

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CCXVI.]

DECEMBER, 1823.

[Vol. XVIII.]

*History of the Presbyterian Chapel, Dukinfield, Cheshire, with the Succession of its Ministers.*

WITH the commencement of the reign of William and Mary began a system of moderation towards the scruples of Nonconformity, which greatly relaxed the ecclesiastical arrogance of the preceding sovereign. Episcopacy was abolished in Scotland, and toleration granted to Dissenters from the Established Church in England. The Act of Toleration was passed in 1689, and immediately after this, the Dissenters in all parts of the kingdom began to erect edifices exclusively adapted to their own forms of worship. As we have no earlier era to which the antiquity of any of our chapels can be referred, so a great number of them have their date about the commencement of the succeeding century. This in Dukinfield was erected, as appears by an inscription over the southern entrance, in 1707, upon a most beautiful and commanding eminence. A school was also about the same time built near to the chapel, but this was taken down some fifty years ago, to give the former building all the advantage of its peculiarly fine situation.

This school is said to have flourished very much, particularly under the mastership of *Domini Gee*, specimens of whose superior penmanship in the Italian court-hand of that period, are yet in preservation. It is not unworthy of remark, that the widow of *Damini Gee's* son is yet a resident in the village, and possesses comparatively strong mental and corporeal energy, now in her 101st year. Not long ago, she was invited to the house of one of her descendants, where a meeting took place at a tea party of five generations in the same family. One of her grandsons is now the stone-cutter and officiating sexton belonging to the chapel-yard. Previous to this school, a seminary for the education of young gentlemen had been conducted with great repu-

tation in this place by a Mr. Barlow, whose classical attainments were held in very great esteem. Indeed, such was his widely extended reputation, that several London merchants, as well as the neighbouring gentlemen, sent their sons to be educated by him. Amongst his pupils from London, a son of the celebrated critic John Dennis, was of the number. This boy is reported to have been a great oddity, whose peculiarities contributed in no small degree to the mirth of his associates.

As Colonel Dukinfield had taken so conspicuous a part in the troubles which happened in Charles the First's time, it may naturally be inferred that his son Robert, the first Baronet of that name, was not adverse to the efforts of the Dissenters in his neighbourhood, when they united their exertions for the purpose of completing the present structure. He gave them a lease for three lives (as the then custom of the manor happened to be) of the land whereon the chapel now stands, besides great part of the materials, free of expense. And although this lease was never renewed, no resumption of his right and title in the freehold was ever claimed by him or any of his descendants.

About the year 1767, this township and several other great estates belonging to the Dukinfield family passed into the possession of the father of the present proprietor, F. D. Astley, Esq., whose conduct towards the Dukinfield congregation has been marked with greater liberality than that even of any of his predecessors. He has added a large portion of land to augment the chapel yard, and, besides encouraging by his subscription an addition to the chapel of a newly-erected vestry and organ gallery above it, he has in the most disinterested manner conveyed the whole of the premises to trustees, in perpetuity for

the purpose of appropriating the chapel to the worship of God, unshackled by creeds and untrammelled by any vague dogma whatever.

There is an endowment belonging to the chapel, consisting of a freehold estate of about thirty-three statute acres, left thereto by Mr. James Heywood. He had acquired a competency in the village as a woollen-draper, and was one of the most ardent promoters of the undertaking. His name and that of his wife are yet remaining over the north and south doors of the chapel. They had an only son and heir, who, dying seven years after the chapel was completed, this estate was by them vested in feoffees, and the issues and profits of it appropriated to the augmentation of the minister's salary, and to the repairs of the chapel, so long as divine worship continues there to be celebrated.

The building of this chapel was attended with no common satisfaction to the harassed and persecuted Dissenters just emancipated from the fetters of the five-mile act, and that for the suppression of conventicles. Tradition can yet point out the place in a neighbouring wood, where on days set apart, under the watch of centinels, and at night fall, when they were less likely to be observed, the proscribed ministers were met by their faithful adherents, when the pious service of prayer, praise and exhortation had no other walls to surround it but the oaken thicket, and no other roof for its protection but the canopy of heaven. There was an additional satisfaction resulting from the completion of this structure, of which only its founders could be duly sensible. The Rev. Samuel Angier, nephew and formerly assistant to the Rev. John Angier, of Denton, was now a resident in the township, on an estate yet known as "Angier's tenement." He lost no time in availing himself of the Toleration Act, to license his out-housing, and there he resumed his long-interrupted ministerial functions. The hay-loft was fitted up as a temporary gallery, and the family of the "Hall" were not ashamed there, surrounded by their tenantry, to attend upon his ministry.

He was the first pastor who dedicated this chapel to the worship of

God, and continued to discharge the sacred duties of his profession for about six years. A register in his hand-writing is yet extant, containing not only memoranda interesting to the congregation, but notices of remarkable events connected with that period, whether of local or national occurrence. An interleaved Bible purchased by him when a student at Christ Church, Oxon, in 3 vols. 4to. and dated 1662, is in the possession of the present writer. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that it is enriched by his notes and classical references in the course of frequent perusal down to the period of 1697. It exhibits its first possessor as a pious and diligent peruser, a candid inquirer, and a learned and critical annotator of the Holy Scriptures. He was interred at the south end of the chapel, and a Latin inscription, very beautifully engraved on his tombstone, designates with great propriety his character. A copy of this is to be found at the end of Calamy's Nonconformists' Memorial.

Mr. Angier's successor was the Rev. William Buckley. He happened to possess a patrimonial estate in the township, and when young, became enamoured of a daughter of the Baronet, whose demesne land lay contiguous to his own. The parties were prevented ratifying that union so much coveted by both, and the lady died soon after (in lovers' language) of a broken heart. He afterwards married a half-sister of the Baronet's, a daughter of Colonel Dukinfield in his old age, by a third wife, whose maiden name was Bottomley. The children of this marriage, six in number, are altogether omitted in the pedigrees of the family, as they are detailed in the Baronetage of the kingdom. One of the children, a brother of Mrs. Buckley's, Joseph Dukinfield, was educated as a Dissenting minister, but at the suggestion of the then Archbishop of York, who promised to provide for him if he would conform, he was induced so to do, and became Rector of Felix Kirk, in the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, of which living the Archbishop is the patron.

Mr. Buckley was minister nearly forty years, and the subjoined docu-

ment, a copy of one in his handwriting, shews the number and respectability of his congregation.

Baronet . . . . .	1
Esquire . . . . .	1
Gentlemen . . . . .	12
Tradesmen . . . . .	16
Yeomen . . . . .	76
Late comers, labourers, servants, &c.	687
	—
	793
Votes for Knights of the County . . .	96

He has been mentioned as possessing an influence over the manners and conduct of the inhabitants almost unbounded. An old native of the village described it to the present writer in the following manner: "If he shook his stick at the Hall Green, (the place of his residence,) the boys trembled as far as the town lane end" (distant half a mile). His tomb is near that of Mr. Angier, and is inscribed with an epitaph commemorative of his worth and usefulness.

After the loss of Mr. Buckley, a lamentable series of congregational divisions occur, and a manifest want of suitability in the ministers that were chosen to succeed him. Mr. Burgess and Mr. Stopford divided the congregation, but neither of them stayed long. The Rev. R. Robinson was next appointed, who left his previous situation at Congleton to settle here. He seems to have possessed much fondness for appearing before the public as an author. At Congleton he preached a sermon against "Popish Projectors," and drew up a small "Scripture Catechism," both of which he published. He removed from Dukinfield to Dob Lane, near Manchester, and there printed two sermons occasioned by the then high price of corn. This put him to some inconvenience, as it drew upon him the animosity of the interested and rich speculators in that commodity. His next removal was to Hatherlow Chapel, where he entered into an agreement with a Manchester printer, of the name of Whitworth, to edit for him a copy of the Bible. It was to appear in numbers, and he procured a diploma of D. D., that his name might come before the public with more advantage in the title-page of the work. He was interred in his own orchard at the parsonage of Ha-

therlow, where his place of sepulture is yet to be seen.

The next was Mr. Gladstone, a Scotchman, whose extreme culpability in seducing the servant woman of the gentleman in whose house he boarded, soon drove him away. The next was the Rev. Mr. Helme, who came to this place from St. Helens, in Lancashire, and, conformably to the wishes of the congregation, he was induced to resign in favour of the Rev. William Buckley, the only son of their former so much esteemed pastor. Mr. Buckley had quitted trade to which he had been destined, and at a mature age devoted himself to an academical education, for the purpose of healing the divisions of the congregation as their minister. He prosecuted his studies at Daventry, under the care of Dr. Ashworth, then the theological tutor,\* for whose character he always expressed the highest regard. The tea-cup and saucer used by him at Daventry were the constant accompaniment of his breakfast service through the remaining part of his life. His ministerial labours were continued for about twenty-seven years, and like a good pastor elsewhere,

"He ne'er had changed nor wished to change his place."

His studious and sedentary habits in advanced life, rendered him too nervous and unfit to discharge his pastoral duties either with comfort to himself, or that satisfaction he had been accustomed to give to his flock. His resignation, therefore, elevated him in the esteem of those around him. He had through life sustained a most blameless and respectable character, was much esteemed by his brethren in the ministry, and the last mournful office that consigned his remains to the tomb was performed by his most particular friend the late Dr. Barnes. It may be remarked of this congregation generally, that the pastor has always been a character venerated and beloved by them, but the high priest has excited feelings of a contrary description.

Mr. Buckley's successor was a young man of much promise, from the academy at Swansea, the Rev.

\* See Mon. Repos. XVII. 164.

David Davies. Of him much was the hope, and great the encouragement that awaited his exertions. Unfortunately, habits of inebriety, early imbibed, blasted the promise of much utility. He became unfitted for his situation, and, quitting the country, it is said he died abroad. Of the succeeding ministers brief notices will only be given, as they are all alive, and most of them in the regular discharge of their allotted duties elsewhere. The Rev. Thomas Smith quitted this place after a two years' residence, and accepted a similar appointment at Stand, in Pilkington, where the literary society of the neighbourhood contributed for many years to his satisfaction. He published, besides an Essay on Avarice, in prose, two volumes of poetry, containing great evidence of a tender and fervent feeling operating upon a vigorous understanding. He removed from thence to Risley, and from the latter place to Park Lane, near Wigan. Some time ago he quitted his last situation and the ministry together. He now resides in the neighbourhood of Chester, near the place of his nativity, and divides his estimable society, when allured from the bosom of his family, amongst a few select friends long known, and long approved.

He was followed by the Rev. William Tate, who with brighter prospects after a half year's residence here, quitted the place for Chorley, where he now remains.

The next successor was the Rev. James Hawkes. He was the second minister this congregation received from Congleton. Accustomed when quite a youth to the tuition of children, he turned his attention to the instruction of the younger members of his flock, and immediately after his connexion with this society, commenced a Sunday-school. His success in this undertaking was more than he at first could anticipate. In a few years, more children attended than any private room could accommodate, and the necessity of a building to be appropriated to this purpose became every day more apparent. Mr. Hawkes had very judiciously commenced a small fund, accumulated from the children's halfpence who attended the school. This became a nest egg to the larger contributions of

the neighbourhood, and soon after was erected, in 1810, the Dukinfield Sunday-school. He remained long enough to see this design completed, but not to its present extent. Another floor has since been added, consisting of a large room over the whole of the premises, as a farther accommodation to the children, or occasionally a lecture-room for more general purposes. He removed to Lincoln, and carried with him the regrets of a large circle of young friends, many of whom will never forget the advantage his instructions were so well calculated to afford. His present residence is with the congregation at Nantwich.

After Mr. Hawkes, the Rev. Joseph Ashton here commenced his ministerial duties, it being his first settlement with a congregation after the completion of his academical course at York. He possesses many valuable requisites for great public utility, from which the Knutsford society, where he is at present settled, will doubtless derive much advantage.

The present minister is the Rev. John Gaskell, who completed his course of study at the University of Glasgow. His first settlement was at Thorne, then a newly-raised society, through the exertions of Mr. Wright, the Missionary. He united himself with this congregation about four years ago, and has a wide field of usefulness here opened before him.

SIR,

I THINK your correspondent E. (pp. 289, 290) too readily admits the inferential reasoning of Mr. Gurney, which is evidently founded on a misapprehension, or too literal acceptance of Jewish phraseology. If any of the Jews have degenerated in their original opinions concerning God, his Word, and his Messiah, it must be such Jews as Da Costa, his cousin Cappadoce, and other converts to the Platonic doctrine of a tripartite God. As to the pretended discovery of the sentiments of the old Rabbins, "*respecting the Trinity and the divinity of the Messiah,*" the statement involves (like the heading of your correspondent's letter) a taking-for-granted of the very points to be proved; namely, the fact, that the old Jews ever dreamed of any Trinity at all, and the fact that they had any con-

ception of a divinity in the Messiah independent and underived.

The assumption of Mr. Gurney, that the phrase "Son of God" implied, in the understanding of the Jews, divinity, is too vague to be tangible: if he mean, as he no doubt does, independent or absolute divinity, the assertion is confuted by the whole tenor of the Jewish Scriptures: and he might as well contend that Ephraim was God, because Jehovah speaks of him as his son.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with the Jew Trypho, expressly ascribes to him the opinion, which he endeavours to refute, that the Messiah would be simply, as to his nature, man. The early Jewish converts, called Ebionites, thought the same: and so did those among the later Christians, who are styled by their enemies heretics, but who boldly appealed to antiquity against the confusion introduced into church theology, by identifying the Word with the Son of God. The Word, said they, is not the Son of God; he is only an attribute, a faculty, a property of the Divine nature. It is the man Jesus Christ who became the Son of God by the communication of the word. The appellation of Son of God agrees only to the man Jesus, mere man as to his nature, how great soever he was by his gifts.—*Beausobre, Hist. de Manichées, Tom. I. 539.*

It is owing to this confusion that modern theologians, and such of the Jews as reason themselves out of the belief that Jehovah is a God, *with* whom and *beside* whom there is no God, fancy they discover a Trinity in the writings of the old Rabbins. That Christ should be called by the name of Jehovah, or that he should be called the Word of God, is so far from affording a proof that the Jews would therefore consider him as Jehovah or the Word, in the sense of personal existence or natural identity, that it justifies the directly contrary inference.

"It is well known that in the Chaldee paraphrases," says Lardner, "it is very common to put *Mimra* Jehovah, the Word of the Lord, for Jehovah or God:" and he observes, "that the Jewish people, more especially those of them who were most zealous for the law, and most exempt from foreign and philosophical specu-

lations, used this way of speaking commonly; and by *the Word*, or the *Word of God*, understood not a spirit separate from God, but God himself,\* as St. John does."—*History of the Apostles and Evangelists.*

What then is proved by the statement, that "when Hosea says, 'And Jehovah shall save his people by Jehovah their God;' the Targum paraphrases it, 'Jehovah shall save his people by *the Word of Jehovah*?' " They mean precisely the same thing.

No Jew, with his eyes open, could light on the passage of Isaiah, "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth, I have put *my spirit* upon him," and conceive that it was any other spirit but that of God himself, or that the elect, who had it put upon him, or was anointed with it, was himself that spirit. But he would naturally, from the metaphorical and figurative genius of his language, and the custom of speech familiarized to him in the writings of the prophets, consider the anointed servant of Jehovah as one and the same with him, not in nature, but in operation and authority. If Moses was made God to Pharaoh, the Messiah, with far stricter propriety, as to him the spirit was given without measure, would be regarded by the Jews as God to them: his Angel, his Son, and bearing his name: but to say that because Messiah is denominated by the title Jehovah, that he is so denominated "in his pre-existing character," unless it have a reference to his pre-existence in the Divine mind or counsels, is to beg the question.

The thing proved, therefore, by the sentiments and phraseology of the old Rabbins, is simply the use of the idiom *Word of God*, as identical with God's power or spirit, or general attributes; and when the writer speaks of this opinion as so different from that "entertained by Unitarians," his observation can only apply to modern Unitarians, nor to them, indeed, without many exceptions. He has only to look into Lardner's Observations on

\* Lardner refers to Numbers xxiii. 8, rendered in the Targum, "How shall I curse the house of Israel, when *the word* of the Lord has blessed them?"

John, or Priestley's Notes on Scripture, for the evidence that this opinion, so far from differing, is identically the same with theirs.

The triumph is not over the Unitarian doctrine itself, but over the critical refinements of individual Unitarian expositors; as *Simpson, Cappe, Kenrick* and *Mr. Belsham*, who have treated the first chapter of John's Gospel as if it had been newly dug up in the isle of Patmos, and had never exercised the sagacity of Christian antiquity. There must be a sort of basilisk fascination in the spell of verbal criticism, or writers of such general acuteness and knowledge, and such undoubted singleness of intention and zeal for the promotion of the truth, could never, one might suppose, have shut their eyes on the whole body of Jewish philology and antiquities, in order to bring down the spiritual and lofty language of the fourth evangelist to the level of the dry, matter-of-fact, penurious apprehension of modern readers, by explaining away the *Word* into the *Preacher*!

But it seems Mr. Lindsey has rendered *λογος wisdom*, and that is not the term by which *wisdom* is expressed in the Old Testament. So because the term cannot here mean *wisdom*, it can mean nothing connected with the Divine attributes at all! Against the reference to the original creation in this proem, it is urged that *εγενετο* is no where used in the sense of *created*. But if we say all things *were*, or all things *became* by the word, the will, or the power, or the wisdom, or all united of Jehovah, where is the difference? However, the allusion, whether to the material or the new creation, is unimportant, and cannot affect the sense of the term the *Word*; the power of Jehovah, or Jehovah himself, which, in the strong metaphor of the Jewish Evangelist, became flesh, and tabernacled among us, when manifested in Jesus of Nazareth.

I regret that the learned and excellent Dr. Carpenter, a "teacher in Israel," should persist in this properly Socinian interpretation, which I cannot but think impairs the value of his improved edition of "Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel." He has also carried verbal refinement still farther, by the rendering of *εν αρχη*

*ην ο λογος*, In the beginning *he* was the *Word*. "The personal pronoun nominative," says Mathiæ, "is seldom expressed with the verb, except for the sake of emphasis; that is, of clearly marking the person as distinguished from others." Now, if this be not an occasion for emphatical distinction, supposing the application to Christ accurate, where can such ever occur? It seems obvious, that *ο λογος* is the nominative throughout; which also accounts for the so-much-insisted-upon omission of the article before *Θεος* in the last clause: and that the sense is the same as if the words were arranged, *εν αρχη ο λογος ην, και ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον και ο λογος ην (ο) Θεος*. The mere transposition of the words for the sake of elegance has surely no effect in obscuring the signification.

EBION.

*Account of the Establishment of Presbyterianism in Manchester.*

No. VI.\*

Manchester,

November 20, 1823.

SIR,  
I SEND you a continuation of the extracts from the Register of the Presbyterian Classically Meeting in Manchester, in the time of the Commonwealth.

W. JOHNS.

"The 42d Meeteinge at Manchester, March the 12th, 1649.

"4. Mr. Leake, preacher at Prestwich, appeared, according to his summons, and upon his request, hath tyme given him untill the next Classe to give in his answeare to the summons.

"6. Another summons drawn up to require Mr. Rob<sup>t</sup>. Symonds, preacher at Shawe Chappell, to attend the Classis at their next Meeteinge, which will bee the second Tuesday in Aprill next."

I judge no extract necessary from the 43d Meeting.

"The 44th Meeteinge at Manchester, May 14th, anno 1650.

"5. Mr. John Leake promised to bring a testimoniall of the soundness

\* For No. V. see p. 275 of the present volume.

of his doctrine, and of his life and conversation, under the hands of severall Ministers, as also subscribed by several honest men, whereas hee hath lived lately.

“6. Delegates appointed to attend the provincially assemblee at Preston, the first Tuesday in June next.” [*Names omitted.*]

“7. A day of humiliation to be upon Wednesday, the 29th of May instant, to seeke the Lord for the removall of the manifold distractions that lye upon us.

“*The 45th Meeteinge at Manchester, June 11th, 1650.*”

“4. Mr. John Leake did not appeare to bringe in his testimoniall, which was then expected.

“*The 46th Meeteinge at Manchester, July 9th, 1650.*”

“4. Mr. John Leake did not appeare this Classe, as he was then expected.

“5. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Angier are desired to draw up a directory of suspension from the Lord's Supper, in order to excommunication of such persons as have committed scandells, and refuse to give satisfaction.

“*The 47th Meeteinge at Manchester, August 13th, 1650.*”

“4. Mr. Angier, Mr. Hollinworth, Mr. Walker, Mr. Meeke, Ministers, and Robert Hyde, Esq., Thomas Strangewayes, Esq., Thomas Smith and Samuel Birche, Elders, are desired to meete upon Tuesday next, at ten o'clocke in y<sup>e</sup> forenoone, to consider of a directorie for suspension from the Lord's Supper.

“A case of conscience to be resolved. That is: How farre a man may keepe communion with one that is notoriously knowne to hold heresie.

“*The 48th Meeteinge at Manchester, September 10th, 1650.*”

“5. Mr. Hollinworth is desired to revise the directory for suspension from the Lord's Supper.

“*The 49th Meeteinge at Manchester, October the 8th, 1650.*”

“A DIRECTORIE for suspension from the Lord's Supper.

“Whereas, A. B. hath been convinced by witnesses—or his own con-

fession—or both—before the Eldershippe of this congregation, to stand guilty of—adultery—fornication—or the like, they havinge seriously considered the haynousnes and scandalousnesse of the sinne in itself: (*here let some fewe pertinent Scriptures bee produced to prove the greatnesse of the said sinne,*) and the severall aggravateinge circumstances thereof in A. B. (*here let the aggravations bee mentioned*). And haveinge used all Christian and loveinge means to bringe him to the sight of, and godly sorrowe for his greevouse sinne, (*here the means used by the Eldershippe may bee speatified in case of his appearance or non-appearance,*) by which God is greatly dishonoured, his soule endangered, the rest of the church grieved and offended, and occasion given to others to speake evill of the wayes of God; yet not perceiveinge that godly sorrowe which worketh repentance to life, and a readinesse and willingenesse to give suitable satisfaction, have in the name and power of the Lord Jesus Christ, accordinge to theire duty, and y<sup>e</sup> merrit of his sine and carriage, Juditallie suspended him from y<sup>e</sup> holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper, wayteinge and prayinge, that God would open his eyes, touche his heart, mightily convince and humble him, and renew repentance in him, and earnestly desire you, in the bowells of the Lord Jesus Christ, to help forward the worke of God, to pitie him, and pray for him, that (if it bee possible) there may be no necessitie of proceedinge to a further and heavier censure against him.

“*The 50th Meeteinge at Manchester, November the 12th, 1650.*”

“4. Mr. Warden did give an account of the Provincially Assemblee at Preston.

“5. A note to bee sent to the severall Ministers and Elders within this Classe, to the end it may appeare, wherefore they do not acte so freely in the government as formerly.

“*The 51st Meeteinge at Manchester, December 10th, 1650.*”

“5. It is ordered that a day of humiliation shall be upon Thursday, the 26th of December instant, in severall congregations within this Classe, in

reference to the cryeing sines of the tymes, and people's generall unaffectednes therewith, notwithstandinge the judgements of God hangeing over our heade and upon us, and particularly the fever that is rife and mortall in severall places, and the unseasonableness of the weather.

*" The 52d Meeteinge at Manchester, January 14th, 1651.*

" 4. The particuar Eldershipps are desired to" [give notice to] " their respective members, that they are required to shew cause why they doe fall off from their offices.

*" The 53d Meeteinge at Manchester, February 11th, 1651.*

" 4. Agreed that the names of all such Elders as are appointed to attend the Classe shall be recorded in writinge.

" 5. Agreed that a publicke fast-day be observed at Manchester the last Wednesday of February instant.

" 6. Agreed likewise that another fast be observed at Prestwich upon Wednesday the 12th day of March next. The grounds of both these fasts are, the great and cryeing sines of the tymes, the heavie judgments of God upon us, and hangeinge over our heads, and the generall sencelessness of people under both sin and judgment.

" 7. It is agreed that there bee an exercise kept in everie congregation within this Classe successively as this Classe shall appoint.

*" A Coppie of a Warrant.*

" By vertue of an order of the Provinciaall Assemblie at Preston, Novemb. 5, 1650, Wee, the first Classis of the Province of Lancaster, doe require you the Minister and Elders of . . . . . to demand of . . . . . one of your Elders, the reason of his withdraweing from the duty of his office, or of his absentinge from the Eldershippe, that you may certifie us thereof, and we may give account thereof to the Provinciaall Assemblie, as we are required.

*" The 54th Meeteinge at Manchester, March 11th, 1651.*

" 4. The persons delegated to review the Register are." [The names

*of six Ministers and seven Elders sub-joined, omitted.]*

" 5. Mr. Clayton, Minister at Didsbury, did withdraw from the Classis, and departed out of the Classis, without any order from the Classis.

" 6. Mr. Hollinworth and Mr. Johnson are desired to goe to Flixton to speak to Mr. Woolmer and the Elders there, to demand their reason of withdrawing from their offices, and absenting themselves from the Classis.

*" The 55th Meeteinge at Manchester, Aprill 8th, 1651.*

" 4. It is ordered that whosoever from henceforth absente himself from the Classis, that is deputed thereunto, without giveinge a sufficient excuse, shall be admonished.

" 5. Mr. Hollinworth and Thomas Edge are further desired to goe to Flixton to speake to Master Woolmer and the Elders there, to demand the reason of their withdrawinge from their offices, and absentinge themselves from the Classe.

" 6. A letter sent to Mr. John Lake, in reference to his forbearinge y<sup>e</sup> administration of y<sup>e</sup> Lord's Supper." (*Interlined.*) " Mr. Lake did appeare this Classis.

" 7. A COPPIE OF THE LETTER sent unto Mr. John Lake.

" ' Sir,

" ' It being evident to us that you doe officiate within this Classis without approbation obtained or sought, and you having declared that your resolution is to administer the Supper of the Lord with the professed neglect of the Eldershippe chosen and constituted in that congregation, and by your solitarie power, will admitt to, and suspend from the Supper; wee beinge very sensible of your irregular walkeinge herein, to the rule of the word, and expresse command of the civill authoritie, do (in tender respect to the glory of God, the purity of the ordinance, and good of the people), intreate and require you to forbear such administration of the Supper, and to entertaine a brotherly conference with us, accordinge to the motion we made to you, (though at present refused by you,) that we may, through the blessinge of God, satisfie the scruples that hinder your orderly and regular acting with us, both in the congrega-



tion and Classis. Thus perswadeinge ourselves of your Christian and brotherly carriage in the particulars mentioned, wee committ you to God and rest: Yours,

“ Subscribed in the name and by the appointment of the Classis, etc.

“ By JAMES WALTON,  
“ Moderator.

“ A COPPIE OF THE LETTER of summons sent to Mr. Valentyne.

“ SIR,

“ Forasmuch as this Classe take notice that you have officiated at Ellinbrooke a longe tyme, and yet are not ordayned, they doe signifie to you, that they cannot approve of your officiateinge there any longer, except you tender yourselfe to ordination; and therefore doe desire and expecte that at their next meetinge, you do come so prepared as is required by the rules in the ordinance for ordination, that so they may forthwith proceed to the tryall and examination of you in reference thereunto.

“ *The 56th Meeteinge at Manchester, May 13<sup>o</sup>. An<sup>o</sup>. 1651.*

“ 2. Ouldham, no Minister nor Elder.

“ 3. The Minister and Elders at Flixton returned their answers in writing, but it was judged by the Ministers and Elders in this Classe not satisfactory, and therefore a conference is appointed to be had with them y<sup>e</sup> 10th of June. [*Here follows the appointment of two ministers and two elders.*]

“ 10. The Classe beinge informed that Mr. John Lake had administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, notwithstandinge their admonition to him to the contrary, they therefore desired the Elders of Ouldham to bringe in what witnesses they could, against their next meetinge, to prove that; that they might proceed against him by censure.

“ 11. Evan Clarke is appointed to goe to Mr. Odcroft, and to tell him that the Classe expect his attendance the second Tuesday in June next; as also, to speake to Mr. Benson, to see what he can say concerninge the course Mr. Odcroft holds in makinge clandestine weddings, baptizeinge

children, and concerninge his life and conversation.

“ *The 57th Meeteinge at Manchester, June 10th, 1651.*

“ 3. Ouldham, no Minister; Samuel Crofield, John Worrall, Elders.

“ 5. Witnesses appeared concerninge Mr. John Lake administeringe y<sup>e</sup> Lord's Supper.

“ 6. Caleb Broadhead, aged about 34 yeares, examined upon oath sayth; That tooe severall Saboath dayes, about y<sup>e</sup> second and third Saboath after Easter, which were the 13th and 20th of Aprill, 1651—beinge at Ouldham Church those twoe Saboath dayes, hee sawe the Communion Table spread, and flagons on the table, in preparation for the Lord's Supper, as hee conceives; and that he heard Mr. Lake speake these words, or words to the like effect, the afternoon of the first day; that forasmuch as he had given warneinge for persons to be examined before they were admitted to the sacrament, his intent was onely of strangers which was not of his owne congregation, and hee desired such as kept away upon that ground would come the next Saboath and communicate with him, for he stood not upon that formalitie of examination,

“ 7. John Worrall, of Ouldham, in the Countie of Lancaster, aged about 66, deposed and saith, that to the best of his now remembrance, the first Saboath day after Mr. Lake, Minister at Ouldham, had been before the Classis at Manchester, hee beinge at Ouldham in the afternoone of the said day, hee there sawe the Communion Table covered, and vessels thereon, as hee conceived in preparation to the Lord's Supper; and as hee, this deponent, heard the number of the communicants were but few, and hee beinge there in the afternoone, he heard the said Mr. Lake publicly say to the congregation, that he did conceive that the people were mistaken, touching the warneinge given by him for examination, for his intent and meaneinge was that yonge folks, that had not formerly received the sacrament, and strangers, should have come to have been examined, and not others.

“ 8. Evan Clarke brought Mr. Od-

croft's answer in writing, and it was deferred to the next monthly meeting.

"The 58th Meeting at Manchester, July 8th, 1651.

"3. Mr. Warden is desired to request the assistance of some Justice of Peace, in relation to ordinance of Parliament concerning Mr. Odcroft's contempt of the Classe.

"4. Mr. Smith is desired to speak to Mr. Valentyne, and withall to request him to come to Manchester, to confer with Mr. Warden and Mr. Hollinworth.

"5. Agreed that warrants be sent forthwith to require some witnesses to come before the Classe, to testify what they can concerning Mr. Odcroft.

"The 59th Meeting at Manchester, August 12<sup>o</sup>, 1651.

"2. Ouldham, no Minister, no Elder.

"3. The business of the last Classe was deferred, because much thereof did relate to Mr. Warden, and he unexpectedly called away.

"THE CLASSE did not meet in the month of September, 1651."

No reason is assigned for this interruption.

W. J.

Islington,

November 4, 1823.

SIR,  
**M**USING upon this day being the anniversary of the landing of William at Torbay, 1688, by which the rights and liberties of the British subject were secured, I could not help feeling grateful that the family of the Stuarts were never suffered to return for the destruction of them. Neither the Rebellion of 1715 nor of 1745 succeeded. In the suppression of these memorable insurrections, our Dissenting forefathers took an active part, and the Brunswick family were sensible of their merits on these occasions. Job Orton, in his *Life of Doddridge*, mentions this good man going about and enlisting young men out of his congregation, in the year 1745. But the following circumstance has recently come to my knowledge; it is a note, found in the *History of the Rebellion, 1715*, by the Rev. Peter

Rae, a work not now much known but marked by information and integrity.

"We have it from several good hands, that upon this day's march, (Nov. 12, 1715,) Mr. Wood and Mr. Walker, two Dissenting Ministers in Lancashire, came to General Wills, while he was yet some few miles from Preston, and told him they had a considerable party of men well armed for his Majesty's service, and that they were ready to take any part his Excellency was pleased to assign them. As soon as he knew who they were, and had seen their men, he told them that after he was come to Preston he would assign them a post. Accordingly, when he arrived there he made the necessary disposition for an attack, and sent back to tell them to keep the bridge of Ribble, to prevent the Rebels escaping that way, or their friends coming from that side to join them. This they did with so much courage and bravery, that the General regretted afterwards that he had not assigned them a better post. However, we are told that after the General went up to London, he was pleased to notify their good conduct on that occasion to Government, who generously settled upon them £100 per annum."

It is well known that the Rebels were surrounded in Preston, and taken so effectually, that it put a speedy end to the insurrection. Thus the Protestant Dissenters, though not the blind and indiscriminate admirers of all the measures of Government, have within them the seeds of genuine loyalty. This numerous and respectable body of religionists can, on a proper emergency, rush forth, and, buckling on their armour, aid the cause as well as swell the triumphs of civil and religious liberty. The patriotism of these two Dissenting Ministers entitles them to a niche in the temple of fame; their deeds should occupy a page in the annals of their country. Indeed, their well-directed ardour in so good a cause, when thousands of Catholics, and even Churchmen, stood aloof, ought, with every due encomium, to descend to posterity.

Pray, Mr. Editor, can any of your Lancashire correspondents give any information of Messieurs Wood and

Walker, of what denomination, and for how long a time their militant zeal met with its appropriate reward?

J. EVANS.

Mr. Marsom on the Efficacy of the Death of Christ.

[Concluded from p. 643.]

THE apostle contrasting the two covenants, the law and the gospel, styles the one, i. e. the law, "the letter which killeth," of which, he says, they were not made the ministers, but of the other, the new covenant, "the spirit," i. e. the gospel, that spiritual dispensation "which giveth life." The one he calls "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," referring to the two tables of the covenant, on which the ten commandments were written, which he says *was to be done away*. The other he calls "the ministration of the spirit." The one, "the ministration of condemnation," the other, "the ministration of righteousness;" and he shews that the glory of the gospel, the ministration of the spirit and of righteousness, was far superior to that of the law, the ministration of death and condemnation. The latter, he says, *was done away, was abolished*, but the former, i. e. the gospel, *remaineth*.<sup>\*</sup> The apostle, in this passage, explicitly and expressly affirms that the law, the *old covenant*, is *abolished and done away*; and this he affirms not merely and exclusively of the ceremonial law, but he affirms it of the decalogue, the law *written and engraven in stones*, which was the ministration of death and condemnation: but as the ceremonial law was not *written and engraven in stones*, nor was it the law of death, what he here says cannot apply to it, but only to the *two tables* containing the ten commandments, which were the *covenant made with Israel at Mount Sinai*, and deposited in the ark, which is called the *ark of the covenant*. Again, when Paul says, that "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus had made him free from the law of sin and death," to what law does he refer? Not to the *ceremonial law*, but to the law contained in the dec-

logue. "I had not known sin," says he, "but by the law, for I had not known *lust*, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet;'" for, "Thou shalt not covet" was a prohibition of the *moral law*, and not of the *ceremonial*. Besides, what benefit would the believing Jews have derived from the abolition of the *ceremonial law* only? If the moral law still remained in force, they would have been left under the *curse*, and in a state of *condemnation*; for it is not the ceremonial, but the *moral law*, the breach of which is threatened with a *curse*.

Such was the severity of the law, that it made no provision for the pardon of the guilty, but pronounced a *curse* for every transgression. But, says the apostle,<sup>\*</sup> "Christ hath redeemed us (qr. bought us off) from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is *every one* that hangeth on a tree." "But how are we delivered from the law by Christ being made a curse, or dying an accursed death? Why plainly thus: as he hereby put an end to the *obligation of the Jewish law*, which pronounced a *curse* on every one who did not in all things continue to observe it, by introducing and establishing a better covenant into the world, even that covenant which God made with Abraham, of which this was the principal article, that faith should be imputed to him for righteousness:"† the introducing of that new covenant superseding the old covenant, the law of Moses, and doing away its condemning power. Were the benefits and blessings of this redemption, then, to be confined to those who were under the law? Were they redeemed merely for their own sakes? Far otherwise. The law was the barrier that prevented the introduction of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God; for their sakes, therefore, it was necessary that it should be removed. "Christ," says the apostle, "hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, that the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the spirit through

\* Gal. iii. 13.

† Dr. Chandler, cited in Balsham on the Epistles of Paul.

faith." Again, he says, "that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and that *the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy.*" Paul, who was the minister of the Gentiles, kept this circumstance perpetually in view. It was the great "mystery of the gospel which had been kept secret from the foundation of the world, but was now made manifest by the appearing of Jesus Christ." Now this could not be accomplished without the abolition of the law, which shut the Gentiles out from all *interest* in, and *participation* of the *blessing of Abraham.*

The writer to the Hebrews further established this important doctrine. He says,\* "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that *through death* he might *destroy* him that had the *power of death*, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through *fear of death* were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily *he* (rather *it*, the fear of death) taketh not hold of angels; but of the seed of Abraham *he* (*it*) taketh hold."†

The word rendered *destroy*, means to *abolish*, *annul*, make *useless* or of *none effect*. The *power of death*, evidently, I think, means, the *unlimited, universal power of death*. This seems manifest from that *universal fear*, at least with respect to the seed of Abraham, which this power is represented as producing, deliverance from which, is here said to be the great object of the death of Christ. Now it is certain that such a power cannot be possessed by any being, in heaven or earth, except that Being who is the Author of life, and with whom alone are the issues of death. In him it exists, and cannot exist any where else, unless communicated by him. But we no where read that HE has communicated such a power to any *being* whatever. Is it possible, then, to suppose that God would invest such a *being* as the *Devil* is supposed to be, the implacable enemy of God and man, with such a power? Impossible. From these observations,

I think, it will appear that the law is here personified as the *accuser* who had the *power of death*, to which the word *abolish* will naturally apply, but not so naturally to a real person; which law indeed had the *power of death*, of which it was the *ministration*. The word *diabolos*, translated *the Devil*, literally means *the accuser*, and our Lord himself thus personifies the law of Moses: "There is *one*," says he to the Jews, "who *accuseth* you, Moses, in whom ye trust." This clause, therefore, should be rendered, "that through death he might *abolish* him that had the power of death, that is, the *accuser.*" Hence also we see the propriety of the writer's ascribing the fear of death produced by the law, to the *seed of Abraham*, to whom only the law was given, and who were under it. How, then, did he deliver them from the fear of death? Evidently by *taking away sin*, which is the *sting of death*, and by *abolishing the law*, which is the *strength of sin*. If, then, we are right in the interpretation of this passage, and I think we are, it expressly asserts that the death of Jesus Christ had for its object the abolition of the law, that by so doing he might deliver them, who, through fear of death, were perpetually subject to bondage. The covenant from Mount Sinai, says Paul, *gendereth to bondage*; through the fear of death which it pronounces for every transgression. Through the gospel we receive, not the spirit of *bondage* again to *fear*, but the spirit of *adoption*, whereby we cry *Abba, Father*. Therefore the apostle tells the Romans, that sin shall not have dominion over them. Why? Because its power is taken away by the death of Christ; for, he adds, ye are not under the law, but under grace, i. e. the gracious dispensation of the gospel. There is therefore *now*, since Christ hath died for sins, no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus; for, he adds, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the *law of sin and death*.

Hence we see the force and propriety of those strong expressions of Scripture, "When he had by himself *purged our sins*, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. But now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to *put away*

\* Chap. ii. 14—16.

† See margin.

sin by the sacrifice of himself. But this man after he had offered *one sacrifice for sin*, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." All this, as we have seen, refers to the PAST transgressions of mankind, the sin of the world which the Lamb of God was to take away, by which all men are brought into a state of privilege, the kingdom of God opened, and all invited to partake of its blessings and promises.

If, then, Christ died to put away the former transgressions of mankind only, and not their future offences, it may be asked, How were their future sins to be done away? To what are we now to look for the remission of sins and justification in the sight of God? I answer, not to atoning blood; not to the death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice; not to his vicarious sufferings, the innocent in the room and stead of the guilty, or to the imputation of his righteousness to us for our justification; but to the riches of the divine grace and mercy exhibited in the new and better covenant, by which the old covenant has been superseded and done away; through which the God of peace brought again our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and which has been ratified by his blood, with which he is figuratively represented as entering into heaven itself, triumphantly, as it were, carrying with him the seal of the new and everlasting covenant which he died to establish; there to appear in the presence of God for us; which is what is meant, and all perhaps that is meant, by his being an advocate with the Father, and by his ever living to make intercession for us. And as it is said of Moses, that when he had spoken every precept unto the people according to the law, he sprinkled with blood both the book and all the people saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you; so the blood of Christ, the blood of the new covenant, is represented as sprinkled on the conscience, purging it from dead works to serve the living God.

The old covenant was surrounded with terrors, guarded with threatenings of condemnation and death; and so terrible was it, that Moses said, I

exceedingly fear and quake, and the people of Israel could not endure that which was commanded. Whereas the new covenant has none of these terrors, but is a proclamation of the exceeding riches of the grace and love of God to mankind, and of free, full and unpurchased forgiveness to all, upon no other condition than that of receiving it, and submitting to the terms of that covenant. It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached (proclaimed) in his name among all nations. Accordingly, Paul, in addressing the people at Antioch in Pisidia, having stated that God had raised Jesus from the dead, and that they were his witnesses unto the people, he opens to them the nature and terms of the new covenant established in the blood of Christ. "We declare unto you," says he, "glad tidings, how that the promise made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again. Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses.\* Thus Jesus having died, cancelled the old covenant, redeemed the transgressions that were under it, and brought the Gentiles who were afar off, nigh unto God. And God, having reconciled the world to himself, by the blood of his cross, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and having, as the God of peace, brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, he sent forth his apostles to open and proclaim this dispensation of grace and mercy, preaching repentance and remission of sins, not through the merits of Christ or his righteousness as a substitute for our unrighteousness; but in his name and upon the ground of the covenant established in his blood. This dispensation of grace, which was kept secret since the world began, but now made manifest, was, says

\* Acts xiii. 32, 33, 38.

the apostle, by the commandment of the everlasting God, to be published among all nations for the obedience of faith.

From the foregoing observations, we learn that the efficacy of the blood of Christ, and all the benefits arising from it to mankind, is to be attributed to it, not as the *blood of atonement*, which it is never said to be in the New Testament, but to its being that blood by which the new covenant is confirmed.

Let us now take a view of the covenant itself, in which we are so deeply interested, and upon which our hope of pardon and salvation rests. The writer to the Hebrews, comparing Christ with Moses, the Mediator of the first covenant, says,\* "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for *the second*. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." How great and precious are the promises of this covenant! How full of grace and mercy! It contains no denunciations of wrath, no sentence of condemnation for every offence, but the absolute promise of forgiveness. Well might this writer

style it a better covenant than the first, and established upon better promises. Let us embrace it with our whole heart, and, having such promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God; for if\* "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted *the blood of the covenant*, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace!"

JOHN MARSOM.

SIR,  
A NOTE in pp. 36, 37, of Mr. Kentish's excellent Sermon delivered at Bristol, has drawn forth from their concealment a few remarks on a passage in Dr. Paley's Natural Theology which I wrote some time ago, and had almost forgotten. Towards the conclusion of the chapter on the Unity of the Deity we read as follows: "Certain, however, it is, that the whole argument for the Divine unity goes no farther than to an unity of counsel." This observation was evidently intended to guard against a conclusion which might otherwise have been drawn from the chapter in which it is found. What that conclusion is, admits of but little doubt. But could the Archdeacon's work fall into the hands of a man who had never heard of three persons in one God, the above remark would perplex him to some purpose. In reading the work up to this very observation, he would find that the author's object was to prove the existence of a mind by which the universe was contrived and executed; and nothing would be farther from his thoughts than the suspicion that more minds than one were concerned in the design. When, moreover, he should recollect the chapter on the personality of the Deity, and the remarkable words with which it concludes; "Design must have had a designer; that designer must have been a *person*; that person is God;"

\* Heb. viii. 6—12.

\* Chap. x. 28, 29.

and should also advert a second time to the title of the chapter in which the above remark is found, namely, on the Unity of the Deity, what would be his surprise on being told that nothing more was meant by this unity than a unity of counsel! A unity of counsel! he would say, between whom and what? Between God and himself? Or between one God, and certain other gods possessing the same essence and the same attributes? The first interpretation he would reject as meaning nothing, and the second he would consider as set aside by the combined force of the two chapters on the personality and the Unity of the Deity, in which it seemed to be proved that God is one intelligent agent or person.

"The whole argument for the Divine unity goes no farther than to an unity of counsel." If by unity of counsel we are to understand, according to the natural meaning of the words, an agreement of purpose between more minds than one, it may be justly observed, that nature gives evidence of *no such thing*. Nor, indeed, is it possible that mere uniformity of design should suggest the notion of more than one designing mind. To say then that the argument for the Divine unity goes no farther than to an unity of counsel, is to say, that it goes no farther than that to which it neither does nor can go. In one sense, indeed, of the word *counsel*, Dr. Paley's observation is true enough; since uniformity of design, *in itself considered*, proves only unity of will or purpose. But when it is allowed that nature points to one Creator alone,\* and Dr. Paley's reasonings have proved that Creator to be a person, nothing seems more clear than that, according to the evidence of nature, God is one great and undivided Mind. But this is a conclusion which Dr. Paley seems to have been unwilling to admit. And, if I understand him rightly, to guard against this conclusion he has emphatically said, "*Certain, however, it is, that the whole argument for the Divine unity goes no farther than to an unity of counsel.*" In other words, *the whole argument for the Divine unity*

by no means proves that God is one; or as Dr. Paley would probably have interpreted his own remark, by no means disproves a plurality of persons in the Godhead. But would it not have been more just to say, that though uniformity of design does not in itself demonstrate, that not more than one mind was concerned in the work of creation, yet when we come to consider the attributes which we must ascribe to a self-existent Being, we see sufficient reason to conclude that God is one undivided and indivisible intelligence? But without this species of reasoning, Dr. Paley's remarks in his incomparable chapter on the personality of the Deity, are quite sufficient to establish this conclusion. He observes that, "in whatever mind resides, there is a person." And what he meant by the term *person*, is manifest from the definition which he afterwards gives of the Deity as a "perceiving, intelligent, designing Being." But as wherever mind resides there is a person, if there is more than one mind and consequently more than one person in the Deity, then, according to Dr. Paley, God consists of more than one intelligent and designing Being, which few will choose to acknowledge.

Should any one say that I have taken advantage of the use which Dr. Paley has made of the term *person*, I answer, that when he defined God to be a person, and also an intelligent Being, he spoke the language of reason and common sense; and if there is a theological hypothesis with which this language is at variance, let those look to it whom it may concern.

I cannot dismiss the subject without expressing my conviction that no Trinitarian, when reading the Natural Theology of Paley, ever conceived of God as consisting of more than one person; nor do I believe that the mind of the writer was ever fixed on more than one person, except it was when he penned the sentence which I have been considering. Indeed, I question not but that Trinitarians universally, except when their minds are engaged on their particular doctrine, or when they are contemplating what they call the scheme of redemption, annex the same idea to the term God which the Unitarian annexes to it, that of one great Intelligence which first created

\* Natural Theology, p. 483.

and now governs and pervades the universe. On the other hand, when they reflect on the divinity of Christ as distinct from that of the Father, I have no doubt but that if they were to analyze their ideas, they would find that they conceive of two Gods as distinct in their attributes as in the offices which their system allots to them. Of the Holy Spirit as a separate person, I am persuaded that the idea seldom presents itself at all.

E. COGAN.

SIR,

Nov. 3, 1823.

I HAVE already observed (p. 571) that the Gnostic impostors changed the name Χριστος into Χρηστος, with the double view of characterising him as a *good demon*, and his doctrine as *useful*. To this interpretation Justin Martyr, Apol. I. p. 6, thus alludes, ὅσον τε ἐκ τῆς κατηγορουμένου ἡμῶν ονοματὸς χρηστοτάτοι ὑπαρχομεν, i. e. from the mere name which is imputed to us as a crime, we are the most excellent. In the next page he calls the Christians Χρηστῖανοι, and he then adds, "To hate, *Chreston*, what is good is not just." To this signification Tertullian (Apol. cap. iii.) also alludes when he thus writes concerning the Christian name: De suavitate vel benignitate compositum: oditur itaque in hominibus *innocuis* nomen *innocuum*. Eusebius refers to the same interpretation, in styling it παντιμος και ενδοξος προσηγορια. H. E. lib. v. cap. i. Lactantius ascribes the change to the ignorance of the Greeks, Qui propter ignorantium errorem, eum immutata litera *Chrestum* solent dicere. Lib. iv. c. 7. But Lactantius is himself to be charged with ignorance or rather with duplicity; for he could not but know, that an alteration in the name, calculated to screen our Lord from unmerited odium, or to express his character as a superior being, must have originated with those who at least pretended to be friends of Christ. His enemies, however, applied to him the name thus altered. For Suetonius thus designates him in his life of Claudius, cap. xxv. Moreover, Lucian in a book entitled *Philopatris*, represents Critias as asking Triphon, who professed to be a Christian, "Whether the affairs of the Christians were recorded in heaven," and receiving for answer, "All nations are there recorded, since

*Chrestus* exists even among the Gentiles." Julian the Apostate in derision of the Evangelist John, whom he supposes to have first taught the divinity of Christ, calls him Χρηστος Ιωαννης, *the demonizing John*. And finally, Aristides the Sophist, in a passage known to refer to the followers of Jesus, (see Lardner, Vol. VIII. p. 85,) stigmatizes them as παντων αχρηστοτατοι, *the most worthless of all men*.

Now, it is my object to shew that the Apostle Paul in two places has an obvious reference to the above interpretation of the word Χριστος. The first is in Philipp. i. 21, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain," where the parallelism requires Χριστος, in the sense of Χρηστον, to correspond with κερδος.

Onesimus was a slave of Philemon, a friend of Paul, and his brother in Christ. While at Rome, that person was converted to Christianity by the Apostle, who being now in chains, and as such having occasion for his service, detained him for some time from his master, and then sent him back with this letter as an apology to Philemon, "I beseech thee, in behalf of my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds, and whom I again send back to thee, receive him as my own bowels." His argument is this: "As Onesimus, while yet a stranger to Christ, was a mere eyeservant driven by fear and compulsion, and therefore worthless to his master, so by imbibing the spirit of Christ, he is now become a faithful and valuable servant—τον ποτε σοι αχρηστον, νυνι δε σοι και εμοι ευχρηστον, i. e. τον ποτε, ως αχρηστον οντα σοι αχρηστον, νυνι δ', ως εν Χριστω σοι και εμοι ευχρηστον. The paronomasia is perceptible only to those who understand Greek, and cannot be translated into any modern language.

Every contribution of Mr. Cogan to the Repository I peruse with pleasure, as the production of an amiable man and accomplished scholar. That in the last, notified in the title-page as "Mr. Cogan on a Criticism of Porson's," more than usually excited my curiosity. But I confess that I was somewhat disappointed, when I saw that it consisted only of the assertion that *αμπαλλετς*, the reading of Porson, was wrong, and that, if it



were the right reading, he should adopt Porson's interpretation. Mr. C. would have done more justice to himself and have been more edifying to his readers, if he had given us "more reasons than one for this opinion." Now, I will give my reasons for thinking that Porson's reading is right and that his interpretation is wrong, and this I shall do with as little intention as Mr. Cogan, to detract from the just reputation attained by that "prince of critics." The passage in Orestes 316, is, *αἰ τε τὸν ἄνατον αἰθερ' ἀμπαλλετε*. Here as the connected noun is in the accusative, the natural construction requires an active verb, "Ye, who shake the expansive air;" and this accords with the object of the poet, who wishes the reader to infer the violence of the furies in pursuit of their victims, by their throwing the whole expanse of the atmosphere into agitation. Hence, Potter in his elegant and vigorous translation, renders the clause, "Ye shake the affrighted air." But if the right reading be the middle form, *ἀμπαλλεσθε*, it must signify to fly, as the Latin version has it, *per latum aerem volatis*, a sense which the verb cannot have but by implication. Besides, a foreign word (*κατα*) must be borrowed to account for the contraction, and a circuitous phraseology is introduced which must weaken, if it be not foreign to the object of the writer. But, says Porson, simplex *παλλω*, medio sensu occurrit, *Elect.* 438. This appears to me to contain a two-fold mistake; first, because *παλλω* is not the verb there used, and secondly, because the active used for the middle voice is an anomaly utterly unknown to the Greek language, unless, indeed, as is the case with *ωγα*, *εχω*, *φερω*, when used in the active voice, the reflex pronoun be understood. In the passage to which Porson refers, Euripides represents the dolphin not as bounding around the ships, but as jumping against the side of the prows as it were to climb, to dance on deck with the mariners to the sound of the flute in which he delighted. Hence, *παλλω* is for *επιπλω* from *επι* *πλω*, with *ἑαυτον* implied—the dolphin caused himself to jump, and this is evident from *πρωπι* in the same clause, which depends on *επιπλω*, combined with the verb, and which otherwise has no le-

gitimate government. Besides, the noun *πλω*, which corresponds to *πλω*, occurs in the context, which occurrence seems to be the effect of association. Had the verb used been *ωγα*, and not *επιπλω*, the ensuing noun would probably have been *πλω*. In line 476 of the same play, *επιπλων* is again used for *επιπλω*, (which is, perhaps, the true reading,) and *δραμα* is implied. The critics render the word here by "currebant," a version which miserably fritters away the sense of the poet, who paints the velocity of the chariot to the imagination of the reader, by representing the horses as causing it to rebound from the ground in the impetuosity of their speed.

J. JONES.

Nov. 29, 1823.

Notes on Passages in the New Testament.

**M**ATT. xxvii. 50: "Jesus, when he had cried again, with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost" [*αφηκε το πνευμα*]; in Mark xv. 37, and Luke xxiii. 46, *εφηνευσε, εφηνευσεν*; in John xix. 30, *παρεδωκε το πνευμα*. There is an abundance of examples in the classical Greek writers, to prove that the phrase describes simply the act of "dying, or expiring." But a far greater stress may fairly be laid on a text in the Septuagint Version, Gen. xxxv. 18, where Rachel's death has been represented in these words, *εν τω αφηνατ αυτην την ψυχην*; and a similar mode of speaking occurs in Isa. liii. 12.

That Jesus voluntarily shortened his sufferings on the cross, is an opinion, which, if true, and if justly pursued, would lead to the most revolting, absurd and dangerous conclusions. By the late Dr. Price it was once entertained: but with his characteristic impetuosity, he afterwards and publicly avowed, that he considered it as destitute of all support. In vain is an appeal made to John x. 17, 18, "Therefore hath my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it

\* Appendix to Sermons on the Christian Doctrine, &c., Note Ff.

down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." \* These words of our Lord were verified in his willing surrender of himself into the hands of his enemies: he would not avert his death, by the exercise of his miraculous endowments in his own defence, but was an unresisting victim, Matt. xxvi. 53—55. Thus, and thus only, he laid down his life, that he might take it again. The "strong cry," † which he sent forth, just before he expired, is no proof that he dismissed his breath before the vital principle was subdued. In circumstances like his, shrieks are sometimes the result of a convulsive effort of nature, and have been known to precede immediately the moment of dissolution. Let me transcribe the judicious and excellent note of J. G. Rosenmüller on Mark xv. 39—"Interpunge: ὅτι οὕτως, κραξας ἐξεπνευσεν, quod ita, (ut nempe comm. 33, 34, 37, dictum) clamore edito expirasset. Non clamor (hic enim non plane insolitus moribundis) sed miracula, de quibus paulo ante dictum, in admirationem rapuerunt centurionem." I will add, that our Saviour's language—"it is finished—into thy hands," &c.—appears to have followed his "loud voice," or shriek.

John xvii. 3: "—— the only true God." † This appellation is explained by the parallel text in 1 Thess. i. 9: "—— ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God;" which passage Hallet has overlooked, in his observations on the phrase. According to that ingenious and learned annotator, § "the expression, *The only true God*, signifies the same as the alone most high, or supreme, God. The true God signifies the same as the chief God, *The God*, by way of emphasis, *the God* in the most famous and extraordinary sense." In this criticism I cannot acquiesce. The sovereign dominion of God would seem to imply his Unity: and it were pleonastic to speak

of him as "the alone most high." Nor is the description, "the true God," identical with "the chief God," but conveys a far more interesting and magnificent idea. To us Christians, there is, literally and absolutely, one God, and no other than He: all besides, who have been so called, are nothing. We dishonour, though unintentionally, the Being whom we adore, when we declare simply that he is "the God, by way of emphasis, the God in the most famous and extraordinary sense:" for the Scriptures go much further. \* "Those places of the New Testament," which Hallet cites, are irrelevant to his purpose: in none of them is the word *true* employed "in a like manner as in this text." Our Saviour, in Luke xvi. 11, contrasts "the unrighteous mammon," i. e. the deceitful, precarious riches of this world, with the *true*, or durable, riches of heaven. In John i. 9, the Evangelist opposes the *true*, the everlasting, light of Christian knowledge, to all material light; as, in John vi. 32, our Lord does the manna received by the Israelites, a temporary and perishable food, to the vital nourishment supplied by his own instructions. So, *the true vine*, John xv. 1, is that which endures for ever, and fails not to refresh the mind: *the true tabernacle*, or *sanctuary*, Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24, is the church of Christ, permanent and stable, in contradistinction to the convention-tent of the Hebrews; it is, figuratively, the "house of prayer for all nations." Even if this class of texts stated, or implied, a comparison of what is chief and eminent with what is greatly inferior—and not a comparison of what is earthly and fleeting with what is spiritual, heavenly and immortal—still, John xvii. 3, does not belong to them: here the phrase is, "The ONLY true God." Now he alone is the *true* God, who is the ever-living God: consequently, the passage before us does not place in contrast a Supreme God and a secondary or subordinate God, but *the only* God and the idolvanities of the Heathens. †

\* Grot. on Matt. xxvii. 50, Benson's *Life of Christ*, p. 514.

† Doddridge's *Expos.*, in loc.

‡ Gerard's *Institutes*, &c., 2d ed., pp. 321, 322.

§ Notes, &c., Vol. I. pp. 14, 15.

\* "The God of gods," in Psa. cxxxvi. 2, is "the Lord of magistrates," &c.

† See Hosea ii. 1, in the original, and Bahrdt's Note on it; *App. Critic.* in loc.

1 Cor. iii. 2: "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for you were not then able to receive it; neither are ye even yet able." On this declaration Mr. Belsham (Translation, &c., in loc.) pertinently asks, "Qu. What was that meat which the Corinthians could not digest? that doctrine which they could not receive?" Doubtless, we can only conjecture, what it was; and there is much difficulty in the employment. I might, indeed, answer generally, that it was some instruction which their contentious, worldly spirit disqualified them for admitting and using. Ver. 3, &c. Still, a more specific reply is desirable. If in the second epistle to the Corinthians Paul had discussed any point of religious doctrine, concerning which he is silent in the former, our perplexity might be removed or lessened. But I discover no such difference between these two letters, which, in truth, are particularly characterised by *local* references, and a *local* application. Probably, the apostle does not, in this passage, allude to any one tenet: all which he means, may be, that, as the consequence of the unhappy state of things in the church at Corinth, and of the prevailing habits of its members, he forbore to touch on certain matters; to which his commission extended, and in which he felt a deep interest; these he waived, as he could not, for the present, write on them with advantage to the infant society—and he consulted, as became him, their urgent wants. "The variety and worthlessness of all their boasted systems of philosophy," had not entirely escaped his attention; as is clear from the preceding part of the epistle. Of "the perfect spirituality of the Christian religion" much could, unquestionably, have been said by him: and this, perhaps, was a subject on which he would have enlarged, had circumstances permitted.\* Another favourite topic of his thoughts and pen, was the *liberty* of converts from among the Gentiles to the Gospel:

\* He who carefully peruses the account, which J. D. Michaelis (Introd. &c., IV. 44) has given of these circumstances, will not be astonished that Paul does not now enlarge on many general topics.

yet Mr. B. rightly intimates, that the apostle was not called upon to treat of it, in the letters to the Corinthians. I have sometimes thought that Paul might refer to the future state of the church of Christ, and the fuller disclosure of the existence, nature, claims and acts of an antichristian power. Concerning all these points he seems to have been in possession of prophetic knowledge: and to his friends at Thessalonica, who, certainly, were *spiritual*, in comparison of those at Corinth, he writes, with much freedom, on the *man of sin*, &c. 2 Thess. ii.

Let me not finish this note, without remarking, that Mr. Belsham's Translation, &c., of the Epistles of Paul, is honourably characterized by some of the most luminous and impressive statements, which can any where be found, of both direct and presumptive evidence in behalf of Christianity.

2 Cor. viii. 2: "— the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty." Dr. Mangey (Bowyer's Conject. in loc.) would read *χρηας*, instead of *χαρας*. Were the emendation requisite, nothing could well be happier than this reading: were the text in so desperate a condition, as to baffle the established principles of *criticism*, we might gladly have recourse to this conjecture. But a glance at Griesbach's edition will shew that all the MSS. and versions, &c., are in favour of the clause, as it now stands: and the attentive reader will perceive that the apostle represents the predominant joy of his Macedonian friends in their Christian privileges as inciting them to make uncommonly generous efforts for the relief of some of their yet poorer brethren, and as thus enhancing the merit of their contributions. Dr. M.'s conjecture is extremely ingenious: I cannot think it solid; and it strongly proves the impropriety of attempting to alter the text of the New Testament only on *conjecture*.

1 Tim. v. 8: "— if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house —," i. e. says Hallet, "for those of them, who are of the household of faith," or Christians; in illustration and support of which comment he cites Gal. vi. 10.\* Now in that passage, the

words are *τοὺς οἰκίους τῆς πίστεως*: here, they are simply *τῶν οἰκίων*. I am therefore unable to consider the texts as parallel. We meet with this adjective only three times in the New Testament; and I see no authority for supposing that in the present instance it is used elliptically. *Philalethes*\* has translated the clause extremely well: "If any person provide not for his own relations, and especially for those who live in his house —." The eighth verse is an explanation of the fourth.

1 Pet. i. 3: " — a lively hope —." Most of the commentators, interpret the words as meaning "the hope of life," or "of future happiness." The true reading is *εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν*, which our translators have rightly followed; although the Syriac version has "the hope of life." I beg to suggest that the rendering should be, "an animating hope," and that the import of the expression is, "a hope, which receives perpetual additions of strength, and habitually gives new vigour to the mind;" according to *Diodati* (Not. in loc.), "*una, viva, sempre crescente ed operante speranza de beni celesti.*" This is a sense, which the Greek participle not only admits but often requires, in the New Testament, as well as in classical authors. *Benson* (in loc.) does not appear to have explained it correctly. *Living water*, John iv. 10, &c., is not so much *water that giveth life*, as "water that flows without intermission:" *living bread*, John vi. 51, &c., is "knowledge incessantly communicated;" *living oracles*, are "oracles which never fail, in point either of duration or certainty"—and so as to other examples. See 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5. † In the passage under review, the apostle speaks first, of the nature of a Christian's hope—it is vigorous and never-dying—then of its basis—the resurrection of Jesus Christ—and, finally, of its object—an inheritance, heavenly and immortal.

1 Pet. i. 12: " — which things

\* See *Mon. Repos.* XIV. 569, &c.

† Upon this text *Benson* appositely quotes *Virgil's—vivoque sedilia saxo.* *Æn.* I. 171. The poet's language is equally and beautifully illustrative of 1 Peter i. 3. So, the Italians speak of "*vive pietre.*" *Boccacio.* Dec. 80, (Firenz, 1820).

the angels desire to look into." Dr. Price, in his *Sermons on the Christian doctrine*, p. 187, puts a question concerning "that scheme of redemption into which," says he, "Paul represents angels as stooping to look." Now we find that the sentiment and the phraseology are, in truth, *Peter's*, and that the comprehensive scope of the gospel, is the subject on which the apostle of the circumcision enlarges.

N.

Arguments against the supposed Impossibility of excluding Evil from the Creation.

SIR,

Dec. 9, 1823.

THE hypothesis that the introduction of moral and physical evil into the universe could not possibly have been prevented even by Omnipotence, may appear to many of your readers as of too speculative a nature to deserve much attention, and too feebly supported perhaps, to require confutation. But, whatever may influence our sentiments respecting the attributes of the Supreme Intelligence, and whatever may tend to degrade his character, and limit his benevolence, in the conception of his rational creatures, ought not to be regarded as unimportant, nor to be treated as a matter of indifference. It is impossible in my apprehension, to establish the doctrine advocated by your correspondent, Mr. Hinton, (pp. 378, 529,) without answering the following objections; and though I admit that we cannot attribute to them equal weight, yet when combined, they appear to me to possess a degree of force which it will not be very easy to invalidate or overcome. The difficulties, indeed, inseparable from the subject, seem to have been but very partially viewed by Mr. H.; and it is meant as no disparagement to say, that his attempt to remove the few to which his explanation is confined, has not been attended with success.

1. The hypothesis in question supposes all superior, and even the highest intelligences in the scale of being, to be liable to miscalculation, failure and misery; and is completely at variance with the Scripture account of a future state of existence.

2. It favours the literal and popular account of the fallen angels; and

similar events, therefore, may again frequently happen, in the progress of eternity.

3. If the Deity has the power of remedying the evils existing in the universe, the same power would have enabled him to prevent them altogether; and if he cannot exclude evil at one period, he cannot, for the same reason, exclude it at any other, that is, he *never* can. But if the evils of the world be incapable of remedy, then the benevolence of the Almighty must, in numerous cases, be defeated, and we cannot rely upon his Providence with any confidence or security.

4. This theory, in one point, bears some resemblance to the *Manichæan* system, because, in each, evil is said to originate without the appointment and volition of the Creator, and because with all his power and all his benevolence, he finds it impossible to prevent its intrusion into his works.

5. The notion that the Divine Being is obliged to *apply remedies* to the defects and misery which he could *not avoid* at the creation, and that he should be under the necessity of renewing (according to Mr. H.'s statement) the existence of those upon whom he means to confer eternal life, reduces him to the condition of a human mechanist, who, having constructed some complicated machine, is compelled frequently to repair the defects which his skill could not, in the first instance, prevent, and to wind up the spring at certain intervals, in order to continue the requisite movements.

6. We see numerous instances in which men pass through life without incurring those severer maladies of body and mind to which others become martyrs; and if the Supreme Being could exempt one individual, he must possess the same power with respect to every other, should his will prompt him to exert it. Hence we may conclude that where it is not thus exerted, it does not arise from his inability, but because he has *appointed* that, for wise purposes, these sufferings should take place. Any other supposition would lead to the preposterous belief that though the Father of mercies may will the happiness of his creatures, he cannot effect his purpose.

7. The negation or absence of per-

fection does not by any means imply pain and misery, and it is, therefore, very conceivable that numerous ranks of imperfect beings, subordinate to each other, may exist without the necessity of undergoing wretchedness either of body or mind. It is a just observation of Seame Jenyns, (from whom your correspondent seems to have borrowed some of his sentiments on other points,) that the evils of imperfection are in truth no evils at all, but rather the absence of some comparative good.\*

8. That pleasure could not exist without its contrast—pain and anxiety, and that all happiness is necessarily inseparable from evil, as maintained by Mr. H., are nothing more than gratuitous assertions. Where is the proof that the tortures occasioned by the dreadful malady of the stone, for example, are inseparable from enjoyment, or necessarily conduct to it? Imagine the case of an atrocious and irreclaimable offender, who after enduring excruciating pain brought on by some fatal accident, at length undergoes all the horrors of death in its worst form. Will any one undertake to prove that this condition of wretchedness will *necessarily* produce its contrast—enjoyment and ease? If the *natural tendency* of evil is to produce good, then the greater the evil, and the longer it lasts, the more intense will become the happiness resulting from it, whether of body or mind. And as this theory must apply as well to *moral* as to natural ill, the more profligate and iniquitous a man may be, the more exalted will be the happiness, to which, as its contrast, his conduct will lead; which, in truth, is nothing less than saying, that vice ought to be recommended as the surest and the shortest path to virtue.

9. So far from having any proof that all pain is, from its own *intrinsic nature*, productive of happiness, we have reason to believe, from what we observe of bodily suffering, that unless counteracted, controlled, and made the *instrument* of good, it would increase and become more intense. That it should spontaneously diminish, seems contrary to all experience

\* Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil, Letter 11.

and just reasoning on the subject; for, it is perfectly clear that nothing can undergo any change in its nature without an adequate cause. Pain, therefore, cannot alter its essential attributes, and be transmuted into pleasure, unless it be made to do so, by some superior and countervailing influence. If then, the Deity possess the power of effecting this beneficial change, he might by an exertion of the same energy, have prevented the original intrusion of pain; but if, on the contrary, he has not this power, then pain must continue its progress, and will admit of no remedy, either here or hereafter.

To these formidable objections, Mr. H. has not attempted any regular answer, except to the first, and in this instance, he has so qualified his meaning, and so completely reduced the force of his position, as to make it amount to a mere nullity. After admitting that "the perfection of the righteous in a future state may be far more exalted than perhaps even the highest intelligence can now possibly conceive," he observes, that "some small degree of alloy must be admitted, since it is contrary to the hypothesis upon which these inferences are drawn, that any created intelligence can exist without some portion of evil; although the portion of evil which may then be necessary by its counteraction to produce pleasure, may be so almost infinitely refined as not at present to be capable of conception as distinct from purity and bliss." Really after this concession, his whole theory seems to vanish like a summer's dream. It is, indeed, totally destitute of proof, and can be regarded as nothing more than a fiction of the brain. But the statement itself involves a contradiction of which Mr. H. is evidently not aware; for, admitting for one moment that the hypothesis is founded on fact, then the axiom recognized in Natural Philosophy respecting matter, may be regarded as equally applicable to the present case:—"That action and re-action are equal and contrary," that is, the greater the action, the greater must be the re-action, and the converse. Hence it is clear that according as the action of evil is powerful or weak, in the same degree will the re-action of its opposite good possess

either of these qualities. But since Mr. H. supposes the portion of counteracting evil, necessary in a future state, to be infinitely refined, or diminished, the happiness resulting from this counteraction must likewise be infinitely small;—a conclusion precisely contrary to that which he means to establish.

With respect to Mr. H.'s remarks on the *infinite duration* of future happiness, as long as he admits the power of the Deity to carry his promises into execution, it is certainly not a matter of essential importance to mankind to ascertain the precise nature of the means adopted for the purpose. At the same time, I consider his assertions (for reasoning it can scarcely be called) respecting the impossibility that the Almighty should confer absolute immortality on any of his creatures, as nugatory, and destitute of evidence. If the great Author of nature can continue human existence for one year, (for example,) what is there in the range of physical causes with which we are acquainted, to disable him from protracting it, for an interminable series of years? If *renewal* be necessary at all, it must be as necessary at the end of a day, an hour, or a second, as at the end of any longer period; and, indeed, the vital principle, (as far as our limited faculties will allow us to reason on so obscure a subject,) must require the unintermitted support of the Divine energy as well in one part of our existence as in another. Should any one consider it as an assistance to his conceptions, this continuation of sustaining energy may be regarded as a perpetual series of impulses or renewals, similar to the notions entertained by philosophers respecting the power of gravitation. From Mr. H.'s mode of arguing, however, we might almost imagine that he believes the Divine Being unable to exclude from his works the ravages of death; but surely the same exertion of power which can ward off its approaches in any human being for seventy or eighty years, can with equal ease produce this effect for any indefinite period of time. Nor is it possible to say, why his vivifying influence should ever experience any other limits than those which his irresistible will may prompt him to assign.

The difficulty attending the occurrence of the word *αἰώνιον*, in the 25th chapter of St. Matthew, in senses of different extent, adverted to by Mr. H., will not in any degree affect the force of the preceding observations; but, in my apprehension, it is sufficiently answered by remarking, that this identical term is used in a similar manner, that is, with two different significations in the same sentence, in other parts of the Sacred Writings.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Lewes,

Dec. 8, 1823.

SIR,

FEELING myself in some measure called upon to answer the objections advanced by your correspondent Mr. Spurrell, (p. 649,) to a position of mine, that it is beyond the finite powers of man, to reconcile the Divine Prescience with the perfect freedom of the human will; and judging that a total silence on my part might be construed either into a want of argument or neglect; I am induced once more to intrude upon the columns of your valuable miscellany, though not without fearing lest the speculative and abstruse discussions lately introduced should be considered as having already occupied too many of its pages.

As to the point in question, I cannot conceive but that the more profoundly and intensely the mind dwells upon the subject, and the more it endeavours, by close reasoning and philosophical deductions, to bear down every obstacle and reconcile the two principles at issue; the more strongly must the conviction be felt, that a degree of intelligence widely differing in its powers from the limited conceptions of man, must be necessary to the comprehension of their compatibility with each other.

A moral agent, according to the Libertarian, has the *free and uncontrolled choice* of two or more courses of action. He will doubtless admit, (indeed he must admit, to be consistent with his own principles,) that there is an *uncertainty* as to which of the different courses that agent will pursue. Now whatever is *uncertain* may or may not take place; this no one can deny. But is not a foreknowledge of what may never occur, a

direct contradiction in terms? Whatever is *foreknown*, whether it be the act of a moral agent, or any other event, *must necessarily come to pass*; and all that chain of causes and effects (for there can be no effect without a cause) which lead to a necessary result, must be necessary too. I conceive it will be no easy task (to say the least) to controvert any of the foregoing propositions; but in acknowledging their validity, what is admitted but the very sum and substance of philosophical necessity; as well as the *incompatibility of the Divine foreknowledge with the uncontrolled agency of man*? I must confess, Sir, for my own part, that the reasoning on which the doctrine of Necessity is founded, (although attended with much difficulty as to moral accountability,) appears to me more solid and unanswerable, than any that can be adduced in favour of the Libertarian system. Man cannot act without a motive; his motives must invariably have their origin in the circumstances by which he is surrounded, and over which he can have no possible controul: while his faculties of retrospection, comparison and anticipation, considered by the Libertarian as proofs of a *self-determining power*, may be shewn by similar deductions, to form prominent links in that chain of causes and effects, which in every period of his existence necessarily determine his volitions. Shall I then presume to affirm, that man, with regard to his moral character, is not the author of his own happiness or misery; that he is not responsible for his actions; or that, being the unhappy victim of predestination, the finally wicked could never have been virtuous; and that with regard to him, the paternal sollicitations of Divine love, were never more than tantalizing aggravations of his miserable destiny? Or shall I on the other hand presume to limit the stupendous attributes of Him who inhabiteth eternity; and whose Spirit, infinite and incomprehensible, pervades all time and space? God forbid! How that Eternal Spirit may embrace the whole connected mass of circumstances, relations and events, whether determined or contingent, throughout the boundless universe, it is not for a

finite creature to explain. I am, therefore, still compelled to believe, that it is far beyond the powers of the human understanding to reconcile by any thing like conclusive and satisfactory arguments, the difficulties attendant upon either of the opposing systems.

As to the practical tendency of the principles held by the Necessarian, and which your correspondent is of opinion must "sap the very foundation of morals;" I conceive the only just ground of such apprehension to be in the danger arising from a misconception or perversion of those principles. Here it must be granted that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing;" and should a superficial view of the argument lead to its abuse, the demoralizing consequences that must necessarily ensue, need neither illustration nor comment. But whether actions in themselves are necessary or otherwise, all parties agree that the consequences which follow (either of pleasure or of pain) are necessary too. This conviction acting upon the strong natural desire in man to secure happiness and avoid misery, must, I should think, in general be a sufficient safeguard against the abuse of any theoretical principles, when such abuse must inevitably be attended with disgrace and infamy. After all, there is an instinctive principle in man, closely interwoven with the moral sense, which seems to tell him that he can refuse the evil and choose the good, and that he is responsible to his Creator for his actions: a principle which our holy religion is evidently framed to work upon, and which is wisely planted in the human breast, by that Being who sees what degree of insight into the mysteries of his Providence is essential to the happiness and welfare of a rational and moral agent. Metaphysical reasoning and moral perception are very different things: the one may lead us into perplexing labyrinths, into which it was never intended man should wander and be lost: the other is the viceregent of God within the soul, a spark of celestial origin, which, if fanned by the breath of gratitude and piety on the altars of devotion, soon rises above the noxious atmosphere of moral contamination, towards those

regions of light and bliss, where it will shine with unsullied brightness, as the stars for ever and ever.

JOHN JOHNSTON.

Stapleton,

December 5, 1823.

SIR, I CANNOT but think that if your correspondent *Clericus Cantabrigiensis*, (pp. 526—528,) had deeply considered the subject of my hypothesis, on the introduction and inevitable existence of evil, he would not have confounded it with the hypotheses of Archbishop King, Soame Jenyns, or Dr. Southwood Smith; since I apprehend that the sentiments of all these gentlemen, as well as of all the other enlightened writers on this subject, will be found to amount only to this—that, while they assert that evil is made by Infinite Wisdom subservient to the production of good, and therefore necessary for its production, inasmuch as they suppose it could not so well be produced without its agency, they nevertheless freely admit the power of the Creator to have dispensed with the existence of evil in creation, if he had thought it best so to do; whereas it is the *principal* object of my hypothesis to assert the very contrary, and to prove that this power could not possibly exist, evil being an inevitable consequence of, and attendant upon, creation itself. *Cantabrigiensis* may, however, rest satisfied, that any claim I may have to novelty in the suggestion of this hypothesis, is but of very little importance in my estimation; and I beg to assure him, notwithstanding the manner in which he has expressed himself in the outset of his letter on this subject, that I should not have the least objection to be indebted to either of the writers he mentions, and particularly to my valued friend Dr. Southwood Smith, to whom chiefly I owe the present constitution and frame of my mind, theologically, metaphysically and morally; in whose own admirable words, when speaking of a friend, "It was he who first led me into that train of thought which directed the future pursuits of my mind; made me what I am, and [thus] determined what I am to be;" (see *Divine Government*, p. 47;) and to whom most gladly would I trace the hypothesis in question;



but where, in the pages of Dr. Smith will *Cantabrigiensis* find the (as they at first appeared to me, and as I fear they will appear to some of your readers,) almost impious assertions—that it was impossible for Infinite Power in creation to dispense with the existence of evil; that evil is the unavoidable attendant of limited attributes; that it is creation's inevitable consequence; and that there never could be, and never can be, in any state whatever, a creature wholly free from its influence? *Cantabrigiensis* is perfectly right in supposing that I consider these propositions as incontrovertible; for the more I think of the subject, the more thoroughly am I convinced, that nothing can overturn the hypothesis in question; that it has been shewn to be demonstrably certain; and that the inferences drawn from it stand upon the same immovable basis: and I have had the daily satisfaction of receiving the concurrent testimony of many persons of competent judgment, among whom have been some eminent theologians, whose opinions have fully confirmed my own convictions. I submit to your enlightened readers, that I am by no means bound to follow *Cantabrigiensis* in all the loose and desultory remarks he has made upon the hypothesis, until he has fairly met and answered the line of argument upon which it is founded, as I apprehend every writer is bound, in the first instance, to reply strictly to, and expose the fallacy of, the arguments which support the hypothesis of his opponent, before he has a right to wander through all space for objections, counter arguments and positions: and unless this rule be observed, it will be difficult in argument ever to arrive at any certain conclusion; for poor indeed must be that position or objection, which will not afford, aided with the ingenuity of a cultivated mind, some plausible arguments to controvert or support any theory whatever. However, though I do not consider myself obliged by the rules of argument to follow *Cantabrigiensis* in his remarks, yet for the further satisfaction of the readers of the Repository, I will undertake this task, as far as those remarks remain unanswered by my last communication, in reply to

Mr. Eaton. The first thing, then, that requires notice is the assertion, that the Deity "might, by the frequent exertion of his power, have perpetuated a future state of felicity from the beginning; and might have rendered permanent, by the same means, such a concurrence of moral circumstances as would, in the first instance, have prevented wrong volitions of his rational creatures." To this position I give a direct denial, grounded upon the arguments which found the hypothesis, since to perpetuate any particular mode or manner of existence, could be nothing short of conferring the attribute of infinity upon finite beings; and no created being can possibly be capable of receiving "such a concurrence of moral circumstances," as would uniformly prevent wrong volitions; 1st, because his attributes are limited, and must necessarily produce the inevitable effects of limited attributes; and 2ndly, because those limited attributes necessarily require change and transition, grounded upon opposite and contending causes, one of which identifies itself with evil, in order to produce in his mind any volition at all.

2ndly, In reply to *Cantabrigiensis's* observation, that "the supposition, that misery could not have been prevented in the original formation of the world, must impress the mind with degrading ideas of the attributes of the Supreme Being, and present the most gloomy view of his superintending providence," I need only observe, that as it is agreed, that evil does exist, I will leave the following question for the decision of your readers—Which system tends *most to degrade* the Divine attributes; presents the *most gloomy view* of Providence, and most impeaches the Divine benevolence, that which supposes that the Deity had full power to prevent the existence of evil, with all its countless miseries, but *would not*, or that which supposes, that he *could not*, but finding that evil must inevitably arise from limited attributes, made the best of it by contriving its absolute subserviency to the production of good, far surpassing the degree of evil? It must be obvious, I should suppose, to every one, that while the former is totally irreconcilable with the Divine

benevolence, the latter presents a full solution of the difficulty, and is, indeed, the only hypothesis that does or can remove it.

3rdly. *Cantabrigiensis* asks, "If creatures could not be formed without being subject to the liability to evil, supposed by the hypothesis, in what consisted the *necessity* (benevolence I suppose is meant) of creating them at all? Non-existence must be preferable to a continued *preponderance* of pain." In reply to this, I observe, that neither the hypothesis, nor any thing that I have advanced in support of it, supposes that evil or misery does, or ever will, *preponderate* over good and happiness, but the very contrary, as *Cantabrigiensis* would have seen, had he sufficiently considered the hypothesis. Here, then, is an end of this monster, which, it seems, existed only in *Cantabrigiensis's* own imagination: and, I contend, that the difficulty of the question—Why did God create at all, if he could not create without evil, ceases to exist on the ground of the hypothesis, but absolutely defies solution upon any other ground; for here, to make all things harmonize with infinite goodness, we have only to inquire, whether the existence of all creatures is, or will be, upon the whole of that existence, a blessing and a happiness to them: and whether good does not, and will not ever, *preponderate* over evil? And if these questions must be answered in the affirmative, the original question is fully solved—Why a God of infinite benevolence could, in strict accordance with that benevolence, create intelligent beings, although he could not make them without evil; while every other hypothesis must for ever remain dumb to the question—Why did not a God of infinite benevolence, and possessed of ample power to create without evil, produce the same happy effects from happier causes, and have dispensed with the existence of evil altogether? I repeat, that every other hypothesis must for ever remain silent to this question, while the hypothesis in dispute presents a solution of the difficulty, so perfectly in unison with the Divine benevolence, that I feel confident it is the only one capable of justifying the ways of God to man. But even if I could give no solution

to the question, it surely does not increase the sum of evil, to say that it exists *inevitably*; but *Cantabrigiensis* really seems to suppose that it does.

4thly. *Cantabrigiensis* asserts, that "it is not within the circumscribed powers of man to solve the question—why pain should be essentially instrumental in the production of enjoyment." It is not consistent, I apprehend, with the rules of argument for *Cantabrigiensis* thus to decide, by mere assertion, the very matter in question between us, and which he has undertaken to refute, since the hypothesis certainly proposes to solve this very important question; and whether it succeeds in this respect or not is the proper matter for discussion.

5thly. *Cantabrigiensis* speaking in allusion to the hypothesis, which he blends with some erroneous notions commonly entertained, says, "It would have been better for mankind that they had never been born;" but that his own notion of the subject, (and which I freely admit is far the best of any that has been heretofore entertained, and was my own till the hypothesis in question suggested itself to my mind,) vindicates the Divine attributes "from those degrading conceptions, which it is *impossible, on any other scheme, not to entertain.*" Now, Sir, all this is mere assertion, and feeling, as I do, the pre-eminence of the hypothesis in question over every other theory that has yet been adopted, I am fully convinced that the expressions he has used in favour of his own notion, belong exclusively to mine: except, indeed, the expression, "it would have been better for mankind that they had never been born," which is, I submit, language which ought not to be used in reference to any mere theory on the subject.

6thly. *Cantabrigiensis* imagines a difficulty in reconciling my hypothesis with the doctrine of Universal Restitution, of which doctrine he rightly supposes me to be a believer: but how the hypothesis stands, in any manner, opposed to it, I have yet to learn. I really do not see any difficulty at all in reconciling them with each other, since our ideas of final restoration, certainly do not imply a state of infinite and unerring perfection, but merely a state in which

moral causes, keeping pace with intellectual improvement, will fit and qualify mankind for the enjoyment of such pure and moral effects, as their several capacities may be susceptible of: and if their powers and employments are made, from time to time, and during an infinite succession of changes, as *full* of perfection and happiness as those powers and employments, to their utmost extent, can possibly contain, it is all that the most voluptuous in future bliss can desire; it is all that Omnipotence can grant; it is even all that infinite benevolence, with all its varied stores of felicity, can devise.

I now turn to combat the strictures of my two other opponents, Mr. Eaton and Mr. J. Johnston, pp. 584 and 585 of your Number for October last. Mr. Eaton says, "The argument of what God can do, and what he cannot do, is scarcely becoming such *frail* and *ignorant* creatures as we are, for the least *flaw* in our conception and argument, destroys our conclusion." "Can any Christian so safely rely on the soundness of his metaphysical abstractions and conclusions, as to place them in *opposition* to the plain language of Scripture?" "Ought metaphysical *subtilities* and speculations to *interfere* with the glorious hopes of the gospel?" "Ought the *cold* and *baseless* speculations of metaphysicians, to be permitted to *chill* or *becloud* such transporting prospects and assurances?" "After the greatest thought and labour, if there be one single *error* in the premises, the glittering castle tumbles to the ground." And Mr. Johnston has the following remarks—"They are far *above the measure of the human understanding.*" "These *mysterious points* are far *above the range of human thought.*" "It leads us to place no confidence in many express promises of God," and many other similarly unfounded assertions. Your readers will perceive that these gentlemen have first *assumed as true*, the objections upon which these remarks are founded, and that without one tittle of evidence, (i. e.) that the subject of my hypothesis does *really* possess a *flaw*, is in opposition to the plain language of Scripture, is a metaphysical *subtlety*, does interfere with the glorious hopes of the gospel, is *cold* and *baseless*, does *chill* or

*becloud* the prospects of the gospel, is *erroneous*, is *above the measure of the human understanding*, &c. all which I utterly deny, and challenge any evidence to the contrary; but I cannot help remarking, that these observations come with a peculiarly ill grace from heretical pens; they are out of their element; they belong to orthodoxy, since all the fearful weapons, which these gentlemen have here opposed to my hypothesis, have with equal force, and with much more *consistency*, been brandished in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity a thousand times. I certainly am not aware of any limitation for the human understanding, nor any boundary for the operations of reason, where certain and definite ideas, founded upon assignable evidence, and reducible to intelligible language and definite terms, form the governing principle of speculation; and while this is or can be done, it is nothing short of Popery, to becloud the intellectual vision with the blindness of mystery, pretended frailty, and *convenient* ignorance, weakness of the understanding, &c. Such observations as these might reconcile us to all the *sacred* mysteries of orthodoxy or heathenism, ancient or modern; and certainly if there be such an arbitrary boundary to rational speculation, it may be much more consistently found within the infallible pale of Popery, than the uncircumscribed range of heterodoxy: and if the inquirer after truth is to be silenced in this manner, it is a great reflection upon those of us who have come out from the regions of mystery into the pure and unclouded light of the gospel, in defiance of precisely similar observations on the part of reputed orthodoxy: and such persons cannot reasonably complain of their Trinitarian brethren, when they attempt to silence them in the same way. Besides which, this convenient scepticism and pretended frailty must inevitably tend to weaken the force of all truth, certainty and evidence; for if the plain deductions of reason are not to be relied on, there is an end of the only legitimate standard of truth, and of all inquiry after it; and acting under the influence of this self-delusion, we should bid fair in time to arrive at that thorough-paced scepticism, which would dictate a similarly

ridiculous expression to that of an ancient Heathen, "I know nothing except that I know nothing." And upon this very principle I consider our orthodox brethren as the greatest of all sceptics. The *real* question is, shall we retain the character of rational theologians, and be ruled by the manifest deductions of reason; or shall we, fearing to offend existing prejudices, bow down and prostrate our understandings, in true orthodoxy form, before the pope-like tyranny of preconceived notions; and suspending the legitimate operation of our rational powers, in the chaos of dark uncertainty, sink into the horrible gloom of universal scepticism? One of these two alternatives we must adopt, and I leave your enlightened readers to take their choice.

2ndly. Mr. Eaton observes, "No one will hesitate to admit, that all created beings, however perfect and exalted, must ever remain finite, and at an immeasurable distance from the peerless glory and excellence of their Creator; but the question is, not whether man will ever possess infinite and abstract perfection, but whether the Deity can place him out of the reach of danger, error and evil." To this I reply that they are both the same question, only differently put; for if it be admitted, "that all created beings must ever remain finite," it remains for him to shew the possibility of the Deity's placing *finite* man out of the reach of *finite* circumstances—error and evil, which would be no less than to make him *infinite*. The fact then is, that he has here admitted all that the hypothesis asserts; and I beg to remind Mr. E., that until the "error in the premises" be clearly pointed out, "the glittering castle" stands on the solid and immoveable rock of truth and certainty.

3rdly. Mr. E.'s feelings are enviable in his anticipations of a state where "nothing shall interfere with the happiness of the righteous," and he adds, "and to give the most absolute security from miscalculation, frailty and ill, God will be all in all." Truly sorry should I be to disturb these anticipations, and he will be surprised, perhaps, when I declare my thorough conviction, that my hypothesis best secures all the delightful anticipations of futurity that we can or ought to

conceive: certainly "nothing shall interfere with the happiness of the righteous," because it has been proved by the hypothesis, (and which proof your readers will recollect not only remains unrefuted, but even *unassailed*, neither of my opponents having even attempted to meet and refute the arguments on which it is grounded,) that the happiness of all beings with limited attributes is, and ever must be, built upon a state of variation and transition; that it could not exist at all in a perfectly unchangeable state; and, therefore, that an unchangeable state would be the most effectual means of interfering with, and destroying, the happiness of the righteous: and, doubtless, God, the author and conductor of that *limited* state of perfection which must ever be requisite for the welfare of *limited* attributes, "will be all in all," to secure the most apt and suitable perfection, and best possible happiness, of his creatures. The security of the happiness of the righteous, therefore, by no means warrants the conclusion of a perfectly infinite, invariable or unchangeable state, but the very contrary: I rejoice, however, with Mr. E. in the anticipation of a state where there will be "no more death," i. e. no change or transition so violent and appalling as death; but surely we are not from hence obliged to conclude that changes and renewals of a more easy nature than death will not be perpetually taking place. That the perfection and happiness of the righteous will never be infinite or unchangeable, but will ever *require* a state of change and variation, even to support that happiness, and will necessarily ever remain subject to some degree of "miscalculation, frailty and ill"—the inevitable lot of all finite beings, seem to be tacitly admitted by the almost universal sentiment of all sects and parties, that there will be progressive improvement in heaven; since *improvement* necessarily supposes imperfection, and *progressive* improvement the successive changes by which that improvement will be effected. Besides which, *perfection* not being capable of improvement, and as all imperfection must be the effect of limited attributes, and as limited attributes must be the inheritance of all created beings, however exalted, it

follows, of course, that unerring perfection, absolute freedom from evil, and invariability of condition, can never be the portion of any created intelligence. At the same time, I wish to express my thorough conviction, that the perfection and felicity of the righteous in a future state of bliss, will be all, and even much more than all, we can now conceive of even infinite perfection and happiness, because our ideas, so far from reaching to any just idea of infinity, must fall far short even of the real extent of the future perfection and happiness of finite beings, however short of infinity that may be. I cannot quit Mr. Eaton without acknowledging the very liberal and Christianlike manner in which he has conducted the controversy.

In replying to Mr. Johnston, his remarks upon the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity first claim my attention; but after the able statements and illustrations of this enlightened doctrine, by Dr. Priestley, Mr. Belsham, Dr. Southwood Smith, and others, in their publications, and the admirable and incontrovertible effusions of Mr. Cogan and others, in your valuable pages, it cannot be necessary for me to enter upon its general statement or defence; but in justification of the hint I threw out upon this subject in my last communication, I shall merely set forth the inference, which I then stated to be one of the suppressed inferences I had drawn from my hypothesis, (i. e.)

“5thly. The foregoing hypothesis demonstrably proves, that as there can be but one Being, possessed of infinite or unlimited attributes, and who controuls the universe and all its causes, all other beings must be, in all respects, dependent upon him and his laws; and, therefore, that it was, and is, beyond the power of Infinity itself to make an independent being or a free agent,\* since an independent

\* Though I have used this term for want of a more definite one, I consider the Necessarian equally as much a free agent as the Libertarian; as I do not see any thing in the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity at all hostile to human liberty: for what idea have we of liberty more than this—to do as we will? and the

being cannot be less than Deity—such a being must necessarily be equal with God; but the hypothesis proves that the Deity himself could not create an equal. The whole universe, therefore, being under the sole controul of him whose eye, unconfined to space, size, or proportion, perceives as distinctly an atom as a world; ‘to whom no high, no low, no great, no small; who fills, who bounds, connects, and equals all;’ and without whose design\* we are assured, that not even a sparrow can fall, all other beings having only limited attributes, can have neither power to controul surrounding causes, nor prescience to foresee future events; and consequently they must be continually under the influence of those causes, over which they have no controul. These causes, therefore, constantly give motive and produce volition; and consequently beings, with limited attributes, can no more controul either their motives or their volition, than they can the causes which originate them: and hence, it is a certain truth, that if they could produce volition, or controul their own motives, even in the smallest matters, independently of these causes, they could as well controul the universe, and usurp the place of the Deity Himself. I am indeed, always shocked when I consider the bold and awfully impious tendency of the free-agency or Libertarian scheme, which shuts the Deity out from the manage-

doctrine of Philosophical Necessity secures this liberty, by asserting, that we cannot do otherwise than as we will, since we *must* ever obey our own will; or, philosophically speaking, that volition which is produced by the strongest motive. We are, therefore, certainly free-will actors as far as respects this volition; but as far as respects the motives, and the causes which dictate those motives, there can be but one free or independent agent—that is God.

\* Matt. x. 29. ‘The Common Version has “without your Father;” but what can we understand by this, when referring to a Being whose attributes are all-pervading, but as implying design or agency? In the Improved Version the word *will* is supplied by the Editors, to express the true meaning; and this rendering is supported by, τῆς βουλῆς, design or decree, in the various readings of Griesbach.

ment of the universe he has formed; dares to usurp his throne; wield his sceptre, with the puny arm of flesh; arrogate his power and his other attributes, to flatter the vanity and feed the fancied importance of the insects of a day. I scarcely know whether to call this tendency Polytheistical, Atheistical, or Pantheistical, but one of these it certainly is; since free-agency necessarily supposes the existence of *many* beings, possessed of perfectly independent power, sufficient to controul the causes which give rise to their motives and actions, independently of any other being or cause in existence, which necessarily constitutes them nothing short of the Deity itself: and here, rank Polytheism is the inevitable result. Or, in another and still more applicable point of view, to suppose a variety of beings possessing this uncontrolled power, must necessarily be, as far as it goes, an infringement upon, and an exclusion and denial of, that *all-pervading and universal power* which is essential to the *existence* of one Almighty and universally controlling Agent, who is supposed to be the Author of all causes, without the smallest exception, and who is described as being 'a jealous God, who will not give or share his glory with another:' and therefore in supposing a variety of beings, with limited attributes, possessed of this uncontrolled power, and *sharing this glory*, horrible Atheism is the unavoidable inference; because the possession of such a power in a variety of beings, with limited attributes, utterly denies, or at least circumscribes, and is therefore absolutely incompatible with, the power, agency and *existence* of that Being who if he exist at all, *must* necessarily possess unlimited attributes, and be the universal Ruler and Agent, and have all other beings subject to his absolute controul; and whose unlimited and all-pervading power and agency must be utterly incompatible with the free-agency or independency of any other being or beings. Prove then the reality of *finite* free-agency, and the non-existence of a being with *infinite* attributes will become certain. Or if we take another view of the subject, the possession of such an independently controlling faculty, in a *variety* of

beings of limited attributes, constitutes an essential part of the Deity; and thus confounding and identifying the supposed first great Intelligent Mover with the second causes and countless motions of that universal machine, which is supposed to be but the mere effect of his infinitely energetic agency, we are here presented with a perfect system of Pantheism; but the difference between this and Atheism must, I should think, be regarded as merely nominal."

2ndly. I beg to assure Mr. J., that if he had so thoroughly understood the nature and basis of my hypothesis as he might have done, it would not have appeared, in his estimation, such a frightful monster as he, through mistake, supposes it to be: many of his observations, for instance, are grounded on the *assumption*, that the hypothesis denies or lessens the ultimate felicity of the righteous, whereas it in fact proposes to *constitute* that felicity. Such expressions as the following can be grounded only upon this assumption, and which I should think a perusal of the foregoing will convince him to be utterly fallacious, [i. e. the hypothesis "denies the power of *progressive improvement* of the human soul, destroys the efficacy and lessens the motives to repentance, annihilates the value of the Saviour's admonition to strive after perfection, and damps the fondly cherished aspirations of the sainted pilgrim, by inducing the fearful and chilling apprehension, that there is no ultimate haven of repose, no security from ill, no not even when enjoying the presence and smile of his Creator in his promised heaven." "An arm all-powerful must secure, without possibility of failure, the ultimate felicity of the whole intelligent offspring of God." Had Mr. J. rightly understood the hypothesis, he would not have suffered his rhapsodical feelings, and poetical style, to have made such manifestly groundless charges against it, and brought positions and arguments in opposition to it which are in fact in perfect unison with it.

3dly. Mr. J. says, "Upon what ground we must conclude that because the knowledge of created beings is not infinite, they must be subject to natural and moral ill, I am at a loss

to conceive." I would request Mr. J. to read the hypothesis again, and if he cannot then *conceive* it, let him endeavour to meet and refute the line of argument upon which it is founded, but which he has not hitherto attempted: and a similar remark applies to his assertion, that "natural and moral evil are only arbitrary terms, which have the same meaning, is a position that cannot be maintained; nor that natural evil constantly arises from moral evil, and *vice versa*." I challenge Mr. J. to refute either of these positions; mere assertions are easily made, but proofs are not quite so subservient.

4thly. Mr. J. asks, in what light the hypothesis will appear if applied to Christ; "Shall he who was without sin be subject to miscalculation, error and *guilt*? The supposition is too preposterous, if not too profane, to be admitted for a moment." I most willingly meet the application of the hypothesis to our Lord Jesus Christ: and here I would ask Mr. J. whether he supposes that Christ was without the *liability* to sin, or was a being of more than finite or limited attributes; and whether his being *without sin* signifies any thing more, than an abstinence from *actual* transgression of the moral law? And I would remind Mr. J., that the Scriptures describe Jesus as being *a man, in all points tempted, like unto his brethren*; which, I should suppose, proves beyond all question that he was by *nature* a mere man, and, like his *brethren*, subject to miscalculation and error, unless Mr. J. can shew that *by office* our Lord was raised above this subjection and *made infinite*, for it could be nothing less. But here, Mr. J. has overstrained the doctrine of the hypothesis, for the purpose of caricaturing it by adding *guilt*. Preposterous and profane then as it may seem to Mr. J. to suppose our Lord Jesus Christ to be by nature subject to miscalculation and error, I shall not hesitate for a moment, to be "preposterous and profane" enough, until our Lord Jesus Christ can be proved to be the infinite Jehovah himself, to assert, that he was, and ever will remain, with all his finite brethren, subject to miscalculation and error; although, as I before

remarked, the degree of error and evil in a future state of bliss, will doubtless be so far removed from all that we now designate by these terms, that the perfection and happiness of the righteous in a future state, will amount to all, and to much more than all, that we can at present conceive of even *infinite* happiness itself.

I believe I have now replied to all the assertions and objections of this gentleman, since those of them to which I have not specifically and distinctly alluded, have received from their similarity to several of Mr. Eaton's observations, their answers in my replies to that gentleman: and in taking my leave of Mr. J., while I cannot compliment his metaphysics or his closeness of reasoning, I must express my admiration of his warm-hearted piety, his evident goodness of heart, and even that honest zeal for his pre-conceived *sacred* prejudices, which has hurried him unintentionally, I doubt not, into several illiberal expressions. Had he been a little more guarded in some of his observations, it would certainly have been more pleasant to the feelings of a fellow-inquirer after truth, who, publishing his sentiments from as pure motives and with as pious impressions and as sincere a desire for the attainment of pure theological knowledge as those of Mr. J. himself, expects to be opposed in the enlightened columns of the Monthly Repository, only by liberality, calm and patient inquiry, and unprejudiced and temperate investigation.

I shall now conclude by summing up the hypothesis in the words of your enlightened correspondent, Mr. Luckcock, (p. 522,) as being a most concise and admirable epitome of it; and for which, and the favourable notice he has taken of the subject, I feel obliged—"All inferiority implies imperfection; and as all creation, material and intellectual, must necessarily be inferior to its great and original Creator; it must consequently partake of some qualities, both physical and moral, which our limited views lead us to express by the term *evil*."

G. P. HINTON.

*Correspondence in a Washington Newspaper on the College established in the Vicinity of that City.*

(See p. 350 of the present volume.)

*"To the Editors.*

**G**ENTLEMEN: In perusing an English publication, put into my hands the other day by a friend, which is called 'The Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature,' for June, 1823, I was struck with a passage in a communication to the Editor of that work, that I think requires some explanation in this district. The writer of the passage in question is a Mr. Reuben Potter, of Rhode Island, Editor of the 'Gospel Palladium,' a paper of a religious cast, published once a fortnight. It seems this Mr. Potter writes in reply to some questions forwarded from England, relating to the state of the Baptist denomination in this country, and he gives a very flattering account of the progress and prospects of that denomination. He describes, indeed, a considerable part of them as rapidly going over to Unitarianism; in this, perhaps, he is mistaken, but whether or not, is not material to the present object. The passage I adverted to above, is in a part of his letter concerning the Seminaries of Learning among the Baptists. He says, 'The National College, at the seat of Government, is under their jurisdiction.' Now, I have lived long at the seat of Government, and I did not know till now, that we had a *National College*. And if we had one, I believe and hope it would not be under the jurisdiction of the Baptists, or indeed of any other religious denomination. Our excellent constitution, (may it live for ever!) prohibits Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, and, consequently, no National College or University can have a religious character, or patronise a sectarian theology. The exclusive influence of religious sects on the great seminaries of learning in Europe, has been productive of such incalculable mischief, and operated so partially, unjustly and oppressively, on large portions of mankind, that we cannot be too jealous of every attempt to accomplish the same pernicious objects in this land of liberty.

"I believe, when the founders of the Columbian College applied to Congress for a charter of incorporation, they met with unexpected difficulties, arising from its being understood that the Institution was likely to be directed chiefly, if not exclusively, to the interest of a particular religious sect. A majority in Congress would not vote for it on that ground, and it was not until the most earnest, solemn and repeated assurances were given, that nothing of a religious nature was contemplated, and that the Institution was to be purely and exclusively for literary purposes, that at length the charter was obtained. Even then a clause was introduced with special care, rendering it unlawful for any person to be hindered or excluded from any office or benefit of this institution, either as governors, professors or students, &c., on account of any particular religious sentiments they may entertain. That the College in question is commonly styled the Baptist College, and that its President and principal officers are of that denomination, are facts that every one knows. But, for that same reason, let it not be called a National College; for our friends on the Hill at Georgetown might, with as great propriety, call theirs the National College. And out of friendship to the Baptists, I would caution them not to be too loud in boasting of their jurisdiction, lest Congress should happen to think that they have forfeited their charter by converting it to sectarian purposes.

"I am informed that the Directors have an agent in London, soliciting donations for the College; this is all well if they apply as a sect, *in forma pauperis*, but if they, at the same time, say it is a National College, I must, as an American, say it has a very beggarly look. We shall have, I hope, a National University in time; but it will be of a very different description from this, and be raised without foreign aid. If I had connexions in England, I should like to have this matter better understood there than it seems to be.

"FAIR PLAY."



*"Columbian College.*

"Messrs. Editors: I observed, in your paper of September 17, a communication, bearing the signature of 'Fair Play,' the purport of which seemed to be to solicit explanations on some points connected with the Columbian College, in this District. No reply has yet appeared, from which fact I infer that the more immediate friends of the College have not thought it necessary either to take any notice of complaints grounded on so slight authority, or to express their gratitude for the gratuitous counsel which your correspondent has bestowed.

"The patriotic sensibilities of 'Fair Play' appear to have been unpleasantly affected by the discovery that an individual in this country had thought proper, in a letter directed to a friend in England, and there published, to employ the term 'National College,' in reference to the Columbian College in this District. This does not seem to be a very serious offence; and, if it were, the proper question would be, how far the managers of the College were answerable for it. The individual who used the expression is, I presume, entirely unknown to these gentlemen. He is not a Calvinistic Baptist, and has no connexion with the great body of Baptists in this country. His remark, that they are rapidly verging to Unitarianism, was shaped rather by his wishes than by fact; and it conclusively indicates the degree of importance which should be attached to his statements and expressions on the subject before us.

"The term alluded to is certainly an improper one; and it has never, to my knowledge, been used by the authority of the Trustees of the College. If any one acquainted with the character of the institution has at any time employed it, it has been applied in that general sense in which the *Intelligencer*, and other newspapers, have assumed the title of 'National.' Its location at the seat of government, and its prospects already partially realized, of becoming a resort for young men from every quarter of the Union, may have led some to apply to it an epithet, not correct in point of official character, but deserved precisely in proportion as the institution shall perform the functions and afford the ad-

vantages of the 'National' Seminary, contemplated by the vaticinations of 'Fair Play.' Nevertheless, his own implied confession that he had never before heard of this appellation, although a resident in the immediate vicinity of the College, proves that it has never been assumed.

"I have thus replied to the only material part of your correspondent's remarks. He has bestowed some sound instruction respecting the constitution of the United States and the charter of the College, accompanied by a few hints by way of advice, all which the friends of the College, who doubtless are quite as much attached to these instruments as himself, and probably understand them nearly as well, will, I presume, take into serious consideration.

"Before I conclude, permit me to quiet the apprehension of your correspondent, by assuring him that the proceedings of the Agent of the College, while in England, have had no tendency either to mislead in regard to its character and title, or to implicate, in any degree, our national honour.

"K."

Clapton,

December 6, 1823.

SIR,

I FIND that I very imperfectly examined Whiston's *Memoirs*, for some account of the *Collet* family (p. 650). He, no doubt, designs the physician, who is the subject of N.'s inquiry, when he speaks (p. 420) of "Dr. Collet's very Serious and Seasonable Address to the Jews; or a Treatise of their Future Restoration. Printed 1747. This book," he adds, "though containing, I think, many mistakes which want to be corrected, does yet give a particular and well-attested account of the goodness of the country of Judea, and of the Jews' happy condition there, upon their restoration, when the Messiah will establish his kingdom at Jerusalem, and bring in the last glorious ages." I have found also, in a volume of inaugural medical dissertations, one, *de Pestis*, delivered at Leyden, in 1731, for his Doctor's degree, by "Joannes Collet, Anglo-Britannus."

It appears (*Mem.* 296), that Whiston's "great and good friend, Mr. Samuel Collet," whom I mentioned p. 650, was "a Baptist," and a most

punctual attendant on the "Society for promoting Primitive Christianity," which met at "the Primitive Library" at Whiston's house in Cross Street, Hatton Garden," from 1715 to 1717; and to which "Sir Peter King, Dr. Hare, Mr. Benjamin Hoadley, and Dr. Clarke, were particularly invited; though they none of them ever came." (See *Mem.* 202, *Hist. Mem.* of Dr. Clarke, 66—74, *Ed.* 3, 1748.) In 1735, Mr. Collet, being "very ill," and, as he supposed, "in danger of death," desired Whiston "to anoint him with oil, according to the injunction in *James* v. 14—16." Whiston "hesitated and durst not venture; not then remembering that the *Apostolical Constitutions* appoint a form for the consecration of oil, and in want of oil, of water, for the healing of the sick, and the casting out dæmons, nor recollecting" Tertullian's relation of "the cure of Severus the Emperor by Proculus Torpacio, upon his anointing him with oil;" otherwise he was inclined to "have consecrated some oil, and anointed him." His friend, however, recovered, notwithstanding the omission from "involuntary ignorance on both sides."

Whiston mentions again (p. 355) "Mr. Collet," with whom he "was at Newbury in 1748," where he "heard Mr. Mace preach in the same Meeting-house where he had heard Mr. Pierce preach before he went to Exeter." There was also a "Rev. Joseph Collet," of "Coat, in Oxfordshire," on whose death, in 1741, a sermon was preached there by the father of the late Dr. Stennet.

In the conversation which I noticed p. 650, Dr. Toulmin informed me that Governor Collet, who had held an appointment in the East Indies, and of whom I promised a further account, was, he believed, the person addressed in a pamphlet, now before me, entitled, "Two Letters to a very eminent and learned Gentleman, attempting to subvert the Doctrine of the Arians. Being Animadversions on a very famous Arian Manuscript, wrote by Him, some Years since, in India. By a Country Gentleman. 3rd Ed. 1751."

In the preface we are informed, that "the author of these Letters, and the learned Gentleman to whom they were addressed, being occasionally in con-

versation, arguments arose concerning the *Arian scheme*: and the author, for several good reasons, declining to enter into the controversy, was pleasantly told by him, that his unwillingness proceeded from a consciousness of the badness of his cause, which, indeed, was the only reflection that could have roused him, or provoked him, to engage at all in this debate; not being willing to enter the lists with a gentleman to whom he stood greatly obliged." Of this gentleman, who appears to have died before the publication of the *Two Letters*, he further says, (p. ix.,) that "he was, *in truth*, a man of great ingenuity, learning, humanity, charity and good sense; but was so particularly eminent for his *Arian* sentiments, (which he was far from endeavouring to conceal,) that had the author leave, and was he so inclined, it would be altogether needless to publish his name."

The "Country Gentleman," thus challenged, now borrowed his *Arian* friend's MS., and "after some considerable time" sent the first letter, to which he received "a very short letter, which did not contain an answer to any one of the author's arguments, but instead thereof, a pamphlet came with it, bearing the name of one *Chubb*, for its author." This pamphlet was, no doubt, "The Supremacy of the Father vindicated," with a dedication "to the Reverend the Clergy; and in particular to the Right Reverend Gilbert [*Burnet*] Lord Bishop of Sarum." (2nd edition, 1718.) Whatever *Chubb* may appear in his later writings, he is here as strictly *Christian* as Dr. Clarke in his "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity." Yet the "Country Gentleman" says of him, (p. 73,) "What he drives at, I am well aware of; and by that way of reasoning, we may bring ourselves into downright Deism, which, I think, the *Arian scheme* naturally leads to." He, also, there mentions "the pamphlet wrote by *Philanthropus*," sent to him by the author of the MS., as "a full answer" to his first letter.

The "Country Gentleman" soon sent the second letter, to which his friend, "being much indisposed, caused a sort of answer to be wrote by another hand." Neither of these letters was he permitted to publish.

The "Country Gentleman" having

mentioned" (p. 22) "his *Arian* friend's preface to Mr. Stennet's book of Hymns," in which he had inferred, from Pliny's Epistle to Trajan, that "the Christians of that time sang songs or hymns to Christ as God," laments, in a note, that he should "afterwards renounce that important article; and continue so to his death." I had the curiosity to look into Stennet's "Hymns for the Lord's Supper, 3rd edition, 1713." After an "Advertisement to the Reader," there is "The Preface by another hand," written chiefly "in vindication of the practice of singing the praises of God as a part of Christian worship." The writer describes himself as one who "laboured under the prejudices of education to the contrary." At the end of the preface, in which are numerous quotations from the New Testament, all in Greek, there is "a hymn written by the same hand, upon his being convinced that singing is a part of divine worship." The "Country Gentleman" quotes, incorrectly, not, I hope, with design, his friend's translation of *Pliny*, whose Latin is in the margin, for, in the preface, the words relied upon are, "to Christ as a God," the proper sense of Pliny, who, familiar with the Pagan deification of heroes, and of favourites of fortune, who were no heroes, would easily misunderstand the language of grateful praise for blessings received through the mediation of Christ, which must, then, have abounded, as it always ought to abound, in the worship of the Christians.

I have observed very little out of the way of *modern* Arianism in the quotations from the MS., except that the writer appears to have adopted *Biddle's* notion respecting the Holy Spirit, as he is said "to take much pains to prove the Holy Ghost to be a creature, though with degrees of excellency superior to other creatures." Also, the author of the MS., having put "the doctrine of the Trinity upon a level with Transubstantiation," the "Country Gentleman" describes the latter (p. 17) as "a God made by a creature, which," he adds, "is downright nonsense, as well as blasphemy, and is very near of kin to that *Arian* position, that a creature can create principalities, angels and worlds." Yet the "Country Gentle-

man" had said, incorrectly, (p. 14,) that "those in the *Arian* scheme generally triumph when Christ is sometimes spoke of as *mere man*, as if that bespoke him to be nothing more." Incorrectness should, however, be excused, for "these letters were not designed for the press; the author was far enough from such a thought; but they having been perused by divers gentlemen, that were called good judges in this controversy, the author has been prevailed on, by their importunity, to do violence to his inclinations, and suffer them to come abroad." Having, however, done what he thinks "sufficient to convince gainsayers," as to those "that are fond of engaging in controversies—he does not design to reply to any thing they may object;" having discovered, after disputing through nearly 100 pages, that "disputes are endless, and not his province."

"That Jesus Christ is God by nature, of the same essence with the Father," is "the proposition" which the "Two Letters" are designed to prove. Some of these proofs would, probably, be rejected, as insufficient, by our more cautious Trinitarians. However easily a "Country Gentleman" might be satisfied, a practised polemic would not, I apprehend, venture to argue, as in the conclusion of this preface, that "if there is a God the Father, it necessarily infers, that he has a Son that is God also; or the epithet *Father*, is impertinent and superfluous;" and again, "that if there is *God the Father*, there must be *God the Son*, or he must be a Father without a Son, which would be an absurdity."

Yet if the "Country Gentleman" was *no great clerk*, he was not a confident and pitiless distributor of divine vengeance on supposed *heretical pravity*, such as too many great clerks have proved themselves. He was "not one of those who damn to hell all that differ from him in this point, though he would not be one of them, nor choose to take his lot amongst them." He may also put to shame, unless they are shameless, our *Christian* persecutors, who still "cry havoc," though they have already brought an indelible stain upon the character of British freedom, and have done more than infidelity could ever

effect, to dishonour "the worthy name by which they are called." As to "the Arians," (p. vi.) "who are in a very dangerous mistake," he is for "calling for the word to convince them, but not for the sword to destroy them;" because "fire and faggot, fines and imprisonments, are the engines of hell and Rome, but tend nothing to convince any one of the truth as it is in Jesus, who never suffered the least injury to be done to any that rejected his doctrine, except the *Gadarenes*, who preferred their hogs to heaven; and, therefore, he justly suffered the Devil to take possession of them, but did no harm to these vile wretches themselves." In this spirit once argued St. Athanasius; and it were well could he gain the attention of those *Christian* persecutors, who heard unmoved the dictates of truth and freedom from *Hume* and the late lamented *Ricardo*. "The Devil," says the *orthodox* Saint, when suffering under *Arian* persecution, "does therefore use violence, because he has a bad cause, and the truth is not in him. Jesus Christ, on the contrary, uses only exhortations, because his cause is good." (See "A Sermon, on Jan. 30, 1732," in *Gordon's Tracts*, 1751, H. p. 294, *Lardner*, IV. 281, 282, IX. 212.) *Lactantius*, as quoted by *Lardner*, thus concisely settles the question: "Nec potest aut veritas cum vi, aut justitia cum crudelitate conjungi;" a decision which may teach us what the *Christianity* must be, to which a persecutor can successfully appeal as "part and parcel of the law of England;" whether that oracular *dictum* proceed from a *Hale* or a *Jeffries*, a *Bailey* or a *Best*.

To return, once more, to the author of the *MS.* and the "Country Gentleman," of whom I wish any of your readers may give a further account. Both the disputants appear to have held a common faith in a supposed *natural religion*, on which so many pages had been expended, till the *necessity* of revelation became very fairly a question. Thus, as Dr. Ellis well observes in his "Knowledge of Divine Things," (1771, p. 12,) "a zeal for natural theology had well nigh destroyed all religion, and Dr. Clarke fell a sacrifice to *Kindel* by the very weapons he had put into his hands."

I quoted in p. 326, col. 2, President Edwards, as providing for the *elect* in heaven, as "a relish of their own enjoyments," the sight of their nearest and dearest connexions on earth, writhing in the indescribable torments of their eternal damnation. I have since found that the President was thus anticipated by a divine of the Church of Scotland:—

"No pity shall then be shewn to them from their nearest relations. The godly wife shall applaud the justice of the judge, in the condemnation of her ungodly husband: the godly husband shall say amen to the damnation of her who lay in his bosom: the godly parents shall say Hallelujah, at the passing of the sentence against their ungodly child: and the godly child shall from his heart approve the damnation of his wicked parents, the father who begat him, and the mother who bore him."

Mr. Thomas Boston, who died minister of Etterick, in 1732, is the author of this description, in his celebrated Calvinistic treatise the *Fourfold State*. (*State IV. Head IV. Sec. 2.*) Well might my friend Dr. Southwood Smith (from whose *Illustrations*, p. 381, I have quoted the passage) say of such theologians as *Boston* and *Edwards*, that "there are persons in whom system has so completely subdued the feelings of humanity, that they have brought themselves to view this horrid picture with a steady gaze, to contemplate it with complacency, nay, even to affirm that it is beautiful and glorious."

A description of hell-torments is, I suspect, among the sober-minded of those who believe in the endless misery of the *non-elect*, no longer a favourite topic as it used to be when that awful subject was treated from the pulpit and the press with horrible minuteness and a most presumptuous confidence. Yet even of those rash intruders on futurity, very few probably can be found, who proposed, like *Boston* and *Edwards*, to consume the bliss of heaven by a contemplation of the torments of hell; and those torments hopelessly endured, perhaps, by

— husband, father, wife,  
And all the dear companions of our life."

In the same page 326, according to a favourite distinction of the mode-

rate Calvinists, I have mentioned "preterition or reprobation," though it is, indeed, scarcely any thing but a distinction without a difference; or according to Wesley's explanation,

"God did not damn them, but decreed, They never should be saved;"

Though Bishop Burnet, in his *Exposition*, would prepare the 17th Article for an Arminian subscription *ex animo*, because "it does not make any mention of reprobation; no not in a hint." Calvin understood this subject better, and maintains the rigorous consistency of his *horribile decretum* against the moderates of his day; deciding, at the same time, that the *non-electi* will comprise a large majority of the human race, a decision, against which humanity has revolted in the gentle bosoms of many followers of Calvin, though it was worthy of a Christian persecutor who could conscientiously betray his correspondent Servetus into a prison, glory in his destruction, and insult his memory. Calvin thus writes:

"Multi, ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem ita fatentur, ut negent quemquam reprobari; sed in scitè nimis, et pueriliter. Quando ipsa electio, nisi reprobationi opposita, non staret. Diceretur segregare Deus quos adoptat in salutem: fortuito alios adipisci, vel sua industria acquirere, quod sola electio paucis confert, plusquam insulse diceretur. Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat: neque alia de causa nisi quod ab hæreditate quam filiis suis prædestinat, illos vult excludere." *Instit.* L. iii. C. xxxiii. S. I.

The old translator thus gives the sense of Calvin: "Many indeed, as though they would drive away the malice from God, do so grant election, that they deny that any man is reprobate: but they do too ignorantly and childishly: for as much as election itself could not stand unless it were set contrary to reprobation. God is said to sever them whom he adopteth unto salvation: it should be more than foolishly said that other do either by chance, or by their own endeavour obtain that which only election giveth to a few. Therefore whom God passeth over he rejecteth: and for none other cause, but for that he will exclude them from the inheritance which

he doth prædestinate to his children." *Institution*, (1634,) p. 462.

I have been very desirous of noticing, before the conclusion of your present volume, a passage (p. 55, col. 1) in the Obituary of Dr. Aikin.

I was the arbitrator chosen by the other party in 1806, and have still a distinct recollection of Dr. Aikin's patient investigation of the subject in dispute, and of the anxiety he discovered to perform the duties, not indeed of an advocate or a partizan, of which he was incapable, on such an occasion, but of an equitable judge such as an arbitrator should always consider himself, however, on commencing an inquiry, he may be, unavoidably, prejudiced in favour of the party who appointed him. I well remember that when the examinations were closed, and we had met to discuss the merits of the question, Dr. Aikin postponed the discussion, that he might re-examine some alleged fact which he apprehended that he had too hastily admitted.

These representations I have considered as becoming my respect for the memory of Dr. Aikin, though quite unnecessary to sustain, either among his acquaintance, or before the world at large, the reputation of his character for just discernment and strict integrity.

J. T. BUTT.

P. S. I can bear testimony to the "eccentricity of character" of Dr. George Edwards, (p. 179, col. 1,) from the recollection of a conversation I held with him in 1792, in company with some literary and political associates. Yet I suspect that you were misled, in imputing to him that very extraordinary dedication.

Mr. George Edwards, the celebrated naturalist, in 1751, prefixed such a dedication to the fourth volume of his "History of Birds." It is quoted, at length, in *Biog. Brit.* V. 554, where Dr. Kippis remarks, that it "was without doubt, very piously designed; but that the wisdom of it cannot be commended. Such an assumption," he adds, with his usual sense of propriety, "is too great for any human creature, and the few instances of the kind that have occurred in the history of literature have always been justly disapproved."

Portsmouth,

December 5, 1823.

SIR,

THE suggestion of your Reviewer, (p. 659,) that the accuser, who had the power of death, in Heb. ii. 14, was *the law*, appears to me to lead to a just and rational interpretation of the passage. Of this I was some months ago convinced, by reading Mr. Belsham's most valuable and lucid translation and exposition of Paul's Epistles. He has, I think, in his note on this verse, satisfactorily shewn that THE LAW was *the diabolos* to which the author referred. Had I not lost the recollection of the admirable paper on verse 16, in the Theological Repository, Vol. V. quoted by Mr. Belsham, I should not, in all probability, have been led to adopt so untenable an interpretation as that of heathenism; at least, beyond the unavoidable haste necessarily attendant on the weekly preparation of the lectures.

When your correspondent N. (p. 573,) made inquiries after Dr. John Collet, of Newbury, I expected that ample information would be afforded him from some of your readers in that town. As that has not been done, permit me to offer an extract from the account given of him by his intimate friend the late Rev. David James, in a Sermon preached at Newbury, May 28, 1780; so that my friend Mr. Rutt (p. 650) must have been misinformed respecting the year of the Doctor's death. The widow of Dr. Collet's brother is still living at Newbury, and is I believe in possession of the Doctor's books and MSS.\*

RUSSELL SCOTT.

"Dr. John Collet was descended of a reputable family. He was born on the fifth day of July, 1708, in London. Blessed in a father whose reverence for revealed religion was shewn by his diligent study of its dis-

\* Should your correspondent be desirous of obtaining more minute information respecting the Dr., I think it probable I might obtain it from a friend of mine at Newbury, who was accustomed in early life to accompany her mother and aunt one evening in each week to read and to converse on the prophecies: the Dr. was always the reader on these occasions.

coveries, and by some useful publications which were well received; and also in an uncle who was for some years a governor\* in two of our settlements in the East Indies, and whose conduct was an honour to his station; he, in early years, imbibed those sentiments of religion and virtue which laid the foundation for the exercise of that probity and goodness for which he was distinguished through his whole life. In his youth he was tractable and orderly, fond of learning, and rapid in his progress in it. The knowledge of the classics and other branches of literature he acquired under Dr. Ward, afterwards professor at Gresham College; and Mr. Weston, who kept an academy at Greenwich. From the place last mentioned, he went to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, in April 1725, to finish his classical education. Some time in the year 1727, he went to Leyden, in Holland, to study under the celebrated Boerhaave, and to qualify himself for the study of physic. After attending the usual course of lectures in that university, and approving himself to his superiors by his application and progress, he took his Doctor's degree on July the fifth, 1731. Quitting Leyden, he visited several cities and towns on the continent: stayed for some time at Paris in order to avail himself of the advantages which that city afforded for improvement in the practical part of dispensing medicine, as he afterwards did in London. Being thus qualified for discharging the duties of a physician, several places were proposed to him by his friends in which his knowledge and skill might be exercised. After some deliberation he fixed upon Newbury, and came here in July 1733, having a few days before been admitted a licentiate by the college of physicians in London. Here he continued from that time till his death, except about six years which he spent at Brentford and Uxbridge. In what manner he has demeaned himself during his residence

\* My late esteemed friend Mr. James was a native of Wales; and was not, I am persuaded, related, as supposed in the page above-referred to, to this gentleman, either by consanguinity or affinity.

R. S.

among us, how virtuously, unblameably, and usefully, most of you are sensible. His skill and success in his profession were indicated by his extensive practice for a great number of years. From the natural benignity of his temper he was ever ready to afford every assistance in his power to relieve the afflicted, and that without regard to distinctions occasioned by outward circumstances. The poor in a thousand instances have experienced his humanity and compassion, not only in removing their pains, but in granting supplies to their indigence."

"Exclusive of his peculiar province as a physician, his knowledge was various and his reading extensive." \*

Evesham,

December 9, 1823.

SIR,

I HAVE now before me two editions of the Latin Primer, by the Rev. Richard Lyne, Rector of Little Pethe- rick. The one, which is the fourth edition, 1806, after the following lines from Lucan, has the adjoined observations: (p. 41:)

Estne Dei sedes, nisi terra, et pontus,  
et aer,  
Et Cœlum, et virtus? Superos quid  
quærimus ultra?  
Jupiter est, quodcunque vides, quocunque  
moveris.

"In this example, 'Superos,' though in the plural number, may like the Hebrew 'ELOHIM,' be rendered in English by a word in the singular number, 'God.' That the sublime poet intended here only that one Spirit, which fills all space, is evident from the words 'Dei' and 'JUPITER,' both spoken of the same Divine Being, though in a different number from that of 'SUPEROS.'"

In the other edition, which is the seventh, 1820, the above observations are omitted. Was it from an apprehension of their militating against the

argument drawn by Orthodox Churchmen for the Trinity, from the word Elohim?

D.

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

No. CCCCX.

*The British Solomon.*

In the Funeral Sermon preached by Bishop Williams, (Keeper of the Great Seal,) and entitled, "Great Britain's Solomon," we are told, that His Majesty was in hand with a translation of the Psalms, "when God called him to sing Psalms with the angels." This discourse is a comparison of James with Solomon, but to the manifest disadvantage of his Judaical Majesty, even in wisdom and eloquence. As for conduct, "Every action," (saith the Bishop of Lincoln,) "was a virtue, and a miracle to exempt him from any parallel amongst the modern kings and princes." Now on reading this sermon, the question naturally arises upon the Right Reverend Lord Chancellor's motive for all these praises, since, whatever doubt might exist as to the other particulars in the King's life, one passage was undenied, viz. that he was naturally dead and going to be buried, if not actually under ground at the time. Why then should the Bishop so squander his commendations? The next sentence explains it: "Of all Christian kings that ever I read of, he was the most constant patron of churches and church-men." His successors were therefore to be shewn how it would fare with them in this world after their decease, if they followed his steps; they would be praised for a few weeks, instead of being suddenly forgotten. His Lordship further shews what became of the King's soul: "Severed from the dregs of the body, it doth now enjoy an *eternal dreaming* (qu. eadem sequitur tellure repostas) in the presence of God, environed no more with lords and knights, but with troupes of angels and the souls of the blessed, his forerunners." (Edinb. Rev. XXXIX. 36, 37, Note.)

\* "Among his papers there are several manuscripts on different subjects, some of which may possibly, at one time or another, be submitted to the eye of the public."

( 720 )

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Questions in Political Economy, Politics, Morals, Metaphysics, Polite Literature, and other Branches of Knowledge; for Discussion in Literary Societies, or for Private Study. With Remarks under each Question, Original and Selected.* By the Author of “*Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions.*” Crown 8vo. pp. 414. Hunter. 1823.

**T**HIS unknown Author's former work, of which we gave so full an account, (XVII. 553 and 625,) prepared us for expecting under the above title a valuable addition to modern literature, and we have not been disappointed. He now appears before us as a compiler, and though he does not surprise us by the extent of his reading, he wins our confidence by his familiarity with the best authors. His references are always pertinent, some

of the extracts are beautiful, and when he intermingles his own remarks, (we wish he had done so more frequently and more largely,) he shews a sound judgment, a rich imagination and a refined taste.

The title of the “*Questions*” explains their object. To that object they are altogether answerable. They will be highly serviceable to young men who are accustomed to associate for intellectual improvement, and they will not be uninteresting to general readers who wish to review their studies, to trace the progress of mental philosophy, and to see the argument on all the great questions that occupy the highest understandings exhibited in a condensed form.

We cannot better explain or indeed recommend the “*Questions*” than by giving one entire, as a specimen.

“ Ques. xlv. *Is it true, that as the Boundaries of Science are enlarged the Empire of Imagination is diminished?* ”

“ In the progress of society, a number of illusions, superstitions, and erroneous associations, which formerly produced a wonderful effect on the mind, and became powerful instruments in the hands of the orator and the poet, necessarily lose their influence. As things become better known, there is less room for the play of the imagination. Hence it is said the world has grown less poetical. In the words of Voltaire :

“ ‘ On a banni les demons et les fées,  
Sous la raison les graces étouffées,  
Livrent nos cœurs à l’inspidité ;  
Le raisonner tristement s’accrédite ;  
On court hélas ! après la vérité ;  
Ah ! croyez moi, l’erreur a son mérite.’ ”

“ ‘ Philosophy,’ says a very able writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, ‘ which has led to the exact investigation of causes, has robbed the world of much of its sublimity : and by preventing us from believing much, and from wondering at any thing, has taken away half our enthusiasm, and more than half our admiration.’ Vol. XXI. p. 25.

“ ‘ It cannot be concealed,’ says another modern critic, ‘ that the progress of knowledge and refinement has a tendency to circumscribe the limits of the imagination, and to clip the wings of poetry. The province of the imagination is principally visionary, the unknown and undefined : the understanding restores things to their natural boundaries, and strips them of their fanciful pretensions. Hence the history of religious and poetical enthusiasm is much the same ; and both have received a sensible shock from the progress of experimental philosophy. It is the undefined and uncommon, that gives birth and scope to the imagination : we can only fancy what we do not know. As in looking into the mazes of a tangled wood, we fill them with what shapes we please, with ravenous beasts, with caverns vast, and drear enchantments, so, in our ignorance of the world about us, we make gods or devils of the first object we see, and set no bounds to the wilful suggestions of our hopes and fears.’ ”

“ ‘ And visions as poetic eyes avow,  
Hang on each leaf, and cling to every bough.’ ”

“ See Hazlitt's *Lectures on the English Poets*, p. 18.



“ On the other hand, the discoveries of Science, particularly those of astronomy, have opened fresh fields for the imagination, and have added in various ways to the beauty and sublimity of natural objects. So at least thought Akenside when he wrote the following lines:—

“ ‘ Nor ever yet  
The smiling rainbow’s vermeil-tinctured hues,  
To me have shewn so pleasing, as when first  
The hand of science pointed out the path  
In which the sun-beams, gleaming from the west,  
Fall on the wat’ry cloud, whose darksome veil  
Involves the orient.’

“ The following passage, from the same author, owes all its sublimity to modern discoveries:—

“ ‘ The high-born soul  
Disdains to rest her heav’n-aspiring wing  
Beneath its native quarry. Tir’d of earth,  
And this diurnal scene, she springs aloft  
Through fields of air, pursues the flying storm,  
Rides on the vollied lightning through the heavens,  
Or, yok’d with whirlwinds and the northern blast,  
Sweeps the long track of day. Then high she soars  
The blue profound, and, hov’ring round the sun,  
Beholds him pouring the redundant stream  
Of light; beholds his unrelenting sway  
Bend the reluctant planets to absolve  
The fated rounds of time: thence far effus’d  
She darts her swiftness up the long career  
Of devious comets, through its burning signs  
Exulting measures the perennial wheel  
Of nature, and looks back on all the stars,  
Whose blended light, as with a milky zone,  
Invests the orient. Now amaz’d she views  
The empyreal waste, where happy spirits hold  
Beyond this concave heav’n their calm abode,  
And fields of radiance, whose unfading light  
Has travell’d the profound six thousand years,  
Nor yet arriv’d in sight of mortal things.’

“ In the discussion of this subject, there is one consideration, which has been generally overlooked. It is evident, that as civilization advances, as the boundaries of science are enlarged, as the world grows older, there is a wider and wider field opening for imagination in the past. Every day is adding to the page of history, and Time is perpetually covering year after year, and century after century, with his visionary hues and sombre colouring, with the moss and ivy of association. Past events are gathering round them that power of awakening thought and feeling, which must ever belong to what is separated from us by the flood of ages. Here, then, imagination has a continually increasing empire, a territory in which she may always ‘reign and revel.’ Our finest poets have accordingly resorted to it for some of their most splendid passages, and it may be fairly doubted whether modern poetry has not gained more from this single source, than she has lost by the dispersion of those powerful superstitions, which have fled the light of science,

“ ‘ As Etna’s fires grow dim before the light of day.’

“ Where is the superstition, that could afford a finer range to the imagination than the following?—

“ ‘ The stars are forth, the moon above the tops  
Of the snow-shining mountains.—Beautiful!  
I linger yet with nature, for the night  
Hath been to me a more familiar face  
Than that of man: and in her starry shade  
Of dim and solitary loveliness,  
I learned the language of another world.  
I do remember me, that in my youth,  
When I was wandering,—upon such a night

I stood within the Coliseum's wall,  
 'Midst the chief relics of almighty Rome.  
 The trees, which grew along the broken arches,  
 Waved dark in the blue midnight, and the stars  
 Shone through the rents of ruin ; from afar  
 The watch dog bayed beyond the Tiber ; and  
 More near from out the Cæsars' palace came  
 The owl's long cry, and, interruptedly,  
 Of distant sentinels the fitful song  
 Begun and died upon the gentle wind.  
 Some cypresses beyond the time-worn breach  
 Appeared to skirt the horizon, yet they stood  
 Within a bow-shot—where the Cæsars dwelt,  
 And dwell the tuneless birds of night, amidst  
 A grove which springs through levell'd battlements,  
 And twines its roots with the imperial hearths,  
 Ivy usurps the laurel's place of growth ;—  
 But the gladiators' bloody circus stands,  
 A noble wreck in ruinous perfection !  
 While Cæsar's chambers, and th' Augustan halls,  
 Grovel on earth in indistinct decay.—  
 And thou didst shine, thou rolling moon, upon  
 All this, and cast a wide and tender light,  
 Which softened down the hoar austerity  
 Of rugged desolation, and fill'd up,  
 As 'twere, anew, the gaps of centuries ;  
 Leaving that beautiful, which still was so,  
 And making that which was not, till the place  
 Became religion, and the heart ran o'er  
 With silent worship of the great of old !—  
 The dead, but sceptred sovereigns, who still rule  
 Our spirits from their urns."

LORD BYRON'S MANFRED.

ART. II.—*An Analytical Investigation of the Scriptural Claims of the Devil.*

(Concluded from p. 660.)

**M**R. SCOTT devotes the Xth, XIth, and XIIth Lectures to the consideration of our Lord's Temptation in the Wilderness. With the literal historic sense of this part of the gospels, he rejects also the hypothesis of its relating either a visionary prefiguration or a symbolic representation of the trials and difficulties of Christ's ministry, and maintains that it is a detail of mental conflicts, "the natural suggestions of a mind like our own." He acknowledges, however, that this interpretation is not free from objections.

The Lecturer makes some very just observations upon our Lord's being without food in the wilderness for forty days. He shews that the wilderness was not an inaccessible or wholly barren country ; that fasting did not always denote in Jewish language a total abstinence from food ; and that the expression forty days was a He-

brew idiom expressing a long time in reference to the action or event described. Hence, he concludes, (pp. 229, 230,) that "when it is said that Jesus fasted forty days and forty nights, we are not to understand by the expression that he literally went without every kind of food during that time, or that he was miraculously supported without eating and drinking, since this is not intimated in the narration by either of the Evangelists ; but that in the exercise of his ministry in the wilderness, being a long time without a sufficiency of nourishing food, he began to feel its effects on a constitution which does not appear to have been robust, but experiencing the uneasy and irritating sensations of hunger."

Lectures XIII. XIV. XV. XVI. and XVII. relate to the Demons and Demoniacal possessions of the New Testament. The author produces evidence to shew that the gods of the Heathens were deified men and women, many of whom were designated by the term demons and worshiped under that name : that centuries before the mis-

sion of Christ, the Heathens believed that the departed souls of good men became good demons, and the departed souls of wicked men became wicked demons: that these ghosts of the wicked, called demons, were regarded as the authors of many of the most distressing maladies and calamities with which men were afflicted, by entering into their bodies and taking possession of their whole frame: and that the Jews adopted these and other opinions, though in opposition to their Scriptures, from the Heathens, during their long captivity in Babylon, and subsequently in the Platonic school of Alexandria. He further represents that the most learned and skilful practitioners of those times disbelieved, controverted and disproved these absurd and superstitious ideas, and that the medical practitioners of the present day can trace the several causes in which these diseases, anciently attributed to the possession of the human frame by evil demons, originate: whence he infers that in the times of our Lord and his apostles, there were no actual possessions by demons or devils, but then, as well as now, each and all of those disorders termed demoniacal, proceeded from a great variety of causes, but all of them connected with the diseased state of the animal economy. Pp. 308, 309.

The critical examination of the case of the Gadarene Demoniac, in the XIVth Lecture, is masterly. The remarks upon his supposed worship of Jesus, (pp. 318—324,) are deserving of particular attention. In the following valuable passage, the reader will see a fair specimen of this part of the work:

“From the preceding examination of the actions and language of this Gadarene maniac, it appears that his was a species of insanity which is not uncommon in our own times. And if the Devil were the author of this afflicting malady then, as many of his believers assert, *why is he not so now?* Or, if these evil spirits, these departed ghosts of wicked men, called demons, occasioned this aberration of the human mind, in all its stages, in the time of our Lord, why do they not cause it now? The various degrees of mental derangement are now occasioned by some disorganization of the animal economy, produced either by an intemperate use of strong, and particularly of spirituous liquors; or by eagerly pursuing

vicious courses, and then making use of pernicious means to counteract their effects; or by giving way to violent passions; or by indulging in enthusiastic notions of every kind, *religious enthusiasm* not excepted; and also by what is termed natural causes. The human system, if we may judge from analysis, or from the description given us by medical writers of that age, and of the present, does not appear to have undergone any change since the time of our Lord. Man was then formed of the same component parts as he now is. Similar causes, therefore, allowing for difference of climate, and a diversity in the manner of living, the habits, the pursuits, and the occupations of men, must produce similar diseases. Knowing these things to be facts, we are not required in the Scriptures to believe what contradicts our senses or our experience; nor are we to regulate our faith by the credulity or superstitious notions of others concerning this or any other disease, in this or any other age. I have already endeavoured to account, and I hope satisfactorily, for our Lord and his apostles making use of the popular language, concerning certain diseases which they removed: their compliance in this respect, does not render it necessary for us to believe an absurdity, nor to credit an impossibility. Some of you may reply, All things are possible with God. True; but *goodness* and *benevolence* are essentially necessary to the perfection of his nature and character; *malignity*, therefore, can form no part of his moral government. These unclean spirits, these ghosts of deceased wicked men, called by Jews and Heathens, demons, cannot be employed by him to inflict diseases on mankind, because the avowed design of these demons, in thus entering into men, was universally acknowledged to be *malignant*. And malign in its consequences must that system of religion be, which is founded on the employment, or, at least, the permission, which amounts to the same thing, of a powerful, evil, malicious spirit, to act as the ‘implacable enemy, tempter, and tormentor of the human race;’ or to allow his coadjutors or agents to indulge themselves ‘in the malicious pleasure of making whom they possessed partakers of their torments.’ Such a system is calculated, from the horror and dreadful agitation it produces in some minds, to become an abundant source of mental derangement. Its tendency does not bespeak it to be the glad tidings of the gospel, nor to be peace on earth, or good will to men. Can it be glad tidings to men to be told that their Creator employs a powerful, malevolent, and implacable enemy to seduce them

from the path of duty; and if they permit themselves to be seduced, they are to be doomed by *him* to an *eternity of torments in hell*? I state not the melancholy tendency of this system upon my own opinion or authority, but on the authority, and as the opinion of one who must be considered as an impartial judge in this case, Dr. Joseph Mason Cox; \* who belonged, from his childhood till his death, to that class of Christians usually denominated Particular, or Calvinistic, Baptists. In his practical treatise on insanity, he observes, 'My experience has furnished many unhappy instances, in which the misplaced, injudicious zeal of preachers has induced *hypochondriasis*; in others, *insanity of the most incurable species* and *moping melancholy* often terminated by *suicide*. Professors of this description, with the very best intentions, too frequently make no allowance for the peculiarity of natural disposition, and impute to serious conviction and celestial influence what more properly belongs to *incipient disease*, or the agency of certain moral and physical causes. Nothing is more calculated to *depress hope* and *induce despondency*, than the indiscriminate practice of minutely describing, in the most glowing colours, the effects and consequences of sin, the horrors of hell, and the sufferings of the damned; dwelling on *the judgments*, more than on *the mercy*, and *the goodness*, of *the Deity*. And I remember to have heard Dr. Mason† deeply lament this tendency in what he termed 'the terrors of the gospel.'" —Pp. 332—336.

We wish the author had suppressed the passage, pp. 424—426, in which he treats almost with levity the statement in Acts xix. 12, that "handkerchiefs or aprons" from the body of Paul possessed a healing virtue. Mr. Evanson has, we know, denounced the passage as spurious; but it is we think unwarrantable and dangerous to apply the pruning-knife ad libitum to the Scriptures, and upon a supposed incongruity or improbability to disregard and set aside the united testimony of all MSS. and all versions. In this case, there appears to us to be no necessity for such a proceeding,

\* "Physician to the long-established Asylum for Lunatics, at the Fish Ponds, near Bristol."

† "Who belonged to the same class of Christians, and was grandfather to Dr. Cox, and his predecessor in that well-conducted establishment."

even were it granted that any particular theory must be supported at all hazards.

The Lecturer does not in our judgment state the case fully when he represents the Ephesian Exorcists (Acts xix. 19) as burning, rather than selling their books because they taught practices which were in opposition to the principles and precepts of the Christian religion (p. 428). These books were recipes for conjuring, Ἐφέσια γράμματα, spells or charms, and the converted magicians destroyed them because they were the known instruments of imposture, fraud and robbery, which are contrary to the principles and precepts of all religions.

Having concluded the investigation of the various passages of Scripture that refer to the Devil, the author proceeds in Lectures XVIII. XIX. XX. XXI. and XXII. to explain the language of the Bible, considered as referring, under the English term Hell, to a place of future punishment. He discusses at large the meaning of the words *Sheol*, *Hades* and *Gehenna*. He proves, we think, that *Sheol*, which in our version of the Old Testament is often rendered *Hell*, would be more truly translated, at least in the majority of instances, by the word *grave*.

The following bold criticism would be more intelligible at Portsmouth than at some other places:

"The next instance in point of time in which we find *Sheol*, is Jonah ii. 3, where the prophet says, that he prayed to God out of the belly of *Sheol*, i. e. Hell, according to our translators; but *Grave*, according to Archbishop Newcome. Jonah is speaking of his great deliverance by the kind providence of God, who, when he was nearly overwhelmed and sinking in a tempestuous sea, provided for his escape from a watery grave, by another ship, whose crew seeing his danger, went to his relief, and rescued him when he was in the very jaws of death, 'from corruption,' שַׁחַת, *shacath*, the grave: he had risen on the waves and descended with them, he had been down to the bottoms of the mountains; the earth, with her bars, was about him for ever. Ver. 6. While thus in the midst of the waves; now on the top of the mountain of the sea, and now at the bottom; from this bed of death, this belly of *Sheol*, he cried unto the Lord, who heard him. Ver. 2. When taken from this perilous

situation, he would, after all his exertions and fears, be naturally exhausted, and was most likely placed in the hold or bottom of the vessel, where he continued in safety for three days and three nights, i. e. until the storm subsided, which would probably be about thirty-six hours, one whole day, and part of two others, when he was safely landed by this vessel, whose distinguishing name, mark, or head, was a whale.\* Thus we have ships called after the name of fishes, Dolphin, the Nautilus, the Sea-horse, &c. At all events, Jonah could not mean to say, that he had been in the belly, or the bottom of such a Hell as our Calvinist brethren advocate; nor, that from thence he prayed to God. Jonah's Hell consisted of salt water, waves running mountains high; not of fire and brimstone. It is related of Hercules, that Neptune sent a sea-dog against him, that the dog swallowed him, and that he remained in the dog's belly uninjured for three days. This, perhaps, is only another edition of the preservation of Jonah by the dog. In the same point of view we may consider the circumstance which is related of Arion, the musician and poet of Lesbos, who, in escaping from the murderous hands of some mariners, jumped from the vessel where he was, upon the back of a dolphin that was close by it, which, having been charmed by his music, carried him safe on shore."—Pp. 495—497.

The Lecturer considers *Hades* to be synonymous with *Sheol*, but he does not satisfactorily explain our Lord's using this term in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, to signify a place of torment. He seems to us to be fettered in this part of his inquiry by his system as a materialist, which however, he frankly avows, asserting in the most unqualified manner, (pp. 530, 536, 566,) that "neither Moses nor the prophets were authorized to make any communications respecting futurity!" We cannot subscribe to this hypothesis, and if we could, (so differently are human minds constituted,) we doubt whether we should be able to admit that the Old Testament contains a Divine Revelation.

On *Gehenna*, rendered *Hell* in the New Testament, Mr. Scott says,

"This is not a Greek word, but is

\* "See Fragments to Calmet's Dictionary, No. cxliv. p. 103."

compounded of *γη* (*ge*), land, and *hinnom*, a proper name; in order to make it correspond as nearly as possible to the Hebrew for the valley of Hinnom; called by Joshua, (chap. xv. 8,) 'the valley of the son of Hinnom,' who assigns its situation near Jerusalem, to the south east. It was the place where the idolatrous Jews anciently celebrated the horrible rite of burning their children in sacrifice to Moloch, an idol of the Ammonites: a fire was continually kept there for this and other idolatrous purposes. To put a stop to such an unnatural and detestable practice, Josiah, about six hundred years before Christ, defiled or profaned the place, by filling it with human bones, as we learn from 2 Kings xxiii. 10—14. It was afterwards the custom to carry out the dead carcasses of animals, the filth and offal of the city, into this valley; in order to consume this nauseous assemblage a fire was kept continually burning. Jeremiah informs us, (chap. vii. 32, 33,) that it became also the common burying-place\* for the poor inhabitants of Jerusalem, who could not afford the expense of tombs or of embalming. Here also were *burned* the bodies of those criminals who were denied burial: and, indeed, some are said to have been there burned *alive*.† The Pharisees, whose opinions concerning the state of the dead were chiefly adopted from the Heathens, and certainly not from Moses and the prophets, had been long accustomed to designate the future punishment of those whom they considered to be wicked, by the name of this horrible place: horrible it really was, whether we consider the shocking inhumanity in which the first fire originated, or the loathsome disgustfulness which occasioned the second."—Pp. 566, 567.

In quoting and explaining Matt. x. 28, (*Fear not them which kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell*;) and the parallel place, Luke xii. 4, 5, the Lecturer does not attempt to reconcile his previously avowed materialism to these seemingly strong assertions of a substance that survives the body: his comment is in our view unsatisfactory, though

\* "That the valley of Gehinnom was a place of *sepulture*, may be proved by reference to various authorities, *Heathen*, Jewish and Christian. Clarke's Travels, Vol. IV. p. 353, note."

† "See Lowth's Isaiah, notes."

we are not certain that we understand it.

“ Our Lord here clearly designates the future punishment to be inflicted on those who do not fear God, by a metaphorical allusion to this mode of punishing criminals. . . It was a human, not a divine sentence ; it was temporal in its nature and origin ; a reference to it, therefore, could not be understood as intending to convey the idea that the future punishment of those who did not fear God would be eternal, like the Hell of the Assembly's Catechism ; nor did he hint, in the most distant way, that the sentence to which he alluded, was an association with the Devil and his angels.”—Pp. 575, 576.

Lecture XXIII. is from Isaiah xlv. 7, and the design of it is expressed in the following comment upon the text :

“ The prophet here rejects, from Jehovah himself, the idea of an evil being, the cause of evil and misery of any kind to the human race, and asserts from Him, that He alone is supreme and omnipotent ; that, besides Him, there is no powerful, omnipresent being, no universal principle of action, no source of good, no author of evil to any of his rational creatures : ‘ I, JEHOVAH, am the author of all these things.’ ”—P. 591.

In this Lecture, Mr. Scott considers the question, “ Whether the rejection of the Devil out of the Christian system, will not remove a salutary check from the minds of men, by inducing them to cast off not merely the fear of him, but also the restraints of religion and the fear of God.”

“ To this it may be briefly replied, that the principle of fear is not the principle of obedience which is recommended in the Christian Scriptures. They who believe a Devil to be necessary to keep men in the fear of God, and render them submissive to the Divine will, compare the kind and benevolent Father of mankind to a slave-holder, and themselves to slaves, requiring a slave-driver, the Devil, to be continually following them with his instrument of punishment, lest their fears should relax, and they become inattentive to the task allotted them. Is it, then, my brethren, the Devil who keeps you honest ? Are the commands of God insufficient for this purpose ? When you have a fair opportunity of defrauding others without detection, is it the Devil who steps in and prevents you ? When you are going to tell a wilful, deliberate falsehood, to serve some vile, base end,

does the Devil present himself to you, shaking his instrument of flagellation at you, restrain you, and instantly make you speak the truth contrary to your intention ? When you are about to defame others or to injure them, by any means, in their reputation and character, are you induced to desist by the Devil threatening to burn your tongue with fire and brimstone ? When you are about to commit a crime, or to indulge in any vice, are you prevented by the fear of the Devil coming and carrying you off with him into his infernal dominions ? If such be the nature of the motives which influence your conduct, you are the worshipers of the Devil and not of God, whose authority with you is perfectly nugatory ; it is the Devil who is all-sufficient with you. Your principles of obedience are not gospel principles ; for the Christian Scriptures command us to honour, serve and obey God from a principle of love, and not from a slavish fear or dread.”—Pp. 597, 598.

The XXIVth and last Lecture is upon Future Punishment, which the author maintains will be temporary and remedial. Here again he opposes “ the Heathenish notion,” (as he freely calls it,) “ of there being a principle in man which is naturally immortal.” This description of a tenet held by the majority of the wise as well as the vulgar of all sects in all ages, is perhaps not to be censured in a work professedly polemical ; but we would suggest whether it be quite correct or altogether candid to say, as the Lecturer says, p. 627, that “ the doctrine of a continuation of being at death, by one part of the human frame being immortal, is in *opposition* to the teachings of Christ and his Apostles, and must, therefore, be *anti-christian*” ?—The practical reflections which conclude the Lecture are truly excellent. Mr. Scott closes with an exposition of his design in taking up such a subject and defending so unpopular an hypothesis, and with a solemn appeal to the understanding and conscience of his audience.

We have said nearly all that we intended upon this work. The reader will have seen that we consider it highly creditable to the talents, industry and moral courage and Christian faithfulness of the preacher. It contains a mass of information, taken from the best authorities, on every

topic to which it relates ; and may be regarded as a text-book on the subject of Demonology. The author's desire to leave out nothing important on any part of the inquiry has caused the volume to swell to a great bulk : this of course limits the number of readers, but it makes the work more valuable to such as have leisure and resolution to study it throughout.

Our sincere respect for the author has not restrained us from stating some objections to his argument ; and he will, we are sure, take it in good part, if we say further that there are some epithets and descriptions in the Lectures which appear to us to be wanting in gravity and even in charity. We refer generally to the epithets " Devil-Believers," " Devil's Advocates," and the like ; to the phrase (p. 188) " head of the Holy Alliance ;" to the remark (p. 241), that the Devil was " not either a native or foreign Jew ;" to the fractional division of the legion of Devils (p. 346) which once procured a semi-profane nickname for a certain dignitary of the church, his only distinction with posterity ; to the appeal to the multitude (p. 401) on their not liking to be " on bad terms" with the Devil ; but particularly to the adoption, by quotation (Note, p. 261) of Mr. Wakefield's unworthy exclamation on a comment of Archbishop Secker's, " So easily are the wretched criticisms of bigotry and superstition put to shame !"

The author has prefixed to the volume a table of the texts preached upon and an Index of those explained or referred to, but not an Index of subjects, which we have experienced the want of, and which in so large a work, comprising so much miscellaneous matter, is almost indispensable.

ART. III.—*A Christmas Present for Young Persons: containing Poetical Allusions to our Saviour's Life and Sufferings; a Brief History of his Mission; and an Account of the Origin and Observance of Christmas-Day.* 12mo. pp. 40. R. Hunter. 1s. 1823.

THE little book here presented to the public does not display any of that elegance of ornament which is

to be met with in Mr. Ackerman's " *Forget me not,*" or Mr. Relfe's tastefully decorated " *Friendship's Offering.*" Its claims to notice are of a far more humble and unpretending character ; and while other productions of the season are calculated for display in the drawing-room, this is recommended as a companion for the young in their more serious moments, and as a means of fixing their attention upon more important subjects.

The first division of the book is written in poetry : the remaining two are in prose. The prose parts " consist almost entirely of extracts." The former of these contains a brief chronological sketch of the mission of Jesus ; the dates, as we are informed in a note, being entirely adopted from Dr. Carpenter's valuable " *Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament.*" This we think will be of considerable use in furnishing the juvenile reader with an intelligible account of the life of Jesus, by laying before him the events recorded in the different gospels in a regular and unbroken connexion. The extracts from Scripture are so numerous in this part of the book, that it may be considered as the language of the New Testament merely, with the addition of dates.

The " account of Christmas-day," appears to be compiled chiefly from Rees's Cyclopædia. It concludes with a copious extract, in which the arguments for and against the religious observance of this day are fairly though concisely stated.

But the " Poetical Allusions to our Saviour's Life and Sufferings," form the most important part of this little " Present." These are classed under the following heads : " The birth of Jesus.—The goodness of God in sending a Saviour, and the permanence of his reign.—The baptism of Jesus.—The Beatitudes.—The hatred of the Jews and the conduct of the Apostles.—The death and resurrection of Jesus.—The Saviour's patience and resignation.—The ascension of Jesus, and his second coming.—The blessings of our Saviour's Mission designed to be universal."—And, lastly, " The obligation of Christians to imitate and obey their Lord and Master."

The following passage, (p. 15,) will at once give the reader an idea of the general character of the poetry, and serve as the foundation for a remark.

“ Ah! why do war and bloodshed rage ;  
 And men with fellow-men engage,  
     In an eternal strife ?  
 When not the wolf that roams the plain  
 With kindred blood its teeth will stain,  
     Or take its fellow's life !  
 But man, more savage than the beast,  
 Still glories in the human feast,  
     And wields the blood-stained sword ;  
 Still triumphs in the trumpet's blast,  
 Sighs when the vengeful fight is past,  
     And union is restored.  
 Blessed are those the strife who stay,  
 And drive the demon War away,  
     And bid the tumult cease !  
 They are the favourite sons of heaven ;  
 To them the glorious prize is given  
     Of everlasting peace !”

These verses are intended as a paraphrase on Matt. v. 9, “ Blessed are the peacemakers ; for they shall be called the children of God.” The turn given to this passage in the above lines is well calculated for poetical effect, and for this reason it seems to have been adopted by our author. But it appears to us that the spirit of the passage would have been more nearly preserved, if the words of our Lord had been taken in a more restricted sense, and applied only to the circumstances of private and domestic life. Here, too, we may remark, that if the word *happy* had been uniformly adopted in the Beatitudes, as it sometimes is, instead of *blessed*, correctness and consistency would have been preserved, while the character of the poetry would have remained uninjured. These observations, it is hoped, will not be deemed fastidious and hypercritical. They are well intended, and, we have no doubt, will be taken in good part.

If this little book should come to a second edition, we would recommend the author to give it a more general character. By the addition of a poetical version of some of the most interesting of our Lord's parables, and select passages from such of his discourses as are best calculated to arrest and fix the attention of the youthful mind, it might be made to assume a still more attractive dress than it already wears ; and, under this new form, we feel no hesitation

in stating it as our opinion, that it would soon find its way into general circulation, and become one of the most useful little works for Sunday-schools and Christian families which we recollect ever to have met with. These hints are by no means intended to depreciate its character in the shape which it now assumes, which, as “ A Christmas Present for Young Persons,” we can recommend with the greatest sincerity and confidence to our readers.  
 O. P. Q.

ART. IV.—*The Apostle John an Unitarian. A Letter to the Rev. C. J. Blomfield, D. D., Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, and Archdeacon of Colchester, occasioned by his “ Five Lectures on the Gospel of St. John as bearing Testimony to the Divinity of our Saviour.”* By W. J. Fox. 12mo. pp. 50. Fox and Co.; Hunter and Eaton. 1823.

DR. BLOMFIELD has great reputation as a Greek scholar, but judging by the extracts from his Lectures that are given in this little tract, he is not likely to obtain much theological fame. Mr. Fox's answer to his arguments is complete. So we think, and nothing would give us more satisfaction than to hear that the Doctor proposes to shew that our judgment is wrong.

Controversy is, in general of less value on account of its vagueness and generality. Where disputants are fixed



to one point, the result is more likely to be favourable to truth. The Arch-deacon has chosen a narrow arena for the display of his polemical power and dexterity, and his opponent keeps strictly within the lists. We do not pretend to be impartial in the contest, but laying aside prejudice as far as we can, we feel authorized to pronounce, that the issue is decidedly favourable to Unitarianism.

The "Letter" is highly honourable to Mr. Fox, on account not only of the logical ability which it eminently displays, but also of the good temper in which it is written, there being no one phrase in it that the least friendly reader can object to on the ground of uncharitableness.

In the investigation of particular texts the Letter-writer is successful, but the general remarks towards the end are particularly valuable. There is a force in them which we see not how any candid inquirer can resist. Besides these, Mr. Fox has given (pp. 44—46) a table of propositions, supported by references to the Gospel of John, which justify the title of his Letter and prove the Apostle to have been an Unitarian.

ART. V.—*The Scriptural Meaning of the Title "Saviour" as applied to our Lord: a Sermon preached at Glasgow, July 28, 1822, at the Annual Meeting of the Scottish Unitarian Association.* By James Yates, M. A. F. L. S. Member of the Geological Society, one of the Ministers of the New Meeting-House, Birmingham. 8vo. pp. 46. Eaton. 2s. 1823.

THIS is a very able discourse; somewhat too critical perhaps for an unlearned auditory, but well deserving serious study in the closet. It has too the recommendation, rarely found in a Sermon, of some novelty, being the exposition (and it is a judicious and clear exposition) of a peculiar theory. The author will best explain his own design:

"The prosecution of this inquiry will lead you, I apprehend, to consider the term 'Salvation' as denoting in its most common scriptural sense, deliverance, not from eternal misery in the next world, but from guilt, ignorance and wretched-

ness in this; and, when you acknowledge Jesus as your SAVIOUR, to regard him as preserving you, not (according to the immediate reference and genuine force of that title) from damnation in the life to come, but from the principles and practices of 'this present evil world.' It is true, that all Christians, who shall attain to the bliss and glory of the heavenly state, will ascribe this deliverance, no less than the other, to the influence of their Christian faith; and, since the cultivation of Christian virtues here is the direct and appointed method of procuring unspeakable happiness hereafter, the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as our deliverer from spiritual darkness and corruption, implies an acknowledgment, that he is also our deliverer from shame and wretchedness in the life to come. It nevertheless appears evident,—and I hope to prove it to the satisfaction of candid and impartial minds,—that the terms under consideration are not most commonly used with any immediate reference to the effects of the gospel upon our condition after death; but that they are used, except in comparatively rare instances, to describe its beneficial operation during the present life; and I advance this interpretation with the greater confidence, because I am supported in it by the authority of some critics, held in high estimation by Christians of every sect; and especially by the authority of Dr. Henry Hammond, who gives place to none in long-established reputation for learning, diligence, accuracy and fidelity; and who, in his Commentary upon the New Testament, maintains in its fullest extent the view of the subject, which it is my design to lay before you."\*—Pp. 6, 7.

We think that Mr. J. Yates has

\* "See especially his Note on Luke xiii. 23: 'Are there few that be saved?' He shews the import of this question to be, 'Is the number small of those who embrace the Gospel?' He has also long and instructive notes, in support of the same views, on Rom. x. 1, and xiii. 11. Le Clerc, in his Additional Notes to Hammond, follows the same principle of interpretation; which is also adopted by Dr. John Taylor (see his Key to the Apostolic Writings, § 93, 94); by Mr. Kenrick, in his 'Exposition of the Historical Books of the New Testament'; by Mr. Belsham, in his valuable work, recently published, on the Epistles of St. Paul; and by the late Mr. Buckminster, of Boston, N. America, in his excellent Sermons, No. 18, on Eph. ii. 5."

made good his general proposition; whether its application in every instance be just and whether more might not have been usefully said of the exceptions to the rule, may admit of inquiry. The subject is entitled to

greater consideration than has been given to it in modern times, and the religious public is indebted to the learned preacher for bringing it forward.

---

## POETRY.

---

### EPIGRAM, BY SENECA, IN EXILE.\*

#### *De Corsica.*

Barbara præruptis insula est Corsica saxis  
 Horrida desertis undique vasta locis;  
 Non poma Autumnis, segetes non educat Æstas,  
 Canaque Palladio munere bruma caret;  
 Umbrarum nullo Ver est lætabile foetis,  
 Nullaque in infausto nascitur herba solo;  
 Non panis, non haustus aquæ, non ultimus ignis;  
 Hic sola hæc duæ sunt, Exsul et Exilium.

#### *Translation.*

The rude bleak rocks that guard this Isle express  
 The savage prospect of its nakedness,—  
 A Desert all around;  
 No golden fruit the mellow Autumn flings  
 Upon the fertile ground;—  
 No rip'ning crops the smiling Summer brings,  
 No Winter-olive grows,— (“Palladio munere”)  
 No where Spring spreads around her leafy wings,  
 Her Zephyr never blows;—  
 No verdure blooms within this hapless Isle  
 'Neath show'r and sunshine born;—  
 No flowers,—no crystal streams,—no Funeral pile  
 Around which friends may mourn;—  
 Ah here! from all Man's sweet Society apart,  
 But these exist,—*Sad Exile* and a *Banished Heart*.

R. B.

*Alnwick.*

---

\* Of the eight Epigrams,—“Hæc in schædis Pythæanis *palam* Senecæ adscribuntur,” in the folio edition, this is one, and “De Temporum Mutabilitate,” inserted and paraphrased in the Repository for August, p. 479, is another. The latter being there erroneously stated to be a passage in one of Seneca's Tragedies.

What a striking illustration this Epigram presents of the influence of Exile, in acerbating the mind, even of a great man! Barren, however, as Corsica may be, it gave birth to another, and more celebrated exile—Napoleon.

To find such men as Seneca and Napoleon, as well as some of the most distinguished of our own countrymen pining in exile, while it may cause us to heave a sigh for the weakness of human nature, should teach us how to prize the blessings of society and liberty.

R. D.

## OBITUARY.

1823. July 20, at *Dundee, Scotland*, of a short illness, DAVID HUGHS, for many years a member of the Unitarian church in that place. He was a member of the first Unitarian church established in Scotland, by Mr. Christie, of Montrose; and also the first who joined Mr. Palmer in Dundee, where he gave zealous and effectual support to that gentleman, in his endeavours to establish a Unitarian church in that place.

August 28, at *Bridport*, the Rev. MATTHEW ANSTIS. A few particulars, which have been ascertained respecting the life of one who was known to many readers of the Monthly Repository, and a brief notice of his worth of character, will, perhaps, not be thought unsuitable for insertion here. Mr. Anstis was born at St. Germans, in Cornwall, Feb. 27, 1740. A near relative gives the following account of his early history: "You are aware that his situation in the country, in early life, prevented him from having the benefit of a classical education, and it was not until about the 17th year of his age that he entered upon a course of study with the Rev. Thomas Morgan, the Dissenting minister at Liskeard, preparatory to his going to the Academy at Carmarthen, where I find he was in the years 1762 and 1763, under the tuition of the Rev. James Thomas. Here he formed an acquaintance with Mr. David Jones, late of Newberry, and corresponded with this gentleman till his death a few years ago; he also corresponded with his tutor for some years. I think he must have left the Academy about the year 1765, and gone to serve the Dissenting Meeting-house at Falmouth: but as his religious views did not accord with the general tone of his congregation, and as he was not inclined to conceal what he believed, he did not long remain there, but in the year 1766 went to Colyton, in Devonshire, where he preached for a short time, not, I think, more than a year, and kept a school. I hardly know when he first went to Bridport, but I think it must have been about the year 1767." For a few years after he became a resident in Bridport, Mr. Anstis performed the duties of the pastoral office to a small society of Dissenters at a village in the vicinity. He was induced, however, by what particular circumstances does not appear, after a time to devote his attention to the education of youth, and till

within some years of his death, conducted a large boarding and day-school. In this capacity he gained the gratitude of many excellent persons, who considered themselves under great obligations to him for the ability and faithfulness with which he discharged the duties of his station. The respected subject of this notice was remarkable for a quickness of susceptibility, which, while it sometimes evinced itself in a transient irritability of temper, rendered him habitually alive to every call of duty, and disposed him to take a deep interest in the welfare of all who had claims upon him. His readiness to sympathize with suffering, his lively concern for the welfare of mankind, especially as identified with the progress of truth and liberty, and his liberality, amounting at times to profusion, in pecuniary contributions, whether for the aid of individuals or for public purposes, will not soon be forgotten by those who had the best opportunities of estimating his character. In rather early life Mr. Anstis adopted the Unitarian system, and was an avowed believer in "One God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," at a time when the great majority of Unitarians in the West of England still held Arian opinions respecting the person of Christ. Although he withdrew from the charge of a congregation, he still occasionally preached, and never relaxed in his zeal for the diffusion of pure Christianity. The writer of this knew Mr. Anstis only after the burden of fourscore years had impaired his energies, and is therefore not competent to speak of what he was in the full vigour of life. It was pleasing, however, to observe that amidst bodily and mental infirmities, he never ceased to realize the full assurance of faith in the One True God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that this faith enabled the sufferer to express his firm conviction, in the sublime and beautiful sentiment of the venerable Lindsey, that "all things are from God, and for good to all."

W. B. G.

[Mr. Anstis was a liberal contributor to various Unitarian charities, under the signature of *Seneca Cornubiensis*. He held a peculiar opinion with regard to the Lord's Supper, which he asserted and defended in several volumes of the Monthly Repository, in papers signed P. K. The reader is referred to Vol. III, p. 495, and Vol. X, pp. 571 and 749. There is

also a paper of his, "on the Judgment of the World by Jesus Christ," Vol. III. p. 39, to which his intimate friend, the late Mr. Howe, of Bridport, replied in the same volume, pp. 563 and 605.]

Oct. 1, at Key, West Thomson's Island, West Indies, Lieutenant STEPHEN ROGERS, of the American Marine Corps, the sixth and only surviving son of the venerable William Rogers, D. D., of Philadelphia. He was carried off in the 24th year of his age by the yellow fever, and which he is supposed to have caught by attendance upon the sick; so that he fell a sacrifice to his humanity! He appears to have been an amiable and interesting youth, possessing all those qualities which endear the child to the parental heart. In 1818, he graduated at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, and subsequently at Nassau College, New Jersey. At both of these literary institutions his talents and attainments ensured to him academical distinction. Having entered the navy of the *United States*, he was acting under Commodore Porter, the object of whose commission was, with his squadron, to scour the seas of those pirates by which they had been long infested. A favourite with his superior officers, he would have risen to eminence in the service of his beloved country. But these flattering prospects have been terminated by a premature dissolution. *Mysterious Ruler—so it hath seemed good in thy sight!* His excellent parents, and three sorrowing sisters, whose loss is irreparable, have drunk too deeply into the spirit of *the glorious gospel of the blessed God*, not to bow submissively to the will of heaven. In the eye of Christian faith, and beneath the beamings of Christian hope, these distressing bereavements are "only so much taken from the enjoyment of *time* to enrich the prospect of *eternity!*"

J. E.

November 7, at Bury, Lancashire, in the 83rd year of his age, Mr. ABRAM WOOD, ironmonger, of this place. He was the son of a respectable farmer, a truly conscientious and pious man, and was born at Stubbins, about four miles distant. In the early part of his life Mr. Wood lived in London. He afterwards opened a shop as an ironmonger in Sheffield, whence, more than forty years ago, he removed to this town, where he has continued in the same line of business ever since. Mr. Wood was possessed of a very strong, intelligent, comprehensive and penetrating mind. Few persons have a greater knowledge of the human heart

than he had; or could more easily and thoroughly see into the real character and intentions of men. He was distinguished for a love of order, and executed any little mechanical work, of which he was very fond, with peculiar neatness. He had an exquisite relish for poetry, and was no mean judge of painting; and had he applied his attention to it, it is believed, by some who were acquainted with him, that he would have been no mean proficient in this charming art. This opinion is formed from a portrait of the Musical Coal Man, which he executed during his residence in the metropolis. As a tradesman, Mr. Wood's punctuality, prudence and industry were exemplary; which, together with the urbanity of his manners, and his cheerful accommodating temper, rendered him very successful. In social intercourse he was a delightful companion; the life of every friendly circle in which he appeared. He had a rich fund of anecdotes, which he used to relate with great propriety and charm; sometimes with the most pertinent effect; he often benefited while he pleased, "and laughing could instruct." He was also, though peculiarly unpretending in his religious professions, a sincere and pious Christian; whilst he lived in London, he attended upon the ministrations of the Rev. Francis Spilsbury and the Rev. Hugh Farmer. For their memory he ever retained the utmost reverence, and used often to express his thankfulness to Providence, which had so disposed his lot, as to permit him to enjoy the ministry of two such men; from which he had, as was very evident through all his succeeding life, derived the most important and lasting benefit. He was also a frequent, if not quite a regular, attendant on the evening lectures of the Rev. Dr. Fordyce, at Monkwell Street. While at Sheffield he attended at the Upper Chapel, upon the valuable ministerial services of the Rev. Messrs. Evans and Dickenson,\* a

\* Mr. Dickenson the writer of this article never knew; but he has often heard him spoken of in the highest terms by those who did know him, both as a man and a preacher. Mr. Evans was one of the first friends of the writer's ministerial life; and a better Christian, or a more judicious divine, he has never known! He was, indeed, a scribe well instructed to the kingdom of God; and of him it may, with the greatest justice, be said,

"He shewed the path to heaven, and led the way."

The writer would have felt uneasy if he

circumstance which he often spoke of with the warmest gratitude and pleasure. As long as ever the state of his health would permit, he was a constant and exemplary attendant on the public exercises of religion. He felt a very warm interest in the welfare of the religious society to which he belonged, and took particular pleasure in superintending and directing any work that was to be done about the chapel, a task that was always assigned him by his fellow-worshippers. Although his catholicism was unbounded, and he loved, as he was loved by most, good men of all parties and denominations, he was a firm Dissenter and a steady, consistent Unitarian, using that term in its broad, legitimate sense, i. e. as comprehending all who pray to God the Father only, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Mr. Wood married Miss Jackson, of Leeds, one of the best of women, and to whom he was always a most kind and affectionate husband. He was particularly distinguished by the tender attention he paid her during a heavy affliction, under which she laboured for many years, in the latter part of her life. She died about seven years ago. By her he had two sons, who survive him, and by whom their father's memory will be ever held dear. By the wise and judicious treatment of them he adopted, by making himself their companion and friend, he rendered his intercourse with them delightful, their home desirable and happy, and formed them to usefulness and respectability. As Mr. Wood's life had been honourable, useful and pious, his death, as might be expected, was attended by that peace which marks the end of the perfect and upright man. One circum-

had not paid this feeble tribute of grateful respect to the memory of this good man. He hopes, also, to be excused if he uses the present as an opportunity to express his best wishes for the prosperity and happiness of the religious society assembling at the Upper Chapel, Sheffield, and for the abundant success of the labours of their present excellent minister. From the fathers of the present members of that body, perhaps from some few present remaining members themselves, he received the most kind and friendly attentions, during his residence in their neighbourhood in early life; and while memory lasts, the recollection of the many delightful hours he has passed among them, both in the house of God and the enjoyment of private social intercourse, will be ever dear; while his heart can breathe a wish, its most fervent wishes will be breathed for the welfare of that society.

stance deserves particular notice; after he found himself, from the infirmities of age, incapable of attending much to business, he spent a very considerable portion of his time in the perusal of the Scriptures, and, in a peculiarly neat and legible hand, transcribing, in well-arranged and orderly sections, those passages which most struck him. This practice, as he observed to the writer of this account, he found of great service to him under the weakness with which the approach of mortality was attended. "I cannot now reason much," said he, "but different passages of Scripture are often occurring to my mind, and afford me suitable and unspeakable consolation." He could look up to his heavenly Father, and say,

"When nature sinks and spirits droop,  
Thy promises of grace  
Are pillars to support my hope,  
And there I write thy praise."

Thus lived and thus died this excellent man! By his decease many persons have been deprived of an esteemed acquaintance; some of a valuable beloved relative; the Christian society to which he belonged of a consistent, greatly-respected, and its oldest member; and what is of greater moment still, the world has lost an honest man. But the day is coming when they shall see him again! May all who knew and respected him imitate his virtues; that their latter end may be like his. And when they shall have accomplished their appointed course of duty and trial, may they, like him, have only to wait for their reward, from the Captain of their salvation.

W. A.

Bury, November 22, 1823.

November 13, in his 66th year, Mr. CHARLES TAYLOR, late of *Hatton Garden, London*. He was for many years the Editor and Principal Contributor of the *Literary Panorama*. He distinguished himself in the Baptist Controversy, by publishing "*Facts and Evidences on the Subject of Baptism*." The public are indebted to him for a new and improved edition of Dr. Wells's useful book on *Scripture Geography*. But his most valuable work is *Calmet's Dictionary*, which he published with *Facts and Illustrations*, &c. It is thought that the labour of getting a fourth and much-improved edition of that work through the press hastened his dissolution.

— 17, at *Almondale, in Scotland*, in his 75th year, the Right Hon. THOMAS LORD ERSKINE. (Of this distinguished advocate and friend of Liberty, we shall

probably communicate some further account hereafter.)

Nov. 18, at *Bristol*, aged 64, after a short illness, the Rev. SAMUEL LOWELL, upwards of twenty-four years minister of the Independent Chapel in Bridge Street, of that city. He possessed respectable talents and enjoyed considerable reputation as a preacher. He was generally supposed to belong to that large class of Christians who are called Moderate Calvinists. He was formerly minister of a congregation of that faith at Woodbridge, in Suffolk. Whilst there he published, in 1794, "Two Sermons," entitled, "The Mystery of Providence and Grace, and The Sins of Britain," and, in 1795, a Sermon against "Superstition," "Suggested by the late Consecration of Colours in various Parts of this Kingdom." The free sentiments contained in the latter were far from pleasing to some of the author's religious connexions. About the time of his leaving Woodbridge for Bristol, Mr. Lowell published an 8vo. volume of Sermons, which have been praised for their moderation, good sense, and easy composition.

— 29, aged 26 years, ANN, wife of James HILL, Esq., *Wisbeach*.

Dec. 19, at *Wisbeach*, Mrs. FARDELL, wife of Mr. Fardell, Leather Merchant. She was present at Mrs. Hill's Funeral Sermon apparently in good health, and on the second Sunday after, she was herself

consigned to the narrow house. The occasion was improved by a discourse from our Lord's words,—"Therefore be ye also ready."

Dec. 7, at *Bridport*, JOSEPH GUNDRY, Esq., aged 73. The subject of this notice passed through life in the modest discharge of its various duties, and experienced few of those vicissitudes which furnish matter for interesting biography. In every relation of domestic and commercial life, he secured the affection and esteem of those who knew him, by his unpretending excellence of character. As a member of religious society, his firm attachment to Unitarian principles, his readiness to aid in promoting their diffusion, and his exemplary regularity in attending the worship of God, demand particular notice. Till within a fortnight of his death, he ceased not to occupy his place in the house "where prayer is wont to be made," although for many months the infirmities of age pressed so heavily upon him, that nothing but a deep conviction of the importance of the service could have sustained him in the performance of it. His family and friends treasure up the recollection of his various excellencies with pensive pleasure, and are encouraged to hope that he was in some good measure qualified, by humble piety and sterling virtue, for admission to the society of the blessed in the life to come.

W. B. G.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### DOMESTIC.

#### *Unitarian Chapel in the Potteries.*

THE above Chapel was opened for public worship on Wednesday, November 19. The introductory part of the morning service was conducted by the Rev. H. Hutton, of Birmingham, and the Rev. J. H. Bransby, of Dudley, after which, the Rev. R. Aspland preached an appropriate sermon from Acts xxiv. 14—16. The discourse was, an Apology for the Professors of Unitarianism, the topics of which were suggested by the language and conduct of the Apostle of the Gentiles. After the service, the ministers and other friends, who favoured us with their presence, sat down to an economical dinner, Mr. Aspland in the Chair. When the cloth was withdrawn, a succession of sentiments and names were given from the Chair, connected with the cause of truth, virtue and liberty, which called

forth from individuals present a series of interesting speeches, some of which furnished the company with most gratifying information as to the progress of that righteous cause in this and in other parts of the world. The pervading spirit of the meeting, seemed to be one of satisfaction and delight, not unmingled with wonder at the new and pleasing situation in which they were placed, that being the first meeting of the kind ever held in this important and populous district. In the evening, the Rev. J. Yates delivered a discourse on the Superior Obligations to Virtuous Conduct arising from the Superior Parity of Unitarian Principles. On the following evening, a sermon was preached at Newcastle, distant from Hanley about two miles, by the Rev. J. H. Bransby, on the Advantages of Public Worship; and, on the following Sunday, Mr. Aspland preached again at Hanley twice. The services were well attended, and the collection liberal,

amounting to about £35. The event here recorded, is one to which the friends of truth must advert with the most lively interest. A very few years ago the profession of Unitarian principles, in a population of 50,000 souls, was confined to one or two individuals. In the chapel now erected upwards of seventy persons and families have taken sittings, and an opportunity will be afforded to many an one of hearing and judging for himself. What has already been done lays a foundation for gratitude and hope, and furnishes a claim to the liberality of the Unitarian public, which, we trust, for the sake of truth and piety, will not pass unregarded.

N. J.

hundred men. The late clergyman of this parish, was what Bishop Watson called "an esteemed Socinian;" the present is an avowed Orthodox minister. The father of the child recommended to the Divine blessing on this occasion, was for many years in the East Indies, where he had ample opportunities of witnessing the debasing influence of heathen idolatry; his attention has been lately directed to Unitarianism, and being convinced of its truth, he is laudably anxious to hold fast the purest religion, in its purest form. Judicious Unitarian Tracts are much required for this place, and for many others in the West of Scotland.

B. M.

#### *Quarterly Meeting, Manchester.*

THE Quarterly Meeting of Ministers, usually denominated Presbyterian, was held in Cross-street Chapel, Manchester, on Wednesday, December 24th. The devotional part of the service was conducted by the Rev. John Gaskell, of Dukinfield; and the Rev. John James Tayler, of Manchester, preached from Rom. i. 16. After service, the Annual Meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Book and Tract Society took place in the Cross-street Chapel Room. The ministers of the Quarterly Meeting, and a few lay-gentlemen, afterwards dined together, and spent the day in a very friendly and agreeable manner.

#### *Unitarianism in Ayrshire.*

(See p. 122.)

Two Sermons were preached on Friday the 7th of November, at Old Cumnock in Ayrshire, after the service of dedication, by Mr. Mardon, of Glasgow. The first discourse, from Matt. xviii. 3: "And Jesus called a little child unto him," &c. The evening discourse, on the want of Scriptural Evidence for the Doctrine of the Trinity, was listened to with profound attention, by more than a

THE "Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society" has just published an interesting report of its proceedings. The Society has been in existence and operation little more than a year, and the following places have been already supplied, by their preachers, regularly or occasionally: Middleton, Swinton and Irlams, Astley, Leigh, Blackburn and the neighbourhood, Wigan, Oldham, Hollinwood and Todmorden. Two congregations, Park Lane and Hindley, were supplied by the Society, while they were without regular ministers. At several places, Sunday-schools have been established, two of which contain about one hundred scholars each. Some libraries have been also formed: and in one or two of the congregations class-meetings have been held for religious conversation and reading.

IN the Press, and to be published by subscription, a volume of Sermons, selected from the manuscripts of the late Rev. Dr. Boog, Minister of the Abbey Church, Paisley. Some account of the excellent and learned author will be prefixed by Professor Mylne. To be neatly printed in 8vo. price 12s. boards.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

An Essay on the Nature and Design of Scripture Sacrifices: in which the Theory of Archbishop Magee is controverted. By the late James Nicol, Minister of the Parish of Traquair, near Peebles. 8vo. 12s.

The Doctrines of General Redemption,

as held by the Church of England and by the early Dutch Arminians, exhibited in their Scriptural Evidence, and in their Connection with the Civil and Religious Liberties of Mankind. By James Nichols. 8vo. 16s.

Dissenting Registers of Births, Mar-

riages and Burials, examined as Documents of Evidence. By A Barrister. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Antichrist detected among Reputed Orthodox Christians. In a Series of Essays. By Richard Wright. 8vo. 4d.

Private Correspondence of the late W. Cowper, Esq., with several of his most intimate Friends: From the Originals, in possession of the Editor, the Rev. Dr. Johnson, Rector of Yaxham with Welborne, Norfolk. 2 Vols. 8vo. Portraits of Cowper and Mrs. Unwin.

Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, and, as historically connected, on the Primeval Religion, on the Judaic and on the Heathen, Public, Mystical and Philosophical: the latter proposed as an Appendix to the Political and Military History of Greece. By W. Mitford, Esq. 9s.

The Christian Philosopher; or, the Connexion of Science with Religion. By Thomas Dick. 12mo. 7s.

Thoughts on Final Universal Restoration. By C. Baring, Esq. 12mo. 2s.

Lives of Learned and Eminent Men, taken from Authentic Sources, adapted to the Use of Children of Four Years Old and Upwards. Portraits. 2 Vols. 18mo. 5s.

Memoirs of the Reign of George III. from the Treaty of Amiens, 1802, to the Termination of the Regency, 1820. By William Belsham. 2 Vols. 8vo. (forming the 9th and 10th Volumes of the Memoirs of George III., and the 13th and 14th Volumes of the History of Great Britain.) 1l. 1s.

Sacred Dissertations on the Apostles' Creed. By Herman Witsius, D. D. Translated from the Latin, and followed with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By Donald Frazer, Minister of the Gospel, Kennoway. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 2s.

Sabæan Researches, in a Series of Essays, addressed to distinguished Antiquaries, and including the Substance of a Course of Lectures, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, on the Engraved Hieroglyphics of Chaldea, Egypt and Canaan. By John Landseer, F. S. A., &c. Illustrated with Engravings of Babylonian Cylinders, and other unedited Monuments of Antiquity. 4to. 2l. 12s. 6d.

The Atlas of Nature, being a Collection of large and curious Engravings, representing every remarkable Object and Phenomenon in the various Departments of Natural Knowledge; designed to serve the same purposes in the Study of Nature, as are served by an Atlas of Maps in the Study of Geography. The whole consists of nearly 100 Half-sheets of En-

gravings, and includes about 1500 several Subjects, some of them of a large size, and many of them accurately coloured after Nature. Copious Letter-press Descriptions are also introduced. 2l. 10s. in Boards, or 2l. 12s. 6d. Half-bound.

Elements of Experimental Chemistry. By William Henry, M. D. F. R. S., &c. The Ninth Edition, enlarged and recomposed throughout. Illustrated with Ten Plates by Lowry, and numerous Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 14s.

The Art of Preserving the Sight unimpaired to extreme Old Age, and of re-establishing and strengthening it when it becomes weak: with Observations on the Inconveniences and Dangers arising from the Use of Common Spectacles, &c. &c. By an Experienced Oculist. Fifth Edition, improved, 5s. 6d.

A Treatise on the Culture and Management of Fruit Trees. By Charles Harrison, F. H. S. London, Gardener to J. A. Stuart Wortley, Esq., M. P. 8vo. 12s.

Professor Sandford's Junior Greek Class Book: Extracts from various Greek Authors, with Notes and a Lexicon. 8vo. 6s. bound.

Philosophical Essays, selected from the Originals, printed in the Philosophical Journals. To which are added Essays, not before printed. By Ezekiel Walker. 8vo. Copper-plates. 10s. 6d.

Statements in regard to the Pauperism of Glasgow, from the Experience of the last Eight Years. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. 8vo. 2s.

A Letter to Lord Grenville, on the late Expulsion of Mr. Baillie from Christ Church, Oxford. 1s.

A Sketch of a proposed Universal System of Weights and Measures; to which is added an Appendix, containing a Brief Sketch of a proposed Universal Calendar. 1s.

Travels through Part of the United States and Canada, in 1818 and 1819. By John M. Duncan, A. B. 2 Vols. post 8vo. 16s.

Travels through Sweden, Norway and Finmark, to the North Cape, in the Summer of 1820. By Arthur de Capell Brooke, Esq., F. R. S. Thirty-three Plates. 2l. 10s.

Northern Scenery: the most Remarkable and Striking Features of Sweden, Norway and Lapland: India Paper. 15s.

The Costume of Sweden, in imperial 4to. illustrated by 22 beautifully coloured Plates. 3l. 3s.

Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa. By W. J. Burchell, Esq. 4to. Vol. II. Map and 116 coloured and black Engravings. 4l. 14s. 6d.



**The Last Days of Spain; or, an Historical Sketch of the Measures taken by the Continental Powers, in order to destroy the Spanish Constitution.** By An Eye Witness. 8vo. 3s.

**London and Paris; or, Comparative Sketches.** By the Marquess de Vermont and Sir Charles Darnley, Bart. 8vo. 9s.

**Specimens of British Poetry,** chiefly selected from Authors of High Celebrity, and interspersed with Original Writings. By Elizabeth Scott. 8vo. 10s.

**Sonnets, Original and Translated.** By the late Charles Johnston, Esq., of Danson, Kent. Crown 8vo. 9s. 6d.

**Faust, a Drama,** translated from the German of Goëthe. By Lord Francis Leveson Gower. 8vo. 12s.

**The Vespers of Palermo, a Tragedy.** 3s.

**Caius Gracchus, a Tragedy;** as performed at the Theatre-Royal, Drury-Lane. By James Sheridan Knowles, Esq. Author of *Virginius*. 3s. 6d.

**Clara Chester; a Poem.** By the Author of "Rome," and "The Vale of Chamouni." Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**Salmagundi; or, The Whig-Whams and Opinions of Launcelot Langstaff, Esq.** By the Author of the Sketch Book. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**Percy Mallory.** By the Author of *Pen Owen*. 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 17. 10s.

**Charlton, or Scenes in the North of Ireland.** By John Gamble, Author of *Irish Sketches, &c.* 3 Vols. 18s.

**Illustrations, Historical, Biographical and Miscellaneous, of the Novels by the Author of Waverley, with Criticisms General and Particular.** By Richard Warner, Rector of Great Chalfield, Wilts. 12mo. 8s.

**The Koromantyn Slaves, or West Indian Sketches.** By the Author of "The Solace of an Invalid." Foolscap 8vo. 5s. 6d.

**Miracles; a Rhapsody.** By E. Barton. 2s. 6d.

**A Complete Exposure of the late Irish Miracles, being a disquisition on the Nature, Object, and Evidence of Christian Miracles, as opposed to the late imposture, in a Letter to Dr. Murray, Titular Archbishop of Dublin. To which are prefixed prefatory remarks on two recent Pamphlets, the "Rhapsody" and the "Vindication of the Principles, Civil and Religious, of the Irish Catholics."** By a Rational Christian. 2nd Edition. 2s. 6d.

**An Attempt to explain, on natural principles, the Cures, alleged to be miraculous, of Miss Lobb and Mrs. Stewart. With an Appendix, containing Cases and Illustrations.** By a Physician. 2nd Edition. 1s.

**A Brief Outline of an Examination of the Song of Solomon, &c., in which the most important Passages are diligently traced to their Hebrew Origin, and illustrated by Remarks Critical and Expository.** By William Davidson, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

**Mental Discipline; or, Hints on the Cultivation of Intellectual and Moral Habits, addressed to Students in Theology and Young Ministers.** By H. F. Burder, M. A. Vol. II. 8vo. 4s. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

**Observations on the Antichristian Tendency of Modern Education and on the Means of its Improvement.** By John Campbell, of Carbrook, F.R.S.E. 2s. 6d.

**Letters on the Extent of the Death of Christ, in Reply to a Sabbath-School Teacher in the West of Scotland.** By James Methven, Stewarton. 1s. 3d.

**A Treatise on Religious Fasting.** By E. B. Lloyd. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

**Miscellaneous Pieces on Sacred Subjects, in Prose and Verse.** By J. Lettice, D. D., written in the 83rd and 84th Years of his Age. 8vo. 6s.

**The Approach of the Latter Days: in Four Dissertations on the following subjects: the Sword or War, Pestilence, Famine and Antichrist.** Reprinted from a Work published in 1713. Demy 8vo. 7s.

**The Christian Religion made Plain, or a Dissuasive from Methodism: with an Appendix, in 3 Parts; the 1st on the Probability of Punishment being corrective, rather than vindictive and everlasting, the 2nd on the Resurrection of the Last Day, the 3rd on the Trinity, &c.** By the Rev. Richard Boucher, Rector of Bright Waltham, Berks. 8vo.

**An Analogical and Popular View of the Church of the Living God, shewing that a Graduated Three-fold Priesthood is found no less under the Christian, than under the Jewish Dispensation, and that Diocesan Episcopacy is in accordance with the pattern delivered from Mount Sinai, as acted upon by our Lord and his Apostles, and their Successors, the Bishops of the Universal Church.** By Thomas Pruen, Curate of Dursley, Gloucestershire. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

**Arminians Reproved and Arminianism Refuted, in a Series of Letters to the Rev. William Lord, Wesleyan Minister at Brighton.** By John Drury, Minister of the Gospel at New Shoreham, Sussex. 1s. 4d.

**Eighteen Short Essays on Prayer, and the Ministry of the Word.** By Samuel Greens, of Bluntisham. 5s.

**The Even-Tide; being a Development of the Mysteries of Daniel and St. John.** By J. A. Brown. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

*Sermons.*

**The History of Christ, a Testimony to the Sole Deity of the Father: and the Connexion between Divine and Human Philanthropy.** Two, preached September 14, 1823, on the Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Edinburgh. By W. J. Fox. 8vo.

Preached in the Parish Church of St. John's, Glasgow. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the late Rev. T. N. Toller, of Kettering: with a Memoir of the Author by the Rev. R. Hall, M. A., of Leicester. 8vo. 10s.

Discourses suited to the Administration of the Lord's Supper, agreeably to the Forms of the Scottish Church. By the Rev. J. Brown, Edinburgh. 12mo. 5s.

Practical, by Joseph Milner, M. A., Vicar of the Holy Trinity Church, Hull. 8vo. Vol. III. 12s.

A Second Series, Doctrinal and Practical, adapted to the Service of Particular Sundays. By James Aspinall, A. M., of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Curate of Rochdale. 8vo. 8s.

A Monitor to Families; or Discourses on some of the Duties and Scenes of Domestic Life. By Henry Belfrage, Minister in Falkirk. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

*Single.*

**The Apostle Paul's Confession of Heresy:** preached before the Sussex Unitarian Association at Brighton, on Wednesday, August 27; and on the Opening of the New Unitarian Chapel at Hanley, Staffordshire, on Wednesday, November

19, 1823. By Robert Aspland. 12mo. 1s.

**The Creed of Unitarians identified with that of Paul:** preached before the Eastern Unitarian Society, at Bury St. Edmunds, June 26, 1823. By William Selby. 12mo.

**A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Merioneth.** By John Jones, M. A. 8vo. 2s.

**A Charge delivered at the Primary Triennial Visitation of the Province of Munster, in the Year 1823.** With an Appendix, containing Observations on Church Property. By Richard, Archbishop of Cashel. 2s.

**On the Crime of Murder,** preached at the Parish Church of Enfield, Nov. 23, 1823. By D. Cresswell, D. D. F. R. S., Vicar. 1s. 6d.

**Jesus Christ in his Divine Nature the Unchangeable God:** preached at Sion Chapel, Fletcher Gate, Nottingham, April 20, 1823, in a Funeral Sermon for the Rev. John Bryan, their beloved Pastor. By Alexander Start, of Ashbourn. 8vo.

**The Masonic Jennerian Sermon,** preached in the Cathedral of Gloucester, Aug. 19, 1823, in aid of the Subscription for Erecting a Monument in Honour of Dr. Jenner, before the Provincial Grand Lodges of the Counties of Gloucester and Hereford, and a very numerous and respectable Assemblage of the Craft. By T. D. Foshroke, Past Provincial Grand Chaplain of the Counties of Gloucester, Hereford and Monmouth. Published for the Benefit of the Monumental Fund. 8vo.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Hampson; Dunn; and Duplock: from S. H. (Exeter); Clericus; G. M. D.; and Berens.

The letter of "An Original Subscriber, &c.," is put into the hands of the Editor of the work in question.

Several communications have been made to us on the subject of a late recantation of Unitarianism, but our sincere pity for the unhappy man whose name has been so indecently proclaimed by the Methodists to the world will not allow us to risque the possibility of disturbing his last moments by exhibiting his true character.

We have received, through a bookseller, W. W.'s MS. volume. We have hitherto been able only to read a few passages, but the impression upon our mind is, that we shall be disposed to insert the Correspondence contained in it, in some successive Numbers of our next Volume.

We have received from our friend and correspondent, Professor Chenevière, of Geneva, an *Historical Account of the late Theological Disputes at Geneva*, which will appear in a Translation in the volume which will begin with the next Number.

In our next Number, the first of Vol. XIX., will be given an Engraved Portrait of RAMMOHUN ROY, the Hindoo Christian Reformer.

## ERRATUM.

P. 626, col. 2, line 35 from the bottom, for "exacted by," read "exacted from."