THE

Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXI.] MAY, 1824. [Vol. XIX.

Character of an English Judge:

A Sermon preached at the Cathedral of York, on Sunday, March 28, before the Judges of the Northern Circuit, by the Rev. SYDNEY SMITH, Chaplain to the High Sheriff, Walter Fawkes, Esq.

[From *The Morning Herald.*]

"Sittest thou here to judge me after the law, and commandest thou me to be smitten contrary to the law?"—Acts xxiii. 3.

"WITH these bold words St. Paul repressed the unjust violence of that ruler who would have silenced his arguments, and extinguished his zeal for the Christian faith: knowing well the misfortunes which awaited him, prepared for deep and various calamity, not ignorant of the violence of the Jewish multitude, not unused to suffer, not unwilling to die, he had not prepared himself for the monstrous spectacle of perverted justice; but loosing that spirit to whose fire and firmness we owe the very existence of the Christian faith, he burst into that bold rebuke which brought back the extravagance of power under the controul of law, and branded it with the feelings of shame: 'Sittest thou here to judge me after the law, and commandest thou me to be smitten contrary to the law?'

"I would observe that in the Gospels, and the various parts of the New Testament, the words of our Saviour and of St. Paul, when they contain any opinion, are always to be looked upon as lessons of wisdom to us, however incidentally they may have been delivered, and however shortly they may have been expressed. As their words were to be recorded by inspired writers, and to go down to future ages, nothing can have been said without reflection and design. Nothing is to be lost; every thing is to be studied: a great moral lesson is often conveyed in a few words. Read slowly, think deeply, let every word enter into your soul, for it was intended for your soul.

"I take these words of St. Paul as a condemnation of that man who smites contrary to the law; as a praise of that man who judges according to the law; as a religious theme upon the importance of human justice to the happiness of mankind: and if it be that theme, it is appropriate to this place, and to the solemn public duties of the past and the ensuing week, over which some here present will preside, at which many here present will assist, and which almost all here present will witness.

"I will discuss, then, the importance of judging according to the law—or, in other words, of the due administration of justice upon the character and happiness of nations. And in so doing, I will begin with stating a few of those circumstances which may mislead even good and conscientious men, and subject them to the unchristian sin of smiting contrary to the law. I will state how that justice is purified and perfected, by which the happiness and character of nations is affected to a good purpose.

"I do this with less fear of being misunderstood, because I am speaking before two great magistrates, who have lived much among us; and whom—because they have lived much among us—we have all learned to respect and regard, and to whom no man fears to consider himself as accountable, because all men see that they, in the administration of their high office, consider themselves as deeply and daily accountable to God.

"And let no man say, 'Why teach such things? Do you think they must not have occurred to those to whom they are a concern?' I answer to this, that no man preaches novelties and discoveries; the object of preaching is, constantly to remind mankind of what mankind are constantly forgetting; not to supply the defects of human intelligence, but to fortify the feebleness of human resolutions, to

recall mankind from the by-paths where they turn, into that broad path of salvation which all know, but few tread. These plain lessons the humblest ministers of the gospel may teach, if they are honest, and the most powerful Christians will ponder, if they are wise. No man, whether he bear the sword of the law, or whether he bear that sceptre which the sword of the law cannot reach, can answer for his own heart to-morrow, and can say to the teacher, 'Thou warnest me, thou teachest me in vain.'

"A Christian Judge, in a free land, should, with the most scrupulous exactness, guard himself from the influence of those party feelings, upon which, perhaps, the preservation of political liberty depends, but by which the better reason of individuals is often blinded, and the tranquillity of the public disturbed. I am not talking of the ostentatious display of such feelings; I am hardly talking of any gratification of which the individual himself is conscious; but I am raising up a wise and useful jealousy of the encroachment of those feelings, which, when they do encroach, lessen the value of the most valuable, and lower the importance of the most important men in the country. I admit it to be extremely difficult to live amidst the agitations, contests and discussions of a free people, and to remain in that state of cool, passionless, Christian candour, which society expect from their great magistrates; but it is the pledge that magistrate has given, it is the life he has taken up, it is the class of qualities which he has promised us, and for which he has rendered himself responsible: it is the same fault in him, which want of courage would be in some men, and want of moral regularity in others. It runs counter to those very purposes, and sins against those utilities for which the very office was created: without these qualities, he who ought to be cool, is heated; he who ought to be neutral, is partial; the ermine of justice is spotted; the balance of justice is unpoised; the fillet of justice is torn off; and he who sits to judge after the law, smites contrary to the law.

"And if the preservation of calmness amidst the strong feelings by which a Judge is surrounded be difficult, is it not also honourable? And would it be honourable if it were not difficult? Why do men quit their homes, and give up their common occupations, and repair to the tribunal of justice? Why this bustle and business, why this decoration and display, and why are we all eager to pay our homage to the dispensers of justice? Because we all feel that there must be, somewhere or other, a check to human passions; because we all know the immense value and importance of men, in whose placid equity and mediating wisdom we can trust in the worst of times; because we cannot cherish too strongly, and express too plainly, that reverence we feel for men, who can rise up in the ship of the state, and rebuke the storms of the mind, and bid its angry passions be still.

"A Christian Judge, in a free land, should not only keep his mind clear from the violence of party feeling, but he should be very careful to preserve his independence, by seeking no promotion, and asking no favours from those who govern: or, at least, to be (which is an experiment not without danger to his salvation) so thoroughly confident of his motives and his conduct, that he is certain the hope of favour to come, or gratitude for favour past, will never cause him to swerve from the strict line of duty. It is often the lot of a Judge to be placed, not only between the accuser and the accused, not only between the complainant and him against whom it is complained, but between the governors and the governed, between the people and those whose lawful commands the people are bound to obey. In these sort of contests, it unfortunately happens that the rulers are sometimes as angry as the ruled; the whole eyes of a nation are fixed upon one man, and upon his character and conduct the stability and happiness of the times seem to depend. The best and firmest magistrates cannot tell how they may act under such circumstances, but every man may prepare himself for acting well under such circumstances, by cherishing that quiet feeling of independence, which removes one temptation to act ill. Every man may avoid putting himself in a situation where his hopes of advantage are on one side, and his sense of duty on the other: such a temptation may be

withstood, but it is better it should not be encountered. Far better that feeling which says, 'I have vowed a vow before God; I have put on the robe of justice; farewell avarice, farewell ambition: pass me who will, slight me who will, I live henceforward only for the great duties of life; my business is on earth, my hope and my reward are in God.'

"He who takes the office of a Judge, as it now exists in this country, takes in his hand a splendid gem, good and glorious, perfect and pure. Shall he give it up mutilated, shall he mar it, shall he darken it, shall it emit no light, shall it be valued at no price, shall it excite no wonder? Shall he find it a diamond, shall he leave it a stone? What shall we say to the man who would wilfully destroy with fire the magnificent temple of God, in which I am now preaching? Far worse is he who ruins the moral edifices of the world, which time, and toil, and many prayers to God, and many sufferings of men have reared: who puts out the light of the times in which he lives, and leaves us to wander amid the darkness of corruption and the desolation of sin. There may be, there probably is in this church, some young man who may hereafter fill the office of an English Judge, when the greater part of those who hear me are dead, and mingled with the dust of the grave. Let him remember my words, and let them form and fashion his spirit: he cannot tell in what dangerous and awful times he may be placed; but as a mariner looks to his compass in the calm, and looks to his compass in the storm, and never keeps his eyes off his compass, so in every vicissitude of a judicial life, deciding for the people, deciding against the people, protecting the just rights of kings, or restraining their unlawful ambition, let him ever cling to that pure, exalted and Christian independence, which towers over the little motives of life; which no hope of favour can influence, which no effort of power can controul.

"A Christian Judge, in a free country, should respect, on every occasion, those popular institutions of justice, which were intended for his controul and for our security. To see humble men collected accidentally from the neighbourhood, treated with tenderness and courtesy by supreme magistrates of deep learning and practised understanding, from whose views they are perhaps at that moment differing, and whose directions they do not choose to follow; to see at such times every disposition to warmth restrained, and every tendency to contemptuous feeling kept back; to witness this submission of the great and wise, not when it is extorted by necessity, but when it is practised with willingness and grace, is a spectacle which is very grateful to Englishmen, which no other country sees, which, above all things, shews that a Judge has a pure, gentle and Christian heart, and that he never wishes to smite contrary to the law.

"May I add the great importance in a Judge, of courtesy to all men, and that he should, on all occasions, abstain from unnecessary bitterness and asperity of speech. A Judge always speaks with impunity, and always speaks with effect. His words should be weighed, because they entail no evil upon himself, and much evil upon others. The language of passion, the language of sarcasm, the language of satire is not, on such occasions, Christian language: it is not the language of a Judge. There is a propriety of rebuke and condemnation, the justice of which is felt even by him who suffers under it; but when magistrates, under the mask of law, aim at the offender more than the offence, and are more studious of inflicting pain than repressing error or crime, the office suffers as much as the Judge; the respect for justice is lessened; and the school of pure reason becomes the hated theatre of mischievous passion.

"A Christian Judge, who means to be just, must not fear to smite according to the law; he must remember that he beareth not the sword in vain. Under his protection we live, under his protection we acquire, under his protection we enjoy. Without him, no man would defend his character, no man would preserve his substance: proper pride, just gains, valuable exertions, all depend upon his firm wisdom. If he shrink from the severe duties of his office, he saps the foundation of social life, betrays the highest interests of the world, and sits not to judge according to the law.

"The topics of mercy are the smallness of the offence—the infrequency of the offence. The temptations to the culprit, the moral weakness of the culprit, the severity of the law, the error of the law, the different state of society, the altered state of feeling, and, above all, the distressing doubt whether a human being, in the lowest abyss of poverty and ignorance, has not done injustice to himself, and is not perishing away from the want of knowledge, the want of fortune, and the want of friends. All magistrates feel these things in the early exercise of their judicial power, but the Christian Judge always feels them, is always youthful, always tender when he is going to shed human blood: retires from the business of men, communes with his own heart, ponders on the work of death, and prays to that Saviour who redeemed him, that he may not shed the blood of man in vain.

"These, then, are those faults which expose a man to the danger of smiting contrary to the law: a Judge must be clear from the spirit of party, independent of all favour, well inclined to the popular institutions of his country; firm in applying the rule, merciful in making the exception; patient, guarded in his speech, gentle and courteous to all. Add his learning, his labour, his experience, his probity, his practised and acute faculties, and this man is the light of the world, who adorns human life, and gives security to that life which he adorns.

"Now see the consequence of that state of justice which this character implies, and the explanation of all that deserved honour we confer on the preservation of such a character, and all the wise jealousy we feel at the slightest injury or deterioration it may experience.

"The most obvious and important use of this perfect justice is, that it makes nations safe: under common circumstances, the institutions of justice seem to have little or no bearing upon the safety and security of a country, but in periods of real danger, when a nation surrounded by foreign enemies, contends, not for the boundaries of empire, but for the very being and existence of empire; then it is that the advantages of just institutions are discovered. Every man feels that he has a country, that he has something worth preserving, and worth contending for. Instances are remembered where the weak prevailed over the strong: one man recalls to mind when a just and upright Judge protected him from unlawful violence, gave him back his vineyard, rebuked his oppressor, restored him to his rights, published, condemned and rectified the wrong. This is what is called country. Equal rights to unequal possessions, equal justice to the rich and poor: this is what men come out to fight for, and to defend. Such a country has no legal injuries to remember, no legal murders to revenge, no legal robbery to redress: it is strong in its justice: it is then that the use and object of all this assemblage of gentlemen, and arrangement of juries, and the deserved veneration in which we hold the character of English Judges, is understood in all its bearings, and in its fullest effects: men die for such things, they cannot be subdued by foreign force, where such just practices prevail. The sword of ambition is shivered to pieces against such a bulwark. Nations fall where Judges are unjust, because there is nothing which the multitude think worth defending; but nations do not fall which are treated as we are treated, but they rise as we have risen, and they shine as we have shone, and die as we have died, too much used to justice, and too much used to freedom, to care for that life which is not just and free. I call you all to witness if there is any exaggerated picture in this: the sword is just sheathed, the flag is just furled, the last sound of the trumpet has just died away. You all remember what a spectacle this country exhibited: one heart, one voice, one weapon, one purpose. And why? Because this country is a country of the law; because the Judge is a judge for the peasant as well as for the palace; because every man's happiness is guarded by fixed rules from tyranny and caprice. This town this week, the business of the few next days would explain to any enlightened European why other nations *did* fall in the storms of the world, and why we did *not* fall. The Christian patience you may witness, the impartiality of the judgment-seat, the disrespect of persons, the disregard of consequences,

these attributes of justice, do not end with arranging your conflicting rights and mine; they give strength to the English people, duration to the English name; they turn the animal courage of this people into moral and religious courage, and present to the lowest of mankind plain reasons and strong motives why they should resist aggression from without, and bend themselves a living rampart round the land of their birth.

"There is another reason why every wise man is so scrupulously jealous of the character of English justice. It puts an end to civil dissension. What other countries obtain by bloody wars, is here obtained by the decisions of our own tribunals: unchristian passions are laid to rest by these tribunals; brothers are brothers again; the gospel resumes its empire, and because all confide in the presiding magistrate, and because a few plain men are allowed to decide upon their own conscientious impression of facts, civil discord, years of convulsion, endless crimes are spared; the storm is laid, and those who came in clamouring for revenge, go back together in peace from the hall of judgment to the loom and the plough, to the senate and the church.

The whole tone and tenour of public morals is affected by the state of supreme justice; it extinguishes revenge, it communicates a spirit of purity and uprightness to inferior magistrates; it makes the great good, by taking away impunity; it banishes fraud, obliquity and solicitation, and teaches men that the law is their right. Truth is its handmaid, freedom is its child, peace is its companion; safety walks in its steps, victory follows in its train: it is the brightest emanation of the gospel: it is the greatest attribute of God; it is that centre round which human motives and passions turn: and Justice, sitting on high, sees Genius and Power, and Wealth and Birth, revolving round her throne; and teaches their paths, and marks out their orbits, and warns with a loud voice, and rules with a strong arm, and carries order and discipline into a world, which, but for her, would only be a wild waste of passions. Look what we are, and what just laws have done for us:—a land of piety and charity; a land of churches and hospitals and altars;—a nation of good Samaritans;—a people of universal compassion. All lands, all seas, have heard we are brave. We have just sheathed that sword which defended the world; we have just laid down that buckler which covered the nations of the earth. God blesses the soil with fertility; English looms labour for every climate. All the waters of the globe are covered with English ships. We are softened by fine arts, civilized by humane literature, instructed by deep science; and every people, as they break their feudal chains, look to the founders and fathers of freedom for examples which may animate, and rules which may guide. If ever a nation was happy—if ever a nation was visibly blessed by God—if ever a nation was honoured abroad, and left at home under a Government (which we can now conscientiously call a liberal Government) to the full career of talent, industry and vigour, we are at this moment that people—and this is our happy lot. First, the gospel has done it, and then justice has done it; and he who thinks it his duty to labour that this happy condition of existence may remain, must guard the piety of these times, and he must watch over the spirit of justice which exists in these times. First, he must take care that the altars of God are not polluted, that the Christian faith is retained in purity and in perfection: and then turning to human affairs, let him strive for spotless, incorruptible justice;—praising, honouring and loving the just Judge, and abhorring, as the worst enemy of mankind, him who is placed there to 'Judge after the law, and who smites contrary to the law.'"

SIR, *Penzance.*

ALTHOUGH many of your readers may be of opinion that they have already heard more than enough about the religious disputes of a small and remote town like this, and that its "little gentry" have already been dragged into a much larger share of public notice than they have any claim to, I am yet obliged to solicit two columns more of your valuable space, and five minutes more of their no less valuable time, for this trite subject. A small pamphlet which I was lately induced to publish, with a view to cir-

culation in the neighbourhood, under the title of *The Unitarian Doctrine Briefly Stated*, has been so unfortunate as to incur a somewhat severe censure from your Plymouth correspondent I. W., in your number for March, (pp. 155, 156,) and as I do sincerely value the good opinion of my brethren, I cannot rest contented without saying a few words in the way of vindication. What he blames is this, that I have said that "*Unitarians may be, and often are, consistent members of the Established Church:*" a sentiment which he deems "*destructive of all honest and open profession, and all fair prospect of the advancement of truth.*" This is a serious charge, but I apprehend I. W. would not have made it had he fairly considered the drift of my argument. I have not *recommended* it to Unitarians to continue members of the Establishment: I have merely asserted that they *may* continue so, and, in fact, often do; or, in other words, that entertaining Unitarian opinions does not, *ipso facto*, separate a man from the Church. Whether it is *right*, or *expedient*, for a Unitarian to remain a member of the Church, is quite another question, and one which I have neither proposed nor resolved. Your readers will remember that a gentleman of this neighbourhood, a regular attendant on the worship of the Establishment, was attacked by our clergy, and displaced from a certain honorary post, on the ground of his not being a member of the Church, inasmuch as he avowed the sentiments of Unitarians. Now it is one thing to secede from the Church freely, and another to be turned out against one's will. The Church is not simply an institution for religious services: that is, its direct and proper object: but it is also made a door of admission to various honours and advantages, to be cut off from which is no small detriment. When, therefore, I see an attempt to exclude a Unitarian from the Church, I see an attempt to injure him, to deprive him of official dignity and influence and debar him from profitable employment: I see an attempt on the part of the so-called orthodox to maintain their monopoly of good things, and all such attempts I feel heartily disposed to resist. This feeling it was that made me come forward to assert that a Unitarian might, notwithstanding his opinions, be a very good Churchman, and the arguments which I urged in my pamphlet, to make good this assertion, and which I. W. has quoted in your pages, still appear to me just and valid. A Unitarian who has been baptized in the Church, and is still accustomed to partake of her worship and communion, appears to me entitled to rank himself among her members.

It is, as I observed before, quite another question, how far it is *expedient* for a Unitarian to maintain a connexion with the Establishment, and as I have not decided this point in my pamphlet, so I shall not pretend to discuss it here. It is really a matter on which a great deal might be said, and would easily furnish out a respectable essay. A few cursory remarks are all that I at present have to offer. In the first place, as I do not see why a man should be supposed to join in the whole of a religious service at which he is present, so I do not see that there is any thing necessarily repugnant to a good conscience in a Unitarian's attending a worship which, in parts, expresses Trinitarian sentiments. It is only necessary, in order to guard against misconception, that he should freely and openly state to his neighbours that there are certain doctrines of which he disapproves. This done, I think he is quite clear from all hypocrisy, both with God and man. All is perfectly well understood: Mr. —— is an avowed Unitarian, and though he goes to Church, yet, of course, he does not join in several parts of the service. But why, it will be asked, should a Unitarian join in a form of worship which presents so much that it is repugnant to his conscientious opinions? I answer, in the first place, there may be a necessity for his doing so; at least the only alternative may be to join in public worship with Trinitarians, or not at all; a dilemma, in which I really am placed myself, and certainly I have no hesitation in preferring the former measure. Then, I must own, I do not much like the *spirit* of Nonconformity: I think there certainly was, and is, such a thing as the sin of schism. Christ desired that his church should be one, and Christian unity is best expressed and felt in common

and united worship. The Established National Church, in some degree, though imperfectly, realizes such worship among all classes of our countrymen; in attending it we testify the essential identity of our religion with that of our neighbours in general, and cultivate a powerful bond of union between ourselves and numerous estimable characters. Perhaps there is nothing that has a happier social influence on men, than communion in religious worship: it introduces the new and interesting relation of fellow-worshipers, and I should be sorry, on the ground of some abstruser points, to forego this relation with the great majority of my neighbours while I retained it only with a few. I might proceed to other arguments, but this feeling alone would, I think, always make me reluctant to drop all connexion with the Establishment. Let me not, however, be misunderstood. As religious worship is the most noble engagement of the mind, so it must be that which we should of all things wish to perform in the most excellent way, that is, in the way most congenial to our sense of truth and right. It is, therefore, a very painful and offensive thing to witness this solemn and reasonable service marred with what we regard as folly or falsehood. It is necessary to worship God in the manner most agreeable to our own consciences: to this important consideration, even that of Christian union with our brethren must bend: and hence I come to this conclusion; that it is *best* for a Unitarian, in general, to attend Unitarian worship, but, at the same time, it will not be improper for him occasionally, or even frequently, to be a partaker in the devotions of the National Church.

In conclusion, I will just notice that I. W. is not correct in stating that Mr. Le Grice was chosen President of the Society in Sir Rose Price's room, that post being assigned to another clergyman of the neighbourhood: he has also incorrectly attributed to him a certain violent and absurd passage, quoted in p. 154, but which came from an anonymous pen. In relation to myself also, I may be allowed to observe, that my Academus was not on the banks of Isis, but of Cam. Finally, I. W.'s paper manifests much, and, I doubt not, an honest zeal to propagate what he deems correct sentiments, and assuredly it is well to be zealously affected in a good thing; but he will allow me to suggest, that there is, even than zeal, "*a more excellent way.*"

A FRIEND TO INQUIRY.

Bloxham, Jan. 13, 1824.

AN extract, with additions, from a Sermon, preached at Bloxham, December 8, 1816, on account of the death of the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, who first settled at Bloxham.

Heb. xiii. 7: "Remember them who have the rule" (preside) "over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation."

"I shall, as a further improvement of this subject, give you a short account of the different persons who have been your settled ministers here and at Milton.—Milton is a mile and a half from Bloxham.

"In the year 1662, in the reign of Charles II., near 2000 ministers of the Church of England left it, because they could not subscribe to certain articles of faith and practice that were then required of them. Those ministers were one principal cause of the great body of Dissenters that are now in England, Wales, &c.; for though there were before a kind of Dissenters from the Church, called Puritans, yet these were the principal cause of the present Dissenting interest.

"Many severe and cruel laws were made against them, and such as dared to attend their ministry.

"At that time our old meeting-house at Milton was provided, which appears to have been originally nothing more than a humble dwelling-house.

"That very small village itself, and the part of it in which the meeting-house stood, were both probably fixed upon on account of their being very private places, as also because it was a central spot to the neighbouring towns and villages of Bloxham, Banbury, Bodicott, Adderbury, Dedington, Empton, and the two Barfords; from most, or all of which, the congregation came.

"When the Five-Mile-Act took place, which forbad these ministers to reside within five miles of a borough town, (such as Banbury is,) some of them

took up their abode at Dedington, and one or more at Empton; from which places they could easily slip down, across the open fields, to Milton, without being much noticed by their enemies.

"The first minister, according to the best information that I have received, (for we have no book of records,) who preached at Milton, was a Mr. Whatley. I find a very short account of him in the Rev. Samuel Palmer's Memorial of the Ejected Ministers, Vol. II. p. 491.—'Sutton-under-Brails,' (a few miles west of Banbury,) 'Mr. Thomas Whatley, son of Mr. William, baptized September 10, 1620. After his ejectment he preached sometimes at Milton, near Banbury, sometimes at Woodstock, and sometimes at Long Crombe, near it. He was buried Jan. 27, 1698.'

"There is sufficient reason to believe that he was the son of the very celebrated William Whatley, Vicar of Banbury, who died at Banbury 'in the 56th year of his age, Anno Dom. 1639;' for the Banbury Parish Register informs us, that Thomas Whatley, the son of the Rev. William Whatley, was baptized in 1620; his residence was but a few miles off, and he was the ancestor of the late Whatleys, of Banbury.

"The next of your ministers that I have any knowledge of was a Mr. Durell. The following facts make it appear that he came here about the year 1692. He was a French Protestant, educated at Sedan, and fled to England from the bloody persecution of Louis XIV., who abolished the Edict of Nantz.

"He first taught the French language in London; after a time procured a place in the Church of England near Woodstock; but not being able to take an oath of allegiance to the Prince of Orange, while King James II. was living, he was obliged to leave his place in the Established Church, the consequence of which was, that at length he became the minister of the two Dissenting congregations of Bloxham and Milton, though he was not a Dissenter in principle. He, therefore, often attended the services of the Established Church of Bloxham. There is no church at Milton.

"He appears to have been a very humble and pious person, but I suspect a poor preacher, for some of his most intelligent hearers went to Banbury to hear a Mr. Davis, who, at that time, preached at the great Meeting there.

"A fire breaking out at the north end of the village of Bloxham, and the wind setting so as to blow the flames into it, Mr. Durell went to the place, and there offered up a prayer to God, that he would prevent the threatened evil. The wind changed, and the fire spread no further. This might, by the good providence of God, have taken place, if Mr. D. had not prayed. But it is a serious fact, that he did offer up such a prayer, that the wind did change, and that the people of the village took notice of it. 'Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.' Psalm L. 15.

"He had so tender a conscience that it sometimes led him to act without much judgment. To give one instance. When a thief was taking away some of his raiment from off a hedge, he seeing him do it, cried out,—You don't steal them, you don't steal them, I give them you, I give them you. He had a daughter who lies buried by him in the south wing of the parish Church of Bloxham. I shall give, in the Appendix, the inscription that is on the stone that covers his grave. I apprehend that a clergyman, of the same name and family, came, a number of years ago, from the island of Jersey, into this neighbourhood, to make inquiry concerning Mr. Durell's family, but we know no more of it than what is related here.

"Your third minister was a Mr. Hancock, who appears from the time of Mr. Durell's death to have settled among you about the year 1726. He continued with you but a little while; for his father dying, and leaving a wife and family, he removed to Dudley, that he might be near them to assist his mother in carrying on his father's business, for the benefit of the family.

"After him a Mr. Nicklin became your pastor, but he falling, in a few years, into a low and melancholy state of mind, laid aside preaching, and went to reside in or near Dudley, where he died, as the Rev. Job Orton informed me, about the year 1781.

"The Rev. Thomas Brabant was your fourth minister. He was born at Ab-

bey-Milton, in Dorsetshire; received his classical learning under Dr. Milner, &c.; afterwards removed to Glasgow, and from thence was placed under the care of Dr. Doddridge for one year, if not longer, whom he afterwards assisted as classical tutor to his pupils for about five years. From Northampton he came to Bloxham about the year 1748, and was your minister for about thirty years. He died at Bloxham, January 19, 1804, in the 85th year of his age. He was a learned, sensible and pious man, a good preacher, but often wanted energy.

"After Mr. Brabant resigned his office, Mr. Benjamin Carpenter became your minister. He was the son of a respectable farmer at the Woodrow, near Bromsgrove, in Worcestershire. He was educated at Daventry, under the Rev. Dr. Ashworth, who succeeded Dr. Doddridge in the care of his Academy. Mr. C. was ordained minister of Bloxham and Milton Dissenting societies, at Banbury, in the latter end of the year 1774.

"After continuing here about two years he removed to Westbromwich, below Birmingham, and in a few years after he went to Stourbridge, and in about eight or nine years more he removed to Clapham, near London; and in a few years returned into the neighbourhood of Stourbridge again; and at length became the minister of the congregation of Stourbridge a second time, where he continued to the time of his death, which took place November 22, 1816, when he was 64 years of age. He was married three times, but left no child behind him. He was a good, learned and sensible man, but rather a heavy preacher; and was much esteemed by those persons who knew him best, for his learning, meekness and earnest desire to promote the best interest of his people. He published some short discourses on our Dissent from the Established Church; a single sermon on Charity; a Liturgy, which was used one part of the day in his place of worship at Stourbridge; two small volumes of Sermons on Various Subjects; and a work on Natural and Revealed Religion. He also had a controversy with Mr. Belsham on Arianism.

"When Mr. Carpenter left you, a Mr. Samuel Withers became your minister. He was a native of Westbromwich, below Birmingham; had part of his grammar learning at Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Addington's school at Market Harborough. From thence he went to Daventry Academy, then under the care of Dr. Ashworth, where he continued four years. The fixed period was five years, but he marrying while he was a student, caused him to leave a year sooner than he would otherwise have done. He was consumptively inclined, and, therefore, after preaching to you for about two years, he resigned his post, and went to live with his parents, where he died after a few months. He was an affable and friendly man, a popular preacher, and meant well, but wanted prudence. He, I suppose, died in the year 1780.

"The Meeting-house at Milton existed before this at Bloxham. What gave rise to this is related as follows: that a Mr. Fletcher, who was minister of the Parish Church of Bloxham, being a Welshman, spoke the English language so very imperfectly, that his people could not understand him; and as he would not go away, a number of them determined to provide themselves with a minister that they could understand. The initial letters of the names of several of the families are still to be seen cut in the forms on which some of you are now sitting.

"Thus, my friends, I have, agreeably to the exhortation contained in our text, given you an account of the different persons whom the good providence of God hath, in a long course of years, set over you and your fathers as your and their ministers in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

"It will be of use to you to recollect these things at times, and to talk them over in your families and amongst your neighbours and intimate friends, and to endeavour to imitate their faith and practice, as far as you believe that it was agreeable to the gospel of Christ. You are greatly indebted to the good providence of God for giving you such ministers; and you have a solemn account to give, to the righteous Judge of the whole earth, of the use you have made of their ministry. The Supreme Being may say to you, as he did to his ancient people the Jews, 'I have sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them.' Jer. vii. 25.

What could have been done more for you, that I have not done? May God give us all grace to improve our religious privileges, that we may give up our account, at last, with joy, and not with grief."

Appendix.

H. S. S.
Reliquiæ Viri Reverendi
Andreæ Durell, Anglo-Cæsarei, A. M.
Universitatis Sedanensis Alumni
Et Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Presbyteri,
Qui
Evangelium non modo fideliter docuit
Sed Vitâ etiam ac Moribus expressit
Sincerâ Pietate, Modestiâ singulari,
Charitate in omnes, sine partium Studio
Eximia
Humano denique ac civili Cultu
Nulli dum vixit secundus:
Junii xi. obiit A.D. MDCCXXV.
Ætatis suæ LXXI.

The village of Adderbury is scarcely a mile from Milton. There the Duke of Buccleugh had, till within a few years, a spacious mansion. The celebrated Lord Rochester sometimes visited that place. I have seen the frame and curtains of a bed there that were said to be his. The curtains were made of a stout dark purple woollen cloth.

There appears to have been at that time, residing in or near Adderbury, a person of the name of Marshall, who was a troublesome man; and when he died, it is said that his Lordship made the following verse on him:

"If heaven is pleas'd when sinners cease
to sin,
If hell is pleas'd when sinners enter in,
If earth is pleas'd when it entombs a
knave,
Then all are pleas'd,—for Marshall's
in his grave."

JOSEPH JEVANS.

SIR,

MY acknowledgements are due to Mr. Sturch for the handsome manner in which he has spoken of the temper with which I replied to his animadversions (p. 220). His last paper will furnish matter for an observation or two which I wish to make, not from the love of controversy nor the desire of victory, but for the sake of truth in a matter of some moment.

Mr. Sturch acknowledges that Christianity has cast a glorious light on the future hopes of man. But *if I rightly understand Mr. Sturch's views*, he considers Christianity as borrowing its *principal* evidence from its conformity to the Religion of Nature. Now, *as far as this is the case*, Christianity cannot render any truth more clear than the Religion of Nature had previously rendered it. Christianity, then, must possess a *clear and satisfactory evidence* altogether *distinct* from that which it derives from its conformity to Natural Religion; and if this evidence does not amount to *certainty*, it must amount to something that to practical purposes will serve as well.

By *all mankind*, Mr. Sturch means mankind *in general*. Mr. Locke meant something more. He did not, it is true, include *idiots* in this expression; but he, doubtless, meant all who possess the common faculties of human nature. And I must repeat, that those truths which are intelligible to *all mankind*, must be *too plain to be misunderstood*. So that the quotation from Mr. Locke, though not the most appropriate that might have been selected, was not altogether irrelevant to my purpose.

I suspected that it might be necessary to call in the aid of some spiritual guide to interpret the Religion of Nature, and that its truths are not *quite so clear* as they are sometimes represented. And I am confirmed in the opinion that some obscurity hangs over this religion, when I recollect that different commentators annex different interpretations to the language in which it is written. To instance in the doctrine of a future life: Dr. Clarke professes to *demonstrate* this doctrine chiefly from the inequality of the Divine dispensations in relation to the virtuous and the vicious. This *demonstration* Mr. Sturch altogether rejects; and, if my memory does not deceive me, maintains what Dr. Clarke considers as altogether untenable, that virtue is in every case its own reward. Another may be as little satisfied with Mr. Sturch's reasonings, as Mr. Sturch is with the reasonings of Dr. Clarke. And a third may reject as inefficient and inconclusive the reasonings of both Dr. Clarke and Mr. Sturch. So that it does, indeed, appear that though the Religion of Nature is *certainly true*, "in its general and abstract

character," yet "with regard to the supposed particulars of this religion the case is different," and that "*certainty may be entirely out of the question.*" Here I am led to observe, that he who *certainly knows* that what nature teaches must be true, but does *not certainly know* what is is that nature does teach, *knows* no more than what is known to every other man. Every man is aware that "the heavens which declare the glory of God cannot be imagined to bear *false* testimony." But as Mr. Sturch observes, "the question arises, what is the testimony that they give, and to what extent does it go?" And to this question different answers will be returned which may perplex the inquirer quite as much as "interpolated texts and various readings." But, it seems, while certainty *may* be out of the question with respect to the truths of Natural Religion, it must *always* be out of the question with regard to the truths of revelation. But why so? If Christianity is allowed to be true, then, as it confirms the Religion of Nature, and "is fundamentally the same with this religion," it must partake of the same certainty, which is indeed no certainty at all, if Natural Religion is only certain as to its *authority*, and this certainty cannot be transferred to the principles which it inculcates.* But Christianity, moreover, has its separate and independent evidence. And the value of this evidence appears from the fact, that it is this by which Christianity has thrown that "splendid and glorious light over the prospect of futurity," for which Mr. Sturch very properly says that he can never be sufficiently thankful. But supernatural religion is "always in some degree dependent upon things which are in their own nature fallacious." Here Mr. Sturch probably alludes, in part, to historical testimony, of which his views are somewhat singular, and which he is disposed to distrust in exact proportion to the importance of the conclusions which are to be drawn from it. And hence, perhaps, he not only allows with me that *multitudes* are incapable of deciding on the *external evidence* of Christianity, but maintains, that not one man upon the face of the earth is competent to the decision—a decision which, it seems, involves the necessity of determining on the truth of every miracle related in the New Testament. However, that these miracles collectively and singly are *worthy of belief*, I am happy to pronounce, upon the authority of Mr. Sturch himself, who in Apeleutherus expresses himself in words *to this effect*—that the doctrine of Jesus and his apostles is so far beyond their natural means of knowledge as to constitute a miracle, and a miracle which renders *all the rest credible*. If this be so, I need give myself little uneasiness about those passages of Scripture which "defy all human power of interpretation." But though the external evidence of Christianity is so difficult to decide upon, yet "men in general, being properly educated," are capable of judging how far its truths are worthy to be received, by their conformity to the principles of Natural Religion. This is so far well. But what are *they* to do who have not been "properly educated," or who have not been educated at all? I am afraid that they must be contented to believe upon authority, that is, to take upon trust the opinions which prevail in the communities to which they belong. However, I have the satisfaction to feel assured, that their incapacity of judging for themselves does not confer upon any man, or body of men, a right to judge for them; so that the interests of Protestantism are still secure.

Upon the whole, from the descriptions which are given of the Religion of Nature, I find it utterly impossible to ascertain what is its true character and value. It is sometimes said to be "intelligible to every human being who is willing to open his eyes and fix them attentively on its luminous and instructive lessons;" sometimes its principles require that men should be "properly educated" in order to understand them. Its *authority* is higher

---

* Mr. Sturch observes, that "whatever can be proved to be a principle of Natural Religion *must be true.*" But as some difficulty attends this proof, and Mr. Sturch has not enabled us to distinguish between those truths which Nature teaches with *certainty*, and those in which *probability is the utmost that we can obtain*, I am at liberty to suppose that some *little* uncertainty is attached to most of them, if not to all.

than that of revelation, but the information which it gives is not so *clear, full, rational and consistent.* It is *certainly true* in the abstract, but falls short of certainty in its supposed particulars, which is *something like* being certain and uncertain at the same time. It is the main support of Christianity, and in return (which indeed is equitable enough,) it receives from Christianity a splendid and glorious light which it does not itself possess, and consequently cannot diffuse. All that here appears clear and intelligible is, that of the *two* religions, if I may still be allowed to call them *two,* Christianity is, as I always suspected, by far the more valuable and important. But I am impatient to take my leave of the controversy, which I do without any diminution of the respect which I have been long accustomed to feel for the character and talents of my opponent. And *if* he shall appear here and there to have reasoned inconsistently, of which I do not make myself the judge, the reader will, I doubt not, attribute it with me to the difficulty of maintaining the divine origin of Christianity together with the superior authority of Natural Religion.

E. COGAN.

Defence of Metaphysical Studies.

I HAVE for some time past been much interested in the study of Metaphysics, as far, at least, as Hartley's inquiries have led me. Of other systems I do not wish to speak, as my knowledge of them is not sufficient to enable me to speak with authority concerning them. I am aware of having derived some improvement and much pleasure from the study, as far as I have pursued it, and was proceeding in it with ardour and fearlessness, when I was warned that, in the opinion of many wise and good persons, it was dangerous to pay too much regard to Hartley's Theory, partly because "there is no safety in mixing metaphysical arguments with religion," and partly because "the Hartleians are apt to disregard the plain, simple evidences of revelation, and to puzzle out a system to which scripture must be afterwards reconciled." I have given much attention to these representations, and the more my thoughts dwell on them, the more am I convinced that they are mistaken; that the tendency of Hartley's system is to confirm the Christian's faith, by affording additional evidence of the truth of the gospel, by exhibiting clearer views of the Divine character and government than could be obtained, except by the "mixture of metaphysical arguments with religion," and by confirming what the Scriptures declare concerning the nature of man, the purposes to be answered by his present state of discipline and his final destination.

As others may be deterred from pursuing this noble study, by similar representations, I think it may be useful to put down a few of the ideas which have occurred to me on the subject, for their consideration. It is my intention to be very brief, and I wish to offer my remarks with the diffidence of a learner, and not with the authority of a philosopher.

With respect to the objection that it is dangerous to mingle metaphysical argument with religion, it seems difficult to give a reason why a science which had its origin in scripture, should be separated from it. Who can suppose that without the Christian revelation, Hartley's system would ever have been framed? Surely the wish to discover what the constitution of the human mind must be, to which such a code of morality as that of the gospel is suited, must have animated the inquiries of the Philosopher. He saw that what was already discovered of our mental structure was, in some respects, inconsistent with itself, with his own experience, and with that revelation which was his guiding star in the midst of his labours. He felt that if he could discover a more peculiar relation than was yet suspected to exist between the constitution of the human mind and the system of moral discipline which he believed to be derived from heaven, his faith would be confirmed, his views of scripture truth more clear, and, consequently, his piety more influential. This peculiar relation he has discovered: it was evident to him, and is now to his followers, that scripture language and doctrines can be consistently and satisfactorily explained upon no principles but those which are derived from his Theory. And here is found so

strong an evidence for the truth of revelation, as ought to dispel the doubts of every thinking mind; if in such a mind doubts can remain. What can be more incredible, than that, in an age when the science of the human mind was unknown, a system of religion should be framed by ignorant men, which should be found to consist exactly with the discoveries of future ages respecting the mental structure of man? How could such a character as that of Jesus be portrayed, so perfectly agreeable as it is to principles, the existence of which was unsuspected for hundreds of years afterwards, by men who, from their education and occupation, were cut off from the means of learning the little that was taught on these subjects by the sages of their time? They copied from the life: ignorant of the rules of drawing, they produced a portrait, perfect in symmetry, unequalled in beauty! If any see not the hand of God in this, let him doubt the existence of God, let him doubt his own existence. If the study in question bring such an accession of evidence of the truth of my religion, I cannot but think those mistaken who object to the "mixture of metaphysical arguments with religion."

The gospel system of morals, also, appears to have a close connexion with Hartley's Theory. On no other system is the necessity of forming virtuous habits so apparent: no other theory makes us so aware of the importance of avoiding temptation, of exercising strict government over the thoughts, of forgetting the things which are behind, and pressing forward towards those which are before: and more especially we are shewn by it the importance of cultivating Christian benevolence, as the chief means of happiness here and hereafter. What can be more consistent with the Christian code of morals, than the conclusion of Hartley, that our ultimate happiness will be found in self-annihilation, that this is to be attained by the diligent cultivation of the benevolent affections, and, in short, by implicit obedience to what is known to be the will of God? Is there any thing in this like disregarding the simplicity of scripture, and perverting it so as to make it suit with a theory invented by human reason? Doubtless the gospel is all-sufficient for the salvation of all men; but why should those who have the means of cultivating their reason by the study of their own minds, cast away an evidence for its truth, for no cause but that it is not known to many, and is not, therefore, called a "simple evidence"? I believe that the ultimate truths of revelation were revealed by God; that science has since developed a train of reasoning which, by leading to the same conclusions, at once corroborates their correctness, strengthens our faith, and demonstrates its own truth. Hence there can be no ground for the fear that this theory should lead us away from scripture; it is derived from scripture; it pursues the same path; it tends to the same conclusions; therefore it appears to me the most valuable study next to that of the Scriptures; the next best gift which has been presented to the human mind, and the highest subject but one which can exercise its powers.

It seems by a remarkable provision to have been ordained, that there should never be the shadow of a failure of evidence with respect to the truth of revelation. While it was yet recent, every fact of history confirmed it; and while it was fresh, no one in his senses, who examined the subject, could doubt that the things related in the Scriptures actually took place. The lapse of time must, however, necessarily weaken that kind of evidence by which the early Christians were assured that Jesus of Nazareth had lived and taught, and done all that is related in the Gospels concerning him. Since that time prophecies have been remarkably fulfilled, and very many yet remain, which, by their gradual development, will prove that the Christian religion is not a work of human reason. It seems to me that the discovery of this metaphysical system is intended as another confirmation of Christian faith. I, with many others, feel it to be so, and I believe the time will come, when these principles will be understood and acknowledged to be true, by the whole body of Christians; and long before that time will the fear be banished that the study of them should lead away from scripture, or even modify its truth. Long before that time will those systems be exploded which lead to scepticism, and

Hartley's Theory, which now comes under the censure bestowed by some wise and good persons on those questions which "found our faith on the doubtful turn of a few metaphysical subtleties," will be acknowledged to have little connexion with them; and none which we may not, by common care, render harmless. I have seen the beneficial effects of the study of Hartley's system, in guiding the reason, strengthening the faith, and cherishing the piety of the wisest and best men whom I have the privilege of knowing: I begin to understand how these effects are produced: I desire them to be produced in myself and others: therefore I intend to pursue the study, and therefore I venture to offer these brief remarks.

I believe that the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity is, after all, the part of Hartley's system which is most obnoxious to those who have not studied his works with attention. Any theory which leads to the belief of this doctrine, is thought to have a mischievous tendency. I was once as much afraid of it as any one can be; but on examination I found that I could not resist the evidence in favour of it: and when I further discovered its real tendency, I rejoiced, and still rejoice, in the clearing up of many doubts, and the removal of many difficulties, which had before perplexed and distressed me. It is necessary for us to believe in the prescience of God; and while I thought myself equally obliged to believe in the free-will of man, I felt that I could not reconcile two points of belief, both important as they affected my practice. It is not in this case as it is in the question of the Origin of Evil; *there* I can make up my mind to remain in ignorance, because the subject appears to be beyond human comprehension. There is such abundant reason to believe both in the omnipotence and infinite benevolence of God, that the difficulty attending this point cannot for a moment shake my faith: I feel how unreasonable it is to expect to be fully informed respecting the mode in which the Divine government is conducted, and am not troubled by any painful doubt on the subject. But with respect to the Divine prescience it is different. It seems a subject on which we ought to be informed, if we are to form our practice by any invariable rule: by a belief in the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity we *are* informed, and other points of belief are strengthened by it. When Hartley began his inquiries, he had no suspicion that they would lead him, step by step, till he found himself embracing this doctrine, of which he had before a great dread, and to which it was long before he could reconcile his mind. What were the consequences of his belief in himself? Was he not meek, humble and devout? Was he not truly a Christian philosopher? He was; and so may all be who, like him, derive their philosophy from the Bible, who believe nothing but what the Bible sanctions, and rest in no conclusions which do not coincide with those of the gospel.

Let us see what will be the belief of one brought up in these principles of Christian philosophy. He will believe, as the Scriptures teach, in one Supreme God, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, who is the Creator of all things, and who has therefore an absolute property in them, and the absolute disposal of them. That as he is the author of all things, he must be the author of evil: for what purpose we know not, and cannot know, but doubtless for a wise and benevolent purpose, as he cannot act inconsistently with his nature. That as he must always act in the wisest and best manner, he must be immutable, and therefore the object of the most unshaken reliance, at all times, and under all circumstances. By the Christian revelation the philosopher is taught that God has destined his rational creatures to a nobler existence than the present: by this revelation he gains clear ideas of the perfections and providence of God; he sees that every event is directed by him, that not a single circumstance takes place without, not a single idea arises within his mind, which has not God for its author. Believing this, he feels himself prompted to the exercise of the purest and most unremitting devotion; he feels the force of the exhortation, "Pray without ceasing." He feels that God is as intimately concerned as his own soul, in every thought, word and action. He knows that his whole life ought to be devoted to its Author, and he is taught how to do this by

the example of him by whom the Christian religion was revealed. He finds in Jesus every perfection belonging to the character of the faithful servant of God, and he acknowledges that these perfections entitle Jesus to be his Lord and Master, his exemplar and his guide. He learns from the Scriptures that the way to become happy here and hereafter, is by the practice of uniform piety and disinterested benevolence. The dictates of his philosophy teach the same thing. They teach that tranquillity and peace reign in the mind in proportion as the idea of *self* is excluded. They teach that happiness consists in a *pursuit* which vigorously employs all the faculties of the soul, and which, at the same time, does not excite too vehement a desire. Is there any earthly pursuit which answers these purposes? There is not. The noble pursuit to which the gospel incites, is the only one which can ultimately render happy. This is the one, therefore, after which the Christian philosopher must strive. Disinterested benevolence, animated by piety, is the excellence which he most wishes to attain, and, therefore, he devotes his powers to the service of his fellow-beings. If he is called upon to educate souls for the immortal existence to which he looks forward as the inheritance of all mankind, his religion and his philosophy still teach the same thing: to guard his charge from temptation till their moral habits are fixed; to train them early according to those principles which he wishes to be their guides through life; for he knows how much depends on early association, how much the mind may be elevated during the first periods of life, by associating the idea of God and Christian obedience with every thought which is caused by external objects; or, on the other hand, how difficult, nay, almost impossible it must be, to render the soul thoroughly subservient to Christian motives, after associations have become firmly united, of which the idea of God forms no part. He is taught by his belief in Necessity to feel the importance of moral habits, the never-failing consequences of moral discipline. This, he knows, is the only safeguard in time of temptation, therefore he exercises himself and those under his charge continually in it. If he has once yielded to temptation, his principles tell him that the same motives will produce the same volition and the same consequent action which were produced before, and he therefore flies from the danger, instead of presumptuously believing that he can overcome temptation which has already overcome him. He feels the force of the petition, "Lead us not into temptation," and it is his continual prayer.

But while he entertains this detestation of sin, and this dread of temptation, he feels the strongest compassion for those who are suffering under them. While he is careful to avoid danger himself, he gives all the faculties of his soul to the steadfast endeavour to enlighten the mind darkened by vice. Instead of indulging contempt and indignation towards the sinner, it is the sin only which he detests. Instead of shutting out a frail fellow-being from every hope of being received again in virtuous society, by exposing his vices, by fomenting angry feelings in himself and others, he exhorts the unhappy one to listen once more to the voice of the good Shepherd: he tells him that the door of the fold is yet unclosed; he speaks to him the consoling words of him who declared that there is more cause of rejoicing over one returning wanderer than over the ninety-and nine which have never strayed. And if his gentle voice and helping hand *are* enabled to reclaim the sinner, he watches over him continually, and, imitating the example of the holiest of mankind, he remembereth his guilt no more.

He is convinced by his philosophy of the extreme difficulty of the cure of moral disease, and is, therefore, confirmed in his gospel belief of the dreadful nature and immense duration of future punishment. He sees no reason, on a careful perusal of the Scriptures, to believe that this punishment will be never-ending; and his philosophy confirms his opinion. He is convinced that a Being of infinite benevolence could not create with the intention of making existence infinitely miserable. Reason and religion teach him that future punishment is designed to be corrective, therefore cannot be everlasting: that if it were everlasting, it would be *vengeance*, not

punishment, and vengeance he feels cannot be inflicted by a God of infinite mercy, long-suffering, and ready to forgive. He knows that men suffer under sin as under other evils, by the will of God, and that, therefore, it is inconsistent with God's justice to punish them infinitely. If any should ask, "How is it reconcileable with the justice of God that he should cause sin, and then visit the sinner with punishment?" he answers, "This question is the same as that of the Origin of Evil; if God is the author of all things, he must be the author of evil; of sin among other kinds: for whether he *allows* man to sin, or *appoints* him to sin, comes to the same thing. Of his purpose in ordering things thus, we know nothing, but that it must be wise and benevolent, as he can do nothing inconsistent with wisdom and benevolence." He looks forward continually to the time when he shall be called on for an account of what he has done during his period of probation, and when he shall receive according to his deeds. He neither wastes his time and his powers in looking back on events which cannot be recalled, nor in anticipating what may be his future lot on earth. When he looks forward, it is to the period when all the things of this life shall have passed away, and, at the same time, takes care that all his powers are employed on the improvement of the present; for the present is his own; the past and future are beyond his power.

While thus educating himself for eternity, the philosopher feels that death, though the end of his period of probation, is only an interruption to his pursuits; that, though the next state of being must be essentially different from the present, his pursuits, having been directed according to the best knowledge he could attain of a future life, must be such as are appointed to be brought to perfection in heaven. If, while sojourning on earth, he has acted as a citizen of heaven, he must find, on his arrival there, that it is indeed his home, and that he may follow the same occupations, probably in a somewhat similar manner, which exercised his best powers while confined to a mortal body. With respect to the lapse of time between death and the resurrection, he feels that he shall abide in the protection of his Maker, whether in a state of consciousness or of insensibility. He may think that the Scriptures favour the supposition of death being the repose of insensibility; but whether it be so or not, whether his soul be immaterial or not, he finds to be points of small importance, as they affect his expectations. He has the firmest faith in the resurrection of the body; as firm a faith as he feels every day, that there will be a morrow; and in what manner he shall be raised, how his identity will be preserved, it matters little to him, and is, he feels at present, beyond his comprehension. Walking by faith in the path appointed by God, he feels more sure of its right tendency than if he walked by sight alone; and if darkness does occasionally render his journey difficult, he still presses fearlessly on, trusting to him who can guide safely, even through the valley of the shadow of death. As he proceeds, one difficulty after another vanishes: he has striven to cultivate his reason to the glory of God; and when approaching nearer and nearer to the eternal world, which shall hereafter be revealed, he finds the coalescence between his philosophy and his religion become more and more complete: he is thankful that he has been granted so strong an additional evidence for the truth of the objects of his faith; he feels that far from being led away from scripture by his philosophy, far from gospel truth being modified by it, his faith has been strengthened, his hope purified and enlarged, and especially his charity warmed and enlightened, in the same proportion as his belief in the divine origin of the Christian religion has been confirmed.

Let, then, this system of mental philosophy be regarded with attention; let those who can inform themselves thoroughly of its doctrines; let them, with as much caution as they will, examine it, and see if what has been said, be not true; let them look around among the followers of Hartley, and discover, if they can, the evil effects of his Theory. Many living examples of its beneficial effects might be brought forward, if it were allowable; as it is not, it will be sufficient to mention the honoured name of Priestley. Who does not regard him with reverence as a Christian philoso-

pher? Was he less religious for being a disciple of Hartley? Let us hear what he says respecting his pursuits, and his views of the Divine Government, in a private letter; one of the last he ever wrote. "The more I contemplate this great system, (of the Divine Government,) the more satisfaction I find in it: and the structure being so perfect, there cannot be a doubt but that the end and use of it, in promoting happiness, will correspond to it. These views, as I take more pleasure than ever in Natural History, contribute much to brighten the evening of my days. But my great resource is the Scriptures, which I have not of a long time passed a single day without reading a portion of, and I am more interested in it continually. I seem now to see it with other eyes, and all other reading is comparatively insipid."

A better example of the influence of the Hartleian philosophy could not be adduced, as Priestley had given a large portion of his time and attention to the study and illustration of the works of Hartley. The most eminent disciple of Hartley found his greatest delight, to the last, in reading the Scriptures! This is sufficient to prove the tendency of his doctrines.

If the same effects should be produced in us, we may give glory to God continually that he has permitted the light of his gospel to shine upon us: and let it not be forgotten among our causes of thankfulness, that he has permitted to arise from this gospel, an independent evidence of its truth, which, if well improved, may render it, in a peculiar degree, a guide to our feet, and a lamp to our path.

H. M.

Petition from Clergy of Merioneth against the Roman Catholic Marriages Bill.

[A Friend in the House of Commons has sent us the Appendix to the Votes of the House, of the 3rd of May, 1824, containing the following clerical petition, which, he thinks, and we think with him, ought to be made known to other persons, besides Members of Parliament.]

A PETITION of the Venerable the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry of *Merioneth*, in the diocese of *Bangor*, was presented and read; setting forth, that the petitioners, anxiously alive, as it is their duty to be, to the welfare of that church to whose service they are consecrated, necessarily look with apprehension to any measure by which its interests can be affected; that the petitioners conceive any further concessions to the Roman Catholics will affect those interests in a very high degree, and tend materially to impair the influence and diminish the utility of the Established Clergy; that the petitioners cannot but feel that, as far as depends upon the Establishment, such influence must rise or fall with the encouragement or discouragement given to the clergy by the government of the country; that the petitioners are clearly of opinion, that if any accession of power be conferred upon the Roman Catholics, and especially if any direct countenance be given to the acts of the Roman Catholic priesthood, not only will the encouragement due to the Established Clergy be diminished, but the adherent of a foreign ecclesiastical potentate placed in fact in a more advantageous condition; that in particular the Bill by which it is proposed to compel the clergy to publish the banns of Roman Catholics, and to register marriages on a certificate handed to them from a Roman Catholic priest, will tend directly to degrade their character and impair their influence, and to destroy, in a great degree, the notion of the National Church as a Christian society; and that any plan which would legitimate the establishment of Roman Catholic institutions in this country would be highly injurious to the Protestant cause in general; that the Established Church, amidst many advantages for which it is grateful, labours yet under this great disadvantage, that it cannot act like its rival associations independently, but is evidently subject to many checks and restraints in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, so that if it be deprived of the support which it possesses in the exclusive countenance of the Government, it will no longer maintain a contest with its adversaries upon equal terms; that such exclusive countenance is in truth implied in the very idea of an Establishment, and that no Establishment from which it is withdrawn can long subsist,

nor, for want of power, promote effectually the religious and moral improvement of the people; the petitioners therefore humbly pray, that no further concessions be made to the Roman Catholics, and that the House will not sanction any encroachment upon the integrity of that Church which has for so long a period been the means of deriving the Divine blessing upon the *British* Constitution.

"There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, *the man* Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. ii. 5.

"God hath *made Lord*—this Jesus."—Acts ii. 36.

"Say ye *of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world*, Thou blasphemest; because I said, *I am the Son of God?*"—John x. 36.

"God *giveth not* the Spirit *by measure* unto him."—John iii. 34.

"Christ—the power *of God*, and the wisdom *of God*."—1 Cor. i. 24.

"Whom not having seen ye love; *in whom*, though now ye see him not, yet believing, *ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory*."—1 Pet. i. 8.

SIR,

I HAVE lately (XVIII. 583) ventured to enter the lists with Athanasianism upon the issue of being "wise above what is written;" and my recrimination has probably been honoured by the concurrence of every Unitarian as a faithful echo of his own every-day convictions, as to our comparative adherence to Scripture testimony and language. I am now about to vindicate Anti-Athanasianism from a charge, on which I know not whether I may promise myself a like unanimity. It has been recently with no little triumph remarked, of a late supposed convert from Unitarianism to Orthodoxy, in his last moments, that he *then* admitted the divinity of our Saviour. Upon the character of the evidence afforded by such all-but-posthumous amplifications of belief, it is not my intention to hazard a single observation, denying *in limine*, as I mean to do, that the tenet in question, properly understood, is an indisputable line of demarcation between the two creeds. Not, let me premise, that I am so mightily anxious as some of my brethren may be about the title of Unitarian: it is enough for me, I own, if I seem to myself, the Christian:—but if to entertain towards Athanasianism much of the same feeling which a devout Jew might entertain towards unwitting and conscientious idolatry; if to deprecate the doctrine as in matter, spirit and terms a scandal to *Protestant* Christianity, as a 'vantage ground given to infidelity, as the best solution of the phenomenon of the slow progress of "the faith once delivered to the saints" amongst the nations, and the main obstacle to its further reception in the world, can entitle me to the surname, then am I unquestionably a Unitarian: yet, in the advocation of the divinity of my Saviour, would I not quail before the most full-blown Athanasian in Christendom. When I say this, do I mean the autotheism of the Son of God, the inherent divinity of the Christ? No. Μη γενοιτο that I should so parody the Sacred Oracles, that I should directly or indirectly "preach" two Gods under the name of one. O no: the deity I ascribe to the "Lord" is no other than that he expressly, and over and over again, challenged for himself: an identification with "the Father," not of parity!!! but of subjection—a nature concurrent with HIS, only because invariably prostrate before it—an image, not a counterpart—a reflection only, not a co-primæval beam—a name not his own, but *given*,—capable of *increment and wane, of resumption and existence only in memory. But in this only scriptural import of the term, does any Unitarian, any more than myself, deny the divinity, the deity, of the Son of God? Does any Unitarian doubt, whether "having seen him," the apostles "had seen the Father"? Whether "he was in the Father, and the Father in him"? Whether "it pleased the Father that in him should dwell all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"? Or, will any Unitarian contend that if these things might be predicated of him during his sojourn upon earth, they cannot be predicated of him now that he has been received into heaven? That what certainly was true of him in his state of humiliation, is probably not true of him now that he is glorified? Must I renounce the title of Unitarian before I can consistently "confess him

---

* Ὑπερυψωσεν.

Lord," though "to the glory of God the Father"? Must I renounce the title of Unitarian if I believe that he may be privy to any prayer I am offering up to his God and mine, or that a name so influential once with our common Father has lost all its interest with HIM ever since? If a Jewish convert, at his feet in the days of his flesh, could, without one thought of treason to the Majesty on High, look up to him as an intercessor, who, if he asked any thing of God, God would give it him, shall not a Christian disciple there, from his youth up, who, with the eye of faith, has long beheld him at the right hand of that Majesty in the heavenly places, as guiltlessly and as justly so look up unto him, though invisible to the eye of sense, now? Am I not an Unitarian, if I presume to hope, that I have an ever present and all prevailing "Advocate with the Father"? Am I not an Unitarian, because though I say with an apostle that the end cometh, when the Son of God shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, I say also with the same apostle, that that kingdom is and shall be his till God have put all his enemies under his feet? And as a subject of that delegated, that temporary kingdom, must I indeed renounce all pretension to the honourable name I bear, unless I can disenchant my mind of the delusion that he is intimately acquainted with every thing that is passing in it, alive every moment to its interests, anxious about the fate of every individual within it, my own personal friend, guide, guardian and co-petitioner to the throne of grace and glory? Ah, then, farewell for one the title of Unitarian Christian. Assuredly I have not so learned Christ or his apostles. In that "name above every name" I have ever prayed; in that "name above every name" I have ever given thanks: never but *through him* do I so much as think of glorifying God: my every trust to Godward has been always and only *through him*: I hope only for the Father's love, because conscious of loving him, and of believing that he came forth from God, that he is gone to God, that he is with God: with HIM to-day, yesterday and for ever; with HIM, as it were in HIS bosom, interceding for my sins, and those of all his other brethren, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God *through* him. And will not many an Unitarian now ejaculate with your correspondent, "even so come Lord Jesus"!

O then let Unitarians no longer unanimously sit silent under the unmerited obloquy of denying the divinity of the Son of God. They do not *singly deny*, on the contrary, they *exclusively affirm* it in the only sense in which it was ever challenged by Christ or imputed by his apostles. They ONLY "honour the Son" SOLELY as "the Missionary of the Father:" and in thus SOLELY honouring him, they ONLY render him that "glory which he sought," they ONLY disclaim with him and for him that blasphemy* which he would have spurned.

CLERICUS.

A Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.

(Continued from p. 164.)

N to I.

5th October.

THE condition of departed spirits cannot be affected by any thing that we can say or think or feel respecting them.

As respects both sects it is agreed that the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is worthy of all acceptation, and to be received, as it is, and was at first, joyfully. Every one who is willing may have it. What is there then to complain of?

I cannot believe that you would tell a known sinner against the Holy Ghost that he would be blessed in heaven to all eternity.

You misunderstood what I said about my attention being distracted at church about this controversy. It was not because I felt myself in difficulty, but because counter proofs poured into my mind in abundance, and I was led too much out in thinking how I should frame the sentences in making my replies.

Whatever may be said, I cannot believe that God has ordained in his

---

* "None is good save one—that is God." Luke xviii. 19.—"If I honour myself my honour is nothing." John viii. 54.

word that wilful despisers should be told they would go to heaven to be blessed for ever. Our people hold with shewing kindness to enemies, and doing all that can be done for their conversion, and they, I think, do as much in this respect as yours. Are men precipitated into ruin by being warned of danger? Far from being shaken, as you think I am, my convictions become stronger; I have, in vain, wished to receive answers.

Some things very consoling have been said. May that which has been professedly expected and sought for with due earnestness on both sides, be obtained fully! I have endeavoured to ascertain what persons have discovered most the evil of sin. I have known those who have felt much of what they have thought to be the love of God, and have not experienced that contrition that ought to flow from it. I have known others who, looking to the liability to eternal death, have been awfully aware of their state as sinners, and of the unsearchable depravity and deceitfulness of the human heart, discovering millions of sins in departing from God; and have been afraid of themselves, and have prayed for the new heart and the new spirit. That experience of the love of God that is not accompanied by such convictions and compunctions, I do not consider to be genuine. Let me look at eternal death as the wages of sin, that I may estimate death as I ought. Our people, at least some of them, have awful convictions of the state of human nature by reason of the fall, which they would find it impossible to give your people a perception of. They know that none but God can give that perception.

I am well assured that all the good that you propose is abundantly secured without your doctrine. I see clear and strong proofs that much evil is produced by it, and I discover the baneful effects of it in the experience of your people. Nevertheless, I hope that you will hereafter joyfully leave these matters to God. You and I are running away from ourselves, and hardening our hearts awfully. Perhaps that we must have some heavy calamity to make us look within and search deeper and deeper, groaning in conviction, contrition and repentance until our last hour, then we shall be more spiritual. We run away from these things to provide for others; but we must come home at last; and how shall we find matters then? Let us settle these first, when we shall be better prepared for the other. You will say it is hardness of heart in me to resist your doctrine. I make answer, that I am told to fear him who, after he has killed, has power to destroy soul and body in hell. I have many similar admonitions to plead to in the day of judgment. My own prayers may be hindered by pleading for truth as well as error. I cannot yet pray as I ought. All my attention is due to my own state.

N.

I to N.

DEAR N. *6th October.*

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us and regain the blissful seat,
Sing heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
Of Oreb or of Sinai, didst inspire
That Shepherd who first taught the chosen seed
In the beginning, how the heaven and earth
Rose out of chaos: or, if Sion hill
Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flowed
Fast by the oracle of God; I thence
Invoke thy aid to my adventurous song,
That with no middle flight intends to soar
Above the *Aonian* mount, while it pursues
Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.
And chiefly thou, O Spirit, that dost prefer
Before all Temples the upright heart and pure,
Instruct me, for thou know'st; thou from the first
Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread,
Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,
And mad'st it pregnant: what in me is dark,
Illumine; what is low, raise and support;
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

You say in one of your communications that we do not sufficiently pray

over the inquiry in which we are engaged. The passage which I have taken from the opening of the grandest poem in our language, contains a prayer which I can heartily adopt; and as the author was a man of deep piety, and, moreover, held Calvinistic opinions, I presume you can feel no objection to unite in it. The circumstance of its being expressed in metre ought to be no hindrance to you, since the pious king of Israel and the prophets were poets.

It really will not be amiss to give our minds an airing. Polemics have the effect of confining and cramping the intellect, so long as the object be to dispute about the import of terms; and as we shall be obliged to bestow some time on this sort of employment, it may, perhaps, cheer and strengthen us if we first take a little excursion, and ascend a height whence we may catch a prospect of the country, after which we will descend and apply ourselves diligently to our work

Let us plant ourselves in imagination on the highest summit of the Andes. These immense ridges appear to be the back-bone of the earth. We see around us on every side

> "Mountains on whose snowy breast
> The lab'ring clouds do ofttimes rest."

How insignificant an animal does man become when stationed on these giddy eminences! But no wonder that we should thus feel while we are placed at a distance from human habitations, and from large assemblies of men. Let us shift the scene and fly to Mount Cassius—thence we perceive an army advancing with banners spread, and all the pomp and circumstance of war: they approach a dark and extensive moor. Turn your eyes another way for a few minutes. Now look again. Where is the army we saw so lately? Not a trace of it remains; yes, on more minute observation I perceive a few soldiers struggling to get out of a morass. Alas! they are the sole relics of that grand array. The rest are swallowed up in that Sirbonian bog. Again, how insignificant a creature is man! Hie we to a city—the haunt of busy man—here surely he will appear to more advantage—here he displays the effects of collective exertion. We will go to Antioch, where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians. This beautiful hill will command a view of it. Here are temples and palaces, streets and squares, and swarms of human beings, engaged in the pursuit of business or of pleasure. What numbers of horses and carriages! How durable are the works of man! Some of these magnificent buildings have stood for ages; perhaps they may last as long as the very hill on which we stand. But the clouds are gathering, we shall be caught in a storm. Now it rages. Surely the earth shakes; yes, indeed; that lofty tower which we were admiring, topples—it falls. Temples, palaces and mansions are laid in the dust, and the people are buried beneath the ruins. Alas, for man! in his proudest state he is but vanity. Hie we to some distant plain. We are now in Chaldea—famous for its astronomers. Having seen so much to humble us, in our own planet, we will lift up our eyes and contemplate the host of heaven. The words of the royal Psalmist come to our remembrance—"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; O Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him?" Look where we will, this truth of the weakness of man, and of his entire dependence upon the power and mercy of his Omnipotent Maker, forces itself upon the attention. "Now, if nature should intermit her course, and leave altogether, though it were but for a while, the observation of her own laws—if those principal and mother elements of the world, whereof all things in this lower world are made, should lose the qualities which they now have—if the frame of that heavenly arch, created over our heads, should loosen and dissolve itself—if celestial spheres should forget their wonted motions, and by irregular volability turn themselves any way—if the prince of the lights of heaven, which now, as a giant, doth run his unwearied course, should, as it were, through a languishing faintness, begin to stand and to rest himself—if the moon should wander from her beaten way—the times and seasons of the year blend themselves by disordered and confused mixture—the winds breathe out their last gasp—the clouds yield no rain—

the earth be defeated of heavenly influence—the fruits of the earth pine away, as children at the withered breasts of their mothers, no longer able to yield them relief—what would become of man himself—whom these things do now all serve?"

Surely the very apprehension of such a catastrophe would call up all our kindred feelings, sink all ideal distinctions between man and man, prostrate the whole race before the awful power which rules above, and even lead us, with Job, to say to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister!

Reflections such as these are well calculated to render us deeply sensible of the infinite power of God; and of the absurdity of supposing, for an instant, that man can thwart his designs. Whatsoever it pleaseth him, that he doeth, both in the army of heaven and among the children of men. None can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou? As for man, his days are but as a shadow; he springeth up as a flower, and is cut down; and the place that once knew him, knows him no more. But cannot the actions of men disturb the tranquillity of the Deity? No; "look unto the heavens and see; and behold the clouds which are higher than thou. If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? Or, if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? Or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man." "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to thee—but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent in whom is all my delight." "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto *men*." But "can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous? Or is it gain to him that thou makest thy ways perfect? Will he reprove thee for fear of thee? Will he enter with thee into judgment?"

I need not multiply quotations to prove that as man has no power to counteract the designs of God; he cannot possibly, do what he may, disturb the peace of the ever-blessed God, who dwelleth in light inaccessible; and, when he speaks without a figure, has declared that fury is not in him. The hearts of kings are in his rule and government, and he ordereth them as seemeth fit to his godly wisdom.

Since, then, the Deity is not actuated by human passions, reason revolts at the idea of his acting towards any of his creatures in a vindictive spirit. The Sacred Scriptures every where represent him in the most amiable light; they positively and plainly declare that he is good—that he is love.

"A being of perfect goodness can possess no attribute which is inconsistent with that perfection; for whatever is inconsistent with goodness is evil; and to affirm that a being may be perfectly good while he possesses a single attribute which is contrary to goodness, is to say that he may be perfectly good at the same time that he is evil.

"Since whatever is inconsistent with goodness is evil—since all evil has its origin in want or weakness—since it is universally acknowledged that God is almighty, and therefore can have no want nor weakness, it follows that he can possess no attribute which is inconsistent with benevolence.

"We have only to determine the nature of an attribute to decide whether or not it can belong to the Deity. If an attribute be evil, it certainly cannot belong to God. Now the attribute, whatever it be, which inflicts endless misery on any being, is evil. It is not affirmed merely that the attribute is evil which inflicts endless misery on the great majority of men: but that that attribute is so which inflicts it even upon one single individual; and the proof is obvious.

"Misery, considered in itself, is evil. Misery is only another word which is used to express pain of some kind or other. Pain, considered simply in itself, is universally admitted to be evil. Whatever produces pain, without doing any thing else, is evil.

"Is all pain then evil? No. Why? Because some pain has an ultimate object, which is the production of good. Hunger, for example, is at-

tended with pain; but this pain is not evil, because it has an ulterior object. Its *design* is not to inflict suffering, but to preserve life, by inducing the animal to take food. In proportion, therefore, as life, is a good to the animal, the pain which excites him to use the means of preserving it is good.

"Now, all pain which has not this ulterior object, being pure and simple pain, pain, and nothing else, is evil. But misery inflicted through endless ages cannot possibly accomplish this ulterior object, since there is no period in which it can effect it; such misery must be evil, therefore, in the highest possible degree.

"It will avail nothing to say that the object of the infliction of endless misery is not pain, but the satisfaction of immutable justice. This does not in the least affect the argument; for the position is, that that attribute, whatever it may be called, is evil, which inflicts misery upon a being without doing, and without designing to do, any thing else to him. To that being it is pure, positive and absolute evil. Whatever makes a being more miserable than happy, the whole of his existence considered, is to him positive evil. A good being must cause to every creature an excess of pleasure above pain, for he is good to it, only in proportion as he does so. But, according to the doctrine of endless punishment, God does not cause to the great majority of his creatures an excess of pleasure above pain; for he deprives them, through the whole of their future existence, of every pleasurable sensation, and inflicts upon them the most unremitted and intolerable anguish."

The words eternal misery, everlasting damnation, are soon pronounced; they run very glibly from the lips of most preachers, and seem to be used as we used "O Deus omnipotens," when at school, to fill up a poetical line, or to terminate a period fully and gracefully. The poor, unthinking mortals who thus flippantly pronounce the doom of innumerable fellow-creatures, and, for aught that they know, their own, would in private conversation manifest a hundred fold more feeling, if they were relating that a friend or relative had to undergo a painful operation on the following day. But when we are arguing seriously upon the subject, it becomes us to envisage the horror of the doctrine. If we had to pass over a crazy bridge, which, for aught we knew, might break down with us, we should deem it of importance to ascertain the depth of the stream and the chances of drowning. Is it possible that a reflecting mind can be content to remain unsatisfied as to the possibility of enduring endless pain? Surely it would not, if once awakened, remit its researches until this doubt was removed. But, as I said before, we really must look the matter in the face, if we intend to examine into it as parties interested in the result of the inquiry.

Suppose a large mountain composed of the minutest grains of sand, suppose one of these grains to be removed once in a million of years, the length of time which would elapse before the removal of the last of these grains, infinitely surpasses our power of conception. Yet this period, immeasurable as it is, is not endless, and therefore can convey to the mind but a faint idea of the duration of future torment. We must suppose the globe itself to be composed of grains of sand, nay, all the planets of our system, and all the stars which we behold in the heavens;—we must suppose the particles which compose those immense and innumerable bodies formed into one vast mass, to be removed by the transposition of a single grain once in a million of years—How inconceivable the period that must elapse before the removal of the last grain! The faculties of the human mind are lost in the contemplation of it! Yet this period is not endless; and it has been often said, that could the wicked be told that at the termination of such a period, their sufferings would cease, the tidings would fill them with inconceivable transport. But they are not permitted to indulge even this forlorn and awful hope. When this dreadful period shall have elapsed, their sufferings will be but beginning; nay, when millions of such periods shall have passed away, their torment will be no nearer its termination, than at the instant of its commencement. And these sufferings are represented as most dreadful in their nature. No imagination it is said can conceive of their horror. No sensation of plea-

sure can ever again be felt by the soul, but through endless ages it must continue inconceivably miserable, without the intermission of a single instant, and without any hope of it, and this for the crimes of eighty, twenty, ten years! All this, and more to boot, has been actually written and printed by an eminent Calvinistic Divine. Could he have written it, had he really believed it? No, no, no. He no more believed it, in the true sense of the word, than those trifiers do who roar out the doctrine to a gaping audience, or those more refined doctors who lisp it to a polite congregation.

Heavenly Father! is it thus that thy character is drawn by those who profess to love thee, and who exhort their fellow-mortals to love thee with all their hearts, and souls and minds—who tell us that we must sing praises unto thee with understanding! I ask you or any man whether you would feel much at your ease, if you were invited to the court of a despot, who had immured in dungeons the greater part of his subjects, and there subjected them to incessant tortures? You would not, I am quite sure, accept the highest office which such a wretch could confer. But what is *his* cruelty in comparison with that of the Calvinist's God? He is benevolence itself. He is not the Father, still less the maker of the people whom he thus punishes; and besides, he cannot prolong their lives beyond a few years. But the great Creator, whose power no creature is able to resist, lives for ever. He is omniscient as well as omnipotent. He saw the end from the beginning, and, knowing all the dreadful consequences of the act, brought millions of men into being, who were to be rendered miserable throughout the countless ages of eternity. Such in all its horrid nakedness is this accursed doctrine, which, melancholy to say, finds abettors in the nineteenth century of the Christian era! Aye, among good men, humble men, tender-hearted men, and women too, who would shed plenteous tears over a scene of mere temporary woe. Oh! David, (if you believed such things as these,) could you say, "Praise the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever"!—"Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men"! Oh thou blessed Saviour of men, thou second Adam, whose birth was announced by the angelic host as tidings of great joy to all people, how couldst thou trifle with thy disciples by telling them, that in forgiving injuries and returning good for evil they would imitate their Father who is in heaven? Oh Paul, why did you exhort believers to put on, as the elect of God, bowels of mercy, gentleness, meekness? Why did you not rather forewarn them to prepare for heaven by steeling their hearts against misery, since they were doomed to witness such torments as eye had not seen, nor ear heard, and which had not entered into the heart of man to conceive?—Why, you all reply, Because the doctrine to which you allude is a lie, a gross libel upon Christianity.

When I supposed (I speak now for myself) that the doctrine of endless misery was scriptural, and began to think seriously of religion, I was haunted day and night with the most gloomy thoughts. When I met people in the streets I said to myself, alas! how many of those who have passed me are in all probability doomed to endless pain, and yet how cheerful they appear! I wondered that the Bible was not filled with the dismal tidings; that the apostles could preach a single sermon without enlarging upon the misery which awaited the bulk of the human race; that the heavens were not constantly obscured by black clouds; that the fields contained a single flower; that the birds could sing, and animals play; and most of all was I surprised to think that there could be any joy at the birth of a child into the world. It pleased God of his infinite goodness to remove the veil from mine eyes. Never shall I forget the joyful change which took place in my feelings, when, after a diligent and most earnest examination of the sacred Scriptures, I became thoroughly convinced that what had been taught as a doctrine of the glorious gospel of Christ, was utterly false. From that day to this I have had no doubt of the love and goodness of my Maker; and while I have breath and retain my faculties, I will, with his assistance, whenever a fit opportunity offers, bear my solemn testi-

mony against the abominable lies which are told of him by those whose business it is to speak good of his holy name.

But, as I have often said, those who pretend to teach and to hold the doctrine, do not believe it in their hearts, I thank God for it. The glorious light of heaven and the innumerable pleasing objects which are constantly obtruded upon us by our Father who sits above, do and will continue to correct the evils of absurd systems. I do in my conscience think that the doctrine in question has proved to be one of the greatest hindrances to the spread of true religion, and the chief encouragement to infidelity, immorality and profaneness.

All this, however, is but a preface to the answers which I shall, if spared, return to the questions which you have proposed, and to which you have demanded my answers. Since you have called for them, you shall have them, whether you will hear or whether you will forbear.

Yours affectionately,

I.

[To be continued.]

Birmingham,
May 17th, 1824.

SIR,

THE Morning Chronicle of this day contained a tolerably extensive report of the proceedings of "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," at their annual meeting; and as you are accustomed to the commendable practice of giving it more fully in the Repository, I anticipate its appearance next month with much satisfaction. One thing, however, I observed with disappointment and chagrin, viz. the total silence of every one who took a share in the business, as to the well-known and pending cause of Peter Watson and the Easter Offerings. Insignificant and contemptible as the cause may appear as to the amount of the demand on the public purse—for this very reason the severe and unaccommodating exaction of it is such a violation of every principle of sound policy, of common justice, and of common sense, that one might suppose there is not a householder in the kingdom but would wish the total annihilation of the litigious claim. I am at a loss for a reason why it should have passed unnoticed by this Society: perhaps it may be an omission of the reporters; if so, there is an end at once to this application; but if not, I wish to know from any quarter where the information may be depended on as correct, how such neglect can be explained or vindicated? And you will therefore oblige me by inserting this, with the approbation, I should expect, of thousands of your readers. The case cannot unwarily have escaped the Society's attention; and if it should be explained as not coming under its cognizance according to its designs and regulations, it must be a matter of regret that a line should be drawn to the exclusion of a subject of such universal interest. As members of the community, all are concerned in its deserved reprobation, and as a subscriber to the Society, I hope to be exonerated from the charge of petulant and intrusive inquiry.

JAMES LUCKCOCK.

History of the Westgate (Presbyterian) Meeting-House, Lewes.

[We extract the following historic sketch from a very interesting and ably-executed antiquarian volume, "The History and Antiquities of Lewes and its Vicinity. By the Rev. T. W. Horsfield." 4to. *2l. 2s.* 1824. Pp. 302—304.]

THE UNITARIAN, OR WESTGATE MEETING.—This ancient building, which has been used as a Protestant Dissenting Meeting-House for the space of about one hundred and fifty years, stands only a few yards to the south-east of the scite of the ancient West gate of the borough. It was originally built as a town residence of George Goring, Esq., but was afterwards converted into an inn. At what period it underwent this change is uncertain; but so early as the 20th of Elizabeth (1578) it is described, in a deed bearing that date, as an inn having the sign of the Bull. For considerably more than one hundred years it was occupied as an inn; but in 1687, when James II. condescended to publish his gracious declaration to his loving subjects, allowing them liberty of conscience, the Rev. Edward Newton, who had formerly been minister of St. Anne's, but was ejected for Nonconformity, again ven-

tured publicly to discharge his official duties, and for that purpose fitted up a part of the premises as a chapel, and continued alone to officiate therein till 1695, when he was aided in the discharge of his pastoral duties by the Rev. Thomas Barnard, whom he had assisted in ordaining at Glynde, about eight years before. They continued their joint labours till 1701, when, a difference arising relative to the enlargement of the Meeting-House, which had become insufficient for the rapidly increasing congregation, a separation took place. As Mr. Barnard had purchased the premises in 1698, he of course retained possession of the chapel, and Mr. Newton opened another place in Crown Lane, where he continued to officiate for some years, until protracted age and increasing infirmities compelled him, in 1709, to resign his office. In 1711, a union was effected between a congregation that had been for some time under the care of the Rev. J. Olive, and the one assembling in the Westgate Meeting-House: and from that time to the resignation of Mr. Barnard, the united congregation was supplied with two ministers. At the death of Mr. Olive, the Rev. Ebenezer Johnston* was elected in his room.

In 1756, the congregation of Dissenters who had assembled in a chapel situated in Watergate Lane, (in the premises now occupied by Mr. T. Shelley, coachmaker,) united with the congregation at the Westgate meeting. Rev. J. Watkins,* who had succeeded the Rev. — Force in the former place, resigned, and Mr. Johnston continued the minister of the united people till 1781, when he was succeeded by

1781	W. Johnson
1783	Richard Shiells
1788	W. Evans Bishop
1790	John Langdon
1794	Evan Davies
1803	Samuel Parker
1811	William Johnston
1817	T. W. Horsfield.

The building has evident marks of great antiquity; the walls are of an extraordinary thickness, and the windows are large, in massive stone frames. The interior is spacious, and, though badly laid out, and without galleries, will seat upwards of four hundred persons. The double roof is supported

---

* The Rev. Ebenezer Johnston was born at Dumfries, in Scotland, and died at Brighton, in 1791, aged 72 years. Having acquired at school a competent share of classical learning, he was entered into the Academy at Northampton, under the care of the celebrated Dr. Doddridge, and there regularly went through the several stages of education for the ministry. His virtuous and unblameable conduct, and his diligence in study, gained him the esteem and applause of his excellent tutor, who gave the charge at his ordination at Lewes. Having been indefatigable in composing judicious and useful discourses for the pulpit, and having uniformly exhibited an example of unaffected piety, benevolence, compassionate sympathy, and honourable prudence, he still lives in the grateful remembrance of his surviving friends. Of the four sons he left behind him, three are still living, and are constant attendants at the Westgate Chapel, the more endeared to them by the circumstance of its being the place in which their father exercised his stated ministry through so long a course of years.

* Mr. Watkins was fellow-student with Mr., afterwards Archbishop, Secker, at a Dissenting academy in Gloucester, conducted by the amiable and truly learned Rev. Samuel Jones. In a letter written by Mr. Secker, whilst he was at the academy, to Dr. Watts, with whom he was on terms of great intimacy, and who had requested from him an account of the academy, he mentions, as one of his fellow-students, Mr. Watkins, as being diligent in study and truly religious. The letter, after describing the different students in the academy, proceeds to point out the course of study pursued under the direction of Mr. Jones, on whom the writer bestows much praise, and to whom he appears to have been affectionately attached. The following passage will shew that it was not the plan of Mr. Jones to make his pupils tremble in his presence, in order to insure their obedience and respect: "We pass our time very agreeably betwixt study and conversation with our tutor, who is always ready to discourse freely of any thing that is useful, and allows us, either then or at lecture, all imaginable liberty of making objections against his opinions, and prosecuting them as far as we can. In this and every thing else, he shews himself so much a gentleman, and manifests so great an affection and tenderness for his pupils, as cannot but command respect and love." —Gibbon's Memoirs of Dr. Watts, p. 351.

by a series of pillars which run down the centre of the building, and give a degree of dignity to the time-hallowed spot. Seen from the south of the town, this structure has a noble appearance, being considerably elevated above the buildings in its front, and its strong and antique walls well contrasting with the small modern buildings in its vicinity. The northern side is hid by mean and obscure dwellings.

SIR, *March* 27, 1824.

WHEN I last wrote to you (p. 15), I fancied myself seated, not "on a hill apart," but at the social board with Mr. Hilton and other choice spirits who have so ably and freely discussed some of the *Academical Questions*—*

("Of good and evil much they argued then,
Of happiness and final misery,")

inquiries to which the human mind ever has recurred, and ever will recur until the day arrives when we shall "know even as we are known." The few suggestions which I offered were thrown out with colloquial freedom, under the persuasion that the persons to whom they were immediately addressed could neither be offended nor staggered at them, but were both able and willing to sound the depth of any moral or theological question which I could propose.

I little suspected that I should have alarmed the piety of the ladies, of whose existence, much as I love them, I had, just at that moment, lost all recollection. Having, however, been summoned to the tea-table, I am most willing to apologize to my fair castigatrix, MARY HUGHES, (p. 97,) for having incautiously used any expression which could lead her to suppose that I intended to treat with levity the authority of Scripture. I beg to assure her that I am a firm believer in the truth of Christianity, not merely from the influence of education, but because, having, for a series of years, examined all the strongest arguments which have been urged against it, I can say with Paley, that "if any thing is true, Christianity is true," and that its value is beyond all price.

If I had any of the pride of authorship, I might perhaps have felt a little sore at the terms in which it has pleased Mrs. Hughes to speak of my ill-fated communication; but being more of a reader than a writer, I can and do heartily forgive her, and, which is more difficult, I will candidly acknowledge that, in point of composition, my paper deserved from "its insignificance," if not from its "absurdity," to be "consigned to the oblivion into which such productions naturally fall." There are, indeed, some matters which fools begin, and wise men can never end but by silence. It, however, generally happens that anger confounds the judgment: and although, perhaps, Mrs. Hughes "did well to be angry," and her anger becomes her well, certain it is that she has, in some measure, indulged it at the expense of justice; for it so happens, that the very proposition which she says could only be entertained by an Infidel, was extracted from the writings of Dr. Priestley,* than whom our holy faith never had a more courageous or more strenuous advocate. To him, pre-eminently, I owe some of the views which have served to strengthen, to stablish, and to settle me; and it is from the veneration with which I regard this traduced Christian sage, that I was induced to bring forward an obscure passage, pregnant with important meaning, in the hope that some one who had caught his mantle, might be enabled to explain it. For my own part, I freely confess, that, in the present state of my information, I cannot reconcile the opinion expressed in that passage, with numerous plain and positive declarations of Scripture. And yet it appears that Dr. Hartley concurred with Dr. Priestley in thinking "that the pains of this life may suffice for the whole of our future existence, we having now" (says he) "resources

---

* See Sir William Drummond's book so entitled.

* Mr. Rutt, to whom the public are indebted for a complete Edition of Dr. Priestley's Works, which were out of print, has expressed his regret, that, owing to the destruction of the Doctor's library and manuscripts by the Birmingham mob, we have been deprived of his arguments in support of the opinion contained in the passage alluded to. I, for one, heartily partake of that feeling of regret.

enow for a perpetual increase in happiness, without any assistance from the sensation of future pain."

Of Dr. Hartley's piety, and respect for the Scriptures, no person who has read his admirable Treatise on Man, (especially Part ii. Chap. 2,) can entertain a doubt. In his 88th Proposition, Part ii., he says, "As man appears, according to the light of reason, to be in a progressive state, it may be conjectured or even presumed, that the rewards and punishments of a future life will exceed that happiness and misery which are here the natural consequences of virtue and vice. However," (adds he,) "the light of reason is not clear and certain in this point: neither can it determine whether the happiness and misery of the next life will be pure and unmixed or not. It may indeed shew, that each man will receive according to his deserts; but then, since there is no pure virtue or vice here, since also there may be room for both virtue and vice hereafter, the rewards and punishments of the next life may succeed each other at short intervals as *in the present*: *or if we adopt the* mechanical system throughout, then we can only hope and presume, that God will ultimately make the happiness of each individual to outweigh his misery, finitely or infinitely; and shall be entirely uncertain whether or not, at the expiration of this life, we shall pass into another in like manner chequered with happiness and misery." He proceeds to say, "The Scriptures, however, represent the state of the good hereafter as attended with the purest and greatest happiness, and that of the wicked as being exquisitely and eternally miserable."—"Now though reason cannot discover this to us, or determine it absolutely; yet it approves it when discovered, and determined previously. At least it approves of the pure and indefinite happiness of the good, and acquiesces in the indefinite punishment of the wicked."

The good Doctor seems, at the time of publishing his book, to have felt it necessary to apologize to the religious world, for entertaining a doubt as to the metaphysical infinity of the duration of punishment, and as a *placebo* to the tenderness of orthodox consciences, he intimates the probability, that the sufferings of the wicked in the lake of fire will endure for at the least 360,000 years. This, one would have thought, might satisfy the most fastidious stickler for punishment, if we did not know that, after the lapse of three quarters of a century, there is as great a dread as ever that the wicked should escape from prison, and obtrude themselves into the society of the saints.

The Doctor had said a little before, that there is no pure virtue or vice here. This is very true; and as God is no respecter of persons, it would seem to follow, not that there should be such an immense disparity in the future condition of such mixed characters, but that rewards and punishments will be dealt out with perfect impartiality in exact proportion to the degree of virtue or of vice which belongs to each individual character.—How then could he consistently with his system, say that reason acquiesces in the indefinite punishment of the wicked? My reason does no such thing; and, if we are to believe Dr. Priestley, Dr. Hartley himself saw cause to abandon this opinion. While, however, I am as anxious as any man can well be, to explode the gloomy notions which have too long prevailed in the world respecting the destiny of the great bulk of mankind after death, I cannot, as I have already said, see my way quite clear to the consolatory conclusion at which these two excellent Christian philosophers had arrived.—Let us, however, endeavour to discover the train of reasoning which they pursued.

Suppose the invisible world and the invisible dispensations of Providence to be in any sort analogous to what appears; or that both together make up one uniform scheme, the two parts of which—the part we see, and that which is beyond our observation—are analogous to each other; then there must be a tendency in the derived power throughout the universe, under the direction of virtue, to prevail in general over that which is not under its direction, as there is in reason to prevail over brute force. But the complete success of virtue cannot be other than gradual; there must be proper occasions and opportunities for the virtuous to join together, to exert themselves against lawless force, and to reap the

fruit of their united labours. Now indeed it is to be hoped, that the disproportion between the good and bad even here on earth, is not so great, but that the former have natural power sufficient to their prevailing to a considerable degree, if circumstances would permit this power to be united. For much less, very much less power,* under the direction of virtue, would prevail over much greater not under its direction.

But, in speculating upon the condition of mankind after death, we must take into our consideration two different hypotheses, namely,

1st, That which supposes that, on the dissolution of the body, the soul continues to exist in a state of consciousness and of more or less activity; and,

2d, That which supposes that consciousness is suspended or extinguished during the period of time which elapses between death and the resurrection.

Adverting to the first of these hypotheses, I would premise, that the doctrine which assigns to man a principle of vitality that continues to exist after the dissolution of the body, does not appear to be necessarily exploded by materialism. "We have no way," says Bishop Butler, "of determining by experience what is the certain bulk of the living being each man calls himself; and yet till it be determined that it is larger in bulk than the solid elementary particles of matter, which there is no ground to think any natural power can dissolve, there is no sort of reason to think death to be the dissolution of it, of the living being, even although it should not be absolutely indiscerptible."† I have no wish to agitate a question which has seldom been discussed with becoming calmness; but I take this opportunity of observing, that as, on the one hand, the Materialist cannot prove that the principle of vitality is absolutely and necessarily extinguished at death; so neither, on the other hand, can the Immaterialist prove the necessary immortality of the soul, unless indeed he is hardy enough to maintain that it is so, independently of the will of the Deity. Neither party would gain any thing by shewing that the substance itself, of which the mind or body is composed, is indestructible; for the Atheist will accord us this sort of immortality. The only real worth of immortality in the estimation of a Christian, consists in the consciousness of personal identity, the lively hope of which immortality, is founded upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and upon the divine promise, that in Christ all shall be made alive.

To return from this digression.—Reasoning from analogy, it is to be presumed that after death the souls of men are intermixed much as we find things to be in the visible world; and that happiness or misery consists rather in the state of the mind than in the place which the individual occupies. Upon this supposition, knowing as we do the tendency of virtue to promote and to preserve union, it is reasonable to suppose that the society of the virtuous must have been constantly increasing in number, in wisdom, and in power, and that, actuated by the same feelings which distinguish good men in this world, their efforts have been unceasingly directed to relieving the miserable, enlightening the ignorant, and reclaiming the vicious. Good men, moreover, will naturally unite, not only among themselves, but also with other orders of virtuous beings; for virtue, from the very nature of it, is a principle and bond of union. If then there be any analogy between the things that are seen and those that are unseen, we shall be warranted to conclude, that the kingdom of Christ, founded upon the prophets and apostles, (he himself being the chief corner-stone,) has been rapidly extending itself in the unseen world. It is to be hoped that the large proportion of human beings which is cut off in infancy, will have been placed in circumstances favourable to virtuous habits, and consequently added to the number of the blessed:—and when we consider how effectual the preaching of Christ and his apostles proved to the conversion of some of the vilest sinners, although the first converts were called to suffer persecution, we are encouraged to hope that the labours of just men made perfect, possessed of ample means of illustrating the advantages attendant upon virtue,

---

* See Butler's Analogy.

† Dr. Hartley uses the same argument.

must prove infinitely more efficacious for the reformation of those who have been removed from the scenes of their former vicious courses, and are brought to reflection by an entire change in their outward circumstances. It would be easy enough to carry on this train of reasoning; but I check myself, and proceed to notice the

Second hypothesis, which supposes that consciousness is suspended during the period of time which elapses between death and resurrection.

If the righteous are to be raised first, and to reign a thousand years before the rest of the dead are recalled to life, it is certain that at the second resurrection the power of the saints will be infinitely greater than that of any society now existing upon earth; and supposing them to exert their power in the same way as our benevolent societies of every description now do, we cannot conceive that they will deem it necessary or expedient to resort to any harsh or violent measures for the correction of vice, knowing as we do, from the most authentic sources of information, how much more effectually kind treatment has conduced to that end, where it has been fairly tried. I would especially refer for a proof of this fact to the experiment made at Munich by the late Count Rumford. We may, moreover, indulge the hope that the resurrection, by taking place gradually, will the better enable the first-born to initiate those who are raised, in the knowledge necessary to qualify them for the enjoyment of virtuous society. And as Dr. Priestley was of opinion that consciousness ceased with death, and would not be revived until the resurrection, it was probably such considerations as those which I have stated which led him to the conclusion contained in the passage which I have quoted from his writings.

Still it must be acknowledged, that however plausible the foregoing reasonings may appear, they rest upon assumed facts; and that it is *reasonable* to believe that those who were enabled by their intimacy with the counsels of God, to foretell so many events which have actually come to pass, were much more likely to know what will be the destiny of mankind, than such short-sighted and shallow-minded mortals as myself. I therefore hold myself bound to give up any speculation which stands opposed to clear and positive scriptural doctrines; and candidly confess, that the Scriptures do appear to me to contradict the theory of the divine government which I have framed out of the scanty stores of my analogical gleanings.

We may nevertheless rest assured, that the Judge of all the earth will do right, and that he will himself overcome evil with good; for otherwise our blessed Saviour would have commanded his disciples to be more perfect than our Father who is in heaven; which supposition is absurd. It is, however, most desirable to *understand* the loving-kindness of the Lord; and we cannot employ ourselves better than by gaining such an insight into the conduct of Divine Providence as shall clear away from our minds the doubts and misgivings which are but too apt to assail us on a view of some of God's dealings. "The spirit of God," says Jeremy Taylor, "is a loving spirit, and if it be your teacher, he will teach you such truths as will make you know and love God.

"Though much of the secret contained in the law is made manifest in the gospel, yet even here also there is a *letter* and there is a *spirit;* still there is a reserve for God's secret ones, even all those deep mysteries which the Old Testament covered in figures, and stories, and names, and prophecies, and which Christ hath, and by his spirit will yet reveal more plainly to all that will understand them by their proper measures. For although the gospel is infinitely more legible and plain than the obscure leaves of the law, yet there is a seal upon them also, which seal no man shall open but he that is worthy."

"Brevis differentia inter Legem et Evangelium;
—timor et amor."

PHILADELPHUS.

Plymouth,
May 11, 1824.

SIR,

THE letter of Mr. Le Grice in your last number, p. 216, requires a few remarks, which I trust you will indulge me by inserting, if possible, in the Repository for the present

month. I am much of opinion that many persons, after having read the whole account of this affair, will join me in thinking, that no one, excepting a flaming son of the Church, would have dragged Sir Rose Price and his opinions into public notice as Mr. Le Grice has done, and thus "called the sluggish friends of an Establishment to an examination of its doctrines, and those who are wavering in their faith to tread in the path of truth." I am not singular in the opinion, that they only who are actuated by a flaming zeal, or, trembling for the shrines of Diana, are hurried into hasty measures, could bring an affair of this kind before the public, and "disturb the quiet of their neighbourhood," the loss of which they afterwards can only deplore. The publication of these facts was not called for; the orthodox friends of Mr. Le Grice think so: and that exposure of a private conversation in which they originated, will not be approved of by the world at large, whatever may be the resolutions of his brother clergymen as to what the reverend gentleman has been doing.

And why should he be so highly offended, as I judge he is, at the epithet by which he is designated in the *Statement of the particulars of this Western Controversy?* Had he honoured me with a reading of the Lectures on Nonconformity, and thought proper to regard me in consequence of them as a flaming son of Dissent, I should have willingly left him in possession of his terms, nor been offended because he acknowledged me in the strongest language the decided and consistent character which, I trust, I ever shall remain. "I honour the man, whatever principles he holds, whose conduct is consistent with his principles," yet not all men under such circumstances exactly alike. I know not what he means by "the grammatical propriety of the epithet;" he says, we all know the meaning of it: yet it is no unusual thing for us to affix different meanings to the same term: he is welcome to affix his own; and I shall only add, that when this controversy first appeared, talking of it with a very respectable gentleman who is well acquainted with the neighbourhood in which Mr. Le Grice lives, and with the greater part of his previous life, he said to me, "He is a flaming son of the Church, I assure you." I replied, "His conduct has shewn it."

As to the Summary &c., excuse me, Mr. Editor, if I inform your readers, that it is a word of your own choosing, not of mine. My manuscript was headed by the words—*Cornish Controversy*, simply.

With respect to the arrangement, in which we are told there is great incorrectness, I assure you, it cost me some trouble to select the points which were worthy, as I thought, of the public notice, and reduce into a reasonable space the tremendous letters which lay before me. I knew the value of your pages, and was not willing to sacrifice them to useless matter. And assuredly, Sir, "the writer did not entertain an idea that the correspondence would appear in your pages, or he would not have" troubled himself with sending you any account of it at all. My communication to you was in London when I saw the first letters in the Repository, and I instantly regretted that it had been written. I had thought myself called on, in one point of view, to make this controversy known to the Unitarian public; but should have been as well satisfied as Mr. Le Grice appears to be, had I known that the letters would speak for themselves in their own language. And now for the incorrectness of my remarks.

On referring again to the letters, I feel no disposition to retract the assertion I have made, that "the attention of the public was first called to the subject by a long address," &c., for in truth the public cared little about the matter until Mr. Le Grice's long letter appeared, which brought before them the numerous particulars that are stated in that letter. It was then assuredly, that the attention of the public was fixed, and not before, and then too, that the attention of the great body of the readers of newspapers was called to the business; for as a controversy it had not been regarded until that letter appeared. Let the reader now say what he will, of the unpardonable sin of which I have been guilty.

What was said in my statement

respecting Dr. Pearson, was an inference in which I might have been mistaken, and if so, I must acknowledge that shame which is so often the portion of fallible but ingenuous mortals. (See letter dated February 9, p. 149.) "That you entertained the intention and that you avowed it with your own lips, I pledge myself to shew by testimony that admits of proof." I think it is evident, therefore, that Mr. Le Grice did consider, that Sir Rose Price had said as much, and I felt authorized by the language that passed between them, to think so too.

I neither professed "to sum up nor to act as a judge." In this the gentleman has assigned me an office I am not willing to undertake. My proposal was merely *to state the particulars of this Western Controversy*; in some trifling particulars of which, I may well have been mistaken, considering the extent and the intermixture of times and circumstances which are conspicuous in the letters which lay before me.

Mr. Le Grice then points out an error. "A meeting was called, and Sir Rose Price soon received a copy of their resolutions to displace him."—Thus far I apprehend I am correct, (see p. 89,) although by his manner of expressing himself, it might be thought that the whole passage is false. In the latter clause I have confounded the office of President with that of Secretary, which is held by Mr. Le Grice; and herein I acknowledge my error.

The most serious charge is next brought against me, reserved for the last as a *coup de grace* and ushered in with all the apparatus that may be useful in preparing the reader for some very deep feeling of indignation. Yet might I not say with truth that "Sir Rose Price is charged by Mr. Le Grice with endeavouring to get into Parliament, in order that he might attempt the overthrow of the Church altogether," after reading these words of Mr. Le Grice? "I then proceed to your avowed wish to try your strength in Parliament, towards a reform in the doctrines of the Church, &c. &c. and a new Act of Uniformity." This is a declaration which I am to suppose the Baronet had made, and which is equivalent, in my view of the matter, to an entire overthrow of the present system of the Church. The Divine could not suppose that I meant an overthrow of the church of Christ, for he has candour enough to believe that Unitarians are Christians, although avowedly opposed to the doctrines of the Church of England; and if we understand any thing of the Baronet's principles, we must believe that, were an alteration made, through his instrumentalitity, in the service of the English Church, it would be an alteration tantamount to an overthrow of the present Church Establishment altogether: for neither he nor I can say to what extent Sir Rose might wish to carry such a reform.

The quotation which follows, "Whoever shall presume to innovate," &c., is, I now suppose, not in the words of Mr. Le Grice. I do not find them in that part of the correspondence which has appeared in the Repository. I must therefore have taken them from a paper which has not fallen into your hands, and incautiously applied them to the leading champion of *things as they are*, instead of another of the zealous opponents of Sir Rose. For this mistake I sincerely beg pardon both of Mr. Le Grice and your readers.

Having thus replied to the remarks of the reverend gentleman, I declare to you, that I feel some satisfaction in the thought, that, while he was desirous of keeping this matter a-going a little longer, it was not in his power to find out any more grievous charge against one who had taken some pains to save the general reader the trouble of steering through a long correspondence, the greater part of which is interesting only in the immediate neighbourhood in which it originated. I cannot regret, Sir, the part I have taken, having had in view only to give publicity to these circumstances in the most convenient form.

ISRAEL WORSLEY.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Sermons on Various Subjects.* By the Rev. T. N. Toller. To which is prefixed a Memoir of the Author. By Robert Hall, M. A. London. Published by Holdsworth. 1824. 8vo. Pp. 331.

WE have often wished to see a posthumous volume of the sermons of many an individual, who attained considerable reputation, for his services in the pulpit: and we particularly hail the appearance of these discourses by the late Mr. Toller. It adds to the value of the publication of the compositions before us, that they have been taken, with no very studious discrimination, "from upwards of three thousand manuscripts:" on this account, they are the more welcome, "as memorials of the preaching of the author;" and for our being pleased with the comparative absence of care in selecting them, there exists another most important reason, to which we shall advert, before we finish the present article of review.

The First and Second Sermons have for their subject, *The Omnipotent God the Joy of the Church;* the text being Ephes. iii. 20, 21: "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." We recognize Mr. Toller's style in the introductory sentences:

"This is what is called a doxology, or ascription of praise, at the close of one of the richest and most comprehensive prayers that was [were] ever formed or offered. And a striking instance it is, how easily God can turn a prison into a spiritual palace, and give liberty of soul under the confinement of the body."

From an illustration of the context, the preacher advances, to offer some thoughts on *the Divine Omnipotence*, to remark that this great perfection of God is *employed for his church and people*, to shew, in what particular ways it may be expected so to exert itself—v. g. *in* a way of *providential, seasonable interposition, and* for the purpose *of spiritual improvement and usefulness,*—and to elucidate *the strong expressions the apostle uses* in his representation of the omnipotence of the Supreme Being, when it is thus manifested. Mr. T. closes his discourse by asking, If there be an Omnipotent God, what is every thing that can be mentioned, compared with the "one touching point"—*Is this God against me or for me? The suitableness of the largest prayers,* is also suggested; and *the importance of waiting for God,* in the way of duty.

As the foregoing sermon treated of the Divine Omnipotence, and of the variety and unbounded extent of its application in behalf of humble and holy souls, the object of the remaining discourse, on the same passage, is to prove that this attribute of God must be matter of joy to his church and people. Here Mr. T. points out who they are that reasonably indulge such joy:

"—— a question occurs—*Who* are the church and people of God? Because these terms have been most miserably understood in the world, and men have sheltered the most abominable vices and hateful characters under them. Sometimes they call a large, venerable building a church, and think the better of themselves because they attend worship within its walls. Thus the Jews trusted to their magnificent temple, and boasted of it as the temple of the Lord. But God dwelleth not in temples made with hands; is not attached to consecrated stones, to altar-pieces and pictures; is not pleased with organs, and fine singing, and costly vestments; nor approves a person at all the more for worshiping there, than under a tree or in a barn. And so miserably were the Jews mistaken in that point, that God suffered their temple, magnificent as it was, and built by his express order, to be razed to the very foundation. Others call particular communities of professing Christians, churches; such as the Church of England, the Church of Rome, the Church of Scotland, the Church of Geneva, and congregational churches among Dissenters. But any or all of these are no farther the church and people of God,

than their doctrine and discipline, their characters, their tempers and lives, are agreeable to the pure word of God, as it lies in the Bible; and no claims of authority, no antiquity of date, no pomp of worship, no popularity of character, no dignity of patronage, no number of members, no orthodoxy of creeds, no splendour of outward profession or appearance of religion, constitute any such a true church, or the true people of God. Others call those exclusively the people of God, who attend on the particular ordinance of the Lord's Supper, who solemnly, publicly, and frequently commemorate the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. But this likewise is no infallible mark of the true church; because an attendance there is of no farther consequence and advantage, than as accompanied with inward discerning of the Lord's body, or the design of the ordinance; and a feeding, by faith and love and hope, on Christ, as the bread of life and Saviour of souls. Who then *are* the true church and people of God? Why, all, of every class, who believe in Christ to the regeneration and salvation of the soul, who love him in sincerity, who are of the same mind and temper with him, who do not live to themselves, but love and live to God and their fellow-creatures."

Mr. T. shews, in the second place, why, to such individuals, the Divine Omnipotence becomes a theme of joy and praise. Such it is, because *the great interests of the church are absolutely secure.* Under this head, he asks and resolves another question:

"—— What *are* the great interests of the church? Not the prosperity of any particular party or community, as such; not the prosperity of the Church of Rome, or of England, or of Geneva, or of Scotland, or of Dissenting congregations, separately considered: the great interests of the church might flourish, though any or all of these, as to the external form of them, were perished and forgotten. Not the prosperity of pontiffs, of forms and ceremonies, of inquisitions and spiritual courts, of dictators and lords over conscience: the interests of the church are very different from all these. Not the spread of the sentiments of any particular person; as Luther, or Calvin, Arius, or Socinus, Arminius, or Baxter: the interests of the church might flourish, though these names were all abolished and buried in oblivion. The real interest of the church lies in the reign of pure scriptural truth and love, righteousness and grace, in the minds, tempers and lives of men. So far as this is the case, and no farther, does the church flourish."

The Omnipotence of God, moreover, is a subject of joy and praise to the church, because *all truly humble and sincere endeavours to promote the true interests of Christ must prosper;* and because *the spiritual and everlasting welfare of every individual soul, is as perfectly easy to the Divine Being as the general prosperity of the church at large.*

As to the inquiry, *Where and how it is desirable that this joy and praise should be expressed*—Mr. T. answers —*publicly and unitedly, evangelically, perpetually and eternally.* And, for the improvement of his subject, he observes, "What a capital point it is to be the objects of the *gracious* omnipotence of God! How groundless and unreasonable are all unbelief and despondency respecting the real interests of Christ's church and people! What reason have we to admire and be thankful, if God has made us witnesses, in any measure, of his power in his church!" On the second of these remarks he thus enlarges:

"Those, of whatever denomination and description, who are much disposed to be alarmed, and cry out, The church is in danger! The church is in danger! strongly insinuate a consciousness that their church, whatever it be, is not the church of Christ; for *that* never is in danger nor can be: it is the church of the living, Omnipotent God: it is founded upon a rock, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' And all churches that are not a part of *this* church, *are* in danger, and *ought to be* in danger, however propped up by civil magistrates, by emoluments, by pompous worship, and outward splendour. They must fall at last, in proportion as the pure church of Christ prospers: 'Every plant, (said our Lord,) which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.' *Amen*, say all the true friends of the church of Christ."

The title of the Third Sermon is, "The Richness and Beauty of the Vegetable World, an Argument for Providential Interpositions in Behalf of Rational Beings;" the text being Matt. vi. 28—30.

Our Lord's hint in this passage, may be illustrated by a general view of nature, and by a minute and particular attention to any of its specific productions. Jesus Christ intimates,

what an amazing waste there appears to be made, in the vegetable world; and from the considerations on which he here insists, he derives *an argument for trust in Providence.* "The force of this argument, and the ground on which it stands," will be clear, if we mark the essential difference between the nature of inanimate things, and God's rational and intelligent creatures; if we view man as a *sensitive*, a *spiritual*, *intellectual* and *immortal* being, who partakes in the privileges and hopes of the gospel. Still more completely shall we enter into our Saviour's reasoning, if we behold it in connexion with the perfections and promise of the Supreme Ruler; with his wisdom, power, goodness and fidelity. Mr. T.'s concluding reflections are, What an amazing field does our Creator open to us, for our admiration, wonder and praise! and—How suitable and desirable it is, to turn the scenes of nature to real and practical improvement!

This is a very pleasing and useful discourse. As we perused it, we could not but be reminded of the following sentences in the Memoir (p. 31):

"In the summer months, he" [Mr. Toller] "frequently rose at a very early hour, and was often met in his solitary walks in the neighbouring woods, by peasants, who were 'going forth to their work and to their labour till the evening.' In these silent and retired scenes he took great delight, and from his observation of the beauties of nature and the operations of husbandry, he frequently derived those images and illustrations which furnished a rich repast for his audience."

A Sermon follows on a vastly interesting yet disregarded topic: "The peculiar Blessedness of Christian Connections;" and the passage which introduces it, the preacher selects from 1 Pet. iii. 7: "As being heirs together of the grace of life." He begins with considering the view here given of future blessedness—the grace of life—and then he enlarges on the endearing and delightful way in which Christians are put in possession of this blessedness. The thought of the joint participation of relatives and friends in the heavenly inheritance, gratifies one of the noblest feelings of the human heart and graces of the Christian spirit—our generosity and benevolence: it adds eminent sweetness to the intercourse of friendship. We are deeply interested in knowing that, by the appointment of Providence, genuine Christians are not only fellow-heirs of eternal life, but fellow-helpers to it: and this consideration furnishes the most powerful cordial, when friends come to part. How richly and graciously, therefore, has God ordered it, that the salvation of Christians should be linked together! Again, How anxious should those be, who are united together by the tender ties of natural affection, to become heirs together of such a life! How important is it, that those who are substantially and essentially heirs together of it, seriously cultivate the dispositions which are most suited to their profession, state and hopes! Further; How desirable is it to have reference to these views in times of need! And, lastly, How terrible is the sentiment of the text, reversed!

Such are the leading ideas of one among the most impressive and affecting discourses in the volume. Our limits confine us to a single extract:

"——— worldly men are anxious, or at least content, to enrich themselves at the expense of impoverishing others. But the nature of Christian happiness is exactly the reverse of this. There is not a Christian under the canopy of heaven who desires to be the only saved soul. On the contrary, a great part of his salvation is wrapped up in the salvation of others; a vast portion of his heaven lies in helping others thither, and in meeting them there at last. And a most sublimely glorious appoinment of divine providence and grace this is; because it makes a man's own salvation as wide as the world of the redeemed, and extends the sources of his future enjoyment to the farthest boundaries of heaven itself: the heaven of all others will be his own heaven."

From Rom. viii. 12, "For we are saved by hope," Mr. T. discourses, in No. V., on "Hope," as "Life's great Cordial." "It is," says he, "a real and general fact, in common and actual life, that *we are carried through the world by hope.* It is our principal enjoyment in agreeable circumstances, and our main relief in unpleasant ones."

The preacher illustrates these two ideas; and then observes, what an amiable and endearing view is hence presented of the blessed Creator! What

a pity it is, that any body should be an enemy to hope! How much are they to be pitied, from whom hope seems to have hidden its face! How desirable is it to keep up a friendly, rational correspondence with hope!

Afterwards, he treats of *the hope of unseen spiritual blessings*. Unseen, spiritual and future are all the great things that Christians live upon: and without hope all these things are objects of terror and misery; while the main part of Christian enjoyment, lies, at present, in the exercise of hope. Hence we should be contented, should try our hope, should patiently wait for its accomplishment, and should apply the lapse of time [the close and the commencement of another year] to this subject.

In No. VI., Mr. T. discourses, from John xiv. 16, on *the Gift of the Holy Spirit* as *a Permanent Blessing*. The question which he begins with considering, is, In what sense the promise contained in the text has been fulfilled? Afterwards, he asks, What, in that sense, is it to us? Now *the consequences* of the miraculous gifts of the feast of Pentecost, have been eminently permanent and rich down to the present day: but the preacher is disposed to be of opinion, that the gifts themselves ceased with the apostolic age. The following ground, therefore, is here taken with respect to the assurance of a comforter "to abide with you for ever;" namely, that the blessing has been lasting—in the infallible inspiration of the New Testament writings—in the efficacious blessing which has attended the preaching of the gospel—and in the acquirements and consolations of succeeding generations of pious Christians.

Mr. Toller next shews, how this gracious, permanent influence is to be distinguished. His particular *criteria* are negative. That which leads men to believe or to do any thing contrary to the word of God—that which makes them satisfied with themselves irrespectively of character—that which fills them with joy and rapture about their safety and eternal prospects, without regard to evidence—can never come from the Spirit of God. What comes from God, leads to him. The author then applies his reasoning practically and devotionally. His arguments would command our assent, his exhortations would approve themselves alike to our understanding and our feelings, did we adopt his exposition of the passage of which he chiefly treats. These words of our Lord, be it recollected, are addressed to the apostles; and this exclusively—for the second person is employed; and the connection restricts the assurance. In the phraseology of the Scriptures nothing will be found more common than the occurrence of the terms "for ever," in a modified rather than an absolute meaning; the limitation being always pointed out by the subject and the context. Hence we feel no difficulty in viewing Matt. xxviii. 20, as the key to the interpretation of the verse, which forms the basis of Mr. T.'s discourse. The promise, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," [the age,] regards no successors of the apostles, and still less the Christian body, but only the individuals, who heard it from their Master's lips: it will, indeed, be perpetually of importance, as a prediction that was fulfilled, an assurance that was made good; yet it has not *personally* an *universal* application.

No. VII. treats of "The Influence of what we call Trifles on our Future State." The preacher's text is Matt. xii. 36. Under idle and unprofitable words he ranks discourse which is a mere waste of time, which has a tendency to weaken our regard to truth, or ultimately to hurt one's own or another's mind. He argues the possibility of our Lord's assertion, in this passage, being true, from the perfections of the great Judge, the formation of the human mind, and the nature of the world to which we are all going. From these observations he infers the grandeur and divine perfection of the final Judge, the awful guilt of deliberate liars, profane swearers, &c., the immense variety in the sentences of the last day, and the unreasonableness of imagining that any thing we say or do is, strictly speaking, a trifle.

The subject is pursued in No. VIII., and the text retained. This topic, adds Mr. T., represents the value of the gospel in a most endearing and interesting light: it, for obvious and weighty reasons, is worthy of the deepest attention of young people; and it forms a strong motive to Chris-

tian watchfulness. To persons in trade—to men of strong passions—in reference to what is called *visiting* and *gossiping*, and to *convivial entertainments*—the passage is of peculiar moment.

In the Ninth Sermon, "Steady Trust in God," is shewn to be "consistent with the most distressing apprehensions." On the book of Job, the preacher makes some exceedingly correct and pertinent remarks; and he selects his text from ch. xiii. 15. The words, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him," disclose a state of great and extraordinary apprehension; such as considerable weakness and pain of body, sad discouragements in a person's circumstances, an accusing conscience, and the influence of temptations on the soul, have often excited. At the same time, the language of the man of Uz expresses a holy, fixed confidence in God. This mixed state of feeling may appear strange and inconsistent with itself: in the present discourse, however, Mr. T., who evidently writes from his own experience, illustrates the manner in which devout confidence acts within the deeply-afflicted soul, and points out the circumstances in which it may be indulged.

His Tenth Discourse is on the pleasing theme of "Friendship:" Prov. xviii. 24: *And there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.* God has implanted in our nature a social principle. Upon this principle, according to the order of Providence, are founded certain qualifications, distinctions and relations among mankind; and they give scope to it. There have been also surprising instances of friendship among men. Friendship keeps society together. Rich pleasures attend the exercise of the social principle. By means of friendship we become, in a humble degree, like God himself: and it is exactly suited to our state and circumstances in both this world and another. Still, from peculiarity of natural temper, from a collision of interests, from an incapacity to help, from the want of religion, from distance of place, and from shortness of duration, human friendship is imperfect. Appropriate precepts and cautions form the conclusion of this discourse, the leading thoughts of which we have set before our readers, and which is of great excellence and value.

An *habitual remembrance of Christ*, is *urged* in the Eleventh Sermon, from 2 Tim. ii. 8. Mr. T. endeavours to shew in what sense it is practicable, in the present state, to remember Jesus Christ. He points out the obstructions which Christians find in the exercise of this remembrance. Then he states why we should remember Jesus Christ, and represents the means that should be employed by us for a purpose so essential and important.

The judicious and instructive preacher advances to the discussion of a topic which has suffered greatly in inferior hands. *The unpardonable sin* is *considered* in No. XII.; the text being supplied by Matt. xii. 31, 32. Mr. T. inquires, in the first place, what the unpardonable sin is, and afterwards shews the grounds or reasons of its unpardonableness. What the sin is, appears plainly from the connection of the passage: *he* sins against the Holy Spirit, who maliciously and obstinately ascribes to a foreign agency—be it diabolical or dæmoniacal—the miraculous operations of the Holy Spirit, amidst the clear discovery and full display of that power. Now this crime is unpardonable, because it implies a contumacious resistance to the last remedy of the soul, and to the utmost evidence that God could give to the truth of his gospel; and, further, because from such offenders God, in righteous retribution, cannot but withhold his grace. On this comprehensive and accurate statement of the subject, Mr. T. builds some admirable remarks; and he honestly acknowledges that he deems it impossible for the unpardonable sin to be literally committed at the present day,—though there are those who make certain approaches to it.

In Dr. Chalmers' opinion,* the sin against the Holy Ghost is not peculiar to any one age, but consists in hardened unbelief, in the wilful rejection of the gospel, in turning a deaf ear to the suggestions of the Spirit. But, surely, the best interpreter of the words of Jesus Christ, is Jesus Christ himself, who expressly informs

* Sermons in St. John's Church, Glasgow, (1823,) pp. 326, &c.

us that the sin in question is *specific*, not *general*. Of this crime the essence is the most malignant calumny: the guilt lies not merely in a state of mind, or even in speaking and acting in opposition to actual conviction, but in *uttering* what is false and wicked, for the express purpose of *personally* injuring and traducing the Messiah.

Mr. Toller's next Sermon is particularly useful and interesting. In No. XIII., he discourses, at large, from Acts v. 1—11, on the history of "Ananias and Sapphira." His observations are arranged under five general heads. The practice of the Christians in the first ages of the Church—The crime of Ananias and Sapphira, in reference to that practice—The manner in which this sin was detected——The awful judgment by which it was punished—And the effect produced upon others.

"The Influence of Christian Intercourse," forms the subject of the Fourteenth Discourse. Our author takes his text from Acts xxviii. 15. ["Whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage."] This passage, he thinks, may suggest to us, that the best Christians are liable to dejection and discouragement in their way to heaven;—that in such cases it is kindly ordered by Divine Providence, that some seasonable, salutary instrument of relief shall be at hand, that shall put new life and spirit into them;—and that the effect of relief in such circumstances is just as described here, to promote gratitude and hope. The sermon is very interesting and valuable; abounding in the characteristic marks of Mr. T.'s style, and representing much, we doubt not, of his personal experience. To this composition, however, no date has been affixed; though as to all the other discourses in the volume, we are informed, *when* and *where* they were delivered.

In the Fifteenth Sermon "Youth" are "guarded against the deceitfulness of sin." The preacher appears to have been in the habit of addressing his young friends on the first Lord's-day in every year. On such an occasion, the discourse now before us was delivered. The text is Heb. iii. 13. ["But exhort one another daily," &c.] To shew wherein the deceitfulness of sin consists, to point out the danger of listening to its imposing misrepresentations, and to notice one capital means of guarding against this fatal evil, are the objects of Mr. T.'s attention; and he pursues them with great wisdom, faithfulness, energy and affection. His representations are calculated to be eminently impressive: scarcely could they be heard, and, we are persuaded, they cannot be read, altogether in vain.

Another New-Year's Sermon follows. In No. XVI., "Life and Death" are "set before the young," from Deut. xxx. 19. The writer's method is the following: First, he shews the rising generation, in what sense life and death may justly be said to be set before them; and, next, life and death, blessing and cursing, as thus stated, thus connected, are proposed to their choice. The sermon is familiar and striking, seasonable and pertinent: a just advantage is taken of local and temporary circumstances; while many remarks are interspersed, which evince an attentive observation and intimate knowledge of human nature.

From Prov. xxiii. 15, "My son, if thine heart be wise, my heart shall rejoice, even mine," Mr. T. discourses on "Filial Wisdom—Parental Joy." This, the seventeenth sermon, was preached too at the very beginning of a year. Our author notices what it was that "this royal father" had so much at heart, what it would be to him if his desire were accomplished, and what force such a motive is calculated "to carry with it on the young and ingenuous and affectionate mind." This is an extremely pathetic, tender and powerful address to the finest sensibilities of youth, in favour of early piety. We extract from it two or three sentences, which are particularly illustrative of the mode of Mr. Toller's writing (p. 301):

"The question returns upon us, What is *that wisdom* which Solomon desired for his son? And, happily for us, Solomon himself has inserted one word in the text which fully enables us to understand his meaning: 'My son,' says he, 'if thine HEART be wise,' &c. Thine *heart*. There it is. In that one word are comprised the contents of volumes. Because that one word sets up a standard of true wisdom, and constitutes the discriminating test by which all spurious and defective wisdom is detected and excluded."

Of the eighteenth, which is also the last, sermon in the volume, the intrinsic merit is very considerable: but the occasions and the circumstances * of the delivery of it, give it yet stronger claims on our attention: "The importance of remembering pastoral instructions, and the uncertainty of their continuance," are urged, with rare simplicity and affection, from 2 Pet. i. 12—15: ["Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance," &c.] Agreeable to this title are the two general heads of the discourse; and the subordinate thoughts are extremely pertinent and well arranged. We shall make some quotations, by which, we trust, our readers will be gratified and improved.

Mr. Toller distinguishes very judiciously between itinerant preachers and the stated ministers of congregations (p. 316):

"They [that class of Christians we commonly call Methodists] go into grossly ignorant villages, and among the very dregs of mankind, who have had no education. The gospel, to such, is, strictly speaking, new. But where the gospel is established, and has been clearly preached for a great number of years, particularly in such a situation as mine, the minister appears principally in the character of a remembrancer."

The following remarks, evince the same power of discrimination, and may serve to correct a current error (pp. 317—319):

"—— if a travelling Methodist were to carry studied sermons among ignorant, profligate people, he would not be very likely to arouse them, or to do them good; and, therefore, such preachers very properly address their hearers in an off-hand, free way, without any study, because to such congregations every thing they say is new. But what is very right in them might be very wrong in us.—And it is exceedingly wrong in congregations, to wish their ministers, as I know some do, to preach in that extempore, unstudied way (however proper and interesting it may be in itinerants and occasional village preachers); because when a man has been long settled, the same things would necessarily come over and over, there would be no variety, and the very people who are so clamorous for this mode of preaching would soon become weary, and wish to hear somebody else. A settled minister, who justly appreciates the importance and difficulty of keeping up the attention of a stated congregation, goes through a vast deal more in studying than people in general are aware of, which is not necessary for the other description of preachers. I have spent some of the most painful, trying moments in my life, and my mind has been upon the stretch, sometimes almost upon the rack, in preparing addresses for you, which, perhaps, you thought were all very easy to me: and sometimes some of you have slept under what had cost me many tears in composing, the sight of which has excited many an inward, bitter pang you little thought of, and has sent me home many times with a sunk and dejected heart."

These hints to auditors, are pursued, (pp. 319, 320):

"Some people who neglect the house of God, assign as a reason, that if they did attend, the preacher could not tell them any thing new; they should only hear over again what they knew perfectly well before. But, by the way, this is not always true. Perhaps these wise men, if they would but condescend to favour us with their attendance, and if, when they came, they would listen and not sleep, might occasionally hear something which even they did not know before."

The following passage will also be found, with few variations, in our author's discourse on the death of the Rev. Samuel Palmer* (pp. 327, 328):

"Suppose this house were as large again as it is, that there were three times as many hearers, and I were to live here forty years, caressed, followed, and extolled all the time,—and this were all; self, in effect, preached all the while, a carnal religion propagated, men amused and made to wonder; but no mind really instructed, no heart humbled, no sinner turned from the error of his way, no Christian graces or Christian duties promoted;—why these forty years must end by and bye—and what then? Why to me it would all be as the bursting of a glittering bubble, the retreat of an actor from the stage, amidst clappings which he is to hear no more. There is one passage of scripture, to realize which is worth ten thousand such caresses and plaudits as these, all put together; namely, when a dying minister can look round

* See the Memoir, pp. 15, &c.

* Some other sentences in *that* sermon are taken, as was natural and proper, from the present.

on an affectionate, weeping flock, and say, 'Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men: forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us; written, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart.'"

[To be continued.]

ART. II. —— *East-India Unitarian Tracts.*

(Continued from p. 236.)

THE full title of the pamphlet, No. IX. in our series, is as follows: "A Vindication of the Incarnation of the Deity, as the common Basis of Hindooism and Christianity, against the Schismatic Attacks of R. Tytler, Esq. M.D., Surgeon in the Hon. East-India Company's Service, Author of an Inquiry into the Origin and Principles of Budaic Sabism, and of 'The Substance of a Discourse in Vindication of the Divinity of our Lord,' and also, Member of the Asiatic Society. By Ram Doss. Calcutta, printed by S. Smith and Co. Hurkaru Press, 1823."

We have called this (p. 236,) a *bonâ fide* attempt by a Hindoo to shew that Hindooism and Trinitarian Christianity are kindred religions. On a second and more careful perusal of the tract, we have almost been inclined to suspect that it is the work of a disguised polemic; but still there are passages that would seem to come from the pen of a Brahmin; and perhaps the real state of the case is, that the Vindication is the work of a Reformed, if not a Christian Hindoo. Dr. Tytler himself allows (p. 9), that Ram Doss may be "a real person."

Ram Doss, be he flesh and blood or a mere creature of the imagination, dedicates his Vindication "to all believers in the Incarnation of the Deity," assuring them that his object is "that all believers in the manifestation of God in the flesh, whether Hindoo or Christian, might unite in support of our common cause, and cordially co-operate in our endeavours to check the alarming growth of the Unitarian heresy."

In an Introduction the writer quotes a passage from a letter of Dr. Tytler's, published in the Bengal Hurkaru of the 30th of May 1823, which he says is "directed against Rammohun Roy, a person who, as is well known, is strongly reprobated by the zealous both among Hindoos and Christians, for his daring impiety in rejecting the doctrine of Divine Incarnations." But he complains that whilst the Doctor censures "this stubborn heretic," (this is a suspicious phrase, but the Missionaries may have taught the Brahmins the language of Christian *offence,)* he introduces unwarrantably contemptuous allusions to the Hindoo Deities.

Dr. Tytler had, it appears, invited Rammohun Roy to a "religious conference." The learned Brahmin declined the meeting, unless Dr. Tytler could procure the signature of one of the missionaries to his creed, attesting it to be Trinitarian Christianity; telling the challenger, "whether you be a faithful believer in the Divinity of the Holy *Lord and Saviour* JESUS CHRIST, or of any other mortal man; or whether a Hindu declares himself a faithful believer in the divinity of his Holy *Thakoor Trata* RAM, or MUNOO—I feel equally indifferent about these notions." Upon this the Doctor complains grievously that his "belief in the divinity of the Holy Saviour is on a par with a Hindu's belief in his Thakoor!" The complaint gave occasion to the first letter of Ram Doss to the Doctor, which being refused by the Editor of the Hurkaru, was sent to Dr. Tytler privately.

Ram Doss says that no Hindoo would be offended at being told by a believer in "the invisible God," that he (the believer) was "indifferent about the Hindoo's faith in the divinity of his Holy Thakoor and Trata Ram or Munoo." He expresses astonishment at the Doctor's being angry at the suggestion of his own belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ being similar to that of the Hindoo in his Thakoor, urging

"———you ought to know that our religious faith and yours are founded on the same sacred basis, viz, *the manifestation of God in the flesh*, without any restriction to a dark or fair complexion, large or small stature, long or short hair. You cannot surely be ignorant that the Divine RAM was the reputed son of Dusuruth, of the offspring of Bhuggeeruth, of the tribe of Rughoo: as JESUS was the reputed son of Joseph, of the house of

David, of the tribe of Judah. RAM was the king of the Rughoos and of foreigners, while, in like manner, JESUS was king of the Jews and Gentiles. Both are stated in the respective sacred books handed down to us, to have performed very wonderful miracles, and both ascended up to heaven. Both were tempted by the Devil while on the earth, and both have been worshiped by millions up to the present day. Since God can be born of the tribe of Judah, how, I ask, is it impossible that he should be born of the tribe of Rughoo, or of any other nation or race of men? And as the human form and feelings of RAM afford sceptics no good argument against his omnipresent and divine nature, it must be evident to you that this deluded sect of Unitarianism can lay no stress on the human form and feelings of Jesus Christ as disproving his divinity."

This is pretty strong. Ram Doss goes on,

"You may perhaps urge, that there is a wide difference between a belief in THREE Persons in the Godhead as maintained by you, and a belief in three hundred and thirty millions of Persons in the Godhead, entertained by the Hindoos: but as all such numerical objections are founded on the frail basis of human reason, which we well know is fallible, you must admit that the same Omnipotence which can make THREE ONE and ONE THREE, can equally reconcile the *unity* and PLURALITY of three hundred and thirty millions; both being supported by a sublime mystery which far transcends all human comprehension."

The Hindoo writer concludes with reminding Dr. Tytler that "the vain and narrow-minded believers in one invisible God, accuse the followers of the Trinity, as well as the sincere worshipers of Ram and other Divine Incarnations, of being idolaters," and that therefore, policy required a good understanding and brotherhood between the two sects, that they "may go hand in hand in opposing and if possible extirpating the abominable notion of God, which strikes equally at the root of Hindooism and Christianity." But it is not too late, he adds, for the Doctor to atone for his indiscretion by expressing his regret at having written any thing calculated "to create dissension among the worshipers of Divine Incarnations."

The reply of the Trinitarian Doctor is worthy of being inserted entire, as a specimen of "the true agonistic style."

"To RAM DOSS,

"I have received your letter, and beg you to receive my best thanks for the trouble you have put yourself to in sending it to me. It was my intention this evening to have proved that *Hindu Idolatry* and *Unitarianism* are the same, and that they both proceed from the *Devil*.—Unfortunately, Mr. Robison, in consequence of the number who were anxious to attend, has requested me to postpone the meeting, to which of course I have acceded. But I am ready,—MIND ME, READY,—to meet you and your runnagate friend *Rammohun Roy* whenever you please, in public and private discussion, and let you know what a humble individual unsupported can do, armed with no other weapon than the sharp sword of the Gospel, in bringing to light the hidden works of darkness which are at present displayed in the *damnable* heresy of *Unitarianism*, of which you are the wretched tool. But neither you, Rammohun Roy, nor the second fallen ADAM, dare meet me, because you fear the WORD of TRUTH.

"Your inveterate and determined
"foe in the LORD,
(Signed) "R. TYTLER.
"*May 6th*, 1823."

This Christian epistle the editor of the Hurkaru inserted, with a remark that "there is a wide difference between the belief which maintains *God* to have appeared in the flesh, and that of the Hindoo who believes the appearance of the omnipotent Being in the shape of a Thakoor, which, (says the Editor,) if we are not mistaken, is composed of stone, metal or wood." Ram Doss replies to the Editor that no Hindoo imagines "that the divine Ram, the son of Dusruth by Houshilya his mother, according to the flesh, was composed either of wood, stone or metal." The images of the Hindoos are, he says, like those of the Roman Catholics; they are not identified with the sacred person they represent, but are mere helps to devotion.—With this letter the Editor inserted some candid explanatory observations upon the controversy, treating Ram Doss as a real person and a sincere Hindoo.

The next letter in the collection is from Ram Doss to the afore-named Editor, and is entitled "Ram Doss's First Challenge to Dr. R. Tytler."

The public are here informed that "this Goliath" "shrinks from the defence of the charges he has brought against Hindooism, and refuses to co-operate with" Ram Doss "in opposing Unitarianism."

A reply to this letter appeared in the newspaper from Dr. Tytler; avowing that he at first considered it to have been "written by some Unitarian under a pseudonymous signature," but that, judging from the last letter of the writer to the Editor, he may have been mistaken, and therefore he informs Ram Doss, "if he be a real person," that he considers there is no book at present in possession of Hindus—the Mahabharat and Ramayuna not excepted—of higher antiquity than the entrance of the Mussulmans into India, say about 800 years from the present period; and that the legends attached to the Avatars are merely corrupted copies of the Holy Scriptures in the possession of Christians. And the Doctor offers to meet Ram Doss, "if he be a real person and wish to obtain information on these topics," at his own house, or elsewhere, to discuss "the *modernness* of the religious system at present followed by the Hindus."

Not satisfied with this, nor inclined to meet such an antagonist in person, Ram Doss sent to the Hurkaru a "Second Challenge to Dr. Tytler," calling upon him for a direct answer to the arguments of his former letter. In return, the redoubtable Doctor reminded the Brahmin, by means of the Hurkaru, that whilst he considered Unitarianism to be "a system of damnable heresy proceeding from the Devil," he looked upon Ram Doss's own superstitions in the same light, and declared that it was unreasonable to expect that he would allow this person to "co-operate" with him, when in fact he maintained "Unitarianism to be nothing more than a new name for Hindoo idolatry."

A "Third Challenge to Dr. Tytler" was now given in the Hurkaru by his unwearied opponent, who inquired, seeing that the Doctor shrunk from entering the field with him against Unitarianism and left him "to encounter the danger and reap the glory single-handed," whether he also flinched from justifying his insinuations against the Hindoo religion, and from replying to the letter proving Hindooism and Christianity to rest on the same sacred foundation? The Doctor contented himself with asserting that the charge of shrinking was too absurd to require notice, and that the histories of Buddha, Saluvahana and Chrisna comprised "nothing more than perverted copies of Christianity."

Ram Doss replied to the Doctor by inquiring "whether if any Hindoo were to make insinuations against the Christian religion, when called to defend them he would be justified in merely referring Christians to the books of the Jews (a tribe equally inimical to Christianity), or Gibbon's History of the Roman Empire, or to a whole History of Jesus Christ, without adducing any particular passage?" He then for the fourth time challenged his antagonist to answer his arguments. The only notice Dr. Tytler took of this letter was in a Postscript to one which he sent to the Hurkaru, as follows:

"I request to be informed by your sapient correspondent *Ram Doss* in what manner he proves Buddha to be the head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism."

This Ram Doss in reply pronounces to be mere evasion; however, "to oblige the Doctor as a fellow-believer in and worshiper of Divine Incarnations," he informs him ("although it has no bearing on the question"),

"——that *Buddha* or *Booddha*, is the head of the sect of *Boaddhus*, who derive their name from him in the same manner as Christians do from Christ. That this sect is inimical to Hindooism is proved by the fact that they deny the existence of *a* Creator of the Universe, in whom the Hindoos believe, and also despise many of the gods worshiped by the latter. There are hundreds of works published by them against each other, which are in general circulation."

But after complying thus far with Dr. Tytler's request, Ram Doss repeats that this has nothing to do with his arguments, which the Doctor by evading confesses he is unable to answer, and therefore denounces him "a defamer of Hindooism, a religion of the principles of which he is (or at least appears to be) totally ignorant." To all this, the Trinitarian champion complacently replies,

"The sapient *Ram Doss* now changes his tone,—and tells us the *Buddhists* 'despise *many* of the gods worshiped by the Hindoos.' It hence follows that *some* of the Hindoo deities must be objects of their adoration. And yet this writer asserts *Buddha* to be the 'head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism,' while his own statement proves Hindoo gods to be the objects of *Buddhaic* veneration!"

To this notice of Ram Doss's fifth challenge (we quote his own phrase) the challenger replies that he calls upon the world to judge "whether the person who can resort to such shuffling and evasion have any just claim to the character of a man of learning or a man of probity?" On the Doctor's supposed detection of an egregious blunder, the Brahmin retorts,

"In what school of *wisdom* did the learned Doctor acquire his logic? Although I *despise* or dislike several members of a family, is this a proof that I MUST adore the rest? May I not regard the rest with indifference, or be unacquainted with them? But granting even that Buddhists do worship *some* of the Hindoo gods, while they despise others, may they not still be inimical to Hindooism? For, do not the Jews despise one of the Christian Gods, worship another, and are indifferent to a third; and yet are they not inveterate enemies of Christianity?

"I now only wish to know from what College or University the Doctor procured a certificate, authorizing him to assume the Title of *M. D.*, and whether that seat of learning, in the distribution of its *academic honours*, usually selects such worthy objects?"

"Dr. Tytler being now," (the pamphlet states) "completely silenced, a friend, under the signature of 'A Christian,' came forward to his assistance." This letter is republished. The 'Christian' expresses his satisfaction at the improvement in mind and character observable in some of the Hindoos, but laments that, indebted as they are to Christians for their light and improvement, they should now turn upon and insult their benefactors by degrading their religion. He asks of his Christian readers, whether they are so far sunk in Asiatic effeminacy as to behold with indifference their holy and immaculate religion placed on an equality with Hindooism, with rank idolatry, with disgraceful ignorance and shameful superstition? This successor of Dr. Tytler puts several theological questions to Ram Doss, which will be found in his answer, and calls upon him, if he is not able to answer them, to refrain from insulting Christians by putting their religion on a comparison with Hindooism. Rammohun Roy is referred to by the 'Christian' in this connexion:

"Rammohun Roy, who appears to me to be the most learned of the Hindoos, is so far from making such odious and offensive remarks, that he apparently gives the preference to Christianity. Vide his First Appeal, entitled 'The Precepts of Christ the Guide to Peace and Happiness.' *I regret the learned Brahmin was interrupted by the intemperate zeal of the Baptists in the praise-worthy course he intended to have pursued*, as set forth in his Preface to the work above alluded to."

This correspondent concludes by recommending Ram Doss to "employ his time and talents in laudable and pious endeavours to reclaim his countrymen from idolatry, rather than attempt to investigate mysteries that are far above the weak comprehensions of man," and "to beware of such Christians" (is this designed for Dr. Tytler?) "as are carried away with every wind of doctrine, and know not what they do."

Ram Doss's reply to the 'Christian' is so able and so complete, that we must give it whole:

"*To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.*

"SIR,

"I regret to observe by the letter in your paper of this morning, signed, 'A *Christian*,' that in repelling the offensive insinuations of Dr. Tytler against the Hindoo religion, I am considered by one of the Christian denomination as endeavouring to degrade his '*faith*.'

"It is well known to you, Sir, that I privately sent a letter to the Doctor, refuting his position in the most friendly, calm, and argumentative manner, to which he returned a note loading me with the grossest abuse; consequently, I thought myself justified in challenging him publicly to make a reply to my arguments. The 'Christian,' therefore, cannot conceal from himself that it is *I* and *my* faith which have been vilified and abused, and that in return, I have offered *not* insult, but merely reason and argument; for it cannot be considered insult for a man to say that another religion is founded on the same basis with his own,

which he believes to be all that is venerable and sacred.

"If by the 'ray of intelligence,' for which the 'Christian' says we are indebted to the English, he means the introduction of useful mechanical arts, I am ready to express my assent and also my gratitude; but with respect to *science*, *literature*, or *religion*, I do not acknowledge that we are placed under any obligation. For by a reference to history it may be proved that the world was indebted to *our ancestors* for the first dawn of knowledge, which sprung up in the East, and, thanks to the Goddess of Wisdom, we have still a philosophical and copious language of our own which distinguishes us from other nations, who cannot express scientific or abstract ideas without borrowing the language of foreigners.

"Rammohun Roy's abandonment of Hindoo doctrines (as 'A Christian' mentions) cannot prove them to be erroneous; no more than the rejection of the Christian religion by hundreds of persons who were originally Christians and more learned than Rammohun Roy, prove the fallacy of Christianity. We Hindoos regard him in the same light as Christians do Hume, Voltaire, Gibbon and other sceptics.

"Before 'A Christian' indulged in a tirade about persons being 'degraded by *Asiatic* effeminacy,' he should have recollected that almost all the ancient prophets and patriarchs venerated by Christians, nay even Jesus Christ himself, a divine incarnation and the *founder* of the Christian faith, were ASIATICS. So that if a Christian thinks it degrading to be born or to reside in *Asia*, he directly reflects upon them.

"First.—The '*Christian*' demands, 'Will RAM Doss or his associates be pleased to inform me if the *incarnation of his god* was foretold by prophets through a period of four thousand years?' I answer in the affirmative—The incarnation of *Ram* was foretold in the works of many holy and inspired men for more than four thousand years previous to the event, in the most precise and intelligible language; not in those ambiguous and equivocal terms found in the *Old Testament*, respecting the incarnation of Jesus Christ, an ambiguity which it is well known has afforded our common enemies the Unitarians, a handle for raising a doubt of Jesus Christ being a real manifestation of God in the flesh.

"Secondly.—The Christian demands of RAM Doss, 'Will he demonstrate the mission or divine incarnation of his deity by incontestable and stupendous miracles such as Christ wrought?' I answer, YES: The divine Ram performed miracles more stupendous, not before multitudes of ignorant people only, but in the presence of princes and of thousands of learned men, and of those who were inimical to Hindooism. I admit that the Jeins and other unbelievers ascribed Ram's miraculous power to a demoniacal spirit, in the same manner as the Jews attributed the miracles of Jesus to the power of Beelzebub; but neither of these objections are worthy of notice from believers in divine incarnations; since the performance of the miracles themselves is incontestably proved by tradition.

"Thirdly.—The 'Christian' asks, 'Will he (Ram Doss) assert that the doctrine of Hindooism is as pure and undefiled as that of Christianity?' Undoubtedly, such is my assertion: and an English translation of the Vedant as well as of Munoo (which contains the essences of the whole Veds) being before the public, I call on all reflecting men to compare the two religions together, and point out in what respect the one excels the other in purity. Should the 'Christian' attempt to ridicule some part of the ritual of the Veds, I shall of course feel myself justified in referring to ceremonies of a similar character in the Christian Scriptures; and if he dwell on the corrupt notions introduced into Hindooism in more modern times, I shall also remind him of the corruptions introduced by various sects into Christianity. But 'A *Christian*' must know very well that such corruptions cannot detract from the excellence of genuine religions themselves.

"Fourthly.—The 'Christian' asks, 'Will he (Ram Doss) prove that the human character has ever been exalted by any system of religion so much as by the sweet influence of Christianity?' In reply, I appeal to history, and call upon the 'CHRISTIAN' to mention any religion on the face of the earth that has been the cause of so much war and bloodshed, cruelty and oppression for so many hundred years as this whose '*sweet influence*' he celebrates.

"That propriety of conduct found among the better sort of Christians is entirely owing to the superior education they have enjoyed; a proof of which is, that others of the same rank in society, although not believers in Christianity, are distinguished by equal propriety of conduct, which is not the case with the most firm believers, if destitute of education or without the means of improvement, by mixing in company with persons better instructed than themselves.

"It is unjust in the 'CHRISTIAN' to quarrel with Hindoos because (he says) they cannot comprehend the sublime

mystery of his religion; since he is equally unable to comprehend the sublime mysteries of ours, and since both these mysteries equally transcend the human understanding, one cannot be preferred to the other.

"Let us, however, return to the main question, viz, that THE INCARNATION OF THE DEITY IS THE COMMON BASIS OF HINDOOISM AND CHRISTIANITY. If the manifestation of God in the flesh is possible, such possibility cannot reasonably be confined to Judea or Uyodhya; for God has undoubtedly the power of manifesting himself in either country, and of assuming any colour or name he pleases. If it is impossible, as our common enemies the Unitarians contend, such impossibility must extend to all places and persons. I trust, therefore, the Christian will reflect with great seriousness on this subject, and will be kind enough to let me know the result.

"I am, Sir, your most obedt. Servt.

"RAM DOSS.

"*Calcutta, May* 23, 1823."

This extraordinary letter is followed by a notice that "Ram Doss having heard nothing more publicly or privately from Dr. Tytler or 'A Christian,' the correspondence here concluded, and the arguments adduced in vindication of the Incarnation of the Deity as the Common Basis of Hindooism and Christianity, consequently remain unanswered."

After the specimens that Rammohun Roy has presented to the public of the height of intellectual and theological improvement which a Brahmin in Bengal may reach, it would be idle to say that Ram Doss cannot be the person he represents himself to be. If Rammohun Roy had stopped short at Hindoo Monotheism, he would have been just such a reasoner and writer as Ram Doss. But whether this name be fictitious or real, the controversy is of great, though it may not be of equal, importance. It must have been read by means of the newspaper and the pamphlet by many natives, and it can scarcely have failed of exciting some of them to inquire into the pretensions of Hindooism and Christianity, and of the several forms of Christianity, now exhibited in India. On the European population, its effect must, one should think, have been still greater; since it places the controversy between Trinitarians and Unitarians on the plain ground of the former being akin to polytheism, and of the latter being the only Christian system that militates directly against every principle of idolatry, and every argument of idolaters.

This last remark leads us to say that there has just fallen into our hands another East-India pamphlet in "Vindication of the Hindoo Religion against the Attacks of Christian Missionaries," of which we propose to give an account in the next Number.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Boston, Mass., U.S., Feb. 5, 1824, Mrs. ELIZABETH W. WARE, aged 31, wife of the Rev. Henry Ware, Junior, and eldest daughter of Benjamin Waterhouse, M.D. There were many qualities in the character of the late Mrs. Ware which gave her a claim to peculiar interest and respect while living, and render her premature death the subject of uncommon regret. To strong natural sense, and more than ordinary powers of mind, she united great energy, firmness, decision and dignity of character. Her feeble health for many years before the sickness which terminated her life, rendered the sphere of her exertions and influence smaller than her disposition would have made it; but even under the pressure of constant indisposition, there are few possessed of the full enjoyment of health, who were capable of so much and of such well-directed exertion. Her life was terminated by a pulmonary consumption, of which the distinct commencement might be dated more than two years before its termination; and during the whole of this long sickness, she suffered far more from bodily distress and pain, than usually falls to the lot of the victims of that disease. With how much cheerful fortitude and Christian resignation she endured all this, can only be known by those who witnessed her days and nights of protracted suffering; who saw her, till within the few last months of her life, perform almost all the duties of a wife and mother, with as much assiduity and fidelity as she had when comparatively in a state of health, and this too with a perfect assurance from the very beginning,

of what must be the event of her disease; and who knew with what calmness and composure she awaited the slow but certain approaches of the last great change. In all the relations of life her example is invaluable, and her loss irreparable; and those who have suffered from this bereavement, can have no consolation but in the recollection of her virtues, and in the hopes which, as Christians, that recollection affords them.

Mar. 27, at his house in *Green Street, Grosvenor Square*, in the 85th year of his age, GEORGE MUSGRAVE, Esq., formerly member for Carlisle, in the county of Cumberland, Vice-President of the Magdalen Hospital, &c. In the several relations of private life, his exemplary conduct, graced by the constant practice of every Christian virtue, will stand recorded in most affectionate remembrance; while, as a zealous and most liberal supporter of public charitable institutions—to three of which, the Magdalen, Bridewell and Blind Society, he has bequeathed the sum of £100 severally—his loss will be deplored with that real sorrow which gilds the memory of the just man and the good.—*(Newspapers.)*

April 28, at *Liverpool*, Mr. JOSEPH HANCOX, second son of Mr. James Hancox, of Birmingham, and grandson of the Rev. James Hancox, formerly a respectable Dissenting Minister of Dudley, in Worcestershire. James Hancox, father of the subject of the present notice, was an extensive iron master in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, during a period peculiarly disastrous to persons engaged in such undertakings. He was a man of strict honour and undeviating principle, qualities which, in the imperfection of this world's institutions, do not always contribute to pecuniary advancement. At his death he was possessed of little property to bequeath to his children: but he had taken care to endow them with a liberal education, and his last legacy was an unsullied name.

At an early age Joseph Hancox selected Liverpool as his place of residence, and there entered into commercial engagements, in the course of which he had occasion to visit America more than once, as well as different parts of the Mediterranean. But it is not our intention to trace his progress in these pursuits, but rather, at the termination of his career, to offer a brief sketch of his character, as a farewell tribute to his memory.

Mr. Hancox possessed most of the qualities requisite to give him consideration and influence in the circle in which he moved: he had travelled and seen the world, and consequently had the information and manners of a gentleman. He had a sound understanding, and a clear conception of the subjects in which society is wont to take an interest: and he possessed a talent for conversation which enabled him to impart his own impressions to others.

As a man of strict probity and integrity of principle, his reputation was permanently high. In his more general and social character, he was the advocate of free discussion; jealous of every encroachment upon the independence of the subject, and a friend to all liberal institutions.

In religion, Mr. Hancox was an Unitarian; free from the bigotry of sects and synods, and allowing to every one the same freedom of sentiment which he claimed for himself. In the year 1815, the society of Paradise-Street Chapel, in Liverpool, published a volume of Hymns, intended principally for their own use, in the arrangement and compilation of which Mr. H. took an active part; revising nearly the whole, besides contributing several original compositions from his own pen. He was, indeed, from his talents as a critic, peculiarly well qualified for the task of revision: and the late Rev. Pendlebury Houghton, the elegance of whose compositions is so well known, did not scruple to solicit the benefit of Mr. Hancock's opinion and suggestions, before he committed to the press some of his latest publications.

Occasionally Mr. Hancox did not scruple to mingle with the noisy and bustling politics of the times; being a steady and consistent Reformer. His notions of the right and extent of suffrage he might carry somewhat farther than some of his Whig friends, with whom he was in the habit of associating: but, as he thought proper to judge for himself, so he cheerfully conceded to others the same privilege. He was, however, rather a private than a public character, and it was in domestic retirement or in social intercourse that he was most known and best appreciated. During his last illness he discoursed with animation upon the signs of a more enlightened and liberal spirit which were observable, not only in the national legislature, but in the local politics of the town in which he lived: contemplating with evident satisfaction that gradual but substantial improvement which has been forced into the administration of all persons holding authority, by the powerful influence of public opinion.

Mr. Hancox was in the 44th year of his age, and had been married about ten years. He has left behind him a widow

and three children. To them his loss will be irreparable; but they may yet experience that calm and solemn satisfaction, which cannot fail to allay the bitterness of grief, and which is to be derived from the reflection that his memory will continue to be cherished with esteem and affection, not only by his nearest and dearest connexions, but by all who had the happiness to enjoy his friendship, or the opportunity to estimate his worth.

B.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Re-opening of Unitarian Chapel, Totnes.

It will be gratifying to the friends of Unitarian Christianity to learn that this Chapel, after an interval of twenty years and upwards, is again occupied by worshipers of One God, even the Father, under the care of a respectable Unitarian minister. Although untoward circumstances for so many years prevented the congregation for whom the building was originally erected from assembling in it, nevertheless, the trustees, like men of honour and principle, were careful to fill up the trust with persons favourable to Unitarian views; and by letting the Chapel, and in other ways increasing the funds attached to it, as well as by their own individual liberality, they were at length enabled to offer a minister a very moderate salary. Application was then made to the Rev. Henry Acton, of Exeter, to visit Totnes, for the purpose of re-opening the Chapel for Unitarian worship; which was accordingly done on the 28th of March. Mr. Smethurst, of Moreton Hampstead, conducted the devotional parts of the service, and Mr. Acton preached, morning and afternoon. The congregation in the morning was encouraging, but in the afternoon the place was crowded with respectable and serious hearers. The Rev. James C. Wallace has been since engaged as the minister for a twelvemonth; and all appearances promise that much success will reward his able services in the great and good cause at Totnes.

Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Missionary Society.

This Society, the want of which had been for some time felt and acknowledged in these western counties, was instituted at George's Chapel, Exeter, on Friday, the 16th of April. Though the day was exceedingly wet and unfavourable, many zealous friends to the cause attended from Honiton, Crediton, Collumpton, Sidmouth, and other places. The Rev. Richard Wright, who, as a veteran Missionary, was invited to preach upon the occasion, delighted and animated his hearers by the ability and energy with which he defended the claims of Unitarianism to the scriptural title of "glad tidings," his text being Acts xx. 24. After the sermon, Mr. T. M. Kingdon being called to the chair, the business of forming the Society was entered into and accomplished. The congregation assembled again in the evening, when Mr. Acton preached. The feeling created in all minds at the close of the day, was that of confident hope and trust that this society will be highly useful in spreading the knowledge of Unitarian views of the gospel in Devon and Cornwall.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

On Wednesday, April 21st, the Half-Yearly Meeting of the Society was held at Ilminster. A more than usual interest was given to the proceedings of the day, by the attendance of *all* the ministers connected with the Society, and by the presence of several gentlemen who reside out of the district, particularly Messrs. Wright, Acton and Smethurst.

The Rev. Samuel Walker, of Crewkerne, preached in the morning, on Fanaticism, and the Rev. H. Acton, in the evening, on the Love and Honour due to our Lord Jesus Christ.

The interval between the services was occupied with the usual engagements. A few new subscribers were added to the Society. It was resolved that measures should be taken to procure the reprinting of a tract, written by Dr. S. Smith, and published in the Christian Reformer, Vol. V. p. 361; and the Rev. E. Whitfield, of Ilminster, was appointed to preach at Crewkerne on the first Tuesday in October.

The writer of this brief notice believes, it may be truly said, that the transactions of the day were productive of one common feeling of gratification and renewed zeal in behalf of the pure gospel of Christ.

G. B. W.

Anniversary of the New Unitarian Congregation, Bolton.

(From The Christian Reflector)

THE Second Anniversary of the Unitarian Christian Congregation assembling in the Meeting-House, Moor Lane, Bolton, was held on Sunday and Monday, April 18th and 19th. Friends were present from most of the towns and villages in the district. We have pleasure in stating that the following ministers were also present: the Revds. W. J. Fox, of London; J. G. Robberds, of Manchester; R. Astley, of Halifax; R. Cree, of Preston; J. Ragland, of Hindley; F. Knowles, of Park Lane; E. R. Dimock, of Warrington; H. Clarke, of Haslingden; J. Ashworth, Newchurch; J. W. Morris, of Dean Row; W. Stevens, of Todmorden; W. Duffield, of Salford; and Mr. W. Boardman, of Swinton; and what are called the *lay* preachers of Manchester. In the morning and evening of Sunday, the Rev. W. J. Fox preached two most admirable and eloquent sermons. The Rev. George Harris preached in the afternoon, and the Rev. J. G. Robberds delivered a most masterly exposure of the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, on the Monday night. The congregations were numerous.

On the Monday more than 250 persons, male and female, sat down to dinner, the Rev. George Harris in the Chair; which number was increased after dinner to 400. Addresses were delivered by Messrs. Fox, Robberbs, Dimock, Johnson, of Carlisle; Ragland, Remnall, of Park Lane; Makin, Brandreth, Clarke and the Chairman.

On Tuesday, the children educated in the Sunday-schools belonging to the congregation, and the singers, and many of the parents, amounting to more than 200 people, dined in the Cloth Hall, Mr. Harris in the Chair. They were addressed by Mr. Robberds and Mr. Fox in speeches which must have made a deep impression on the minds of all who heard them. The collections during the religious services exceeded *ninety pounds*.

The debt incurred by the congregation in purchasing and fitting up the Meeting-house, *is now entirely liquidated*. Such an instance of united, of disinterested zeal, accomplishing its objects in so short a period as two years, has hitherto been unknown to the Unitarian denomination. It proves the people's power, if the people can only be induced to exercise it. It is the triumph of consistency, and firmness, and perseverance. Soon may the example induce others to labour diligently in the good work of Christian reformation. And may the congregation shew, by the continued moral rectitude of the principles on which they were founded and have acted, that they are deserving of the aids they have received from their friends, and may their society remain a monument of faithfulness to generations yet to come.

The following sentiment was received at the dinner with unanimous approbation: "The Unitarian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, and may we have the pleasure of seeing them here at our next anniversary."

General Baptist Annual Association, Dover.

ON Tuesday, May 18, was holden at Dover, the General Baptist Annual Association. A sermon was preached on the preceding evening by Mr. Austen, of Smarden. The service was introduced by Mr. Farrin, of Canterbury. On the following day the service commenced at 10 o'clock, when Mr. Squier, of Edinburgh, read and prayed; Mr. Chapman, of Deptford, gave out the hymns; and Mr. Briggs, of Bessel's Green, delivered an excellent discourse from Rom. x. part of the 9th and 10th verses: "The word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God that hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." After the service the business of the Association was entered upon, when we were gratified to witness the increasing liberality of opinion which was manifested. An economical dinner was provided at two o'clock. At half-past three the business was resumed in the chapel. At about five o'clock, according to old custom, tea, prepared in the vestry by the young ladies of the congregation, was introduced, and at half-past eight, the business being concluded, that the day might be ended as it was begun, socially, the friends retired to a very plain supper, after which a question, introduced by the Chairman and Preacher, was discussed with considerable animation. The subject was, "What are the Hindrances to the Spread of Rational Religion?" The whole day passed off with great spirit and pleasantness, which were, however, sadly lessened by the loss which the General Baptist body has so lately sustained in the decease of two of its valued ministers, Mr. Marten, of Dover, and Mr. Moon, of Deptford. It is needless to say how many wishes were uttered, that those who are coming forward in life may emulate their zeal, and worthily occupy their places in the church and at our social meetings.

PARLIAMENTARY.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

MAY 4, 1824.

Unitarians' Marriage Bill.

THE Marquis of LANSDOWNE moved the order of the day for the House to go into a Committee on this Bill.

The Bishop of CHESTER rose to oppose the motion. In justice to his own feelings, in justice to the supporters of this measure, he was bound to declare, after giving the subject his most anxious, long and painful consideration, that his present opinion was the same as that which he had formerly had the honour to state to their Lordships. Again must he contend that the Unitarians had no ground, on the score of religious conscience, to object to the marriage ceremony of the Church of England. No Unitarian could conscientiously object to the betrothing clause on account of words which they themselves used on other occasions. It was a mockery in them to contend that they had any ground to reject those words in the marriage ceremony which were the same as they used in baptism. If any Noble Lord could shew that the Unitarians had any just grounds on the score of religious conscience, to reject the marriage ceremony, he, for one, should have very different feelings towards them, and would vote in their favour. He admitted fully, however, that the blessing did distinctly recognize, in explicit terms, the doctrine of the Trinity. But was not this the declaration of the minister—not an act in which the party joined? The Church of England would be wanting to its own dignity and character, were it not to take every proper opportunity to declare and maintain those doctrines it believed to be the true doctrines of Christ. If the framers of our Liturgy had considered all the circumstances under which the Unitarians were now found, they could not have more fairly met the scruples of others, without compromising the dignity and character of the Church, than is now done by the mode in which this doctrine is recognized, without requiring any assent from the parties. He knew not why the Unitarians objected to comply with the established law and customs of their country. They had an example for doing so in the Apostle of the Gentiles, and even in our blessed Lord himself, who, though he objected and protested against the doctrines and discipline of the Sanhedrim, and the accustomed worship of the Temple, conformed to the institutions of his country. We have seen only concession following concession, and demand rising on demand; and, if this point be conceded to the Unitarians, other concessions will be required, and other demands will follow. Our Church was tolerant in principle and practice, but toleration had its limits. The privilege was conceded to all, to worship God according to their conscience, but the Church was not to be called on to renounce its opinions, or to give up its doctrines. The Church of England was not one sect among others—it was the Established Church of this realm, with rights and privileges established for a long course of years, one of which was, that the marriage ceremony should only be performed in some of the churches or chapels of the Church of England. Unless some strong reasons could be urged for it, she ought not to be called on to abandon her rights and privileges. If one stone were taken away from the building after another, it would at length disappear altogether. He entreated their Lordships not to give up the doctrines and discipline of the Church, of which they were the hereditary guardians, and under which this country had attained her present proud pre-eminence. The interest of the Church was interwoven with the best interests of the State, and he trusted their Lordships would not invade either the liberty or privileges of the Church. He would therefore move that their Lordships should resolve themselves into a Committee on that day three months, as an amendment to the Noble Marquis's motion.

The Bishop of EXETER said, if he thought the proposed measure were a violation of the doctrines or privileges of the Church, he would not support it; but feeling that it was not, feeling that there was no danger in the concession, and feeling also that the Church of England would be relieved, by ceasing to compel those who did not believe in her doctrines to join in her service, he thought the Bill, with proper amendments, might be made satisfactory to all parties, and would therefore vote for the Committee. In that Committee he should have some amendments to propose, unless he were prevented by some Noble Lord more competent to the task. The object of his amendments would be to assimilate the present Bill as much as possible, in civil principle, to the Bill of last Session, providing against clandestine marriages, and making some provisions for punishing those who were instrumental in carrying them into effect. He should also propose another clause, to enable the Unitarians to keep the registers of their own marriages: with amendments of this description, he thought the Bill would be bene-

ficial, and he should vote for the Committee.

The Bishop of ST. DAVID'S then spoke, but in so low a tone as to be nearly inaudible below the bar. We only caught a sentence or two. His Lordship said, the Unitarians objected to doctrines which were held by the great mass of Christians to be essential to Christianity. The objections of the Unitarians, therefore, were to what the House must consider as the essential doctrines of Christianity, and it ought to be prepared, if it relieved them, to relieve every one, however opposed to Christianity. The words used, he contended, required no declaration of faith from the parties, they were merely the conclusion of a contract pronounced by a third person.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY admitted that the Unitarians denied the Trinity, which the Church considered as an important and essential doctrine of Christianity, and it was on that account that they sought relief; but it could be no satisfaction to the Church, nor could the Church desire it, to force the Unitarians to acquiesce in some parts of its service which they denied, or, at any rate, to maintain a seeming acquiescence. He had heard it said, with great surprise, that the words might be used by the minister in one sense, and received by the parties in another. What was this but to encourage prevarication, and a simulated assent to doctrines which the parties did not believe? He was persuaded that it would give as much relief to the minister to be exonerated from the duty now imposed on him, as it would do to the Unitarian, and he should therefore vote for the Bill going into a Committee, where it might receive such amendments as were proper.

The Bishop of ST. DAVID'S explained, disavowing any opinion that the Church could recognize the affixing of a different meaning to the words used.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY. That was the very point. The words were notoriously used by the Church in one sense, and, it was said, might be received by the parties in another.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE could not allow this opportunity to pass without adverting to some topics which had been urged out of that House, and partly adopted, perhaps by some of their Lordships, and which could only be maintained in complete misapprehension of the Bill, and of the law of England, when it was stated that these Dissenters should be placed in the same situation as they were in the reign of King William; those who stated this, forgot that if the law were now as it was then, the Dissenters would now have had no occasion to ask for relief. It was in consequence of an after innovation, effected by the Act introduced by Lord Hardwicke, in the 26th of George II., intended for a very different purpose, that the Dissenters were indirectly subjected to those hardships from which they now sought relief. This Act, so far from being intended to produce what had been described by the Archbishop of Canterbury as a simulated assent to doctrines which were not believed, was intended, as the title of the law imports, solely to prevent clandestine marriages, and give the community all the security which the law could bestow against the consequences of such marriages. Incidentally it had the effect complained of, by subjecting the Dissenters, like all other persons, to the regulations for preventing these marriages, and it was this incidental effect from which they now wished to be liberated, and which constituted a distinct and fair ground of claim for relief; not by altering the Liturgy of the Church of England, however, as the Right Reverend Prelate who spoke first, seemed to suppose. The Dissenters asked no such thing; they sought no concession from the Church, but an alteration in the law, which would relieve them from the evil of which they complained. They knew that it had been thought necessary to adhere rigidly to the Liturgy; and that it had been declared that no alteration could be made—and they, therefore, only asked relief in a mode which would subject them to additional trouble and expense, but would, at that cost, liberate them from the practice of admitting the doctrines of a Church which they are prepared to deny, and which, in the free exercise of their opinion, they were entitled to deny. The Noble Marquis said he had, on a former occasion, taken some trouble to elicit from the Noble and Learned Lord his opinion as to the legal situation of these parties, and he could not discover that that Noble Lord had any ground for considering the opinions of the Unitarians illegal. In the courts of justice in this kingdom it had been long and cheerfully acknowledged, that there was a wide distinction between those blasphemous opinions which were entertained by persons who had no other object than to subvert religion, and those which grew out of free discussion, which were conscientiously formed, and which might legally exist. But the present Bill had been represented as a blow aimed against the Church, not intentionally by those who had brought in the Bill, but by the Bill itself, in its necessary operation. It was easy to make assertions of this nature, and he could not help recol-

lecting that some of the most mischievous delusions which had ever disgraced a country, had originated in the unfounded assertion, that the Church was in danger. The most disgraceful acts recorded in our history were excited by erroneous clamours of this sort. The mob, who had carried the torch to the house of one of the greatest magistrates who had ever presided in England, had been led on to that act of violence and barbarism, under the influence of such an absurd belief. When, therefore, an opinion respecting the danger of the Church Establishment was thrown out by such an authority as the Noble Lord on the Woolsack, it was to be wished and expected that he would condescend to state in what the danger consisted. He would take leave to direct their Lordships' attention to what had been done in Ireland, where the Church was the same as the Church of England, except so far as the measure to which he was about to allude had altered and liberalized the spirit of church government. An Act was then passed in 1781, declaring all marriages of all Dissenters to be valid, and without any of the regulations which this Bill proposed; and he would ask the Prelates of the Church Establishment in Ireland, to state in what instance this regulation had been found injurious to the Church? That Act had passed in Ireland, not only with the approbation of the Right Reverend Bench and of the Lord Lieutenant, but of the Privy Council, acting at that time under the influence of Lord Thurlow, a man not likely to disregard the interests of the Church. Some of the Bishops, who had taken a part in that proceeding, had left their opinions recorded in a protest; and those opinions were so different from those avowed by the Noble and Learned Earl, that he could not help alluding to them. The Bill for allowing the marriages of Dissenters in Ireland, passed the Commons without any opposition. In the House of Lords it was objected to; but when some of the Prelates came to form a protest against the measure, after it had passed into an Act, they stated their objections to be, not against the principle, of which, on the contrary, they approved, but because it gave the Dissenters *greater* privileges than the members of the Church, (they being willing to give them *as much*,) and because it did not contain in its enactments a provision against clandestine marriages, nor a provision to facilitate divorces in the ordinary cases. They expressed themselves most willing to concur in the principle of the Bill, which they would not have done if they thought it likely to be attended with danger to the Church. He could not conceive that any objection could be made to the principle of the present Bill, except by persons who held that Unitarians were unfit to be recognized in civil society. What difference there might be in point of doctrine between them and the Established Church, it was not his business to inquire; but if Unitarians had been tolerated, and were still considered worthy to be tolerated in this country, and to contract marriages—it followed, that they ought to be relieved from a form which imposed upon them a simulation of conformity and an acquiescence which the Church ought to disdain to accept, unless it came freely and from the heart. He could say with truth, that in proportion as he attached importance to the doctrines of the Church of England, he would be anxious that no other assent should be required on their behalf, but that which flowed from the conviction of the heart. If there were any persons in this country who felt a complete indifference on matters of religion, who regarded it only as a trick of State, intended to secure obedience to Government, and respect for law, those were the very persons who, he expected, would be the first to compel others to wear that mask which they were content to wear themselves. But such a proceeding was unworthy of a Christian and Protestant teacher, unworthy of the Church of England, and unworthy of that Assembly: they had no right to ask from others any submission which was not essential; and, after obtaining what was necessary to secure against clandestine marriages, they would not, he was persuaded, consent to vex the consciences of individuals, by obtaining a false assent to doctrines, in which they could not sincerely acquiesce. With respect to the amendments suggested, he should have no objection, if the Bill went into Committee, to meet the views of the Right Reverend Prelates, preserving the principle of the Bill. But with respect to the proposition for obliging the Dissenters to keep a separate registry of their own, he doubted whether the general registry would not be more effectual; at the same time that he was willing to agree to any regulations which were considered necessary. The Bill was not intended for the benefit of Unitarians, but for the general benefit, by giving to marriage the greatest solemnity of which it was capable;—the best way to insure that solemnity was, to connect it with the religious belief of the parties, whether they might consider it mistaken or not; and the most certain way to weaken and destroy it was, to call them into the bosom of the Church, and, as it were, into the presence of their Creator, for the purpose of affecting opi-

nions which they did not believe, though certain Right Reverend Prelates were good enough to point out the way in which the evasion might be reconciled to their consciences. He knew that in times which ought never to be referred to for precedents, during the ascendancy of the Romish Church, instruments of torture had been resorted to, for the purpose of compelling an acquiescence in doctrines which its professors had resolved to propagate; but such cases could only be referred to for the purpose of disgusting them with the example. With regard to the amendments suggested, he would willingly discuss them in the Committee. As to the objection of Lord Liverpool to the Bill's applying to cases where only one of the parties was an Unitarian, he was still of opinion that it ought, but was not disposed to be pertinacious on that point. The East-India Act gave the relief where either of the parties dissented.

The LORD CHANCELLOR observed, that the respect he had always felt for the Noble Lord who advocated this measure, for the other Noble Lords and Prelates who differed from him in opinion, and (though in a much smaller degree) for himself, compelled him to state to their Lordships the grounds upon which he felt that he never could conscientiously vote for sending this Bill to a Committee. He did not mean to say that it was impossible to frame a Bill which should give relief to those who were supposed to be entitled to it; but the present Bill contained principles irreconcilable with the security of the Established Church. He begged the House would not suppose he wished to press his opinions upon any one; but feeling it to be his duty, and he was sure it was his inclination, to support the interests of the Church; feeling also, after having devoted a great portion of a long life to the consideration of the subject, that if ever that moment should arrive when this country should be deprived of her Established Church, she would lose the best security that any country ever had or could have, for the continuance of religious toleration; upon that principle he felt it his duty, for the sake of the Dissenters themselves, to object to any change which was calculated to degrade that Church. It was not for the benefit of the Church alone, but for the security of the great principle of religious toleration, that he should oppose this Bill, and any other which he conceived to be liable to the same objections. No one more than himself wished for a liberal and large toleration, but it could never be enjoyed securely without they had a Church established on the principles of a liberal and large toleration. A Noble Lord, in allusion to what had passed on a former occasion, had found fault with him, as if he had raised doubts which he himself did not entertain as to the legal situation of these parties. He would, in vindication of himself, repeat and explain what he had stated. In the first place, then, he wished to remind the House, that those who denied the Trinity were excepted from the Toleration Act. No man living could disapprove more than he did of the rigorous Act passed in the time of William, and the still more severe enactments of the Scottish Parliament against Dissenters: it could only excite horror in every man who had his heart in his right place, that speculative opinions should be visited by such punishments. But still it must be remembered, that the 9th of William spoke of the denial of the Trinity not as a dissent, but a denial of the Christian religion. When that Act, which had imposed particular punishments upon the offence which it so described, came to be repealed, it was perfectly understood, (though he knew that the writings of some ecclesiastics had introduced an opinion, that the act of repeal let loose the common law, and all on the subject,) and he could confidently appeal to that respectable member who brought it into the other House, that there was no intention to affect the common law, whatever it was. And as to that he could only repeat, that the Act of William and Mary spoke of these opinions as being contrary to the Christian religion. In the Court of Chancery, in the case of Attorney General and Pearson, (the object of which was to carry into effect a charitable foundation, being a meeting-house, founded after the Act of William and Mary, and before its repeal, and which was sought to be appropriated by Unitarians,) Sir S. Romilly (on whom his Lordship pronounced a high eulogium) argued, that as the Act of William had declared the denial of the Trinity to be contrary to the Christian religion, it was as much out of his (the Lord Chancellor's) power, even at this moment, to establish a provision for Unitarian worship, as it had been decided to be with respect to foundations for teaching the Jewish law. Sitting in a court of equity, he had declined to decide any such question, as to the present legal condition of these parties, and he had, therefore, rested his decision on the principle, that the trust having been founded at a time when Unitarian doctrines were illegal, it could not now be appropriated to an object which must be supposed to have been out of the contemplation of the founder. He said this to clear

himself from the imputation of having launched a doubt where none could be fairly entertained. What had been said as to Ireland, induced him still more strongly to believe that the principle on which this Bill was put, was to be extended to all Dissenters. He denied the possibility of refusing it to any if it were granted to the Unitarians. But it had been said, that the same was already done in the case of Jews and Quakers. What had they done for Jews and Quakers? Merely exempted them from the operation of Lord Hardwicke's Act. Let them, if they wished, bring in a Bill to place them on the same footing with those people, and the Bill would be considered on its own grounds; but then it would be a very different Bill from the present, and would place the parties on a different footing; for he could not undertake to say distinctly how the law stood as to the Jews and Quakers.—Their marriages stood upon the law as it existed before Lord Hardwicke's Act; but what that was, or with how many difficulties it was entangled, he would leave them to judge when he told them he had been engaged fifteen days hearing counsel on the point, on a question of legitimacy. Their Lordships would as soon wish to pass through the Inquisition as to hear all the arguments connected with that investigation; and it seemed clear to him that they must soon be called to make some legislative provision on the subject. To look a little in detail at some parts of this Bill, (for he could tear in pieces almost every sentence of it,) the persons called Unitarians are described as having conscientious scruples to the doctrine of the Trinity. How many persons, he would ask, had the same scruples? Deists, Atheists, and he knew not what, might rank under so vague a description as this. If he understood any thing of the Church of England, (though, after all he heard, he almost fancied he did not,) it was impossible that there could be a greater repugnance between any sets of doctrines than between those of that Church and the Unitarians, so far so, that they must, to be consistent, hold that Church to be idolatrous. Whom then did they propose to bring together by this Bill? Are persons to go to an Archbishop and say, "You hold and reverence the doctrine of the Trinity as an essential of Christianity, but I consider you an idolater, therefore give me facilities which no legislature ever gave!" So, he contended, the whole machinery of the Bill went to make the Church subservient to the cause of dissent. If the Jews and Quakers were to be taken as a precedent, let them take the proposition as broadly, and let the Unitarians struggle with the same legal difficulties. To the State's policy as to clandestine marriages, he never would sacrifice the greater policy of maintaining the dignity of the Church. He, for one, would never be accessary to its degradation. In stating what he had, he was influenced only by a wish to discharge his own personal duty; it was far from his wish, even if he had the power, to controul the opinion of others; he had discharged his conscience and relieved himself of his responsibility; if the House chose to pass that Bill, he would leave it in their hands; but for himself, he must declare, that a worse Bill than the present had never been submitted to Parliament.

LORD HOLLAND said, that after the discussion which had taken place before, and the decision to which their Lordships had come in favour of the principle of the Bill, he could hardly have expected to find so much warmth, anxiety and opposition, as was now manifested against the question for going into the Committee. So strongly was he impressed with the opinion that no such difficulty could have arisen, that instead of considering this subject, he amused himself, on his way down to the House, with reading a publication of one of the purest and most elegant writers which this country had produced—he meant Mr. Cowper, the poet. In that publication he met with a story, which he little thought, at the time, could admit of any application to the proceedings of their Lordships' House. It appeared that the writer, walking one day in Ramsgate, had met an eminent lawyer whom, in familiar language, he called "Sam Cox," buried in profound meditation on the beach. Being curious to ascertain the subject on which his mind was occupied, he asked what he was thinking of. The lawyer replied, that he was wondering why such an expansive element as the ocean should produce such an insignificant animal as a sprat. In the same way, though reversing the application, he (Lord Holland) was disposed to pause and wonder how such a miserable sprat of a Bill could produce such a commotion in the element of this grave and sedate House. He would say to the Noble and Learned Lord, with all his anxiety for the Church, that it was not the best way either to consult its dignity or to maintain its power, to cry out "Wolf" at every little mouse that made its appearance; he ought not to be so ready "to rin and chase wi' murdrin' battle" such "wee sleekit, cowring, tim'rous beastie." How would a stranger be surprised to hear that, after all this rout, the whole question was whether the Unitarians should

be allowed to marry here as they did always till the year 1756, and as they did now in Ireland. One Right Reverend Prelate (as to whose conduct he should certainly wonder if he did look less at "ex quo natus" than "quibuscum vixit") had taken upon himself to explain away, not his own scruples, but the scruples entertained by other people. He knew no way of ascertaining the scruples of other men but by their own professions; he knew no way of judging of these scruples but as he would wish to be judged. If he said that any doctrine or opinion was contrary to his conscience, no man had a right to say that it was not. It was contended that the words employed in the Church ceremony had been made use of by our Saviour himself. The Unitarians admitted this, but contended that they were used under different circumstances, and in a different sense. Oh! but then it was said, "You may use them still in your sense, and we'll put ours upon them for ourselves." What could this be but, as the Most Reverend Metropolitan had stated, to recommend equivocation—to bring a man to the altar of God to use words in an equivocating way? Then came the objection to making the Church, as it had been elegantly expressed, a handmaid to dissent. And the Noble and Learned Lord, in a very eloquent part of his speech, had at least hinted at a great distinction between mere dissent and this Unitarianism.—But surely one would suppose, from all these arguments, that this Bill was totally the reverse of what it was—that it was a Bill to bring these parties, so opposite in religious opinions, together, instead of being a plan to get rid of this union and to separate people who agreed so ill. If the Church was a handmaid under the operation of this Bill, which only used her for the purpose of registration, what was she as the law now stood?—She participated now, not merely with one member, but "toto corpore." She was not a handmaid, but the prostitute to civil purposes. The Noble Lord says, "God forbid that the Church should register you, you set of Deists, Atheists, and what not: but though she shan't register you, she shall administer to and participate with you all her most sacred rites." So stood the law at present. Though perhaps many of the Right Reverend Bench might think him more Popishly inclined than themselves, he was unwilling to see the Church of England giving countenance and encouragement to such prevarication. But the Noble and Learned Lord had advised them to place the Unitarians on the same footing as the Jews and Quakers. Would he support such a Bill if he took him at his word? And a pretty preface he had given to such a recommendation; for when he came to describe what that footing was, he confessed himself, after some hesitation, unable to explain it! Fifteen days, he says, had he been arguing and considering the point, and then even he says he does not know what it is! What, then, must be the situation of the Unitarians, if the Noble and Learned Lord's arguments were to be adopted as the outline of any Bill for their relief? What had all the doubts about the common law to do with the question before them? On that point, he must beg leave to remind the Noble and Learned Lord of the way he had treated him on some former occasions. He remembered that, on one occasion, when he (Lord H.) took an active part against the Alien Bill, he asked the Noble and Learned Lord to inform him, in point of courtesy—for their Lordships had no right to call upon the Noble and Learned Lord to give a legal opinion—who were aliens and who were not. He could, however, get no satisfactory answer from the Noble and Learned Lord on that point. In vain did he urge that it was a subject of great importance, and that, when they were called upon to subject a large body of men to arbitrary power, in a manner uncongenial to the principles of the law, they ought at least to know who aliens were. With this view, he proposed seven questions, to be referred to the judges. The Noble and Learned Lord, however, declined giving any answer to his inquiry, and declared, that whoever might come under the description of aliens, it was prudent to subject them to the provisions of the Alien Bill. On another occasion, when the Bill for detaining Napoleon was under discussion—a Bill which, he should ever maintain, reflected disgrace and dishonour on the character of this nation—he (Lord H.) wished to know from the Noble and Learned Lord what the state of the law was, before they proceeded to legislate on the subject. In vain did he ask whether, looking to all the circumstances under which Napoleon Bonaparte had fallen into our power, he could be legally considered as a prisoner of war or not. In vain did he ask whether we had a right to call upon Napoleon for local allegiance; and whether, if we had a right to call upon him for local allegiance, he had not an equal right to call upon us for protection. In vain did he apply to the well-known learning and great abilities of the Noble and Learned Lord, to know whether an action for debt, or defamation, or libel, might or not be brought in the name of Napoleon Bonaparte. All the Noble and Learned Lord

said on that occasion was, either that he did not know, or he would not tell. The Noble and Learned Lord treated the question in a very cavalier manner, and declared, that whatever the state of the law might be, it would make no difference as to the vote he should give on that Bill; and that if the law gave Napoleon any advantage inconsistent with national security, it was no reason why the Bill should not pass. Such was the indifference of the Noble and Learned Lord as to the state of the law on questions involving points of great constitutional importance. But how was this indifference consistent with the line which the Noble and Learned Lord had taken to-night? When they were discussing laws of coercion, restriction and severity, the Noble and Learned Lord had not the slightest anxiety to ascertain the state of the existing law; but when they were called upon to pass this little act of miserable and extorted indulgence, then the Noble and Learned Lord felt the greatest anxiety and alarm as to the state of the law. Singularly indifferent as the Noble and Learned Lord had shewn himself about the state of the law when they were called upon to coerce, all his legal partialities and anxieties revived when they were called upon to extend a little indulgence; and not a step must they stir in the work of charity, till men, nursed in doubt, and cherishing the sinews of their understandings by such doubts, were satisfied, and had resolved all their difficulties. Like the Right Reverend Prelate, the Honourable and Learned Lord had declared, that if a single stone were touched, there was no saying what would become of the whole fabric of the Church. "Coerce and restrain," argued the Noble and Learned Lord, "to what extent you please, if coercion and restriction be prudent, and I care not what the state of the law is; but I will grant nothing in the way of concession—I will concede nothing on the score of liberality—I will not stir a single step in the path of indulgence, until every doubt is removed, every scruple satisfied, and all the possible bearings and consequences of the law are distinctly ascertained." And, after all, what was this concession, what was this great amount of indulgence, which had excited so much anxiety and alarm in the mind of the Noble and Learned Lord? He had heard it said by a Right Reverend Prelate, that this concession would be galling to the dignity and high character of the Church. He (Lord H.) was an unlearned man, but if he understood any thing of the character of the Christian Church, or rather, of the character of Christianity, it was lowliness and charity, and not dignity and lofty pride. Did the Right Reverend Prelate mean to say, that it would be an insult to the Church of England if persons out of the pale of that Church were admitted to the civil advantages of marriage? This was all the Unitarians asked; and he (Lord H.) must say, if he might be allowed to give an opinion as an unlearned man, that it would be much more in conformity to the spirit and principles of the gospel to extend than to deny this relief. In his opinion, the Bill was calculated to afford as much relief to the clergy of the Church of England as to Dissenters; for, deeply impressed as the clergy must be with the importance of their religious opinions on the subject of the Trinity, they could not but feel it—he would not say degrading, for there could be no degradation in discharging a duty—but they could not fail to feel it a most painful and irksome duty to hear the name which they never invoked without the greatest awe and solemnity, pronounced by persons who felt far differently. He could not but think, therefore, that the sentiments expressed by the Learned Metropolitan were most consistent both with those feelings of liberality and of true Christian piety, which should distinguish a great Christian church. Where was the pleasure which it seemed to be supposed was to be derived from the haughty and intolerant language of those dignitaries of the Church, who were opposed to this slight concession? Where was the delight of being able to say to the Dissenters, "You pretend to have conscientious opinions of your own, but what is the value of your opinions? We hold the only infallible opinions—opinions approved by Parliament, and lauded by princes and kings; you are degraded individuals, who are allowed to pick up the crumbs from our table, and we, in all our lordly and priestly pride, will compel you to use equivocating language, and pay at least an outward homage to doctrines which we know that in your hearts you revile and despise." This was not true dignity; this was not high character; but it was that encroaching spirit of ecclesiastical intolerance, it was that haughty, uncharitable overflow of Pharisaical pride, which every man who loved the Church Establishment, every man who really understood the nature of religious duties, must wish to see banished from the Church of England. The Noble and Learned Lord professed an ardent and anxious love for the Church, and was at liberty to do so; but really to talk of such a Bill as this as aiming blows against her interests and dignities, was rather too much. He had just been reading an eloquent invective against

exaggeration, which would be well worthy of the Noble Lord's attention. On a former night, when a Right Reverend Prelate expressed some anxiety about the tithes and dues, the Noble and Learned Lord said, "Oh, these are all objections of very inferior importance, for if you once allow such a Bill as this to pass—if you once allow Unitarians to enjoy the same civil privileges with respect to marriage as Jews and Quakers, there will be an end to the whole thing—there will be no Church—away may go all such little things as tithes and emoluments; the dignity of the Church is gone for ever if this Bill passes." Now, if there were any ground for this reasoning, if the *dictum* of this Protestant Pope were infallible, that respectable and venerable matron the Church of Ireland was already extinct, for Unitarians might marry in Ireland, without being forced into the inside of a church. If the Noble and Learned Lord, therefore, did not retreat from his own argument, he must admit that there was in reality no Church in Ireland; and a glorious thing this would be when they came to discuss the revenues of this Irish Church. Now, they should have full play to deal with her tithes and properties. What would the Noble and Learned Lord care for such little considerations as these? The dignity of the Church was gone — Unitarians could marry as they pleased. Oh unfortunate Ireland! This then was the climax of her miseries—this the key to all her distresses. Her venerable Church was gone, for the Unitarians were not bound to swallow there the doctrine of the Trinity. Really, really, all this was too preposterous to argue with. What then was the evil to the Church, that the Noble Lord had in his head? He found it easy enough to talk loudly of certain evils which were to befal us, (and especially which were to befal the Dissenters, for he was most anxious on their account it would seem,) but how all this dreadful catastrophe was to come about nobody could make out. He (Lord H.) was on the contrary anxious that the Bill should pass, because it gave relief to a highly moral and valuable class of the community, (*judging of them by their fruits,*) because it would afford that relief, without in any way interfering with those precautions which, whether wisely or unwisely, had been taken by the Legislature against clandestine marriages; and because it did so without depriving either the clergy or any other classes of the fair privileges which they now enjoyed. With respect to the question of registration, of which so much had been said, it formed no part of the institutions of the Church of England; it had no ecclesiastical foundation; it was, in fact, a mere civil regulation imposed by an Act of Parliament. When the Noble and Learned Lord expressed so much apprehension of every thing like change, he should recollect that the Unitarians prayed only in substance that the law might be restored to the state in which it stood before Lord Hardwicke's Act, and in which it now stood in Scotland and Ireland. The Noble and Learned Lord had, indeed, said, "Why don't you bring another sort of Bill? Why don't you put these Dissenters exactly on the footing of the Jews and Quakers?" Had he done so, he could easily chalk out (though of course not so eloquently) the sort of speech the Noble Lord would meet it with. But it was sufficient to say, "If you admit the principle honestly and fairly, and don't like this Bill, do you bring in another; if ours will not suit you, let us have one that will, but at present we are satisfied with our own." He repeated, that this Bill was calculated to give relief not only to the Unitarians, but to the Clergy of the Established Church themselves, as it would relieve them *from the odious and painful* duty of compelling a reluctant Dissenter to go through the solemn mockery of repeating forms, for which he, in his conscience, entertained no respect, but which it was *not less the inclination* than the duty of the Established Clergy to revere.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, he was sure no one who had watched his political life but would believe, that in a sincere attachment to the Church of England, he yielded to no man; but, after having heard all that had been said by his Noble and Learned Friend on the Woolsack, and all that had been urged by some Right Reverend Prelates, he could not perceive one scintilla of a ground for maintaining that this Bill could be injurious to the interests of the Established Church. This Bill, as a measure of relief to the Unitarians, went no further than to place that class of Dissenters on the same footing on which they stood antecedently to Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act; for before that Act it was competent to all classes of Dissenters to contract matrimony according to their own forms. His Noble and Learned Friend had pressed strongly upon them, that the principle of this Bill would extend the same relief to all other classes of Dissenters. He (Lord L.) might observe, in conformity to what had been already stated by the Most Reverend Prelate, (the Archbishop of Canterbury,) that the case of the Unitarians was materially different from that

of many other classes of Dissenters. He would here say a few words as to some observations which had been made with respect to conscientious scruples. He agreed with the Noble Baron opposite, (Lord Holland,) that they ought to estimate conscientious scruples not by their own opinions, but by the opinions of those who entertained such scruples. The conscientious scruple, with respect to the benediction, was, in his opinion, a just and well-founded scruple. He came to this conclusion, by putting the question to himself and feeling that he could never consent to receive a benediction in the name of Jupiter or Mahomet, or of any religion which he did not acknowledge; he could not but acquiesce in the justice of the conscientious scruples entertained by the Unitarians, however he might condemn or disapprove of the doctrines of that sect. If the question were put to him whether he would apply the principle of this Bill to other classes of Dissenters, he would repeat the opinion which he had given on a former occasion. When the Noble Marquis opposite (Lord Lansdowne) brought in a Bill, in the last Session, to extend relief generally to Dissenters, he (Lord Liverpool) voted for the second reading of that Bill, stating, however, at the same time, that it was extremely doubtful whether so general a Bill could be adopted in a shape which he could ultimately approve. The more he reflected on this subject, the more strongly he was convinced that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to apply the principle of this Bill generally to all classes of Dissenters. If, however, proper securities against clandestine marriages were preserved, he must confess that he saw no objection in principle to conceding to Dissenters the right of being married according to their own religious forms, provided both parties were Dissenters. Here he should draw his distinction; for he thought it was not only the right but the duty of the Church of England to take care that its members should be married according to the established forms. This Bill did not introduce any new principle, it merely recognized the principle which was already admitted in the case of Jews and Quakers. It had been said that very serious doubts might be raised as to the legal situation of these parties, and the effect of the repeal of the Act of William and Mary. As far as he had experience he would not deny that doubts might be raised on any subject, and, certainly, as to matters of law, he felt himself incompetent to decide. All he would observe, was, that that Act was introduced to relieve Unitarians from their difficulties as to toleration, and to place them on the same footing as other Dissenters; in short, to give them substantial protection and relief. That was quite sufficient for him. If technical doubts and difficulties arose on the construction of the Act, when the case arose they ought, as a matter of right, to be removed, but, in the mean time, he stood on the general acknowledged understanding of the intention of the law. In the same way as to marriages of Jews and Quakers, they were told there were doubts and difficulties as to their legality, but there could be no doubt, that ever since the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act, marriages between Jews and Quakers had been recognized by the practice of the country, and property to an immense amount had passed in consequence of those marriages. This was enough to satisfy him; if doubts arose, it would be but justice to the parties interested that those doubts should be cleared by an Act of the Legislature; but unless such doubts appeared in some tangible shape, he should assume that the recognized practice of the country was the law of the land. As to the Unitarians, he must repeat that he thought them fairly and conscientiously entitled to the relief; that their scruples were on the face of them fair and just. But the Noble and Learned Lord said if the Unitarians were to be placed on the same footing as Jews and Quakers, then put them on the same footing as Jews and Quakers in every respect, and let them not be married in any degree through the instrumentality of the Church of England. —This, he apprehended, was entirely a question for the Committee on the Bill; it would be for the Committee to decide whether it would be proper that the Unitarians should keep their own registers or not. The inclination of his mind, on civil grounds, was the other way; he thought that their marriages ought to be registered in the Established Churches; and that opinion was founded, not upon a religious, but a civil ground; because such a regulation would most effectually prevent clandestine marriages. Whatever might be the merits or defects of the Bill, he could not understand how it could in any way operate injuriously to the Church of England. He concurred with the Noble Baron opposite (Lord Holland) on this point, and he was the more ready to express that concurrence, because he differed from the Noble Baron most essentially and fundamentally on many important questions connected with the security of the Church of England. He agreed also with the Noble Baron, that it was not the wisest policy to stretch every little measure of concession into a

question of alarming magnitude, or of danger in the Church, and that such a course as this was ill calculated to secure the safety of the Church in cases where danger really existed. Believing, as he did, that this measure was founded on principles of sound policy, and was in no degree opposed to the laws and constitution of the country, and that it was calculated to afford relief to a class of Dissenters who were entitled to relief on the score of fair, conscientious scruples, he should certainly vote for the Bill going into a Committee.

The Bishop of CHESTER, in reference to an observation which had fallen from a Noble Lord opposite, denied that equivocation could be justly imputed to the Church of England. He regretted that such an observation should have fallen from a Noble Lord who usually stood forward as the champion of liberal opinions. Elevated as the rank, and illustrious as the descent of the Noble Lord might be, he (the Bishop of Chester) would disclaim the imputation which had been cast on the Church of England; it was as unjustly applied to the Church of England as it would have been to any Noble Lord opposite. The Reverend Prelate then adverted to the allusion made by Lord Holland to the opinions of his father. Whatever they might be, he neither was bound by them, nor claimed any merit from them;

> Et genus, et proavos, et quæ non fecimus ipsi,
> Vix ea nostra voco.

Lord HOLLAND explained, and repeated his surprise in seeing the Reverend Prelate in his present position. As to the Prelate alluded to, (Law, Bishop of Carlisle,) he could only repeat, that no one who knew his worth would believe that he would ever have been found at the head of such an opposition.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, in explanation, observed, that he had not imputed equivocation to the Church of England; he had only said, that the Church of England imposed equivocation on others.

The House proceeded to divide on the Amendment. Contents, present, 55; Proxies, 50—105. Non-Contents, present, 41; Proxies, 25—66. Majority in favour of the Amendment, 39.

The Bill was, therefore, lost.

The Secretary of the Unitarian Association is indebted for the following paper (which he has communicated to us for publication) to the Marquis of Lansdowne, for whose kind and zealous exertions we cannot be too grateful. It contains a minute of the proceedings on the Irish Dissenters' Marriage Act, referred to in the above debate, and was extracted from the Journals of the House, under the Noble Marquis's directions.

Irish Dissenters' Marriage Act.

11th and 12th Geo. III.

THIS Bill is not a mere *Irish* precedent. But having passed before the alteration of the Irish Constitution, it was certified, under the Great Seal of England, at some time between the 11th of March and the 22d of April. It must, therefore, have had the sanction of Lord Thurlow's authority as Chancellor.

House of Commons. The heads of the Bill were ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Stewart, (Kellymoon,) Right Honourable Mr. Burgh, Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Grattan and Mr. Montgomery.

11th March. The heads of Bill were brought in and sent to the Lord-Lieutenant. (Lord Carlisle.)

22d April. The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

The Bill passed the Commons without a division.

At this time
Lord Lefford was Chancellor.
Lord Avonmore, Attorney-General.
Lord Carleton, Solicitor-General.
Paterson, C. J. of K. B.
Lord Anally, C. J. of C. P.

House of Lords. Bill brought up by Mr. Stewart, and others, read first time.

25th April. Read second time. Lord Lefford, Chancellor, present.—Petitions for and against the Bill were read.

Counsel ordered and heard.

Division, for the Bill,	Contents, .	29
	Non-Contents,	20
Proxies called,	Contents, .	35
	Non-Contents,	23

It thus appears that the Bill was most fully discussed. It was objected to, on the ground that the Bill was imperfectly framed, and that it went to place the Protestant Dissenter, or any person who chose to call himself so, *in a better* condition than the Churchman; and those who opposed the measure declared their willingness to assent to a Bill giving the Dissenters *equal* rights respecting marriages, with those enjoyed by the Established Church.

See the Protest on the Lords' Journals.

Dissentient,

1st. Because the Bill may lead to clandestine marriages, by facilitating marriages in fraud of the Act between persons not Dissenters.

2dly. Because past marriages being made by this Bill good and valid, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, no divorces can take place *a vinculo*, for pre-

contract, consanguinity or impotence. The Bill gives to Dissenters *all the advantages* without any of the disadvantages of Church marriages.

3rdly. Because it may lead to celebration of marriages, by persons falsely calling themselves Dissenting ministers.

4thly. Because it validates, first marriages not consummated, against second marriages consummated, and bastardizes the issue of the latter.

5thly. Because those who opposed the Bill did repeatedly *declare themselves willing to vote* for another Bill, rendering all matrimonial contracts *heretofore* contracted between Protestant Dissenters, and celebrated by Dissenting ministers, *as good and valid to all intents* and purposes, as such contracts would have been if celebrated by the clergy of the Established Church; and also rendering all *such* contracts *hereafter* to be entered into *as good and valid*, as if they had been entered into by the clergy of the Established Church.

Richd. Armagh,	R. Dublin,	Clonfert,
Belmore,	H. Meath,	Cashel,
Shannon,	W. Waterford,	Ferns,
	L. Cork & Ross,	Raphoe,
		Down,
		Cloyne,
		Kildare,
		Elphin.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MAR. 29.—The bill for regulating Burials in Ireland, in order to provide for Catholics and Dissenters the right of Sepulture in Churchyards, with their own religious service, was read a second time *nem. con.*, on the motion of Mr. PLUNKETT, who made a very able and liberal speech upon the occasion. He complimented very highly Sir John Newport, who had first brought this matter before the House, and explained that in taking the measure out of his hands, the Government meant only to make his own proposal more effectual by giving to it the sanction of administration. He stated that the Bill allowed the Protestant clergyman to give permission of burial; which he would, according to usage in like cases, be bound to give, unless he could shew reasonable grounds of refusal; such grounds to be stated in writing to the Dissenting clergyman making the application, and a copy of the paper to be forwarded to his Ordinary, and thence to be transmitted to the Lord Lieutenant. With regard to the Catholics, their whole Burial Service, comprehending High Mass, was not to be allowed to be performed, but merely the Grave Service; the rest of the service to be gone through, as it is now, in the houses of the Catholics.—The present Bill repeals the Act of the 9th of Wm. III. cap. 7, prohibiting Roman Catholic Burials in certain consecrated places: in speaking of that Act, Mr. Plunkett said, "The Act was framed, and it fell still-born; it had never been acted on for a single hour—it met the fate of all Acts which had been passed, in defiance of the wishes, the feelings, the dispositions of the people. There was no person found wild enough to invade the established practice. *But if an Act was to be found on our Statute Book, the compliance with which was considered a crime, and of which the negligence was esteemed a duty, such an Act ought no longer to be allowed to remain in force—it was a deformity to our law—it could only induce a disrespect to the laws of the country, and therefore ought to be repealed.*"—The speaker shewed great tenderness to the Prelates and Clergy, whose vexatious interference has had the good effect of suggesting this liberal measure.

MAR. 31. Mr. HUTCHINSON presented a petition from two individuals, Mr. Devereux, a gentleman of great fortune in the county of Wexford, and Mr. Lucas Macdonnell, of the county of Mayo, against the *Irish Catholics' and Dissenters' Burial Bill.* In presenting it, the Honourable Gentleman expressed his regret at its being offered to the House, because whatever were the defects of the Bill, he had no doubt of the kind intentions of Mr. Plunkett and of the Irish Government on the subject; and he felt it his duty, as an Irish gentleman, to say that he considered Ireland deeply indebted to Lord Wellesley for his unceasing anxiety to promote the welfare of Ireland, and that he was persuaded, that if his Excellency's administration had not succeeded to the extent of his Excellency's wishes in restoring peace and quiet, it was not for want of his earnest exertions. The petitioners complain, "That although the principle of toleration is distinctly recognized in the terms of said Bill, nevertheless its provisions not only render such principle inoperative, but introduce new enactments more intolerable and obnoxious than those which they affect to remedy. That the operation of said Bill, if passed into a law, would be to tempt and excite the clergy of the Established Church to the exercise of an odious jurisdiction, to taint the great body of the people of Ireland, both lay and ecclesiastical, daily and hourly, upon the degradation to which the law proscribes them on account of their professing the Catholic faith, to produce con-

stant and immediate collision between the clergy of the different communions, and to increase that spirit of disunion and discontent, already so perniciously prevalent in Ireland. That no inconvenience had resulted from the practice of free burial, as it existed in the city of Dublin prior to the appointment of the most Rev. Dr. *Magee*, as Archbishop of the diocese; and your petitioners humbly submit to the consideration of this Honourable House, whether it can be esteemed a just or reasonable regulation, to subject the enjoyment or dispensation of such a right to the caprice of the very same individuals, whose proceedings respecting the same matter, have rendered necessary any application for the interposition of the Legislature."

In the Debate in the House of Commons upon Lord Althorp's motion on the State of Ireland, (May 12,) Mr. Tierney reminded Mr. Canning of what had taken place in the other House upon the *Unitarian Marriage Bill*:—"Does not the Right Honourable Gentleman know that there are two parties even in the Church? Has he read the newspapers as to what passed in another place upon a different question? A plain man might have thought that he was following a pretty safe leader when he went with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who himself was followed by the Archbishop of York, and seven other Bishops: no such thing; the Archbishops, and the seven Bishops too, were nothing compared with *him who is in fact, though not in office perhaps, the prime minister of the Cabinet.* The consequence was, that the Archbishops found themselves in as miserable a minority as I ever joined, who have been a minority man nearly all the days of my life."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Ireland.

The Catholic Burial-Permit-Bill, as it is called, excites great commotion in Ireland. We deem it right to state that Dr. Magee, the Archbishop of Dublin, has written a letter to the Bishop of Limerick, which has since been made public, denying altogether that he ever gave any orders for interrupting or interfering with the burials of Catholics. At the same time he acknowledges, that being on one or two occasions, subsequent to the first misunderstandings on this case, consulted "by some of the parish ministers as to what they should do in this *new and alarming state of things*, should a Roman Catholic Priest insist on exercising his functions at an interment in their church-yards," his advice to them was, "that they should be ready at their posts, *to officiate according to the rites of the Established Church;* and that, if not permitted, and that the Priest still persevered in his *invasion of their rights*, they should employ no force and oppose no resistance, further than to protest formally and solemnly the unlawfulness of the act, with a view to ulterior proceedings before the proper tribunal."—The Morning Chronicle of the 17th inst. remarks, with great *sang froid*, that to the Archbishop's "supposed interference with Catholic Burials—he is chiefly indebted for any little celebrity he has obtained in England." What will be thought of this by the numerous assailants of the Unitarians, who have been accustomed to do homage to Dr. Magee as their leader, and to borrow from his arsenal their various missiles of insinuation, misquotation, misrepresentation and calumny!

Ecclesiastical Preferments.

The King has made Dr. R. J. Carr, Bishop of Chichester, in the room of Dr. *Buckner*, deceased.

The Rev. Christopher Lipscombe, M. A., Fellow of New College, Oxford, (and not Mr. *Sumner*, as stated p. 187,) is the First *Bishop of Jamaica;* Mr. *Coleridge*, as before stated, is the *Bishop of Barbadoes.*

NOTICES.

The Annual *Assembly* of the General Baptists will be held on Tuesday, June 8th, at Worship Street, Bishopsgate Street, London. The Rev. R. Wright, of Trowbridge, is appointed to preach. Divine service will commence at eleven o'clock.

The Anniversary of the Unitarian Fund Society will be held on Wednesday, June 9th, at the Chapel, South Place, Finsbury, London. The Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester, is appointed to preach.

The Annual General Meeting of The Unitarian Association will be held at the *London Tavern*, on Thursday the 10th of June, at *Two* o'clock in the afternoon. This hour is appointed for the accommodation of such subscribers as mean to be present at the meeting of The Christian Tract Society, at the same place, later in the day.

The Christian Tract Society Anniversary will be held on Thursday, June 10th, at the *Old London Tavern*, Bishopsgate Street. The Chair will be taken for business at three o'clock precisely.

Charity Sermons.—On Sunday, June 13th, two Sermons will be preached on behalf of the Charity Schools belonging to the Unitarian Chapel, Hackney. The Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester, has kindly engaged to preach the morning sermon. For further particulars respecting this and the foregoing notices, see advertisements on the Wrapper.

Our readers will see by an advertisement on the cover, that an Evening Lecture is about to be preached in the new and elegant chapel in *Stamford Street*, Blackfriars, of which the Rev. Dr. Thomas Rees is the minister. The first lecture will be delivered on Sunday Evening, June 13, by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester. Service to begin at half-past six o'clock.

The Yearly Meeting of the *Eastern Unitarian Society* will be held at Ipswich, on Wednesday, June 30th, and Thursday, July 1st. Mr. Scargill, of Bury St. Edmunds, will preach on the Wednesday evening, and Mr. Aspland on the Thursday morning.

EDWARD TAYLOR,
Secretary.

The Rev. J. H. Bransby, of Dudley, has accepted an invitation to preach before the *Southern Unitarian Society*, at their Annual Meeting, at Chichester, on Wednesday, the 30th of June. There will be a Lecture in the evening, for which a preacher is not yet engaged.

The Anniversary of the *Southern Unitarian Fund Sermon*, hitherto held in the Easter Week, at Portsmouth, is, for the present year, postponed, until the close of the summer. The fortnightly Lectures, established by this Society in Portsea and neighbourhood, have been, during the winter, ably supported by the Revds. J. Fullagar, Wm. Hughes, S. Walker, E. Kell, W. Stevens and Baird.

The Annual Meeting of the *Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association* will be held at Maidstone, on Wednesday, June 30th, when the Rev. W. J. Fox is expected to preach.

The Chapel erected for the Unitarians at *Todmorden*, near Halifax, will be opened on Whit-Sunday, and the Association of Unitarians in that district will be held in the same chapel on Whit-Monday, when the Rev. Dr. Philipps and Messrs. G. Harris and W. Stevens are expected to preach.

LITERARY.

The Rev. Dr. Evans, of Islington, has in the press a little volume entitled, *Richmond and its Vicinity, with a Glance at Twickenham, Strawberry Hill and Hampton Court.*

Preparing for publication—Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem: a Picture of Judaism in the Century which preceded the Advent of the Messiah. Translated from the German of F. Strauss. With Notes and Illustrations by the Translator.

Early in June will be published, *The Works of Vicesimus Knox, D. D.*, in seven volumes, 8vo. with an Engraved Portrait by Ward.

Mr. Sparks, recently pastor of the Unitarian Church in Baltimore, having retired from his pastoral charge, has purchased the establishment of the North American Review, and will, in future, be the Editor of the work. The high character of this Review has procured for it extensive currency and distinguished reputation, both in America and in Europe. It is now, in fact, in a considerable degree identified with the American literary character. We are assured, that it will lose nothing on the score of literary merit by the recent transfer. Mr. Sparks is said to be a most accomplished scholar. —*Man of Letters.*

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Etymologic Interpreter; or, An Explanatory and Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language. To which is prefixed, An Introduction, containing a Full Development of the Principles of Etymology and Grammar, &c. &c. &c. By James Gilchrist. 8vo. Part I. 8*s.*

A Summary of the Theological Controversies which of late Years have Agitated the City of Geneva. By M. J. J. Chenevière, Pastor and Professor of Divinity. Translated from the French. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Letter from Robert Haldane, Esq., to

M. J. J. Chenevière, Pastor and Professor of Geneva, occasioned by his "Summary," published in the Monthly Repository. 12mo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Original Letters of Algernon Sydney to his Father, the Earl of Leicester, written during the Years 1659, 1660, 1661. Edited with Notes, and a Short Biographical Memoir. By Robert Willis Blencowe, M. A. 8vo.

A Selection of Tracts and Observations on 1 John v. 7. By the Bishop of St. David's. 5*s*.

Annotationes Millii, Bengelii, Wetstenii, Sabeterii, &c., ad 1 Joann. v. 7. 7*s*.

An Essay upon the Relation of Cause and Effect, controverting the Doctrine of Mr. Hume, with Observations upon the Opinions of Dr. Brown and Mr. Lawrence. 8vo. 8*s*.

The Difficulties of Infidelity. By G. S. Faber, B. D., Rector of Long Newton. 8vo. 7*s*.

Religious Liberty stated and enforced, in Six Essays and an Appendix. By T. Williams. 2nd Edit. With an Essay on the Duty and Importance of Free Communion. 8vo. 6*s*.

Answer to the Question, Why are you a Congregational Dissenter? By J. Morrison. 6*d*.

A Brief Historical Reference to the Three Capital Offences of the Church of Rome; containing a Detailed Account of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, a Contradiction of several Particulars in the last Volume of Dr. Lingard's History of England, and a Defence of Queen Elizabeth. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

A Defensive Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, and into the Notion, under the Patriarchal and Mosaical Dispensations, of a Future Life. By C. J. Burton, M. A., Vicar of Lydd, in Kent. 2*s*. 6*d*.

An Inquiry into the Studies and Discipline adopted in the two English Universities, as preparatory to Holy Orders in the Established Church; in a Letter respectfully addressed to the Rt. Hon. R. Peel. By A Graduate. 2*s*.

The Private Journal of Captain G. F. Lyon, of H. M. Ship Hecla, during the Recent Voyage of Discovery under Captain Parry. 8vo. 7 Plates and Map. 16*s*.

Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor, with Comparative Remarks on the Antient and Modern Geography of the Country. By William Martin Leake, F. R. S. 8vo. Map. 16*s*.

Narrative of a Pedestrian Journey through Russia and Siberian Tartary, from the Territories of China to the Frozen Sea and Kamschatka, performed during the Years 1820—1823. By Captain John Dundas Cochrane, of the Royal Navy. 8vo. Maps. 18*s*.

An Introduction to Practical Astronomy: containing Tables, recently computed for facilitating the Reduction of Celestial Observations, and a Popular Explanation of their Construction and Use. By Wm. Pearson, LL.D. F.R.S., Rector of South Kilworth, Leicestershire, and Treasurer to the Astronomical Society of London. 4to. 3*l*. 3*s*.

Tours to the British Mountains, with the Descriptive Poems of Lowther and Emont Vale. By Thomas Wilkinson, of Yanwath, Westmoreland. 8vo. 8*s*. 6*d*.

Physiological Fragments; to which are added, Supplementary Observations to shew that Vital and Chemical Energies are of the same Nature, and both derived from Solar Light. By John Bywater. 8vo. 5*s*. 6*d*.

A Philological Grammar of the English Language. By Thomas Martin, Master of the National School, Birmingham. 12mo. 6*s*.

Robinson Crusoëus Latine Scripsit F. J. Goffaux, Humaniorum Literarum Professor in Lycæo Imperiali. Ed. Nov. 12mo. 5*s*.

An Exposure of the Hamiltonian System. By J. H. Hartnoll. 1*s*.

The Mechanics' Magazine. Vol. I. Nearly 100 Engravings on Wood. 8*s*.

Sketches of the Principal Picture Galleries of England. 5*s*.

The Economy of the Eyes: Precepts for the Improvement and Preservation of the Sight. By William Kitchiner, M. D. 12mo. 7*s*.

A Compendium of the History of Ireland, from the Earliest Period to the Reign of George I. By John Lawless, Esq. 2 Vols. 18*s*.

Pignotti's History of Tuscany, from the Earliest Period to the Establishment of the Grand Duchy, with Occasional Essays on the Progress of Italian Literature. Translated from the Italian. By J. Browning, Esq. 4 Vols. 8vo. 2*l*. 8*s*.

Some Account of the Hospital and Parish of St. Giles-in-the-fields, Middlesex. By the late Mr. John Parton, Vestry Clerk. 4to. 5*l*. 5*s*. Large Paper 10*l*. 10*s*.

Some Account of the Present State of the English Settlers in Albany, South Africa. By Thomas Pringle. 12mo. 4*s*.

A Memoir of the Life of the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke; with Specimens of his Poetry and Letters, and an Estimate of his Genius and Talents, compared with those of his Great Contemporaries. By James Prior, Esq. 8vo. 16*s*.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rt. Hon. Lord Byron. With Anec-

dotes of some of his Contemporaries. 8vo. Portrait. 14*s.*

Life and Genius of Lord Byron. By Sir Cosmo Gordon. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Memoirs of Jeanne D'Arc, surnamed La Pucelle D'Orleans. With the History of her Times. Compiled from Original Manuscripts in the Royal Library at Paris, &c. 2 Vols. 8vo. Portrait and Plates, 1*l.* 16*s.* Large Paper, 4*l.* 4*s.*

Life of Mr. J. Bundy, of Bristol. By T. Wood, A.M. 12mo. 2*s.*

The Life of Shakspeare; Inquiries into the Originality of his Dramatic Plots, and Essays on the Antient Theatres and Theatrical Usages. By Augustine Skottowe, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Various Pictures and Prints, which from the Decease of the Poet to our Own Times have been offered to the Public as Portraits of Shakspeare. By James Boaden, Esq. 8vo. 5 Portraits. 15*s.* Quarto, Proofs. 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Some Account of the Life of the late Gilbert Earle, Esq. Written by Himself. Post 8vo. 8*s.*

The Greek Revolution; its Origin and Progress: together with some Remarks on the Religion, National Character, &c., in Greece. By Edward Blaquiere, Esq., Author of "An Historical Review of the Spanish Revolution," &c. &c. 8vo. With a Large Map. 12*s.*

The Atrocities of the Pirates; being a Faithful Narrative of the Unparalleled Sufferings endured by the Author during his Captivity among the Pirates of the Island of Cuba; with an Account of the Excesses and Barbarities of those Inhuman Freebooters. By Aaron Smith, who was himself afterwards tried at the Old Bailey as a Pirate, and acquitted. 12mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

A Key to Hutton's Compendious Measurer; containing Solutions, at full length, to all the Questions which have only the Answers annexed to them in that Work. By J. M. Edney, Teacher of Mathematics. 12mo. 5*s.* bound.

A Translation from the German of Goëthe's celebrated Novel, Wilhelm Meister. 3 Vols. Post 8vo.

The Second Volume of Mr. Rose's Translation of The Orlando Furioso. Post 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

The History of Matthew Wald. By the Author of Adam Blair. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Tales and Sketches of the West of Scotland. By Christopher Keelivine. 12mo. 6*s.*

Mornings at Bow Street. By Mr. Wright, Bow-Street Reporter to the Morning Herald. With Designs by G. Cruikshank. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Blank Book of a Small Colleger. Post 12mo. 4*s.* extra boards.

Our Village: Sketches of Rural Character and Scenery. By Mary Russell Mitford. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Sacred Melodies, with an Admonitory Appeal to the Rt. Hon. Lord Byron. By Mrs. J. H. R. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

The Satires of Bishop Hall, with the Illustrations of the late Rev. Thomas Warton; and some Additional Notes by S. W. Singer. 9*s.*

A Midsummer Day's Dream; a Poem. By Edwin Atherstone. Foolscap 8vo. Plates. 8*s.*

Winter; a Poem. By H. W. Woolrych, Esq., Barrister at Law. 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Agamemnon of Æschylus, translated into English Verse, by John Symmons, Esq., A. M., late Student of Christ Church. 8vo. 8*s.*

The Chimney-Sweeper's Friend and Climbing Boy's Album, containing Contributions from some of the most Eminent Writers of the Day, in Prose and Verse. Arranged by James Montgomery, and illustrated with Designs by Mr. Cruikshank. 12mo. 9*s.*

The Loves of the Colours, with a Few Occasional Poems, and a Trifle in Prose reprinted. Foolscap 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

The Silent River; and, Faithful and Forsaken Dramatic Poems. By Robert Sulivan. Foolscap 8vo. 5*s.*

The Village Grammar School, and other Poems. By Thomas Maude, Esq., A. B. Oxon. 3*s.*

The Brides of Florence; a Play, in Five Acts; illustrative of the Manners of the Middle Ages: with Historical Notes and Minor Poems. By Randolph Fitz-Eustace. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Poems and other Writings by the late Edward Rushton, of Liverpool. To which is added, A Sketch of the Life of the Author, by the Rev. W. Shepherd. 6*s.*

The Impracticability of a North-West Passage for Ships, impartially considered. 4*s.* 6*d.*

A Short Account of the Progress of J. B. Logier's System of Musical Education in Berlin. By J. B. Logier. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Observations on Mr. Withers's Report of the Hempstead Appeal Case, between the Rector and Parishioners, and on the Attempt which has been made in Norfolk to establish the Principle of Productive Value as the Basis of rating Land and Tithes for the Relief of the Poor. 2*s.* 6*d.*

A Pamphlet on the Alien Bill. By an Alien. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Glimpses across the Irish Channel. By a Friend, not a Flatterer. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Moral Inquiries on the Situation of

Man and Brutes, on the Crime of committing Cruelty on Brutes, &c. By Lewis Gompertz, Esq.

A Reply to the Letters of the Abbé Dubois on the State of Christianity in India. By James Hough, Chaplain to the Hon. the East India Company, on the Madras Establishment. 5*s.*

The Two Rectors; in Ten Papers: Illustrative of the Sentiments of the Two Parties in the Church of England. 12mo.

Divine Influence; or, the Operation of the Holy Spirit traced from the Creation of Man to the Consummation of all Things. By Thomas T. Biddulph, A. M., Minister of St. James's, Bristol. 8vo. 9*s.*

The Missionary's Farewell: A Piece of Music. The Words by an American. Composed for the Piano Forte, &c., with Accompaniments. By W. Causton, Esq. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Address on Laying the Foundation of a New Chapel. By T. Scales. 8vo. 6*d.*

Grief and Hope: a Tribute to the Memory of John Smith, Missionary at Demerara. By James Cooper. 1*s.*

The Missionary's Appeal to the Religious Public. A Statement of Facts respecting the Mission in the Island of Trinidad, occasioned by the Author's Recall from that Mission. By Thomas Adam. 1*s.*

An Account of the American Mission to the Burman Empire: in a Series of Letters addressed to a Gentleman in London. By Ann H. Judson. 8vo. 8*s.*

A Third Course of Practical Sermons, expressly adapted to be read in Families. By Harvey Marriott, Rector of Claverton. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* (Vols. I. and II. 10*s.* 6*d.* each.)

Two Sermons on the Death of the Rev. T. Cotterill, A. M., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Sheffield, preached in that Church, Jan. 11, 1824. By J. Blackburn, A. M., and H. Price.

Faith, in Connexion with Personal Holiness, exemplifying the Christian Character: a Sermon preached by C. Thurgar, Curate of High Wycombe, Bucks, as his Farewell Address. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Negro Slavery.

Observations upon Slavery; setting forth that to hold the Principle of Slavery is to deny Christ. By Robert Lindoe, M. D. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Immediate, not Gradual Abolition; or, an Inquiry into the Shortest, Safest, and most Effectual Means of getting rid of West-Indian Slavery. 1*s.* 6*d.*

A Refutation of Various Calumnies against the West India Colonists, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Editor of the Times, and which appeared in that Newspaper under the Signature of a West India Proprietor (lately Deceased—Mr. Marryatt). 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Facts, verified upon Oath, in Contradiction of the Report of the Rev. Thomas Cooper, concerning the General Condition of the Slaves in Jamaica, and more especially relative to the Management and Treatment of the Slaves upon Georgia Estate, in the Parish of Hanover in that Island.

Anti-Negro Emancipation: an Appeal to Mr. Wilberforce. 1*s.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Dr. John Jones; and Messrs. Fullagar and Marsom: from C. B.; an Old Subscriber; and Albanus.

Our young friend M. is informed that the non-appearance of acknowledged communications does not imply their containing any "glaring error:" at the same time, we could not, without great inconvenience and a departure from our custom from the beginning, undertake to assign particular reasons for putting any communication aside.

In consequence of the length of the interesting Debate in the House of Lords upon the Unitarians' Marriage Bill, we are obliged to leave out various articles of Review, Intelligence, &c., which had been prepared and designed for the present Number, including the Report of the Anniversary of the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, Lord Holland in the Chair.

We have received the following donations sent at the request of the late Mr. Henry Bowman, of Shrewsbury,—

For Unitarian Fund	£5	0	0
For Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty .	5	0	0

By an oversight in the last Unitarian Fund Register, the following benefaction to the Society, by the hands of Mr. Aspland, was omitted to be acknowledged,—

Mrs. Mary Hughes, Bristol	£50	0	0

Subscribers or others having duplicates of No. 133, of the Monthly Repository, containing the Memoir of the late Rev. W. Vidler, may have other Numbers in exchange, or the value in money, for that Number, with or without the Portrait, on application to the Publishers or the Printer.