Hodgson. Sold in London by Hunter. 1822. 8vo. pp. 368.

SERMONS are often estimated, and, in some degree, not improperly, as theological or as literary compositions. The contents of the present volume, while they possess, in both these views, no ordinary merit, claim additional and far higher praise. They illustrate, without doubt, the knowledge and the taste, the judgment and the talents, of the lamented author: but they are, at the same time, transcripts of his heart, of the devotion, the purity, the benevolence, the affectionate and holy zeal, which inhabited it; nor will it be easy or desirable to read them, without a frequent reference to the circumstances in which they were written, and to those under which they are given to the world. Who can glance at the title-page without deep sympathy and interest? The name there presenting itself to us, is associated with recollections, with attachments, and with anticipations, which numerous friends of scriptural piety and learning, of religious truth and knowledge, of Christian liberty and virtue, of sound education, of public spirit, of literature and science, in a word, of all the best interests of man, have been eager to express. Our eyes open, too, on a volume of discourses of a deceased pastor, which are published at the request of the younger members of the bereaved church. This fact, of rare occurrence, is, surely, not a little honourable to the character of their departed instructor, and to their own! Other and still tenderer emotions, are awakened by the motto,* which so impressively yet

delicately informs us, that this selection from the papers of a much-loved son is printed under the care of a father; in whose consolations and supports may *they* share, whose bosoms are, at any time, pierced with equal or the like sorrow!

We have not room to copy the preface, which consists principally of a biographical memoir, and which would be injured by abridgment. It is worthy of being repeatedly perused by young ministers, and by candidates for the ministry: nor do we think it less entitled to the serious regard of the religious societies, with which they are or may hereafter be connected. The testimonies of grateful recollection and profound sorrow, which appear in the introductory pages, lead us to believe, that this excellent pastor was placed among men of temper, views and pursuits congenial with his own; among those who were capable of estimating his solid and modest worth, and who were solicitous to aid his schemes of usefulness: and such records give much encouragement to persons who fill the same or a similar situation.

Mr. Henry Turner *thought it natural, that “they who fear the Lord, should speak often one to another” of the subjects included in their noblest*

corpus humatum est, quod contra decuit ab illo meum. Animus vero non me deserens, sed respectans, in ea profecto loca discessit, quo mihi ipsi spero esse veniendum.” Many of our readers will instantly perceive, that these words, with two slight, but essential, alterations, are Cicero’s, who puts them into the mouth of the elder Cato, at the end of the *Treatise on Old Age*. A translation of the former sentence, is supplied by the language of Mr. Burke (Letter on the Duke of Bedford, &c., p. 22): “I live in an inverted order; they who ought to have succeeded me, are gone before me: they who should have been to me as posterity, are in the place of ancestors, &c.” Of the remainder of the quotation from Cicero the import is the same with the following assurance, when employed by the Christian believer, “I shall go unto him; but he shall not return to me.”

* “ — Quo nemo vir melior natus est; nemo pietate præstantior; cujus a me

knowledge, and connected with their most valuable hopes.* With signal propriety therefore, the first of the discourses in this volume, is "on Religious Conversation" (Mal. iii. 16). The preacher investigates "the causes which may be supposed to occasion"† an extraordinary reserve, and apparent want of interest, with respect to topics of religion. These causes he discovers in a false delicacy, in too great an appetite for the good opinion of the world, and in "a certain fastidiousness, which persons of taste and cultivation indulge, to a degree which indisposes them for bearing a part in any but the most studied and learned arguments" on such themes. In mentioning the chief motives which ought to induce those "that fear the Lord, to speak often one to another," he observes, that to step out of the line of common custom, in this instance, would at once save us from the temptation of conforming to other customs, of which conscience still more decidedly disapproves; that by communicating our sentiments to those around us, we should gain additional strength of principle; and that it is our high duty to promote the interest of religion in the mind of others:

"Every one has a sphere, within which he is as much bound to be a preacher of righteousness and a minister of the word of God, as the highest prelate in the land. Friends should cement their friendship by mutually imparting their hopes and fears, their admonitions and encouragements, respecting these their most momentous concerns. Masters should reward and secure the fidelity of their servants, by setting before them the service which they themselves owe to their 'Master who is in heaven.' Above all, parents should spread before their children the treasures of divine truth; and, whilst they are at pains to adorn their minds with the useful branches of human learning, should not forget the superior value of religious wisdom.

"If the interests of religion be left to the stated services of the pulpit, and the unseconded labours of the public ministers of religion, they will be very imper-

fectly secured. It is not the splendour of cathedral pomp—it is the Bible in the cottage of the labourer, it is the prayer that ascends from the bosom of a Christian family—that proves the prevalence of religion. In the beautiful scheme of the gospel, Christians universally are 'a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.' Thus every believer in Christ is virtually in holier orders than any that can be given by the power of earthly authorities."

* * * *

"— To be silent on the things that relate to salvation and immortality, when there are so many ignorant, sinful, despairing, faithless men around you, is, as if you were in a ship, which had long sailed in unknown regions of the sea, and which, after having been tossed about by storms, driven from its course by winds, rocked by swelling waves, and shattered by continued tempests, at length approached its haven, and you, being on the mast, saw the fair summits of a green and fertile land, and forbore to tell your discovery, to cheer the feeble heart-sick mariners below."— Pp. 12—14.

The second discourse is, "on the Love of God," [love to God,] from Mark xii. 29, 30. We have perused many valuable sermons on this first and great commandment, and listened to not a few of the same character: we have met with none, however, in which the mutual connexion of an enlightened belief in the unity of the Supreme Being, and strength of love to him is so well unfolded, or some of those circumstances which are either favourable, or, on the other hand, adverse, to our attainment of this noble and most excellent disposition, are so perspicuously and concisely stated.

In the third sermon the preacher treats of "Trust in God," from Psa. xxxvii. 23—25. His introductory remarks on the spectacle of a cheerful old age, which the text presents, are highly appropriate: and he then describes the basis of pious confidence, and makes a useful application of his subject.

"God" is considered in No. IV. as "the good Man's Support under Afflictions." (2 Tim. i. 12. *) The following passage evidently glances at a

* Mon. Rep. XVII. 121.

† Mr. H. T., in pp. 5, 6, states this part of his design with more accuracy, when he says, "many causes may contribute to produce" the peculiarity in question.

* We are of opinion that this passage declares the apostle's enlightened and unwavering faith in Jesus Christ.

noble author, who possesses and abuses commanding talents (59, 60):

“—darker scenes are generally exhibited, when selfishness becomes predominant; the passions, that are raised to relieve languor and discontent, regardless of the bounds of reason, soon acquire a frightful ascendancy, and precipitate their victim into excesses, which, to ordinary observers, who have been happily exempt from feelings that lead to them, appear the height of frenzy, and altogether unaccountable on any supposition but that of insanity. And should it so happen, that one of these slaves to ungovernable passions is possessed of genius which enables him to present a faithful picture of such a mind, what an awful scene of mental confusion does it exhibit; what a wild chaos of feeling; how rayless and benighted is the path into which it leads; and what pernicious forms of malignity and despair hover around!”

We find a similar reference in a recently printed, yet unpublished, sermon, from which we are permitted to copy a few sentences:

“To the disgrace of genius it must be confessed, that many a noxious weed is found amongst the fairest flowers of eloquence and poetry; that a mortal poison is hidden in the fruit, which is most goodly to the eye and sweetest to the taste. The danger to the young mind is the greater, because those who seek to corrupt the heart by means of literature, usually make their appeal to those sensibilities and passions, which are most strong and lively in the youthful bosom; and endeavour to captivate and lead astray the judgment, which is then necessarily most weak and open to delusion.”*

Mr. H. Turner's fifth sermon is entitled, “On the Public Worship of God.” [Psalm xxvii. 4.] He discusses with ability and zeal a topic which, though extremely familiar, is of vast importance. After setting forth generally the obligations of this practice, he makes a feeling appeal to his hearers as Protestant Dissenters and Unitarian Christians: and, surely, it could not be made in vain!

* The complaint is not peculiar to modern times: Mr. Berington (Hist. of Abeillard, &c., 252), says, with reason, of a well-known poem of Pope's, “It presents poison to the hand of inexperienced youth, and the cup which holds it is all of burnished gold.”

We extract a passage distinguished by taste and pathos. In reference to David's habits and language, our author observes (67),

“The beauty of Zion is a source of interesting recollection to the hearts of Christians; for *out of Zion God hath shined, even unto the ends of the earth*; there, the great plan of the world's redemption from its idolatry and sin, was carried forward, and finally accomplished; there, was spent the youth of the church of God: and even at this cold philosophic period, when at any time the Christian traveller describes to us his emotions at the sight of the desolate, yet still magnificent Jerusalem, there is a responsive feeling of tenderness and veneration in the breast of every reader.”†

“Neglect of public worship,” is considered in the sixth discourse (Nehem. xiii. 11), which forms an admirable supplement to the foregoing. In a strain of delicate, yet forcible and dignified, remonstrance, the writer animadverts on certain omissions of duty, which no enlightened, zealous and consistent friend of Christianity will fail to deplore.

In No. VII. our author enforces “Firmness of regard to Duty and Faith.” [1 Kings xviii. 21.] He well describes the magnificence of the spectacle to which his text refers; and then exposes the folly and the guilt of halting between two opinions, between God and the world, religion and irreligion.

From Jer. viii. 6, the “Necessity of Repentance” is argued in the eighth sermon. Mankind are not naturally incapable of repentance. Yet long-indulged habits have a baneful effect in changing the character and obliterating the natural qualities of the mind. Repentance is more than transient feelings of sorrow: it calls for a considerable sacrifice of present ease and pleasure, and for

† Sandys calls Jerusalem, “This city once sacred and glorious, elected by God for his seat, and seated in the midst of nations; like a diadem crowning the head of the mountains.” (Travels, &c. 6th ed. p. 120.) Of such an association the historian and the poet have skilfully availed themselves: so far as scriptural criticism and theology are concerned, it is treated of in Mon. Rep. XV. 216—220.

reparation, wherever reparation is possible.

A sermon properly follows, No. IX., on "the Value of Repentance" [Luke xv. 10]. This momentous point is extremely well reasoned, and forcibly applied, from scriptural considerations, and especially from our Saviour's parable of the prodigal.

[To be concluded in the next Number.]

ART. II.—*The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness, Extracted from the Books of the New Testament ascribed to the Four Evangelists. To which are added, the First and Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Reply to the Observations of Dr. Marshman, of Serampore.* By Rammohun Roy. Calcutta, Printed: London, Reprinted by the Unitarian Society, and sold by R. Hunter, D. Eaton, and C. Fox and Co. 1823. 8vo. pp. 346.

ART. III.—*Final Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the "Precepts of Jesus."* By Rammohun Roy. Calcutta: Printed at the Unitarian Press, Dhurmtollah. 1823. 8vo. pp. 400.

ART. IV.—*The Claims of Jesus: a Sermon preached in Calcutta, on Sunday, Sept. 23, 1821.* By William Adam. Calcutta: Printed at the Eurasian Press, Chouringhee. 1821. 12mo. pp. 28.

THE reader will have seen by the first paper in the present Number with what correctness Mr. Ivimey denominated Rammohun Roy a "Pagan," in one of the public Journals.* The notorious fact is that the Hindoo reformer is not only an avowed Christian, but also as zealous for his views of Christianity, derived from the study of the Scriptures, as the Baptist Missionaries are for theirs. His publications and especially the "Final Appeal," which has been recently received in this country, demonstrate the entire devotion of his heart and soul and mind and strength, and we believe we may add, of his substance,

* See the correspondence between Mr. Aspland and this gentleman, reprinted from the Morning Chronicle, in our last volume, XVII. 682—690.

to the cause of pure Christianity. He has studied most diligently the great question between the Unitarians and Trinitarians, and he defends the general doctrine maintained by the former with a degree of ability rarely exceeded by the most practised polemics of this country. His accuracy and skill in the use of the English language are truly wonderful and must be the result of much study. The reformer has probably, besides genius and industry, a great facility in acquiring languages, for he has made himself master of the Hebrew and Greek, with a view to the controversy before us, and the criticisms which he has given in his "Appeals," are proofs of no mean proficiency in these tongues.

As far as appears from his works, Rammohun Roy has made up his mind upon the Unitarian doctrine from the Scriptures only; and his testimony to this doctrine is of the more weight since he studied the Scriptures without any prejudice of education upon this point, and since as an Oriental he was more likely than an European to understand the meaning of scriptural imagery, and as a Heathen by birth and habit he was in the best condition for learning the import of both the Jewish and Christian sacred books, which bear a constant reference to the state of Heathenism.

The history of such of Rammohun Roy's Christian works, as are collected in the volume which stands first in the list at the head of this article, is thus related in the Preface by Dr. Thomas Rees:

"Having now become upon deliberate and rational conviction a Christian, he hastened to communicate to his countrymen such a view of the religion of the New Testament as he thought best adapted to impress them with a feeling of its excellence, and to imbue them with its pure and amiable spirit. For this purpose he compiled the first pamphlet inserted in the present volume, which he intitled, 'The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness,' &c. To this work, which consists entirely of extracts from the moral discourses of our Lord, he prefixed an 'Introduction,' in which he stated his reasons for omitting the doctrines and the historical and miraculous relations which accompany them in the writings of

the Evangelists. Soon after the publication of this tract, there appeared in 'The Friend of India,'* a periodical work under the direction of the Baptist Missionaries, an article animadverting upon it, which was signed 'A Christian Missionary,' but written by the Rev. Mr. Schmidt. To this paper, Dr. Marshman, the editor of the magazine, appended some 'Observations' of his own,† in which he styled the Compiler of the 'Precepts,' 'an intelligent HEATHEN, whose mind is as yet completely opposed to the *grand design* of the Saviour's becoming incarnate.'

"These 'Observations' produced the second of the following pamphlets, intitled 'An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to Truth.' The writer is now known to have been Rammohun Roy himself. He complains in strong terms, of the application to him of the term Heathen, as 'a violation of truth, charity, and liberality;' and also controverts some of Dr. Marshman's objections to the compilation, and to his reasonings in the Introduction. In a subsequent number of the 'Friend of India,'‡ Dr. Marshman inserted a brief reply to this 'Appeal,' in which he still denied to the author the title of 'Christian,' because, he writes, 'we belong to that class who think that no one can be a real Christian without believing the divinity and the atonement of Jesus Christ, and the divine authority of the whole of the Christian Scriptures,' disclaiming, however, all intentions of using the term 'Heathen' in an invidious sense.

"Dr. Marshman, in his first 'Observations,' had promised to 'take up the subject' of Rammohun Roy's work 'more fully in the first number of the Quarterly Series' of The Friend of India, then in preparation. Accordingly, there appeared in that publication some 'Observations on certain ideas contained in the Introduction to The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness.'§ In reply to this paper, Rammohun Roy published the last of the following pamphlets, intitled, 'A Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus.' To

this tract Dr. Marshman printed an elaborate answer in the fourth number of the Quarterly Series of 'The Friend of India.'* Here the discussion rests, as far as we are at present informed."†—Pref. pp. xiv—xvii.

The republication of Dr. Marshman's papers in the controversy by some of his Baptist friends in England,‡ induced the Unitarian Society to reprint Rammohun Roy's pam-

* "December 1821. Dr. Marshman's Tracts, London Edition, pp. 64, &c."

† "The reader may be referred for some further particulars relating to Rammohun Roy, to the Monthly Repository, Vol. XIII. pp. 229, &c.; XIV. pp. 561, &c.; XV. pp. 1, &c.; XVI. pp. 477, &c.; XVII. pp. 682, &c.; and to Mr. Belsham's Introduction to William Roberts's (of Madras) First Letter to the Unitarian Society, 1818."

‡ This republication is entitled "A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in Reply to Rammohun Roy, of Calcutta. By Dr. Marshman, of Serampore." It is an 8vo. volume and is sold by Kingsbury and Co. We have not put it at the head of our list, though it is lying before us, because we find nothing in it to review, except as it is quoted by Rammohun Roy. It is, in fact, the repetition of the common-place arguments which have been again and again refuted in this country; though Dr. Marshman's reading at Serampore is not very likely to have made him acquainted with the refutation. These exploded arguments are put forth with great solemnity of manner and in the tone of infallibility. Of Dr. Marshman's confined theological information, Dr. T. Rees has exhibited a proof in the Preface above quoted: "It is not intended in this Preface to enter into a review of the controversy. Dr. Marshman has, however, made a remark, which, as it refers to the Unitarian Society, we may be permitted to notice. In raising an argument for the Deity of Christ, upon the supposed application to him of the term 'fellow' in the English translation of Zechariah xiii. 7, he thus quotes Rammohun Roy's criticism upon that text: 'Unable to deny this, our author merely hints in a note that עמיתו *Immitthi*, fellow, signifies one that lives near another; 'therefore the word, fellow, in the English translation is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Archbishop Newcome in his Improved Version,' lately published," adds Dr. Marshman, "by the SOCINIANS of

* "No. XX. February 1820."

† "London Edition of Dr. Marshman's Papers, p. 1."

‡ "No. XXIII. May 1820. Dr. Marshman's Papers, London Edition, p. 5."

§ "Idem. p. 17. Friend of India, September 1820."

phlets; and a more interesting and acceptable volume this useful society never presented to its subscribers and the public. The "Final Appeal," (No. III. on our list,) has reached England since the "Precepts of Jesus" was republished, and this also we trust the Unitarian Society will commit to press. It is, in our judgment, the most valuable and important of all the Hindoo Reformer's works. Though last in point of time of his publications we cannot help referring to it first of all. It is printed, the reader will observe, at the "Unitarian Press." This is explained by the author in a "Notice" to the reader. All his preceding works on the subject of Christianity were printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, which is, we believe, employed in general work for the sake of profit, in order to serve the mission; but (says Rammohun Roy) "the acting proprietor of that press having, since the publication of the Second Appeal, declined, although in the politest manner possible, printing any other work that the author might publish on the same subject, he was under the necessity of purchasing a few types for his own use, and of depending principally upon native superintendence for the completion of the greater part of this work." This refusal, however polite in its manner,

does not bespeak the confidence of the Missionaries in the strength of their arguments; but no Unitarian will lament it. Being the occasion of the establishment of an "Unitarian Press" in India, it will doubtless (as Mr. Ivimey says* of Mr. Adam's departure from Trinitarianism and Calvinism) 'turn out rather for the furtherance of the gospel.'

In a very interesting Preface to the "Final Appeal," Rammohun Roy appeals to the candour of Indian readers on the ground of his being engaged in self-defence. He says very feelingly,

"I am well aware that this difference of sentiment has already occasioned much coolness towards me in the demeanour of some whose friendship I hold very dear; and that this protracted controversy has not only prevented me from rendering my humble services to my countrymen, by various publications, which I had projected in the native languages, but has also diverted my attention from all other literary pursuits for three years past. Notwithstanding these sacrifices, I feel well satisfied with my present engagements, and cannot wish that I had pursued a different course; since whatever may be the opinion of the world, my own conscience fully approves of my past endeavours to defend what I esteem the cause of truth."—Pref. pp. i. ii.

He adds, with equal sense and spirit,

"I feel assured that if religious controversy be carried on, with that temper and language which are considered by wise and pious men, as most consistent with the solemn and sacred nature of religion, and more especially with the mild spirit of Christianity, the truths of it cannot, for any length of time, be kept concealed, under the imposing veil of high-sounding expressions, calculated to astonish the imagination and rouse the passions of the people, and thereby keep alive and strengthen the preconceived notions, with which such language has in their minds been, from infancy, associated. But I regret that the method which has hitherto been observed in inquiry after religious truth, by means of large publications, necessarily issued at considerable intervals of time, is not, for several reasons, so well adapted to the speedy attainment of the proposed object,

England."* Dr. Marshman has here allowed his zeal to outrun his knowledge. The work quoted by Rammohun Roy is not Archbishop Newcome's translation of the New Testament, which formed the basis of the 'Improved Version,' published by the Unitarian Society; but that learned prelate's 'Attempt towards an Improved Version, &c. of the Twelve Minor Prophets;' a production well worthy of the perusal of every Biblical student."—Pp. xviii. xix. Of Dr. Marshman's acumen as a controversialist, we may take one short specimen from his book. Replying to objections to the worship of Christ, he says, p. 241, "That in the state of humiliation in which his infinite love to sinners had placed him, and in which he declared, 'If I honour myself, my honour is nothing,' he should pray to himself, or formally prescribe this to his disciples, was scarcely to be expected!"

* "Dr. Marshman's Defence, &c. p. 133."

as I, and other friends of true religion, could wish."—Pref. pp. iii. iv.

These reasons he assigns to be, want of leisure in many, disgust felt by some at injurious insinuations and personalities, and the disheartening, distracting effect of a multiplicity of arguments and various interpretations of passages of Scripture. To obviate these inconveniences, he makes the following judicious and laudable proposal :

"As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticism, and to subject Unitarian as well as Trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

"For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the book of Exodus, and so on with all the books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

"If any one of the Missionary gentlemen, for himself and in behalf of his fellow-labourers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request that an essay on the book of Genesis, of the kind above intimated, may be sent me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits, not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge, should the Missionary gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Christianity, towards this object; and also that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy, by short monthly publications, may be attended with all the advantages which

I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions, and such arguments as have no immediate connexion with the subject, and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never allow ourselves for a moment to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation."—Pref. pp. v.—vii.

This is evidently the proposal of a sincere inquirer after truth, who believes that the object which he seeks will be promoted by free discussion. It is, we hope, by this time carried into effect. The energy of Rammohun Roy's mind, his zeal on behalf of pure Christianity, and the means with which Providence has blessed him, are pledges that no measure which he conceives to be serviceable to his countrymen and fellow-creatures will be neglected by him or lightly abandoned. The Missionaries will, we apprehend, excuse themselves from any contribution, literary or pecuniary, to such a work. Rammohun Roy and his associates are not the persons to whom they look for converts. Without them, however, such a periodical publication may be carried on in British India, where, we are informed, there is a large proportion of persons, in both the military and civil service, and amongst the merchants and traders, who are disposed to lend an ear to sound reasoning on behalf of the gospel, and the more so from their conviction that the system of "orthodoxy" imported from Europe is not the religion that will make its way with either Mahometans or Hindoos. Heartily do we wish success to the projected work, from which we shall probably borrow hereafter for the gratification of our readers.

In some remarks introductory to the "Final Appeal," Rammohun Roy complains with great reason of the treatment he has experienced from the Missionary Magazine. He published the "Precepts of Jesus," he says, to exhibit the pure and elevated morality of the gospel to his countrymen and others, unaccompanied by those mysterious and contradictory doctrines with which the various teachers of Christianity have associated,

and, as he thinks, impaired them. He was hence charged with omitting the only foundation of Christianity, viz. "the doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and the Holy Ghost and of the Atonement." This compelled him, he adds, "as a professed believer of one God, to deny for the first time publicly those doctrines; and now," he concludes, the Editor "takes occasion to accuse me of presumption in teaching doctrines which he has himself compelled me to avow."—P. 5.

Rammohun Roy expresses some surprise at his antagonist's real or pretended ignorance of his opinions :

"The Editor assigns, as a reason for entering on this controversy, that, after a review of the 'Precepts of Jesus and the First Appeal,' he 'felt some doubt whether their author fully believed the deity of Christ,' and consequently he 'adduced a few passages from the Scriptures to confirm this doctrine.' He then adds, that this Second Appeal to the Christian public confirms all that he before only feared. (P. 1.) I could have scarcely credited this assertion of the Reviewer's unacquaintance with my religious opinions, if the allegation had come from any other quarter; for both in my conversation and correspondence with as many Missionary gentlemen, old and young, as I have had the honour to know, I have never hesitated, when required, to offer my sentiments candidly, as to the unscripturality and unreasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity. On one occasion, particularly when on a visit to one of the Rev. colleagues of the Editor at Serampore, long before the time of these publications, I discussed the subject with that gentleman at his invitation; and then fully manifested my disbelief of this doctrine, taking the liberty of examining successively all the arguments he, from friendly motives, urged upon me in support of it."—Pp. 5, 6.

In our judgment nothing can be more satisfactory than the following confutation of the charge of presumption and vindication of the true method of religious research; the extract is long, but we could not abridge it without injury, and we wish our readers to see a full-length portrait of the Indian Reformer.

"In page 503 the Editor insinuates that vanity has led me to presume that 'freedom from the powerful effects of early religious impressions' has enabled me to discover the truths of Scripture in

its most important doctrines more fully in three or four years than others have done by most unremitting study in thirty or forty.' The doctrine of the Trinity appears to me so obviously unscriptural, that I am pretty sure, from my own experience and that of others, that no one possessed of merely common sense will fail to find its unscripturality after a methodical study of the Old and New Testaments, unless previously impressed in the early part of his life with creeds and forms of speech preparing the way to that doctrine. No pride, therefore, can be supposed for a moment to have arisen from commonly attainable success. The Editor might be fully convinced of this fact, were he to engage a few independent and diligent natives to study attentively both the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, and then to offer their sentiments as to the doctrine of the Trinity being scriptural or a mere human invention.

"To hold up to ridicule my suggestions in the Second Appeal to study first the books of the Old Testament unbiassed by ecclesiastic opinions imbibed in early life, and then to study the New Testament, the Rev. Editor states that 'could it be relied on indeed,' my compendious method 'would deserve notice, with a view to Christian education; as,' on my plan, 'the most certain way of enabling any one to discover, in a superior manner, the truths and doctrines of Christianity is to leave him till the age of thirty or forty without any religious impression.'—(P. 503.) I do not in the least wonder at his disapprobation of my suggestion; as the Editor, in common with other professors of traditional opinions, is sure of supporters of his favourite doctrine, so long as it is inculcated on the minds of youths, and even infants; who, being once thoroughly impressed with the name of the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity, long before they can think for themselves, must be always inclined, even after their reason has become matured, to interpret the sacred books, even those texts which are evidently inconsistent with this doctrine, in a manner favourable to their prepossessed opinion, whether their study be continued for three, or thirty, or twice thirty years. Could Hindooism continue after the present generation, or bear the studious examination of a single year, if the belief of their idols being endued with animation were not carefully impressed on the young before they come to years of understanding?

"Let me here suggest that, in my humble opinion, no truly liberal and wise parent can ever take advantage of the

unsuspecting and confiding credulity of his children to impress them with an implicit belief in any set of abstruse doctrines, and intolerance of all other opinions, the truth or reasonableness of which they are incapable of estimating. Still less would he urge by threats the danger of present and eternal punishment for withholding a blind assent to opinions they are unable to comprehend. Parents are bound by every moral tie to give their children such an education as may be sufficient to render them capable of exercising their reason as rational and social beings, and of forming their opinion on religious points without ill-will towards others, from a thorough investigation of the Scriptures, and of the evidence and arguments adduced by teachers of different persuasions. Judgments thus formed have a real claim to respect from those who have not the means of judging for themselves. But of what consequence is it, in a question of truth or error, to know how the matter at issue has been considered, even for a hundred generations, by those who have blindly adopted the creed of their fathers? Surely, the unbiassed judgment of a person who has proceeded to the study of the Sacred Scriptures with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, even if his researches were to be continued but for a single twelvemonth, ought, as far as authority goes in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves, or have studied after prejudice had laid hold of their minds. What fair inquiry respecting the doctrine of the Trinity can be expected from one who has been on the bosom of his mother constantly taught to ask the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and to hear the very name of Unitarian with horror? Have the doctrines of the Vedant ever succeeded in suppressing Polytheism amongst the generality of Hindoos brought up with the notion of the godhead of the sun, of fire and of water, and of the separate and independent existence of the allegorical representations of the attributes of God? Were the sublime works written by the learned among the Greeks ever able to shake the early acquired superstitious notions and polytheistical faith of the generality of their countrymen? Nay, even when Christian converts became numerous, did not those who were brought up in the ancient superstition introduce some vestiges of their idolatry into their new persuasion? In fact, nothing can more surely impede the progress of truth than prejudice instilled into minds blank to receive impressions;

and the more unreasonable are the doctrines of a religion, the greater pains are taken by the supporters of them to plant them in the readily susceptible minds of youth.

“The Editor has filled a complete page in proving that, besides early impressed prejudices, there are also other causes of error in judgment—an attempt which might have been dispensed with: for I never limited the sources of mistake in examining religious matters to early impression alone. I attributed only the prevailing errors in Christianity to traditional instructions inculcated in childhood, as the language of my Second Appeal will shew: ‘Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the Scriptures themselves, I may, perhaps, be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for theirs; inasmuch as I attribute their different views, not to any inferiority of judgment, compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom.’ (P. 160.) If the Editor doubt the accuracy of this remark, he might soon satisfy himself of its justice, were he to listen to the suggestion offered in the preceding paragraph, with a view to ascertain whether the doctrine of the Trinity rests for its belief on scriptural authorities, or on early religious impressions.

“The Editor mentions, ironically, (in p. 3,) that my success in scriptural studies was such ‘as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry.’ In answer to this, I only beg to ask the Rev. Editor to let me know first, what a Protestant, in the fifteenth century, could have answered, if he had been thus questioned by a Roman Catholic: ‘Is your success, in examining the truths of Scripture, such as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken, as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry, by introducing the worship of Mary, the mother of God, and instituting images in churches, as well as by acknowledging the Pope, as the head of the church, vested with the power of forgiving sins?’ Would not his answer be this, ‘My success is, indeed, so as to prove these doctrines to be unscriptural. As to your inferences they are no more divine than mine, and though I do not doubt the piety and learning of

many Christians of your church, in every age, I am persuaded that many corruptions, introduced into the Christian religion by the Roman Heathens, converted in the fourth and fifth centuries, have been handed down through successive generations, by impressions made in the early part of life, and have taken such root in the minds of men, that piety and learning have fallen short of eradicating prejudices nourished by church and state, as well as by the vulgar superstition and enthusiasm.' Were this reply justifiable, I also might be allowed to offer the following answer: 'I find not the doctrine of the Trinity in the Scriptures; I cannot receive any human creed for divine truth; but without charging the supporters of this doctrine with impiety or fraud, humbly attribute their misinterpretation of the Scriptures to 'early religious impressions.'"—Pp. 6—13.

Leaving the body of the work for future notice, together with the first and third articles in the list, we can now only advert to two paragraphs in the conclusion, which are the more interesting as being lately written, and containing the author's last recorded feelings [The "Final Appeal" came out in February, and the preface is dated "Calcutta, January 30, 1823"]. One of these is in reply to Dr. Marshman's exhortation to him to become a convert to the creed of the Missionaries, which, notwithstanding Ram-mohun Roy's mild manner of answering it, contains in reality a threatening of the loss of salvation, if he should refuse.

"I tender my humble thanks for the

Editor's kind suggestion, in inviting me to adopt the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but I am sorry to find that I am unable to benefit by this advice. After I have long relinquished every idea of a plurality of Gods, or of the persons of the Godhead, taught under different systems of modern Hindooism, I cannot conscientiously and consistently embrace one of a similar nature, though greatly refined by the religious reformations of modern times; since whatever arguments can be adduced against a plurality of Gods strike with equal force against the doctrine of a plurality of persons of the Godhead; and, on the other hand, whatever excuse may be pleaded in favour of a plurality of persons of the Deity, can be offered with equal propriety in defence of Polytheism."—P. 378.

The other is the final paragraph of the work, and is peculiarly gratifying to us as Englishmen. Such a testimony to the English Government is more sterling praise than is contained in a volume of court addresses.

"I now conclude my essay by offering up thanks to the Supreme Disposer of the events of this universe, for having unexpectedly delivered this country from the long-continued tyranny of its former rulers, and placed it under the government of the English, a nation, who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends."—Pp. 378, 379.

(To be continued.)

POETRY.

PARAPHRASE

Of Lines from a Tragedy of Seneca's.

"De Temporum Mutabilitate."

"Omnia tempus edax depascitur, omnia carpit,
Omnia sede movet, nil sinit esse diù.
Flumina deficiunt, profugum mare littora siccant,
Subsidunt montes, et juga celsa ruunt.
Quid tam parva loquor? Moles pulcherrima coeli
Ardebit, flammis toto repentè suis.
Omnia mors poscit *lex est*, non pœna, perire,
Hic aliquo mundus nullus erit."

On the Changes effected by Time.

All nature's works are food for Time,
 Earth, ocean, air, even worlds sublime,
 He shall at length consume ;—
 The brightest gems shall melt away,
 As flowers that hasten to decay
 And lose their vernal bloom.

Nor long shall ought on earth remain,
 Nor long their present forms retain,
 All things are stationless ;—
 On flinty rocks and mountains rude,
 On sweet society and solitude,
 Time shall his age impress.

Rivers shall dry and flow no more,
 The mighty sea desert its shore,
 The tempest's voice be still ;—
 Mountains shall sink and disappear,
 Their frowning cliffs with awe and fear
 Nor long the soul shall fill !

Yet what are these ? The azure sky,
 Far spread in blue immensity
 Whose beauty poets praise ;
 The spangled canopy of heaven
 By Time's controul to ruin given,
 With its own fires shall blaze !

Death's frozen grasp no power can fly,
 It is the *law*,—not pain—to die,
 Which all things must obey—
 By this decree the just and brave—
 All shall be mingled in the grave,
 And worlds shall waste away !

Almeick.

R. B.

GENOA.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

Genoa "the proud," thy pride is humbled now,
 And the scathed wreath drops withering from thy brow ;
 The merchant brow, that once bid Monarchs wait
 In trembling expectation at thy gate,
 Must smooth its burning frown beneath the rod,
 That lifted waits a petty tyrant's nod ;
 Smile when he smiles, and bless the auspicious hour,
 Which gave those walls to his protecting power ;
 Content to live and eat—'tis all a slave
 May have—'tis all a slave deserves to have.
 No fond remembrance of thy glories past,
 Can make despair forget they are the last,
 Or deck the dim horizon of thy sky,
 With one faint gleam of dawning liberty.
 Think not a Doria's heart will swell to save
 This land from death, more awful than the grave ;
 Or that the chains, which faithless Monarchs made
 For the lost captives whom their arts betrayed,
 Will shiver, when thy unavailing grief,
 Instead of striking, prays of heaven relief.
 Thee, too, those chains become, for thou hast been
 From infancy to dotage, ever seen

A tyrant or a slave ;—the one to those,
 Thy friends in bondage, and thy fallen foes,
 Yet crouching to the many-headed thing,
 Child of thy loins, which, gathering strength to sting
 Its parent from the blood which gave it birth,
 Trod on thy neck and pressed thee to the earth.
 On that ill-fated, well-remembered day,
 When British thunder rolled along thy bay,
 Pledged was a nation's faith, a soldier's word,
 'Twas Freedom's sacred cause called forth the sword ;—
 Oh ! let thy curses fall on those who deem
 Freedom a plaything, honour but a dream ;
 A people's groans meet music for the ear
 Of kings ; and love more dangerous than fear ;
 Those panders to their master's vicious mood,
 E'en like a vampire's, when it thirsts for blood ;
 But think not *he* was faithless, or that *we*
 E'er aim a willing blow at Liberty ;—
 Would that the hour were come, as come it must,
 When Europe's sons, now trampled in the dust,
 Impatient of the chains, which cannot bind
 Their still increasing energy of mind,
 Shall, with one mighty effort, raise on high
 Their front, in renovated majesty ;
 Blushing to think what slaves they were before,
 And swear, and *feel*, they will be such no more ;
 —Thou, sea-girt daughter of fair Italy,
 Wilt, with the rest, then perish or be free !

Genoa, Sept. 1822.

F.

HYMN FOR EASTER.*

I.

Lift your loud voices in triumph on high,
 For Jesus hath risen, and man cannot die,
 Vain were the terrors that gather'd around him,
 And short the dominion of death and the grave ;
 He burst from the fetters of darkness that bound him,
 Resplendent in glory, to live and to save.
 Loud was the chorus of angels on high,
 " The Saviour hath risen, and man shall not die."

II.

Glory to God, in full anthems of joy ;
 The being he gave us, death cannot destroy.
 Sad were the life we must part with to-morrow,
 If tears were our birth-right, and death were our end ;
 But Jesus hath cheer'd the dark valley of sorrow,
 And bade us, immortal, to heaven ascend—
 Lift then your voices in triumph on high,
 For Jesus hath risen, and man shall not die.

* The above is extracted from the Christian Disciple, No. I. Vol. I. p. 38. Some of the readers of the Monthly Repository may be acquainted with an animated air and chorus in the collection of " Sacred Melodies," (of which Moore and Sir J. Stevenson are Editors,) adapted to a triumphant song on the overthrow of the Egyptians :

" Sound the loud timbrel o'er Egypt's dark sea,
 Jehovah hath triumphed, his people are free."

The above lines, to the same tune, are more suitable to Christian worship, and particularly adapted to Easter Day.

EPITAPH.

The mortal remains of
PATIENCE HOPE,
Who lived and died an illustration of
Her expressive name,
Are deposited in this
Unconsecrated ground.

Hence Superstition! hence thy train,
Of clouded minds and gloomy birth,
Revolving her eventual doom,
Who rests in this unhallowed earth!
For she was wise,—in speech, in act,
She glowed with mental energy;
For she was good,—her moral course
From stain or imputation free.
And by religion's sacred flame,
Her heart was kindled to rejoice
In her Creator, whom she sought,
As conscious of his cheering voice.
And where the pious, good and wise
Repose, where'er that spot is found,
Without a priestly sanction, *there*
Be sure thou tread'st on *holy ground*.

BREVIS.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Presbyterian Academy, Carmarthen.

THE Triennial Visitation of this Academy was held in the beginning of July. The Visitors appointed by the Presbyterian Board were the Rev. Dr. Rees (the Secretary), the Rev. R. Aspland, and James Esdalle, Esq. (the Treasurer). The following Report is from the *Carmarthen Journal* of Friday, July 4:

"On Wednesday and Thursday, the Annual Meeting connected with the Presbyterian College in this town, was held at Lammas-Street Chapel, on Wednesday evening. The Meeting commenced by singing and prayer, by the Rev. W. H. Lewis, of Glastonbury, and the Rev. Mr. Bulmer, of Haverfordwest, and the Rev. Mr. Williams, of Llanwrtyd, preached from 1 Kings xix. 19—21, and 1 Cor. ii. 2; the former in English, and the latter in Welsh. On Thursday morning, at 7, the Rev. Mr. Davies, Cardigan, prayed; and the Rev. Messrs. Griffiths, Alltwen, and James, of Cardiff, preached from Luke x. 2, and Psalm cxix. 114; both in Welsh. At ten o'clock, the Rev. Mr. Davis, of Evesham, prayed; and the Rev. A. Rees, LL.D., [D. D.] from London, and the Rev. Mr. Jones, of Llannwchlyn, preached from John xv. 17, and Psalm cxvi. 12—14; the former in English, and the latter in Welsh. At three o'clock, the Rev. Mr. Aspland, of London, preach-

ed in English, and the Rev. Mr. Jones, of Denbigh, in Welsh, from Psa. cxxxix. 7—9, and Ezek. xvi. 19, 20. This morning, the Triennial Examination of the Students took place before the Rev. Dr. Rees, the Rev. Mr. Aspland, &c. &c. &c. (which is to continue this day and tomorrow), and we have reason to expect that, from the strict attention paid by the Students of the College to their studies, the Deputation from the Board will be highly gratified with the great improvement they have made since their last visit."

At the close of the Examination on Saturday, both Dr. Rees and Mr. Aspland addressed the Students at some length, expressing, upon the whole, much satisfaction in the progress of their studies. There are twelve Students upon the Foundation. The Tutors are the Rev. Mr. Peter, and the Rev. D. Jones. On the following Sunday Dr. Rees preached for Mr. Peter in the morning, (Mr. Aspland conducting the devotional service,) and in the evening Mr. Aspland preached at the Unitarian Chapel for Mr. Evans.

Quarterly Meeting of Presbyterian Ministers.

On the 23rd of July a *Quarterly Meeting of Ministers* of the Presbyterian denomination was holden at Llwyn-rhydowen, Cardiganshire. On the afternoon

of the preceding day, the Rev. Thomas Griffiths, of Cribin, conducted the devotional part of the service; the Rev. Evan Lewis, of Kilgwyn, preached from Heb. xii. 1; and the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham, from Phil. iii. 8, 9. On the 23rd, the service commenced at 10 o'clock in the morning. The Rev. E. Lewis prayed; and the Rev. John Jeremy, of Caeronen, preached from John vii. 46; the Rev. David Jones, Tutor of the Carmarthen College, from Matt. xii. 50; and the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham, from 1 Tim. vi. 12. The meeting-house was crowded, and some hundreds were out of doors, so that the preachers were obliged to stand on one of the window seats, in order to be heard by those within and without. As a proof of the Welsh desire to hear sermons, it may be observed, that the three preachers were heard with great attention, and though very heavy showers of rain fell during the service, those that were without stood their ground unmoved. A little after one o'clock the services were over, and those who came from a distance partook, in the meeting-house, of some refreshment provided for them by the congregation; and the ministers, fourteen in number, dined at the inn adjoining. In less than an hour they met again in the meeting-house to hold an open conference. The question discussed was "the Origin, Design and Abolition of Sacrifices." The meeting was crowded till five o'clock in the evening, when the conference closed by a prayer from the Rev. D. Davis, who had been nearly fifty years minister of the congregation, and all departed seemingly highly gratified with what they had seen and heard.

August 12, 1823.

Unitarian Society in South Wales.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Unitarian Society in South Wales* was held at Capel-y-groes, Cardiganshire, on the 26th of last June, at which the Rev. J. James, of Gelli-Onnen, preached. The Rev. John Jones, of Bridgend, and the Rev. Thomas Davies, of Coed-y-Cymmar, preached on the preceding afternoon at Ystrad, a place connected with Capel-y-Groes. On the 26th, after service at Capel-y-Groes, the question, "Whether Christ's Judging the World be a proof of his proper Deity," was discussed, and after that the business of the Society was transacted. Its next meeting was appointed to be held at Aberdâr, Glamorganshire, and the Rev. John Thomas, of Pant-y-deafid, Cardiganshire, to preach on the occasion. The

next Quarterly Meeting of the Unitarian Ministers is to be held at Blaengwrach, Glamorganshire, the Rev. John Davies, of Capel-y-Groes, to preach.

Unitarian Chapel, Edinburgh.

THIS building is nearly completed. It is to be opened on Sunday, Sept. 14. The Rev. W. J. Fox, of London, is to preach on the occasion, morning and evening.

Unitarian Congregation, Ilminster, Somerset.

WE are requested to state that this congregation will be vacant after the 28th of September, by the resignation of the Rev. T. Bowen.

LITERARY.

MR. FRANCIS KNOWLES, of Park Lane, Ashton, near Wigan, proposes to publish by subscription, in Numbers, (probably 16, to form an 8vo. volume,) once a fortnight, price 6d., *The Test of Truth*; or, *the United Evidence of the Sacred Scriptures respecting the True Object of Religious Worship, and the Condition of Acceptance*; in the Language of the Scriptures; including the Evidence of the Scriptures on the Person, &c. of Jesus Christ.

THE continuation of Mr. Booth's *Analytical Dictionary of the English Language* is now in the press, and the several parts will be published, successively, at short intervals. The printing of the Second Part was necessarily delayed for the purpose of calculating, with some degree of probability, the number of copies that would be required.

THE *Berwick New and Improved General Gazetteer, or Compendious Geographical Dictionary*, containing a Description of the various Countries, Kingdoms, States, Cities, Towns, &c. &c., of the known World, brought down to the present period, accompanied with twenty six elegant maps, from the latest authorities, in three handsome volumes, 8vo. is just published, price 2l. 2s. or in 16 parts, price 2s. 6d. each.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Presbyterian Synod of Munster.

ON Wednesday, the 2d instant, the Synod of Munster held its Annual Meeting at Bandon. The business of the day

was preceded by divine service, which was introduced by the Rev. Joseph Hutton, one of the ministers of Eustace Street, Dublin, and a sermon suitable to the occasion, was preached by the Rev. James Armstrong, one of the ministers of Strand Street, Dublin, from these words:—"I exhort you that you should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Jude 3. After which, the Rev. William J. Hort, of Cork, was elected Moderator for the ensuing year, and the ministers and elders proceeded to give a detailed account of the state of their respective congregations.

The Synod, together with a number of the members of the Cork and Bandon congregation, dined together at Williams's Inn. In the course of the evening much social enjoyment, mingled with enlarged Christian feeling and liberality of sentiment was evinced.

The following were among the toasts given from the chair:—

"The King."

"The Duke of York and the Royal Family."

"The Lord Lieutenant and prosperity to Ireland."

"The Presbyterian Church of Ireland."

"Our Brethren of the Established Church."

"Our Fellow-Christians of every Denomination."

"May all our fellow-subjects, how much soever they may differ in their sentiments and modes of worship, find at length, 'How good and pleasant a thing it is to dwell together in unity and love.'"

"Religious zeal, without sectarian bigotry."

"The Archbishop of Cashel.* May his truly Christian principles be universally adopted."

"Civil Liberty without popular licentiousness."

"The 12th of August; the birth-day of our beloved and patriotic Sovereign; the day also memorable for his arrival among his people of Ireland."

"Civil and Religious Liberty, declared by His Majesty to be the birth-right of his people."

The next meeting was appointed to be held in Dublin, the first Wednesday in July, 1824.

[*Cork Southern Reporter.*]

* See his Grace's reply to the address of the Presbyterians of Cork. [Mon. Repos. XVIII. 228.]

The "National" (as it is strangely called) "Society for Education" have obtained the King's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, authorizing a collection throughout England and Wales in behalf of their funds. The letter has been read in the churches, and application made in consequence from house to house throughout the parishes. The measure is too sectarian to be fully successful. What Dissenter can consistently contribute to a system of education which, though falsely called *National*, excludes the children of Dissenters, a very large part of the population? On a note being sent by the churchwardens to the present writer, he returned his compliments with an answer, that he subscribed only to "Schools for all."

THE injudicious prosecution of Mr. John Ambrose Williams, editor of the Durham Chronicle, for an alleged libel on the Durham clergy, has at last been adjourned *sine die*.—*Monthly Mag.*

Evidence of an Unbeliever rejected.—On a late occasion, when an information was laid before the magistrates at Bow Street against a bookseller for literary piracy, Wm. Dugdale, formerly known as the "Radical Quaker," appeared as a witness in support of the information, when the following examination took place:

"Mr. COOPER (the Counsel for the Defendant) begged to put a few questions to this witness, previous to his being sworn; and he did so as follows:—As you are about to be sworn on the holy Evangelists, I wish to ask whether you believe in them?—*Witness* hesitated, and at last said, he did not think it a fair question. The *Magistrate* decided that it was a very proper one; and the witness said, if it was put again, he would endeavour to answer it.—Mr. COOPER. Do you believe in the revelation promulgated in the Evangelists?—Certainly not—altogether.—Mr. COOPER. Do you believe, by your having kissed that book, you incur a greater punishment for speaking falsely, than you otherwise would have done? *Witness*. I should have no fear of any punishment but such as the law provides for perjury. My kissing that book would not influence me in either way, as to whether I should speak truly or falsely; but I will speak the truth for my character's sake.—Mr. COOPER submitted that the evidence of this witness could not be received after the declaration he had made; and the *Magistrate* coinciding, Mr. CLARKE (Attorney for the Prosecution) said he did

not wish to press the evidence of a witness who professed such tenets. He would call another. He fully proved the publishing by other respectable witnesses."

Society for Relief of Evangelical Dissenting Ministers.

A SOCIETY has been lately formed in London under the above title. It may be wanted, and will no doubt do good. It is lamentable, however, that charity should be connected with subscription to articles of faith. The persons to be relieved by this society must be such as "maintain the sentiments of the Assembly's Catechism, both as to faith and practice," and must produce a *certificate* of their *religious principles*! Baptists are as much excluded from this "Evangelical" Society as Unitarians. Even a *Baxterian* cannot derive benefit from it without some subterfuge. The idea of so sectarian an institution was probably suggested by the two or three individuals who objected, at the formation of the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Society, to the union of the Three Dissenting Denominations, inasmuch as it would imply that all three were equally Christian!

Portuguese Superstition.

"JUNE 24th. The 22d was a day of real triumph, on which their Majesties and Royal Highnesses went in solemn procession to the Church of Santa Maria Maior to return thanks to the King of kings, and the Queen of Heaven," &c. (*Morning Chronicle*.) Upon this a correspondent observes, "The Protestant smiles or frowns, as well he may, at seeing the wife of a Jewish carpenter worshiped *pari passu* with God, as the Mother (in Protestant Trinitarian language) of Him, who is the Supreme Being. O 'the mote in a brother's eye!' *Quo fonte?*"

PARLIAMENTARY.

Christians' Petition against the Prosecution of Unbelievers.

(See the Petition at length, pp. 362—364.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JULY 1.

Mr. HUME rose for the purpose of presenting a petition which he considered of great importance. Before he did so, he begged to correct an error which had got abroad respecting what he had said last night. He had been made to say in one publication, that he disapproved of

Dissenters altogether, when, in fact, he only expressed his disapprobation of that sect to which an Honourable Member belonged (Mr. Butterworth). His acquaintance lying very much among Dissenters, many of whom he knew to be most intelligent and virtuous men, he should have belied his own experience if he had said so. He was of opinion, that general censures were always wrong, and as his feelings had been more excited on the occasion to which he alluded, by the intolerance displayed by that sect of which alone he spoke, he took the opportunity of this cooler moment to explain what he had said. Having done so, he would add, he regretted that any person should have presumed to arraign his conduct, and to have designated him as the advocate of a person whose opinions he was so far from advocating, that if that person had listened to his advice, he would long ago have abstained from publishing them. He was well convinced that to attack prejudices in the way Mr. Carille had attacked what he considered prejudices, was the best means of diffusing and strengthening them. He did hope that in future no person would take the liberty of endeavouring to represent him as the advocate of such opinions. The petition to which he now called the attention of the House was signed by 2,047 persons, members of Christian congregations, of whom 98 were ministers. Among the latter were names which the House would agree were entitled to considerable respect, such as those of Dr. Evans, Dr. Jones, Dr. T. Rees, Dr. Barclay, Mr. Roscoe and others. A more sensible petition, and one more consistent with the spirit of Christianity, had, perhaps, never been presented to the House. He could not conceive that any sincere believer in the doctrines of the Christian religion could doubt that any thing which tended to stamp the character of persecution upon that religion was more calculated to bring it into contempt than all the scoffs and the arguments of its worst enemies. He proposed to follow up the reading of the petition with a motion which he should submit from a sense of duty, and which, if adopted by the House, as he anxiously hoped it would be, would tend to check the mischief which had been caused by recent proceedings.

On the motion that the petition be printed,

Mr. BUTTERWORTH asked by how many ministers of the Church of England this petition was signed, and of what class of Dissenters the other petitioners consisted.

Mr. HUME replied, that it was signed by Dissenters of all classes, and the names of the ministers were in a separate column.

Mr. W. SMITH could not see the pertinency of the Honourable Member's question. The petition was, however, signed, he could assure him, by persons whose religious opinions were as perfectly opposed to each other as possible.

The petition was ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUME then rose for the purpose of making the motion of which he had given notice. His object was to obtain the admission of that principle which he had always thought to be part of the law of this country—namely, that every individual was entitled to freedom of discussion on all subjects, whether controversial or religious. At Edinburgh, where he was brought up, it was held that any man might entertain and express his opinions, unless they became a nuisance to society, when, perhaps, they might be brought under the operation of the common law. Since the year 1817 a disposition had been manifested to prosecute persons for the publication of old as well as new works, the object of which was to impugn the authenticity of the Christian faith. He was aware that since the period to which he had referred, the number of such publications had increased; but he thought, also, that the progress which had been made in knowledge, and the extent of education to all classes of persons, had brought with it a remedy for this evil. Looking at the advantages which resulted from the freedom of discussion, and the part which able men were always ready to take in behalf of true religion, he thought it would be doing equal injustice to that religion and to the community to adopt any other means of arriving at the truth than by fair discussion. He had always been led to believe that the greatest blessing which Englishmen enjoyed was the complete freedom with which they were permitted to express their religious opinions, and to follow whatever sect or persuasion their own opinions coincided with. Recollecting, too, that we enjoyed the blessings of a religion which had been established by means of discussion, and by differing from those which had preceded it, he thought the House would act unjustly, and with bad policy, if it should now turn round upon those who differed from us, as we differed from those who had preceded us, and exercise a rigour which in our own case we had been the first to deprecate. Such a course he was convinced was more likely to generate doubts and ignorance than to give any stability to the religion. It was quite evident that persons who wished to investigate religious subjects must meet with a great variety of opinions; some of these might confirm their belief, while others might give rise to doubts. Now, he

wished to ask, whether it was not proper that they should be allowed to state those doubts, for the purpose of having them refuted if they were erroneous? In Christian charity such an indulgence ought not to be refused to any individual. When he observed thirty or forty sects in this country differing from the Church of England, and differing equally from each other, he thought it was not at all surprising that amongst those who engaged in what might be termed periodical discussion on the subject of religion, many were found who dissented entirely from the great body of sectarians of every description. There was nothing wonderful in such a circumstance; but it was indeed wonderful that they should be prosecuted and punished for promulgating their opinions in the way of controversy. What right had any set of individuals to set themselves up as following exclusively the true religion? Religion, very different from ours, was preached and adopted in other countries; and those who pursued such religion proclaimed it to be the true one. Where there was such a diversity of opinion, they taking the Scriptures as the rule of their conduct and actions, ought to extend to all persons that merciful toleration which *The New Testament* so forcibly inculcated in every page. They ought not to proceed, in the manner which was now too common, against individuals who differed conscientiously from them on points of religious belief. The perpetration of acts of a physical nature might be prevented by force; but no power, however harshly applied, could controul opinions, or make a man receive doctrines which he did not believe to be correct. The Government of this country had been tolerant to the Jews. To that race of people who denied altogether the Christian religion, who disbelieved in the divinity of its great Founder, the most complete toleration was extended. No one attempted to interfere with their opinions. The Quakers, who differed on many essential points from the Established Church, were tolerated; and the whole body of Dissenters, various as were their doctrines, were suffered to preach them without molestation. This was highly to the honour of this country; and he wished, very sincerely, that every species of disability, whether in the nature of a test or otherwise, which applied to the Dissenters, should be wholly removed. He should be happy to see every human being placed in that situation in which he would be enabled, without any fear of the civil magistrate, to entertain whatsoever religious opinions he pleased; and to endeavour to obtain, by fair and candid discussion, information on those points which might not ap-

pear sufficiently clear and satisfactory to him. That was the only way by which any man could arrive at a fair conviction. Religion must be implanted in the mind; and nothing but plain argument,—nothing but the free discussion of points which an individual conceived to be doubtful,—could either alter his mind, with respect to any new doctrine, or confirm him in the truth of that which he had been accustomed to uphold. Physical force could have no effect whatever, either in eradicating new, or establishing old opinions. If there were any thing unreasonable in his proposition, he should not have brought it forward; but, looking over the pages of the Holy Scriptures, he could not find a single sentence that authorized punishment on account of difference of opinion, or that called on the civil magistrate to interfere. The conduct of the Divine Founder of the Christian religion was entirely at variance with this prosecuting spirit. When he was pursued with bitter hate, because he preached new opinions, his prayer was, "Father! forgive them; for they know not what they do." It was in consequence of that mild spirit of forbearance, that the Christian religion spread and flourished. It was not propagated by the great and the powerful; no, the meek, the lowly, and the humble, were its advocates; and its mild tenets made their way where force and violence must have failed. That religion had advanced in spite of the efforts of power, in defiance of every species of persecution; and, with that great example before their eyes, he demanded, ought they now to renew those scenes of persecution and oppression, which the earlier Christians had suffered with so much fortitude? Were they to immure individuals in dungeons for doing that which their own ancestors had done—for adopting new opinions? He might be told, "Those persons may express their opinions, but it must be done in a proper way." Now, for his own part, he knew not where the line of distinction was to be drawn, at which ribaldry began and sound discretion ceased. With respect to blasphemy, he would ask any one who referred to the Act of James I., whether on that subject a great change had not taken place in the public mind? That act sets forth—"That any stage-player, performer at May-games, or at any pageant, who shall use the name of God, of Jesus Christ, or of the Trinity, shall be adjudged guilty of blasphemy, and shall be subjected to all the penalties by this statute made and provided." Would any man say, after reading this, that a great difference of opinion had not taken place on this point? Was it possible that the provisions of that statute could

now be carried into effect, even if it were attempted by the most rigid sectarian? Again, by the 9th and 10th of William, it was provided, that "any person denying the doctrine of the Trinity, or contending that there are more gods than one, or impugning the truth of the Christian religion, shall be adjudged guilty of blasphemy." But they had themselves done this provision away by an act of the legislature. When this was the case,—when such an alteration was effected in public opinion,—he was prevented from seeing clearly what was to be considered blasphemous ribaldry, indecent discussion, or calm and dispassionate reasoning. He knew not what line of discussion was to be tolerated, and what ought to be allowed, unless the legislature would define what blasphemy really was. Where there was no definition of that kind, how could any man who reasoned on a religious subject be satisfied that in his argument he avoided blasphemy? How could he tell, let his intentions be ever so pure, that he did not expose himself to the visitation of the civil magistrate? He, therefore, submitted that the uncertainty which prevailed, with respect to what was and what was not blasphemy, ought to put an end to accusations of that nature, and to the punishment arising from them. Doubtless it would be said, that individuals had no right to express opinions which were different from those held by the great mass of the community: but if this principle had been always acted on, Christianity never could have made the progress which fortunately it had done. All the missionaries they employed in foreign parts, all the preachers they sent out to Hindostan, contradicted the correctness of this position. Those persons were sent abroad to expose the follies and absurdities of religious creeds which were revered by millions. They declared their dissent from those superstitious doctrines; and were, therefore, doing the same thing as certain individuals did in this country who could not believe all the tenets of Christianity. He thought in this the legislature were holding out two very different measures of justice. On the one hand, they were sending out persons to various quarters of the globe, for the express purpose of calling on the natives to inquire, to investigate, and to ascertain the truth of the doctrines they professed; while, on the other, a similar inquiry was treated here as an offence of very great magnitude. It was only by such inquiry that they could hope to benefit either the Hindoo or Mahometan subjects in India. If they invited the Hindoos to enter into every kind of discussion the most extensive that could be imagined, why should

they in England, because a few persons differed from the general feeling and opinion, withhold from those individuals the benefit of that principle which was so liberally adopted elsewhere? He thought that Christianity had stood too long and too scrupulous an inquiry to be shaken in the present day. When men of the very first abilities had attempted to impugn it and had failed, he entertained no apprehension of the attacks of men who possessed neither talent nor education. Christianity had marched on with rapid strides, notwithstanding the efforts of men of powerful minds. When this was so, why should they dread the assaults of a few ignorant persons, who, of late years, had excited public attention? It was impossible that they could state any arguments, or adduce any facts, which could endanger the tenets of the Christian religion, when assailants infinitely more powerful had formerly attempted the same thing without effect. The end of discussion was the attainment of truth; and he agreed with those who believed that the more the Christian religion was examined, the more firmly it would be fixed, and the more seriously it would be followed. Those who prosecuted persons for promulgating opinions hostile to that religion, did not check, but aggravated the evil. He would quote the opinions of some of the most learned and pious men that this country ever produced, in support of freedom of discussion. Tillotson, Taylor, Louth, Warburton, Lardner, Campbell, Chillingworth, and many others, had placed their opinions on record with respect to the propriety of allowing the freest investigation of the Christian religion. Tillotson said—"that the Christian religion did not decline trial or examination. If a church opposed itself to investigation, that circumstance would be no light ground of suspicion, since it would seem like a distrust of the truth." The Honourable Gentleman then went on to quote the opinions of the several divines whom he had mentioned in support of the principle, that the utmost latitude should be given to discussion. He alluded more particularly to the writings of Dr. Lardner, who, in speaking of the work of Mr. Woolston, said, that the proper punishment for a low, mean and scurrilous way of writing, was neglect, scorn and detestation. That learned divine added, that the stream of resentment would always turn against the prosecutor, where opinions were made the subject of complaint, especially if the punishment happened to be severe. In this way, continued Mr. Hume, the writings of Carlile ought to have been treated. He believed that they were scurrilous in a very high degree. He had never read

one of his publications until he had presented his petition, and he had then perused a few numbers of the *Republican*, in order to judge. He there found some calm argumentative writing; and some articles so exceedingly offensive, that if Carlile had the smallest idea of the feelings of mankind, he would not have published any thing so revolting. He had, however, been most severely dealt with, and the consequence was, that the stream of feeling had been changed; resentment had been kindled against the prosecutor, and compassion had been excited in favour of the prisoner; but for those prosecutions few people would have known the thousandth part of his writings. The Attorney and Solicitor General saw the thing in its proper colours. They had not proceeded against Carlile, because they felt that such a course would be to spread abroad the very poison which they wished to eradicate. But the Society for the suppression of Vice and the Bridge Street Association took the matter up, and became parties to the charge of disseminating those publications. They brought forward prosecution after prosecution, until the individuals who were the objects of punishment left the court of justice, after being sentenced to fine and imprisonment, with the characters of martyrs to the cause which they had espoused. So much was this the fact, that if fifty persons more were in dungeons on account of these opinions, twice that number would be ready to come forward for the same purpose. Carlile, with all his efforts, never could have sold Paine's works to the extent he had been enabled to do in consequence of these prosecutions. When Hone was prosecuted for his Parodies, 20,000 copies were sold, which never would have been the case if they had not been brought into notoriety by legal proceedings. In the same way the poem of "Wat Tyler," which was written by Mr. Southey, the Poet Laureat, in early life, and which he (Mr. Southey) wishing to suppress, had applied for an injunction to restrain its publication, became, in consequence of that step, most widely disseminated, no less than 30,000 copies of it having been sold immediately after the application. The Honourable Gentleman then proceeded to quote Bishop Watson, who held that the freedom of inquiry, which had subsisted in this country during the present century, had been of great benefit to the cause of Christianity; and he also referred to Dr. Campbell, who held—"that that man could not be a friend to Christianity who would punish another for expressing his doubts. Every man who doubts should be invited to discussion, that the objections might be an-

answered: so far from objecting to discussion, I believe that the most violent attacks on the religion of Jesus have been of service to it. Let them argue, and when argument fails, let them even cavil against the Christian religion as much as they please, I have no apprehension of the result." He (Mr. Hume) could not conceive why the Bridge Street Association should interfere in the unconstitutional manner they had done. They had found a stock-purse to prosecute individuals, and took upon them that duty which really belonged to the magistrate. They had a great deal to answer for in taking such a course. He regretted to see such respectable persons amongst them. He was sorry that they had allowed themselves to be misled by interested individuals, secretaries and others, who had only their own profits in view, and cared very little about the objects which had been contemplated by the persons who subscribed the funds. The Honourable Gentleman then quoted the charge of the Bishop of London to his clergy last year, in which that Right Reverend Prelate stated that he was a friend to discussion, because he thought that it called forth the mental energies of those whose duty it was to meet any arguments urged against the Christian religion. With so recent an opinion before them, why, he asked, should they act in a spirit so entirely different? The Honourable Member then alluded to the opinion of Mr. Justice Blackstone, who held that it was contrary to sound policy and civil freedom to prosecute on account of religious opinions. If such were the sentiments of the many pious, wise and learned men whom he had quoted, how would gentlemen reconcile them with the prosecutions now going on? Of what use were those prosecutions when individuals gloried in their punishment as an act of martyrdom? Discussion ought to be allowed in the most full and unrestrained degree, and the power of the magistrate ought only to be resorted to when the safety of the state demanded it. He had not touched upon the question of Atheism for this simple reason—because he had never seen any such man as an Atheist, and he doubted whether any person existed who denied the being of a great Creator of the universe. He did not mean to defend any attacks on the Christian religion, or any of the publications which had been complained of. They ought to be put down; but put down in the way they deserved—by complete neglect and utter contempt. The Honourable Member concluded by moving "That it is the opinion of this House that free discussion has been attended with more benefit than injury to the com-

munity, and it is unjust and inexpedient to expose any person to legal penalties on account of the expression of opinions on matters of religion."

On the question being put,

Mr. WILBERFORCE addressed the House; but in so low a tone, that very little of what he said could be distinctly heard in the gallery. We understood the Honourable Member to observe, that it was the duty of individuals to prosecute publications of the nature of those alluded to, as they were evidently *contra bonos mores*. The Honourable Mover had observed that he believed there was no such a thing as Atheism; but in one of those very publications there was a passage, in which it was stated that Atheism was the only ground on which a man could find a sound and secure footing. It was exceedingly unpleasant to quote from any of those works; but in another number it was declared that Christianity could be proved to demonstration to be a gross imposture, and as it was supported for the purpose of upholding a bad system of government, the author wondered why it had not long since been removed; and he went on to ask whether the inquiring mind of man could find any sound footing except in Atheism. (Hear.) The Honourable Member (Mr. Hume) had quoted from Bishop Warburton, the Bishop of London, and several other eminent divines, with whose sentiments he (Mr. Wilberforce) entirely concurred: for no man held more strongly the opinion that it was proper to investigate the established religion of the country fairly. But none of those pious and learned men had argued that gross and vulgar abuse of the religion of the state ought to be tolerated. (Hear.) Dr. Paley's opinion was clear and decisive on this point. He said "that persecution could produce no sincere conviction; and under the head of religious toleration, he included toleration of all serious argument, but he did not think it would be right to suffer ridicule, invective, and mockery to be resorted to with impunity. They applied solely to the passions, weakened the understanding, and misled the judgment. They did not assist the search for truth, and instead of supporting any particular religion, destroyed the influence of all." (Hear, hear.) With respect to Carlile, he had not been harshly treated. No prosecution was instituted against him until he had placed over his door "The Temple of Reason;" and the dissemination of irreligious works became too notorious to be overlooked. He thought the country owed very great thanks to private individuals (seconded by the state) who had endeavoured to

disseminate such works and to support such a moral education as would enable the people to combat those principles. He entirely denied the truth of the argument which the Honourable Member had drawn from the employment of missionaries abroad. Those individuals never proceeded to insult the prejudices of the natives of other countries by any gross and indecent reflections. They adduced nothing but fair and sober argument to effect their purpose. The Honourable Member said that there was no drawing a precise line in arguments on this subject. His answer was, that it was not intended to draw a precise line. Let truth go to its fullest and fairest extent, but let ribaldry and indecency be avoided. Did Christianity ever insult the country where it was attempted to be planted? No: it was distinguished by decorum, respect, and obedience to the powers that be. Even the government of the Emperor Nero, one of the most cruel tyrants that ever lived, was not abused by the Christians. With respect to those who had voluntarily taken upon them to prosecute publications of this nature, he must observe that there were many wrongs by which society in general suffered, but which were likewise so offensive to individuals, that they hesitated not to visit them with the penalties of the law. There were also, it should be observed, certain other crimes, more injurious to society than even robbery or murder, but which, as they did not affect the particular interests of private individuals, they did not stand forward to punish. Therefore the formation of societies for the purpose of visiting such crimes with severity, was a praiseworthy act. It had been stated over and over again by the judges, that persons who associated together to carry the law into execution, where offences of this kind, which were mischievous to society, were perpetrated, were acting in a perfectly legal manner. The introduction of obscene pictures and improper books into schools had been effectually checked by that means. When individuals combined together for this purpose, and were only actuated by public principles, and where the over-zealous disposition of some was tempered by the moderation and prudence of others, it could not be doubted that great good was likely to be the result.

Mr. RICARDO said that he had heard with pleasure a great part of the speech of his honourable friend who had just sat down, and the remainder certainly with some concern. The greater part of that speech was in support of the opinion which he (Mr. Ricardo) held in common with his honourable friend who had

introduced the motion—namely, that no man had a right to dictate his own opinions upon abstract opinions to another, upon peril of punishment for a refusal to adopt them (hear, from Mr. Wilberforce); and his honourable friend had further admitted, that so long as the controversy upon such topics were conducted with decency, it ought not to be prevented by force of law. Now, he lamented that when his honourable friend had thought proper to quote the sentiments of Dr. Paley, he had not given them more at length, for he would, in the writings of that eminent individual, find a more large and liberal spirit of toleration, than he was disposed to admit practically in other parts of his speech.

Mr. WILBERFORCE.—“Dr. Paley distinctly excepts to the treatment of such subjects with levity and ribaldry.”

Mr. RICARDO resumed—that, certainly, was Dr. Paley's only exception; and he, as well as the other chief ornaments of the church, for instance, Dr. Tillotson and Dr. Porteus, had asserted in the largest sense, the right of unfettered opinion. If the validity of such opinions were admitted, who could advocate the operation of the law of this country in such matters? Who could sustain those impolitic and unjust prosecutions? What was the prosecution of Carline for republishing the *Age of Reason*? That was not a work written in a style of levity and ribaldry, but a serious argument upon the truths of the Christian religion. Look again at the impending prosecution for eighteen weeks of the same man for Mr. Hone's *Parodies*, which was not abandoned until Hone had himself secured an acquittal on the charge. But, said his honourable friend (Mr. Wilberforce), in justification of these public prosecutions, there were some offences which did not directly affect private interest although they injured the community, and which might go unpunished, were it not for general associations which took cognizance of such matters; and he talked of obscene writings in illustration of his opinion. Was there really any comparison between such writings and those upon speculative points of religion, which were the only topics to which this motion applied? (Hear, hear.) They were all agreed that obscene writings ought to be punished; and why?—because they were obviously pernicious to the moral interests of society, and constituted a general and disgusting species of offence. (Hear, hear.) But not so abstract religious subjects, upon which it was quite impossible to obtain universal assent. No man had a right to say to another, “My

opinion upon religion is right, and yours is not only wrong when you differ from me, but I am entitled to punish you for that difference." Such an arrogant assumption of will was intolerable, and was an outrage upon the benignant influence of religion. (Hear, hear.) They might talk of ribaldry and levity, but there was nothing more intolerable than the proposition which he had just stated, and which was nothing less than the power contended for by the advocates of these prosecutions for mere opinions upon points of faith. (Hear, hear.) Then, as he had said on a former occasion, what an absurd and immoral mode did the law provide for estimating the credit of a man's faith before his testimony was legally admissible! When the question was put to a witness, "Do you believe in a future state?" If he were a conscientious man, entertaining seriously such an opinion, his answer must be in the negative, and the law said he should not be heard; but if he were an immoral man, and disregarded truth, and said, "I do believe in a future state," although in his conscience he disbelieved in it, then his evidence was admissible, and his hypocrisy and falsehood secured him credibility. Now there would be some sense in the law if it declined tempting the hypocrisy of the individual, or his fear of the world's hostility or prejudice, and let in other evidence to establish, from previous knowledge of the individual, whether or not he ought not to be admitted as a witness; but as it stood, it was absurd and ridiculous; and when he (Mr. Ricardo) was charged upon this ground with a desire to do away with the sanctity of an oath, his reply was, "I do not desire to diminish the sacredness of the obligation; but I do desire to get rid of the hypocrisy by which that oath might be evaded." (Hear, hear.) But then, again, was it possible for a man not to believe in a future state, and yet be strictly moral, and impressed with the necessity of upholding credibility in the common obligations of society? For his part he firmly believed in the possibility of a man's being very honest for all the social purposes and essential obligations of the community in which he lived, and still not assenting to the belief of a future state. He fully admitted that religion was a powerful obligation, but he denied it to be the only obligation—it was, in fact, one which was superadded to the general force of moral impressions—it were a libel upon human nature to say otherwise. (Hear.) Tillotson was of that opinion in the following quotation from his works:—"As for most of those restraints which Christianity lays upon us, they are so much

both for our private and public advantage, that, setting aside all considerations of religion, and of the rewards and punishments of another life, they are really good for us; and if God had not laid them upon us, we ought in reason, in order to our temporal benefit and advantage, to have laid them upon ourselves. If there were no religion, I know men would not have such strong and forcible obligations to these duties; but yet, I say, though there were no religion, it were good for men, in order to temporal ends, to their health, and quiet, and reputation, and safety, and, in a word, to the private and public prosperity of mankind, that men should be temperate, and chaste, and just, and peaceable and charitable, and kind and obliging to one another, rather than the contrary. So that religion does not create those restraints arbitrarily, but requires those things of us, which our reason, and a regard to our advantage, which the necessity and conveniency of the things themselves, without any consideration of religion, would in most cases urge us to." He read this passage for the purpose of shewing, and from great authorities in the church, that the obligation of religion was not alone considered as the influential test of moral truth, and that a man might be very sceptical upon doctrinal points, and yet very positive in the controul of moral impressions distinct from religious faith: for instance, there was Mr. Owen, a great benefactor to society, and yet a man not believing (judging from some opinions of his) in a future state. Would any man, with the demonstrating experience of the contrary before his eyes, say that Mr. Owen was less susceptible of moral feeling because he was incredulous upon matters of religion? Would any man, pretending to honour or candour, say that Mr. Owen, after a life spent in improving the condition of others, had a mind less pure, a heart less sincere, or a less conviction of the restraint and controul of moral rectitude, than if he were more imbued with the precepts of religious obligation? (Hear.) Why, then, was such a man (for so by the law he was) to be excluded from the pale of legal credibility? Why was he, if he promulgated his opinions, to be liable to spend his days immured in a prison? With respect to the exception provided according to his honourable friend (Mr. Wilberforce), for treating such subjects with levity and ribaldry, he (Mr. Ricardo) must confess, that he thought it a very singular reservation: for what was it, but to say—"You may discuss, if you please, in the most solemn, most serious, and therefore most

influential manner, any topic of religion you please; but the moment you discuss it with levity or ribaldry, that is, in such a manner as to be sure to offend the common sense of mankind, and therefore deprive you of really acquiring any serious proselytes, then the law takes cognizance of your conduct, and makes your imbecility penal." (Hear.) Was not this a glaring inconsistency? The law allowed the greater evil, the serious and substantial principle of discussion; and it denounced the lesser, which, after admitting the first, it ought to have tolerated; and yet his honourable friend (Mr. Wilberforce) had by his argument justified and supported so singular a course. There was one passage of this petition which was very forcible, and to which he called the attention of his honourable friend, it was this:—"The reviler of Christianity appears to your petitioners to be the least formidable of its enemies; because his scoffs can rarely fail of arousing against him public opinion, than which nothing more is wanted to defeat his end. Between freedom of discussion and absolute persecution there is no assignable medium." When this subject was last before the House, unless his memory deceived him, he had heard singular opinions propounded by gentlemen who took a different view of this subject from himself: he thought that he had heard it avowed, that the religion which ought to be established in a state, was not that which the majority said they believed, but that whose doctrines were true. He had heard an observation like that fall from a very respectable quarter. It was very difficult to argue with any body entertaining such an opinion, for where was the test by which such an argument could be tried? (Hear.) There was not in polemics, as in astronomy, one unerring criterion to which the common credence of mankind bowed—it was not like the rising sun, or any of the other phenomena of nature, which were bound by indissoluble and indisputable laws; but, on the contrary, a subject open to conflicting opinions. Who, then, was to decide upon the truth—who was authorized to say, "My opinion is right, yours is wrong?" If this were impossible, how was the test to be decided? (Hear.) How, for instance, in such a country as Ireland (and to that he alluded in his observation) try the question of the truth of what ought to be the religion of the state, against the opinions of the majority of the people? (Hear.) How would, upon that test, the stability of the Protestant religion in Ireland be secured? Or if it was secured there, merely because the minority thought it

the true religion, the same reason, and the same duty, would authorize the extension of the principle to India; and why not supplant Mahometanism to establish the doctrines of the Reformation? Into this wide field did the gentlemen enter who embarked in such fanciful notions. He begged to be understood as having argued this question from beginning to end as the friend of free discussion; he knew the delicacy of the subject, and was anxious to guard himself against being supposed to entertain opinions obnoxious to the bulk of mankind: he repeated that he only contended for the general right of self-opinion, and for the unfettered liberty of discussion, and hoped that while doing so, he should not have, as his honourable friend (Mr. Hume) had last night, certain opinions fixed upon him which he did not entertain, and which it was quite unnecessary for him to countenance, in supporting the line of argument which the subject suggested to him, and which his reason approved. (Hear.)

Mr. HORACE TWISS contended that the Honourable Members who supported this petition were erroneous, when they supposed that that law was severe and arbitrary against which they protested; on the contrary, he was prepared to shew that the law originated in the best time of the constitution, and was that which the great Lord Somers had suggested to that constitutional Sovereign, King William. The honourable and learned gentleman then quoted the address of the House of Commons to that Monarch, in the year 1697, and his Majesty's answer, which, in obedience to the desire of the House, recommended the adoption of additional measures for the suppression of profane and immoral writings, and for putting down publications which had a tendency to subvert or disparage the Christian religion. He then proceeded to argue, that it was a mistake to say that the law was levelled at mere opinions, while on the contrary it was directed against overt acts, which attacked the public peace and security by striking at the roots of the existence of civil society. (Hear, hear.) There was a wide distinction between matters of belief in politics and in religion: in the latter the belief was the substance, and could not safely be dispensed with. He begged to be understood as agreeing with those who thought that hasty prosecutions on such topics were impolitic, and tended to aggravate the evil; but did it follow that he was prepared to abolish the exercise of a prudent discretion in selecting objects for such prosecutions, and that he was at once to exonerate from all legal responsibility, every sort

of assailant upon the Christian religion? for to that intent did the Honourable Member's motion apply. (Hear.) It was singular that the Honourable Gentlemen who supported the present motion for affording such a latitude of opinion and action to the disbelievers of all religion, should be the very men who, on a late occasion, when the rights and opinions of six millions of fellow-Christians, not unbelievers, were under consideration, felt themselves justified in withdrawing from the House, and thereby exposing to a defeat, which their presence might have averted, that principle of the exercise of conscientious opinion without controul, for which they had this night evinced so uncompromising an attachment. (Hear.) He was not surprised to hear from the Honourable Member (Mr. Ricardo) who was the advocate of free trade, such free opinions upon topics of religion (a laugh)—he was properly enough an advocate for free trade, because it was a bounty on production, and for the same reason he (Mr. Twiss) was not an advocate for such sentiments as this petition asserted. (Hear.)

Mr. W. SMITH was afraid that this was not a topic well calculated to secure that grave attention in a debate which it so essentially required. He could assure the House, that no man felt more disgust than he did at the publications for which Carlile had been prosecuted; but at the same time he thought that liberty of conscience without the liberty of divulging one's opinions, was a poor and imperfect privilege. The only question raised this night, was simply this—whether all manner of treating religious subjects should be allowed in controversy. He had long thought upon this subject, and the result of his reflections was the painful conviction, that it were better to leave such matters to the general opinion of society. He then argued the impossibility of establishing a safe test of opinion for the penal guidance of society. What in England they thought moral and just, might not be equally so considered in India. The Brahmin who, from motives of religion, sanctioned the burning of Hindoo widows, might, if left to his decision, consign to the same flames the Englishman who complained against so cruel and irreligious a practice.

Mr. THOMAS WILSON trusted that the House would shew by its vote of that night that its opinion was not in unison with those which had been expressed by the Honourable Member who spoke last. He thought that the minds of the lower orders were poisoned by the blasphemous publications which had been spread abroad. The lower orders would eagerly

imbibe the poison, but would not seek the antidote.

Mr. MONEY opposed the motion. Since Parliament and other societies had done all in its power to disseminate the blessings of education, care ought to be taken that it was not abused. His principal object in rising was to do justice to an individual who had been alluded to during the debate—he meant Mr. Owen. The Honourable Member for Portarlington had said that Mr. Owen disbelieved in a future state. Since that assertion had been made, he (Mr. Money) had communicated with Mr. Owen, and he had great reason to believe that the Honourable Member for Portarlington had mistaken the opinions of Mr. Owen. He begged the Honourable Member to state in what part of Mr. Owen's works he found that opinion promulgated which he had attributed to Mr. Owen.

Mr. RICARDO said the last act he would commit would be to misrepresent the opinions of any individuals. He had gathered Mr. Owen's opinions from the works which he had published. After reading the speeches which Mr. Owen had delivered in Ireland, and other places, he had come to the conclusion, that he (Mr. Owen) did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments. It was one of the doctrines of Mr. Owen, that a man could not form his own character, but that it was formed by the circumstances which surrounded him—that when a man committed an act which the world called vice, it ought to be considered his misfortune merely, and should not be visited with punishment. He (Mr. Ricardo) certainly had imagined that Mr. Owen would extend the same principle to a future state. It would, however, give him great concern to find, that he had inadvertently misrepresented Mr. Owen's opinions.

Mr. PEEL complained, that an Honourable Member on the other side had assumed that the House was prepared to go a very considerable way in accordance with the views of the Honourable Member for Aberdeen. He, for one, was not prepared to advance one step along with the Honourable Member. (Hear, hear.) He objected to his motion altogether. He disliked the form in which the Honourable Member had brought the question before the House. The practice of proposing resolutions declaratory of the opinion of the House had, he was sorry to see, become very prevalent of late. If the Honourable Member considered the law which subjected individuals to punishment, improper or unnecessary, why did he not move for its repeal? (Hear, hear.) In the resolution which the Honourable Member had

proposed, he first declared that free discussion had been attended with more benefit than injury, and then said that it was inexpedient to subject individuals to punishment on account of the expression of their opinions on religious matters. If the first part of the resolution was true, the second was quite unnecessary. If there had been, as the Honourable Member assumed in his resolution, free discussion, what more did he desire? To be consistent with himself, the Honourable Member should have framed the resolution in a prospective sense, and said, that more benefit would arise, &c. With respect to the petition, he must say that he had never read any thing more absurd or sophisticated. It commenced by stating, that the petitioners had a strong sense of the benefits which resulted from a belief in the Christian religion, and afterwards expressed a wish that the laws might be repealed which prevented individuals from attacking and endeavouring to destroy that religion. He (Mr. Peel) was satisfied with the law as it stood, and would not consent to change it. He could conceive that cases might occur in which it would be impolitic to put the law in force. That was a matter of discretion. But if it could be shewn that in a dozen cases the discretion had been abused, it would not determine him to put aside the law altogether. He would not consent to allow men, who, from sordid motives,

endeavoured to undermine the religion of the country, to go unpunished.

Mr. HUME said he would not press the House to a division on the resolutions, because if they should be affirmed, there would not be time to pass a Bill founded upon them during the present session.

The SPEAKER then put the question on the resolutions, which were negatived without a division.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

JULY 4.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN presented a petition, signed by upwards of 2,000 persons, amongst whom were 200 ministers of various religious persuasions, against prosecuting persons for writings supposed to be hostile to the Christian religion. His Lordship, on presenting the petition, said, that although he could not go the length to which the petitioners went, that there ought to be no statute against such publications, and no punishment under that statute, yet he was free to declare that there was no subject on which legislation could be exercised, in which it was more likely for harm to be done by misdirected zeal, whose efforts frequently tended to produce the very effects which it was the object of the law to check.

The petition was then read, and ordered to lie on the table.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Memoir of John Aikin, M. D. By Lucy Aikin. With a Selection of his Miscellaneous Pieces, Biographical, Moral and Critical. 2 Vols. 8vo. 24s.

A Calm Defence of the Critical Examination and Reply, containing Strictures, adapted to the English Reader, on various Terms in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, connected with the Trinitarian Controversy. (In Answer to the Rev. S. Slocock's second Pamphlet.) By the Rev. John Kitcat. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Sunday Evening's Amusement, consisting of Sacred Melodies, composed and arranged for the Piano Forte and Organ. By Wm. Dalmer, Bath. 4to. 5s.

Hebrew Elements, or a Practical Introduction to the Reading of the Hebrew Scriptures: consisting of Four Tracts, viz. A Hebrew Primer; Syllabarium Hebraicum; and the Hebrew Reader, Parts I. and II. By Thomas, Lord Bishop of St. Davids. 6s.

Drunopædia; or a New and Interesting

View of the Druidical System of Education, elucidating the Obscurities in which the early parts of British History are involved. By Jonathan Williams, A. M. 8vo. 4s.

A Letter to the Right Rev. Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible. By Henry Walter, B. D. and F. R. S., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

The Prometheus Vincit of Æschylus, literally translated into English Prose, with the Greek Text, the Metres, the Greek Order, English Accentuation and Notes. By T. W. C. Edwards, M. A. 8vo.

Considerations on the Abolition of Negro Slavery, and the means of practically effecting it, &c. By J. F. Barham, Esq. 2s. 6d.

An Essay on Average, containing much new matter, including an Essay on Arbi-

tration. By Robert Stevens, of Lloyd's. 8vo. 4th edition. 12s.

The Chemical Catechism, with Tables, Illustrations and Experiments. By Samuel Parkes, F. L. S. M. R. I. &c. 8vo. 10th edition, augmented and improved. New Plates. 14s.

An Essay on the History and Theory of Music, and on the Qualities, Capabilities and Management of the Human Voice. By J. Nathan, Author of the Hebrew Melodies. Royal 4to. 2l.

An Encyclopædia of Gardening, comprising the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Gardening; including all the latest Improvements, a General History of Gardening in all Countries, and a Statistical View of its Present State, with Suggestions for its Future Progress in the British Isles. By J. C. Loudon, F. L. S. H. S. &c. One large volume, 8vo. of 1,500 pages, closely printed, with 600 Engravings on Wood. 2l. 10s.

Bibliotheca Gloucestriensis; a Reprint of Scarce Tracts relating to the County and City of Gloucester. Portrait and Map. 4to. 10s. 6d. Royal 4to. 21s.

Interesting Roman Antiquities recently discovered in Fife, &c. &c.; also, Observations regarding the Ancient Palaces of the Pictish Kings in the Town of Abernethy. &c. By Andrew Small. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, and on Religions connected in History, the Primeval, the Judaic, and the Heathen, Public, Mystical and Philosophical. 12mo. 9s.

Letters on the State of Christianity in India; in which the Conversion of the Hindoos is considered as impracticable. By the Abbé J. A. Dubois, Missionary in Mysore. 8vo. 7s.

A Visit to Spain during the latter part of 1822 and the first four Months of 1823. By E. Quin, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

A View of the Past and Present State of the Island of Jamaica. By J. Stewart. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Travels through Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Finland, Norway and Russia, with a Description of the City of Petersburg during the Tyranny of the Emperor Paul, being the VIth and last Vol. of the Author's Travels in Europe, Asia and Africa. By E. D. Clarke, LL.D. Numerous Engravings, Maps, &c. 4to. 3l. 13s. 6d.

Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians of North America, from Childhood to the Age of Nineteen. With Anecdotes descriptive of their Manners and Customs, and some Account of the Soil, Climate and Vegetable Productions of the Territory westward of the Mississippi. By John D. Hunter. 8vo. 12s.

The Works of Garcilasso de la Vega, surnamed the Prince of Castilian Poets, translated into English Verse, with a Critical and Historical Essay on Spanish Poetry, and a Life of the Author. By J. H. Wiffen. Post 8vo. Portrait and Engravings. 12s.

The Graces; a Classical Allegory, interspersed with Poetry, and illustrated by Explanatory Notes. Translated from the Original German of Christopher Martin Wieland. Foolscap 8vo.

Alfred: a Romance, in Rhyme. By R. P. Knight, Esq. 8vo. 14s.

Cardinal Beaton. A Drama. By W. Tennant. 8vo. 6s.

Byzantium, a Dramatic Poem. By Edward Richard Poole. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Poetical Memoirs; the Exile, a Tale. By James Bird. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Superstition; or, the Perils of Ireland in the Projects of Rome. A Poem. By Clericus Hibernicus. 1s. 6d.

Heraldic Anomalies; or, Rank Confusion in our Orders of Precedence. With Disquisitions, Moral, Philosophical and Historical, on all the existing Orders of Society. By It Matters Not Who. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 20s.

The Curate's Daughter, a Tale for Young Persons. By Mary Mullion. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Provisional Constitution of Greece, translated from the Second Edition of Corinth, accompanied with the Original Greek, preceded by a Letter to the Senate of the Grecian Confederation, and by a general view of the Origin and Progress of the Revolution. By a Grecian Eye-Witness. 8vo. 5s.

The Peruvian Pamphlet, describing the Organization of the Existing Government; to which is added, A Biographical Memoir of Gen. San Martin, &c. 2s. 6d.

The Cottager's Manual, for the Management of his Bees, for every Month in the Year, both on the Suffocating and Depriving System. By Robert Huish, Esq. 3s.

Advice to Young Mothers on the Physical Education of Children. By a Grandmother. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

New Ideas on Population; with Remarks on the Theories of Godwin and Malthus. By Alex. H. Everett, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States of America, at the Court of the Netherlands. 8vo.

Impressment: an Attempt to prove why it should, and how it could be abolished. By Lieutenant R. Standish Haly, R. N. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

An Examination of the Principles on which the British and Foreign School Society is established, the Nature of the Education it imparts, the extent of its Operations and the Support to which

it is entitled. By William Williams. 1s.

A Plea in behalf of a Christian Country for the Christian Education of its Youth, addressed to Various Classes of Society. Abridged from the larger Work of George Monro, M. A. 1711. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Hunterian Oration, delivered in the Royal College of Surgeons in London, on the 14th of February, 1823. By Sir Wm. Blizard, Knight, President of the College, &c. 4to. 6s.

A Letter to the Lord Chancellor on the Nature and Interpretation of Unsoundness of Mind and Imbecility of Intellect. By John Haslam, M.D. 1s. 6d.

The Valedictory Address of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, delivered by the Lord Bishop of Bristol at a Special General Meeting of the Society, June 13, 1823, to the Lord Bishop of Calcutta, previously to his Departure for India; together with his Lordship's Reply. 1s.

A Treatise on the Patriarchal, Levitical and Christian Dispensations; by the Rev. G. S. Faber, B. D. 2 Vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.

Remarks on the late Count Volney's New Researches into Ancient History; to which are added, General Remarks on Infidelity. By J. B. Emmitt. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

A Letter to Lord Liverpool on the Catholic Question, Clerical Residence and the State of Ordination. By R. Mitchell, D. D., Rector of Freyerning, and Vicar of Eastwood, Essex. 1s. 6d.

An Account of the American Baptist Mission to the Burman Empire, in a Series of Letters to a Gentleman in London. By Ann H. Judson. 8s.

A Voice from St. Peter's and St. Paul's, being a few plain Words to the Members of both Houses, on some late Accusations against the Church. By a Member of the University of Oxford. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Sermons.

On Several Subjects; with Notes Critical, Historical and Explanatory, and an Appendix. By Charles Swan, late of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Jacob, or Patriarchal Piety. A Series of Discourses delivered in St. James's Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh. By Edward Craig, M. A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Single.

Motives to induce Unitarian Christians to excel their Brethren; preached at Bury, June 19, 1823, before the Annual Assembly of the Unitarian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire. By George Harris. (2nd ed.) 1s.

The Early Success of the Gospel, an Evidence of its Truth and an Encouragement to Zeal for its Universal Diffusion: preached at Craven Chapel, London, May 20, 1823, before the Home Missionary Society. By Ralph Wardlaw, D. D.

Resignation to the Divine Will; occasioned by the Death of his Daughter, January 6, 1823. By Thomas Langdon. 1s.

Preached in Lambeth Chapel, June 1, 1823, at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Reginald Heber, D. D. Lord Bishop of Calcutta. By A. Bland Wrightson, M. A., Rector of Edlington. 4to. 1s. 6d.

St. Paul's Views of the Christian Ministry: preached at the Parish Church of St. Chad, Shrewsbury, June 12, 1823, at the Visitation of the Venerable Hugh Owen, M. A. Archdeacon of Salop. By Edward Bather, M. A. Vicar of Meole Brace. 1s. 6d.

Preached at Dudley, on the Death of Viscount Dudley and Ward. By L. Booker, LL.D. Vicar. 8vo. 1s.

Preached in Bedford Chapel, Charlotte Street, Bloomsbury, for the Benefit of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, &c. May 25, 1823. By G. H. Law, D. D. F. R. and A. S. Lord Bishop of Chester. 4to. 1s. 6d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Manning, W. Evans, and John Johnston, and from M., and Aliquis.

We admire *Grapho's* zeal, but he seems to overlook the virtues of candour and prudence. There is "a time for all things," and surely nothing would be more injurious to the cause of Unitarianism than to take advantage of a public meeting convened on the principle of agreeing to differ, to obtrude that system upon the unwilling ears of Trinitarians. Not a little appears to us to be gained on behalf of truth, when the discourses of Unitarian ministers on the common salvation, are heard by a mixed audience with approbation.

ERRATUM.

P. 382, col. 2, note †, for *Ed. 6th, &c.* read "*Ed. Sixth V. P. M. &c.*"