

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXVI.]

OCTOBER, 1824.

[Vol. XIX.]

Original Letters from the Baxter MSS. in Dr. Williams's Library.

"Of Original Sinne."

(A Letter to Baxter, supposed to be from GILBERT CLERKE. See p. 432 and XVIII. 65.)

S^r,
I LIKE your words, p. 215, viz.,
"The word imputation as ambiguous I purposely avoid, unlesse when I may explaine it." I use to explaine it thus:

I. Imputation in a proper sense is, when there is *fundamentum in re*: thus the fault is justly imputed to the man who did not doe it, but advised, commended, imitated, &c., and so had a hand in it. 1 Sam. xxii. 25.

II. In an improper sense when there is *fundamentum in personâ* by reason of some relation: thus traytours' children may be accounted legally traytours and beggared for their parents' treason, when they are in heart and life really y^e most loyall persons of any what so ever.

Thus by virtue of our relation to Adam and God's decree, I hold y^t all Adam's posteritie fell with him, and were by his sinne made obnoxious to a necessary and eternal death; w^{ch} I take in a proper sense—*Dust thou art*, &c., although they were not guilty of transgression, i. e. of sinne or rebellion against an expresse or promulgate law, Rom. v. 12, &c., in whom, or rather, for as much as *all sinned*, i. e. quasi by this kind of imputation in an improper sense, as Dr. Lushington in Gal. p. 143 sayth, not actively by transgresseing in his transgression, but passively by being prejudicated in his judgement—so ἀμαρτωλοὶ, in ver. 19, w^{ch} Chrysostom expounds κατὰ δέδι κασμενοὶ τῷ θανάτῳ. The words following in ver. 13, *For untill y^e law*, are an objection unto w^{ch} y^e latter clause, *But sinne is not imputed*, are an answer: q. d. Though all men w^{ch} lived before the law of Moses did really commit actual sinne more or lesse, yet being they did not sinne against an expresse and promulgate law as Adam did, that is after

his similitude, there was no such necessity of punishing or imputeing their owne sinnes to y^m, but death reigned over them from Adam, from Adam I say, who did so transgresse. Then *macula sequitur reatum*, this guilt is followed as a punishment upon Adam's children for his sinne, by an extraordinary inclination to such honour, pleasures and profit, as cannot be had without sinne, and is a woful curse or plague upon mankind, but not sinne in a proper sense, as I thinke with Zuinglius. Then the sinnefull effects of ill inclinations are much to be attributed to y^e temptations of y^e world and y^e Devil, who is said to be y^e deceiver of all nations and of y^e whole world; therefore we often lay y^e blame of men's debaucheries, especially of young men's, first upon themselves, as if there was no necessitie y^t they should have been so bad, and then upon their company, as if notwithstanding their owne dispositions they might have been good if they had kept good company: to be tempted from within or without is an ill thing, and to be prayed against, but properly no sinne of itself, for X^t was tempted.

The Socinians denie not the pro- nesse of men to sinne, but seeme to dislike the word (impute), but then they take it in a proper sense, otherwise they acknowledge y^t eternal death did come upon Adam's children for his sinne, *ex occasione peccati*, and y^e rather, for y^t all have sinned actually even before y^e law. Rom. v. 12. But I see no such need of exactnesse and propriete in speaking by y^t word, if other men did not force it by their misexplications and driveing of things to an ill sense.

I take this for certaine, y^t although sometimes a word may be conveniently used in some good sense w^{ch} it

may beare, yet if y^t word be more capable of an ill sense, it is not well done to exact rigorously a constant use of y^t word or to enuntiate absolutely in that word without explication, as you said of imputeing, p. 215. And as the old ffathers used the words merit and penitential justification, yet if y^e Papists or others will scrue up the sense of those words, they may deserve to be reprov'd as extremely erroneous.

I see not much difference betwixt you and mee but in point of proprietie; indeed you use many scholasticall words w^{ch} I have not time to examine, and w^{ch} can pretend but to some more than ordinary exactnesse or accuracy; but for the use of Christians, if I was pastour of a parish I would tell my people what they are obnoxious unto by Adames fall, and warne them against that cursed inclination w^{ch} we have more or lesse by nature; and if I call it a curse and you call it a sinne, y^e one may be as effectual as the other to move them to gett into X^c and pray for the assistance of the spirit, to watch, strive, &c. You beginne with original righteousness as others doe, but you speake mostly from reason rather than scripture.

The image of God in Gen. i. seems to be expounded of dominion, w^{ch} man hath stille in great measure over y^e creatures, and in w^{ch} respect X^t is undoubtedly said to be y^e image of y^e invisible God, Coll. i. 15, and w^{ch}, I doubt not, was intended in the allegoricall sense of this scripture, referreing cheifly to y^e exaltation of X^t. So 1 Cor. ii. 7. *Y^e woman is y^e glory* (or image) *of y^e man*, because shee is next to him in y^e government of y^e family; y^t in Coll. iii. 10, is y^e new evangelical creature opposed to mere nature, and especially as inclineable to evill and depraved by y^e acts and habits of sinne. As for Eccles. vii. ult. *God made man upright*, I say y^t although y^t book and Job are canonicall, yet they are not so proper to pick for the resolution of a question in divinitie. They are poetically and in many places obscure, as this ver. 28, *A man amongst a thousand*, &c.: by the context y^e words would seem to be directed against the actual harlotry of women rather than to inferre originall sinne, against w^{ch} the

words might be rather construed, q. d. y^t men were not borne so bad, but they made themselves so; as I have heard a divine much insist upon y^e modesty of nature till abused: by *man* is not necessarily meant Adam, as appeareth by y^e opposition, *they; they have found out*. Besides, 'tis sufficient ffor Adam if he was made more inclineable to good than evill, though without such perfection of habits as a man may goe into his study and imagine, not as y^e truth is or may appeare in scripture, but as he is able to draw an idea of perfection. Some men are apt to think y^t if God makes a thing he must needs make it as good as he can, yet wee commonly see y^t good artificers doe not always make things as good as they can, but as is fit and reasoneable, and God thought good to lett that be first w^{ch} was natural.

To be sure, God did not make man a sinner, but him and every thing else good in its kind and for y^e uses it was made, otherwise wee are not able to say in what degree of good nature or mere natural honesty man might have been made, or that he needs must be made an eternal being and under law in order to eternal life; nor see I much scripture w^{ch} speaks of y^e original corruption of man's nature in general upon Adam's account or of a contagious propagation. That in Gen. vii. 11 is certainly meant of actual sinnes; y^e *imaginations and thoughts of men's hearts* are actual sinnes, and many Scriptures w^{ch} you have quoted as of infants are most reasonably to be expounded of y^e adult; but I gather it rather from reason and the universal experience of y^e wickednesse of the world; and then seeing the apostle, Rom. v. 12, doth plainly attaint all men with a reputative guilt as from Adam, and considering the curse befallen men from that sinne and some particular scripture, as y^t, *Behold I was shapen in iniquity*, &c., I thinke this vitious inclination is most fairly reducible to Adam's sinne as a punishment of y^t, and included in y^t clause, Rom. xii. 5, *For as much as all sinned*; but I find neither scripture nor reason requiring me to believe this propagated contagion, w^{ch} hath such evill effects, in y^e circumstances in w^{ch} men are, to be a sinne in a

proper sense, but I seeme to my selfe to have good arguments to prove y^e contrary.

1. Because not properly voluntary. You say, p. 79 and 218, y^t it was reputatively voluntary; therefore it is reputatively a sinne, say I, And Adam's sinne was reputatively punished, i. e. not in a proper sense.

2. Because Adam and Eve saw y^t the fruit was desireable, before they did eat it, and had some inclination, or they had not both so suddainly fallen, now *magis et minus non variant speciem*.

I admitted of no other curse than a graduated inclination to turne to y^e creature rather than to the Creatour in the present circumstances, I meane not an habitual love of y^e creature more than of y^e Creatour, but an intense and dangerous inclination to such a thing; I doubt not but that if Adam had not sinned, there would have been thornes and thistles, but not so many as to make y^e ground cursed, and y^e woman might have had some paines, for the text sayth, *I will multiplie thy sorrows*; so I thinke men are cursed with multiplied inclinations, besides objects, examples and tempters, so that *facilis descensus Averni*: you, calling this sinne in a lesse proper sense analogically, page 192, come neare y^e matter.

3. Sinne is against law, but y^e law is not *Thou shalt not be inclined to eat*, but *Thou shalt not eat*; nor, *Thou shalt be inclined to love y^e Lord thy God*, &c., but *Thou shalt love*; nor, *Thou shalt not be inclined to covet thy neighbour's*, &c., but *Thou shalt not covet*. We are to repent of breaking y^e law, but no man can repent of such inclinations as he was borne with and could never helpe. I doe not thinke y^t you will say y^t man's nature is so weakened by Adam's fall as to make any one sinne necessary to him; else I see not how he could be blamed or called to repentance for that sinne.

4. This vitious inclination is judicially inflicted as a punishment of Adam's sinne, as many divines hold, nor is it likely y^t one act of y^e understanding and will by deception should of itself not only abolish a habit of original righteousness in such perfection as hath troubled some to con-

ceive how Adam could sinne at all, but also physically alter the constitution so much as to propagate a vicious quality by seminal traduction to all his posteritie. And if judicially inflicted it can be no sinne, else God would be the author of sinne. Your selfe say, p. 169, Y^t God by way of penalty should create y^e soul immediately sinful, seems plainly to make him the author of sinne: 'tis true God punisheth sinne with sinne, by delivering men up to temptation *proponendo objecta*, &c., but not by infuseing or creating sinfull qualities. But it is not unreasonable to say, y^t God may be the authour of an evill thing as a curse *per modum pœnæ*, yet so as not to necessitate man to sinne if he will watch and strive against it: and why may not God put his creature upon terms of striving to please him, and difficult terms, especially upon proposeall of a great reward and no other punishment but such as might be materially inflicted *ex vi domini*, viz., eternal death in a proper sense? therefore quere if two might be made defectible, whether two millions might not? And then suppose more occasions and tempters, would it not be probable y^t y^e much greater part would not only have done amisse, but so much amisse as to deserve positive punishment, or at least some of the most extravagant men? And I am inclineable to thinke it is no other wise now; I am farre from thinkeinge of every little sinne, as some speake; (what good master punisheth his servant so?) or y^t every sinne w^{ch} is materially as great as y^t first sinne of Adam is also of like influence. The apostle, Rom. v. 13, plainly admits y^t men before y^e law did sinne, but denies y^e like influence; see also ver. 16, of y^t one sinne.

5. How came so many of y^e angels to fall if they had not some considerable degree of inclination w^{ch} they took not one from the other; and so suddainely as Placæus intimates and most believe! Plac. Sub. Arg. 21, ἀλογος, p. 243.

6. In your way y^e embryo but as bigge as a beane, yea y^e very seed should have in it a quality properly sinneful, and so must be raised againe and come to judgement, as you say infants must, for there is no other way of propagation but that.

7. I argue from those words, Matt. xix. 14, "For of such is the kingdom of heaven:" how *of such*, if before they are able to act at all they have nothing but a habit properly and morally vitious, disposing y^m to sinne as a habit of drunkennesse disposeth a drunkard to be drunke, and w^{ch} no man can have and be regenerate, the habits of virtue and vice being *avortata*. Experience proves as much as I graunt, and it is not my part to prove more, but yours who affirme it, w^{ch} you endeavour to doe, but I thinke your arguments are fairly answered, as followeth to y^r first argument.

1st Arg. p. 20. I answer that all infants have sinned quasily or reputatively, and that Adam's sinne was imputed in the improper sense to all his children as relatives. I suppose you and I agree about this, but the difference is about y^e (*macula*) corruption of nature w^{ch} some call *peccatum originale originatum*, viz. whether this be sinne in a proper sense. To

2nd and 3rd Arg. I answer in like manner; they are condemned by virtue of God's decree for their reputative guilt, and accordingly punished, i. e. in an improper sense dealt with as sinneful Adam himselfe was, for their relative guilt w^{ch} y^e angels having not y^e like relation could not be.

[To be concluded in the next Number.]

Manchester,

September 1, 1824.

SIR,

IN a note to the Preface of Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the able translator says, "that he has passed over the doctrinal parts of the work generally without remark, but does not mean to be supposed to agree with the opinions of the author." I could have wished that he had in his notes given us a few more remarks of this nature than he has done; as the few notes of this kind which occur, appear to me very excellent. Thus on Vol. II. p. 90, where M. Strauss translates Psalm li. 6, "Behold, thou delightest in the truth in secret things, teach me, therefore, thine hidden wisdom," Mr. Kenrick observes, "Such is the turn which the author gives to the words, which in our version are rendered, 'Behold, thou desirest truth in the

inward parts; and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.' The whole connexion is unfavourable to this interpretation, for David is evidently praying for moral purity. 'Truth in the reins' is probably sincerity in virtue; and wisdom, in the book of Proverbs, is often used in the same sense." On the opinions of the Jewish Rabbis concerning the Messiah, Mr. Kenrick has given a Latin note, a translation of which is, I think, deserving of a place in the Repository. "Those who contend that the Messiah is called Jehovah, in the writings of the Rabbis, quote Echa, on Lam. i. 16, 'What is the name of the King Messiah?' R. Abba f. Cohana says, Jehovah is his name, according to Jer. xxiii. 6, 'Jehovah our righteousness' (where, however, by this symbolical name the Israelites are designated, and in Jer. xxxiii. 15, the same name is given to Jerusalem). What says R. Levi? It is good for the city to have the same name with its king, and for the king to have the same name with his God; according to Ezekiel xlvi. 35, 'And the name of the city from that day shall be, Jehovah is there.' Even the just, who enjoy the favour of God, are called by the name of God, Bava Bathra. 'There are three that are called by the name of God himself, namely, the just.' Isa. xlii. 7: 'Bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth, every one that is called by my name.' The Messiah, Jer. xxiii. 6, and Jerusalem, Ezek. xlvi. 35. But in what sense the Messiah is called Jehovah righteousness, in the writings of the Rabbis, we are informed by R. Albo: 'The Scripture calls the name of the Messiah, Jehovah our righteousness, because he is the Mediator of God, through whom we shall receive righteousness from God.' And Kimchi, 'The Israelites call the Messiah by this name, Jehovah our righteousness, because in his times the righteousness of God shall be firm and stable for us, and shall never depart.'" I wish Mr. Kenrick had given his readers a note on Vol. II. p. 117, where M. Strauss says, "How often does Jehovah declare, that he has no pleasure in sacrifices and burnt-offerings, i. e. when they are not presented with a reference to the Messiah! Taken in this con-

nexion, they have a reconciling virtue." This kind of assertion is very usual among the advocates for the doctrine of Satisfaction. But it is totally unscriptural; and when connected, as in this passage, with a mangled quotation of half a sentence of scripture, torn from its connexion, and with its meaning thus disguised, it can hardly be considered as less than a perversion of scripture. If David, when he wrote Psalm li., had these ideas, how came he not to express them? But the fact is, that, when he had said in the 16th verse, "For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt-offering," he proceeds in the 17th, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, - O God, thou wilt not despise." Thus we see, that instead of saying, like M. Strauss, that his sacrifices would have a reconciling virtue, if presented with a reference to the Messiah; David places all his hope in the free mercy of God, who would not despise a contrite heart. This seems to me clearly to prove, that he had never heard or thought of such a doctrine as that of Satisfaction. Isa. i. proves the same with respect to that prophet, for, after very strongly expressing the vanity of sacrifices, vers. 10—15, instead of saying, as the believers in the doctrine of Satisfaction do, that sacrifices have a reconciling virtue, if presented with a reference to the Messiah, Isaiah says, vers. 16—18, "Wash ye, make ye clean; cease to do evil; learn to do well. Come, now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Here the forgiveness of their sins is not made to depend upon the anticipated sacrifice of the Messiah, but on the free mercy of Jehovah, who would pardon them, if they ceased from doing evil and learned to do well. These passages of scripture seem to me to take away all foundation for the doctrine of Satisfaction.

I am not quite convinced by Mr. Kenrick's reasoning, Vol. II. p. 369, "No ancient authority supports the Samaritan reading of Gerizim for Ebal, Deut. xxvii. 4, Josh. viii. 30. Had the Jews corrupted the reading

out of hatred to the Samaritan worship, they would have made Gerizim the Mount of Cursing, Deut. xxvii. 12." A circumstance which appears to me to favour the Samaritan reading is, that Mount Ebal was in Samaria, as well as Mount Gerizim; and, therefore, if the Jewish reading of Deut. xxvii. 4 had been the original, it would surely have led the Samaritans to build their temple upon Mount Ebal. Before the building of their temple, it was indifferent to them which mountain it was upon, except so far as they were guided by this passage; but after the Samaritans had built their temple, there was a temptation for the Jews to alter the passage, if it were originally, as it now stands in the Samaritan copy.

T. C. HOLLAND.

Bloxham,

July 26, 1824.

SIR,

I HAVE a few things to say to you on the following passage, Rom. viii. 9: "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This passage of scripture is supposed to assert that every real Christian possesses the virtuous and pious temper of Jesus Christ. But I shall endeavour to prove that it refers to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit of God.

I. The Apostle had spoken of the Christian temper just before; see vers. 4—9, where he asserts that the Christians of Rome were not in the flesh, but in the spirit; not carnally minded but spiritually minded. And, then,

II. He proceeds to prove that they were partakers of it. He, in effect, says that it was so, "If so be that the spirit of God dwell in you," ver. 9; that is, if they were possessed of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. Now, it has been observed that, "In the time of the gospel dispensation, those, in general, who embraced Christianity were invested with some miraculous gifts." When the penitent Jews, on the day of Pentecost, asked the apostles what they should do, Peter replied, "Repent, and be baptized, &c., for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off," (the Gentiles,) "as many as the Lord our God shall call."

Acts ii. 37—39. Accordingly, when some persons at Samaria were converted to the Christian faith, the apostles at Jerusalem sent Peter and John to them, who baptized them, and afterwards laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. Acts viii. 10—17. So when Paul came to Ephesus, finding some disciples there, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And learning that they had not, he laid his hands on them, and the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues. Acts xix. 1—6. In like manner, while Peter was preaching the gospel for the first time at the house of Cornelius, the Holy Ghost fell upon them. Acts xi. 15. The book of Acts and Paul's Epistles abound with such accounts. So common were the miraculous gifts in that age.

III. The miraculous gifts being, in general, imparted to none but sincere Christians, the possession of them proved their piety, and they would have a very powerful, sanctifying influence on their tempers and characters. They were given in part for this purpose. And they had this effect, in a very sensible degree, even on the holy apostles themselves. Recollect, Sir, how timidly and unfaithfully they behaved to their Lord and Master, when he was seized and crucified by his enemies; but with what courage and zeal they maintained his cause after the Spirit descended upon them on the day of Pentecost. Before, they were as fearful as sheep, but after that event they were as bold as lions. To those who imprisoned them, and forbade them to speak any more in the name of Jesus, they said, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Acts iv. 18—20. Archbishop Newcome says, "The Christians at Rome are spoken of as a collective body, and are supposed to be spiritually minded, because they were strongly obliged so to be, having received the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Newcome in loc. And on Titus iii. 8, he says, "By that renovation of mind which the Holy Ghost, usually communicated to converts in those ages, had the strongest tendency

to produce." Yes, and most certainly did help to produce; it would have been strange if they had not. And thereby such are said to be sealed to the day of redemption. Ephes. iv. 30.

IV. Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his. That is to say, as all who are converted to Jesus Christ have the Spirit of God, if you have not the Spirit of God, i. e. the miraculous gifts of the Spirit of God, you do not belong to Christ; you are not Christians. You may, indeed, in your hearts believe in him, but you are not yet baptized into him; or, if you are baptized into him, there is more remains to be done to make you thoroughly initiated Christians—you must receive the miraculous gifts of the Spirit of God. You are not like the disciples at Ephesus, mentioned before, who were neither baptized nor endowed with the Spirit of God. See Acts xix. 1—7.

This sense of this passage is supported by Grotius, the prince of commentators, who says, on the words, *ἐκ εἰς αὐτὸς*, "Nondum plene Christi est. Nam credere et baptizatum esse non sufficit." Such a soldier of Jesus Christ is like a man who is merely enlisted into the army, but has neither received the bounty nor taken the oath of allegiance to his sovereign. He can scarcely be called a soldier yet; and so it was then with the believer in Christ who had not received the miraculous gifts.

And that this is the true sense of these words, may be further argued, as follows:

1. The words that immediately precede them, and those that follow after, do probably both refer to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit.

In ver. 9, the apostle says, "If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you:" and in ver. 10, "If Christ be in you:" and in ver. 11, "But if the spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead, (that is the Spirit of God,) dwell in you." Is it then probable that the apostle would introduce the subject of the Christian temper between two clauses, which relate to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit?

2. If it be said that the language in the two passages is different; that in the first it is called the Spirit of God, but in this the Spirit of Christ,

and, therefore, they must relate, not to the same, but to two different subjects, it may be answered, that the miraculous gifts, which were always called the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, under the Old-Testament dispensation, were sometimes named the Spirit of Christ, after his appearance, because it was imparted through him. See John xiv. 15—17 and 26. "Of his fulness have we received, and grace for grace." John i. 16. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." John xv. 26. So Grotius.—Moreover, the language may be varied to improve the diction.

3. The phrase, "The Spirit of Christ," is never met with in any other place in the Scriptures to express the Christian temper, and, therefore, it most probably has not this signification here.

There are, indeed, some modes of speech a little like it, as where it is said, "Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Rom. viii. 15. And again, Gal. iv. 6: "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Here the Christian temper is probably referred to, but the language is different from that we are now considering the sense of.

On the other hand,

4. There is one passage, if not more, where the phrase, the *Spirit of Christ*, does most certainly not signify the temper of Christ, but the miraculous gifts. We find it in 1 Peter i. 10: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and preached diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: seeking what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."

Here you see that the terms, the *Spirit of Christ*, do doubtless refer to the miraculous gifts, and, therefore, they may have the same signification in Rom. viii. 9.

We also read of the Spirit in Acts xvi. 7, which Griesbach thinks should read the Spirit of Jesus, and which undoubtedly refers to the miraculous

operations of the Spirit, for it is said, "After they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bythia: but the Spirit suffered them not." And in the preceding verse, "That they were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia." And Philipp. i. 19: "The Spirit of Jesus Christ." This also evidently refers not to the temper of Christ, but to the operations of the Spirit on Christians, whether they be common or miraculous.

So that the analogy of scripture makes very much against the commonly-received sense of these words.

5. If it be said, But if no persons belong to Jesus Christ but such as have the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, what a gloomy thought this must raise in the minds of all modern Christians; it may be said in reply, Certain things are true in one age, that are not so in another; and that so it is here. The miraculous gifts of the Spirit were, on many accounts, necessary for the first Christians, which reasons do not exist in our day. We are in very different circumstances to what they were. Ours is a changeable world.

Upon the whole, as there is no manner of necessity for believing that these words refer to the Christian temper, the passage admitting of a different good scriptural sense, and as the same phrase does not signify the Christian temper in any other place in the New Testament, and, above all, as these very words do in another place, in the New Testament, most certainly refer to the miraculous gifts; therefore, it is most reasonable to affix that sense to them here. Difficult and dubious passages of Scripture must be explained by those whose meaning is more plain and certain.

To conclude, if the Christians of later ages had better known and considered how much oftener the miraculous gifts of the Spirit of God are spoken of in the New Testament, than the common moral operations are, they would have better understood this passage, and have been more sparing in the use of the terms, the *Spirit of God*, in their writings and religious services.

It is, indeed, a very serious truth, that if any man have not the virtuous

and pious temper of Jesus Christ that he is none of his; but this passage, probably, was not designed to assert it.

JOSEPH JEVANS.

Islington,

October 2, 1824.

SIR,

IN the year 1795 I published my *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*, which being well received, was soon followed by similar works. Of this circumstance I make no complaint; every individual has a right to print what he conceives might prove beneficial to his fellow-creatures. But the fact is, these authors stole from my little volume the information I had collected together, without acknowledgment, most *honestly* refraining to steal from my *Reflections on Candour and Charity*! At length appeared, in three volumes, *The Religious World Displayed*, by the Rev. Robert Adam, A. M.,—a Clergyman of the Church of England. His work was, on the whole, fair and impartial, drawing largely from my *Sketch*, which was duly acknowledged, though entire paragraphs from my *Remarks* were transcribed as his own composition. This I deemed trivial, and made no expostulation on the subject. The Rev. Robert Adam has recently abridged his larger work into a six-shilling volume, the same size and price with my *Sketch*, omitting the paragraphs he had clandestinely stolen, and retaining the information without acknowledgment.

This I merely state as a matter of fact, having not the least apprehension that this *Abridgment* will prove injurious to my *Sketch of the Denominations*, the sale of near one hundred thousand copies having borne irrefragable testimony to its accuracy and impartiality; whilst the disposal of not much less than ten thousand copies of its *Sequel*; or, *Golden Century*, including the biographies of one hundred divines, has contributed to aid the divine cause of truth and charity.

Thus far respecting my own works. I proceed to shew you how far this *Abridgment* is entitled to a favourable reception from the public.

The Rev. Robert Adam, in his Preface, thus remarks:—"In a work of

this nature the author's duty is not to detail his own sentiments, but to state, as fairly and impartially as he is able, the avowed sentiments and opinions of others; and so strictly have I adhered to my duty, in this respect at least, that different Reviewers appear to have come to conclusions quite opposite as to my private sentiments on some of the points that are most warmly controverted by modern theologians; for

'While moderation is all my glory,
Tories call me Whig, and Whigs a
Tory!'

"But so far is this circumstance from shewing, in my opinion, an objection to the work, it strongly recommends it, and I cannot help viewing it with satisfaction, as a compliment indirectly paid to the author's *impartiality*, or an implied acknowledgment of his possessing one essential requisite in every historian of religious opinions."

These are high pretensions; for the justness of the writer's claim to them, in this present edition of his work, take the following specimens. His account of Arians is thus concluded:

"Socinianism having swallowed up nearly the whole of this body, it will probably ere long receive the mutilated remains; and it will be well if they rest satisfied with rational Christianity, or with any thing short of renouncing the Christian name."

Under the article denominated, *Socinian Unitarians*, occurs this passage:—"The members of this sect have never been known as the planters of the gospel; they have never strived to preach it where Christ was not named. The fact is, they have no gospel to preach; their scheme possesses no glad tidings to communicate; no Saviour to offer; no relief to propose to the guilty, labouring under the pressure of their sins; their system being little more than Paganism, in some degree polished, refined and modernized! The *Monthly Magazine* is a great organ of Unitarianism, but *The Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature*, which Dr. Magee calls 'the general storehouse of Unitarian Deism,' has long been the general and accredited vehicle of Unitarian sentiments. In

addition to these, recourse has lately been had to a *New Translation of the New Testament*, in which a meaning has been attached to many passages which, according to former translations, did not belong to them, and notes are added, in which Unitarian views of our Lord's person are illustrated and defended. Such are the means which have been adopted with a view to support this dangerous system, which, as Bishop Heber has well observed, 'leans to the utmost verge of Christianity;' and which has been in so many instances a stepping-stone to simple Deism."

His account of the *General Baptists* is thus concluded:—"To so low a condition is this class (Anti-trinitarian) now brought, that four of their congregations in London were lately united into one, and it is not likely to exist for any length of time. In the mean time, their General Assembly, consisting of from fifteen to twenty ministers, is still held annually at Worship Street, on the Tuesday in the Whitsun-week, when one of the members preaches, and the affairs of their Society are taken into consideration; and we are told that they have thus met for upwards of a century. Among their eminent men may be ranked the names of Gale, Foot, Noble, Bulkley and Wiche, all of them, as far as I know, sound Trinitarians; and Foster, Burroughs and Robinson, whose orthodoxy does not appear in their works."

Now, Mr. Editor, where is the claim of the Rev. Robert Adam to candour and impartiality? Here are palpable falsehoods and the grossest misrepresentations! The *Arians* may be diminishing, but it is a vile insinuation that they are degenerating into infidelity. The *Socinian Unitarians* (as he is pleased to term them) have a gospel to preach, and good-tidings to proclaim in announcing forgiveness of sin upon repentance, and the resurrection of the dead, when those who persevere in well-doing, shall be graciously rewarded by the possession of eternal life! It is most unfair to refer to Horsley and Magee, two sworn enemies of rational Christianity, for the virulent abuse of which the former was raised to an English Bishopric, and the latter elevated to an Irish Archbishopric. "Verily, they have

their reward!" With respect to the *Anti-trinitarian General Baptists*, their crime is, being few in number, forgetting that Christ had only at first twelve apostles, and their followers met in an upper room, though they were afterwards destined to multiply and enlarge their borders over all the earth! Neither Gale, nor Foot, nor Noble, nor Bulkley, nor Wiche, were Trinitarians; indeed, the latter, who was the friend of Lardner, was a zealous advocate for the simple humanity of Christ. Foster, Burroughs and Robinson, likewise were not Trinitarians; in vain, then, do you look for orthodoxy in their works. But what is infinitely better, they were enlightened, conscientious men, asserting, through "good report and through evil report," the doctrines of the New Testament, and exemplifying the spirit of their great Master, whose declaration was, "My kingdom is not of this world." Indeed, Jesus Christ when on earth had a little flock, but it was to this little flock he gave the kingdom—not to the blind and erring multitude. Catholics are more numerous than Protestants, and Christians are exceeded by Mahometans and Pagans, throughout the three quarters of the habitable globe. Neither numbers nor success can be pronounced legitimate tests of truth. We read in the Revelation that two witnesses only, and they were clad in sackcloth, prophesied in a very degenerate state of the church against the enormous errors and the iniquitous practices of an apostate world.

As to the *Improved Version of the Testament*, whatever be its imperfections, it has been ably defended by the Rev. Thomas Belsham; and were there no new renderings deemed necessary, it would have been a work of supererogation. With respect to the charge of *Deism*, brought by Dr. Magee against *The Monthly Repository*, it carries on the face of it falsehood; but its Editor is fully competent to repel the imputation, should he not think proper to treat it with silent contempt.

The Rev. R. Adam exults in the extinction of Warrington, Exeter and Hackney Academies, bearing "for a time imposing names, but all annihilated, and the only one which they now have is that which was removed

from Manchester to York." For his consolation I inform him that York College is in a flourishing state, the students being numerous, the supporters of it most respectable, and the tutors men of talents, erudition and piety. I have not the honour of knowing either of them personally; but the Reply of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved to Archdeacon Wrangham, (bishops and archdeacons, says the Edinburgh Review, being the natural enemies of Unitarianism,) may be pronounced a lasting monument of his zeal and integrity. I am not here advocating the truth of any of the *isms* that have embroiled and cursed mankind.

In a similar spirit of chivalrous triumph Mr. Adam announces the demolition of Unitarianism by Magee in Ireland and by Wardlaw in Scotland. But unfortunately there exist at this time respectable congregations of Unitarians, meeting in newly-erected chapels—the one at Glasgow, under the Rev. Benjamin Mardon—the other at Edinburgh, under the Rev. John Squier—the two principal cities of North Britain. Of Ireland I know nothing, except that from a letter lately addressed to me by an intelligent and liberal divine of the North of Ireland, thanking me for my *Sketch*, I learn that there are half a million of Presbyterians in that country imbibing the spirit and treading in the steps of Abernethy, Leland and Duchal; therefore friends of free inquiry and of Christian charity. They must abhor all uncharitableness and bigotry.

I shall now advert to the Rev. R. Adam's account of the Protestant Dissenters, especially his sketch of the Presbyterians, on which the "pitiless pelting of the storm" falls with distinguished severity. His words are these:—"The glory is now departed from their Israel, for whilst most others around them are making rapid advances towards a re-exhibition of the best days of Christianity—the fervour of their zeal is abated—their divinity has become cold blooded, and an orthodox Presbyterian among the writers of the present day, it will be difficult to find."

This account is taken from *Bogue and Bennett's History of the Dissenters*, of no authority whatever, and which even their own party has aban-

doned to oblivion. And yet upon the bare assertion of this disreputable work, is the body of Presbyterians, the most respectable of all the classes of Protestant Dissenters, for talents and learning, for benevolence and piety, consigned over to execration. In compliment to the truly venerable Dr. Abraham Rees, he is, in a note attached to this calumnious paragraph, stated to be at the head of this ruined and desolated sect in London; thus reminding me of the awful spirit which poets feign as presiding over Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain, frowning in solitary grandeur on the barren heaths and dreary prospect of the adjacent country!

But the attention of the reader must be turned to the practical use which the Rev. R. Adam makes of the diversity of sentiment, prevailing to so sad an extent among Protestant Dissenters. He immediately subjoins,—"Here I cannot avoid observing the great use of articles of religion for preserving a church in its original purity. The English Presbyterians originally held the doctrine of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* as firmly as their brethren of the now Established Church of Scotland; they were formerly as steadfast believers in the doctrine of the Trinity as they are, or as the members of the Church of England, and there were among them men who did honour to the Christian name!" But is it not a notorious fact that, concerning the meaning of these said articles of religion, the clergy themselves are not agreed, and at this time are filing off in two distinct bodies from each other, under the respective appellations of the Arminian and of the Evangelical Clergy? So far from uniting, it is a bone of contention, the brand of discord, and subversive of that unanimity which has always been sought after, but never can be obtained. The imposition of articles of faith is the source of numberless perjuries. The creed of an established church is not the child of conviction nor the offspring of free inquiry. It is the result of necessity, generating the silence and tranquillity of the tomb!

The late Rev. Andrew Fuller edited *An Account of the Sects and Denominations of Christians*, a few years ago,

by Hannah Adams, of Boston—in itself a respectable work. But the Editor's additions were disgraced by the infusion of party spirit, and especially by an Essay, prefixed, on Truth; the object of which was to recommend his own opinions, and proscribe those of a contrary description. I am glad to find that, on the republication of the English edition in America, Mrs. Adams omitted this said *Essay on Truth*, a proof of her good sense and impartiality. This I learned from the recent Editor, Mr. Thomas Williams, who has acted honourably in conveying the curious fact to the public this side the water. He would have derived ~~and~~ more credit by omitting the Essay altogether, not distrusting the sacred energies of truth, which is best elicited by a full and fair investigation of the New Testament. It is remarkable, that the celebrated Joseph Berrington, a Catholic priest, in the year 1811, wrote me a letter, thanking me for the *Sketch*, under the persuasion that the endless diversity of opinion there delineated, shewed the incontrovertible necessity of an Infallible Head,—the only legitimate Parent of uniformity in matters of religion. Now, mark, here is a triumvirate of divines: Andrew Fuller, a Protestant Dissenter, with his *Essay on Truth*; Robert Adam, a minister of the Church of England, with his *Articles of Faith*; and Joseph Berrington, a Catholic priest, with his *Infallible Head*, attempting to fetter free inquiry, and put down rational Christianity. Thus it is that the Bible Society is reproached by a learned bishop for giving away the Sacred Scriptures without note or comment, whereas the Bible should be given away only with a Common Prayer, which, neutralizing the contents of Holy Writ, produces a finished Churchman, at once the admiration, the blessing, the perfection of mankind!

That the Rev. R. Adam should have thus committed himself is matter of astonishment. Indeed, after his high pretensions to moderation, he does add, "I have had particularly in my eye the instruction and benefit of the young of both sexes, who are less able to judge of themselves. I have ventured to make occasional remarks on some doctrines and opinions which

it was my duty to state." Be it so; but then relinquish all claim to having observed the strictest impartiality, so that even Reviewers cannot discover the author's sentiments, when his antipathy against all Anti-trinitarians rages with an uncontrollable fury. With such inveterate prejudices, how can the writer express a hope that his work "will be found of a beneficial tendency—that it may be safely introduced into all schools and seminaries of useful learning—and, in particular, prove a suitable companion for the students of our universities"? This indicates either an awful instance of self-deception, or must be pronounced as an imposition on the world. As author of the *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*, I shall conclude with an extract, with which the Rev. R. Adam closes his Preface most inconsistently, taken from a learned and amiable divine, Dr. George Cook:—"I have endeavoured to keep my mind as far as possible from all bias. How far I have succeeded it is not for me to determine; but I trust that I have been uniformly guided by the love of truth, by the desire of more closely uniting those who are already partially united as to the most interesting subjects that can fix our attention; and by the earnest desire not to make a single observation which could imply any doubt upon this point; that in most communities of Christians, and under all diversities of ecclesiastical polity, there are many who may be venerated as lights of the world, who are sincerely devoted to the blessed cause of pure religion, and who, although now separated and unknown to each other, shall, through that Master whom they delight to serve, meet in heaven."

JOHN EVANS.

A Suggestion to Unitarians.

"Fas est ab hoste doceri."

Norwich,

SIR,

September 13, 1824.

A SMALL work, entitled "A Concise View of the Leading Doctrines connected with the Socinian Controversy," containing the most specious arguments for "Orthodoxy" from Dwight and Wardlaw, having re-

cently issued from the press, and being strongly recommended in "Evangelical" Magazines and Reviews, I beg leave to suggest the propriety—not to say the necessity—of its being met by a concise view of the leading doctrines of Unitarianism.

As the Trinitarian publication advocates the deity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the atonement of Jesus Christ,—the answer should contain lucid proofs of the Divine Unity, the subordination of the Messiah, the impersonality of the Holy Spirit, and salvation of the free grace of God. Perhaps selections from Yates's *Vindication of Unitarianism*, and *Sequel*, Marsom's *Impersonality of the Holy Ghost*, Wright's *Anti-Satisfactionist*, and Madge's *Sermon on the Atonement*, would furnish a very cogent reply; but as Belsham's *Summary View of Unitarianism* in the second part of his *Calm Inquiry*, and Fox's *Sermons on the Voice of Revelation and on Popular Objections to Unitarianism* are invaluable works on those subjects, a CONSOLIDATION of the whole, *condensed* into a small *Compendium*, is highly desirable. The Editor of the orthodox publication above-mentioned seems in his preface to deny the name of Christian to Unitarians: should this pitiful malignity be thought to deserve an answer, more than is necessary to rebut the slander may be found in Aspland's excellent sermon on "The Unitarian Christian's Appeal to his Fellow-Christians on the Christian Name."

If persons in general could be induced to hear both sides of theological questions, and to read the answers to Trinitarian calumnies, Unitarianism would be much more prevalent. Educated as I was in "the straitest sect" of orthodoxy, I became a Unitarian from a careful perusal of the controversy between Wardlaw and Yates; though strongly prejudiced against "Socinianism" when I began to study the subject. The arguments and proofs in Yates' powerful *Vindication of Unitarianism*, and in his incomparable *Sequel*, made me an *unwilling* convert to the force of truth; and upon some gentlemen whom I well know, and one friend whom I highly esteem, a similar effect was produced by the reading of those works. Much

as I have suffered in a pecuniary way from becoming a Unitarian, and acutely as I have felt the reproach of relatives and friends, (and none but those who have been placed in similar circumstances can tell how keenly reproach comes from such characters,) I cannot repine while consoled by the *mens sibi conscia recti*.

It is well known that the *whole* of the controversy between Wardlaw and Yates, or between Horsley and Priestley, is not generally read by "the orthodox;" and that they confine themselves to Wardlaw and Horsley, instead of attending to the equitable aphorism "*audi alteram partem*." I think, however, that a *Compendium* of Unitarian doctrines, with the arguments and proofs by which they are supported, about the size and price of the "*Concise View*," would meet with their attention: it would certainly be read by hundreds who will not wade through volumes. And as strenuous efforts are making to spread the summary of Trinitarian doctrines, I trust it will be seen that Unitarians can display equal zeal in the cause of truth and righteousness.

Cordially wishing the spread of "pure and undefiled religion before God, even the Father," I remain, &c.

ΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟΣ.

P. S. Would it not be worth while for the London Unitarian Society to print the *text* of Griesbach's Greek Testament? The two volumes are too dear for some who would be purchasers, and many prefer the *simple text* "without note or comment." It would be then about the size and price of a school Greek Testament, might be used also as a school-book, and would undoubtedly have a great sale as such, besides being very acceptable to all who wish to have the pure original. Such a publication would be serviceable to Unitarianism, as it would effectually expose the disingenuous artifice of those Editors of the Greek Testament who have inserted Griesbach's name in their title page, without regarding his text, and would more generally spread that edition of the Greek text, which real scholars of all parties now admit to be the most correct.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository. By an American.

For March, 1824.

Conclusion of Professor Chenevière's Defence. This indeed is a most spirited and able article. I do not know that there is too much warmth in it, considering all the circumstances.—The contrast between Christianity and Methodism would make a fine tract for distribution. I do not recollect any composition where the peculiar merits of the two sides of the question are more happily summed up. It were to be wished that the Professor had subsequently gone into some detail as to the relative strength and prospects of parties in Geneva.

Mr. Cogan in Reply to Mr. Sturch, appears to me in most points to have conducted a successful defence. I had not read this reply when I made my remarks on Mr. Sturch's strictures, and am happy to perceive some traces of coincidence between Mr. C.'s thoughts and my own.

The suggestions of *B.* in the next article I should presume are quite unanswerable.

Mr. Flower's recommendations are worthy of being adopted, and the principle of them extended to every erroneous translation or difficult passage which occurs in the public reading of the Scriptures.

Vindex receives all my sympathy, not only in point of deep respect and regard for a lady of Mrs. Hughes's character, but also in the firmness with which he has remonstrated against her mistaken zeal.

Cornish Correspondence. I had run through this portion of it when I made my remarks on the last Number, and have not much more to say. I would ask Mr. Towasend whether he would not confidently rely on the atonement made by the sacrifice of a human being, if God had appointed such a method of remitting the sins of mankind. Allowing that the Scripture contains the doctrine of an Atonement by Jesus Christ, yet there is no fact in existence more indisputable, than that the Scriptures give not the least shadow of intimation that the Being who makes the atonement must be necessarily and for that purpose divine. The truth is, that the

two doctrines of the divinity of Christ and of the Atonement have been unwarrantably used to bolster up each other. Even if they were both true, there is not, according to the Scripture, the slightest connexion between them. Those who believe in both, may fancy, indeed, such a connexion, and devise some reasons for it, such as the infinite nature of sin requiring an infinite atonement, and the like. But in vain do I search the New Testament for a justification of these devices.

Summary of the Controversy by I. W. Very fair for a Unitarian; who has a right to present the subject in the most favourable light he can for his own side, without perverting or misrepresenting the facts. Certainly, a good deal can be picked out of Mr. Le Grice's correspondence, which will not tell well for that zealous and apparently conscientious gentleman. But a correspondent of the Christian Observer might undoubtedly present a very different view of the matter. Fortunately, the cause of truth is not identified with that of any local squabble.

Brevis on the Athanasian Creed. The object of this satire is undoubtedly fair game. But we Unitarians have gained nothing, I think, by mockery. We should not like to see it turned upon ourselves. The strain of irony in this piece is not, to my taste, of a high order.

Mr. Wallace in Reply to Mr. Frend has exhibited much learned and ingenious criticism. Still retaining, however, the opinions I expressed in my remarks on Mr. Frend's communication, it seems to me superfluous for Mr. Wallace so anxiously to defend our Saviour from the charge of superstition in adopting phraseology, of which the origin happened to be superstitious.

Friendly Correspondence continued. This correspondence is indeed a curiosity. How original! What a mighty play between two strong minds, each of which, for different purposes, is striving to keep off from the downright point at issue, but are at last led by an irresistible attraction to rush together in the contest. Never were the workings of character more conspicuously displayed.

Mr. Adam on renouncing Trinita-

rianism. His Letter to the Missionary Committee is indeed an honour to human nature, and his defence of himself against Mr. Ivimey complete.

Dr. Evans's communication, like all his others, is instructive, agreeable, and to the point. I have a fancy that his conversation is in the same style.

Mr. Baker on the Old Congregation at Bolton. Would it not, thirty years since, have been rather a startling phenomenon, that a clergyman should come forward and claim it as an honour to his church and congregation, to be considered as Unitarian; to be jealous of sustaining any other character, and anxiously to rectify before the world an accidental mistake on the subject? I regard this little note to the Editor, therefore, with considerable emotion, as an encouraging symptom of the actual posture of our cause.

Review of the Life of Toller. A very agreeable narrative.

Obituary. Judge Toulmin. Every sentence deeply interesting. Let me make one correction of a slight error, which I presume is only typographical. Secretary of the Treasurer should read Secretary of the Treasury.

Monthly Repository for April 1824.

Unitarian Fund Register. No. IV. Mr. Martin's Journal is very interesting. The Unitarian Missionary-spirit is not yet started in America. It would have one advantage here more than in England. The odium excited against it would have no *political* tinge whatever. All religious feelings in this country are *purely* religious. Power looks not down with the frown of scorn, rage and jealousy upon the conscientious efforts of any zealous sectarians. While enjoying therefore this happy exemption, I cannot but still more admire the undaunted firmness and fortitude with which the English Unitarians bear up against the complicated opposition they are obliged to endure. True, I have been informed by some of their own body, that a little bitterness of political discontent often mingles with the higher motives that animate them. But this is no more than should be expected. Their very relation to the state is a peculiarly political one. The government has made it so; and

to suppose them free from re-action against the influences which oppress them, would be to suppose them not men. Yet there is every reason to believe, as far as I can learn, that their general motives as a sect are as pure as those of any other denomination, not excepting even the predominant party who happen (to use a favourite quaint expression of the historian Neale) "to be in the saddle."

The Nonconformist. No. XXVIII. I recognize in this writer a power of selection and compression of facts, joined to a sweet, easy, clear style, scarcely surpassed by the pen of Goldsmith. I always feel *larger of soul*, after reading a paper of the Nonconformist.

Lord Byron. There is something affecting in the circumstance that the hopes of better things here expressed for Lord Byron's Christianity, must have been uttered about the time when he was bidding adieu to the vanities and criticisms of this life, and entering on the discipline of another.

A Friend to Sunday-Schools has pointed out an inconsistency in the conduct of Unitarians to which they must plead guilty. Indeed, the general fact that predestinarian religionists are more indefatigable in the use of means, than those Christians who almost contend for the *omnipotence* of means, is a mysterious problem, which I cannot yet resolve.

Vindication of Mr. Bellamy, &c. This writer has given some interesting representations, but he is rather misty in the results at which he attempts to arrive.

On an Improved Version of the Scriptures. A pretty little piece of theological chit-chat.

Dr. Evans on Mr. Irving. Mr. Irving seems to have agitated no little interest in the bosom of Dr. Evans. Mr. Irving will make no permanent effect in the religious world, and for this plain reason, that he understands nothing of human nature.

Mr. Le Grice on his Correspondence, &c. I really think that the few trifling errors which Mr. Le Grice has pointed out in the Summary of I. W. has affected neither the character of that contributor, nor the merits of the general question at issue. Mr. Le Grice would be very unreasonable

to complain of being anywise injured by the misstatements which he has here enumerated. He has not even attempted to explain or apologize for some of the most exceptionable things found against him by I. W.

On mitigating Negro-Slavery. I must differ from Androphilos with regard to the wisdom of selecting one of the West-Indian Islands to try an experiment upon. But in this most difficult and perplexing question, let both sides entertain the most perfect candour and charity for each other.

Mr. Cogan on Natural Religion. I am siding with Mr. Cogan in this controversy.

Mr. Sturch in reply to Mr. Cogan. As far as I can deliberately and candidly judge, Mr. Sturch is certainly labouring against very superior odds.

Mr. Wallace on Isaiah ix. 6, 7, finds in the writer of these lines a thorough convert to his leading principles and aim, and an admirer of many of his criticisms.

Z. N. on his two first Chapters, &c. A sturdy champion.

An Old Subscriber might have attempted to be more explicit in shewing how the fact to which he alludes results from the supposed custom among the ancient Jews.

Review of the Life of Toller. A beautiful specimen of dignified reproof.

East-India Tracts. Highly curious. Dr. Tytler seems to be a Unitarian in disguise.

Review of Wellbeloved's Sermon. A happy abstract of a noble argument.

Intelligence. And have the Dissenters any hope of "success" in their petitions to that British Parliament? Let them not be deceived. And yet the prospect would appear a little bright, when next glancing at *The Debate on the Unitarians' Marriage Bill in the House of Lords.* I am particularly struck and gratified by observing throughout this debate so many compliments paid to Unitarians, and their persons and opinions treated in so gentle and liberal a way. Every noble lord has a kind word to say to them, with the exception of the Chancellor. There is something exceedingly gloomy and iron-like in his treatment of them. He seems to be a man whose heart is covered over with the dust of

courts, and encased in the stiff forms of law. All his notions of religion, conscience and morality, appear to be borrowed from the statute-book. And then, how fierce, how inhuman, how tinged with the blackest prejudice, is that question which he hurled with a vain triumph at Lord Harrowby—"Would you permit a Mahometan to set up his religious scruples?" Merciful heaven! Would his Lordship have uttered such a sentiment, if he were now in the morning of life, and on the point of setting out to pass a few years of classical leisure and research in Turkey?—Lord Calthorpe's speech, in comparison with the others, has made the deepest impression and excited the longest train of reflections in my mind. I think, if I were an Englishman, I would write a good round letter to Lord Calthorpe, and send it for insertion in the Monthly Repository, beginning it perhaps after the following fashion, and subscribing it An English Unitarian:—

MY LORD,

In the name of the denomination to which I belong, I hasten to thank you for the favourable colours in which you have been pleased to delineate our character before the highest tribunal of the country. Your testimony to "the remarkable observance of the decencies and proprieties of life by the sect of Unitarian Dissenters, and their regular and exemplary discharge of the duties of their situations," shall not fall without its proper effect on our hearts. It shall awaken our gratitude for the noble liberality that dictated it, stimulate us to new exertions to deserve it, console us under the storm of unjustifiable odium and outrageous prejudices with which we are elsewhere assailed, and induce us once more to review with candour and deliberation, the arguments for the great doctrine on which we are so unfortunate as to differ from your Lordship—I mean the doctrine of the Unity of God. We also acknowledge feeling that particular sensation which persons of every religious denomination feel under the influence of flattery, when you "recognize the excellence of those virtues which," you say, "have placed us in the foremost ranks of the friends

of humanity and truth." But let me venture to ask you, my Lord, if you have examined the doctrines of Unitarians with the same candour and attention that you have bestowed upon their lives? It is, I assure you, impossible for me to believe so, when I hear you making the strange assertion, that "man, amidst the sorrows and cares of this life, required something more consoling, more heart-sustaining, than their cold and precise doctrines." What, my Lord! More consoling and heart-sustaining than that *God is love*; that he took so peculiar an interest in the welfare of our race as to send his beloved Son for our salvation; and that life and immortality are brought to light by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead? Is there "coldness" in these views, my Lord? Would to God that you were altogether in our predicament, save and except our civil disabilities. We are persuaded it is owing to the influence of association that you thus stigmatize our doctrines. They are not connected in your mind with warm, elegant, cushioned churches, a magnificent and comfortable establishment, your own youthful recollections, and perchance your past religious experience, which in general has no intrinsic dependence on metaphysical dogmas. Strip the subject of these accidental associations, and we are persuaded that so far from feeling our religious views cold, you will perceive in them a warmth and efficaciousness not to be despised, although they do not imply the crucifixion of the Deity and the eternity of hell-torments. And do you mention it as an *objection* to our doctrines that they are *precise*? &c. &c. &c.

—
Geneva,

SIR, September 17, 1824.

YOU have inserted in your Magazine the injurious language Mr. P. Smith has thought proper to address to me. I expected civility from those gentlemen; but, in unmasking sectaries, one should expect their wrath. The insults I have received do not alter the facts advanced by me, the truth of which I warrant. If Mr. Smith had had sound reasons to offer, he would have written differently.—We see that he was embarrassed by

a statement of facts. He would have been pleased if I had been declamatory, as he accuses me of being: in that case an answer, however superficial, would have been easier to write. He seems to have taken my reasons for insults, for he sends me insults in reply, instead of reasons.

Mr. Haldane has given us his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans under another form; it is not read more than formerly: the dose is still too strong. He has fallen into such gross errors, that I might treat him with the epithets which he and his friends have so liberally bestowed on me; but I think that we should keep some terms even with antagonists, and that persons may have been mistaken without having intended or wished to deceive. Mr. Haldane, who came to Geneva, and who professes to have heard me preach, perpetually confounds me with another clergyman, whose actions he attributes to me: he asserts that it was I who, in the pulpit, replied to M. Cellerier after he had attacked those who do not admit the consubstantiality of the word:—this is a mistake, I was not the person. He attributes to me a sermon on *the Mysteries*, in which he says I have contradicted the gospel: it is not I who preached the discourse on that subject to which he alludes. He states that I preached on Cornelius, holding out the example of a man who was accepted of God without the knowledge of the gospel: it was another pastor who at that time composed a discourse on Cornelius, of the drift of which I am ignorant. He asserts that I have confessed that the Pastors of Geneva have fallen very low in public estimation, and he proceeds from that point as an acknowledged fact, &c. &c. If I were as ill-bred as those gentlemen, I should take delight in justly retorting the abusive expressions which they use respecting me, whether through the medium of the press, or of private letters, as has been done, with unparalleled rudeness, by Mr. Huber-Strutt, whose unpardonable conduct towards the Reverend Bock I have made known; but I relinquish to them the practice of incivility.

I now confirm all that I have written on the Theological Controversies originated at Geneva by the men I

have pointed out; whether they are distinguished by the appellation of Methodists, Calvinists, or evangelical persons, is of little consequence—I adhere to the facts. They preach doctrine opposed to the letter and the spirit of the gospel; they have sown division in many families; they have caused distraction; they have revived incredulity; they tend by their doctrines to throw ridicule on Christianity, the gift of God; and, to say all in one word, the *Etoile* and the *Drapeau Blanc* are become their auxiliaries: we may thus judge how far they are friends to Reformation. We will resist them unceasingly, and we will multiply our efforts to preserve our churches from that malady, that leprosy which has attacked the preachers whom I have pointed out to the vigilance of Christians. Let them overwhelm me with insults, let them paint me under false colours, still I will bless God that the enemies of the Reformation cannot make out a better story against its defenders.

CHENEVIÈRE, *Profr.*

Mr. Bakewell on the State of Morals,
&c., in Geneva.

LETTER II.

WHEN I wrote the Observations on the State of Morals, &c., in Geneva, (see Mon. Repos. pp. 513—519,) I had not read the third letter of Dr. J. Pye Smith, in which that writer, emboldened by the silence of those he was attacking, indulges a violence of abuse against them, altogether unrestrained by candour or courtesy. What was before stated interrogatively, is now positively asserted in direct defiance of facts, and the most respectable testimony in their favour. As I believe the main object of Dr. Smith's accusations of the Genevese is, through them, to attack the English Unitarians, by representing their doctrines to be productive of gross immorality and impiety, and as he returns to the charge in a more direct manner than before, I shall principally confine myself in the present letter to an examination of its truth, this being a subject of far higher importance than the merits or demerits of M. Cæsar Malan. I had recently an opportunity of witnessing the effect produced by Dr.

Smith's letters, on two of the most respectable English residents in Geneva, whom I had been acquainted with there, and who left that city only the present summer. I was so fortunate as to meet with them in a short excursion I made to France in September. I read to each, separately, part of Dr. Smith's charges. The first said, "I do not agree with the Genevese in matters of faith, but during the four years I have resided in their territory with my family, I have acquired a full conviction that there is less vice and immorality in Geneva than in most other cities, and I know no place where young people would be so safe from temptation or the influence of bad examples." The other gentleman said, "I am astonished that any respectable person should make such a charge against the Genevese. Geneva is unquestionably the most moral city in Europe; this I do not attribute to their religion so much as to their domestic education, and to the circumstance of every one being personally known to his fellow-citizens; but to whatever cause we attribute it, the fact is unquestionable." This is the evidence of two gentlemen of high consideration in their own country, who are members of the English Church, and have resided several years at Geneva, and I never heard a respectable Englishman who had lived there some time, speak to the contrary.

The character which M. Simond gives of the Genevese is still more favourable than what I have described in my Travels. According to this traveller, Geneva is eminently distinguished for the superior excellence of its morals. There is scarcely an instance, he says, of the character of a Genevese lady being even suspected: the number of *enfants trouvés* (foundlings) received at the hospital, (which comprises the greater proportion of those born in the whole state,) does not exceed thirty annually, whilst at Lyons, with a population scarcely more than double the territory of Geneva, it exceeds twelve hundred.* To which I may add, that high gaming, luxury and intemperance, the vices

* The population of the whole territory, since the annexation of part of Savoy, is about forty-four thousand, that

of other cities, are scarcely known in Geneva. The lower classes are sober, industrious, and regular in their deportment, the number of criminals is small, and those are chiefly foreigners. If there be any vice or immorality in Geneva, and what city in the world was ever entirely free? I believe it will be found, that by far the greatest portion occurs among those inhabitants who are not members of the Genevese Church. M. Simond cites an instance in proof of the powerful influence of religion over the minds of the Genevese people: from what period does he take this instance? From the golden age of orthodoxy? No—but fifty years after they had left the faith of Calvin, and, according to Dr. Smith, were given up to deadly indifference and infidelity. Such is the account of Geneva, by persons who have resided a considerable time there, and who have no interest in misrepresenting facts. Dr. Smith, looking at Geneva from his easy chair at Homerton, tells us “that it is a well-known fact that among the Genevese, indifference and contempt of all serious religion, bold infidelity, and open flagitiousness, have been fearfully increasing, in proportion to the departure from the ancient doctrines: infidelity has spread tremendously and rapidly, and dissolute manners kept pace with it.” To this accusation I might, were I not restrained by courtesy, reply in Dr. Smith’s own words: it would scarcely be possible to select any forms of expression more appropriate: “*It is truly painful to have undertaken the examination of such a writer as this Professor of Divinity, who can thus bid defiance to conscience and truth; the utmost stretch of charitable construction will not enable me in this and other instances to acquit him of wilful and deliberate falsehood.*” No, I will not ‘mete’ to Dr. Smith ‘his own measure,’ I will not believe that he was aware when he wrote the above character of the Genevese, that he was penning a most false accusation. In the fervour of composition and his eagerness to attack the reputation of the Genevese heretics, he forgot every

of the city of Geneva forming about one-half. The Catholic population is about one-third. I do not know the number of Lutherans in the Canton.

other consideration, even the respect due from himself to his own character. The bees in their attacks, yield their own lives with their stings, *animas in vulnere ponunt*, but the point of Dr. Smith’s weapon being untempered by truth, he has ejected his virus against the Genevese without hurting any one but himself.

The extreme bitterness of Dr. Smith’s enmity to M. Chenevière and the Genevese Pastors, which is so apparent in his letters, manifestly indisposes him to see the truth: he seems to feel that in leaving the doctrines of Calvin, they have become the “enemies of the Lord;” and, therefore, like David, he may “hate them with perfect hatred;” but such feelings reflect no honour on a Christian divine. The word anger occurs nearly two hundred times in the Old Testament, but it is found only three times in the New; and in the books of the latter, the word hatred occurs only once.*

Even the style of M. Chenevière and “the cloudiness of his reasoning” are made the subject of complaint; but I believe it is the clearness and not the cloudiness of his statements, which is so particularly offensive to Dr. Smith. The style, seen through the medium of a translation, will not suffer by a comparison with Dr. Smith’s; it is true we do not find in M. C.’s letters such phrases as “*ruthless confederates,*” “*wilful and deliberate falsehood,*” “*M. Malan, that good man,*” “*that excellent man,*” nor any of those figures of rhetoric, which remind us of the mixture of coarse abuse and cant, that adorn the pages of the theologians of the Oliverian age. By far the most important assertion in Dr. Smith’s third letter respecting Geneva is the following:—After boldly describing the *gross immorality, open flagitiousness*, and dissolute manners in that city, he says, “The substitute for despised Calvinism has proved its insufficiency to stem the tide of moral corruption in Geneva.” This, if words have any meaning, implies that Geneva is more morally corrupt than other cities and communities, which have retained the sweet preserving influences of Calvinism: if this be

* See Cruden’s Concordance.

not so, all the lamentations and reproaches which Dr. Smith bestows upon the Genevese, amount to mere drivelling, and had better have been reserved for his friends nearer home. Now let us see how the case really stands, divested of all extraneous considerations. Geneva and Edinburgh were the sister queens of the Church of Calvin; they were the southern and the northern Zions of Calvinism; they had the same creed, the same church government, the watch-towers of their faith burned with the same fierce and troubled flame, and shed a lugubrious glare over the Protestant world. For nearly a century, the leading men in each city, fully proved by their deeds, that they had drunk deeply of the cruel, contentious spirit of Calvin, and but very sparingly of the spirit of Christ, which produces the peaceable fruits of righteousness. But it is not with the ancient history of these cities that we are now concerned. In my last letter I have described what Geneva was in the days of its orthodoxy. Fortunately, we have at present nothing to do with the uncertainty of history, for Dr. Smith has told us that the depravity of Geneva has been progressively increasing; we will therefore take it in its present state, when its depravity is at the highest pitch it has ever been, for at no period was its departure from the faith of Calvin more decided and avowed. I say we will take it in its present state, and compare it with Edinburgh, which being the head seat of government of the Kirk of Scotland, has remained under the sweet, preserving influences of Calvinism. Geneva, as we have before stated, has publicly departed from that faith a century since: but it is only as cities, that the moral comparison can be made, for the members of the Genevese Church being nearly all resident citizens, can only be fairly compared with citizens in other states. Now Edinburgh is, according to Dr. Smith's position, at the present day greatly, very greatly superior to Geneva in moral virtue and piety, for it has retained its faith, and therefore has resisted the tide of moral corruption which has overwhelmed Geneva. Such (I say) is or ought to be, according to Dr. Smith's position, the present relative, moral,

and religious conditions of the two cities, the one sunk in depravity and infidelity, the other splendid with faith and piety—a holy community of saints. But will any impartial person, who knows the two cities, assert that such is the case? Will any one believe the assertion, were it made, that there is less vice, less intemperance, less profligacy, less infidelity, in orthodox Edinburgh, than in heretical Geneva? Where the latter city has sent one infidel into the world, it might not be exaggeration to say, orthodox Edinburgh has sent a thousand fold the proportion: so much for the preserving influences of Calvinism. Geneva, it may be shewn, has escaped, if not entirely, at least in a great measure, the contagion of infidelity, and it has escaped by the very cause to which Dr. Smith ascribes its fall, namely, by having a rational religion, which requires no one to believe what is contrary to scripture and reason. The distinction between contrary to reason and above reason, is well understood both by the pastors and people.

Perhaps Dr. Smith may say, the comparison between Edinburgh and Geneva is not a fair one, as the tide of moral corruption has set in more strongly to the North than the South; but what is the value of the divine, preserving influence of Calvinism, if it be only useful in stopping little tides, and has no power to resist great ones? If so, it is most efficacious where its aid is least wanted. The evident tendency of Dr. Smith's letter is to declare that Calvinism has stopped the tide of moral corruption wherever this faith prevails; but I might direct the inquiry nearer home, and ask Dr. Smith, whether the Calvinists in London and its vicinity are less desirous of wealth and honours, or less worldly-minded or selfish than their neighbours? The accusation of open flagitiousness and dissolute manners, would be as true if applied to the English Calvinists, as to the members of the Genevese Church; but it would be a foul libel if applied to either generally. I am willing to admit that English Calvinists may fairly rank for moral virtue with the members of other Dissenting societies, but I cannot allow that they are superior, nor do I believe their own ministers

flatter them with the persuasion that they are so. I once entered a Calvinistic meeting at Heckmondwicke, in Yorkshire, when the preacher was labouring to convince the congregation that, though they thought themselves the Lord's people, and talked much about religion, they had not more real righteousness than their neighbours: "You have much of religion upon your lips, much religion in your heads, but of what use is it to you? It never sinks lower. I may truly say of many of you who now hear me, that if your heads were cut off, you would have no religion left at all; it has never sunk so low as the heart." This was coarse but cutting eloquence, and its meaning was very intelligible. Perhaps Dr. Smith may say it proves nothing, as the preacher was well assured that the experiment would not be made, for though the heads of his hearers were stuffed with a very indifferent sort of religion, in other respects they served them well enough for the common purposes of life, and, therefore, they had no disposition to try the truth of the assertion. It would be extremely painful and invidious to draw the comparison in detail between the English Calvinists and the members of the Genevese Church, particularly were we, like Dr. Smith, to look only on the dark side of the scene. Nothing would be more easy, but, at the same time, more disgraceful, than to select instances of depravity from a large community, and then to charge the whole body with the crimes of the few. Now, unless Dr. Smith have done this with the Genevese, I am at a loss to understand what he means by the terms and epithets he applies, in the serious charges of *profaneness, blasphemy, gross immorality, impiety, irreligion, open flagitiousness and dissolute manners*. To support these charges, he must, with the aid of his friends, rake long and deeply in the mire of Geneva; but let him not rake up the crimes of the Trinitarian part of the population, (now very large,) and throw them at the Genevese Church. Even with all his raking, I defy him to make good his charge, for Geneva "is unquestionably the most moral city in Europe." Instances of individual depravity will not serve his purpose, unless he can prove that Geneva generally is

more morally corrupt than those large cities where Calvinism is the prevailing religion—Edinburgh, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, &c. Dr. Smith, when pressed for his proofs, will perhaps say, that by blasphemy, impiety and irreligion, he meant only Arianism and Socinianism; and by open flagitiousness and dissolute manners, he meant only to say that the Genevese passed their Sundays like other Protestants and Catholics on the Continent. But unless he can make a better defence than this, he must retire from the field with the word calumny emblazoned on his banner. He may be armed with much scholastic learning and logical subtlety, and he will doubtless despise the opposition of a layman, but learning and subtlety will not avail against plain facts. Goliath of Gath came forth to taunt and defy the worshipers of the one God, and "*his armour was brass*," but he fell before a simple shepherd boy.

We have examined "the sins of commission;" "the sins of omission," which he charges against the Genevese, remain to be noticed: the principal one shews Dr. Smith's ignorance of the subject, or the obliquity of his moral vision, when those he deems heretics are concerned. After accusing the Genevese pastors and people of remaining in a state of deadly indifference and infidelity for three generations, he proceeds tauntingly to ask, "What have these children of improvement ever done for the religious benefit of the dark and miserable districts which lie at their gates; for Savoy, Piedmont and le Vallois, the last of which, though an independent Republic, is scarcely above the level of Spain and Portugal?"

Now, every one acquainted with the government of Savoy, of Piedmont, and of the Vallois, must know that the Genevese could not interfere with the religion of either of these countries, without endangering their own safety as a state. Though the Vallois is an independent Republic, its religion is so exclusively Catholic, that I believe no Protestant would be suffered to reside in the country, at least he dare not have public worship in his own house. The Catholic religion is guaranteed to the people by the Helvetic league, and any attempt to interfere with it would nearly

amount to a declaration of war. In no part of Europe have the Jesuits and priests more influence, and the Genevese have neither the power nor the right to oppose them. The same may be said of Savoy: individuals not connected with the government may, at their own risque, secretly distribute books, but they would be imprisoned, or sent away under a guard if discovered, as happened to M. Cæsar Malan.

Now, during the lapse of the three generations,* when the Genevese are accused of neglecting to convert the Savoyards and Vallasiens, which it was impossible for them to do,—what were the sons of orthodoxy, the regular Scotch and English Calvinists, doing to improve the Irish Catholics, subjects of the same government as themselves, but incalculably more ignorant and degraded than the Catholics of Savoy or the Vallois? What were these sons of orthodoxy doing for the conversion of the many thousand gypsies in their own land, a race below the Hottentots in religious knowledge? What were they doing for the conversion of the half savages in the more unfrequented parts of England and Wales? I believe the answer will be—absolutely nothing. For until the Methodists, whom the regular sons of Calvin at first affected to despise, I say until the Methodists had, much to their credit, begun to preach to the greatly-neglected part of our population in Cornwall and elsewhere, it does not appear that the Kirk of Scotland, or the regular Calvinistic Dissenters in England, ever bestowed a thought upon the subject. The latter, at least, were content with dreaming over their own righteousness or with talking of the Lord, whilst they were dosing over their pipes: their congregations, in the mean time, were diminishing in almost every part of England;† of which the number

of empty, or nearly empty, Calvinistic Meeting-houses that were to be seen in various country places, thirty or forty years since, is a proof. Now, if this be true, and I think Dr. Smith will not deny it, he surely would have done well to have directed his accusations of deadly indifference, &c., to persons nearer home.

It is a remark more to be commended for its truth than its novelty, as it has been made by every moralist since the days of Æsop, “Men have a magnifying vision when looking at the faults of others, but are very shortsighted when looking at their own or those of their own party.” Now, however common or obvious this remark may be, it seems entirely to have escaped the *perspicacity* of Dr. Smith, if he will allow me to use his own expression; nor does the Doctor appear to be acquainted with the well-known passage, “First cast the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see more clearly to take out the mote that is in thy brother’s eye.” This ignorance is easily accounted for; the passage occurs in a sermon of Christ’s, which is entirely moral, and as Dr. Smith has expressed his utter contempt for moral sermons, he could scarcely think the simple practical advice here given, was deserving the attention of a divine so deeply read in all the mysteries of the Calvinistic faith.

If Dr. J. Pye Smith be really desirous of knowing what the Genevese have done for the Savoyards and Vallasiens, if he will lay aside his anger and prejudice for a while, and let us have a little sweet communing together, I will tell him, and I will tell him truly.

They have not, it is true, gone forth to preach in the towns or villages of Savoy; neither did their ancestors, the orthodox Genevese, do so, or if they did, it was always with the sword in one hand, and the Bible in the other. In conjunction with the Bernese, they sometimes entered Savoy to plunder and despoil the inhabitants, to deface their churches, and afterwards to preach to them the gospel of peace; but the religion of Calvin, though watered with blood, did not flourish either in Savoy or the Vallois. Fifty-eight years after the conquest and conversion of Chablais (a province

* From 1700 to the French Revolution.

† I speak of what I observed in the country when I was young. And here I may state, that I have no prejudices against the Calvinists: it is Dr. S. who has called forth the comparison between them and the Genevese, which I had no desire to make. My own ancestors were for many generations zealous and consistent Calvinists.

of Savoy) by the Bernese, it was reconquered by the Duke Charles Emanuel, and all the Protestants who would not renounce their faith, were permitted to dispose of their property and retire. This was in the year 1594. Ever since that time the exercise of the Protestant religion has been prohibited, and all attempts to introduce it were regarded as acts of hostility, which the Genevese were desirous of avoiding, as they were in no condition to resist. I have stated in my Travels the secrecy which it was thought necessary to observe, even in burying a Protestant without any religious ceremony, who died at Duing, on the Lake of Auncey, when I was there in 1821. The Genevese cannot be blamed for omitting what they had no power to do; but though they could neither preach Calvinism nor Unitarianism, something better remained to be done, and this they have meritoriously performed. They have shewn by their example how real Christians ought to act, even to those who regard them as heretics and enemies. Many of the Genevese have country-houses in Savoy, and are, I well know, actively engaged in relieving the great distress of the poor Savoyards, for which they are looked upon with much suspicion and enmity by some of the Catholic priests: the latter have been known to refuse the consolations of religion to those poor Catholics who receive aid from heretics.

On many occasions the Genevese have assisted the Savoyards very extensively in times of scarcity, and have saved numbers of families from starving; particularly in the year 1816; their charitable and well-timed aid gave great offence to the Sardinian Government. I believe that no opportunity of doing good to the Savoyards, has been neglected by the Genevese, though it has ever been the policy of the Sardinian Government to excite an hostile feeling towards them, among the Savoyards of all classes.

I have decribed elsewhere, at some length, the warm interest which the Genevese took in the sufferings of the inhabitants of Monetier, a mountain village in Savoy, destroyed by fire, when I was at Geneva; it was truly interesting to observe the unostentatious but judicious exertions made for their relief. I may add, the Sa-

voyard domestics in Geneva must derive much moral benefit from the good examples generally shewn them by the Genevese, and from the kindness and care which they see is taken of their health and morals.

The Savoyards may truly say to the Genevese, "We were naked and ye clothed us, we were hungry and ye fed us, we were sick and ye visited us." And what is the language of Christ, "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these, ye did it unto me"? a praise far outweighing the merit of preaching the doctrines of Predestination and Final Perseverance to an honest, simple-hearted people, who are more in want of food and raiment than of unintelligible mysteries.

When a small part of Savoy, comprising, with the town of Carrouge, nearly the worst part of the Savoyard population, was annexed to the territory of Geneva, the Genevese Government and Pastors lost little time in providing means for the instruction and religious improvement of the Savoyards. A large Protestant church was nearly finished in Carrouge before I left Geneva. I shall now leave the present state of morals in Geneva, but propose on a future occasion to advert to other parts of Dr. Smith's letters relating to that city. I have no prejudices in favour of the Genevese which can indispose me to see their defects, for I have stated them fairly and with some severity. Almost every nation has defects from peculiar circumstances.

ROBERT BAKEWELL.

SIR, *October 11, 1824.*

I SHOULD be sorry that the questions of your correspondent Εξεταστης (p. 539) should remain unanswered, as they seem to originate in a candid spirit of inquiry, equally creditable to himself and interesting to others; and I therefore offer a few remarks which appear to myself to obviate the difficulties he states; though I am so conscious of my own unfitness to enter into deep arguments of this nature, that I make it my particular request that if any communication should reach you on this subject in which the questions are more ably discussed, you will not suffer this letter to appear.

I will just observe by the way, that though Unitarians believe that the reason stated by Εξετασης for their rejection of the doctrine of Atonement is quite sufficient to justify that rejection, yet many other objections remain: there is much besides in this doctrine both irreconcilable to their reason and revolting to their feelings. It is not necessary to point out these objections, as we have now only to do with the questions proposed by your correspondent.

1st. Your correspondent asks, "Is it not as inconsistent with the justice and equity of God to permit that an innocent person should suffer for the *benefit* of a criminal, as that he should suffer in his *stead*?" Or, if the injustice in the former case be not as *great* (in degree) as in the latter, is it not *equally* an injustice?"

That suffering should exist at all, under the government of a perfectly benevolent Being, is certainly a difficulty: but we see that he has ordained it to be thus from the fall to the present time, and there is every reason to believe that the partial dominion of evil will not soon have an end. But we have experience enough of the overflowing kindness of our Heavenly Father to be assured that the infliction of evil is intended to fulfil some benevolent purpose: and this assurance is much strengthened by the conviction daily impressed upon us, of the good arising out of suffering, both to the sufferers themselves and to others. The consequences of suffering are never confined to its object alone; and that others should derive benefit from it, is in the usual course of God's providence. Punishment sustained by the guilty, serves as a warning to others. The sorrows of the righteous exalt the hopes, confirm the faith, awaken the conscience, or alarm the fears, of those around him. In many ways besides do the sufferings of one secure benefits to others; but in no single instance do we find that an innocent being has borne the whole punishment of a guilty one. In the usual infliction of evil, we can see, in some measure, how good may arise from it; but in this case we cannot even discern how any purpose is to be answered by an appointment apparently so unjust. What connexion is there between the suffering of an innocent

person, and the absolution of a criminal? How is the latter a consequence of the former? There is difficulty in both suppositions: of two difficulties, let us choose the least. If we chose the greatest, the other would remain: let us then reject it altogether. The case seems to me to stand thus: The world was (for what reasons, it concerns not us to inquire) in a state of sin and misery at the time of our Saviour's appearance upon earth: it was to be redeemed from this state by his mission and death. Now which appears the most consistent with what we know of the usual course of the Divine government—that a perfectly innocent person should die to appease the wrath of the very Being who made us to sin, and him to suffer; should take upon himself the punishment due to the sins of all the criminals of that and of all succeeding times, provided that they should have faith in him (the connexion between such a sacrifice and such absolution not being discernible by us);—or that this innocent person should die (being made perfect by his sufferings) to set the strongest seal and give the most perfect ratification to the new covenant by which God declared his intention of redeeming his people? This ratification of the new covenant is to establish and confirm such faith in men as shall enable them "to work out their own salvation," instead of having it wrought out for them by the suffering of an innocent person, at the easy price of faith in him.

2d. "Does not the moral government of the world present similar instances of seeming injustice,—nay, even of *vicarious sufferings*?" No, I cannot allow that it does: not even the high authority which your correspondent quotes can make me think so. When some persons help others out of the consequences of their vices and follies, they do not bear the punishment instead of the vicious and foolish, though they may participate in their difficulties. We may by "the law of nature" "afford them assistance" "with very great pains and labour and sufferings to ourselves;" we may "by personal suffering" "contribute to the relief of others;" but we do not sustain their sorrows *for* them; they do not lay the burden

of their griefs on our shoulders; they are not easy and happy while we are suffering for them. The instance adduced by your correspondent of "children being punished (and that before they have done either good or evil) for the sins of their parents," is still less to the point; for do the pains of the children in any degree lessen those of their parents? Do they not rather increase them? I see nothing in either of these cases, or in any which my experience of human suffering furnishes me with, in the slightest degree resembling vicarious punishment.

3d. "Is not the whole animal creation, though innocent of moral guilt, made subject to pain and death?" Yes—and, as was before said, for reasons inscrutable to us. But why we should, because one appointment does not coincide with our ideas of justice, believe in another which appears infinitely more unjust, and even absurd, I own I cannot see. Much might be said in explication of the reasons why the animal creation are made subject to pain and death; but this is not to our purpose. I would only just ask, what connexion their suffering has with vicarious punishment, or what resemblance to it; or whether any one can conceive that portion of evil to be inflicted for any purposes of redemption?

Your correspondent takes it for granted that the Orthodox doctrine of Atonement is "certainly the most agreeable to the language of scripture." Unitarians in general do not think so. They believe that if the mind were divested of all prejudice, nothing could appear farther from the language, as well as the tenor of scripture, than this mysterious doctrine, and would easily account for the use of all the language which now appears to the Orthodox to inculcate it, by remembering the custom of the writers of the Epistles to allude to Jewish ceremonies and institutions; among others, to the very striking institution of Jewish sacrifices. In the Gospels there is nothing whatever which can be twisted to the meaning affixed to certain passages of the Epistles.

This doctrine must be acknowledged to be attended with difficulties very harassing to the mind anxious in the search of truth; and as I know

by experience the uneasiness of doubt on subjects of such importance, I most heartily wish that Εἰρεσμός may soon repose in the perfect conviction that his Saviour died, not to appease wrath, or to remove from the guilty the punishment denounced against their sins by Him who cannot lie, but to induce "the sinner to forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts," by setting the seal of his blood to that new and better covenant which invites the transgressor back to the "Lord who will have mercy on him, to the God who will abundantly pardon."

H. M.

SIR,

IN your number for February last, (pp. 88, &c.) containing Correspondence on a Charge of Heresy against Sir Rose Price, Bart., who has adopted Unitarian doctrines, and is said to have asserted that he knows it to be a fact, "that, with respect to the Trinity, the king is of the same sentiments as himself," you have subjoined part of a letter signed O, which appeared in the Bath and Cheltenham Gazette, of the 27th of January, the writer of which says, "he can easily conceive it to be true, and that a large proportion of his Majesty's subjects are believers in the Unity of the Godhead." Little did the writer of that letter expect to be so fully borne out in his conjecture, or that it would be allowed in so extensive a degree as is since admitted by the venerable Archdeacon of Bath, in his late Charge to the Clergy of the Deanery of Bedminster. The Archdeacon there says, speaking of Unitarians, that the name is "a false distinction," and, repeating the expression, assigns as a reason for it, that "the Unity of the Godhead" is holden by himself and his reverend brethren as a vital principle in their faith.

With due deference to Dr. Moysey, I beg leave to say, that I do not know a fitter name than Unitarians for those persons who believe there is only One God, or a more proper distinction between them and those who profess the doctrine of a Trinity.

Contemplating this subject in connexion with royalty, an argument occurs, which may have had some weight in the royal mind, and which

I do not remember to have seen brought forward in that portion of Unitarian discussion which has fallen under my notice.

With all the reverence and seriousness which the subject demands, if it may be allowed to compare things spiritual with temporal, may it not be urged that the title to sovereignty and empire belongs as exclusively to Jehovah, as to an emperor or king, who appoints his prime minister, as God sent his beloved Son, to publish his will and commands, which commands are to be rendered effective by the operation of an executive power, vested in the several subordinate degrees of civil officers in one case, and in prophets, apostles and numerous ministers of the Divine government in the other, acting under sacred authority, and the influence of a loyal (or holy) spirit, essential to the faithful discharge of their respective commissions? If peculiar royal or imperial honours are exclusively due to an earthly monarch, surely, the distinguishing and supreme honours of Deity should be paid exclusively to the only true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the original Source from whom proceed all emanations of the holy spirit which he has been pleased to impart in various degrees to Moses and his other messengers and faithful servants, but which, we are told, "was not given by measure" to his beloved Son. This explains several passages of scripture where Christ assimilates and identifies himself with his heavenly Father, from whom, he expressly says, he received all the powers and authority he possessed, and without whom he could of himself do nothing.

O.

"I and my Father are one." John x. 30.

"— that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him." John x. 38.

"Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father

that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John xiv. 9—11.

See also John xiv. 20; John v. 17, 19, 23, 26, 27.

John xvii. 21; John xii. 44, 45, 49, 50; Matt. xxviii. 18, &c.

A Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.

(Continued from p. 461.)

N to I.

16th October.

IF you understand that, when it is admitted that all things will be restored to their proper place, that proper place must needs be heaven, although your people may think so, *we* believe ourselves to be commanded by the word of God to think otherwise, although we have fully considered your quotations.

None of us know the evil of sin, or of the human heart *in its best state*, by the fall. Blindness, misconception, hardness, enmity, unsearchable deceitfulness, &c. These are all scripture terms, and applied to all men by nature. We shall see these things clearly in the future state.

It is afflicting to find in others a strong professed sense of the love of God, unaccompanied by proportionably deep conviction of sin, contrition and compunction; but much more so to feel it in ourselves. May the Lord save us from ourselves!

N.

I to N.

DEAR N.

17th October.

It is now high time to inquire what is the precise object of a correspondence which did not originate with me, and which has involved a controversy on doctrinal points, which I had not the least wish to agitate, from a persuasion that it was not likely to be conducted in that spirit of candour, humility and child-like simplicity that can alone lead to the knowledge of truth.

We are too apt to place ourselves in the situation of the Ruler of the Universe, to identify our own notions with his word, and to regard opposition to those notions as opposition to

the Majesty of heaven. When this is the case, it is utterly vain to expect that any impression can be made upon a mind thus clad in the armour of infallibility, and, therefore, to attempt it is worse than useless. This leaven of uncharitableness unhappily works very widely in the Christian world, and is by no means confined to the Church of Rome, or indeed to any sect.

There are, it must be admitted, convictions so deep as to be incapable of being removed or weakened by human reasonings. We all have some such convictions. You have yours—I have mine. But no personal experience, whatever it may teach *as to our own state* and condition, can be urged upon another as conclusive in respect to the decrees of the Almighty with regard to the final state of mankind. These decrees can only be ascertained by a comparison of spiritual things with spiritual, by reading, marking, learning, and inwardly digesting the revealed will of God, in a temper of mind corresponding with that of the Bereans, who were commended by a holy apostle, endowed with the gift of working miracles, for not receiving on trust, the truths which he declared to them. If such men as he disclaimed the right of lording it over the minds and consciences of God's heritage, let not such pigmies as ourselves presume to claim it.

But to recur to the inquiry pointed at in the commencement of this paper, I ask, what is your precise object? Is it to convince me of error in matters of faith, or is it to awaken me to the importance of personal holiness? If it be the former, you must proceed very differently from what you have hitherto done, in order to gain your end. If it be the latter, I hope your endeavours will not be altogether thrown away. But I must say that, however unfashionable it may have become, I like very much to use the very words of scripture in treating of spiritual things; and if you will take the trouble to select such texts as contain the truths which you wish to inculcate, they will have more force with me than any other form in which they could be expressed; and if you will permit me to take the same liberty with you, it will

answer the good purpose of exercising our minds in researches which may render us more familiar with the Sacred Writings. I also engage to keep clear of the particular doctrine which we have been discussing, and to confine myself to experimental religion.

If, however, which I deem most probable, you are indisposed to receive even the words of scripture through a medium so contaminated as you consider mine to be, I shall take what you give me, and keep my meditations to myself.

I do not see why personal intercourse should be suspended;* for although I cannot submit my faith to the dictation of any human authority, I am far indeed from taking offence at the endeavours of any man to correct or instruct me; and I am willing to suppose that this, and not a prurient disposition to intermeddle, is the motive by which you are actuated.

We have lately adverted chiefly to points in regard to which our opinions differ: it may, perhaps, be useful to ascertain wherein we coincide.

I firmly believe in the truth of the Sacred Scriptures.

I esteem Jesus Christ as the unspeakable gift of God, and hold myself bound to submit to his authority.

I believe that true happiness in this life and eternal felicity result from a knowledge of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent, who died for our sins, and was raised from the dead for our justification.

I admit that without holiness of heart no man can see God; that out of the heart are the issues of life; that true faith worketh by love, and purifies the heart; that the heart is deceitful above all things; and that few, very few of us, are acquainted with the actual state of our own hearts.

I regard sin to be the procuring cause of all the evil and misery which have hitherto existed or may hereafter exist, although I cannot say that it is either infinite or unconquerable by divine power. It reaches not to God, who alone is infinite; if it did, it never could be blotted out.

I admit that the Scriptures do attribute to the fall of Adam (the first

* This appears to refer to a request to that effect made by the other party.

federal head of our race) the evils which we inherit; but I hold that the Scriptures also disclose an ample remedy, whose operation began at the fall. Under the Mosaic dispensation God was made known as forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin. I am far, however, from considering the evil (whatever be its precise nature and extent) incident upon the fall of our first parent, as in the slightest degree affecting the justice and goodness of the Divine government. It has pleased him, for the wisest and best of purposes, to order things so as that the condition of men shall be influenced by the acts of their parents. If he has declared that he will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third or fourth generation of them that hate him; he has also declared that he will shew mercy unto thousands of generations of them that love him and keep his commandments; and if all die in Adam, all shall be made alive in Christ. But I am sliding into controversy, which it is now my wish to avoid.

In the last place, I would state it as my opinion that although the religion of Jesus Christ has, ever since its promulgation, been accompanied with a display of power to turn men from darkness to light, and has proved the support and consolation of true believers both in life and in the hour of death; there is, nevertheless, great reason to lament that this power is so feebly experienced by the majority of professors of every denomination. For my own part I do not deem myself worthy of ranking with those who are renewed in the image of Christ; but I nevertheless know enough of his spirit to be enabled to judge of its fruits, and not to be imposed upon by any attempt to confound them with those tempers and dispositions which are sometimes manifested by persons who wish us to suppose that they are holier than the rest of mankind. We may deceive ourselves, but God will not be mocked, nor allow evil to be called good, without exposing the fraud.

I conclude with again requesting you to consider calmly and deliberately what precise object you have in view, and to shape your future communications accordingly: in so doing you will save yourself the trouble of perusing, and me the labour of writing, much that is wide of the mark.

Yours affectionately,

I.

N.

1. The nations of the world who have not heard the gospel will be dealt with according to the knowledge they have. It is not argued that those who would have received the gospel, if offered to them, will be condemned for not having heard it. On the contrary, it is argued that these persons are saved in Christ, and will know it hereafter.

2. The gospel is, or is not, "worthy of all acceptance." The primitive Christians received it joyfully, and suffered death in its most terrifying forms in defence of it.

3. If it is worthy of acceptance it merits to be received without postponement. Where is the difference between postponement and rejection? The Scripture does not appear to make any.

I.

1. True. See the 2nd of Romans; also Peter's sermon to Cornelius.

2. Most undoubtedly it is worthy of *all* acceptance, because it is glad tidings of great joy to *all* people.

The love of Christ is the most powerful motive of human action. Many waters cannot quench love—neither can the floods drown it. I glory in the fact here alluded to. But is our love sufficiently strong to bear such a test? God knows.

3. Those who truly apprehend the excellency of the gospel will not wish to postpone their acceptance of it.

N.

4. If it is not worthy of acceptation, what need is there of postponement? Why is it not rejected immediately?

5. Shall a man say, If I thought the consequences of hardening my heart and not obediently hearing the voice of God *to-day*, would be irremediable hereafter, I would immediately close with the offer made me: but presuming that the offer will be repeated in a future state, I will defer the acceptance of it, and go on sinning against God till then? Do not men practically say so? Does the rich man in the gospel appear to expect such offers? Why is the gulph that intervenes between him and paradise said to be impassable? How can it be said of any man who is to be blessed to all eternity—It would have been good for him if he had never been born? *

6. If the gospel is duly received, future punishment is done away with altogether.

7. A certain person, who is now on a very long voyage, manifested astonishment on being told that his tutor professed to believe that the finally impenitent would suffer in hell-fire for a succession of ages, although not interminably. None of the brothers appear to have any definite belief in future punishment, and some of them avowedly disbelieve it altogether.

8. As respects awakening, according to the scripture account of things, not one of us is a thousandth part awakened, nor convinced of his sinful state by nature, nor the spirituality of the law of God. Jer. xvii. 9.

I.

4. There is such a thing as halting between two opinions.

5. Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid! Sin and misery are inseparably united. It is an evil and a bitter thing to sin against God.

Those who *profess* to believe in endless punishments, nevertheless defer repentance. Be assured that doctrine tends to harden the heart. Sin and terror do but harden all the while they work alone; but a sense, &c.

You allude to a parable: Dives addressed Abraham as his father; and Abraham spoke in kind terms to the sufferer.

Whither shall I go from thy presence? If I make my bed in hell, thou art there! God is love; God can pass the gulph, and eventually destroy it. This will be done when he who sitteth on the throne shall create all things new.

6. The saints to enjoy heaven on the condition of witnessing the irremediable misery of their fellow-creatures, must have the heart of flesh replaced by a heart of stone.

7. I profess not to define the duration of future punishment. It is enough for me to know that it will not in any instance endure one moment longer than may be necessary to convince men of the folly of sin, and to prepare them to receive the grace of God. Let us rejoice then in hope of his mercy and goodness. If Paul was misunderstood or misrepresented, no wonder that so weak an instrument as I am should be so.

8. Those who profess to believe in eternal misery, falsify their creed by their daily practice. If they really believed it, there could be no place in their minds for any other thought. If I firmly believed that I stood a chance

* This was a Jewish proverb. Job wished he never had been born. Let us not attempt to place such equivocal phrases as these in opposition to fundamental religious truths. Let us not forget that we are part of a great whole, and that we cannot possibly be perfectly happy so long as a single particle is miserable. There is a constant accession of joy in heaven over every addition to the number of the saved. Every new triumph of grace occasions a shout of joy.

of suffering the pain of burning for ten years only, it would effectually destroy all the comfort of my intermediate life. I could not talk of any thing else. And yet how light and trifling is the conversation of these very men! The fact is, that the goodness of God is continually undermining the mischief of erroneous creeds. And I feel truly thankful to him for having provided this remedy for systems which, if systematically operative, would drive men mad.

9. Love of God to be genuine, must make us feel proportionably the infinite evil and bitterness of sin, in ourselves and those we care for.

9. There is nothing infinite but God; the doctrine of infinite evil is a Heathen doctrine; namely, that of the ancient Persians, adopted by the Manicheans.

The love of God and the love of man are inseparably united, and what God has joined together, let not man put asunder.

N. to I.

19th October, 1823.

As respects your doctrine I see and feel increasing danger. I wish that these points may not be mentioned in conversation. Earnest prayer to God for thorough convictions will succeed better than discussion. You have admitted the doctrine of the unsearchable deceitfulness of the human heart. Your resource and mine, therefore, is in prayer to God.

23rd October.

“A testimony for its *proper* season.” Then it must be improper to bring forward the doctrine prematurely, when it is capable of being abused.

Let the Supreme Judge of the quick and the dead solve these questions.

1st. When the designation of the rejectors of the gospel was made, and the nature and duration of their punishment set forth, were not terms made use of capable of the most extended meaning; as, for instance, the never-ending duration of the blessedness of the righteous, and punishment of the wicked, being expressed in the same terms?

2dly. Was it not intended that sinful man should apprehend interminable displeasure as the consequence of a wilful rejection of the offers of Divine mercy?

3rd. Do the professors of your doctrine *feel* the evil of sin so much as the genuine, deep-taught scripture Calvinists do?

4th. Do not the genuine Calvinists offer the gospel freely to every one that is willing to receive it, and assert that such a one, so willing, will be saved?

5th. Are not all men disposed to overrate the evil of suffering, and to under-rate the evil of sin, through ignorance of the holiness of God's law?

6th. Does not the last verse of Isa. lxvi. afford an answer to your question—“How could I be happy in a state of blessedness, with such a scene of suffering before me?” The import of those words let God determine. Whether it be not this? “Do not disapprove the suffering of the sufferers, but look on the sufferers with abhorrence, because they have sinned against me.” Their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched (however the duration may be interpreted). Is not abhorrence substituted for pity?

7th. Does not this rule apply to the parents who, under Moses or in the time of Zechariah, were commanded to kill their own children in certain cases of transgression?

N.

Tenterden,
October 9, 1824.

SIR,

IF you judge the following narrative to be sufficiently interesting to the Dissenting body at large, and to all liberal-minded Churchmen, be so obliging as to give it a place in your valuable work.

The 29th of August is the day, according to their charter, of electing the mayor of Tenterden, in Kent, and also public office-bearers of that corporation. Mr. Joseph Munn, in consequence of being articled to Mr. Witts, who had been for a considerable period the town-clerk, and afterwards having entered into partnership with him, had for some years virtually filled the office, and this to the entire satisfaction of the corporation; Mr. Witts, from a nervous affection, not being able to apply himself to business. In these circumstances it was at length judged to be necessary to elect another person. Mr. Munn, of consequence, naturally offered himself to the corporation, and had a very fair prospect of success; although, as a Dissenter, he could not conscientiously comply with the provisions of the above Acts. An opposition took place, and the opposing candidate availing himself of the circumstance just stated, and objecting that Mr. Munn as not qualified, and determined not to qualify, was not eligible, this objection proved fatal, nullifying every vote which might be given him. Upon this Mr. Munn declined, and the opposing candidate was of course elected; Mr. Munn receiving the most flattering expressions of respect and approbation from the corporation and all present.

Upon Mr. Munn's return home he received a most pleasing testimony of approval, from his venerable and respected pastor, in a letter, with the presentation of ten guineas for a *gold medal*, to have the following inscriptions:

Tenterden, August 29,
1824.

A Tribute of Respect
To unshaken uprightness, from
The Rev. L. Holden
To Mr. Joseph Munn,
Upon his refusing to prostitute
The Lord's Supper
As a qualification
for a
Civil Office.

On the reverse:

The
Triumph
of
Truth.

Let it be understood that the sole ground of these circumstances being offered to public attention, is to awaken the minds of *Dissenters*, and all liberal members of the Established Church, to a just sense of the disqualifying nature of the above-mentioned Acts, *so unworthy of a land of freedom*.

It is also to be observed, that the very circumstance which recommends a person to any public office or place of trust, even his conscientiousness, is here the cause of his disqualification. Whereas *unprincipled persons*, whether Dissenters or otherwise, and those who *reject all religion, natural or revealed*, will have no scruples of the kind, but will readily comply as *matter of form*, and may thus hold the highest and most important offices of the state. We may confidently assert also, and this without fear of contradiction, that the Dissenters, as a body, have ever proved themselves the true friends of the civil and political constitution of their country.

AMICUS.

SIR,

YOUR Correspondent from Bristol (pp. 201, 202) has, undoubtedly, been a little too indiscriminate in his severe censures of Unitarians, upon the important subject of the education of the poor. Many great and honourable exceptions may certainly be adduced, and which perhaps are not much inferior to the solitary one which he has mentioned. But I am afraid it will be found that another of your correspondents, "Verus," who writes from Sheffield, (pp. 549, 550,) has been at least equally undistinguishing in his vindication of the Unitarians from these charges. The former has asserted, that it is a lamentable fact, that among Unitarian Christians, there are to be found those, and he fears many, who, if not averse, are manifestly indifferent to the teaching of the poor, in other words, to Sunday-Schools. In reply to this, Verus undertakes most positively to deny the correctness of the general statement as to the facts.

This is uneandid; besides that the reasons which he gives for this positive denial are not such as completely to satisfy a reflecting mind. In the first place, *he knows* of no Unitarians, although he has a pretty general acquaintance with them, who are either averse or indifferent to the education of the youthful poor; and *he never heard* of any till he saw the letter from Bristol. I rejoice that this is the case, and I am not for a moment disposed to call in question the truth of his assertion. But his experience does not justify him in contradicting facts brought forward by a person in a remote part of the kingdom, any more than the King of Siam was justified in contradicting the person who informed him of the existence of ice. Each has a right to relate what he has seen and heard; but surely it argues a want of civility, as well as of candour and good sense, thus to attempt to make his own experience invalidate that of others in distant places.

His second reason is equally curious, namely, *he knows not* of any large and populous town, where there are Unitarian places of worship, without Sunday-Schools. This likewise is a matter of his own experience; and I am sure every friend to the best interests of the community will rejoice that such is the case, in the neighbourhood of Sheffield. But had this gentleman seen more of the southern parts of the country, he might, perhaps, have seen cause to have spoken differently on the subject. My residence is something more than thirty miles from the metropolis; and although I cannot, like Verus, boast of a very extensive acquaintance with Unitarians, yet I know of several large and flourishing congregations in very populous places, who have no Sunday-Schools; nor do I think that they have any thing of the kind in view. I say not this to reproach my Unitarian friends, but if possible to stimulate them to the good work. I have had considerable conversation with some of the members of these congregations, and endeavoured all in my power to convince them of the utility and importance of these institutions, and to persuade them in earnest to set about a work which I was convinced would be pro-

ductive of incalculable benefit, as well to themselves, as to the objects of their benevolent exertions. The utility and importance of the work they readily admitted; admitted, alas! in words; but here they stopped. No arguments in my power could induce them to make the least effort towards so desirable an object. If this paragraph should meet their eye, they will know that it is dictated in the spirit of Christian friendship, and by an ardent desire to see Sunday-Schools established wherever the name of Unitarianism is mentioned.

I heartily concur with your correspondent Verus, in disclaiming all foreign support for the trifling expenses incurred by Sunday-Schools, unless, indeed, in cases where the congregation consists entirely of very poor people. But I earnestly wish that my experience coincided with his in the ample assistance obtained from the young persons of the congregation. Here we do indeed differ widely; and perhaps he will scarcely give me credit when I assure him, that in the Sunday-School with which I am connected, the difficulty of obtaining assistance is so overwhelming to the very few individuals who are engaged in it, that we have several times been upon the point of giving it up in despair, and that nothing but a sense of imperative duty and the growing interest we feel in the improvement of the children of our charge, could induce us to proceed under such very discouraging circumstances. Most earnestly do I wish that it were possible to arouse the members of the congregation, and more particularly the young, to engage in this interesting and delightful duty. Those who *have* engaged in it, have declared that they felt an increased interest every time that they attended, and such would be the case of the rest, if it were possible to induce them to begin. But while they remain at a distance, and fancy themselves incapable of rendering us any assistance, the work languishes, and almost dies in our hands. Let us then pray the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest.

We have likewise, in common with several of your correspondents, who have written on this subject, been

sometimes greatly perplexed for want of a sufficient variety of proper books. All other denominations of Christians are much better supplied than we are, and we have often wondered, as well as greatly lamented, that some zealous, intelligent Unitarian bookseller in London should not have turned his attention more to this subject. Is there no one who has the interests of real Christianity at heart sufficiently to do this? The supposition is injurious. It is only for want of having sufficiently reflected on the subject. When they have reflected more, I am strongly persuaded that some one among them will devote a part of his attention to wiping off this reproach and supplying this deficiency.

A SOUTHERN UNITARIAN.

SIR,

Oct. 7th, 1824.

YOUR valuable Correspondent N. in your last Number, (p. 530,) endeavours to reconcile the precept of Paul, "Be ye angry and sin not," (Ephes. iv. 26,) with the direction, which follows soon after, "Let all anger be put away from you," (ver. 31,) by supposing that in the former instance the Apostle has the *act* in his view, and in the latter instance the *habit*. There is, however, no *grammatical* reason on which this distinction can be founded; but, on the contrary, the verb ὀργίζεσθε, used in the former instance, and supposed by your correspondent to express the *act* only, may, according to the common mode of using the present tense in Greek, signify either "*Be angry*," or "*Be habitually angry*." But, in whichever of these two senses the word be taken, it appears strange that a Christian apostle should deliver an express precept to be angry, when all men are sufficiently prone to anger without such encouragement, and rather need every motive to guard against it.

Upon the precept, "Be angry and sin not," Whitby remarks, "These words, though spoken imperatively, are not a command to be angry, but a caution to avoid sinful anger." The observation appears to me correct; and it is only to be wished that the learned commentator had stated the *principle* on which his criticism may be justified. I have for some years been disposed to regard the expres-

sion of Paul, ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε as a *Hebraism*, for which, if he had written *classical* Greek, he would have said ὀργισθέντες μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε. Were I to dwell upon the fact of the occurrence of Hebraisms in the Greek of the New Testament, it would certainly be out of regard to others of your readers, and not with a view to your learned and able correspondent. But, assuming the fact as granted, I shall suppose that St. Paul wished to convey the following piece of advice; "If at any time through the weakness of human nature you are excited to anger, beware of its betraying you into sin." The words ὀργισθέντες μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε would have expressed this sentiment in correct and Attic Greek. But suppose a Jew had wished to translate this precept into his own language: in consequence of the want of a participle expressing past time, he must have rendered it thus, or according to some similar form, רגו ואל תחטאו; and this phrase, *literally* translated into Greek, would give the very expression which Paul employs, ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε. The sense here supposed is remarkably suitable to the clause immediately subjoined, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath;" in which the apostle gives a very useful practical rule for restraining and terminating the ebullitions of anger.

Such were the reasonings which occurred to my mind on considering the phrase in question merely as the language of a Jew, who was liable even in writing Greek to adopt Hebrew idioms. But the sense of the passage, which I have supposed, is confirmed, as it appears to me, beyond all reasonable doubt, when it is considered that the precept is not originally Paul's but David's, and that it is quoted from the Septuagint Version. It occurs in the 4th Psalm, and was probably intended by David as an admonition to the irritable spirits by whom he was surrounded at the court of Saul. In illustration of David's meaning, I shall take the liberty of quoting a rule from the Syntax of Schroeder's Hebrew Grammar, (lii. 2,) in which he adduces this very precept by way of an example: Imperativus nonnunquam conditionem exprimit, alii Imperativo præmissam;

ut *לֵאמֹר lætare, juvenis, — וְיָדַע et scito*, i. e. si læteris, tum scias, Eccles. xi. 9. *וְאַל תִּרְסָמוּ Irascimini, sed ne peccate*; i. e. si irascamini, ne peccetis. Ps. iv. 5.

The ancient Greek Version translates David's expression literally, and St. Paul has quoted this translation. The Syriac translator has preserved the same construction, since indeed his language required it as much as the Hebrew, being alike destitute of a form analogous to the Greek participle of the Aorist; and the Syriac translator of Paul's Epistle has quoted the Syriac translator of the Psalm. Most of the other ancient versions have preserved the Hebrew idiom in both places. The Chaldee, however, seems to have taken the first word in a wrong sense, and has thus led the way in introducing the version of Ps. iv. 5, in our Bible, "*Stand in awe and sin not.*"

I submit these remarks to the candid consideration of your correspondent, and to the indulgence of your readers in general.

A YORK STUDENT.

Mr. Frend on a recent Notice of him in the British Critic.

SIR,

PERMIT me to solicit a place in your Repository for some remarks on the notice which the British Critic has been pleased to take of me in a late number of his work. It may not be deemed an improper intrusion on your valuable pages, as through me an attack is made on all Christians who reject the doctrine of the Trinity. The passage, after some complimentary phrases to myself, for which I beg the writer to accept of my best acknowledgments, runs as follows:

"The same individual (meaning myself) who denies the doctrine of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, denies also the Newtonian doctrine of Gravitation. If we ask on what grounds, we shall find that both doctrines are denied on precisely the same grounds. The one doctrine, though confessedly asserted in the literal sense of scripture, is yet rejected because it is incomprehensible to the human faculties. To the other doctrine this author does not object, because Newton has not sufficiently demonstrated it: he does not find or pretend to find any fault or erroneous

step in the processes of Newton's demonstrations. This is not his ground. But he rejects what is demonstrated to be the fact, because it is beyond the limits of the human faculties to conceive how a particle of dust on the surface of the earth can gravitate towards a particle of dust on the surface of the moon. This is truly consistent. We do not wish for a better illustration of Unitarian principles. The doctrine of Monotheism and the rejection of revealed truth may be worthily professed by those who reject the doctrine of Gravitation, and deny that two and two make four."

The drift of this passage is, that the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Newtonian doctrine of Gravitation arises from the same aberration in the faculties of the human mind, by which it is rendered incapable of discovering truths supposed by the Critic to be equally well-founded and demonstrable in each. But surely it has escaped the recollection of the Critic that I am not singular in the rejection of Newton's doctrine of Gravitation. Many clergymen, whose attachment to the thirty-nine articles was never called in question, have, equally with myself, opposed this hypothesis of our philosopher, and I shall content myself with mentioning one whose work on the Trinity was, when I was a student at Cambridge, put into all our hands, and I believe remains at present a standard book for candidates for orders. The clergyman's name is Jones, a late very worthy divine, and an intimate friend of Bishop Horne, who, I have reason to believe, entertained the same opinion with himself on the Newtonian philosophy. His works have been, I believe, collected, and occupy several volumes, and the small tract to which I allude is entitled, I think, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity*, in which he attempts to demonstrate its truth by a collection of a great number of texts of scripture. It is many years since I saw the work, but as far as I can recollect, it seemed to me (born and bred in the sect established by law) in my youthful days to carry perfect conviction with it. I need not say that a fuller investigation of its contents led me afterwards to a very different opinion of the merits of this work.

I have given an instance of a firm believer in the thirty-nine articles, who yet rejected the Newtonian doctrine of Gravitation: I shall be content with a single instance of a believer in Monotheism and yet an advocate for the doctrine of Gravitation, and this is Newton himself; he was an Unitarian.

Thus we see that a man may believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, and disbelieve the doctrine of Gravitation; another may disbelieve the doctrine of a threefold God, and be the inventor of the doctrine of Gravitation; and I am an instance of a person who believes neither the one nor the other.

How the Critic has drawn from my rejection of these two doctrines an illustration of Unitarian principles I cannot conjecture. For, if this had any thing to do with the argument, we should naturally be led to imagine that the Unitarians would be distinguished by this rejection of the Newtonian doctrine of Gravitation. But this I do not find to be the case; for among the many persons I have conversed with on the subject, I can scarcely bring to my recollection a single Unitarian Christian who agreed with me in exploding the doctrine of Gravitation, though I remember a celebrated writer of that body treating my notions with a degree of levity and contempt, such as the Critic himself would not, I am sure, have indulged in my presence. The last person who expressed his doubts to me of the Newtonian theory is a clergyman, and was a distinguished tutor in one of our universities.

The Critic asserts that I reject both the doctrines in question precisely on the same grounds, namely, because it is beyond the limits of the human faculties to conceive them. In this he labours under a mistake. I did not reject the religious hypothesis on any such ground. I rejected it because I could not find any basis for it in scripture. The question with me was simply this, Is the doctrine contained in scripture or not? To this test and to this test alone did I apply myself, availing myself of what knowledge I might have of the Scriptures in their original language; and my other sources of information in interpreting them, were chiefly drawn from the favourers of the es-

tablished doctrines. With respect to the term itself by which the majority of Christians worship the Supreme, and which is derived from a barbarous Latin word, I could not of course find that in the Scriptures, nor were the two expressions God the Son and God the Holy Ghost to be found there. This of itself is now a sufficient reason for me to reject, without farther inquiry, the use of these terms; for had the Supreme deemed it fit they should be used, I can have no doubt that the holy persons through whom his communications have been made to us, would have employed them in those writings on which and on which alone my faith and the faith of every Christian ought to be established. The propriety of using these terms is justified only on the ground of inference, and by whom was this inference first made? I leave that to the ecclesiastical historian to settle. By whomsoever made, my argument remains the same. These terms are not used by Christ or his apostles, and therefore rest on an authority to which we owe no deference.

On this subject I beg leave to call the attention of our Unitarian brethren, who, like myself, may have frequently been taunted with the assertion, that it is to the pride of reason we owe the rejection of the mysterious union of three persons in the Godhead, and that it little becomes us who know so little of ourselves that we cannot explain the union of the soul and body, to pretend to deny a union in the Godhead, which is a greater mystery. For my own part, I entirely disclaim this pride of reason. I do not reject the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead because it is above my comprehension, but because I believe that no such union is taught in the Holy Scriptures. I waive therefore all reasoning upon the credibility or incredibility of this doctrine, and I keep to this single point: We have the Scriptures before us; shew me one single passage in which we are commanded to offer up prayers to God the Son or God the Holy Ghost or the Trinity. Upon this plain statement the whole of the controversy which now agitates the Christian world rests. It is intelligible to the meanest capacity. All the authority of Fathers of the Church, of Councils, of Acts of Parliament, on which there

may be endless discussions, are of no avail in the question. They are only tests of the opinion of fallible men in different ages; and as well might the writings of eminent philosophers who adopted the Ptolemaick system, be brought forward to establish it in the present days, as this argument *ad verecundiam* from the very general belief of past and present ages in the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead. Churches have erred, according to the thirty-nine articles, and on this ground the revolt from the Church of Rome is vindicated, and they who are called schismatics by that Church make their appeal to the Scriptures. From these schismatics I also make my appeal to the same authority, and by that and that alone do I consent to be tried. Shew me a single precept for worshiping the Trinity, or God the Son, or God the Holy Ghost, and I have done.

I offer up my prayers to one Being only, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and why do I so? Because I have the precept of my Saviour to do it—"When ye pray, say, Our Father who art in heaven."—Under this appellation he prayed to his God and our God, and neither he nor his apostles gave any command to authorize us to worship any other person. If I am supposed to be wrong in this important transaction of human life, what have I to say in my defence? I follow the commandment and example of my Saviour. If others are wrong in their worship, we followed, they may say, our interpretation of scripture, or it may be the mere traditions of men. But do not let them inveigh against me, who follow a plain and positive precept accompanied by the uniform example of my Saviour.

The British Critic insinuates in the latter clause of the extract at the beginning of this letter that I reject revealed truth. If he had said I reject what he believes to be revealed truth, he would have spoken correctly. But whatever has been revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures is my delight, my daily meditation. Nothing in this world would be a compensation to me for the loss of that which is my only support in this life, and the ground of my hope and confidence in a future state of existence. I do not

read the Scriptures with the eyes of the British Critic; but to reject any thing which appeared to me to be revealed in them is most abhorrent to my feelings and my principles.

So far from rejecting any revealed truth, I shall be found to lay much greater stress on revealed truths probably than the British Critic does, or any member of his sect. Your pages will bear testimony to my zeal for them, when a celebrated divine among the Unitarians promulgated what appeared to me to be a very unfounded notion—that Moses, though a good divine, was a bad philosopher, and his opinion received the sanction of an Unitarian congregation. This divine will be supported by no small part of the Newtonians; but to me the first chapter of Genesis conveys the strongest proofs of its divine original. With the first sentence my faith begins, nor is it shaken by the taunts of philosophers in the whole of the history from the formation of the first man to the final triumph over the serpent delineated in the Revelation. I firmly believe in the temptation of our first mother, and moreover, that every one of her children has been or will be subject to similar trials till the head of the serpent is completely crushed, as foretold in the earliest prophecy upon record. But my faith does not presume to parcel out the Godhead, being content with the command, "There is only one God," of whose attributes I can have but a very imperfect knowledge, being contented with the conviction that he is my Father, and is more willing to attend to my petitions than any earthly father is to those of his children. Far from indulging in vain speculations respecting him who is unsearchable and past finding out, my faith is like that of Abraham, founded on the conviction that what he has promised he is able to perform; and having seen the completion of much that he has promised, I have not the least doubt that what remains will in the same manner be fulfilled, and in spite of all the contradictions of the world and of the opposition to divine truth, more by professing Christians than professed Infidels, his kingdom will be finally established. I shall have quitted this scene of existence, but the glorious

day will come when all enemies shall be put under foot, truth shall be established in the earth, and love, universal love, will be the glorious theme of all nations.

The belief in only one God, as distinguished from that of three persons in the Godhead, is acknowledged by persons who are not Christians; and notwithstanding what I have said above, my right even to the title of Christian may be called in question, because I may entertain erroneous opinions not only with respect to the person of our Saviour, but also to the nature of his mission. Great have been the discussions lately on what is called the Atonement, and this word as rendered by different writers in reference to the death of Christ, sets them in hostility to each other, and they combat their opponents' opinions with all the arms that ridicule, sarcasm, and levity can bring to their aid. The word itself occurs, I believe, only once in the New Testament, and in the margin it is rendered by the translators reconciliation, which, in fact, is the true rendering of the Greek word. I am a firm believer in the reconciliation by the death of Christ, whom I look up to as my Saviour who was sent to make us sons of God, through whom alone is eternal life, not as some Unitarians say as a mere teacher, but as Paul expresses it, Eternal life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. As through Adam we all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Adam's sin produced death, Christ's obedience produced life. I acknowledge my obligations to Christ as my teacher, but these are slight compared to the debt of gratitude I owe to him in that comprehensive word so often used by his faithful missionaries, our Saviour. But all this is consistent with the distinction pointed out so accurately by Paul, between the Supreme and his beloved Son. To us there is only one God even the Father, and one Lord even Jesus Christ. I bow the knee therefore as the apostle did to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to him alone, without any impeachment of the reverence due to our Saviour in his character of Lord.

I was not aware when I begun, that this subject would have carried

me to so great a length; and as other points in the charge of the British Critic remain to be answered, you will perhaps indulge me with a place in a future Repository, when I shall endeavour to shew, that what the Critic has advanced against me and Unitarianism, it is not in his power to substantiate.

W. FRENCH.

SIR,
I HAVE heard much wonder expressed at Dr. J. Jones's *novel* hypothesis that Josephus was a concealed Christian. But there is nothing new under the sun. Let your readers look into Whiston's Collection of Authentic Records, Part II. p. 960, and they will see that this learned man confidently affirms that Josephus "was no other than a Nazarene or Ebionite Christian, and with them (the Ebionites) esteemed our Saviour to be a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary." Honest Whiston laments over both "the Nazarenes or Ebionites, whom we now call Socinians" and the Athanasians, and says they are all convicted of their errors by the "denial of supernatural gifts."

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

SIR,
I HAVE been much surprised at some recent compilers of Hymn-books ascribing to Andrew Marvell the beautiful devotional poems, beginning "The spacious firmament on high," and "When all thy mercies, O my God," which have been for a century regarded as Mr. Addison's. The only authority that I am aware of for this substitution of Marvell's name is Captain Thompson's statement, in his Preface to the 4th edition of Marvell's Works, in 3 volumes, published in 1776, that these with other poems were found in a manuscript of the Hull patriot's. On so slender a foundation, who would place so serious a charge against the pious Addison as every one knows is implied in the alteration? Nothing is extant of Marvell's undoubted writing which shews him to have been capable of writing verses of so much polish and sweetness as the hymns in question.

A PSALMODIST.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Not Paul, but Jesus.* By Gamaliel Smith, Esq. London, 1823. Printed for John Hunt. 8vo: Pp. 403.

THERE are four propositions concerning Paul, to the proof of which we shall apply ourselves:—That his conversion was miraculous and real—that his divine commission was recognized by the rest of the apostles—that his views and conduct were perfectly disinterested—and that his writings authenticate themselves and the history of his labours.

The conversion of Paul was the effect not of a mere impulse upon his mind—an impulse which ordinary circumstances might have occasioned—but of a miracle properly so styled: and it was a genuine or inward conversion, as distinguished from only an outward change of manners and deportment.

There was, we repeat, an actual miracle in the case. The event did not occur in a “secret chamber,” and, therefore, did not resemble the alleged instances of Lord Herbert, of Cherbury,* and of Colonel Gardiner;† from both of which it differed as in other circumstances so in the fact of its having witnesses and spectators. We must carefully discriminate between the sincerity of a man’s impression and its correctness. In the two examples that we have adduced, and in some resembling them, we cannot justly doubt of the parties having been ingenuous: they felt what they reported, they believed what they declared; yet testimony additional to

their own is requisite, before we can be satisfied of the miraculousness of the appearance. Does the account, however, of Paul’s conversion depend merely on the evidence of the individual himself? Does it rest on the authority of his historian? Our reply must be in the negative. Men were not wanting who, on their personal knowledge, could attest the reality of the transaction: it took place on a public road, and in open day; and the attendants of the future apostle would not have failed to contradict him, had contradiction been practicable.

If we compare Luke’s narrative with Paul’s statements of the facts,* we shall perceive the sure mark of truth—substantial agreement in the relation, accompanied by some variety in the language. The candid and attentive reader will discern, that the immediate effect of the miracle was the utter astonishment of Saul and his companions; that the articulate sounds of the voice were distinctly heard by himself alone, while his associates, nevertheless, both saw the light, and were, in some measure, sensible of a noise; and that these men were so overpowered by the effulgence, as to remain silent, even after they had risen from the ground. The supposed contradiction of Acts ix. 7, to Acts xxii. 9, is well explained by Mr. Biscoe,† who pertinently cites John xii. 28, 29, where it is said, “Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again: the people therefore that stood by and heard it, said that it thundered, others said that an angel spake unto him.” Many of the bystanders heard only a noise like thunder, but heard not the particular words spoken. So it was with St. Paul’s companions. They heard a sound, probably like that of thunder, but heard not the particular words spoken. It must also be observed, that the word *ακουειν* signifies to understand as

* Leland’s View of the Deistical Writers, &c., (4th ed.,) Vol. I. pp. 24, &c. Lord Orford’s Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors, &c. A. D. 1648.

† Doddridge’s “Remarkable Passages in the Life of the Honourable Colonel James Gardiner.”—“That the impression made upon his” [Col. G.’s] “mind was in a dream, is sufficiently intimated to be the opinion of Dr. Doddridge.* * * As a dream it may very rationally be accounted for from the predisposing circumstances.” Kippis’s Life of Doddridge, cii., and Biog. Brit., 2d ed., V. 289.

* Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.

† Sermons at Boyle’s Lecture, &c. 665, 666.

well as to hear, and that almost as frequently. St. Paul's companions heard a voice, but did not hear it so perfectly as to understand what was said. Thus, too, "when Daniel saw a vision," (Dan. x. 7,) "the men that were with him * saw nothing."†

Should it be asked, Was Paul's conversion thorough? Did it extend to his understanding, his feelings and his character? Or was it simply apparent and external? We ask, in reply, What better proof of its being sincere and inward than the course in which he afterwards persevered? If we are desirous of bringing the honesty of a man's change of opinion to the test, we shall mark whether his behaviour be uniform and consistent with itself: we shall observe what he does, what he foregoes, what he hazards, what he suffers; and this not for an inconsiderable time, but through his whole life, not on one spot, but in every place which he visits or where he dwells. Tried by this standard, the conversion of Saul the persecutor into Paul the servant of Jesus Christ, is complete and real. Imposture could not have worn a mask so long: the enthusiasm of a heated fancy would much sooner have subsided.

Let us attend next to the nature of his claims. He styles himself‡ "an apostle, not of men," i. e. not employed on a human errand, "neither by men," i. e. not receiving his commission and embassy from any uninspired human being, "but by Jesus Christ." Words less ambiguous than these we cannot discover or imagine. They import thus much, and no more, that Paul was authorized immediately by our Saviour to teach his doctrine. The question to be considered then is, Did the other apostles receive him as being so authorized? We affirm that they did; and we make our appeal to the vouchers of the following statement:

* Of these, the number, in the apostle's case, it is probable, was much smaller than has generally been supposed. We can with difficulty believe that any Roman guards accompanied Paul. Painters and engravers, almost without exception, give very incorrect representations of the scene.

† Kenrick's Expos. in loc.

‡ Gal. i. 1.

After Paul, as was natural, proper and useful, had resided, for some time, * in Syria and Arabia, he went up to Jerusalem, where he continued during fifteen days, and saw James † and Peter. On a very solemn and urgent occasion, he again visited this city, after a considerable lapse of time, and, together with Barnabas, received from Peter, James and John the right hand of fellowship; "that we," says he, "should go unto the Heathen, and they to the circumcision." This is his own language, in the beginning of his Epistle to the Galatians; and with this fully agrees that of the historian. In the circular letter of the Council at Jerusalem, which Luke has preserved, the apostles and elders thus address the Gentile Christians residing in different parts of Asia: "It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Can there now be a clearer, stronger recognition of Paul, in what we may style his official capacity, than these passages afford? Do such passages furnish even the shadow of a pretence for denying that his doctrine was the doctrine of our Lord and of the eleven apostles?

Let us look at another part of the letter to the Galatians: "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not after man; for I neither received it from man, nor was I taught it otherwise than by the revelation of Jesus Christ." ‡ Is not this declaration altogether consistent with what he says before and subsequently, and with what Luke says respecting him? Paul tells us, what the narrative likewise tells us, and what facts indisputably prove, that Jesus Christ was his sole instructor in the Christian religion. This passage, we might well suppose, is the last, which, by possibility, can be adduced as testifying that the apostle taught a religion of his own: if usage has established any alliance between ideas and words, this passage bears quite the opposite meaning, and alleges

* Horæ Paulinæ, Galat. Ch. v. No. xi.

† Acts xv., and xii. 17.

‡ Gal. i. 11, &c.

that Paul's instructions accorded entirely with his great Master's, and, by consequence, with the preaching of the body of the apostles.

True; Paul was specially appointed to be the Apostle of the Gentiles; while the services of his fellow-labourers were directed to the Jews. The distinction is precisely what the infant state of the church required: they wrought in different fields, yet under one Lord, and for one and the same purpose; nor were their objects in any degree mutually opposed. Must we not regard this condition of things as being strictly agreeable to nature and to truth? Is it not presumptive of the genuineness of the history, and of the divine origin of the Gospel?

Upon one occasion, a dispute arose between Paul and Peter: and hence some persons have inferred the absence of a recognition of the claims of the apostle to the Heathens, on the part of the apostle to the circumcision. The inference is perfectly unjustifiable.* Their dispute was of short duration: it grew out of Peter's temporizing spirit, and placed the enlightened zeal and inflexible honesty of Paul in the fairest point of view; it proves, moreover, that these illustrious men did not combine with each other to impose a fraud upon the world—and thus it becomes a separate and resistless argument in behalf of Christianity.

The apostles then co-operated with Paul. Would they have done so, had they discredited his conversion and his mission? Let the case be examined on the principles of human nature, on the laws of historical testimony: let it be decided by means of a rigorous application of those principles and laws to Luke's narrative and Paul's Epistles; and we cannot doubt as to what must be the answer.

We further maintain that the views and the conduct of Paul were entirely disinterested; that he was free from the influence of covetousness, of ambition, and of every sinister and merely selfish motive; and that he had a mind supremely intent on advancing the glory of God, the interests of his Saviour, and the highest welfare of mankind.

It is a strange and a novel intima-

* Mon. Repos. VII. 699, &c.

tion, that avarice might prompt him to assume the profession of a Christian. Saul was evidently a person of no mean rank and consideration among his countrymen. Hence we may with reason judge it probable that he belonged to a family in easy circumstances, and surrendered all hope of sharing in its temporal advantages, when he embraced the religion, and entered into the specific service, of Jesus Christ. What, though he had learned a trade, by the exercise of which he afterwards gained a livelihood? Every Jew, even the most intelligent and accomplished, passed through the same discipline, and was taught to labour with his hands.* The education that Saul of Tarsus received, was not of an ordinary kind: and can a person of sound understanding fancy that such a man, by the act of joining the first Christians, would not forego and lose far more property than he could thence acquire?

Of what funds was the infant church possessed? To read and hear the language of certain individuals, on this subject, we might suppose that not a few of the apostle's followers were men of affluence. The contrary was the truth. Not many rich were called. Barnabas and some others, undoubtedly, sold estates, and threw the produce into a common stock, for the supply of common wants. But this was a spontaneous and a temporary measure: the whole amount of the sums so contributed, would be inconsiderable; nor do we find that Paul had any controul over it, or any share in distributing it. That the hope of partaking in the management of such a fund might govern him, is one of the wildest of imaginations: and he who can form this opinion, shews how nearly allied to each other are scepticism and credulity. Whether the common property of which we are speaking existed after Saul's conversion, is far from being evident. Of the collections subsequently made, among a different class of believers, for the distressed Christians at Jerusalem, he, beyond question, was a bearer. Yet we cannot have forgotten his wise, disinterested conduct, on the

* See Michaelis' admirable chapter on the Character, &c. of St. Paul, *Introd.*, &c., (Marsh,) IV. Ch. xxiii.

occasion.* For the purpose of obviating suspicion, he associated with himself other individuals in the trust: he provided for “things honest,” for what was becoming and honourable, not only in the sight of the Lord, but in the sight of men; nor could the breath of calumny taint his reputation. This apostle even waived the exercise of his right to a maintenance on the part of those whose spiritual interests he superintended. It is therefore impossible that the love of money could have been his motive for entering into the Christian church.

Was fame the end of his pursuit? Did his soul burn with the fever of ambition? Were power and dominion the acquisitions for which he panted?

Let his writings and his history give the answer: let these declare, whether it was practicable for him to gratify such passions, when he enlisted under the banner of Jesus Christ. What human reputation could he expect to obtain by joining, or even by leading, a poor, despised, persecuted sect, by exchanging the vanity and pride of the school of Gamaliel for the humble lessons of the prophet of Nazareth, of the sufferer on Calvary? We do not ask our readers to receive Paul's own assertions, unless they are substantiated by evidence. But we call on ingenuous men to weigh deliberately every part of the narrative of the apostle's ministry, and to say, whether he did not with truth represent himself as being made “the scouring of all things.” Let us judge of him, as the opponents of Christianity would have us to judge: for a moment, let us imagine that he was not really converted, but was an interested deceiver. Then, how shall we explain his conduct, on the laws of the mind and the principles of our nature? If we compare, or rather contrast, what, in a temporal point of view, he relinquished with what he gained, we shall discover, that he surrendered more than even an Indian Bramin would lose in being deprived of his *caste*; and that, in return, no wordly equivalent was secured. In the circles of learning and philosophy at least, the fine parts of Paul, and his high attainments, would have opened his way to great distinction. Why

did he prefer to preach Christ, and him crucified?

His epistles, and the history of his public life, will endure the scrutiny of rigorous criticism. So examined, they prove that he evinced uncommon moderation in employing the miraculous powers with which he was supplied. Was this the disposition, this the course, of a crafty and ambitious man? Or rather, was not the fact a demonstration of still more than honest intentions—of pure and delicate feelings, and of a sober judgment? And is this the man on whom the charge can be fixed of either imposture or enthusiasm? If in simplicity and godly sincerity, and not with fleshly wisdom, he had his conversation in the world, who can resist the inference, that he was an apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ?

Paul's writings, too, authenticate themselves, and the history of his labours: they do so pre-eminently—in a degree beyond those of any individual with whose existence we are acquainted. That such writings should have been constructed on the basis of deceit, is morally impossible.

At the same time, the letters of Paul, though full of argument, and containing a number of precepts and prohibitions, abound in allusions and references to *facts*: they every where present an animated, living scene; and, happily, we have it in our power to compare them with memoirs of a large portion of his ministry. The result of this comparison (for it has been made) is, in our own judgment, inferior only to the report of the senses, and to the force of absolute demonstration. Indolence and prejudice may shrink from instituting or reviewing it: however, it is not to indolence and prejudice that our appeal is urged.

When we consider the style, observe the topics, and weigh the reasoning of Paul's Epistles, we cannot but assign the date of them to an interval of time between the ascension of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem—to nearly, or precisely, what external testimony declares to have been their real date.

It is assumed, but has not been shewn, or even attempted to be shewn, that the doctrine of this apostle con-

* 2 Cor. viii. ix.

tradicts his Master's. Such a discordancy would be "passing strange;" inasmuch as he professes to have received his knowledge of the gospel immediately by revelation from Jesus Christ. In truth, the allegation has been hazarded by men, who, we venture to assert, have either not read Paul's Epistles or not studied them on any just principles of interpretation. Those letters, when attentively examined, will be found to contain nothing which opposes what our Saviour and the companions of his ministry delivered.

The issue of the whole inquiry may fairly be put on many parts of the apostle's writings, and especially on the following chapters: Rom. xiv., xv.; 1 Cor. xiii., xv.: he who diligently peruses them, in the silence of his closet, will, it is probable, rise from the employment with an enlightened, a strong and delightful conviction of the authenticity of the works in which they appear. Surely, no impostor, no enthusiast, could be so ingenuous, so wise and sober, or cherish such views of men and things, of mortality and immortality, of human duty and human expectations. What remains, therefore, except to acknowledge that Paul has made good his claims to be an apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ?

These are the observations which presented themselves to us, on reading the volume, the title of which we have transcribed. We deem it unnecessary to follow the author through his several chapters and sections. All that we shall further do, is to bring forward a few passages illustrative of his qualifications for his undertaking.

In the Table, marked No. I., which faces the title-page, he contrasts with each other the following clauses, Acts ix. 1—9, xxii. 3—11, and prints in italic characters the words *synagogues* and *brethren*; as though they were in mutual contradiction. The expression is indeed varied, yet the meaning is the same; the *synagogues*, or rulers and members of the synagogues, and the *brethren* being equally descriptive of Saul's countrymen, the Jews—and the term *brethren* throughout this history being restricted or extended in its signification by the context, and

denoting sometimes Jews, and sometimes Christians.*

We read in page xiii. this sentence: "Of the notes to Scholey's [Bible], the author or compiler was, as every page testifies, a Church of Englandist: Blair, it is presumed, a Church of Scotlandist." Why is this presumed? A little inquiry would have enabled the writer to ascertain, that Dr. John Blair, the author of the Chronological Tables, was indeed a native of North Britain, yet, in respect of religious profession and ecclesiastical station, a member and a dignitary of the Church of England. The mistake is of no moment in itself, and in any ordinary case would be so trifling and venial as not to require animadversion. We notice it, because, together with numerous other passages, it illustrates an extreme want of care in Gamaliel Smith, even with regard to circumstances that come under the immediate observation of almost every man of literature and reading; and because it shews his incompetency, so far, to discuss with correctness the question of Paul's apostleship.

In p. xv. he says of Paul's Epistles, that their genuineness, "unless in one not very material instance, seems to stand hitherto clear of dispute." A most remarkable admission by such a writer! How he can reconcile it, and a similar concession, in p. 4, in favour of Luke, with the strain and purpose of his own work, we are unable to imagine.

He observes, in p. 33, that "For administering the ceremony of baptism, a single apostle, Philip, was sufficient." Now the Philip of whom he is speaking was a deacon and evangelist,† and not the apostle of that name.‡ The nature of the case makes the distinction clear and essential; Philip, who preached to the Samaritans, not having the power of conferring the gifts of the Holy Spirit. But Mr. Gamaliel Smith, who classes Luke among the eleven, § might with ease commit the more pardonable error of confounding Philip the evangelist with Philip the apostle.

A capital mistake, which pervades

* Acts xxviii. 14, 15, 21, are examples fully to the purpose.

† Acts vi. 5. ‡ Matt. x. 3. § P. 342.

a large portion of this author's volume, is the assumption, (p. 59,) that Saul incurred the guilt of treason, when, converted, as he was, to the gospel, he refrained from persecuting the Christians at Damascus. The Roman government was, at that time, the only earthly power against whom Saul, or any other Jew, could commit *treason*: and the Roman government had not authorized the persecution. Were the Jews, at the æra before us, a *sovereign* people? Could Mr. Gamaliel Smith be unacquainted with their political subjection and dependence? Is it only by these inaccuracies of conception and of language that he can plead his cause? What would he say to the believer, who should permit himself to fall into these mistakes?—Probably, what we will say to him, *Tantum rem tam negligenter agere!*

But a little grosser error must be exposed. He continues to maintain that Paul was guilty of an act of perjury.* In other words, Mr. Gamaliel Smith does not distinguish an exculpatory oath from a Nazaritic or some other vow. We entreat those of his readers into whose hands our pages come, to consult Acts xxi. 18, &c., and then to ask themselves, whether *any*, and what, *perjury* was committed by the individual whom this author styles "the self-constituted apostle." Perjury is the wilful violation of the truth which has been declared, or of the assurance which has been given, under the solemnity of an oath. That man is perjured who forswears himself. Paul, nevertheless, on the occasion to which reference has been made, violated nothing. He had contracted, no doubt, a certain obligation, from which he gained his discharge, exactly in the way prescribed by the legal institutions of his country. A vow is not an oath: a vow is then violated when it is not fulfilled. Yet Paul fulfilled *his* (we do not now inquire what it was) with the utmost punctuality. On his becoming a Christian, it was perfectly optional with him to observe or not the Levitical injunctions.† At

* Mon. Repos. XVI. 234.

† Dr. George Benson has some valuable observations on this case in his *History of the First Planting of Christianity*. (2d ed.) II. 227, &c.

a period, and in an instance, of which we have no precise knowledge, he had brought himself under the obligation of a vow: and being with injustice suspected and accused, by some of his countrymen, of hostility to the law of Moses, he refutes the accusation, by performing those legal ceremonies which, in his own case, he had never renounced, and by assisting others to perform them. An author, nevertheless, who can affirm that *εὐχὴ* signifies an oath,* may well refrain from discriminating between vows and oaths: he who sees no difference between the names will, of course, see no difference in the things.

What can fair and candid readers think of the following paragraph?—Pp. 361, &c.

"Now then comes the trial. (Acts xxvi. 1.) Scene, at Cæsarea, the Emperor's bench. Lord Chief Justice, Roman Governor Festus; Puisne judge, Jew Sub-king Agrippa. Present 'Bernice... chief captains and principal men of the city.' Special accusers, none. Sole speaker, whose speech is reported, the defendant. Points in defendant's speech, these:" &c.

Obviously, there was no *trial* at all. The Jewish prince, Agrippa, wished to hear the prisoner; and Agrippa's wish was gratified. For the rest, so burlesque a method of treating the subject, as this paragraph discloses, is alike revolting to correct taste and to manly feeling.

Against credulity Mr. Gamaliel Smith perpetually levels his reproaches; sometimes in direct terms—sometimes by *inuendo*. Yet he endeavours to persuade us that Paul is the *Anti-christ* whom Paul denounced and stigmatized!†

Of the *synopsis* of this work we took such notice as we deemed it to require.‡ Internal evidence led us to ascribe it, in our own minds, to a writer of no ordinary merit, yet of considerable singularity in method and in style. To that distinguished individual it is now unhesitatingly attributed: and the public seems to understand that *Gamaliel Smith* is the *nom de guerre* of *Jeremy Bentham*. It is, we confess, a mortifying disco-

* P. 261.

† Pp. 371, &c.

‡ Mon. Repos. XVI. 231, &c.

very. We have no pleasure in contemplating the decay of high talent and extensive intelligence, of mental vigour and moral sensibility. How can we account for the melancholy change? The circumstances whatever they are, which have impaired so gifted a mind, and occasioned such a perversion of spirit, taste and thought, must be seriously deplored. Yet we question not the sincerity of the writer. We recollect with gratitude his numerous and valuable services to his fellow-men; and we are desirous of forgetting that the author of the "Letters on Usury,"* is also the author of "Not Paul, but Jesus;"

— quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore, qui redit exuvias indutus
Achilli,
Vel Danaum Phrygios jaculatus puppi-
bus ignis!

N.

ART. II.—*A Reply to Two Deistical Works, &c. &c.* By Ben David.

(Continued from p. 558.)

BEN DAVID justly complains of Gamaliel Smith's disingenuousness in pretending to have in view merely the purification and establishment of Christianity, and to be following in the steps of Lardner and Farmer:

"The author of this work is not a believer in Revelation: and his pretence to imitate the example of the above venerable names, in removing the corruptions which, in the eye of reason, weigh down Christianity, is a mere snare to entrap his readers; and if this publication succeeded, it might soon be followed by another from the same pen, entitled, 'Neither Paul nor Jesus.'—P. 172.

Resenting this insidious mode of proceeding, Ben David rebukes sharply the Deistical author; and if we grieve that hard epithets should be affixed to a name on many accounts so respectable, we grieve more that we cannot censure them as undeserved.

There is weight in the following remarks on the antecedent probability of Paul's conversion, the history of which Gamaliel Smith represents as a fable:

* See Mr. Wynn's opinion of this work, in Mon. Repos. XIX. 188.

"If we would judge fairly of the probability or improbability of the conversion of Paul, we must not consider it as a naked or isolated event, but in connexion with the events which preceded it, and the end which Providence intended to answer by it. If a divine communication was made to Jesus of Nazareth, designed and calculated to reform the world, the choice of a person, like Paul, qualified to fulfil that design, the account of his conversion, though supernatural, cannot be deemed improbable. The other apostles, though not illiterate, were not men of learning. Still less, it is probable, were they acquainted with the state of the heathen world, and therefore little qualified as far as they could be by human means, to convert the nations. On the other hand, Paul possessed superior talents, which he had cultivated and improved by all the advantages of a refined education, having made himself acquainted not only with the language, but with the literature of Greece. Nor was he fitted for his high destination, less by temper and character, than by talents and cultivation: for he was open, sincere and ardent in his attachments, yet steady and circumspect in his pursuits—patient of injuries, fatigue and hunger—resolute and collected in the face of danger, and capable of sacrificing every personal consideration, every selfish interest, for the attainment of his glorious end. Now whatever evidence renders the gospel or the history of Christ credible, disposes us to look upon the miraculous story of the Apostle Paul as not incredible: whatever evidence supports the one, lends its full weight in support of the other; so that he who on rational ground believes the miracles and resurrection of Jesus, cannot hesitate to believe his supernatural appearance to Paul."—P. 177.

The moral reason of the time and place of Paul's conversion is thus happily stated:

"If Paul was an apostle according to the will of God, if he had been separated from the beginning a chosen vessel to carry the gospel before the Gentiles, how was he not chosen also to be a disciple of Christ during his ministry? At least, why not appointed to succeed Judas, or why not converted by the apostles, or converted and furnished with his commission in their presence, before their divine Master had yet ascended to heaven? Then a writer like Gamaliel would have nothing to say against Paul, but what he would have said against the apostles or against Jesus himself. No circumstance connected with Christianity

places the wisdom of heaven in so conspicuous a light as the manner in which Paul was called to his high office as apostle of the Gentiles. The Anti-christian teachers endeavoured to undermine the gospel by maintaining, that the Christ who appeared after death was not the same with him who had been put to death. If this position were well-founded, the return of Jesus to raise the dead and judge the world, would fall to the ground. The divine power promised to the disciples was deferred till Jesus had ascended to heaven, in order that its communication from thence might be considered as a conclusive proof of his actual ascension, and a pledge of his return at some future period to confer a new life on mankind. The conversion of Paul in the manner it was effected, had in view the more complete establishment of the same great object. If Jesus some years after he had left the earth appeared to one that was an enemy—if, appearing amidst his celestial glory, he convinced that enemy that he was the very Jesus of Nazareth whom he was persecuting—if he next enlisted him within the same service with those whom he had already chosen, imparting to him precisely the same doctrine, inspiring him with the same spirit of meekness, patience and devotion in the cause of his divine Master—finally, if he endowed him with the same power of working miracles, and that without any communication with the rest of the apostles, and even without their knowledge:—if Jesus did all these things, he gave to Paul, to all his followers, and to the whole world, an everlasting proof that the Saviour was still alive, dwelling in inaccessible light with his heavenly Father, and that one day, however distant, he would in the power of his Father descend to consummate the grand events promised in the gospel. This scheme of Divine Providence required that Paul should hold no intercourse with the other apostles until he was converted, until his credentials were fully ratified from above, independently of them. In pursuance of this purpose, Divine Wisdom made use of his misguided zeal to remove him from Jerusalem: and Jesus deferred appearing to him, till he was too far on the road to return. Being near Damascus, he was led to that city, where he was to receive his commission, and to commence his arduous undertaking as an apostle of Christ.”—Pp. 183—185.

Gamaliel Smith has seized with great acuteness some of the discrepancies between the several relations of the same circumstances in Paul's history in various parts of the Acts

and the Epistles. These Ben David attempts to explain, sometimes successfully, but at other times rather ingeniously than satisfactorily: e. g.

“ — the historian asserts that, while the companions of Saul, though they saw no one, did hear the voice, Acts ix. 7; while Paul in his apology, xxii. 9, represents them as having seen the light, without having heard the voice. Here it must be remembered that the mode in which the apostle had stated the event, was afterwards penned by Luke, as well as his own: and it is utterly incredible that he should have recorded two statements apparently so inconsistent, and so likely to furnish objections against himself, unless he was perfectly satisfied of the correctness of both. And the case stood thus: The commission in which Saul engaged, must have been occasioned by an information brought to the chief priests and authorities in Jerusalem, from the enemies of the gospel in Damascus. The delegates who had brought the information, of course returned with Saul: and as they were Greeks or Hellenistic Jews, they might not understand the Hebrew language. It is further reasonable to suppose, that persons, concurring with the object of his commission, attended Saul in his journey: who as Jews, educated in the seat of Hebrew learning, must have understood the Hebrew tongue. When, therefore, Jesus appeared unto Saul, they *heard*, or, more conformably to the original, *understood* or *obeyed* the voice, that is, they became converts and joined with their principal, the persecuted party. But there was this difference in the vision: these attendants saw no man, that is, though they heard the voice of Jesus, they did not see his form, as Saul had done. The pre-eminent end to be answered by Saul's conversion, Jesus thus distinctly marked by shewing himself exclusively to him, as designed to bear his name before the Gentiles. Divine Wisdom, in order to meet the exigencies of the case, appointed that the rest of the party should remain among the enemies of the gospel. Accordingly Jesus declined to appear to them also. They saw the light indeed, and though they must have heard the sound of his voice, they did not comprehend it, nor of course did they, like the rest, become obedient to it. Now Luke, writing for the use of the believers, and having in his mind that party only who had joined them, writes, ‘ And the men who journeyed with him, stood speechless, hearing the voice, but seeing no man.’ On the other hand, common sense required that Paul, when defending himself before his accusers, should

appeal to those of his party, who, as ignorant of the voice and purport of the vision, still continued among the enemies of the gospel. Accordingly he says, 'And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice, i. e. they neither comprehended nor obeyed the voice of him that spoke to me.'—Pp. 191—193.

We may grant to unbelievers most of their alleged variations in the apostolical history, without compromising the truth of Christianity. The character of historic truth, in relation to independent witnesses, is substantial agreement amidst incidental differences.

With the popular absurd notion of the efficacy of baptism in his head, Gamaliel Smith objects to the ceremony in the case of Paul, and expatiates on the immoral tendency of the doctrine, that it washes away sins. In answer, Ben David quotes the following passage from Lactantius, (lib. iii. c. 26,) "whose honeyed flow of eloquence procured him the appellation of the Christian Cicero"—

"The mighty energy of the divine precepts on the minds of men, is demonstrated by daily experience. Give to Christ a man that is irascible, reproachful or impetuous, and, by a few words of God, he will restore him mild as a lamb: give to Christ a man that is covetous and tenacious of his property; and he will give him back to you liberal, and distributing his money with both hands: give to Christ a man that is fearful of pain and of death; and he will presently despise crucifixion, and flames and torments: give to Christ a man that is lustful, an adulterer or a gambler; and you will soon see him sober, chaste and honest: give to Christ a man that is cruel and thirsty for blood; and his fury will be immediately changed into unfeigned clemency: give to Christ a man that is unjust, foolish or an offender; and he becomes equitable, prudent and inoffensive. *For by a single baptism all his wickedness will be washed.*"—Pp. 197, 198.

On the sentence put in italics, Ben David remarks,

"The last sentence of this writer illustrates what the early Christians meant by baptism. It was practised by them, not as an atonement for guilt, but as a symbol of moral purity: it was, on the part of those who submitted to it, an open avowal of their faith in Christ, a public declaration that, as his followers,

they were determined to forsake their sins, to correct their most favourite passions, to eradicate the most deeply-rooted vices, to imitate the example and obey the precepts of their divine Master. This rite, no doubt, in the course of time became much mistaken and abused. Paul was apprehensive of this consequence; and he declined the practice of it, as forming no part of that gospel which he was commissioned to preach."—P. 198.

Reverting to a position of the author of the "New Trial," &c., that in Paul's Epistles no trace is to be found of the existence of any such document as one of the four Gospels, Ben David quotes 2 Cor. viii. 18 as a direct testimony on the part of Paul to the Evangelist Luke:

"It is well known that Luke was the companion and fellow-labourer of Paul; and in 2 Cor. viii. 18, we meet with these words: 'We have sent with him our brother, whose praise by means of his gospel is throughout all the churches.' Here we see a person, whom Paul calls a brother, and in the next verse a *fellow traveller*, praised by all the churches, and praised too by means of his *gospel*. It follows then that this gospel was received by all the churches, and that the author was known to all the churches through the medium of his gospel: for this reason he is said to be proved, not by individuals in one place or in many places, to whom he might be personally known, but by all the churches, i. e. by all the societies of Christians who used his gospel. They must, therefore, have esteemed him as an honest man, who had published a history of his divine Master, deserving of universal credit for its accuracy, fidelity and truth."—Pp. 200, 201.

In a note, pp. 286, 287, the author defends this rendering of the passage, and points out the defining power of the Greek article:

"Sometimes things can be defined by only being connected: hence the article in Greek becomes a connective serving to attach an adjunct to its subject, or a property to its possessor. In such cases its import in English is expressed by the pronominal adjectives *my, thy, his, her, our, your, their*. Let us illustrate this application of the Greek article by a few examples. 'Ὅταν παραδῇ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ' 1 Cor. xv. 24, 'When he shall deliver up the kingdom to the God and Father, i. e. to *his* God and Father;' which in the common translation is improperly 'to God even the Father.' Επεβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτόν.

Acts xxi. 27, 'They laid *the* hands upon him, i.e. their hands upon him.' A Greek epigram has *χῶλον εἷς τοῦ νοῦν ὡς τοῦ ποδῶς*, 'Thou hast *the* mind lame as *the* foot, thou hast *thy* mind lame as *thy* foot, thou art lame in mind as well as in feet.' The Cyclops in Lucian, complaining to his father Neptune of the injury done him by Ulysses, says, *Κατεσοφισατο με τῷ ὀνόματι*, 'he overreached me by *the* name, i. e. by *his* name,' the wily traveller having given *Ουτις* instead of *Οδυσσεύς* as his name, which proved the means of saving him from destruction. Let us apply this to one of the many cases the full force of which has been overlooked by the critics, 2 Cor. viii. 8: 'We have sent with him *the* brother, whose praise in *the* gospel is throughout all the churches,—we have sent with him *our* brother, whose praise by means of *his* gospel is throughout all the churches.' The brother here meant is Luke, whom Paul calls a fellow-traveller in the next verse. It was natural that, as Luke had written a gospel or a memoir of his divine Master, and, as he accompanied the Apostle Paul in establishing the Gentile Church, he should leave a copy in the possession of each church. And here we are very incidentally furnished with a happy testimony to the early existence of the Gospel of Luke, and to the estimation in which the author of it was held for his fidelity and truth."—Pp. 286, 287.

The author afterwards maintains that the Gospel of Luke was not only known and alluded to, but actually "*copied by Paul.*" He founds this novel opinion on 1 Cor. xv. 3.

"We have seen that the Apostle speaks of the Gospel of his brother and fellow-labourer, (Luke,) as praised in all the churches. A Gospel thus known to and valued by all the churches, must have been equally known to and valued by Paul himself. Now I observe, and I make the observation with pleasure, that the Gospel of Luke was now open before Paul, and that the above paragraph written by him is but a transcript from it, in substance exactly, in words nearly, the same: and that it is to the authority of this Evangelist that he alludes when he says, 'For I delivered unto you, among the chief things, *WHAT I ALSO RECEIVED*, or *what I also have taken.*' Turn to the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke, and there you will find what he has taken:—'And he said unto them, These are things which I said unto you while yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the

law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their mind that they might understand the Scriptures. Thus it is written, and thus the Christ ought to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day; and repentance and the dismissal of sins must be preached in his name among all the nations.' The narrative of Luke implies that our Saviour died—that he was buried—that he rose—that he rose the third day—that he died and rose according to Moses, to the Psalms, and to the Prophets, i. e. according to the Scriptures—that repentance and the dismissal of sins was to be preached in his name to the nations: and these are precisely the things which are attested by the apostle. It is to be observed, that Paul mentions 'according to the Scriptures' *twice*: and the same words are twice implied in Luke.

"It was not usual with the apostle to designate his divine Master simply under the name of 'Christ;' but here he so designates him, and designates him *once*: he is designated, and only once designated, under the same name by the Evangelist. Finally, Luke is the only Evangelist who says that Jesus, after his resurrection, appeared unto *Simon*, and that, after appearing unto Simon, he next appeared to the rest of the disciples. This is said, and said in the same order, by Paul, that he shewed himself to Cephas, (Simon Peter,) and then to the twelve."—Pp. 251, 252.

We cannot follow Ben David through all his replies to the Objector, but must content ourselves with taking here and there an interesting passage.

On the proposed resolution of James, in the apostolic council, that a decree should be sent to the Gentiles, that they should "abstain from things offered to idols, and from fornication, from blood and from things strangled," our author observes,

"The objects of worship among the Pagans, were impure in the extreme. By contemplating and ascribing solemn praise to such beings, the sanction of religion was given to lust and licentiousness; and their very temples were but brothels sacred to lewdness. For this reason idolatry and fornication were ever associated in the language and ideas of a Jew; and James here alludes to a passage in Moses, where they are united as cause and effect: 'They shall no more offer sacrifices to their false gods, whom they follow to commit fornication.' Lev. xvii. 7.

"The Pagans offered blood to the demons, and used it as a rite in invoking the souls of the dead. This we find in

Homer, Odyss. v. 535. Besides, to shed blood and to eat it, sounds alike in the ears of civilized society. And not only Moses but the common feelings of our nature, forbid the use of it. Things strangled, meant animals that were killed without letting their blood: and we are assured, that the offering of victims deprived of life by strangulation was in the number of the Pagan rites. We meet with a remarkable instance of this kind in the Georgics of Virgil, lib. iv. 299. Aristæus, at the direction of his mother Cyrene, sacrifices four bullocks to appease the wood-nymphs for the restoration of his bees. The manner in which one of them is killed, is thus described: 'Then is sought a steer, whose forehead winds with biennial horns; while he violently struggles, both his nostrils and the breath of his mouth are stopped up; and when he is beaten to death, his crushed bowels putrify, while his skin remains entire.' We shall find reason to believe that this vile practice prevailed in Egypt, whence it was borrowed by the Greeks and Romans as early as the days of Moses, and that it is one of the offensive impurities against which his prohibition is levelled. The question in debate was the observance of the ceremonial law. This law consisted of rites that, though not immoral, were useless, burdensome, and odious to the new converts, or of prohibitions that were irrational and debasing in the extreme. Of the first kind was the rite of circumcision; of the second were offerings made to idols, the use of blood and of animals strangled, with every species of impurity known to attend the Pagan worship. The decree proposed by James had for its object to cancel every rite that was merely national or ceremonial; while it acknowledged and enforced the perpetual obligation of those prohibitions, which were calculated to prevent the corruption of morals, and thus to co-operate with the purifying influence of the gospel.

"The reason which this Apostle gives for the resolutions proposed by him, is worthy of observation: 'For Moses from ancient times has in every city those who preach him, he being read in the synagogue every Sabbath:' which is to this effect; 'It is in vain for us to hold out to the Gentiles the duty of abstaining from their idolatrous rites and the impurities consequent on them, on the authority of Moses; for this experiment has been tried, and tried in vain, for ages: it is necessary, therefore, to forbid the same things on a higher authority—the authority of Christ through us; and in his name to enjoin a total abstinence from all such debasing practices as disqualify them to become members of a nobler

community in a future world.'"—Pp. 227—229.

In a note (pp. 281—283) on the quotation of Virgil in this passage, the author displays more than his wonted ingenuity. (Ben David and Essenus are the same author.)

"The passage in Virgil is thus:—

"Tum vitulus, bima curvans jam
cornua fronte,
Quæritur; huic geminæ nares, et spir-
ritus oris
Multa reluctanti obstruitur; plagisque
perempto
Tunsa per integram solvantur viscera
pellem."

"Presently it is said that a swarm of bees flew out of this carcase, as a shower from the clouds. Now, if we take this story in a literal sense, it must appear false and ridiculous. But in truth it was never intended to be so understood. The poet intimates, that it originated in Egypt, see Georg. lib. iv. 285. In a little work, entitled "A New Version of the First Three Chapters of Genesis, accompanied with Dissertations, illustrative of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Principle of Evil, and the Plagues of Egypt," by Essenus, it is shewn that the facts of the Mosaic history form the basis of the Egyptian mythology. The fable of Aristæus and his bees is another illustration of that assertion. The calf here intended was APIS, whom the Israelites, as devoted to Egyptian superstition, at first worshiped; see Exod. xxxii. The bees which issued from the carcase of this Apis were the Israelites themselves, who escaped from Egyptian bondage, and on the fruits of whose labour, while in slavery, the Egyptians lived as drones in a hive. The Greeks at first seem to have called bees *βουγεναι*, *Ox-begotten*, an idea evidently derived with their mythology from Egypt; and it is still more remarkable, that the Latins have preserved, without any change, the original *Apis* as a general name for *bees*.

"A plague fell on the bees and cattle of Aristæus, because he had violated Eurydice, a beautiful woman, and the wife of Orpheus. If we cut off the termination of this last name, and read it from right to left, Orpheus in Hebrew is precisely *Pharoah*—hence we discover the origin of the fable. A plague was sent on that monarch and his house, because of his conduct to Sarah, wife of Abraham. Gen. xii. 17. Eurydice in escaping is torn by a serpent, and Orpheus recovers her from Hades by the charms of his music, but on condition that he should *not look back*, as she followed him to the

region of light. Forgetting, however, this condition, he did look back, and she vanished for ever. The source of this fiction will be found in Genesis xvii. 17—26.

“Aristæus, by the assistance of his mother, compels *Proteus* to explain to him the cause of his disasters. This *Proteus* was a sea monster, who turned himself at will into all sorts of beasts, but principally into a lion. This we learn from the fourth *Odyssey* of Homer. The impostors, who delivered oracles in his name, were the authors of the fable about the bees; the main object of which seems to have been to ridicule the Israelites for worshipping as their god a strangled calf. According to Homer, *Proteus* was not in Egypt, but frequented the shores of an adjacent island: and we find him opposed to *Jehovah* among the Philistines, under the name of *Dagon*, which means a *fish* or *corn*, as the word is derived from one of two Hebrew terms very similar in sound, though thus different in sense. If then the devotees of *Dagon* or *Proteus*, under the fable of the strangled calf and the bees, ridiculed the Israelites and the true God; and if it was usual with *Proteus* to metamorphose himself into a lion, we shall see the purport of the following piece of history: ‘Then went Samson down and his father and his mother to *Temnath*—and behold a young lion roared against him, and the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him: and he rent him as he would have rent a kid, and he had nothing in his hand.... And after a time he returned, and he turned aside to see the carcase of the lion, and behold there was a swarm of bees and honey in the carcase of the lion.’ Judges xiv. 5—9. This act was miraculous, inflicted in just and signal vengeance by a servant of the true God, to illustrate the folly and falsehood of those who trusted in the popular gods opposed to him. The punishment inflicted on *Dagon*, as meaning *corn*, was also very signal, but different. ‘And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took fire-brands, and turned tail to tail, and put a fire-brand in the midst between two tails. And when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines; and burnt up both the shocks, and also the standing corn, with the vineyards and olives,’ chap. xv. 4, 5. The Philistines ascribed this corn to the bounty of *Dagon*, and its destruction proved the nullity of the god which they worshiped.”

Ben David has some very good observations upon Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, so strangely, and we might

say, so madly, misrepresented by Gamaliel Smith, and also upon the erroneous apprehension of the Thessalonians that Paul represented the end of the world as at hand, which is, as might have been expected, eagerly laid hold of by the same author as an argument against the apostle; but we can only refer to them, leaving the reader to satisfy himself by a perusal of the volume.

In Ben David, the Apostle of the Gentiles has an ardent admirer and an ingenious and eloquent advocate. No one who has read Gamaliel Smith ought to rest contented without reading likewise his learned answerer. We have sufficiently shewn that we cannot yield conviction to Ben David in all his hypotheses and criticisms, but we think, and have pleasure in stating, that the Christian world is indebted to him for his able and honest exposure of an attempt to destroy Christianity by an attack upon the Chief of the Apostles.

ART. III.—*The History of Christ, a Testimony to the sole Deity of the Father: and the Connexion between Divine and Human Philanthropy. Two Sermons, preached on the Morning and Evening of Sunday, September 14, 1823, at the Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Young Street, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh.* By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 44. Edinburgh, Bell and Bradfute; London, C. Fox and Co.

ART. IV.—*The Spirit of Unitarian Christianity. A Sermon, delivered at the Opening of the Finsbury Unitarian Chapel, on Sunday, Feb. 1st, 1824: To which is prefixed, An Address, delivered on laying the First Stone of the Chapel, on Thursday, May 22nd, 1823.* By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 36. C. Fox and Co.

IN these kindred publications, Mr. Fox asserts the claims of the Unitarian doctrine with his wonted ability and ardour.

The first Sermon at Edinburgh, from John xviii. 37, is designed to shew that “Christ bore witness to Unitarian Christianity;” and after a judicious and satisfactory summary of “the History of Christ” as “a Testimony to the sole Deity of the Fa-

ther," the preacher concludes with an exhortation to consistency and firmness in the profession of the truth, to zeal for its diffusion, and to conformity with its dictates. He says, as truly as eloquently,

"Distraction and depression are the natural results of the notions of a plurality of divine persons, and of the vindictiveness of divine justice. They hide the truth, and, of course, obstruct and weaken, if not destroy, the feelings of pious gratitude which would spring up in its light. Above, heaven bends in benignant loveliness; and below, earth smiles in grateful and responsive fruitfulness, like God and the heart of man; but the interposing cloud that veils the glories of the one, casts a broader and deeper circle of gloom upon the other. From you that cloud has passed away. Soon may it in all regions, that to Him whose right they are, the prayers, and thanksgivings, and hearts of his children may be restored. The services for which this building is destined are not those of vain forms, or slavish feelings, or sectarian narrowness. It is the worship of the Father, 'in spirit and in truth,' that we would cultivate; not only here, but in our bosoms, our homes, our lives. We revere him in all the spirituality of his nature, the immensity of his presence, the paternity of his character. The universe is his temple; the dome of heaven its lofty roof; the plain of earth its wide basis; sun, moon and stars its glittering ornaments; every contrite heart an altar, every upright man a priest; and obedience and sincerity the incense that shall ascend to his palace and his throne, and draw down his gracious benediction."—Pp. 25, 26.

The Evening Sermon at Edinburgh is an argument, from 1 John iv. 11, for the truth of Unitarianism as a benevolent system, illustrating the love of God, and thus producing love to man. Mr. Fox here assumes the doctrine of universal restoration. The "Connexion between Divine and Human Philanthropy" is shewn by the following observations: 1. The mere exhibition of excellence disposes the observer to imitation. 2. The imitation of God is a Christian duty. 3. The condition on which God blesses each, is solicitude for the well-being of the whole. 4. The usual expression of divine love is the relation of Parent to us, and to all, which implies our fraternal relation to one another. 5. The object of God's love in the gospel is to excite, enlarge and strengthen

this mutual affection. 6. If God, the pure and infinite Spirit, loves man, much more should we, brethren in infirmity and sins, love each other. 7. God's love has endowed us with a common nature, deduced us from a common origin, and it designs for us ultimately a common destiny of joy.

In the second of these pamphlets, the Address on laying the First Stone of Finsbury Unitarian Chapel, stands at the beginning. It is a concise, perspicuous and manly declaration of Unitarianism, and an impressive description of the moral uses of a Christian House of Prayer. A pleasing tribute of gratitude and respect is paid towards the end to Winchester and Vidler, the former pastors of the congregation; and the Address terminates with a short, appropriate and solemn invocation of the Divine blessing.

The Sermon on the opening of the Chapel, from Rom. viii. 9, has for its object to vindicate the Unitarian system by demonstrating that its spirit is precisely the spirit of the gospel. The preacher selects for instances the several topics of *piety; faith; liberty and liberality; holiness; philanthropy, and hope*.

Some excellent observations are made (pp. 17—23) upon faith, which Mr. Fox treats, not as the belief of a string of propositions, but as "confidence in a faithful or benignant God."

The preacher sums up the subject of discourse, and exhibits a glowing practical illustration of it, in the following passage:

"We are strong in the plain and literal declarations of the New Testament; but we are yet stronger in the sameness of the *general impression* made by Christianity and Unitarianism as to the moral qualities with which these declarations are associated in the teacher's mind, and which they are designed to produce in the convert. The machinery is the same; the object the same: our system has the spirit of Christ, and is his, and Christianity is Unitarianism. And were it needful to illustrate this practically, not hard would be the task; for men who have had an abiding and universal sense of the Divine presence, who have shewn that God was in all their thoughts, and who seem to have made the very state of consciousness an act of adoration: men who with filial confidence could cast themselves on his protection, and obey the

call of duty, though summoning to the bitterest sacrifices of fortune or of feeling, renouncing every prospect for the testimony of a good conscience, and in reliance on his providence: men who have developed the powers and asserted the rights of intellect, and won from Philosophy her proudest trophies to cast them at the foot of the Cross; and whose exalted talents and unshaken faith were an exhibition of the native affinity of Reason and Revelation: men who have raised the standard of religious freedom, and fought its battles, and suffered in its cause, and prompted its manly and generous assertion, not only for those who were like-minded with themselves, but on behalf of all, even though holding opinions the most remote, and mad with a bigoted hostility the most inveterate: men who, deeply impressed with the practical importance of their own tenets, could yet most readily allow, and praise, and love goodness in others, whatever they believed, or whatever they rejected: men whose pure lives shewed that even if the head were wrong, the heart was right, and that, if doing Christ's will be building on a rock, they need not dread the storm, come when it may: men who loved their neighbour as themselves, and felt the zeal of benevolence in all its energy, and were in doing good unwearied, and grappled man to their hearts with the affection of a brother: men who through life's changes, and in death's struggles, had hopes fixed on high, ever firm and glorious, drawing their souls to heaven to join the kindred society of the just made perfect, and enjoy the full triumphs of that cause for which they combated, in the subjection of all enemies at the Saviour's footstool:—men such as these has no system done more honour to Christianity than Unitarianism by producing in comparative abundance. The descriptions will suggest to you names whose praise is in all our churches; nay, which pervades our country, and beams forth beyond, even to the very boundaries of enlightened and civilized society." —Pp. 33, 34.

Our good wishes and fervent prayers are given to these Temples of the Living God. May they be at once memorials and shrines of Evangelic truth, pure and undefiled! And may the Holy Spirit of the gospel, "the spirit of power, and of love, and a sound mind," "the spirit of glory," rest upon them, and secure peace and prosperity within them!

ART. V.—*An Address, delivered on Opening a New School Room, belonging to the Trustees of Mr. Baylies's Charity, in Tower Street, Dudley, on Monday, March 22, 1824.* By James Hews Bransby. 8vo. pp. 36. Ipswich, printed by John Bransby, and sold by R. Hunter, London.

MR. ROBERT BAYLIES, a lime-burner of Dudley, by an indenture, bearing date Nov. 9, 1732, founded an institution for educating and clothing fifty poor boys. He provided that his trustees should be chosen from among such as are "by profession Protestant Presbyterian Dissenters," but he solemnly enjoined that in selecting objects of his bounty, "no regard whatever should be had to party or persuasion." He died at the beginning of the year 1745. By the improvement of the charity, the trustees are enabled to educate two hundred and twenty boys, though only fifty are clothed. They have also built an elegant and commodious school, on the opening of which the above "Address" was delivered, which is in every respect appropriate. Mr. Bransby concludes with a suitable anecdote from Mr. Charles Butler's Works (IV. 346):

"We are told that when the pious and amiable Gerson, the Chancellor of the Church and University of Paris, was on his death-bed, his soul appeared to be agonized at the thought of impending dissolution, and at the prospect of standing before his eternal Judge. Astonished and affrighted by his terrors, his friends strove to console him. They brought to his recollection the great and virtuous actions of his public life; the services he had rendered to the cause of religion, of which, during many years, he had been one of the brightest ornaments; the learned and pious works he had written; his long protracted old age spent in prayer and meditation. But all was vain!—His terrors continued, and he appeared to be sinking under them. At length one of his friends quitted the room. In about half an hour he returned, followed by three hundred children, who were supported and educated by the charity of the dying man. The little creatures spread themselves from the threshold of his house to his bed-chamber; and there, falling on their knees raised their hands to heaven, and cried, 'O God, be merciful to one, who in thy name has been

so kind to us! O God, be merciful to our kind and generous benefactor!— Hope, peace and comfort returned to his fainting heart. 'Now, O God!' he exclaimed, in a transport of holy joy, as he closed his eyes in death, 'Thou dost let thy servant depart in peace! The soul that is accompanied to eternity by the prayers of three hundred children may advance with humble hope into the presence of their Father and their God!'— Pp. 35, 36.

ART. VI.—*An Account of the Life and Religious Opinions of John Bawn, of Frenchay.* By Michael Maurice. Also, *Answers to some*

Objections advanced against Unitarians. 12mo. pp. 56. Bristol, printed and sold by W. Browne: sold also by R. Hunter, London. 6d.

THIS biographical "Account" was first printed in *The Christian Reformer*, for August 1822. It is now published separately with additions, and we think that Mr. Maurice (lately minister of the Unitarian congregation at Frenchay, near Bristol) has consulted the good of his fellow-creatures in the publication.

OBITUARY.

1824. May 9, at *Trowbridge*, in the 77th year of her age, Mrs. SARAH WALDRON, daughter of the late Rev. W. Waldron, fifty years Pastor of the General Baptist Church in Trowbridge, who finished his valuable life and labours in that town, in the year 1794. She had from early life been an exemplary member of the above-mentioned church; her steady piety, Christian simplicity and zeal, the deep interest she took in every thing which concerned the welfare of the congregation, her readiness to do good to others to the utmost of her means, and the uniform consistency of her conduct, endeared her to the Christian society with which she had been so many years united. To the last, her hope firmly rested upon the fatherly character of God, and his free mercy and grace manifested in Jesus Christ. After for a considerable time gradually sinking under the weakness and infirmities of age, cherishing the animating prospect of a future, happy immortality, without any violent struggle she fell asleep in Jesus. On the 16th, she was interred in the family vault in the General Baptist Meeting-house, when a suitable address was delivered; and on the following day, Sunday, May 17, her funeral sermon was preached from 1 Thess. iv. 14, to a respectable audience. Persons belonging to other congregations shewed their respect to her memory by attending on the occasion.

R. W.

May 31, at *Quorndon*, in *Leicestershire*, in the 59th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS OWEN. Mr. Owen was born at *Garn Fawr*, in the county of *Caermarthen*, January 1, 1766. His parents had five children, two sons and three daugh-

ters, of which he was the eldest, and of course heir to the patrimonial estate: fortunately for him it was an entailed one, or he would have been deprived of it on account of some differences in the family. At the age of sixteen he entered the Academy in *Caermarthen*, under the care of Mr. Gentleman. It was afterwards removed to *Swansea*, where he finished his education under Mr. Howell. He settled at *Findern* as minister in 1785. After preaching here about six years, he removed to *Loughborough*, Feb. 19, 1791, and undertook the care of the Unitarian congregations at that place and *Mount Sorrel*. His departure from *Findern* was much regretted. Thus far in life he had been an Arian. He was deeply learned in polemical divinity, and considered the acquisition of truth one of the great ends of human existence. During his ministry in these congregations his opinions underwent a gradual change, and at the time the writer of this memoir became acquainted with him, (1817,) he had given up the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, and was a confirmed Unitarian in the strictest sense of the word: his views were liberal and enlightened, being a believer in philosophical necessity, and a materialist. In the year 1798 he married Ann Catharine Dethick, who died Feb. 10, 1804, aged 34, leaving one daughter, an only child. Grief at the loss of his wife increased much the constitutional irritability of his temper: but what often occurs at the death-bed of the pious was realized in his last illness, which was peculiarly marked by suavity and evenness of feeling. The disease which carried him off, was what is commonly called a decline. At *Loughborough* and *Mount Sorrel* he officiated nearly a quarter of a century,

and in 1816 gave up his situation as minister, on account of the infirm state of his health. His love of truth was shewn by that earnest search after it, which marked the whole course of his life, and the liberality of his mind, by strong hatred of persecution. His moral character was, I believe, unimpeachable, so much so that his integrity of purpose and action partook of sternness. We have all our failings, and happy is he whose errors are those of the head merely, not residing in the heart, or having their origin in moral turpitude: and full of glorious promise will be the resurrection of him who descends to the grave like the subject of the present memoir, his thoughts pure, his conduct irreproachable, and his affections fixed upon his God. The best idea will be given of the uprightness of his conduct by stating his own words. In one of our conversations we insensibly got upon the subject of character, when he made the remark, "I have anxiously endeavoured through the whole of my life, to be correct in my moral conduct, and I believe no human being can lay any thing serious to my charge." Resigned, as might be expected, was the death of him who was under the influence of this feeling: he could repose with full and pious confidence upon the tender mercy of his God, trusting he would forgive those imperfections which belong to humanity, and accept the heart that had not intentionally sinned. Conscious that he had diligently exerted himself to prepare for eternity, he had no wish, as he expressed to me in his last illness, to stay in this world, except on account of that strong love every good father feels towards the child of his affections whom he is going to leave behind. The cheering influence of gospel truth sweetened his departure, and he found consolation and comfort in meditating upon one of those promises of our Saviour which apply only to the good, and the pleasure of which the pious alone can enjoy; "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

Fessus rerum in gratam quietem decessit.

Loughborough.

W. P.

August 3rd, at *Appledore, Devon*, in the 88th year of his age, the Rev. RICHARD EVANS, who had been for more than half a century pastor of the Independent Congregation in that town; which office his infirmities led him a few years ago to resign. He was descended in a line of pious ancestors from one of the ejected ministers. He was educated at Ottery, the place of his birth, under

the Rev. John Lavington. He lived and died universally esteemed.

Sept. 2, at *Dairsie, in Fifeshire*, aged 84, the Rev. Dr. ROBERT MACCULLOCK, author of "Lectures on the Prophecies of Isaiah," 1794, and of "Sermons on Interesting Subjects," 2 vols. 12mo. 1823.

—19, the Rev. WM. BENTLEY CRATHERN, late of *Dedham, Essex*. He was educated at Homerton Academy, and was ordained pastor of the Independent Church, Saffron Walden, July 22, 1778, and continued there till 1785, when he removed to Dedham. Here he continued to labour till 1823, when he resigned the pastoral office, and retired to the village of Nayland, in Suffolk.

Oct. 14, at the house of his son, in *Leadenhall Street*, JOHN SIMPSON, Sen., in the 92nd year of his age. Some particulars with regard to this much-esteemed and venerable Christian will appear in our next.

Lately, at *Gainsbro'*, after a very short illness, in his 25th year, the Rev. JAMES KENNEDY, Minister of the Unitarian Chapel there; a young man of great promise, and of very extensive acquirements, and whose early loss will be long lamented by those whom he honoured with his friendship. He was interred in the new burial ground belonging to the chapel, and is the second (his father-in-law, the late Mr. James Lloyd, being the first) whose body reposes in that place of sepulture.

Additions.

MAJOR CARTWRIGHT. (See p. 571.)

THE following extract from his will is quite characteristic:—

"To my country, anxiously desiring her welfare, I leave a fervent wish for such necessary, deep, and salutary reforms in her institutions, as would not only restore her lost freedom, but purify from the odiousness and debasement of unfaithfulness and corruption, all her public departments. By a complete restoration of her genuine polity (which I have endeavoured to place before her eyes), she might, in my humble judgment, so correct the morals and the habits of her people, as to establish on a solid and enduring basis, her future liberty, prosperity, and renown. To this end she must cease to follow the example of conquering states, which, from small beginnings, become what may be considered as vast pyramids absurdly resting on their points, with their broad founda-

tions in the air; from the unnaturalness of which position they necessarily fall in ruins, misery, and contempt. When England shall restore the simplicity of her original polity, she will have a basis sufficient for stability, felicity and glory; and then, instead of insanely making her state to resemble an inverted pyramid, she, by merely colonizing on her own natural, sound, constitutional principles, may spread to a wide extent confederate nations, sincere friends to her welfare, firm supports of her greatness; and, in place of jealous rivals or secret and insidious enemies of her repose, she would raise up around her willing ministers of her aggrandizement."

REV. JAMES LYONS. (See p. 571.)

HE was born in Ireland of Presbyterian parents. His father was superintendant of a timber-yard at Seaford, in the North of that country. While yet a boy he became a convert to the Wesleyan Methodists, and at the early age of 16 commenced preacher to such of his neighbours as would come to hear him in his father's orchard. This was in the absence of the father, who was displeased with his son's zeal. From the age of 19 to 25 he was a circuit preacher amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, in which connexion he came over to England when he was about 21. He was appointed first to Wales and then to Devonshire. His secession from the Methodists was occasioned by an alteration of his views regarding baptism, which led him to connect himself with the Baptists at Plymouth Dock, (now Devonport,) to whom he preached, assistant we believe to Mr. Birt, for some time. From this place he removed to London, as a supply to the Baptist congregation at Walworth, which had been raised by Mr. Swaine. He was next called in 1796 or 1797 to be assistant to the Rev. John Beatson, pastor of the Baptist church in George Street, Hull, author of two treatises on the Divine Character and the Satisfaction of Christ. Here he was settled first as co-pastor and next as successor to Mr. Beatson, the younger of whose daughters he married in 1798. [This lady died at Chester, November 11, 1809. An account of her by her husband is inserted, V. 90.] At the latter end of the year 1807, Mr. Lyons's mind underwent another considerable change: he embraced Unitarianism, and consequently took leave of his congregation, after ten years of mutual happiness. [See Mr. Wright's account of this change, III. 166.] On this occasion, Mr. Lyons preached and published a Farewell Sermon, on "The Right and Duty of a Faithful and Fearless Exami-

nation of the Scriptures," 8vo. 1808, which was reviewed, III. 272. Immediately upon his declaration of Unitarianism, Mr. Lyons became connected with the Unitarian Fund, and under the patronage of the Society visited Scotland as a Missionary, the first Unitarian Missionary to that part of the kingdom. His visit was so far successful as to lead the way for Mr. Wright, and in fact to introduce Unitarian worship into some of the principal towns. The effect of it is fully appreciated by a competent judge, IV. 512. He preached the anniversary sermon before the Society, June 8, 1808, [III. 349, &c.,] which was published in 8vo. and 12mo. under the title of "The Dissemination of Unitarian Principles Recommended and Enforced;" a sermon which may be characterized as full of heart. In 1810, as soon as the anniversary of the Fund was passed, Mr. Lyons went a second time as Missionary into Scotland, V. 309; an important visit, of which a very pleasing account may be seen, VI. 60—63. The next year, he went as a Missionary into Wales, where he laboured for 50 days: an abstract of his labours is printed in the same volume, VI. 683—692. Soon after giving up the pastoral charge at Hull, Mr. Lyons was invited to several Unitarian congregations; he chose that of Chester, over which he settled as minister in Nov. 1808. He continued his ministry here till Dec. 1813, when he resigned, and was henceforth without any permanent ministerial engagement. He resided to the last in Chester and the neighbourhood, but in the earlier part of the period of his disengagement from the pastoral connexion, had supplied the congregations of Parliament Court, London; Newport, Isle of Wight; Reading, &c. His early and best habit of preaching was extempore: he was fluent and animated and his manner was free and manly. His elocution was agreeable. He had a mind of considerable powers, and with early cultivation would have been distinguished in any profession. He was a cheerful companion, and his conversation abounded in humour and pleasantry. His affections were warm; his disposition generous. From feeling and principle he was a lover of his species, and a declared enemy of all intolerance and oppression. With the excellencies of this cast of character, even friendship cannot claim for him an entire exemption from its defects; but this may be said with perfect truth, that they who knew him best were his most steady friends, and now cherish his memory with the most tender regard.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

THE Half-Yearly Meeting of the *Somersetshire and Dorset Unitarian Association* was held at Crewkerne, on Tuesday, the 5th of October. There was a religious service in the morning, at which Messrs. Walker, of Crewkerne, and Hughes, of Yeovil, performed the devotional parts; and the Rev. E. Whitfield, of Ilminster, preached from John iii. 16. In the evening, the Rev. Mr. Yeates, of Sidmouth, introduced the service, and the Rev. L. Lewes, from Dorchester, addressed a crowded congregation on the words of the historian of the Apostles, Acts xvii. 16: "While Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry."

The interval between the services was occupied by the usual engagements. The only parts of the transactions, however, which demand public notice, are, the resolution that the next Meeting shall be held at Honiton, on the day commonly called Good-Friday, 1825, and the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Davies, of Taunton, to be the preacher on that occasion.

It is hoped that the proceedings of the day, interesting as they appear to have been to those who visited Crewkerne on the occasion, will be also useful in diffusing and increasing an enlightened zeal for the great principles of Protestant and Unitarian Dissent.

G. B. W.

Southern Unitarian Fund.

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held at Portsmouth on the 22nd of September. The Rev. Samuel Walker delivered an impressive discourse in the morning, on the Importance of Consideration with respect both to the Doctrines and Duties of Religion. The Secretary (Rev. Russell Scott) read the Report of the Committee, detailing the continued success of missionary exertions for the spread of gospel truth. The members and their friends dined together (T. Cooke, Jun., Esq., of Newport, in the Chair). The Revs. S. Walker, R. Scott, Hughes, Fullagar, E. Kell, Beard, Sen. and Jun., Mr. Archibald Kenrick, of West Bromwich, and other gentlemen, severally addressed the meeting, recommending perseverance, and

pointing to means of more extensive usefulness. The Rev. S. Walker also delivered a lecture in the evening, in which he eloquently shewed that Unitarianism is more honourable to God and more conducive to the improvement of mankind, than the popular creeds of the day. The public services were well attended.

D. B. P.

Oldbury Double Lecture.

ON Tuesday, Sept. 14, 1824, the Annual Meeting, denominated the Double Lecture, took place at Oldbury. The Rev. Hugh Hutton, of Birmingham, conducted the devotional service. The Rev. Joseph Hunter, of Bath, and the Rev. Charles Wallace, of Altringham, preached. The former on 1 Cor. xii. 12; the latter on Acts i. 7. Sixteen ministers were present. The ministers and some of the members of their respective congregations, afterwards dined together, the Rev. John Corrie being in the Chair: and in the course of the afternoon several gentlemen addressed the meeting on subjects connected with the interests of religious truth and liberty. The Rev. John Small, of Coseley, and the Rev. Evan Jones, of Bewdley, were appointed to preach at the next anniversary.

J. H. B.

Welsh Unitarian Quarterly Meeting.

The Quarterly Meeting of Unitarian Ministers, in South Wales, was held on Thursday the 7th of this month, at Pant-y-defaid, Cardiganshire. A meeting was held in the afternoon of the preceding day, at Capel-y-groes, about seven miles distant from the former place. Mr. J. Davies, of Llwyn-rhyd-Owen, introduced the service, and Mr. J. James, of Gellionen, preached from Rom. iii. 28. On Thursday, about fourteen preachers were present at Pant-y-defaid. Dr. D. Rees, of Merthyr, conducted the introductory service, and Mr. T. Evans, of Aberdâr, preached from John v. 23. The question discussed, at the close of the service, was *Original Sin*. Some of the preachers produced several convincing arguments against that doctrine, and shewed that those passages of Scripture which are often cited to prove it, afford it no support, when rightly explained, consistently with their context. In the evening, Dr. D. Rees, of Merthyr, preached at Llwyn-rhyd-Owen Chapel, from 2 Cor. v. 17. All the services were well attended.

The Winter Quarterly Meeting was appointed to be held at Nottage, Glamorganshire, on the last Thursday in the present year. And Mr. J. James, of Gellionen, was requested to preach the sermon.

The following question was proposed to be discussed:—*What Proofs can be had, that the Holy Spirit works immediately and supernaturally, on the heart of a Sinner, in his Conversion?*

J. T.

October 15th, 1824.

Ordination of the Rev. Franklin Baker.

The ordination of the Rev. FRANKLIN BAKER took place in the Bank-Street Chapel, Bolton, on Thursday the 23rd of September. The service commenced at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, with an introductory prayer by the Rev. Charles Wallace, of Altrincham. Afterwards a few questions were proposed to the young minister by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester, in which he was requested to state what were the views with which he had undertaken the duties of the pastoral office: to these queries he returned a very modest and sensible reply, declaring his conviction of the truth and importance of the Christian religion, and his determination to make it the rule of his teachings and practice. Another prayer was then offered up by the Rev. Mr. Tate, of Chorley, for the mutual happiness of the pastor and his flock in the connexion then solemnly ratified between them. The Rev. John Kentish, of Birmingham, next delivered an excellent charge, abounding with the most judicious precepts and affectionate advice, which was listened to with the deepest attention by the whole assembly, and must have been felt peculiarly edifying by the numerous young ministers who were present. The charge was followed by a sermon from the Rev. Mr. Bransby, of Dudley, who preached, in a very animated and argumentative strain, from Acts iv. 19 and 20, upon the principles of Protestant Nonconformity, and, in conclusion, made a touching application of his discourse to the peculiar circumstances of the occasion. A short prayer from Mr. Bransby terminated the interesting services of the day. In the afternoon, the congregation, the ministers, and several lay-friends from the neighbourhood dined together. The subject of the Revival of Ordination Services amongst Protestant Dissenters was discussed in several speeches that were delivered after dinner. There seemed to be but one feeling as to the agreeable and salutary impression

produced by the services of that day; and guarded, as the ceremony of ordination is in its present form, from the liability of abuse to superstitious purposes, it was thought that the general revival of it would be attended by many beneficial consequences. It is understood, that the gentlemen who officiated on the occasion, have consented that their services should be printed.

Methodist Conference.

The Eighty-First Annual Conference of the *Wesleyan Methodists* was held at Leeds from Wednesday, July 28th, to Tuesday, August 10th. Upwards of three hundred and sixty preachers, and an immense number of strangers, were present. The clear increase of members at home and abroad is stated to be 8,678. The number of members in the American Societies when last taken was 312,540, and the number of preachers 1,214.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[*Advertisement.*—The Deputy Treasurer of the *Unitarian Fund* has received a donation of Two Hundred Pounds, from a Friend, for the general purposes of that Institution.

[*Advertisement.*—The Treasurer of *Manchester College, York*, has received the sum of Two Hundred and Forty-six Pounds, a donation to the College, from "A Friend."

Manchester, Oct. 20, 1824.

The Corporation of London have unanimously resolved to establish a LIBRARY in their Guildhall, and have granted £500 as an outfit, and £200 per ann. for the purchase of books.

A volume of the matters obtained by unrolling HERCULANEUM MSS. will shortly be given to the public.

Midland Catholic Association.

Sept. 22nd, a public meeting of the Catholics of the midland counties was held at the Royal Hotel, Birmingham, (EDWARD BLOUNT, Esq., in the Chair,) for the purpose of forming a Catholic Association in connexion with that established in the metropolis. One of the resolutions entered into was to the following effect: "That the basis on which this Association is founded is the right which every man possesses of worshiping God according to the dictates of his conscience, with-

out being subjected on that account to any civil pains, penalties or disabilities whatsoever. That in accordance with the principle above declared, we solemnly protest against being called upon, as the condition of enjoying our civil rights, to take any oath, or make any declaration, or submit to any arrangements, which may, in the remotest degree, affect the most free exercise of our religion; but as we have already taken, so we shall be at all future times prepared to take, any oath approved by our ecclesiastical superiors, which will perfectly secure our most full and complete allegiance, in all civil concerns, to the Government of our country." Mr. Blount was elected Chairman of the new Association; Mr. Hardman, Treasurer; and the Rev. T. M. M'Donnell, Secretary and Chairman of the Committees.

LORD BYRON.—A character of this extraordinary man in the *London Magazine* for October, has excited much attention. Some of his friends are disgusted with the freedom of the detail of his Lordship's errors, but the general truth of the picture seems to be admitted, and is indeed supported by strong internal evidence. The following passage relates to his views of religion:—"He left very little behind him. Of late he had been too much occupied by the Greeks to write, and, indeed, had turned his attention very much to *action*, as has been observed. *Don Juan* he certainly intended to continue; and I believe that the real reason for his holding so many conferences with Dr. Kennedy in Cephalonia was, that he might master the slang of a religious sect, in order to hit off the character with more verisimilitude.

"His religious principles were by no means fixed; habitually, like most of his class, he was an unbeliever; at times, however, he relapsed into Christianity, and, in his interviews with Dr. Kennedy, maintained the part of an Unitarian. Like all men whose imaginations are much stronger than the reasoning power—the guiding and determining faculty—he was in danger of falling into fanaticism, and some of his friends who knew him well, used to predict that he would die a Methodist—a consummation by no means impossible.

"From the same cause—the preponderance of the imagination—there might have been some ground for the fear which beset his latter moments that he should go mad. The immediate cause of this fear was, the deep impression which the fate of Swift had made upon him. He read the life of Swift during the whole of his voyage to Greece, and the

melancholy termination of the Dean's life haunted his imagination."

Ireland.

Ecclesiastical affairs in this country are evidently coming to a crisis. The Catholic Association has become more vigorous, and unites within its pale nearly the whole Catholic population, including nobility, gentry, professional men, merchants and the people, and the clergy of all ranks, from the prelate to the parish priest. The leaders of this body, knowing that money is the sinew of war, have instituted a voluntary tax upon the Catholics, under the name of the *Catholic Rent*, which has been gradually increasing, and now brings in £300 per week. To this fund, the nobleman and the peasant contribute their proportions. The object of it is to employ the press in the Catholic cause, and, above all, to support weekly and daily petitions to the Legislature. Dr. Doyle, the titular Bishop of Kildare, says in a letter to the Association just published, that the Government must put down this body or grant emancipation. Mr. O'Connell is the leading speaker of the society. His speech at the opening of their present session is abundant in eloquence, if not in wisdom. He praises the King of France, the Marquis Wellesley, Mr. Cobbett and the King of England; and pours out his censures very freely on the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Goulburn, the Holy Alliance and the English press. Other speakers attack the Bible Society and the various proselyting institutions in Ireland. A motion is announced for an address to the People of England on the subject of these societies. Of late, the Catholics have made a point of attending Bible and other public meetings of the more zealous Protestants, and of pointing out mistakes and contradicting false assertions; the effect of which has been, in some instances to cause the meetings to disperse, and will probably be to check the progress of itinerant eloquence in Ireland, which even in England has become insipid, if not tiresome. Cobbett, the political Proteus, is now the avowed advocate of the Irish Catholics, and they have adopted him, by a formal resolution, as their champion. It is easy to foresee that Ireland will fill a large space in the debates of the next session of Parliament.

The late Dr. Oudney, the African Traveller.

(From the *Glasgow Courier*.)

WE insert an interesting letter from Lieut. Clapperton, regarding the death of his fellow African traveller, DR. OUDNEY, on the western frontier of Bornou, in the

interior of Northern Africa. His journals and papers, which must be extremely interesting, he has recommended to the care and revision of Mr. Barrow, of the Admiralty. The immediate cause of his death opens to our view a new and astonishing feature in the geography of interior Africa. Instead of burning sands and a country arid from heat, we learn that the cold was so severe that it froze the water skins to a solid mass. The part where this took place, if former accounts from these travellers be correct, is in about 12 deg. N. lat. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this degree of cold can only take place in that parallel from a very great elevation, and which very elevated country, while it bars the progress of the Niger to the eastward and to the Nile of Egypt, must give birth to innumerable powerful streams, which will tend to swell, not decrease its stream as it flows eastward and southward. Considering this, we are at no loss to account for the mighty floods which enter the Atlantic, in the Bights of Benin and Biafra. Leo Africanus told us, that the country of Zegzeg, situated about this part of Africa, was exceedingly cold, but his narrative was treated with ridicule. Subsequent travellers gave us similar reports, but they were laughed at, and the low swamps which absorbed the Niger were placed where we find a country so elevated as in 12 deg. N. lat. to be visited by frost in December equal to any we feel in this parallel of latitude. On the summit of the Blue Mountains in Jamaica, in 18 deg. N. lat., and at an elevation of 8000 feet above the level of the sea, frost is altogether unknown. From this we may judge of the great elevation of that part of Africa where Dr. Oudney died. Before frost could be felt to such a degree, the elevation in 12 deg. N. lat. would probably exceed 14,000 feet above the level of the sea. Captain Laing ascertained that the sources of the Niger do not exceed 1500 feet above the level of the Atlantic. Its passage eastward, therefore, to the Nile, may be set down as physically impossible.

Extract of a Letter from Lieut. Clapperton to Mr. Consul Warrington, dated Kano, Feb. 2, 1824.

"The melancholy task has fallen to me to report to you the ever-to-be-lamented death of my friend Dr. Walter Oudney. We left Kuka on the 14th of December, 1823, and by easy journeys arrived at Bedukarfea, the westernmost town in the kingdom of Bornou. During this part of the journey he was recovering strength very fast; but on leaving Bedukarfea, and entering the Beder territory on the night of the 26th and morning of the 27th, we had such an intense cold that the water was frozen in the dishes,

and the water skins as hard as boards. Here the poor Doctor got a severe cold, and continued to grow weaker every day. At this time he told me, when he left Kuka, he expected his disorder would allow him to perform all his country expected from him, but that now his death was near; and he requested me to deliver his papers to Lord Bathurst, and to say he wished Mr. Barrow might have the arrangement of them, if agreeable to the wishes of his Lordship.

"On the 2d of January, 1824, we arrived at the city of Katagum, where we remained till the 10th, partly to see if the Doctor, by staying a few days, would gain a little strength to pursue his journey. On leaving Katagum he rode a camel, as he was too weak to ride his horse. We proceeded on our road for ten miles that day, and then halted; and, on the following day, five miles farther, to a town called Murmur. On the morning of the 12th he ordered the camels to be loaded at day-light, and drank a cup of coffee, and I assisted him to dress. When the camels were loaded, with the assistance of his servant and me, he came out of his tent. I saw then that the hand of death was upon him, and that he had not an hour to live. I begged him to return to his tent and lie down, which he did, and I sat down beside him; he expired in about half an hour after.

"I sent immediately to the Governor of the town to acquaint him with what had happened, and to desire he would point out a spot where I might bury my friend, and also to have people to wash the body and dig the grave, which was speedily complied with. I had dead clothes made from some turbans that were intended as presents; and as we travelled as Englishmen and servants of his Majesty, I considered it my most indispensable duty to read the Service of the Dead over the grave, according to the rites of the Church of England, which happily was not objected to; but, on the contrary, I was paid a good deal of respect for so doing."

Kosciusko, the venerable Polish Patriot, who resided for some time in America, bequeathed 20,000 dollars, to be appropriated to the amelioration of the condition of the Blacks in the United States. His administrators had neglected to carry the provision into effect; but the affairs being now adjusted, the sum has been assigned to the Colonization Society, who have resolved to purchase a farm between Baltimore and Washington, with accommodations for 200 persons, at which Black and Coloured children will be received to be trained for the Society's colony. Similar establishments are anticipated in other parts of the Union.

General Synod of Ulster.

(From the *Dublin Evening Post*, Tuesday, July 13.)

The following is a summary of the proceedings of this venerable Body:

Wednesday, the 7th, was chiefly occupied in routine business, such as the appointment of Committees, receiving the Reports of the Presbyteries, &c., and various other acts of discipline. A Report was given in by the Committee appointed to superintend the formation of a Fund for the support of the Professorship of Divinity in the Belfast Academical Institution. Such measures were, in consequence, adopted, as are likely to promote that laudable object.

A Code of Discipline for the direction of the Presbyterian clergy and laity in connexion with the Synod of Ulster was now submitted. This document had been in preparation for several years, and had undergone a final revision by a numerous Committee of the Synod, which had met at Moneymore in December last. In this amended state, after due deliberation, it was finally adopted, and orders given that it should be printed, under the direction of a Committee, which was then appointed.

On the morning of Thursday, the Rev. Mr. COCHRAN, of Larne, appealed from the sentence of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, who had suspended him *sine die*. The Synod dismissed the appeal, and confirmed the sentence of the Presbytery. After a protracted discussion, it was agreed that, in future, clergymen who shall absent themselves from the Annual Meeting of the Synod, shall each pay a fine of 2*l.*, except in the case of ministers whose state of health, or advanced time of life, necessitates them to employ assistants. The assistants are also exempt, in consequence of their receiving no share of the Royal Bounty.

After some other business of minor importance, Mr. Cooke, the Moderator, left the Chair, in order to propose an overture to the Synod. After expressing his approbation of the conduct of the management of the Belfast Institution, and the great utility that must result from this Seminary, he concluded by moving an overture to the following effect:—That hereafter the Moderator, on being notified of an approaching election, should call together the Synod's fixed Committee,* and submit to them the names and qualifications of the candidates; that he should then take their advice as to the

vote he should give, and should be authorized to express to the other electors the opinion of the Committee.—The Learned and Reverend Gentleman observed, that in this way the Moderator would appear and act as was intended by the framers of the Act of Incorporation, not as a private individual, but *as the Representative of the Body*. This motion, which was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Porter, of Newtownlimavady, passed unanimously, and seemed to give the most general satisfaction.

An Address from the Faculty of the Belfast Academical Institution was then read, giving favourable details of the literary operations and progress of that Establishment during the last year. Another address was presented by the Rev. W. D. H. M'Ewen, Professor Thomson and Thomas Ekenhead, Esq., from the Joint Boards of Managers and Visitors of the Institution, detailing the proceedings of those Boards; and, in particular, referring to an application which was lately made to the British Government, in favour of that Seminary. It also stated, that Parliamentary Commissioners had been appointed to inquire into the utility, administration and resources of the Establishment. On this important subject, Mr. M'Ewen and Professor Thomson gave such farther details as seemed necessary for the more perfect information of the Synod.

The Synod then unanimously came to a resolution, which was in substance to the following effect:—"That they learned with great satisfaction, that Parliamentary Commissioners had been appointed to inquire into the state of the Belfast Academical Institution, as they hoped that such investigation might tend to establish that connexion betwixt Government and the Institution, which would be so instrumental in promoting the inestimable advantages of home education in this part of Ireland—an object which, from the experience of nine years, they have found this Seminary so eminently calculated to effect."

On Friday, a memorial from certain members of the congregation of Turlough, in Connaught, was presented to the Synod, complaining that their rights had been invaded, in the election of a minister, and that the Rev. John Hamilton had been irregularly ordained among them, by the Presbytery of Clogher. A long statement of the facts was read by the Clerk, and the Presbytery of Clogher heard in defence. It was decided, that the proceedings of the Presbytery have been informal and precipitate, and three members were appointed to visit the congregation, and act according to Synodical regulations.

* This Committee, which is appointed annually, consists of two ministers and an elder from each of the fourteen Presbyteries contained in the Synod.

A complaint from the congregation of Coothill was heard, and finally referred to the Presbytery of Monaghan. Several petitions were then presented from newly erected congregations, praying the Synod to take the necessary measures to procure for them a share of the Royal Bounty. The agent stated, that Bounty had been received for the congregations of Drumlough and Anaghlon, which had been recommended last year.

On Saturday, an appeal was lodged against the decision of the Presbytery of Letterkenny, in the case of a young man who emigrated to America. It appeared in evidence, that after he had received a call from a congregation in the Presbytery of Huntingdon, in Pennsylvania, a letter of inquiry respecting him was sent to the Moderator of the Presbytery of Letterkenny, that he had answered it without their advice, and that their proceedings had been subsequently irregular. After a long and animated discussion, a vote of disapprobation was passed on those members of the Presbytery engaged in the transaction, and an account of the Synod's proceedings was ordered to be transmitted to the Presbyterian brethren in America.

The congregations of Brigh, Randals-town and Anaghlon, were removed from the care of their respective Presbyteries, and given in charge to different Committees appointed for that purpose.

A memorial was presented from the Presbyterian inhabitants of Tipperary, praying to be recognized as a congregation, and to have the ordinances of religion administered among them. The prayer of this memorial was unanimously granted.

Several overtures passed the House, among which there was one disapproving of the principles of Socinianism, and prohibiting the ministers of the body from admitting Unitarian preachers into their pulpits; and another, contradicting the assertion, in the preface to Dr. Bruce's Sermons, that the peculiar doctrines inculcated in them are "making extensive, though silent, progress in the General Synod of Ulster."—The Synod concluded with prayer.

PARLIAMENTARY.

Belfast Academical Institution.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JUNE 10, 1824.

Lord ARTHUR HILL presented the following Petition from the Vice President, Managers, Visitors, and Proprietors of the Belfast Academical Institution:

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, the Petition of the undersigned, Vice-President, Managers, Visitors and Proprietors of the Academical Institution, humbly sheweth,

"That the Proprietors of the Belfast Academical Institution were incorporated by an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1810.

"That they have contributed upwards of 30,000*l.* for the establishment and support of this Institution, which diffuses the advantages of a classical and scientific education over the province of Ulster; and provides for the theological education of the candidates for the Presbyterian ministry, whose congregations in that province amount to more than half a million of souls.

"That it is considered very advantageous by that body of Presbyterians (a branch of the Church of Scotland, from which country their forefathers emigrated to the province of Ulster, in the reign of James the First), that their theological students should be educated in their own country, near their families and future congregations, and under the constant inspection of their fathers in the ministry.

"That the great principles of social order, allegiance to the King, obedience to the laws, and attachment to the Constitution, have ever been inculcated by the Professors of this Institution.

"That the manifest utility of the Institution procured for it, for some time, the countenance and aid of Government, which in various respects contributed to its welfare.

"That your petitioners, while they heartily approve and admire the liberal policy which induces a Protestant Parliament to provide for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood, in their own country, hope that they also may be allowed to lay before your Honourable House, these claims of the Presbyterians on your favourable consideration.

"That having perceived by the votes of your Honourable House, that a commission is about to issue for the purpose of inquiring into the state of education in Ireland, they humbly pray your Honourable House to employ your good offices with his Majesty, to intreat that he would be graciously pleased to instruct the Commissioners so appointed, to inquire into the utility, administration and resources of the Belfast Academical Institution, and to report their opinion concerning the same, to his Majesty. And your petitioners will ever pray.

"(Signed) Downshire, *Vice-President*; James Dromore, *Visitor*; Vane Londonderry, *Proprietor*; Lord Arthur Hill, M. P., *Visitor*; Matthew Forde, M. P.,

Visitor; Honourable J. O'Neil, M. P., *Visitor*; H. and J. Johnson, Fletcher and Co., Lewis Tate and Co., J. Barry and Co., J. Richards and Co., J. Bell, Carrick and M'Chan, J. M. French, James Blair, M. P., London, and Samuel Thompson, Mackamore Abbey, Ireland, *Proprietors*; John Barnett, and W. and H. M'Ewen, Belfast, *Managers*."

On the motion that the petition should lie on the table,

Mr. HUME supported the prayer of the petition, and trusted the attention of his Majesty's Government would be called to the subject. Should that turn out not to be the case, he hoped the Noble Lord by whom the petition had been presented to the House, would make a specific motion respecting it.

Mr. GOULBURN expressed his apprehension, that if an inquiry into private institutions, such as the one under consideration, were required of the Commissioners in question, they would be overlaid with the immensity of their business. The ultimate object of the petitioners was to obtain support from the public purse; but there were many other institutions of a similar kind both in Ireland and in England, which were equally deserving of support.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE expressed his surprise at what had fallen from the Right Honourable Gentleman. When he considered the nature of this Institution, he had been so far from thinking that the prayer of the petition would be opposed by any Member of his Majesty's Government, that he had imagined they would express the utmost thankfulness and gratitude to the petitioners for their application. Perhaps the House were not aware of the objects of the Belfast Academical Institution, and of the class of persons to whom its benefits applied. They were applied to the great body of the Protestants in that part of Ireland. The object was the education of those who were to be the instructors of the Protestants, not only as clergymen but as schoolmasters. The object was not, as those who had heard the Right Honourable Gentleman's statement might be induced to suppose, particular and individual, but general. It was a most extraordinary argument on the part of the Right Honourable Gentleman, that the objects of the Institution ought not to be promoted at the public expense, because Belfast was an opulent town, the inhabitants of which, therefore, ought to take the charge upon themselves. Ought private means to be called upon for the support of an Institution which was to educate clergymen, not for large benefices and no flocks, but for large flocks, among whom they were to reside, and to exercise the most powerful

influence? Was it not most monstrous, that when so small a sum was required for such an object, there should be the slightest disposition on the part of the Irish Government to withhold it? The Right Honourable Gentleman would represent the Institution as if it were only a private one, omitting to state that it had once received the support of Government. Why that support had been withdrawn he would not then say. The petitioners were quite ready to meet, and indeed challenged every possible inquiry into all parts of their conduct. They desired that every part of the conduct of the Institution, and of the character of every thing connected with it, should be scrutinized and canvassed with the utmost severity. If what he had heard was true, the support of Government had been withdrawn from the Institution because Government had unsuccessfully endeavoured to interfere and obtain the patronage of the Institution.

Mr. FORDE expressed his conviction, that if the proposition were acceded to, such a return would be made as would induce the House to consent to a very liberal grant. The Institution was conducted in the most excellent manner; and when the Catholics had their College at Maynooth supported by Government, for the education of Catholic clergy, it was only fair that the Presbyterians should be allowed the same privilege in their own country.

Mr. SPRING RICE said, he did not mean to enter on the defence of the Belfast Institution, as it had not been made the subject of attack; but he thought that if any public establishments were required in a country, none could be of more importance than an institution for the education and maintenance of the Clergy. They did not require a permanent annual grant; all they wanted was such assistance as would enable them to render their own exertions available; and it was his intention, if he could obtain the concurrence of his Noble Friend (Lord Arthur Hill), to move an Amendment, which would open the whole question; for he perfectly agreed, that the Presbyterians were just as well entitled as the Catholics, to receive the assistance of Government. He should now move, as an Amendment,—“That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, praying that he would be graciously pleased to order that the Commissioners to be appointed to inquire into the state of Education in Ireland, should take into their early consideration the condition and resources of the Belfast Academic Institution, and report their opinions on the same to the House.”

Sir JOHN NEWPORT said, the real ques-

tion which the House had to consider was, not whether a Parliamentary Grant should be made, but whether an Institution, founded for the purpose of supplying the Presbyterian Church of Ireland with Ministers of the Gospel, was or was not a fit and legitimate subject for inquiry; and if the Right Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) should be of opinion that it was a fit subject of inquiry, he could not see how he could resist the motion which had been just made by his Honourable Friend (Mr. S. Rice).

Mr. GOULBURN said, it would seem that he had been misunderstood in what he had stated to the House. What he did say was this; not that this subject was not a fit subject for investigation, but that it would be inexpedient to divert the attention of the Commissioners from other subjects of paramount importance, and to occupy them with a question, now, for the first time, introduced to the House. He could never have supposed that the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Rice) would, on the occasion of presenting a petition, have, without any previous notice, moved for an Address to the Crown. This was certainly neither the most ordinary nor the most convenient course; it was a course, although within the orders of the House, yet by no means conformable to its practice. He was quite sure that when the Right Hon. Baronet (Sir J. Newport) had proposed the appointment of the Commissioners, if he (Mr. Goulburn) had risen and proposed, that when they should be appointed, the first subject of their inquiry should be the Belfast Institution, the Right Honourable Baronet would have been the first to state, and he would have been supported by all his friends, that the object of such a proposition was to render nugatory the exertions of the Commissioners, and to divert their attention from the great object of their inquiry. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman (Mr. Abercrombie) had said, that the support of Government had been withdrawn from this Institution, and that the reason of it was that they wished to obtain some patronage in its management. He could only say, that whatever occurred, took place before he had any connexion with the Irish Government; and if the Hon. and Learned Gentleman would inquire into the matter, he would find that the Government had proceeded upon very different grounds. He was quite aware that there was no situation in which a responsible servant of the Crown could be placed, more disagreeable to himself, more unpalatable to his friends, or which laid him more open to

the attacks of his enemies, than to refuse money when it was sought. But at the same time it was his duty to consider well whether the money was demanded on a sound principle; and he was sure the House would agree with him that it would be most inexpedient to divert the attention of the Commissioners from the more important inquiries upon which they were about to enter.

Mr. SPRING RICE said, the Right Hon. Gentleman had misunderstood him in supposing that he meant the Commissioners should enter upon this inquiry first: the expression used in the Address was *early*, and it contained not one word at all about a money grant.

Mr. C. HUTCHINSON said, the Right Honourable Secretary had treated the question as if he had been taken by surprise. He talked about paramount importance; but he would ask him, what subject could be more important than the education of Ireland? He could not see how the Right Honourable Gentleman could justify to himself his opposition to the motion; for the simple question was, whether the Commissioners should inquire into this Institution?

Mr. GOULBURN said, he thought the main object of the motion was a Parliamentary grant. His object was not to oppose Presbyterian education, but to avoid the interruption of the inquiries of the Commissioners.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE said, he had distinctly understood the Right Honourable Gentleman to say, that the Commissioners could not, and would not, inquire into the subject.

Sir JOHN NEWPORT said, that when he had moved for the appointment of the Commissioners, he had stated, over and over again, that they should embrace all institutions relating to education; and if he had not so expressed himself, he had fallen very short of the object he had in view.

Mr. PEEL said, a charge had been made against the Government of Ireland, at the period when he was connected with it, to which he pleaded not guilty. He must disclaim altogether, on the part of the Government, any view of patronage, if by patronage were meant any desire to have the nomination of the professors or ministers. It was about nine or ten years since the transaction had occurred which had been alluded to, and not expecting this discussion this evening, he had not refreshed his memory with the circumstances. Formerly the Presbyterian clergy of the North of Ireland received their education and obtained degrees in the Scottish Universities; the practical result of which system had been,

to provide for the North of Ireland as respectable a body of clergymen as ever existed. He considered that it was a great disadvantage to form a college in an extensive manufacturing town; and judging not merely from the result, but forming an opinion *a priori*, he thought that great benefit must arise from a communication between the different parts of the United Kingdom: it encouraged kindly feelings, dispelled prejudices, and promoted those sentiments which he was sure the House would be desirous to cherish. He had very great doubt as to the propriety of interfering with the established system of education, and he must avow that there was much in the proceedings of this Institution which he disapproved. What he had said to them was this—if Government consented to grant the vote, they would then become responsible for their proceedings. All the Government required was some check over their proceedings, and that check to be composed of two persons of the highest rank in the North of Ireland, who should take a part in their deliberations; but they disclaimed all intention of interference with the nomination of their professors. He therefore hoped the Hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Rice) would be satisfied with a promise of inquiry at a future period. When the more pressing matters should have been gone through, then it would be very easy to give instructions to the Commissioners to inquire into this Institution.

Mr. SPRING RICE observed, that provided the great object of inquiry was obtained, it was of little importance whether it was effected by the interposition of Parliament, or by the orders of the Crown. As there was now an understanding relative to that point, he should move that the Amendment should be withdrawn.

Mr. BROUGHAM was disposed to believe that the Irish Government had no view, by any interference on its part, to possess itself of the patronage of the Institution; but he did think that the tendency of that proposition was eventually to obtain an absolute controul over the Establishment.

Mr. Secretary PEELE said, that when a Veto, over the appointment of the Professors, was offered, he declined it as a most invidious exercise. He well recollected, indeed, the discussion had brought it to his recollection, that in the letter alluded to, he disclaimed any interference in the appointment of the Professors.—The Petition was ordered to be printed.

LITERARY.

The Milton Manuscript.—This anxiously-expected work is announced in 4to. for the beginning of the ensuing year. It is printing at the Cambridge University press, under the care of Mr. Sumner, librarian and historiographer to his Majesty. The Latin title is as follows; "Joannis Miltoni Angli de Doctrina Christiana Libri duo posthumi, nunc primum typis mandati." With the original will be published a translation by Mr. Sumner, entitled "A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, by John Milton."

Mr. Hone and the Quarterly Review.—It may be known to our readers that Mr. Hone some time ago published a book called *The Apocryphal Gospels*. For this he was charged with ignorance, fraud and impiety, by a *Quarterly Reviewer*. He put out a reply under the title of "*Aspersions Answered*," in which he ingenuously confessed some errors, but convicted the Reviewer of other errors. The anonymous antagonist has returned to the charge, with an acknowledgment of some of his own blunders and new abuse of Mr. Hone. The latter gentleman has published a rejoinder, in a sixpenny pamphlet, under the title of "*An Article for the Quarterly Review*," in which he shews great ability and spirit, and has convicted the Reviewer of such dishonest artifices as must disgust even the proprietors of the *Quarterly*, now, at least, that they are exposed to the public.

WE see with pleasure an advertisement of the whole Works and Correspondence of Sir Thomas Browne, Knt., M.D., of Norwich, under the care of S. Wilkin, F.L.S., and Member of the Wernerian Society of Edinburgh. With the Works will be given the Critical and Explanatory Notes and Observations of Sir Kenelm Digby, Dean Wren, Lefebvre, Keck, Moltkenius and others; and also the Life of Browne, by Johnson, with copious and interesting additions. The Editor promises that some of the works shall be collated with original MSS.

NOTICES.

We are requested to give notice, that a *New Unitarian Chapel* will be opened in YORK STREET, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE, for divine service, in the month of December next. Full particulars hereafter.

The Rev. S. ALLARD, B. A., has accepted an invitation to become the minister of the Unitarian congregation at the Great Meeting, Hinckley.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Novum Testamentum Græce. Cura Leusdenii et Griesbachii. 18mo., uniform with the Regent's Classics. 7s.

Acta Apostolorum Variorum Annotationibus instructa integris et selectis. Edidit Hastings Robinson, A. M., Collegii Divi Johannis apud Cantabrigienses Socius.

Polybii Megalipolitani Historiarum, quidquid superest, recensuit, digessit, emendatione, interpretatione, varietate Lectionis, Indicibus illustravit Joannes Schweighæuser, Argentoratensis. Editio Nova.—**Lexicon Polybianum** ab it. et Merico Causaubone olim adumbratum, inde ab Jo. Aug. Ernesti elaboratum, nunc ab J. Schweighæusero passim emendatum plurimisque partibus auctum. In 5 Vols. 8vo. 4l.

Herodotus, literally translated into English from the Greek Text of Schweighæuser. Illustrated with copious Notes, &c., from Larcher, Gibbon, &c. To which will be added, A Summary of the Chronology of Herodotus. By a Graduate of the University of Oxford. 2 Vols. 8vo. 24s.

Lexicon Thucidæum; a Dictionary in Greek and English of the Words and Phrases and Principal Idioms contained in the History of the Peloponnesian War of Thucydides. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Natural History of the Bible: or, a Description of all the Quadrupeds, Birds, Fishes, Reptiles and Insects, &c. &c., mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures. Collected from the Best Authorities, and alphabetically arranged. By Thaddeus Mason Harris, D. D., of Dorchester, Massachusetts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Paraphrase on the Book of Ecclesiastes, first published in the Year 1768, and intitled "Chokeleth, or the Royal Preacher, a Poem. With Notes." To which are added, Supplementary Notes, &c. By Nathaniel Higgins. 5s.

Etymological Researches, wherein numerous Languages, apparently discordant, have their Affinity traced, and their Resemblance so manifested, as to lead to the Conclusion that all Languages are radically one. By Joseph Townsend, M. A., Rector of Pewsey, Wilts. 4to. 1l. 1s.

Introductory Key to the Greek Language: consisting of an Elementary Greek Grammar, an Interlineary Translation of the Gospel of Luke, &c. 8vo.

An Introduction to English Botany, upon a new Method, intended to open

the Linnæan System and Language, and call attention to such of our native Plants as are most easily obtained. By the Rev. J. M. Butt, M. A., Vicar of East Barston, Berks. 5s.

Historical Essay on the Rise, Progress and probable Results of the British Dominion in India. By John Baptist Say, Author of "Letters to Mr. Malthus," &c. 8vo. 2s.

Greece in 1823 and 1824, being a Series of Letters and other Documents on the Greek Revolution. Written during a Visit to that Country, by the Hon. Col. Leicester Stanhope. 8vo. (Several Fac Similes.) 13s.

Parables; by Dr. F. A. Krummacher: translated from the German by F. Schöberl. 12mo. 6s. half-bound.

An Attempt to ascertain the Age of the Church of Mickleham, in Surrey, with Remarks on the Architecture of that Building, accompanied by Plates illustrative of its Restoration. By P. F. Robinson, Architect. Royal 4to. 1l. 5s. Imp. 4to. 2l. 2s.

Picturesque Views of the principal Monuments in the Cemetery of Père la Chaise, near Paris; also a correct View of the Paraclete, erected by Abelard: accompanied with concise descriptive Notices. Drawn by John Thomas Serres, Marine Painter to his Majesty and H. R. H. the Duke of Clarence, 10 Coloured Views. Atlas 4to. 1l. 1s.

A Selection of Ancient Coins, chiefly of Magna Grecia and Sicily, from the Cabinet of Lord Northwick. Engraved by Moses from Drawings by Del Frati. The Descriptions by G. H. Noehden, LL.D. Part I. 4to. 15s.

Venice under the Yoke of France and of Austria; with Memoirs of the Courts, Governments and People of Italy. By a Lady of Rank. Written during a Twenty Years' Residence. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Memoir of the Life and Character of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke, with Specimens of his Poetry and Letters, and an Estimate of his Genius and Talents. By James Prior, Esq. 8vo. 16s.

The Confessions of a Gamester. Crown 8vo. 7s.

The Infant's Death, a Poem. And other Pieces in Verse. By Samuel Dobell. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Rose, comprising Botanical, Poetical and Miscellaneous Recollections of that celebrated Flower: in a Series of Letters to a Lady. Royal 18mo.

Translations, Imitations, &c. By the Author of "Ireland, a Satire." 12mo. 7s.

The Buccaneer, and other Poems. By John Malcolm. 8vo. 6s.

Moments of Forgetfulness. By T. Clare. 8vo. 5s.

The Human Heart. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Rameses, an Egyptian Tale: with Historical Notes of the Era of the Pharaohs. 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 17. 10s.

My Children's Diary, or the Moral of the Passing Hour: a Tale for Young Persons from Ten to Twelve or Thirteen Years of Age. 6s. 6d.

The Clerical Portrait, or a Study for a Young Divine. 8vo. 7s.

Memoirs of the late Rev. John Escreet, M. A., with Extracts from his Letters, Diary, &c. By T. Webster, M. A., Minister of Tavistock Chapel, &c. 12mo. 2s.

The Ten Commandments illustrated and enforced on Christian Principles. By W. H. Stowell. 8vo. 6s.

Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism. By the late Rev. Henry Martyn, B. D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and some of the most Eminent Writers of Persia. With some Account of a former Controversy on this Subject, and an additional Tract on the same Question. By Samuel Lee, A. M., Professor of Arabic, Cambridge. 8vo. Portrait of Martyn.

The Christian Ministry; or, Excitement and Direction in Ministerial Duties, extracted from various Authors. By William Innes, Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh. Post 8vo. 8s.

Is the System of Slavery sanctioned or condemned by Scripture? To which is subjoined an Appendix, containing Two Essays upon the State of the Canaanite

and Philistine Bondsmen, under the Jewish Theocracy. 8vo.

The Question of Christian Missions Stated and Defended: a Sermon, with Particular Reference to the recent Persecution in the West Indian Colonies. By R. W. Hamilton, Leeds.

The West Indies as they are; or, a Real Picture of Slavery; but more particularly as it exists in the Island of Jamaica. By a Clergyman.

Sermons.

Christian Instructions, consisting of Sermons, &c. By W. Morgan, B. D., Minister of Christ Church, in Bradford, Yorkshire. 12mo. 5s.

On the Nature and Offices of the Holy Ghost. By J. Edmondson, M. A., and R. Treffry. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Single.

Preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge at Edinburgh, June 3, 1824. By Stevenson Macgill, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. With Appendix. 1s. 6d.

The Necessity of Home Missions: preached before the Home Missionary Society. By John Reynolds. 8vo. 1s.

The United Claims of Home and Foreign Missions. Before the Same. By H. F. Burder. 8vo. 1s.

Occasioned by the Death of the Rev. R. Clarke, A. M., Lecturer of Hexham, preached in the Presbyterian Chapel, May 9, 1824. By J. Richardson. 6d.

The Minister's Last Appeal to his People: a Farewell Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Louth, on Sunday, September 12, 1824. By the Rev. R. Milne. 8vo. 1s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Drs. J. Jones and J. P. Smith; from Mr. I. Worsley; and from Te Tace; W. W.; Cicest; J. M.; D.; R.; and Bereus.

We agree with the "Unitarian" that ridicule is a dangerous weapon; but he must admit that it was successfully and usefully employed against *idolatry* not only by the Protestant Reformers, but also by the Jewish prophets. If theologians will persist, as much against scripture as reason, in making religion ludicrous, on whom but themselves can the blame fall?—The whole is matter of taste, and we so far coincide with the "Unitarian" as to prefer argument to wit.

The Editor has received Five Pounds from the Bridport Fellowship Fund for the Chapel at Todmorden, Lancashire; and will thank the Treasurer of that Chapel to inform him by letter (post paid) directed to the publishers', in what way the sum can be remitted. At the same time, it might be advantageous to the interests of the Chapel, if such information were communicated in the letter, as could be laid before the public, relative to the financial state, present condition and future prospects of the Society.

The Advertisement of Subscriptions to *Welburn Chapel*, near York, (amounting to £198,) came too late for the present month, but shall be inserted the next.