

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CCXXVII.]

NOVEMBER, 1824.

[Vol. XIX.

*History of the Irish Presbyterians.*

[As the attention of the country is more drawn towards Ireland, the history and present state of the Presbyterians in that country becomes an object of inquiry. Their numerical strength, (half a million of people,) their singular ecclesiastical constitution, a secondary endowed church-establishment, and their *general* tendency towards a free and charitable spirit in matters of religion, render them peculiarly interesting to the readers of the Monthly Repository. There are two publications from which we are able to take an outline of their history, and it is singular that both of these are proofs of the revival of religious zeal amongst our Irish brethren. One is a new edition of Towgood's "Dissent from the Church of England," printed at Newry, in 1816: "to which is added a Large Appendix, illustrative of the History, Principles and Present State of the Presbyterian Church, particularly that of Ireland." [To our copy of the "Dissent" is attached "An Essay on Church Consecration," by James Crombie, D. D., one of the ministers of the first Congregation of Presbyterians in Belfast, printed at the same press, in the same year; a sensible pamphlet, well worthy of being reprinted in England.] The other is a new edition of Palmer's "Nonconformists' Catechism," with an additional chapter, containing "A Brief History of the Irish Presbyterians," in question and answer, by a Presbyterian clergyman of Carrickfergus, who entertains the design of writing a complete history of his body, and who, if we may judge from this specimen, is fully qualified for the work, which is a desideratum in ecclesiastical literature. In the following sketch, every thing is borrowed from these two works. The Appendix to the Dissent is the basis of the article; the paragraphs within brackets are from the addition to the Catechism. The history will be completed in this and the following Number. We call the attention particularly of our Irish

VOL. XIX.

readers to this attempt to familiarize to the English public a people little known to them, and solicit their assistance in correcting, explaining, or extending the memoir. ED.]

**G**EORGE BROWN, whom Henry VIII. had created archbishop of Dublin, was the first person who publicly attempted to reform the religion of Ireland. During the reigns of Henry and Edward, he made considerable progress in abolishing the Popish superstitions. Queen Mary had meditated great severities against the Irish Protestants; but dying before her designs were carried into execution, the accession of Elizabeth saved them from the intended persecution.\*

[As yet, no distinction of Protestants was known in Ireland. One instance will suffice to shew this to be the fact. The second Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was Walter Travers, a Presbyterian minister, ordained at Antwerp, and admitted to the Provostship in 1592, though maintaining his Presbyterian principles. To this it may be added, that the two persons, who, after public examination, first obtained the situation of Fellows in this College, were also Presbyterians. These were Mr. James Fullarton and Mr. James Hamilton; the latter being tutor to the celebrated Usher, and afterwards ennobled by the title of Lord Clandeboy.]

When James I. came to the throne of England, the British and Protestant interests were extremely low in Ireland. The government had, at an early period, encouraged many English families to remove into that country, to assist in keeping the native inhabitants in subjection; but a considerable number of the settlers having returned home, to assist in the contest between the houses of York and Lancaster, the Irish, who were extremely impatient of the English yoke, soon manifested a high degree of in-

\* Mosh. Eccles. Hist. Vol. III. p. 263.

subordination. They regarded their governors with still stronger aversion, when Henry VIII. abjured the supremacy of the Pope; for they now apprehended that even their religion was brought into danger. In Elizabeth's reign, their hereditary antipathy acquired additional strength, and the progress of the Protestant religion was greatly retarded by an Act continued from the former reign, entitled, "An Act against bringing in of Scots, retaining of them, and marrying with them." The country, distracted by continual insurrections of the native Irish against the English, displayed a dreadful scene of anarchy and confusion.

James, finding that the laws could not be carried into execution without the aid of a military force, endeavoured to make a favourable impression on the people of Ireland by lenient measures. He therefore restored to some of the most considerable Irish rebels their former possessions. But this step was not followed by any salutary consequences. Many projects were proposed for settling the kingdom; and at length the Parliament resolved to repeal the Act against the bringing in of the Scots: and though many Scotch families, anticipating a change of measures in their favour, had previously removed into Ireland, the plantation of Ulster is properly dated from the time of that repeal; for soon after, many thousands of Presbyterians, together with their ministers, came over and settled in Ulster. Three English ministers, Mr. John Ridges, of Antrim, Mr. Henry Calvert, and Mr. Hubbard, of Carrickfergus, who had been a pupil of the great Cartwright, came over to reside in Ulster at this time; the two former under the patronage of the Clotworthy family, (afterwards Massereene,) and the latter under that of Lord Chichester, then Lord Deputy of Ireland. The first Presbyterian minister who arrived from Scotland was Mr. Edward Bryce, who settled in Broad-island, anno 1611.\* After him, Mr. Robert Cunningham was settled in Holywood; Mr. Robert Blair in Bangor; Mr.

James Hamilton, nephew of Lord Claneboy, in Ballywalter, and Mr. John Livingstone in Killinshy. Soon after, Mr. Josias Welsh, grandson of Knox, the Reformer, became minister of Templepatrick, and Mr. George Dunbar, of Larne.

The good understanding which subsisted at this time between the two parties of Protestants in Ireland, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians, tended to facilitate the settlement and plantation of Ulster.\* The following is a remarkable instance. When Mr. Robert Blair, who scrupled at episcopal ordination, was presented to the parish of Bangor by Hamilton, Lord Claneboy, Echlin, Bishop of Down, proposed that the Presbyterian ministers should join with him in the ordination, (Mr. Blair acknowledging the bishop to be a presbyter, and as such to have power of ordination, in conjunction with other presbyters,) and that any expressions to which Mr. Blair should object, in the established form of ordination, should be exchanged for such as he might recommend.—Thus was Mr. Blair publicly ordained in the church of Bangor.† The Bishop of Raphoe granted the same indulgence to Mr. John Livingstone; and the same form was used in the ordination of all the Scotch ministers who settled in Ireland from that time till the year 1642.

The Presbyterian ministers at this

---

\* It has been observed, that the principles inculcated by the Culdees, for several centuries, probably tended to produce in the inhabitants of Scotland that strong predilection for Presbyterianism which they have always evinced. See Edinb. Encyclop. article Culdees. It is not unlikely, that the existence of the same religious order in Ireland, so late as the time of Usher, was, in some respects, favourable to the settlement of the Presbyterians in that country.

† Mr. Blair was born at Irvine in Scotland. He was ordained minister of Bangor, in his 29th year; and had under his care 1200 persons of age, besides others. Lord Claneboy was son of a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who had been a Fellow of Dublin College, and said to have been tutor to the great Usher.—Lord Chichester had been a pupil of Cartwright, and was a man of fine talents. The Clotworthy family was of the Presbyterian persuasion.

---

\* This is the date ordinarily assigned, but a stone in the old church or meeting-house has it 1613. Mr. B. probably came over in 1611.



time possessed the churches and the tithes, though they did not use the liturgy, nor otherwise conform to the usage of the episcopal church. They were, however, comprehended within the Church of Ireland; for they frequently met and consulted with the Bishop concerning the common interests of religion, and some of them were members of the Convocation, in the year 1634.\*

They held monthly meetings at Antrim, in which, with much solemnity and devotion, they consulted together on the best methods of serving the cause of the Reformation. They had also quarterly communions, which greatly contributed to the increase of piety. Their labours were eminently useful in civilizing a rude people and promoting general tranquillity; inso-much that their entire conduct commanded the approbation of all the moderate Episcopalians, particularly of Primate Usher, with whom Mr. Blair was intimately acquainted, and who vouchsafed to him and his brethren his warmest tribute of applause.

Many of the ministers were held in high estimation by men of the first consequence in the province of Ulster. Their ministry was much respected, and was attended even by some of those who did not scruple to conform to the Established Church. This was remarkably instanced in the case of Mr. Blair, who, at the desire of the Bishop of Down, preached on Easter-Sunday, before the judges of assize. In the evening of that day, he was sent for by one of the judges, that he might converse with him on the subject of the sermon which he had preached; on which occasion, his Lordship testified the highest regard for Mr. Blair and his brethren, and the ministry in which they were engaged.†

The Protestant religion being now pretty well established in Ireland, it was thought expedient to draw up articles of the common faith, after the manner of other churches. Accordingly, some moved in Convocation, that the articles of the English Church should be adopted; but this was opposed, as unsuitable to the dignity of an independent national establishment,

and therefore it was agreed to, that a new confession should be prepared. The articles contained in it are in a great measure the same as those which the Puritans requested in the Hampton-court Conference.\*

The plantation of Ulster was considerably forwarded by the harsh treatment which the Presbyterians both of England and Scotland experienced at this time. For as the public safety and interest required a union of counsels among the Protestants of Ireland, many of the Scotch and English Non-conformists escaped into that country, where they were secure from the persecution which awaited them at home.

The good effects resulting from the settlement of Presbyterians in Ulster, were afterwards so sensibly felt by

---

\* "For 1st, (as Mr. Neal observes,) the nine articles of Lambeth are incorporated into this confession. 2dly, The morality of the Lord's Day is strongly asserted, and the spending it wholly in religious exercises is required. [Art. 56.] 3dly, The observation of Lent is declared not to be a religious fast, but grounded merely on political considerations, for provision of things tending to the better preservation of the commonwealth. [Art. 50.] 4thly, All clergymen are said to be lawfully called and sent, who are chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given them in the church, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard; [Art. 71;] which is an acknowledgment of the validity of the ordinations of those churches that have no bishops. 5thly, The power of the keys is said to be only declarative. [Art. 74.] 6thly, The Pope is declared to be Antichrist, or that Man of sin, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming. [Art. 80.] 7thly, The consecration of archbishops, &c. is not so much as mentioned; as if done on purpose, (says Mr. Collyer,) to avoid maintaining the distinction between that order and that of priests. Lastly, no power is ascribed to the church in making canons, or censuring those who either carelessly or wilfully infringe the same. Upon the whole, these articles seem to be contrived to compromise the difference between the Church and the Puritans; and they had that effect till the year 1634, when, by the influence of Archbishop Laud and of the Earl of Strafford, these articles were set aside, and those of the Church of England received in their room." Neal's Hist. Pur. Vol. II. p. 95.

\* Presb. Loy. p. 162. Neal's Hist. Pur. Vol. II. p. 94.

† Presb. Loy. p. 164.

the government, that in the 10th of Charles I. an Act was passed in the Irish Parliament for the naturalization of all those of the Scottish nation who were born before King James's accession to the crown of England and Ireland: the object of which was—to improve the condition of some Scots who had come over before, and who were liable to various inconveniences for want of being naturalized, and to encourage more of the Scots to come over and settle in the country. In that Act, their great usefulness in improving the state of the kingdom is set forth in these remarkable words—"It being a great discouragement and disheartening unto many of your said subjects of Scotland, that otherwise would have planted themselves here, for the farther civilizing, strengthening and securing this your Highness's said realm, against rebels at home, and all foreign invasion."

During the reign of Charles I., very considerable encouragement was given to the Papists both in England and Ireland, by the King and his Court, notwithstanding the strong remonstrances of Parliament; and they were, in many instances, promoted to situations of trust and power. "They had," says Lord Clarendon, "for many years, enjoyed a great calm, being on the matter absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with for the gentlest." In fact, the hierarchy discovered a manifest tendency to Popery; and the faith and worship of the national church did not differ widely from those of the Church of Rome.\*

[This union subsisted among the Northern Protestants till the year 1633, when Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, by the agency of Laud, was made Lord Deputy of Ireland. He behaved

\* Neal's Hist. Pur. Vol. II. pp. 146, 209, 246. Hume's Hist. Eng. Vol. VI. p. 225.

"If we would but open our eyes, we should see that we are beholden to the Dissenters for the continuance of a great part of our theological principles; for if the High Churchmen had no checks, they would have brought in Popery before this time, by their overvaluing pomp and ceremony in divine worship. So that if there had been no Dissenters, the Church of England had been long since ruined."—*Dr. Edward's Preacher*, Vol. II. p. 133.

towards the Presbyterians in the most tyrannical and unjustifiable manner; pursuing a course similar to that of his patron in England. He caused Echlin, Bishop of Down and Connor, who had formerly joined in ordaining many of the Presbyterian ministers, and lived in habits of intimacy with them, to depose four\* of them for not conforming to the ceremonies of the Episcopal Church, though there was not at that time a single canon to authorize such violent proceedings.]

In 1633, Laud determined that the Thirty-nine Articles should be adopted by the Church of Ireland: and, accordingly, a canon was passed in Convocation, with but one dissenting voice, approving of the Articles of the Church of England, and denouncing excommunication against all those who should affirm that they contain any thing superstitious or erroneous.†

[The spirit of persecution being once raised was not easily laid. The ministers were driven from their flocks, denounced as outlaws, obliged to skulk in privacy through the province. Even the schoolmasters who were suspected of being Presbyterians, were required to subscribe, though there was then no warrant for it in the canons: and while the conscientious Protestants were thus persecuted, the Papists were connived at in their masses, nunneries and schools, and suffered little or no molestation. In the diocese of Down and Connor, Leslie, made bishop in October 1635, on the 12th of August following, deposed five more Presbyterian ministers,‡ ex-

\* [These were, Blair, minister of Bangor, Livingston, of Killinchy, Dunbar, of Larne, and Welsh, of Templepatrick. They were shortly after restored, but it was only for half a year, when Wentworth again relapsed into his former severities, and they were once more deposed. The three former fled to Scotland for a time; but Welsh, who was grandson to Knox, the Scottish Reformer, died shortly after, in 1634.]

† Neal's Hist. Pur. Vol. II. p. 219.

‡ [These were, Brice, of Broad Island, the first Presbyterian minister that came to Ireland; Ridge, of Antrim; Colvert, of Oldstone; Cunningham, of Hollywood; and Hamilton, of Ballywalter, nephew to Lord Clancarty. The former died in his charge in 1636—the others fled to Scotland.]



posed them to many privations, and at last forced them to abandon the kingdom. Many of the ministers returned to Scotland—some remained in privacy in the country, and a few prepared to transport themselves to North America, which at that time was an asylum for all persecuted Protestants. Three of them\* prepared a vessel at Belfast, and, with about 140 persons, embarked for New England in September 1636; but they encountered such tempestuous weather off Newfoundland, that they were driven back to Carrickfergus Lough; whence they afterwards succeeded in reaching Scotland in safety.]

About this time, an oath, commonly called the Black Oath, was imposed in Ireland, without any parliamentary authority and sanction, on all persons of the Scottish nation of the age of sixteen years and upwards, under heavy penalties.† The Presbyterians refused to take this oath, both because it was imposed in an illegal manner, and because it tended to the destruction of liberty and property; and for so doing, multitudes of sincere Protestants were miserably persecuted and driven into banishment. These violent and unjust proceedings greatly contributed to depress the Protestants, and to strengthen the Roman Catholic party in Ireland.

The countenance and encouragement which the Papists received from Charles and his ministers, was one of the causes to which may be attributed the bloody massacre of 1641. Vast multitudes of Protestants perished in the insurrection of that year; but as many Presbyterian ministers had been driven out of the kingdom by Wentworth's persecution and the Black Oath, a remnant was providentially saved, and reserved for farther usefulness. These returned, and were joy-

fully received by their flocks, after the storm of persecution had subsided.

On the breaking out of the Irish rebellion, the Lords Justices importunately applied to England for a supply of men, money and arms; and as the Scots could be more readily transported into the North of Ireland, the government agreed that 10,000 Scotch soldiers should be sent over, to oppose the insurgents. Owing to a difference of counsels between the King and the Parliament, the first division of these troops did not arrive until April 1642. The several regiments were accompanied by their ministers, who united with those that remained in the kingdom, and founded a Presbytery, which met at Carrickfergus, July 10th, 1642, [and planted ministers in various parts of the adjacent country, who, as their predecessors had done, enjoyed the tithes and churches of their respective parishes.]

[The gentry now felt that the re-establishment of the Protestant religion depended principally upon the ministers, while the power of the Scots, at this conjuncture, in Ulster, still farther promoted their views. Lord Viscount Montgomery, of Airds, Lord Clondeboy, Sir John Clotworthy, and others, wrote to the Presbytery that they would "join them in discipline," and support their cause.]

The former nobleman afterwards accepted of a commission under the Marquis of Ormond, who had projected a union of the King's forces with the Irish insurgents, and thereby incurred the strong displeasure of the Presbytery.

[One of the first acts of the Presbytery in July 1642, was to forward a memorial to the General Assembly of Scotland, for a mission of ministers to supply the destitute remnant of Presbyterians in the kingdom. They again petitioned the same body with a similar view, in August 1643, and May 1645, and were gradually furnished with preachers, who disseminated extensively the principles of the Protestant faith. The government of the kingdom at this period was in the hands of the Marquis of Ormond, a staunch friend to Charles I., who was now at war with his Parliament in England, and whose authority was but low in Ulster, where that of the Parliament was principally respected. The

\* [These were, Blair, Livingston and M'Clelland; the vessel was called the Sea-Wing, and was about 150 tons burthen.]

† The oath obliged them to swear as follows:—"I will not bear arms, or do any rebellious or hostile act, against any of the king's royal commands, but submit myself in all due obedience thereunto. And I will not enter into any covenant or bond of mutual defence or assistance against any person whatsoever, by forces, without his Majesty's sovereign and regal authority."

Solemn League and Covenant was taken in Ireland by almost all the Protestants in Ulster, in the beginning of 1644. The dates of its being taken in two places are preserved; viz. at Carrickfergus on the 4th, and at Hollywood on the 8th of April, 1644. The Covenant was not hostile to the King's authority; it was principally directed against prelacy, and intended to promote a union among Protestants, upon Presbyterian principles. The Presbyterians in Ireland appear, at first, to have agreed with the Parliament in their early and intrepid resistance of the tyrannical encroachments of the King; but when they found that the total overthrow of the royal authority was intended, they took part with the King, and continued ever afterwards steadfast to his cause.]

Ormond had made various attempts to effect a coalition with the Irish, and at length concluded a peace with them in 1648, highly favourable to the Popish interest. His design was, to transport into England a considerable body of Irish troops, to aid the King in his contest with the Parliament, as had been done in 1643, during the cessation.

The Presbytery, observing the dangers to which civil and religious liberty was thus exposed, drew up a declaration, at Bangor, with a view of preventing the evil consequences that were likely to result from the rash measures now adopted. After representing the evil tendency of the peace and commission, they beseech their people to avoid all connexion with such a cause, and charge those especially who had renewed the covenant, not to serve in the army under the present command.

In Ireland, the Presbytery, assembled at Belfast, February 15th, 1648, framed a paper entitled, "A necessary Representation of the present Evils and imminent Dangers to Religion, Laws and Liberties, arising from the late and present Practices of the Sectarian Party in England and their Abettors," to be read from the pulpits of their several members. In this document, they strongly express their abhorrence of the violent proceedings of the sectaries, in imprisoning many Members of Parliament, seizing the person of the King, carrying him

from place to place, trying him and finally putting him to death—"An act, say they, so horrible, as no history, divine or human, ever had a precedent of the like." "These practices of the sectaries and their abettors, they declare, directly overturn the laws and liberties of the kingdom, root out all lawful and supreme magistracy, and introduce a fearful confusion and lawless anarchy."

Their zeal prompted them even to write to Sir Charles Coote, then at Londonderry, and to Colonel Monk at Dundalk, to dissuade them from complying with the measures of those who then held the reins of government. Both applications however were unsuccessful.

[They refused to join with Ormond, when he had united with the Irish insurgents in his measures for upholding the Royal cause, because they condemned the peace he had made with the Irish, so strongly favouring the re-establishment of Popery; they saw and dreaded the danger that would accrue to the Protestant religion, from again trusting the Roman Catholics with military power; and when Montgomery, Lord of Airds, deserted their cause and joined with Ormond and his confederates, they reprehended him, in their printed declaration of June 29, 1649, as a traitor to the cause of God. In opposition to Montgomery's justification of his proceedings, they drew up at their meeting in Bangor, on July 7th, a counter-declaration,\* setting forth the evils resulting from a union with the Roman Catholics; the necessity of adhering to the Covenant, and of its being taken by the King for the security of the Protestant religion.]

When the *Rump* party, upon acquiring greater strength, found that the Presbytery were not to be seduced from their loyal principles by methods of persuasion, they determined to accomplish their purpose by measures of coercion and intimidation. Accordingly, Colonel Venables, who

---

\* [This "Bangor Declaration" made such an impression in the province, and was so directly opposed to the Commonwealth party, that the celebrated Milton thought it his duty to reply to it, which he did in a very harsh and scurrilous manner.]



commanded in the northern district, summoned the ministers to appear before him, to answer for their conduct, in preaching, praying and practising against the Commonwealth of England, and in favour of the royal family. Upon this, some of the Presbytery fled, some absconded and others were taken prisoners. Venables sent them a proposal to this effect:—that if they would give under their hands, that they would not, in their sermons, prayers or conferences, meddle with state matters, any farther than was allowed by the English Government, they might return in peace to their several charges—or, declining to do this, if they would engage to remove to Scotland in ten days, they should be freely allowed to do so, without being subjected to any farther inconvenience.

Four ministers, Mr. John Drysdail, of Portaferry, Mr. Bautie, Mr. Main, and Mr. Alexander, having at that time been brought prisoners to Colonel Venables, defended their principles and conduct with the most consummate ability and address.\*

In 1651, diligent search being made after them, some fled and others were taken prisoners, confined in Carrickfergus, and shortly after sent off to Scotland, where they officiated for three years. About seven remained in Ireland, viz. Thomas Peebles, minister of Kirkdonald, James Gordon, of Comber, Gilbert Ramsay, of Bangor, Anthony Kennedy, of Templepatrick, Robert Cunningham, of Broadisland, and Patrick Adair, of Cairncastle. Under great difficulties they continued to exercise the ministerial functions through the succeeding year 1652.

The universal refusal by the ministers of the oath called the *Engagement*, which required them to be faithful to the Commonwealth of England, without king and house of lords, is an uncontrovertible proof of their inflexible integrity. For they were urged to take it, by promises, importunities and threats, and were reviled for refusing to comply.

The Commissioners having desired a meeting and conference with the Presbytery in Belfast, October 21st, 1652, a long debate took place, but

the ministers would not in the least recede from their principle, of refusing to recognize the present government as lawful, and to bind themselves by any oath or subscription to it. Some weeks afterwards, the Commissioners proposed sending some of them to Dublin, to appear before General Fleetwood and the council of officers, in order to explain their conduct. The Presbytery deputed Mr. Patrick Adair and Mr. Archibald Ferguson, and instructed them to adhere with resolution to the principles maintained before the Commissioners. These gentlemen replied to all the questions put to them with great firmness and integrity; and in a few days were dismissed, the court not having thought proper to adopt any resolutions respecting them.

The Commissioners not having been able to make any impression on the ministers and people, and finding that they constantly opposed their measures, determined on transporting them to the south of the kingdom. Accordingly in the year 1653, having summoned the ministers to appear at Carrickfergus, and to bring with them the greatest and best part of their parishioners, that they might either take the engagement, or assign sufficient reasons for refusing it, the design was suddenly abandoned, even while a ship was lying in the bay, ready to receive the ministers on board, in consequence of the arrival of intelligence from England, that Cromwell had raised the Parliament, dissolved the Commonwealth, and assumed the title of Lord Protector. There being now, therefore, no Commonwealth to which to swear fidelity, the ministers and people were dismissed.\*

The ministers opposed Cromwell as warmly as they had the Commonwealth. Henry Cromwell, the Lord Lieutenant, being much incensed at their conduct, wrote threatening letters to them, and summoned two of their number, Mr. Hart and Mr. Greg, to appear before him, and answer for their neglect of the fasts and thanksgivings appointed by government. Having pleaded "that their consciences did not allow them to comply with any power that was against the constitution and lawful magistracy of

\* Loy. Presb. p. 289.

\* Presb. Loy. p. 300.

the kingdom," the Viceroy charged them with ingratitude, because each of the ministers was in the receipt of £100 a-year from the government. But this salary they did not consider as a gift, which laid them under any obligations to acknowledge the government, but as matter of right; for the usurpers had deprived them of the tithes, and had given them in stead £100 each per annum, which was a very inadequate compensation for the loss which they had sustained. But though they held their livings by this precarious tenure, they persisted in their loyal declarations and resolutions, and publicly prayed for the restoration of the King, even while exposed to great danger from the army of the Protector. At the Restoration, although they had been so well affected towards the King, they were not reinstated in the possession of their benefices, which were intercepted by the episcopal clergy.

[Charles II., for whom they suffered so much, treated them with the same ingratitude he did the Presbyterians in England and Scotland. Their livings were intercepted by the episcopal clergy; they were ejected from their churches by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and treated with much unmerited and severe persecution, by the reigning powers. When the Act of Uniformity was passed, out of 64 ministers then in Ulster, only four appear to have conformed; \* the remainder preferring the approbation of their conscience to the favour of the Court.]

In 1662, several Presbyterian ministers in Ireland were brought into trouble by the conspiracy of Major Blood, a desperate adventurer from England, who laid a plan to surprise the castle of Dublin, and seize on the person of the Duke of Ormond, the Lord Lieutenant. Blood, and his brother-in-law, Lecky, who was partner with him in the conspiracy, being Dissenters, the enemies of the Presbyterians improved this circumstance against them; and, in particular, caused suspicion to fall on three ministers, Mr. Adair, Mr. Stuart, and Mr. Semple, who happened to be in Dublin shortly before the plot was

discovered, having been sent thither to wait on the Lord Lieutenant with an address from their brethren in the North. These ministers were brought up to Dublin; but after a very severe and critical examination, no ground of accusation could be found against them. Some other persons were also examined; but every new circumstance which came to light, served only the more strongly to establish their innocence. The matter issued in a manner entirely creditable to the loyalty and honour of both the clergy and laity of the Presbyterian body. The Duke, however, at the instigation of their adversaries, had caused many of the ministers to be imprisoned, merely on suspicion. Seven of them, namely, Mr. Greg, Mr. Drysdall, Mr. Stuart, Mr. Alexander Hutcheson, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Ramsay, and Mr. Gordon, were imprisoned in Carlingford, where they received very harsh treatment. He at the same time disarmed all the Scots resident in the country.\*

Sir Arthur Forbes, (afterwards Earl of Granard,) having been in London in 1672, had some conversation with the King concerning the Presbyterian ministers and people of the North of Ireland. The King inquired of Sir Arthur concerning the ministers' conduct and manner of life, stating that he had always been informed that they were loyal subjects, and that though they had suffered on that account, they were men of peaceable behaviour. Sir Arthur having confirmed this account, and added that they and their people were by no means in affluent circumstances, the King, "of his own mere motion," granted them £600 per annum out of the revenue of Ireland, (a sum which he had designed for a charitable use,) to be paid to Sir Arthur quarterly, for secret service.†

Sir Arthur, on coming to Ireland, wrote for four ministers to come to him to Dublin, that he might settle with them concerning the distribution of the money. The four ministers

\* Loy. Presb. pp. 378, &c.

† The King had intended to appropriate £1200 to the use of the ministers; supposing that so much remained undisposed of in the settlement of the revenue of Ireland; but upon inquiry it was found, that there was only the half of that sum.

\* [See Woodrow's History, Appendix, No. 5.]



were, Patrick Adair, William Semple, Alexander Hutcheson, and Archibald Hamilton. Having consulted apart, they gave it as their opinion, that each minister who was in the country in the year 1660, should have an equal proportion; and that the widows and orphans of those who were removed by death, might share of the King's bounty: with which plan Sir Arthur being pleased, ordered immediate payment for the first quarter.

Towards the end of Charles's reign, however, the Court having revived its persecution of the Dissenters, the bounty was withdrawn.

[To be continued.]

SIR, Nov. 1, 1824.  
H<sup>A</sup>VING in my last (pp. 531—533) alluded to a grammatical canon which has been applied to prove the divinity of Christ, I will now, with your leave, state the canon, as given in the Classical Journal, No. XVI., and make an observation or two upon it. "When two or more attributives joined by a copulative or copulatives are *assumed* of the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is *inserted*, before the remaining ones it is *omitted*." That this canon holds true *in general* I have no doubt. But it is manifest that it is applicable only when the noun which has the article *can be* an attributive of the subject which is to follow. And it is worthy of observation, that the epistolary writers of the New Testament do not commonly use the article with an attributive standing *before* the name of Jesus Christ, when such attributive is introduced by a conjunction, the word Θεος having preceded. Before Θεος, in such case, I contend, that they employ the article or not as the occasion may require. Such passages as the following are numerous, απο Θεου πατρος ημων, και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου, and in all these passages Κυριος is the same to us as ο Κυριος; and before Θεος the article is not wanted. Should it be said that the article is omitted before Κυριος because it is omitted before Θεος, I answer that this reason, simply considered, is not sufficient, as might easily be shewn.\*

\* The following passage is worthy of notice, εξ ου και σωτηρα απενδεχομεθα Κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον. Phil. iii. 20.

In the Epistle of James i. 1, we read, Ιακωβος Θεος και Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος δεσλος. Here the article before Θεος is omitted as unnecessary; hence Paul also writes, Παυλος δεσλος Θεος. 2 Thess. i. 12, we read κατα την χαριν τε Θεου ημων, και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου. Here the article is inserted, because ο Θεος ημων is more correct than Θεος ημων. In the first Epistle to Timothy v. 21, we find διαμαρτυρομαι ενωπιον τε Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου. Here again the article is inserted, because ενωπιον τε Θεου is the usual expression. But the apostle, it seems, in these instances ought to have inserted the article before Κυριου, if he did not intend that Jesus Christ should be considered as both God and Lord. But what if in the view of the apostle he *could not* be thus considered? And certainly his habitual practice of speaking of God and *our Lord Jesus Christ* in the same sentence, as distinct from each other, constitutes a *point of difference* between these passages and those cases to which the canon is justly applied. In illustration of the canon the following words of Æschines have been quoted, ο συκοφαντης και περιεργος Δημοσθενης. But who sees not, from the observations which have now been made, that this passage is not analogous to the controverted passages in the New Testament, except in *form*, and that their coincidence in this respect may justly be considered as accidental? We read ο Κυριος ημων και σωτηρ Ιησους Χριστος, and here the canon holds good. But Κυριος ημων not only is an attributive, but a perpetual attributive of Jesus Christ; whereas Θεος and Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος are perpetually distinguished from each other. It is easy to lay hold of a rule, and to apply it to cases which appear similar, without considering in what they differ, but this has never yet been deemed the part of sound criticism; nor will any vigilant critic suffer himself to accept an imperfect for a perfect analogy.

In a word, the canon in question will prove nothing until the divinity of Christ shall have been established by other evidence, and when this shall have been done, I shall say of the canon, *valeat quantum valere potest*. But were I a Trinitarian, I should wonder that Jesus Christ should never be called *our God*, except with ano-

ther appellation. I do not question the sincerity of those who endeavour to support the divinity of Christ by this canon, but I am persuaded that they would gladly exchange all the passages to which it has been applied for one such expression as the following, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

E. COGAN.

November 6.

P. S. When I said that the epistolary writers of the New Testament do not *commonly* use the article with an attributive standing before the name of Jesus Christ, &c., I had in mind the following passage, 2 Tim. iv. 1, Διαμαρτυρομαι εν εγω ενωπιον τῶ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and I did not know whether there might not be one or two passages similar to this. But I believe that there are not; and I find that τῶ Κυρίου is excluded from the text of Griesbach.

Nov. 2, 1824.

*Essay on the incidental Communication of Religious Knowledge to the Young.*

— soon a nobler task demands her care.

Apart she joins his little hands in prayer,

Telling of Him who sees in secret there.

ROGERS.

**T**HE difference, in Western countries, between the manners of ancient and those of modern times, is generally known: nor are my readers less acquainted with the yet more impressive difference, which in all ages has subsisted between the customs of the Eastern world and those of Europe. It is with a view to this distinction, and with every just allowance for it, that I shall now describe and recommend one method of teaching religion to the young.

Religious knowledge, truth and duty, being of supreme importance, claim to be subjects of *direct* instruction: that kind of instruction I am far from disparaging; the course which I shall point out, must be combined with it, and instrumental to it—nor are topics of this serious moment to be treated of in a spirit and manner uncongenial to their nature. Parents, however, and others upon whom the charge of children and of youth devolves, will have numerous *incidental*

opportunities of fixing the great principles of faith and virtue on the tender mind.

With the Hebrews religion entered far more into the concerns of daily life than it does among ourselves. The father of a Jewish household, was really its priest and its instructor: and, in proportion as he was pious and enlightened, he engrafted the best of truths and maxims on the inquiries which his children made, and on the occurrences which they witnessed and experienced. Why is the example lost upon those who are placed in the same or a similar relation, and who are favoured with still more and higher advantages? Why do the professors of Christianity refuse to communicate its interesting facts, discoveries and sanctions to their offspring, *as they sit in their houses, and when they walk by the way?* The employment is not or should not be difficult of performance: the advantages flowing from it, would be incalculably numerous and valuable.\*

To illustrate what I mean, I shall borrow a few sentences from the works of one of whom devotion seemed to be the element. He introduces a father thus conversing with a young child, initiating him in the knowledge of God; and the pious and affectionate parent is supposed to say,

“The little time you have been in the world, my child, you have spent wholly with me, and my love and tenderness to you has made you look upon me as your only friend and benefactor, and the cause of all the comfort and pleasure that you enjoy. Your heart, I know, would be ready to break with grief, if you thought this was the last day that I should live with you. But, my child, though you think yourself exceedingly happy, because you have hold of my hand, you are now in the hands and under the tender care of a much greater Father and friend than I am; whose love to you is far greater than mine, and from whom you receive such blessings as no mortal can give. \* \* \* You see, my son, this wide and large firmament over our heads, where the sun and moon and all the stars appear in their turns. Were you to be car-

\* Wellbeloved's Memoirs of the Rev. Wm. Wood, pp. 4, 5, 6.



ried up to any of these bodies, at this vast distance from us, you would still discover others as much above you as the stars that you see here are above the earth \* \* and yet, my child, so great is God, that all these bodies added together are but as a grain of sand in his sight ; and yet you are as much the care of this God and Father of all worlds and all spirits, as if he had no son but you, or there were no creature for him to love and protect, but you alone. \* \* \* \* therefore, my child, fear and worship and love God: and take him for your Lord and Father and Friend. \* \* Your youth and little mind is only yet acquainted with my family, and, therefore, you think that there is no happiness out of it. But, my child, you belong to a greater family than mine : you are a younger member of the family of the Almighty Father of all nations ; who hath created infinite orders of beings and numberless generations of men, to be fellow-members of one and the same society in heaven." \*

This is a specimen of the manner in which a kind, judicious father may converse respecting God with his children, when he sits in his house, and when he walks by the way. Not that a *long* address to them on these interesting subjects can be either requisite or desirable. The quotations which I have made, are to be considered as only a *pattern* of this indirect but attractive method of instruction. To individuals who cherish habits of correct thought and feeling, in the all-important task of education, these extracts will perhaps have suggested hints, both as to the manner and the practicability of communicating religious knowledge in their families : and of such hints they will not fail to take advantage. In acting upon them, their own judgment and hearts will be their best directors. We must frequently have remarked the extreme curiosity of the infant mind : we cannot be ignorant that the principle is bestowed on it, for highly beneficial purposes ; and, if we be wise, we shall not neglect to guide youthful curiosity into a proper channel, and to apply it to the most useful ends. For the accurate and successful performance

of this parental duty, two errors must be avoided : we must shun alike tediousness and levity.

Could I suppose that any of my readers are in danger of mistaking the nature of the practice, of which I have ventured to express my feeble approbation, I would here mention a circumstance, which, a few months ago, seized the attention of the writer of this essay. On a venerable and engaging spot, that commands a boundless view of the ocean, he perceived a mother and her young son apart from every other individual. The child gazed with earnestness on "the world of waters : " he beheld it, as is probable, for the first time, and with all the astonishment which such a spectacle, so magnificent and so novel, cannot fail of raising in the youthful mind. Nothing was heard of their conversation : no attempt was made to break in upon their seclusion. It was observed, however, that the parent most carefully directed her child to the whole of the stupendous scene before them, encouraged his curiosity, and seemed to aim at gratifying it ; nor, at that moment, could I forbear to imagine, and indeed to hope, that she was elevating the thoughts and affections of her beloved charge to Him who made "earth, sea, sky ; " that, while pointing to the vast expanse, she was, in effect, saying,

"View the broad sea's majestic plains ;  
And think how wide its Maker reigns :  
That band remotest nations joins,  
And on each wave His goodness  
shines." \*

Let not this anecdote be considered as a digression : it will be more than excused, if it enable a single parent better to understand what is meant by talking of God with his children in the way, or supply him with a new motive to the practice.

On all proper occasions, therefore, but especially when, being alone with our youthful charge, our regards are directed to the objects of creation ; when the rising and the setting sun, when "all the dread magnificence of heaven," when the charms of spring, when summer suns, when the glories of the decaying year, and when the snows and storms of winter present

\* Law's Serious Call, &c., (Ed. 7.) 239—246.

\* Doddridge.

themselves to our senses, we should avail ourselves of these scenes for the purpose of conducting the young mind to the God of nature and revelation, and for implanting in that mind the filial love and reverence which are due to the Father of the universal family.

This incidental method of religious instruction, will impress the youthful memory, understanding and imagination. With persons who have already made some advances in years and knowledge, a different way of teaching may be both requisite and useful. In the case, however, of the young and ignorant, in regard to individuals of a very tender age, it will be found expedient, if not essential, to address the reason by the aid of the senses, and to combine familiar with direct and formal precept. What took place in the infancy of the world, may deserve to be considered, and, in a certain degree, to be imitated, with respect to the infancy of every man's life: religion must be inculcated by means of external objects, and, as much as possible, in the shape of history. The volume of nature is always open to us, for this purpose: and both the Jewish and the Christian revelations come down to successive races of men, principally in the pages of historians. By visible signs the Hebrew was reminded of the leading points of his faith: by *parables and similitudes* the prophets of former days, and He to whom the prophets bore witness, instructed the people. Would all this have been done, unless from a well-founded conviction, that this method of teaching religion is particularly adapted to the frame and the wants of men? To those of children, therefore, it must be eminently suited.

I am sensible of the value of catechisms, as text-books in the hands of judicious parents and instructors. Still, I must express my wish that our first catechisms be short, and that the rest be wholly or chiefly scriptural. I feel little partiality for those, however, in general, correct and well executed, which contain long answers, drawn up in somewhat abstracted language. In a word, it would seem greatly desirable that, with a view to aid the memory, the understanding and the imagination,

the young be instructed in religion principally through the observation of the senses or by the history of facts.

By the practice which I am recommending, the mutual affection of parents and of children would be cemented: the highest benefit of both would be promoted. Fathers and mothers would thus become the daily instructors of their offspring in the best of all knowledge: and what is there which more powerfully or tenderly binds together the hearts of the young and of their elders than their reciprocal relation as kind teachers and grateful pupils? What then must be the force of this bond, when additional strength is given to it by the ties of nature!

Parents who teach their children, teach themselves. They even do more than retain and increase their own stock of religious knowledge: they gratify and heighten those practical habits of piety, kindness and self-government, which are the richest and only durable possession of mortal creatures and immortal spirits. Nor are these the sole blessings which they confer. They, at the same time, eminently subserve the interests of pure religion in a still larger circle. On domestic and personal, all social virtue must be built.

N.

---

#### On Unitarian Missionary Preaching.

Plymouth,

SIR, September 25, 1824.

IT has long been my wish to address a few thoughts to you on this subject, from the persuasion that has rested on my mind, that the societies which have been formed amongst us with a view to spread the knowledge of the Unitarian doctrine, have been sadly misapplying their money, by keeping in their pay itinerant preachers, who have gone about the country without any regular plan of acting, and, after having dropped a few useful hints here and there as chance directed, have gone away and been heard of no more. I am not prepared to say that by the services which have been performed by Messrs. Gisburne, Wright, Smethurst, Martin, &c., no good has been done. I hope and believe that some good may have been done by even the most desultory of



their services. But I believe that their labour has been for the most part thrown away, and with it the money they have carried in their pockets; and this, I believe, will be the case so long as they are mere itinerants, and after having completed a circle of visits in the North are sent away to the West or elsewhere. What is greatly wanted, in order to accomplish the purpose for which such men go out, is a regular plan, well-digested, which, when it has been gone through, may be begun again; and where one good impression has been made this month, a second and more effectual one may be made a month or two after; and the people who have once heard with pleasure, the simple doctrine of the gospel of Christ, may know that, at the end of every second or third month, they will hear it again, until gradually hearers shall accumulate, and societies shall be formed which, with a little management among the settled ministers of neighbouring places, may maintain a regular worship, and so go on to increase and multiply. But this will never be done by preaching in market-places, or on the open quays, or on the sea-shore, or in the public streets—as I am sorry to say many of our Unitarian missionaries have done—calling together a large company of curious women and noisy children, who are like enough, before they have done, to pelt them with insulting language and with mud, a disgrace which our ——— have sometimes met with. Take such a plan as this at the very best, and suppose the descriptions of these meetings—which have been well enough got up in the reports of your missionaries for the Repository—to be correct; “that the people have heard with seriousness,” “that the companies have been large,” “that they have shewn great desire to have tracts,” which, of course, they will do when they can get them for nothing, be they what they will; to what does all this amount? Exactly to the momentary refreshment of a light shower in July, after the ground has been parched up for a month: it will soon be unknown on what spot the shower had fallen. *These are they that receive seed in stony places.* Matt. xiii. 20. Indeed, I doubt whether as much good is done by such

a solitary service as is received from the transient shower. In travelling over half a dozen counties in this way a good deal of money may be expended; and were you to pass over the ground a few weeks after, you probably would find, that scarcely one impression is left alive which had been produced by the first opening of the Unitarian doctrine. I am of opinion also, that it is far too soon for us to think of going into small villages and towns about the coast, where the Unitarian worship cannot be established for want of means to support it, and where, under the most favourable circumstances, no preaching can be kept up, no effectual and lasting service can be rendered. The Methodists are much wiser in their generation: they do not wander about in this kind of way, and deliver their good doctrine to be driven away by the winds of heaven. Their plan of stations round about a chief town or head quarters, is far better calculated to enlighten the population, and bring them to their worship. If one of their missionaries, a local preacher or a settled minister, call the people’s attention to-day to the principles they profess, they are led to expect that in a week or fortnight hence he will come again: they expect to hear him, and are prepared to come, accompanied by some of their neighbours. But until we command a number of auxiliaries in the service of Unitarianism, approaching to that of the Wesleians, we should satisfy ourselves with taking our stations in those good towns or large villages, in which there may be a probability, by a continued exertion, of forming a society that can maintain itself. A Missionary, residing in a large town, around which he can select a number of stations, say ten or twelve, or even a score, to which he makes his periodical visits, if it were only once in two months, and spends a week at each, might do great service to the cause. There are many towns in the West of England, and doubtless in other parts, where have formerly been Presbyterian societies, which have perished for lack of the gospel, in which a hope might be entertained that a Unitarian society might be raised, and the old chapel, with its endowments, recovered, or a small chapel built. Settled ministers would oc-

casionally assist in promoting such a design, leaving the Missionary to do duty in their chapels, if a provision was made for the expenses of journeying. Admit even that a Missionary, so stationed, employ some years before he can accomplish the formation of societies, able to maintain their worship, it must appear to every one, that there is a better prospect of ultimate success with such a scheme, than there can be in the flying visits which have been made from time to time to distant places, but which were not repeated. I have now in my recollection a case in point. Before Mr. Wright became a regular Missionary he resided at Wisbeach; he then went out occasionally and visited some towns in Lincolnshire and in Yorkshire, making them periodical visits in such a way that they expected to see him at certain distances of time. By these visits he was instrumental in reviving the congregation at Lincoln, confirming it in Unitarian principles, and inducing the few people who assembled to engage a Unitarian minister. They have since maintained their worship, and are, I hope, in an improving state. During the same time, and for some years afterwards, he proceeded in his journey as far as Thorne, a small market town on the south side of Yorkshire; he there began to preach to a very small number. I think I have heard him say there was only one person whom he could consider Unitarian; but by degrees more were added, who became confirmed in that doctrine by his regular visits. He passed, as I well remember, in his route, through Lincoln, dropping a word of exhortation as he went along there and in other towns, until the society at Thorne had grown up to a sufficient maturity to build a chapel, and raise a stipend for a minister.

This is the way in which the few Missionaries we can obtain should proceed for the present, visiting always and regularly good towns or villages, where they can find a welcome reception even from a very few, who may, with safety, calculate upon hearing them again; *meeting in a licensed room, and never in yards, or on quays, or in any open places*; thus maintaining the respectability of the cause they are advocating, and giving inducement

for those to join them in their good work, who have the means of assisting the cause both by their influence and by their wealth. Let it not be said, that in acting thus we are despising the poor; it is far from my thoughts. There are poor in good towns as well as in retired villages, and if we will promote our cause among them, it must be in those places where it can be promoted. It is folly to talk, as some are doing, of imitating the apostles, and preaching to the poor as they did. This is mere youthful effervescence and sheer nonsense. We are now in a state of society very different from theirs, and, moreover, we have not the same powerful and effectual instruments to work with. We must be satisfied with those that are in our power, and make the best use of them to produce the best effect. The poor of a small town cannot maintain their worship; we cannot find them ministers to maintain it for them, however great may be our wish to do so. But we may, by our united exertions, plant the gospel in many of the principal towns in which it is not now thriving, where are insulated individuals who would gladly water it, and where, when it has grown, it may spread its branches yet wider, and offer its refreshing shade to those neighbouring places in which at first it would have wanted nourishment. Yes, Sir, like that celebrated banian tree, of which we read in the Indian history, the branches of the parent tree, spreading widely around, would throw out roots, which striking deep in the earth, will gradually grow into trunks, which shall form their own offspring too.

It affords me pleasure to find, that a professed Missionary Society has been formed at Exeter, for the purpose of supporting a preacher in these counties. I beg to offer its members my advice upon the subject; that they break up the good ground before they make any attempt upon the downs and the moors around us; that they labour steadily in cultivating that good ground; it is not wanting here;—that they endeavour to form Unitarian societies in the good towns of this and the neighbouring county, before they think of employing their resources in smaller places and on the sea-shores; that they take good

care to have a man to carry on this work of love, whose age, respectability of manners, knowledge of the world, and acquaintance with the controversies of the day, fit him to meet the adversaries he may expect to encounter—and until they can find such a man, to consider, whether they had not better keep their means of doing good for a more favourable opportunity. With the expression of the most hearty wish to see much fruit of their labours, I am, Sir, &c.

I. WORSLEY.

SIR,  
YOUR pleasant American correspondent and censor has delighted us all with his information (p. 554) regarding the Jews in the United States. Israel appears to be domiciliated in that happy land. I learn also from Mr. Ingersoll's Oration at New York, that the Roman Catholics are quite at home in Republican North America, and are not only good citizens but also zealous patriots. He dwells upon the fact as if it were new or surprising. Why should it be so esteemed? The Roman Catholics are men, and there is nothing in their religion to render them indifferent to the rights of property and the invaluable advantages of personal freedom. Maryland, a Catholic colony, set one of the first examples of religious liberty amongst our American brethren. Of this, I have been agreeably reminded, lately, by a volume of American music that has been put into my hands. It is Catholic music, published in Baltimore, about the year 1805, consisting of "Masses, Vespers and Litanies, Hymns, Psalms, Anthems and Motetts, composed, selected and arranged for the use of the Catholic Churches in the United States of America, and respectfully dedicated, by permission, to the Right Rev. John Carrol, D. D., Bishop of Baltimore, by Benjamin Carr. (Price, bound, one Eagle.)" These "Masses," &c., contain a "Prayer for the Commonwealth," well set to music by "R. Taylor." The words are as follows:

Save, O Lord! the Commonweal,  
Let thy people's rights prevail,  
Let Columbia trust in Thee,  
To whom she owes her Liberty.

Chorus.

Voice of praise, let us raise  
Great Jehovah! praise to Thee,  
We are free, thanks to Thee,  
Great Jehovah! we are free,  
Father of our Liberty!

Let us ne'er ungrateful prove,  
For such mercy, and such love,  
But bear in mind, that He who gave  
Can destroy, as well as save.

Chorus.

Voice of praise, &c.

In this, and a thousand other instances, we see exemplified the pleasing truth that a government founded upon principles of reason, truth and justice, is not only a direct blessing to a community, but indirectly the means of diffusing those liberal opinions and charitable feelings upon which the happiness of society depends more than upon legislative enactments and police regulations.

A PSALMODIST.

*Dr. J. Jones on Mark and Luke being the Two Disciples that fled to Emmaus.*

THE Apostle Paul, as not having himself witnessed the works and sayings of Jesus, was attended in his travels by a person who had been a witness of them. This was a wise precaution, in order to furnish the most satisfactory evidence to those whom in his discourses he sought to convert. John Mark at first seemed to have fulfilled this office for the Apostle; and hence we might infer, that this evangelist had attended the ministry of his Divine Master. A circumstance, however, occurred, which separated Paul and Mark; and Luke succeeded him in accompanying the Apostle; and from this we might conclude, that this evangelist also had ranked with the disciples of Christ. But we have his own declaration, unequivocally asserting his constant attendance on the ministry of Jesus. For he asserts, in the introduction to his gospel, that he accompanied with close attention all the particulars respecting the Word; and that this was the circumstance which induced him to undertake his narrative. He, moreover, fortifies his authority by premising that eye-witnesses and ministers of the word "delivered them to us," meaning by us, in the second verse,



what he means by the same pronoun in the first, when it clearly means the Jewish believers, or the people in the midst of whom the advent and works of the Messiah were fulfilled. The Evangelist then attests, that he was in the number of those to whom the apostles, in their discourses, delivered an account of the actions and instructions of Jesus; and then adds, as a mere adequate qualification for becoming the historian of his Divine Master, that he had himself attended and noted with scrupulous accuracy the transactions which he records in his gospel. But mark the gross and inexcusable error which learned men have committed on this subject: they talk of *us*, in the second verse, not meaning, as it evidently does, the same persons with *us* in the first, but the same with *me* in the third, thus making the writer contradict himself, and invalidating his authority as a competent historian. This blunder was first made by Irenæus about the end of the second century, and it has without exception been adopted by modern critics. It is observable, that neither Matthew nor Mark nor John say that they were eye-witnesses of the facts which they respectively record; while Luke is so particular and emphatic in stating his qualification in this respect. The cause of this peculiarity is to be sought in the reference which this writer makes to the pseudo-evangelists, who, having published their gospels in Egypt, and pretending that Jesus had been in that country, affected to be competent historians of the facts which they related.

If, then, Luke, as he most emphatically declared, had witnessed every thing that is related by him, he must have been one of the two disciples who went to Emmaus; for he is the only writer who gives a full account of that occurrence. And the internal evidence that he was one of the two is complete; for in *three* places he uses the first for the third person, and from the nature of what he says, it is clear that he wrote not what had been told him by another, but what he remembered to have been *felt* by himself, "And they said to one another, How did our hearts burn within us as he spoke to us on the way!" Besides the writer, in telling the story, relates but imperfectly some mi-

nute circumstances of which his presence alone could give him a full and adequate impression: "It happened that, while they were communing and reasoning together, that Jesus himself, *having drawn near*, went with them." It seems from the original, that Jesus affecting to be a stranger, kept aloof for a time for fear of intruding, and drew nearer them as they appeared to wish his approach to unite in their conversation; and this is a circumstance which could hardly enter the mind of any but one that had been present.

The other disciple is said to have been *Cleopas*. Now I propose to shew that this Cleopas was no other than Mark the Evangelist. Mark's father was a *Roman*, but a proselyte to Judaism, and thence became a resident of Jerusalem. From his extraction he appears to have assumed the name of Mark or *Marcus*, while, as a Jewish proselyte, he adopted the name of *John*, which in Greek is interpreted *Cleopas* or *Clopas*, meaning *sweet-voiced*, just as a female would have been styled *Calliope*. For the origin of *John* or *Iov*, is the Hebrew verb *נָאָה* *ona*, which under the form of a noun *Iona*, is applied by Isaiah xiii. 22, to certain birds, which the Septuagint render by *σειληνες*, *sirens*, doubtless on account of their sweet or enchanting voice. Mark's father was at this time dead; but his mother was still alive, and had a house at Jerusalem. It was natural for Mark to assume his father's name of Cleopas, but he seems to have declined it after he had ranked with the disciples of Christ; and this seems to be the reason why the name of Cleopas, though a leading disciple, never occurs in the New Testament except on this occasion, nor in any ecclesiastical writer to my knowledge.

If, then, Luke and Mark were the two disciples that went to Emmaus, we can account for some circumstances which characterise this incident. First, we see why Luke and Mark, and not Matthew and John, notice this event—because the two former were personally concerned in it, and alone able from their own knowledge to relate it. Secondly, we see the important reason why our Lord should shew himself separately to these two, and unfold to them in

particular the fulfilment of Moses and the prophets by his death and resurrection, because he knew that they were soon to become the historians of his life and the vouchers of those great events. Thirdly, we see the reason why Mark and Luke thought fit to flee, when it was apprehended that the body of Jesus was stolen. Mark, probably, with Luke his constant companion, was an inhabitant of Jerusalem. Suspicion would more likely fall upon him as being best acquainted with the place; nor could he seclude himself from notice with the same security as the other disciples, who were for the most part strangers at Jerusalem.

J. JONES.

N. B. It seems to have escaped the notice of learned men, and of your excellent correspondent N., among the number, that the maxim *οργιζεσθε και μη αμαρτανετε*, *be angry and sin not*, is copied verbatim from the Septuagint Version of Psalm iv. 4, and this circumstance serves to ascertain the sense of the Apostle. The Hebrew verb to which *οργιζω* corresponds, is *רגז* *ragaz*, which in general signifies to move—as to move *with force*, to shake, cause to quake,—to move *with desire*, captivate, charm—to move *with fear*, cause to tremble, agitate—to move *with anger*, provoke, irritate. The meaning of the Greek verb is limited to the last, and the purport of the passage is this: “Grant that you are irritated or provoked by the injurious or violent conduct of another, yet let not your irritation betray you to sin.” The sin meant, is retaliation or revenge. This is clear from the sequel: “Let not the sun set on your wrath.” The point and propriety of this admonition must have been more forcibly felt in an age and country of the world, when it was not unusual to execute schemes of revenge after the setting of the sun and under the cover of darkness, than in our own. The Apostle then cautions the converts against that species of provocation or irritation which, instead of evaporating or expending itself in complaints or menaces, settles into silent and fell revenge. The anger to which Paul alludes is thus described by Seneca in

his admirable work on Anger, lib. i. c. 4, *Quædam (iræ) in verborum maledictorumque amaritudinem effusæ; quædam ultra querelas et aversiones non exeunt; quædam altæ gravesque sunt et introrsus versæ.* After this admonition concerning such irritations as may be unavoidable, the apostle proceeds to say that all anger, anger of every kind and every degree, should, root and branch, be eradicated from among them. The distinction of anger into *acts* and *habit* is a mere fiction to account for a difficulty, and utterly unknown to the ancients, who considered *anger* as a *passion* in contradistinction to *habit*. The origin of *οργη* is the verb *οργω*, to stretch at a thing, to desire; and hence Aristotle (Rhet. lib. 2, c. 2,) defines it, *ορεξις τιμωριας*, the desire of revenge; and in this sense it is utterly prohibited in the Christian Scriptures. And it is in vain to plead that anger in any degree is allowable as not sinful, or that it is even warranted by the example of Jesus. Mark, in one place, ascribes this feeling to his Divine Master; but it should be recollected that this evangelist was an Hellenistic Jew, who used the word anger in the wide sense of the corresponding term in Hebrew, namely, *agitation of mind*. Being himself sensible of this, he explains this anger or strong emotion to be no other than “grief at their blindness.” Mr. Belsham’s paraphrase of this verse is most happy, being just, elegant and comprehensive.

SIR,

Oct. 12, 1824.

THE intolerant patrons of the rejected American Quaker Creed, who so meanly shrunk from bringing forward their accusations against Elias Hicks, in his presence and before a few of his friends, as stated pp. 544—546, sent him, about a week after, the following letter, which contains similar and equally unfounded charges:

“To Elias Hicks.

“Friends in Philadelphia having for a considerable time past heard [by means of our circular] of thy holding and promulgating doctrines different from and repugnant to those held by our religious society [as described in

the forthcoming Creed], it was cause of uneasiness and deep concern to them, as *their* sincere regard and engagement for the promotion of the cause of truth made it very desirable that *all* the members of our religious society *should move* [according to our notions] *in true harmony*, under the direction of our blessed Redeemer, upon being informed of thy sentiments by Joseph Whitehall.

“That Jesus Christ was not the Son of God, until after the baptism of John, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, and that he was no more than a man; that the same power that saved him, must save us.”

“Many friends were much affected therewith; and some time afterwards, several friends being together in the city, on subjects relating to our religious society, they received an account from Ezra Comfort of some of thy expressions in the public General Meeting immediately succeeding the Southern Quarterly Meeting, lately held in the State of Delaware, which was also confirmed by his companion Isaiah Bell,—‘That Jesus Christ *was the first man* that introduced the *Gospel dispensation*.’ [Surely he was. A strange charge this! To whom do these elders look up as the author and finisher of the Christian faith?] ‘The Jews being under the outward and ceremonial law or dispensation, it was necessary that there should be some *outward miracle*,’—[Do these elders doubt or deny this?] ‘as the healing of the *outward infirmities of the flesh*, and raising the *outward dead bodies*, in order to introduce the *Gospel dispensation*.’ [Do they deem the belief of these truths a crime in the minister they accuse? They add] ‘He [Christ] had no more power given him *than man*,’ [was capable of receiving from God,] ‘for he was no more than man; he had nothing to do *with healing of the soul*, for that belongs to *God only*. Elisha had the same power to raise the dead. That man being obedient to the spirit of God in him, could arrive at *as great or [a] greater degree of righteousness* than Jesus Christ. That Jesus Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God, neither do I think it robbery *for man to be equal with God*. Then endeavoured to shew that by at-

tending to that stone cut out of the mountain without hands, or the seed in man, it would make man *equal with God*, saying, for that stone in man *was the entire God*.’ On hearing which, [and unwarrantably circulating these groundless reports and calumnies with no little industry,] it appeared to Friends a subject of such great importance, and of such deep interest to the welfare of our religious Society, [that is, in the eyes of these creed-makers,] as to require an early extension of care, in order that if any incorrect statement had been made, it should as soon as possible be rectified, [How did their subsequent conduct evince this?] or, if true, thou might be possessed of the painful concern of Friends, and *their sense and judgment thereon*. Two of the elders accordingly waited on thee, on the evening of the day of thy arriving in the city; and although *thou denied the statement*, yet thou declined to meet these two elders, in company with those who made it, left the mind of Friends without relief. [Elias claiming the right, if he met them, to adduce evidence, ‘*that those reports were false*.’ They add] One of the elders who had called on thee repeated his visit on the next day but one, and again requested thee to see the two elders and the Friends who made the above statements, which thou again declined. [Firmly as we *then* believed their report.] The elders from the different Monthly Meetings in the city were then convened, and requested a *private opportunity with thee*, which thou also refused; yet the next day consented to meet them at a time and place of thy own fixing; but when assembled, a mixed company being collected, [as related p. 545,] the elders could not in this manner enter into a business which they considered *of a nature* not to be investigated in any other way *than in a select, private opportunity*—[without any other evidence than our own]. They therefore considered that meeting a clear indication of thy continuing to decline to meet the elders *as by them proposed*. Under these circumstances, it appearing that thou art not willing to hear and disprove the charges brought against thee, [on mere exparte evidence,] we feel it a duty to declare,



that we cannot have religious unity with thy conduct, nor with the doctrines thou art charged with promulgating."

Signed 12 Mo. (Dec.) 19, 1822, by Caleb Pierce, and nine other elders.

By the concluding observation of the ten elders, they seem to disown all the doctrines Elias Hicks is charged with promulgating, at least by their letter. Whether this disunity goes farther, I cannot say. If not, it extends to his adherence to several very important *Christian and scriptural doctrines*. In reply to it, however clearly such a man as Elias Hicks must have seen this, he has with commendable moderation abstained from noticing these really heretical notions, and strictly confined himself to a denial of the truth of *the greater part of their charges*, and appealed to much better evidence than his accusers relied on, in his own vindication.

His reply is as follows:

*"To Caleb Pierce and the other Friends."*

"Having been charged by you of unsoundness of principle and doctrine, founded on reports spread among the people in an unfriendly manner, and contrary to the order of our discipline, by Joseph Whitehall, as stated in the letter from you, dated the 19th inst.; and as these are charges *not literally true*, being founded on his own forced and improper construction of my words, *I deny them*. And as I do not consider myself amenable to him, or any other, for crimes laid to my charge, as being committed in the course of the sitting of our last Yearly Meeting; as not any of my fellow-members of that meeting discovered or noticed any such things, which I presume not to be the case, as not an individual has mentioned any such thing to me, but contrary thereto, many of our valuable Friends, who had heard some of these foul reports, promulgated by an individual of our city, [New York,] acknowledge the great satisfaction they had with my services and exercises, in the course of that Meeting, and were fully convinced, that all those foul reports *were false*; and this view *is fully confirmed* by a certificate granted me by the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, of which I am a member, in which they express

their full unity with me; and which meetings were held a considerable time after our Yearly Meeting. In the course of which, Joseph Whitehall has presumed to charge me with unsoundness, contrary to the sense of the Yearly, Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of which I am a member, and to whom only *I hold myself amenable* for all conduct transacted within their limits. The other charges against me, made by Ezra Comfort, as expressed in your letter, are, *in the general, incorrect*, as is proved by the annexed certificate.\* Moreover, as

---

\* We, the undersigned, being in the city of Philadelphia when a letter was handed us, signed by ten of its citizens, Elders of the Society of Friends, and directed to Elias Hicks; after perusing and deliberately considering the charges therein against him, for holding and propagating doctrines inconsistent with our religious testimonies, and more especially those said by Ezra Comfort and Isaiah Bell, to be held forth at a Meeting immediately succeeding the late Southerly Quarterly Meeting, and we being members of the Southern Quarter, and present at the said Meeting, we are free to state, for the satisfaction of the first-mentioned Friends, and all others whom it may concern, that we apprehend the charges exhibited by the two Friends named, *are without substantial foundation*; and in order to give a clear view, we think it best and proper to transcribe the said charges—and our own understanding of them, viz. "That Jesus Christ *was the first man* that introduced the gospel dispensation," &c., as stated by the ten elders, "*in substance is correct*." Of the next charge, "That he (Christ) had no more power given him than man," they say, "*this sentence is incorrect*;" and also "That he had nothing to do with the healing of the soul, for that belongs to God only," "*is likewise incorrect*;" and the next sentence, "That Elisha also had the same power *to raise the dead*," should be transposed thus, to give Elias's expressions, "*By the same power it was that Elisha raised the dead*." "That man being obedient to the spirit of God in him, could arrive at as great or [a] greater degree of righteousness than Jesus Christ," they declare also "*is incorrect*." "That Jesus Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God," with annexing the other part of the paragraph mentioned by the holy apostle, [Phil. ii. 6—11,] "*would be correct*." As to their next charge against Elias,

Ezra Comfort has departed from gospel order in not mentioning his uneasiness to me, when present with me, and when I could have appealed to Friends of that meeting to have justified me, therefore I consider Ezra Comfort to have acted disorderly, and contrary to [our] discipline. These are the reasons that induced me to refuse a compliance with your requisitions, as considering them *arbitrary, and contrary to the established order of our Society.*

“ E. HICKS.

“ *Philadelphia, 12th Mo. (Dec.) 21, 1822.*”

Some weeks after the date of the above letter and certificate of the three Friends, which refutes the far greater part, and all the weighty charges those elders had in substance been privately circulating, nine of them, and Jonathan Evans, whose name was affixed to the rejected creed, signified their continued disunity with Elias Hicks by the following letter :

“ *To Elias Hicks.*

“ *Philadelphia, 1 Mo. (Jan.) 4, 1823.*

“ On the perusal of thy letter of the 21st of last month, it was *not a little affecting* to observe the same disposition still prevalent that avoided *a select meeting with the elders*, which meeting consistently with *the station we are placed in*, and with the sense of duty *impressive upon us*, we were engaged to propose and urge to thee, as a means wherein the cause of uneasiness might have been investigated, the Friends who exhibited the complaint fully examined, [but not thy

that he added to the text, as given in the received Version, “ Neither do I think it robbery for man to be equal with God,” they also say “ *is incorrect.*” And they declare the same of the last accusation, which it is therefore unnecessary to repeat. They conclude by saying, “ We were then of opinion, and still are, that the sentiments and doctrines held forth by our said friend Elias Hicks, are agreeable to the opinions and doctrines held by George Fox and other worthy Friends of his time.

Signed, ROBERT MOORE,  
JOSEPH TURNER,  
JOSEPH G. ROWLAND.

12 Mo. (Dec.) 21, 1822.

witnesses,] and the whole business placed in a clear point of view.

“ On a subject of such importance, the most explicit candour and ingenuousness, with a readiness to hear, and [mutually to] give complete satisfaction, ought ever to be maintained; this the gospel teaches, and the nature of the case imperiously demanded it. [Especially of accusers and those who claim to be judges of their brethren.] As to the certificate which accompanied thy letter, made several weeks after the circumstances occurred, [but within two days after the date of our written charges,] it is in several respects not only vague and ambiguous, but in others (though in different terms) it corroborates [they assert] the statement *at first made.* [This statement charged Elias Hicks with holding various sound and scriptural doctrines, *which he cannot deny.* They add] When we take a view of the whole subject, [doubtless including their famous Creed, agreed to on the 17th of this month, and ordered to be printed for distribution,] the doctrines and sentiments which have been promulgated by thee, though under *some caution while in this city*, and the opinions which thou expressed in an interview between Ezra Comfort and thee, on the 19th ult., we are fully and sorrowfully confirmed in the conclusion, [but on what evidence?] that thou holds and art disseminating principles very different from those which are held and maintained by our religious Society.

“ As thou hast on thy part closed the door against the brotherly care and endeavours of the elders here *for thy benefit*, and for the clearing our religious profession, this matter appears of such serious magnitude, so interesting to the peace, harmony and well-being of [the] Society, that we think it ought to claim *the weighty attention of thy Friends at home.*

“ Signed, Ellis Yarnall, Thomas Wistar, Leonard Snowden, Joseph Scattergood, Caleb Pierce, Samuel P. Griffiths, Thomas Stewardson, Edward Randolph, Israel Maul.

“ Being present when the foregoing letter was concluded on, *I unite with the concern* and care of my brethren, the elders of this city, that our religious Society might not be under the imputation of holding doctrines which

do not accord with the testimony of the Holy Scriptures.

"JONATHAN EVANS."

Elias Hicks does not appear to have replied to the above disingenuous and pharisaical letter, but the following notice of the above charges against him, *as being unfounded*, signed by twenty-two Members of the Southern Quarterly Meeting, who were present at the time alluded to, is inserted at p. 31 of "The Cabinet":

"We, the subscribers, being informed that certain reports have been circulated by Ezra Comfort and Isaiah Bell, that Elias Hicks had propagated *unsound doctrine* at our General Meeting, on the day succeeding our Quarterly Meeting in the 11th Mo. last, and a certificate signed by Robert Moore, Joseph Turner, and Joseph G. Rowland, being read, *contradicting* [the] *said reports*, the subject has claimed our weighty and deliberate attention; and it is our united judgment that the doctrines preached by our said Friend on the day alluded to, *were the truths of the gospel*; and that his labours of love amongst us, at our particular Meetings, as well as at our said Quarterly Meeting, *were united with by all our members, for aught that appears*. And we believe the certificate signed by the three Friends above-mentioned, is, *in substance, a correct statement of facts*."

To this vindication of Elias Hicks from the above unfounded aspersions upon him, I have neither seen nor heard of any reply. The decision of the Yearly Meeting, a few months after, against the imposition of the unscriptural and incongruous Creed, which appears to have been fabricated on the spur of the supposed necessity to obstruct Elias Hicks on his visit of gospel love to his brethren of Philadelphia, who nevertheless received him with open arms *as a gospel minister*. Of his accusers it may surely be said, that, like some corrupters of the primitive Christian faith, "they have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." 1 Tim. i. 6, 7.

BEREUS.

P. S.—The name, George Witby, which occurs at the latter part of my last, p. 549, should be *George Withy*.

HAVING lately read the very excellent work of Rammohun Roy, and seen the importance of its being more known and finding its way into the libraries of our students, and the value it would be to all of us as a book of reference; may I suggest to the Unitarian Society, to whom we are indebted for this valuable addition to our Scripture Criticism, that they might print it in a duodecimo volume, omitting the first part—since we can at any time refer to the evangelists for the Precepts of Jesus—on such plan as to sell it at five shillings, or even four?—in which case I suppose it would be necessary to put those words into English characters which belong to the ancient and Eastern languages.

What we have particularly to admire in these pages is the circumstance that the Indian Unitarian Christian has acquired his views of Christianity from his own study of the Scriptures and a comparison of the ancient languages, and not from the books of our polemics, and therefore presents us with many combinations of texts and uses of words which we do not find in other writers—and because he has had it in his power to shew the striking analogy between Indian and Christian polytheism, and how forcibly the arguments of the one may be applied to support the doctrine of the other: these are new lights which we shall receive from no other quarter.—I find by calculation that five hundred copies may be neatly printed at about three shillings and sixpence each, and the pages leaded.

A SINCERE ADMIRER OF  
RAMMOHUN ROY.

*Mr. Bakewell's Defence of the Genevese Pastors, &c., in Reply to the Charges of Dr. J. Pye Smith.*

LETTER III.

Torrington Square, Bloomsbury,  
SIR, Nov. 4, 1824.

I IN my two former letters I have endeavoured to disprove the erroneous assertions of Dr. J. Pye Smith, respecting the state of morals in Geneva, and to shew,

1st, That the Genevese, in the days of their orthodoxy, notwithstanding their long prayers and pharisaical ob-



servances of fast-days and sabbaths, were far, very far from being the righteous people Dr. Smith would represent them.

2ndly, That so far from the Genevese of the present day having become corrupt, irreligious and dissolute, since their departure from the faith of Calvin, they are particularly distinguished among the inhabitants of other cities of Europe, for the correctness of their moral conduct, and for the care they bestow on the religious education of the youth of both sexes.

3rdly, I have challenged, and still challenge Dr. Smith to name any populous city, where Calvinism is the dominant or prevailing religion, and where there is less vice and profligacy, less irreligion or blasphemy, than in Geneva; and to aid him in the comparison, I have directed his attention to Edinburgh, and to the Calvinists in England and elsewhere.

The whole of Dr. Smith's charges are founded on the assumption that the Genevese are more morally corrupt than the Calvinistic inhabitants of other large cities. He says to them, almost in direct words, "Stand off ye pastors and people of Geneva, for WE ARE HOLIER THAN YE; thank God we have not, like you, abandoned the faith of Calvin, and are not like you, dissolute, profligate, irreligious and blasphemous." I trust I have shewn, to the satisfaction of your readers, that this assumption resembles very closely the vain-glorious boasting of the Pharisee. Justice now imperiously demands that some notice should be taken of the outrageous attack made by Dr. Smith on the moral character of M. Chenevière, a minister of the gospel, most highly and deservedly esteemed by his fellow-citizens. The attack has been admitted into the pages of the Repository; admission cannot be refused to an exposure of its grossness and injustice; the character of an unprotected foreigner ought not to be defamed with impunity. M. Chenevière, in his "Summary of the Religious Controversies in Geneva," had occasion to refer to the translation of an English work, called "*The Refuge*," and has given a concise account of part of its contents; this has drawn upon him the most slanderous and virulent

abuse that was perhaps ever poured forth by a Christian minister on the head of a brother. The merits of the parties will be clearly seen by placing the passage from the *Refuge* and M. Chenevière's explanation in italics, and Dr. Smith's comments below:

*M. Chenevière.*

"*Mr. Haldane waged war so indiscreetly against good works, that they were spoken of with disdain in the discourses of his adherents, and in the pamphlets circulated to perpetuate his influence, after his departure. In so licentious a manner was it common to treat this subject, that a young ecclesiastic did not blush to translate into French and to publish THE REFUGE, in which we read in so many words, that the man most deeply stained with crimes, and the man who has performed the greatest number of good works, are perfectly equal in the sight of God.*"

*Extract from "The Refuge." See Mon. Repos. 469, quoted by Dr. J. P. Smith.*

"*Suppose a character among the apostate sons of Adam, in whom resides all the moral excellency that ever dignified human nature since the fall; and, on the other hand, one in whom concentrates all the moral evil committed since that fatal period; and it will be found on examination, that in point of justification before God, they stand on a perfect level. The accumulated virtue of the former, if pleaded as that which might render him acceptable to his Judge, would avail nothing; nor would the enormous guilt of the latter, simply considered, be an obstacle to the bestowment of grace and glory.*"

Such are the words in the *Refuge*, and such the meaning which M. Chenevière attaches to them, and such would, I fully believe, be the explanation given of the passage, by four-fifths of those who understand the English language, were they required to explain it. Now please to mark Dr. Smith; he says, "*I take my stand on the insulated passage (from the Refuge) itself, and affirm that M. Chenevière could not have written what he has done, without deliberate fraud! He must have known that while he was writing so and so, 'we read in so many words,' he was*

*adducing what was not found there, in clauses, or words, or sentiments. I am at a loss for words to express my sense of the baseness of any one who could read the Refuge and then represent it as he has done; his heart must be hardened beyond even a very high degree of moral callousness. To such a heart falsehood must be food and the most outrageous calumnies a congenial delight"!!!*

I recommend to your readers to re-peruse the pages of the Monthly Repository, pp. 468, 469, which contain the passage from the Refuge more at length, with further abuse of M. Chenevière; I will leave them to determine whether such language as Dr. Smith employs, is what a Christian minister, a scholar, or a gentleman ought to use. Would Dr. Smith have addressed a respectable English minister in the same terms, had he given the same account of the passage in *The Refuge*? But M. Chenevière is a foreign heretic, and Dr. Smith thinks he may with impunity vilify him in the most disgusting and opprobrious terms; and though he must know he is degrading himself by so doing, he may consider it praise-worthy to disregard his own reputation, when he is attacking those whom he numbers among the enemies of heaven. Many persecuting bigots have done the same, and while they were indulging their own angry and vindictive feelings, have supposed that they were only animated with holy zeal for the honour of God; but heaven requires not the malignant passions to be called forth in its defence. We must not fight the cause of divine truth with such weapons as malice and all uncharitableness. Much better would it be to adopt the maxim of Tiberius, when called upon to resent some affront to the Roman deities—"Leave to the gods the care of their own wrongs." I say, much better would this be, than to make ourselves parties in their cause, and invoke the powers of darkness to our aid. The honest enthusiast, George Fox, used to say, "That people too often raised the devil in their own minds, to oppose what they thought wrong in others." If Dr. Smith have done so, I would earnestly exhort him to lose no time in laying the evil spirit, and, like our first parent, in

the "cool of the day," when the fervour of passion has subsided, let him hearken to the still, small voice of conscience; then will he feel deeply ashamed that the naked grossness of his abuse is not concealed by the anonymous leaves of a Review; then will he be sensible that he has exhibited to the world, in his own name and person, a melancholy specimen of the gentle spirit and Christian charity of a Calvinist divine. Will the Unitarians of England, or the heretics in Geneva, be deeply affected by his example, and persuaded to embrace a faith which produces such overflowings of brotherly love?

When Dr. Smith tells a highly-respectable Christian minister, "that he is guilty of deliberate fraud and falsehood, that his heart is hardened beyond a very high degree of moral callousness, that falsehood is its food, and the most outrageous calumnies a congenial delight," he ought, at least, to have some foundation for the charge, which, I hold, he has not. I hope, however, that these hints and admonitions will not be thought by Dr. Smith either ill-timed or unfriendly, for he is our real friend who warns us when we have wandered into a dangerous path. I feel assured that he will abstain from the use of such disgraceful language in future. When he again addresses a brother minister of the gospel, if he be even an erring brother, he will greet him with some more gentle and endearing appellation than "deliberate liar," a "callous-hearted devourer of outrageous calumnies."

With respect to the insulated passage from "The Refuge," I confess myself unable to attach any other meaning to it, than what M. Chenevière has given. To me it appears to contain the most demoralizing doctrine that was ever published; it confounds all moral distinctions, and strikes at the very foundation of religion and civil society, by representing a Nero and an Antoninus, a Thurtell and a Howard, "to stand in point of justification on a perfect level before God." A doctrine more fatal to the peace of mankind was never promulgated; but though such are my most serious and earnest feelings respecting it, I would not revile Dr. Smith for believing that this doctrine may be

true and salutary; he may have, and I dare say he has some recondite interpretation, by which he moulds it into accordance with his own views of Christianity, but he ought to have a little candour and charity for those whose understandings are not so pliable.

I must now notice some of the charges which Dr. Smith brings against the pastors of Geneva in their collective capacity, as a Synod or Consistory. He tells us, "M. Malan was dragged before the Consistory, interrogated like a criminal at the bar, or rather like a victim of the holy office of Madrid, and finally deprived and degraded, so far as it was in the power of M. Chenevière and his ruthless associates to degrade such a man; a man whose appearance before them forcibly reminds us of that of Hus and Jerome before the Council of Constance." It is, I think, scarcely possible for misrepresentation to go farther in describing a plain transaction. M. Malan, though still regarding himself as a member and pastor of the Established Genevese Church, erected a chapel in his own garden, where he preached against and reviled in no measured terms the doctrines and the pastors of that Church. This was borne with silence by the Consistory for three years, when M. Malan began to encroach more and more on the pastoral functions in the parishes of the Genevese Clergy, and violated the rules and regulations relating to the examination and admission of young persons to the Lord's Supper, and also for the admission of Catholic converts, assuming, at the same time, the title of Pastor.

Now, three things only remained for the Consistory to do; 1st, either to suffer the rules and regulations of their Church to be violated by a person who styled himself one of its pastors; or, 2ndly, To suspend or expel him without any hearing or examination; or, 3rdly, To cite him before them in order to hear his defence and examine into his conduct, before he was expelled. The latter was the only rational and just line of conduct which they could adopt, and they appear to have treated M. Malan with exemplary gentleness and forbearance. Had they expelled M. M. without citing him before them, or what Dr. Smith

"calls *dragging* him before them," we should have heard from his partizans a most violent outcry of intolerance and persecution. M. Malan, however, after many long-protracted equivocations, did what a sensible and honest man ought to have done several years before, he sent in a written declaration of his entire separation from the Genevese Church. After this the Consistory and magistrates could have no power over his conduct, so long as he did not violate the laws of his country.

Had M. Malan separated himself from the Genevese Church when he first opposed its authority and doctrines, he would, I think, have shewn more of a true Christian spirit than what he has evinced by his opposition, but then he would not have acquired so much celebrity, or been so much talked of as a martyr or confessor. I believe, however, that M. M. was strongly acted upon by a party in this country, that wished him to remain a Pastor of the Genevese Church, in order to annoy it more effectively: to this influence his vacillating conduct (justly exposed by M. Chenevière) may, I believe, be chiefly attributed. I trust we shall now hear no more of the "*dragging of M. Malan*," though we must admit that Dr. Smith has a wonderful talent, like Cacus in the *Æneid*, of *dragging* facts by the wrong end, in order to conceal their true position and bearing, and to press them into his own service. There is one part of M. Chenevière's statement, with which I cannot agree: it is that where he speaks of M. Malan, as if he considered him censurable for continuing to conduct religious worship in his own chapel, in defiance of what he styles the civil and religious authority. Surely when M. M. had entirely separated himself from the Genevese Church, he was, or ought to be, at liberty to worship according to the dictates of his conscience; and, in fact, notwithstanding this censure, he was left at perfect liberty so to do. It must be remembered that the Church of Geneva has been a State-religion ever since it was made so by Calvin and his contemporaries, and, perhaps, the world never saw an instance of an Established Church suffering one of its ministers to secede from it, and to preach against its doc-



trines, without regarding him as a dangerous schismatic. Would the Calvinist Kirk of Scotland treat a seceding minister with the same lenity and forbearance as M. Malan has experienced from the Genevese Church? In justice, however, both to M. Malan and the Church of Geneva, it should be stated, that the secession of a regular pastor was, under all the circumstances, an entirely novel case, and it may well be believed that, with the best intentions on both sides, they might be much embarrassed, and uncertain how to act in the best manner. Dr. Smith compares M. Malan before the Consistory, to Huss or Jerome before the Council of Constance: I am almost surprised that he has not compared the Consistory to the Jewish Sanhedrim, and M. Malan to a much higher personage than either of the two Reformers. The partizans of M. Malan, at Geneva, discover in his physiognomy a striking resemblance to the head of Christ, as drawn by the best Italian masters; and it must be confessed that the parting of the hair over the forehead, from whence it descends in long waving curls to the shoulders, combined with an agreeable and benevolent expression of countenance, tend to confirm the illusion. This is highly favourable to him as the leader of a new sect: were his hair to be cut in the modern fashion, he would, I believe, perceive, like Samson, that his strength had in some degree departed from him.

The Pastors of the Canton de Vaud have not escaped the condemnation of Dr. Smith. They are, he says, believers in the Deity of Christ, but that is not sufficient to save them from perdition, for they believe in the doctrine of Free Will, they are Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians, and, therefore, Dr. Smith, from his judgment-seat at Homerton, pronounces them to be formalists in religion, "and to hold the truth in unrighteousness"!! What! does Dr. J. Pye Smith assume the attributes of an Omniscient God! None but He who seeth the secrets of all hearts can know whether a nation or society of respectable Christians hold the truth in unrighteousness or not. The arrogance of such rash judgments, pronounced by weak and fallible men, can only be equalled by their monstrous absurdity. "Who art thou

that judgest another?" "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Surely these moral admonitions in the gospel are too much undervalued by Dr. Smith. A great portion of his letters, relating to Geneva, proceeds upon the assumption of his power to search the hearts of other men, and of his right to pass judgment upon them, which he does as freely as if he were admitted into the deep counsels of heaven. The Pastors of Geneva, than whom a body of more truly respectable ministers cannot be found, exemplifying the sincerity of their faith by the simplicity and integrity of their lives, and by their active exertions in the discharge of their various duties, yet these men Dr. Smith most presumptuously pronounces to be all that the false teachers were of old, quoting against them the words of Isaiah lvi. 10. He looks into their hearts and sees that many of them know not what they believe; and the heart of one of them feeds upon falsehood. The people of Geneva, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, are dissolute, profligate, blasphemous and impious. The Pastors of the Pays de Vaud "hold the truth in unrighteousness;" and what is to be the future fate of such, is well known. Thus does Dr. Smith consign whole bodies of people to perdition, with as much *nonchalance* as if he were ordering his cook to kill a fowl for his dinner. Now, of these people whom he so freely condemns, I believe he knows little or nothing, except it be from hearsay, but they are heretics, and that is sufficient: "*his own resources*" will enable him to decide their present condition and future doom. It is too much the daily habit of certain religionists to assume the functions of Omnipotence, and to divide mankind into goats and sheep, classing among the former those Christian sects who differ on what they call essentials: Arians, Socinians and Unitarians are consigned to Tartarus, with a single word: Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians and Sabellians "hold the truth in unrighteousness," their fate is also sealed: others are guilty of "formalism," and are not, perhaps, quite hopeless. These self-elected judges seem to forget that the final Judge of mankind will not be Calvin, but Christ. The great inquiry we are

solemnly assured will not be, "What have you believed?" but "What have you done?" We are also told, that those who were so forward in boasting of their orthodoxy and missions, saying, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?"—received for answer, "Depart from me, I know ye not."

The Pastors of Geneva, during the three last generations, are said by Dr. Smith to have been given up to spiritual indolence and deadly indifference. "They are dumb (*dogs*\*) sleeping, lying down, and loving to slumber." How little does he know of the people he thus undertakes to describe! During the period to which Dr. Smith alludes, that is, from the year 1700 to the beginning of the French Revolution, when (I repeat it) the English Calvinist ministers were principally engaged "in dosing over their pipes," the "dumb dogs," the Pastors of Geneva, were performing the most arduous and painful duties that could be imposed on the ministers of the gospel of peace. The Republic of Geneva was a democracy, in which the different powers of the Government and the citizens were ill-defined and little understood, and the attempt of certain families to establish an aristocratic dominion, led to the fiercest political dissensions, which sometimes broke out into open civil war. These dissensions were heightened and embittered by the unavoidable mixture of personal feeling with political animosity, in a densely crowded city, where every man was well known to his neighbour. This state of affairs lasted about eighty years, with short periods of apparent tranquillity, and the Pastors had often to witness the painful spectacle of members of one common family, educated at the same schools, and brethren of the same church, ranged in arms against each other, or breathing rage and resentment in their political assemblies.

The zealous labours of the Pastors

\* In the quotation Dr. Smith turns the "dogs" out of the text, but he well knew that the memory of the reader would recall them; this is a refinement on the Roman casuistry that could divide an improper word into syllables, and utter it in parts by two speakers.

to calm the minds of the contending parties, and their exhortations and endeavours to repress personal violence were; I believe, very influential in preventing the citizens from destroying each other.

Amidst the fierceness of political contention the sense of religion was not obliterated, as was particularly shewn on one occasion, when some regulations made by the magistrates respecting corn, had greatly irritated the lower orders, and they had broken into a baker's shop to plunder the contents, one of their pastors appeared among them, and walking through the crowd, he kneeled down upon the threshold of the house, and prayed aloud that the people might be preserved from the great wickedness of plundering their neighbours. The mob, in the height of its fury, instantly became calm and retired home quietly, and brought back the loaves which had been taken away from the shop. This occurred fifty years after the faith of Calvin had been abandoned.\* The Pastors of Geneva, whom Dr. Smith so contemptuously calls "dumb [*dogs*] sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber," were assuredly better employed in preaching peace at home, than they would have been if engaged in missions among their Catholic neighbours, had this been possible, which it was not.

The Genevese Pastors are reproached by Dr. Smith for preaching moral sermons, but he omits to inform us that they almost always enforce their exhortations to a life of virtue and holiness, by an appeal to the great doctrine of Christianity—a resurrection from the dead to a future state of rewards and punishment. It was thus the good old-fashioned Christians of the apostolic age taught mankind "to live soberly, righteously and piously in the present world, looking for the happy end of their hope;" and this was considered sound doctrine long before the pure stream of gospel truth became soured and embittered by an admixture with the gall and vinegar of Calvinism. Your readers, who have not visited Geneva, would

\* It was to this instance I referred in my second letter. I believe it is stated in Picot's "*Histoire de Genève*," from which it is taken by M. Simond.

be greatly mistaken, however, were they to suppose, in consequence of Dr. Smith's misrepresentations, that the Pastors confined their public discourses to practical subjects. There are services in two churches in Geneva, La Madelaine and St. Gervaise, every Sunday, which may be regarded as purely scriptural and doctrinal. These services comprise the instruction and examination of the catechumens in the doctrines and evidences of Christianity. The first part consists of what may be styled a colloquial sermon, explaining certain parts of the Christian doctrine in a familiar manner; the second consists of a verbal examination of the catechumens. More interesting lessons on Christianity, I think, can scarcely be given, and they are generally attended by adults as well as by the catechumens. There is also a sermon every Thursday at 9 o'clock, which is confined to an explanation of the Scriptures. Besides this, there is a service every Saturday afternoon, which is entirely devotional, and intended to prepare the mind for the duties of the following Sunday morning. The churches are all very fully attended on the Sunday,\* and in those where the more popular ministers preach, it is even difficult for a stranger to procure a seat, unless he go half an hour before the service begins. Attention and seriousness strongly mark the countenances of the auditors. And as I do not (like Dr. Smith) presume to see into their hearts, I could discover none of that "deadly indifference" which he lays to their charge: sometimes they were evidently deeply affected; and the younger members of the audience were in tears. The style of preaching may be open to criticism, and I have bestowed five pages upon the subject in the 2nd volume of my Travels; but it surely ought not to be objected to the preachers as a crime, that they commit their sermons to memory. Will Dr. Smith say that he preaches by inspiration and not by premeditation?—I will beg leave here to repeat what I have said respecting the character of the Genevese Clergy

\* The hours of public worship are ten, twelve and two: the latter service closes at three, when the city gates are opened for the remainder of the day.

in the volume above referred to, p. 143:—I believe its truth cannot be controverted: "The Genevese Pastors are highly respectable: their salaries are too small to maintain a family; but most of those who have but little private property, increase their incomes by taking pupils; others marry the daughters of opulent citizens. The moral character and attainments of the candidates for ordination are scrupulously examined before their admission to the ministry; and as they generally distinguish themselves in private life by the excellence of their example and their active zeal in promoting the cause of virtue and humanity, they justly possess the esteem and confidence of their fellow-citizens."

It may be proper to mention, that the Sunday services for the catechumens comprise a recapitulatory explanation of those sections of the catechism in which they have been instructed in classes four days in the preceding week. Young persons do not commence this course of religious instruction until about the age of fifteen; the course lasts twelve months, but where catechumens appear deficient in their examinations, they pass through another course in the following year. The catechumens all write down in their own language the instruction which they receive verbally in their classes. The writing is carefully examined and corrected by the pastor. The youth of both sexes, rich and poor, are expected to attend this course of instruction: there are evening classes for the apprentices.

I will not occupy the pages of your Repository with what I have elsewhere described; but if it were not presumptuous in a layman to "touch the things pertaining to the temple," I would strongly press on the attention of Unitarian ministers and congregations the propriety of imitating their Genevese brethren in their mode of religious instruction. The want of a system of instruction of this kind is the reason, I believe, why many persons fall away from the society when they enter into the world. Solitary reading or private instruction possess not the impressive and sympathetic charm which is excited by the social exercise of our best feelings and faculties; but, *ne sutor*, I am wandering



from the main object of my letter, which was to convince your readers that the Pastors of Geneva are not the dumb and slothful [dogs], nor are the people the irreligious infidels, which Dr. J. Pye Smith and his friends would willingly persuade them to believe.

ROBERT BAKEWELL.

P. S. My last letter ended abruptly in consequence of the slip of paper on which the conclusion was written having been omitted. The sentence when completed was as follows: "Almost every nation has defects from peculiar circumstances" *in its situation or government; but the traveller who marks these defects should remember, that his own countrymen are not faultless.*

Homerton,

October 9, 1824.

SIR,

**N**O object of envy is he who once sets his foot in the thorny brake of controversy. But we must not, to consult our ease, desert the cause which we believe to be that of truth and righteousness. Mr. Robert Bakewell has honoured my observations on Professor Chenevière's Summary with some remarks, which oblige me to request your allowance of a rejoinder. I shall aim at brevity.

I. In all that Mr. B. has advanced I can find nothing which touches the *chief object* of my argument, that, by all the rules of reason, equity and religion, M. Malan, as a minister of the Church of Geneva, and other persons as Dissenters from it, have the same right to preach the doctrines which they believe, (and *à fortiori* as being the original doctrines of that church,) which ministers of the opposite class have to preach their religious sentiments.

It is to no purpose to dilate, as Mr. B. has done, upon the intolerant and persecuting spirit of the old Calvinists of Geneva. My papers have admitted and deplored and condemned it. In this respect they fell under the same condemnation as, I mourn to say, all the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, except the Congregationalists of England, the Antipædobaptists, and the Quakers. But the more modern Church of Geneva has no excuse if, in this greatest of all respects, it has

not kept up with the march of the age, the progress of liberal and just opinions. The chief authors of its altered state, when they imported Mr. Locke's notions as a theologian, ought also to have paid him practical honour as the noble and unanswerable advocate of Religious Freedom. Consistent Christians of all denominations, in the present day, lament the slowness of their predecessors, at the period of the Reformation, to perceive the universal right of full religious liberty. But this mischievous defect was not peculiar to Calvinists: the Lutherans, the English Arminians under Laud and the Steuarts, and other classes of Protestants, were deeply infected by it. However, it should not be forgotten that the body of men who first stood forwards as the advocates of toleration, were the English Independents or Congregationalists, and that *they were CALVINISTS.*

For what purpose, but that of creating an unfair odium, does Mr. B. introduce the sanguinary executions at Geneva for the crime of witchcraft, in the times of the Calvinistic ascendancy? He cannot but know that, during that period, most, if not all, civilized nations laboured under the same delusion; and that, in England, a considerable number of persons was executed for that imaginary crime.

Mr. Bakewell defends the Genevese Pastors for removing M. Malan from their community, upon the ground of the right of every religious society to form its own regulations; and he pursues his argument thus: "M. Malan, disregarding these regulations, not only made those doctrines the principal subject of his discourses, but represented all who did not believe them in his own manner, as unworthy the name of Christians. What would Dr. Smith say, were a preacher among the Independents or Methodists to declare in his discourses that all his brethren in the ministry were in a state of deplorable and damnable error; that the doctrine of the Trinity was false, and all who believed in it were idolaters and had no hope of salvation? Surely Dr. S. must admit, that if after being remonstrated with mildly again and again, the minister still persisted in preaching against the Trinity, and in calling his brethren idolaters and enemies of the gospel, they would be

imperiously obliged to expel him." On this paragraph I submit three remarks.

1. There is abundant reason to believe that M. M. *did not violate* the Regulation referred to; and to which undoubtedly, absurd, insidious, and oppressive as it was, he had bound himself to conform. I have read several of his sermons, and I must say that they are extremely far from wearing the character which Mr. B. draws of them. They are, indeed, plainly and honestly evangelical, but they are highly practical, and deal much in powerful addresses to the heart and conscience. I have found in none of them any kind or form of disrespectful or depreciating allusion to other ministers, or any reference to them whatsoever, unless their own consciences might make a self-application of the addresses to irreligious and worldly characters, which are, indeed, very frequent and very pungent, but never (so far as I have found) descend to personalities, never depart from Christian tenderness of feeling and propriety of language. I did understand, but I cannot pledge myself for the accuracy of the impression, that the two sermons which were either the last preached by him in any of the churches at Geneva, or were regarded as the most offensive, were, the one from Luke xix. 10, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost;" and the other from James ii. 20, "Art thou willing to know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" The latter of these sermons I read about six years ago. Its purport was what might be expected from the text—an exhibition of the nullity of all pretensions to religion which are not substantiated by the sincere, universal and constant practice of holiness. I have no recollection of any passage that could reasonably be deemed offensive by the most captious mind; and, had there been such, I think its impression would have remained with me. But the former sermon I have before me; and, after careful examination, I can discover no paragraph or sentence to which Mr. B.'s censure could attach, except upon that most unfair principle which would destroy all the fidelity of the pulpit, that persons should be offended by addresses to *classes*

and *characters* of men. Allow me to extract one of its strongest passages.

"Call to your recollection the Easter solemnities of the past year. Retrace the impressions which the law of God then made upon you, the confessions of unworthiness which it drew from you, the resolutions of amendment which you then formed. Drawn by the Lord himself, you entered into his temple. The sacred table was prepared. Grace was offered to you there. Your conscience pressed you with secret remonstrances; and, at that solemn moment, your heart was touched. Then, opening your eyes upon your past life, you felt yourselves pierced with bitter and deep regret: groans burst from your soul; your agitated conscience was sensible of the loss of its peace; the thought of God's justice struck you with terror; and the most determined resolution, the most positive engagement to turn to Christ, appeared to you the only means of avoiding dreadful miseries. That resolution you formed; for the word of truth had made you feel its first impressions. That engagement you took; in the temple, before the altar. Have you fulfilled it? Say, have you been faithful? The habits, the inclinations, the worldliness, which you had then been led to detest, did they not soon lose in your esteem their deformity and danger? The voice of God which you had heard,—did you not soon despise it? Say, O sinners, did not the very sins whose turpitude you acknowledged, again defile your body, degrade your heart, and blot your soul? Does no reproach, on this point, rise within you? Is there no sad remembrance that makes you blush? And if, at this very moment, that mysterious hand which, amidst the riot of an impious feast, wrote in silence upon the wall the death-warrant of a wicked king; if that hand should now advance, and trace upon these walls the history of the months and days and hours of your life, since you engaged to make it pure; if the truth-telling lines revealed in this place your deeds, your thoughts, when far from human notice, in the secrecy of your heart;—say, who is the man among you that would dare to direct his eyes to the awful inscription? Does not the

mere supposition make you shudder? Do you not feel it necessary to banish it from your thoughts? And is that necessity any thing else than the cry of conscience, reproaching you,—yes, you—with having courted again the same impurities; you, the same guilty passions; you, the same avarice; you, the same acts of injustice, the same arts of deceit, the same intemperance, the same pride, the same sins of the tongue, which you had taken the oath to renounce?”—

I do not wonder that this kind of speaking was unpleasant to some whose ears were accustomed to the smooth and soft words of flattering unction; but I do maintain that such addresses fall by no means within the range of Mr. B.'s representation.

2. The terms of the iniquitous Regulation itself left M. Malan all the liberty that he took. The prohibition to “*discuss*,” in the only proper sense of the word, could extend to nothing but the polemical examination of arguments and objections. Practical applications of the doctrines which (however differently understood by the individual pastors, each putting his own meaning upon terms left designedly short, or ambiguous) were already professed to be believed in a general sense, are most certainly not *discussions* of those doctrines. For example: the Regulation commands “to abstain from discussing—the manner in which the Divine Nature is united to the person of Jesus Christ.” Now, surely, a prohibition to discuss *the manner* of a given fact or position *implies* the admission of *the reality* of that fact or position. When, therefore, M. Malan founded upon that admission his earnest exhortations to submit to the authority and grace of Christ, and his solemn warnings against treating the Divine Redeemer with disobedience or indifference, he was acting within the fair meaning of the restriction. In like manner, if the other articles under prohibition were interpreted by the rules of reason and equity, I believe it would be found that M. M. was not chargeable with transgressing them.

3. The case which Mr. B. has imagined does not possess a sufficient analogy to justify his conclusions. If an English Dissenting minister alters his religious sentiments, he finds a

class of persons congenial to his new views, and, separating from his old connexion, he joins himself to them: and, if his congregation participate in the change, they have the right and the power to retain him as their pastor and teacher. The separation may be painful, but it is easily effected, and neither party can give laws to the other. But the Church of Geneva *cannot be justly represented as Unitarian*. It has taken the ground of NEUTRALITY OR INDIFFERENCE, with regard to the great points at issue between the chief denominations of Protestants. Its two Catechisms and its Liturgy are, I conceive, the only documents that can be considered as declaratory of its faith: and they are of that kind that persons of very different sentiments may build their own doctrines upon them. Its clergy also are very far from being united in sentiment. While some are Arminians of the school of Episcopius and Limborch, others are Arians, and some go near to the verge of the German disguised Deism; there is a number not inconsiderable, who still hold the doctrines of the Reformation, and who adorn their Christian profession by the fidelity of their preaching and the purity of their conduct. From this class I apprehend that M. Malan does not differ in any material respect: and had he been advanced to the pastorate previously to the change in his religious convictions, it is probable that he would have met with no more than the petty harassments which they have to endure. At the same time it must be confessed that their situation is full of snares and difficulties, from their ecclesiastical connexion with persons so opposed to their most important views and feelings. From these infelicities M. Malan's ejection has happily freed him.

II. Mr. B. appears to me entirely to misunderstand the nature of *tolerance* and *intolerance*. He affirms that M. Malan “has evinced more of a persecuting spirit than his opponents;” and he endeavours to prove this position by the following argument: “I hold that man to be a persecutor in the worst sense of the word who depreciates the character of his neighbour, because he does not adopt the same creed as his own, who, on this account, represents him in his public



discourses as irreligious and an enemy to Christ, and who endeavours to destroy his respectability and influence in society. I say such a man is a persecutor, whether he have or have not the temporal power to punish those whom he defames."

Here I would respectfully suggest to my opponent, that he confounds two things which are essentially different; *religious toleration* (I would rather say **RELIGIOUS FREEDOM**) and *religious approval*. I trust that no attentive reader of my former letters can fail to have perceived that I have always kept in view this vital distinction. The former, no human being has a right over his fellow-man, either to give or to withhold. The latter cannot be exercised without a similarity of sentiments and practice on the principal points of religion. I trust that Mr. B. admits the divine authority of the Christian Scriptures. He must, then, believe that there are *some* doctrines essential to the Christian faith, and *some* states of mind and conduct essential to Christian practice. It inevitably follows, that a person who rejects those *essential* parts, cannot be regarded as really a Christian; and to him the numerous passages must apply which speak to this effect: "He that believeth not is condemned,—he shall not see life,—the wrath of God abideth on him." Undoubtedly, Sir, many of your readers look upon me as an idolater, setting up other gods besides the Only JEHOVAH; because I believe in the Deity of the Saviour and of the Sanctifier. Now the Scriptures uniformly represent idolatry as among the most dreadful of crimes against God, and declare in the strongest terms that no idolater can be saved. But if any persons should apply this inference to me and other Trinitarians, would they, in so doing, violate the rights of religious liberty; or could I charge them with indulging a spirit of intolerance and persecution?—Most assuredly not.—Neither is M. Malan or any other man to be called intolerant, because his studious and serious convictions compel him to profess his most solemn persuasion that to reject the Divine Person, the Atoning Sacrifice, and the Influential Grace of Jesus our Redeemer, is to cut the cable of human hope; and

that those who preach any other way of salvation for the sinful children of men, are themselves deluded, and are the awful instruments of delusion to others. It is for ever impossible that persons holding these opposite views, upon the most interesting and awful of subjects, can regard each other with religious *approval*: and, if they be honest men, they will urge their respective arguments and warnings with the utmost zeal and earnestness. But does their so doing involve any violation of the rights of citizens and the courtesies of society? Does it entitle either of the parties to charge the other with a persecuting spirit? Every man of sound discernment will say, No.

I may here, in passing, notice a very common error, into which the language of Mr. B. makes it appear that he has unconsciously fallen. This is, supposing that the orthodox (I use the name for distinction) hold the theoretical belief of a certain creed to be a sure title to salvation. A most erroneous imputation. Our position is, that the sincere and heartfelt belief of the few plain and essential doctrines of the gospel will *always be* **PRODUCTIVE** of such a *holy condition* of the motives, affections, and outward conduct, as constitutes what is usually and very properly called the state of grace, that is, of favour and acceptance with God our righteous Judge. Every one must perceive the perfect opposition of the two notions.

To return: I readily admit that any person would be exceedingly blameable who should express the solemn conviction in any other than the most serious, tender, and compassionate manner; and with sincere benevolence, justice, kindness, and courtesy, towards those whom he is compelled to regard as "rejecting the counsel of God against themselves:" and still more criminal would he be, if he were to "depreciate the character of his neighbour," or "endeavour to destroy his respectability and influence in society." But I am persuaded that Mr. B. writes from much ignorance of the sentiments, preaching, and character of M. Malan, to whom he repeatedly imputes this style of proceeding. Notwithstanding his long residence at Geneva, I must be allowed to doubt whether he ever read M.

M.'s writings, or frequented his religious services, or took any sufficient pains to inform himself correctly on these subjects. When M. Malan exclaims, "If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be (*anathema*) accursed:—which, indeed, is not another; but there are some who trouble you, and desire to alter the Gospel of Christ," (Gal. i. 8, 7—Unitarian Improved Version,)—he does no more than recite one of the most certain and awful TRUTHS OF INSPIRATION; a monition which it infinitely behoves every Christian to consider and apply, according to his sincere judgment and conscience. But in all the passages of this kind which I have met with in M. M.'s writings, he only urges *principles*; he does not make personal applications. Indeed, he seems to me to go the utmost length of charitable indulgence that an honest man, who bows to the word of the Most High, can possibly do. As evidence I will insert a few sentences from the most doctrinal of all his publications that I have seen: "I think, my dear friends, that we ought to be extremely reserved, extremely cautious, in the judgment which we pass on the faith of others. You know that it belongs to HIM who searches the hearts, to know what passes there; and no where in the holy Scriptures do we find this prerogative conferred upon men. I should then fear to speak confidently upon such a question as this. I hope that every where, and particularly in our own Switzerland, there is a goodly number of ministers faithful to their Master."—Another person in the Dialogue then makes an objection, to which he replies; "Certainly, we ought to try the spirits, from fear of being led astray by falsehood: and I cannot but blame, or rather pity, those persons who neglect to compare what is preached to them with the word of God, and who fancy they have heard that word because they have heard a sermon. But do me the favour to observe, that it is one thing to carry on this examination for one's self, with matured judgment and charity, and for the purpose of directing one's own personal conduct; and another thing to take upon us to do so for others, and to utter the anathema against a minister, be-

cause his preaching does not entirely satisfy us, or even because his manners have not all that strict propriety which is of undoubted importance.—If a minister lay another foundation—[than that of the gospel]—"I withdraw from him, according to the express command of the apostle; and I exhort men to avoid him with more care than they would the most pestilential contagion. But he must have publicly made known his false doctrine. I would carefully guard myself against judging him by appearances, or by mere inferences. In this respect, I repeat it, we cannot exercise too great caution." (*Conventicule de Rolle*, 1821, pp. 3, 4, 7. A real, not a fictitious conversation.)

III. Mr. Bakewell has made representations of M. Malan, upon some other points, which require correction.

1. To justify M. Chenevière's assertion that "the gates of fortune have been opened before him," Mr. B. says, "He [M. M.] had, when I was at Geneva, eight or nine pupils, who paid, as I was informed, each 200 Napoleons per annum, or about £160 sterling: now, with these terms, and the Genevese style of living, he could scarcely gain less than £900 clear profit each year, a sum which he could hardly have realized in thirty years, from the small salary of which he was deprived, as a minister of the Genevese Church." Mr. B. has made this calculation look favourably upon his own argument by considerably under-rating the expenditure and over-rating the receipts. M. M. began to take pupils in the spring of 1819, at £100 a year; and in 1821 or 1822, he found it necessary to raise his terms to £120. The average number of pupils, down to this time, has been six. The outfit of beds and furniture for them, was to be provided for; his children have increased from four or five to seven; and he must have required two or three domestic servants. From some of the pupils and their friends I have learned that his establishment has been conducted in a liberal manner, and that he has maintained a becoming generosity and hospitality. Having derived my information from these sources, I have ventured to draw out an estimate for every year, to the close of 1824; by which it appears that, if he has used

strict economy, M. M. may have gained, in the whole time, about £600. This is indeed a larger amount than I had previously imagined it would turn out: I sincerely wish that it may be near the truth. But it is not more than his toils and sufferings have well earned. From his labours as a minister he derives no emolument; but, on the contrary, has to sustain the expenses of his chapel and Sunday-school, besides other works of beneficence. A mercantile gentleman, who knows more of M. M.'s establishment and affairs than I do, and to whom I have shewn my calculation, assures me that he believes M. M. has not realized a sum that approaches to my estimate.

2. Mr. B. recites a conversation between M. M. and the minister of the English Episcopalian Church at Geneva, which certainly exhibits the former as not a little deficient in good sense and humility, but abundant in spiritual pride. Every candid man, however, will admit that stories of this kind are peculiarly liable to disfigurements. Mr. B. does not say that he was present, or even that he had his information directly from Mr. Rooke. The latter was probably the case; and I am far from impugning the testimony of that respectable clergyman: but the omission of a few words, and various other means, may give an effect to such a recital that will be considerably remote from the truth. I presume that none of M. M.'s enemies will deny him to be a man, not only of good understanding, but of superior mind. It appears next to incredible that he should be guilty of such egregious weakness, on any occasion, and especially in society which so obviously required him to be on his guard. Besides, I have satisfactory evidence that the young gentleman alluded to did attend very frequently upon the ministry of Mr. Rooke: and this fact alone seems to throw a shade of discredit upon the story.

For the sake of brevity I passed by a similar attempt of M. Chenevière to create prejudice against M. Malan, by representing him as a man of excessive vanity. He says, "I remember, one day when we met in the city, he did not hesitate to ask me the question, 'What do men think of

me?'" These words are characteristic of all his proceedings: his first consideration is the opinion of men, the suffrage of his fellow-creatures." Such general criminations can be answered only by the evidence of a man's general character, and, I trust, M. M. will amply refute them, by a patient continuation in well-doing. With regard to the egotistical question imputed to him, I can only remark, that M. C.'s prejudices and injustice make him an inadmissible witness, and that we cannot judge of the case unless we knew the occasion and bearings of the conversation. It may be, that vanity is a temptation to which M. M. is peculiarly liable: for neither he nor his friends imagine him to be sinless, and I am perfectly certain that he will be grateful for the rebuke of an enemy. On the other hand, it is equally probable that, at some peculiar conjuncture of his very trying circumstances, he might be innocently and even laudably desirous of knowing the state of public opinion; and such an inquiry might be very properly made to M. C., between whom and himself there formerly, as I have reason to think, subsisted an intimate friendship.

3. Mr. B. has this striking paragraph: "I confess M. Malan's doctrine of Final Perseverance, or, *that when a man is become a chosen vessel, one of the elect, he cannot afterwards fall from salvation, whatever crimes he may commit,*" appears to me more likely to encourage presumption and spiritual pride, than the Christian virtue of humility; nor can I see how the moral conduct of the Genevese would be improved by adopting it." Had Mr. B. taken no more pains to become acquainted with facts and hypotheses in geology, than he has done to inform himself upon theological doctrines, he would never have acquired the respect which he enjoys as a lecturer and an author. Some ignorant and wicked Antinomians may have used such language as he has recited: but *they are not Calvinists*. I challenge him to justify his statement by fair citations from Calvin or Malan, or any Calvinistic author of credit, whether ancient or modern. Is he ignorant that the very word, SALVATION, means *deliverance from sin*? His representation is a contradiction in terms. As well might one



impute to a school of medicine the dogma, that "*a man may continue in perfect health, while he is loathsome with disease*"! Does he not know that Calvinistic writers of all ages are the most serious, the most practical, the most high-toned, of all religious authors;—that the common charge against them is, that they are too strict in their notions of moral obligation, and their demands of holiness in heart and in practice; and too little lenient to what the world calls excusable frailties? Will he permit me to inform him that the doctrine of Final Perseverance is no other than this, that *All true believers and obedient followers of Christ are so graciously sustained by Divine power and mercy, that they will assuredly persevere in the love and practice of HOLINESS, and will eventually attain that perfection of moral purity which they supremely desire, and which is the ESSENCE of heavenly happiness?* Absurd and wicked perversions of this doctrine may and do exist: and what truth in morals, or in any branch of knowledge, is not susceptible of being misrepresented? But, to say that the doctrine itself, as held by all genuine Calvinists, is unfriendly to holiness, (under which scriptural term we comprehend all the duties of piety towards God, virtue in relation to our own minds and actions, and morality with respect to all social relations,) or that it holds forth any indulgence to sin, is really to utter a contradiction; for Perseverance is nothing else than *Persevering*. It is the perseverance of saints, that is, of holy persons, in the course of holy obedience, guaranteed by that GRACE to which they feel themselves indebted for every thing. If, then, I am not conscious of that *inward sincerity and purity*, and possess not that *outward rectitude*, which characterize a holy person; this doctrine, so far from giving me any encouragement, speaks to me nothing but CONDEMNATION, the strongest and most decisive condemnation. An individual can derive comfort from it, only in proportion to his actual sincerity and integrity in every branch of inward and outward religion. That a really good man may fall into sin, and in some rare instances even into gross sin, is, alas! too true. Does any one deny it? But such a man,

whatever his previous character may have been, cannot obtain the smallest consolation from the doctrine of perseverance, till, by deep repentance and supplications to the Divine mercy through the Saviour, he acquires a solid evidence of his restoration to the paths of holiness: and even then, it may be very long before his contrite heart can receive any great degree of consolation.

If Mr. B. would give candid attention to these remarks, perhaps he would perceive that there is, in the nature of the case, a perfectly safe and rational foundation for the Christian Assurance of Hope; which, according to his statement, M. Malan professed in so very indiscreet and inopportune a manner. If the Saviour of mankind has said, "He that believeth on me,—he that followeth me,—shall not perish, shall not come into condemnation, shall have everlasting life;" and if a man has the sincere consciousness of his relying upon the Redeemer for pardon and deliverance from sin, of his hating and renouncing every sinful thing, and of his freely choosing and earnestly practising all holiness; does it not plainly follow that *such a man (but no other)* may make the deduction, that his Lord and Saviour "will keep him from falling, will present him holy and spotless and irreproachable in his sight, will keep him by the power of God through faith unto salvation," will take infallible care "that neither death nor life—nor any other creature shall be able to separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord"?—Is it not the duty of every true Christian to live so holily as that he may attain, and always enjoy, such an assurance? And is there any thing in it in the least degree calculated "to encourage presumption and spiritual pride"?—They may think so who will not seriously examine the matter: but the fact is far, very far, otherwise. He who *boasts* of this heavenly blessing supplies the most painful reasons for apprehension that he is a total stranger to it: but the soul which *possesses* it will be modest, lowly, penitent, grateful, intensely vigilant against all sin, and walking in deepest humility before the Most Holy One.

If Mr. B. imagines that what he

calls "M. Malan's doctrine of Final Perseverance," differs at all from the statement thus made by me, I can assure him of the contrary. It is impossible for any person to read M. M.'s publications with common justice, and entertain such an opinion. In a single sermon alone, I find exhortations upon the very topics which Mr. B. puts into the mouth of Mr. Rooke, the absolute necessity of holy watchfulness, care, caution, habitual dependence on divine grace, and constant prayer, in order to avoid temptations, and to be preserved in the path of universal obedience; exhortations which, in tenderness, pathos and strength, incomparably exceed any thing which Mr. B. could produce on the same subjects from writers of the modern school of theology. The fear of transgressing due limits prevents my inserting some of those passages from M. M.'s sermon on Matt. xxvi. 40, entitled, *La Rechute du Fidèle*: and the same sentiments are to be found, in different forms of connexion, scattered through all his publications.

IV. Mr. Bakewell's principal object appears to be to contradict my assertion, that "the relaxation of manners, among all classes of the Genevèse, increased and spread in proportion to the departure from the old theology." On the contrary, he maintains that the old "orthodox Genevèse were notorious for cheating and insincerity;—and were greatly inferior in moral virtue to those of the present day."

A thermometrical accuracy (if I may use the expression) of comparison, in such cases, is plainly impossible. I most cordially admit that a coerced and mechanical orthodoxy was the necessary result of the intolerant Calvinism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and that hypocrisy, canting, avarice, cheating and secret abominations, were very likely to be the sins of any people under so unscriptural a system. Of the two, I conceive that undisguised profligacy, with liberty of religion to all who choose to be religious, is a less evil than such a state of things. Yet, in forming our estimate of the effect of those opposite conditions of society upon the interests of true religion, there is a circumstance of difference necessary to be taken into the account. Whatever number of genuine Christians existed

under the former state of things, would be overtopped and hidden by the general, though insincere, profession of religion in the great mass around them: thus, there might be much true piety, but it would be discoverable only by long residence and minute inquiry, and would not be readily apparent to any stranger, as Bishop Burnet was when he visited Geneva in 1684. I may remark, in passing, that Mr. Bakewell is mistaken in saying that Burnet's "faith was in perfect accordance with that of the Church of Geneva;" for he was not a Calvinist. But in the state of a community in which immorality is open and fearless, any number of religious people would be placed in circumstances quite the reverse of the former: they would become conspicuous by the force of contrast, and it would not be difficult for strangers to find them out.

Mr. B. had certainly much longer opportunity for becoming acquainted with the state of society and morals at Geneva, than I could personally have. I may, however, remark that, during the few days that I was there in 1816, inquiries concerning the state of religion were *my chief object*; and I pursued them as actively and earnestly as I could. Mr. B. was two winters at Geneva: but his principal objects of attention were, I apprehend, natural science, literature and statistics. Besides, his views of religious practice and pure morals are essentially different from mine. He appears to feel no impropriety in "public and private amusements commencing" as soon as the public services of the Lord's-day are over, that is *at three o'clock*: to me, the scene was extremely painful. I believe, equally with Mr. B., that "religion is an internal principle," directing the life according to the rule of divine authority: and I feel it difficult, or even impossible, to conceive of that principle as taking delight in worldly gaiety and amusements, and declining to avail itself of *all* the opportunity which one day in seven affords, for domestic and secret, as well as public, exercises of sacred instruction and devotion. Mr. B. admires "the interesting ceremony of their admission as members of the church, when they make a public profession of their faith, and partake of the Lord's Supper." I,



too, should have been charmed with such a sight, if I had reason to believe it to be the result of serious conviction and holy choice: but, knowing it to be a matter of routine, prescribed not by mind and character but by age and custom, prepared for by a mechanical course of observances, deemed necessary to precede a young person's introduction into the world, and immediately followed by a plunging into giddy dissipations as remarkable, in the one extreme, as the gloomy season of austerity which preceded it was in the other, I could not but perceive in this usage so much of the nutriment to delusion, hypocrisy and formality, as stripped off its pleasing garb and left the impression of only grief and pity.

My opinions, truly unwelcome and painful to myself, of the prevailing irreligion in Geneva, notwithstanding the retention of public forms which were to me externally very pleasing, have been derived not from "an active imagination," as Mr. B. conceives, but chiefly from the information of natives, in whose competency and integrity I have full confidence: and Mr. B.'s denial does not relieve me from the persuasion of the strict truth of what I have asserted; that notorious infidels and immoral persons come to the sacred table, without impediment; and that infidelity, licentiousness and blasphemy have fearfully increased, *without a counterbalancing increase of true Christians*. To this last circumstance I entreat attention. It is most material to the comparative estimate; but Mr. B. has entirely passed it by. In London, Manchester, Glasgow, and many other parts of our own country, infidelity and every kind of wickedness have perhaps increased; yet I doubt whether in a greater proportion than the increase of population and the opportunities of developing what existed before. But *the counteracting process has also been going on, in a most encouraging degree*. The powers of evil are mustering themselves; but the energies of good are also on the alert; and God will prevail over Satan.

Mr. B. charges me with taking no account of the "demoralization in countries that were the seat of war." But, if he will do me the favour to refer to my attempted enumeration of

the causes and occasions of the effect deplored, (p. 465 of this vol.,) he will find other circumstances mentioned besides the declension of the Genevese from the profession of evangelical principles. Among these is the contamination from the worst part of the French nation. Under this idea I designed to comprehend the effects of the French Revolution, so far as they were evil: and, though I probably had not the wars occasioned by the Revolution actually in my thoughts, yet they might be not improperly considered as a part of those effects.

If Mr. B. has found, in the circles in which he moved, that acquaintance with the evidences and doctrines of religion which he asserts is so general among all classes at Geneva, I do most sincerely rejoice. I hope that the assertion is, in part, true. Those who have committed to memory either of the two Catechisms, greatly deficient as they are in the views which they give of Christian truth, are in possession of a respectable sketch of scripture-history, and of the external evidences of revelation: and a feeble light, though insufficient for the most important purposes of vision, is better than gross darkness. But my information derived, at different times, from natives of Geneva and other persons better qualified to judge than Mr. B. can be, is far from going the length of his statements. I apprehend that the time and pains bestowed by Mr. Haldane upon these inquiries, within a single week, exceeded all that Mr. B. could or would spare from scientific pursuits and evening parties during the whole of his two winters. The Theological Students of the College must surely have afforded the most favourable specimen of the religious culture of youth in Geneva. Mr. Haldane is a man whose veracity is above all question, and this is his testimony: "Had they been trained in the schools of Socrates or Plato, and had they enjoyed no other means of instruction than those afforded, they could scarcely have been more ignorant of the doctrines of the gospel. They had, in fact, learned much more of the doctrines of those Heathens, than of that of Jesus Christ. *To the Bible and its contents their studies had never been directed.*" (Letter to M. Chenevière, p. 21.)



A gentleman, whom I have since had the honour of knowing, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and whose high scientific attainments have often contributed to the volumes of the Philosophical Transactions, resided a considerable time at Geneva, with his most accomplished lady, a little before the French Revolution. They were not Calvinists nor Methodists. They moved in the first circles, and were very far from being rigid censors. But their testimony, for the faithful report of which I pledge myself, was most strong and painful with respect to the extreme dissoluteness of manners which then prevailed at Geneva.

To the sources of personal information, I add two evidences from printed books. The first is, indeed, taken from a translation, as I have no access to either of the originals: but the character of the translator is above suspicion. It is an extract from the volume for 1785 of *Dr. G. F. Seiler's Literary Journal*, in which the Editor reviews *Meiner's Letters on Switzerland*. "— At Lausanne, neither infidelity nor profligacy of manners dare to appear openly, or to attempt gaining proselytes.—Far different is Geneva.—The civil war [in 1782] was less owing to a defective legislation, than to growing depravity of manners both among high and low; for even to the lower ranks has this corruption spread. The works of Voltaire and Rousseau are read in shops, manufactories and workhouses." This German traveller, describing what he witnessed at church, says, "Even when communicating [at the Lord's Supper], they could not so far govern themselves as to suppress the appearances of profanity and scoffing.—Certainly Rousseau, perhaps even Voltaire, would have witnessed with indignation this unnatural impiety, in ladies proud of their excellent education. Formerly, adultery was considered at Geneva as a most shocking crime; and divorce was rendered as difficult as possible. Now, the first is laughed at, and the second more easily and frequently obtained than at London or Paris." Dr. Seiler (President of the University of Erlangen, of whom a high character is given in *Saxii Onomasticon Literarium*, Vol. VIII. p. 279), adds the following remarks of his own: "I have had cer-

tain accounts, by private letters, that, in many families of distinction in that city, Christianity is almost entirely neglected; and, by modish and excessive refinement, the children are formed to levity, and rendered incapable of serious religious reflection. Hence, solid and edifying preachers are despised by this race of men. Only they who bring to the pulpit masterpieces of eloquence, are sometimes attended; whose discourses are blamed or praised just as dramatic performances would be, and hence can have little or no influence on the heart." (From the late *Dr. Erskine's Sketches and Hints of Church History*, &c. Vol. I. p. 232.)

It is with much pleasure that I add, from my own observation, thirty years after Meiner wrote, that the visible decorums of public worship, so far as I could perceive, were maintained in a becoming manner.

The other evidence I take from a work in four volumes, full of seriousness, zeal and piety, published at Geneva in 1803 and 1804, by M. de Joux, then one of the Venerable Company of Pastors, a gentleman of distinguished talents, and, as is the laudable character of the Genevese in general, warmly attached to his native city. The following are some of his pathetic mournings.—"The cause to which our present and deplorable calamities must be attributed are, a total forgetfulness of RELIGION and MORALS, a forgetfulness of the God whose existence we acknowledge, but whom—we have too long renounced.—It is to the unbridled love of the world, to the dereliction of religious worship, to the contempt of the Holy Scriptures, to an absolute indifference for religion, that we must attribute all our miseries and all our vices. Their true source is the almost entire oblivion of religion, the abandonment of our holy assemblies, and the immorality which is the direct consequence.—Is it not the fact that the scorn of religious reading, of holy conversation, of private and family worship, is daily increasing in the midst of us? O city formerly so renowned for the religious character of its inhabitants, how couldst thou become so quickly changed? How hast thou suffered thy crown to be ravished from thee, the precious ornament which was thy dis-

tion?—O city of my birth, what bitter lamentations, what cutting reproaches, fall upon thee! Into thy bosom I pour the sorrows of a father's heart. If thou return not to thy God, O Geneva, if thou abjure not thine irreligion, I shall charge upon thee the ruin of my family! I shall repent of having had thee for my children's country!" (*Prédication du Christianisme*, Tome I. pp. 367, 370, 377, 393.) This strain flows through many pages, and the author anxiously cautions his readers against supposing that his accusations and confessions are rhetorical exaggerations.

Mr. Bakewell says, "I boldly challenge Dr. Smith to name any city of equal size where Calvinism is the dominant religion, or indeed any city containing twenty thousand people, either in Protestant or Catholic Europe, equally advanced in civilization, where, among all classes, public or private morals are more correct, where there is less vice of any kind, or where so large a portion of the population has received a religious education, and is so well instructed in the evidences and leading principles of Christianity. I have been in almost every large town and city in England and Scotland, and in several cities on the Continent, but I know none that can compare with Geneva in these respects." To this challenge I reply, that there is not a large town in England and Scotland, where, if as much wickedness be found in it, (which might be justly doubted,) there is not also found a much greater proportion than at Geneva, a short time ago, of the counteracting principle, "the salt of the land," pure, genuine, practical religion. Nor can I think that, in any one of our populous towns, we should see the soldiers forcibly taking religious tracts from terrified children, ramming them into their pieces, and boasting, "We fire off the Lord"! Or that it would be possible to raise a mob to attack a place of worship and its peaceable occupants, with the outcry, "Down with Jesus Christ"!—But I have satisfactory testimony that both these horrors have been witnessed in modern Geneva.

In the first of these Letters, advertising to the insatiable attacks of the majority of the clergy upon the comfort and usefulness of M. Malan, and

his very means of subsistence, I applied to them the epithet *ruthless*. This Mr. Bakewell represents as peculiarly harsh, and says that its usual adjunct is *monster* or *villain*. I entirely disapprove the employment of irritating language on any occasion, and most of all in religious controversy: and if I have been guilty of it, I would be the first to condemn myself. But Christian meekness is not a tame and insensible apathy, when virtue and truth are outraged. The old English adjective *ruthless*, merely signifies *merciless*, (Fr. *impitoyable*,) and was, I still think, by no means too strong for the occasion. Mr. B. is mistaken when he affirms that the two reproachful words which he has adduced are usually associated with it. In Mr. Todd's edition of Johnson, our best and most copious Lexicon, the only substantives joined with *ruthless* are *sea*, *flint*, *people* and *monarch*.

J. PYE SMITH.

*Mr. Belsham's Remarks on Dr. E. Channing's Attempt to delineate Dr. Priestley's Character.*

[The passage to which these "Remarks" refer, is as follows; being a note to a Sermon of Dr. Channing's on the Leading Traits of the present Age, preached at the Ordination of his Colleague, Mr. Gannett, and since published:—

"The Unitarians of that country (England) may be considered as forming a political as well as religious party.

"The influence of *distinguished individuals*, so great on all classes of Christians, has not been favourable to a just zeal among Unitarians in England.

"Dr. Priestley should always be named with respect for his eminent endowments, and for his devotion to science and to the cause of Christianity; but the distinctive traits of his mind made him too receptive of the spirit of his times, which was a spirit of innovation as well as of improvement. Distinguished more by rapidity than by profoundness of thought; inclined, perhaps by his attachment to physical science, to confound the provinces of matter and mind; constitutionally deficient in moral enthusiasm and deep feeling; and connected by



political and literary sympathies with the revolutionists on the Continent, whose hearts were frozen by an earth-born philosophy; he was not particularly fitted to spread warmth and earnestness around him, nor to exhibit Christianity in its most quickening form. He endeavoured to incorporate with Unitarianism the chilling doctrines of the materialism of the soul, of the mechanical necessity of human actions, and of the suspension of consciousness for ages after death, and adopted *philosophical* notions, as they have been falsely called, in regard to prayer, divine influence, &c. I think too that his literary connexions, his habits of physical research, and the spirit of the age, led him to believe, that Christianity would be made more credible by excluding from it the *supernatural* as much as possible; an opinion which probably swayed not a little his views of his favourite doctrines, and which, indeed, is not uncommon among philosophers; though to me it seems not very rational.

"The result was, that he framed and propagated a system in many respects open to the charge of being cold and uninteresting."]

**D**R. CHANNING'S own character is too correct to admit for a moment the supposition of an intentional misrepresentation of the character of Dr. Priestley; but I who knew Dr. Priestley well, will venture to assert that a more erroneous representation never existed.

Dr. C. allows, what indeed none can deny, that "Dr. P. possessed *eminent endowments*, together with a *devotion to science and the cause of Christianity*."

But he alleges, that "the distinctive traits of his mind made him too receptive of the spirit of his times, which was a spirit of innovation as well as of improvement." If I understand the meaning of this obscure sentence, it is, that Dr. P. was constitutionally disposed to *innovate* as well as to *improve*. I can only reply from my personal knowledge of Dr. P., that he was at no time desirous of any *innovations*, moral, philosophical, or political, which he did not regard as *improvements*. The reluctance which he discovered to adopting the French theory of chemistry, is a proof that

he was not much disposed to innovation in philosophy; nor is there any proof that he was an innovator upon other subjects.

"Distinguished more by rapidity than by profoundness of thought."—And yet, in the estimation of many who were equally competent to judge with Dr. Ellery Channing, Dr. Priestley was as eminently distinguished for precision of thought, for comprehension of mind, for perspicuity of expression, and for force of reasoning upon subjects of the most difficult and abstract nature, as he undoubtedly was for quickness of apprehension and rapidity of composition.

"Inclined," says Dr. Channing, "perhaps by his attachment to physical science, to confound the provinces of matter and mind." How an attachment to the pursuit of one species of knowledge can incline a person to confound the object of it with something totally different from it, is more than my humble intellect can comprehend.

"Constitutionally deficient in moral enthusiasm and deep feeling."—A very extraordinary assertion this from a gentleman who could not possibly know what Dr. Priestley's constitution was! I will take upon me, from my own knowledge, to affirm, that Dr. Priestley was constitutionally a man of a very ardent mind. He was early remarked for the eagerness with which he sought after, for the zeal and fervour with which he embraced, and for the courage with which he professed, what appeared to him to be important truth. And indeed, what was it that drew upon him the hatred of men in power, and excited the violent persecution which obliged him ultimately to relinquish his country? Not his political tenets: not his approbation of the *early* principles and measures of the French Reformers, for in these he only coincided with Mr. Fox and the Whigs of England. It was his zealous opposition to ecclesiastical tyranny; to all Church Establishments, as such; and particularly to the Established Church of England. And that, not as Dr. C. would have us believe, because he was connected by political and literary sympathies with the Revolutionists on the Continent, but because he was a sincere and zealous Christian; because he was



a believer in the omnipotence of truth, and because he was persuaded that the progress of pure Christianity was impeded rather than promoted by the officious interference of the civil power.

That he was upon amicable terms with the French chemists, is true; because he was ardently engaged in the same philosophical pursuits. He knew they were Unbelievers; and they, to their great astonishment, discovered that he was a real and zealous believer in the Christian revelation: but this discovery did not interrupt their philosophical harmony, nor produce any civil discord between them.

Dr. Channing charges Dr. Priestley with incorporating with his Unitarianism what he calls the chilling doctrines of the materialism of the soul, of the mechanical necessity of human actions, and of the suspension of consciousness for ages after death. As to the doctrine of Materialism, it is plain that Dr. Channing does not understand what Dr. P. meant by it. I will only say, that Dr. Priestley no more believed that solid, inert matter had the power of thinking, than Dr. C. himself.

With respect to the doctrine of Necessity, surely it is no proof that Dr. Priestley was a man of a cold moral constitution to profess his belief of it, when the celebrated President Edwards has written what Dr. P. always represented as the most able and unanswerable defence of it that ever was penned. And if any persons think that Mr. Edwards was a chilling writer, let them read what he has written upon the eternity of hell-torments. It would better become Dr. C. to answer the argument for Necessity, than to abuse the doctrine and its advocates.

Dr. Priestley, like his friend Dr. Price, together with many thousands of sincere believers in Christianity in England and elsewhere, believed in the suspension of thought between death and the resurrection: and if Dr. Channing does not believe it, let him explain what St. Paul means when he affirms, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, all who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished. It was no *chilling tenet of an earth-born philosophy*, but a regard to the plain language of inspired scripture, which induced Dr. Priestley and many others

to maintain, that the reward of the righteous will be deferred to the awful period when all who are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth.

I shall notice only one more allegation against the character of my venerated friend, and that is one which, had he been now living, would have excited his highest indignation, as a direct contradiction to the whole tenor of his life and writings. I will transcribe it in the words of the accuser himself:—

“I think too that his literary connexions, his habits of physical research, and the spirit of the age, led him to believe that Christianity would be made more credible by excluding from it the *supernatural* as much as possible; an opinion which probably swayed not a little his views of his favourite doctrines.”

That any persons should have the assurance to call themselves Christians while they deny every thing supernatural in the Christian revelation, is truly astonishing. Revelation is itself supernatural communication, or it is nothing. Jesus Christ rose from the dead, or he is an impostor. They who deny these facts, are Unbelievers; they are no Christians; they have no right to call themselves Christians. To assume the name is base hypocrisy; it is downright falsehood. I do not deny that Unbelievers may be good moral men: I am far from judging of their final state: I believe that in some countries they may have powerful reasons for assuming the name and profession of Christians, when, in fact, they are not such. An Anti-supernaturalist is, *ipso facto*, an Unbeliever in the Christian revelation. He must regard the resurrection of Christ as a falsehood, and the miracles of the gospel as fables. To assert that Dr. Priestley was an Anti-supernaturalist, is a palpable contradiction to all his professions, to all his writings, to the whole scope and tenor of his character; and if he were now living, he would regard it as the greatest personal insult that could be offered him.

What Dr. Channing means by asserting that “Dr. P. framed and propagated a system in many respects open to the charge of being cold and uninteresting,” he best knows. Let me tell him, that Dr. Priestley framed

no system of theology, if that be his meaning. Dr. P. took his religion from the New Testament, and expressed it in the words of the New Testament. Dr. P. believed that "there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." He also believed that "as by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." And, finally, he believed that "God will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained, whereof he has given assurance to all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

This may, for aught I know, be a very cold and uninteresting doctrine in the estimation of Dr. Channing, but it was the doctrine of Dr. Priestley, and is the doctrine of St. Paul.

T. BELSHAM.

P. S. Dr. Channing is pleased to represent the Unitarians of England as a political sect. This charge is too unfounded and too contemptible to need refutation. Dr. Channing is a man of talent and of many good qualities, but let me recommend to him a little more consideration and candour before he again publishes what, however unintentional, is nevertheless, in fact, false witness against his neighbour. It is understood that Dr. Channing derived his ideas of Dr. Priestley and of the English Unitarians from Dr. Southey; which accounts for his gross misconceptions of their opinions and character. It is even said that Dr. Southey represented the English Unitarians as being generally, if not universally, Anti-supernaturalists; than which nothing can be more erroneous, not to say calumnious, on the part of a man who ought to be better informed, and from whose rank and character more candour might be expected. The fact is, that Anti-supernaturalism never prevailed in England. The theory is so absurd, that it never yet met with a public advocate. I never knew but two individuals who professed it. One was a clergyman of the Established Church, lately deceased; the other is a gentleman distinguished by an attachment to paradox.

*Essex Street, Nov. 6, 1824.*

*Letter from Rammohun Roy to Dr. T. Rees.*

*Kennington,  
Nov. 19, 1824.*

SIR,

LAST year I was intrusted by the Committee of the London Unitarian Book Society to forward to Rammohun Roy a few copies of the edition of his "Precepts of Jesus," and the first two Appeals in the defence of that work, which they had then just published, accompanied by a letter expressive of their high respect for his talents and character, and of their sense of the value of his services to the cause of Christian truth. A few days ago I received his answer to that communication. I herewith transmit to you his letter, thinking, that as every thing relating to this extraordinary man must be interesting to the religious, and especially to the Unitarian, public, you may deem it worthy of insertion in the Monthly Repository. I am unable to say any thing respecting the books referred to in the postscript, as they have not yet come to hand.

THOMAS REES,

Secretary to the Unitarian Society.

*To the Rev. Dr. Thomas Rees, &c. &c.,  
London.*

REVEREND SIR,

I RECEIVED your letter of the 16th June last, accompanied by a parcel of books to my address, with feelings of peculiar gratification. I cannot but be proud of the honour which the Committee have conferred upon me in reprinting my compilation of "The Precepts of Jesus," and the two Appeals in its defence. I beg you will oblige me by communicating to the members my warm acknowledgments for so distinguished a mark of their approbation. I also beg you will accept my best thanks for your valuable present of the Racovian Catechism, which I shall not fail to read with due attention.

I have no language to express the happiness I derive from the idea that so many friends of truth, both in England and America, are engaged in attempting to free the originally pure, simple and practical religion of Christ from the heathenish doctrines and absurd notions gradually introduced under the Roman power; and I sincerely pray that the success of those gentlemen may be as great as (if not greater than) that of Luther and others, to whom the religious world is indebted for laying the first stone of religious reformation, and having recom-

mended the system of distinguishing divine authority from human creeds, and the practice of benevolence from ridiculous outward observances.

But what disappoints, or rather grieves, me much is, that our sovereign, (whose reign may God crown with peace and prosperity!) whom all parties, either Whigs or Tories, enthusiastic radicals, or political time-servers, are compelled by the force of truth to acknowledge as the most accomplished person of his time, of most enlightened acquirements, and most liberal sentiments, should not use his royal influence to remove from the members of his National Church the fetter of a solemn oath, imposed by the Thirty-nine Articles, naturally liable to doubt, and disputed as these have been, from the beginning of Christianity, and that he has not caused to be discontinued the repetition of that general denunciation found in the concluding part of the Athanasian Creed, to wit, "This is the Catholic faith, which except a man *believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.*" The only consolation which I can offer to myself is, that as his Majesty is the best judge of suitable opportunities for the introduction of improvements in the National Church, it is probable that in due time more enlarged principles may receive the Royal sanction.

As to the state of the Unitarian Society in Calcutta, our Committee have not yet been able to purchase a suitable piece of ground for a chapel and school. They will, I hope, soon succeed in their endeavours. We have collected, partly by purchase, and partly by gift, a great number of works, and established a pretty respectable library in Calcutta, in which I have placed the books with which you have favoured me, in the same manner as all the books that the Rev. Mr. Adam, the Unitarian Missionary in Bengal, and myself have received at different times from England. Mr. Adam is preparing a catalogue of the books belonging to this library, and will, I doubt not, send a few copies for the perusal of the Committee in London, Liverpool, &c.

In the month of December last, Mr. R., a member of the firm of Messrs. M. and Co. of this place, left Bengal for Europe, and I embraced that opportunity of answering a letter I had the pleasure of receiving from the venerable Mr. Belsham, and begged at the same time his acceptance of a parcel of books sent in charge of that gentleman. I also sent a duplicate by the hands of Mr. S. A., a Member of the Unitarian Society in Calcutta, and a particular friend of mine. As subsequent to these despatches I received the books stated in Mr. Belsham's

letter to have been forwarded to my address, I beg to send a short letter acknowledging the receipt of them; which I shall feel obliged by your transmitting to that gentleman.

I have the pleasure of sending you for your acceptance a few tracts as a token of regard and respect, and remain,

Yours most obediently,  
RAMMOHUN ROY.

*Calcutta, June 4, 1824.*

P. S. From the pamphlet, No. 6 and 7, published by a neighbour of mine, and another by a friend, you will perceive to what a degree of ridicule the Trinitarian preachers have brought the religion they profess among the enlightened natives of India. I hope to God these Missionaries may at length have their eyes opened to see their own errors.

R. M. R.

### *A Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.*

(Continued from p. 605.)

*I. to N., with N.'s Observations (inserted as Notes).*

DEAR N. 23d October.

HAVING understood you to be disinclined to prosecute the discussion\* respecting the duration of future punishments, I had made up my mind to drop the subject. I am surprised that you should have again revived it; and, to speak my mind plainly, I must declare that I do not think that the continuance of this sort of correspondence is likely to prove useful to you. For my own part, although for very many years I have been very little in the practice of mentioning my opinions to persons not immediately connected with me, (with the exception of such† as have founded objections to the Bible upon the supposed doctrine of endless misery,) yet I derive pleasure in going over the grounds on which I rest my faith in the universal love and effectual grace of God,‡ as manifested in Jesus Christ.

No person, however, is fitted for an inquiry into the revealed designs of

\* It is afflictive to me to do so.

† These people will not believe any thing they do not like. They say death does away all sin; or else, for certain assigned reasons, the soul is not immortal.

‡ To every returning sinner.



the Almighty regarding the final destiny of the human race, who does not regard himself as a party deeply interested in this momentous question.\* If he separates† his own case from his fellow-creatures, and supposes himself a privileged character,‡ he wants the degree of sympathy§ which is indispensable to an earnest, candid, persevering examination|| of the tenor of scripture, as relating to this point. *It appears* to me that you are thus wanting,¶ and that your object is rather to frown upon my opinions, than to afford your cordial assistance to the ascertainment of truth.

You tell me, that I am not sufficiently impressed\*\* with a sense of the *evil of sin*. I do not pretend to say that I am; but I am thoroughly persuaded that I cannot possibly enjoy *perfect* happiness until sin and all its miserable consequences are exterminated from the universe,†† and the whole creation shall be brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The angels in heaven must have a similar feeling, for our Lord expressly declares that *their* joy is augmented by every accession of penitents to the number of the just;‡‡ and therefore their joy cannot be completed until the last stone§§ of the sacred edifice shall crown the work of divine grace. If you had known the power of God and the glorious mystery of his will as revealed by Paul, you would have perceived that nothing short of this could satisfy the desires of a soul renewed in the image of

---

\* Who denies this? But cannot an individual thus implicated escape by repentance and faith?

† He does not separate.

‡ He condemns himself, and prays to God to search and try him.

§ Sympathy with God's holiness and justice.

|| God must give eyes to see.

¶ I have told you repeatedly that I am not at ease, but wish to seek for peace in the right way.

\*\* Who is? The great matter is how shall we pray *unreservedly* for such conviction.

†† I conscientiously believe this to be an error.

‡‡ Prove repentance, and that will suffice. God is the Judge as to the nature of repentance.

§§ What is that stone?

Christ; that is to say, filled with love to God and to man. For faith worketh by love, and purifies the heart from all those evil passions which can derive the smallest gratification from the sufferings of others.\*

Indeed, no man who understands the connexion which exists between all sentient beings (exemplified as it is in scripture, and in daily experience, by the influence which the conduct of one man produces upon the condition of others) can fail to perceive that, in order to produce a perfect state of society, all must co-operate for the benefit of all. Hence the promises that we shall be heirs of all things; that all things are ours; and that God shall be all in all.† Think you that I can be satisfied with such paltry, meagre explanations of these exhilarating passages, as the narrow systems of human reason or sophistry can give me? No; let God be true, and every man who contradicts him a liar. Your people, while they decry the exercise of reason, are continually racking their brains to darken and confound, by metaphysical‡ subtleties and unscriptural§ phrases, the plain word of God. I charge this upon their system, and I stand to the charge; while at the same time (as often said before) I respect and esteem the individual whose better judgment has been enslaved by human inventions. The inventors themselves must answer to their Maker|| for having presumed to deform his lovely character, and to teach for doctrines, the commandments of men. If they had not represented him as delighting in the death and damnation of the works of his own hands,¶ poor, ignorant, angry sinners would not have been so prone to invoke his wrath upon themselves and others. If they had been better taught, they would have learned

---

\* The matter is totally misunderstood. The righteous rejoice in the punishment of the impenitent. The scripture is full of this.

† God is all in all in the punishment of the finally impenitent.

‡ Full conviction of sin and holiness is metaphysical.

§ The words of scripture are quoted.

|| Those who tell the presumptuous sinner that he will be eternally blessed, will have to answer for it.

¶ They do not.

to be merciful, because God is merciful.\*

In saying that the doctrine of the restitution of all things, or (as elsewhere expressed) that Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all,† is a testimony for its proper season, I understand, not that the testimony should be reserved and suppressed, but that it will not be generally received and believed, until the proper season arrives.‡ Our Lord commanded his disciples to preach the gospel to every creature,§ although he knew that it would be rejected and abused by many of them to whom it was preached. I feel quite confident that the display of the mercy and goodness of God, in the most unreserved and universal terms that language furnishes, so far from tending to harden the heart and rendering men careless, is calculated, above all things, to work their reformation.|| Of course there are good and bad modes of doing every thing; and a preacher would be very deficient in his duty, who, while he represented the willingness of God to pardon offenders, did not, at the same time, point out the indissoluble connexion of vice with misery, and the awful consequences¶ of perseverance in a sinful course. This will be much more effectually done\*\* by saying, after our Lord and Master, that he who, knowing his master's will, disobeys it, shall be beaten with many stripes; and he who ignorantly offends, with few stripes; and with the general tenor of scripture, that God will reward every man according to his works, without respect of persons, than to vociferate the words, eternal damnation,†† and to apply

the same endless duration of punishment to all descriptions of sinners; thus making the distinction\* of character vain and of no effect.

You say, "Let the Judge of quick and dead solve these questions;"† which you proceed to propound, and which are eight in number. I cannot presume thus to challenge his *direct*‡ interposition for the decision of the matter in dispute. We have Moses and the prophets, Jesus and his apostles, and they are sufficient authorities for our guidance.§ Nor need we doubt that if, in the temper of little children,|| we seek for instruction, we shall obtain all that is necessary for reproof or consolation. The result of my inquiries is, I, "That although the same word is used to designate the duration of rewards and punishments, it does not follow that happiness and misery will be equally interminable.¶ Because the scripture abounds in declarations respecting the character of God and his purposes in creating mankind, which are directly opposed to the doctrine of endless misery.\*\* Because the same authority intimates that there will be degrees of punishment†† exactly proportioned to degrees of crime. Because the Almighty has condescended to challenge men to inquire into the rectitude‡‡ of his conduct, and has enjoined it upon them to imitate it. I will add, that it appears from scripture that rewards,§§ as such, will cease, at the period when, after having subdued all things unto himself, the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all. In the mean time, the rewards of believers are described by our Lord and

---

\* The scripture holds forth the damnation of the impenitent.

† Who truly apply to him.

‡ Totally inconclusive. Man can perceive nothing aright, until awakened and converted.

§ So it is; and every one may have it that is willing.

|| This I totally disbelieve. Men must be taught the evil of sin. A reformation may be effected in the outward manners, while the heart is blind to its fallen state.

¶ And yet these very consequences are, through the blindness of men, by reason of the fall, unperceived.

\*\* This is not denied.

†† When the sentence is pronounced,

---

the meaning (say Aonian if you please) will be understood.

\* I have not denied the distinctions.

† Because we are not competent or impartial judges.

‡ He will decide.

§ But we must have sight given to us to perceive.

|| It would be well if we did.—Open mine eyes!

¶ It must be feared.

\*\* No penitent is subject to this.

†† I have not denied this.

‡‡ Our people are as well satisfied with respect to this rectitude as your people are.

§§ I leave this.

his apostles as consisting in the enjoyment of power and authority;—they are to rule over cities; to be kings and priests; and the first-fruits of God's creatures. They will not surely be destitute of subjects\* over whom to reign, nor of a people for whose benefit to officiate. How beautiful, and worthy of the Ruler of the universe does this scheme appear; and how well calculated to excite in us an eager desire to obtain a crown of righteousness!†

2. The only way of ascertaining the intentions of God is, by studying his word.‡ If he had intended “that sinful man should apprehend§ interminable displeasure as the consequence of a wilful rejection of divine mercy,” he could have expressed himself in terms not to be misunderstood.|| He could, for instance, instead of using a word which is applied to things which have had an end, or must have an end, have said that punishment would be without end. In this case, the Sacred Scriptures would have avoided the use of a single expression which could possibly weaken the force of so tremendous a denunciation; they would not have held forth manifold expectations which are altogether inconsistent with such a horrid design.¶ Nor would Christ or his apostles have preached a single sermon without reference to the impending fate of impenitent sinners.\*\*

3. As to the comparison between the characters of Calvinists and Universalists, I must say that you do not see and know enough of the latter, either of their persons, or actions, or writings, to be competent to draw a just comparison. They are but a little flock at present, and comparatively unknown to the religious world. I

\* We are not told that these subjects will comprehend impenitent sinners.

† We have still higher motives.

‡ After we have obtained sight and light; and for this we must pray; else study is unavailing.

§ Yes, apprehend.

|| They are so understood by the best people.

¶ Man and God see differently.

\*\* The damnation of the impenitent unbeliever was to be preached every where.

have the happiness, however, to know that since the period when a few\* of us used to meet at Parliament-Court, the number has been greatly multiplied, and that the effect of the labours of our writers† is to render other sects less and less prone to consign their fellow-creatures to endless perdition. Their tone of late years is very much softened down;‡ and in another generation or two, I doubt not, the testimony alluded to in the beginning of your paper, will be generally, not to say universally, received. Upon the whole, I am pleased with the complexion of the times as respects tolerance and Christian charity.§ But, after all, the proper answer to this third question is furnished me by Paul: “Judge nothing until the Lord come,” (that is to say, nothing that is not palpably obvious,) “who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of all hearts; and then shall every man|| have praise of God.”

5. The evil of sin consists in its being the certain cause of suffering;¶ the excellency of holiness in ensuring happiness. “Without holiness, no man can see the Lord;”\*\* and of all the sources of happiness, none can be compared to that which results from a sense of divine favour.

6. Do you seriously think that the passage in Isaiah, to which you refer, can be fitly urged in defeasance of the positive command of Jesus Christ to love our enemies?†† This feeling is compatible with an abhorrence of their actions, and an acquiescence in the justice of God in visiting their transgressions with punishment; but wherever sin abounds grace will super-

\* There are myriads of unawakened professors of Calvinism.

† By gaining *their* assent, you gain nothing.

‡ This has no weight with one who is fully convinced of the evil of sin.

§ All this is the refinement of unconverted man.

|| Who is entitled to it.

¶ An afflictingly awful and fatal mistake; and in my judgment the foundation of the whole. Full conviction of sin can alone annul this sentiment.

\*\* Admitted of course.

†† They are abhorred as God's enemies, not ours.



abound.\* There is a time for all things.—God turneth man to destruction, and again he says, Return, ye children of men.† Mercy rejoices over judgment, &c. I must reserve for another opportunity an explication of the text on which you lay so much stress.

7. The case of the children marks indeed the severity of the law, and should render parents, who live under the gospel dispensation, deeply sensible of the superior privileges which they enjoy.‡ Death, however, is the common lot of mankind; and probably the form of death, as judicially administered, does not inflict more pain than is experienced by those who die in their beds. I cannot bring myself to think that the parents who were the executioners of their offending offspring, had any suspicion that they were thus rendered the instruments of consigning them to endless misery.§ A great and useful purpose was intended in thus manifesting the determination of God to cut off those whose evil example tended to corrupt and degrade a people whom he had selected as the depositaries of his law, and as the instruments of reforming the world. They have for a while been superseded in this office by the Gentiles; but they shall eventually be restored to it under happier circumstances, “and so all Israel|| shall be saved.”

8. I do not deem it consistent with the modesty enjoined by our Saviour, to talk about, far less to boast¶ of private devotions. This is the only answer you will ever receive from me to questions as to prayer. Whether or not we make a proper or pious use of the privilege of communing with the Father of Spirits, who seeth in secret, will be manifested by the rewards

which he has promised to bestow *openly* upon such as seek him.\* This reward will consist in the graces of his holy spirit, which are love, joy and peace, long-suffering and gentleness.† Those who observe our lives and conversations will judge of the degree in which we bear those fruits. I am truly sensible of my barrenness, and deeply lament the defects of my character. The sense of these defects serves to close my lips and to impair my usefulness. I sincerely hope that your experience may enable you to win many souls to righteousness, and that you may shine like the sun in the kingdom of heaven.

I.

---

\* God is the judge whether we actually do pray unreservedly for a full conviction of the evil of sin.—We shall know in the next world.

† Here again conviction of and feeling for the evil of sin is put away because it is distressing. It is always put away and not suffered to abide a minute, if we can help it. The evil of sin, as our people understand it, principally consists in its being opposed to God; and not in our suffering as the consequence of it.

All your arguments seem to me to spring from one source, namely, God's not having given you a thorough conviction of the evil of sin.—I am quite sure you will not obtain that conviction but by his gift.—I entertain awful apprehensions of such teaching. May the Lord grant me his grace, so that I may be emboldened to pray for a full discovery of the awful realities of the eternal state! I consider, that from motives of self-love, and through our natural blindness, we are apt to underrate the evil of sin—that it is even *salutary* to contemplate the predicament so obnoxious to you, that we may be enabled to have a most hearty quarrel with sin, and be prepared for and actually obtain all those delightful and glorious things which you anticipate, and which cannot be fully and *purely* realized through any other medium. I have witnessed inexpressibly awful mistakes and delusions in these matters. When sin is not duly appreciated, pleasing experiences terminate in unspeakable anguish and disappointment. Such is the unsearchable deceitfulness of the human heart. It is blindness and deadness not to perceive what the scripture says of the evil of sin.

---

\* In a time-state.

† At the resurrection.

‡ I cannot admit this explanation; I dare not.

§ We do not know to the contrary.

|| I leave with God what is meant by Israel.

¶ Boast of what?—A confessed backwardness to pray for a full conviction of sin.

[To be concluded in the next Number.]

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*An Appeal to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish New Testament, printed at Paris in 1819. Containing a View of its History, an Exposure of its Errors, and palpable Proofs of the Necessity of its Suppression.* By Ebenezer Henderson, Author of a “ Journal of a Residence in Iceland.” London, printed for Holdsworth. 1824. 8vo. pp. 70.

ART. II.—*Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to The Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish Version of the New Testament printed at Paris in 1819. To which is added, An Appendix, containing certain Documents on the Character of that Version.* By the Rev. S. Lee, A. M. D. D., of the University of Halle, &c. &c., and Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge, printed by Smith. Sold, in London, by Seeley, &c. 1824. 8vo. pp. 159. App. 44.

IT is not a little remarkable, that of the controversies of which the British and Foreign Bible Society has been the occasion and the subject, nearly all have regarded its principle and constitution, rather than its actual administration. We should antecedently have looked for the reverse of this state of things. It appears extremely difficult to conceive, on what ground an association for circulating the Holy Scriptures can, so far, be arraigned by Christians, or, at least, by Protestants; while, on the other hand, nothing was more probable than that some of the measures of a very miscellaneous body of men would betray strong marks of fallibility, and afford just cause of animadversion. Warmly attached as we are to the avowed purpose of the Society, we think, nevertheless, that the conductors of it have fallen into grand mistakes: we are not indeed of opinion, that Dr. Henderson has made good his charge, or effectually defended his secession from the service

of the institution; but, previously to our further notice of his pamphlet, and of the tract of his opponent, we shall avail ourselves of this fair occasion of saying a few words upon the extent of the Society's agency, and upon one or two collateral topics.

Now, according to our deliberate yet humble judgment, that agency is placed in too many hands, and absorbs an undue proportion of the monies entrusted to the disposal of the Committee. The sole and proper object of the British and Foreign Bible Society, is the circulation of the Scriptures. Not only therefore should its revenues be applied, as far as is possible, exclusively to this end; but we must further be sensible that in the same ratio in which its salaries and incidental expenses are multiplied, will be its inability to print and distribute the volume of revelation. In consideration, for example, of the *fifteen hundred pounds*, now paid annually to the Secretaries, a vast number of copies of the Bible, and still more of the New Testament, might be obtained and spread abroad. A most capital error has been committed, in annexing any salary to that office; in converting the character of the Secretaries from that of gratuitous and honorary to stipendiary. We are far from being disposed to underrate the merits of the gentlemen who are at present employed in such a relation, or to measure their labours by any pecuniary standard. Surely, however, it was of the first importance that the reputation of such a Society for disinterestedness, for a freedom from all party-attachments, and, we will add, for enlightened prudence and discretion, should be perfectly unassailable! We could heartily wish that a step which we so much lament might be retraced; while we fear that the very nature of it forbids this desirable issue. There are, besides, a vast number of inferior agents of the institution: and, admitting, as we do, that they should receive no inadequate compensation for their time, their efforts and their responsibility, we cannot but pro-

test against so large an appropriation of the funds of the Society. Many of those agents, are, in effect, *missionaries*; so that there is at least *danger* of *oral* notes and comments accompanying the distribution of not a few even of those copies of the Bible, which, ostensibly, are distributed without any note or comment whatsoever. If it be alleged, that, as the consequence of the agents being more numerous, more Bibles are really put into circulation, and more money obtained for the institution, we may demur to the principle of the allegation, even should we allow the fact. We cannot grant that for a highly excellent purpose—no, not for the best of all—money is to be sought and procured without reasonable discrimination: we must observe, that every measure pursued should accord with the dignity and sacredness of the design. Our view of the *real* interests of the Society, is the same with Dr. Henderson's. (Pref. p. v.) We deprecate any thing like a selfish, gainful and mendicant spirit—any thing like a departure from first and noble principles: on which account, we must, in particular, express our regret that so very considerable a sum is expended on printing *Monthly Extracts*. This measure is virtually, if not literally, a deviation from the original and repeatedly professed object of the institution. What, in truth, are these *monthly extracts*, for the most part, but *notes and comments*; *religious tracts*, often containing sentiments and phraseology, which, as we believe, will scarcely bear the test of the volume that they aim to recommend? This consideration, together with the circumstances on which we have already insisted, has, we acknowledge, shaken our confidence in the judgment and good faith of the Directors of the Bible Society; while the strains of fulsome and reciprocal panegyric, and the ostentatious homilies, which are so frequently heard at its meetings, both in town and country, the unmeasured praise bestowed upon its friends, the censures pointed against its real or supposed adversaries, are greatly offensive to men of correct taste and sober piety.

Let us not be reckoned among the enemies of the institution, for thus

“telling” what we deliberately consider as “the truth.”\* We shall always endeavour, as we have, thus far, endeavoured, to aid the circulation of the Sacred Volume. But we distinguish between the *end* and the *means*. The British and Foreign Bible Society, while yet in its infancy, was more attentive to the letter and the spirit of its declared principle than it has been during its more advanced stages. Success can render bodies of men, as well as individuals, less vigilant and careful.

These observations are far from being irrevelant to a review of the controversy between Dr. Henderson and Professor Lee. The pamphlets before us have arisen, in effect, from the extent of the agency procured by the Society, and from some want of judgment in the selection of the agents. Dr. Henderson, we doubt not, is a man of solid worth and merit: yet we must be permitted to question his qualifications as an oriental scholar and a scriptural critic.

His complaint is, in substance, the following, that in Ali Bey's Turkish Version of the New Testament, printed in Paris, 1819, and circulated under the sanction of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, are numerous and gross and hurtful errors; prejudicial to purity of faith, revolting to accurate taste, and bearing throughout marks of a most censurable accommodation to Mohammedan practices and ideas. Concerning these things Dr. Henderson remonstrated with the Committee: his remonstrance, however, being ultimately ineffectual, and Ali Bey's Version being continued in circulation by them, though with some few modifications, he has retired from the service of the Society, and now makes his appeal to its members and to the public.

It certainly appears from the minutes of the General Committee, and from those of the Sub-Committee, “in which the subject of the Turkish Testament was brought under consideration,” that great pains were employed to procure the opinions of competent judges of the Version. Among the names of some distin-

\* Gal. iv. 16.



guished Orientalists, who were consulted, on the occasion, we find Professor Lee's, at whose suggestion, and that of his colleagues, measures were taken, by which it was hoped that Dr. Henderson's objections might be removed. Some leaves were cancelled; some tables of *errata* were prepared and adopted. In the mean time, the circulation of Ali Bey's Version was suspended: its merits were still made the subject of investigation by the Sub-Committee; and, after a long and careful scrutiny, this Turkish Testament was again circulated by the institution.

We cannot be astonished that, under such circumstances, Professor Lee comes forward to vindicate a step, which he was so deeply concerned in advising. Before we met with the "Remarks," &c., we had put down a few notes on different parts of Dr. Henderson's "Appeal," &c.: some of our strictures we shall transcribe.

The author of the "Appeal," &c., does not distinguish between what is matter of exposition, of *interpretation*, properly so called, and what is matter of translation:

Rom. x. 13. In Dr. H.'s opinion, (p. 41,) "the change of το ὄνομα Κυρίου, 'the name of the Lord,' to [in the Turkish Version] 'the name of God,' seems to have been done with the design of annihilating one of the proofs of the divinity of Christ, as also not only the lawfulness but the necessity of addressing divine worship to him."

Now it is neither just nor candid to intimate that the translator had this design, or indeed any design beyond that of rendering the passage with correctness and fidelity. Dr. Henderson would have been better employed in consulting Joel ii. 32, whence the quotation (for such it is) has been borrowed. He would have found that the prophet uses the word *Jehovah*, and that the LXX, from whom, as is most probable, the apostle cites the clause, render this word by the corresponding term Κυρίῳ. Neither in the book of Joel, nor in Rom. x. 13, is there a reference to Jesus Christ, to his alleged divinity, or to the worship that Dr. H. supposes him to claim.

The writer of the Appeal subjoins, "The Lord in this verse, is unquestionably the Lord of all, mentioned

in that preceding." Thus far we agree with Dr. H. Not so, when he proceeds to say, "and who *He* is we read Acts x. 36." But the key to this latter text is Acts ii. 36, "God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Jesus is Lord of ALL, of believing Gentiles and believing Jews; from each of which classes of men converts have flowed into his church.

Other indications and examples of Dr. Henderson's propensity to confound translation with exposition, occur in pp. 14, 29, 52, 64, of his pamphlet.

In some of his animadversions on the *text* of the Turkish New Testament he is exceedingly unfortunate.

"Matt. vi. 15.\* Τα παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, *your trespasses*." Our author complains of the omission of this clause in Ali Bey's Version. Now Griesbach has annexed to the preceding clause the mark of probable omission: and this he justifies in one of the highly excellent notes contained in his *Commentarius Criticus*, &c. We cannot, indeed, blame him for retaining the words in the text of his edition of the Greek Testament: but neither shall we accuse Ali Bey of a want of either judgment or fidelity in rejecting them; because he might easily mistake the one clause for the other, and because he has assuredly given the speaker's meaning. Dr. Henderson would have done well in weighing the external and internal evidence on both sides of the question. The *Commentarius Criticus* is less known in England than it deserves to be: nor, probably, will our readers be displeased, if we copy the note to which we have referred:

"Vers. 14 et 15, Τα παραπτώματα αὐτῶν S. ὑμῶν, in vulgari textu legitur, in codice L et aliis quater, in D et nonnullis aliis bis. Nobis præ cæteris arridet lectio codicis D, quæ comm. 15 τα παραπτώματα αὐτῶν omittit. Inserta fuerunt hæc verba, quo comma 15 exactius responderet commati 14, sicut in fine versûs 14 ab aliis intercalatum fuit τα παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, quo comma 14 propius ad similitudinem commatis 15 accederet. Ergo in utroque commate eam præferimus lectionem, quæ parallelismum mem-

brorum sistit imperfectiorem; hunc enim defectum sarcire studebant librarii." \*

"Matt. viii. 5. Ἰησὺς." Here, too, Dr. Henderson points out what he regards as an omission in the text of the Turkish Version. Let us look then into Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament, where the clause stands thus, Εἰσελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ. †

We cite another example,

"Rev. iii. 21. Μετὰ τὸ πατρός μου." Of these words the omission is strongly remarked upon, by the author of "The Appeal," &c., who tells us that the effect of such an omission "is to leave the Mohammedan in the dark, as to the *throne* on which the Faithful and True Witness declares he was seated after his victory." Pp. 46, 47.

But the context renders that point completely unambiguous: and Griesbach's observation in his inner margin, in loc. should have abated Dr. Henderson's severity of criticism. ‡

"(h) Ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. Arm. Moyses in Epist. ad Cypr. Ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ=ips. 6."

Our decision would not have been the same with Ali Bey's. Yet this transcript denotes a variety in the early readings, and sufficiently vindicates the Turkish Translator from the implied accusation of being governed by some corrupt bias.

Dr. Henderson is not more successful in his interpretation than in his adjustment of the Sacred Text:

"Rom. v. 6. Κατὰ καιρὸν is rendered [in the Turkish Version by Ali Bey] "at the *predestined* period: but the Apostle seems to refer to the *suitableness* of the time at which Christ died, as well as that predetermined in the Divine counsel." Pp. 37, 38.

Be it so. Yet if Paul refer to both these points, as, undoubtedly, he does, then what expresses the one, implies the other. Why was *that æra* predetermined, why selected, except on account of its *suitableness*?

Dr. Henderson is particularly sensitive with regard to those parts of Ali Bey's version, in which he suspects an heretical taint, and which may be

thought to bear on the Trinitarian controversy. His suspicions, fears and criticisms are alike groundless. A correct theological scholar knows that scripture must be interpreted by itself, and not by previously-formed systems. When the author of the "Appeal" objects to the Turkish translation, the rendering which follows,

"John x. 30, I and the Father are *one thing*," we must remind him that in the original we read ἐν ἐσμεν, and that John xvii. 21, 22, are texts exactly parallel. We should rather complain of the words being *too literally* translated.

"It is the concurrent testimony," says Dr. H., "of all orthodox divines that in Rom. iv. 13, v. 17, x. 3; Gal. ii. 21, iii. 6, 21, the word 'righteousness' is not descriptive of any inherent or implanted righteousness, or any works of righteousness done by man, but of the meritorious righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in virtue of which alone any sinner can be justified in the sight of God." P. 33. We believe, on the contrary, that the word δικαιοσύνη here means *justification* or *acceptance*: and, in proof of our statement, we might appeal to the connexion, and to many other texts. Nevertheless, it is not merely on this gentleman's erroneous annotations that we must pass our censures: it still more becomes us to complain that where only *translation* is concerned he obtrudes an *exposition*.

In what passage of the New Testament does he meet with the terms "the Christian Sabbath?" \* No traces of such a phrase, or of such an institution, can be found in the records of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The words τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ought, unquestionably, to be rendered "on the Lord's-day:" yet Dr. Henderson, who has noticed different versions of them by some European and ancient English translators of the Bible, should have been more indulgent, if we must not say more equitable, to Ali Bey. In Cranmer's or the Great English Bible we have, "I was in the spirit on a Sunday." Rev. i. 10.

We are desirous of the author of the "Appeal" being consistent with himself. In reading his pamphlet, it frequently occurred to us, that of the

\* See, too, Professor Lee on this subject, "Remarks," &c., pp. 139, &c.

† Professor Lee's Remarks, ib.

‡ Ib. pp. 142, 143.

objections which he urges against the Turkish translation of the New Testament, not a few are applicable, on principle, to our Received Version. A tract as large, or larger than Dr. Henderson's, might be filled with instances of false readings, of mistaken renderings, of obsolete expressions, of grammatical improprieties,\* of unwarrantable accommodations† to modern ideas, modern tenets and modern usages, in that English translation of the Scriptures which the Bible Society circulates without note and comment. Let him undertake, let him execute this task, and lay the result before the Committee of that institution, and before the public. In respect of the smaller of those bodies, we cannot promise him greater success than he has already experienced: as to the larger, we think, a considerable portion of it may admit that he will then have done good service to biblical criticism and to sacred truth.

His reasonings against the Turkish Version by Ali Bey, have so little of relevancy and strength, that we cannot but look upon Dr. Henderson as being governed by additional and more powerful motives, in withdrawing from the service of the Bible Society: Professor Lee, we perceive,‡ intimates as much; and some of the expressions which fall from our author himself, justify, even if they do not produce, this suspicion.

We should have felt real pleasure in being able to speak with approbation of Dr. Henderson's "Appeal." His learned opponent has replied to him at considerable length, and with an effect that, we think, would not have been weakened by greater mildness of temper and courtesy of language. The extent and accuracy of Professor Lee's acquaintance with the Oriental dialects, fully authorize him in giving a far more decided opinion concerning the points at issue than would have been suitable to a man of

inferior attainments. He evidently writes, however, under the influence of something like personal irritation: he appears too often like an *individual* party in the cause; and, though the combatants are most unequally matched, though it is at fearful odds that Dr. Henderson contends with Professor Lee, we certainly wish that the antagonist who is here put upon the defensive, and who has effectually maintained his ground, had not sullied his triumph by unnecessarily harsh and contemptuous expressions. When he speaks of "such an Homeromastix as this," and says, with a sneer, respecting one extract, "This is in Dr. Henderson's very best style truly," he disgusts the unbiassed reader, and descends from the high station which his knowledge and his reasoning had entitled him to take.

Professor Lee employs eight chapters in noticing distinctly the objections of the gentleman to whom he is opposed. His tract also contains an Appendix, the documents in which bear directly and materially upon his defence of the Society.

The chief subjects discussed in this controversy, are, the character, &c. of Ali Bey, principles of translation and criticism, the supposed mistranslation of proper names, alleged synonymes, &c., want of uniformity, false renderings, omissions, real or imagined, additional words and phrases. On all these points light is cast by Professor Lee's superior learning and good sense.

Neither of the combatants appears to entertain a correct view of Rev. xxii. 8, 9. About the text and the translation there can be no dispute. The proper subject of inquiry is the interpretation. In a word, who is it that in the 7th verse, says, "Behold, I come," &c., and in the 9th, "I am thy fellow-servant," &c.? Now the speaker is the angel, not the Messiah, or the Lamb. We refer to Dean Woodhouse's excellent observations in loc.; the rather, because he is not only a learned but a reputedly orthodox expositor. Lowman, in a most valuable note on Rev. xix. 10, admirably explains the term "worship."\*

We hope that the "Appeal" and the "Remarks" will be read even be-

\* See Bishop Lowth's English Grammar, and Dr. Symonds' Observations on the expediency of revising our present Version of the Gospels and Epistles.

† The rendering of Acts xii. 4, is a striking example; *Easter* being there most unjustifiably substituted for "the Passover."

‡ Remarks, p. 156, and Appeal, p. 56.

\* See, too, Rev. vii. 12.



yond the circle of the intelligent portion of the members of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Even professed theological scholars are not sufficiently attentive to the principles of the criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures, and to the influence of this kind of knowledge on the state of Christian truth and virtue. N.

ART. III.—*The Conclusion of a Sermon preached in the Meeting-house, Church Street, Wolverhampton, on the Evening of the Lord's-day, October 31, 1824, on Occasion of the Death of Mrs. Hannah Jevons, who departed this life on Friday, Oct. 22, 1824, in the Ninety-first Year of her Age.* By James Hews Bransby. Ipswich, printed. Sold by Hunter, St. Paul's Church-yard, London. pp. 15. Crown 8vo.

**I**N the present instance, Mr. Bransby has deviated from his usual practice, on occasion of his preaching funeral sermons: but his reasons for thus departing from it, are cogent and satisfactory; they are, that he may hold up to his hearers a character eminently worthy of their imitation, and that he may gratify his own feelings by recording the virtues of one who was the oldest member of the society of Unitarian Christians at Wolverhampton, and whom he sincerely esteemed and honoured.

The individual to whose memory he pays this affectionate and well-deserved tribute of respect, had, in her early years, received instruction on the subject of religion, its history, its precepts and its ordinances, from the lips of a minister whose praise is in all our churches—the Rev. Samuel Bourn. Nor did the good seed fall on an unfavourable soil. The venerable person whose Christian graces are sketched in the pages before us, bore the fruits of piety and righteousness to a protracted old age. What she was, the following copious extract will enable our readers to perceive; and it will afford, at the same time, a very pleasing specimen of the preacher's style:

“ Her lot was cast among the tenants of the vale: and never was it more clearly seen that the real enjoyment of life depends less upon outward circumstances

than upon the dispositions and feelings of the heart. She knew with what propriety the Apostle could say, ‘ Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another.’\* She felt the force and beauty of his exclamation, ‘ This is our rejoicing, even the testimony of our consciences, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, we have had our conversation in the world.’† Amidst inconveniences, privations and difficulties, her principles displayed their power; producing the fair fruits of virtue, opening inexhaustible sources of consolation, and rendering her humble dwelling the abode of industry, contentment, cheerfulness and peace.

“ She was a worshiper of the one true God, through his beloved son, Jesus Christ; and it affords me a mournful pleasure to think on the concern which she manifested for the prosperity of this Christian society in its peculiar trials—on the regularity with which, while she enjoyed a tolerable degree of health and strength, and even when her great age and increasing weakness would have excused her to others, she took her seat among us—on the holy fervour and animation with which she was wont to celebrate the high praises of her God—and on the unaffected seriousness and candour with which, on all occasions, she listened to the instructions of this place.

“ Nor can I refrain from mentioning it to her honour, that she was always early as well as constant in her attendance. So established and perfect was this habit, that I am scarcely able to recollect a single instance of her entering the house of prayer after its services were begun. She was sensible that every duty, in which we here engage, is an important duty; and she appears, moreover, to have acted upon the maxim which, in this respect, governed the conduct of a pious and enlightened Christian of her own sex, who, on being asked the reason of her always coming so early to church, wisely said, ‘ It is a part of my religion not to disturb the religion of others.’‡

“ For the true and lasting welfare of all the members of her numerous family, she was tenderly concerned; in seasons of prosperity warning them of their duty and their danger; and amidst the visitations of sorrow, pointing out to them their safety, if they would but be faithful to themselves, under the government of a Being whose nature and whose name is Love. ‘ As Abraham commanded his children and his household after him,

\* Gal. vi. 4.

† 2 Cor. i. 12.

‡ Mrs. Chapone.

that they should keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment,\* so she left it in solemn charge with me to urge it upon her children and descendants, as her last request, that when it should please her heavenly Father to take her from them, and her eye could watch over them no longer, they would continue to cherish a forbearing, mild and compassionate spirit towards each other, and live together in harmony—that they would seek their happiness in religion, as the only spring of happiness to a frail and sinful creature—and that they would never, for the sake of pursuing either the business or the amusements of the world, neglect the duties of the Lord's day or the ordinances of the Lord's house."—Pp. 7—10.

It is always gratifying to know that parental wisdom and kindness meet with corresponding regards from children. In the example under our review, the feeble, tottering steps of age were supported by "that filial piety, ever watchful, ever assiduous, than which the eye cannot rest upon an object more attractive."—P. 12.

\* Gen. xviii. 19.

Mr. Bransby, it will have been noticed, adverts to some "peculiar trials" of the Christian Society now meeting in Church Street, Wolverhampton. Few, if any, of the constant readers of the Monthly Repository, can be ignorant of the nature and circumstances of those trials.\* The important question at issue has not yet been decided in the High Court of Chancery. To urge a decision, is, we think, an object of considerable expediency; for, if Religious Toleration be, in truth, so imperfect as some great authorities have intimated, and may declare, a legislative remedy must be sought for, and will, it is probable, be obtained. In all events, our humble commendations, cordial good wishes and cheerful services are due to the aggrieved and meritorious body of Unitarian Christians which had the happiness of ranking the late Mrs. Hannah Jevons among its members.

N.

\* Mon. Repos. XII. 430, &c. &c.

## OBITUARY.

1824. Sept. 8, in the 43rd year of her age, ELIZABETH, wife of Rev. William FILLINGHAM, of Congleton, Cheshire, after a long and painful illness, which she bore with Christian fortitude. She was interred in the Unitarian Chapel at that place, when the Rev. George Cheetham, of Macclesfield, delivered an impressive oration at the grave, and on the Sunday but one following, the Rev. Edward Hawkes, M.A., preached her funeral sermon to a numerous and deeply-attentive audience, from Eccles. vii. 1.

October 12, at Leeds, in the 70th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS LANGDON, who had been for upwards of 40 years pastor of a Baptist congregation in that town. The *New Evangelical Magazine*, in drawing his character, exhibits only one defect, viz. a degree of religious liberality! He admitted mixed communion in his church, that is, he allowed Independents to join their Baptist brethren at the Lord's table, and he conducted himself with affability and kindness to-

wards persons of different religious opinions! The good man would probably have consented to his picture being taken with these shades.

October 21, in the 37th year of her age, in premature child-birth, MARY, the wife of Mr. Ebenezer JOHNSTON, Jun., of Bishopsgate; sincerely and deeply lamented by her family and friends.

— 21, at Saint Adresse, in Normandy, aged 70, ROBERT CHARLES DALLAS, Esq., formerly of the island of Jamaica, and the author of "The History of the Maroon War," &c. &c.

— 30, at Dublin, after a protracted illness, the Rev. C. MATURIN, Curate of St. Peter's, in that city, author of a volume of Sermons, of Bertram, a Tragedy, and some ingenious Novels.

November 7, at Chichester, aged 47, MARGARETTA HAMILTON. Reared in the bosom of an opulent family, she was so

fortunate as to have her natural endowments, which were far above the common level, improved by all the aids which cultivation and instruction could furnish. Her memory, which was retentive, and her recollection, which was prompt, supplied her imagination with every thing fitted to render her conversation eminently pleasing and interesting, recommended especially, as it was, by the genuine politeness of her manners, and the unaffected propriety of her expressions: but these qualifications, in whatever degree they might afford gratification or command applause, were comparatively of small import in the estimation of those intimate friends who had an opportunity of knowing and appreciating her more solid merits. In consequence of family mischances, she had sunk from affluence into what, to a person of her education and habits, could hardly, in the present times, be deemed a genteel competence. She bore this change with distinguished magnanimity, never declining to speak of it on fit occasions, and never speaking of it but in a manner evincing how little it affected her happiness: indeed, her happiness consisted in enjoying and returning the attachment of her friends, and in doing all the good in her power, and this she did in all circumstances both of prosperous and adverse fortune. In warmth of heart, few have equalled her, and none could surpass her in integrity, disinterestedness, and independence of mind. Miss H.'s piety was not less admirable than her other qualities. Her religion was of the most liberal and catholic description, manifesting itself by no undue attachment to particular modes of faith or forms of worship—an attachment which, in its excess, may, without breach of charity, be often regarded as a *modification of egotism*—but by a reverential regard to the Author of her being, and a patient acquiescence in his will under severe and protracted suffering. Her favourite manual of private devotion was that selected from the works of Jeremy Taylor by the Rev. Mr. Fellowes, while, for family worship, she preferred and admired the prayers of the late Mr. John Palmer. Frequently, during her last illness, which, among other distressing privations, was attended in a great degree by the loss of sight, has the writer of these lines been affected and edified by the manner in which she was accustomed to join in the last-mentioned forms of devotion.

It is not ascertained that Miss H. was educated in the communion and principles of the Church of England, but she was accustomed regularly to attend its worship. About ten years before her decease, accident introduced her to the

familiar acquaintance of a lady of distinguished worth. This lady, who had suffered much more than Miss H. from adverse fortune, having lost nearly the whole of a competent property, was fond of talking on subjects of religion, and having, from her more advanced age and excellent understanding, no small influence over her younger companion, she led her to inquire into the grounds and reasons of her faith. The inquiry induced first a suspicion, and afterwards a conviction, of their insufficiency, and lastly, a full persuasion that *Unitarianism is the doctrine of the gospel*. This persuasion she retained during the remainder of life, and, till disease had made too great ravages on the mental functions, she continued to give unequivocal proofs that the *gospel, so understood*, is of prevailing and sufficient efficacy to support the mind under the most trying circumstances. During the last four or five days of her oppressive and disabling illness, her mind was never sufficiently collected for the purpose of any continued thought; but within not many hours of her death, and amid almost constant wanderings, she uttered a favourite prayer with perfect correctness, and with her usual fervour of manner: it is reasonable, therefore, to conclude, that, in the lucid moments of her departing life, her mind was directed to that GREAT OBJECT on which she had fixed her faith and hope.

HYLAS.

Nov. 8, of a lingering consumption, which was borne with most exemplary patience, ELIZA CHADWICK, the fourth and youngest daughter of the late James Chadwick, of *Patricroft House*, near *Manchester*. If the death of a being the most pure, possessing enlightened piety and active benevolence, can, without presumption, claim the regret of the public, the subject of this notice, without offence to truth or modesty, may justly demand it. From reading and reflection, she became a decided Unitarian, and, from a conviction of the truth of those views, frankly gave up the faith and worship of that church in which she had been educated, to embrace one she esteemed more pure and influential. Her persevering and candid search after divine truth, and her gentle but firm avowal of what she conceived to be such when found, entitled her to the respect even of those from whom she dissented. Though her meek and unpretending mind liked not the thorny paths of controversy, yet she was always willing and able to give a reason for the hope that was in her, to all who asked it.



The mere record of deceased mortality, if unmarked by any moral or intellectual lesson, availeth little. Not so here. The subject of this was indeed an encouraging instance to her own sex of the perfect compatibility of a mild and sweet disposition harmonizing with a firm and decisive tone of mind, which was evinced in a warm desire to elevate the character of the poor by whom she was surrounded, and to whose children she was a most kind and patient instructress.

Farewell, beloved Eliza! Thou hast indeed left a sad vacuum in that circle in which thou wert the sweetest ornament and the dearest object. But let us not sorrow as those without hope. Let us rather humbly trust thou art only gone to that rest from which, if there be any truth in the promises of that gospel thou so dearly valuedst, and whose precepts thou so consistently and conscientiously practisedst, thou shalt arise to a blessed and glorious resurrection.

Liverpool, Nov. 17, 1824.

#### Additions.

Mr. JOHN SIMPSON, Sen. (P. 628.)

HE was a native of Yarmouth, in Norfolk; and in early life was a preacher in the Methodist connexion, and in close intimacy and friendship with Mr. John Wesley. He was instrumental in raising a congregation at Yarmouth, as well as one at Lowestoffe. He continued for some years an acceptable preacher in this connexion; but not experiencing those immediate and sensible illuminations and assistances of the Holy Spirit which persons of that sect profess to feel, he was much discouraged, and preaching became a burden to him. This led him to a more close examination of the subject, which issued in a conviction of the fallacy of those pretensions. Under these circumstances he communicated by letter to Mr. Wesley the state of his mind; to which Mr. W. returned the following laconic answer: "*Samson, the Philistines are upon thee: escape for thy life.*" On leaving the Methodists, he joined a society of the followers of Cudworth, who denominated themselves "the Followers of the Apostles." Their distinguishing tenet was, "that faith is not a miraculous work of the Holy Spirit, but the operation of evidence on the mind, or the receiving of the report of the gospel from a conviction of its truth and importance." They held also the popular doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement. Amongst this people Mr. S. laboured for years in the ministry, during which period (about forty years ago) the writer of this first became acquainted with him. He was

then a believer in the Trinity, but shortly after the commencement of their intimacy he renounced that doctrine, under a firm conviction of its inconsistency with reason and revelation, and embraced the Unitarian system, in which he found a solid foundation for his faith and hope. The personal unity of the Divine Being, his paternal character, his omnipotent power and unbounded goodness, together with the promises and prospects held forth in the gospel, were to him a never-failing source of consolation and joy. The foundation of his eminent piety, of his habitual sense of the omnipresence of God, and of his earnest endeavour to approve himself to him, was probably laid in the serious impressions which he received in his first connexion with the Methodists; but, under every change of sentiment, he was always the same pious and excellent character—a bright example to his numerous descendants, and to all with whom he was connected. May they be followers of him, inherit his virtues, and enjoy his consolations and prospects!

He was for about fourteen years pastor of the afternoon congregation meeting in Worship Street, and was succeeded in that office by the Rev. James Gilchrist, who now fills it. In 1802, he published a pamphlet entitled "*Plain Thoughts on the New-Testament Doctrine of Atonement.*" His dissolution was brought on by a gradual decay of nature, which reduced him to the necessity of keeping his bed for three weeks before he died, although he did not experience any bodily pain. The writer was with him on the Monday previous to his death, when he expressed himself perfectly composed and happy, and, in an affectionate farewell, commended him to the blessing of God. He retained all his faculties to the last, except that of speech, which he lost but a few minutes before his decease; and then, when no longer able to express in words the grateful sentiments of his heart towards his daughter-in-law for her assiduous and kind attentions, he took her hand and kissed it in the most affectionate manner: he then made signs to have a servant called in who had assisted in waiting upon him, shook hands with him, and, putting his own hands in the attitude of prayer, in a few minutes breathed his last, gently falling asleep in Jesus, in firm hope of the glory which shall be revealed at *his* appearing.

Thus lived and thus died this faithful servant and minister of Jesus Christ, exhibiting in his death the strongest evidence of the power and efficacy of Unitarian principles to afford all that support, consolation and hope, of which the Christian

stands in need at the trying and awful period of dissolution.

In his private character, Mr. Simpson was distinguished by strong natural sensibility, which, heightened and directed by the truest principles of Christian benevolence, led him to take a lively interest in the welfare of others. His hand and purse were ever open to assist the unfortunate to the utmost limit of his means. There are some, now far advanced in life, who can date their early religious impressions from the instructions which he was accustomed to give, in the most familiar manner, to his family and connexions.

He was buried on Thursday, the 21st instant, in the burial-ground at Worship Street, when Mr. Gilchrist delivered a funeral oration, and on the following Sunday afternoon improved the event in a discourse from Psalm lxxxix. 48, "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death?"

M.

October 30, 1824.

#### MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

(Pp. 571 & 628.)

[Although we have already inserted obituary notices of this truly worthy man, we cannot forbear inserting the following sketch of his character, from the pen of a respected friend.—ED.]

There are few men who have been so long known to the public, or whose virtues have so much entitled them to regard, as this distinguished individual. He was the third son of William Cartwright, Esq., of Marnham, in the county of Nottingham. A gentleman by birth and education, as well as by his mild and liberal manners, his correct habits, and his manly and independent sentiments, he occupied a considerable share of public attention during the space of more than half a century. Endowed with a vigorous understanding, matured by reflection, his mind was richly stored with various knowledge and information. As a younger brother, he had been originally destined to the Navy; but he soon relinquished that profession, and evinced an early predilection for subjects of political disquisition, which eventually became the leading object of his attention; and, though his active and enterprising spirit was occasionally directed to other pursuits, yet, in the course of a long life, he never relaxed in the ardour of his application to this favourite subject. Engaged in such speculations and inquiries, he cultivated politics as a science; and devoted his time and his talents to this study, as a rational exercise of the understanding, and as the means of being useful in pro-

moting the welfare and happiness of his country. Ever observant of the great events of his time, he cherished a vigilant and jealous regard to the rights of the people. With this important object in view, the cause of Parliamentary Reform opened to him a wide field of discussion, and employed all the powers and energies of his mind. An able and experienced combatant in the arena of political controversy, he repelled the attacks of his opponents with unshaken firmness and dexterity. His writings in favour of civil and religious liberty, were numerous; and though they were sometimes perhaps too speculative and elaborate to be what is termed popular, in the common acceptation of the word, yet they were, generally speaking, the result of deep thought, and of close research into the nature and origin of the British Constitution, the fundamental principles of legislation and government, and the true grounds of the liberties of the subject. They display great acuteness and ingenuity in detecting abuses, a just discrimination in tracing the artifices of corruption, a fearless intrepidity in exposing the intrigues and struggles of ambition, and in resisting the encroachments of arbitrary power. It cannot be matter of surprise, that the principles so warmly asserted by Major\* Cartwright, as the champion of freedom and reform, together with the corresponding consistency of his political conduct, should have rendered him an object of calumny and misrepresentation amongst the advocates of passive obedience and non-resistance, the corrupt and unprincipled votaries of interest, and the determined supporters of absolute power and unrestricted prerogative.

However some might view the principles maintained by Major Cartwright through the dense medium of prejudice and party-spirit, those who knew his real character, esteemed him an ardent, honest, conscientious patriot; and, as such, long will his memory be held in veneration. He was, as might naturally be expected, deeply interested in the result of the Spanish revolution, and in the misfortunes of those unhappy exiles from their native soil, who sought protection in this country, which has on various other occasions afforded an asylum to those who have suffered under the rigours of persecution, or the baneful influences of tyranny and oppression. He especially revered the high and heroic virtues of the brave RIEGO, that victim of the basest

---

\* Many years ago, Mr. Cartwright held the rank of *Major* in the Nottinghamshire Militia.

treachery, cruelty and injustice; while his benevolent and sympathizing nature was sensibly affected by the untimely fate of the interesting relict of that illustrious chief, whom she soon followed to the mansions of innocence, purity and peace, where "they hear not the voice of the oppressor."

To the character of Major Cartwright may be justly applied, what he himself, not long since, observed of another person, with an originality of expression peculiarly his own, and with an energy and warmth of feeling unimpaired by age;—"In his praise, I need not say more, than that he is a true friend to civil and religious liberty; having a rooted abhorrence of tyranny, and a lively sympathy with all who suffer under its impious cruelties:"—after which, he thus proceeds to mention "those relatives of the martyred Riego, who have taken refuge in this country, and bear his honoured name;—a name, which, in the dispensations of Providence, I trust, will prove of no small potency in raising up a moral force, against which, the brute force of despotism, alike offensive to God and man, will not long be able to stand."

In a detail of the political life and labours of Major Cartwright, the character of such a man, while it presents an object of contemplation of no inconsiderable interest to the calm and dispassionate mind, affords also an instructive lesson to every man of observation and reflection. We see one, whose benevolence, simplicity and purity of intention are unimpeached; whose dignified and philosophic mind, with a zeal and ardour paramount to all personal and selfish motives, was wholly devoted to the grave consideration of such measures as might be most conducive to the benefit of his countrymen; and whose patriotic exertions in forwarding that important object, yielded to no obstacles, were discouraged by no difficulties, but were pursued with unwearied diligence and the most steady and determined perseverance, "in season and out of season, through good report and evil report."

The differences of opinion, upon questions of policy, which too often divided the friends of freedom, and unhappily disturbed their mutual harmony and cordial co-operation, were a subject of deep regret to those who had the good of the public really at heart, while they afforded occasion of triumph and exultation to the enemies of Reform. Amidst

these discordances, Major Cartwright maintained that entire composure, and unruffled serenity of temper, which seemed never to forsake him. We can now only take a melancholy retrospect of the transactions of his time, accompanied with the reflection, that, as far as he was concerned, all political contention, animosity and party-feeling are buried with him in the tomb where he now lies "quietly inurned."

In appreciating the merits of this excellent man, we have dwelt only on those points of character which mark him as an example of public virtue unawed by power, and of political integrity uncorrupted by interest or ambition. And we have no hesitation in designating the virtuous and venerable Major Cartwright, as a patriot in the fullest extent of the term;—an able, enlightened, sincere, and tried friend to the liberties of his country and of mankind. In truth, he possessed, in an eminent degree, the virtues of a pure and disinterested patriotism.

But, amongst the valuable qualities that adorned his upright and honourable mind, it is impossible to forget, though perhaps it were needless here to record, the private and social virtues that distinguished him as a member of the community, as a husband, a brother, and a friend;—his memory will never cease to be cherished by those who were best qualified to appreciate his excellence and value in the endearing intercourses of domestic life. This amiable man died, beloved and lamented, at his house in London, on Wednesday, the 23d of September, 1824, having nearly completed the 84th year of his age—"without a struggle or a groan, or any expression of pain during his illness, but what arose from witnessing the affliction of his family."

That his attachment to the great cause of liberty, was warm and unabated, and his "ruling passion" still "strong," even in his latest hour, appears by an affectionate farewell address to his friends, as delivered in his own words to a beloved relative, who, with unremitting attention, administered to him the soothing balm of tenderness:—"Say to my friends, that I have never ceased to entertain the most consoling hopes of the ultimate establishment of civil and religious liberty; but to this end, there must be virtuous instruments, which, it is to be hoped, the times will supply."

October 22, 1824.

T. J.



## INTELLIGENCE.

### DOMESTIC. RELIGIOUS.

#### *Episcopal Unitarian Chapel, Westminster.*

WE have authority to state that the Chapel in YORK STREET, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE, will be opened for divine service on Sunday the 19th of December. Sermons will be preached in the morning and evening of that day, and of the following Sunday, by the Rev. Dr. CARPENTER, of Bristol; and it is hoped that Dr. Carpenter will preach in the same chapel on the morning of Christmas-day. The Rev. Mr. HARRIS, of Bolton, is expected to preach in such chapel the three first Sundays in January, and it is intended that there shall afterwards be a regular succession of eminent ministers from different congregations to perform the morning and evening service in conjunction with the regular minister of the chapel. The morning service will begin at half-past eleven o'clock; the evening service at seven o'clock.

The Rev. B. MARDON has, we hear, announced to the congregation assembling in Union Chapel, *Glasgow*, his intention of resigning his office as minister amongst them, at the end of the ensuing month of April. In the mean time, he proposes to deliver a series of lectures once a fortnight on the Sunday evening, on the various doctrines of reputed orthodoxy, 1st, which appear to impeach the character of God, 2nd, which appear to contradict the scriptural doctrine of the Person of Christ.

#### *Proposed New Chapel at Sheerness.*

SIR,

Permit me through the medium of the Repository to lay the following case before the Unitarian public; a case which I feel both a pleasure and duty respectfully but earnestly to recommend to the attention of the benevolent and liberal.

It is now more than three years since I first succeeded in establishing a Unitarian Society at Sheerness, the first-fruits of my mission; since which I have often visited them, and can bear testimony to their zeal and prudence. They meet three times a-week, twice on Sunday, and once on a week evening: and they have also established a small library. The religious services are alternately conducted by two or three friends, in a man-

ner highly creditable to themselves, and to the cause of truth: and, all things considered, they are generally pretty well attended. But unfortunately the place they meet in is not only so very obscurely situated as to render it unknown even to many in the very neighbourhood itself, and almost impossible for a stranger to find out, but the entrance to it down a *dirty, narrow lane*, is so exceedingly disagreeable and repulsive, as to deter many from coming who, under more favourable circumstances, would be induced to attend.

To obviate this obstruction to the progress of Unitarian Christianity in that populous town, which is already in summer the resort of many strangers, and is likely to become a popular watering-place, the friends there feel desirous of erecting a small chapel in an eligible part of the town. But they are poor. All, therefore, which they can contribute towards the erection is a piece of ground and most of the labour; several of them being carpenters and bricklayers, and one of them a painter and glazier, all volunteering their services gratuitously. The friend who has kindly offered the piece of ground, which is situated in front of one of the principal streets, is himself a bricklayer, and has generously engaged to add his skill and labour to the gift of the ground.

It is estimated that the expense of materials and the wages of a joiner, (not having one of that trade amongst them,) for making window-frames, door, &c., will not exceed ONE HUNDRED POUNDS.

Persuaded of the generosity, benevolence and liberality of their Unitarian brethren, they venture to make this appeal; and, convinced it will not be in vain, they look forward with confidence to such assistance as will justify them in raising a temple dedicated to the only true God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and of all mankind.

M. HARDING.

October 14, 1824.

P. S. Contributions to this object will be thankfully received by Rev. M. Harding, Cranbrook; Thomas Hornby, Esq. Deputy Treasurer, and Rev. W. J. Fox, Secretary to the Unitarian Fund.

The Unitarian Fund has contributed 10*l.*, and a Lady, by Rev. R. Aspland, 2*l.* Should the Unitarian public befriend this object, a list of the contributors will be inserted on the cover of the Monthly Repository.

*Presbyterian (Seceding) Synod of Ireland.*

On Tuesday, the 6th instant, the Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name of Seceders, met in the Meeting-house of the First Congregation of Belfast. The meeting was opened with a sermon from the Rev. Dr. Gamble, of Ramelton, Moderator, from Acts xx. 28: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

The evening of the first day of meeting was spent in solemn prayer and praise. The early part of Wednesday was occupied in receiving reports of Presbyteries.

On the same day, two deputations, one from the Joint Boards of Managers and Visitors of the Belfast Academical Institution, and the other from the Board of Faculty, were introduced to the notice of the Synod. The former consisted of Dr. Tennent and John Barnett, Esq.; the latter of Professors Hincks and Thompson. The address of the former was read by the Synod's Clerk, and the deputation heard with attention and interest. Mr. Barnett gave a detailed account of the proceedings of a deputation sent from that seminary to confer with his Majesty's Government on the subject of pecuniary assistance. The address from the Faculty was also read, and gave general satisfaction.

The Synod agreed unanimously to support and encourage that infant establishment, and appointed two or three of their members to prepare a suitable and respectful answer to both the addresses, and to embody in them their sentiments respecting the institution and a home education, especially as they understood an investigation, on the part of Government, was about to take place into the entire management of the institution.

The Synod also expressed themselves to be satisfied with the diligence, attention and abilities of the different Professors and Teachers employed in that establishment.—There were also suggested some improvements in the course of collegiate study, in regard to their own young men, in order to afford them time and opportunity to acquire a knowledge of the Hebrew language, without which they expected no general certificate should be given to any of their students.

On the same day was presented to the Synod a deputation from the Scottish Missionary Society, consisting of the Rev. Mr. Brotherston, of the General Assembly, and the Rev. Mr. Thompson, of the Secession Synod, who detailed the object and nature of the mission. The Synod

heartily concurred in the sentiments expressed by the deputation, and promised to give the mission their warmest support.

The remainder of Wednesday and part of Thursday were employed in matters of a local nature, and what could excite no general interest.

The greater part of Thursday and Friday was spent in discussing the subject of the Proclamation of Banns. On this subject, a diversity, both of opinion and practice, had existed for some time past in the Synod. To devise, if possible, some scheme that would at once meet the wishes of both parties, and prevent any irregularity, seemed to be the object of the great majority of the members. The matter underwent a thorough investigation, and the discussion was, perhaps, unnecessarily protracted. Every member was heard, and every one supported and maintained his own view of the subject with a becoming steadfastness, and at the same time with the best of feeling towards those whose sentiments were different.

Several enactments were made in regard to marriage—such as consent of parents, &c., with heavy penalties in case of infraction on the part of any one minister of that body.

The Rev. John Rogers read reasons for fasting and thanksgiving, for the current year; and the Synod enjoined their members to observe the same, if at all possible, in the last week of November.

The remaining part of the meeting was chiefly employed in receiving Reports of Committees, and discussing overtures and other matters relating to the order and discipline of the body, which, though useful, and of great importance to the people of their charge, cannot be regarded of such general interest as to merit public insertion in the columns of a newspaper.

The Synod are to hold their next Annual Meeting in Belfast. We understand that the Moderator of the Seceding Synod, for the time being, is placed on the same footing, in academical institution, as the Moderator of the General Synod of Ulster.—*Dublin Evening Post.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE Trustees of Mr. Coward's Fund for the Education of Dissenting Ministers have appointed the Rev. JOHN TOWNSEND, of Bermondsey, Trustee in the place of the late Mr. Philips, of Clapham (see Obituary, p. 365). The other Trustees are the Rev. Thomas Tayler; Dr. W. B. Collyer; and James Gibson, Esq.

*Wolverhampton Case.*—The cause of the Rev. Alexander Fletcher and the United Associate Synod, is now before

the Court of Chancery. We take notice of it only for the sake of putting upon record a reflection of the Lord Chancellor's on the Wolverhampton Case, which heretofore occupied so many of our pages. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, on behalf of the Trustees, said there was a case reported in 3 Merivale 353, the Attorney-General v. Pearson, which bore upon the point (the force of the trust-deed). His Lordship had there declared, that "it is the duty of the Court to administer the trust in such a manner as best could establish the usage as a matter of implied contract between the members of that congregation." Here, therefore, a comprehensive principle was introduced, and was most applicable to the present case. The LORD CHANCELLOR remembered, that, in the case cited by the learned Counsel, the parties differed about the doctrine of the Trinity. The difficulty there, if he recollected rightly, was this—that they could not make out the usage, and that an inquiry was to be instituted as to what was the usage. *The congregation, at last, however, had the good sense to find out that the Court of Chancery was the worst place in the world to find out such a usage.*

#### *The Situation of Protestants in France compared with that of Catholics in England.*

(From the *Etoile*, a Paris Newspaper.)

*The law in England is made for the maintenance of the Protestant religion.* In France,\* on the contrary, notwithstanding the small number of Protestants, the hostility of their principles to all authority, and the novelty of their existence, *the law is equal for all.* It is a principle in England, that all religions which differ from the religion of the State, ought to be destroyed. In France, far from being destroyed, they are protected, and even supported, at the expense of the Public Treasury. In England, Protestants, considered as the friends of the new system, are distinguished by the most eminent prerogatives; and the Catholics, who form a third part of the population, are an outcast people. They are a children disinherited by their father, excluded from all marks of confidence, and from every pursuit which leads to honour and fortune. They bear all the burdens of the State, and share none of its advantages.

In France the twenty-nine-thirtieths of the population attached to the religion of the State do not enjoy the slightest exclusive privilege. Protestants are admissible to all public posts, and, in fact, hold them to an extent beyond the proportion of their number. They are

electors, and eligible equally with Catholics, who frequently return them, without inquiring into their religious faith. There are among them Peers, Deputies, Generals of Division, Prefects, Presidents of the Royal Courts, Councillors of State and of the First Tribunals, Mayors, &c. We have even seen, both under the old and the new regime, several Protestants in the French Ministry; whilst England would be alarmed, and think herself on the brink of ruin, if a single Catholic were to enter the King's Council or occupy an important office.

In the British Empire the Protestant clergy live only upon the spoils of the ancient church—they enjoy immense property, founded by Catholics and for Catholics, who little imagined that these benefices, the fruit of their pious donations, would one day pass into the hands of their enemies, and be employed against the donors. Besides, the Catholics who have outlived oppression, or who are still tolerated, are compelled to support their Bishops and Priests, and to build, at their own expense, humble chapels by the side of the temples which have been taken from them. They are forced too, besides paying the ecclesiastical tax—tithes—to a clergy foreign to their creed, which provides for none of their spiritual wants, to contribute to the building of Anglican Churches, which they never enter, and which are not even frequented by Protestants. In France, on the contrary, the Catholic clergy, although reduced to a slender hire—a poor compensation of their confiscated property—have not taken a farthing from the Protestants. There are even given to the latter Catholic temples, and, where there are none, they receive aid to construct new ones; none of their property has been confiscated; they enjoy in peace what they possessed, and their ministers receive a salary from the Government, although they cannot claim it by any title of indemnity, and this salary exceeds that of Catholic Rectors, who are very differently occupied. We will not inquire whether this is right or wrong—we will not attempt to decide whether the toleration of a religion which is not that of the State, or even the protection of it in the event of its being troubled, ought, in strict propriety, to extend to favours and direct support—we will merely report facts, establish a point of comparison, and shew the respective positions of the Protestants in France and the Catholics in England.

Notwithstanding all this, and the liberty of the former, France still passes for fanatical, intolerant and persecuting; and under this view the English and German papers are filled with invectives



against her, whilst, notwithstanding the state of oppression of seven millions of Catholics, England passes in the eyes of the multitude for the classical country of toleration, and the generous protector of civil and religious liberty.

**PARLIAMENTARY.**

*Petition of Mr. Blunt, complaining of Calumnies against Roman Catholics, in a Pamphlet circulated by the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."*

**HOUSE OF COMMONS.**

MAY 28, 1824.

Lord ALTHORP presented a petition from Mr. Blunt, a Roman-Catholic gentleman, complaining of the conduct of a clergyman, in circulating among his (Mr. Blunt's) tenants, a pamphlet containing false and scandalous imputations on Roman Catholics. This pamphlet was printed some years ago for the Protestant Chartered Schools in Ireland, but had been subsequently withdrawn, and was now again brought into circulation by the Society calling itself the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. It contained all those false and scandalous imputations on the Roman Catholic religion, which had been solemnly disclaimed by the six Catholic Universities.—Mr. Blunt had taken the oath of allegiance, and solemnly disclaimed all the tenets which were imputed to him in this pamphlet. In presenting this petition he (Lord A.) could not but observe, that he thought the House would do right in expressing its disapprobation of this attempt to impute base and disloyal principles to the Catholics, whose loyalty and exemplary conduct had been recognized by the Legislature. Neither Mr. Blunt nor any other Catholic had a right to complain of a Protestant minister, who endeavoured to convince others of the truth of the doctrines of the Church of England; but he had a right to complain of a clergyman of the Church of England who disseminated a scandalous pamphlet in his neighbourhood, for the purpose of making him odious in the eyes of his fellow-subjects. The conduct of the Society for the propagation of Christian Knowledge was still more culpable; for they ought to have known that this pamphlet had been withdrawn by the Chartered Schools in Ireland, as containing injurious imputations on the Catholics, which had been solemnly disclaimed.

Mr. Secretary PEEL said, that as he was not aware that he had ever seen this pamphlet, and as he knew nothing of the clergyman alluded to, he could say little on this subject. If this clergyman, or any other individual or society had circu-

lated a pamphlet, the object of which was to sow religious animosities, he could only say, that such an act met with his decided disapprobation. He did recollect that the Protestant Chartered Schools in Ireland, formerly used a catechism which was liable to objection, and which had been subsequently withdrawn. He should be sorry to find that any public institution had again circulated a publication, which had been withdrawn in consequence of its objectionable character by the Protestant Society in Ireland. From the frequent experience, however, which he had had in matters of this kind, he thought it would be right for the House to suspend its judgment, until the fact were ascertained. He repeated, that if any clergyman of the Church of England had taken the course of which the petitioner complained, it was impossible for him (Mr. P.) to give his approbation to such a proceeding.

Mr. PHILLIPS bore testimony to the highly respectable and amiable character of the petitioner. He thought the conduct of the Society, calling itself a Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, could not be too strongly reprobated. It appeared that they had printed and circulated a scandalous pamphlet, imputing to the great body of the Roman Catholics tenets and principles which they had disclaimed upon oath, for the express purpose of exciting hatred and persecution against a large portion of their fellow-countrymen.

Mr. CURWEN, as a member of the Society, expressed his unwillingness to believe the accuracy of the statement which had been just made. He trusted the charge would turn out, upon inquiry, to be unfounded.

Sir JOHN NEWPORT said, he would take upon himself to say that the pamphlet in question was printed by the Society's printer, circulated by their booksellers, and appeared upon the face of it to be circulated by their authority and sanction. He could conceive nothing more disgraceful, than that a public Institution, the professed object of which was to promote Christian Knowledge, of which they ought to consider Christian charity a main ingredient, should give fresh circulation to a publication, containing slanderous imputations on the Roman Catholics, which had been disclaimed upon oath—a publication which had been withdrawn from the Chartered Schools of Ireland by the Protestants themselves.

Sir F. BURDETT said a few words in so low a tone, as to be inaudible in the gallery.

The petition was ordered to lie on the table.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Nineteenth Report of the British and Foreign School Society to the General Meeting, May 10, 1824, with an Appendix. 8vo. 2s.

Unitarian Christianity defended; being a Reply to the Revs. Abraham Scott, T. Allin, and W. France; Mr. Richard Carlile; and the Revs. Joseph Fox and Wm. Jones. By George Harris. 2s. 6d.

A Commentary on the Vision of Zechariah the Prophet, with a corrected Translation and Critical Notes. By John Stonard, D.D., Rector of Aldringham, Lancashire. 8vo.

Seventy Plain Psalm Tunes, arranged for the Organ and Piano Forte, and adapted to Selections from the Old and New Versions. By George Drummond, Mus. Bac. Oxon. 5s. Half-bound.

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

An Historical Inquiry into the Principal Circumstances and Events relative to the late Emperor Napoleon; in which are investigated the Charges brought against the Government and Conduct of that eminent Individual. By Barclay Mountney. 8vo. 16s.

A Fragment on the Organization of the World; containing Observations on the Mosaic History of the Creation. By Thomas Snelson. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Letter to the Committee of Magistrates of the County of York, appointed to alter and enlarge the County Jail. By Sydney Smith, A. M. 8vo. 1s.

Scholia in Platonem, collata ad Codices optimos, ab Immanuele Bekhero. 8vo 7s.

Temæi Sophistæ Lexicon Vocum Platoniarum, ex codice MS. Sangermanensi, nunc primum edidit atque Animadversionibus illustravit, David Ruhnkenius. 8vo. 8s.

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

A Discourse on the Rise, Progress, Peculiar Objects and Importance of Political Economy; containing an Outline of a Course of Lectures on the Principles

and Doctrines of that Science. By J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. 8vo. 5s.

Bichat's General Anatomy, applied to Physiology and the Practice of Medicine; translated from the last French Edition, by Constant Coffyn, revised and corrected by George Calvert, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Notitia Historica: containing Tables, Calendars and Miscellaneous Information for the Use of Historians, Antiquaries and the Legal Profession. By Nicholas Harris Nicolas, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Author of the "Life of Wm. Davison, Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth," &c. 8vo. 12s.

An Elementary Course of Gymnastic Exercises, intended to develop and improve the Physical Powers of Man, now introduced into various National and Private Establishments in England, and illustrated by Thirty Copper-plate Figures. By Capt. P. H. Clias, formerly Director of the Gymnastic Central Establishments at Berne, and now Professor of Gymnastic Exercises in the Royal Military Institutions of Chelsea, Sandhurst, &c. 7s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Arithmetic and Elements of Algebra. By John Walker, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Life of Law, of Lauriston, Projector of the Mississippi Scheme; containing a detailed Account of the Nature, Rise and Progress of this extraordinary Joint Stock Company, &c. By J. P. Wood, Esq. 12mo. 6s.

The Life of Samuel Johnson, D.D., the First President of King's College, New York. With an Appendix of Original Letters of Bishop Berkeley, Archbishop Secker, Bishop Lowth and others. By Thomas Bradbury Chandler, D.D., formerly Rector of St. John's Church, Elizabeth Town, New Jersey. 8vo. 6s.

The Works of Samuel Stennett, D.D., now first collected: with some Account of his Life and Writings. By W. Jones. 3 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Creation's Friend: Lines addressed to, and published with the approbation of, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. By W. R. Hawkes. 3d.

Irish Melodies. No. IX. By Thomas Moore, Esq.: with Symphonies and Accompaniments, by H. R. Bishop. 15s.

Theodric: a Domestic Tale. And other Poems. By Thomas Campbell, Esq. Foolscap 8vo. 8s.

*Horæ Poeticæ*; or, Effusions of Candour. By a British Officer. Post 8vo. Extra Boards. 5s.

*Woodland Echoes*; or Poetical Sketches of the Scenery and Objects in that highly Picturesque Vale, through which the Thames flows from Medmenham Abbey to Cliefden. With Notes and other Poems. By William Tyler. (Line-Engraved Frontispiece by Allen) 6s.

*Alice Allen, and other Tales.* By Alexander Wilson. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

*Gilmour*; or, The Last Lockinge. A Novel. 3 Vols. 12mo. 17. 1s.

*Lasting Impressions.* A Novel. By Mrs. Joanna Carey. 3 Vols. 12mo. 17. 1s.

*Rothelan*; a Romance of the English Histories. By the Author of "Annals of the Parish," &c. 3 Vols. 12mo. 21s.

*A Second Volume of the Scrap Book*; a Collection of Amusing and Striking Pieces in Prose and Verse, with occasional Remarks and Contributions. By John M'Diarmid. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

*A Second Series of Highways and Byways*; or, Tales of the Road Side. Picked up in the French Provinces by a Walking Gentleman. 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 27s.

*The Contributions of the late Miss Jane Taylor to a Periodical Work, under the Signature of Q. Q.* With some Pieces not before published. 2 Vols. 12mo. 9s.

*Walladmor*, "freely Translated from the English of Walter Scott." Translated from the German. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 17. 1s.

*James Forbes*: a Tale, founded on Facts. Crown 8vo. 7s.

*Tales of Irish Life*; illustrative of the Manners, Habits and Condition of the People. Engravings on Wood from Designs by G. Cruikshank. 2 Vols. 12s.

*The Eternity of Divine Mercy established, and unconditional Reprobation discarded*: in Remarks upon a Sermon of Dr. Adam Clarke's in the Methodist Magazine for September 1824. By W. Catton, Pastor of the Baptist Church, Uley, Gloucestershire.

*Suicide, and its Antidotes*: a Series of Anecdotes and Narratives, with Suggestions on Mental Distress. By the Rev. S. Piggott, A. M. 6s.

*Considerations on Negro-Slavery, with Authentic Reports illustrative of the Actual Condition of the Negroes in Demerara, &c.* By Alexander M'Donnell, Esq., Secretary to the Committee of Inhabitants of Demerara. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*A Project of a New Penal Code for the State of Louisiana.* By Edward Livingstone, Member of the House of Representatives. 6s.

*A View of the Present State of the Salmon and Channel Fisheries, and of*

*the Statute Laws by which they are regulated, shewing that it is to the Defects of the latter that the present Scarcity of Fish is to be attributed. Comprehending also, the Natural History and Habits of the Salmon, &c.* By J. Cornish, Esq. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

*The Law of Turnpikes*; or, an Analytical Arrangement of, and illustrative Commentaries on, all the general Acts relative to the Turnpike Roads of England. The whole being in Answer to the following Questions:—1. What are the General Acts now in force? 2. What is the Extent of them? 3. How do they affect every Turnpike Road? By Wm. Cobbett, Jun., Student of Lincoln's Inn. 3s. 6d.

*The Glasgow Mechanics' Magazine.* Vol. I. (Likeness of Watt, and above Fifty other Engravings.) 8vo. 8s.

*A Narrative of the Condition of the Manufacturing Population, and the Proceedings of Government which led to the State Trials in Scotland, in 1817, with a detailed Account of the System of Espionage adopted at that Period at Glasgow, &c.* Also, a Summary of similar Proceedings in other Parts, to the Execution of Thistlewood and others for High Treason in 1820. By Alexander B. Richmond. 6s.

*Observations on the System of Theology taught by the Rev. Dr. Hawker.* By Isaiah Birt. 1s. 6d.

*Nouveaux Cantiques Chrétiens pour les Assemblées des Enfants de Dieu*; composés par César Malan, Ministre de Christ. 32mo. 2s.

#### *Almanacks, &c., for 1825.*

*Time's Telescope*; or, a Complete Guide to the Almanack. Frontispiece and Christmas Carol set to Music. Extra Boards. 9s.

*The Christian Remembrancer, a Pocket Book.* (Profits to Missionary Purposes.) An Engraving. Boards. 2s. 6d.

*Forget Me Not, a Christmas Present.* Twelve Embellishments.

*The Cambridge University Almanack.* Imperial Sheet. 4s. 6d.

*The Prophetic Almanack*: in elegant Red and Black. 2s. 6d.

*The Catholic Ladies' and Gentlemen's Pocket Book, or New Year's Gift for 1825.* Copper-plate Engravings, and Hymn set to Music. Various Prices from 1s. to 6s.

#### *Lord Byron.*

*Lord Byron's Conversations with Capt. Medwin.* 4to. 17. 11s. 6d. Second Edition. 8vo.

*Narrative of Lord Byron's Voyage to Corsica and Sardinia, during the Summer and Autumn of the Year 1821.* Compiled



from Minutes made during the Voyage by the Passengers; and Extracts from the Journal of his Lordship's Yacht, 'The Mazeppa, kept by Capt. Benson, R. N., Commander. Foolscap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Recollections of the Life of Lord Byron, from the Year 1808 to the end of 1814: detailing the Progress of his Literary Career, &c. By the late R. C. Dallas, Esq. 8vo. 15s.

The Parliamentary Speeches of Lord Byron. Printed from the Copies prepared by his Lordship for publication. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Messenian on Lord Byron. By M. Casimir Delavigne. Translated into English Verse, by G. H. Poppleton.

Lord Byron. By Madame Louise Belloc. 8vo.

A Further Exposure of the Mis-statements contained in Mr. Medwin's Pretended Conversations with Lord Byron. 8vo. 1s.

Wanderings of Childe Harolde, a Romance of Real Life, interspersed with Memoirs of the English Wife, &c. By John Harman Bedford, Lieutenant R. N. Author of Views on the Shores of the Black Sea, and who accompanied the Childe in his Wanderings till within a few Months of his Death. 3 Vols. 12mo. 17. 1s.

The Spirit of the Public Journals, for the Year 1824: illustrated with a splendid Engraved Portrait of the late Lord Byron, and Twenty Humorous Designs, by Rowlandson, &c. 10s. 6d.

#### Sermons.

Sermons and Tracts, before separately published, and now collected and uniformly printed. By Daniel Wilson. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 8s.

In which the Connexion is traced between a Belief in the Truths of Revelation, and the Character, Comfort and Prospects of Christians. By Miles Jackson, Minister of St. Paul's, Leeds. Second Edition. With Additional Sermons. 2 Vols. 12mo. 12s.

The Bampton Lectures for the Year 1824; being an Attempt to trace the History and ascertain the Limits of the Secondary and Spiritual Interpretation of

Scripture. By J. J. Conybeare, M. A., Prebendary of York and Vicar of Bath Easton; late Student of Christ Church, and Professor of Anglo Saxon and of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 8vo.

On the Internal Evidence of Christianity, as displayed in the Connexions of Natural and Revealed Religion, and the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul and a Future State. By Charles Mayo, LL.B., Rector of Beching Stoke and Huish, Wilts. 8vo. 7s.

Sixteen, on Practical and Doctrinal Subjects. By B. T. H. Cole, A. M., Rector of Warbleton, Sussex. 8vo. 8s.

#### Single.

The Testimony of Jesus to the Supremacy and Free Grace of God: preached at the Unitarian Chapel, Kendal. By John Harrison. 12mo. 8d., or Ten Shillings per Score.

The Origin of Frauds detected; or, a Brief Commentary on Paley's Exposition of "The Law of Honour," preached at Laura Chapel, Bath, Oct. 31, 1824. By E. W. Grinfield, M. A., Minister of Laura Chapel. 1s.

A Charge to the Clergy of the Deanery of Sarum, at his Primary Visitation, July and August, 1824. By Hugh Pearson, D. D., Domestic Chaplain to his Majesty and Dean of Salisbury. 1s.

An Assize Sermon at Winchester, August 3, 1824. By John Haygarth, Rector of Upham, Hants. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Preached at the Consecration of the Lord Bishop of Jamaica and of the Lord Bishop of Barbadoes. By A. M. Campbell, M. A. 4to. 2s.

Preached in Alnwick Church to Society of Sons of Clergy, June 3, 1824. By H. B. Tristram, A. M., Vicar of Eglington. 6d.

A Charge, at the Visitation of Thomas Ebrington, D. D., &c., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, June, 1824. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Christian Spirit which is essential to the Triumph of the Kingdom of God: a Discourse, delivered at the Annual General Meeting of the Baptist Missionary Society, June 23, 1824. By Christopher Anderson. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Drs. J. Jones and Dr. J. P. Smith: from Mrs. Mary Hughes: from Messrs. J. T. Rutt; W. Frend; Joseph Dare; and J. C. Wallace: from A. B.; A. B. (2); M. A. P.; E.; I. W.; R. (1); N. E.; W. P.; H.; I. H.; A. S.; T. F. B.; and M. S.: and from Tyro; Old-fashioned Unitarian; Ruris Colonus; A Friend to Sunday-Schools; Te Tace; Constant Reader; R.; Vectis; Philalethes; An Old Subscriber; and Daleth.

*Errata.*—P. 618, col. 1, line 24, for "little," read *still*.

P. 627, in obituary of Mrs. S. WALDRON, for "May 9," read *October 9*.