

# THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXX.]

FEBRUARY, 1825.

[Vol. XX.]

*Mons. Sismondi on the Political, Moral and Religious State of the British Possessions in India.*

SIR,  
*Birmingham,  
January 28, 1825.*

A LATE number of the *Revue Encyclopédique*, published at Paris, contains a valuable paper, written by the celebrated Sismondi, on the state of our vast possessions in India. The article is a review of two English publications on the same subject, which are full of the most enlightened views and important information.\* The following extract from the review, will, I trust, be deemed worthy of a place in the *Monthly Repository*; the readers of which will be not a little interested in learning what is thought by foreigners of talent and disinterestedness on a subject which so deeply involves our national character as the friends of humanity and civilization. The extract closes with a tribute of admiration to the great and virtuous Rammohun Roy.

Y.

How important is it that the East Indies should attract the public attention! This immense empire comprehends the most populous and the richest part of Asia: with its subjects and its vassals, it contains nearly eighty millions of inhabitants; and as the English have all the advantages to be derived from superiority in the arts of warfare and government, it may perhaps extend over the rest of Asia. Nevertheless, a law which would injure the interests of Bristol or Manchester would much sooner inflame the British nation, than if it overwhelmed the whole of India. This is not surprising: Hindostan is separated from England by the whole terrestrial globe. The accounts which

are received from thence are often six months in arriving: the communications between the inhabitants of the two countries are so expensive as to become rare: a long and difficult study is necessary in order to have an idea of the organization of a country so completely different from any with which we are acquainted; and this study is rendered still more difficult from the number of words and names, drawn from the unknown languages of India, which we cannot succeed in pronouncing, and which we cannot easily remember.

Many English, undoubtedly, go to India, but scarce one in ten escapes the pernicious influence of the climate; scarce one in ten returns to his native country with a fortune bought at the expense of health and activity, which have given place to languor and weakness. These veterans of India form, however, almost the only individuals who understand sufficiently the affairs of India to take a lively interest in them. Lastly, the India Company—which is placed between the nation and its subjects, which forbids all colonization to the English, and has long prohibited all commerce, so that England has hardly any advantages from its immense Asiatic possessions—has succeeded in making the English almost completely uninterested in the affairs of India.

Nevertheless, in spite of all these disadvantages, the public opinion of England has still a good effect upon India. It is a lighthouse, whose rays can hardly pierce the darkness at so immense a distance; although they point out some rocks wherever they do penetrate. The social system of Hindostan is little better than that of the West Indies; but it is advancing. The good which has been done in India, has been demanded from power by public opinion: greater good is and will be demanded for it still. The national wishes with regard to India are still confused and feeble;

\* Two Letters to Sir C. Forbes on the Suppression of Public Discussion in India, &c. 1824. Richardson, Cornhill. Reprinted in the *Oriental Herald* for Aug.—An Inquiry into the Expediency of the Colonial System for the Government of India. 1822. Richardson.

but they will be enlightened, they will be strengthened, and they will finally obtain what they have once required.

India, thanks to the management of the Company, does not enrich the English. This fact is the result of observation, established by M. Say and by all who have studied the affairs of the Company. This will sooner or later cause the dissolution of the Company, and the complete reunion of the country it governs to the British empire. But this consideration is quite secondary, when compared with the duty of governors. The government of a state is not a commercial undertaking, of which the profits can be calculated by pounds, shillings and pence: it is an august task, a sacred duty to be fulfilled. In whatever manner this power may have fallen into a person's hands, his duties are still the same: he ought to employ his power solely for the good of the people he governs; for its good, not only physically, but morally; for its improvement, as well as its tranquillity or opulence. The Company is accountable to England, and England to the rest of mankind, for from seventy to eighty millions of human beings, of which they can, and therefore ought, to make men. The duties of England towards India will not be accomplished till these men are as virtuous, as happy, as free, as those whom she glories in having made so at home. To raise subjects thus high from a state of profound degradation, must undoubtedly require from the English nation time, and a great length of time. She will not be reproached on this ground, if she employs the time well; but it is necessary for her to advance, and to wish to advance, whilst the Company wishes to remain stationary. And most commonly the Government wishes it too, though there have been glorious exceptions, particularly during the late administration of the Marquis of Hastings. It belongs to the English nation to wish more fervently than either, for the welfare and advancement of humanity.

The subjects of Britain in India are of two religions: the great mass of the ancient inhabitants worship Brama; the descendants of the Mogul conquerors are Mahometans. Other religions are professed only by foreign-

ers. Experience has sufficiently shewn that both the religions professed by the natives are hostile to the development of moral sentiments, to the progress of intellect, to the love of country, and to that of liberty.

But for experience, better hopes might have been entertained of Islamism; a religion founded upon the worship of one God, a pure Spirit, all-powerful, all-good; which makes charity the first duty of the faithful. But despotism and priestcraft have dreadfully changed the religion of Mahomet. Wherever it is professed, a savage fanaticism is found; a hatred of all intellectual and moral improvement; and external observances put in the place of moral duties. The religion of Brama is still more fatal to the human species. It has so constantly substituted ritual observances for virtues, that its professors do not think of seeking any tie between religion and morality. A great number of its customs are atrocious; others are obscene; and its most constant effect is to efface humane feelings from the heart. But, especially, it is founded upon the division of the people into castes; upon the invincible aversion that it establishes between them; upon the repugnance which it inspires between one man and another of a different caste; upon that idea of offending the Divinity which it attaches to the progress of each individual towards a superior state. The religion of Brama enchains human nature; it rivets the irons which fix each to his place, and which must for ever impede civilization.

The English really bear to their Indian subjects the relation which the absolute governments of Europe pretend to bear to theirs, when they arrogate to themselves the right of judging what is fit for man and what is not; when they speak of the people as if they themselves, instead of being a part of the people, were angels. The English are a superior race to the Indians; they know better than the inferior race what is proper for them; they may properly aspire to be the tutors, the instructors of their subjects; whilst our governors, chosen from among ourselves, ought to consider themselves only as our representatives. However, the English have thought that the sovereign power with

which they are invested, does not extend, and ought not to extend, to the command of the religious opinions of their subjects. They have respected, they have protected, the national religions. This was their duty as governors, and they have performed it. But this duty was not contrary to their duty, as men and as Christians, of enlightening their subjects, raising them gently to a purer religion, and preserving them, by public authority, from actions contrary to all morality, to all progress in civilization, which the law has always a right to repress.

The English are now animated by a religious zeal, an ardour for proselytism, which has no parallel in their own history, or in that of other nations. The consequence is, that even their language is seldom free from that affectation of devotion which is called *cant*, and which sometimes excites distrust. Nevertheless, this national feeling is completely stifled by the interest which it is believed the India Company has in preventing the progress of civilization and the development of the minds of its subjects. When Mr. Wilberforce proposed, in 1813, to Parliament to endeavour to introduce Christianity into India, as a source of other ameliorations, Mr. Marsh, who undertook to refute him, and to shew the danger of the introduction of Christianity, insisted particularly "upon the advantage of the institution of castes to repress the restlessness of ambition and the impatience at obedience." Mr. Charles Grant, who, in concert with his brother, Mr. Robert Grant, has shewn himself one of the most skilful and constant apologists for the India Company, is not less explicit in his desire to preserve the religion of the Hindoos; to preserve also, by its means, that part of the system which prevents most efficaciously all progress of civilization, all enlargement of the mind. "The institution of castes," says he, "constitutes a source of security for the permanence of our government in the East Indies which cannot be equalled in the history of the world; and as it is not probable that mankind will ever see such another phenomenon, it would be a great pity were we to take measures which might destroy it prematurely. Here the maxim which all

politicians maintain, *divide et impera*, has been established in practice and consecrated by the hand of time." Such is the theory of men in power, and their practice is conformed to it. They continue to permit, if not to favour, the sacrifice of widows upon the funeral pile, with the dreadful accompaniments which have very lately occupied the public attention. Five or six hundred women are the victims every year in British India, of an odious rite, which the civil government may and ought to prosecute as a murder. A glorious reform has, however, begun to spread among the Hindoos. A Bramin, whom those who know India agree in representing as one of the most virtuous and enlightened of men, RAMMOHUN ROY, is exerting himself to restore his countrymen to the worship of the true God, and to the union of morality and religion. His flock is small, but increases continually. He communicates to the Hindoos all the progress that thought has made amongst the Europeans. He is among them, by a much juster title than the Missionaries, the true Apostle of Christianity. He had undertaken a periodical publication in his native tongue, not with any views of interest, to which his large fortune makes him a stranger, but to extend the doctrines of civilization. He was encouraged in this noble undertaking by the last Governor of India, the Marquis of Hastings; but in the month of April 1823, Mr. Adam, the new (*pro tempore*) Governor-General, in concert with the Judge of Calcutta, Macnaghten, suppressed all liberty of the press, and obliged the illustrious RAMMOHUN ROY to renounce his journal.

SIR,  
IN this day of scientific discovery, invention and improvement, changes are insensibly taking place of which we are scarcely aware. I have sometimes amused myself with thinking how many of the common-places of eloquence are thus, one after another, taken away. Many a simile and many a trope which once figured in the pages of the learned, are now abandoned to the humblest class of writers, and will soon be found (thanks to Mechanics' Institutes and similar esta-



blishments, together with the cheap press) unfit even for them. New and philosophical images may indeed be started; Dugald Stewart has led the way in this course of eloquence; but it requires great delicacy of conception and felicity of language to preserve such figures from the appearance of pedantry on the one side, and of vulgarity on the other. It can only be by some happy artifice that we are led to connect elegance with the steam-engine, the gasometer or the spinning-jenny. The present oratorical Secretary of State for the Home Department never drew a figure, whatever money he may have derived, from the last-named manufacturing engine.

A collection of *obsolete* eloquence would be a valuable curiosity. I have now and then pencilled my books for materials. Take an example of a beautiful illustration of Lord Bolingbroke's, which Capt. Parry has dashed to the ground and broken in pieces. "There was a time," says he, speaking as a philosopher, *ex cathedra*, "when navigators bent themselves obstinately to find a passage by the north-east or the north-west to Cathay. Neither frequent losses nor constant disappointment could divert them from these enterprises, as long as the fashionable folly prevailed. The passage was not found; the fashion wore out; and the folly ceased. The bounds of navigation were set: and sufficient warning was both given and taken against any further attempts in those dark and frozen regions." (Works, 8vo., I. 277, 278.) Alas! for mere eloquence: but the illustration was fine, as will be seen by its application. "Many such (attempts) there are in the intellectual world: and many such attempts have been made there with no better success. But the consequence has not been the same. Neither examples nor experience have had their effect on philosophers, more fool-hardy than mariners: and where the former wandered to no purpose three thousand years ago, they wander to no purpose, at least to no good purpose, still."

Blair, if I remember right, has spoken contemptuously of the style of Bolingbroke's Philosophical Works; but Blair never wrote a passage equal to this, which is not one of Boling-

broke's best. Good as eloquence is, truth is still better, in the judgment of  
A BOOK-LOVER.

Plymouth,

October 10, 1824.

SIR,  
A SHORT time ago, a friend put into my hand an American newspaper which both excited surprise and afforded me pleasure; for the newspapers of that inquiring country appear to have objects in view which do not come within the plan of our English editors. This paper is called "The Evening Gazette," devoted, among other objects, "to Literature and Piety." It is printed at Boston. This number, which forms a part of the tenth volume, contains a short essay on "the Faith of the Heart," copied from The Unitarian Miscellany. I shall call the attention of your readers to the sentiments contained in this essay, marking them with inverted commas; but will first mention, that not only is this paper aiming at the spread of Unitarian principles, but that there is also one published at Philadelphia, called "The Christian, devoted to Religion, Morals and Literature," the character of which is distinctly marked by several of its pieces, especially by one lying before me, on the subject of "Jesus made both Lord and Christ." I copy from this number the following article of intelligence, which will gratify many who will read it in your pages:

"A week or two ago we stated, that at least three-fourths of the 'Friends' in this city were Unitarians. Several respectable members of that body have since called upon us, and told us, we should have been nearer the truth if we had said nine-tenths; and we make this correction at their request."

I apprehend we may form nearly the same conclusion respecting the Society of Quakers in New York, from the communication of Bereus, Vol. XIX. pp. 544 and following.

*The Faith of the Heart.*

What is belief? A question surely of no mean importance, since thinking must go before acting, and faith must precede our works. Why do we pursue a chosen line of conduct, but because we believe that it will lead us



to an object which we are desirous of obtaining? Why form a regular system of living, and shape our course by an established rule, but because we have duly weighed the value of the offers which have been proposed to us, and have made our choice of that which we prefer? There is not an intellectual being, in whom the mental powers are in activity, that is not moved in what he does by a faith of some sort: but it must not be supposed that faith or belief is an unique principle which admits of no different shadings.

"Belief or faith, strictly defined, is the assent of the understanding to a stated and intelligible proposition. But this assent may be given to error as well as to truth; and it may be rendered when it ought to be withheld, and withheld when it ought to be rendered: for the decisions of the understanding are not infallible."

We have only to examine the different classes of mankind in order to be convinced that the determinations of the human mind, even those which arise from and depend upon belief, are as various, and assume as many colours, as the rainbow; that they also incline towards and merge into one another, and, like itself, depend upon the peculiar circumstances which gave them birth. Man can believe only as circumstances arise to afford him information; and as these circumstances are indefinitely various in the different walks of life, and in the different climates of our earth, so man believes upon very different grounds, and forms an infinite variety of creeds and systems of acting. Leaving all other varieties of faith for the present, we will consider that there are two strong points of difference in the faith of men; for there is a faith which rests altogether on feeling, and there is a faith of which the heart cordially participates. Mere thinking may suffice to form a creed, and to make a firm and stubborn believer; but it is *with the heart* that man believeth unto righteousness. Now, the object of religion, it will surely be admitted, is to form the soul to righteousness; therefore it becomes a matter of absolute necessity, that, in forming that faith which is to be the foundation of a religious life, we believe not with the understanding alone, but also with

the heart, with the consent of all the powers and sympathies of the man, with the full approbation of his intellectual faculties, and of those tender and amiable feelings which have their seat in the heart.

"By the faith of the heart is to be understood, in the first place, a faith which does not terminate in speculation."

We are quite sure there are many professors of religion whose faith terminates where it begins, in a simple assent to certain principles which have been offered under the sanction of some powerful authority. Mankind at large, as well in Pagan and Mahometan countries as in those that are Christian, receive their faith in this way. It is with them a mere matter of social feeling, a habit which begins to be formed in early life, grows up with their growth and strengthens with their strength. The intellect is little called on to judge whether their system be right or wrong; they have never called in question the correctness of their fathers' faith: the very thought of a different profession wounds them: they wonder, they know not why, that any of their neighbours can avow another faith. Ask them whence this wonder arises, they can give no other answer but that they are going with the stream of public opinion, and not a doubt can be entertained that public opinion is correct. Little has occurred in their lives to induce a thought of the comparative excellence of systems; and they are capable of no other sentiment except that of astonishment, accompanied by a painful apprehension as to the situation in which a dissenter from their system is placed. These men can assign no legitimate reason of the faith that is in them: I say no legitimate reason, because men of contrary faiths, in kingdoms that patronize contrary opinions, are all in the same condition; but contrary things cannot be true.

"But the religion of the heart is a vital religion; a religion which lives and breathes and moves and acts, which prompts the virtues and regulates the conduct: a religion which tells the heart to beat whenever the blessed names and offices of integrity, purity and justice, are recited: which commands the affections to fly wher-

ever there is a tear flowing which they can wipe away, or a bosom bleeding which they can bind, or a care which they can render lighter by their support, or a sorrow which they can alleviate by their sympathy: a religion which bids its votaries lift a reverend and grateful eye to the Creator for his ceaseless and unspeakable bounties, and then look down again on the world, and endeavour to deserve them.

"To believe with the heart is not to give a cold assent of the head to any truths, but to feel their influence and bow to their authority. Good principles may be received and then forgotten; but he who believes with the heart will not only receive, but retain them, keep them in his heart, and oppose them, whenever there is occasion, to the temptations of the world. Some there are who think it sufficient that they have turned their attention to religion on certain occasions, and honestly subscribed a form of faith, as far as they comprehended it, once in their lives: farther examination or reflection they conceive to be unnecessary; thus making way for pernicious principles and low-bred interests to gain ground until it is too late to correct them. But they who believe with the heart, acquire a habit of recalling at will those principles which they have once acknowledged to be true, and of renewing those impressions which they have ever found to be beneficial; and thus they prevent the admission or continuance of other principles and opposite impressions. Their faith is always by them. In the world it will defend, comfort, cheer, support—and in heaven it will crown them.

"Again, to believe with the heart is to make our opinions invariably respect the good affections of our nature, and to admit no principles which are opposite to them; not, indeed, to be guided by the heart, but never to offer any violence to its dictates. There is no heresy so dangerous as that which rebels against the innocent and regulated feelings of humanity. There is no schism so dreadful as that which breaks away from the communion and companionship of the heart. There is no belief so widely unchristian and unsound as that which would in the least degree contribute to weak-

en or to sever the bonds of society and the ties of neighbourhood, friendship and affection. That counsel is of Moloch, and not of God, which proclaims war against charity and love. Faith is never glad when Feeling weeps: Religion never speaks of duty to a shuddering bosom: and Christianity disclaims the power which Nature would recoil to exercise."

What, then, shall we say of whole societies of Christians who profess to believe that all but themselves will suffer the everlasting wrath of God, in consequence of sin which they could not prevent, and disobedience over which they had no controul? The language of the Calvinist creed is this: "We believe that this vice, original sin, is a sin which makes all and every man, not even excepting infants in the womb, liable, in the sight of God, to eternal death" (*Gallic*): which in other creeds is worded thus: "Liable to the pains of hell for ever." Such is indeed the tenor of all Calvinistic creeds, which admit of no other relief than this, that some are elected from everlasting, and redeemed by the blood of Christ, and thus made secure of eternal life and happiness; but who they are, and how many, no one can tell. Now, can any one with the heart believe so horrid a doctrine? Can he reconcile it to his feelings, and call his tender affections to approve of what must be the result of such a system, namely, that by far the greater part of the human race—and among them he is compelled, perhaps, to number his nearest and dearest friends, the partners of his love, with whom his sympathetic affections have ever been in unison—shall go away into everlasting punishment? The head of man is often weak; it is much imposed upon by crafty, designing men, and by men whose heads are as weak as his own; and with his head he may believe this doctrine, or any other that appertains to a Moloch or a Juggernaut; but with his heart he cannot believe it. His heart revolts against the belief; and he must effectually close every passage from which the tender affections flow out, before his tongue can dare to confess that such is the serious and approved article of his faith.

"Again, to believe with the heart is to believe ardently, warmly, deeply."

A man may be brought to profess what is in open rebellion against every dictate of the heart. Awed by a great name, or terrified by the awful denunciations of those that are teaching falsehood, the mind may crouch and humble itself before an earthly god, and may in an agony, induced by the conflict of his feelings, be ready to cry out, *I believe—help thou my unbelief*. There is nothing deep in such a profession; there is nothing warm in the feeling with which it is uttered. All is shallow as the noisy stream; all is cold and wretched as the boreal mountain: it is as barren too; as barren of every thing on which human nature can live; as far removed from all social regards, as the wilderness is removed from the "garden of God."

How miserably cold and comfortless has life been often made by a gloomy view of those eternal decrees upon which the happiness and misery of an eternity have been supposed to depend! The language of many a poor deluded Calvinist has been, *Oh! that I could but believe what I am taught, is false*. The judgment has refused its assent. All the best feelings of their frame have revolted against their doctrine. For not one moment would their sympathies grant their approbation; and not one single principle of their entire frame has been engaged in the formation of their creed but their fear: they have been afraid to deny what has been enjoined upon them by an authority they dared not call in question, enforced by arguments they were not prepared to confute.

To many a one within the knowledge of your readers does this description apply. To one, worthy and excellent, does the eye of my memory now carry me, to whom the duties of life, under these painful impressions, were a drudgery, because they led to nothing but tribulation and anguish; to whom the services of religion could do no more than add fuel to the fire of despair; and who could behold in him who was the Author of a present miserable existence, and of that more wretched state for which he is in cruelty training his intelligent offspring, nothing but a stern determination to fulfil his merciless decrees. It is well if, with such views, men can call it

justice; even then the heart tells them it is cruelty.

But let us suppose the disciple of Calvin is one of his more fortunate followers, who has persuaded himself that he has the light within him, that he is renewed by grace, that for him Christ has died, and that his way is clear and his end will be happy. By some fortunate combination or other, this is, I suppose, the more common case: flattering hope will kindle in the human breast, as well in spiritual as in temporal concerns. Does his heart approve the dictates of his religion as they respect the great body of his fellow-creatures; of those, especially, who profess a different faith, and who, on that account alone, he must think will be eternally damned? Does his heart approve of such an opinion? Can he really bless the name of his God, who, with a justice so severe, has singled him out of a large family, and condemned all the others—as good as himself, perhaps a great deal better, and more useful in the stations he has directed them to fill; or, if he has not fiercely condemned them, has passed them by, and suffered them to remain where mercy cannot reach them? Such a man is in general careful not to consult his heart upon such knotty points, and is, above all things, determined to subdue the dictates of nature, and check those risings of compassion which are sometimes too powerful even for his strongest convictions. And then he rebels against his creed, and has recourse to some kind of subterfuge, which will either soften the severity of his doctrine or smother the tender thoughts which spring up. Indeed, of the man that is led away by the delusions of falsehood in his religious profession, it may, according to our views of truth, be said, that either with his heart he does not believe unto righteousness, or that he is in a fluctuating state, suspended between the cruel decisions of his religion and the kind dictates of his heart.

Other reflections might be added to the above to illustrate this most awful subject, but I shall be drawn out to too great a length, and will therefore withhold them, anxious still to offer a solution of what has ever seemed problematical in the character of many



who have adopted an erroneous view of Christian doctrine.

We know that pure Calvinism, carried to its legitimate consequences—or, if any of your readers object to this declaration, I will say Antinomianism—does encourage acts of unrighteousness in many men, while it cherishes acts of virtue in none. I say we know that it does; for we have seen, often and often, that the doctrines of election and of reprobation, when admitted in their full extent, do not fail to produce this effect in a corrupt and wicked mind—and who shall exclude them from such a mind?—for with such, joined to an active imagination, they are most acceptable. But they do not *generally* produce this effect; and why do they not? There are many who hold these doctrines, in our view destructive of all moral distinctions, and yet are patterns of general virtue; and, while their religion teaches that all the actions of their lives are equally corrupt, and I might say vicious; and that none of them, be they what they may, have any merit in the sight of God; they give a decided preference to those which are pious and virtuous, admire them in others, and practise them themselves. There is an incongruity in such a line of conduct too palpable to escape notice. If a man believe from his heart that every thing which he does is alike corrupt, that in the final issue of things it will make no difference in what manner his present life is passed, for that he must owe his salvation to the redemption of the blood of Christ, or cannot obtain it at all, therefore, that his future welfare can be neither promoted nor prevented by any thing or by every thing he can do,—why should he not walk in the ways of his heart and in the sight of his eyes, in the assurance that for these things God will not call him into judgment?

It appears to me that the subject we are now upon explains to us why he does not. I think that while his theological system dictates to him one thing, his heart dictates another. It seems to me there is an open war declared between his creed and his feelings; and that while in his judgment he bows submissively to what he regards the written word of God,

he yields, and he cannot avoid yielding, a quiet submission to those dictates which are written by the finger of God upon his heart.

Happy is it for frail humanity that a weak head cannot always overcome the suggestions of a tender heart, and that the error which so easily obtains a seat in the mind, is not in general powerful enough to counteract those delightful feelings which are made the basis of human excellence, and which alone can make the society of mankind happy upon earth. One cannot help believing that, in order to convince man of his weakness, he is allowed to wander in the deepest mazes of error, and follow all the leadings of a wayward mind, but that a check is provided by his beneficent Creator to the evil that must assuredly arise from his weakness, in those kind affections which are implanted within him, and which no accumulation of falsehood and of bigotry can altogether destroy.

I have seen, Sir, the remarks of "A Calvinist" in your last number (Vol. XIX. p. 536). He writes much about a *consistent Calvinist*. This is a very equivocal term. The shades of what is called Calvinism are varied as the colours of the rainbow; and in whatever line a man may place himself, from the tender violet to the flaming red, I apprehend he thinks himself *consistent*. With his own principles he perhaps is so; but he must allow us to judge, not from his thoughts, which are not open to us, but from the creeds of Calvinistic churches, and catechisms, and those books which were written by the great men who have been held to be oracles of the party. There is *high Calvinism*, which is *proper Calvinism*, and there are modifications of it, which, in truth, are no Calvinism at all. These modified systems have been prevalent for more than two centuries among the Dissenters of England and in the Established Churches, in spite of all their Articles and Confessions of Faith; and they have been held by those respectable characters of the family in which I was born, whose Nonconformity I value, but whose theology, I must think, needed a purging not less efficient than that by which the forms of the Church

were purified by their virtuous energies.

With respect to "the doctrine of Divine influence in the conversion and sanctification of souls," is your correspondent *a stranger in our Jerusalem*, and does he not know that this doctrine has also its various shades; that our most respected friend and champion at Bristol has carried it somewhat farther than many of us can follow him (*Mon. Repos.* XIV. 545—550); and that there is a sense in which we may all be disposed to admit it? But suppose I do not admit it in any sense—shall I speak less respectfully of my ancestors because, being men, they held some errors? Surely not. I respect them for the virtues on account of which I have spoken in their praise; nor do I doubt that, if I knew your correspondent, "A Calvinist," better, I should find in him much to esteem. Already I believe that *his heart is good*; and if the admissions of his creed are false—we know he is fallible—I am not sure that mine are not so too. I esteem and love many Calvinists; if I did not, I should be a most unworthy brother. I only desire, if I am in the right, that they were even as I am; and, while I think myself so, I shall offer up this prayer.

I. W.

P. S. In a letter just received from a friend, I read,—“The ‘Calvinist’ of the Repository seems open to an assault on the ground of his bearing this questionable title, under the surmise that *Le vieux Monsieur Chauvin, Législateur et Pasteur de Genève*, fut absolument infaillible. To Christ, as an accredited plenipotentiary, we attribute infallibility, and therefore profess to follow him implicitly in faith, hope and love. But is this follower of a blind guide prepared to admit that he is, to all intents and purposes, a soldier of Calvin’s train bands? Is he devoted to his theory of tactics in his Institute, and resigned to his orders and generalship, as under the banner of another Messiah? Is not this Popery at Geneva, the Rome of the Reformation, as it has been called?”

SIR,

YOUR Reviewer repeats, (p. 39,) after Mr. Wellbeloved, that the Unitarians have not claimed Dr. Paley

VOL. XX.

as one of their body. Generally they have not; but I confess for one, that when I have read his *Sermon on the Use of Scripture Language*, and indeed his works *passim*, I have been inclined to suspect that he was no distinct believer in the peculiar doctrines of his Church. He subscribed the Articles, I apprehend, in his own sense, and as articles of peace. His posthumous *Sermons* savour more of "orthodoxy" than any thing which he published in his lifetime; but is not the orthodoxy here in words merely? Could not an Unitarian, of a *large* conscience and of a conciliatory temper, have said all that Paley preached to his parishioners?

That Paley has been claimed by some Unitarians, would appear from a passage in the *Memoir of the Rev. Philip Chase*, son of Bishop Chase, of Ohio, who was lately in this country, inserted in the *Missionary Register* for December. This young man, who died March 1, 1824, aged 25 years, was educated at Harvard University. Alluding to this heterodox Transatlantic seat of learning, the biographer says of Mr. Chase, "He abhorred the attempt, so often made, to share in the Saviour's work; and made it a subject of incessant thanksgiving to God, that he had been so mercifully preserved from what he considered the melancholy error in the creed of the respectable University wherein he received his education."

To this passage is subjoined the following note:

"Mr. Chase always expressed the highest respect for many in the government of the College, (and particularly for President Kirkland,) both as scholars and governors. He thought very highly also of his 'Alma Mater,' in regard to literary advantages; but he always spoke with great warmth of the danger to which young men of talents were exposed from Unitarian sentiments. A classmate (who was not, however, in his division) says, 'It was related one day after recitation, that, on one of the Tutors or Professors mentioning to the class that Dr. Paley was a Unitarian, Mr. Chase modestly contradicted the assertion, and firmly stated some reasons for his denial of the fact.'"

Whatever credit be due to this an-

ecdote, it is clear that by somebody or other Paley has been suspected of Unitarianizing (as the old divines would say); and indeed it is impossible that the out-and-out believer of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Three Creeds should be satisfied with (what Bishop Marsh calls) his *generalized Christianity*. You have told us from the *Quarterly*, that Mr. Biddulph, the leader of the "Evangelical" Church party, disowns him (p. 60); and I verily believe he would be disowned by all sticklers for things as they are, if it were not necessary to keep him, as Lardner is kept, in spite of his heresy, for his services as the advocate of *external* religion. Paley committed two sins for which he will never be forgiven; he denounced bigotry and he dared to reason.

#### CANTABRIGIENSIS.

SIR, *Islington,*  
*January 12, 1825.*

**I** RECOMMENDED the case of the General Baptist Church at Dover to the liberality of the readers of your Miscellany (Vol. XIX. p. 343). I must now beg leave to state some circumstances which have transpired respecting it, and which call for immediate attention.

The Church has a debt upon it by the erection of its new Chapel, so admired for its neatness and convenience. An old gentleman had promised to leave £250 for its liquidation, provided the remaining portion of the debt could be raised by the subscription of 100 persons, a guinea each, for three succeeding years. Several subscribers have been obtained, and the remainder will, no doubt, be procured in so good a work. But this should be directly accomplished, for the £250 will be advanced without delay, the donor finding that he cannot, by the Mortmain Act, leave it for such a purpose. This is so generously proffered, that any person disposed to come forward with his subscription will be so kind as to do it immediately. *He gives twice who gives quickly*, was a sage maxim of antiquity.

J. EVANS.

P. S. I thank Mr. Rutt for his communication respecting Dr. John Gale (Vol. XIX. p. 712). With him I was

aware that his Antitrinitarianism could not be inferred from his works. But perusing, many years ago, a very old church book belonging to the General Baptist Church at Barbican, one of its memorandums was to this purpose: "Received Dr. John Gale from the General Baptist Church at Deptford, where he had preached, but could preach no longer on account of his unsound notions on the Trinity, Original Sin, &c." These are not the exact words, but it is the substance; and ever since I have ranked Dr. Gale as no Trinitarian, though no precise ideas can be given of his views on the subject. The writer of the short *Memoir* prefixed to his Sermons, says, that he intended writing on Original Sin; but he died soon after; when this and other projected works remained unaccomplished.

Such is the ground on which I proceeded, and it satisfies my own mind, though it may not be so decisive as I could wish on so important a subject. The Rev. William Foot, of Bristol, I have also stated to be an Antitrinitarian, though some of my friends doubted it; but his worthy daughter, Mrs. Foot, has assured me of the fact. It may not be generally known that this divine kept an academy for many years at Bristol; and, heterodox as he was on the article of the Trinity, he had the honour of having for his pupil the present Poet-laureat, Robert Southey, Esq., LL.D., so distinguished for his loyalty and orthodoxy! This gentleman, therefore, ought to have some respect for Unitarians; and, notwithstanding his zeal for the extirpation of *heretics*, feel kindly towards this intelligent and deserving portion of the religious community. *Verbum sat sapienti.*

With respect to the Rev. Robert Adam asserting that these General Baptist Ministers were sound Trinitarians, it by no means follows that their successors and descendants should be so too, who have seen the error of their forefathers, and wisely corrected it. Their revolution of sentiment they deem an approximation to truth. This should be recorded, not to their disgrace, but to their honour. We have apostolical authority urging us on to *perfection*. And the great and good Dr. Isaac Watts has this declaration, which should be engraven in lasting



characters upon the mind of every professor, of every denomination, throughout the wide extent of Christendom :

"It becomes the All-wise God, and not mortal man, to be unchangeable. It doth not belong to such poor, imperfect beings as we are, to remain for ever immovable in all the same opinions that we have once indulged, nor to stamp every sentiment with immortality."

*Dr. Fordyce's stumbling at the Marriage Service.*

SIR,

AMPLE, in relation to your limits, as is the review of the "Memoir of the late Mrs. Fordyce," (pp. 44—47,) you have omitted one short extract which appears to me to be peculiarly worthy of a place in your Repository. It refers to the Doctor's marriage, which was celebrated by dispensation at his brother Alexander's seat at Roehampton, and is as follows: "The Dean of \* \* \* \*, who had been engaged to perform the ceremony, began and continued to pronounce the words with impressive solemnity till the Doctor had to say, 'With my body I thee worship,' when he substituted the words, 'With my body I thee honour.' The Dean repeated 'worship;' the Doctor repeated 'honour.' Three times the Dean reiterated 'worship;' and as often the Doctor, in a voice which inspired awe, repeated 'honour.' The dignitary paused; a momentary red suffused his cheek: but he proceeded; and the ceremony was concluded."—(P. 47.)

Here we see and must admire the struggling of a Presbyterian conscience; but let us admire also the candour of a Church-of-England dignitary, whose name ought to be known.

A DISSENTER.

SIR,

WHEN I have said the little which I have to say upon a subject, I cannot easily, amidst the pressure of my occupations, turn my attention to it a second time; but as silence in some cases is liable to be misinterpreted, I think it proper to say a word or two in reply to the observations of your correspondent Ω, pp. 29, 30.

In the Second Epistle of Peter, i. 1, some manuscripts, instead of Θεος, read Κυριος; so that this passage, allowing the genuineness of the Epistle, cannot be confidently appealed to on the question. Your correspondent is right in considering the Common Version as incorrect. I should, without hesitation, render the passage as it is rendered in the Improved Version, and should extend to the word Σωτηρ the remark which I made in relation to the word Κυριος, nor do I see any sufficient reason why it should not be thus extended. Indeed, when I made the remark, I conceived that if there were good reason to believe that the canon did not hold good with respect to ὁ Θεος ἡμῶν καὶ Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος, it could not hold good with respect to ὁ Θεος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρ Ιησους Χριστος. But your correspondent asks, "If ὁ Κυριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρ Ιησους Χριστος is correctly rendered 'our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,' why should not ὁ Θεος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρ Ιησους Χριστος be rendered 'our God and Saviour Jesus Christ'?" To this question my former communication will give what, I think, may be considered as an answer; and if your correspondent will do me the favour to read it again, if I mistake not, he will perceive that, though the grammatical construction of the two passages is the same, yet when the general language of the apostolic writers is considered, there is a circumstance of difference between them which justifies an adherence to the canon in the former instance, and the neglect of it in the latter. It may moreover be observed, that when a writer can suspect no danger of being misunderstood, he may unconsciously fall into a construction which he would otherwise have avoided. I have reasoned, as your correspondent will perceive, upon the supposition that Peter was the author of the Epistle, and that he wrote Θεος, not Κυριος.

Since I wrote my former paper, I have read Appendix, No. III., to Dr. Carpenter's third edition of Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel; to which I would refer those of your readers who wish to see a full and judicious discussion of the subject.

E. COGAN.

Norwich,

February 3, 1825.

SIR,

**T**HE intention of some of the Calvinistic party to attempt to plunder the Unitarians, had reached me before I saw the Repository for January (p. 56). You have spoken of that intention in very appropriate terms. That there are individuals sufficiently regardless of their characters as men and as Christians to make such an attempt, I am not surprised; but I am loth to believe that it can be countenanced by the body of orthodox Dissenters. They will probably think twice before they proceed to acts of open hostility against us. They will consider well whether it be worth while to engage in a contest, of which the benefit they expect to derive must, to say the very least, be exceedingly doubtful, and which must inevitably have the effect of depriving them of the advantages which they derive by their occasional union and connexion with us. I will mention an instance or two. The Unitarian Chapel in this city was built during the ministry of Dr. John Taylor, "for the worship" (as he expresses it in the Sermon which he preached at the opening of it) "of the living and true God, through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, according to the rules and spirit of genuine Christianity — that upon this ground the Society may be quite free to search the Scriptures, to discover, correct and reform, at any time, their own mistakes and deficiencies, and at liberty to exercise communion with any of their Christian brethren." During the period of his ministry, a pious and worthy lady of his congregation left a sum of money in the hands of trustees, members of that congregation, to be by them every year distributed in such way and to such Dissenting Ministers as they and their successors might think fit, with this restriction *only*, that they should be resident in Norfolk or Suffolk. Now, Sir, from that time to this, the sum so left has been distributed among Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, without regard to their creed, the only aim of the trustees having been to give it where it was most wanted. Thousands of pounds have been thus distributed by Unitarian trustees to Independent and Baptist Ministers. This fact the or-

thodox Dissenters here know full well: and they also know that in no other hands would so fair a division be made; for the Independents are well aware that if the Baptists had it in their hands, not a sixpence would they ever receive; nor the Baptists, if the Independents had it. It is equally notorious here, that hundreds of the children of orthodox parents have enjoyed the advantages of gratuitous education in the excellent school which is attached to the Unitarian congregation here.

Twenty-five years ago, a Society was instituted in Norfolk for the Relief of aged Dissenting Ministers and their Widows and Orphans. To this Society the members of the Unitarian Chapel here largely contributed; for, as appeared by the printed accounts, within five years after the formation of the Society, they had given £225. 15s., while the Independent congregation here had given only £87. 8s. Now, from the period at which the Society was formed, up to the present moment, not a single claim has been made upon it by any Unitarian congregation or minister. But, I would ask, is it likely, can it be imagined, if this declaration of war be followed up, that Unitarians will go on to exercise the same liberal and friendly feeling towards their orthodox brethren as they now do? Have the latter reckoned up all the consequences which must result from the step they propose to adopt? Let them take care. They have as yet only proceeded to words, but the moment the sword is drawn, adieu to all the ties which now bind us to them as brother Nonconformists. I say nothing of the unkind feeling which must be engendered where friendship and good-will now exist; I speak merely of the gross folly of their intentions; and I would advise them, from mere motives of prudence, to desist. The zealots who urged on this pillaging scheme, have very little notion of the extent to which their friends throughout the kingdom will *instantly* suffer. There is yet time for the reflecting portion of the Calvinists to interpose and put a stop to it. If they neglect to do so, be the consequences upon their own heads.

EDWARD TAYLOR.

Homerton,  
February 12, 1825.

SIR,  
TO a demand from any of your correspondents, but especially to one from Mr. Gibson, (p. 17,) I am happy to pay respectful attention. You and he will excuse my expressing myself more in the dogmatic form than is at all agreeable to me. I know no other way of avoiding diffuseness: and, if I were to introduce arguments and illustrations, my letter would swell to a very inconvenient size.

When, in the Remarks which you did me the favour of inserting upon the Statements of M. Chenevière, I touched upon the subject of JUSTIFICATION, it never occurred to me that it was needful to define the term and to guard it against such a confusion of ideas as Mr. Bakewell manifested in his Reply. (Mon. Repos. Vol. XIX. p. 663.) Notwithstanding our unhappy differences, I certainly should not have expected that a well-instructed Unitarian, or indeed any man but moderately acquainted with the theory of religion, could have so egregiously stumbled in subjects of such easy distinction as the nature, grounds and objects of Justification on the one hand, and Sanctification (or the dispositions and actions of universal holiness) on the other.

Mr. Gibson suggests that "a simple affirmative or negative may suffice" for a reply to his four questions. In this I am sorry that I cannot entirely agree with him. His first and last cannot, I conceive, be answered without some explication of terms. I will, however, give the shortest answers that I can devise to each of the questions; and I trust you will allow me space for a few remarks to explain and guard against misapprehension.

Quest. 1. "Is the justification of a sinner in the sight of God determined by the unchangeable obligations of universal virtue?"

Ans. The justification of a sinner in the sight of God is determined upon the principles of strict equity, in relation to the moral government of God and all the obligations of accountable beings: and it is a blessing gratuitously bestowed upon sinful men, in that mode and under all those circumstances which are, and ever will be, the most effectual to the promo-

tion of their personal holiness, in every possible respect.

Obs. I use the term *personal holiness*, as the most accurate and comprehensive; and understanding by it a sincere, habitual and circumspect observance of all the inward principles and all the outward rules of *piety* towards God, *virtue* in the government of our passions and the employment of our faculties, and *morality* in relation to our fellow-creatures.

Quest. 2. "Will those persons who most habitually attend to the obligations of universal virtue, and who acquire most personal holiness, be the justified before God?"

Ans. YES.

Quest. 3. "Will any such persons be excluded from the justification before God?"

Ans. NO.

Quest. 4. "Will those persons who have less habitually attended to the obligations of universal virtue, and who have less personal holiness, be preferred and equally justified before God?"

Ans. The term JUSTIFICATION expresses not a disposition or quality of mind which might exist in various degrees, but a *state* or *relation* of man, as an accountable being, with respect to God as the righteous and holy Governor of the moral universe. It therefore does not admit of degrees: it either is or is not. We may distinguish between the act and the state of Justification.

(1.) The *act* of Justification is the judicial decision of the Supreme Moral Ruler, by which he pardons the sins of those who are the subjects of this blessing, and regards them with complacency as persons upon whom it is equitable, right and well-pleasing to all the Divine perfections, to bestow the enjoyment of perfect and eternal happiness, a species of happiness of which holiness is the chief and essential part.

(2.) The *state* of Justification is that condition, standing or relation of a sinful human being, in respect of the perfect moral government of God, which denominates him pardoned and accepted to the favour of the righteous Deity.

This is not the opportunity for adducing proofs in support of this



description of the great Christian doctrine concerning the Justification of a sinner in the sight of God. Yet I would say, that I have assumed no more than is contained in the definition of this subject given by Valentinus Smalcus in the Racovian Catechism: "By faith in Christ we obtain Justification.—Justification is God's esteeming us as righteous; which he does by granting us the pardon of our sins and the bestowment of eternal life; of which the Apostle Paul clearly testifies, when he says that 'the blessedness of man consists in the Lord's imputing to him righteousness;' and then adds from the Psalm, 'Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sin.'"—P. 240, ed. Racov. 1609.

Requesting attention to these preliminary positions, I answer Mr. Gibson's question by the following remarks:

I. Every man is either justified or not justified, in the righteous and unerring judgment of his holy Sovereign. There is no intermediate or neutral condition.

II. If a man thinks himself to be justified, while he does not from the heart abhor and renounce all sin, and with equal earnestness cultivate all holiness, he is under an awful delusion.

III. Yet it is a fact which we know by painful and humbling experience, that sincerity of motive, uprightness of intention, and circumspection of practice, with regard to all the duties of holiness, do not imply perfection, in the present life. There are low degrees, as well as high, in the character of *genuine* and *cordial* obedience; and there are all the intermediate points of the scale: but the lowest, be it ever remembered, is honest, sincere, upright, allowing of no sin, and aiming at perfection. The Omniscient alone knows unerringly the real character and state of individuals. If we see a person who seriously professes faith in Christ, according to the Scriptures, and whose conduct exhibits all the appearances of Christian integrity, we rejoice in the rational evidence that he is a justified person, pardoned and accepted by God. If, with the same outward evidence, we are conscious of "sim-

plicity and godly sincerity," we are scripturally encouraged to take the same consoling hope to ourselves; yet ever remembering the apostolic caution, "Examine yourselves:—thou standest by faith:—be not high-minded, but fear."

IV. SANCTIFICATION, or the sincere love and persevering practice of all holiness, is the *necessary* and *invariable* adjunct of Justification. It is the criterion of all well-founded hope of favour with God. As, in the animal frame, the nervous and the arterial parts of the constitution are totally different in structure and function, yet neither can subsist without the other, and both are essential to life; so, in the moral system, Justification and Sanctification are blessings of salvation quite distinct, yet each absolutely necessary, the one inseparable from the other, and both equally essential to the spiritual life or the reality of religion.

The following distinctions may be of some use to preclude misapprehension:

1. *Justification* respects the state of the soul as standing in the judicial presence of God, the Supreme Lawgiver and Ruler. *Sanctification* respects the inward and conscious perceptions of the mind, in its inclinations, aversions, motives, aims and practical determinations.

2. *Justification* is an act of Divine Benevolence; yet, through the infinitely valuable MEDIATION of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is conferred without compromising the honour of the divine law, in either its requirements or its sanctions. The penitent and believing sinner is pardoned, because Christ gave himself a sacrifice, a ransom, an atonement; *not to purchase* the Father's grace, but *as a fruit and effect* of that grace, and in order that this exercise of mercy might be just, fit and glorious, and in no way disparaging to the claims of infinite and unchangeable rectitude. The penitent and believing sinner is also beheld with complacency by the Holy One; and supreme happiness is conferred upon him as *the recompense of merit* to Christ, whose righteousness is no more than justly acknowledged by the conferring of all the blessings of salvation on those who seek them

through him, but to the sinner himself as *the free gift* of sovereign and unmerited grace.

*Sanctification* is a work of Divine Power and Goodness upon the rational susceptibilities and faculties of the mind, producing a holy sensibility and justness of feeling, by virtue of which it detests all sin, and loves and pursues all holiness.

3. *Justification* is an act of Divine love and mercy performed *for* us: *Sanctification* is an operation of Divine influence performed *in* us.

4. *Justification* is the ground of right and title to celestial blessedness: *Sanctification* is the process of preparing and qualifying for the possession of that blessedness. The one may be compared to the reversal of an attainder, and the restoration of the forfeited estate, by the proper act of the legislature; the other, to the educating of the heir to fill his station, and the imbuing him with the mind and manners congruous to his rank. Only, let it be observed, that in this imagined illustration the two requisites might be separated; but, in the case illustrated, they are absolutely and for ever inseparable.

v. There is, therefore, an essential difference between the lowest degree of that kind of personal character which necessarily accompanies Justification before God, and that kind which is governed by sinful principles, whether it be plainly laid open or masked with plausible hypocrisy.—“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor impure abusers of themselves, nor thieves,\* nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor rapacious men, will inherit the kingdom of God.” A change of state may, indeed, take place with such persons, through the riches of Divine grace; and it will be infallibly attended by a change of cha-

acter: they will abhor and renounce their sins, and turn to God and holiness with all their hearts. Then may they be addressed by the sequel of the passage: “Such were some of you: but ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.”

vi. Do the defects of Sanctification extinguish the interest in Justification? I answer, No; for they are defects, felt, lamented and opposed in sincerity and with constancy: they are *defects*, not indulged sins masked under the name of infirmities. If the case be not thus; if the professor of religion prove that he is not “redeemed from all iniquity, purified unto Christ, and living soberly, righteously and piously;” let him know that “he has neither part nor lot in this matter, for his heart is not right in the sight of God.”

vii. But does not this doctrine make all characters equal, as sinners before their conversion, and as saints after it? By no means. The remarks already submitted sufficiently prevent such an inference. As, among unconverted persons, there are vast differences of character, though all are alienated from a right regard to God, and form themselves upon principles of corrupt selfishness, whether gross or refined; so, among true Christians, though all are justified before God, and all are governed by sincere and upright principles, there are great inequalities as to the attainment and exercise of personal holiness. Yet I venture to think that, waiting those dreadful falls by sudden and violent temptation which with real Christians are, I trust, very rare, their deficiencies and infirmities are to be ascribed more to other causes than to any corruptness of motive or principle. The more closely I have been enabled to study the human character, and the more intimately to become acquainted with serious persons, the more have I seen reason to conclude that their unhappy infirmities are chiefly the offspring of intellectual deficiencies; of absurd and unchristian education; of natural weakness of mind, producing contracted habits of thought and an inaptitude to understand and apply general principles to particular cases;

\* In which class I cannot but include plagiarists, who publish other men's writings as their own; and malverters of trusts, who apply the property which they hold as trustees for fulfilling the will and intent of others, to purposes which they know to be entirely contrary to that will and intent.

of ignorance, become inveterate by untoward circumstances; of connexions with prejudiced and ill-informed persons; of a vicious style of religious instruction from the pulpit; and of a neglect to cultivate the mind by judicious and comprehensive courses of reading. I admit that much blame attaches to the persons who are perverted, by these and similar causes, from the simplicity and purity of the Christian character, or are prevented from attaining to higher degrees of them. The moral evils of the heart mingle with those noxious causes and occasions. The subjects of them are what the apostle denominates "babes, unskilful in the word of righteousness, carnal, and walking as men" governed by low and worldly principles. Yet, with all this deduction from attainment, comfort and usefulness, it is evident that sincerity and integrity do indeed reign in the heart and character.

VII. Mr. Gibson has inserted the word "preferred," in a manner which I do not clearly understand, and which seems to obscure the purport of his query. Perhaps the intention is to ask whether, according to what appears to me to be the scripture doctrine of Justification, defective, yet sincere, Christians will have the same dignity and happiness in the heavenly state as those who have far exceeded them in the practice of personal holiness and universal virtue. I reply, *By no means*. Though the future happiness of the righteous will be pure and unalloyed, we have reason to think that its *quantity* (if I may so speak) will be very different in different subjects. The *capacity* for holy happiness and immortal services to the Lord of glory, will probably be unspeakably greater in some than in others: and this capacity in the world of perfect bliss will be *in proportion* to the amplitude and energy with which holy principles operated in this probationary state. Thus, though all sincere followers of Christ are justified, all are sanctified, and all shall "be with him, where he is, to behold" and to partake "his glory;" yet the degrees of glory will be very different, according to the degrees of ardent and active holiness acquired in the present life. I should

esteem myself happy if my request could induce my respectable Querist to read Mr. Fuller's Sermon on "The Christian Doctrine of Rewards."

I beg to conclude this long letter by two extracts from the writings of a dear and venerable friend, who, through a long and useful life, has been eminently "set for the defence of the gospel." Though these citations refer to those unhappy persons, the Antinomians, who ignorantly misrepresent or perversely misapply the doctrines usually called Calvinistic, they are not the less available for obviating the GREAT misapprehensions which are entertained by my respectable Querist, and probably by many others in his class of religious profession.

"They who are redeemed from the 'curse of the law,' will never suppose that Christ has *cancelled or lessened* their obligations to obedience. Like Paul, they will consider themselves as being not without law unto God, but *under the law* unto Christ; or as debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh, but debtors to God and grace. Knowing that they are bought with a price, they will own that they are the property of their Redeemer, and feel themselves bound to glorify God with their bodies and with their spirits, which are God's. The Lamb that was slain hath redeemed us to God by his blood; and his grand object, when he once suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, was, that he might *bring us to God*, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness. He has *confirmed every antecedent obligation* which we were under to obedience, and has *super-added new ones*, of the most powerful and endearing kind. He has redeemed us from the curse of the law, *not from the blessing of the law*. For surely it is a blessed thing to have a certain standard of duty, a directory to shew us how we ought to walk and please God; and a still higher blessing to be truly conformed to that standard." *Dr. Ryland's Sermon on Redemption from the Curse of the Law*, p. 35.

"Surely, of the two, there is far more reason to say *natural* evil can do no harm to the believer, than to say *moral* evil can do him none. But



will any man abuse this, so as to encourage a disregard to health or safety, or to discourage the use of means for preservation? We are expressly assured that neither tribulation, nor distress, nor persecution, nor famine, nor peril, nor sword, shall separate from the love of Christ: but who will say, 'Be not careful to avoid poverty, or contagious diseases, or robbers, or fire, or inquisitors;—none of these things can hurt a believer! Leap from St. Vincent's rocks, or throw down your child from the precipice;—neither broken bones nor loss of children can hurt a believer!' You would not tell a consumptive friend, or one in danger of any infectious disorder, 'You need not be so careful of your bodily health, for sickness and death cannot hurt you.' And will you tell a poor, imperfect professor, before he becomes exposed to any particular temptation, that, if it should come in his way, and he should comply with it, it can do him no harm? Can that man be a believer who fears nothing but final damnation; who cares nothing for the dishonour of God?"—*The same Author's Serious Remarks*, p. 69.

J. PYE SMITH.

SIR,

**H**AD I been less connected with the Services at Bolton which have called forth the animadversions of your correspondent *Ruris Colonus*, (pp. 27—29,) I might have felt disposed to trouble you with some remarks in reply to his paper: but, under present circumstances, something more than inclination—a sense of duty—compels me to come forward in defence of the service of Ordination; since, in my own case, it was neither determined upon without an anxious and careful examination of its propriety, nor adopted in connexion with any circumstances that could legitimately give it even the appearance of superstition.

The Services of that occasion are now before the public, so that your correspondent will have an opportunity of judging for himself whether, "in its present form, its liability to be abused to superstitious purposes is not guarded against." But he adds, "Was it not objectionable on far other

grounds than this—as an infringement on Christian liberty?"

If I understand the import of this phrase aright, it presumes that the service under consideration deprives the individuals concerned in it of some Christian privileges which they previously enjoyed. The only parties whom it can affect are either the congregation or the minister: and upon the liberty of which does it infringe? The minister is already the fixed and unbiased choice of the society with which he is connected. He seeks not the counsel of his brethren to *qualify* him for the work which he has undertaken; for previously to this service he has fulfilled all the duties of his office. He makes no profession of opinions which are to fetter his investigations, or to prevent any future change in his sentiments. He makes no promises, he enters into no engagements, except that he will devote his time and his abilities to the discovery and diffusion of truth, and to the peculiar duties of his office. If, then, the mutual privileges of the parties remain the same; if the right of private judgment is uncontrolled, and the independence of each church is strictly preserved, how can there be any infringement of Christian liberty? Such a power is specially disclaimed in the "Services" already alluded to. "Never, indeed," says the author of the passage in question,—"never may any of us forget that the whole business of this day and place has our common advantage for its object; that we are all brethren in the midst of brethren; that we humbly aim at recognizing and aiding a fellow-labourer in our Master's household; and that your appointment and admission here are exclusively the acts of the Christian society who have chosen you to be their pastor."\*

But *Ruris Colonus* further inquires, whether the service "is not objectionable as a practice not enjoined by Christ, or authorized or used by his apostles, and, as such, partaking truly of the character of will-worship?"

To the first part of this objection, it might be enough to state, that there is no precept in the gospel for the

\* See the Services at the Ordination of the Rev. F. Baker, Mr. Kentish's Charge, p. 40.

observance of the Sabbath; and yet it is so consistent with the tenour of Christ's teachings and practice, that no sound argument can be urged to controvert its expediency and usefulness. Upon the same grounds we plead the propriety of Ordination Services. Neither the present manner of conducting them, nor the present style of preaching, is strictly agreeable to the original model. Circumstances of time and place have compelled us to depart from the primitive mode of worship, and circumstances, equally uncontrollable, have given a different character to the service in question; but the object of each is the same, distinctly and essentially the same, as in the days of the apostles. The Sabbath is still dedicated to moral and religious purposes; Ordinations are still intended to recognize the public teachers of religion, to recommend them to the favour of God, and to aid their inexperience by tried wisdom and affectionate counsel. It is granted that, in the earliest age of the Christian Church, some special powers were communicated by prayer and ordination: it must also be granted that the preaching of the apostles was by Divine inspiration: yet who contends that there should be no public instructions on the Sabbath because the days of inspiration have passed by? If it be admitted that the teachings of ministers endowed only with ordinary intellectual and moral powers, are agreeable to the spirit of Christ's intentions, it must also be conceded that the service of Ordination adapted to the present state of mankind, must be equally proper and obligatory, and equally removed from the character of will-worship. No facts are more plainly recorded in the New Testament than the ceremonies which accompanied the ordination or setting apart of persons for special employments or different offices in the church.\* They might be principally used for conveying to them supernatural powers in proof of their appointment. But, besides these gifts, they received directions peculiarly suitable to the work they had to perform and the difficulties they had to surmount, and were commended to

the protection of God by a solemn act of prayer. It is these latter instructions that we can imitate and employ; and, as long as no pretensions are usurped, there must be considerable propriety in following a scriptural practice to aid the inability of youth, and supply the wants of inexperience. I argue only on the proper use of the service; for, as to the communication of spiritual authority by the imposition of hands, "every rational believer in the truths of Christianity discards at once the idea of a ceremony founded upon such an utter misapprehension of the meaning of scripture and the present state of society, and which can be entertained for a moment only on the supposition that the miraculous gifts enjoyed by the first promulgators of the gospel, have been transmitted, in regular and unimpaired succession, to the religious teachers of modern times."\*

Again, your correspondent asks, whether the service "is not objectionable as accompanied, in many cases, with a considerable degree of usurpation, and, in general, calculated to impress men's minds with superstitious notions, especially with regard to the validity and sacredness of the clerical office and character?"

This objection is clearly founded on the abuse of the service. It would be very easy to select the corruptions from the best institutions in order to fix upon them the stigma of superstition. Neither "priestly usurpations," nor "ghostly pretensions," are at all necessarily connected with this service. We may associate "superstitious notions" with any rites, however rational and obligatory; in proof of which I need only allude to a too general feeling respecting one of the positive institutions of Christianity: but even *Ruris Colonus*, I am persuaded, would not argue from that circumstance that it should be altogether abandoned. It ought to be an additional reason for enforcing its observance, by rendering it simple as its object is important, and stripping it of those repulsive corruptions which the superstitions of former ages have thrown around it. The same reasoning will apply to the

\* See Acts vi. 6, ix. 17, xiii. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 10.

\* See the Rev. J. J. Tayler's Ordination Service, p. iv.

service of ordination. If any superstitious and corrupt ceremonies have been mingled with it, let them be condemned and omitted; but let an enlightened discrimination preserve what is scriptural and beneficial. In the present manner of conducting the service, nothing like usurpation or dominion is exercised over the mind, unless the terms be applied to an act of devotion, or to "language of fraternal equality and affection." Nor, in my opinion, is any undue authority attached to the clerical office and character. If they be raised in the estimation of mankind by this service, it is only by a statement of the duties connected with them, and the obligations to fulfil them. No end can be more legitimate than this; for while it impresses upon the mind of the minister the important character he has to sustain, it also solicits from his congregation that allowance for imperfections which must necessarily appear in the prosecution of a work so arduous.

So far, Sir, in my view, is the service of Ordination from lying under the above objections, that it appears to me eminently scriptural in its origin, reasonable in its object, and beneficial in its tendency. After a new connexion is formed between a minister and a congregation, there is something peculiarly proper in their uniting to solicit the prayers and exhortations of experienced pastors to strengthen and consecrate the union so lately formed. The duties which relate to their mutual relation may have been acknowledged by them; but by the minister especially, young and inexperienced, there will be felt many difficulties which only his more advanced brethren can remove, because they only have known them. The very relation in which he stands to his people, while it enables him to enter at some length into their duties, places him in a delicate situation with respect to the nature and extent of his own. While he is fearful, on the one hand, of promising more than he is able to perform; and, on the other, of not promising so much as his people have been accustomed to receive, or as they have a right to expect;—what can be so satisfactory as to be told, by the voice of encouragement and affection, what those duties are which

really belong to the office of a minister, and to be told them by *one* who has himself performed them in an exemplary manner, who is himself a pattern of those virtues and acquirements which are so indispensable to the due discharge of those duties? What can be a greater excitement to virtuous exertion, in both minister and congregation, than the presence and blessing of those excellent servants of Christ who have devoted their talents and labours to the diffusion of Christianity, and who may come to strengthen the hands of their brother, to give him and his people affectionate counsel, and to solemnize their mutual connexion?

With such views of this service, I cannot better conclude this letter, which has run out to a much greater length than I expected, than by quoting a passage on the subject from Dr. Priestley: "When the design of Ordination, as above explained, is well understood; when the person ordained shall have performed every part of the ministerial duty before, as well as after, his ordination, though the name given to the service no longer suggests the idea that was formerly annexed to it, no superstition is encouraged. And since the connexion between a minister and his congregation, and especially the first that he forms, is a very serious concern, there cannot surely be any impropriety—but, on the contrary, the greatest propriety—in making it an occasion of solemn prayer; and then exhortation or admonition from a minister of greater age and experience to one who has but lately entered upon the office, is particularly seasonable. I cannot help, therefore, expressing my wish, that some service, to which the name of Ordination may well enough be given, may be kept up among us; at the same time, that every precaution is taken to prevent superstition with respect to it." \*

FRANKLIN BAKER.

SIR,  
THE more I review the statements of Locke in his "Reasonableness of Christianity," the more I am sometimes tempted to incline to what seems to me to have been his convic-

---

\* See Preface to the Discourse containing a View of Revealed Religion.



tion with regard to the person and office of Christ, viz. that he was not a man born as other men are, but by the miraculous intervention of the Supreme Being, and therefore, in a *peculiar* as well as emphatical sense, denominated his Son: that, so born, he, like Adam, was not by the necessity of his nature subjected to death; or, in what I conceive to be the full meaning of his own very remarkable declaration, that, when he died, he abdicated, in obedience to the will of God, a life which it was not in the power of men, at any time, to take away: that the death of such a second Adam, in point of nature, was the means appointed by God, in the good pleasure of his justice and mercy, to redeem mankind from the penalty passed on the whole human race for the transgression of their progenitor, viz. the grave; thus being made not only "a living soul," but also "a quickening spirit:" and that faith in the efficacy of this sacrifice is the distinguishing tenet between the Jew and the Christian.\*

It is not my intention, at present, to appeal, in confirmation of this opinion, to the unquestionable faith of the apostles in the *entirety*, the *unity*, the *individuality* of their † Son of God, on the one hand; nor to the almost overwhelming sense *they* manifestly entertained of his love in dying for the sins of mankind, on the other. As little am I disposed, just now, to remark on the probability, derived from analogy, of *such a mode* of redemption, or the complete apology which *alone* it seems to afford for that otherwise apparently anomalous extreme of horrors with which the most intrepid, as well as the meekest, of mankind contemplated an event so perilous to the apprehension of every mortal human being, and, in his own case, divested of every terror but its concomitant pain. My sole object in these few lines is to inquire whether

one of the strongest objections to the narrative of the miraculous conception of our Saviour, viz. its not being referred to or hinted at by any of the apostles, be as well founded as some of its patrons suppose; or rather, perhaps, to submit to their reconsideration the two following texts, which appear to me to militate against such a conclusion:

Rom. i. 3, 4: "Made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and *declared* to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness" (in the holy spirit,) "by the resurrection from the dead." What are we to understand here by the phrase, "the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness"? Coupled with the preceding member of the sentence, my imagination or my understanding describes in it no less than an express and obvious reference to the fact in question. The resurrection from the dead testifies, it is said, that he who was of the seed of David, &c., was the Son of God, &c. Translated into other words, the testimony seems to my mind to be, that the man Jesus was in a peculiar sense *the offspring of the Spirit of God*, in the sense here described in terms by the apostle. This only is the *full* extent of the deposition. There is a remarkable coincidence seemingly in the phraseology of the disputed narrative and the supposed allusion to it in this place. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee," (the Virgin Mary,) "and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; THEREFORE," (the verse proceeds,) "that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called *the Son of God*." "It was not possible" that such a descendant of David "should be holden of death;" and thus his almost immediate resurrection from the grave attests the miraculous conception and birth of the Messiah. Such a person was "*our Lord Jesus Christ*."

The other text to which I would recall the attention of Unitarians is Gal. iv. 4—7: "God sent forth—*HIS Son made of a woman*." Does not this statement remarkably correspond with the former? If the fact were undisputed, would it not be considered as a precise and exact description of the Christ? Is it not, then, a strong presumption in favour of the authenticity

\* Mr. Wardlaw talks of "a key." If the doctrine of "keys" is to determine the question, I know not one that fits all the wards so well as this.

† "'Come, see the place where *the Lord* lay.' They would not have crucified *the Lord of glory*. It was *the Lord* that died." (Not, according to the orthodox hypothesis, the suffering man, while the impassible God looked on.)

of the narrative? Or, may it not at least answer in some degree the purpose for which it is now produced, to tempt the reader to pause before he too dogmatically concludes the utter ignorance of all the apostles of an event happily recorded by two of the four evangelists.

#### AN APOSTOLIC CHRISTIAN.

*Dr. J. Jones's further Proofs of Josephus being a Christian Advocate.*

1. **I**N my last paper [XIX. 722—725] I have proved that the Judaism which Josephus defends in his immortal work against Apion, is the Judaism of the New Testament. It follows, therefore, that he must mean the Judaism of the New Testament wherever he speaks of Judaism in other parts of his works. Now, Josephus speaks of the religion of the Jews in connexion with great events at Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Alexandria, Antioch, Damascus, Rome, &c.; and in these places there is independent evidence that, on each occasion, he means what we now call Christianity, or, as the Jewish believers considered and designated it, the religion of Moses and the prophets improved and perfected by Jesus Christ. In other words, there is abundant evidence to prove that Josephus, in many parts of his *Jewish Antiquities* and his *Jewish War*, is the historian and apologist of the gospel.

2. Whenever the writings of Josephus shall, as they ought, be studied in connexion with the existing circumstances of that age, there will appear sufficient grounds for believing that he had the gospel always before him; and, well knowing that its records were before the public, he took every fair opportunity, without notifying his intention, to state facts calculated to illustrate or to verify them.

3. From the *Memoirs* which Josephus gives of his own life—one of the most important and interesting pieces of biography extant—we may infer that he early classed himself with the followers of Jesus, and finished his education under a Christian minister. In the twenty-sixth year of his age, some of the priests who had become converts to the gospel, were sent to Rome by Felix, who, about the same

time, and with the same view, sent thither the Apostle Paul—namely, to be tried before Cæsar. Josephus, at the risk of his life and fortune, followed his friends to the capital; and, having by his address and influence effected their deliverance, he returned to take an active part in the affairs of his country, where the flames of war had already broken out.

4. In the twentieth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus has given a very long and very interesting account of the conversion of the royal family of the Adiabenes to the Jewish religion; and his narrative contains decisive evidence that the religion of which he speaks is the same with that which was disseminated by Paul. The person who effected the conversion of that family was *Ananias*: and we are left to infer that this Ananias was no other than he who is mentioned in the Acts as the friend of that apostle; for he taught *Izates*, the young prince who had now succeeded to the throne, that, in embracing the religion of the Jews, it was not necessary to submit to the rite of circumcision in order to worship God with acceptance. This was the doctrine of a Christian Jew, and of a Christian Jew only. A still more remarkable and characteristic circumstance is interwoven with the history. Paul and his brethren, in disseminating the gospel, were followed to every place by emissaries of the Gnostics or antichristian teachers at Jerusalem. Ananias encountered the same opposition on the conversion of *Izates*; for Eleazar, who affected to be a man of superior wisdom and skill in the law of Moses, obtained admission to the court, assailed the prince with tremendous curses, unless he submitted to the rite of circumcision; and thus he effected his purpose, contrary to the advice of Ananias.—The characters of Helen and *Izates*, as drawn by the pen of Josephus, are the finest on record; and the object of the historian is to illustrate the happy influence of Christianity on the lives of those who embraced it among the Gentiles.

5. Josephus is the historian and apologist of the Jewish Christians under the name of *Essenes*. From the days of Moses to John the Baptist, that people formed an order of men distinguished, not as a separate reli-

gious sect, but by their superior knowledge of the Scriptures, by greater purity of manners, and a more ardent zeal in the service of God. They constituted the sons of the prophets mentioned in the Book of Kings, of whom Elijah was one; and here, even so late as the days of Josephus, the Pharisees and Sadducees finished their education, and were qualified to fill the highest offices in the church and in the state. At the head of this body was John the Baptist when our Lord appeared. By submitting to his baptism, Jesus became an *Essene*; and by the testimony which the Baptist bore to him, the Essenes became Christians, excepting a considerable portion of the higher order, who seceded, and, uniting with the Pharisees, formed the Gnostic school. It is well known that the Essenes are not mentioned, nor alluded to, in the New Testament. The reason is, that the writers of the Christian Scriptures were themselves of the number, and could not speak of the Essenes but under those names by which they speak of themselves. Josephus availed himself of these circumstances, and, in order to exclude the charge of being *innovators* and *heretics* brought against the followers of Jesus, he describes them as that body of people who from immemorial ages had been held in the highest veneration for their learning and probity.

6. Josephus speaks of the Gnostics, the worst and most bitter enemies of the gospel, under the name of *zealots*. These men, uniting by means of their emissaries with the pagan priests and philosophers, were the chief agents in causing the corruption of Christianity and the ruin of their country; and Josephus holds them forth to the indignation of mankind, as the most depraved and wicked men that ever lived. It will be found an interesting fact, that the men thus described by the Jewish historian are the very same with those whose character is delineated by Peter and Jude; and that coincidence will prove the means of placing the genuineness of those Epistles beyond contradiction.

7. Josephus has, in the nineteenth book of his Antiquities, given an account of the death of James, the brother of our Lord; and in that brief narrative he has contrived, with great

skill, yet with great caution, to bring forward the principal men of Jerusalem as disapproving the cruel sentence passed upon him by Ananus, and bearing testimony to the truth of the gospel.

8. Soon after the resurrection of Jesus, the Gnostic imposture was taught in Rome. The authors were a Jew, guilty of every crime, and mentioned by Paul in Rom. ii., and some Egyptian priests, with the famous Simon of Samaria. These pretended that Jesus was one of the pagan gods miraculously conceived; and they instigated Tiberius to propose his deification to the senate in order to place him in the Pantheon. Simon, at somewhat a later period, finding that there existed a statue in honour of a Sabine divinity called *Simo Sanco*, pretended, from the similarity of his name, that he was that divinity. The senate, from malice towards Jesus, connived at the trick, and either erected a new statue to Simon, or more exactly inscribed his name on the old. It was natural for the people of Rome to conclude that Jesus was himself a magician, similar in character to those who pretended to teach his religion in the capital. These circumstances induced Josephus to take a decisive course. He takes Jesus from Judea, and Simon from Samaria, and places them together before the view of the Romans. On one hand, he bears testimony to the wisdom, the love of truth, and the works, which distinguished our blessed Lord: he fixes the time of his appearance in opposition to the deceivers, who assigned an earlier period for his birth: he excludes from his real history the doctrines of his divinity and miraculous birth, and represents the men who endeavoured to impose these doctrines on the emperor and the Roman people, as villains to be held in execration. On the other hand, he held forth Simon to public infamy, as a liar, an impostor, and a disturber of the public peace, though the senate, from hatred against the truth, had affected to raise him to divine honours. Such is the origin of the passage in Josephus respecting Christ which filled all Europe with disputes for a hundred years.

9. Our Lord predicted the fall of Jerusalem with a detail of particulars



which excluded the possibility of conjecture or coincidence. Jesus caused this prediction to be inserted in his gospel, though little consistent with its genius as good news to mankind. His object by this was, that this prophecy should be known to the whole world years before the object of it was accomplished. The fulfilment of it was intended to be the last seal which God put, in a supernatural manner, to the divine mission of Jesus, and Josephus was the honoured agent whom Providence had employed in fixing it. A belief in supernatural beings was very general among Jews and Gentiles: many things, therefore, might be deemed supernatural without the necessity of concluding that the immediate author came from the only true God. It was allowed that no man could foretell events yet in futurity without the universal acknowledgment that God was with him. *Magicians* might, it was thought, be aided by demons; but *the true prophet* was, beyond contradiction, inspired by the wisdom of God. Josephus could not but be aware of this, and he knew that, in writing his Jewish War, he was publishing to the world, and transmitting to posterity, the last decisive proof to the truth of the gospel. In doing this, he was actuated by the same consummate wisdom which dictated all his works. In order to shew that he had no sinister end in writing, that he had no design beyond the recording of facts which had taken place within his own observation, he confines himself solely and exclusively to his province as an historian; and though his narrative supplies complete evidence to the inspiration of Jesus, he has left the application to the reader. Throughout the whole, he keeps the prophecy and even the name of Jesus out of sight, and by that means he sinks in the historian the advocate of the gospel, and secures from his readers that confidence which is due to his veracity as a witness and recorder of facts. Yet, though he has done this, he is thought by modern critics not to have been a believer in Christ, and I am ridiculed for maintaining that he was.

10. Daniel had been held in high estimation by the ancient Jews; but, since the days of our Saviour, his countrymen attempted to degrade him

below the character of a prophet, not only because he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem and the advent of the Messiah, but fixed the very time in which the Messiah was to appear. Josephus, as a believer in Jesus, was led to an opposite conclusion, and he extols Daniel as surpassing all the other prophets, because he not only predicted the Christ, but even the exact time of his appearance.— See A. J. lib. x. ch. 17, 11.

11. The Jews of Josephus's days, and afterwards, hated him as an apostate from their religion; while the Greek and Latin fathers considered him as one of those whom they branded under the name of *Ebionites*.

Passages might be adduced to prove the above statements: and I shall have occasion to produce some hereafter. But I cannot conclude, without observing, that those Jews who rejected the claims of Jesus, expected a *temporal king*, and disbelieved, or affected to disbelieve, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple; while those who believed in him, looked forward with absolute certainty to that event. This was a broad line of distinction which divided the friends and enemies of Christ: and there is abundant evidence in his writings, that Josephus was not one of those Jews who expected a temporal deliverer, but on the contrary, was one of those who looked forward to the destruction of the Jewish state. To this effect is the following (J. W. lib. vi. c. 5, 6.): “What chiefly instigated them (the Jews) to engage in this war, was an ambiguous prophecy found in their sacred writings, that some one of that country would govern the world. The Jews applied this prediction to themselves; and many of their wise men were hence deceived in their judgment. But the oracle respected the government of Vespasian, who was appointed chief commander in Judea. But it is impossible for men to escape the punishment that is fore-ordained, though placed before hand before their eyes. For the Jews wantonly perverted some and derided others of the warnings given them, until the capture of the city and their own ruin evinced their madness.” Observe what Josephus here says, “*Many* of their wise men expected some one of that country to govern the world, and were mistaken

in their judgment." There were *others* then among the wise, who did not thus expect a temporal deliverance; and who therefore were mistaken in their judgment. These were the followers of the Prince of Peace, who interpreting the prophecies in a spiritual sense, considered them as fulfilled in Jesus; who is already come to deliver them from sin, to conquer death, and will hereafter come to establish on the earth the kingdom of God. These listened to the warning voice of their Divine Master; and it is evident that Josephus here ranks himself with that number; and as he avoided the impiety and madness of the refractory, he in common with the followers of Christ, escaped in a great degree the calamities and ruin which overtook the rest of his countrymen.

J. JONES.

SIR, February 16, 1825.

I HAVE read with considerable pleasure, a paper in the last number of the Repository [pp. 20—23], on the subject of Anti-supernaturalism. I cannot, however, help thinking that the candid spirit of your correspondent has in some measure misled him. The passage referred to is the following: "I would be far from asserting, with Mr. Belsham, that anti-supernaturalists, when they assume the name of Christians, are guilty of 'base hypocrisy,' or 'downright falsehood.'" An excess of candour is so amiable a fault, that one scarcely knows how to condemn it, yet I will venture to dissent from your correspondent on this point, and to vindicate the language which he hesitates to adopt.

Mr. B. has long been in the habit of using "great plainness of speech." His language here is certainly strong; but let us examine a little into the circumstances of the case, and it may not perhaps be found too severe. What is this anti-supernaturalism of which we talk? Is it something entirely new, that needed a new *name* to characterize it? Is it not rather the adoption of a name to gloss over what before existed under a more odious designation? The name is indeed recent, but we have long been acquainted with the thing, as infidelity or unbelief. We have long heard, and read, and spoken

of unbelievers, always understanding by the word, persons who do not believe in the supernatural in religion—in the miraculous origin of Christianity—in one word, in Revelation. The anti-supernaturalist is characterized by precisely the same kind of unbelief. To speak therefore of an *anti-supernaturalist* Christian, is quite as absurd as to speak of an *unbelieving* Christian. To be a Christian is not to believe that the gospel is good; but, that it is *divine*. And however highly any person may admire certain of the doctrines and precepts of Jesus; however loudly he may profess to reverence the gospel morality as a rule of life; unless he admits Christ to have been a divinely-inspired teacher, sanctioned as such by evident miracles, he is not a Christian. He may call himself by what *names* he pleases, but he *is* all that is usually meant by an unbeliever.

Now, when anti-supernaturalists adopt the Christian name, are they acquainted with the ideas, generally attached to it? Do they know what that community of Christian believers with which they associate, mean by it? If they do, and publicly adopt it, without publicly explaining their own *peculiar* meaning, Mr. Belsham's language is not greatly to be complained of. Let the man who has rejected all that is supernatural in Christianity, inform the members of that Unitarian Church with which he has connected himself, that he thinks the *divine mission* of Jesus to have been nothing more than a pretence, either on his part, or that of his disciples; that he considers the miracles to be idle tales, and the resurrection to be altogether destitute of proof; let him do this *plainly*, and they will inform him that they do not consider him to be a Christian. They will tell him that, in their view, an *anti-supernaturalist Christian*, is a contradiction in terms.

And, again, if those anti-supernaturalists who, calling themselves Christians, now exist in our societies, were to avow their sentiments, in their naked reality, and call themselves by their old designation, could they expect the same cordiality which they now meet with from the members of the Unitarian congregations? Could they then form a part of our Christian churches, or appear to the world as fellow-unitarians? If they could

not, and knowing that they could not, they do yet, from a wish to remain "nominally within the pale of some religious community," call themselves Christians, candour itself must confess that there is something in their conduct, not very unlike *hypocrisy and falsehood*.

In thus speaking concerning the adoption of the Christian name by persons amongst us, who have rejected all the ideas which *we* reckon essential to the proper use of the name, we do not, as your correspondent M. A. R. seems to insinuate, "condemn, in a moral point of view, the mere profession of any opinions whatever." It is the profession of Christianity, in order to escape the odium of an open avowal of unbelief, which is condemned as false and hypocritical.

R. A. M.

Professor Lee, Dr. Henderson and Mr. Bellamy.

[This paper has been lying by us for some time, and was indeed in our hands before we inserted the article of Review on the same subject, XIX. 687—692.]

SIR,

**W**ITHOUT being (in my own estimation at least) a more pugnacious animal than the generality of my neighbours, I must candidly confess that literary controversies of every description are my delight, although if there any that more particularly give me pleasure, it is when "Greek meets Greek and we've the tug of war."—Oh, Sir, to retrace the battles of our pugilistic heroes in the *attacks, appeals, replies, or rejoinders* of grave professors—to witness all the evolutions of "the ring" in a literary scuffle, from throwing up hats and peeling, to drawing claret, or getting into chancery, and eventually cutting a somerset, or dying game, and to notice, *en passant*, the sly hits which both combatants give to their brethren for the purpose of ridiculing their systems, or abusing their practice—truly 'tis highly entertaining! I have been induced to make this avowal in the hope of its being accepted as an apology for my troubling you with a paper, which though indebted for its origin to a controversial hit, will, I trust, lead one or another of your

VOL. XX.

N

readers to an examination of graver matter, and enable them to profit accordingly.

My fondness for literary disputations led me the other day to dip into a *brochure* lately published by Professor Lee, of Cambridge, entitled *Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to the Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish Version of the New Testament, by Ali Bey, printed at Paris, in 1819*. Without pretending to decide on the respective merits of the Doctor's *Appeal*, or the Professor's *Remarks*, for which an intimate knowledge of Turkish is absolutely necessary, (and, unlike some of my neighbours, I must confess myself wholly ignorant of the language of the Grand Seignior,) I cannot refrain from avowing the merit which an observation of the professor afforded me, although made by him on a subject altogether serious. In alluding to the want of uniformity which Dr. Henderson asserts is discernible in the Version of Ali Bey, he took occasion to make the following remark: "While it is granted that there are words which are used in different senses, and where words of equal latitude cannot be found, &c., it is a fixed maxim in biblical interpretation, that where such diversity exists, and where the same sense obtains, the words of the sacred original are to be rendered uniform throughout the translation." This the pugnacious professor denies in toto, insisting upon it that the evangelists and apostles, Luke, Paul, and others, in making citations from the Old Testament, never observed any such uniformity; that the best translators, since the first Targumist, down to the present day, have not been found to adhere to any such rule as that broached by Dr. Henderson; nay, that had it actually been the case, "violence would have been done both to the sacred volumes and to the idioms of the language into which they have been translated." He then continues, "Let any one read the remarks of St. Jerome, on the verbal and etymological renderings of Aquila, in his epistle *de optimo genere interpretandi*, and then ask himself the question, whether Jerome was justified or not in styling him *contentiosus interpretas*, or in denominating the principle by which he was guided *Kαταζήλια*? If he doubt at all after this,



he may next turn over a few of the now neglected pages of Mr. John Bellamy, and he will be perfectly satisfied that no such principle as that laid down by Dr. Henderson can for a moment be admitted."

I have been particular in calling your attention to the last sentence quoted from the Professor's work, which he doubtless intended as a kind of triumphant climax to his broad assertions in opposition to Dr. Henderson, because "thereby hangs a tale." To a person not altogether conversant with recent literary set-tos, the dictum of the Cambridge Professor might appear as a *settler*, a perfect *quietus* for poor Bellamy. But how must the laugh be turned against the *soi-disant* champion, when on referring to the latest battle fought between him and Bellamy, not in Pierce Egan's *Boxiana*, but Lee's *Remarks*, and Bellamy's *Reply*, the reader will find that the Professor was repeatedly floored, and so terribly mauled in the last rounds, that he was at length unable to come to the scratch again, whilst Bellamy, for whom the phrase "neglected pages" is intended as a sort of revengeful after-slap, stalked away, little the worse for the affray, and contenting himself with sarcastically calling out to his antagonist to bear in mind for the future that "whatever asses may do now, they certainly never spoke in the days of Balaam!"

But, a truce to pugilistic comparisons! The real object of the present letter is to make a few observations on the proposition maintained by Dr. Henderson as already quoted, and at the same time, by adducing a few instances from Mr. Bellamy's Version of the Pentateuch, in support of the Scotchman's assertion, to prove that, whatever may be said to the contrary by those whom he has disdained to flatter, his pages neither are neglected nor deserve to be so.

I have had occasion, Mr. Editor, to address you more than once, and, if I am not greatly mistaken, the impression made on your mind, by your unknown correspondent, must be, that he is a plain-spoken man, one who, as already said, knows as little of Turkish, as many a Professor, and whose knowledge of Arabic, barely enables him to distinguish between a

sin and a shin, nor are you at all mistaken. In the absence of scholastic learning, I feel perhaps the more inclined to cling to established maxims and canons, and hence the shock I experience on finding a particular rule disputed, which has been gravely and uniformly set forth by translators and commentators of every description under the general and hacknied maxim that "the Bible must be suffered to interpret itself." Without attempting to prove that what is here said of the sacred volume, applies equally to any other literary work, and without pretending to shew how far the maxim here quoted extends, it surely will not be denied by any one, that it includes among the rest the substance of Dr. Henderson's remark, which in plain English amounts to nothing more than this, "that any particular word occurring frequently in the same meaning in an original work, ought as frequently to be rendered by the uniform adoption of a corresponding word in the translation." In a Greek treatise on the *mange of dogs*, for instance, Professor Lee would certainly never think of rendering *κυν* by *cat*, but as often as the Greek term occurred, would use the corresponding English term *dog*, whereas by the rejection of what he terms Dr. Henderson's *new canon*, I apprehend he would be at liberty to translate it by *cat* or even *monkey*, as the whim might seize him. To confess the truth, I greatly suspect that Professor Lee had some other object in view than merely to defend Ali Bey's Turkish Version of the New Testament, when he undertook to controvert and exhibit, as *novel*, a canon which has long been in the mouth of every commentator on the Bible, and which he must have heard rung in his own ears, at one period of his life at least, pretty often. I fear his arguments were intended to be applied in defence of the *Authorized Versions* of the Bible generally, and I am the more convinced of this, when I refer to the expressions used by him in regard to Mr. Bellamy's translation, and bear in mind the futile attempts made by him for the same purpose in his attack on that gentleman already noticed. Be that, however, as it may, it is my firm opinion, that by neglecting Dr. Henderson's Canon (if his it may still be called), the translators of our

own Authorized Version have fallen into many and gross mistakes. What can, for instance, be more absurd than to render a word, which has uniformly one and the same meaning in the original, sometimes by a man, and at other times by a perfect non-descript? Or can any thing be more ridiculous than to apply a particular meaning to a word in one single passage, which it does not bear in any other throughout the Bible; and by the adoption of which that very individual passage is rendered unintelligible, or becomes downright nonsense? In proof of what is here alleged against the current Authorized Versions, including our own, I shall content myself with only three quotations from Mr. Bellamy's translation of the Pentateuch, and those too, taken indiscriminately from the book of Genesis, leaving your readers to decide whether by adhering to the rule condemned by Professor Lee, of suffering the Bible (of course in the original) to be its own interpreter, Mr. Bellamy has done more for the cause of truth, or those who have abandoned and now impugn it.

Much has been said on the subject of *angels*. In the original, as well as in all modern Versions, they are represented as men; that is, they are seen in the shape and form of men; they touch and are touched; they hear and talk, eat and drink, and perform the various functions incident to humanity; and yet the idea of their being something *more* than men will be found to prevail amongst the generality of English readers of our Bible; so that, whilst your good angel is supposed to bear the form of a youth with wings attached to his shoulders, (a sort of non-descript, forming in the poet's eye a link between man and birds,) an evil one figures away as a grinning monster, with cloven foot, and, in the Linnæan phrase, *caudâ tenui elongatâ* (exhibiting a similar poetical link between man and quadrupeds). The Hebrew uniformly adopts the word מלאך which, in defiance of Henderson's rule, has been arbitrarily rendered by our translators in some places by *angel*, and in others by *messenger*. Mr. Bellamy's Version rejects the unintelligible word *angel* throughout; and in luminous notes on chap. xii. 8, and xviii. 2,

he satisfactorily shews, that the Hebrew term never has any other meaning than that of a human messenger, but that, according to circumstances easily gathered from the context, it is frequently used for a messenger of God, i. e. a human messenger (the officiating priest) dispatched from the place where the divine communication was given by God, to issue or execute his commands. Accordingly, "the angel of the Lord" who, in our Authorized Version, found Hagar in the wilderness, and informed her of the Almighty's intentions respecting her posterity, is called by Bellamy, "the messenger of Jehovah;" and the "two angels" who, according to the same translation, (chap. xix.,) arrived towards evening, *per pedes apostolorum*, at Sodom, and joined in "a feast," are simply styled "two messengers" by Bellamy, whose important errand, however, is sufficiently explained in the succeeding verses.

Again, who that has read only the English Bible, and has chanced to meet with the productions of Voltaire and others of the same stamp, but must have sighed at the authorized version of Gen. ii. 21, 22? Let such a person take up Mr. Bellamy's Translation of the Pentateuch, and he will at least find a meaning attached to this passage in the original, which, as it does not reflect on the Creator, has undoubtedly probability to favour it. Let him further be informed that the Hebrew word רִב is no where else, even in our Authorized Version, translated by *rib* than in this single passage, but means *side*: let him, at the same time, bear in mind that the same Hebrew verb and preposition which are here rendered *took of*, or *from*, are in our said Authorized Version translated, in other places, by *brought to*; and, lastly, that תחתנה, in the Authorized Version rendered by *instead thereof*, is in the same Version (Zach. xii. 6) given by *in her own place*; — and surely he will gladly allow that the old Canon of suffering the Bible to interpret itself, is, after all, the best. In strict conformity with it, and supported even by our Authorized Version, as already shewn, Bellamy renders the 21st verse thus: "Now Jehovah God caused an inactive state to fall upon the man, and

he slept: then he brought one to his side whose flesh" (sc. uterus) "he had enclosed in her place."

But the last instance I would beg leave to quote in support of Dr. Henderson's rule, and to shew that, how much soever Mr. Bellamy's pages are neglected by a Professor of Arabic, they are both deservedly read and valued by others, is the well-known 22nd verse of Gen. iii. It is useless to pretend that in the LXX., the Vulgate, and our English Common Version, this verse has any but an absurd meaning. If any signification whatever can be attached to it according to these Versions, it must be, that "to prevent man (who had become like God, to know the difference between good and evil) from living for ever, the Almighty banished him from the garden of Eden." But this version involves two glaring absurdities; for, in the first place, it states, that it was only after sinning that man became like God!—and, secondly, it maintains that *the Almighty*—notwithstanding the numerous assertions, both in the Old and New Testament, to the contrary—*willed the death of the sinner*, inasmuch as, by banishing him from Eden, he took measures to prevent his living for ever! In short, there is a manifest contradiction to the tenor of the whole word of God in the translation of this verse, as we find it in the Authorized and Common Versions. Let us now turn to the pages of Mr. Bellamy, so willingly neglected by Professor Lee, and we shall find a translation of the verse in question as beautiful as it is literal; a version, Mr. Editor, for which, had I a Doctor's hat—whether of Halle or any other university—I would cheerfully renounce it in favour of Mr. Bellamy; in short, a version which, as it shews that the original, instead of a curse, contains the first direct promise of eternal life to man after the fall, is and will be entitled to the gratitude of every sincere reader of the Bible who becomes acquainted with it. Mr. Bellamy's Version runs thus: "Moreover, Jehovah God said, Behold, the man was as one of us,

with the knowledge of good and evil; therefore, now surely he shall put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life; yea, he shall eat and live for ever!" Before, however, adding Mr. Bellamy's arguments in favour of this translation, I must beg leave to quote the version of Dr. Leander Van Ess, the well-known Ex-Professor of Marburg, in his Version of the Bible in German, (Sulzbach, 1822,) wherein, although he differs somewhat from Bellamy, (the First Part of whose Translation, by the way, was published in 1819,) he yet agrees with him in giving the sense of the promise. Ver. 22: "Da sprach Jehova Gott: Siehe! der Mensch ist unsers gleichen worden, so dass er Gutes und Böses erkennt. Nun—soll er nicht die Hand aus strecken und noch dazu vom Baume des Lebens nehmen und davon essen und so ewig leben?" I have said that Mr. Bellamy's Version is literal. The Hebrew verb *יָהָה*, in the first clause of the verse, is strictly *was*, and no where in the Bible means *is become*. The words, *as one of us*, do not refer to God, but are applied by the writer to the human race at large; and the general meaning is, that man was appointed (as any one of us now, or as we all, are) to know both good and evil. The whole meaning of the second clause, which contains the promise of Jehovah, turns on the signification attached to the word *וְיָ* which Bellamy proves, from various passages in the original, as well as on the authority of the learned Targumists, Onkelos and Jonathan, who, it must be remembered, wrote when the Hebrew was a living language, to signify *verily, truly, indeed*; and the subsequent verb *וְיָשָׁה* being in the future, gives the sense, *surely he shall stretch forth his hand, &c. &c.*

I fear, Mr. Editor, that I may have trespassed too much on your patience, and that of your readers, at one sitting: allow me, therefore, to apologize, and at the same time to request, that, if I may have erred in any thing I have advanced, one of your numerous correspondents will be kind enough to set me to rights. □



## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Three Letters addressed to the Ven. and Rev. Francis Wrangham, M. A., &c.* By C. Wellbeloved.

(Concluded from p. 44.)

**W**E left Mr. Wellbeloved in the act of exposing the disgraceful errors into which the Archdeacon of Cleveland's want of candour, and neglect of personal inquiry, had betrayed him, while he was attempting to overthrow the authority of the Improved Version. A still grosser mistake than any which has already passed in review, the writer of the "Three Letters" thus corrects:

"You do not always treat your own oracles with due respect; but \* \* \* you can misrepresent your friends, while accumulating your misrepresentations of those whom you so bitterly oppose. In page 62, heaping your sarcasms upon the modern Unitarian interpretation of the Logos, in the first chapter of John, according to which, you say, 'an attribute' (wisdom) 'was *μονογενής*, the only-begotten; or, to adopt the Improved Version, the *dearly-beloved*,' &c.; you add in a note on this word, 'Used, as Mr. Belsham states, for *αγαπητός*, which he vouchsafes to inform us, does not once occur in the New Testament, whereas it occurs, at least, six times! (Nares.)' But Nares, from whom you profess to derive this note, is not guilty of the blunder here palmed upon him. He does not assert that a word occurs in the New Testament *at least six times*, when a glance upon the column of his *Schmidius* would shew him that it occurred at *least sixty*. Nares's remark is, 'It is not true that the word *αγαπητός* does not occur in the writings of St. John. It occurs in these writings at least six times.' But you, perhaps, served him right to misrepresent him; for he has in this very passage misrepresented Mr. Belsham, and again misled you. Mr. B. vouchsafes no such information as that which, on the supposed authority of Dr. Nares, you ascribe to him. The passage on which Dr. Nares animadverts, is in the *Calm Inquiry*, p. 166, 2nd edit., and is as follows:—'It (the term *μονογενής*) is often metonymically used to express *dearly-beloved*. See Heb. xi. 17. And the same word, in the original Hebrew, which by the LXX. is rendered *μονογενής*, *only-*

*begotten*, is, in other passages, translated *αγαπητός*, *beloved*. Jer. vi. 26; Amos viii. 10. Hence it is probable, that, as the word *αγαπητός*, *BELOVED*, does not occur in John as a title of Christ, this writer uses the word *μονογενής*, *only-begotten*, instead of it, and where the other Evangelists would use *beloved*.'—Now, Sir, does Mr. Belsham vouchsafe to inform us that *αγαπητός* does not once occur in the New Testament; though you have vouchsafed to inform us that this word, which occurs there above sixty times, occurs at least six? But thus it is that the writings of Unitarians are misquoted and misrepresented, and then, on the strength of their adversaries' blunders or artifices, they are branded as sciolists and shallow theological critics, and denied the possession of common sense, common honesty, or the learning of school-boys!"—Pp. 70—72.

What shield can Archdeacon Wrangham employ which shall protect him from the shafts of his antagonist, and from his own?—One further extract shall be made from Mr. Wellbeloved's Reply on the subject of the Improved Version:

"'Those,' you say, 'who wish for farther evidence of the accumulated tricks exemplified in the Improved Version, may find them *ἐλφ τῷ θυλακί* in Magee's, Laurence's, Nares' and Rennell's admirable strictures written expressly on that subject.' True, Sir, your readers will find a 'sack full' of accumulated tricks in the possession of every one of those to whom you refer them, but they are all their own; not one of them ever was the property of the Editors of the Improved Version. I will confidently refer our readers (if, indeed, I should have the good fortune to reckon among my readers any who have been yours also) to that Version itself; and, though they may find some mistakes, and many things in the text, and more in the notes, of which they may disapprove, I will venture to say, they will not find a single trick; any thing which can justify the suspicion of disingenuousness or artifice. I may be allowed again to say, that I am better acquainted with the Improved Version than you, to whom I suspect it is known only through the medium of the authorities you have cited; and I affirm without hesitation, that, though I am far from regarding it as a faultless work, either

as to the translation or the interpretation of many important passages, it is conducted throughout in a fair and honourable manner, under the manifest and powerful influence of a sincere and supreme love of truth."—Pp. 72, 73.

We perfectly agree with the author of the "Three Letters" in his estimate of the character of the Improved Version, and of the motives of its Editor. The work possesses many and great, though of course not unalloyed, excellencies; and we are persuaded that it has been highly useful. One beneficial purpose it has served, which perhaps was little contemplated: it has been the *experimentum crucis*, in respect of the theological learning, the critical skill and knowledge, and, we must add, the candour and probity, of the Archbishops, Archdeacons, and other dignitaries and academics who have made it the subject of their attacks. He who shall contrast the present race of divines in the Established Church with their predecessors, must deeply regret the degeneracy now exhibited, in point of fair dealing, as well as of professional attainment. The fact is too notorious to be denied: the writer of the "Three Letters" has placed it in the clearest light; and the causes and tendency of a change so lamentable, suggest many observations, for which we cannot here find room. We are speaking, be it observed, of the class of men who have been mentioned, not as general scholars, but solely as *divines*: the acknowledged eminence of several of them in literature and science, is far from lessening the dishonour which attaches to them in the characters of theologians and polemicists.

Mr. Wellbeloved advances to the last crimination in his antagonist's Charge that requires particular notice:

"In page 11, you say, 'Among the principal grounds of the creed or no-creed professed by Socinians, may be ranked (as it has been remarked) the accordance of its dogmas with philosophical prejudices. By *philosophical prejudices* are meant the prejudices of men of taste and science on the subject of religion. Accustomed to revel in the riches of the intellect, and the pleasures created by the magic of genius, they feel a strange and adverse descent when they are summoned to receive the peculiar

disclosures of the Christian Revelation.'"—P. 74.

We will endeavour to lay before our readers, in a condensed form, the reply of the author of the "Three Letters:"

"These disclosures you assume to be the doctrines maintained by the Established Church of this country, and other sects usually denominated orthodox. The grounds of a creed, I should imagine, would be generally understood to denote the foundation on which it professes to be built; the principles contained, or supposed by those who frame the creed, to be contained, in the Scriptures. But if I am not greatly mistaken, you confound these with the motives by which some at least—you cannot mean to say all—who maintain that creed, have been induced to adopt it, after it has been framed. If you do indeed intend to say that the creed of Unitarians has been framed on 'philosophical prejudices,' by men of taste and science, I deny the fact, and without any hesitation assert, that it was the creed of the illiterate, though inspired, apostles of our Lord; and that in all succeeding ages it has been held, with various modifications and corruptions indeed, by those who have not generally ranked among the wise and learned. If you mean that the continued existence of this creed is owing to the countenance it receives from men of taste and science, I deny that also to be the fact; and I would advise you to lay aside all unmeaning declamation, and to produce some sufficient proof of what you assert; and, at the same time, to reconcile this assertion with your censure of Unitarianism as a school of sciolism. If you mean to say that men of taste and science, in general, are prejudiced against religion, and betake themselves to Unitarianism to shroud themselves from the imputation of infidelity, permit me to ask, how are you borne out by experience?"—P. 75.

Thus is Archdeacon Wrangham suspended on the horns of a dilemma! If he persist in affirming that Unitarianism is a school of sciolism, how can he venture to tell us that its dogmas accord with philosophical prejudices, or with the prejudices of men of taste and science, on the subject of religion? On the other hand, if Unitarianism recommend itself to men of taste and science, how can it be a school of sciolism? Does this reverend gentleman write first and think afterwards?

But he goes much further: he is calumnious as well as inconsistent. According to the Archdeacon of Cleveland, Unitarianism "conciliates not only the Pyrrhonist, but the profligate." Here he sacrifices truth, and his own character for candour and discernment, to the love of *alliteration*. A false and perverted taste will eagerly combine together the Pyrrhonist and the profligate: and the play upon the words shall be so much the easier to the disputant, if his pen be dipped in the gall of the *odium theologicum*. We suspect that Lord Calthorpe\* has known a great deal more of Unitarians than has fallen to the lot of Archdeacon Wrangham; and though the creed and its professors are not exactly the same thing, there is still a shrewd presumption that they do not vastly differ from each other. Now Lord Calthorpe (we say nothing of his *theological* qualifications or decisions) was pleased to bear his testimony in favour of the moral charities and deportment of Unitarians. Certainly, he did not describe them as *profligates*; and in expressing his opinion of their creed, he was too honest and honourable to maintain that it conciliated the *profligate*. Something he assuredly knew of their character and reputation in society: nor was he unjust to his own convictions, and to *their* humble and, we will add, unfeigned, pretensions. The dignitary before us, outrages decency and common opinion:

"It is impossible," remarks Mr. Wellbeloved, "for any conscientious Unitarian, who experiences the animating and the purifying influences of his faith, to read this passage without feelings of indignation. I hesitate not to avow that such are my feelings; but they are mingled with sentiments of deep regret, that one, from whose extensive learning, correct taste, enlightened understanding, and general urbanity of manners, every thing fair, and candid, and honourable, might have been justly expected, should thus violate truth and charity, in the service of a party, and afford the sanction of his authority to the revilings and the calumnies of ignorance and bigotry."—Pp. 76, 77.

After convicting the Archdeacon of Cleveland of a misapprehension, or

more than misapprehension, of passages in Dr. Priestley's writings, the author of the "Three Letters" admirably vindicates the memory of that great and much-injured man from vulgar calumny. He appeals to incontrovertible facts, in proof of his supreme love and value of the Scriptures; he confidently invites serious and candid persons to read his devotional and practical works, and even those of a controversial and speculative nature, as illustrative of his excellent spirit. Speaking of him in his polemical character, he justly says,

"He was no *bickerer*, no *skirmisher*. He engaged in what he felt to be a momentous and an arduous contest, in defence of genuine Christianity; and he engaged in it with all his might, fairly, honourably, and, I will add, not without success—success as distinguished and as merited as any that attended his physical speculations. *Virulence* belonged not to him. His language may be occasionally strong, but it is not bitter; and the severest expressions he ever employs, betray no resentment or malignity, but only a virtuous indignation against groundless suspicions, misrepresentations, and calumnies, tending at once to injure his own character and to impede the progress of truth."—P. 93.

Mr. Wellbeloved is naturally led to make an estimate\* of Dr. Priestley's controversy with Bishop Horsley: this he does at some length, and with much accuracy and fairness; and the result he thus states:

"On one or two points of minor importance, I allow that he was foiled: but on every leading question, and especially on that which formed the chief topic of discussion, *the existence of a church of Orthodox Hebrew Christians at Ælia*, he was decidedly and triumphantly victorious."—P. 99.

Our author does not close the second of his letters without briefly adverting to Archdeacon Wrangham's attack on Mr. Belsham for having "in an unguarded burst, which it is painful to transcribe, represented the promised Messiah as a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties! appearing even to insinuate that his 'pri-

\* In which undertaking he shews that Archdeacon W. is a stranger to Dr. Priestley's writings.



vate life' might possibly have been less pure and unimpeachable than his public conduct!"—Pp. 104—108.

These, be it considered, are the words of the Archdeacon of Cleveland; and this is the charge which he now prefers against Mr. Belsham, who shall therefore speak for himself: we quote from the former edition of the *Calm Inquiry*, pp. 190, 191:

"The moral character of Christ, through the whole course of his public ministry, as recorded by the evangelists, is pure and unimpeachable in every particular.

"Whether this perfection of character in public life, combined with the general declarations of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus through the whole course of his private life was completely exempt from the errors and failings of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion."

We make this citation for two reasons: first, to convince our readers that what Mr. Belsham has written, refutes, and should have obviated, Archdeacon Wrangham's gloss and animadversion; secondly, that we may appeal to them, whether Mr. Belsham has here done justice to his subject or to himself. His proposition, we think, is not enunciated with the precision and distinctness which usually characterize him. We have no doubt that by "errors and failings," errors and failings *not sinful* must be intended; and the epithet *not sinful* should, accordingly, have been added. Of our Saviour's perfect virtue and piety in every relation of life, who that reads the memoirs of him, can harbour a suspicion?

In the third of these "Letters," Mr. Wellbeloved examines the Archdeacon of Cleveland's defence of the creed of the Established Church, so far as it relates to the doctrine of the Trinity.

The dignitary exclaims, "Shall we not teach them [the Unitarians] that what they simply regard as their exclusive and self-evident tenet, the Unity of the Godhead, depends for its certainty upon the testimony of the Scriptures; and that the unity of design which pervades the natural world, proves only—to adopt the defi-

nition of our own luminous PALEY—a unity of counsel?"

Now the testimony of the Scriptures, is one thing; the definition, or rather the conjecture, of *Paley*, is quite another. Where can we discover evidence that the Scriptures put any distinction between the Unity of the Creator and the unity of a mere creature? Independent proof must be given of the doctrine of the Trinity, before such comments are admissible. Let it be established that three persons actually co-operate with each other in a design and undertaking, previously to an attempt at shewing that these persons form only one being. The author of the "Letters" before us, properly speaks of Paley's definition, or concession, as relating rather to the question "between Monotheists and Polytheists, than to that between Unitarians and Trinitarians." This, it would seem, is its true and natural reference. Not that Paley so employed and limited it: there can be little doubt that *he* glanced at the Trinitarian controversy; and our highly valuable correspondent Mr. Cogan, whose powers of estimating and of conducting metaphysical and moral reasoning, have rarely been surpassed, has in this view, completely destroyed Paley's inference.\*—Pp. 109. 110.

Archdeacon Wrangham asks, "Why are plural appellations so frequently employed, in the original Hebrew, to designate the Godhead?" He informs us too, that "in the very first page of the Bible we meet with terms applied to the Supreme Being, which inseparably combine the ideas of Plurality and Unity; terms which gratuitous hypotheses of Orientalism, of the ordinary style of royal proclamations, or of the association of angels, in the acts and decrees of Omnipotence, are vainly adduced to explain."

If, after what we have already perceived, we could be astonished that the Archdeacon of Cleveland relies on an argument like this; if, under such circumstances, we could exclaim, "*Hæc non modo mirabilia sunt, sed prodigii simile est, quod dicit!*" our wonder, nevertheless, would give place to our gratification at the opportunity with which Mr. Wellbeloved has been furnished, and of which he has availed

\* Mon. Repos. XVIII. pp. 694, &c.

himself, of further illustrating the Hebrew terms and idioms in question.

One of the references of Archdeacon Wrangham, in this part of his Charge, "stands thus: *Joseph. ap. Phot.*" He will be little obliged to his acute and learned opponent for not passing it in silence:

"*Joseph.* can of course be no other than Josephus, and *Josephus ap. Phot.* can be no other than the Jewish historian, from whose works Photius has made some extracts. The term *Τρις*, used by Josephus, struck me immediately as not a little extraordinary; and though I knew that some Christian Fathers had tampered with his works, I felt persuaded from my recollection of the passages cited by the author of the *Myriobiblon*, that the term had not been foisted into any of them. Not being wholly unacquainted with the learned patriarch's work, a little search discovered to me the real author,—one *Jobius*, a monk of the sixth century, distinguished by his fanciful defence of the orthodox doctrine. I will allow what, I fear, you would not, in similar circumstances, grant to a Unitarian writer, that this wrong reference was the consequence, not of design, but of inadvertence; but there is something so imposing and so misleading to an unwary reader, in the connexion of *plural Hebrew terms*, as names of God, the *Trinity* and *Josephus*, a *Jewish writer* known to be contemporary with the apostles, that I could not suffer the error, trifling as it may perhaps be thought by some, to pass unnoticed and uncorrected."—P. 114.

We are much pleased with the following reply to an ill-considered interrogation:

"You go on to inquire, 'Why are the names, and attributes, and works, and worship of the Divinity, ascribed to a certain character, appearing upon different occasions throughout the Old Testament; and more particularly appropriated by the prophets, in almost every variety of application, to the Messiah?' In answer to this inquiry, I must be permitted to say, Produce the passages; prove that such things as belong to the true God, are ascribed to any other than to Jehovah, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the reason shall be given."—Pp. 116, 117.

The Archdeacon of Cleveland appeals to the Baptismal formula and to the apostolic benediction—nor to these alone, but to *numberless passages* in the New Testament,—as involving the irresistible conclusion

VOL. XX.

O

of the doctrine of the Trinity; upon which language ['numberless passages'] his antagonist pertinently remarks, that it is "somewhat hyperbolic," and that the dignitary here displays "more of the orator than of the divine."—P. 118.

As to the *Baptismal formula*, Mr. Wellbeloved fairly questions the propriety of Matt. xxviii. 19, being so denominated; since there is not an instance on record of its having been ever used in the apostolic age. He explains the passage, as well as 2 Cor. xiii. 14, [an apostolic benediction,] with sound judgment and learning, with perspicuity and success.—Pp. 119—123.

The Ven. Archdeacon inquires, 'Why, with more especial reference to the second person of the Trinity, do we read that *the word*, which was *made flesh, and dwelt among us, was God, even God over all*, blessed for ever?' His question is answered by another:

"Where," the writer of the 'Three Letters' also asks, "do we read, that 'the word was God over all, blessed for ever'? Paul, from whom this last phrase is cited, (Rom. ix. 4,) never once speaks of *the word*; and we Unitarians maintain, that it is not even of Jesus, the preacher of the word, that he here speaks; but of that Great Being, whom he elsewhere calls the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, (2 Cor. xi. 31,) and to whom he ascribes praise for the benefits conferred first in the Jewish, and afterwards in the Christian, dispensation."—Pp. 123, 124.

With reference to the *Logos* of the beloved disciple,\* the Archdeacon of Cleveland speaks of the intelligible commentary, and the brief and obvious interpretation, of the Church of England: and this *interpretation*, whatever it be, for we can scarcely discern it, he chooses to contrast with some varying paraphrases by Unitarian expositors. Here he has to encounter another awkward question:

"Is this the interpretation of the Church of England? for I do not find that all her sons agree in their comments. Are we to judge of her views respecting this passage [1 John i. 1,] as she declared them by the mouth of Dr. Daniel Waterland, in the year 1719,

\* John i. 1; 1 John i. 1.

at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London; or as she afterwards declared them, in the years 1764-5, at the very same place, by the mouth of Dr. Benjamin Dawson? If we listen to her first oracle, we shall be told that '*In the beginning*, before there was any creature, (consequently from all eternity) the Word existed; and the Word was no distant, separate power, estranged from God, or unacquainted with Him; but he was *with God*, and himself also *very God*: not another God, but, *another person* only, of the same nature, substance and Godhead.' But if we attend to the other, we shall learn, that such is not the meaning of the evangelist, but that *the Word is the gospel*. 'This was, John tells us, from God himself; for that *in the beginning*, before it was published to the world, it *was with God*; *God was the word*, the original author and giver of it.' Which of these are we to regard as the dictate of the Church of England? As you refer to some intelligible commentary, it cannot be the first; I would gladly persuade myself, therefore, that you mean the latter, as this commentary, proceeding from the Metropolitan church, is nearly the same that I have long been accustomed, as a Unitarian, to maintain."—Pp. 125—127.

Nothing of the kind can be more pertinent and conclusive than the reasoning which we have now transcribed. As an argument *ad hominem*, it is overpowering: but it has much more than an individual application, and deserves to stand at the head of "Articles designed to prevent diversities of opinion concerning true Religion!"

To the question, "Why do we read that in him [Jesus Christ] *dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*?" Mr. Wellbeloved's answer is the following: "Why did the apostle pray (Eph. iii. 19), that the disciples at Ephesus 'might be filled with all the fulness of God'?"\* When the Archdeacon of Cleveland inquires, 'Why do we read that he had power to forgive sins, (and who can forgive sins but God only?)' his censor refers him to Numb. xii. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 24; John xx. 23; and proves that he has mistaken the import of our Lord's words in Matt. ix. 2, 6; in the latter of which verses, let it be further remarked, the term [*ἐξουσίαν*] rendered *power*, signifies "delegated power."

The dignitary refers next to John v. 21: 'As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.' But the twenty-sixth verse of this very chapter ['As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *GIVEN* to the Son to have life in himself?'] might have taught Archdeacon Wrangham, that this high prerogative is *conferred*, and not *essentially inherent*. So, again, when we read that, 'as the Father knew Him [Jesus Christ], even so knew he the Father,' the context makes it plain that it is not the personal nature of the Father and of the Son, which forms the subject of the speaker's observation, but the designs of the Father and the commission of the Son.\* At the same time, the passage [John x. 14] quoted by Mr. Wellbeloved, effectually repels his antagonist's attempt at erecting on the basis of such phraseology the received tenet of the deity of Christ.

In respect of John v. 23, that "all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father," we have it on the Archdeacon of Cleveland's own authority, that the word translated *even as* "frequently denotes, not equality, but such an analogy (in many cases far from complete) as the character of the things spoken of admits." Here we think him indisputably right. Yet, without laying all the stress on this criticism, which, however, it will in reason bear, we interpret the passage by what precedes and follows. Why are all men to honour the Son even as they honour the Father? Clearly because the Father hath *COMMITTED* to him, (ver. 22,) all judgment. Then comes the inquiry, In what consists this honour? As evidently, in acknowledging the perfections of the Father, and in admitting his attestations to the claims of the Son.† [Verses 32, 34, 37, 38, 43.]

According to Archdeacon Wrangham, "Jesus is the true God, and eternal life." It was little probable that an affirmation so unlearned and so unscholar-like, would fail of being corrected by his opponent.

"I deny," says the author of the

\* Mr. Wellbeloved correctly quotes Coloss. ii. 10, as a parallel text.

\* Mon. Repos. XI. 532, &c.

† The phraseology and sentiment are illustrated by Luke x. 16.



'Three Letters' "that we do read this, as predicated of Jesus Christ. Our common version (1 John v. 20) is, 'This is the true God and eternal life,' and the pronoun 'This,' refers not to the nearest, but to a remoter antecedent, 'Him that is true:' just as in 2nd Ep. 7, 'This is a deceiver,' refers not to Jesus Christ, the last antecedent, but to one of the 'many deceivers,' at the beginning of of the verse. The true God, is not Jesus Christ, but that Being whom he hath given his disciples understanding to know." John xvii. 3.—Pp. 130, 131.

With the same perspicuity of method and expression, in the same happy strain of the soundest interpretation, Mr. Wellbeloved compares together certain verses in the chapter to which he has just referred—John xvii. 11, 24, (5,) 21, &c. no less than the transaction and language recorded in John v. 17, 18, explains Heb. i. 8, John x. 18, and such passages as Gal. vi. 18, Eph. vi. 23, &c., and then with reason asks,

"Are these the numerous and decisive texts, by which the cause of Trinitarianism is to be firmly established?—As a counterbalance to these, you tell your clergy, who, if they were at all acquainted with the works of Unitarian writers, must have heard you with some degree of astonishment, that a few passages are brought forward where Christ is represented as commissioned by the Father, as praying to him, and as acknowledging his superiority. A few passages! No, Sir, not a few passages: even those to which you immediately refer are many, and besides those, we produce whole books—the general strain and tenor of the Scriptures, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. We say, and we think that we can prove it, and that we do prove it, that it is uniformly and plainly the language of the Old Testament, that there is but one God, Jehovah, the same who, in the New Testament, is called the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; and that the same doctrine is that of every book of the New Testament; maintained and taught by Jesus himself, and, in the most express terms, by his apostles. We affirm that the doctrine of the Trinity is not taught in any single passage, that it is inferred only from very few; and that the doctrine of the deity of the founder of Christianity, depends also upon a few scattered texts, separated from their connexion, and interpreted without a just regard to idioms of speech, and the circumstances of the primitive church."—Pp. 136, 137.

The author of the "Three Letters," then exposes with uncommon force the gratuitous but convenient hypothesis of "two natures" in Jesus Christ, and sets in array against it the simplicity and clearness of the Unitarian faith.

Nor does he pass unnoticed his antagonist's appeal to the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Of these the Archdeacon of Cleveland produces no meagre catalogue: among these he assures the unlearned reader, that there is a most entire concurrence, as to the point referred to, the Divinity [the Deity] of Christ. "They are meant, however," adds the dignitary, "not to establish that point, for"—and here Mr. Wellbeloved most cordially agrees with him,—"better foundation can no man lay than what is already laid in scripture; but to shew," (the Archdeacon continues,) "in opposition to vague and illiterate assertions, that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were *not* Unitarians." Here the author of the "Three Letters" takes occasion to make some pertinent observations.

"Such assertions you may indeed well call vague and illiterate; but who has made them? So far from considering these Fathers as Unitarians, we charge them (with the exception of those denominated apostolic) with being the corrupters of the Unitarian doctrine. All that we contend for is, that they did not hold the doctrine of the Trinity as it is now professed, that they had no notion of three co-eternal and co-equal persons, forming one God; but that, although they spoke of the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, they spoke of it uniformly as an inferior and subordinate divinity, derived from the Father, who was the supreme and only true God, and to whom alone, the highest degree of worship is to be paid."—Pp. 142, 143.

From this statement we cannot withhold our humble praise: it is perfectly accurate and luminous. Mr. Wellbeloved goes on to offer some remarks on the second epistle of Clement of Rome, on the alleged epistle of Barnabas, on certain writings ascribed to Ignatius, on the supposed doxology of Polycarp, &c. &c., which evince his own well-digested learning, and are excellently calculated to place before his readers a fair and equitable view of this part of the controversy. Within the compass of a few pages, he affords to students in Theology

highly valuable information. In a note\* he speaks of Dr. Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity, and his History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ, as works which are not indeed wholly free from mistakes, but which contain more correct and comprehensive views of the opinions of the ancient Christian church, and of the progress of error, than are elsewhere to be found: and this sentiment we quote with the greatest pleasure, because it is the sentiment of a capable judge, and because we conscientiously and deliberately think that its justness will continue to be attested, and will finally be established, by time and investigation. Before we dismiss our author's reasoning on the Fathers, we shall produce his comment on one or two clauses in Tertullian:

"The words of Tertullian cited by Bishop Bull, in the passage given in your note, p. 46, are not, as you represent them, a formula; and if the learned prelate means by his '*communem fidem exponens ait*,' to say that the Presbyter of Carthage designed they should be so understood, he is far from correct. Tertullian speaks, indeed, more than once of a rule of faith (*regula fidei*), but he means by that the substance of the faith, not any form of words; nor is any such form to be found in his writings, or in any of so early a date. Little was known of Creeds before the council of Nice; after that, not a council was held, whatever its object, or however small a number of bishops assembled, but it ended with a new creed, graced with a due portion of anathemas. If any very ancient creed is to be found, it is one given by Paul: 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' This is our confession; thus we believe; and are therefore surely justified when we allege antiquity in our favour."—Pp. 149, 150.

With his accustomed correctness, Mr. Wellbeloved intimates, that even this declaration, scriptural, simple and comprehensive as it is, was not employed in apostolic times, as a creed. Of that age it was the creed that *Jesus is the Christ*. Would that none other had afterwards been prescribed and adopted!

We must not wonder that the Arch-

deacon of Cleveland approves of the canon applied by Mr. Granville Sharp, Bishop Burgess, &c., to the Greek article in Eph. v. 5, &c.; that last and weakest subterfuge of modern Orthodoxy!

"The fallacy of these rules," says Mr. Wellbeloved, in reply, "has been most satisfactorily proved by a very acute though perhaps not sufficiently grave writer, styling himself Gregory Blunt,\* in six more letters to Granville Sharp; by the Rev. Calvin Winstanley, in a vindication of certain passages in the common English version, &c., and by a critic in the Monthly Review, N. S. Vol. 62 and 67, who, in his remarks on the publications of Bishop Middleton, and Mr. Veyrie, has proved himself a master in his art."—Pp. 151, 152.

We shall now copy the concluding sentences of these "Three Letters," both for the true dignity of style, and excellence of spirit, which they manifest, and with the view of preparing our readers for those "Additional" Letters, from the same pen, to which we shall next invite their attention:

"If" says Mr. Wellbeloved, "in vindicating the doctrines you have so bitterly opposed, and the characters you have so wrongfully aspersed, there has been any thing in my manner needlessly harsh and offensive; if I have been betrayed into any thing unbecoming a scholar and a Christian, I here avow my sincere regret, and tender a willing apology. And if I have in any instance, misapprehended your words, and attributed to them a meaning which they will not bear, or which you did not design them to express, or if I have fallen into errors of any other kind, I require only to be convinced, in order publicly to acknowledge and correct them. In such case, only, am I disposed again to notice the subjects of these letters. I have no fondness for controversy, nor any wish to acquire, by practice, 'polemical dexterity.' The character of a controversialist I have now

---

\* "Who was the author of that most able and convincing tract?" is a question which must interest many scholars and theologians still more than the inquiry, Who wrote the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*? Dr. Wordsworth, possibly, may have heard the conjecture, that the 'Six more Letters' proceeded from the pen of a late most estimable divine of the Established Church, who declined some of its greatest honours and emoluments."

sustained, for the first time : I willingly lay it down, to be resumed no more."—P. 153.

N.

ART. II.—*My Children's Diary ; or, the Moral of the Passing Hour*. 12mo. pp. 352. Harvey and Darton ; and R. Hunter. 6s. 6d.

ON reading the beginning of this book, though pleased with its rationality, we pronounced it *dull*. We say this to prevent our readers from hastily laying down a work which, on further acquaintance, we have found capable of strongly interesting every judicious parent or intelligent child. It appears to be the production of a woman of highly-cultivated mind, who is an affectionate, wise and truly Christian mother. It offers the picture of a family consisting of parents ever watchful to promote the improvement and happiness of their children, and of children possessing not only all the loveliness and endearing qualities, but all the imperfections likewise, of their period of life. This little sketch from nature points out in a happy manner the right mode and the true objects of rational education. We select one short extract, which will give an idea of the easy way in which the author conveys moral instruction to the mind :

"Esther and Mary had formed a pretty nosegay of field flowers, such as the season afforded \* \* \* \*. It was perhaps the last bouquet of the year, and nothing but zeal could have made one so pretty in October. It was difficult to decide who had the largest share in the work, but each had some particular reason for wishing to present it to me, singly ; and sorry am I to say that a little dispute arose, such as, happily, is of very rare occurrence in our house, or, although it was conducted without any degree of acrimony on either side, our domestic comfort would be seriously impaired. It does not require a gale to beat down the plants of loveliest growth.

"An appeal was made to Grace, and I was amused by hearing her decision. Happy for the world if nations and individuals would act upon her principle !

"Which of you is in the right ?" said she.

"The girls looked at each other. 'Why, that is what we wanted you to tell us, Grace.'

"Nay, your own consciences will tell

you best ; and then, whoever is in the right, must give up to the other.'

"The right give up ! That seems very odd.'

"Not at all. She will be infinitely the best off, after all. It is at all times, and under every circumstance, so much better to be right than wrong, that we can afford to give up any point such as this, when we are quite sure of our ground. And surely it is far nobler to give a boon than to receive one. Whereas to lose one's aim, and to be in the wrong too—O you would not wish such ill fortune to an enemy !"—Pp. 319, 320.

ART. III.—*The Primitive Christian Faith. A Discourse, delivered in the Evening Service at the Opening of the Chapel in York Street, St. James's Square, London, December the 19th, 1824 : to which is prefixed, the Prayer used after the Liturgy in the Morning Service*. By Lant Carpenter, LL.D., one of the Ministers of Lewin's Mead, Bristol. 8vo. pp. 38. Hunter and Eaton. 1825.

THE "Opening of the Chapel in York Street" has excited not a little attention, and the Unitarian public are much indebted to Dr. Carpenter for presenting to them, through the press, one of the Sermons which he preached on the interesting occasion. From 1 Pet. iii. 15, 16, the preacher delineates "The Primitive Christian Faith," shewing that it is Unitarian, and explaining how far it agrees with, and in what points it differs from, the prevailing theology of our country. The seriousness and candour, as well as the scriptural reasoning, of the Sermon, make it peculiarly worthy of perusal, and must recommend the object near to the author's heart to every intelligent, dispassionate and pious reader. We have been gratified at finding very clearly stated (pp. 14, 15) the ground of dissent from the Established Church, "because by its very constitution it implies the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion, which we see reason to believe introduces worldly motives into the solemn concerns of religion, and powerfully tends to make men hypocrites or self-deceivers."—Let the services of York-Street Chapel be carried on in the same spirit with which this



publication shews us that they were begun, and we cannot doubt of the success of the experiment.

ART. IV.—*Antichrist Detected among Reputed Orthodox Christians. In a Series of Essays.* By Richard Wright. 8vo. pp. 24. 4d.

ART. V.—*Thoughts on Paul's Man of Sin; or, the Great Apostacy from the Christian Name, described 1 Thess. ii. 3—12.* By the Same. 8vo. pp. 20. 4d.

ART. VI.—*The Christian Ministry Defended, and Priestcraft Exploded.* By the Same. 8vo. pp. 86. 1s. 6d.—All printed and sold by F. B. Wright, Liverpool; and sold by Eaton and C. Fox and Co., London. 1824.

THESE tracts appeared in successive numbers of *The Christian Reflector*, a periodical publication at Liverpool, and are now made up for wider distribution, with separate title-pages, and, in the case of the last, a Preface. They are in the author's usual unpretending manner, and are well adapted for such readers as have not access to more bulky and elaborate works.

The title of the first pamphlet shews where Mr. Wright finds "Antichrist." He contends that the portentous name cannot be applied to his own denomination.

"Unitarianism is not only, no where in the New Testament predicted as a departure from the faith, no where mentioned as included in the apostacy which it was foretold would take place under the Christian name; it is also undeniable that the apostate church, in which the most prominent of the predictions referred to have been verified, has always been Trinitarian, and Unitarians have never been allowed within its pale.—Trinitarianism has all along been the doctrine of that church which Protestants have denominated the mother of harlots, and of the apostate churches, her daughters, it is found in all their creeds, and is identical with the predicted apostacy. The marks of antichrist, as stated by the apostle, have ever been found associated with the other great and acknowledged corruptions of Christianity. It cannot be pretended that the name *mystery*, which stands foremost in the titles of the mother of harlots, and which is so strikingly appropriate to reputed orthodoxy, can in any way be applicable to

Unitarianism, which is as rational as it is scriptural, and as perfectly suitable to man as it is honourable to God, and to his Christ. If Trinitarianism exhibits the marks of antichrist mentioned in the apostolic writings, and be included in the grand apostacy foretold in the New Testament, and Unitarianism bears none of those marks, and cannot be traced as either that apostacy, or any part of it, which is what I have aimed to shew, it cannot remain questionable which of the two systems is the true doctrine of Christ."—Pp. 22, 23.

The second tract is a sequel to the first. The author does not follow those that interpret the "Man of Sin" of his Holiness at Rome. "The titles 'man of sin,' and 'son of perdition,'" (he says, p. 8,) "are not designed to characterize any particular man, or church, or class or description of men, but are forms of expression used to personify the corrupt and destructive system of false doctrine, bad principles, superstitious practices, delusion and infatuation, religious domination, prostration of the understanding, and mental and moral debasement, which has for ages borne the venerated name of Christianity, and which the spirit of prophecy anticipated as existing and prevailing during the continuance of the grand apostacy predicted by the Apostle Paul." He explains the hindrance to which the Apostle refers, in the way of the man of sin, as being not, according to the majority of commentators, Rome Pagan, but the apostolic ministry, supported by miraculous powers.

The third tract is on a fruitful subject. The author treats it in the free spirit of a Nonconformist. He is careful to distinguish between priesthood and the Christian ministry.

"It does not appear that any precise form of church order, government and discipline was given by Jesus Christ; for we find no precise form laid down in the New Testament; but the great principles which he taught, and the maxims he inculcated, are a sufficient foundation for Christians to build upon, and rule for them to proceed by, in all ages, if they be careful to do everything in his spirit, and never to depart from his precepts. The wants of mankind, and the edification of the church, rendered the ordinary Christian ministry essentially necessary at first, and its evident utility would lead to its continuance. So long as the wants of men render religious and moral instruc-

tion necessary; so long as the public ministration of the gospel is calculated for the good and salvation of the world, and to promote the comfort and spiritual edification of those who believe; and so long as the solemn worship of Almighty God, conducted in an acceptable manner, is felt by Christians to be an invaluable blessing, the Christian ministry must be necessary, and will be encouraged and supported by all serious, candid, pious and benevolent persons. On this ground, viz. its suitableness to the moral and spiritual wants of mankind, its tendency to promote the knowledge, virtue, piety and happiness of those who enjoy it, and the little probability of preserving, much less of promoting and diffusing pure and undefiled religion in the world without it, we may rest the weight of the question respecting the importance and value of the Christian ministry; without seeking for what we are not likely to find, the proof of its being an immediate divine institution. It is enough that it naturally emanated from Christianity in its first best days, grew up under the patronage of the apostles, and, notwithstanding its gross corruption, perversion and abuse, has done much towards enlightening and regenerating the world. While we set our faces against its abuses and corruptions, and protest against priests and priestcraft, let us cherish the Christian ministry wherever we find it existing in simplicity and purity."—Pp. 13, 14.

Mr. Wright denounces the *ordination* of ministers to be "priestcraft," if it be considered as giving them authority to teach or administer ordinances, or as conferring upon them any character or right which they had not previously acquired from the choice of the people; but he allows that a public service on the settlement of a minister may be useful, and is,

with proper guards, expedient. (Pp. 25, 26.)

He maintains that a minister may be learned in theology who has no pretensions to learning, as it is commonly reckoned: he allows, however, with good sense, the value of all learning, and the necessity of establishments for ministerial education. (Pp. 33—35.)

He distinguishes between a scriptural and a political church. The former is an assembly of Christians, the latter an ecclesiastical corporation. (P. 57.) The phrase, *Church and State*, he says, p. 62, is an absurdity; putting the Church first is putting the creature before the Creator. Referring to penal laws and statutes for the protection of the Church, he says,

"All such laws and statutes for the defence of religion may be regarded as the offensive weapons of priestcraft. They are not necessary to guard true religion; that is not to be defended by any such carnal weapons; but to guard the absurd notions, and superstitious practices, the usurpations, honours, power and emoluments, of what is called the Christian priesthood. If things were called by their names, prosecutions for heresy and blasphemy would be called, prosecutions for securing to the priests the uninterrupted practice of their craft, and the advantage of their suberviency for political purposes."—P. 63.

Our readers will by this time have perceived, that the author of these tracts is learned in "the law of liberty," his study of which has, in apostolic phrase, (1 Tim. iii. 13,) "purchased to himself a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

## OCCASIONAL NOTICES OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS.

WE apprehend that the writings of our brethren in America are but little known among the English Unitarians; and we are desirous to contribute to their greater acquaintance with each other. Some of the smaller tracts published in New England, (among which we must rank, as of eminent utility and merit, Dr. Channing's *Ordination Sermon* for the Rev. JARED SPARKS, and his invaluable *Discourse on the Evidences of Chris-*

*tianity*,) have been reprinted in England: \* but with the exception of these,

\* We do not recollect that more have been reprinted in England than the following: Dr. CHANNING'S *Ordination Sermon for the Rev. Jared Sparks, at Baltimore*, reprinted twice in Liverpool. Dr. C.'s *Discourse on the Evidences of Christianity*, reprinted twice in Bristol. Dr. C.'s *Ordination Sermon for the Rev. E. S. Gannett*, lately reprinted in Liverpool. Professor WARE'S *Ordination Sermon for*

we believe that little notice has been taken, on this side the Atlantic, of those publications which are producing gradual but powerful effects in the United States, by weakening the strong holds of orthodoxy, without, at the same time, incurring the risk of loosening the ties of Christian faith, or lessening the influence of gospel principles. There is a sobriety and solidity in their general style of composition, which does not quite suit the excitement of strong feeling, or that satiety which can relish nothing but the high-seasoned viands that have destroyed its taste for the simple fare of plain truth, or that hastily-glancing style of examination which the multiplicity of books, in the present day, tends to produce; but it seems likely to have peculiar efficacy in regions where the din of controversy is but little heard, and where the pomp and imposing influence of a wealthy and powerful establishment is unknown.

In reference to the effect of the first of the above-mentioned publications, we find the following statement in the Preface to the *Christian Examiner* for 1824 :\*

“Many eminent individuals, in church and state, have adopted the sentiments

---

his son, the Rev. William Ware, at New York, reprinted in Liverpool. Professor NORTON's *Thoughts on Religion; Hints to Unitarians; and Consolations of Unitarianism, particularly in the Hour of Death*: all three reprinted at Liverpool from the *Christian Disciple*. And a tract by the Rev. HENRY WARE, (the son of Dr. Ware,) entitled *Three important Questions answered, relative to the Christian Name, Character, and Hopes*, just reprinted in Bristol. It is much to be wished that all the American Tracts republished in England should be printed in 12mo, for uniformity's sake, and with a regard to neatness and legibility; and that they should have a London Bookseller's name in the Imprint.

\* After the periodical publication called the *Christian Disciple*, which came out every two months at Boston, U. S., had been continued five years under that name, it was deemed expedient to begin a new series, which is entitled the *Christian Examiner*. The first number of this valuable periodical was published at the commencement of 1824. We believe Mr. Hunter has made arrangements to get a supply of it, and of some other works by the American Unitarians.

which we have maintained. Ministers professing them, have been settled in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina; and societies of Unitarian Christians have been organized in the cities of Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, and New York. A more extensive and powerful effect upon the religious public than has been known in any other instance in this country, (unless the preaching of Whitfield and his associates make an exception,) was produced by the sermon of Dr. Channing, at Baltimore, which contained rather a sketch, than a defence of Unitarian opinions. In many parts of our country, besides those which we have specified, there are considerable numbers, and in almost all parts, religious individuals, attached to this system from conviction and conscience. A spirit of religious inquiry is still more generally diffused; and besides those who have embraced our views, there are many who are subjecting them to a candid examination.”

The writer of the Preface then proceeds,

“Nor has this progress of opinion been attended with any extraordinary excitement of uncharitable feelings. Doubtless, in common with all who have been in a minority in religion, we have occasionally had cause to regret that we were misjudged and misrepresented. But we think we look in vain for any other instance, in which so considerable a reformation of belief has been effected with so little mutual irritation. In comparison with those who in other times and countries have engaged in similar labours, we consider ourselves to have been signally privileged in regard to the amount of obloquy, which we have been called to endure, and the temptations to unchristian feeling which we have had to resist. And we have ceased, in a great measure, to dread the influence of controversy upon an intelligent and serious community, since we have perceived that in the course of these discussions they have assumed a more moderate and elevated character; and a better mutual understanding, and greater mutual respect, have come to prevail between the adherents to opposite opinions. Exceptions to this remark undoubtedly occur; but it is no small cause of satisfaction, that, to such an extent, a good example is set by those whose example will naturally be regarded.”

This is as the best friends of Unitarian Christianity must desire: but while our American brethren have so



much cause for grateful complacency, in the state of things among themselves, they must learn to make great allowances (and greater perhaps than they sometimes feel easy to make) for the influences of the widely different circumstances in which the English Unitarians have been placed, and to appreciate more highly those persevering efforts of our older advocates, to which, in all probability, they mainly owe their present great advantages. They enjoy the peaceful fruits of the war of controversy in the mother country. While they profit by our errors, as well as by our exertions, may they never lose sight of that firm attachment to truth, which, while it sees, and values, and embraces all, in the midst of opposing errors, which accords with the spirit and teachings of the gospel, will never yield from the straight-forward course in order to court the favour of men, or spare their prejudices, nor allow the specious name of candour (noble as the genuine virtue is) to divert it, whenever Providence opens the way, from the faithful statement of unpopular doctrine, or the earnest refutation of popular errors.

What we conceive to be the peculiar duty of Unitarians at the present period of the controversy, is, to connect, in their writings and discourses, as much as possible, those views of Christian hopes and privileges which bind the gospel to the heart, and afford it its best supports and consolations under the consciousness of sin and spiritual imperfection, and in the prospect of death,—and those elevated and refining principles of Christian duty (in constant union with its awful sanctions) which guide and invigorate as they are faithfully imbibed and carried into active efficacy,—with those great truths respecting the character and worship of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which are the essential points of Unitarianism, and the main value of which consists in their intimate alliance with those views and principles to which we have just referred, and in their mutual dependence on each other. In our judgment, those opinions respecting the Mediator between God and man, which represent him as being in all respects, as to nature, like his brethren, best harmonize with the facts and

representations of the Scriptures, and give the greatest influence to his example, and to his resurrection; and, in all probability, when the Christian world in general have advanced so far as to receive his God and Father as “the only True God,” they will learn to regard Christ Jesus, according to his own simple representation, as “a Man who declared the truths which he heard from God;” while, at the same time, they love him as their Saviour, and reverence him as their Judge: but we cannot hesitate in yielding the honourable appellation of Unitarians to those who do not entertain these sentiments respecting the person of Christ: if they keep close to those views of the Proper Unity, and Unrivalled Supremacy, and Essential Mercy, and Exclusive Worship of Jehovah, which it is our privilege to possess, we feel we are united by the strongest bonds, and minor differences should not be allowed to weaken them. Indeed, if we will limit the appellation, we must refuse it, not only to Dr. Channing and the greater part of our American brethren, but to Mr. Adam in Hindoostan, and even to Rammo-hun Roy himself, who seems raised up by Divine Providence, effectually to commence the Christianizing of our eastern possessions.

The doctrine of “One God even the Father,” says Dr. Channing, (at the close of the paragraph in which he has expressed opinions so erroneous respecting Dr. Priestley,) seems to me “to attract to itself, naturally and powerfully, all those doctrines of Christianity which are most suited to touch, move, exalt and sanctify the soul; and, however mixed at present with imperfect views, it will, I doubt not, through the affinity which subsists between all the truths of God’s word, unite with itself, more and more, whatever of genuine Christianity is scattered through the various denominations of Christians.” And it should be our aim (as many of our English Unitarians have made it) to shew the connexion between whatever is spiritualizing in the Christian doctrine, and holy in its requirements, and adapted in its hopes to the wants of the frail, erring children of mortality, and those points of belief which we maintain in opposition to the great body of the Christian world, because

we regard them as the faith once delivered to the saints. The skeleton was abundantly sufficient for the philosophic Galen to shew to him the wisdom of the Creator; and these doctrines, simply stated, must, we think, approve themselves to the sound, unbiassed understandings of men; but we wish to see them connected with that which will give them vitality, which will make them not only direct the understanding, but influence the affections, and give scope to that "sacred power" which bears the mind onwards and upwards to contemplate the ways and purposes of Him who dwelleth in light inaccessible.

The influence of Dr. Channing's writings has strengthened greatly the painful impressions with which we peruse his strictures on Dr. Priestley's character and labours, which have already met with the animadversion of some of our ablest correspondents, and are well examined in the excellent Preface to the Liverpool Edition of Dr. Channing's Sermon at the Ordination of his Colleague-Pastor, the Rev. Ezra Stiles Gannett. We trust, however, we shall, on neither side, let these things move us from kindly feelings and useful purposes.

Among these we must rank co-operation in aiding the diffusion of primitive Christianity among the inhabitants of Hindoostan, whether Hindoos or Mahometans. We have lying before us a letter, dated June the 9th, 1824, from a highly-esteemed brother, who is very earnest in aiding to direct the attention of the American Unitarians to the subject of foreign missions, and would rejoice to see our attention so directed. He laments, as "a very great evil, that the Unitarians of England, and of America, are but very imperfectly informed concerning each other. A constant communication (he continues) is kept up between all classes of the orthodox, in both countries; and they consequently can, and do, co-operate in every important measure for the accomplishment of their objects. This is as it should be: but why is it not so also among us?" Soon after our correspondent had preached a Sermon at the "Thursday Lecture at Boston," on the causes which have withheld Unitarians from engaging in the work of foreign missions, (which, by the desire of his

brethren who heard it, has been printed in the Christian Examiner,) answers were received from Mr. Adam, of Calcutta, and also from Rammohun Roy, to twenty queries proposed to them by the Rev. Dr. Ware, (Professor of Divinity in Harvard College, Cambridge,) regarding the missionary exertions in India, and the probability of good to be done by sending Unitarian Missionaries to that country. These were immediately published at the Cambridge University Press, under the title of *Correspondence relative to the Prospects of Christianity, and the Means of promoting its Reception in India*. It forms an octavo pamphlet of 138 pages, of which Mr. Adam's Answers, with the Queries, extend to page 120. This correspondence produced, says our American friend, "a very strong excitement among us, to the end of which I am looking with great interest.—Perhaps the foreign missionary service may become a principle of union among us,—strange as at first it may appear,—as it is among other denominations." Whatever may be the case on this particular topic, we shall indeed rejoice to see the bonds of union increasing among all who have received that knowledge which is life eternal. (John xvii. 3.)

The Editor of the Correspondence, in an advertisement prefixed, expresses his belief "that the information which it contains will be useful in communicating more distinct views than are generally possessed, relative to the prospects of Christianity in one quarter of the world; and that it may assist in giving such a direction to the efforts of Christians, to propagate their religion in Heathen countries, as shall yield a hope of better success than has been yet experienced." It would give us great satisfaction to see the tract reprinted in England, especially if those could be induced to peruse it, who have so long contributed to support, and have themselves earnestly laboured to promote, the cause of missionary service in India.\*

---

\* We wish it may enter into the heart of some of our rich and liberal-minded men, to form a little fund, (which might be done with no great risk,) to secure the republication of valuable tracts and other works by our brethren in America.

Professor Ware's Questions are as follows; and there can be no hesitation in characterizing them as alike judicious and comprehensive:

"1. What is the real success of the great exertions which are now making for the conversion of the natives of India to Christianity?"

"2. What the number and character of converts?"

"3. Are those Hindoos who profess Christianity respectable for their understanding, their morals, and their condition in life?"

"4. Of what caste are they generally? And what effect has their profession of Christianity upon their standing?"

"5. Are they Christians from inquiry and conviction, or from other motives?"

"6. Of what denomination of Christians have the Missionaries been most successful; Catholic, Protestant, Episcopalian, Baptist, Trinitarian, Unitarian?"

"7. What is the number of Unitarian Christians? And are they chiefly natives or Europeans?"

"8. How are they regarded and treated by other Christians? Is it with any peculiar hostility?"

"9. What are the chief causes that have prevented, and that continue to prevent, the reception of Christianity by the natives of India? May much of the want of success be reasonably attributed to the form in which the religion is presented to them?"

"10. Are any of the causes of failure of such a nature, that it may be in the power of Unitarian Christians to remove them?"

"11. Are there any reasons for believing that Christianity, as it is held by Unitarians, would be more readily received by intelligent Hindoos, than as it is held by Trinitarians?"

"12. Can any aid be given by Unitarians to the cause of Christianity in India with a reasonable prospect of success? If any can be given,—of what kind,—in what way,—by what means?"

"13. Would it be of any use to send Unitarian Missionaries with a view to their preaching Christianity for the purpose of converting adult natives?"

"14. Would it be useful to establish Unitarian Missionary schools for the instruction of the children of natives in the rudiments of a European education, in the English language, in Christian morality, mingling with it very little instruction relative to the doctrines of Christianity; leaving them chiefly or wholly out of view, to be learnt afterwards from our books, and our example?"

"15. Are there many intelligent natives who are willing to learn the languages of Europe, to cultivate its literature, to make

themselves acquainted with our religion as it is found in our books, and to examine the evidences of its truth and divine origin?"

"16. Are there many respectable natives who are willing to have their *children* educated in the English language, and in English learning and arts?"

"17. What benefits have arisen, or are likely to arise, from the translation of the Scriptures into the languages of the East? Are they read by any who are not already Christians? And are they likely to be read generally even by those who are? This question is suggested by the representations which have been made, that converts to Christianity are mostly, if not altogether, of the lowest and most ignorant classes of society. Is this representation true?"

"18. Will any important impression favourable to Christianity ever be made, except by the conversion and through the influence of persons of education and of the higher classes of society, who can read our sacred books in the original, or at least in the English version?"

"19. Are the translations which have been made, faithful; free from sectarian influence, as to the expression of Christian doctrine?"

"20. Are there any *particular parts* of India or of the East, where efforts for propagating Christianity or preparing the way for it, might be made with better hopes than in others?"—Pp. 4—6.

The letter of Mr. Adam, containing his Answers to these Queries, is dated Calcutta, December 24, 1823. It is copious in its detail, and bears the marks of a sound mind, fairly stating whatever might afford means of judgment to others, earnest in its desires for the spread of Christian truth, and not disposed to sink under difficulties, yet weighing those difficulties faithfully, and giving such results, wherever required by truth of fact, as may discourage the more sanguine, and check the expectations of some who through ignorance may have raised them too high; yet in the midst of all, giving such an insight into the real bearings of the case, and such encouragement to those who know how to work for the future, that we are persuaded it will damp ardour only where it is undisciplined, and will point to good hopes to those who desire always to abound in the work of the Lord.

Much of the information which Mr. Adam gives to our American bre-



thren, is such as could have been given by no other. He betrays no confidence ; but he removes much of that false glare which is thrown around the missionary services of orthodoxy, by shewing us the plain fact ; and were we of that party, we should thank him for his unvarnished tale.

It will be our object in the next number, to give some of the varied information to be derived from this Correspondence, which may enable our English Unitarians to judge what course they should pursue, and will, we think, induce them to co-operate with our American brethren in following the call of Providence, and (without forgetting the worthy labourer at Madras, William Roberts) saying to Rammohun Roy and his able co-adjutor, What we can, we will do, with full purpose of heart.

To shew, however, how little has hitherto been done, we will extract two passages from the *Correspondence* at the close of the answers to the first inquiry ; the first by Rammohun Roy ; the second, more detailed, by Mr. Adam :

“The Baptist Missionaries of *Serampore* have repeatedly given the public to understand, that their converts were not only numerous, but also respectable in their conduct ; while the young Baptist Missionaries in *Calcutta*, though not inferior to any Missionaries in India

in abilities and acquirements, both European and Asiatic, nor in Christian zeal and exertions, are sincere enough to confess openly, that the number of their converts, after the hard labour of six years, does not exceed *four* ; and in like manner, the Independent Missionaries of this city, whose resources are much greater than those of Baptists, candidly acknowledge, that their missionary exertions for seven years have been productive only of *one convert*.”—*Corresp.* p. 126.

“The result (says Mr. Adam) of my own observations, of my examination of the different missionary accounts to which I have had access, and of my inquiries from those who, in some cases, have had better means of knowing or of being informed than myself, is, that the number of native converts, properly so called, now living, and in full communion with one or other of the Protestant Missionary Churches, does not exceed three hundred. It will give me pleasure to see it proved that there are nearly a thousand baptized natives ; but it will not surprise me if an accurate investigation should shew that the number of such persons is even less than that which I have stated. Whatever be the number of real converts, however, many of them have relations, children, friends and acquaintances, who, although not converts, may be considered as belonging to the native Christian population, on account of their being brought, in a greater or less degree, within the sphere of Christian instruction. The number of these it would be still more unsatisfactory to compute.”—P. 42.

## POETRY.

### HAPPY HOURS.

Happy hour in which I rise  
From the mists of selfish cares,  
From this vale of vanities,  
From this scene of woes and tears,  
Seeking a sublimer goal,  
For a heaven-aspiring soul.

Happy hour in which I hold,  
Sweet communion with my God ;  
When the book of life unroll'd,  
Shews the upward, onward road,  
Which conducts to heav'n, where rest,  
Peace and joy, await the blest.

Happy hour in which I taste  
Some sweet promise of the day,  
Which the present and the past  
Light with hope's serenest ray ;  
Throwing o'er a future bliss,  
All the brightest beams of this.

### HUMILITY.

Lord! from its deepest, most retired recesses,  
Thee my cheek'd spirit tremblingly addresses;  
And all its weakness, all its fears confessing,  
Implores Thy blessing!

My life is full of error. Hadst Thou set Thee  
To mark my faults, as I, Lord! to forget Thee,—  
Hadst Thou been swift to punish, I had found me  
With terror round me.

But Thou art merciful, though pure, and writest  
No strict account against me, but delightest,  
Not in our bane, but bliss. We are surrounded  
By love unbounded.

If I should wander, call me back t' obey Thee;  
Lead me, and sanctify, and save, I pray Thee;  
Pour out Thy light, Thy love, Thy bounty o'er me—  
To peace restore me.

Thy peace, which makes my heav'n—Thy love, unclouded,  
Which shall shine out at length, however shrouded,  
O let them bless me, and desert me never,  
Now and for ever!

---

### ACCEPTABLE WORSHIP.

Not with trees of Lebanon  
Would we raise  
Altars—Thou all-blessed One—  
To thy praise.  
No! our altars, Lord! shall be  
Bosoms of sincerity.

Not with blood of goats or kine,  
Would we pour  
Offerings to Thy name divine;  
But adore,  
In the meekness and the peace  
Of our spirits' loneliness.

Not with incense steaming high,  
Would we mount  
To Thy temple, in the sky,—  
Glory's fount!  
But in hymns as gently breath'd,  
As the dews by twilight wreath'd.

---

### ADVENT OF CHRIST.

*Single voice.*

Lo! he comes, the Lord of glory,  
Peace and triumph in his train;  
Lo! he comes, by angels guarded,  
Over all the earth to reign.  
Death and darkness  
Would arrest his course in vain.

*Chorus.*

Lo ! he comes, the Lord of glory,  
 Sin and sorrow scatt'ring far ;  
 Lo ! he comes, and at his presence  
 Woe retires and wasting war.  
 Bow before him ;  
 Bow before yon orient star !

Lo ! he comes, the Lord of glory,  
 Shouts of joy his path attend ;  
 Lo ! he comes. Let tribes and nations,  
 Grateful and rejoicing, bend.  
 He has triumph'd,  
 Saviour—Conqueror—Master—Friend.

---

 THE INFANT'S GRAVE.
 

---

Dim is the eye—the eye of blue—  
 No more shall its brightness glow ;  
 And the locks that play'd so gracefully,  
 Repose on a forehead of snow—  
 Not a tear bedews that innocent face,  
 Nor the smile of joy finds a resting-place.

Mute is the tongue—the prattling tongue,  
 That whiled the dull hour away ;  
 The artless wish ne'er shall move it again,  
 The impulse of love give it play—  
 Its accents were sweet—more sweet than the tale  
 The nightingale tells to the evening gale.

Pale is the form—the beauteous form—  
 It is laid in a lowly bed ;  
 The blossom of promise is perished, alas !  
 The gay dreams of hope are all fled :  
 From the spoiler's hand could not innocence save ?  
 See ! the cypress waves o'er the infant's grave.

Pure is the spirit—it lives ! it lives !  
 Nor to death's dread influence yields ;  
 The flight of a seraph it wings sublime,  
 It alights on Elysian fields ;  
 It tastes the pure joys of the blest above,  
 And dwells in the rays of eternal love.

So fades the gem—the fragrant gem,  
 That peeps from beneath the shade ;  
 Drooping it falls from its lowly stem,  
 In the dust its beauties are laid ;  
 Its colours are lost—neglected it lies—  
 But still it is sweet—the perfume ne'er dies.



## OBITUARY.

1824. April 7, at *Philadelphia*, WILLIAM ROGERS, D. D., in the 73rd year of his age. He was born, 1751, in Newport, Rhode Island; his parents being respectable and pious members of the Particular Baptist denomination. Early impressed with the importance of religion, he made a profession of his faith by Baptism, and became a member of the church, of which he was an ornament to the latest period of life. At the age of twelve years, he commenced his preparatory studies for the ministry, and in two years entered the College at Warren—which was afterwards removed to Providence. In 1769, he finished his studies and took his degree of A. B. He was one of the first pupils of this Institution, for which he retained a predilection to the day of his decease. His gratitude to his *Alma Mater* could not be obliterated. Under the superintendence of Dr. Asa Messer, it is become one of the most flourishing Universities in America. It was indeed to the suggestign of Dr. Rogers, that *Brown University* stands indebted for that valuable accession to its library, the books of the late *William Richards*, of Lynn, who admired the broad basis on which it was raised—at once favourable to the right of private judgment, and to the claims of Scriptural Christianity. In 1771, Dr. Rogers was called to the Christian Ministry. Soon after, he left Newport, where he had taught an Academy, and settled at Philadelphia. In March 1772, he took the pastoral charge, by ordination, of the first Baptist Church in that city. Here commenced his ministerial career amidst a people who recognized his merits; whilst he, in return, did every thing in his power to promote their improvement. In this station he would have remained, pursuing the even tenor of his way, had not an event occurred which had been for some time anticipated, and by which the Continent was convulsed to its foundation. This was no other than *the revolt of the Colonies*, which brought on a war of seven long years with the Mother Country, but the successful issue of which ranked the United States among the nations of the earth! At this momentous crisis, the energies, intellectual and moral, of Dr. Rogers were of too high an order to be suffered to remain dormant. In these spirit-stirring times, he was selected to take an assigned station, where he discharged his duties with singular fidelity. In June 1775, the Pennsylvanian Legislature voted

three battalions of foot for the defence of the province, of which he was appointed Chaplain. Not long after, he was promoted to a Brigade Chaplaincy on the Continental Establishment, where he continued during the war, witnessing the incessant alternations of defeat and victory which marked that eventful contest from its rise to its termination. In these conflicts, he mingled with correspondent emotions of sorrow or of joy. After an immense expenditure of money and of blood on the part of Britain, success crowned the cause of his native country, which he had warmly and generously espoused. In 1781, he exchanged the theatre of war for the scenes of a beloved privacy, and which he has been heard to declare he never would have quitted, but for the *amor patriæ* which glowed so vividly in his breast. In his letters to the writer of this article, he often touched on the favourite topic with delight, never mentioning the celebration of the return of the 4th of July, the day on which *American Independence* was proclaimed, but in terms of rapturous exultation. Having once congratulated him upon *the tranquillity of their rising empire*, he, in his reply, spiritedly retorted, “Talk not, my dear friend, after this manner. You forget, we are a vast Republic, having on this side of the water neither empires nor kingdoms amongst us, and of course neither kings nor emperors to disturb our tranquillity.” The watchful patriot is never found slumbering over the hallowed liberties of his country.

The public situation held by Dr. Rogers during the war, brought him frequently in contact with *General Washington*, who seems to have entertained a more than ordinary regard for him. Indeed, he was of great service in introducing certain British emigrants to the illustrious President of the American Republic; one of which interviews was thus communicated by a young man to a friend in this country:—“We waited (June 1793) on Dr. Rogers, a most entertaining and agreeable man. We were with him great part of the time we remained in the city, and were introduced by him to General Washington. The General was not at home when we called, but while we were talking with his private secretary in the hall, he came in, and spoke to Dr. Rogers with the greatest ease and familiarity, immediately asking us up to the drawing room, where was Lady Wash-

ington and his two nieces. When we were seated, the General called for wine and cake, of which we partook; he drinking our health and wishing us success in all our undertakings. The General asked us a number of questions concerning Europe, to all which, you may be sure, we answered in our best manner. It is his general custom to say little, but on this occasion we understood he was more than usually talkative. He made but one remark which, under the circumstances in which it was delivered, has a peculiar energy, that 'we had chosen a *happy country*, and one *large enough*!' After sitting about half an hour, we retired, highly gratified."—The hospitality of Dr. Rogers towards a large portion of Dissenting emigrants who crowded to America at the close of the war, has been the subject of just and general commendation. On his secession from public life, Dr. Rogers had numerous invitations to settle in the ministry. He declined all, and rather chose to be a supernumerary, officiating occasionally in Philadelphia and its vicinity. Though himself a *strict Calvinistic Baptist*, and the head of the American Baptists, yet he preached for ALL denominations—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents and Methodists—sharing alike in the favours of the State, and, however diversified as to modes of worship, living together in peace and harmony. Towards Dr. Priestley, indeed, on his hearing that he had landed in America, an intemperate pulpit ebullition of zeal escaped his lips. But on his becoming acquainted with that *great and good man*, he behaved towards him with the utmost kindness and attention. In one of his letters to the present writer, he says, "Dr. Priestley, when residing at Philadelphia, often took coffee at my house, and I passed some delightful evenings in his company." And he also mentioned in the course of his correspondence, a circumstance honourable to his feelings, that in one of his excursions to the Northern States, he sought out the grave of his old *heretical* friend WINCHESTER, and shed tears to his memory. Here are no indications of rancour or of bigotry. The native kindness of his disposition responded to the spirit of Christianity. Though very zealous and active in the promotion of what are usually denominated *orthodox* sentiments, he never ceased to maintain the sacred right of private judgment in matters of religion. There never existed a warmer friend to the civil and religious liberties of mankind.

But while Dr. Rogers was thus engaged as a divine, he was not an idle member of the republic of letters. A

warm friend to education in every useful department of knowledge, he would have the rising generation well fitted to discharge the duties of society. In 1789, he was elected Professor of English and of Oratory in the College of Philadelphia, and, soon after, in the University of Pennsylvania. The title of D.D. was now conferred upon him, having for many years bore the title of A.M., received from three different literary institutions. He sustained likewise a number of responsible offices to benevolent, moral and religious societies in Philadelphia, whilst his zeal glowed most intensely for the abolition of slavery—the crying abomination of the land. In 1812, he resigned his Professorship in the University, having for twenty-three years discharged its duties with an exemplary assiduity. The decease of such a man must be a loss to any community. Retiring into the bosom of his family, Dr. Rogers passed the remainder of his career with ease and tranquillity, employing himself in a correspondence with literary and religious characters in almost every part of the world. His letters are replete, with good sense, benevolence and piety. The writer of this *obituary*, who became his honoured correspondent in 1818, on the death of their mutually beloved friend, the *Rev. William Richards*, of Lynn, bears testimony to the urbanity of his disposition, and to the sensibilities of his heart. He was married twice: his first wife, an amiable and pious woman, fell a victim to the yellow fever, that scourge of the Western Continent. His second worthy partner survives him—with three daughters—who, living together, and devoutly cherishing his virtues, await—blessed hope!—their reunion with him in heaven. Dr. Rogers did not distinguish himself as an author; but the publication of a volume of sermons is meditated, which, while it exhibits a faithful record of his talents and attainments, will embalm his memory.

The decease of Dr. Rogers was sudden and unexpected. He sustained a severe shock by the death of an *only son*, from which he never fully recovered, though his mind had subsided into a devout resignation to *the will of Heaven*. About a fortnight previous to his dissolution, he was seized with an apoplectic fit, in the act of explaining a passage of scripture to a friend! The stupor induced by this attack was abated by the use of remedies, but a relapse produced a fatal termination. Most placid was his dismission from the burden of mortality; and it is said, that the day after his decease, the features of his countenance as-

sumed an unwonted serenity. He was interred in the Baptist burial-ground, with all possible tokens of respect, and a stone over his remains conveys, in appropriate terms, his merits to posterity.

The writer of this obituary will conclude in the words of his own dedication of the *Cambro-British Biography* to the deceased: "The waves of the wide Atlantic rolling between us oppose no barrier to the sensibilities of the heart. It is no ordinary case for individuals so far apart and of different sentiments, to be knit together in the bands of brotherly affection, who never have known, nor ever will know, each other in this world. But it is the noble prerogative of *Christian friendship* to rise above the impediments of 'this diurnal sphere,' and seek its consummation in a superior condition of being. In a future state of existence, objects at present beheld through *a glass darkly*, will in their finished proportions rush upon our delighted vision, invested with their own radiance, and encircled by an imperishable glory!"

Islington.

J. EVANS.

August 15, whilst on a clerical tour, at *Hambarlotte*, Dr. TWISTLETON, the Hon. the Archdeacon of Ceylon. He had many years most ably and conscientiously fulfilled the duties of Sitting Magistrate at Colombo, and Senior Colonial Chaplain on that station, and was, in 1815, by his Majesty's gracious favour, appointed Archdeacon of the island, as a mark of approbation for his services. He was the second and only brother of the Rt. Hon. Baron Saye and Sele.

Dec. 2, aged 82, the Rev. JOHN TOOGOOD, M.A., Rector of *Kington Magna, Dorset*. He was the son of an opulent mercer at Sherbourne, where he was born, and was educated at the Grammar School under the Rev. Joseph Hill, M.A., and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he took his degree of M.A. June 12, 1766. On the resignation of his former master, Mr. Hill, he was instituted to the living of Kington by John Toogood, Esq., of Sherbourne. He published some Sermons and small Tracts upon religious subjects.—*Gent. Mag.*

1825. Jan. 6, at *Ipswich*, in his 56th year, THOMAS GREEN, Esq. He was educated for the bar, but the easiness of his circumstances led him to choose a life of learned leisure. He united, it is said, a profound knowledge of constitutional law, with a devoted attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty. He published "*The Methodion*;" or, a Poetical Olio." London, 1788, 12mo.—"An

Examination of the Leading Principle of the New System of Morals, as that Principle is stated and applied in Mr. Godwin's Enquiry concerning Political Justice." London, 1798, 8vo. 2nd. edit. 1799.—"Extracts from the Diary of a Lover of Literature." Ipswich, 1810, 4to.

Jan. 13, at *Trowbridge*, Mr. GEORGE WALDRON. He was many years an active and useful member of the Unitarian Baptist congregation in the above town; but during the last few years had resided at Caermarthen, in Wales, and came to Trowbridge to attend the funeral of his sister in September last, though at that time much out of health, and was never after well enough to return to Caermarthen. He suffered much, but his last hours were serene, peaceful and happy. He was buried in the family vault in the meeting-house in Trowbridge, when a suitable address was delivered on the occasion, and a funeral discourse preached on the following Sunday, to a respectable audience, from Psalm xvii. 15.

Jan. 15, at *Liverpool*, at the age of 85, the Rev. ROBERT LEWIN, many years the respected pastor of the Presbyterian congregation now meeting in Renshaw Street. [We should be obliged by some biographical notice.]

Jan. 26, at *Crediton*, aged 37, CATHERINE, only surviving child of the late Christopher EMMET, Esq., of Dublin, niece of Thomas Addis Emmet, Esq., of New York, and of the high-minded, but unfortunate, Robert Emmet, who lost his life in the attempt to revolutionize Ireland, towards the close of the last century. She possessed, in all its better parts, the characteristic temperament of her country. She was ardent, sincere, susceptible and generous, fondly attached to her unhappy country, and an enthusiast for the sacred cause, in which her family had been so fatally engaged. In literature, she had made many rare acquisitions. She was familiar with several of the European languages, and capable of writing or conversing in most of them with a singular degree of fluency and correctness. Her religious opinions were those of Trinitarianism, and her character reflected no discredit upon her creed. Of all with whom the writer of this notice has conversed, she appeared to have the most *impassioned* faith in the reunion of divided friends in a happier life. Hers had been no ordinary trials, and they had fallen upon a heart of no ordinary feeling; but Religion was to her, what it will be to all who prove its efficacy, a source of



high comforts and bright anticipations, amid the reverses of a mutable world.

---

Jan. 29th, at *Bury*, in *Lancashire*, aged 45, Mr. THOMAS JACKSON WOOD. Few persons have ever lived more generally respected and beloved, or died more sincerely and deeply lamented. In his character were united ardent yet rational devotion, with the warmest benevolence; inflexible integrity, with perfect candour; a steady adherence to what he conceived to be truth, with the most unbounded charity to all who differed from him. Society, in him, has lost an amiable and intelligent companion, and the religious community to which he belonged have to regret the removal of an useful and valuable member.

Lord! how mysterious are they ways!  
How blind are we! how mean our  
praise!

Thy steps can mortal eyes explore?  
'Tis ours to wonder and adore.

---

#### *Additions.*

MRS. MARY HUGHES. (See XIX. 754.)

IN the 69th year of her age, Mrs. MARY HUGHES, youngest daughter of the Rev. Edward Hughes, Rector of Norbury, in the county of Stafford. Her pious and excellent father died when the subject of this memoir was only two years old, and she was entirely educated by a mother, who was, by all who knew her, beloved and respected as a woman of most amiable and truly Christian character. From this parent, to whom she was most devotedly attached, Mrs. Mary Hughes early imbibed that deep sense of religion, and those feelings of diffusive benevolence, which in after life formed the distinguishing traits in her character. She gave proof of the former while yet very young, by adopting the excellent plan of every Sunday morning selecting a short text of scripture, intended to be the rule of her conduct during the ensuing week. The writer remembers having heard her mention the three following as having been of the number: "Rejoice always;" "Set your affection on things above;" "Pray without ceasing."

The benevolence of her disposition was early displayed, by the self-denial which she practised in appropriating a fourth of her then small allowance, to the relief of the indigent. As she grew up and this allowance was enlarged, she devoted half of it to the same laudable purpose, and towards the support of such institutions as she believed to be best calculated to promote an object, which by that time began, and ever after continued to en-

gage her attention, and interest her mind in an eminent degree,—the spread of what she believed to be the pure and uncorrupted doctrines of the gospel. To this last division of her income she strictly adhered until the year 1820, when the death of her eldest sister made a considerable alteration in her pecuniary affairs, after which period she prescribed no limits to her liberality, but constantly gave all she could possibly spare, for the same useful and laudable objects.

She took a deep interest in the education of the poor, to promote which in her own neighbourhood, she, in conjunction with her second sister, (whose benevolence of heart was as warm, although her pecuniary means were not so large, as her own,) established a Sunday school in the village of Hanwood, four miles distant from Shrewsbury, where they resided, which, with the aid of a small annual subscription, they carried on for many years to a large extent, and a full account of which may be found in "The Sunday Scholar," which forms No. 40 of The Christian Tract Society's publications.

When seventeen years of age, Mrs. Mary Hughes passed twelve months with some near relations, zealously attached, as she herself was at that time, to the Established Church. On her return home, she found that her much-esteemed friend, the Rev. Edward Harries, of whom an account is given in Vol. VII. of "The Monthly Repository," p. 118, was become an Unitarian, and had led her mother and sisters to adopt, upon full conviction of their truth, his own opinions. She was at first shocked at this change, and argued, as many others have done, "that there would be no merit in faith, were all the things required to be believed, level with our comprehension." Her strong and candid mind, could not, however, long resist the force of the arguments and clear scriptural proofs brought forward by her friend, and by her mother and sisters, in support of their newly-adopted, but firmly-established belief in the Divine Unity; and no sooner was she convinced of their soundness, and of the futility of all she could urge in favour of those opinions which she had hitherto held than she not only openly and fearlessly avowed the change, but with all the ardour natural to a new and zealous convert to Unitarianism, used every means in her power for its dissemination. Nor did these exertions last only whilst the stimulus of novelty continued to operate. All who were acquainted with Mrs. Mary Hughes, knew how warmly interested she was in the cause, and how anxiously she strove to assist it, both by her purse and and by her influence, until the oppressive

weight of daily increasing weakness and indisposition paralyzed these efforts.

It will perhaps surprise some of my readers, who have read the Tracts written by Mrs. Mary Hughes, but who are ignorant of the circumstance about to be mentioned, to hear that she was first led to try her skill in that species of composition, by reading the proposal for the formation of The Christian Tract Society which appeared in the Vol. of this work, for the year 1808, she being at that time *fifty-two* years of age. This first attempt ended in the production of "William's Return," which forms No. 1. of its publications, and which has been succeeded by several others from her pen, published by the same Society, and which are well known to the Unitarian public. It would be difficult to describe either the facility with which she composed those useful and interesting little works, or the delight the employment afforded her. It beguiled many an hour, which pain would otherwise have rendered tedious; for her health, always from infancy feeble, was by this time so much impaired, that neither she herself, nor any of her friends, expected, that a frame so peculiarly fragile and delicate, could have held out so many years, as it was, by care and the Divine blessing, enabled to do. This new and interesting occupation, presented to her active and benevolent mind, another means of benefiting her fellow-creatures, and was besides the means of introducing her to the personal acquaintance of many excellent individuals, to whom she would probably, without it, have remained a stranger.

In the year 1819, she, together with her sisters, removed her residence to Bristol, whither they were accompanied by her two nieces, the daughter and granddaughter of her second sister, who had for the eight preceding years, been inmates of the family. They had long purposed changing their abode from the country to a town, and were influenced in their choice of Bristol, by their wish to attend the ministry of the Rev. John Rowe, with whom and his amiable family they had been acquainted when he was pastor of the Unitarian congregation, High Street, Shrewsbury, and with whom their eldest niece had enjoyed the happiness of being admitted into terms of intimacy, during a previous residence of three years in Bristol. Indeed their wish to place her and her daughter near to these excellent and invaluable friends, that, when death should deprive them of their natural protectors and advisers, they might enjoy the inestimable privilege of their friendship and counsel, had a large share in determining their choice; a choice which the individuals

for whose sake it was in so great measure made, had often the satisfaction of hearing them declare, that, far from having any cause to regret, it had greatly increased their happiness.

During the first three years of her residence in Bristol, Mrs. Mary Hughes found her health somewhat improved, and was enabled to make exertions, to which her strength would have proved inadequate before she quitted Shropshire; but after that period, it again declined, and she was, during the largest part of the two last winters, confined to her apartment. In this very precarious state was she, when the death of her excellent and only surviving sister, after a very short illness, and when she appeared to be recovering, by the severe shock which it gave to her spirits, and the too great exertions which she could not be dissuaded from making, brought on a dangerous illness, from the effects of which she never recovered. Her nervous system had always been peculiarly sensitive, and it being severely shaken by her late mental and bodily sufferings, occasioned a depression of spirits, equally new and painful to herself to experience, and to her friends to witness. She continued weak and languishing, though free from any specific disease, during the space of four months, when she was attacked by an acute one of the inflammatory kind, which was in a few days removed by the skill of her medical friend: but her feeble frame was exhausted; "the delicate machine," as the above-mentioned medical gentleman observed to the writer of this account, "was worn out. The springs which had with difficulty been kept in motion so long, would no more perform their allotted functions." On the tenth day from her seizure, her "spirit returned to Him who gave it."

During the trying period which preceded this, her last illness, she often expressed a fear that if she should remain long in this state of languor and nervous depression, which she found much harder to bear than any pain she had previously suffered, she might become impatient. She prayed often, and earnestly that this might not be the case. "My faith" she would often say, "does not fail, and, blessed be God! I know that even should it at last fail, *His* goodness, and *His* mercy never will."

Her faith did not fail. It rather appeared to gain strength as her bodily powers decayed: during the few last days of her life, she was occasionally delirious, but in her lucid intervals, which were frequent, her mind was tranquil; and although she spoke little, the few words which dropped from her were full of pious resignation and hope; and the last

evening of her life was marked by a characteristic act of benevolence.

M. A. P.

Bristol, February 8, 1825.

The Rev. JOHN DAVIES, of *Collumpton*, of whose character a very just and able sketch was inserted in your last number, (p. 52,) was born on a farm called *Pont y faen*, in the vale of Aeron, and near the little port of Aberaeron, in Cardiganshire; in the neighbourhood of which place some of his relatives are still living. He received his grammar education under the Rev. David Davis, of Castle Howell, in the same county, whose school maintained, for a long series of years, a very high

reputation, and produced many of the first scholars in the Principality, both among the Dissenters and among the clergy of the Establishment. Previously to the elevation of Dr. Horsley to the see of St. David's, candidates for orders were ordained from the Dissenting schools if they passed the appointed examination. With him the practice changed, and none are now admitted who have not received their education at certain licensed clerical schools. The present Bishop's celebrated new College in the recesses of Cardiganshire, will probably introduce another change.

R.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### DOMESTIC.

#### RELIGIOUS.

#### “*Evangelical*” Declaration of War.

The Party insinuate, through both the *Evangelical* and the *Congregational* Magazines, that the hostilities threatened in their manifesto (see last No. p. 56,) are to be carried on. The insinuation is made in a report of the *Blackburn Independent Academy*, inserted in the same form in the two works; whence it appears that the notable scheme for robbing Unitarians of their chapels is the project of the INDEPENDENTS! The would-be plunderers say, “The friends of the Blackburn Academy in particular, and the friends of evangelical truth throughout the country, are reminded of the vast importance of supporting this institution, as clearly evinced in the able and spirited controversy that has for some time been carried on and is still continued in the columns of the Manchester Gazette, with reference to the right of Socinians to most of the places of worship they at present occupy in the north of England.” These Blackburn Independents are somewhat obscure, but we suppose they mean that as they are about to eject the “Socinians” from their chapels, it is the more necessary to educate young Independents to take possession of them! This is rather premature. There is a rule for all things, and robbers do not commonly divide the spoil before it is taken.—The *Congregationalists*, with all their virtues, have the small failing of breaking the Xth commandment by coveting their neighbour's house and every thing that is his. In their last monthly Gazette they give an account of the late Dr. Williams's charities; and having published a list of the Trustees they put it to those gentlemen's consciences, with

edifying simplicity, how they can keep these charities in their own hands, and not rather hasten to transfer them to sound believers in the Assembly's Catechism! By not doing so, remark the Congregationalists, (hard name for such simple Christians!) “these gentlemen have contracted a fearful responsibility,” at least, in the judgment (as they put it) of the *candid*!

#### General Unitarian Association.

The meeting of the General Committee for preparing a plan for the above object is postponed till April, to give gentlemen and societies in the country further time for expressing their opinion of the project. The reader will remember that the plan was stitched up, in a separate half-sheet, with our last number.

The next half-yearly meeting of the Somersetshire, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire Unitarian Missionary Association will be held at Bradford, (in Wiltshire,) on Easter Tuesday, April 5th. The service to begin at eleven o'clock. H.E.H., Sec.

The annual general meeting of the subscribers and friends to the Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Missionary Society, will be held at Exeter on Good Friday next, the 1st of April.

The half-yearly meeting of the Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association will be held at Honiton, (Devon,) on Friday, April 1st. (commonly called *Good Friday*). The Rev. Dr. Davies, of Taunton, has undertaken to preach in the morning. It is expected that there will be a religious service in the evening likewise.

Bridport.

G.B.W.



*Annual Receipts of the Chief Religious Societies.*

[From the Missionary Register for December, where the Table is thus prefaced:—  
In the following List, we have been able to make some addition to the Societies enumerated in that of last year. The total amount exceeds the amount of that year by nearly 40,000*l*. In a few cases, not having received the statements of the year 1823-4, we have re-printed those of the year preceding; as in the American Episcopal and Methodist Missionary Societies, and the Christian-Knowledge and National-Education Societies. It should be noticed, that, in two instances, the Contributions include Government Grants: the Gospel-Propagation Society thus received 92*l* 12*s*. 10*d*.; and the Irish Education Society, 899*l*. 13*s*. 4*d*.]

Societies.	Year.	Contributions.			Sales.			Total Income.		
		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
African Institution .....	1823-4	.....			.....			918	11	10
American Bible .....	1823-4	.....			.....			9,543	16	0
American Board of Missions....	1822-3	.....			.....			12,557	0	0
American Episcopal Missionary	1822-3	.....			.....			852	18	9
American Jews .....	1823-4	.....			.....			1,800	0	0
American Methodist Missionary	1822-3	.....			.....			2,009	10	11
Americ. United For. Missionary	1823-4	.....			.....			3,259	7	0
Anti-Slavery .....	1823-4	.....			.....			3,519	13	5
Baptist Missionary .....	1823-4	.....			.....			12,153	6	2
Baptist (General) Missionary..	1822-3	.....			.....			1,627	19	9
British and Foreign Bible .....	1823-4	55,332	4	8	42,386	12	10	97,718	17	6
British and Foreign School ....	1823-4	.....			.....			1,920	10	4
Christian-Knowledge .....	1822-3	28,263	16	10	26,627	9	2	54,891	6	0
Church-Missionary .....	1823-4	38,955	11	4	316	15	11	39,272	7	3
Church-of-England Tract .....	1823	234	3	0	402	11	2	634	14	2
Continental .....	1823-4	.....			.....			2,014	3	4
Gospel-Propagation .....	1823	.....			.....			16,012	14	8
Hibernian .....	1823-4	7,282	5	4	116	14	0	7,398	19	4
Irish Sunday-School .....	1822-3	1,536	7	0	347	10	2	1,883	17	2
Irish Education .....	1822-3	9,333	8	4	3,278	4	10	12,611	13	2
Irish Tract and Book .....	1822-3	1,166	16	1	2,108	11	6	3,275	7	7
Irish and British Ladies' .....	1822-3	.....			.....			401	6	0
Irish Society of London .....	1823-4	.....			.....			300	9	5
Jews' Society of London .....	1823-4	.....			.....			12,426	0	8
London Missionary .....	1823-4	.....			.....			33,907	2	11
Merchant-Seamen's Bible .....	1823-4	658	11	10	195	3	9	853	15	7
National-Education .....	1822-3	.....			.....			1,996	15	0
Naval and Military Bible .....	1823-4	.....			.....			2,277	7	9
Newfoundland Education .....	1823-4	.....			.....			1,140	12	10
Port-of-London Seamen's .....	1823-4	430	2	2	9	17	6	439	19	8
Prayer-Book and Homily .....	1823-4	1,174	19	7	528	5	4	1,703	4	11
Religious Tract .....	1823-4	3,265	11	5	7,802	13	10	11,068	5	3
Scottish Missionary .....	1823-4	.....			.....			7,331	11	11
Sunday-School Union .....	1823-4	145	12	6	2,263	8	0	2,409	0	6
United Brethren .....	1822	.....			.....			9,644	4	5
Wesleyan Missionary .....	1823	.....			.....			34,650	5	3
Total .....								£406,426	16	5

*Report of the Committee of the Deputies of the Protestant Dissenters to the General Body, December 18, 1824.*

THE Report of the Proceedings of the last year, which, in compliance with the direction of the General Meeting your Committee have prepared, although containing no great mass or variety of information, they hope will prove, on the

whole, not unsatisfactory; its brevity being chiefly owing to what is rather a subject of congratulation, viz., that the ordinary business of supporting Rights and rectifying Wrongs has been comprised within a very narrow compass;—the complaints of Infringement or of Injury having been few, none of a very aggravated nature, and chiefly quieted without much difficulty or any appeal to Public Justice. Of internal disputes there have been several

cases, in some of which the Committee declined to interfere; and others, in which their advice and assistance has proved salutary; but none of sufficient importance to merit a particular narration,

In the business of the Dissenters' Marriages, your Committee would readily have engaged, if they had thought that they could have done it usefully: but on mature consideration of the subject, it seemed probable that an attempt to procure any change in the Law in favour of the Dissenters at large, might injuriously affect the measure which our Unitarian brethren were then soliciting in the House of Lords, without producing any adequate compensation of advantage to the general body; by whom neither had they been called on to take a part:—it was therefore thought most expedient to remain silent, though not uninterested, observers. The issue of that application is too well known to require any minuteness of detail;—it may be sufficient to say, that the friends of civil and religious liberty had ample reason for satisfaction, at least, if not for triumph, in the strain both of the arguments and the language to which the debate of May the 4th, on Lord Lansdowne's motion, "For going into a Committee on the Bill," gave occasion: and the conclusion presented to the country the singular spectacle, of a measure, treated as one of great importance both to the State and the Church, supported by His Majesty's prime minister, and other members of the cabinet; advocated in a manner which did him high honour, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head and prominent guardian of the interests of the Church, and some of his reverend brethren; and yet defeated by a majority of 105 to 66,—which majority, however, it may be observed, included the proxies of 50 Noble Lords who were not present at the debate.

In a later period of the Session, your Committee, participating in the indignation so universally felt throughout the country, at the conduct of the Colonial Government of Demerara, thought it incumbent on them to join the general voice, by presenting a petition to Parliament, conveying a strong censure on those proceedings;—to which step they were also prompted by observing the violent and daring spirit which seemed to pervade some other of the West-Indian Colonies; where, not only in lan-

guage, but by very extraordinary overt acts, bordering closely even on rebellion, they seemed to declare a determination that the religious freedom which is enjoyed in Great Britain under all the securities of law and justice, and which freedom extends to those very Colonies, should be there held (particularly in Barbadoes), on no more secure tenure than the good pleasure of persons, who, by whatever name they might choose to designate themselves, were, in fact, no other than an ignorant, a prejudiced, and infuriated mob; heedless alike of the obligations of morality, and the restraints of law.

On our great object, the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, your Committee have pursued the course pointed out to them; and in the early part of the Session solicited the concurrence and co-operation of the general body of the Ministers, the Protestant Society, and the Unitarian Association: of whom, the latter only signified their approval of an immediate application; the two former declining to join it on the ground only of the unfavourableness of the time. Considering, therefore, the acknowledged importance of unanimity in a matter of so much moment, and of common interest, the Committee thought it better to defer the intention of proceeding by motion, and to confine their operations for the session, to petitions, which were accordingly presented,—that to the Lords, (in the absence of the Bishop of Norwich,) by Lord Holland; and that to the Commons, by the chairman.

On the Committee resuming their meetings in the autumn, the subject was instantly revived,—the co-operation of the same bodies was again requested: Conferences have been held;—preparatory steps have been taken for exciting public attention to the subject;—a general notice thereon has been sent to those Monthly Journals which take more especial cognizance of such matters,—and it is intended to recommend the continuance of these measures to the new Deputation and the new Committee, who will probably ere long take the opinion of some gentlemen of consequence in the House of Commons, as to the time and mode of proceeding in the ulterior stages of this very important affair.

All which your Committee submit to the consideration of the Meeting.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*A List of Joint-Stock Companies, the Proposals for which are now, or have been lately, before the Public.*

A friend, on whose accuracy we can rely, has put into our hands the subjoined extraordinary list; which, though not belonging to the subjects usually embraced by our Magazine, we think it right to put on our pages, as a record of the state of the public mind, in the latter end of the year 1824, and the beginning of the year 1825. There has been no instance of extravagance equal to this which we now exhibit, since the infamous South-Sea Bubble in the year 1720. The number of projects is nearly twice as many as grew out of the mania of the last century; we believe the amount of capital speculated upon is considerably less. Happily, the government have given no countenance to the commercial excitement, but have, on the contrary, intimated very plainly their disapprobation of the principle and plan of many of the schemes proposed. Some of them are, on the face of them, useful, and may in the end be profitable; but the majority are chimerical, and must, in the nature of things, entail loss on the persons duped by them, and disgrace on the projectors. It is now debated in the House of Commons, whether members possessing shares in companies applying for legislative sanction, shall not be deprived of the liberty of voting in these cases. Whatever may be the result, the agitation of the question will probably revive an honourable feeling in the breasts of the members to whom it relates. We call this an enlightened age, and so in many respects it is; but the table below shews how easily the sense of a nation is overruled by the rage for money. The event will, we apprehend, prove the madness of the expectation, which the public are sometimes seduced into, of acquiring riches suddenly and without labour.

1 Saint Catharine's Docks	.	.	.	Tooke, Solicitor	1,200,000
2 South London ditto	.	.	.	Wright, ditto	750,000
3 Bermondsey ditto.	.	.	.	Gatty, ditto	800,000
4 Ditto ditto and Canal	.	.	.	Drew, ditto	
5 Ditto Collier ditto and Coal Depôt	.	.	.	Williams, ditto	750,000
6 All-Saints' and Poplar ditto	.	.	.	Alliston, ditto	
7 Rotherhithe and Deptford ditto	.	.	.	Sweet, ditto	
8 Isle of Dogs Collier ditto	.	.	.	Fortune, ditto	
9 Ditto ditto ditto	.	.	.	Gatty, ditto	
10 Ditto ditto ditto	.	.	.	Freshfield, ditto	
11 Hull New Junction ditto	.	.	.	.	
12 Portsmouth Commercial ditto	.	.	.	.	100,000
13 Cardiff ditto	.	.	.	.	
14 London, Portsmouth, and Southampton Dock and Rail Road	.	.	.	.	2,000,000
15 Ditto ditto ditto Rail Road	.	.	.	.	1,000,000
16 Ditto to Bristol ditto	.	.	.	.	1,500,000
17 Ditto to Birmingham ditto	.	.	.	.	1,500,000
18 Ditto to South Wales ditto	.	.	.	.	1,000,000
19 Ditto Northern ditto	.	.	.	.	2,500,000
20 East London United Docks ditto	.	.	.	.	100,000
21 Grand Western, Southern, and Eastern ditto	.	.	.	.	3,000,000
22 Taunton Grand Western ditto	.	.	.	.	200,000
23 Bristol, Northern and Western ditto	.	.	.	.	800,000
24 Ditto to Birmingham ditto	.	.	.	.	800,000
25 Ditto to Bath ditto	.	.	.	.	100,000
26 Stroud and Severn ditto	.	.	.	.	50,000
27 Kennet and Avon to Old Sarum ditto	.	.	.	.	
28 Birmingham to Liverpool ditto	.	.	.	.	600,000
29 Manchester to ditto ditto	.	.	.	.	400,000
30 Ditto to Leeds ditto	.	.	.	.	500,000
31 Ditto and Bolton ditto	.	.	.	.	150,000
32 Bolton and West Leigh ditto	.	.	.	.	
33 Grand Junction ditto	.	.	.	.	2,000,000
34 General ditto	.	.	.	.	200,000
35 Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex ditto	.	.	.	.	1,000,000
36 Surrey, Sussex, and Hants ditto	.	.	.	.	750,000
37 Kentish ditto	.	.	.	.	1,000,000
38 Canterbury ditto	.	.	.	.	25,000

Carried forward £24,775,000



		Brought forward	24,775,000
39 Brighton to Shoreham	Rail Road	.	.
40 Portsmouth to Southampton	ditto	.	.
41 Exmouth to Exeter	ditto	.	35,000
42 Cromford and High Peak	ditto	.	150,000
43 Leeds to Hull	ditto	.	500,000
44 Huddersfield to Wakefield	ditto	.	.
45 Stockton to Darlington	ditto	.	64,000
46 Duffryn Llynvi to Pwl Cawl	ditto	Glamorganshire	30,000
47 Rumney Iron Works to Pye Corner	ditto	Monmouthshire	.
48 Ditto to the River Usk	ditto	ditto	.
49 Galligate to the Navigation House	ditto	on the Glamorgan Canal	.
50 East Lothian	ditto	.	.
51 Edinburgh to Glasgow	ditto	.	.
52 Dundee to Strathmore	ditto	.	.
53 Berwick to Kelso	ditto	.	.
54 Royal Hibernian General	ditto	.	.
55 Hibernian General	ditto	.	1,000,000
56 Limerick to Waterford	ditto	.	300,000
57 Belfast to Dublin	ditto	.	.
58 Dublin to Kingston	ditto	.	.
59 Tees and Weardale	ditto	.	.
60 Monkland and Meokentillock	ditto	.	.
61 Redruth	ditto	.	.
62 London and Portsmouth Grand Ship Canal	.	.	5,000,000
63 English and Bristol Channel	ditto	.	1,750,000
64 Worcester and Gloucester Union	ditto	.	100,000
65 Berks and Hants	ditto	.	100,000
66 Faversham to the East Swale	ditto	.	33,000
67 Rumford	ditto	.	.
68 Peak Forest and Sheffield	ditto	.	.
69 Canal and Rail Road Terras Pike to Redgate and Pier at East and West Looe, Cornwall	.	.	.
70 Continuation of Elsmere and Chester Canal to Birmingham	.	.	300,000
71 Manchester Ship Canal Company	.	.	1,000,000
72 Hertford Union Canal, from the River Lee to the Regent's Canal	.	.	.
73 Ulster Canal	.	.	.
74 South American and Colonial Gas Company	.	.	1,000,000
75 Jamaica	ditto	ditto	250,000
76 Havannah	ditto	ditto	.
77 Imperial Continental	ditto	ditto	2,000,000
78 British	ditto	ditto	400,000
79 Albion	ditto	ditto	500,000
80 Birmingham and Staffordshire	ditto	ditto	100,000
81 New Imperial	ditto	ditto	250,000
82 Provincial	ditto	ditto	1,000,000
83 United General	ditto	ditto	2,000,000
84 Phoenix	ditto	ditto	450,000
85 Hibernian	ditto	ditto	1,000,000
86 Dublin Oil	ditto	ditto	.
87 Boston	ditto	ditto	.
88 London Portable	ditto	ditto	250,000
89 Provincial ditto	ditto	ditto	1,000,000
90 London and Westminster Oil	ditto	ditto	500,000
91 Aberdeen	ditto	ditto	.
92 Glasgow Oil and Coal	ditto	ditto	100,000
93 Edinburgh	ditto	ditto	.
94 Independent	ditto	ditto	50,000
95 Great Yarmouth	ditto	ditto	16,000
96 Warwick	ditto	ditto	12,000
97 Woolwich	ditto	ditto	12,000
98 North London Oil	ditto	ditto	.
99 Manchester Imperial Oil	ditto	ditto	.
	Carried forward		£46,027,000

					Brought forward	£46,027,000
100	Manchester Oil	Gas Company	.	.	.	
101	Gravesend and Milton	ditto ditto	.	.	.	
102	Rochester	ditto ditto	.	.	.	
103	Stockport	ditto ditto	.	.	.	
104	Cork Portable	ditto ditto	.	.	.	20,000
105	Ashton-Under-Lyne	Water-Works	ditto	.	.	
106	Gas Engine Carriage		ditto	.	.	200,000
107	Stamford and St. Martin's	ditto	ditto	.	.	
108	Stroud	ditto	ditto	.	.	
109	Hereford	ditto	ditto	.	.	
110	Kennington	ditto	ditto	.	.	
111	Leeds Oil	ditto	ditto	.	.	
112	Isle of Thanet	ditto	ditto	.	.	
113	Greenwich and Deptford	ditto	ditto	.	.	
114	Oil Gas		ditto	.	.	
115	Compression	ditto	ditto	.	.	
116	Metropolitan Marine Baths		.	.	.	500,000
117	Royal National	ditto	.	.	.	250,000
118	Australian Agricultural Company		.	.	.	1,000,000
119	Van Diemen's Land	ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
120	Canada	ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
121	Thames Quay	ditto	.	.	.	610,000
122	London Patent Steam Washing	ditto	.	.	.	
123	Australician	ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
124	City of London Central and Northern Improvement Company		.	.	.	800,000
125	Great Westminster Dairy Company		.	.	.	150,000
126	East London	ditto	.	.	.	125,000
127	South London Milk	ditto	.	.	.	100,000
128	Alderney Milk	ditto	.	.	.	100,000
129	Metropolitan Alderney Milk	ditto	.	.	.	60,000
130	Edinburgh Dairy	ditto	.	.	.	30,000
131	Metropolitan Water Works		.	.	.	500,000
132	Thames	ditto	.	.	.	750,000
133	United Thames	ditto	.	.	.	
134	London	ditto	.	.	.	500,000
135	Edinburgh and Leith	ditto	.	.	.	
136	Cheltenham	ditto	.	.	.	
137	Bolton	ditto	.	.	.	
138	Canterbury	ditto	.	.	.	
139	Sea and Inland Coal Company		.	.	.	500,000
140	General United	ditto ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
141	Welch Iron and Coal Mining	ditto	.	.	.	250,000
142	Irish Mining Coal	ditto	.	.	.	
143	British Iron	ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
144	Bristol and South Wales Iron	ditto	.	.	.	500,000
145	South Wales Iron	ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
146	Wilsontown Iron Works and Foundry	ditto	.	.	.	150,000
147	Shotts Iron Joint-Stock Company		.	.	.	
148	British Mining	ditto	.	.	.	400,000
149	Equitable	ditto	.	.	.	200,000
150	English Association Mining	ditto	.	.	.	250,000
151	Hibernian	ditto ditto	.	.	.	500,000
152	Royal Irish	ditto ditto	.	.	.	
153	Imperial	ditto ditto of Ireland	.	.	.	
154	Mining	ditto ditto	.	.	.	
155	Consolidated Copper	ditto ditto	.	.	.	65,000
156	Gold Coast	ditto ditto	.	.	.	750,000
157	Arigna Coal and Iron	ditto ditto	.	.	.	300,000
158	Anglo-Mexican	ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
159	United Mexican Mining Company		.	.	.	240,000
160	Anglo-Chilean	ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,500,000
161	Chilean	ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
					Carried forward	£68,327,000

				Brought forward	£68,327,000
162	Bolanos Mining Company	.	.	.	200,000
163	Brazilian ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
164	New or Imperial Brazilian ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
165	Columbian ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
166	Pascoe-Peruvian ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
167	Real del Monte ditto ditto	.	.	.	200,000
168	General South American ditto ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
169	Tlalpazaban ditto ditto	.	.	.	4,000,000
170	Rio de la Plata ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
171	Association for assisting to work Mines in Mexico and other parts of Spanish America	.	.	.	1,000,000
172	Indemnity Mutual Marine Insurance Company	.	.	.	5,000,000
173	Alliance Marine ditto ditto	.	.	.	5,000,000
174	St. Patrick's ditto ditto ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
175	Patriotic ditto ditto of Ireland	.	.	.	1,500,000
176	South Devon ditto Fire and Life ditto	.	.	.	200,000
177	Commercial ditto ditto of Scotland	.	.	.	1,000,000
178	Alliance British and Foreign Fire and Life ditto ditto	.	.	.	5,000,000
179	Crown Life Assurance ditto	.	.	.	1,500,000
180	Palladium Fire and Life Assurance ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
181	United Empire and Continental Life Assurance ditto	.	.	.	
182	Protector Fire ditto ditto	.	.	.	5,000,000
183	Medical, Clerical and General Life ditto ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
184	Manchester Fire and Life Assurance ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
185	West of Scotland Life Insurance Annuity and Endowment ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
186	Scottish Union Fire and Life Insurance ditto	.	.	.	5,000,000
187	Grand Commercial Assurance Company and Guarantee Association	.	.	.	3,000,000
188	British Annuity Company	.	.	.	3,000,000
189	Equitable Loan Bank	.	.	.	2,000,000
190	United British and Foreign Loan Company	.	.	.	2,500,000
191	London and Manchester Equitable Loan ditto	.	.	.	500,000
192	Metropolitan Loan Investment ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
193	Irish Investment and Equitable Loan ditto	.	.	.	500,000
194	North British Loan ditto	.	.	.	
195	Rock and Reversionary Loan ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
196	Equitable Investment ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
197	Metropolitan ditto ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
198	Ditto Banking ditto	.	.	.	500,000
199	Irish Provincial ditto ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
200	Northern ditto (Belfast) ditto	.	.	.	
201	Native ditto (Dundee) ditto	.	.	.	200,000
202	British Paving, Building and Investment ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
203	Hibernian Joint Stock ditto	.	.	.	800,000
204	Equitable Tontine Glasgow ditto	.	.	.	
205	British Shipping Loan ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
206	Promoter Benefit ditto	.	.	.	60,000
207	General Benefit ditto	.	.	.	50,000
208	Reversionary Interest Society	.	.	.	500,000
209	Berks and Provincial Fire and Life Assurance Company	.	.	.	500,000
210	Dublin Equitable Loan ditto	.	.	.	
211	Annuity Company of Ireland	.	.	.	
212	Metropolitan Flour and Bread Company	.	.	.	
213	Kent and Essex Genuine Flour ditto	.	.	.	210,000
214	Flour and Corn Dépôt ditto	.	.	.	200,000
215	New Corn Exchange ditto	.	.	.	
216	British Shipping ditto	.	.	.	1,000,000
217	Irish ditto ditto	.	.	.	300,000
218	India Steam Packet ditto	.	.	.	
219	London, Yarmouth and Norwich ditto ditto	.	.	.	
220	General Steam Navigation ditto	.	.	.	2,000,000
221	Thames and Isis ditto ditto	.	.	.	120,000
222	Ionian ditto ditto	.	.	.	20,000
				Carried forward	£146,887,000



	Brought forward	£146,887,000
223	Portsmouth, Plymouth, Devenport, and Falmouth Steam Packet Company	
224	London and Leith Steam Packet Company for the Carriage of Goods	500,000
225	London, Brighton and Devon Fishing and Steam Navigation Company	500,000
226	Westminster Fish Company	100,000
227	Metropolitan ditto ditto	500,000
228	British Fishing ditto	1,000,000
229	Thames Tunnel ditto	200,000
230	Ditto ditto ditto, Greenwich to Poplar	
231	Columbian Pearl Fishery Company	625,000
232	St. Catherine's Bridge Suspension Company	
233	West India Company	4,000,000
234	Association for Reclaiming Bogs and certain Waste Lands in Ireland	500,000
235	London Brick Company	500,000
236	British Patent Brick ditto	300,000
237	Bognor New Town ditto	300,000
238	London and Manchester Van Company	40,000
239	British Distillery ditto	200,000
240	St. Ives' New Pier ditto	30,000
241	Sandwich New Harbour ditto	80,000
242	New North Road ditto	11,050
243	Journal ditto	250,000
244	Newspaper Investment ditto	210,000
245	Hammersmith Bridge ditto	75,000
246	Tontine Bridge across the Swale ditto	24,000
247	London Sub-way ditto	100,000
248	Plymouth Public Baths ditto	12,000
249	Scottish Wood Stapling ditto	
250	Joint-Stock Wine ditto of Scotland	
251	Ditto ditto Company for the Manufacture of Paper, Edinburgh	150,000
252	Respectable Concern that will realize, without risk, 40 per cent. the first year, and from 50 to 60 per cent. may be obtained the second and following years; apply to Mr. Henry Bloomfield, 11, Old Jewry, 1000 Shares of £10 each (Times, Feb. 2, 1825)	10,000
Total of the Capital as far as the amount has been ascertained		£157,104,050

#### PARLIAMENTARY.

The Parliament met on the 4th instant. The King's speech was conciliatory and satisfactory, except that measures were recommended against the Catholic Association in Ireland. The debates turned upon Ireland, and in both houses allusions were made to the late decrees for securing religious liberty in Hanover, the King of which appears so much more enlightened than the ministers of the King of Great Britain. On the second day's debate in the Commons, Colonel PALMER amused the House by an allusion to Captain Rock, (Thomas Moore's celebrated book in favour of the aggrieved Irish,) and to Mr. Irving, the popular Scottish preacher in London, at whose church he had met some of the ministers, and whose exhortations in behalf of tolerance and clemency he hoped the ministers would follow. Mr. HUME gave notice on the 7th, of a motion on the 3rd of March for a Select Committee to investigate the

Church Establishment of Ireland. The chief discussions since have been on the bill of the ministers for putting down the Catholic Association of Dublin. These lasted four nights, during which both sides of the House exhibited a splendid eloquence peculiar to the House of Commons. The argument was, we think, on the opposition side; we need not say that the votes were on the other side. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT's speech is allowed on all hands to have been masterly; and the hearers of the debate pronounced it to have been the best delivered during this great contest. One of the members read from the newspapers the report of the Bible Debate in Ireland, when a Catholic Priest personated a "Socinian," and pronounced that on Protestant principles his argument was conclusive. The ministers' bill against the Catholic Association is now in progress, and will no doubt be carried, though petitions, signed by thousands upon thousands, are presented against it, some of

these by Irish freeholders, landholders and capitalists. A curious fact has come out, that the Marquiss Wellesly, the Lord Lieutenant, has sent a document to the Cabinet in which he attributes the present peace of Ireland to the Catholic Association. Attempts have been made to raise the "No Popery" cry, and to get up Anti-Catholic petitions, but without effect, except as regards a few of the rural clergy. The bill against the Usury laws has been lost, chiefly through the activity of a few members of corporations and country gentlemen, against the political economists and the majority of the ministry. The Unitarian MARRIAGE BILL was read a first time, without an observation, on the 23rd instant, on the proposal of Mr. WILLIAM SMITH, and is to be read a second time on the 4th of March, when the ministers in the Lower House will have made up their minds as to the course to be pursued. There is a probability, we should hope, of the bill passing the Lower House; of its reception from the Upper House, the experience of last year allows us to form a tolerably accurate opinion. It seems to have been judged expedient, by the supporters of the Bill, that no further petitions should be presented.

#### LITERARY.

In the Press, and will appear early in Autumn, *Four Volumes of Sermons*, by the Rev. PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D. D., agreeably to a clause in his will to that purpose, and four MSS., which will be furnished by the Family.—Such an acquisition will be duly appreciated by the religious world.

*Archdeacon WRANGHAM* is said to be engaged in preparing for the Press, *Walton's Prolegomena*, with additional notes.

Cambridge, Dec. 31.—The prize for the Hulsean Dissertation for the year 1824, is adjudged to James Amiraux Joremie, B. A., Scholar of Trinity College.—Subject, "The Doctrines of our Saviour, as derived from the four Gospels, are in perfect harmony with the Doctrines of St. Paul, as derived from his epistles." Friday, Jan. 7. The following is the subject of the Hulsean Prize Dissertation for the present year: "In what respects the Law is a Schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ."—*New Monthly Mag.* p. 61.

#### FOREIGN.

##### HANOVER

The KING of this Country has lately issued edicts in favour of Religious Liberty, and of an equitable administration of Church Revenues. Were Ireland Hanover, how little cause would the Irish have to complain!

*Proclamation, George IV., &c.*

It having come to our knowledge, that some doubts are entertained respecting the interpretation and application of the first paragraph of the 16th article, of the act of the German Confederation of the 8th of June 1815, which is to the following effect; "The difference of the Christian religious communities, cannot lead to any difference in the enjoyment of civil and political rights, in the countries composing the Germanic Confederation;" we are induced to issue the following declaration and ordinance:

1. The several professors of the Christian faith, enjoy a perfect equality of civil and political rights in the kingdom, and, in conformity with the said article, the notion of a predominant and of a merely tolerated church, is entirely abolished.

2. All Christian religious communities have a right to the unobstructed and free exercise of their religious worship, and every clergyman can require the surplices, &c. only from the parishoners of his own persuasion. Consequently,

3. Those inhabitants who belong to a different Christian persuasion from that of the parish, are to pay the fees, &c. only to the clergyman of their persuasion, to whose parish they are positively annexed. Fees can be required by a clergyman of a different persuasion, when he has been required to perform an official duty, and has really performed it.

4. On the other hand, all dues to churches and schools, which proceed from houses, farms, and other landed property in a parish, without regard to the personal qualifications of the professor in respect to his religious belief, are still to be paid to those entitled to them by every possessor, even if he belong to a Christian party different from that of the parish.

5. Contains regulations for the entries in the church books.

*Hanover, Dec. 18.*

##### AMERICA.

Two new Unitarian Churches have been erected, one in Boston and the other in Salem, Mass.; the former has been recently dedicated to the worship of the only living and true God.

Mr. William H. Furness has accepted the invitation of the Unitarian Church in Philadelphia to become their Pastor, and is to be ordained the 12th of January next. It is expected that the Rev. Dr. Kirkland, President of Harvard University, will preach on the occasion.

#### MEXICO.

"It is decreed that the traffic of slaves, under whatever flag or nation, is for ever prohibited in the territories of the Mexican United States."

"*Evangelical*" alarm.—"The Evangelical Witness, published under the patronage of the American Evangelical Tract Society," has the following "Item of Intelligence" in the Number for April last:—"The sixth Number of a Unitarian Journal, entitled 'The Christian, &c' has been issued in Philadelphia.—The Socinian editors congratulate their readers on the approximation which 'the respectable theological school at Andover,' is making towards 'the truth that is in Jesus,' i. e. towards Socinianism. They assert, that Dr. Murdock, in a dissertation lately delivered in that Divinity school, has given up every thing like Calvinism. We fear there is too much reason for their exultation. SOCINIANISM MAKES ALARMING PROGRESS."

A new plan of religious instruction has been adopted in Transylvania University, Kentucky, by an unanimous vote of the Academical Faculty, and the Board of Trustees. By this measure, the ministers of every religious denomination, in Lexington, are invited to preach in turn, during the academical session, in the chapel of that University. In this list are included the ancient people of God, the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists and the Methodists. "It is believed," says President Holley, "that this is a measure eminently calculated to unite public sentiment, to secure public confidence, to advance the interests of truth, to extend Catholicism, and to excite a spirit of emulation in the cause of religious liberality."

#### SWITZERLAND.

At a late meeting of the students in Theology, the Bishop of Basle earnestly exhorted the pupils of the Catholic persuasion "to preserve amity and good feeling with their Protestant class-fellows, under pain of being refused ordination."

#### PRUSSIA.

The King has just issued an order (28th Dec. 1824) relating to the Censorship of the Press. To Englishmen this is so odious an usurpation of power, that we can hardly speak of it with coolness: but really there is some discrimination, not to say humour, in his majesty of Prussia's rescript. "—editions are not allowed of works that generally attack the foundations of all religion, strive to render important truths suspicious, contemptible or ridiculous, or dare to represent to the people the Christian religion, the Bible, as well the historical as dogmatical truths contained therein, as objects of doubt or even derision, by which the base of all religious sentiment is undermined.—I, at the same time decree, that with respect to works intended for a more confined circle of readers, or only for *savans*, all undue and bitter attacks are avoided and suppressed, which do not tend to the direct support of any opinion, or to the calm refutation of sentiments in opposition, and stigmatize as heretics those who entertain opposite religious opinions."—"What," exclaims the Editor of the *Journal des Debats*, at Paris, "would become of the *Etoile* if it was published in Prussia?" And what, we ask, would become of the Evangelical, Congregational and Baptist Magazines, and the long list of intolerant and abusive periodicals?

#### RUSSIA.

*The Jews.*—The measures lately ordered by the Emperor of Russia relative to the Jews in Poland, and the desire expressed by his Majesty to make them apply to agriculture, give an interest to a communication from the south of Russia, by which we learn, that about five miles from Nikotajeu, in the Government of Cherson, there has existed for several years a Jewish village, with very fine fields and pastures, built and inhabited by Israelites. This village, Jese Nahr, in the vicinity of which there are six other smaller villages of the same kind, most of them with Hebrew names, is inhabited by about fifty families. Their fields are diligently and skilfully cultivated, though there is not a Christian peasant in the whole village. They have good artisans and workmen of every description, and are now building a synagogue. As soon as the harvest is over, those who understand a mechanical trade are allowed to go into the neighbouring towns to exercise it, furnished with a passport from the magistrates. The women endeavour to earn something during the winter, by getting work from the inhabitants of the



towns, which they make at home. The young colony is indebted for its origin and present prosperity to Nahum Funkelstein, who was in the sequel, its chief bailiff. Though he is a rich man, he set his brethren the example by keeping his own children assiduously employed in agricultural labour, and by this, and through indefatigable industry and patience, he has brought the little community to its present thriving condition.

#### TURKEY.

*The Bible.*—It is rather a singular coincidence, that while the Pope and the Roman Catholic clergy are making such great exertions to suppress the Bible, the Grand Seignior should issue a firman for the same purpose, from which the following is an extract:—

“Know that it is ascertained, that books have been printed in Europe, viz. Bibles, Psalters, Gospels with the History of the Apostles at the end; two or three thousand of each sort, with a tract in Persian; and there have come to my capital two or three hundred of each sort, with four or five of the Persian tracts. And as it is my duty to prevent entirely such things when they happen in my kingdom during my reign, let these books be returned to Europe; and if hereafter

any of them arrive at the custom-houses, let careful search be made and advice sent to my capital, in order that none may be sold or bought. Likewise, let no Turk whatever take any of these false books; and when any of them are found, let them be taken and cast into the fire that they may be burnt, and let them not be bought or sold in any country.”

Another account states—“The Grand Seignior has issued a firman prohibiting the circulation of the Scriptures, which had been translated into the Persian language. The firman was put into the hands of the Cadi, who sent for the chiefs of the different Christian sects, told them what the Sultan’s orders were, and ordered them to cause all their people who had any of these books in their possession to deliver them up, threatening to hang any man who should be found to keep back any of them. The Cadi also ordered the sequestration of the copies of the sacred scriptures.”

#### EAST INDIES.

The King of Oude has compiled and printed a Persian Dictionary, in seven large folio volumes. A magnificent copy of this work, bound in the Oriental style, has been presented, by his Majesty, to the Rev. Professor Lee.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Tales and Miscellaneous Pieces. By Maria Edgeworth, now first collected and printed, in an uniform edition. 14 vols. Foolscap. 4l. 4s.

The System of Infants’ Schools. By W. Wilson, M. A., Vicar of Walthamstow. 8vo. 8 Engravings. 6s.

The Christian Ministry defended; and Priestcraft exploded. By Richard Wright. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Thoughts on Paul’s Man of Sin. By the Same. 8vo. 4d.

Antichrist detected among reputed Orthodox Christians. By the Same. 8vo. 4d.

The Restitution of all Things. An Essay. By the Rev. James Brown, D. D. late of Barnwell, Northamptonshire. 8vo. 4s.

Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures. In 3 Parts. I. From the Geography of the East. II. From the Natural History of the East. III. From the Customs and Manners of Ancient and Modern Nations. By Geo. Paxton, Professor of Theology of the Associate Synod, Edinburgh, 2nd

Edition, corrected and greatly enlarged. 3 Vols. 8vo. Portrait and Map. 1l. 16s.

Tabula Theologica; or the Elements of Scriptural Knowledge, presented in one Tabular View, for the Use of Students, who would decline the Popular Extremes of Materialism and Fanaticism. Engraved on one Large Sheet, done up in a Case, or on Canvas and Rollers. 1l. 1s.

The Progress of Dissent: Observations on the Quarterly Review. By a Non. Con. 1s. 6d.

Practical Observations upon the Education of the People, addressed to the Working Classes and their Employers. By H. Brougham, Esq., M. P., F. R. S. 6d. 5s. per dozen. 1l. 14s. per hundred.

A Final Appeal to the Literary Public, relative to Pope, in Reply to certain Observations of Mr. Roscoe, in his Edition of that Poet’s Works. To which are added, some Remarks on Lord Byron’s Conversations, as far as they relate to the same subject and the Author. By W. L. Bowles, A. M., Prebendary of Sarum, &c. 8vo. 7s.

The Man of Sin in a Decline, according to the Prophecy of St. Paul. By J. Nicholson, A. M., Curate of Great Paxton. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Cobbett's Book of the Roman Catholic Church. 4 Parts. 3d. each.

A True History of the Protestant Reformation, in reply to Cobbett. In Nos. No. I. 3d.

Theatre of the Greeks; containing, in a Compendious Form, a great body of Information relative to the Rise, Progress, and Exhibition of the Greek Drama, &c., &c. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Poetical Works of John Milton; with Notes of various Authors, and Newton's Life. By Edward Hawkins, M. A., Fellow of Oriel College Oxford. 4 Vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Westminster Hall; or, Anecdotes and Reminiscences of the Bar, Bench, and Woolsack; with the various Reliques and Curiosities of Legal History, Biography, and Literature. 3 Vols. small 8vo. 20 Portraits and Engravings. 1l. 1s.

Histoire de la Revolution de 1688 en Angleterre. Par M. Mazure, Inspecteur Général de l'Université de France. 3 Vols. 8vo.

The History of England, during the Reign of Geo. III., being a Continuation to Hume and Smollett. By W. Jones, Author of "the History of the Waldenses." 3 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s. Extra bds.

The Annual Biography and Obituary, for the Year 1825. 8vo. 15s.

Memoirs of the Life of J. P. Kemble, Esq., including a History of the Stage, from the Time of Garrick to the Present Period. By J. Boaden, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. Portrait. 1l. 8s.

Memoirs of Jeanne D'Arc, surnamed La Pucelle D'Orleans, with the History of her Times. 2 Vols. 8vo. Portrait and Plates. 36s.; large paper, 4l. 4s.

Travels in Russia, the Crimea, Caucasus and Georgia. By Robert Lyall, M. D. F. L. S. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

A Visit to Greece, containing Various Facts respecting the Revolution, which have been very lately collected in that Country. By George Waddington, Esq. Author of "Travels in Ethiopia. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Tour in Germany, and some of the Southern Provinces of the Austrian Empire, in the years 1820—22. By John Russell, Esq. 2nd Edition. 2 Vols. 12mo. 16s.

Recollections of Foreign Travel, on Life, Literature, and Self-Knowledge, By Sir Egerton Brydges, Bart. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

Travels in South America, during the years 1819—1821. By Alexander Cald-

cleugh, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. Map and 9 Engravings. 1l. 10s.

An Historical Outline of the Greek Revolution. Map. 8vo. 5s.

The War in the Peninsula, being a Continuation of the "Recollections of the Eventful Life of a Soldier." 12mo. 5s.

The Hermit in Italy; or, Observations on the Manners and Customs of the Italians at the Commencement of the 19th Century. 3 Vols. 12mo. 18s.

Lionel Lincoln; or, the Leaguer of Boston. By the author of the "Pilot," &c. 3 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

The Tragical History of Hamlet. By W. Shakespeare. Accurately reprinted from the only known copy of the 1st Edit. of 1603. 8vo. 5s.

The Death of Absalom. A Seatonian Prize Poem. By Hamilton Sidney Beresford, A. M., of Clare Hall, Cambridge. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Odes and Addresses to Great People.

Religion and the Oppressed Greeks, a Poem. 12mo. 4d.

The Poet's Pilgrimage, an Allegorical Poem, in 4 Cantos. By J. Payne Collier. Foolscap 4to. 8s.

The Bar. with Sketches of Eminent Judges, Barristers, &c., a Poem, with Notes. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

Walker's Companion to Dr. Rippon's Tune-Book. No. I. of a Second Volume. 2s.

The Annual Biography and Obituary, for the Year 1825. 8vo. 15s.

Popery in 1824; a Circular Letter of Pope Leo XII. to all the Patriarchs, &c. of the Roman Catholic Church; and the Bull of Jubilee for the Year 1825. From the Latin, with Introduction and Notes. 8vo. 6d.

*Ireland.*

A Letter from the King to his Catholic Subjects. 2s. (*Unauthentic.*)

A Voice from Ireland in 1825, addressed to all Englishmen. 8vo. 2s.

Hints to Irish Landlords. By a Land Agent. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

An Authentic Exposure of Irish Affairs, calculated to elucidate the Chief Causes of the Present Condition of that unhappy Country. By E. H. Orpen, Esq. 2s.

A Sketch of Ireland in 1824; the Sources of her Evils considered and their Remedies suggested. 2s.

Letters on the Pernicious Tendency of the Biblical System, and the Disastrous Consequences, Moral and Physical, which have resulted and must continue to result from that System—formed on the absurd, the impious and unscriptural principle, The Bible alone the Rule of Faith. By

Clerophilos. First Series. (Dublin.) 2s. 8½d.

The Real Grievance of the Irish Peasantry, as immediately felt and complained of among themselves, with an Address to the British Nation on Roman Catholic Emancipation. By a Beneficed Clergyman, in the South of Ireland.

Simple Memorials of an Irish Family. By a Clergyman. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

Letters from Ireland, on the Present Political, Religious, and Moral State of that Country. Republished from the Courier Newspaper. 2s. 6d.

The Case of Ireland set at Rest; a Letter to the Rt. Hon. R. Peel, M. P. By W. Frith, Serjeant at Law. 1s. 6d.

A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam, on the Disturbance at a Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Oct. 21, 1824, at Loughrea. By a Senior of the Church of England.

#### Sermons.

A Series of Orations. In Four Parts. 1. The Doctrine. 2. The Experiment. 3. The Argument. 4. The Duty. By Edward Irving, A. M. (Part 1, The Doctrine, for the Benefit of the Widow Smith. 4s. sewed.)

Discourses on some Important Subjects of Natural and Revealed Religion, introduced by a short View of the best Specimens of Pulpit Eloquence, &c. By David Scott, M. D., Minister of Corstorphine. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

On Faith, and other Subjects. By Robert Nares, M. A., F. R. S., Archdeacon of Stafford, &c. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Five, on the Personal Office of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. Preached at Berwick upon-Tweed. By W. Procter, Jun. A. M., Fellow of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Parochial and Domestic. By R. S.

Barton, Vicar of Alconbury, Hants. 12mo. 4s.

Twenty-Two, on various Subjects, delivered in St. Michael's Church, Gloucester, A. D. 1824. By B. S. Claxson, M. A. Curate. 8vo. 9s.

Eternal Life; or, a Future State the Universal Doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures. Three Sermons. 2s. 6d.

#### Single.

The Primitive Christian Faith: delivered in the Evening Service at the Opening of the Chapel in York Street, St. James's Square, London, Dec. 19, 1824. By Lant Carpenter, LL.D. 8vo.

The Principles of Protestant Dissent: preached at Bolton, at the Ordination of the Rev. Franklin Baker, M. A., Sept. 23, 1824. By James Hews Bransby. 8vo.

The Ordination Services at the Settlement of the Rev. T. Price, at the Particular Baptist Church, Devonshire Square. 8vo. 3s.

The Importance of an Early and Decided Attention to the Concerns of a Future World: delivered to Young People, Jan. 1, 1825, in Carter Lane, Doctors' Commons. By John Hoppus, A. M.

A View of Slavery in Connexion with Christianity: delivered in the Wesleyan Chapel, Stoney Hill, Jamaica, Sept. 19, 1824. By Robert Young, Wesleyan Missionary. With an Appendix, containing the Resolutions of the Missionaries in that Connexion, at a General Meeting at Kingston, Sept. 6, 1824.

The Night and the Day; on Behalf of the Church Missionary Society at St. Saviour's, Southwark, Dec. 12, 1824. By Thomas Mortimer, M. A.

On the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, delivered at the Independent Monthly Meeting. By Joseph Fletcher, A. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Mr. John Esdaile; Mr. S. Parker; E. T.; P.; E.; and Homo.

The Rev. J. A. James, of Birmingham, has addressed a letter to us, complaining of and denying the charge of plagiarism brought against him in the last number (p. 60). The writer of the paper in question instructs us to say, that he took his statements entirely from the pamphlet entitled, "The Plagiary Warned;" but that he esteems it just to Mr. James to compare his Sermon with Archbishop Tillotson's, and that he will state freely the result of such comparison in the next number; in which also shall be inserted Mr. James's letter.

Mr. Dowden, of Cork, has sent us a letter relating to the Rev. Thomas Halliday, formerly assistant Tutor at Daventry, which we scarcely deem it prudent to publish, but which we beg to inform any of Mr. Halliday's friends who may be our readers, demands their immediate attention. The letter may be seen on written application to the Editor at the Publishers'.

We are requested to say that our Correspondent S., p. 33, is invited to open a correspondence with Mr. D. Eaton, High Holborn, on the subject of his manuscript.